Library Progress International
Vol.44 No.3, Jul-Dec 2024: P.5448-5453

Print version ISSN 0970 1052
Online version ISSN 2320 317X

Original Article

Available online at www.bpasjournals.com

The Intersection of Law, Ethics and Medicine in the Right to Die Debate: A Global Analysis

Ritesh Kumar Upadhyay[1], Professor (Dr.) Rohit P Shabran[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Institute of Legal Studies, Shri Ramswaroop Memorial University, Lucknow, Deva Road, Barabanki, UP.
[2]Professor & Director, Institute of Legal Studies, Shri Ramswaroop Memorial University, Lucknow, Deva Road, Barabanki, UP.

How to cite this article: Ritesh Kumar Upadhyay, Rohit P Shabran (2024) The Intersection of Law, Ethics and Medicine in the Right to Die Debate: A Global Analysis. *Library Progress International,* 44(3), 5448-5453.

Abstract

The evolution of medical practices related to end-of-life care has profoundly transformed how society approaches death and dying. From the rise of the hospice movement to the widespread integration of palliative care, these developments reflect a growing emphasis on patient dignity, comfort, and the alleviation of suffering. As the global population continues to age and medical technology advances, the role of palliative care and the ethical complexities surrounding end-of-life decisions will remain central to the broader healthcare landscape. Thus the aim of this paper is to provide a comprehensive global analysis of how law, ethics, and medicine intersect in the right-to-die debate. It seeks to explore the ways in which these three domains converge and diverge in addressing the complex issues surrounding euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide. By examining legal frameworks, ethical considerations, and medical practices across various jurisdictions, the paper aims to illuminate the diverse approaches to end-of-life decisions, highlighting both the harmonies and tensions that arise in different cultural, legal, and medical contexts. Through this analysis, the paper aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how societies navigate the right-to-die debate.

Keywords: *Right to Die, PAS, Euthanasia, Life, Ethics*

I. Introduction

The "right to die" debate is a deeply complex and emotionally charged issue that explores whether individuals have the moral and legal authority to end their own lives, particularly in cases of terminal illness or extreme suffering. This debate has become increasingly significant in contemporary society due to advances in medical technology, changing social attitudes, and legal reforms in various countries. Medical advancements have greatly improved the ability to extend life, even in cases where patients suffer from terminal illnesses or irreversible conditions. However, these same advancements have raised ethical questions about the quality of life for individuals who may experience prolonged suffering.[1]

For some, the ability to artificially extend life presents an ethical dilemma, should people be allowed to end their suffering by choosing death, especially when their quality of life is severely diminished? This question brings into focus the role of medical intervention not only in preserving life but also in mitigating suffering. In contemporary society, autonomy the right of individuals to make decisions about their own bodies and lives is a central value. Advocates for the right to die argue that autonomy should extend to the decision to end one's life, particularly in cases of incurable illness or unbearable pain.

The debate touches on whether the state or medical professionals should have the authority to prevent someone from making a voluntary, informed decision to die with dignity. The right to self-determination in life and death

[1] James B. Phillips, "Right to die: 2,000 years of debate", *Journal of health care finance* (2019).

is seen by many as an essential human right. Ethical concerns about the right to die are rooted in the balance between two opposing principles: the sanctity of life versus the alleviation of suffering. Opponents argue that life is inherently valuable, and intentionally ending it whether through euthanasia or physician-assisted suicide violates a fundamental moral principle.[2]

On the other hand, supporters of the right to die emphasize compassion, arguing that prolonging life at the expense of unbearable suffering may be inhumane. They argue that in some cases, allowing individuals to die with dignity is more ethical than forcing them to endure a prolonged, painful existence. Attitudes toward death and dying have shifted in many parts of the world. As discussions about quality of life, palliative care, and end-of-life options become more common, public support for the right to die has grown in many countries. This shift reflects a broader cultural movement toward personal choice and control, including in matters of death. Many people believe that individuals should have the ability to choose how and when they die, particularly if they are facing inevitable death due to terminal illness.[3]

Research Questions

1. What are the main legal, ethical, and medical arguments surrounding the right to die?
2. How do different jurisdictions approach the legalization of euthanasia and assisted suicide?
3. What are the key tensions and harmonies between law, medicine, and ethics in this debate?

II. Historical and Philosophical Background

The evolution of medical practices related to end-of-life care, such as palliative care and the hospice movement, reflects significant advancements in how society and healthcare systems address terminal illness, pain management, and patient dignity in death. Over time, these practices have shifted from a focus solely on life-saving interventions to a more holistic approach that prioritizes the quality of life, patient autonomy and relief from suffering.

