

Should active voluntary euthanasia be legalised?

My argument is against the use of Euthanasia. Euthanasia I think is not proper to be practiced in any form. Namely I am against Active Voluntary Euthanasia. Euthanasia is the act of taking a person's life which is wrong even if the person desires to die. As defined by euthanasia definitions, active voluntary euthanasia is when the person who is killed has requested to be killed. It is a crime to take someone's life. **Who has the right to take another person's life? Who should be allowed to state whether a person should die? And who can determine whether taking a person's life is for the benefit of the person who dies?** Euthanasia is wrong and should not be legalized because of three reasons: it violates the constitutionalized law. It violates the fundamental principle of medical ethics and it also violates the teaching of many religions.

My first argument against is that the euthanasia should not be practiced because It is a rejection of the importance and value of human life, human life is a very higher value to be destroyed by euthanasia. Active euthanasia is the act of killing of a living person in attempts to stop the suffering on someone's behalf. Active euthanasia should remain illegal because of the immorality of the acts. In looking at the definition that will be enough to prove that active euthanasia should not be accepted in our society. In the first part of the definition, active euthanasia is the killing of a living person. Despite any circumstances, a living person has the right to live liberty and the pursuit of happiness. By taking away the life of a living person, it takes away from the natural rights given upon us by being Australian citizens living under the declaration of independence. If one's life is taken away from them, then they no longer have that right to live and have therefore their rights of freedom and their hope of happiness no longer exist either.

It is a slippery sloop. Euthanasia would not only be for people who are terminally ill, it could extend its possibility to that is not terminally ill. Now if we specify this in our case, to a terminally ill patient we agree that this human being is in need of help. All the resources that are available should be for his welfare because his being proceeds in value terms than any other thing. Human life as shown takes a much higher status at top of all other worldly considerations, therefore an individual should be left to reach his natural death and in the latter only relieve his pain through the enhanced modern medicine and not kill them. The act of causing death to someone with the full intent to kill them is murder. Let's look at all the advancement in science and technology and all the social sciences that their ultimate motive is human welfare.

Now taking the case of a patient who is terminally ill can we say that there judgment is wholly rational or sound. It is not so. Because this very consent for death is against human nature, since fear of death which is universal. This proves that there consent is not reasonable or sound. This left the argument of choosing life or death for a patient is weakened because these individual are in no better position to choose for them death. Therefore because a patient has given consent of death does not provide a sound basis for euthanasia. A terminally ill patient has a very complex state of life, Generally speaking human nature is very much influenced by its external environment. I will act differently in different situations in life. For example if I am in pain I would only be concerned about my health not wealth, education etc. Moreover my social and emotional thoughts and actions would be different in each state. All this suggests that human behaviour is liable to change. Therefore my judgment is influenced.

Moreover, euthanasia violates the teaching of many religions. It is stated in the fifth commandment, "**thou shall not kill.**" And a script from the Holly Quran that clarifies "**when their time comes they cannot delay it for a single hour nor can they bring it forward by a single hour.**" Men are made from the image and likeness of god. God gave us life. Therefore only god alone, the creator of life, has the right to take the life of a person. No one can dictate when to end a person's life. Killing is an immoral act. Euthanasia is a form of killing. Even if a person is in a state of comatose, there is possibility that the person will wake up and still continue his life. That possibility is a miracle, it is given by our creature, God. Miracle do happen when you have hope and trust in God.

All this shows the wrong side of voluntary euthanasia. Now the question points to what should be the alternative course taken with this serious problem. Euthanasia should at all costs be avoided because as stated in one of the aims of organization working against the use of euthanasia, that human life should be sustained right from fertilization till death. Additionally all the resources at disposal, including modern medical technology should be supplied in helping the patients to lessen their pain without causing death. In this regard, it might be helpful to put more financial, capital and research resources to help people in terminal stages of life. Therefore, if I were to make a declaration of my view of euthanasia, it would simply be, "I am against active euthanasia."