

Good research paper on euthanasia: pros and cons

[Health & Medicine](#), [Euthanasia](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

\n[toc title="Table of Contents"]\n

\n \t

1. [English](#) \n \t
2. [Pros \(In Favor\) of Euthanasia](#) \n \t
3. [Cons \(Against\) of Euthanasia](#) \n \t
4. [Works Cited](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

English

Euthanasia is simply a “ euphemism” for death (Johnston). Many cases of people being euthanized are not being reported with the assumption of killing in the name of mercy by offering ultimately, good death (Pereira; The Telegraph). Whether it was part of the person’s living will or death wish, even with family members’ consent, termination of life prior to natural death is often due to long agony or continual suffering brought about by ‘ dehumanizing’ factors such as vegetative condition, terminating illness, debilitating disease, long-time comatose, and so on.

Given such a scenario, pro-euthanasia group advocates for the basic human rights of all people, not only of life, but also death. They insist that brain dead patients should be given the permission for physicians or doctors to end lives. On the other hand, anti-euthanasia group insists that (mercy) killing people (or letting others do it for them) is similar to suicide or worse murder –even with personal, familial, legal, societal, medical, and other forms of consent.

Hence, the question remains whether euthanasia should be resorted to or

not based on various arguments and counterclaims of those who are in favor or against of it. For me, given the abundance of researches about euthanasia, it should not be resorted to because many negative repercussions will come out later for individual patient, family members, and societies the world over.

Pros (In Favor) of Euthanasia

Pro-euthanasia people argue that all individuals have the explicit rights to choose what to do with their lives, even to the point of ending it (Debate.org). For them, individuals possess the personal freedom to do as they please with their lives, such as when under the anathema of a debilitating illness. Additionally, pro-euthanasia individuals argue that all human beings have inalienable rights to life, liberty, property, and/or even death. Since people own their lives, it is on their own discretion to risk their lives when choosing even the assumed best intervention alternatives. They mentioned how some Japanese people save faces by resorting to hara-kiri or traditional ritual suicide. Hence, not far from the concept of various forms of self-annihilation, euthanasia is considered as an option by people who want to end their life, or those of their loved ones, because of unbearable suffering, hopes for a good death, and possibly fears of abuse (for instance) of the right-to-die law (Angell, 2012).

Moreover, if people's rights to terminate their lives do not violate other individuals' rights, mercy killing should be permitted by our society (Dowbiggin). For pro-euthanasia groups, it is a violation of personal freedom or right of a person if people are denied the right to have quick death because their pitiful life is now unworthy of continued existence. Many

adherents of euthanasia assert that upon people attaining maturity, they should already have control over all their decisions, actions, and outcomes in their lives.

Since people on earth came into this world without predetermined consent, it is only fitting now that as rational individuals, they should be given full discretionary power to decide and act according to their best interest as autonomous or free willing human beings. Family members of those who undergo good death are thankful for having physician-assisted death because it is already nearly impossible for them to live normal lives. The death wish is like a sweet smelling aroma for their souls once they finally become detached from excruciating pains, unimaginable infliction, dehumanizing health condition, and so on.

Moreover, pro-euthanasia individuals advocate for the avoidance of great economic burden, wastage of personal, familial, societal, health, medical, and other resources when patients in vegetative states should rather be dead. The reason is for them to help conserve a variety of resources for other hundreds or even millions of indigent individuals who need more immediate help and treatment for curable diseases .

Apparently, pro-euthanasia individuals believe that there are more people from many underdeveloped and calamity-prone countries who need the most financial services (such as, healthcare, medical). If more scarce resources are saved, thousands or even millions of people across the world may be treated to live healthy and meaningful lives and become productive members again of societies (such as when money is allocated on research for the medical breakthrough). Since some individuals who suffer constantly

excruciating pain want to die anyway, it is best to allot human services, such as less expensive drugs and other amenities to those who have a greater chance of recuperating from common diseases (such as in the use of vaccine).

