

The morality of mercy killing

[Experience](#), [Human Nature](#)



Why is there such a thing in our world that is called mercy killing?, why? In this report I will discuss about euthanasia or mercy killing. Euthanasia is the deliberate killing of a person for the benefit of that person. In most cases euthanasia is carried out because the person asks to die, but there are cases where a person can't make such a request. A person who undergoes euthanasia is usually terminally ill. Euthanasia can be carried out either by doing something, such as administering a lethal injection, or by not kill a person even if they are terminally ill because this person needs a chance to live along and see his life, but there are people that disagree.

Introduction

Mercy killing, also known as mercy killing or assisted suicide is an act of murder which are usually to end the life of a person suffering from severe pain or terminal illness. An individual who is tormented by a disease you want to plant at the end of his life, but do not have the ability to do so. In such a case, and may request assistance from another person. This is illegal in most, but not all, areas of the world. Allow certain languages, provided that they are to follow strict guidelines and the procedure is by a doctor, the patient's request.

In the United States, assisted suicide is legal in only two states – Oregon and Washington. And others have created, such as the Netherlands, Switzerland, Belgium and Luxembourg are also rules for legal mercy killing. Rules of practice in areas where the law allows assisted suicide voluntary.

That regulations governing the work of doctors allowed to put an end to the suffering of patients who choose voluntarily to physician assisted suicide.

The case of terminally ill, which creates severe physical pain may require assistance. In areas where it is permitted by the physician assisted suicide is generally not legal for any person other than a doctor to help in the death of the last, however.

Mercy killing and assisted suicide is a controversial issue in the community and among medical professionals in general. Some doctors believe that the practice of assisted suicide is incompatible with the teaching profession does not hurt. On the other hand, others argue that extending the life of a person who wishes to die is a violation of human rights harsh.

One of the most popular activities assisted suicide is an American pathologist Dr. Jack Kevorkian. She helped illegally in the death of more than 100 patients in the United States, was convicted of second-degree murder in late 1990. In 2007, he was released from prison. Since then, Dr. Kevorkian appeared in several universities in the talk shows to promote his beliefs and theories about the patient's right to die.

While it is more common, and not all of mercy killing with the help of a doctor. Although it is a criminal act, there are many reported cases in one family member or other non-medical staff until the life of another, usually at the request of the patient. In some cases this is done by removing or cutting the life-saving device. At other times, the act was committed by administering a lethal overdose of drugs. If convicted, the person who can send mercy killing is illegal to prison

Classification of mercy killing

And mercy killing can be classified according to whether the person giving informed consent in three types: voluntary and non-voluntary and involuntary.

There is controversy in the medical literature and bioethics about what if it can be considered as non-voluntary (and by extension, it was accidental) killing patients, mercy killing, regardless of the intentions or the circumstances of the patient. In the definitions offered by Beauchamp and Davidson, and then by the Wreen, and consent by the patient which are not considered to be one of the criteria, although it was asked to justify mercy killing. However, others see the agreement as necessary.

Voluntary mercy killing

Mercy killing was carried out with the consent of the patient's so-called voluntary mercy killing. And active voluntary mercy killing is legal in Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Voluntary passive mercy killing is legal in the United States Cruzan V. Director of the Department of Health and the state of Missouri. Is often used when the patient brings about his death for the assistance of physician-assisted suicide instead. Suicide is legal in Switzerland and the United States from Oregon, Washington and Montana.

Non-voluntary mercy killing

The implementation of mercy killing if the patient's consent is not available so-called non-voluntary mercy killing. For example, mercy killing, which is illegal in all parts of the world, but in the criminalization of certain specific circumstances in the Netherlands with the Groningen Protocol.

Involuntary mercy killing

Performed mercy killing against the wishes of the patient's so-called non-voluntary mercy killing.

Procedural decision

Can be divided into voluntary and non-voluntary mercy killing and involuntary to more variables, passive or active. A number of authors to consider these conditions to be misleading and unhelpful.

Passive mercy killing

Passive mercy killing involves the rejection of common treatments such as antibiotics, which are necessary to sustain life.

Last mercy killing

Last mercy killing involves the use of lethal substances or forces to kill the most controversial.

Sense of medical

The poll comes in the United States more than 10000 doctors to the conclusion that it was thought about 16% of the doctors to stop life-sustaining treatment because the family's request, even if he believed it was too premature. About 55% do not, and the rest 29% depends on the circumstances.

This study also noted that California. 46% of doctors agree that he should be allowed to physician-assisted suicide in some cases 41%, no, and the remaining 14% think it depends

Discussion

Even some who accept and we can say the above principles, there is no real difference between allowing someone to die and the status of the person suffering in a coma until his death, in order to alleviate the suffering. Then you have to choose not to remove life-support systems. After all, as they say, and the result is the same in both cases. Also, if you remove your old age or treatment of a patient dying, the patient dies because of this procedure. Thus, they contend, by removing life-prolonging treatment is. A case of murder in the mercy killing as the cause of death is the direct intervention by the person injecting the performance or act of violence after death. Although the two procedures, euthanasia, and allowing to die, is similar in the result, are not the same in process or in the grounds next.

In the case of allowing to die, it is true that the patient usually dies on the removal mechanisms of aging or treatment, but the cause of death is a condition that there is now allowed to have a natural effect. For example, the device is removed the ventilator and the patient died because of disease, cardiovascular system and lungs. Mechanism or treatment that prevent the removal of this life-threatening disease because it is more useful cognitive function and emotional, are not allowed to be a disease that affects the natural. Allows nature to take its course. In euthanasia, and the cause of death is a disease caused by a mercy killer. Can cause disease by direct interference with the normal activity of the physiological system of the patient or to withhold specific treatment for the system that should be provided. Can therefore be achieved by withholding the necessary euthanasia drug, as well as a pistol. In one way or another, therefore,

euthanasia is an act of violence committed in the physiology of the person concerned and which caused the disease. In addition, at least an implicit justification of euthanasia is to exercise total domination over the human life.

Some argue that the ultimate justification for euthanasia, and to liberate the suffering, is enough to justify this action. In this way, as they say, Roswell Gilbert, and others who wish to put an end to the suffering should not lead to the imposition of moral or legal. Unfortunately, there are many ethicists today to justify any action until the last reason is good. But such thinking ignores the reality. Actions that lead to achievement motivation and one that will eventually be a reason to be morally justified. For example, if the final was my motivation may be to collect money to send my children to university, and I do not have the right to steal the money of widows and orphans.

Conclusion

Mercy killing can and do not go hand in hand.

According to Buddhism, can not justify mercy killing. Mercy killing can and do not go hand in hand. Some people kill pets because they do not like seeing animals suffer.

Some try to justify mercy killing with the misconception that if the motive or reason for this is good, then the act itself is a good thing. Then that the claim to kill pets, they have the intention to alleviate the suffering of the unfortunate animal, and so a good job. There is no doubt that the original

intent or motive is good. But the act of killing the evil that is done during the second idea would certainly help in achieving health outcomes.

final thought: To determine the value or not intended in any business and we realize that may be the person who conducted the work of a self-satisfied with any sense of moral guilt. In the case of Roswell Gilbert and all the others in this same position, and we will be more interested in the discussion of the support system that would allow him to achieve his pain more humane way to discuss what could be a just punishment.