

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910967036103321
Autore	Taylor James Stacey <1970-, >
Titolo	Death, posthumous harm, and bioethics // James Stacey Taylor
Pubbl/distr/stampa	New York : , : Routledge, , 2012
ISBN	1-136-25775-6 1-283-70926-0 0-203-10642-3 1-136-25776-4
Edizione	[1st ed.]
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (243 p.)
Collana	Routledge annals of bioethics ; ; 12
Disciplina	128/.5
Soggetti	Death Death - Moral and ethical aspects Respect for persons Dead Bioethics
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references (p. 205-221) and index.
Nota di contenuto	Cover; Title; Copyright; Dedication; Contents; Acknowledgments; Introduction: Death Unthinkable; Full-blooded Epicureanism and Contemporary Bioethics; A Note on Methodology; Outline of this Volume; 1 Posthumous Harm and Interest-based Accounts of Well-being; The Intuitive Case for Posthumous Harm; The Anti-Hedonistic Intuition; Wronging the Dead; The Feinberg-Pitcher Argument for Posthumous Harm; Assessing the Argument for Posthumous Harm; Accommodating Orphaned Intuitions; Accommodating Feinberg's and Parfit's Anti-Hedonistic Intuitions; Can the Dead be Wronged? Portmore, Posthumous Harm, and the Desire Theory of WelfareConclusion; 2 Further Criticisms of the Possibility of Posthumous Harm; Levenbook's Account of Harm as Loss; Levenbook's Argument; Criticisms of Levenbook's Argument; Grover's Quality of Life Arguments; Grover's Argument; Criticisms of Grover's Argument; Sperling's Human Subject Account; Sperling's Argument; Criticisms of Sperling's Argument; Harm and Implication in Evil; Conclusion; 3 The Impossibility of Posthumous Harm; Death, Goods, and the Extinction of

Desires; Responding to Luper; Towards Hedonism; Objects and Causes
Conclusion4 Can the Dead Be Wronged?; Desert and Injustice; Blustein
and the "Dear Departed"; Responses to Blustein's Arguments; Response
to the Rescue from Insignificance Argument; Response to the Enduring
Duties Argument; Response to the Reciprocity Argument; Rights and
Interests; Conclusion; 5 Why Death Is Not a Harm to the One Who Dies;
The Epicurean Argument; Hedonism Revisited; Death and Deprivation;
Does a Person's Death Deprive Her of the Goods of Life?; Responses to
these Deprivation-based Arguments for the Harm of Death; The
Existence Variant and Presentism Defended; Conclusion
6 Fearless SymmetryLucretian Arguments; Challenges to the Lucretian
Symmetry Argument; Responses to Nagel's Objection; Stoic fate;
Hetherington's Symmetry Arguments; Earlier Birth and Personal Identity;
Kaufman's Defense of Nagel's Argument; Responses to Kaufman;
Responses to the Other Criticisms of this Lucretian Argument; The
Backfire Problem; Feldman's Objection; Parfit's Hospital Example;
Conclusion; 7 Epicureanism, Suicide, and Euthanasia; McMahan's
Reconciliation Strategy; An Epicurean Approach to Suicide and
Euthanasia; Suicide; Euthanasia; Conclusion
8 Epicureanism and Organ ProcurementEpicureanism and Policies of
Presumed Consent; Presumed Consent and the "Fewer Mistakes"
Arguments; Autonomy-based "Fewer Mistakes" Arguments; Gill's
Arguments; Why Gill's Argument against the Qualitative "Fewer
Mistakes" Argument Fails; Objections to Gill's Quantitative Autonomy-
based "Fewer Mistakes" Argument; The "Fewer Mistakes" Arguments
and Violations of Autonomy; Presumed Consent and Respect for
Autonomy; From Presumed Consent to Organ Taking; The Standard
Pro-Taking Argument; Two Unjustified Assumptions-Moving Towards
Markets
The Ownership of Organs

Sommario/riassunto

Death, Posthumous Harm, and Bioethics offers a highly distinctive and original approach to the metaphysics of death and applies this approach to contemporary debates in bioethics that address end-of-life and post-mortem issues. Taylor defends the controversial Epicurean view that death is not a harm to the person who dies and the neo-Epicurean thesis that persons cannot be affected by events that occur after their deaths, and hence that posthumous harms (and benefits) are impossible. He then extends this argument by asserting that the dead cannot be wronged, finally presenting a de
