WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Understanding Active Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide: Ethical, Legal, and Medical Perspectives

Dr. Santosh Kumar

B.Sc., LL.M., NET, JRF, SRF, Ph.D. (Law), Advocate, High Court of Judicature at Allahabad.
Email- santoshpandeyadv2012@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Active euthanasia and assisted suicide are complex and highly debated topics that raise ethical, legal, and medical considerations. This abstract provides an overview of these practices, exploring their definitions, historical context, ethical dilemmas, legal status, and medical implications.Active euthanasia involves the deliberate act of ending a patient's life by administering lethal substances, while assisted suicide entails providing the means for a patient to end their own life. Both practices aim to alleviate suffering in terminally ill or severely incapacitated individuals who wish to die with dignity.The ethical debate surrounding active euthanasia and assisted suicide centers on autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. Proponents argue that individuals have the right to make autonomous decisions about their own lives, including the decision to end suffering through euthanasia or assisted suicide. They emphasize the importance of respecting patients' wishes and relieving their pain and distress. However, opponents raise concerns about the sanctity of life, the potential for abuse, and the slippery slope towards involuntary euthanasia.The legal status of active euthanasia and assisted suicide varies widely across countries and jurisdictions. Some countries, such as the Netherlands, Belgium, and Canada, have legalized these practices under strict regulatory frameworks, while others, including India and many U.S. states, maintain prohibitions against them. Legal considerations often revolve around issues of consent, competence, and the role of healthcare providers in end-of-life decision-making.

From a medical standpoint, active euthanasia and assisted suicide present complex challenges for healthcare professionals. Physicians must navigate ethical dilemmas while upholding their duty to relieve suffering and respect patient autonomy. They also face practical challenges related to diagnosis, prognosis, and the provision of palliative care.Research on the effects of active euthanasia and assisted suicide is ongoing, with studies examining patient outcomes, physician attitudes, societal attitudes, and the impact on healthcare systems. Substantive and procedural safeguards are essential to mitigate potential risks and ensure that these practices are implemented ethically and responsibly.In this paper, various dimensions of active euthanasia and assisted suicide have been examined.

Key Words: Euthanasia, Activ Euthenisa, Assisted Suicide, Dimensions.

Introduction:

Euthanasia, originating from the Greek words "eu" meaning good and "thanatos" meaning death, is the act of intentionally ending a patient's life to alleviate their suffering. Typically, this practice is reserved for patients who are terminally ill or experiencing unbearable pain. The concept behind euthanasia is to offer a more dignified and humane death instead of prolonging suffering. There are two main forms of euthanasia: passive and active. Passive euthanasia involves withdrawing life support, allowing the patient to die naturally, while active euthanasia entails administering lethal substances to end the patient's life intentionally. Active euthanasia is particularly controversial, sparking debates and ethical dilemmas surrounding its practice.

Active euthanasia can be further categorized into voluntary and non-voluntary euthanasia. In voluntary euthanasia, the individual explicitly consents to the procedure or agrees to the withdrawal of life support. However, complications arise when the patient is incapacitated and unable to provide consent. In such cases, euthanasia may proceed as non-voluntary, with consent granted by the patient's family or a designated medical representative. Decisions in non-voluntary euthanasia are made based on the patient's best interests, as the patient's wishes may not be known.

The term "non-voluntary" is specifically employed to differentiate it from involuntary euthanasia, where individuals are euthanized against their will and without any form of consent. Involuntary euthanasia is universally regarded as murder and is prohibited by law worldwide. An infamous instance of involuntary euthanasia is Nazi Germany's "T4 euthanasia program," which targeted mentally ill and elderly individuals for extermination.

Euthanasia and assisted suicide are interventions involving deliberate actions aimed at ending life to alleviate ongoing suffering. The legality of these practices varies globally, with some countries permitting both euthanasia and assisted suicide, while others criminalize any attempt at suicide regardless of the circumstances. In certain nations like India, only passive euthanasia is permitted, offering relief to patients afflicted with terminal illnesses.

Status of Active Euthanasia in India

In some countries such as Belgium, Colombia, Luxembourg, and Canada, active voluntary euthanasia is legally permitted. However, India does not allow active euthanasia. Nonetheless, in 2018, the Supreme Court of India made a landmark decision regarding passive euthanasia.