In earlier periods of medical history, care for the dying was often focused on attempts to prolong life, with little attention given to pain management or the emotional and psychological needs of terminal patients. Death was typically seen as a failure of medical treatment. During the early to mid-20th century, advances in medical technology, such as antibiotics, mechanical ventilation, and other life-extending interventions, often meant that patients could be kept alive even when their conditions were terminal. This created ethical dilemmas about the appropriate use of such technologies, particularly when they prolonged suffering without realistic hope of recovery.[4]

The modern "hospice movement" began in the 1960s, largely credited to *Dame Cicely Saunders*, who founded the first modern hospice, "St. Christopher's Hospice", in London in 1967. Saunders introduced the concept of "total pain," which emphasized that patients' suffering could be physical, emotional, social, and spiritual. The hospice movement sought to provide a more compassionate approach to dying, focusing on comfort, dignity, and relief from pain, rather than curative treatments.[5] It advocates for a patient-centered approach where the goals of care shift from curing illness to managing symptoms, addressing emotional and spiritual needs, and supporting both patients and their families. By the 1970s, the hospice model had spread to the United States and other parts of the world, becoming a cornerstone of end-of-life care. Hospices offer environments where patients with terminal illnesses can die with dignity and without the aggressive interventions common in hospitals.

The "palliative care movement" emerged as an extension of the hospice philosophy but was integrated into mainstream medical care. Unlike hospice care, which is reserved for those in the final stages of life, palliative care can be provided to patients at any stage of a serious illness, alongside curative treatments. Palliative care focuses on improving the quality of life by managing symptoms such as pain, breathlessness, and anxiety, while also

[2] Juan Pablo Beca, Armando Ortiz, and Sebastián Solar, "The debate about the right to die", 133(5) *Rev Med Chile* 601-6 (2005).

[3] Scott Cutler Shershow, "Deconstructing dignity: A critique of the right-to-die debate" (2013).

[4] Spyros D. Mentzelopoulos, Keith Couper, Violetta Raffay, Jana Djakow, and Leo Bossaert, "Evolution of european resuscitation and end-of-life practices from 2015 to 2019: a survey-based comparative evaluation",11(14) *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 4005 (2022).

[5] Margaret A. Crowley, "The hospice movement: A renewed view of the death process",4 *J. Contemp. Health L. & Pol'y* 295 (1988).

addressing psychological and spiritual issues. It prioritizes patient comfort and the alleviation of suffering, offering a holistic approach to care. In the 1980s, the World Health Organization (WHO) recognized the importance of palliative care, calling for its inclusion as part of comprehensive cancer care. By the 1990s, palliative care had become a formal medical subspecialty, and the WHO expanded its definition of palliative care to include all patients suffering from life-limiting conditions, not just those with cancer.[6]

As palliative care evolved, the emphasis on patient autonomy became central to end-of-life care decisions. This marked a significant shift from paternalistic medical practices to a model where patients' preferences and values play a critical role in determining care plans. The focus on patient autonomy also paved the way for advance care planning and living wills, legal instruments that allow patients to make their end-of-life care preferences known, ensuring that their wishes are respected when they are no longer able to communicate their decisions.[7]

III. Legal Frameworks: A Comparative Global Analysis

The global diversity in legal approaches to euthanasia and Physician Assisted Suicide (PAS) reflects profound differences in cultural, ethical, and legal perspectives on life, death, and suffering. Legal systems grapple with balancing patient autonomy, the sanctity of life, and the role of medical professionals in ending life. The distinctions between passive euthanasia, active euthanasia, and PAS are critical in these debates, as they involve different levels of involvement in the dying process and raise distinct ethical and legal questions.

- *Passive euthanasia* involves withholding or withdrawing life-sustaining treatments, allowing the patient to die naturally from their illness. This may include stopping mechanical ventilation, feeding tubes, or life-prolonging medications.
- *Active euthanasia* involves a deliberate action taken by a physician or other party to directly cause the death of the patient. This might involve administering a lethal injection or other means of ending life.
- In *PAS*, a physician provides the means (typically a prescription for a lethal dose of medication) for a patient to end their own life, but the final act of ingesting or administering the drug is performed by the patient.

