

Good active euthanasia vs. passive euthanasia argumentative essay example

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



Euthanasia refers to the act or practice of ending a life intentionally with the aim of relieving pain and suffering. Different countries have different laws on Euthanasia. According to the British Select Committee that deals with Medical Ethics in the House of Lords, euthanasia is " a deliberate intervention which is undertaken with the main intention of ending life, with the purpose of relieving intractable suffering". In the Netherlands, it is understood as " the termination of life at the patient's request by a doctor. Euthanasia can be voluntary, involuntary, or non- voluntary. Voluntary euthanasia is considered legal in certain countries and some U. S. states, and non-voluntary euthanasia is considered illegal in every country. Involuntary euthanasia is murder, and is carried out against the will of the patient.

Euthanasia can further be categorized into active and passive euthanasia. In passive euthanasia, the doctor or other medical practitioner allows the ailing patient to die by not giving them their treatment. Active euthanasia involves the doctor or other medical practitioner taking measures, which directly lead to the death of the patient. There are many arguments on these two types of euthanasia, especially on their morality. Some people argue that none should be approved. Most people who support euthanasia argue that passive euthanasia is better because it does not involve the direct intervention of the medical practitioner. However, it is better to die from active euthanasia than to die from passive euthanasia.

In most cases, active euthanasia is usually more humane than passive euthanasia. Euthanasia is usually carried out on patients who are terminally ill, with no chance of recovery. For these patients, there is nothing in the field of medicine, which can heal them. No amount of medication can make

them better. In such cases, the doctors have already tried everything and there is nothing left for them to do. There is absolutely no hope for such patients. When these patients make the decision to end their lives, it means that they no longer have the will to live and wish to end their suffering. When the doctor or other medical practitioner chooses passive euthanasia over active euthanasia, they are simply prolonging the patient's suffering.

Withholding medication will only kill the patient slowly, and is even worse than continuing with treatment. In passive euthanasia, the doctor can only stop all treatment and let the patient suffer and die. This beats the logic behind euthanasia, as its main purpose is to end the patient's suffering.

Active euthanasia, on the other hand, would cause the patient to die quickly, thus avoiding the unnecessary suffering that comes with passive euthanasia.

A lethal injection would end the patient's suffering in a matter of seconds, as opposed to passive euthanasia where the patient would have to suffer even for days before dying. This makes active euthanasia more humane than passive euthanasia.

Secondly, when a patient suffers from a terminal disease and wish to end the suffering, they should at least be given the opportunity to decide when they should die. In a situation where a person is suffering from a serious ailment, the first logical step would be to treat the medical condition in the most effective way possible. If all possible treatments that were tried fail, the medical practitioners should determine whether the patient would live. Once they have determined that there is no chance of survival, it is in the patient's best interest to end their suffering. However, this should be done at a time of the patient's choosing, and in the manner they choose. The patient should

have a choice, and this cannot be so in passive euthanasia. Giving them a lethal injection would effectively end their suffering, and it can also be done at the time of their choosing.

Euthanasia is only administered to patients who are terminally ill and have absolutely no chance of survival. At the end of it all, whether euthanasia is given or not, the patient would still die. Passive euthanasia only prolongs the patient's suffering and does not preserve their lives. It would only be morally better if it could somehow preserve the life of the patient, but this is not the case. Since either way the patient still dies, then it makes no moral or ethical difference whether they die through active or passive euthanasia. For instance, if a person kills another in cold blood, it is considered morally wrong. It is also considered morally wrong if a person watches another person drowning and does nothing to help him. If he simply watches as the person drowns and dies, it is morally wrong. It is not possible to judge which act is more or less moral. The morality of active euthanasia cannot be judged, if compared with passive euthanasia. The question of morality would only come in when trying to determine the morality of euthanasia as a whole.

Some people argue that the intentional termination of the life of one human being by another-mercy killing- is contrary to what the medical profession stands for, and is contrary to the policy of the American Medical Association. As medical practitioners, doctors, nurses, clinical officers and other people in the field of medicine are sworn to save lives, and not terminate them.

Doctors are supposed to apply medicine to protect human lives, and not to harm them. It is the role of the doctor to ensure the patient lives. Killing the

patient is contrary to what doctors and other medical practitioners ought to do. According to the American Medical Association, the physicians' involvement in euthanasia puts him or her in a position where they assume the unique responsibility for ending the life of the patient. The association argues that the physicians should effectively respond to the patients' need at the end of their life. They should instead be given emotional support, adequate pain control, comfort care, respect for their autonomy, and proper communication. The AMA argues that killing them is not the solution, but will only worsen the situation.

However, one must consider that euthanasia is usually given to patients for whom the doctors can do nothing more. The physician's lack of involvement would not serve any purpose, other than prolonging the suffering of the patient. Active euthanasia should be permitted only in extreme cases, in which there is nothing more a physician can do to save, cure or help their patient or improve the quality of their life. It should also only be carried out at the patient's request. Allowing the patient who would eventually, still die to continue to suffer is inhuman. It would be in the patient's best interest to end their suffering. Passive euthanasia only prolongs their suffering, and this makes it better for the patient to die from active euthanasia than from passive euthanasia.

Works Cited

Gorman, Martha. *Euthanasia: A Reference Handbook*. New Jersey: ABC-CLIO, 2008.

Print.

Jackson, Linda. *Euthanasia*. New York: Raintree, 2005. Print.

<https://assignbuster.com/good-active-euthanasia-vs-passive-euthanasia-argumentative-essay-example/>

Manning, Michael. Euthanasia and Physician-assisted Suicide: Killing or Caring? New

Jersey: Paulist Press, 1998. Print.

Torr, James. Euthanasia: Opposin Viewpoints. New York: Greenhaven Press, 2000. Print.