Legalization of Passive Euthanasia

The issue of euthanasia revolves around the right to die. In the case of Aruna Ramachandra Shanbaug v. Union of India (2011), the Supreme Court ruled that the right to die is not explicitly protected under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, which guarantees the right to life. This decision contrasts with the ruling in Smt. Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab (1996), where a Constitution bench deemed both euthanasia and assisted suicide illegal in India.

In the Aruna Shanbaug case, it was established that active euthanasia was deemed illegal worldwide unless explicitly legalized. This stance extended to India, where active euthanasia was considered illegal and classified as an offense under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. The case clarified active euthanasia as a process involving deliberate actions to induce death, such as administering substances like sodium pentothal. This results in the patient falling into a deep, painless sleep before passing away.

The Common Cause v. Union of India case established the right to die with dignity under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, reflecting changing views on individual autonomy. The case exemplifies the complexities surrounding euthanasia legalization, as seen in the request made by an elderly couple from Mumbai to the President of India to allow active euthanasia due to their dissatisfaction with life.

Issues surrounding active euthanasia are complex, particularly when viewed through the lens of international human rights law. There isn't a definitive directive regarding active voluntary euthanasia, but rather a nuanced consideration of various rights. Finding the appropriate balance among these rights is open to interpretation and may vary depending on different perspectives.

Therefore, while the right to life doesn't inherently encompass the right to choose to die, it also doesn't require a State to safeguard a person's life against their expressed wishes. The State's duty to preserve life must be balanced with individual autonomy, which is manifested in the right to privacy in cases of voluntary euthanasia requests. Laws limiting access to voluntary euthanasia could potentially infringe upon the right to privacy guaranteed by Article 17 of the ICCPR, but such restrictions might be justified as reasonable limitations of that right. It's crucial to recognize that administering medical treatment without consent could violate a person's physical integrity and their rights under Article 17 of the ICCPR. Additionally, the Disability Convention asserts that individuals with disabilities possess the same entitlements to life, health, physical integrity, and personal autonomy as those without disabilities.

If a country opts to legalize active voluntary euthanasia, the ICCPR stipulates that the law must incorporate robust safeguards to prevent abuse. This legislation might need to include a provision for conscientious objection, ensuring compatibility with the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and belief. According to research, there isn't a singular right mandating the legalization of voluntary euthanasia, nor is there a singular right prohibiting it, as long as stringent protections are established. From a human rights perspective, it seems viable to support the legalization of voluntary euthanasia if adequate measures are in place to prevent arbitrary or discriminatory loss of life.

Advocating for the Legalization of Active Euthanasia

The freedom to make choices

Legalizing euthanasia primarily aims to grant individuals the autonomy to decide how they wish to live their lives, encompassing the right to self-determination. Self-determination holds significance as it enables people to pursue their vision of a fulfilling life, within the boundaries of justice and in harmony with others who do the same. Through self-determination, individuals assume accountability for their actions and the trajectory of their lives. At the core of human dignity lies the capacity for individuals to shape their own destinies.

Transparency and Adherence to the Law.

It's undeniable that active euthanasia may happen unlawfully. Therefore, legalizing it and establishing a structured framework can effectively minimize potential abuse. With legalization, the practice can occur under safer conditions, offering predictability for patients and physicians involved. Additionally, implementing essential safety measures can enhance the procedure's patient-friendliness.

Resources

Focusing resources on patients with a genuine chance of recovery is often seen as more beneficial. Allocating resources to those unlikely to recover may be deemed wasteful and futile.

Counterarguments to the Legalization of Active Euthanasia

The Role of the Doctor

The argument against legalizing active voluntary euthanasia often revolves around the belief that such actions conflict with the traditional role of the physician outlined in the Hippocratic Oath. However, this perspective is open to debate. An alternative viewpoint defines the doctor-patient relationship more as a provider-client dynamic, where the patient, as a consumer, can request their desired treatment, and the doctor can choose whether to provide it. Within this framework, a doctor might be seen as justified in actions that could be interpreted as active voluntary euthanasia.

Palliative Care Industry

One significant argument against active euthanasia is that its legalization could potentially undermine the palliative care sector and lead to decreased investment in it. Furthermore, there's concern that legalizing euthanasia may diminish the perceived necessity for palliative care, which plays a crucial role not only for patients but also for their families.

Slippery Slope

The slippery slope argument against legalizing active voluntary euthanasia, suggesting it could lead to widespread involuntary euthanasia and devalue the sanctity of life, is a common objection. However, this assertion lacks substantial evidence. Critics argue that the slippery slope argument is often presented without proper consideration for the risks of abuse or other complexities associated with maintaining the current legal stance on euthanasia.