The legal landscape surrounding euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide (PAS) varies significantly across the globe, reflecting differing cultural, ethical, religious, and political attitudes toward end-of-life choices.[8] Countries have adopted diverse legal approaches, ranging from full legalization of both euthanasia and PAS under strict regulations, to total prohibition, with some forms of passive euthanasia allowed in certain jurisdictions as further discussed.

1. Countries That Have Legalized Both Euthanasia and PAS[9]

- **Netherlands**: The Netherlands is a pioneering country in the legalization of euthanasia and PAS. The **Termination of Life on Request and Assisted Suicide Act (2002)** allows both euthanasia and PAS under strict conditions: the patient must be suffering unbearably with no prospect of improvement, and the request must be voluntary, well-considered, and persistent. A physician must also consult with another doctor before proceeding, and the case is reviewed by a regional euthanasia review committee.

- **Belgium**: Following the Netherlands, Belgium legalized euthanasia in 2002. Belgian law allows euthanasia (but not PAS) for adults and emancipated minors who are enduring unbearable physical or mental suffering. Notably, Belgium extended euthanasia rights to minors in 2014 under stringent conditions.

- **Luxembourg**: Luxembourg legalized both euthanasia and PAS in 2009, allowing terminally ill patients to request death, with similar safeguards as in the Netherlands and Belgium.

---

[6] Ilan Bernstein, "At the intersection of palliative care, psychedelic medicine, and healthcare reform: A call for a new hospice and palliative care movement",37(2) *Journal of Palliative Care* 93-96 (2022).

[7] Gabrielle Roy and Mélanie Vachon, "Palliative care: changing paradigms to face new challenges",8(5) *Medical Research Archives* (2020).

[8] Ronit Tsemach, and Anat Amit Aharon, "Decision-making process regarding passive euthanasia: Theory of planned behavior framework", *Nursing Ethics* (2024).

[9] Douglas S. Krull, Stephanie L. Varga, Jadyn G. Sgro and Sarah RA Krull, "Self-destruction or surrender? Religiosity and active versus passive euthanasia", 47(6) *Death Studies* 762-768 (2023).

- **Canada**: In 2016, Canada passed **Medical Assistance in Dying (MAiD)** legislation, which allows both euthanasia and PAS for individuals with a grievous and irremediable medical condition. Canadian law requires that patients give informed consent and be in an advanced stage of irreversible decline, though the definition of eligibility has expanded over time.

2. Countries Where Only PAS Is Legal

- **Switzerland**: Switzerland is unique in that it permits PAS, but not euthanasia, through a loophole in the penal code. It is not illegal for a person to assist in another's suicide as long as the assistance is provided without selfish motives. Swiss law does not require that a person be terminally ill to seek PAS, which has led to Switzerland becoming a destination for so-called "suicide tourism," with organizations such as Dignitas offering assisted dying services to non-residents.[10]

- **United States**: In the U.S., euthanasia is illegal, but some states have legalized PAS under "Death with Dignity" laws. These include **Oregon** (the first to pass such a law in 1997), **Washington**, **California**, **Colorado**, **Maine**, **Vermont**, **Hawaii**, **New Jersey**, and **New Mexico**. In these states, terminally ill adults with a prognosis of six months or less to live may request a prescription for life-ending medication from a physician. Strict criteria must be met, and patients must be mentally competent to make the decision.

3. Countries Where Euthanasia and PAS Remain Illegal[11]

- **United Kingdom**: In the UK, both euthanasia and PAS are illegal, punishable by up to 14 years in prison under the **Suicide Act of 1961**. The law does, however, allow for the withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment in certain cases (passive euthanasia). Despite ongoing public debate and several high-profile legal challenges, the UK has maintained a strict stance against legalizing PAS or euthanasia.

- **France**: France prohibits euthanasia and PAS, although passive euthanasia (withholding or withdrawing life-sustaining treatments) is allowed under the **Leonetti Law (2005)**. In 2016, a revision of the law introduced the concept of "deep and continuous sedation" for terminally ill patients until death, but active euthanasia remains illegal.

- **Germany**: Assisted suicide was legal in Germany until a 2020 ruling by the Federal Constitutional Court decriminalized physician-assisted suicide, allowing individuals to seek help in ending their lives. However, euthanasia remains illegal. The ruling ignited debate over how the law should regulate assisted suicide moving forward, particularly in terms of safeguards against coercion.

4. Countries with Partial Legalization of Passive Euthanasia

- **India**: India legalized passive euthanasia (withdrawal of life support) under certain conditions in a landmark 2018 Supreme Court ruling[12]. Patients can refuse treatment through advance directives, and passive euthanasia is allowed for patients in a permanent vegetative state or with no hope of recovery.

