

# A right to life but not to stay alive

Law



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Moreover, one's right should not be infringed to protect another as in the case of Jodie's right. The ruling by the judge to defend the right of life of Jodie is ethical even though it caused termination to the life of Mary. The decision of the judge had no violation of the law because even without conducting the surgery, Mary would still not survive (The Guardian, n. d). The attorney general's conclusion to protect the judges from conviction and criticism further considered the need to remain objective while making the rulings. Mary would still die even without having the surgery and thus decided to protect Jodie's right is prudent.

Finally, protection of the weaker should not be taken to authorize the violation of the dominant one. Though the submissions of the Catholic Church, pro-life and the parents had some essence, the judges went ahead to reaffirm to them that the decision does not make killing lawful and gave a comprehensive explanation to their decision (The Guardian, n. d). By so doing, the judges acted ethically and made their ultimate decision without completely disregarding the voices of all the parties. The opponents of the decision should, therefore, remain open-minded and be cognizant of the unique circumstances. The judge's decision is therefore supported and all parties should appreciate the ruling that saved a life.