

# Example by StudyDriver

Source: <https://studydriver.com/euthanasia-and-death-penalty/>

---

## Euthanasia and Death Penalty Example

The difference between killing and letting die is killing would be ideal in the medical field such as giving a person a medication to rush or conclude their existence gently to put them out of suffering or torment. Letting die would be letting a god take direction and just give them a drug to have a person content until they take their last breath and die. Reasons why killing is morally defective than letting someone pass away would be society feels it's wrong to assist in suicide to someone in the cases of euthanasia because they feel it is morally wrong and the doctor nor patient should be able to hand someone a prescription drug to put them to rest. Another example is the death penalty. There is still an enormous quantity of people that think the death penalty is exceptionally unlawful no matter the circumstances.

- The case in which a doctor can give a patient a prescribed medication to end a person's life is a case that Rachels thinks that letting die is morally negligent than killing. Rachels thinks it's never appropriate to do this and that it's illicit even though Rachels still believes this is a situation that giving someone the opportunity to take their life is worse than killing.
- Rachel's "Smith and Jones" case strives to reveal that there is no moral contrast between an action which causes

passing, and inactivity which directly permits death to exist. This is related to the debate relating to euthanizing humans about the noble difference between killing a person and letting them die. The moral suggestions of this is how the dissimilar thinking processes from unlike people can and are different but still trying to get the same outcome.

- Nesbitt censures Rachel's steadily because he has the complete opposite judgement and viewpoints as Rachel's, so he is quite different in his response and he also strikes Rachel's with a ton of what if's and has a bundle of multiple scenarios her way just, so he looks like he is accurate and more rational.
- Nesbitt's claim is as bulletproof and as logical as James Rachels' on the same topic. Alternatively relating the subject to active and passive euthanasia, Nesbitt steers straight to what he calls the "difference thesis" saying that no moral contrast between killing and letting die. Nevertheless, Nesbitt initiates the rivaling philosopher Raziel Abelson, yet gives no words to his belief or explanation. I feel that Nesbitt is zooming from the facts by excluding this counter argument. Whether the dispute would have diminished Rachels' is unconnected, Nesbitt could have initiated the argument more broadly and given a counter argument to point out any misconceptions.
- Rachel's perspective on the ethics of killing versus letting die would be most reasonable with utilitarian because utilitarianism states "actions are right if they are useful or for the benefit of a majority. By saying if helping a patient innocently and painlessly to pass away to make it stress-free on that human being and to make it comfortable for the family and supporters around them to change on and endure with their lives then utilitarianism agrees that this a case in which they think it's morally acceptable and tolerable to assist the patient to die by aiding with their death.

Nesbitt's viewpoint would be the opposite and he would be more for the natural law ethical framework because he reasons killing is never justified and that death should be all natural and not hurried to benefit the patient and or their family. People with the same thoughts believe that we shouldn't muddle with life expectancy and we should let human beings pass on their own standings not with the help of the medical work force or whatsoever that would life alter with the working of god. For myself, I agree with Rachel's way over Nesbitt's. I'm a firm

believer that person or a person's kin should have the option on what takes place to their body or life. I feel there are numerous cases in which it is crucial and multiple cases in which it is morally the precise and suitable thing to continue with. I thoroughly comprehend peoples thought process and viewpoints on how they just want their lives over and where they just want it all to be ended. I think it is the right thing to respect patients requests and demands and that it is their lives and if that's what they wish then you must admire their choice.