- **Italy**: The Italian Constitutional Court ruled in 2019 that assisted suicide could be permissible under certain strict conditions for patients who are irreversibly ill and experiencing unbearable suffering. However, euthanasia remains illegal.[13]

- **Japan**: Japan has no legal framework regulating euthanasia or PAS, but passive euthanasia is sometimes practiced under informal guidelines. Japan's cultural norms emphasize patient autonomy, but the practice remains unregulated and legally uncertain.

[10] Mansi Gohar, "Legal Aspects of Euthanasia", 18 *Supremo Amicus* 488 (2020).
[11] Dasari Divya, "Comparison of Euthanasia Laws in Belgium, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom", 3(6) *Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human* 2506 (2023).
[12] Jayanta Boruah, "Euthanasia in India: A review on its constitutional validity", *Lex humanitariae: journal for a change* 1-10 (2021).
[13] Emanuela Turillazzi, A. Maiese, P. Frati, M. Scopetti, and M. Di Paolo. "Physician–patient relationship, assisted suicide and the Italian Constitutional Court", *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* 1-11 (2021).

IV. Ethical and Medical Perspectives: Tensions and Convergences

The ethical debate around right to die presents a complex landscape where different philosophical, religious, and moral perspectives either converge or clash. Euthanasia, defined as intentionally ending a person's life to relieve suffering, raises fundamental questions about the value of life, the right to die, and the role of autonomy and compassion in medical decision-making.

A. Tensions in ethical perspective can be categorized into the following:

a. **Deontology** (Duty-Based Ethics) vs. **Utilitarianism** (Consequentialism)[14]

Rooted in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, deontological ethics emphasizes the duty to follow moral rules regardless of the consequences. In the case of euthanasia, deontologists argue that deliberately taking a life, even to alleviate suffering, violates the moral duty to preserve life. Kantian ethics holds that human life has intrinsic value, and euthanasia may be seen as morally impermissible because it violates the categorical imperative not to treat life merely as a means to an end. Deontologists generally oppose euthanasia because they believe that taking life is inherently wrong, regardless of the patient's suffering or consent. The principle of "do not kill" is a moral absolute. In contrast, utilitarianism, a consequentialist theory developed by thinkers like Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, evaluates actions based on their outcomes, focusing on maximizing overall happiness or minimizing suffering. From a utilitarian perspective, euthanasia can be ethically justified if it reduces suffering and increases the well-being of both the patient and those affected by their condition (e.g., family members, society). The utilitarian approach conflicts with deontological ethics because it allows for actions, such as euthanasia, that would be impermissible in a duty-based framework if they result in greater overall good. This is particularly evident in cases where continuing to live causes significant suffering without hope of recovery.

b. **Autonomy** vs. **Sanctity of Life**[15]

The principle of autonomy emphasizes the right of individuals to make decisions about their own lives, including the right to choose when and how to die. Proponents of euthanasia argue that patients suffering from terminal illnesses or unbearable pain should have the right to end their lives on their own terms, as an expression of self-determination and dignity. This view aligns with liberal ethical theories that prioritize individual choice and personal liberty. The principle of autonomy can conflict with traditional medical ethics, which emphasizes the physician's duty to preserve life. Critics argue that allowing euthanasia based solely on patient autonomy risks devaluing life and creating a slippery slope where vulnerable individuals may feel pressured to choose death to avoid being a burden. Sanctity of Life is the ethical principle that holds that life is inherently valuable and should be preserved, regardless of circumstances. This view is often grounded in religious traditions, such as Christianity and Islam, which teach that life is sacred because it is given by God. From this perspective, euthanasia is seen as morally wrong because it undermines the intrinsic value of life and violates the natural order. The sanctity of life argument stands in opposition to autonomy-based arguments for euthanasia, as it asserts that human life cannot be intentionally ended, even to alleviate suffering. This creates tension between respecting individual choice and upholding the moral obligation to preserve life.

B. Convergences in Medical and Ethical Perspectives on Euthanasia can be categorized as:

a. Relief from Suffering

Despite their differences, many ethical perspectives converge on the goal of alleviating suffering, even if they disagree on how to achieve this. Both utilitarianism and compassion-based ethical frameworks prioritize reducing patient suffering as a key moral concern. Even some deontologists acknowledge the importance of minimizing pain, though they argue for different means (such as palliative care) rather than euthanasia. Right to die debates often highlight a shared desire to protect the dignity and well-being of patients facing terminal illness or unbearable pain. While opinions diverge on whether euthanasia is an ethical response, there is general agreement that suffering should be addressed compassionately and respectfully.[16]

---

[14] Benjamin K. Stoff, "Foundations of clinical ethics." *Dermatoethics: Contemporary Ethics and Professionalism in Dermatology* 3-10 (2021).

