Euthanasia In The Society Today

Posted on January 10, 2020

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/euthanasia-in-the-society-today/

Introduction

Euthanasia is one of the most difficult questions in contemporary bioethics because it brings suffering, autonomy, dignity, professional duty, vulnerability, family relationships, and social justice into direct tension. A utilitarian approach is especially relevant because it asks which available course of action is likely to produce the greatest overall wellbeing and the least avoidable suffering. Yet a serious utilitarian analysis cannot be reduced to the claim that death ends pain or lowers the cost of care. It must consider the patient's present suffering and future possibilities, the reliability of diagnosis and prognosis, the availability of palliative care, family consequences, clinician responsibilities, public trust, disability discrimination, unequal access to healthcare, and the effects of legal rules on people who may feel pressured to die. It is also essential to distinguish euthanasia from physician-assisted dying, refusal of treatment, withdrawal of burdensome treatment, and palliative sedation. These practices differ in intention, agency, causation, and legal status, so combining them under one label obscures rather than clarifies the ethical problem.

Defining the Practices Before Judging Them

Euthanasia generally refers to a clinician or another person intentionally administering a lethal intervention to end a patient's life for the purpose of relieving suffering. Physician-assisted suicide, sometimes called medical aid in dying under particular laws, differs because the clinician provides medication or means and the eligible patient performs the final life-ending act. By contrast, a decision-capable patient may refuse ventilation, dialysis, chemotherapy, artificial nutrition, resuscitation, or another medical intervention even when refusal is expected to shorten life. When unwanted or nonbeneficial treatment is withheld or withdrawn, the underlying illness causes death while clinicians continue comfort care. Palliative sedation is different again: medication is proportionately used to reduce consciousness when severe symptoms remain refractory, with relief of suffering rather than death as the intended goal. The American Medical Association opposes euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide while recognizing treatment refusal and carefully governed palliative sedation as ethically distinct practices, and the World Medical Association draws similar distinctions (American Medical Association, 2026; World Medical Association, 2019). Precise terminology is therefore the first requirement of defensible ethical analysis.

These distinctions matter particularly when a patient lacks decision-making capacity. A person in a

coma cannot make a current voluntary request for euthanasia, and family members do not acquire a moral entitlement to choose death simply because treatment is expensive, emotionally difficult, or prolonged. Decisions about life-sustaining treatment should instead follow a valid advance directive, previously expressed wishes, substituted judgment based on the patient's values, or a best-interests standard when preferences are unknown. Withdrawing an intervention that no longer meets the patient's goals can be ethically permissible without becoming an intentional lethal act. Capacity itself is decision-specific and ordinarily involves understanding relevant information, appreciating how it applies personally, reasoning among options, and communicating a choice. Delirium, severe psychiatric symptoms, medication effects, or neurological disease may impair this ability, while an unusual or unpopular decision does not by itself prove incapacity. Because euthanasia is irreversible, uncertainty about capacity, voluntariness, or prognosis strengthens the case for careful assessment and repeated discussion rather than rapid action.

Utilitarianism and Bentham's Felicific Calculus

Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism evaluates conduct according to pleasure, pain, and the consequences of action. His felicific calculus considers features such as intensity, duration, certainty, proximity, fecundity, purity, and extent. Applied to euthanasia, these dimensions invite questions about how severe a patient's suffering is, how long it is expected to continue, whether relief is realistically available, how certain the prognosis is, and how each option affects everyone involved (Bentham, 1789). The framework can support voluntary euthanasia when a capable person faces enduring, intolerable suffering that cannot be relieved in an acceptable manner and repeatedly requests death. It can also support opposition when broader consequences—coercion, diagnostic error, weakened trust, unequal care, or pressure on vulnerable groups—are judged more harmful. The calculus therefore does not mechanically produce one answer. Human experiences cannot be assigned perfectly reliable numerical values, and one person's fundamental interests should not be overridden merely because relatives or institutions would find a different outcome financially or emotionally convenient. Utilitarian reasoning must remain morally disciplined as well as consequential.

Autonomy, Suffering, and the Meaning of Dignity

Supporters of voluntary euthanasia often begin with autonomy and relief of suffering. A capable adult who faces irreversible decline may believe that control over the timing of death is essential to dignity, especially when pain, breathlessness, nausea, weakness, dependence, or loss of function becomes intolerable. Suffering is broader than physical pain and may include fear, loneliness, loss of meaning, and inability to participate in activities central to personal identity. High-quality palliative care can relieve many symptoms, but it does not guarantee that every person will regard the remaining condition as acceptable. Respect for autonomy therefore requires listening seriously to a sustained request rather than dismissing it as irrational. At the same time, autonomy is not simply the expression of preference. A voluntary decision requires adequate information, freedom from coercion,

stable capacity, and realistic alternatives. A person who lacks pain treatment, disability support, housing, caregiver assistance, or mental-health care may be choosing under constraints that society could change. Expanding meaningful options is therefore part of respecting autonomy rather than an obstacle to it.

