

John Pfeilsticker

Medvesky

ENC1101

5.22.08

In the argument for Assisted Suicide, a person must analyze what level of control human rights decrees grant them. Firstly, if the suicide is “assisted” what level of involvement do the outside parties have? How clearly recorded are the patients intentions to die? What could grant legal efficacy to a citizen wishing to turn himself off? A right to die seems appropriate where a right to life has been granted, but death is the ultimate cultural taboo second only to self-inflicted death. In the same way that governing bodies have trouble controlling what substances their subjects ingest, it's very challenging to manipulate suicidal intentions with a force as fickle and symbolic as law.

In the case of the *South Park* episode, where Stan's grandfather goes as far as locking him in a room with Enya playing to convince Stan of the horrors of old age, it seems hard to argue. If one is shitting in a colostomy bag, and urinating through a catheter, death could release them from a tomb of physiological malfunction. The real debate here lies in popular belief as to what happens once our anatomical processes cease. In a mostly Christian society, where suicide is a one way ticket to eternal damnation, it's not likely to be legalized. But what are the alternatives? How far from assisted suicide is pumping an old man full of morphine, oxycodone, fentanyl, hydromorphone, and other opium derivatives, via intravenous injection, waiting for respiratory arrest akin to heroin overdose?

It's with a heavy heart that I condone assisted suicide. Death may or may not be an end to consciousness, and it's hard for a society so entangled in spiritual contradiction to admit their ignorance. There is a severity of physiological malfunction I will not allow myself to reach, law and morality aside. Perhaps this government “for the people” should reconsider the excruciating pain it's elderly are swimming in, in the name of untestable, religious fanaticism.