Euthanasia Treatment Withdrawal and End of Life Ethics

Posted on October 11, 2022

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/euthanasia-treatment-withdrawal-and-end-of-life-ethics/

Introduction

End-of-life ethics requires careful distinctions among preserving life, relieving suffering, respecting patient autonomy, and intentionally causing death. The four questions in this discussion concern the physician's role, withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment, withholding treatment, and the ethical difference between those decisions and euthanasia. A coherent answer begins from the principle that medicine is not obligated to prolong biological life through every available technology regardless of benefit, burden, or patient preference. Physicians are responsible for diagnosis, prevention, treatment, symptom relief, honest communication, and respect for informed choices, including choices made when cure is no longer possible. Beneficence supports interventions that advance a patient's welfare, nonmaleficence cautions against disproportionate harm, autonomy protects the competent patient's authority over medical treatment, and justice requires protection against discriminatory undertreatment or coercion. These principles can conflict, which is why end-of-life decisions require deliberation rather than slogans. A patient may lawfully and ethically refuse a burdensome intervention without requesting euthanasia, while clinicians remain responsible for comfort, communication, and compassionate presence throughout the dying process.

Question One: The Physician's Role and Voluntary Euthanasia

A physician's duty includes preserving life when treatment is beneficial, but it also includes relieving suffering and recognizing the limits of medicine. Voluntary euthanasia is generally defined as a clinician intentionally administering a lethal intervention at the voluntary request of a patient with decision-making capacity. It differs from physician-assisted dying, in which the patient performs the final life-ending act, and from refusing or discontinuing medical treatment. The World Medical Association opposes euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide, while laws and professional positions vary across jurisdictions (World Medical Association, 2019). A physician may oppose voluntary euthanasia because intentionally causing death appears inconsistent with the healing role and may create risks for people affected by coercion, disability discrimination, inadequate care, or poverty. Supporters emphasize autonomy and relief of otherwise intolerable suffering. Even where the clinician

objects, a patient who expresses a wish to die should not be abandoned. The request should prompt assessment of symptoms, capacity, mental health, coercion, social support, and available palliative options.

Conscientious objection is ethically relevant because clinicians may hold serious moral or religious reasons for declining participation in assisted dying where it is legal. Such refusal should be communicated respectfully and early enough to avoid leaving a patient without information or continuity of care. Local law and professional standards determine whether an objecting clinician must provide information, transfer care, or make a referral, so no single procedural rule applies everywhere. What remains constant is the duty not to punish or demean a patient because of disagreement. Clinicians continue to owe emergency care, honest explanation, appropriate symptom relief, and treatment consistent with the patient's goals and applicable law. Palliative care is particularly important because it addresses pain, breathlessness, nausea, anxiety, spiritual distress, communication, and family needs even when disease-directed treatment is no longer effective. The physician's role therefore cannot be reduced either to prolonging life at all costs or to acceding automatically to every request. It requires sustained care while ethically and legally contested choices are considered.

Question Two: Withdrawing Life-Sustaining Treatment

Withdrawing life-sustaining treatment means stopping an intervention that has already begun, such as mechanical ventilation, dialysis, vasopressors, artificial nutrition in appropriate circumstances, or another technology that prolongs physiological function. The American Medical Association recognizes that a patient with decision-making capacity may request that a medical intervention be stopped even when death is expected, and an authorized surrogate may decide for a patient who lacks capacity under established standards (American Medical Association, Opinion 5.3). The ethical basis is that medical treatment requires consent and should serve goals the patient accepts; removing an unwanted intervention allows the underlying disease to take its course rather than introducing a new lethal act. Capacity should be assessed carefully because delirium, medication, depression, neurological illness, or misunderstanding may interfere with decision-making. A capable patient should understand the diagnosis, likely consequences, alternatives, and burdens of refusal. Communication support, interpreters, and repeated discussion can resolve uncertainty, while mere disagreement with a clinician does not establish incapacity. Withdrawal must be accompanied by active symptom control and family support.

When a patient lacks capacity, advance directives, healthcare powers of attorney, prior statements, and known values help guide surrogate decisions. Substituted judgment asks what the patient would have chosen, while a best-interests standard considers expected benefit, burden, pain, function, and dignity when preferences are unknown. A family member does not gain unlimited authority merely

through relationship, and financial interest should never determine whether a patient continues to receive appropriate care. Difficult conflicts may require ethics consultation, second opinions, or legal review. Similar caution applies to medically ineffective or nonbeneficial treatment. Clinicians are not ethically required to provide an intervention that cannot achieve its intended physiological goal, but judgments about benefit should be transparent and should not reflect prejudice about disability, age, or cost. A time-limited treatment trial can sometimes clarify whether an intervention produces an agreed outcome. Stopping an ineffective technology does not end the duty to care; comfort measures, nursing, communication, and attention to family remain essential medical responsibilities.

