

Re: My thoughts on the Terry Schiavo case

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.transcription/2005-03/1672.html>

From: Anne Vasquez (annevasquez_at_NOSPAMhotmail.com)

Date: 03/22/05

Date: Tue, 22 Mar 2005 17:55:22 GMT

Well said, Jay. When I saw the header, I expected to disagree with you and instead found myself nodding all the way through the post. Sorry for preconceived misconceptions! :-)

Anne

Jay Vance wrote:

- > *If ever there was a situation that doesn't seem to have one "right"*
- > *solution, this is it. I feel for Terry's family, even though I don't*
- > *necessarily agree with their attempts to keep her alive at any cost, with no*
- > *real reason to expect that she will ever improve. I am staunchly pro-life,*
- > *but I have a real problem with the vast amounts of money that are spent to*
- > *add a few months or even weeks to our lives, and I also disagree with the*
- > *concept that if it is scientifically possible to do something, we ought to*
- > *do it, regardless of what the practical benefits may be. I have a problem*
- > *with using Christianity as the basis of a "life at all costs" philosophy*
- > *without also acknowledging that for a Christian this life isn't all there*
- > *is--on the contrary, what's waiting for us after this life is over is so*
- > *much better than anything we enjoy now. The Christian point of view about*
- > *the sanctity of life is incomplete without acknowledging that death for the*
- > *Christian is not some horror to be avoided at all costs. The Bible simply*
- > *does not teach that.*
- >
- > *I realize my point of view is colored by the pragmatic nature of my*
- > *upbringing; my family has never been much into drama or histrionics. Death*
- > *has never been something to dread for us. My grandfather passed away at*
- > *home in his own bed with Alzheimer's. When he had no knowledge of anything*
- > *going on around him, we simply let him go--meaning we didn't force-feed him.*
- > *All this talk of how horrible it must be to die of starvation or dehydration*
- > *is simply not accurate when you're talking about someone who has no*
- > *cognitive abilities.*
- >
- > *The fact that it is POSSIBLE to keep someone alive for years and years in a*
- > *vegetative state by feeding them parenterally or intravenously or whatever*
- > *doesn't mean that it is IMPERATIVE that we do so. In fact, I'm going to go*
- > *WAY out on a limb and suggest that what Terry did or did not say about being*
- > *kept alive at any cost is not the issue. Are we REALLY saying that if a*

> person says, "I want to be kept alive no matter how much it costs and no
> matter how debilitated I am and no matter how much technology it takes," we
> as a society are then **REQUIRED** to honor those wishes **NO MATTER WHAT?** Are we
> going to start prosecuting people who don't spend every last dime of their
> own money and/or society's resources in order to keep someone's heart
> beating and lungs working a little while longer? I'm not talking about
> actively causing someone's death, mind you, nor am I advocating legalizing
> suicide or assisted suicide. But it should not be a crime to let someone
> die in peace when their body and/or mind is simply worn out. I can hear the
> question being asked, "So who gets to decide when enough is enough?" All I
> can tell you is that for doggone sure I don't want the **FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**
> making that decision!

>

> I have a real problem with the federal government getting involved in this
> for a couple of reasons. First of all, it's just another example of
> government intrusion into our lives, something conservatives should be
> fighting against tooth and nail. Furthermore, it undermines the rule of
> law, something else that is a bedrock principle of conservatism. This issue
> has been reviewed and re-reviewed ad infinitum by at least 19 judges and I
> don't know how many legislators in Florida. The laws of Florida have been
> followed; there is no cause for federal intervention, in my opinion.
> Thirdly, I don't agree with using a tragic situation like this to further a
> political agenda, I don't care whose it is. To me this is no different than
> when feminists were using bogus statistics some years back about the
> percentage of women who were the victims of abuse at the hands of men. When
> they were confronted with the fact that their statistics were out and out
> lies, they responded by saying that the issue of abuse was real, so
> therefore anything that brought attention to the problem was okay, even if
> it wasn't actually true! Regardless of what the issue is, it is morally and
> ethically wrong to use false information or personal tragedy to further an
> agenda, in my opinion.

>

> Jay

>

>