

1.1.7 Physician Exercise of Conscience

Physicians are expected to uphold the ethical norms of their profession, including fidelity to patients and respect for patient self-determination. Yet physicians are not defined solely by their profession. They are moral agents in their own right and, like their patients, are informed by and committed to diverse cultural, religious, and philosophical traditions and beliefs. For some physicians, their professional calling is imbued with their foundational beliefs as persons, and at times the expectation that physicians will put patients' needs and preferences first may be in tension with the need to sustain moral integrity and continuity across both personal and professional life.

Preserving opportunity for physicians to act (or to refrain from acting) in accordance with the dictates of conscience in their professional practice is important for preserving the integrity of the medical profession as well as the integrity of the individual physician, on which patients and the public rely. Thus physicians should have considerable latitude to practice in accord with well-considered, deeply held beliefs that are central to their self-identities.

Physicians' freedom to act according to conscience is not unlimited, however. Physicians are expected to provide care in emergencies, honor patients' informed decisions to refuse life-sustaining treatment, and respect basic civil liberties and not discriminate against individuals in deciding whether to enter into a professional relationship with a new patient.

In other circumstances, physicians may be able to act (or refrain from acting) in accordance with the dictates of their conscience without violating their professional obligations. Several factors impinge on the decision to act according to conscience. Physicians have stronger obligations to patients with whom they have a patient-physician relationship, especially one of long standing; when there is imminent risk of foreseeable harm to the patient or delay in access to treatment would significantly adversely affect the patient's physical or emotional well-being; and when the patient is not reasonably able to access needed treatment from another qualified physician.

In following conscience, physicians should:

- (a) Thoughtfully consider whether and how significantly an action (or declining to act) will undermine the physician's personal integrity, create emotional or moral distress for the physician, or compromise the physician's ability to provide care for the individual and other patients.
- (b) Before entering into a patient-physician relationship, make clear any specific interventions or services the physician cannot in good conscience provide because they are contrary to the physician's deeply held personal beliefs, focusing on interventions or services a patient might otherwise reasonably expect the practice to offer.
- (c) Take care that their actions do not discriminate against or unduly burden individual patients or populations of patients and do not adversely affect patient or public trust.
- (d) Be mindful of the burden their actions may place on fellow professionals.
- (e) Uphold standards of informed consent and inform the patient about all relevant options for treatment, including options to which the physician morally objects.

- (f) In general, physicians should refer a patient to another physician or institution to provide treatment the physician declines to offer. When a deeply held, well-considered personal belief leads a physician also to decline to refer, the physician should offer impartial guidance to patients about how to inform themselves regarding access to desired services.
- (g) Continue to provide other ongoing care for the patient or formally terminate the patient-physician relationship in keeping with ethics guidance.

AMA Principles of Medical Ethics: I,II,IV,VI,VIII,IX

Background report(s):

CEJA 1-I-14 Physician exercise of conscience

REPORT 1 OF THE COUNCIL ON ETHICAL AND JUDICIAL AFFAIRS (I-14)
Physician Exercise of Conscience
(Reference Committee on Amendments to Constitution and Bylaws)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As practicing clinicians, physicians are expected to uphold the ethical norms of their profession, including fidelity to patients and respect for patient self-determination. At the same time, as individuals, physicians are moral agents in their own right and, like their patients, are informed by and committed to diverse cultural, religious, and philosophical traditions and beliefs. In some circumstances, the expectation that physicians will put patients' needs and preferences first may be in tension with the need to sustain the sense of moral integrity and continuity that grounds a physician's personal and professional life.

Preserving opportunity for physicians to act (or to refrain from acting) in accordance with the dictates of conscience in their professional practice is important for preserving the integrity of the medical profession as well as the integrity of the individual physician. This report examines the implications for patients, physicians, and the medical profession when tensions arise between a physician's professional commitments and his or her deeply held personal moral beliefs. It offers guidance on when a physician's professional commitments should outweigh personal beliefs as well as when physicians should have freedom to act according to the dictates of conscience while still protecting patients' interests.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON ETHICAL AND JUDICIAL AFFAIRS*

CEJA Report 1-I-14

Subject: Physician Exercise of Conscience

Presented by: Patrick W. McCormick, MD, Chair

Referred to: Reference Committee on Amendments to Constitution and Bylaws
(Mary E. LaPlante, MD, Chair)

