

A Critique of COVID-19 Vaccine Mandates for Healthcare Workers

Joseph Flores

Grand Canyon University

COM-362 Argumentation and Advocacy

Professor Cheryl Pietkiewicz

December 17, 2023

A Critique of COVID-19 Vaccine Mandates for Healthcare Workers

Navigating Individual Autonomy and Ethical Considerations

The COVID-19 pandemic has prompted a heated debate over mandating the COVID-19 vaccination series for all healthcare professionals. This essay examines the opposition to COVID-19 vaccination requirements for healthcare workers, analyzing its logical structure and soundness. Furthermore, fundamental assumptions of this stance are made, and judgments about its congruity with the Christian Worldview. In the following discussion, the paper will formulate a counterargument that considers the ethical ramifications associated with the implementation of vaccination mandates while concurrently recognizing the collective obligations of society.

Opposition to mandatory vaccinations for healthcare professionals stems from preserving personal freedom and autonomy in healthcare decision-making. This autonomy is breached with the implementation of vaccination mandates, leading to ethical concerns (Kates et al., 2021). Upon closer examination, it becomes apparent that this argument's soundness relies heavily on accepting its fundamental assumption, which posits that individual liberty should always be prioritized above group health concerns. On the other hand, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the global arena introduces a complicated ethical dimension that demands thorough examination. Do individual rights suggest that in a public health crisis all people have equal rights? Such a study is about societal obligations in the light of the wellness of society as a whole.

Therefore, the COVID-19 pandemic's worldwide impact forms the basis of this argument from a psychological angle through the freedoms of man at all times. It is a significant point that raises questions about how privacy can be defined and what people must do in order to find

solutions (Biswas et al., 2021). Concerning health care, it is necessary to pick up certain interests, such as individual freedom, against the broader ethical concerns. Supporters of forced vaccines need to think about this issue that concerns personal freedom and public interest in the light of declining health conditions in the contemporary world. It is also essential to adopt a holistic approach while making people understand the depth of things in order to uphold everyone's rights and obligations for the purpose of promoting societal wellness.

This argument assumes a libertarian standpoint, which asserts that health care should primarily be based on an individual's freedom of choice. That is one of the greatest issues since it becomes a component that allows people to discuss aspects of Christianity on distribution and joint activities (Corcoran et al., 2021). Such a comparison illustrates the complex interplay of society's obligation to ensure healthcare and individuals' right to decide on modes of treatment they wish to undergo. What is more, this question fosters reflections regarding the way rules are established to help citizens maintain the equilibrium between individual freedoms and social commitments in general.

The opposition to COVID-19 vaccination requirements for healthcare professionals reflects ethical concerns, including anxieties over possible adverse effects, enduring ramifications, and personal convictions. Although the significance of ethical issues cannot be denied, the assumption fails to acknowledge the multifaceted viewpoint offered by the Christian Worldview (Corcoran et al., 2021). Christianity places a significant emphasis on the duty to advance the welfare of others, highlighting the need to maintain a delicate balance between individual beliefs and the common good. This assumption underscores the difficulty of harmonizing personal ethical considerations with the Christian mandate to promote the well-being of the collective.

The conflict between individual liberty and societal responsibility is evident in both conceptions. As the discussion progresses, it becomes crucial to navigate this intricate equilibrium, necessitating a comprehensive comprehension of the intricate ethical factors involved in personal health decisions and society's welfare (Giubilini et al., 2022). The statement above highlights the intricate nature of harmonizing contrasting perspectives and moral systems within the continuing discourse of COVID-19 vaccination regulations for healthcare professionals.

Counterargument

In the ethical framework of society, the prioritization of the overall welfare of its members is often seen. As mentioned before, the primary assumption acknowledges the interdependence among people and emphasizes the need to safeguard the broader community from the danger posed by contagious illnesses.

Healthcare workers, being at the forefront of their field, are obligated to minimize the transmission of contagious illnesses. Implementing a need for COVID-19 vaccinations, people can use the knowledge and skill of healthcare workers in order to ensure their own protection and the safety of the patients they are responsible for along with protecting the community.

Therefore, everyone should be responsible for public health, especially in helping healthcare personnel minimize the transmission of COVID-19 and other contagious illnesses. All individuals should honor their responsibilities, which include vaccine requirements. Accordingly, the argument concludes by implying from these initial premises that the morality of those mandating a COVID-19 vaccine arises out of its fitting into this broader common civic responsibility to public health (Kates et al., 2021). The reason to require healthcare workers to

get vaccinated is that it does not violate principles of logic consistency or developmental rationality.