If people who are comatose, terminally ill, or in vegetative states continue to live for years, decades or lifetime, we only let them suffer the more and remain as burdens of their families and society. Because there usually is not a cure for conditions that require mercy killing, people in favor of pleasant death reason out: Why should not we rather give them what they want or deserve (that is, peaceful death).

Given the arguments above by pro-euthanasia groups/individuals, many people can choose the right to die as an alternative or for their best interest. With laws, euthanasia would be practiced, it also would mean the need for proper regulatory measures of medical practitioners. Thus, instead of licensed doctors performing euthanasia clandestinely, it will not be the case anymore because they will not get penalized in such cases.

Just like prostitution, gambling, abortion, gay marriages, assisted suicide, etc. in other countries, because they are legal/lawful, there is no problem for practitioners to engage in activities considered illicit by other people and countries. They are also not stigmatized, incarcerated, made as outcast, and so on. People who opt to do such activities freely do so lawfully because they see more the benefits of euthanasia than its myriad disadvantages. So, why not do the same for mercy killing?

Further, since euthanasia happens anywhere anyway at any time across the world, pro-euthanasia claimers push for its lawful implementation as the only

possibly best solution. With euthanasia being legal, many physicians would then practice mercy killing without much burden to their conscience either. Since death is a part of the normal cycle of life, why should we not rather have euthanasia as the individual, family, and/or societal alternative? Should we rather allow it to be illegal so that more people will be incarcerated for being merciful to their loved one? Are not other countries have harsher laws, who kill others for the sake of their tradition (e. g., beheading other human being whose religious practices are contrary to theirs, killing in the name of fanaticism/ideology, wars, and so on)? Why should not rather legalize euthanasia so that practitioners have to follow utmost professional standards in performing mercy killing? However, before delivering my final statement or stand on this very controversial issue as I enumerated first its many pros, let me proceed with the cons or negative repercussions of mercy killing.

Cons (Against) of Euthanasia

The refutation to the above first pros is that anti-euthanasia groups argue that despite people having rights, freedom, or free will, it is limited in scope or in its entirety. Religious people believe that God has the Sole Authority to give and take people's lives. Since He is the Provider of Life and Everything else, He alone is the Rightful Claimer of the life of any person – no matter what their conditions are in this life.

Despite the fact that individuals die in different manners, God has the final word when it is time for human beings to rest in peace. In other words, anything that people call freedom is limited because of being mortal beings only. Unlike God who is Immortal, although He takes again people's lives, He

alone can resurrect them. No one, for that matter, is above The Almighty. People should not use their freedom to do anything that is contrary to the normal flow of events, nature, or will of God. Hence, many euthanasia groups argue that no argument is best to justify mercy killing no matter how good people's reasoning and intentions are.

Anti-euthanasia people assert that no person is as merciful as the Provider and Claimer of life. Because human beings will face death anyway, let alone God decide when it is due time for people to die naturally. Further, individuals who like mercy killing will only weaken respect for the sanctity of life, whether in the short-term or long term sense of the word. The fact that there are unscrupulous and evil-minded individuals means that they will advance their own self- or vested-interest to perform euthanasia even to innocent patients or family members . In some cases, even when someone who is terminally ill or in vegetative state does not want to die, that is, should he/she be given the chance to be conscious and speak, he/she may not concur with the supposedly ' mercy' that is to be shown by these evil people. Somehow, many individuals still believe in miracles, that they do happen. So, as believers of God, they do wait and see rather than apply any " test of futility" (Griffith 591).

Further, killing dying human beings to conserve scarce health, financial, medical, etc. resources is simply a foolish idea. People's lives are more precious than all the material possessions in the world. When people approve of euthanasia, they are not really showing mercy but the lack of it – the lack of love that can work wonders. No amount of money can equate the love shown to fellow human beings no matter their situations are. It also

proves that when people are compassionate with their neighbors, they are making the world a better place to live in.