1 The practice of medicine is inherently a moral activity, founded in a “covenant of trust” between
2 patient and physician.[1,2,3] The respect and autonomy that medicine enjoys rest on the
3 profession’s commitment to fidelity and service in the patient-physician relationship, and on
4 individual physicians’ recognition that in becoming members of the profession they commit
5 themselves to upholding its core ethical values and obligations.
6

7 Yet physicians are not defined solely by their profession. As individuals, physicians are moral
8 agents in their own right and, like their patients, are informed by and committed to diverse cultural,
9 religious, and philosophical traditions and beliefs, as well as the expectations of their profession. In
10 some situations, the expectation that as healers, physicians will put patients’ needs and preferences
11 first may be in tension with the physician’s own need to sustain the sense of moral integrity and
12 continuity that grounds his or her personal and professional life. In such situations, physicians must
13 decide whether and how personal conscience should guide their professional conduct.
14

15 Preserving opportunity for physicians to act in accordance with the dictates of conscience is
16 important for preserving the integrity of the medical profession as well as the integrity of the
17 individual physician. Ethically sound patient-physician relationships and the practice of medicine
18 as a moral activity rest on trust in physicians’ personal and professional integrity. Thus physicians
19 should have considerable latitude to practice in accord with well-considered, deeply held beliefs
20 that are central to their self-identities. Nonetheless, both as individual moral agents and as members
21 of a profession dedicated to promoting the welfare of patients, physicians have a responsibility to
22 be thoughtful and deliberative in making such decisions.
23

24 CONSCIENCE, INTEGRITY & DEEPLY HELD BELIEFS

25
26 When individuals speak of “acting in good conscience” or of acting in a way that preserves their
27 “integrity,” they are saying that they seek to align their decisions and actions with the deeply held
28 beliefs that shape their self-identity as moral agents. To have integrity requires that “one’s words
29 and deeds generally be true to a substantive, coherent, and relatively stable set of values and
30 principles to which one is genuinely and freely committed.”[4] Those values and principles—
31 which encompass not only religious beliefs, but also moral, social, and political values[5]—are
32 central to an individual’s understanding of who he or she is[6,7,8] as an individual and, for some,
33 as a professional.

* Reports of the Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs are assigned to the Reference Committee on Amendments to Constitution and Bylaws. They may be adopted, not adopted, or referred. A report may not be amended, except to clarify the meaning of the report and only with the concurrence of the Council.

1 Having integrity provides a sense of personal identity, along with satisfaction and self-respect in
2 knowing that one lives in accord with one's beliefs.[4] Acting against one's conscience can create a
3 sense of self-betrayal, loss of self-respect, and a feeling that one undermines one's
4 integrity.[5,6,7,8] Having integrity "provides the basis for reliance, trust, friendship, and love." [4]
5 When an individual's integrity is called into question, the trust others extend to him or her is
6 undermined.

7
8 A claim to exercise conscience is underpinned by a claim that an act supports or violates one's
9 deeply held beliefs. It does not rest on intuition or emotion, but requires that the individual
10 carefully consider what is at stake for the patient, the profession, and the physician and be able to
11 articulate how the "substantive, coherent, and reasonably stable" values and principles that
12 constitute those beliefs justify acting one way or another. A claim to exercise conscience also
13 requires willingness to accept the consequences of that action.[7,9]

14 15 PHYSICIANS' PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

16
17 As a profession, medicine is dedicated to "a certain degree of altruism, or suppression of self-
18 interest when the welfare of those [it serves] requires it." [10] In becoming members of the
19 profession of medicine, physicians commit themselves to upholding its ethical standards and
20 expectations. Physicians' freedom to practice medicine within the bounds of their conscience must
21 be considered in light of their professional responsibilities to their patients.

22
23 With certain exceptions, physicians are free to choose whether and with whom to establish a
24 patient-physician relationship.[11,12] A physician must provide emergency care unless another
25 qualified health professional is available, but a physician may decline to provide care for any
26 individual patient so long as the decision is not based on characteristics that would constitute
27 "invidious discrimination," such as race, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, or
28 disease status.[13,14,15,16,17]

29
30 Prior to forming a patient-physician relationship, physicians have considerable latitude to establish
31 expectations in accord with their well-considered, deeply held beliefs. Certain specialties or
32 geographic locations may incur increased responsibilities on the part of physicians to establish
33 these expectations. However, once a physician has agreed to enter into a patient-physician
34 relationship, his or her first responsibility is to the patient.[11,18] Physicians' fiduciary obligations
35 to patients include putting patient interests and well-being ahead of the physician's personal
36 considerations [11] and respecting the patient as an autonomous decision maker.[18,19,20] To be
37 able to participate meaningfully in decisions about their health care, patients must be confident that
38 their physician will present medical facts accurately and make recommendations in accordance
39 with good medical practice,[21] and that the physician will not withhold information without the
40 patient's agreement.[22]

