

ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF JACQUES MAURICE'S CONCEPT OF THE HUMAN PERSON AND THE PRACTICE OF EUTHANASIA IN THE MODERN WORLD.

OGBONNA, HENRY
STUDENT: PH.D./1920/000704
THE UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA CURACOA

A Concept of Man and Euthanasia In the modern-day world, everything is carried out with reference to a piece of work. This study examines how to deter the exercise of euthanasia. The objective of this study critically examines the views of supporters and opponents of euthanasia from the position of justification of person. This is rooted in the values of God, which comprise justification and the right to life. Supporters of euthanasia disagree from the standpoint that every human with feelings should not be compelled to go through unnecessary, prolonged, and dehumanizing suffering and pain from terminal illness. Euthanasia refers to intentionally ending someone's life to alleviate suffering and pain. On occasion, doctors carry out euthanasia when asked by human beings who have an incurable and terminal ailment and are in a whole lot of pain. It is a complicated process and involves weighing a whole lot of factors. The researcher claims that euthanasia is unacceptable as there may be a thin line between voluntary and involuntary euthanasia. According to the study, there is a risk and threat that health negligence will hide behind the lofty belief of "mercy killing," causing victimization of the most vulnerable members of society and, eventually, changing the right to kill. The researcher's response: first, all human beings have intrinsic dignity because of their natural form. A human being is an unrepeatable being whose dignity is felt and grasped through contact with another. The truth of the matter is that all people must have value in human life. Based on the findings of the study, a conclusion and recommendation were reached, providing the basis for further studies.

INTRODUCTION

The world has come to the understanding that issues related to the end of life, including assisted suicide and euthanasia, are matters of enormous public interest and concern. Pain and suffering on the route to dying is a more dreadful experience for humans than even death itself. It may be stated that dying, rather than death, is what people are afraid of. It suggests that one is afraid of going through the pains of dying when everyone knows the outcome, rather than facing the darkness of death. That is, at the end of time. Euthanasia is the intentional ending of a patient's life to relieve pain and suffering. Stolberg (2007) says that euthanasia is killing people who depend on you for your own benefit, either by doing something or not doing something (V. Goel, 2008). "Dignity in Dying," for instance, has followed the subsequent definition of assisted dying:

An assisted death is when a physician prescribes an existence-finishing dose of medicine to a mentally capable, terminally sick person at their request, and the patient then chooses to manage the medicine themselves. Euthanasia and assisted suicide are one-of-a-kind practices. The term "third party" is frequently used to explain the existence of a finishing medicinal drug being administered with the aid of a third party. Assisted suicide refers to supplying help to die to a person who isn't always dying (<http://www.dignityindying.org.uk/assisted-dying.php>) by Killick Millard (1935).

In some ways, the concept of euthanasia is described in terms of suicide, which is regarded as a form of murder, except that the victim is the author himself. One example is aided suicide, which occurs when someone gives someone information, direction, and the tools to commit suicide with the knowledge that they will be utilized for that purpose. Physician aided suicide occurs when a doctor assists another person in killing themselves (Mystakidou, 2005). Euthanasia is the intentional ending of someone's life, usually to alleviate pain. Doctors occasionally perform euthanasia on people who have a terminal condition and are in excruciating suffering. It's a prolonged method that involves weighing numerous standards. Local laws, a person's physical and mental health, and their own ideals and wants all play a role.

Contemporary debates on euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide (PAS) have been the subjects of heated debate in recent years. There is a case to be made, primarily based on the idea of human dignity. This argument derives from the critically ill patient's health condition, which has deteriorated to the point where enabling him to live would be degrading. Those who argue for human dignity believe that it is preferable to assist such a person in dying with dignity. Forcible euthanasia without the patient's permission also takes away from the dignity of life, which is based on the idea of dignity.

Maritain bases her argument on this premise: life is sacred and should not be treated lightly. However, it is widely acknowledged that when giving palliative care to dying patients, clinicians may inadvertently hasten death. In addition, a few medical doctors might prefer death over existence for specific sufferers when making therapeutic decisions that result in withdrawal or omission. As a result, society is edging closer to death hastened with ethical justifications for finishing the lives of individuals who may not have given their consent. In order to advance the argument for the sanctity of life, it is essential to investigate Jacques Maritain's definition of the human person and euthanasia. This article examines Jacques Maritain's view of a person's being and its euthanasia in modern society. Another important goal is to find out how many patients have positive feelings about euthanasia and PAS.

The Theory of Justice for Human Beings and Maritain's

Maritain created a justification theory in which rights are divided into: foundational rights, which derive immediately and always from natural regulation; rights derived from the regulation of countries, which also flow with the drift immediately and always from regulation. Because the self is taken into consideration antecedent to his or her objectives, Michael Sandel describes the Rawlsian view of a person as an "unencumbered self." Third, positive law rights are contingently resulting from natural regulation, in step with Maritain, *The Rights of Man and Natural Law*, under positive situations; and fourth, positive law rights are contingently derived from natural regulation, according to Maritain, *Rights of Man and Natural Law*. The explanation of the primordial rights by Maritain appears to be particularly at odds with Aquinas' natural law theory. Because of our ultimate end in God and our early membership in a family, which is earlier than

our admission into civil society, we have primordial rights. These main, fundamental rights take precedence above societal obligations since they are acknowledged as essential to human dignity and are not provided by society. The proper to existence and the proper to spiritual liberty are examples of primordial rights. They grant someone freedom to disregard public obligations and the temporal rather than common corrective action with a view to pursuing one's judgment of right and wrong. So, if there is a war between the voices of right and wrong as God's will and the voices of family or social responsibilities, the voice of right and wrong comes first.

