

The journal has had 5 points in Ministry of Science and Higher Education parametric evaluation. § 8. 2) and § 12. 1. 2) 22.02.2019.


© The Authors 2019;

This article is published with open access at Licensee Open Journal Systems of Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz, Poland Open Access. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author (s) and source are credited. This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non commercial license Share alike. (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

Received: 25.08.2019. Revised: 30.08.2019. Accepted: 07.09.2019.

Contemporary ethical problem – Euthanasia

Name **Patrycja Ręba** 

Affiliation Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences,
Jan Kochanowski University

Country Poland

Bio Statement —

Principal contact for editorial correspondence.

Abstract Admission
Cultural changes and more dynamic medical techniques result in a multitude of questions related to the bioethical aspects of medicine. In recent years, increased interest in the sphere of death. One of the issues related to the process of dying euthanasia, which raises many philosophical controversies in many environments including among lawyers, doctors, philosophers and ethicists. Permanent ongoing disputes about whether terminally ill person, with the right to a dignified life and a decent death, may request to shorten their suffering. Etymologically the term comes from the Greek, euthanatos This juxtaposition of two words: eu - good and thanatos - death, which means "good death" or "death gentle and free of suffering." In historical perspective, euthanasia has always been present in the history of mankind, although this term hid multiple definitions and practical applications. In modern times, euthanasia is to terminate the patient's life.

Aim
The aim of the study is to analyze phenomenon euthanasia in terms of ethical and medical.

Material and methods

A review of available literature.

Results

Despite extensive discussion blurred the differences between the resignation of persistent therapy, active and passive euthanasia - but you can not erase the difference between natural death and intentional, and imposed due. In the strict sense of euthanasia we have to do when the so-called dignified death wants to achieve by some form of suicide or homicide. The purpose of medicine is not a fight to the death, but the health and care of the sick. Palliative medicine and hospice care should be more appreciated and used. They are just as important as the medical staff and are closest to the patient in the most difficult and the most important moment of his life, at the time of his death. This existential attempt to humanity of every person is important not only for the patient but for thehis family, for the environment, for the community, for the whole culture.

Conclusions

Euthanasia is an extremely complex problem. It is difficult to define clear limits, which would distinguish her way clear of other activities in the field of medicine. Each case is separate and must be adapted to it all "for" and "against."Analyzing the arguments for and against euthanasia is not easy to take a clear position. You can not make generalizations, responsible for suffering, Terminally ill family that daily struggle with unimaginable suffering coming. It is easy to criticize escape from suffering when you yourself were not in such a situation. However it is a very cautious approach to the legalization of euthanasia, because even partial leave by law, may be the reason for abuse. There is a risk that the boundary between murder and euthanasia may be fluid.It calms the public saying that it was for the good of the patient, that everyone has the right to a dignified death, it was at the request of the patient. The disadvantage of humanistic ethics argument is that she sees the man as an ordinary part of the world, which favors the objectification of subjectivity, which we are entitled.

Key words: euthanasia; persistent therapy; good death

Cultural changes and more dynamic medical techniques result in a multitude of questions related to the bioethical aspects of medicine. In recent years, increased interest in the sphere of death. One of the issues related to the process of dying euthanasia, which raises many philosophical controversies in many environments including among lawyers, doctors, philosophers and ethicists. Permanent ongoing disputes about whether terminally ill person, with the right to a dignified life and a decent death, may request to shorten their suffering. Etymologically the term comes from the Greek, *euthanatos* This juxtaposition of two words: *eu* - good and *thanatos* - death, which means

"Good death" or "death mild pain-free" [1]. In historical perspective, euthanasia has always been present in the history of mankind, although this term hid multiple definitions and practical applications [2]. In modern times, euthanasia is to terminate the patient's life. Because to make a decision about killing the patient, euthanasia is divided into: personal (when asked about the death of the patient or his family) and legal (when the death determines the legislation of the country concerned). Because method of conducting euthanasia distinguished: active euthanasia (artificial acceleration of the death of the diseased person, or the elderly, for example. injection of increasing doses of the drug) and passive euthanasia (suspend further treatment in desperate cases) [3]. Also lists a number of medical instruments at the end of life of the patient, such as: 1) administration of pain suppressing agents in doses that can accelerate death; 2) reduction or discontinuation of active treatment or resuscitation; 3) separation of artificial life support devices (eg. a respirator, artificial kidney); 4) accompanying or assisted suicide; 5) injection of a lethal substances. All these efforts do not end with a discussion of the concept of euthanasia and ethical evaluation of such activities [2, 3].

