Ethical Issues Concerning Euthanasia

Posted on September 19, 2019

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/ethical-issues-concerning-euthanasia/

Introduction

The prospect of euthanasia is one of the crucial issues of debate today in the world. The feature of euthanasia comes up with many different considerations. The specific word euthanasia is known as the happy death or mercy killing. It is the prospect which allows the person to die (Biggs). It is essential to consider that giving permission for someone to die is moral, but killing someone under the paradigm of euthanasia cannot be justified. The concept of euthanasia is characterized as the practice of killing a person by choice who is dealing with an immense level of pain and suffering. It is a deliberate attempt to finish someone's life for the sake of providing relief from an immense form of physical pain. There are always some concerns which are associated with the practice of euthanasia.

The particular practice of killing someone without consideration of the prospect of nature makes it one controversial topic. The feature of controversy involves the following phenomenon because it involves many different forms of moral and ethical features. There are some people who provide an ethical basis to consider it as an unethical and illegal activity to kill someone even if he/she suffers from chronic health concerns ("Should Euthanasia or Physician-Assisted Suicide Be Legal?"). There is another side of opinion which comes in favour of the practice of euthanasia. The pro and the against opinions approach about the practice of euthanasia make it a topic of controversy. Here, the focus is to identify different perspectives related to the ethical controversy of euthanasia and provide arguments as to why it should not be considered as an option.

Discussion

Debate on Euthanasia

It is evident that euthanasia is the one debatable issue over time when it comes to legalizing this practice on a vast level. Different ethical and legal considerations are presented from the perspectives of both patients and healthcare providers. The following approach to euthanasia also concerns the one form of ethical dilemma which is faced by doctors. Undoubtedly, it becomes a difficult decision for doctors when they have to make decisions about health and care in case of chronic illness. Difficult conditions demand them to consider difficult decisions referring to the approach of moral reasoning. The decisions on health provisions become difficult for doctors when

they have to deal with different forms of ethical dilemmas, such as euthanasia. The phenomenon of euthanasia is defined as murder or killing as it considers the immoral approach or position of the physicians based on their obligations. It is a reality that it is a tough decision for healthcare providers to withhold or withdraw treatment in the case of a patient who suffers from a chronic health condition (Levin et al.). It is a crucial and difficult perspective due to different cultural, religious, and legal considerations. It is notable to mention that different nations have different approaches to adopting the feature of euthanasia. There are laws in many countries which permit the willful killing of a person who goes through an extreme form of pain due to a chronic illness, and there are no chances of cure. There are also many countries that strongly condemn and prohibit the practice of euthanasia as it is considered an action against the strong ethical foundations. There is an example of a few individual cases in which people try to convince the government and the court to legally permit the feature of euthanasia because it is the only form of relief in case of severe pain or lethal disease which is incurable.

Religious foundations of the world never encourage the idea of euthanasia as it is considered immoral or unethical activity to kill oneself without the will of God. It is considered suicide, which is a sinful activity because they want to finish their lives just due to worldly problems and pain. The religious perspective changes the overall feature of the debate in the case of euthanasia as it never comes up with many cultural and spiritual considerations. The concept of euthanasia is also a crucial perspective under philosophical considerations. Many philosophers have come up with the approach that it is not just the actions which are associated with killing, but allowing someone to die can also be recognized as a form of killing under the phenomenon of euthanasia (Quill et al.). The element of cause plays a crucial role in determining the concept of euthanasia as an ethical or unethical practice, as it is crucial to understand the reasons and consequences associated with allowing someone to die willingly.

Kinds of Euthanasia

It is crucial to understand that the features of euthanasia can be identified through its different kinds. A proper understanding of the form of euthanasia helps to make inferences about its ethical perspective. The active form of euthanasia is the most discussed form, which is defined as the act of painlessly leading someone to death to give relief from the chronic and incurable form of the disease. This form of euthanasia can be implemented by giving a heavy dose of medicine, which ultimately becomes the reason for the killing. Passive is another broader form of the prospect of euthanasia. It is identified as the paradigm in which healthcare providers allow patients to die if they struggle with immense forms of pain and turmoil due to their severe health conditions (Inbadas et al.). When doctors do not give a required form of medicine to the patient with the intention to kill, it is an example of the passive type of euthanasia. Both the wide terms of euthanasia can be explained as the concepts of the voluntary and non-voluntary forms of euthanasia. Voluntary euthanasia is concerning in particular cases when the patient himself/herself gives consent or requests to the healthcare providers for a specific kind of medical treatment or non-treatment to get relief from the

misery and pain of their severe health conditions.