Jacque Maritain is implying that human dignity may be preserved even in the absence of public contact. In this manner, Maritain's attempt to adapt the liberal concept of natural rights to natural regulation unwittingly parallels Locke's conception of the individual within the state of nature. This is prior to civil society participation. The risk in this dichotomy is that it implies that one's social ties to one's own circle of relatives are natural, while one's courting of society is artificially created. The concept that essential rights exist in "primordial society" or "the own circle of relatives" before they are limited by the greater political community appears to create a misleading distinction between one's character and political ties to the larger society. Maritain believed human rights to be inextricably linked to moral responsibilities.

The dignity of the person, who's a religious individual created by God, underpins each of the rights and responsibilities. If a man is morally certain of the matters that may be important to his future achievement, he clearly has the right to meet his future; and if he has the right to meet his future, he also has the right to the matters that may be important for this motive, as he defined in *The Rights of Man and Natural Law* (1943).

Despite their views on normal human rights, Maritain and Macintyre agree that the most critical and important venture of existence takes place with a number of the humans with whom we stay and work each day. The underlying political truth, Maritain argued, "isn't always the state; however, the political framework, with its several establishments, the couple of groups it encompasses, and the ethical community that emerges from it." According to Maritain, churches, schools, universities, and community groups are the lifeblood of any society. These "pillars of society" must articulate the social vision by highlighting the natural needs, rights, and wants of those they serve. These groups have the potential to add to and improve the tone of our public discourse. They can also make a big difference in our moral and cultural development by encouraging people to follow their inner dreams and look beyond material gain and financial convenience to the more lasting values of God, their own family, friendship, and ethical excellence.

Like Maritain, she is a staunch supporter of man's rights, which are based on God's principles and include the right to life. As a result, every action that leads to the end of someone's right to

exist is an affront to man's dignity and God's values. It is argued, however, that if there may be a right to exist, then there must additionally be a right to die. Ravi Agarwal (2008) considers that terminally ill sufferers and their households must be given the choice between the "right to existence" and the "right to loss of life." With care, Bansal (2005) supports the legalization of euthanasia. He claimed that many humans are involved so that they must no longer be compelled to live in advanced bodily and mental decrepitude by artificial means in a generation of expanded medical information combined with better existence spans, he claimed. When a terminally ill patient's chances of survival are slim, it makes no sense to force him to stay alive against his will. This approach lacks both justice and sympathy. Euthanasia is a viable option in this situation. However, there is a significant risk that medical malpractice will be hidden behind the noble concept of mercy killing. Second, Gupta (2006) said unequivocally that there is no mercy in killing, arguing that poverty, a lack of inexpensive care, and patients' perceptions of being a burden on their families all contribute to the desire for mercy killing, even when the patient wishes to live. In reality, it's a scream for assistance. It is also claimed that "mercy killing" will result in a reduction in medical therapy and ill-treatment of society's most susceptible members. The concern is that, be it mercy killing, it will evolve from the "right to die" to the "right to kill." Since the debate over end-of-life issues like euthanasia, assisted suicide, and the idea of a human person is far from over, this article gives you a chance to make a huge contribution to the scope and direction of those debates, especially by learning about famous philosophers' views on the issue and how they feel about it.

JACQUES MARITAIN'S HUMAN PERSON AND EUTHANASIA

Ashley K. Fernandes says that Jacques Maritain, a Catholic natural law philosopher who was involved in preparing the Declaration on how the human person acquires rights due to the very fact that it is a person, a whole, master of itself and of its acts, and that, as a result of this, "not merely a means to an end, but an end which must be treated as such" (Maritain 1949, 65). Maritain expressed that the "dignity of the human person" "means nothing if it does not imply the virtue of the law of nature; then man has the right to be valued; he is the subject of rights, his own rights." (Ashley K. Fernandes, 1933 and 1945).

Maritain emphasized the importance of being mindful of the dignity of both human beings and human labor (Brian, 2009). Slavery violates human dignity and necessitates the use of human labor. It is important that an employee be able to train and prepare to organize and contribute to the common good. Hence, it does not permit the individual to take responsibility for their own life and make important decisions to meet their future. Maritain advanced the concept of human dignity in conflict with the more common liberal-individualistic and communist perceptions of it which might be accepted nowadays. Maritain says that "the point of human dignity is based on the kind of person in society who has the power to do good with the help of serving the common conquest of intrinsically human ethics, spiritual goods, and freedom of autonomy" (Brian, 2009).

Maritain provides insightful notes that may be useful today in the debate over natural law and its significance in the understanding of human dignity. Maritain cited Laserson, who defined how theories of the law of nature must now no longer be stressed with natural law itself. Different kinds of theories of natural law, like every other concept, may produce different arguments and conclusions to aid or refute the law of nature. This difference is essentially significant when considering the philosophical roots of the belief in human dignity nowadays: we can't comprehend human dignity if we do no longer cross past the numerous theories and doctrines of natural law to what may be truly noticed as the genuine concept, the reality, of natural law itself. Maritain could be very privy to this and underlines the factor with the aid of quoting Richter, who mentioned the Natural Law and its correlation. (Laserson, 1947).

Maritain cited Richter by stressing that human understanding does change and progress while the law of nature does not. This is the foundation of the misunderstanding and uncertainty between the natural law theory and natural law itself. The ontological foundation of natural law distinguishes one's understanding of the law of nature from another. In other words, people may not know that natural law exists. But people who might have an idea depend on how their society's moral standards change over time, which is helped by historical and sociological changes.

Maritain emphasized Kant and Rousseau's rights doctrine about the transformation of personal rights into certain unrestricted rights that would result in the rights conflicting or disagreeing with the rights of other beings (Maritain, 1998). As a matter of fact, knowing the basis of the rights shows that they are certainly limited to the reality of the human person being part of a larger society. Maritain speaks in favour of the rights of man because he believes in natural law. His writings in 1951 on "Man and the State" place it clearly: "The Philosophical Basis of the Rights of Man is Natural Law (Maritain, 1998). He was pragmatic enough to understand, based on his extensive work on drafting the Universal Declaration, that this did not imply that humanity agreed to the primacy of natural law, its position as the foundation for human rights. In drafting the Universal Declaration, he explained how the rational arguments for claiming those rights needed to be left apart. Still, Maritain says that his outspoken opinion about the importance of natural law is the point that can't be argued with.

