

Euthanasia already
used mercy killing on
animals



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Euthanasia has long been an issue of controversy for years. The term 'euthanasia' basically means the action of bringing about an easy and painless death for persons suffering from incurable diseases. Euthanasia, though now becomes a hot discussion, is actually not an uncommon thing. Scientific workers in agricultural aspect already used mercy killing on animals long time ago. Yet, that did not draw as much attention as now among human beings. Opponents of euthanasia always disapprove of euthanasia on two grounds.

Firstly, that taking away someone's life is wrong under all circumstances. Secondly, some of the arguments are based on the side-effects and responsibilities that euthanasia brought about. In this paper, I will argue against both of the above.

I will discuss the arguments for euthanasia based on three principles. Firstly, people have their own right to decide when and how to die. Secondly, patients have the right to die with dignity. Thirdly, euthanasia actually should not be considered as an inhumane action. As a result, it will be concluded that euthanasia can be morally acceptable. Keywords1.

Introduction This short paper seeks to discuss the controversial issue about euthanasia and argues that euthanasia can be morally acceptable.

In order to establish the validity of such an argument, the paper first introduces some background information about euthanasia. After that, it starts to emphasize that people have the right to make decisions about when and how to die. The first step of this task consists of talking about other

human rights implying the right to die, This reflects that human beings own the autonomy for their deaths.

Then, it moves on to argue for the claim that people also have the right to die with dignity. Finally, it tries to discuss the argument that mercy killing does not violate humanity. Once these three steps are completed, this paper then eventually concludes that euthanasia, morally, can be accepted. 2.

Background Euthanasia means ‘ good death’, ‘ dying well’. There are ranges of activities can be done for conducting euthanasia such as withholding or withdrawing treatments and providing someone the means to end his or her life. There are also six types of euthanasia including voluntary active euthanasia, voluntary passive euthanasia, involuntary active euthanasia, involuntary passive euthanasia, non-voluntary active euthanasia and non-voluntary passive euthanasia. Since both involuntary active euthanasia and involuntary passive euthanasia are commonly regarded as a type of murder, this paper mainly focuses on talking about the other four types of euthanasia. 3.

Right to Die Human beings have the right to make decisions for their death (when and how to die). As long as the person is lucid, and his or her decision is clear and beyond doubt, there should be no question (BBC, 2014).

Although there is no specific common agreement saying that human beings have the right to control their death, the right to life covers the right to die. It is arguable that the right to die should be included in human rights. The right to life does not simply talk about someone’s existence, it also values the quality of life at the same time. Life contains the process of dying which is

one of the most significant events of one's life. Thus, people have the right to make their own events of life as good as possible.

If the dying process is suffering and unpleasant, people should have the right to shorten the painful dying process, so as to prevent the unendurable pain and quicken the unavoidable death, then consequently increase the quality of life. Yet, people bear obligations to their families, friends, doctors and nurses. These obligations limit their right to die.

However, it is important to be noted that those obligations should not outweigh their rights. Hence, the right to die seems to be included in human rights and people should be given the right to self-determination over life and death. We have correlative duty to respect the right.

This implies euthanasia morally is not a contravention of human rights and the choice of euthanasia should also be respected. In line with the right to die is the belief of autonomy. This important belief held by human beings should also be taken into account.

The term autonomy can be simply demonstrated by an informed, competent adult patient who has the right to control what happens to their bodies. He or she can refuse or accept treatments, drugs or surgeries according to his or her wishes as he or she is rational and has his or her own freedom. These decisions must be respected by everyone even if those decisions are not in the best interest of the person.

As a result, in order to insure an individual's autonomy, the right to die should be respected and euthanasia should be considered as morally

acceptable. 4. Die with Dignity Many people frown upon euthanasia on religious grounds. They think that it is an improper behaviour which shows no respect for human life and is a blatant violation of God's will. In their eyes, the action of killing patients by conducting life-ending treatments contravenes the God's law. Therefore, Christians hold strong belief that no one owns the right to take off someone's life and hope.

In concordance with the religious standpoint is the traditional standpoint. Conservative persons are also opposed to mercy killing on the grounds that it is counter to the traditional ethics. A person's life is the most valuable present given by our parents. Therefore, from their point of view, under no circumstances should we give up our precious life, nor does anyone have the right to carry off another's life. Yet, whether the above points reasonable remains to be discussed. Undeniably, life is invaluable and divine.

