

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	Medical Ethics.	
5	Plan	
	Palliative Care Bill - 2009	
	'care with the intention of relieving pain + distress caused by terminal illness.'	
	support for families	
	Marie Curie Hospices for cancer patients 1948	
	Pro	
	'good terminal care' - Chap 5	
	allows for 'dignity in death' - Chap 5	
	sacredness of life. 'imago dei'	
	'There is a season for all things... for death.' - natural end.	
	addresses spiritual needs, values life.	A put in euthanasia
	'gross violation of the law of god.'	
	Pro	
	→ dog P singer. → compassionate.	
	→ cost effective.	
	→ is not murder.	
	'I am in terrible pain, + want to die'	
	- Samel 1:9-10.	

ENTER
NUMBER
OF
QUESTION

Medical Ethics..

5.

In modern society, we are presented with a number of ways to help treat the sickly or elderly. One of those ways is palliative care. The 2009 palliative care bill defines palliative care as 'care with the intention of relieving pain and distress caused by a terminal illness. It can take a number of forms, such as medical and physical care, as well as psycho-social addressing psychological and spiritual needs.

This type of care can be carried out in a number of places, but most commonly this kind of care is carried out in hospices, such as Marie Curie.

Hospices for cancer patients, set up in 1948. Many see palliative care as the best way to lessen the pain of terminal illnesses, over other alternatives such as euthanasia. Yet, this is debatable.

debatable

Palliative care is the preferred method of care over euthanasia...

ER SER	<p>* therefore, Palliative care replaces the need for euthanasia as it is morally preferable</p>	
TION	<p>* 2 this could mean that palliative care replaces the need for euthanasia as it provides active care and treatment</p>	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>for</p>	
	<p>by many religious organisations, such as the Church</p>	
	<p>of Scotland (CoJ 5.) The primary reason for this</p>	
	<p>is the belief in the sanctity of life. The CoJ 5</p>	
	<p>believes palliative care affirms the sanctity of life by</p>	
	<p>attempting to preserve life, over compared to euthanasia,</p>	
	<p>which takes life. Life is sacred as all humans are</p>	
	<p>made 'imago dei' by God, created individually</p>	
	<p>by God. As God's creation all humans have individual</p>	
	<p>but equal worth, and therefore by showing respect to</p>	
	<p>one another, we show respect to God. Therefore Christians</p>	
	<p>would favour palliative care over euthanasia as such an</p>	
	<p>approach values life and its sacredness, and therefore</p>	
	<p>the CoJ 5 describes palliative care as 'good terminal</p>	
	<p>care.' * 2 Yet this view has a number of strengths</p>	
	<p>and weaknesses. A key strength is that it is compatible</p>	
	<p>with religious text. Palliative care is, primarily, primarily,</p>	
	<p>a form of care which conforms to Biblical principles</p>	
	<p>about caring for one's neighbour, 'love thy neighbour</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE THE MARKS

85 neither replaces the other - both are necessary to allow for choice.

ENTER
NUMBER
OF
QUESTION

DO NOT
WRITE
IN THE
MARG

which could decrease quality of life. As John Harris
argues 'when we take away someone's autonomy
we treat them as incompetent.' Euthanasia should
be legal - as well as palliative care - simply to
give people autonomy, and thereby measure their quality
of life. Similarly, Peter Singer argues that
palliative care is not preferable to euthanasia in many
cases as there comes a point when symptoms of a disease
are so bad that they decrease quality of life, and
this life is only of value when it has quality. Therefore
there will always be a need for euthanasia, as
palliative care cannot fulfil this need. There are a number
of strengths and weaknesses to
these secular views. For one, a strength is that the
view is compassionate. Arguably it shows respect for the
life of an individual - surely it is much more
respectful to let someone end their lives if it
is full of pain and suffering, rather than forcing them

* or at the hands of another person

* only euthanasia can offer this, so palliative care can ^{not replace} it

DO NOT
WRITE IN
THIS
MARGIN

to continue it. By doing this it shows a value for human rights and dignity - humans should not have to put up with low standards of life, for example in poverty.

Why then is it morally ~~debatable~~ debatable to say they should not have to put up with similar pains because of a critical illness? This view also allows for autonomy and individual freedom.

Yet there are also a number of weaknesses.

How can one's quality of life be measured, and who are we to suggest that someone's life is not worth living? It could lead to a slippery slope where life is undervalued overall. Nevertheless these views

make it clear that there are simply some problems palliative care can't solve, and that euthanasia may provide a more effective answer for.

