Passive_and_Active_Euthanasia_Research_Paper.edited.edited.docx

by

Submission date: 28-Nov-2021 11:04AM (UTC-0600)
Submission ID: 1714213168
File name: Passive_and_Active_Euthanasia_Research_Paper.edited.edited.docx (20.97K)
Word count: 2018
Character count: 11201

Passive and Active Euthanasia Research Paper

Name:

Institution:

Course:

Instructor:

Date:

Passive and Active Euthanasia Research Paper

Euthanasia is the purposeful termination of life to get rid of discomfort and distress. Euthanasia is divided into two classes: active and passive assisted suicide. The deferral of standard therapies, or exceptional means, required for continued survival, is known as passive euthanasia (Annadurai et al., 2014). Active euthanasia is when a practitioner uses either a lethal inoculation or other tactics to terminate the life of a patient who has stated a plea to break their misery. Socrates's death was a form of active euthanasia. He was found guilty of corrupting the youth, believing in false gods, and was sentenced to drinking poison hemlock. He used his death to teach his learners instead of escaping, embracing his death calmly (Hogan, 2017). The American Medical Association (AMA) believes that any feat adopted by a doctor to end a person's life at their wish deliberately is professionally and psychologically unethical. Nevertheless, they believe that conducting passive euthanasia and deferring therapy to relieve agony or misery at the patient's desire is entirely ethical. There are compelling arguments against this notion, as well as the opinions of the American Medical Association. "No moral distinction between active and passive euthanasia is justifiable," asserts Rachels (1975), the writer of the essay Active and Passive Euthanasia.

This assertion, which was affirmed by the American Medical Association's House of Delegates, accepts most medical professionals' ideology. It is acceptable to withdraw remedy and let the patient pass on, but it is inexcusable to take active steps that can lead to death. “The intentional termination of the life of one human being by another (mercy killing) is contrary to that for which the medical profession stands and is contrary to the policy of the American Medical Association. The cessation of the employment of extraordinary means to prolong the life of the body when there is irrefutable evidence that biological death is imminent is the decision of

the patient and their immediate family. The advice and judgment of the physician should be freely available to the patient and their immediate family" (Rachels, 1975). Most physicians approve of passive euthanasia while shunning active euthanasia. Rachel's fundamental idea is that, unlike some individuals' philosophies that killing somebody is justly eviler than allowing them to pass on, active and passive deaths are ethically alike, and physicians should not distinguish the two methods. There is a reasonable argument for a compelling example besides this concept. Rachels's objective is to uncover some of the essential comments supporting his position and get physicians to rethink their positions.

Among Rachels's essential opinions is offered with a famous type of scenario: a person with terminal malignancy of the esophagus is in extreme pain that cannot be managed satisfactorily to heal. This person's life prospect is weeks. In the person's belief, a few days is long based on their immense discomfort. All the patient asks is for the agony to cease quickly. They ask the physician to stop it, and the relatives become engaged. In this event, the physician answers affirmative and offers to stop treatment. Conversely, if postponing treatment demonstrates to be lengthier and torturous than a more straight approach like fatal inoculation, the person's agony would escalate. In the craving to end agony earlier, active euthanasia is by definition more humane than inert euthanasia. That explains why a common explanation exists for a legitimate argument in contradiction of the American Medical Association's stance. It is the identical motivation that convinces the person to demand an ending to their misery. A similar determination led to active euthanasia being branded a more ethical alternative. As per Rachels (1975), nobody considers that a remedy that causes additional discomfort is more virtuous. Rachels aims at establishing in this reasoning that there exist entirely significant circumstances where "killing somebody" is ethical instead of "letting them die." Maybe only a theoretically

precarious disease distinct to a person's awful deficiencies can disclose that active euthanasia can save the person a miserable life due to the perilous disease and the developmental disabilities.

This ethical subject of "assisted death" of a person facing an unhappy, tormented life is a source of great dispute because some entities contemplate this explanation for assisted death to be insignificant. "The ordinary concept informs decisions involving life or death made on unsuitable principles," Rachels (1975) argues. James Rachels illustrates children with Down's condition who need procedures to live due to anomalies not linked with the condition. These practices are challenging to execute and sometimes not a proper choice for newborns with Down's syndrome. As such, it is not commonplace for surgeons and families to reject operations. It is ludicrous that the sacredness of life is overlooked since someone was born sick. With a minor that has no complications, nevertheless, the state is overturned. In any case, the decision to terminate a person's life is based on irrational considerations as the subject is Down's syndrome, not an irrelevant disorder. Rachels presents authentic reasons for opposing the theory as irrelevant considerations start to control outcomes. Rachels adopted this case to explore if "killing" is ethical compared to "letting a person die" and concluded that the two could contrast, mainly when supplementary aspects like secondary ailments are considered. On the other hand, Rachels emphasizes determining whether to kill or let the patient die and the humane option.

Another argument involves the example of Smith and Jones. It proves that permitting someone to perish is as horrible as murdering them. Rachels offers his view as to whether murder is far eviler than letting somebody perish. He presents circumstances, one featuring killing and the other featuring demise. In the initial setting, Smith is a fellow standing to obtain a huge sum of cash if his relative perishes. Smith goes into his cousin's restroom and suffocates him, making it look like a misfortune. In the next instance, if Jones' relative passes, he will

become heir to many funds. He creeps into the plunge bath to sink his relative, but he sees his kin trip, hit the face, and then drop lifeless in the tab. Jones remains delighted and willing to support destiny transpire in his eyes.

