

Student Name

Professor Name

Course

Date

Worksheet

According to Peter Singer, we should always give what we can and be ready to sacrifice the entire life as well as our wealth and everything we have. In *Famine, Affluence, and Morality*, he talked about the 1971's incident when people were dying in East Bengal due to lack of shelter, medical assistance, and food. According to Peter Singer, it's the right time when we come forward and prevent wrong from happening to those innocents. Using the examples of that time, he tries to justify his point, but sometimes sacrificing everything for others is impossible for us.

Kantian's position is lesser demanding because of limited scope and confusing moral values. Scholars like Peter Singer and Onora O'Neill always try to connect the issues of world's famine to our moral codes of ethics. O'Neill believes that we must fulfill the duties of justice and humanity because something uncertain can happen to us anytime, anywhere. She argues that Kantian ethics do not say anything about the moral statuses of unintentional actions. I feel that Peter Singer's point of view is far better and valid than that of O'Neill thoughts and ideas because Peter does not ask us to sacrifice things outside of our scope; instead, he wants us to surrender whatever we have to prevent bad from happening.

Rachels believes that euthanasia is not permissible as the dignity and self-respect of humans don't depend on the amount of suffering they go through. In contrast, the utilitarian

argument is that the more a person suffers or faces problems in his life, the better are his chances of achieving success and polishing his capabilities. In fact, dignity is inherent, and it has nothing to do with how much we suffer.

So the idea of euthanasia is entirely wrong and is not based on evidence. Not only Rachels but also other scholars and writers argue with the utilitarian concept stating that it is not practical and should not be opted for at any cost. True compassion requires us to support and love one another, and it is a never-ending process.

Foot wants to defend DDA in case 1, where a person is allowed to die because his death will eventually save the lives of other people. When a patient needs heavy doses of medicine, and six other people need light doses of the same medicine, then letting this one person die makes sense as not only his medication would be equally distributed among those six but also his body organs can be transplanted to save more lives.

This concept, however, is far different from Rachels' Smith and Jones cases because both Rachels and Jones believe that saving a person's life is our core responsibility and we should be ready to sacrifice anything for that. Though he is single, he is a human and letting him die for the sake of organs makes no sense.

A right is a claim that one person may exercise against the others. Cohen believes that animals should not be given any rights, but they are obliged to fulfill their duties. According to him, animals cannot have rights as they are not capable of performing their tasks on their own. Instead, they need proper training by their masters (humans) and are obliged to act upon their orders. Kent, by no means, would agree with this statement because he believes that animals are also living beings and thus they do have rights, and their rights should be respected by the humans.

Regan believes that non-human animals do have a right to live their lives according to their desires and expectations, while Cohen believes that animals cannot survive by their own and need humans' assistance and continuous support. Similarly, Regan has his own way to deal with the marginal human case which is different from that of Cohen's ideas and beliefs.

According to Regan, all humans and animals should be treated equally. Even when they fell ill, they should be given equal importance by doctors. However, Cohen states that humans are superior and better than animals and both of them can never possess equal rights. I feel that Cohen's statements are valid and authentic and should be agreed to.

According to Warren, potential persons should be rights similar to that of actual persons because our future depends on them and we cannot survive, or our generations cannot grow without them. In contrast, Marquis states that potentials individuals should be gotten rid of as soon as possible and they can never have rights equal to that of actual persons.

Marquis' argument has nothing to do with the idea and theory of Warren because he thinks that killing unconscious persons is ethical and we should go for it whenever needed. Those fetuses have nothing to do with humanity and are tiny things that can be gotten rid of instantly.