41
42 Having once taken on the care of a patient, physicians have a further duty not to abandon the
43 patient, encompassing obligations not to neglect the patient and to "support continuity of
44 care." [14,23] While a physician may ethically withdraw from a case, he or she must notify the
45 patient of the intent to withdraw sufficiently in advance to allow transfer of care to another
46 physician.[23]

47 48 CONSCIENCE & PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

49
50 In some circumstances, a physician may find that the dictates of his or her conscience do not align
51 with the professional ethical expectation that a physician will provide care in keeping not only with

1 a patient’s medical needs, but also with the patient’s values, preferences, and goals for care.
 2 Resolving—or at least reducing—the moral tension this creates requires that the physician exercise
 3 discernment and thoughtful judgment.

4
 5 Perhaps most commonly, this tension arises when a physician is asked to provide an intervention
 6 that the individual believes is inconsistent with or would outright violate his or her deeply held
 7 beliefs and, thus, compromise his or her integrity. Such situations would include, for example,
 8 those in which the physician objects to providing “a legally and professionally permitted service,
 9 such as abortion, sterilization, prescribing or dispensing emergency contraception, and organ
 10 retrieval pursuant to donation after cardiac death.”[8] These situations should be distinguished from
 11 cases in which a physician refuses to provide care in keeping with his or her clinical judgment and
 12 consistent with recognized professional standards. Physicians are not expected to provide care that,
 13 in their professional judgment, is unlikely to achieve the patient’s clinical goals. Indeed, they
 14 should not do so.[24]

15
 16 Moral tension can also arise when conscience dictates that the physician provides an intervention
 17 or service that is medically permitted “when doing so is prohibited by law, institutional rules,
 18 employer policies, and so forth.”[25] Examples include when a physician feels morally obligated to
 19 prescribe emergency contraception or to care for patients regardless of their immigration status, in
 20 violation of hospital policy, law, or professional ethics.[25] Importantly, health care professionals
 21 may hold very different core beliefs and thus reach very different decisions based on those core
 22 beliefs, yet equally act according to the dictates of conscience. For example, a physician who
 23 chooses to provide abortions on the basis of a deeply held belief in protecting women’s autonomy
 24 makes the same kind of moral claim to conscience as does a physician who refuses to provide
 25 abortion on the basis of respect for the sanctity of life of the fetus.[26] It must be remembered that
 26 a physician may never impose medical care against the wishes of a patient who has decision-
 27 making capacity.[27,28]

28
 29 In resolving situations of moral tension, a physician must balance preserving his or her integrity
 30 with the interests of the patient, future patients, and the medical profession. Yet, “being a
 31 conscientious medical professional may well mean at times acting in ways contrary to one’s
 32 personal ideals in order to adhere to a general professional obligation to serve patients’ interests
 33 first.”[29] These obligations may arise more frequently when a physician works in an area in which
 34 access to care and referral options are limited. Or it may mean structuring one’s practice to avoid,
 35 to the greatest extent possible, situations in which one would be asked or expected to provide care
 36 that creates significant challenges to one’s moral integrity.

37
 38 Patients, the public, and fellow professionals must be reasonably able to expect that physicians will
 39 uphold the fiduciary responsibilities of the profession and will, in general, provide legally
 40 available, medically permitted interventions or services in keeping with patients’ medical needs
 41 and values, preferences, and goals for care. Physicians should use great restraint in deciding to act
 42 contrary to that general expectation.

43
 44 **RESOLVING OR REDUCING MORAL TENSION**

45
 46 As moral agents in their own right, physicians must have some scope to act so as to honor the
 47 beliefs that ground their sense of self and preserve integrity. As noted above, certain actions are
 48 beyond physicians’ discretion: declining to provide care in emergency situations when no other
 49 qualified professional is available, discriminating against patients, imposing care against a
 50 competent patient’s informed refusal. In other situations, when the foreseeable burdens for the
 51 patient are minimal, physicians have greater discretion to act in conscience. Between these

1 endpoints, for physicians facing situations of moral tension, determining how best to preserve their
2 integrity in discharging their professional ethical obligations to patients calls for thoughtful
3 deliberation that takes into account a variety of factors. These include considerations of medical
4 need, whether there is an established patient-physician relationship, and the burdens a decision to
5 act in conscience will pose for the patient, the physician, and others. A physician's decision to act
6 in conscience has ramifications at all levels of patient care: providing interventions or services,
7 informing the patient about treatment options, and referring the patient elsewhere for care.

