



**National Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering,
Science, Arts & Humanities (NCETESAH – 2022)**

27th February, 2022

CERTIFICATE NO : NCETESAH/2022/C0222315

**OVERVIEW ON EUTHANASIA WITH RELATIONSHIP TO PHILOSOPHY
AND BIOETHICAL ISSUES**

Rumana Afrose

Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy,
Mansarovar Global University, Sehore, M.P.

ABSTRACT

Euthanasia's bioethical concerns cover the ideas of life and death. Bioethics, a subfield of "applied ethics," explores the moral dilemmas that face the human community, from the neighbourhood nursing home to the human genome project. It is an interdisciplinary field where ideas are contributed by experts from a variety of fields, including philosophy, theology, law, medicine, and science. In this article, overview on euthanasia with relationship to philosophy and bioethical issues has been highlighted.

Keywords: Euthanasia, Philosophy, Bioethics.

INTRODUCTION

Ethics is typically understood to be a collection of moral guidelines that are upheld by an individual, a group, or a particular tradition. It explores what is good or bad and assesses whether a certain behaviour is right or wrong. It is a science of human-life-related ideals. Normative ethics and practical ethics are the three main topics of study in ethics. Theoretical implications, references to moral claims, and how their truth-value may be assessed are all covered by meta-ethics. The focus of normative ethics is on goals, values, and what "ought to be." It refers to right or wrong, which may be unrelated to any one individual's or culture's ideals. Applied ethics examines diverse moral questions and societal obligations in relation to day-to-day activities. Additionally, it covers the moral issues raised by various circumstances.



National Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering, Science, Arts & Humanities (NCETESAH – 2022)

27th February, 2022

Although the study of applied ethics as a subfield of philosophy dates back to the time of the ancient Greeks, it has only recently come to be taken seriously as a separate academic field. The majority of professionals in their respective fields do not care about the moral principles guiding their work. Most of the time, their line of work is at odds with moral principles. This thesis addresses the particular problems and predicaments faced by these professions as well as the values at play in these situations on a fundamental or foundational level. Many contentious concerns result from advances in biology and medicine. The ethical issues that arise in the interactions between life sciences, biotechnology, medicine, politics, law, and philosophy are of interest to bioethicists [1]. It also looks into the most common moral problems in general health care and other parts of medicine.

EUTHANASIA WITH RELATIONSHIP TO PHILOSOPHY AND AN ETHICAL ISSUES

The Greek words "bios" and "ethike" are the sources of the word "bioethics." The words "bios" and "ethike" both refer to life. It is the study of moral dilemmas that arise when biological professions like nursing, medicine, and other health care careers are practiced. The core elements of bioethics are the medical community and other healthcare professionals. This field of philosophy has recently attempted to describe, analyze, research, and examine the ethical problems relating to the medical sciences. Bioethics is concerned with fundamental human values, including the right to life and health, as well as the rightness or wrongness of specific developments in healthcare institutions, life technology, medicine, and the health profession. It is also concerned with society's accountability for the life and health of its members. It has to do with the moral values guiding biology and medical research. It deals with a number of moral questions that come up in the family, hospital, government, and society as a whole [2].

In the year 1970, Van Rensselaer Potter coined the phrase "bioethics." According to his definition of bioethics, it is "a new discipline that integrates biological knowledge with a knowledge of human value systems, which would construct a bridge between the humanities and the sciences, help humanity survive, and sustain and develop the world in which civilization exists." The phrase "human survival" was first used in the fields of philosophy and science by Potter and is devoted to a higher standard of living. Later, in 1971, Georgetown University established the Kennedy Institute of Ethics



National Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering, Science, Arts & Humanities (NCETESAH – 2022)

27th February, 2022

as an ethical institute. The study of the ethical implications of biology and medicine is called bioethics, according to the Kennedy Institute. Dan Callahan established the prestigious research centre known as "Bioethics as a Discipline" in 1974. The classical philosophical investigation of human emotions, societal factors, and political impacts on medical practise were all used in this field. According to the philosopher Onora O'Neill's "bioethics is not a discipline... It has become a meeting ground for a number of disciplines, discourse, and organizations concerned with ethical, legal and social questions raised by advances in medicine, science and biotechnology" [3].

Biotechnology is a branch of science that is value neutral, meaning it has neither right nor wrong. Similar to how we use blades to cut things, biotechnology has the potential to either cut something like a vegetable or kill someone depending on the user. Similar to this, science can be both beneficial and harmful depending on the person making the decision. For instance, the rationale behind the development of dynamite and the atomic bomb was to use them constructively for the advancement of humanity, but we instead chose to use them destructively by impeding that advancement. Similar to cloning, genetic engineering, gene therapy, plastic surgery, and hybridization, these technologies were created with good intentions but are rarely applied appropriately in many circumstances. Some of the most important bioethical issues are cloning, the human genome project, euthanasia, and abortion. Albert R. Jonsen states biomedical ethics as;

Intense study of ethical implications of this important medical advance led to guidelines and legislation that defined the permissible scope of screening programs. Just as the ethics of biomedical experimentation stressed the consent of the subject, so the ethics of genetic screening emphasized that programs of premarital and prenatal carrier screening be done with the knowledgeable consent of those screened.

