OCR H573 | INDEPENDENT REVISION

A* Model Essay

Euthanasia

Religion and Ethics

Discuss whether quality of life is sufficient for judging the morality of euthanasia.

1,369 response words | Complete annotated PDF | Individual topic edition

What is included

A complete original response, an argument plan, paragraph-level AO1/AO2 annotations and source works for further reading.

A* describes the intended style of this teaching model. This is independently written, not an OCR-marked script or a guaranteed grade.

Use this model to study argument and evaluation, then write your own answer. Do not submit it as your own assessed work.

Individual-use digital edition | 10 November 2026

Argument plan

Discuss whether quality of life is sufficient for judging the morality of euthanasia.

Thesis: Quality of life is indispensable because end-of-life ethics must attend to suffering, agency and the patient's lived condition, but making it the only focus is unjustifiable: autonomy, equal dignity, intention, relationships and reliable safeguards determine whether and how a quality judgement may guide action.

1. Quality-of-life reasoning takes suffering and the patient's experience morally seriously.

Counter-argument: External rankings of quality can devalue disabled, dependent or unconscious lives.

Interim judgement: Quality is relevant only when interpreted with equal dignity and strong priority for the person's own perspective.

2. Autonomy supports competent voluntary choice about dying.

Counter-argument: A request may be shaped by depression, coercion, inadequate care or fear of burdening others.

Interim judgement: Autonomy is a separate condition requiring capacity and genuine alternatives, not a synonym for low quality.

3. Consequentialist and situationist approaches can justify euthanasia where continued life imposes grave suffering.

Counter-argument: Predictions are fallible and social consequences may endanger vulnerable people.

Interim judgement: Compassion needs case-sensitive and institutional evaluation rather than a single welfare score.

4. Sanctity, double effect and treatment limits protect life without requiring maximal intervention.

Counter-argument: Absolute opposition can prolong burdens and overstate the moral difference between acts and omissions.

Interim judgement: Dignity and intention should constrain quality-of-life reasoning, not erase it.