Polish codes (1932., 1969., 1997). Treat human life as good of a special nature, which is entitled to special protection. On the basis of the Criminal Code of 1932. Provision of art. 227 stated that the man who kills at the request and under the influence of sympathy for him is punishable by imprisonment up to 5 years or detention. The Commission draws up this code codification in recitals legislative ruled: "Adoption of the request includes an external expression firm, undeniable desire to perish hopefully requesting. In particular, where someone asks kill him, so when it comes to things undoubtedly serious, you can talk about the request only then if both its form and content are sufficiently clear and convincing "[4, 10]. The doctrinal emphasis was not that of euthanasia murder occurs when requesting considers death for deliverance from evil dotkliwszego far, which would remain alive as a result of an incurable disease, accompanied by long-term, recurring pain, terror even shame. The Penal Code of 1932. Enforces not only the victim but also the request for the same compassion on the side of the perpetrator. If the perpetrator acted from other motives (eg. The heir wants to inherit the fall) could not enter the game and recipient. 227 (Art. 225 § 1 of the Penal Code of 1932. - murder). On the basis of the Criminal Code of 1969. Euthanasia murder was the same as in the previous Penal Code (1932.). It is worth noting that Article conviction. 150 kb were rare. In the years 1970 - 1980 sentenced 7 people (in 1970. 3 people, and in 1973. 4 people) [4, 7, 8]. The Polish law strictly prohibits euthanasia under the threat of sanctions. The Penal Code of 1997. there is a regulation (Art. 150): "Who kills a man at the request of and under the influence of compassion for him, shall be punished by imprisonment from 3 months

to 5 years (...) Whoever by persuasion or by rendering assistance induces a person to take his own life, be punished by imprisonment from 3 months to 5 years, "[4] . differedny is, however, the provision of Article. 150 § 2 which states that, in exceptional circumstances, the court may apply extraordinary mitigation of punishment, and even renounce its imposition. The doctrine emphasizes that the exceptional cases should be understood particularly strongmotivational emphasis on the offender, and therefore an extremely valid reasons of compassion for the victim. Exceptional circumstances may be justified by the particularly high level of intensity of the suffering of the person requesting the deprivation of her life. It should be recognized that the perpetrator działał not only under the influence of compassion, but great love for a man who wanted to save the inhuman suffering. In support of the government's draft of the Criminal Code emphasized, "referring to the Criminal Code of 1932., It is recognized that not conducttoday the need for changes to the concept of murder eutanatycznego; new code, which milder punishment is associated with a lower degree of fault and bringing to suicide by helping noncriminal in some legislations, thus spoke on rollingabove discussion of scientific and philosophical against the abolition of criminal euthanasia and passive assistance for suicide (leaving within the patient's medications accelerating fatal outcome), and thus the holiness of life (art. 150-151 of the Penal Code) "[4, 10]. For the application of Article. 150 of the Penal Code must appear Primary reasons for the deprivation of life, which are the theme of compassion on the part of the perpetrator. The doctrine lists are usually suffering associated with severe incurable disease, very severe injuriesZhenya as a result of the crash, bombing, which cause demand to shorten a person's life affected them. Offense referred to in Article. 150 of the Penal Code is a common crime, the perpetrator can be anyone, not just the doctor (oranother staff person medycznego) [10]. It is not only action, but failure. In the event of a failure, the culprit may be the only person to whom was under a legal, special duty to prevent such an effect. The murder of euthanasia can only be committed intentionally. The doctrinalthere are disputes as to whether it comes only going to direct (*dolus directus*) If the recklessness (*Dolus eventualis*). Conceptually, it is possible to committing murder with the intent eutanatycznego possible, and the designstatutory constituent elements is not precluded. The provision of Article. 150 § 2 gives the possibility to withdraw from the punishment. In this case the offender is found guilty of making alleged act, and the verdict is a conviction. Fromotherwise proceed by punishment (pursuant to Art. 150 §2 CC), the court can also waive the center area, even his judgment been (Art. 61 § 2 kk) [4, 10]. Data from the General Headquarters of Police shows that in recent years refOtowano in Poland following the number of murders eutanatycznych: in 2012 - 10, in 2011 - 5, 2010 - 1, 2009 - 8, 2008 - 4, 2007 - 3 [11]. In Polish law and some European countries, euthanasia is a type of privileged in relation to crimemurder. Still relevant question is whether you can justify

euthanasia? In Poland, there is a large social acceptance of euthanasia. According to research conducted by CBOS in 2009. That, according to nearly half of Poles (48%) physicians should satisfy NIACE will suffering, terminally ill, who insist on giving them the cause of death. The opposite opinion is less than two fifths of respondents (39%), while one in eight (13%) have no opinion on the subject [12].

