


## Balancing Ethics, Education, and Compassion in Physician-Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia

Kamaljot Kaur Ahuja<sup>1</sup> , Srishty Agarwal<sup>2</sup> , Ramsha Mahmood<sup>3</sup> , Rohit Jain<sup>4</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Shri Guru Ram Rai Institute of Medical and Health Sciences, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India 

<sup>2</sup> Government Medical College, Surat, Gujarat, India 

<sup>3</sup> Wellspan Good Samaritan Hospital, Lebanon, Pennsylvania, USA 

<sup>4</sup> Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania, USA 

### Abstract

**Objective:** It is 2024, and the debate of physician-assisted suicide and euthanasia remains highly complex and impactful. This discussion extends to the legal and ethical theories that affect these issues but also profoundly impact real lives and families. Understanding where we stand today requires a look back at historical contexts and current perspectives, while pointing out the necessity of raising awareness concerning educating healthcare professionals and the role of palliative care.

**Methods:** A review of historical developments, legal cases, and current perspectives related to physician assisted suicide and euthanasia was conducted to understand how these practices have evolved and how they influence modern medical decision-making and ethical discussions.

**Results:** A major turning point occurred in the 1980s when Jack Kevorkian's assisted suicide device was made, raising concerns in courts, including the Supreme Court cases of *Vacco v. Quill* (1997) and *Washington v. Glucksberg* (1997), which ultimately ruled that the legality of physician-assisted suicide should be determined by individual states. Oregon's 1999 "Death with Dignity" law set the standard and became evident in other states with similar legislation, showing a growing trend of acceptance of physician-assisted suicide in the US, while euthanasia remains legalized only in a few countries abroad.

**Conclusion:** The current issue remains the debate between individual autonomy and fears of ethical misuse, along with possible consequences for palliative care. Providing thorough training to healthcare providers and ensuring that patients and families receive clear information about their choices must be a priority. A common approach to physician-assisted suicide may help standardize care and address ethical and practical challenges while emphasizing respect and compassion in end-of-life decisions.

**Keywords:** Physician assisted suicide, Euthanasia, Palliative care, Dignity

**Corresponding Author:** Kamaljot Kaur Ahuja  
**E-mail:** ahujakamal7@gmail.com

*Turk J Int Med* 2026;8:8 DOI: 10.46310/tjim.1604934

**Received:** December 21, 2024  
**Accepted:** July 9, 2025  
**Published:** March 10, 2026

**Cite as:** Ahuja KK, Agarwal S, Mahmood R, Jain R. Balancing ethics, education, and compassion in physician-assisted suicide and euthanasia. *Turk J Int Med* 2026;8:8. doi:10.46310/tjim.1604934.



As we are navigating through 2024, PAS and euthanasia are an ongoing debate, stirring complex discussions. It is evident that it's not just about legal issues and ethical theories, but it involves real people, impacting them and their families in profound ways. To see where we stand today, we need to understand the history and current perspectives on these issues and analyze the importance of raising awareness on the proper education of healthcare professionals and role of palliative care.

In the early 20th century, euthanasia was linked with eugenics movements—programs aimed at improving the genetic quality of the human population and as some of these ideas were supported, ethical and practical issues became a concern, leading to rejection. In the 1980's pathologist Jacob Kevorkian created his own device allowing patients to self-administer lethal medications. In 1999 he was convicted of second-degree murder, leading to major battles and supreme court decisions in *Vacco v. Quill* (1997) and *Washington v. Glucksberg* (1997), where the Supreme Court ruled that there is no constitutionally protected right to die. These left matters in the hands of state legislatures to decide.

The real turning point took place in 1999 with Oregon's "Death with Dignity" law. This groundbreaking legislation allowed terminally ill patients to request medication to end their lives. This involved ten other states and the District of Columbia to pass similar laws, highlighting the rising acceptance of PAS in the U.S. [1]. However, euthanasia remains illegal in the U.S. even though it is permitted in countries like the Netherlands, Belgium, and Canada. This difference highlights the variety of legal and cultural views regarding end-of-life choices around the world.

As of 2024, factors such as personal autonomy and ethical concerns hugely impact our views and reflection on PAS and euthanasia. PAS is much supported since it respects an individual's right to make decisions about their own death. According to research, terminally ill patients often seek PAS to avoid losing their control and dignity in life as they are close to dying [2]. This agrees with the rising notion of individual choice, as well as the freedom to choose one's own path which is highly valued in today's society. Conversely, ethical issues come into concern, where critics worry that PAS does not comply with the Hippocratic ideals of "do no harm" fearing it could be misused, especially by people in vulnerable states and consequently devaluing palliative care rather than trying to harness its potential [3]. The "slippery slope" argument is also a major concern and suggests that permitting PAS would encourage society to accept euthanasia, which would impose a threat to the ethical standards in medicine [4]. It could lead to the potential legalization of either voluntary (person makes a conscious decision to die) or non-voluntary euthanasia (person is unable to give their consent, other person takes decision on their behalf based on previously expressed wish). The only way to prevent this shift would be by maintaining legal classification of voluntary euthanasia as homicide.

