Rich Price

Professor Michael O'Neill

Survey of Scripting Languages

October 26, 2024

The Ethical Implications of AI in Healthcare: A Christian and Professional Code of
Ethics Perspective

The healthcare industry stands at the forefront of technological advancements and
Artificial Intelligence (AI) plays an increasingly influential role. AI-driven systems are
being developed to diagnose diseases, recommend treatment plans, and even assist in
surgeries. These advances promise significant benefits, including more accurate
diagnostics, faster patient care, and improved medical research. However, the integration
of AI in healthcare raises critical ethical issues, particularly around patient privacy,
informed consent, and the potential for bias in decision-making algorithms.

A relevant professional code guiding ethical decisions in healthcare is the
American Medical Association (AMA) Code of Medical Ethics. This code outlines
principles for patient care, privacy, and equitable treatment, aiming to maintain the trust
placed in medical professionals. As the field embraces AI, these ethical principles are
being challenged and reinterpreted to ensure technology enhances ethical medical
practices. This essay will examine AI's impact on healthcare, ethical implications, and
compare the Christian worldview with the AMA's ethical guidelines to understand how
each framework addresses the ethical challenges AI poses.

AI's integration into healthcare brings about both innovation and ethical concerns.
One of the most significant transformations is the automation of diagnostics and

administrative tasks. For example, AI algorithms can analyze medical images with high accuracy, enabling faster and potentially more precise diagnoses. However, this reliance on AI for diagnosis raises ethical concerns. Misdiagnoses can still occur, and accountability for errors becomes complex, especially when AI rather than a human physician makes the critical decision.

Another significant impact of AI in healthcare is its role in personalized treatment plans. AI can analyze a patient's medical history, genetics, and lifestyle to recommend a tailored treatment plan. While this capability enhances treatment effectiveness, it raises ethical questions about patient autonomy and informed consent. Patients may feel coerced to accept AI-generated recommendations without fully understanding them, especially if the technology is presented as an infallible tool.

Furthermore, AI's dependency on large datasets for training introduces issues around data privacy and security. AI systems rely on vast amounts of patient data, including sensitive medical and personal information, to make accurate predictions. Ensuring the security of this data is crucial, as breaches could lead to severe violations of privacy. Additionally, there is the risk of algorithmic bias in AI models, as these systems may reflect the biases present in their training data, potentially leading to inequities in patient care.

These ethical concerns call for careful examination and clear guidelines on how AI should be used responsibly within healthcare. Balancing innovation with patient rights and safety is essential, and both the AMA Code of Medical Ethics and the Christian worldview offer perspectives on achieving this balance.

In examining the ethical issues AI brings to healthcare, two contrasting perspectives provide valuable insights: the Christian worldview and the AMA Code of Medical Ethics. From a Christian ethical perspective, the emphasis is on the sanctity of life, compassion, and justice. The teachings of Jesus Christ promote caring for others selflessly, respecting human dignity, and seeking justice (Matthew 22:34-40). Christian ethics would likely advocate for AI's responsible use in healthcare as a tool to improve patient care, if it does not dehumanize patients or reduce their autonomy. For instance, Micah 6:8 highlights that individuals are called to "act justly and to love mercy," which suggests that AI systems should be designed and used in ways that promote fairness and compassion, avoiding harm to patients.

Furthermore, the Christian principle of honoring human dignity underscores the importance of informed consent and patient autonomy. Christian ethics would caution against AI systems that override patient decisions or manipulate individuals into certain treatments. AI should serve as a supportive tool for healthcare providers, empowering patients rather than diminishing their role in making informed health decisions.

In contrast, the AMA Code of Medical Ethics addresses AI-related ethical issues from a secular, professional perspective. It emphasizes patient confidentiality, equitable treatment, and the avoidance of harm non-maleficence. In the context of AI, the AMA Code would prioritize maintaining patient confidentiality by ensuring that AI systems adhere to strict data security standards. Additionally, the AMA Code promotes fairness, advocating for unbiased AI algorithms that provide equal care to all patients, regardless of background.

While the Christian worldview may bring an added dimension of compassion and

moral responsibility, the AMA's ethical framework provides practical guidelines grounded in patient rights and established medical ethics. Both perspectives emphasize respect for patients, but the AMA Code specifically addresses how healthcare professionals should respond to technological advancements within a clinical setting, providing more detailed recommendations on patient confidentiality and equitable care.

The Christian worldview and the AMA Code of Medical Ethics share common ground in emphasizing respect for individuals, fair treatment, and the need to avoid harm. However, these perspectives diverge in their approach and emphasis. The Christian worldview frames these responsibilities within a theological context, encouraging compassion and moral responsibility guided by Biblical teachings. In contrast, the AMA Code of Medical Ethics is grounded in secular principles, focusing more on legal and professional standards that align with patient rights and the ethical obligations of healthcare providers.

One of the primary differences lies in the emphasis on patient autonomy. The AMA Code explicitly stresses the importance of informed consent, ensuring patients have control over their healthcare decisions. The Christian worldview also values autonomy but may place a stronger focus on moral responsibility and acting in a way that aligns with principles of compassion and justice. For instance, a Christian healthcare professional might feel an ethical obligation to advocate for patients who may not fully understand AI's role in their treatment, going beyond standard informed consent practices to ensure patients feel respected and understood.

In assessing whether these viewpoints are compatible, it appears they can complement each other. The AMA Code provides specific, actionable guidelines for

managing ethical issues related to AI, while the Christian perspective adds a broader ethical framework that prioritizes compassion and moral accountability. Together, they create a comprehensive approach to addressing AI ethics in healthcare, with each perspective enriching the other.

As AI continues to evolve within healthcare, ethical considerations are paramount to ensuring these advancements benefit society without compromising individual rights. Both the Christian worldview and the AMA Code of Medical Ethics offer valuable perspectives on navigating AI's ethical challenges, though each has a distinct approach. While the AMA Code provides healthcare professionals with clear ethical guidelines, the Christian worldview adds a moral dimension, emphasizing compassion, justice, and respect for human dignity.

For future leaders in healthcare, integrating these ethical frameworks will be essential. By respecting professional standards while embodying compassion and moral integrity, healthcare professionals can guide AI's responsible use in a way that honors both patients and the foundational principles of their profession. In a field as impactful as healthcare, balancing innovation with ethical responsibility will be critical in fostering trust and achieving positive outcomes for all.

References

American Medical Association. (n.d.). AMA Code of Medical Ethics. https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/ama-code-medical-ethics

Bible Gateway. (n.d.). Matthew 22:34-40, Micah 6:8. https://www.biblegateway.com/

Esteva, A., Kuprel, B., Novoa, R. A., Ko, J., Swetter, S. M., Blau, H. M., & Thrun, S. (2017). Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks. Nature, 542(7639), 115–118. doi:10.1038/nature21056

IEEE. (2021). IEEE Code of Ethics. https://www.ieee.org/about/corporate/governance/p7-8.html

Nundy, S., Montgomery, T., & Wachter, R. M. (2019). Promoting Trust Between Patients and Physicians in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. JAMA, 322(6), 497–498. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.11564