



INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

(Peer-reviewed, Refereed, Indexed & Open Access Journal)

DOI : 03.2021-11278686

ISSN : 2582-8568

IMPACT FACTOR : 7.560 (SJIF 2024)

“IN FAVOUR OF EUTHANASIA”

Kannagi Sharma

Student,
Amity Institute of Social Sciences,
Amity University,
Noida (Uttar Pradesh, India)
E-mail: k.sharma7834@gmail.com

Dr. Suyasha Singh Isser

Assistant Professor,
Amity Institute of Social Sciences,
Amity University,
Noida (Uttar Pradesh, India)
E-mail: ssisser@amity.edu

DOI No. **03.2021-11278686** DOI Link :: <https://doi-ds.org/doilink/04.2024-25958127/IRJHIS2404032>

Abstract:

This paper provides a comprehensive exploration of euthanasia, advocating for its legalization by analyzing ethical theories, legal frameworks, and humanitarian considerations. Beginning with an introduction to euthanasia, it defines its types. It contrasts euthanasia with assisted suicide and delves into ethical perspectives, covering autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence and justice. Legal frameworks and international perspectives on euthanasia are examined, along with challenges in legalization. Patient and physician viewpoints are elucidated. Ethical dilemmas, resolutions, and the repercussions on the healthcare system and society are also addressed, culminating in a supportive conclusion for euthanasia.

Keywords: Assisted suicide, autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, double effect, terminally ill.

Research Objectives:

1. To examine various ethical theories, legal frameworks, and humanitarian considerations.
2. To explore international perspective on euthanasia laws, including the evolution, challenges and controversies.
3. To investigate the perspectives of terminally ill patients and physician.

Research Questions:

1. How do various ethical theories influence the discourse surrounding the right to choose euthanasia in the context of unbearable suffering?
2. What are the key factors driving the necessity of legalizing euthanasia?
3. How do the perspective of terminally ill patient and physician contribute to our understanding of the ethical humanitarian considerations surrounding euthanasia legalization?

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

Euthanasia, derived from the Greek words "eu" (good) and "thanatos"(death), refers to the

deliberate act of ending a person's life to relieve suffering. It is a highly controversial topic in medical ethics and law, with various definitions and classifications. Broadly speaking, euthanasia can be categorized into several types:

1.1. Voluntary Euthanasia:

In voluntary euthanasia, the patient explicitly requests assistance in ending their life due to unbearable suffering or terminal illness. This type of euthanasia requires the informed consent of the patient, who is of sound mind and capable of making autonomous decisions.

1.2. Non-voluntary Euthanasia:

Non-voluntary euthanasia occurs when a patient is unable to provide consent due to factors such as unconsciousness, cognitive impairment, or being in a persistent vegetative state. The decision to end the patient's life is typically made by a surrogate decision-maker, such as a family member or legal guardian, based on what they believe to be in the patient's best interests.

1.3. Involuntary Euthanasia:

Involuntary euthanasia involves ending a person's life against their expressed wishes or without their consent. This type of euthanasia is highly controversial and often illegal, as it violates the principle of respect for patient autonomy.

1.4. Passive Euthanasia:

Passive euthanasia refers to the withholding or withdrawal of life-sustaining medical treatment with the intention of allowing the patient to die naturally. Examples include turning off a ventilator, discontinuing artificial hydration and nutrition, or refusing to initiate aggressive medical interventions, or administering a lethal injection to end life.

1.5. Active Euthanasia:

Active euthanasia involves the deliberate administration of a lethal substance or intervention with the explicit intention of causing the patient's death. This can include administering a lethal dose of medication, injecting a lethal substance, or performing a medical procedure to induce death. Example – stoppage of antibiotics treatment in certain cases where it is necessary for the continuation of life, removal of life support system, etc.

2.0 ASSISTED SUICIDE V EUTHANASIA:

Assisted suicide and euthanasia are often confused, yet they entail distinct actions and legal frameworks:

Assisted Suicide: Involves aiding a terminally ill individual in ending their own life, where the individual themselves performs the final action, typically by ingesting prescribed lethal medication. Physicians or others provide the means or information for the individual to end their life but do not administer the lethal substance. It necessitates the individual's sound decision-making capacity and voluntary choice.