Despite the wide dyskusji blurred the differences between the resignation of persistent therapy, active and passive euthanasia - but you can not erase the difference between natural death and intentional, and imposed due. In the strict sense of euthanasia we have to do when socalled dignified death wants to achieve by some form of suicide or homicide. [14]

In fact, Polish dispute relates primarily to legal euthanasia between opponents, the Christian circles, and supporters eutincluding anazji representatives of humanistic ethics.

Most religions of the world recognizes that euthanasia is unacceptable and considered as a violation of God's laws. Muslims believe that man can not decide about their own death or drund person, even in the event of severe and incurable disease. The destruction of the Buddhist ethics of life, someone else's, as well as his own, is in first place amongnegative works [1, 3]. The Catechism of the Catholic Church states that "direct euthanasiaand, regardless of the motives and means, it consists in putting an end to the life of handicapped, sick, or dying. It is morally unacceptable ". [5] but emphasizes the importance of the distinction between euthanasia permitted by the Church" persistent refusalj therapy ", which means" discontinuation of medical treatment expensive, dangerous, extraordinary or disproportionate to the expected results (...). It is not intended to cause death, it is assumed that in this case can not be przeskth e. The decisions to be taken by the patient if he is competent and are capable of doing so; otherwise - by authorized persons, always respecting the reasonable will and legitimate interests of the patient "[2, 5]. The views presented by spinningedstawicieli Catholicism posiłkują the axiom of the existence of God - the donor and the recipient lives. They refer to the fact that "man is not the absolute owner of his own autonomous life. Life is a gift from God and it is He who is his only Panem. Euthanasia would therefore not only directed against the action of man, but mean as a consequence of the rejection of God's absolute power over life and death, and assigning it yourself or to someone who would use it for other request "[1, 5]. At this point, there is discussion, namely in accordance with the teachings of the Catholic God gave man freedom in disposing of their own lives, so why paradoxically the Church claims that this freedom is somewhat limited at the momentwhen a person takes a decision in terms of the duration of your life? Proponents of euthanasia believe that the Church is in contradiction considering two truths that are in opposition to each other. Another argument concerns the meaning

of human suffering: "In accordance with the teachings of *beetleścijańska* - as it is written in the document of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith - the suffering, especially in the last moments of life, takes its meaning in God's salvific plan; It is in fact involved in the passion of Christ and connects with the Sacrifice of Redemption, which he made with obedience to the Heavenly Father. It is only natural that some Christians want the moderate use of medical anesthetics to voluntarily accepting at least part of their sufferings, they could join the Christ nailed to the cross ". [6] Proponents of euthanasia are asking whether the desire to persevere in suffering is the "human" or "inhuman"? Succumb questioned whether the suffering is so important argument in favor of abandoning euthanasia. In the encyclical "Evangelium Vitae", Pope John Paul II pointed out that what might seem logical and humane, when deeper analysis turns out to be absurd and inhuman. The Pope recognized the problem of euthanasia, one of the most distressing symptoms of the culture of death, spreading smokers in prosperous societies. He said Euthanasia is a crime for which human law can condone. In Judaism, human life has absolute value, is sacred, inviolable and is the gift of God [10]. The future of man depends only on God, therefore the doctor has no right to decide about the patient's death. The one who seemed undisputed judgments, puts on a par with God, and such an attitude in the Jewish religion is considered a sin and a crime. In the first article of the Declaration of Human Rights and Civil Code, euthanasia, doctors are not allowed to practice since the time of Hippocrates, whose oath requires "anyone even on demand, do not give a deadly poison, or anyone I would not advise it," [10]. This prohibition is repeated in Article. code 38eksu medical ethics, "the doctor should accompany the dying until the last moments, by appropriate means and measures to ensure the quality of his life, which draws to a close, take care of the patient's dignity and support their surroundings. There are no rights and deliberately fed to his death "[10]. Patient care is not about inflicting death. Opponents of euthanasia argue that palliative care is the best answer to euthanasia. To prevent euthanasia is necessary to ensure patient human support. It includes psychosocial care, spiritual care and quality of life. An important role is played here by the presence of the sick, the ability to listen and talk, as well as family support [3, 5, 10]. Opponents of euthanasia point out that the legalization euthanasia will mean that the elderly will feel a sense of duty death, because they recognize that they are a burden for children and relatives. A huge impact on the controversy surrounding euthanasia was the development of hospices. The widely available such institutions become, the less will be the need for euthanasia. There are views that the legalization of euthanasia is similar to join the equally sloped, because time is allowed the opportunity to receive life opens the way for other such *poczyń* [6, 7]. In addition to theological arguments is an argument against euthanasia society - concern for the abuses resulting from the legalization of euthanasia. Abuses include: "putting pressure on the patient (by

