

From: [REDACTED] Crous
To: [medboardconsultation](#)
Subject: Draft revised Good medical practice: A code of conduct for doctors in Australia
Date: Monday, 30 July 2018 9:18:39 PM

Dear Members,

I am not a medical doctor, but as a professional engineer I see many parallels in what I see happening in professions where the bodies are no longer concerned with the professional practice and competence of the individuals, but begin to prescribe to professionals what to believe and to act contrary to the best interests of the public - the original intent of professional registration.

1. Science and opinion

Facts are facts. Scientific fact can either be proven or not, if you can, it is fact, if you cannot it is speculation and should be discarded from consideration. Even when "an overwhelming majority" of opinion is claimed, it remains opinion and speculation until proven. Medicine is about using science for the maximisation of the health of the individual. Sometimes that means telling them something they do not want to know. Denying the fact that you have cancer, will not change the fact that you have cancer and not receiving treatment is not in your best interest. Bringing "opinion" into scientific conversation does not contribute to the outcomes, and without exception the intent is always to establish political control.

2. Importing "anti-discrimination crimes" into the profession

Every person has an opinion that they hold to be true. When somebody expresses their personal opinion honestly about a matter, it is the DECISION of the other parties to be offended or not by such opinion. In practice, the makes an individual face the consequence of someone else's decision - a travesty of justice. In the name of "equality", this practise gives power to certain individuals to claim "offence" and the opposing party having the burden of proof and no recourse to claim the same with the opposing party expressing a different opinion. Logically, at the moment of claiming "offence", the party making the claim "offends" the accused; it is a pointless exercise with its only purpose to politicise professional bodies to the detriment of the members, the body and by extension the public. As so eloquently demonstrated by Dr Jordan Peterson, for society to continue to evolve, new ideas are always required, and new ideas require the consideration of ideas that risk offending, else new ideas could never be considered. Of course there are respectful ways to express an opinion, but the suggestion that "anti-discrimination" like rules would apply to the determination of professional competence opens the door to Pandora's box and makes the professional body a tool to enforce political agendas rather than oversee competence. Of course a doctor can successfully treat an infection without agreeing with and endorsing all political views of the patient; the opinions of the individual has no relation to that activity. It is not the role of professional organisations to prescribe personal beliefs and values to their members.

Political activities have made Engineers Australia irrelevant. Don't do the same to the medical profession.

Regards,

Rudolph Crous