This form of euthanasia is based on patients who are characterized by a functional state of mind and are fully willing to finish their life due to the severe effects of any chronic disease (Pereira). It is also observed that sometimes patients permit their relatives to decide their lives on their behalf. On the other hand, the approach of non-voluntary euthanasia is different because it is not based on the decision made by the individual who is to die (Materstvedt et al.). The patient with an unconscious mind can be considered as an example of non-voluntary euthanasia when a doctor or the relatives decide about his/her death due to the health condition. It can be characterized as the one severe form of murder or killing because the individual does not have the idea that his/her life is going to end soon. All the death decisions are identified under the prospects of voluntary and non-voluntary forms of euthanasia.

Arguments about Euthanasia

There is the existence of many arguments which are strongly raised against the practice of euthanasia in many parts of the world. The first major argument against the following concept is that it is totally against the will of God. People do not have the right to interfere in the doings of God. It is obligatory for humans to accept the decisions of nature and God exactly the way they are and not try to refuse the will of God. Many critics argue that the practice of euthanasia cannot be justified because there is a purpose of nature behind every prospect of nature. If someone immensely suffers from some fatal disease, there should be some universal approach behind that, and individuals should respect the decisions of God by accepting their state of life.

It is crucial to describe the counterpoint of this particular argument to make successful inferences about the ethical concern of euthanasia. Some individuals believe that the option of euthanasia should not be rejected in specific cases where people suffer immensely from their lives just because it is against the will of God. It is argued that one can make inferences about what God wants. God provides intellect to individuals so that they can make decisions and make their lives easy. People should adopt an approach that gives them more happiness and less suffering. It is feasible for individuals to decide on the end of their lives if their suffering becomes immense and unbearable. It is recommended that when life becomes troubling for humans, they should have the authority to end their lives (Emanuel et al.). This form of counter-argument can be easily rejected by deeply understanding the prospects of comfort and trouble in life. It is crucial for humans to accept the reality of life and understand the true approach to life. It is obligatory for humans to think critically about why God created them. Religions of the world provide the perspective that suffering and pain are the evident part of humans' life, and they cannot segregate themselves from this happening. People have to deal with different forms of troubles in their lives, so it does not mean that they end their lives due to the trouble. Severe health issues are also one form of trouble for humans from God, and they should accept this as a test with patients. Ending life cannot be the solution to the problem as it eliminates all the chances of betterment and development in life.

Another valid and strong argument against the consideration of euthanasia is that it is immensely difficult to decide whether someone is fully willing to accept the feature of voluntary euthanasia. Consent of the patient about the murder always comes up with less surety as every individual loves life, and no one wants to end his/her life on a permanent basis. There is a valid chance that the patient agrees to end their life, but it only comes up with a temporary emotional state of mind and never means it in real.

The argument against this point is raised in the form that there are some cases in which individuals are all willing to end their lives because they immensely suffer from the chronic form of diseases. When people understand the reality that they are dealing with an incurable disease, then they can go for voluntary consent to kill themselves. This particular point of euthanasia can be rejected by considering the emotional state of the patients. It is quite clear that people who suffer from different lethal diseases in their lives mostly show a confused and distorted state of mind. They indicate the imbalance in their approach to their emotional patterns. There is the possibility that sometimes they ask for death due to their pain, but that does not prove that they want the practice of euthanasia to end their life.

The wrong diagnosis by the healthcare providers is another approach which determines the fact that euthanasia should not be the one option for the patient. Undoubtedly, there is the possibility that the doctor wrongly diagnoses the health prospect, and there will be a chance of cure in the case of the patient. It never seems feasible decision to take someone's life just by the doctor's approach. All the chances of treatment should be considered as the different medical advancements are the reality of today's world.

The following argument of the wrong diagnosis is rejected through the justification that there are very few chances of the wrong health assessment by the doctors. There are many fewer chances when doctors fail to properly and correctly diagnose the aspect of incurable illness. This particular feature cannot be considered as the approach to accepting euthanasia as the legal and ethical practice for the people. It is crucial to understand that the chances of the wrong judgment are always there, and we cannot avoid this happening. It can happen in any case, as human error cannot be fully rejected, irrespective of the technological advancement in the field of medicine. It is accepted that a diagnosis at the doctor's end is not always wrong, but what if it is wrong judgment? The aspect of misdiagnosis cannot be fully avoided, and euthanasia should not be the point of consideration as the chances of the wrong diagnosis in case of incurable health concerns are always there.