8 9 *Patient-Physician Relationships*

10
11 Entering into a patient-physician relationship establishes the physician's fiduciary obligations to
12 this particular individual.[30] Until such a relationship is established, physicians may decline to
13 accept prospective patients (with the caveats noted above) and have considerable latitude in their
14 exercise of conscience. Once a relationship is established, physicians must fulfill their
15 responsibilities to promote patient welfare, respect patient autonomy, and adhere to standards of
16 professionalism or formally terminate the relationship.[23]

17
18 In some instances, of course, patient and physician will share deeply held beliefs, and situations are
19 unlikely to arise in which a physician would feel compelled to act in conscience contrary to the
20 patient's values and preferences. But physicians cannot predict that they will share deeply held
21 beliefs with all of their patients, or all of the time. A physician who knows that there are specific
22 interventions or services he or she cannot "in good conscience" provide has a responsibility to
23 make that clear to prospective patients before entering into a patient-physician relationship with
24 them,[31,32] for example, by posting a notice in the waiting room. During this time, before the
25 onset of the patient-physician relationship, the physician's discretion to exercise conscience is at its
26 greatest. If the physician does not make this clear prior to establishing a relationship, his or her
27 obligation to refrain from acting in conscience, or temper his or her action, is stronger than it would
28 otherwise be. Yet disclosure alone is not always sufficient; how clearly the physician states his or
29 her position, how well the patient understands the disclosure (and its implications for future care),
30 and the nature of the patient's needs (e.g., emergency care), are also important factors to consider.
31 Further, prospective efforts to inform patients are limited to the extent that physicians cannot
32 always predict the types of care patients might request, or how advances in medical science or
33 technology may alter the course of their practices over time.

34
35 Having discretion to follow conscience with respect to specific interventions or services does not
36 relieve the physician of the obligation to not abandon a patient. This includes a responsibility to
37 facilitate transfer of the patient to another physician willing to provide an intervention or service
38 the treating physician finds morally objectionable.[20] It also includes responsibility to provide
39 ongoing care for a patient, even if the need for that care stems from an objected-to intervention,
40 until the patient can be transferred to another physician.[14,23,33]

41 42 *Medical Need, Timeliness & Alternatives*

43
44 Medical need constrains physicians' freedom to act according to conscience. All patients are
45 vulnerable to some degree—they must rely on physicians' professional knowledge and skill and
46 must trust that physicians will be dedicated to promoting their welfare.[30] The greater a patient's
47 medical need, the more he or she must trust the physician and the greater the physician's fiduciary
48 obligation to fulfill that trust. Thus physicians have least latitude to decline to provide care that is
49 morally objectionable to them when that care is medically needed, unless the needed care is
50 available to the patient elsewhere in a timely fashion.[23,33] The greater the medical need, the
51 stronger the obligation to treat.[16] Conversely, physicians have greatest latitude to decline to

1 provide care when that care is elective, particularly when the desired care is available elsewhere
2 and delay in obtaining it will not unduly compromise the patient's well-being. Physicians should
3 not act so as to create a significant barrier to the patient receiving care that is medically needed.

4
5 In some cases, delay in receiving treatment may alter the patient's outcome—for example, timely
6 access to emergency contraception. In exercising conscience, physicians must consider whether
7 their actions by delaying care would effectively deny the patient access to desired care and what
8 harms the patient would experience as a result including financial, medical, psychological, or other
9 harms.

10
11 Physician exercise of conscience often has a scalar effect where a physician might justify certain
12 acts because the alternative would be less acceptable. For example, a physician who would decline
13 to provide abortion may feel comfortable providing contraception to prevent an unwanted
14 pregnancy the patient might choose to abort, or may morally oppose gender reassignment
15 operations but justify it in the case of an otherwise self-destructive patient.

16 17 *Harms & Burdens to Patients*

18
19 The likelihood of harm to the patient and the degree of harm also constrain physicians' freedom to
20 act on grounds of conscience. The fiduciary nature of patient-physician relationships carries with it
21 the obligation for physicians to minimize harms, and to a lesser extent burdens, to patients. Harms
22 to patients can come in a variety of forms and may include physical harms, dignitary harms (as
23 when the physician fails to respect the patient and disregards the patient's values and preferences),
24 and psychosocial harms.[34-38] As with medical need, the greater the likelihood that acting in
25 conscience will harm the patient, the less discretion the physician has, particularly when the harm
26 in question is serious and imminent (e.g., significant pain, disability). Some harm to the patient
27 may be so significant and foreseeable that a physician's exercise of conscience is not justifiable—
28 for example, death or permanent injury in contrast to minor bleeding or discomfort.