[15] Akshat Hegde, Balpreet Kaur Bhatti, Vedika Dalvi And Purna Chandora, "Balancing Personal Autonomy and the Right to Life in Euthanasia" (2024).

[16] Monica Verhofstadt, Loïc Moureau, Koen Pardon, and Axel Liégeois, "Ethical perspectives regarding Euthanasia, including in the context of adult psychiatry: a qualitative interview study among healthcare workers

b. Respect for Autonomy (With Limits)[17]

While some ethical frameworks oppose euthanasia outright, many accept the principle of patient autonomy, at least in theory. In medical practice, respecting patient decisions is a core value, particularly in informed consent and treatment refusal. Even critics of euthanasia, such as certain religious or deontological ethicists, generally agree that patients should have the right to refuse excessive or futile medical interventions that prolong suffering without offering meaningful benefit. There is a widespread acceptance of patient autonomy as an ethical value, though its application to euthanasia remains contentious. The tension lies in how far autonomy extends whether it includes the right to die or is constrained by other moral duties, such as preserving life.

c. Palliative Care as a Common Ground

One area where ethical perspectives often converge is the recognition of palliative care as an essential response to end-of-life suffering. Palliative care aims to relieve pain and improve the quality of life for patients with serious illnesses, without hastening death. It offers a middle ground for those who oppose euthanasia but still seek to address suffering humanely. Both opponents and proponents of euthanasia generally support the development and accessibility of palliative care. Ethical frameworks that prioritize non-maleficence, compassion, or the sanctity of life can all find common ground in promoting pain relief, emotional support, and dignity in dying through palliative care.[18]

d. Safeguards Against Abuse

A shared concern across various ethical perspectives is the potential for abuse if euthanasia were widely legalized. There is agreement that strict safeguards are needed to prevent involuntary euthanasia, coercion, or the devaluation of life for vulnerable individuals (e.g., the elderly, disabled, or those with mental health issues). Legal frameworks for euthanasia in countries where it is allowed typically include rigorous checks, such as psychiatric evaluations, multiple physician approvals, and time for reflection. Even among those who support euthanasia, there is consensus that robust legal and ethical safeguards are necessary to ensure it is practiced only in carefully defined circumstances. This concern reflects a broader ethical commitment to protecting vulnerable individuals and ensuring that the decision to pursue euthanasia is genuinely voluntary.[19]

Conclusion and Suggestions

The right to die is a global issue, with different countries and cultures taking diverse approaches to the legality and morality of euthanasia and assisted suicide. While some countries have legalized the practice, others strongly oppose it, often based on religious, cultural, or ethical grounds. The debate is increasingly informed by international human rights discussions, with proponents arguing that the right to die is a fundamental human right that should be recognized globally. Critics, however, maintain that cultural and moral values should shape national laws on the matter. The clinical and professional challenges of euthanasia are significant and multifaceted, encompassing uncertainties in medical diagnosis, conflicts in ethical obligations, and the emotional toll on healthcare providers. Medical professionals must navigate these challenges within the constraints of legal frameworks, ethical duties, and institutional policies, all while maintaining trust and integrity in their role as caregivers. Addressing these challenges requires clear legal and ethical guidelines, interdisciplinary collaboration, and strong support systems to ensure that both patients and medical professionals are supported in making difficult end-of-life decisions.

in Belgium", 25(1) *BMC Medical Ethics* 60 (2024).

[17] Iheanacho Chukwuemeka Metuonu, "Medical Ethics and Entrepreneurship: Convergence and Divergence." In *Medical Entrepreneurship: Trends and Prospects in the Digital Age* 39-59 (Springer Nature Singapore, 2023).

[18] Georgiana Cimpu, "Ethical and Legal Discussions concerning Euthanasia. Aspects from ECHR Case Law." *Annals Constantin Brancusi U. Targu Jiu Juridical Sci. Series* 89 (2020).

[19] Devan Stahl, "Understanding the Voices of Disability Advocates in Physician-Assisted Suicide Debates." 27(3) *Christian bioethics: Non-Ecumenical Studies in Medical Morality* 279-297 (2021).