

ди, погано виваженого реформування вітчизняного кримінального законодавства, яке відбулося на рубежі XX та XXI століть.

Відмову вітчизняного законодавства від використання такого узагальнюючого поняття як розкрадання, при характеристиці злочинів проти власності, слід визнати невдалим кроком, оскільки це сприяє появі негативних тенденцій у кримінальній законотворчості та численним помилкам на рівні правозастосування. Тому, подальший розвиток національного законодавства щодо відповідальності за злочини проти власності повинен бути пов'язаний з поверненням цього поняття (бажано шляхом його легального визначення) у кримінально-правову площину. Це дасть змогу, з одного боку, забезпечити «речову чистоту» відносин, що охороняються розділом VI КК, а з іншого – правильно вирішити питання щодо його інструментальних можливостей у межах інших розділів Особливої частини.

Список використаної літератури:

1. Кваліфікація злочинів: навч. посібник / за ред. М.І. Панова. Х.: Право, 2016. 356 с.
2. Кримінальне право України: Загальна частина / за ред. В.Я. Тація, В.І. Борисова, В.І. Тютюгіна. Х.: Право, 2015. 528 с.
3. Постанови пленумів Верховного Суду України та вищих спеціалізованих судів України в кримінальних провадженнях / упоряд. С.А. Кузьмін, М.С. Кучеренко. К.: ПАЛІВОДА А.В., 2016. 860 с.

Ключові слова: власність, викрадення, заволодіння, обертання, розкрадання, форми.

Ключевые слова: собственность, похищения, завладение, вращения, хищения, формы.

Key words: ownership, abduction, capture, rotation, theft, forms.

KHIMCHENKO ANASTASIYA

Department of Criminal Law
National University «Odessa Law Academy»
Postgraduate Student:

EUTHANASIA: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

In recent years, disputes over the admissibility, justification, ethics of euthanasia, and even its legal implementation (“legalization”) have become more active. The discussion was encouraged by adoption of special regulations which not only allow euthanasia, but also regulate the conditions for its realization by health professionals. Nowadays, the issue of euthanasia is of international significance. The question of whether euthanasia is a mercy killing remains unclear [1].

The idea of euthanasia originated a long time ago. However, health professionals are increasingly willing to use this practice, when the

patient asks for death. How do we treat this trend? The issue of euthanasia has many aspects: biomedical, legal, moral and ethical, religious and others [3]. The problem of euthanasia became especially acute in recent decades, when medicine achieved unprecedented results in the field of resuscitation, transplantology, rehabilitation of comatose patients, and got ahead in developing new methods of life support and establishing the criteria for death coming.

The issue of euthanasia has always been reduced to several aspects: the human right to choose to live or die; the right of the person who chooses death with the help of health professionals [4]. Medicine advances put a set of questions, the answers to which have not yet been found. Does a person have the right to dispose of his/her own life and refuse of medical care in the case of an incurable disease? If a patient has this right, can a health professional, whose duty obliges him/her to fight the disease and to preserve the life, comply with the patient's request? Is it legitimate and humane to refuse terminal ill patient to end his/her suffering? This is not a complete range of questions that all the researchers of euthanasia face [5].

Proponents of euthanasia believe that the following advantages exist:

1. A person has the right to die. Every person has the right to control his/her body and life, so people should be able to dispose of when and how to die. Death is a personal right of everyone and the state should not interfere with this right.

2. Humanity of the method. Euthanasia is a relatively painless process, so this type of death is considered the most humane.

3. The distribution of medical resources. Terminal ill patients are provided with large resources, while patients who can be cured do not receive the necessary drugs.

The opponents agree with the disadvantages of euthanasia:

1. Violation of the will of God. God gave life and only God can dispose of it, determining the moment when its end will come and how it will happen.

2. Medical malpractice. When a medical professional makes an incorrect diagnosis, the patient may ask about euthanasia, although in this situation his/her life could be saved.

3. Crimes committed under the guise of euthanasia. In this case, we are talking about incitement to make a decision on euthanasia or the murder for mercenary motives by relatives or other people interested in the death of the patient.

4. The deterioration of medicine progress. In this case, it is the development of medicine that makes it possible to hope for a positive outcome in the treatment of patients.

I am opposed to euthanasia and I guess it is unacceptable to legalize euthanasia because of serious disadvantages. Moreover, euthanasia entails negative consequences including death, that significantly prevail over the advantages. The problem of euthanasia is highly debatable, both locally and internationally. In my opinion, medicine should evolve, thereby minimizing the level of incurable diseases.

References:

1. Francis Bacon: the major works By Francis Bacon, Brian Vickers.
2. Euthanasia Terminology. Retrieved from <http://www.life.org.nz/euthanasia/abouteuthanasia/euthanasia-controversy1/Default.htm>
3. Najimudeen M., Melaka Manipal Medical College (2013). Euthanasia.
4. American Pocket Medical Dictionary. Philapedia. – London: Saunders, 1953. – P. 230.
5. Pichugin V. Right to Live or Right to Die.

Ключові слова: евтаназія, медичний працівник, право на життя.

Ключевые слова: эвтаназия, медицинский работник, право на жизнь.

Key words: euthanasia, medical worker, right to life.