Brian explains more on Maritain's real function of human rights begins with human dignity; the important work of any civilization serves the dignity of the human person. He carries the concept of human dignity to the advanced scope wherein it belongs with the explanation that "within the flesh and bones of man, there lives a soul that is a spirit and which is worth more than the entire world" (Brian,2009). The idea of human dignity establishes a limit to the human person due to its great worth. Hence, nothing is valued much more than the human soul and the divine. This is due to the intrinsic dignity of man; any society depends on human life. Jessica Keating highlights in an American magazine a number of serious issues since she argues towards the reasoning of those who have lauded Brittany Maynard's (the younger lady who captured national notice a

year ago by deciding on assisted suicide in the face of a terminal illness) and her choice to take her very own life is considered "courage, rationality, and high regard." She admits that she did not make the decision. Maynard could not but suffer critically and would likely be rendered unproductive and unattractive. She could have been found in a relationship network even if she was unaware, and probably could have been examined, washed, dressed, and touched. She would have been lightly loved to the end.

The argument is that the issue of euthanasia tells Suffering devalues human life and it alleviates suffering, but it also devastates the body and mind that come with that suffering. However, it prepares a terminally sick person for "death with dignity" with less suffering. It implies that if illness dilapidates a person into a vegetative state, it may not be advised to keep the person alive. It is seen that the reason for euthanasia is to show compassion as long as dignity and values are preserved. (Euthanasia and Love: Peter Knott, SJ, February 15, 2016). Many people practice euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide as a humane and compassionate response to terminal illness, but many people oppose it. Maritain shows and tells us that the sufferer needs to be loved to the end, even in an unconscious state. It seems that the unconscious state of the sufferer could have also given off an intangible but very powerful sense of care and love, like how Jesus' broken, naked body on the cross gave off a powerful grace that gave people life.

Rarely do we believe that Jesus gave his life for us by his actions. He saved us and died for us. Jesus gave his life through his activity and usefulness, while he gave his death to us through his passivity, helplessness, and humiliation of his body on the cross. Anyone who has sat by the bedside of a dying loved one has had the opportunity to practice giving what was not provided during their active life in the helplessness, hopelessness, and pain. The helplessness and pain of the sufferer influence the ability to attract a collective family, the power to feel and understand deeper things, a deeper appreciation of life, and a deeper appreciation of life and spirit.

According to Peter Knott's writing, what Maritain says about intangible gifts emanates from the thriller of pain, non-application, and dying wherein she or he is enclosed. In our dying bodies, we are able to supply our cherished ones with something we can't absolutely supply them when we're healthy and active. In part, Euthanasia is unaware of the thriller of the way love is given. That's half the argument for euthanasia. The difference is read in this manner: Not only could she have been cherished to the end, but possibly more importantly, she could have been actively emitting love till the end. From her ravaged, silent, mainly subconscious frame could have emanated an intangible, however mainly effective, nurture and love, similar to the effective existence-giving grace that emanated from Jesus' broken, bare frame at the move (Euthanasia and Love: Peter Knott, SJ, Feb 15, 2016). Jacques Maritain (1985), writing after the World II era, acutely saw the consequences of any other good obscuring the good of the individual person. In national socialism, Maritain saw the danger of having a concept of a person that is not absolute. (Ashley K. Fernandes, Sheldon Rubinfeld, and Daniel P. Sulmasy, 2020).

MARTIN MARTIN'S PERSPECTIVE ON THE HUMAN BEING

The human person is viewed by Maritain as independent through means that construct his or her identity through individual chosen pursuits. Through human rights advocacy, he improves specific Catholic opinions that promote Catholic advocacy of human rights. Miller and Bellah write that Maritain's political and social vision called for a new social order conspicuously noticed by a number of cultures controlled by democracy and active by the Christian spirit. According to Miller and Bellah, he says that Maritain expected a "personalist" democracy that could control individualism yet not be totalitarian. He advocates human rights and promotes human freedom as vehemently essential to the common good in union with virtue. But the principle of subsidiarity became the heart of this personalist democracy (Miller and Bellah, 1988). Subsidiarity meant that there should be a variety of organizations in the middle to encourage personal initiative and action at the local level.

According to Maritain, the law helps to provide an explanation for a person based on Thomas' principles of natural law. He recognizes that particular goods from the community belong to individuals as members of a community. Thomas expresses his ideas that what is due to individuals and what is due to individuals derives from the person's social nature and role in society. A person's social position serves the common good, implying the set of social conditions necessary to promote the proper well-being of individuals and the overall growth of society. Maritain complements Thomas' principles of normal social relations, where individuals are principally meant to observe their responsibilities. Based on the natural law structure, it follows that duties are active while the implied rights are passive due to their legitimacy depending on the initial fulfilment of one's duties and justice requirements. In fact, your virtue of justice earns you rewards in the community (Maritain, 2001). Maritain observed Thomas expressing the nature of the individual and the supernatural end before figuring out what was due from that person. Maritain is a human being who imagines a "creative self" (Proietti, 2009). Maritain, nonetheless, deviated from Thomas for not considering an individual's social bonds before controlling certain rights due to the person. In other words, he assigned rights to individuals before identifying their social, historical context, and role in the community. Maritain definitely came up with a list of rights that everyone has from the beginning of time.