Jones did nothing to the sinking child but stood by as it unfolded. Jones "simply" allowed the minor to succumb, but Smith made sure that he was aggressively in charge of his kin's passing. "If the dissimilarity in killing and permitting one perish are ethically important, we ought to assert that Jones's behavior is less detestable than Smiths," Rachels probes. Rachels offers a convincing example that the two individuals had similar motivations and occasioned in identical outcomes, and thus none is as dreadful as another. The sole argument to the notion that permitting someone to perish is healthier than killing is to admit a broken ethical judgment. While Rachels's concepts are morally justifiable in this picture, they can be taken to mean in an entirely changed light dependent on the underlying root of mortality.

Rachels' explanations back his assertion that allowing people to die is just as evil as slaying them in person. There exist substantive rebuttals with substantiated assertions in any outstanding case. Rachels labels one prevalent and well-supported principle. In "passive euthanasia," the physician does not accelerate the patient's demise. They, in reality, do nothing; they let fate and the ailment consume the person until they die. "Active euthanasia," on the contrary, comprises the physician prompting the "unintentional" passing away (Rachels, 1975). They unquestionably contribute to the person's passing. The critical discrepancy is that in active euthanasia, a deadly dose affects passing, whereas, in inactive euthanasia, the illness gradually consumes the person. This backs the American Medical Association's espoused philosophy. Rachels contests the rebuttal. According to Rachels (1975), " choice to let a person die is

susceptible to moral assessment in the same way that an idea of killing him will be: it might be judged intelligent or imprudent, sympathetic or cruel, fair or unfair."

To analyze it further, he uses a specific case. He asserts that if a physician ignores a curable condition, the practitioner is exclusively accountable for the death. He says that a physician has a comparable degree of guilt as a clinician who "executes" a patient. Both of them would encounter similar indictments. Rachels settles by offering rational and supportable counter-arguments to the AMA's certified thinking. Also, Rachels has offered many hypothetical scenarios, but we should recognize that such examples are weak because they are not founded on real-life examples.

An example is Dr. Jack Kevorkian (Dr. Death), who publicly endorsed physician-assisted suicide. According to reports, 60% of his patients who died due to his assistance did not experience terminal illnesses, and thirteen had no pain (DeCesare, 2016). Others lacked psychiatric evaluations and decided to end their lives due to other causes, which are not associated with terminal illnesses. In hypothetical scenarios offered by Rachels, there is no mention of psychiatrists or the patient's mental health. Dr. Jack Kevorkian's actions provide raw data on what to expect if we endorse physician-assisted death.

In the case of Rachels, the use of hypothetical examples in his argument has severe limitations. The primary drawback is that the outcome suggested in his opinion indicates the expected result and future intentions instead of the actual behavior as witnessed with Dr. jack Kevorkian’s actions. In addition, a hypothetical scenario, in this case, ignores the option of further medical treatment. A person does not necessarily have to be terminally ill to seek assistance in committing suicide, as per Dr. Kevorkian (DeCesare, 2016). There is no difference,

and the decisions should be with the individual, to go through or not to go through with the act of assisted suicide.

Nevertheless, many people can decide to seek the help of a physician to commit assisted suicide not because they are sick but for other reasons not related to their health. Also, some of the worst illnesses care treatable based on scientific innovation and modern medicine that minimizes pain and anguish, argued in the scenarios offered by Rachels. In essence, although most real instances of killing are ethically worse than other proven incidents of allowing patients to die, we are more acquainted with death cases (especially the horrific ones that make the news). Still, we are less aware of the details of assisted euthanasia. Because of this disparity, we assume that killing is active worse.

Three divisions are made in Rachels' theoretical foundation: biology and biographical life, murdering and allowing death, and standard and exceptional medical care. Because of their philosophical, conceptual, and practical deficiencies, these characteristics do not offer a viable ground or criterion for the admissibility of active euthanasia. Rachels's hypothetical scenario is dismissible due to logical reasoning, slippery trajectory, and inconsistent with central justifications. His additional differentiation is digressive, unnecessary, and redundant. His dismissal of the line between regular and special medical care is unfounded.

To sum it up, Rachels' final assertion is that there exists no honorable dissimilarity between behavior, actions, and abstaining. Where abstaining is permissible, doing so must be authorized as well; meaning, where "passive euthanasia" is accepted, we ought to take active euthanasia as well. Rachels' hypothetical argument is unrelated to the AMA's statement and there are distinctions between the scenarios owing to intent and causation. Rachels fundamentally provided valid counter-arguments to the AMA-renowned position. He even established how

active euthanasia ought to be the preferable route on some occasions. Rachels' arguments, and the counter-argument, were both exceedingly convincing. Since the well-acknowledged ethical and practical constraints, one decisive solution may not be imaginable in today's setting. Even so, Rachels trusts that any interpretation that passive euthanasia is less dreadful than active euthanasia can be refuted using the evidence of each scenario.

References

Annadurai, K., Danasekaran, R., & Mani, G. (2014). 'Euthanasia: Right to die with dignity'. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, *3*(4), 477. https://doi.org/10.4103/2249-4863.148161

DeCesare, M. (2016). How 'Dr. Death'Single-Handedly Fought for the Right to Die. *Aeon*.

Hogan, J. E. (2017). The Conscience of the Law. *The Catholic Lawyer*, *21*(3), 4.

Rachels, J. A. (1975). *Active and passive euthanasia*.

Passive_and_Active_Euthanasia_Research_Paper.edited.edite...

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%	0%	0%	0%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to University of Stirling Student Paper	<1%

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	Off
Exclude bibliography	On		