Social Perspective

Indeed, many religions view euthanasia as akin to murder and therefore morally objectionable. Similarly, suicide is deemed "illegal" in various religious doctrines. From an ethical standpoint, there's concern that legalizing euthanasia could erode society's reverence for the sanctity of life.Regarding voluntary euthanasia, it's essential that the patient is mentally competent, fully aware of the options and consequences, and capable of clearly communicating their desire to end their life. However, determining and defining this capacity can be challenging.

Crime

Patients facing serious illness may indeed feel pressured to consent to euthanasia due to various factors, such as concerns about burdening their families financially, emotionally, and mentally. Even if the state covers treatment costs, there's still a risk that hospital staff may have economic incentives to encourage euthanasia consent.

Suicide and Assisted Suicide

The concept of the right to die involves individuals having the autonomy to choose to end their lives, often in cases of severe illness or a loss of will to live. This idea sparks debates about whether such a right should be granted and the conditions under which it should apply. While many declarations of human rights address the right to life, the right to die is not explicitly mentioned in international or regional declarations. In some countries, like the United States, suicide has been decriminalized in most states, yet attempted suicide remains illegal in many. Historically, in the United Kingdom, suicide was considered a crime against God and the monarchy. The Suicide Act of 1961 in the UK punished those who assisted in suicide and prohibits any actions that encourage or assist in suicide.

In this scenario, a doctor aids a patient in ending their own life upon request, typically following the criteria outlined in the state's laws regarding physician-assisted suicide. This assistance often involves prescribing a lethal dose of medication. Several countries, including Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Luxembourg, New Zealand, etc., have legalized physician-assisted suicide with specific conditions. Some common requirements for performing assisted suicide include:

- The individual must have an incurable disease.

- They must be of sound mind.

- They have consistently expressed their desire to die.

- The individual must administer the lethal dose themselves.

Updated Status of Right to Die in India

In the case of Maruti Shripti Dubal v. State of Maharashtra (1986), the petitioner, who had long-standing mental health issues, attempted suicide, leading to charges under section 309 of the Indian Penal Code. The petitioner challenged the constitutionality of this section, and the Bombay High Court deemed it unconstitutional, citing a violation of Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. The court asserted that just as the right to remain silent coexists with the right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19, the right to die must coexist with the right to life. The desire to end one's life is not abnormal, and thus, no one should face punishment for it. Similarly, the Supreme Court of India in the case of P. Rathinam v. Union of India (1994) also found section 309 to be in violation of fundamental rights, considering it cruel and inhuman to punish someone who is already suffering. This reasoning led to the decision to strike down the section.

In the case of Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab (1996), the previous decision was overturned by a five-judge Constitution bench. They ruled that the "right to life" is fundamentally at odds with the "right to die," similar to the inherent contradiction between "death" and "life" itself. Article 21 of the Constitution

encompasses a person's right to life, which includes the right to live with dignity, extending to a dignified dying process and thus recognizing the right of a dying individual to die with dignity. The court asserted that while the right to life is a natural right, suicide is deemed an unnatural act. Therefore, the apex court upheld the constitutional validity of section 309 of the Indian Penal Code.

In the case of Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug vs. Union of India and Others (2011), the petitioner was attacked, resulting in severe brain damage and leaving her in a permanent vegetative state for 36 years. The Supreme Court rejected mercy killing pleas but acknowledged the concept of a "living will" and permitted passive euthanasia in specific serious situations. This landmark ruling paved the way for the decriminalization of suicide in India.

The Mental Health Care Act of 2017 narrowed the application of Section 309, specifying that any individual attempting suicide would be presumed to have done so under severe stress, unless proven otherwise. Such a person is considered a victim and is not subject to punishment.

Should India Consider Legalizing Assisted Suicide?

Currently,there is widespread agreement that individuals should have the right to die with dignity. In fact, India's reluctance towards euthanasia is viewed as cultural stagnation. People should be empowered to end their lives if circumstances become intolerable, without facing punishment for such decisions. Many individuals suffering from incurable diseases are forced to endure their suffering, not because they want to, but because the law mandates it. Euthanasia would offer relief to the families of terminally ill patients, as long-term treatment costs are often overwhelming. Prolonging life artificially serves not only the interests of the patient's family but also the patient themselves.