Therefore palliative care cannot replace euthanasia.

* therefore palliative care cannot replace it.

TER
MBER
F
TION

DO N
WRIT
TH
MARK

There are three ways to carry out euthanasia; direct, indirect, and passive. Passive is simply letting someone die and not intervening, with indirect follows the notion of double effect - by increasing pain medication you may lessen someone's life span, for example. Euthanasia is legal in places such as Switzerland and Oregon. In Switzerland the procedure must be reviewed by two doctors, and be carried out by a licensed organisation such as Dignitas.

Many secular people view Euthanasia to be morally right and that it can't be replaced with alternatives such as palliative care. Euthanasia allows people to escape from pain, which many people - even doctors such as Dr. Jack Keenan - see as compassionate. This kind of compassion cannot be replicated in alternatives such as palliative care. *
Indeed, Peter Singer argues euthanasia shows more respect to life than methods which prolong

	MARK
<p>suffering such as palliative care, and therefore euthanasia cannot be replaced. Palliative care makes people sub-ordinate to a concept, and therefore shows little respect for the sanctity of life. In fact, argues Singer, the very concept of sanctity of life makes no sense outside of a religious context, and we show more compassion for our fellow humans by giving them the right to die. If our pets can be put down, surely we can be put out of our misery too. Palliative care does not allow for this option and therefore it cannot replace the need for euthanasia. There are a number of strengths to this view. It shows compassion for individuals by allowing them to choose. It could also be more cost effective than palliative care. Yet there are also several weaknesses. People suffering from these illnesses are vulnerable. How could we be certain that they were doing it for the right reasons, rather than acting out because of stress</p>	

and depression.

Many religious people find reasons to agree that euthanasia cannot be replaced by palliative care. Palliative care may

provide a way out of suffering, and this compassionate view could be seen as following the 'do unto others

as they would have them do unto you.' Additionally,

euthanasia can be backed up by religious text,

such as James 1: 9-10 'Be cried out.

'I am in terrible pain and want to die.' So I killed

him.' Euthanasia can be seen as an act of kindness

and mercy by providing relief from suffering, and

argued by in some cases this relief cannot be gained for from palliative care. Therefore it does not replace it.

Yet other Christians would disagree. The Catholic Church believes euthanasia to be a grave violation of the law of God, as it disrupts God's plan.

This can be a strength of this is that it can

QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p> and so replace euthanasia also be backed up by religious text, 'there is a time for all things... a time to die.' Men should not 'play God' by taking life in this manner, there are a number of strengths and weaknesses and therefore euthanasia is morally wrong and palliative care must replace it by default. Additionally the aims of euthanasia are at odds with the Catholic view, as the Church believes that 'suffering... especially in the last moments of life plays a great part in God's saving plan.' This means suffering should not be avoided but embraced, as it can bring us closer to God, and the by denying suffering euthanasia is wrong, and palliative care can provide effective pain relief instead. There are a number of strengths and weaknesses to this view. For one, it is hopeful as many people would find it uplifting knowing that their suffering was bringing them closer to God. Yet it can also be seen as heartless </p>

NUMBER OF QUESTION	DATE
①	

and cruel - as there seems little purpose in suffering.
By philosophising suffering the Church formalizes it.
Finally, just because the Church believes
the need to end suffering is wrong does not
mean palliative care deals with this need,
and therefore palliative care does not replace the
need for euthanasia.
In conclusion, while palliative care offers hope
and support to many people, it can never fully
replace euthanasia as a means with dealing with
or ending suffering.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	Philosophy of Religion	DO NOT WRITE THE MARKS
1	<p>The 'Cosmological Argument' was created by St. Thomas Aquinas, a Franciscan monk, based upon the previous writings of Plato. The argument was outlined in Aquinas' 'Summa Theologiae', in which Aquinas attempted to prove that belief in god was the result of reasoned and logical thinking. The argument has been criticised by a number of philosophers who believe that all the argument points out is that the universe must have a cause, yet this is debatably debatable.</p> <p>The argument can be summarised as follows, everything that exists has a cause, and every cause has a cause. Either this cause of causes goes back forever or there is one 'First Cause', who is what Leibniz describes as a 'Necessary Being' as it does not rely on something else for its existence. Aquinas dismissed the first option as infinite regress is impossible, so there must be a first cause. Aquinas identifies this</p>	

as God.