This has seen doctors at the center of the debate, faced with emotional and ethical dilemmas. On one hand, research confirms that several physicians support PAS and euthanasia, but on the other hand, it reveals that many are ambivalent about it and struggle with dilemmas of conscience. Documentation of the experiences of Dutch physicians, who tend to be supportive of PAS and euthanasia, still find these decisions challenging, which suggests that guidelines and support networks are essential to assist doctors in making decisions [5].

In addition to doctors and patients, both PAS and euthanasia have a significant effect on the families of the patients. Most patients opt for PAS to escape from endless suffering and retain autonomy in the last part of their lives which provides a sense of comfort and satisfaction and 'death by dignity'. However, the patient's relatives are often confronted with intense emotions, such as mourning, guilt, and anguish when a loved one resorts to this decision. Empirical evidence indicates that relatives require help to cope with emotional reactions and comprehend end-of-life decisions [6].

Besides personal will, social and religious beliefs of society largely determine their approach toward PAS and euthanasia. Various cultures and religions hold diverse views regarding death and dying. For example, the majority of the Christian and Islamic traditions focus on the sanctity of life and consider PAS and euthanasia morally wrong. On the other hand, there are some schools of thought in Buddhism

and Hinduism that offer a more lenient perspective by permitting the decisions regarding end-life as a part of the broader concept of suffering and karma [7].

Palliative care provides patients and their families with a range of options for a humane and dignified death, which is a very important alternative to PAS and euthanasia. It includes not only the treatment of physical pain but also provides emotional and psychological support. Good palliative care may sometimes be the solution to issues that compel people to think of PAS, for instance, pain management and dignity of life.

Due to the contextual nature of PAS and euthanasia, healthcare providers must receive the required in-depth training about these issues. Education should prepare professionals for the legal and ethical responsibilities of assisting patients with PAS but also for implementing PAS in a patient-centered manner. These programs should address ethical considerations, communication capabilities, and effective integration of palliative care.

Besides health care systems and professionals, patients and families require clear and easily accessible information about the options they have in the case of an end-of-life situation. Educating individuals on PAS, euthanasia, and palliative care allows people to make educated choices and to address the subject with their doctors in a meaningful way. Support services, including counseling and spiritual care, are vital for families to work through the emotional intricacies of end-of-life decisions.

The debate over Physician-Assisted Suicide and euthanasia continues to be strongly contested. Involving the ethical, legal, and social factors, advocates stress the importance of the right to autonomy and relief from suffering whereas the critics raise concerns about potential misuse and ethical boundaries. Integrating robust palliative care offers a compassionate alternative that addresses many of the issues driving requests for PAS. To address these challenges effectively, we need to encourage open dialogue and provide comprehensive education keeping in mind the wishes of both healthcare professionals and patients. By the development of a formal, standardized process keeping into account a multidisciplinary team to guide willing patients through the process, we can ensure that end-of-life decisions are made with the utmost respect, dignity, and empathy.

If all states were to allow Physician-Assisted Suicide, it would be necessary to create uniform rules and regulations to ensure consistency and protect patients' rights throughout the country. Greater transparency and a unified approach in the U.S. would be a step toward a more just system, thus showing our commitment to individual autonomy and addressing all ethical and practical questions in a comprehensive manner.

### Article Information Form

**Funding:** *This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.*

**Financial Disclosure:** *All authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.*

**Conflicts of Interest:** *All authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.*

**Ethical Declaration:** *No ethical approval was required for this article.*

**Author Contributions:** *Conceptualization: KKA, RM, SA, RJ; Resources: KKA, RM, SA, RJ; Data curation: KKA, RM, SA, RJ; Writing – original draft: KKA, RM, SA, RJ; Writing – review & editing: KKA, RM, SA, RJ; Supervision: RJ*

---

## REFERENCES

1. Dugdale LS, Lerner BH, Callahan D. Pros and cons of physician aid in dying. *Yale J Biol Med.* 2019;92(4):747-50. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31866790/>
2. Al Rabadi L, LeBlanc M, Bucy T, Ellis LM, Hershman DL, Meyskens FL, et al. Trends in medical aid in dying in Oregon and Washington. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2019;2(8):e198648. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.8648.
3. Sleeman KE, Timms A, Gillam J, Anderson JE, Harding R, Sampson EL, et al. Priorities and opportunities for palliative and end of life care in United Kingdom health policies: a national documentary analysis. *BMC Palliat Care.* 2021;20:108. doi:10.1186/s12904-021-00802-6.
4. Walker RM. Physician-assisted suicide: the legal slippery slope. *Cancer Control.* 2001;8(1):25-31. doi:10.1177/107327480100800104.
5. Evenblij K, Pasman HRW, van Delden JJM, van der Heide A, van de Vathorst S, Willems DL, et al. Physicians' experiences with euthanasia: a cross-sectional survey amongst a random sample of Dutch physicians to explore their concerns, feelings and pressure. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2019;20:177. doi:10.1186/s12875-019-1067-8.
6. Roest B, Trappenburg M, Leget C. The involvement of family in the Dutch practice of euthanasia and physician assisted suicide: a systematic mixed studies review. *BMC Med Ethics.* 2019;20:23. doi:10.1186/s12910-019-0361-2.
7. Pew Research Center. Religious groups' views on end-of-life issues. 2013 Nov 21. Available from: <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2013/11/21/religious-groups-views-on-end-of-life-issues/>