Birth control and death control go hand in hand, says ethicist Joseph Fletcher. They are the opposites that play a role in every aspect of human life, including debates over euthanasia and abortion as methods of birth and death control, respectively. Thanks to the development of science and technology, we now have a powerful instrument to control birth by combining genetics, obstetrics, and foetal medicine. In a similar way, we have made it possible for people to manage the process of being raised from the dead and having their lives extended. This appears to be illogical since, on



National Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering, Science, Arts & Humanities (NCETESAH – 2022)

27th February, 2022

the one hand, we accept medical abortions using the rationality of mercy as justification and, on the other hand, we continue to be reluctant to accept positive action towards a person's final stage of life, where the progression of life has become hopeless and painful, even in terms of medical and social criteria.

The fear of lingering between life and death in an intolerable and painful condition is one of the reasons why issues surrounding euthanasia have become one of the most contentious concerns in the current context. The development of science and technology in the realm of health has given doctors more control over the terms of treating diseases that were once thought to be deadly. The distinction between life and death has blurred as a result of this implication, and many people now firmly believe that, with a doctor's help, we can always order death to wait a while longer. With the help of machines, the transition from living to dying can now be kept going. This bridges the gap between living and dying. One significant effect of this breakthrough in science and technology that led to sustaining death was a significant concern among doctors, lawyers, ethicists, and society about where the line between life and death should be drawn. For instance, doctors want to establish certain legal definitions of death that will allow them to practise certain medical operations, such as organ transplantation, and ease their consciences when it comes to dealing with death. It has long been believed that the absence of biological functions, including breathing, heartbeat, and stimulus-response, is equivalent to death. The ability to prolong biological life has grown stronger, and the methods currently in use to identify the precise signs of death are insufficient. These misunderstandings have made doctors and patients vulnerable to the technology. This has the effect of confusing doctors and making people fearful [4]. An effort to find a resolution to this contentious problem would be good. Finding a resolution to this dilemma is of interest to philosophers and theologians alike. “Philosophers advocated that the selection of patients should be made on the basis of social utility, assessed in light of the social worth of individuals as contributors to society”. Theologians responded that “the inherent dignity of individuals required that judgments of social worth be reputed and that selection be made by random methods, such as lotteries”.



National Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering, Science, Arts & Humanities (NCETESAH – 2022)

27th February, 2022

As was already established, the development of bioethics led to the cessation of numerous experiments and inventions involving human life. For instance, cloning allows for the consideration of moral and social implications in solving problems. Newer difficulties in daily life are brought about by the growth of science and technology. Perhaps, especially in the healthcare industry, they are causing new issues. The most significant and serious bioethical challenges are cloning, stem cell treatment, euthanasia, and abortion. The current thesis is a modest attempt to assess assisted suicide from a medical professional's and ethical standpoint. A careful synthesis of factual reality and modern science has been done in order to reveal the merits or demerits and rights or wrongs of euthanasia with ethics as the cornerstone, a careful synthesis of factual reality and modern science has been done.

When people hear the phrase "euthanasia," they frequently feel intense emotions mixed with dread and perplexity. Most people have the idea that euthanasia is just another word for murder, and some people think it is compassion killing because they think there is no purpose in delaying the inevitable. Marvin Kohl, in his writing, *'The Morality of Killing'* brings down both these views and stated that;

According to the critics it is almost self-evident that euthanasia is morally wrong, and therefore unjustifiable homicide. To the advocates it seems equally obvious that a moral man is obliged to avoid and help to reduce, needless misery, and that non-voluntary euthanasia ought to therefore be legalized.

According to its etymology, the word "euthanasia" comes from the Greek word "euthanathos," which means "happy death." However, the phrase is used inconsistently throughout the literature, which frequently causes misunderstandings. Two humanistic concerns serve as the foundation for the arguments in favour of euthanasia. The first is compassion for those who are suffering or terminally ill, and this argument can be expanded to encompass the patient's choice to decide how and when to die. The second is a concern for freedom of choice and human dignity. Neglecting the second issue causes the person in question to lose some of their dignity. The universal prohibition on killing others is one of the counterarguments, and it is upheld in most societies. These individuals firmly believe that all forms of euthanasia should be prohibited. They believe that life has intrinsic value and that being



National Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering, Science, Arts & Humanities (NCETESAH – 2022)

27th February, 2022

alive is preferable to death, regardless of one's aspirations, achievements, or ultimate purpose. According to a religious viewpoint, life is God's gift, and nobody has the authority to interfere with the Absolute's operations [5]. In fact, we can find such a stance on the sanctity of life concept even in Christianity. Thus, harming anyone in any way is categorically forbidden by the Almighty's moral code. Joseph Fletcher argued in opposition, saying that this dread is really just rule worship. The implication of a universal prohibition on murder to preserve life does not imply that life is without flaw. There may come a time when life is no longer worthwhile.

CONCLUSION

This is not to say that life isn't worth living, but rather that the point has been reached where it's no longer worth it to save a life. Euthanasia cannot be seen as murder or killing in instances when a person is no longer a human, is unable to form interpersonal interactions, or has no awareness of events around them.

REFERENCES

1. Fecio, J. M. & Gorman, M. Euthanasia a Reference Handbook, Second Edition, Contemporary World Issues, California: ABC Clio Publishing, 2008.
2. Khushf, G. Handbook of Bioethics: Taking Stocks of the Field from a Philosophical Perspective, Springer, 2004.
3. Lltis, A. S., Johnson, H. S. & Hinze, B. A. Legal Perspective in Bioethics, New York: Rutledge, 2008.
4. Paterson, C. Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia a Natural Law Ethics Approach, Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
5. Skutch, F. A. Moral Foundations an Introduction to Ethics, Mount Jackson: Axious Press Publishing, 2007.