The above-mentioned orderly case incorporates varying perspectives in highlighting the fact that everybody is responsible for guarding public health. It involves a dual process of individual free will and obligation to look after society at large. The logic brings together the various ideas and proves that vaccine requirements align with the objectives of public health. This position exhibits its exceptional character when personal autonomy is regarded as desirable only within the limits of protecting public health. Consequently, there is a strong argument for the morality of insisting that healthcare professionals be vaccinated against COVID-19.

Hence, the ethical justification for implementing COVID-19 vaccination regulations is in the framework of collective duty. The logical sequence of reasoning leads to the conclusion that morally justified activities are in accordance with community duties (Kates et al., 2021). Implementing COVID-19 vaccination regulations for healthcare professionals, safeguards persons within the healthcare system and aligns with the ethical obligation to advance public health and overall well-being.

This counterargument presents the ethical rationale for implementing vaccination requirements from a community perspective, highlighting the interrelated obligations that people, including healthcare professionals, have towards the whole society, formulating a counterargument against the stance opposing COVID-19 vaccination because it is crucial to build a coherent and morally grounded framework that emphasizes societal duty. By adopting this viewpoint, we achieve a harmonious equilibrium between personal independence and the collective need to alleviate the consequences of a worldwide public health emergency.

The counterargument favoring implementing COVID-19 vaccination requirements for healthcare professionals accepts the ethical problems voiced by individuals who oppose such mandates. However, it presents a broader perspective that emphasizes societal duty. This viewpoint argues that enforcing vaccination requirements may be justified by considering the overall welfare of society, so it fits with the ideals adopted by the Christian Worldview.

Contrary to the importance of individual liberty, the counterargument is that safeguarding others and assisting the community become more vital in a global health catastrophe. It aligns with the Christian principle of altruistic love and attending to the collective welfare without anticipation of reciprocation (Corcoran et al., 2021). Christians emphasize communal obligation due to the biblical commandment to "love others as you love yourself." This viewpoint asserts that the ethical duty to safeguard the well-being and security of the community takes precedence over personal liberty.

Additionally, the counterargument considers the repercussions of excessive emphasis on individual autonomy in healthcare. By their profession, healthcare personnel are obligated to safeguard the health of their patients. Consequently, vaccinating healthcare personnel could be considered a pragmatic approach to protecting susceptible patients and a Christian social obligation. A compelling rationale exists for mandating COVID-19 vaccination for healthcare personnel, supported by a counterargument that presents a perspective that harmonizes ethical considerations with societal obligations (Vellappally et al., 2022). This counterargument makes a strong case for a balanced strategy that protects individual freedom and the community's general health by relating to the Christian view of love, kindness, and social welfare.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the main reason people are against COVID-19 vaccine requirements for healthcare workers is that they believe individual freedom is very important. However, the truth of this argument goes against the logic that says vaccine requirements are based on shared duty. This argument creates a unified case by bringing together different points of view and putting equal weight on individual rights and duties within society. Looking at things from a Christian point of view, it takes effort to balance between personal rights and social duties. Emphasizing community service in the counterargument during the pandemic takes into account moral concerns and improves the well-being of the whole society. In ongoing efforts to fight the disease, it is still very important to find a balance between personal freedom and social duties.

References

- Biswas, N., Mustapha, T., Khubchandani, J., & Price, J. H. (2021). The nature and extent of COVID-19 vaccination hesitancy in healthcare workers. *Journal of Community Health, 46*, 1244–1251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-021-00984-3>
- Corcoran, K. E., Scheitle, C. P., & DiGregorio, B. D. (2021). Christian nationalism and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and uptake. *Vaccine, 39*(45). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.09.074>
- Giubilini, A., Savulescu, J., Pugh, J., & Wilkinson, D. (2022). Vaccine mandates for healthcare workers beyond COVID-19. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 49*(3), medethics-2022-108229. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2022-108229>
- Kates, O. S., Stock, P. G., Ison, M. G., Allen, R. D. M., Burra, P., Jeong, J. C., Kute, V., Muller, E., Nino-Murcia, A., Wang, H., & Wall, A. (2021). Ethical review of COVID-19 vaccination requirements for transplant center staff and patients. *American Journal of Transplantation, 22*(2), 371–380. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.16878>
- Vellappally, S., Naik, S., Alsadon, O., Al-Kheraif, A. A., Alayadi, H., Alsiwat, A. J., Kumar, A., Hashem, M., Varghese, N., Thomas, N. G., & Anil, S. (2022). Perception of COVID-19 Booster Dose Vaccine among Healthcare Workers in India and Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(15), 8942. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19158942>