

Essay on euthanasia

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



English

first i want to say that English is not my native language that is way I said I am in high school but i am not but I don't want it to have very sophisticated vocabulary.

so what i need is an Persuasive Essay and I want to talk about why I think Euthanasia should be allowed, ((because of the right of humans who have terminal illnesses to die in dignity, also the right to end their suffer and pain, and that they don't have the life quality also it is a emotional and physical distress for the family experiences)) I don't know but these points what came to my mind, maybe you like it maybe there are some of the point needed to be change, do what ever you think is right; however, I need it to have 3 sources article or books with pg numbers and for each source we should right a paragraph long about it in order to strengthen our arguments, , I will show you an example:

Annotated Bibliography

Batt, Ellen G. " Teachers' Perceptions Of ELL Education: Potential Solutions To Overcome The Greatest Challenges." *Multicultural Education* 15. 3 (2008): 39-43. ERIC. Web. 30 Sept. 2013.

Callins, Tandria. " Culturally Responsive Literacy Instruction." *TEACHING Exceptional Children* 39. 2- (2006): 62-65. ERIC. Web. 30 Sept. 2013.

but also we need to have Counterarguments and Supporting Arguments for each point and we should have 4 of them and we should support our arguments with an articles or books about the argument to be more persuasive.

I hope you understand what I am trying to say here

I hope you got the idea

thank you.

Euthanasia is derived from the Greek words eu and thanatos, which means pleasant and death, respectively. Many individuals consider euthanasia, or pleasant death, as mercy killing because terminally ill people are killed prior to their own natural death rather than suffer continually from their long agonizing situation or vegetative conditions. Defenders of euthanasia argue that all persons have basic human rights, not just to life, but also death. For instance, they insist that brain dead people, through closed family members, should be given the legal permission for physicians to end the lives of their loved ones. To the contrary, opponents of euthanasia argue that killing people (or letting others do it for them) is like murder –even with their legal and other consents. Hence, euthanasia presents a moral conflict because there is no consensus to any of the above claim and counterclaim held arguments for or against it, as we shall see below:

Pro-Euthanasia People

Pro-euthanasia, or those who are in favor of euthanasia, argue that people have the explicit rights to choose what to do with their lives, such as on how to end it. For them, individuals possess the personal freedom to end their lives, especially under the curse of a debilitating disease. Pro-euthanasia groups believe that human beings have inalienable rights to life, liberty, property, and/or even death. Since individuals have their own lives, it is for their own taking and risk. For example, some Japanese people who want to save faces resort to hara-kiri traditional ritual suicide). Hence, not far from

the concept of various forms of self-destruction, mercy killing becomes an alternative for people who decide to end their life because of their “unbearable suffering,” “hopes for a good death,” and “fears of abuse”. Further, if people’s rights to terminate their lives do not violate other individuals’ rights, euthanasia should be permitted by our society. For pro-euthanasia individuals, it is a violation of personal freedom if people are denied the help to achieve quick death unworthy of continued existence. Many adherents of euthanasia assert that upon attaining maturity, human beings should already have control of their decisions in life. Since people on earth came into this world without predetermined consent, it is only fitting that given their rational maturity now, should rather be given full discretionary power to decide and act according to their best interest as autonomous beings. Family members of those who undergo mercy killing are thankful for having doctor-assisted death because it is already nearly impossible for living normal lives. The death wish is like a sweet smelling aroma for their souls because once they finally become detached from excruciating pains.

Second, pro-euthanasia individuals and groups insist that to avoid great economic burden, wastage of health, medical, and other resources, people in vegetative states should rather be allowed to die. The reason is for them to help conserve a variety of resources for other hundreds of indigent individuals who need more immediate help and treatment for curable diseases. Obviously, pro-euthanasia people believe that there are more individuals from many underdeveloped countries and calamity-prone who need the most financial services (e. g., healthcare, medical, etc.). If more

scarce resources are saved, other people will be cured to live healthy and meaningful lives and become productive members again of their society. Since some people who suffer unbearable illnesses 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. If people who are comatose, terminally ill, or in vegetative states continue to live for years or decades, we only let them suffer the more and remain as burdens of their families and society. Because there usually is not a cure for diseases requiring mercy killing, people in favor of pleasant death reason out: why should not we rather give them what they deserve (that is, peaceful death).