both physicians and family), would yousmite consent to euthanasia; lowering the quality of palliative medicine and the inhibition of growth, expressed in the fact that if we accept voluntary euthanasia, it is time we consider the legalization of this involuntary "[7].

convocationnnicy euthanasia emphasize that they are not for unlimited access to it, because "Legalization of euthanasia in exceptional and lined on the harsh cases, it seems moral and civilizational necessity. As the legal, may na nagrowin really small number of people, many times smaller than it actually is taking place now (if only because of the obvious requirement of a clear consciousness of the patient), and therefore it is important that new legislation covering all morally sensitive procedures intensive care, pain medicine, and (above all) palliative care "[8, 9]. Supporters of legalization are hopeful that" the legalization of euthanasia should leave it something unique and rare, and the law concerning it, with the whole integrated spinningepisów relating to the conduct of the dying, should contribute to reducing the frequency of euthanasia and combating other phenomena unkind. These provisions should be limited random and unfair differences in the way the chorymi, so in some way to standardize them, and above all give up control of all sensitive procedure, including euthanasia "[7, 8]. People in long-term coma, the prognosis of slight wake, are kept alive through aparaturze, which absorbs a large part of the functioning of state finances. This money could be used to rescue people, where you are more likely to say that they lived. Another argument for legalizing euthanasiaThis problem of euthanasia underground. In Poland, the total ban on euthanasia does not imply that the underground is destroyed, on the contrary develops. Allowing euthanasia under certain strict conditions can have a positive effect on reducing przestępczośyou in this regard. The next argument is that decisions related to their own lives and health is a personal matter of human and they should be due to "spontaneous realization of our desires, if only we will be freed from fear and casualtiesand "[7, 9]. The fact is that people" over time they have had enough sacrifices required by caring for them, that we being dying, I really do not want to be a burden to others and bother them together, remembering how it was when they had to someone aboutpiekować "[3, 8].

The dignity of being a person entitled to a dignified life and, according to proponents of euthanasia only to those who meet certain quality criteria, such as awareness and responsibility, participation in social life, the ability to care of their interests, and to ensure at least a minimum of independence in terms of dress, keeping personal hygiene and meals. Who does not meet these criteria, the titer is deprived of subject and person, and becomes at mostabove zdefektowanym body. Thus, proponents of euthanasia, even those like Michael Tooley, Peter Singer, Hugo Engelhardt, Zbigniew Szawarski, exclusive group of people from diverse group of people.

According to them, man is not a person in the prenatal period, noworOdek, a man with profound disabilities, mentally and terminally ill. People are just people consciously pursuing their own interests. "Nieosoby" have no personal rights, also do not have the right to life. According to P. Singereuthanasia of a disabled noworodka is just as permissible and recommended as abortion before he was born. Euthanasia of the terminally ill, in this approach as the most rational act, and even morally prescribed. Similarly, rational action is euthanasia of those who by pewien period were individuals, but as a result of severe illness became former people [13]. In this way, if the proponents of euthanasia make a double killing a man. First, they kill him as a person, and then demanding or unnecessary killingganizmu human. According to their anthropology should be enough for a person's death. This is a person in this theory is in fact the one who is alive, his dignity, is the subject of the law. Its absence, as in the case of mental or terminal illness should end dyskusthem out. Meanwhile, supporters of the fenomenalistycznej cramped theory, people do not end the discussion, but demand remaining after the death of a person body. After the death of the person you need to kill the organism [15].