29
30 Beyond harms as such, physicians should consider other burdens that acting according to the
31 dictates of their conscience may impose on patients. Burdens can range from the inconvenience of
32 having to go elsewhere for care that is readily available when a physician declines to provide an
33 intervention, to more significant challenges when the patient's access to care is limited by
34 constraints on services in the local health care system or such patient-specific factors as health
35 literacy or access to transportation. Time, distance to care, cost, or other logistic burdens might be
36 so severe as to outright bar the patient from obtaining necessary care. Again, the more significant
37 the burden, the more physicians should temper their exercise of conscience in the interests of
38 patient welfare. Likewise a minor inconvenience to a patient should not force a physician to act
39 outside the dictates of conscience. Yet, physicians must be aware that what may initially seem to
40 the physician to be a minor harm or burden could act as a significant barrier to care for the patient,
41 depending on the patient's individual situation.

42 43 *Harms and Burdens to Physicians & Others*

44
45 For an individual physician, not being able to conduct his or her life in keeping with deeply held
46 beliefs can lead to moral distress,[39] the sense that one has fundamentally compromised one's
47 integrity,[4] and loss of self-respect.[4] The moral and psychological harm for the individual
48 physician can be compounded if it adversely affects his or her ability to provide high quality
49 care.[40,41] Unaddressed moral distress can lead to dissatisfaction among health care workers,
50 [6,40] which raises concerns that disaffected providers will be unable to provide high quality care,
51 possibly resulting in harm to their individual patients and to patients as a class.

1 Moreover, prohibiting physicians from exercising conscience may deter some individuals from
2 becoming physicians or from becoming certain types of specialists, or it may lead physicians to
3 become callous, disrespectful toward patients with diverging beliefs, or cavalier in upholding both
4 their personal and their professional commitments, thus potentially compromising patient care and
5 putting strain on the patient and public trust in personal and professional integrity of
6 physicians.[40]

7
8 Patient care can also be affected at the institutional level. When a physician declines to provide an
9 intervention or service on grounds of conscience, the burden falls to others to ensure that the
10 exercise of conscience does not disrupt practice or compromise patient care, including care of the
11 patient whom the dissenting physician has declined to treat, or the functioning of the
12 institution.[6,41,42] Permitting individual physicians to exercise conscience without constraint can
13 also damage professional relationships with colleagues who either do not share a physician's
14 deeply held beliefs, or who find other ways to resolve moral tensions between their beliefs and the
15 expectations of their profession. Finally, while patients and the public must trust the moral integrity
16 of physicians, permitting physicians to exercise conscience freely may, paradoxically, put at risk
17 the trust that physicians will uphold the commitments asked of them by their profession.

18 19 THE PROBLEM OF MORAL COMPLICITY

20
21 When a physician participates in an action that is in tension with his or her deeply held beliefs he or
22 she may feel complicit, in some measure, in moral wrongdoing. Complicity involves "[sharing] in
23 the guilt of an ethically improper act" by virtue of one's level of involvement with that act.[43] It is
24 concerned with how participating in another party's immoral action (or inaction) violates one's
25 own moral integrity.[32]

26
27 The degree to which an individual's action (or inaction) implicates him or her in a moral wrong
28 depends on the individual's "moral distance" from the wrongdoer and/or the act, including the
29 degree to which one shares the wrongful intent.[32,43] If one facilitates a moral wrong, but
30 intended a morally licit purpose in doing so, then one is not morally complicit in the wrong. Moral
31 distance also involves the extent to which one's action can be predicted to facilitate a moral
32 wrong.[7,44] Loaning one's car to a friend who subsequently becomes drunk and kills someone
33 while driving is morally more distant from the death than loaning one's car to a friend when one
34 knows the friend plans to drink or has already been drinking.[32]

35
36 Other factors that influence moral complicity include the severity of the immoral act,[32] whether
37 one was under duress in participating in the immoral act,[45] the likelihood that one's conduct will
38 induce others to act immorally,[44] and the extent to which one's participation is needed to
39 facilitate the wrongdoing.[32,45]