Dignity is similarly complex because it can refer both to inherent human worth and to a person's experience of control, privacy, independence, or bodily integrity. Dependence, disability, incontinence, or cognitive decline should never be described as making a life inherently undignified. Such language can intensify stigma and create pressure on people who already encounter discrimination. Nevertheless, an individual may genuinely experience loss of dignity and should be able to explain what that means without being dismissed. Clinical care can respond through privacy, symptom control, assistive support, participation in decisions, and attention to personal values. The ethical debate over Supporters of euthanasia and opponents is therefore not a simple contest between compassion and indifference. Both sides may value dignity and relief while disagreeing about whether deliberately causing death can form part of medicine. Beneficence and nonmaleficence point in different directions depending on whether continued suffering or intentional life-ending action is regarded as the greater harm.

Vulnerability, Family Interests, and Social Consequences

A utilitarian analysis becomes ethically dangerous if it treats financial savings as a straightforward benefit of euthanasia. Patients may already fear that prolonged care will consume family resources, reduce an inheritance, burden caregivers, or impose costs on a health system. If death is presented as the cheaper option, these pressures can transform an apparently voluntary choice into a response to inequality. Families matter because they experience grief, exhaustion, caregiving responsibility, conflict, and love, but their convenience cannot displace the patient's interests. Similar concerns arise in disability rights. Some advocates warn that a wish to die may be accepted too readily when expressed by a disabled person whose quality of life is underestimated, while supporters of assisted dying argue that categorical exclusion can itself deny equal autonomy. Justice requires avoiding assumptions in either direction. Safeguards must therefore examine coercion, access to palliative and disability support, language barriers, rural access, mental health, and socioeconomic inequality. A formally identical legal rule may not create equally free choices for people whose alternatives are radically unequal.

Professional Duties, Safeguards, and Legal Policy

The physician's role remains central because medicine is committed both to relieving suffering and to protecting life and vulnerable patients. The American Medical Association regards euthanasia as incompatible with the physician's role as healer, while some jurisdictions and professionals defend

carefully regulated assistance in dying. Conscience protections are therefore important, but objection should not become abandonment: clinicians continue to owe honest communication, symptom control, emergency care, and continuity consistent with applicable law. In permissive systems, commonly discussed safeguards include adulthood, decision-making capacity, a voluntary and repeated request, informed consent, serious or terminal illness as defined by law, independent medical review, opportunities for reflection, reporting, and the ability to withdraw the request. Such safeguards should be evaluated by actual practice rather than their existence on paper. Legal policy also raises a broader utilitarian question than an individual bedside case. A person may regard euthanasia as morally defensible in exceptional circumstances yet oppose legalization if expected system-wide harms appear greater, while another may support regulation because transparent oversight seems safer than unreported practice.

Utilitarian Assessment and Position

A balanced utilitarian assessment begins with the patient's suffering and autonomous wishes but deliberately widens the field of consequences. It asks whether symptoms are refractory, whether palliative options have been offered, whether capacity is secure, whether prognosis is sufficiently understood, whether coercion or financial pressure is absent, and whether a legal rule protects people likely to be disadvantaged by unequal care. The framework can support voluntary assisted dying in rare circumstances involving a capable, informed adult with enduring and intolerable suffering, but that conclusion does not justify nonvoluntary euthanasia or decisions made primarily for family or institutional convenience. A patient in a coma should be treated according to prior wishes, authorized surrogate standards, and best interests rather than presumed expendable because continuing treatment is costly. Compassion also requires aggressive relief of suffering, respectful treatment refusal, psychological and spiritual support, and access to palliative care. The moral disagreement remains genuine because utilitarians can weigh long-term social consequences differently, but no defensible calculation should count a vulnerable person's death as socially preferable merely because care is expensive.

Conclusion

Euthanasia cannot be evaluated responsibly through a simple equation in which death eliminates pain and therefore maximizes utility. The issue requires precise distinctions among euthanasia, physician-assisted dying, treatment refusal, withdrawal of unwanted intervention, and palliative sedation. Utilitarian analysis must consider autonomy and relief, but it must also include diagnostic uncertainty, future possibilities, coercion, disability stigma, family influence, healthcare inequality, clinician wellbeing, public trust, and the consequences of legal rules. Bentham's felicific calculus is useful because it widens attention to intensity, duration, certainty, and extent, yet it cannot convert human dignity into a mechanical score. A defensible position may permit philosophical support for voluntary assisted dying under narrow conditions while rejecting nonvoluntary action, financial pressure, and

the assumption that dependence makes life less valuable. Whatever legal policy a jurisdiction adopts, ethical healthcare should ensure that patients receive honest information, symptom relief, meaningful alternatives, respect for lawful treatment choices, and protection from circumstances that make death appear more available than care.

References

American Medical Association. (2026). *Code of Medical Ethics Opinion 5.7: Physician-assisted suicide*.

American Medical Association. (2026). *Code of Medical Ethics Opinion 5.8: Euthanasia*.

Bentham, J. (1789). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*.

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of biomedical ethics* (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.

World Medical Association. (2019). *Declaration on euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide*.