I think this article was very provocative because it made valid logical arguments that defy our natural moral compass. I think the effect is even greater when considering that it’s author personal bias was great. Obviously, I do not condone Peter Singer’s proposed solution to disabled persons in our society. I think Peter Singer, unlike Hitler, means to euthanize humans born so severely impaired that their quality of life is unequivocally compromised. Previous explorations in this school of thought have concluded that disabled persons are a weak link in society and elected to remove them as such. Singer’s approach is intended to be compassionate, not efficient. He believes that disabled persons should be euthanized at birth out of empathy, not social Darwinism. The problem with his proposed solution is that humans are imperfect creatures. He wants to put the judgment of a disabled persons future quality of life and cognizance in the hands of other people. Specifically, parents of newborn disabled children, who are in a state of mental and physical shock and are in no condition to make life and death decisions. I support the notion that disabled persons or rather everyone should have access to assisted suicide past a certain age limit. That being said, I think the decision to take a life should not be placed in the hands of anyone other than the life to be taken. The only exception to the above condition is a person who is clinically brain dead and dependent on medical apparatus to survive. Perhaps for those who are severely disabled the age restrictions on assisted suicide should be amended but should still be placed squarely in the hands of the person.