Not necessarily fit into this anthropological argument, citing the fact that euthanasia reduces suffering. According to this theory, a person thinks, suffers and suffers when it is in the body. If it is missing, in that case the body does not think, does not suffer and do not suffer. The person in severe disease states can not therefore suffer, because the accepted theory held that in such conditions it is already dead. So euthanasia advocates who speak dualistic, fenomenalistyczną, descriptive theory of those tangled up in different niedorzecznościach. Such nonsense is to promote the double death, which in theory first kills a person and in practice demands the sacrifice so. defective human body. "The argument of supporters of euthanasia - writes M. Szeroczyńska - is based on unacceptable from a moral point of view of paradoxes: the paradox of medical care, which leads to the elimination of the patient to eliminate his pain; the paradox of freedom, which to obtain confirmation gives up any possibility of self-realization; the paradox of dignity for the sake of which you must destroy the man who is her disposition; paradox respect to life, for the implementation of which comes to provoke death "[16, 18].

Despite appearing to be problems in medicinesolve ethically. The purpose of medicine is not a fight to the death, but the health and care of the sick. Palliative medicine and hospice care should be more appreciated and used. They are just as important as the medical staff and are closest to the patient in the most difficult and the most important moment of his life, at the time of his death. This existential attempt to humanity of every person is important not only for the patient but for his family, forenvironment, for the community, for the whole culture. Culture superficial -

juwenalistyczna, consumerist and hedonistic - your fear of death wants to overcome the promotion and use of euthanasia. But it is not appropriate to overcome fear, but its time to move accumulation. Accelerating the death of others is not overcoming his fear of death. Medicine can not correct their mistakes in the struggle with death if he continued as a result of "losers" would triumph over death by asking acceleration and death [16, 17].

Euthanasia is an extremely complex problem. It is difficult to define clear limits, which would distinguish her way clear of other activities in the field of medicine. Each case is separate and must be adapted to it all "for" and "against." anwhilst implementing the arguments for and against euthanasia it is not easy to take a clear position. Nie you can make generalizations, responsible for suffering, Terminally ill family that daily struggle with unimaginable suffering najbliższych. It is easy to criticize escape from suffering when you yourself were not in such a situation. However it is a very cautious approach to the legalization of euthanasia, because even partial leave by law, may be the reason for abuse. Istexists a risk that the boundary between murder and euthanasia may be fluid. It calms the public saying that it was for the good of the patient, that everyone has the right to a dignified death, it was at the request of the patient. Is such a request to be taken literally?INad± humanistic ethics argument is that she sees the man as an ordinary part of the world, which favors the objectification of subjectivity, which we are entitled.

Bibliography:

1. M. Machinek Death at the disposal of man. TheologyMoral to the ethical issues at the end of human lifeOlsztyn 2001: 47-70
2. Plato, State, Kety 2003 90-108
3. N. Aumonier B. Beignier, P. Letellier, Euthanasia, Warsaw 2003
4. The Code of Criminal Law, Art. 150, Art. 151
5. The Catechism of the Catholic Church, No. 2277
6. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Declaration on Euthanasia Iura et Bona, 3
7. L. Israel, euthanasia or life until the end, Cracow 2003
8. R. Fenigsen, euthanasia - death by choice, Poznan 1997
9. J. Hołówka. ethical relativismWarsaw 1981: 109

10. J. Lukaszewicz, R. Lukasik, euthanasia and palliative care, ethical, religious, psychological and legal, Catholic University of Lublin, Medical University Lublin, KUL 1996
11. <http://www.statystyka.policja.pl/> (Date of entry 15.08.2019r.)
12. http://www.cbos.pl/SPISKOM.POL/2009/K_142_09.PDF (date of entry 10.08.2019r.)
13. Biesaga T., eds.: Bioetyka Poland. Krakow, Ed. Sciences. PAT 2004: 145-164
14. Ramsey P.: The indignity of "death with dignity". In: Lammers SE Verhey A.: The moral medicine. Theological perspectives in medical ethics. Grand Rapids / Cambridge, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998: 209-222
15. Bołoz W. Lynx M., ed.: Between life and death: addiction, euthanasia, situations border. Warsaw, Ed. Univ. Card. S. Wyszyńskiego, 2002: 122-134
16. Morawiec Z., ed.: Saving civilization - to save human life. Krakow, DEHON, 2002: 53-64;
17. Bartoszek A.: Palliative Care as an alternative to euthanasia. In: P. Morciniec, ed.: Euthanasia in the discussion. Opole, Red. Ed. WT UO, 2001: 151-154
18. Aumonier N., Beignier B., Letellier P.: Euthanasia. Crowd. E. Boer Warsaw, Pax, 2003 50-51