In this regard, Cooper's writing brings the similarity in both views between Jacques Maritain and John Locke about the work on the liberal theory of nature. Maritain tries to familiarize the liberal theory of natural rights with natural law as well as the Lockean view, where individuals have an abstract existence prior to membership in civil society (Cooper, 1985). Though by distinction, Maritain did not go as far as John Locke did in concerning the Lockean view on the idea of the pre-political man and that of the pre-social man in Locke. The risk of this difference is the idea that one's social bonds with family are natural, whereas one's connection to the broader society is built. The idea that "primordial rights" exist in "primordial society" or "the family" before the

larger political network that can limit rights seems to set up a false separation between a person's social nature and their political ties to the larger society.

According to Simon, in his writing, Maritain considers human rights to be correlative with ethical responsibilities. Both rights and obligations are rooted in the dignity of the individual, which is spiritual and religious. *The Rights of Man and Natural Law* (1943) explained that a man who may be morally sure of the matters that are needed to fulfil his destiny has the right to deal with important matters on this principle (Simon, 1943). For example, if a mother and father are "ethically sure" that they can afford, give, and take care of their children, they have a duty under natural law and human rights to work and work hard to meet this obligation.

In the course of Jacques Maritain expressing his view on the human soul, it has dignity and is sacred. He says that each soul has eternal value and absolute dignity. When making his case for universal human rights, his position is that only God has an absolute claim on the human person. Maritain supported and preserved Thomas' position that God comes first and is superior over political duties and, in turn, superior over our individual interests. There is a hierarchical preference in the need for God in one's life (Maritain, 1943). In the work of Crosson about Maritain and the human person, Maritain sees human persons as an independent entity whose rights are based on an elusive dignity, which overlooks the teleological nature of the man or woman whose dignity is essentially dynamic and socially-embedded reality. This view contrasts with that of Macintyre's teaching on the systematic social nature of human persons, which makes the idea of human dignity intelligible best as a relational term. Independently, human dignity can't be posited for individuals. Secondly, Macintyre sees that universal rights distort morality by conceptualizing it from the historical societies in which it works. In other words, individuals value the nature of morality, which is based on universal rights and is dependent upon the traditions and social relations integral to an individual's identity and worth. Crosson, 1983).

According to Grace, Maritain's contributed, repeated, and modified the works of Macintyre, considering that in our contemporary world, the political task of moral and spiritual progress is greater than that of material progress. Maritain provided in his writings on the political duty towards human life, such as improving the multitude of good lives, the betterment of human conditions, internal improvement, and material progress (Grace, 1944). Also, he watches how training, teaching the irrational to think rationally, and learning moral virtues and ethical values are done in the political body (Grace, 1944).

Nonetheless, if freedom of choice is the most fundamental to freedom and virtues, and perfection for several dimensions of our moral life, they are both means to an end, what has sometimes been called terminal freedom. Maritain says that only at this level of disciplined freedom can we use the old idea of a free person being self-sufficient in the real sense of this word that is often misused. The proper use of autonomy refers to something that is an interior conquest, and thus the notion of human beings possessing a capacity to choose (Deweert, 2013). However, man, in

his finite and unhappy being, escapes his bounds to adhere with his intelligence and love to a better idea. Individual character is at its best when it's at its most unique, but man's unsteadiness is what makes the mystery of freedom's conquest.

Hence, to him, God and man are not competitors in this view, as if what has to be given up or accepted on man's part were somehow a diminishing of his autonomy. That has been the error of many in the past three centuries or so. Rather, it is the right and full appreciation of what autonomy would mean—perfect union with the Divine—that resolves what appears to be a conflict of wills by moving to a higher level where human freedom coincides with God's plan. In this study, the philosophy of Maritain expounded the connection between Christianity and humanism. He drew ideas from the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas and founded them on it. However, humanism, Christianity, and his philosophy oppose the atheism of the totalitarian regimes.

Paradoxically, there are non-Christian writers who developed ideas and improved the concepts of humanism. However, these writers are opponents of anthropocentric atheism. Contrarily, the humanist writers created their own ideas that were basically different from those of the totalitarians. Questions are raised about whether young people understand the value of the meaning of life, values of good and values of beauty in their youth. Still, the conclusions that can be drawn from the qualitative research studies can help us learn more about what young Christians want and need from their religious education today.

Humanism, according to Jacques Maritain, points a man to absolute meaning in God. In reality, it makes one more conscious of humanity and reveals the greatness of the past. As for a man, there is a tendency to make him exhibit his unique greatness. However, it participates and contributes to everything in nature and history, which enriches, but humanism asks man to develop his inner abilities, internal competencies, creativity, and intellectual life. It takes a lot of hard work to make the physical universe a tool for freedom. Humanism shows us that man lives in space, sees beyond time, and has deep desires that go beyond the natural order of things.

In his writings, Jacques Maritain refers to the philosophy of Aristotle on humanism:

A human being is made up of three parts: body, spirit, and soul, with the spirit being stronger than the body. Giving a man only human things is a betrayal and a desire for his misfortune. It is founded on Aristotle's philosophy that each person creates his own attitude towards life and, in its intentions, he behaves somehow in life, whether or not it is related to any particular religion or philosophy. Therefore, anthropocentric and theocentric are both humanisms that are known. By considering the distinctions between anthropocentric and theocentric humanism, Thus, anthropocentric humanism regards humankind as the central important element of existence, especially as opposed to God or animals, while theocentric means having God as a central focus. Maritain looks at theistic humanism as relating to or characterized by belief in the existence of a

god or gods. As such, human freedom in its naturalistic conception states that freedom comes from man himself, though through God's grace comes freedom and redemption (Jacques 2002).