40
41 For physicians, the question of moral complicity arises when they facilitate in some manner the
42 accomplishment of an end they believe to be morally wrong. For example, a physician who
43 declines to provide an intervention or service, such as abortion, on grounds of conscience must still
44 grapple with whether to inform a patient about the objected-to option and whether to refer the
45 patient to another physician who will provide the intervention or service. (A physician who is
46 unwilling to forgo life-sustaining treatment may similarly worry that he or she is complicit in
47 wrongdoing with respect to informing the patient about the option to forgo care or transferring the
48 patient to another physician willing to withhold or withdraw such care.) Physicians must grapple
49 with the degree to which their actions will compromise their feelings of moral integrity—some
50 physicians may be able to justify some provisions of care but not others based on their level of
51 complicity, even if the care implicates similar moral questions (for example, sanctity of life). It

1 may be the case, as one example, that a physician can reconcile choosing not to participate in
2 abortions with still providing emergency or other contraception. Yet in all circumstances, whatever
3 the dictates of conscience, physicians must recognize and fulfill their other, continuing professional
4 ethical obligations to the patient.

5
6 *Duty to Inform*

7
8 The duty to provide patients with the information they need to make well-considered decisions
9 about their care is the embodiment of respect for patients' autonomy and is one of a physician's
10 most fundamental professional obligations. As previously noted, physicians have a duty to present
11 medical facts accurately,[17] including the risks, benefits, and costs of treatment alternatives,[13]
12 and not to withhold information from patients.[33]

13
14 Providing information about treatment options the physician sincerely believes are morally
15 objectionable or about how the patient might obtain objected-to treatment elsewhere is morally
16 distant from what the physician's deeply held beliefs tell him or her is wrong. Providing
17 information is sufficiently distant that the risk to physician integrity is outweighed by the
18 professional obligation to inform, given the strong ethical import of informed consent.[5,29,32,46]
19 Physicians can avoid any taint of complicity by notifying prospective patients prior to initiating a
20 patient-physician relationship about interventions or services that conscience prohibits the
21 physician from offering.[33]

22
23 *Duty to Refer*

24
25 The matter of referring a patient to a physician who will provide an objected-to intervention or
26 service is more challenging. Physicians have a duty not to abandon their patients and to provide for
27 continuity of care.[14,23] While these ground an obligation to refer when one cannot or will not
28 provide needed care oneself, referring a patient for care that violates the physician's deeply held
29 beliefs is clearly less morally distant from the objectionable act than is providing information.

30
31 As in making a determination whether to exercise conscience with respect to providing care,
32 determining whether or how to refer requires that the physician consider medical need, risks and
33 burdens to the patient of referring or not referring, and the likely impact of the physician's decision
34 on colleagues and others. The greater the likelihood or severity of harm, the stronger the
35 physician's duty to facilitate in some way the patient's access to needed care, even in the face of
36 becoming in some measure complicit in what the physician believes is wrong. Conversely, when
37 there is little risk of harm, the weaker the duty to facilitate access to the objected-to intervention or
38 service. Physicians may have a heightened duty to refer in the context of an established patient-
39 physician relationship.[47,48]

40
41 Physicians have a number of options for discharging the duty to refer, ranging from something as
42 simple—and morally distant from wrongdoing—as providing a toll-free number or local hospital
43 number for the patient to inquire about services, to formally referring the patient to a specific
44 physician or institution.[32]

45
46 Physicians may also avoid (or at least minimize) moral complicity by terminating the patient-
47 physician relationship and encouraging the patient to find another physician better able to meet the
48 patient's needs.[46] However, terminating the relationship is ethically permissible only when
49 timeliness of care is not a factor and the physician adheres to ethical guidelines for terminating the
50 relationship, including providing needed care until the patient is transferred to another physician
51 and ensuring that the patient's records are made available to his or her new physician.[23]

1 PROTECTING PATIENTS, PRESERVING INTEGRITY

2
3 The freedom to maintain moral views and act on them is central to a pluralist, democratic
4 society.[6,7] Physicians, no less than patients, should be able to expect that they will be respected
5 as moral agents. There is reason to think that preserving opportunity for physicians to act according
6 to the dictates of conscience may “yield better overall medical quality by fostering a diverse
7 workforce that possess integrity, sensitivity to patients’ needs, and respect for diversity.”[40] In
8 determining whether and how to exercise conscience physicians have a responsibility—rooted in
9 their own status as moral agents and their commitments as medical professionals—to deliberate
10 thoughtfully about the implications for the well-being of patients and others and to seek ways to
11 resolve or reduce moral tension that will neither unduly compromise the physician’s moral integrity
12 nor disproportionately burden the patient.