Third, another argument from people who favor mercy killing advocate for the its legalization so that people can choose death as an alternative or for their best interest. With laws, euthanasia would be practiced legally and it would mean proper regulatory measures of medical practitioners. Thus, instead of licensed physicians performing euthanasia illegally, they won't get penalized. Take for example prostitution, gambling, abortion, etc. in other countries; because they are legal, there is no problem for practitioners to engage in illicit activities. They are also not stigmatized, incarcerated, made as outcast, and so on. People who opt to do such activities freely do so lawfully. So, why not do the same for mercy killing? Further, since euthanasia happens anywhere anyway at any time across the world, pro-euthanasia defenders push for its lawful implementation as the only best solution. With euthanasia being legal, many physicians would then practice mercy killing without much burden to their conscience. Since death is a part of the normal

cycle of life, why should we not rather have euthanasia as an 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 whose religious practices are contrary to them)? Why should not rather legalize euthanasia so that practitioners have to follow utmost professional standards in performing mercy killing?

Anti-Euthanasia Individuals

The refutation to the above first pro-euthanasia argument is that anti-euthanasia defenders believe that despite people having free will, it is limited. For them, God only has the Sole Authority to take people's lives. Since God is the Provider of Life and Everything, He alone is the Rightful Claimer of the life of any person. Despite the fact that individuals die differently, 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 they are only mortal beings. Unlike God who is Immortal, although He takes again people's lives, He alone can resurrect. No one, for that matter, is above God. People should not use their freedom to do anything that is contrary to the normal flow of nature. Hence, many euthanasia groups argue that no argument is best enough to justify it no matter how good people's reasoning and intentions are. Anti-euthanasia people insist that no person is as merciful as God. Because human beings will die anyway, let alone God decide when it is time for people to die. Further, people who like mercy killing will only weaken respect for the sanctity of life in the long run. The fact that there are unscrupulous and evil-minded people means that they will

advance their own interest. In some cases, even when someone who is terminally ill or in vegetative state does not still want to die, should he/she be given the chance to be conscious and talk, they will be at the supposed mercy of evil people. Many people 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).

Second, for anti-mercy killing groups, killing dying individuals to conserve scarce health, financial, medical, etc. resources is simply a foolish idea of a devil’s advocate. People’s lives are more important than material possessions. Likewise, if people are simply considered as undesirable members of their family/society, more ethical problems will follow.

Professionals and other practitioners may abuse the power given to them by law to get rid of their enemies, disabled individuals, and special children seen as burdens only of our society. When we kill people, can we bring their lives back should there suddenly be a cure for their disease?

Third, anti-euthanasia defenders assert that the legalization of euthanasia will only result to the undermining of life. Other than people with evil schemes will do their power to gain more from it, euthanasia will not succeed if it will not be legalized (that is, without help from “doctors, nurses, and other healthcare professionals) (Atherton 19). Some people will use it only to blackmail others; thus, killing an innocent dying patient 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, euthanasia) by family members. Whatever the reasoning and intention behind mercy killing, surely, the victim is at its worst situation, worse than before. He may lose

everything he worked for his entire life as inheritance for those whom he truly loves. Also, think of legalizing euthanasia where there is no punishment for wittingly doing it. Better not to legalize it than be at a sorrier state than before. Sometimes it is best to leave things as they are than meddle with them.

In conclusion, I am not in favor of euthanasia because I strongly believe that God is more loving, more merciful, and wiser than anyone. Additionally, euthanasia might only lead to other disadvantages (e. g., infanticide, genocide). Moreover, it can be used for more inhumane acts never before imagined. Further, legalizing euthanasia would undermine more lives because not all professionals will act in the name of laws. Some selfish individuals who value money more than lives will have more chance to kill others intentionally for their evil purposes. Therefore, euthanasia will become unfavorable to anyone who live but once; so, why not rather value life despite anything contrary to it?

Works Cited

Atherton, Helen. "Dangers Of Ambivalence: Lessons Learned From The Nazi Era." *Learning Disability Practice* 16. 1 (2013): 16-20. Web.

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

Griffith that the there is a law, for instance, that recognizes the futility of providing continuous life-sustaining treatments to very ill and critically sick patients. Courts rejected consistently an absolutist approach to intervention that requires physicians and carers to keep on futile treatments until near death. Life sustaining interventions may be legally withdrawn should it is not

anymore to the patient's best interests to have treatment. Nurses are advised to know when interventions become futile to make sure that they are perform their duties legally should a decision is made to withdraw treatment. The author of this article considered the recent test to determine whether treatment should still be resorted to when it is futile to do so and how it will affect nursing practice.

Hendry, Maggie, et al. " Why Do We Want The Right To Die? A Systematic Review Of The International Literature On The Views Of Patients, Carers And The Public On Assisted Dying." *Palliative Medicine* 27. 1 (2013): 13-26. Web.