Maritain indicates that there are three aspects: looking at the individual person, culture, and God. A man sees himself as disciplined and principled, providing legal guidelines to follow and morally good from his perspective on an individual person. The victory that resulted from the ideas of Darwin, which never opposed the faith of Christians, shows the awareness of the rationalist's mind to non-recognition of metaphysical continuity. God created the body, spirit, and soul, but there is a plan to demonstrate that there is no place for the moment of creation of a new spiritual being with a soul, and God gave man his destiny to fulfill. Then there is the soul, which is dropped into being in order to achieve its eternal destiny. According to Freud's idea, human consciousness is pronounced but nothing more than a plaything of powers throbbing between the instinctive layer of man and the norms of society that he has adopted inside his existence. The philosopher Freud, in his view, ironically converted unique human importance into a being that best conceals its needs in his very own instincts. According to Maritain, first, this tradition (as a foetus of the Renaissance) separated the world from the sector concerned with eternity. However, (as a whole) it remained Christian. The whole thing insinuated fulfillment and success within the improvement of the science and technology era. The basic ideas of Maritain's humanism can be seen in the way science and technology are developed for human needs.

A Point of View on Euthanasia

According to Rachels (1975), euthanasia is an act that makes us who we are or who we ought to be. It is an action that takes place at the heart of what it means to be human. In modern times, many people with little or no knowledge of bioethics have a rudimentary understanding of the major arguments for and against euthanasia. This work is to point out Maritain's implied view on euthanasia. Even though euthanasia was a common practice in ancient Greece and Rome, people still argued about whether or not it was morally okay.

Josef Kure (2011) would say that the Hippocratic tradition, whose core is the Hippocratic oath, prohibits the killing of a human being just as it forbids any aid in suicide. As a result, the position of euthanasia and physician assisted suicide in medicine was altered, even though the aid was not allowed in the Hippocratic School. Christianity sees this philosophical and realistic practical prohibition as useful, which corresponds with Revelation, which instilled and made someone realize its human value because of our creation in God's image and likeness. Besides, Singer and Siegler would say that it is through acting alone that a human person exhibits himself in an existing occurrence (Singer & Siegler 1990).

The human person has the capability to prove his potential by action in life and show his individual human dimension when acting together with others. According to Seale and Addington in their writings, demonstrated below as practical experiments:

The death of a man or woman, A, is an example of euthanasia if any of the following conditions are met: (1) there may be enough contemporary evidence for B to consider that A is acutely suffering or irreversibly comatose, or there may be enough contemporary evidence for both A and B that the causal way to A's death will not produce any more suffering than could be produced for A if B did not intervene; (4) the causal way to A's death is chosen with the (Seale & Addison-Hall, 1994).

Man is an animal specially created with intelligence, rationality, sense, self-determining and dignity. These authors, George Robert P and Lee Patrick, argue that human beings are physical, animal organisms, notwithstanding, essentially rational and free. The authors argue that their personal identity across time consists of the persistence of the animal organisms they are. They criticize hedonism and hedonistic drug-taking and present detailed defenses of the profile positions on abortion and euthanasia (George Robert P. and Patrick Lee, 1952). Euthanasia is primarily based, openly or indirectly, on a body-self dualism; that is, on an identity with a self-conscious that possesses a body. To put it another way, a man must continue to exist by demonstrating and practicing his inherent dignity and moral worth.

Fernandes argues the idea of dignity is situated along a continuum which carries both the interface of the ethical and the aesthetic, which becomes a continuum. Most appeals to humanity convey both the ethical and the aesthetic. However, basic dignity falls clearly toward the ethical end of this continuum, which connotes both something of objective quality and absolute quality. In all of this, it serves and permits that to function as the basis of social norms and policies. Although it tends towards the aesthetical. As such, they are more subjective and contingent in nature. (Fernandes, 2001).

In the Maritain's view, man observes intrinsic dignity that must be respected and, based on that, no human being is vulnerable enough to be killed. Obviously, we must use this as a prima facie reason to avoid killing. Maritain's opined with the exceptional idea that the concept of basic dignity is best thought and reasoned as the incalculable value of the person, which is grasped at the beginning through a simple and philosophically experiential encounter with another, though difficult to articulate in common language. In another vein, we can find out through the difficult process of reason that human beings possess a dignity that cannot be taken away. Jacques Maritain (1985), writing acutely, saw the consequences of any good, obscuring the good of the individual person. Maritain saw the danger of having a concept of a person that is not absolute. (Ashley K. Fernandes, Sheldon Rubinfeld, and Daniel P. Sulmasy, 2020). Maritain views the human person as a natural greatness, found out by observing a person.

Rachels's (1975) writing agrees with Maritain's position on the dignity of the human person as a natural greatness is experienced and by experiencing a person; the experience of these values is evident both on an individual level and when one investigates the relationships between individuals in a community. That is, one's personal worth and value are principally determined

through "affective contact" with another. The community actually arises out of human dignity itself. Therefore, the community works as the mechanism for discovering, and the product of, intrinsic human dignity. First, the community is a vehicle through which we experience our own dignity and the dignity of others; second, the connectedness of "persons with dignity"—and the value of each person found out through their interdependence—is what makes the community possible and gives the community a dignity all its own. But if the intersubjective experience of dignity is ignored, the opposite happens: a person risks being alone and rejected, and the community that holds two people together is broken (Rachels, 1975).

Maritain would explain that as we develop this "inter-subjective knowledge" through the beginning of uniquely human activities, there are interacting energies and a life dynamism to the free act. Maritain has desired to find dignity in the experience of a person herself, in the "lived experience of human dignity." He recognizes that a person's worth is linked to his or her ability to reason and exercise free will, but he falls short of tying this to reality and the good. Dignity could never be comprehended outside of man's ability to act freely and in reality. However, it could not be fully comprehended outside of the human person's spiritual dimension.