Another crucial aspect which makes the overall argument strong against the approach of euthanasia is that there are chances that the legalization of euthanasia opens many wrong ways for people. Individuals can use this particular practice in many wrong ways as it is the approach which has the potential to encourage a non-voluntary form of euthanasia. Regular practice of euthanasia can be the cause of the generation of many immoral approaches in society. If it becomes difficult for people to take care of old people, then they can go for the option of non-voluntary euthanasia, which is entirely against the right to live for every individual. The exercise of euthanasia can be common in society as

people find it difficult to take care of individuals who are dependent on others as they are disabled or very old. There is no second opinion about the fact that the feature of euthanasia can be the cause of many immoral features in society (Ferreira). This form of argument is answered by many people to initiate strict rules with the consideration of euthanasia. There should be a strong implementation of policies related to voluntary death decisions to eliminate the chances of non-voluntary euthanasia in society. The following argument of counterpoint for the case of euthanasia can be easily rejected because, most of the time, it is immensely difficult to differentiate the difference between voluntary and non-voluntary forms of euthanasia. If things are misjudged by people in the case of the practice of euthanasia, then it will end with the valuable life of the individual by killing or murder.

Another crucial aspect which eliminates the approach of euthanasia is that it is crucial for the people to understand that life is a very precious gift from God which should be handled carefully. It is the one necessary obligation for the people to understand and consider the blessedness of life. Life is not something that is taken for granted, as it is the only chance for the individual to connect with their loved ones while considering all the prevailing problems.

There are many individuals who present the approach in favour of the practice of euthanasia, in which everyone has their rights. There should be liberty for everyone to decide whether to live their life or give up their lives (Harris). It should be individuals' decision that what they want to do with their lives. The following argument can easily be rejected with the point that society should not allow individuals to give up on their lives as it can be a factor of encouragement for the practice of suicide. It is crucial for people to consider that when the aspect of suicide is not acceptable in society, then what makes the practice of euthanasia acceptable for people? It is crucial for society to understand that life is the gift of God, and although sometimes it comes up with the feature of pain, people must live through it according to the will of God.

Conclusion

To conclude, the discussion about the prevailing practice of euthanasia in society is that it is crucial for people to make decisions about life and death by considering the features of morality and ethics. It is crucial for society never to consider the approach of euthanasia as it is not only applied in the case of individuals who suffer from a fatal illness. If this practice is legalized, then it can become an option for those as well who are not severely ill. It can encourage the prospect of killing those people who are not willing to undergo the pain of the low intensity. Allowing the practice of euthanasia can encourage people to use it for their benefit to avoid their responsibilities of care and concern for others.

Work Cited

Biggs, H. *Euthanasia, Death with Dignity and the Law.*. Hart, 2001, https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=E3asTXxKps4C.

Emanuel, Ezekiel J., et al. “Attitudes and Desires Related to Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide among Terminally Ill Patients and Their Caregivers.”. *Jama*, vol. 284, no. 19, 2000, pp. 2460–68.

Ferreira, Nuno. “Latest Legal and Social Developments in the Euthanasia Debate: Bad Moral Consciences and Political Unrest.”. *Med. & L.*, vol. 26, 2007, p. 387.

Harris, Nonie M. “The Euthanasia Debate.” *Journal of the Royal Army Medical Corps.*, vol. 147, no. 3, 2001, pp. 367–70.

Inbadas, Hamilton, et al. “Declarations on Euthanasia and Assisted Dying.” *Death Studies*, vol. 41, no. 9, 2017, pp. 574–84.

Levin, Kfir, et al. “Attitudes Toward Euthanasia for Patients Who Suffer From Physical or Mental Illness.”. *OMEGA-Journal of Death and Dying*, 2018, p. 0030222818754667.

Materstvedt, Lars Johan, et al. “Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide: A View from an EAPC Ethics Task Force.”. *Palliative Medicine*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2003, pp. 97–101.

Pereira, José. “Legalizing Euthanasia or Assisted Suicide: The Illusion of Safeguards and Controls.”. *Current Oncology*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2011, p. e38.

Quill, Timothy E., et al. “Palliative Options of Last Resort: A Comparison of Voluntarily Stopping Eating and Drinking, Terminal Sedation, Physician-Assisted Suicide, and Voluntary Active Euthanasia.”. *Giving Death a Helping Hand*, Springer, 2008, pp. 49–64.

“Should Euthanasia or Physician-Assisted Suicide Be Legal?” *PROCON.ORG*, 2018, https://euthanasia.procon.org/.