A number of philosophers have argued that Aquinas's argument proves only that the universe had a first cause, which does not prove the existence of God. One of these philosophers is David Hume. In his book 'Natural Religion' Hume argued that Aquinas makes a leap of faith by asserting that the First Cause is God - there is no evidence for this. It could be anything. Hume argues that it need not be the Christian God, but perhaps a team of gods, or it - as the world is imperfect - it could be 'the first rule essay of original an object deity'. This view is logical and valid. Indeed, Bertrand Russell pointed out that there is no need to identify something outside the universe as God, as we have no knowledge of what is outside it. The world itself could be the first cause. 'I should say the universe is just there

②

TER BER TION	<p>and that is all. Many proponents link this view to the view of the Big Bang Theory. Nevertheless, some say such a view is close-minded, and it is possible that there was an outside cause of the universe. One such view is How could the universe create itself if it is bound by the laws of the universe - the laws of physics etc? This surely suggests that there must be a First Cause must be outside the universe, and this First Cause is God.</p> <p>Yet others argue that the cosmological argument does not prove anything at all - not even that the universe needs a first cause. Aquinas argues that infinite regress is impossible, yet the concept of infinity is used often in math suggesting there is no first cause but an infinite chain of causes. This view is however somewhat illogical, as infinity is a theoretical concept that</p>	DO NOT WRITE THE MARGINS
--------------------	--	-----------------------------------

cannot manifest in the physical world (The
Hilbert Hotel paradox asks what infinity +
1 is, and how this would manifest in reality,
showing the fragility of the concept in practice.)
This means a chain of infinite causes is unlikely,
and a first cause is more likely. This could
suggest that Aquinas's theory holds some
weight - a first cause is necessary and this
could be God. Yet other philosophers have
also argued that Aquinas's theory does not
prove the need for a first cause. As Stephen
Hawking argues, sub-atomic particles can pop
into existence and out again with no seeming
apparent cause. Perhaps the universe itself
the same, but it has no 'first cause.' Yet
this view is also questionable just because
no cause can be observed does not mean there
is not one, and while sub-atomic particles
are tiny, the universe is huge and made up of

billions of particles. Therefore the suggestion that the universe could appear without cause seems unlikely, and Aquinas' view that there is a first cause - whether or not this is god - seems far more practical.

Many people suggest that the Big Bang Theory (BBT) was the First Cause, and actually a lot of Aquinas' argument can back up this theory. There are a number of similarities to the theory, such as the need for a first uncaused cause. The BBT leads many people to question the existence of God as it seems to be a more logical scientific explanation for the universe.

The Big Bang occurred and created time and space, in a moment of infinite heat known as 'the Singularity'. Over time, the first elements - hydrogen and helium, combined to make dust clouds. These condensed and eventually formed the planets we know today after B.S

③

DO
WRIT
TH
MAP

billion years. The Big Bang could be the first
 cause, and therefore the universe could cause itself
 instead of God causing it. This view is
 backed up by evidence such as red shift and
 Cosmic Microwave Background radiation. Aquinas's
 argument could therefore prove help to back
 up the Big Bang as the first cause, rather than
 God. Yet there are a number of problems with
 this theory. For one, as Paul Davies points
 out the universe cannot create itself, as it is
 bound by the laws of itself. Therefore there must
 be a Grand Unified Theory which transcends
 this, and this theory does not come from within
 the universe but instead is caused by the outside
 force of God. This view is logical, yet this
 view backs up Aquinas and argues that
 God is the only logical First Cause. This
 view is logical, yet just because nothing is

our experience can cause itself. does not mean it could not happen. Nevertheless, Davies backs up Aquinas, and if the two most logical possibilities are that 1. the universe caused itself or 2. god was the first cause, it must be concluded that option 2 is the most logical. That's to Davies. None the less, Davies simply asserts that the first cause must be outside the universe, and this does not mean the cause outside the universe is God. However, while it may not be the God of the Bible, any supernatural being outside the universe with the power to create the universe has the omnipotence of God, so it is logical to assume that it is God.

In conclusion, Aquinas's cosmological argument proves that there most likely needs to be a First Cause, and that's to Davies.

we can see the cause must be outside the universe. Therefore it is logical to assume the First Cause is a god of some sort, whether it be a personal god or not. Yet Aquinas does not prove this being to be the God of the B.B.