Carr et al., as authors in their writings, gave the conception of the human person. In the writings, a person is not defined solely by reason, and individual substance of a rational nature and a notion of express abilities are divided into two parts. This is not a reason alone, according to the Kantian belief in dignity. Understanding the significance of an individual substance in a person becomes an understanding of the rational nature of the individual substance in a person. A person is defined by the concept of communicability. Therefore, Maritain critically mentioned, "If you are making a brand new acquaintance, you don't have to celebrate that you met somebody exceptional who is able to reason ideas." "Human beings have different concepts for communication." Therefore, you cannot have a so-called "person" without this capability to reason and communicate. Thus, it is critical to comprehend that Maritain departs from a strictly Kantian belief in dignity that is positioned best within the powers of thought. It is important to know that dignity is discovered both through rational abstraction and existence itself. Reason is simply an important component of dignity; Kant developed this (Carr et al., 1995). The experience of fundamental dignity is the understanding of both "being with a rational capacity" and also "what makes us understand another's value is that point of meeting which expresses his utter irreplaceability and individual uniqueness." This finding directs us towards Maritain's unique personification of human action: the moral occurrence.

The strength of dignity should be observed in the course of someone's existence as an individual. Considering the nature of the being in the course of an encounter permits one to "acknowledge the bipolarity of human dignity between its idea and its lived-existing encounter and to appreciate the dynamic oscillation in both of them." For instance, let me summarize Mai Tai's view with this real-life instance: There was a person whose father battled severe stomach cancer. When the pain became intense, he passed away in his 50s a few years ago. His quantity of weight

was lost tremendously owing to the malignancy and chemotherapy, and he seldom ate. However, when the pain became so intense, he passed away.

His daughter and family often visited him in the hospital, which helped the daughter to share his story when his father was at the point of death, though he was unable to talk because of his critical condition. There were records of a circle of relatives visiting the hospital. She and her own circle of relatives have been traveling with him. As she checked out her emaciated, jaundiced father with tears in her eyes, she asked him if there was anything else she ought to do for him. He replied, with tears in his eyes, that he had misplaced the manipulator of his bladder and that it had to be modified. It is easy to see how a proud, unbiased father and a dutiful, formerly established daughter ought to sense, in this example, the remarkable suffering of the loss of personal dignity. It is an utterly "undignified" scene. Even though it's hard to think about, we can deal with this kind of lack of dignity. Yet, does this sort of loss imply that the person has misplaced value?

It is in actual snapshots like this one that we come to realize the strength of fundamental dignity and inherent value: there is a lack of aesthetical splendor and an inherent value in the daughter and father as humans. The questions raised by euthanasia and assisted suicide produce intrinsic dignity and human value. Would euthanasia add to the deceased's fundamental dignity, even supposing he or his daughter requested it? Can the situation reduce his really valuable worth? Within "the internal," for the daughter who replaces her father's bedclothes, and for a father who stands and sustains the indignity of being changed at the beginning, this would be an instant of profound love and interdependence. In the real sense of it, we're touched and affected by a loss of attributed dignity right here, due to the fundamentally essential dignity being acknowledged. Attributed value counts due to fundamental dignity. People's basic dignity is recognized by living with them and seeing them as people, not by arguing with them.

Based on Maritain's view, all people have natural dignity due to the kind of entity we are. The value is experienced and grasped through touch with each other. The truth of the matter is that the dignity of the individual needs all people. However, this doesn't reject an opportunity to respect people. Society may be misunderstanding what dignity entails.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The work relies on the concept of "slippery." Slope argued that there is a tendency for doctors to abuse voluntary euthanasia under the guise of "mercy killing" to relieve patients of pain due to terminal diseases. Philosophers in favor of euthanasia have also based their case on a terminally ill person experiencing pain before dying; after all, he is going to die anyway. The writer saw it differently as he relied on a concept of individual value and human rights law, pointing out the

intrinsic worth of an individual and the acceptance of that intrinsic worth and respect by others, and the condition for the public or government, in acknowledging the inherent value, to exist for the sake of an individual. In addition, the writer argued that voluntary or involuntary euthanasia is a sign of responsibility laxity or weakness exhibited by the victim or close allies. As pointed out by Immanuel Kant (2009),

Kant says that to abandon a job assigned in the workplace in the world without being arranged is to contravene one's obligation to another person and is analogical to killing oneself. Again, Kant obeys a metaphysical aspect of a man or woman, which apparently lacks right consideration in the most contemporary euthanasia debates. (Immanuel Kant, 2009). As pointed out by John Paul, human life is inviolable and should have the right to life. However, embryonic and foetal life from the moment of conception is subject to protection. John Paul supports Jacques Maritain in reaffirming dignity in the human person (John Paul II, Encyclical Letter, 1991). He also agreed with Kant on the importance of human dignity. According to Judge Fura-Sandstromup and Akpinar and Altun V, Turkey holds the position that respect for human dignity extends also to the dead. (Case of Akpinar and Altun V. Turkey, no. 56760/00, 2007).

Maritain's account of dignity as a demand is especially heartbreaking when we recall a person with a doctor-patient relationship. A person who is trained to heal and a person who demands a cure are diametrically opposed. Certainly, a weak, terminally sick patient looking for hospital treatment asks for recognition of her inherent dignity; she asks for a toll recovery from the pain and suffering inflicted on her imputed dignity. The actual recovery connection between the healthcare giver and the person whose sickness is deteriorating is consequently a chance to support dignity for both the doctor and the patient. If, on the other hand, the sick person is allowed and supported by family, friends, and acquaintances, or if the doctor decides to die through euthanasia, both the doctor and the sick person would join a group that fights for their recovery.

Importantly, religious people have these positions that euthanasia opposes God's creation and will. Religious people are of the view that the practice of euthanasia weakens society's respect for life and the sacredness of life. They see pain and affliction as worthwhile and of vital value. Voluntary euthanasia begins a slippery slope that ends in involuntary euthanasia. Occasionally, religious people oppose euthanasia due to the fact that they see encouraging worth in suffering. For that reason, Christianity instructs and learns that suffering has a place in the plan of God. Therefore, she practices mortification that leads to virtue. The writer saw biblical points to back up its argument that the position of a person is sacred and has its basis in the creation of God. The scripture presents us in the old testament, Genesis 1:27, that man is created in God's image and likeness. The fact remains that, regardless of gender, age, or socio-economic status, a man lives with value and dignity. Those who protect biblical creation should connect its worth to human existence and stand in its defense. As God asserts His authority over human life, He makes those who try to take it away from Him answerable.

