

Candidate 3 evidence

5. One religious response to the statement "end of life decisions should be based on care, not killing" would be that of a Christian perspective. A Christian response on this statement would be that they would agree with it completely as the majority of Christians are against the idea of euthanasia and are in support of palliative care, which has a strong focus on caring for people in the time they have left and attempts to make their lives as comfortable as possible, an idea supported by Christians as many of them believe that only God has the right to both give and take life, meaning that He decides when a person is to die and to speed up that process would be opposing God's wishes. They also believe that the process of death should not be interfered with and should be allowed when God wishes, this however has opened the faith up to criticism as it can be said that they have interfered with the process of death themselves when caring for the sick and even sometimes preventing the death of these people. This however can be dismissed as a counter to their ideas as doing so, caring for the sick and preventing death, is perfectly in line with the teachings of Jesus. Another criticism of this argument could be that it forces people to create decisions based upon little to no evidence, following only the teachings of a very old book and many people who may not fully understand it. A disadvantage however of the Christian argument is that although there is a focus on care for people at the end of their lives and choosing not to allow them euthanasia it is sometimes best to offer euthanasia to these people to prevent their suffering as not doing so could be even more harmful and painful for them, showing a possible lack of care. I believe that this perspective is a very biased one and requires the Christians to think from more of a group perspective, limiting their freedom of thought in this way.

A non-religious response to this statement would be from the perspective of a utilitarian who would agree to the statement but only to a small extent as they would believe that although there should be a strong focus on care at the end of people's lives to reduce suffering and increase happiness they would also know that sometimes the best thing to do for someone would be to allow them euthanasia as that may be the most caring thing to do as well as also allowing them a degree of free will not available in other perspectives. A criticism of this

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>argument could be that although they do have a focus on increasing happiness allowing patient with a degenerative disease that freedom to make decisions could have disasterous results as these people may not be fit to make the decisions that they would be offered. Another criticism is that there is no clear outline as to who is eligible to make these decisions on thir own lives as someone with a mental disorder that inhibates their lives greatly and severely reduces their quality of live may not be allowed this process whereas someone with a terminal illness may be allowed, even if they have a higher quality of life than the other person. An advantage of the utilitarian perspective could be that they have been able to create a balance between the 2 ideas presented in the statement, knowing that there is times when killing someone may be the best possible option as they may wish for it and they may be able to have a higher quality life at the end than if they weer not allowed this service, showing care. Another advantage of this perspective is that many of the methods used are painless and quick meaning they cannot be felt by the patient at all, as opposed to the slow and painful death they would receive at the hands of their disease. I believe that this is the most balanced of the arguments towards this statement and allows the most fair consideration of it.</p> <p>A third and final perspective on the issue is that of a Buddhist perspective which is quite unique in the fact that they do not believe that the body is very important, meaning that they may even disagree with this statement as in thir belief system the body is nothing more than a vessel for the soul, wasting resources on prolonging an unessesary life would be against the Buddhist ideas. Although the buddhists are in support of caring for other people the unique perspective of the statement focusing on the decisions at the end of someones life may cause a Buddhist to lean more towards killing a person through the use of euthanasia than caring for them as they will live past the death of their body. A criticism to this argument could be that although they are attempting to do what is best for the soul of the person they have not considered the views of the doctor in their assessment, forcing them to go through with a process they do not agree</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>with simply because an unseen entity of the person will live past they death of the body. Another criticism of this argument could be that the Buddhists in this sense do not seem to be very caring towards the lives of others but that critisims can be easily counter by understanding the beliefs of Buddhists in that they will help other especially in a life threatening situation but they do not believe that the body is entirely important, it is one of the things that makes us a person but there is still much of the person left without it as through the process of reincarnation the same person can be reborn. A disadvantage of this belief system is that it is not very convincing as it relies on belief in something that there is little to no evidence indicating, it requires blind faith even when someones life is in question. I believe that this is much like the Christian perspective in that it requires a very bias outlook of the statement to justify this viewpoint, forcing Buddhists to not look at it from a personal perspective but instead as a Buddhist and deciding that way.</p>	