Just imagine when individuals who are direly in need, people just dispose them like garbage. Would that amount to love, of being a humane human being? People who are in favor of euthanasia are worse than some animals because, unlike some animals, they are moved by compassion. They protect the lives of their young even to the point of sacrificing theirs. Hence, if individuals are simply considered as undesirable members of their family/society, more ethical problems may ensue.

Professionals and other practitioners may abuse the authority given by virtue of the law to get rid of their enemies, disabled individuals, and special children seen as burdens only of their societies. They would not have a second thought to 'remedy the situation' in case they are themselves blackmailed into doing something that is against their conscience. Thus, killing our fellow human beings cannot, in our human capacity, bring their lives back should there suddenly be a cure for their diseases. That is already next to impossible. Hence, it is disadvantageous to people to resort to euthanasia because it is not human nature to be oxymoronically brutal and at the same time show mercy. It is even irrationally!

As expected, there is a greater possibility that some people will use euthanasia only to blackmail others; thus, killing innocent dying patients for money's sake. Even when a terminally ill person does not want to die yet, a physician can be used as an accomplice to a 'crime' (that is, mercy killing) by selfish family members. Whatever the reasoning and intention behind mercy killing, surely, the victim is at its worst situation, worse than ever

because of his/her innocence. He may lose everything he/she worked for his/her entire life as inheritance for those whom he/she truly loves.

Also, think of euthanasia where there is no punishment for wittingly doing it. Better not have euthanasia than be at a sorrier state than before. Sometimes it is best to leave things as they are than meddle with them because of our human limitations. Perhaps, if ever, if we can bring people back to life, we can end their lives. But suffice for the moment that that is the work of God, better not intrude or play God.

In conclusion, I am not in favor of legalizing euthanasia because I strongly believe that God is most loving, most merciful, and wisest than anyone else. In addition, mercy killing might only lead to other unexpected disadvantages (e. g., infanticide, genocide, extreme dementia, etc.). Moreover, it can be used for more inhumane acts.

Further, legalizing euthanasia would undermine more and more the sanctity of lives because not all professionals will act in the name of laws, their conscience, etc. Some selfish individuals who value money more than lives will have more chance to kill others intentionally for their own evil purposes or purposes other than its original intent. Therefore, euthanasia will be much more unfavorable to anyone who live but once; so, why not rather value life despite anything contrary to it? Yet, I still want to live the question with you: Should euthanasia be legalized? It is yours to decide.

Works Cited

Angell, Marcia. Why Do Americans Balk at Euthanasia Laws? 11 December 2013. .

Atherton, Helen. " Dangers Of Ambivalence: Lessons Learned From The Nazi

Era." Learning Disability Practice 16. 1 (2013): 16-20. Web.

Debate. org. Should euthanasia be legal? 2013. Web. 12 December 2013. .

Dowbiggin, I. A Concise History of Euthanasia: Life, Death, God, and Medicine. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007. Print.

Fieser, James. Euthanasia. 15 January 2011. The University of Tennessee at Martin. Web. 10 December 2013. .

Griffith, Richard. " When Does Life-Sustaining Treatment Become Futile?" British Journal Of Nursing 22. 10 (2013): 590-591. Print.

Johnston, Will. Rebranding Killing and Suicide: The Ugly Truth About Euthanasia. 9 October 2013. Web. 10 December 2013. .

Pereira, J. " Legalizing euthanasia or assisted suicide: the illusion of safeguards and controls." Current Oncology 19. 3 (2012): e227. Web. .

ProCon. Org. Top 10 Pros and Cons: Should euthanasia or physician-assisted suicide be legal? 18 May 2012. Web. 9 December 2013. .

The Telegraph. Number of Dutch killed by euthanasia rises by 13 per cent. 24 September 2013. Web. 12 December 2013. .