The economic strain and strain on medical resources caused by long-term palliative care for terminally ill patients pose significant challenges. These resources could be better utilized by patients who desire to live and can benefit from them. However, the concept of assisted suicide faces widespread rejection in India due to concerns about potential misuse. Factors such as property disputes, financial motives, and familial conflicts could lead to abuse of euthanasia practices. Legalizing euthanasia or assisted suicide in India may increase the risk of unlawful killings, disguised as mercy killings. Additionally, a significant portion of the Indian population remains uneducated about their rights, potentially exposing them to victimization and exploitation if euthanasia were to be legalized.

Dr. Roop Gursant, a panelist doctor in the Aruna Shanbaug case, advocates for the legalization of assisted suicide but under certain conditions. He believes it should occur in a society free from corruption, where every individual is morally and ethically responsible. Given the current state of affairs, with corruption still prevalent in the judiciary and administrative bodies, Dr. Gursant warns that legalizing euthanasia would be a grave error.

"How Other Countries Have Approached the Legalization of Assisted Suicide"

Certainly, the legal status of assisted suicide varies across different countries. Here's a brief overview:

1. "Netherlands": Assisted suicide and euthanasia are legal under strict conditions, with physicians required to follow specific protocols.

2. "Belgium": Similar to the Netherlands, both assisted suicide and euthanasia are permitted under strict regulations, including consultation with multiple physicians.

3. "Switzerland": Assisted suicide is legal if the helper has no vested interest and if the person seeking assistance is of sound mind and makes a voluntary decision.

4. "Canada": Assisted suicide, known as Medical Assistance in Dying (MAID), is legal for adults who are mentally competent and have a grievous and irremediable medical condition.

5. "Luxembourg": Assisted suicide and euthanasia are legal under specific conditions, with safeguards in place to protect vulnerable individuals.

6. "Germany": Assisted suicide is legal, but commercial assistance with suicide is prohibited.

7. "United States": Assisted suicide is legal in several states, including Oregon, Washington, California, Vermont, and others, under specific regulations and criteria.

These are just a few examples, and the legal landscape surrounding assisted suicide continues to evolve globally.

Conclusion :

As euthanasia and assisted suicide become increasingly legalized worldwide, many jurisdictions are decriminalizing suicide and implementing laws to facilitate these practices under specific circumstances. With greater access to assisted suicide, it's crucial for administrations to prioritize additional research on its effects on patients, physicians, healthcare systems, and society as a whole. Monitoring substantive and procedural safeguards is essential to ensure that these practices are implemented ethically and responsibly.

In a country like India, beyond medical considerations, ethical and religious factors must also be taken into account when discussing euthanasia. While legalizing euthanasia could potentially lead to abuse, it's important to recognize that it can also offer individuals the opportunity to die with dignity, rather than being compelled to continue living solely due to legal constraints. Before considering legalization, several factors must be carefully evaluated, including thorough diagnosis by mental health professionals, ensuring reversibility of the condition, and obtaining multiple consultations with the patient.

Collaboration between the medical community and legislature is essential to establish rules and guidelines for the practice of euthanasia and assisted suicide. Active euthanasia, particularly when voluntary, can be viewed as a humane option for terminally ill patients. Prolonging suffering without relief serves no purpose, and reluctance to legalize euthanasia primarily stems from concerns about potential abuse. However, with the implementation of a proper framework, euthanasia can be beneficial, making the system more efficient and patient-friendly while minimizing the risk of misuse.In conclusion, active euthanasia and assisted suicide are contentious issues that require careful consideration from ethical, legal, and medical perspectives. While they offer the promise of relieving suffering and respecting individual autonomy, they also pose significant challenges related to ethics, law, and medical practice. Continued dialogue and research are necessary to navigate these complexities and develop policies that balance compassion with protection of vulnerable individuals.

References:-

1.Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug vs. Union of India, 2011 SCC (4) 454

2. Article 21,The Constitution of India,1950

3.Gian Kaur vs. State of Punjab, 1996 SCC (2) 648

4.Section 302 The Indian Penal Code,1860

5. Common Cause (A Registered Society) vs Union of India and Others, AIR 2018 SC 1665

6.Maruti Shripti Dubal vs. State of Maharashtra, 1987 (1) BomCR 499

7.section 309, The Indian Penal Code,1860

8.Article 19,The Constitution of India,1950

9.P. Rathinam vs. Union of India, 1994 SCC (3) 394

10.The Right to Die: Understanding Euthanasia , Pinki Virani, Viking Penguin