Euthanasia: Involves a third party deliberately ending the life of a suffering individual, where a physician or another person administers a lethal substance or intervention with the explicit intention of causing death. Unlike assisted suicide, euthanasia entails the active participation of a third party in ending the patient's life. It can be categorized based on the patient's consent and the circumstances surrounding the decision.

3.0 ETHICAL PERSPECTIVES ON EUTHANASIA

3.1. Autonomy:

Autonomy, the principle that individuals have the right to make decisions about their own lives, lies at the heart of the ethical argument for euthanasia. Advocates argue that individuals facing terminal illness or unbearable suffering should have the autonomy to choose a peaceful and dignified death. Respecting patients' autonomous decisions regarding their end-of-life care empowers them to assert control over their own destinies and avoid prolonged suffering against their wishes.

3.2. Beneficence:

The principle of beneficence compels healthcare professionals to act in the best interests of their patients and alleviate suffering. Euthanasia is viewed as a compassionate response to relieving pain and distress, offering terminally ill patients' relief from physical and emotional torment. By ending a patient's suffering through euthanasia, healthcare providers fulfill their duty to promote the patient's well-being and alleviate unnecessary agony.

3.3. Non-maleficence:

Non-maleficence, the principle of avoiding harm, is central to ethical deliberations in euthanasia. Proponents argue that in cases of extreme suffering, allowing patients to die with dignity through euthanasia may be less harmful than subjecting them to futile medical interventions or prolonged agony. The principle of double effect is often invoked, suggesting that the primary intention of euthanasia is to relieve suffering rather than cause harm, even though death may be an inevitable consequence.

3.4. Justice:

Ethical discussions about euthanasia also consider principles of justice and equitable distribution of resources. Advocates argue that legalizing euthanasia can alleviate the financial burden on healthcare systems by reducing the costs associated with end-of-life care for terminally ill patients. Furthermore, ensuring access to euthanasia options for all individuals, regardless of socioeconomic status, promotes fairness and equal treatment in healthcare delivery.

4.0 LEGAL FRAMEWORKS AND JURISDICTION

4.1 International Perspective on Euthanasia:

The international perspective on euthanasia varies widely, with some countries legalizing it under specific conditions, such as the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada, and parts of the United States,

while others maintain strict prohibitions. This diversity reflects a complex interplay of legal, cultural, religious, and ethical factors. Ethical debates centre on principles like autonomy and beneficence, while global dialogue emphasizes the importance of ongoing collaboration to address challenges in end-of-life care. Overall, the discourse surrounding euthanasia underscores the need for careful consideration of individual rights and ethical principles in navigating this complex issue internationally.

4.2 Evolution Of Euthanasia Laws:

The evolution of euthanasia laws reflects changing societal attitudes towards end-of-life care and individual autonomy. Initially considered criminal, legal precedents began to shift in the mid-20th century, prompting landmark cases and legislative reforms. Countries like the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada, and parts of the United States and Australia have legalized euthanasia, with stringent eligibility criteria and procedural safeguards. Despite legalization, ongoing debate and reform persist, focusing on issues such as expanding access and ensuring ethical standards. The evolution of euthanasia laws underscores the complex interplay of legal, ethical, and social factors in navigating end-of-life decision-making while upholding individual rights and ethical standards in medical practice.

4.3 Challenges And Controversies In legalisation Of Euthanasia:

The legalization of euthanasia has ignited numerous challenges and controversies worldwide, spanning ethical, moral, legal, and medical domains. Central debates revolve around the ethical dilemmas of intentionally ending human life and the shifting roles of medical professionals. Concerns also arise regarding safeguarding vulnerable populations, potential impacts on palliative care, crafting effective legal frameworks, and navigating religious and cultural perspectives. Public opinion varies widely, reflecting diverse attitudes influenced by personal experiences and societal norms. International comparisons offer valuable insights into the benefits and challenges of legalization, informing ongoing policy discussions and decision-making processes.

5.0 EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE:

5.1 Patient Perspective:

From the patient's perspective, euthanasia represents a complex and deeply personal decision influenced by various factors. For some terminally ill individuals facing unbearable suffering, euthanasia may be viewed as a way to maintain autonomy and dignity at the end of life. It offers a sense of control over their own fate and the opportunity to avoid prolonged suffering and loss of quality of life. Patients may see euthanasia as a compassionate option that allows them to end their life on their own terms, sparing themselves and their loved ones from further pain and anguish. However, patients may also grapple with ethical, moral, and religious considerations, as well as concerns about the impact on their family members and caregivers. Making the decision to pursue

euthanasia requires careful deliberation, support, and access to comprehensive end-of-life care, as well as respect for individual beliefs and values.