The intrinsic value of humans is shown by the divine expression of love and affection within the sacrifice of His Son, who suffered and devalued himself for the sins and transgressions of mankind. By biblical understanding, God owns all human beings. He allowed humans to undergo suffering and enjoy the beauty and nature of life. For God, suffering is doubtlessly practical and purifying. From the attitude of the proponents of suicide and euthanasia, suffering is humiliating and demeaning, so it could be done away with if possible. To support the biblical perspective of the permissible will of God allowing humans to go through suffering, Job gives the prototype of significant suffering. He persevered in pain and abandonment. Similarly, according to the Holy Scripture, Jesus went through suffering, pain, passion, and death. Yet he did not ask for assisted suicide or euthanasia, but he endured. However, Jesus' suffering and pain brought mankind redemption, and it assures us that he identified with our suffering character. However, going by the biblical perspectives, even in pain, suffering, and dying, humans should be able to value human dignity during pain, suffering, and dying, thus discouraging the practice of euthanasia, assisted suicide, and physician assisted suicide. In all of this, the writer is saying factors that might lead people to commit suicide as terminally ill patients are fear, helplessness, pain, depression, and isolation. These are real factors.

By relating applicable hospital therapy with emotional health, hospital progress shows that some people demand assisted suicide as soon as the pains are indicated, then it is attended to. The general observation is that "most people think that people decide to kill themselves on their own, maybe by self-medicating, and that they might not choose death if they weren't in pain."

The biblical point of suffering opposes the slippery reason for the justification of dying. The philosophy of life is, in a manner or other, provisional. For a terminally sick patient, dignity is conditioned on the worth of life. Supporting the suicide of a terminally ill patient is a dangerous practice that opens the door to demeaning life and the broader practice of euthanasia. Although the American College of Physicians shows worry that assisted suicide might additionally result in a terrible encounter with these: a terminally sick patient, a demented person, the disabled, and the vulnerable and weak. We must respect how God sees the value and worth of all life, whether it is born or not, young or old, healthy or sick.

Suggestions

Based on the analysis of different viewpoints on euthanasia and Jacques Maritain's position on people.

1. He is against the sacred value of not caring for one another. The law is meant to guide human conduct within society.
2. That is, the law helps to regulate human behavior. Laws have been formulated as to whether someone who is critically sick should be killed mercifully through euthanasia.
3. Some western countries have legalized euthanasia. But it should be reemphasized that legalizing euthanasia may result in a concept of "slippery slope" that is capable of encouraging involuntary euthanasia, or simply put, "killing."

4. Most importantly, in illness and ailment, it is unnecessary to invoke laws to ensure the provision of treatment and possible cure for a patient.
5. Life should be seen as sacred, and therefore, the right to life should be respected and worthwhile from the unborn to the dying.

The wrong use of language is a challenge the supporters of euthanasia make. It begins with the use of language. They see a man or woman feeling humiliated or degraded without having lost his or her basic dignity. We must accept the dignity of every person in life by loving one another. Man's understanding of human values cannot be stopped if the isolation of illness does not alter it. Through human action, dignity is confirmed in freedom. Also, through incalculable value, this stands between the embracing of vulnerable life and the isolation and death of the unwanted person.

The writer is opposed to doctors that practice euthanasia, which is physician assisted suicide, because doctors are those who resuscitate and cure. They may reduce the pain of a sick patient by destroying or exterminating them, which may be seen as ethically right.

The writer's position on euthanasia should not be practiced. To avoid raising controversy, even willful allowance should not be considered. Humans must respect moral values by not viewing their fellow man as a burden, whether in terms of finance or the economy, or in a state of deteriorating health. In general, humans should not be seen as liabilities. There should be value in the sacredness of life.

Therefore, the writer also lays its claims on God's creation of man, and no one should tamper with His creature. A position holds that life has its root and basis in God. Therefore, life is sacred and must be valued and respected. We may say that life is created in God's image and likeness. However, the soul is sacred. This reality conveys special value to every life, irrespective of race, sex, age, socio-economic status, health challenges, etc. The position on the Christian bible base supports the claim of the value of human dignity. The biblical injunction opposes euthanasia, assisted suicide, and physician assisted suicide, which in all of this is termed "murder." For "whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God has God made man" (Genesis 9:6).

The writer looks at the position that should discourage euthanasia, which may be considered universal. Hence, we must never practice euthanasia because it would lose its value and human dignity in society. Again, euthanasia leads to worse care for critically sick patients and provides many rights to physicians, thereby damaging the trust between patients and doctors.

There is a need to encourage scientists, doctors, and nurses to further study modern medicine and therapy for incurably sick patients to save lives and thus to avoid weakening the obligations of scientists, physicians, and medical personnel.

We should consider that all is created by God and that man has limits in life. In other words, humans are meant to satisfy our desires. The man, however, was not killed.

We should hold to these positions that human life is sacred and, as such, avoid the practice of euthanasia.

1. Every man and woman is a gift from God, and so life must be respected.
2. Life is good in itself and as a means to an end.

According to Immanuel Kant, man is a rational being who must be treated as an end in itself rather than a means to an end; thus, life is good in and of itself, and human beings have value in and of themselves.

1. Humans must be valued regardless of their age, gender, religion, socioeconomic status, or health challenges.

2. We must stop the intentional killing of human beings because of the sanctity of life, except in self-defence against others.

In view of the foregoing, it is recommended that all states take a stance to address, especially the judicial and legislative organs, to bring out laws to govern any state to discourage euthanasia and respect the sacredness of life.

