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In the world of the 21st century euthanasia is a widespread topic of discussion which can be heard in a variety of spaces such as the parliaments of states that populate the earth. Euthanasia’s well-deserved significance of its place in such prominent spaces stems from its deep connection to the “highest social value”, the human life, which is its potential to bring it to an end. Euthanasia is defined by Draper as “*death that results from the intention of one person to kill another person, using the most gentle and painless means possible, that is motivated solely by the best interests of the person who dies”* which arguably should be the definition to be used with the addition of consent as without consent, as in involuntary euthanasia, the act could possibly be classified as murder in legality.

The People’s Republic of China has not yet legalised euthanasia though debates are still ongoing. The state has a population with members of various religions and beliefs, that include atheism, which indicates that religious motivation throughout the debate of the legality of euthanasia does simply not exist. To date, “*According to article 232 and 233 of Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, PAD is illegal.*”. Although no definitive decision has been made regards to the legality of euthanasia in the People’s Republic of China, the state still recognizes the fundamental human right to live and other human rights which might mean that in the foreseeable future euthanasia could be legalised as ending one’s own life with appropriate cause may be considered as right on its own.

The human life begins without consent thus the decision to end it willingly must be treated with respect. The causing of suffering onto the people who endure extreme pain with no possible treatment cannot be justified as a person in the modern society lives by their own free will and must not be tortured by the state due to some legal issues. Preventable suffering dealt to a member of the society will only lead to further pain and agony to the person and their close ones. As long as a person does not intend to harm the state and its citizens, they should be able to do anything according to their free will. Limitations to one’s free will only damages the state more as it causes misery which does not translate well to any economic or social aspects of a healthy state.