

Biomedical ethics assignment

[Art & Culture](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Term Paper When a competent adult chooses to end his or her own life others are morally obliged to interfere only to the extent of providing access to the help needed to achieve the goal. Claim whether this is true or false; defend your claim by arguing that better reasons exist for accepting the claim than rejecting it. Be clear and unbiased, objective and good reasons. First paragraph, make your claim and preview how you intend to support it. Draw upon readings. When using ideas of other authors, make it clear you are doing so.

Quotations are limited to one sentence. Paraphrase other author's ideas into your own words. Spelling and grammar and make sure every sentence makes sense to what you want it to say. 1100-1200 words. If a competent adult agrees to end their life, I believe that others are morally obliged to interfere only to the extent of providing access to the help needed to achieve this goal. My claim to permit active euthanasia is going to be supported by Earache's Minimal paper, as well as his response to Sullivan paper negating Earache's profound arguments.

I will put forth reasoning behind why Sullivan and B?? chamel and Childless were not assessing the overall points of Rachel. I will back up my view of permitting active euthanasia with Kant's categorical imperative, the golden rule argument, and the mercy argument. This will compliment my standing on how passive and active euthanasia are equivalent. When there is an option to put an end to a terminally ill patient's life due to suffering and lessen the prolonging effects of agony to loved ones, increase utility in the hospital and in society at large, this option should be permissible with the patient's consent.

<https://assignbuster.com/biomedical-ethics-assignment-essay-samples-4/>

The right moral decision ; n such cases will be illustrated in this critical examination. Rachel evaluates the American Medical Association (AMA) system and general IEEE on allowing passive euthanasia in public policy, however, condoning active euthanasia as impermissible. Killing and letting die are equal. For example, when Smith kills a child for Inheritance money, and Jones simply allows the child to die (when he could have saved the child) for the same end goal, Is a good parallel onto how active and passive euthanasia are corresponding.

If a patient is suffering and is going to die regardless despite all the medication, injections of pain killers, anesthetics, surgeries involved, and if the patient agrees they want to be let out of their agony with also allowing their loved one's out of an antagonizing and horrible experience, then euthanasia should be permissible. By providing active euthanasia, you are not harming anyone, you are letting someone out of harm.. You are doing good (beneficence). B?? chamel and Childless unknowingly confirmed Earache's position of that active and passive euthanasia are equivalent.

In their reply to Earache's they stated that is it morally permissible to allow patients to die under certain conditions, therefore it should be morally defensible to kill them in the same conditions. They then used lack of empirical evidence as their scapegoat out of the argument (fallacy). Of the argument. Sullivan, being a traditionalist, focused on ordinary and extraordinary means by arbitrary definitions as " benefit" and " excessive" which I personally feel have no objective or operational definition to help others understand it in a real life sense.

I feel that the traditional view is meaningless when plugged into practical decision making, which makes an ethical theory unfavorable. If an ethical theory does not give us a decision procedure, it is not helpful in real-life situations. Sullivan pleads that intention is of importance in the rightness or wrongness of an act, whereas Earache's claims that intention has nothing to do with it. I agree with Earache's that intention is a judgment of character, and it's the action that counts.

Jack and Jill both did a morally right thing in helping take care of their sick grandmother, however their intentions were different. We see Jack as honorable due to his character, but Jill did not do anything wrong. I don't see how anyone could think that Dry. Black was wrong in taking the patient out of their agony sooner than Dry. White, allowing the patient to die slowly. To knowingly allow someone to suffer in my opinion is the same as killing them, if not worse and is simply inhumane.

Earache's reply to Sullivan states two very important arguments to help show why active euthanasia should not be a crime. The mercy argument and the golden rule argument. The mercy argument is in itself justified: to put an end to suffering, and cruelty remains to let a living thing be in such pain and agony for no right or justified reason. The golden rule argument comes from Kant's categorical imperative and states that "do unto others as you would others unto you. This means that if you had a choice to suffer a long and slow death or be put out of your misery right away (like we do as veterinarians to suffering dogs) a sane person would choose to be put out of misery. This is the best decision not only for the interest of the patient or you perhaps one day, but also the family, the nurses and doctors so that they can use the <https://assignbuster.com/biomedical-ethics-assignment-essay-samples-4/>

recourses and time to help other patients in need and care. I think if there is no hope for the dying patient, staying alive is causing them harm, and if they agree to die, then let them go.

If those opposed to the utilitarian view of making public policy decisions based solely on happiness and misery are trying to claim that there are there things to take into consideration, then they should remember that they themselves state that autonomy, Justice, freedom and rights are important. If the patient chooses to die, this is their freedom of choice and autonomy that the medical system usually poses such significance onto, however in the case of the patient wanting or even begging to be put out of their misery, the medical system ignores autonomy.

Killing is wrong, but I also think that there is a bad connotation onto that word. I am not in favor of euthanasia when it not needed, as Rachel himself, but I am in favor f active euthanasia when it is the right choice given the circumstances and situation. When we think killing, we think murders. We are being unethical if we are making patients live painfully for 8 years with no quality of life, as in the tragic Jonathan Swifts case.

The traditional view protects its traditions, but does not accept reasoning, can be hypocritical, and ironic. We are violating rights and humane behavior by allowing patients to suffer. Many of the arguments made against active euthanasia miss the point of that it no one's rights are violated, then it is a the right choice. Using fallacies and focusing n particular events in a paper do not grasp the overarching point of the argument, but rather, protect their psyche from agreeing with what the author is saying.

The arguments in Sullivan and B?? chamel and Childless, the bible and Christianity themselves all unknowingly confirm that allowing active euthanasia is not immoral. We must use objectivity and take a wholesome approach. We need to use reasoning and logic to hone in closer to doing what is truly right rather than protective and defensive practices to what has been done in history. To do this, we must use objectivity and take a wholesome approach to euthanasia.