5.2 Physician Perspective:

Many physicians view euthanasia as a way to relieve patient's unbearable suffering and honor their autonomy and wishes for a dignified death. Physicians may grapple with ethical concerns surrounding euthanasia, balancing their duty to relieve suffering with the obligation to do no harm and uphold the sanctity of life. Some physicians advocate for patient-centered approaches to end-of-life care, which prioritize open communication, shared decision making, and respecting patient's values and preferences.

6.0 ETHICAL DILEMMA AND RESOLUTION:

The tension between respecting patients' autonomy and promoting their well-being can arise when patients request euthanasia to end their suffering, while physicians are concerned about the potential harms of assisted death.

Resolution: Physicians can engage in thorough discussions with patients to explore the underlying reasons for their requests, address any unmet needs for symptom management or psychosocial support, and ensure that all available alternatives, including palliative care, have been considered.

Deciding on euthanasia for patients who lack decision-making capacity, such as those with advanced dementia, raises ethical concerns about surrogate decision-making and ensuring the patient's best interests.

Resolution: Advance care planning, including the designation of a healthcare proxy and the creation of advance directives, can help ensure that patients' wishes are respected even when they are no longer able to communicate them directly.

Concerns about the potential for abuse of euthanasia laws, particularly with vulnerable populations such as the elderly, disabled, or mentally ill, raise questions about ensuring informed consent and protecting individuals from coercion.

Resolution: Implementing strict eligibility criteria, thorough assessment processes, and oversight mechanisms, along with robust legal safeguards and periodic reviews, can help mitigate the risk of abuse and protect vulnerable individuals.

Legalizing euthanasia can impact trust in the medical profession, as some patients may fear that physicians prioritize cost containment or personal beliefs over patient well-being.

Resolution: Promoting transparency, clear communication, and adherence to professional ethics can help rebuild trust between patients and healthcare providers, emphasizing the primacy of patient-centered care and the commitment to relieving suffering.

7.0 IMPACT ON HEALTHCARE SYSTEM AND SOCIETY:

Research has assessed the broader impact of euthanasia legalization on healthcare systems,

society, and public attitudes towards death and dying. Studies have examined the impact of euthanasia legalization on healthcare resource allocation, including healthcare costs, utilization of palliative care services, and allocation of hospital beds and resources.

Research has investigated the influence of euthanasia legalization on social attitudes towards death, dying, and end-of-life care, as well as efforts to reduce stigma, promote open conversations about death, and improve access to supportive care services.

Studies have analysed the legal and policy implications of euthanasia legalization, including changes in legislation, court rulings, public policies, and regulatory frameworks governing end-of-life care.

Research has explored the impact of euthanasia legalization on societal values, cultural norms, religious beliefs, and ethical debates surrounding the sanctity of life, individual autonomy, and the morality of assisted dying.

Concerns about the potential for abuse of euthanasia laws, particularly with vulnerable populations such as the elderly, disabled, or mentally ill, raise questions about ensuring informed consent and protecting individuals from coercion.

CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, the international perspective on euthanasia reflects a complex interplay of legal, cultural, religious, and ethical factors. While some countries have legalized euthanasia or assisted dying under specific conditions, others maintain strict prohibitions due to concerns about the sanctity of life, potential abuse, and ethical considerations. The evolution of euthanasia laws has been marked by landmark legal cases, legislative reforms, and ongoing debates about the ethical implications of assisted dying.

Jurisdictions where euthanasia is legal, such as the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada, and parts of the United States, have provided valuable insights into the practical implications of legalization. These experiences highlight the importance of clear legal frameworks, robust safeguards, and ongoing evaluation to protect patient rights and ensure ethical end-of-life care.

Ethical dilemmas surrounding euthanasia, such as autonomy vs. beneficence and concerns about vulnerable populations, require careful consideration and resolution to uphold ethical principles and protect patient well-being. Additionally, the impact of euthanasia legalization on healthcare systems, society, and public attitudes underscores the need for comprehensive approaches that address legal, cultural, and ethical dimensions of end-of-life care decision-making.