However, its value does not rest on its duration, but depends on its quality. The extension of a feeble and excruciating life seemingly just adds agony and pain rather than hope to the dying patient. While the religious belief aims at providing people with spiritual relief, doctors' purpose of conducting euthanasia is having the same lofty nature. As doctors' role is to care for patients and to be their advocate, they wish to relieve human suffering caused by lethal diseases and respect their desire of choosing euthanasia to have a painless death.

So, euthanasia is a moral act for patients who are incurably ill to die peacefully, and most importantly, with dignity. Furthermore, for those who suffer from incurable illnesses, death is a mercy. It is common to see people

committing suicide are with the intention of being reluctant to be burdens on others. Choices between committing suicide and conducting euthanasia, the latter is obviously a more dignified one. No one wants his or her death to be immersed in pain and torment. It ought to be admitted that some physical, as well as psychological pain and suffering can only be relieved by euthanasia. It should therefore be moral and ethical to accept and respect the desire of the badly ill patients who are desperate for euthanasia which can sustain their dignity. According to Swanton (2015), when one feels hopeless that his or her life is no longer meaningful and worth living because of intractable pain or loss of dignity and capability, he or she should have an option of seeking assistance in dying.

Voluntary active and passive euthanasia are already a moral and civilized outcome for Australia with dignity provided for the terminally ill patients. This demonstrates how euthanasia helps to sustain one's dignity at the end of one's life. Euthanasia thereby should be considered moral as it is not only concerning a person's right to die, but also his death with dignity. 5.

Euthanasia Is Not Inhumane There are some arguments which against euthanasia focus on the drawbacks and responsibilities that mercy killing brought about. Although it is a fact that euthanasia is generally carried out based on the request of the patient himself, people still doubt and challenge the extent to which it is humane.

If euthanasia is morally accepted or even made to be a legal option, there may be chances that people may put pressure on their dying relatives to be willing to undergo euthanasia. Moreover, doctors may easily give up patients who still have opportunities to recover, All these weaken society's

<https://assignbuster.com/euthanasia-already-used-mercy-killing-on-animals/>

commitment to provide care for dying patients. Hence, these people may regard euthanasia as an indirect form of murder. But, one should be ready to accept the reality that having deadly diseases is equivalent to waiting for death. The decision on euthanasia is surely beneficial to patients instead of a doctor's own interest.

If it had not been for the untreatable illnesses like brain death, doctors would not have conducted euthanasia. Though some people claim, and correctly so, that technical advancement may turn incurable diseases into curable ones in some not too distant future, it should be noted that none of the cases on euthanasia are conducted promptly. Sometimes, it takes few years to deal with the process.

During this period, patients can get sufficient chance to show progress. If no signs of recovery can be observed, why wait for miracles endlessly and letting the patient be afflicted with misery? This seems not a humane thing that we expect. No one means to discard another's life viciously, but that is the last resort. While many objections to euthanasia are concerning humanity, it is believed that our definition of 'humanity' ought not to be too narrow. Clearly, the most debatable human rights' contravention touches on the attack on others' rights to live.

Yet, other patients' right to survive should not be neglected. Resources are always limited, it is not affordable for hospitals to allow hopelessly ill patients to constantly occupy the wards. Every day, patients suffering from kidney diseases, diabetes or stroke are waiting for medical resources and hospital services. It is even more inhumane to exchange these patients' lives with

those who have no chance of getting recover from extreme physical or mental disability. Some may counter that medical ethics of nonmaleficence principle obligates us not to cause harm to others (Henderson, 2015). Harm is the term by which we mean leading someone to death (inhumane).

Most of us consider death a bad thing because most people do not want death. People value being alive, they wish to experience and do many things (BBC, 2014). The case, however, is not for the terminally ill patients. Death may be a good thing instead of a bad one for the dying patients. People who agree to conduct euthanasia are always longing for a good death which is peaceful, painless, lucid and with loved ones gathering around. In this kind of situation, euthanasia can even be regarded as humane as it provides people with spiritual and physical relief which results in a good death with dignity. 6.

ConclusionIn view of the analysis above, we can see that some claims attacking euthanasia are not valid. It is not fair to see euthanasia as inhumane and unethical as euthanasia let patients who are suffering from mortal illnesses have their right to make decisions concerning their own death. Besides, euthanasia provides hopeless, dying patients with means to end their life in a more dignified way. Last but not the least, euthanasia is not contradictory to humanity, it even reveals its humanity in nature in some conditions.

Hence, euthanasia, if properly applied, will bring moral and ethical benefits to stakeholders ranging from the patients themselves, healthcare providers, other patients to society. Actually, the concept of mercy killing seems to get more and more popular over the world and gain ground everywhere. It is

high time we started to be open-minded to recognize that euthanasia should be morally accepted.