13
14 RECOMMENDATION

15
16 The Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs recommends that the following be adopted and the
17 remainder of this report be filed:

18
19 Physicians are expected to uphold the ethical norms of their profession, including fidelity to
20 patients and respect for patient self-determination. Yet physicians are not defined solely by
21 their profession. They are moral agents in their own right and, like their patients, are informed
22 by and committed to diverse cultural, religious, and philosophical traditions and beliefs. For
23 some physicians, their professional calling is imbued with their foundational beliefs as persons,
24 and at times the expectation that physicians will put patients’ needs and preferences first may
25 be in tension with the need to sustain moral integrity and continuity across both personal and
26 professional life.

27
28 Preserving opportunity for physicians to act (or to refrain from acting) in accordance with the
29 dictates of conscience in their professional practice is important for preserving the integrity of
30 the medical profession as well as the integrity of the individual physician, on which patients
31 and the public rely. Thus physicians should have considerable latitude to practice in accord
32 with well-considered, deeply held beliefs that are central to their self-identities.

33
34 Physicians’ freedom to act according to conscience is not unlimited, however. Physicians are
35 expected to provide care in emergencies, honor patients’ informed decisions to refuse life-
36 sustaining treatment, and respect basic civil liberties and not discriminate against individuals in
37 deciding whether to enter into a professional relationship with a new patient.

38
39 In other circumstances, physicians may be able to act (or refrain from acting) in accordance
40 with the dictates of their conscience without violating their professional obligations. Several
41 factors impinge on the decision to act according to conscience. Physicians have stronger
42 obligations to patients with whom they have a patient-physician relationship, especially one of
43 long standing; when there is imminent risk of foreseeable harm to the patient or delay in access
44 to treatment would significantly adversely affect the patient’s physical or emotional well-
45 being; and when the patient is not reasonably able to access needed treatment from another
46 qualified physician.

47
48 In following conscience, physicians should:

- 49
50 (a) Thoughtfully consider whether and how significantly an action (or declining to act) will
51 undermine the physician’s personal integrity, create emotional or moral distress for the

- 1 physician, or compromise the physician's ability to provide care for the individual and
2 other patients.
3
- 4 (b) Before entering into a patient-physician relationship, make clear any specific
5 interventions or services the physician cannot in good conscience provide because they
6 are contrary to the physician's deeply held personal beliefs, focusing on interventions or
7 services a patient might otherwise reasonably expect the practice to offer.
8
- 9 (c) Take care that their actions do not discriminate against or unduly burden individual
10 patients or populations of patients and do not adversely affect patient or public trust.
11
- 12 (d) Be mindful of the burden their actions may place on fellow professionals.
13
- 14 (e) Uphold standards of informed consent and inform the patient about all relevant options
15 for treatment, including options to which the physician morally objects.
16
- 17 (f) In general, physicians should refer a patient to another physician or institution to provide
18 treatment the physician declines to offer. When a deeply held, well-considered personal
19 belief leads a physician also to decline to refer, the physician should offer impartial
20 guidance to patients about how to inform themselves regarding access to desired
21 services.
22
- 23 (g) Continue to provide other ongoing care for the patient or formally terminate the patient-
24 physician relationship in keeping with ethical guidelines.
25
- 26 (New HOD/CEJA Policy)