Overall, empirical evidence and case studies from jurisdictions where euthanasia is legal inform policy development, clinical practice, and public discourse on end-of-life care, highlighting the importance of respecting patient autonomy, ensuring access to palliative care, and upholding ethical standards in medical practice.

REFERENCES

1. "Principles of Biomedical Ethics" by Tom L. Beauchamp and James F. Childress.
2. "Euthanasia, Ethics, and public Policy: An argument Against Legalisation" by John Keown".
3. "End of Life Decision in Medical care: Principles and policies For Regulating the Dying Process" by Stephen L. Issacs and Gregg D. Caruso
4. "Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide: global views on choosing to End Life" edited by Michael J. Cholbi
5. "The Oxford Handbook of Bioethics" edited by Bonnie Steinbock
6. "Physician-Assisted Death in Perspective: Assessing the Dutch Experience" by Stuart J. Younger, Gerrit K. Kimsa, and Paul J. Van Der Maas
7. "Assisted Suicide: The Liberal, Humanist Case Against Legalization" by John Koewn
8. "The Case Against Assisted Suicide: For the Right to End-of-Life-Care" by Kathleen Foley and Herbert Hendin
9. "The Right to Die: The Law of End-of-Life Decisionmaking" by Alan Meisel, Kathy L. Cerminara, and Lisa S. Parker
10. "Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide: Lesson from Belgium" by Raphael Cohen-Almagor (Journal of Medical Ethics, 2017)
11. "Legalizing Euthanasia or Assisted Suicide: The Illusion of Safeguards and Controls" by Margaret Somerville (McGill Law Journal, 2015)
12. "Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide: A Review from Moral Philosophy Perspective" by R. M. I. M. Huysmans (Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics, 2019)"
13. "Euthanasia and Law in the Netherlands" by J. H. Gerestein (Journal of Medical Ethics, 2016)
14. "Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide: The Arguments For and Against" by Emily Jackson (Journal of Medical Ethics, 2018)
15. "Understanding Euthanasia: Perspectives of Patients, Physicians, and Family Members" by Jessica McCarty (Journal of Palliative Medicine, 2019)
16. "Physician Attitudes towards Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide: A Systematic Review of International Surveys" by Mara Buchbinder (Journal of Medical Ethics, 2017)
17. "Patient Perspectives on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide: A Systematic Review" by Anneke U. Engelberts (Palliative Medicine, 2019)
18. "Physician Aid in Dying: Ethical Considerations and Practical Implications" by Lisa Sowle Cahill (The Hastings Center Report, 2016)
19. "Ethical Issues in End-of-Life Care: The Role of Autonomy and Well-being" by Timothy E. Quill (New England Journal of Medicine, 2019)

20. "Advance Care Planning: Ethical Considerations and Practical Implications" by Rebecca L. Sudore (Annals of Internal Medicine, 2018)
21. "Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide: Ethical Considerations and Legal Perspectives" edited by Margaret P. Battin et al. (Oxford University Press, 2015)
22. "Protecting Vulnerable Populations in the Context of Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide: Ethical and Legal Considerations" by David Orentlicher (Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 2019)
23. Emanuel, E. J., Onwuteaka-Philipsen, B. D., Urwin, J. W., & Cohen, J. (2016). Attitudes and Practices of Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide in the United States, Canada, and Europe. JAMA, 316(1), 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.8499>
24. Chambaere, K., Vander Stichele, R., Mortier, F., Cohen, J., & Deliens, L. (2015). Recent Trends in Euthanasia and Other End-of-Life Practices in Belgium. New England Journal of Medicine, 372(12), 1179–1181. <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmc1414527>
25. Battin, M. P., van der Heide, A., Ganzini, L., van der Wal, G., & Onwuteaka-Philipsen, B. D. (2007). Legal physician-assisted dying in Oregon and the Netherlands: evidence concerning the impact on patients in "vulnerable" groups. Journal of Medical Ethics, 33(10), 591–597. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2007.021731>
26. Hendin, H. (2008). Seduced by Death: Doctors, Patients, and the Dutch Cure. Issues in Law & Medicine, 23(3), 183–204.
27. Rosenthal, E. (2014). The Death Treatment. The New York Times Magazine. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/22/magazine/the-death-treatment.html>

