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1) My initial research question was whether or not it is just to place an impediment on someone’s autonomy and devoid them of their natural right of liberty in attempt to restrict them from encroaching on their right to life, assuming that this decision was made in a rational state of mind, using contemporary ideas of natural rights.

2) I conducted research by initially seeking philosophers of natural rights and read their philosophies pertaining to my question.

3) I found that most of their work was far too irrelevant to the scope of my essay so I had to discard most of it. They sparingly entertained the idea of lexical priorities of natural rights so most of the time I had to read in between the lines and interpret their thoughts or how they would have thought when presented with a question they had not yet postulated. It was quite hard as I had to understand all the nuances of their philosophy to be able to predict how they might react in this given scenario.

4) My most helpful source was Albert Camus’ essay “The Myth of Sisyphus” because it helped me arrive to the conclusion that suicide can never be just and from that I derived that since euthanasia in a non-comatose state is a small sect of the whole that is suicide, and since suicide is never just, thus euthanasia in a non-comatose state is never just. But then I ran into the problem of trying to categorize euthanasia in a comatose state. To answer that I had to first constitute what I meant by life, or living which was quite difficult. I decided finally that being permanently comatose or in a permanently vegetative state does not constitute as living and thus Camus’ philosophy is null.

5) My sources complemented each other well as they were all talking about the same idea of natural rights and the source regarding Sarah Lyall served as practical case study. Furthermore, although Kant and Rawls were not used for their thoughts on natural rights, they were still useful in trying to construct a model of euthanasia which was divorced from eugenics. My overall strategy in citing sources changed as my question changed. First, it was answering whether euthanasia was just and for that Locke, Hobbes, and Camus were useful. Then the question evolved into whether it were hypothetically possible to implement euthanasia and for that Kant and Rawls were adequate. And finally a case study by Sarah Lyall was just added as a final verification check of the argument that had been constructed so far.

6) My question was first only concerned with whether or not euthanasia was just. I also refuted the initial argument against euthanasia saying that it allocates lexical priority over natural rights which are by definition equal. The latter state was proven wrong promptly by Hobbes and from there on when I was finished with the prior question, I arrived to a new question whether or not we can ever implement euthanasia safely in a manner that is divorced from eugenics.

7) I did not draft my research essay initially with an audience in mind but now in hindsight I believe my audience would encapsulate other scholarly philosophers who are interested in the idea of contemporary natural rights and would like to see how I implicitly defined natural rights through euthanasia rather than explicitly defining natural rights and then coming to a conclusion regarding euthanasia. My audience could also potentially be lawmakers and doctors who are unsure on what their strance is on euthanasia and need to see how a possible approach could be taken in adopting a view and from there on the audience can either consent to my view or refute it and have my logical reasoning plainly laid out to find faults in. I think I did a good job because the logical steps taken to arrive to my conclusion are clearly laid out so if anybody wished to refute my claims they have an easy time of doing so.

8) I believe the purpose of my essay seems to be encapsulated in the genre of the paper itself, it is to research about a certain topic and arrive to a conclusion based on logical reasoning. I think I achieved my purpose, although my logical reasoning may have some innate built in biases which I was not able to dissociate myself from.

9) My idea of writing has become more explicit where I find myself defining quintessential terms that are going to be used ubiquitously in my essay. I think it is essential for the reader and the author to understand what a term means and although the reader might disagree on the interpretation of the term, I believe the reader can understand why I arrived to a certain conclusion based off of my interpretation. Which helps the reader see my thought process more clearly and explicitly.