

Baby theresa

[Philosophy](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Baby Theresa Case As all cases related to bioethics, the case of baby Theresa does not have a single right answer that could satisfy all arising moral and ethical issues. It puts forward a number of considerations to be taken into account and demands making a deep insight into moral principles one has. As for me, it was not an easy decision, but I support the decision of not allowing parents to donate organs before the natural death of a child, because it undermines sanctity of human life that has various negative implications.

In my opinion, no one can have a moral right to make decisions about death and life of other people, regardless of whether they are ill or are not capable of making decisions. The facts that baby Theresa was born with a terrible decease that left her no chances for recovery and that she was alive only for 9 days serve as grounds to argue that her organs could have been used for transplantation. However, the following point view implies that this is up to people decide who should live and who should be used as a means for achieving an aim. Permission to kill anencephalic babies for their organs immediately makes such children inferior to others and means that someone has a right to evaluate the importance and relevance of somebody's life. It appears that approach which regards the possibility of taking one life to save another undermines the value of human life as whole. Here arises the problem of deciding who can be considered alive and who is not.

Immediately, one can question the relevance of existence of people in coma and regard them as inferior and less important than conscious people.

Similarly, could it touch severely retarded children, who are not capable of making decisions or leading a conscious and reasonable dialogue? I believe yes. The main issue here is that no one should have a right to making

<https://assignbuster.com/baby-theresa/>

evaluations of whose life is more important and who is merely a means and to take a responsibility of talking about the common good and beneficence. In addition, allowing to donate organs of a child with anencephaly can serve as a precedent and further lead to widening of the law. The following can, eventually, result in a permission to transplant organs without patient's consent in various contexts. For instance, it would give more freedom for medical workers to decide whom to consider eligible for donation. It could happen that soon people in coma or severely ill patients would be used as donors of organs without their permission or will be forced to give such permission. In any case, I do not feel that any human can be exploited and used as a merely an object.

Solution of current bioethical dilemmas is quite a challenging task that presupposes a reconsideration of moral principles, personal values, and legal aspects. With the development of various kinds of technologies and tools that are now widely used in medicine, the number of dilemmas continues to grow and, often, there could not be a single right answer to the questions that were put forward. It seems that people's opportunities outstrip the ability to comprehend their implications. Thereof, what once seems to be a good can soon become a disaster.