Fiscal Note: Less than \$500

REFERENCES

1. Pellegrino E, Thomasma D. *The Virtues in Medical Practice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1993: 35-36.
2. Inui TS. *Flag in the Wind: Educating for Professionalism in Medicine*. Washington, DC: Association of American Medical Colleges; 2003.
3. Swick HM. Toward a normative definition of medical professionalism. *Academic Medicine*. 2000; 75:612–616.
4. Benjamin M. *Splitting the difference: compromise and integrity in ethics and politics*. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence Kansas 1990.
5. Brock DW. Conscientious refusal by physicians and pharmacists: who is obligated to what, and why? *Theor Med Bioethics* 2008; 29: 187-200.
6. Magelsen M. When should conscientious objection be accepted? *J Med Ethics* 2012; 38(1): 18-21.
7. LaFollette E, LaFollette H. Private conscience, public acts. *J Med Ethics* 2007; 33: 249-54.
8. Wicclair MR. Conscientious objection in medicine. *Bioethics* 2000; 14(3): 213-20.
9. Charo RA. The celestial fire of conscience- refusing to deliver medical care. *NEJM* 2005; 352(24): 2471-73.
10. Pellegrino ED. Professionalism, profession and the virtues of the good physician. *Mt. Sinai Journal of Medicine*. 2002; 69(6):378–384.
11. [Principle VIII, AMA Code of Medical Ethics.](#)
12. [E-9.06, Free Choice.](#)
13. [Principle VI, AMA Code of Medical Ethics.](#)
14. [E-8.11, Neglect of patient.](#)
15. [E-9.12, Patient-physician relationship—respect for law & human rights.](#)
16. [E-10.05, Potential patients.](#)
17. [E-2.23, HIV testing.](#)
18. [E-10.015, The patient-physician relationship.](#)
19. [Principle I, AMA Code of Medical Ethics.](#)
20. [E-10.01, Fundamentals of the patient-physician relationship.](#)
21. [E-8.08, Informed consent.](#)
22. [E-8.082, Withholding information from patients.](#)
23. [E-8.115, Termination of the physician-patient relationship.](#)
24. [E-2.037, Medical futility in end-of-life care.](#)
25. Wicclair MR. Negative and positive claims of conscience. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics* 2009; 18:14-22.
26. Harris LH. Recognizing conscience in abortion provision. *NEJM*. 2012; 367(11): 981-83.
27. [E-2.22, Do Not Resuscitate Orders.](#)
28. [E-2.20 Withholding or withdrawing life-sustaining medical treatment.](#)
29. Frader J, Bosk CL. The personal is political, the professional is not: Conscientious objection to obtaining/providing/acting on genetic information. *Am J Med Genet C Semin Med Genet* 2009; 151C(1); 62-67.
30. Pellegrino ED, Thomasma DC. *For the Patient’s Good: The Restoration of Beneficence in Health Care*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988, ch 2-4.
31. Cavanaugh, TA. Professional conscientious objection in medicine with attention to referral. *Ave Marie L. Rev.* 2010; 9: 198-201.
32. Antommara AHM. Conscientious objection in clinical practice: Notice, informed consent, referral, and emergency treatment. *Ave Marie L. Rev.* 2010; 9: 84-97.
33. Dickens BM. Reproductive health services and the law and ethics of conscientious objection. *Medicine and Law* 2001; 20: 283-93.

34. Gert B, Culver CM, Clouser KD. *Bioethics: a return to fundamentals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
35. Beauchamp TL & Childress JF. *Principles of biomedical ethics*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
36. Pellegrino ED. Patient and physician autonomy: conflicting rights and obligations in the patient-physician relationship. *J. Contemp. Health L & Pol'y* 1994; 10: 47-68.
37. Little MO. Abortion, intimacy, and the duty to gestate. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 1999; 2(3): 1-8.
38. Jonsen A. Do no harm. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 1978; 88: 827-32.
39. Morton NT, Kirkwood, KW. Conscience and conscientious objection of health care professionals refocusing the issue. *HEC Forum* 2009; 21(4): 351-64.
40. White DB, Brody B. Would accommodating some conscientious objections by physicians promote quality in medical care? *JAMA* 2011; 305(17): 1804-05.
41. Cohen JA et al. Stress and the workplace: Theories and models of organizational stress. In: Rice VA, ed. *Handbook of Stress, Coping, and Health: Implications for Nursing Research, Theory, and Practice*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications; 2012; 310-33.
42. Bischoff S, DeTiene K, Quick B. Effects of ethics stress on employee burnout and fatigue: an empirical investigation. *J Health Hum Serv Adm* 1999; 21: 512.
43. Pellegrino ED. Balancing science, ethics, and politics: Stem cell research, a paradigm case. *J. Contemp. Health L. & Pol'y* 2002; 18: 603-04.
44. Brown MT. Moral complicity in induced pluripotent stem cell research. *Kennedy In. Ethics J.* 2009; 19(1): 2-5.
45. Sulmasy DP. What is conscience and why is respect for it so important? *Theor Med Bioeth* 2008; 29: 135-149.
46. Harrington MM. The ever-expanding health care conscience clause: the quest for immunity in the struggle between professional duties and moral beliefs. *Fla. St. U. L. Rev.* 2007; 34:822-823.
47. Dickens BM. Unethical protection of conscience: Defending the powerful against the weak. *Virtual Mentor* 2009; 11(9): 725-29.
48. Cook RJ, Dickens, BM. The growing abuse of conscientious objection. *Virtual Mentor* 2006; 8(5): 337-40.