Question Three: Withholding Treatment and Resuscitation

Withholding treatment means deciding not to start an intervention, and under equivalent clinical and ethical conditions it is generally regarded as morally comparable to withdrawing the same intervention. A decision not to intubate, begin dialysis, or attempt cardiopulmonary resuscitation can be appropriate when it reflects informed patient preferences or when the proposed intervention cannot reasonably achieve the agreed goal. Starting a treatment trial does not create an obligation to continue it indefinitely, and fear of later withdrawal should not prevent a potentially useful intervention from being tried. Do-not-attempt-resuscitation orders illustrate why precise communication matters. Such an order applies to cardiopulmonary arrest; it does not mean “do not treat.” A patient may still receive antibiotics, oxygen, surgery, transfusion, dialysis, nutrition, or intensive symptom management when those measures fit the goals of care. Resuscitation discussions should include realistic outcomes and burdens rather than asking whether a family wants “everything.” Good advance planning reduces the likelihood that a crisis becomes the first moment in which values and treatment limits are discussed.

Question Four: Euthanasia, Palliative Sedation, and Ethical Difference

There is an ethically important difference between euthanasia and forgoing life-sustaining treatment. In euthanasia, the clinician intentionally performs an act designed to cause death; in withholding or withdrawing an unwanted or nonbeneficial intervention, the clinician stops imposing treatment and allows the underlying condition to determine the course while continuing comfort care. Palliative sedation also requires distinction. It may reduce consciousness when symptoms remain refractory near the end of life, but its purpose is proportionate relief rather than death, and it requires consent where possible, documentation, careful dosing, and continued care (American Medical Association, Opinion 5.6). Medically provided nutrition and hydration can also be treatments with benefits and burdens rather than automatic obligations in every dying patient. Decisions should be individualized, while ordinary mouth care, hygiene, warmth, and human presence remain fundamental. Calling all

decisions that precede death “passive euthanasia” obscures differences in intention, causation, consent, and the ongoing duty to care.

Justice adds another dimension because end-of-life choices occur within unequal healthcare and social systems. A patient may reject a burdensome intervention for reasons consistent with deeply held values, yet another may feel driven toward refusal because home care, disability support, income, communication assistance, or adequate palliation is unavailable. Safeguarding autonomy therefore requires more than obtaining a signature; clinicians should ask whether remediable social conditions are shaping the choice. The same principle works in the opposite direction: disability should not be used to deny a competent person the right to refuse treatment that other patients possess. Fair care protects people from both unwanted intervention and discriminatory undertreatment. It also requires listening to whose preferences are believed, whose pain is treated, and whose family receives support. Ethical end-of-life practice is strongest when decisions are connected to reliable information, genuine alternatives, transparent review, and respectful communication rather than assumptions about what makes a life worth living or what level of dependence should be tolerated.

Conclusion

The physician’s role combines preservation of life with relief of suffering, respect for autonomy, truthful communication, and protection of vulnerable patients. Voluntary euthanasia remains ethically and legally contested, but it should not be confused with a competent patient’s refusal of treatment or with the withdrawal of an intervention that no longer serves accepted goals. Withholding and withdrawing treatment are ethically equivalent when the reasons, consent, and clinical circumstances are comparable, even though stopping a visible machine can feel emotionally different from never starting it. Palliative sedation aims to relieve refractory suffering rather than cause death, and decisions about nutrition, hydration, resuscitation, and other interventions should be individualized rather than governed by absolute formulas. Good end-of-life care neither abandons a patient nor treats every available technology as mandatory. It aligns treatment with informed goals, continues symptom relief and human support, uses surrogates appropriately when capacity is lost, and examines social conditions that may constrain choice. These distinctions preserve both the duty to care and the patient’s authority over medical intervention.

References

1. American Medical Association. “Withholding or Withdrawing Life-Sustaining Treatment.” *Code of Medical Ethics*, Opinion 5.3.
2. World Medical Association. “Declaration on Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide.” 2019.
3. American Medical Association. “Medically Ineffective Interventions.” *Code of Medical Ethics*, Opinion 5.5.
4. American Medical Association. “Sedation to Unconsciousness in End-of-Life Care.” *Code of*

Medical Ethics, Opinion 5.6.
5. National Consensus Project for Quality Palliative Care. *Clinical Practice Guidelines for Quality Palliative Care*. 4th ed., 2018.
6. Beauchamp, Tom L., and James F. Childress. *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 8th ed., Oxford University Press, 2019.