REFERENCES

- Ashley K. Fernandes (1933 and 1945): A Critical Analysis of the Anthropological Roots of Euthanasia under National Socialism and Today JK Science Medco Legal Notes, 7, 3, pp. 169–171
- Jacques Maritain and Dignitatis Humanae: Natural Law as the Common Language of Religious Freedom.*
- Carr, D. (1995), Haldane, J., McLaughlin, T., & Pring, R., Return to the Crossroads: Maritain fifty years on, 162-178 in the British Journal of Educational Studies, 43(2).
- Second Edition (CCC)* (2000), Second Edition (translated by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops). Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City.
- Cooper, J. W. (1985), *The Theology of Freedom: The Legacy of Jacques Maritain and Reinhold Niebuhr*. Mercer University Press,
- Fernandes, A. K. (2001), *Euthanasia, assisted suicide, and the philosophical anthropology of Karol Wojtyla*. *Christian Bioethics*, 2001, 7 (3), 379-402.
- Ferrel, B., Virani, R., Grant, M., Coyne, P., and Uman, G. (2000). Beyond the supreme court decisions: *Nursing perspectives on end-of-life care*. *Oncol Nurs Forum* 2000;27:445-55.
- Finnis, John (2001), *Natural Law and Natural Rights*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Hendin, The Case against Assisted Suicide: *For the Right to End-of-Life Care*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Grace, W. J. (1944), *Jacques Maritain and Modern Catholic Historical Scholarship*. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 1944, pp. 434–445.
- Hermesen MA (2002), Ten Have HAMJ. Euthanasia in Palliative Care Journals. *Pain and Symptom Management*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 517–525, 2002.
- Hemmings, P. (2003) Dying wishes: Should patients have the right to choose when and how they die? *Nursing Times*, 47:20–22, 2003.
- Howarth, G., & Jefferys, M. (1996) Euthanasia: sociological perspectives. *British Medical Bulletin*, 1996, 52 (2), 376-385.

Hurst, SA, Mauron, A (2006). *The ethics of palliative care and euthanasia: exploring common values*. 107–12 in *Palliative Medicine* 20 (2006).

Man and the State, by Jacques Maritain (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951).

Maritain, J. (2001). *Reflections on Theory and Practice*, South Bend, 2001.

Kant, I. (1992), *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. James W. Ellington (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co.).

Kohl, Marvin; Kurtz, Paul (1975). "A Plea for Beneficent Euthanasia." *Marvin Kohl's*

(ed.). *Beneficent Euthanasia Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, p. 94*, quoted in

Beauchamp & Davidson (1979), p 295.

Even if there is no discomfort?doi: 10.1016/j.CRC.2014.02.007

Susan E. Lederer, *Medical Ethics and the Media: Oaths, Codes, and Popular Culture*, 1999. In *The American Medical Ethics Revolution: How the AMA's code of ethics has transformed physicians' relationships with patients, professionals, and society*, eds. Baker, Robert B., Caplan, Arthur L., Emanuel, Linda L., and Latham, Stephen R., Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Maritain, J. (1943), *The Rights of Man and Natural Law, Traducción de Doris C. Anson. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons*.

J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain, J. Maritain

Press the button.

Maritain, J. (1955), *Bergsonian Philosophy and Thomism, Trans. ML Andison, New York, Philosophical Library*,

Maritain, J. (1955), *Thomist Views on Education. Modern Philosophies of Education*.

Maritain, J., & Fitzgerald, J. J. (1946), *The Person and the Common Good. The Review of Politics*, 8(4), 419–455

Maritain, J., Flannery, E. H., Mouroux, J., Lamb, G. R., Friedman, M. S., & Braithwaite, R. B. (1957). *An Essay on Christian Philosophy*

Magnier, Mark (8 March 2011). "India's Supreme Court lays out euthanasia guidelines." *The LA Times*, retrieved on March 8, 2011.

Materstvedt LJ, Clark D, Ellershaw J, Forde R, Gravgaard AM, Muller-Busch HC, et al. (2003). Euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide: A view from an EAPC ethics task force. *Palliat Med*. 2003;17:97-101.

McGee, E.M. (1997). Can suicide intervention in hospice be ethical? *Journal of Palliative Care*, 13 (1), pp. 27–33, 1997.

McInerney, Ralph (1993), *The Question of Christian Ethics*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Millard K. (1935) *Campaign for Dignity in Dying*, 1935.

Miller, W. L., and Bellah, R. N. (1988), *Religion and the Public Good: A Bicentennial Forum*. Mercer University Press, 1988.

The Evolution of Euthanasia and its Perceptions in Greek Culture and Civilization, by K. P. Mystainfantou, E. Tsilika, E. Katsouda, and L. Vlahos. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 97–98.

Otani, I. (2010) "The Good Manner of Dying" as a Normative Concept: Autocide, "Granny Dumping" and Discussions on Euthanasia/Death with Dignity in Japan. *Country Journal of Japanese Society*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 49–63.

Patel, Kant, and Rushefsky, Mark E. (2015). *Healthcare policy in an age of new technologies* Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Peter A. Singer and Mark Siegler (1990), "Euthanasia: A Critique," *New England Journal of Medicine* 322 (1990): 1881–1883.

Rachels, J. (1976). *Active and Passive Euthanasia* *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 1975, 292 (9).

The Legal Cell: The Right to Die (<https://legalcellforall.blogspot.com/2008/09/right-to-die.htm>) Ravi A.

Seale, C., & Addington-Hall, J. (1994), Euthanasia: Why People Want to Die Earlier. *Social Science & Medicine*, 39(5), pp. 647–654, 1994.

Singer, P. A., & Siegler, M. (1990). *Euthanasia—A Critique*, 1990.

Sulmasy, Daniel P. (1994), "Death and Human Dignity," *The Linacre Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 4, Article 7. <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol61/iss4/7>

Thomas More, (1951) *Utopia and A Dialogue of Comfort*, 1516, ed. John O'Hagan (London, UK; New York, NY: Dent/Dutton, 1951).