

# Euthanasia: Views, Ethics & Laws

Authored by  
**mohammed looti**

November 19, 2025

## RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammed looti (2025). *Euthanasia: Views, Ethics & Laws*. Psychepedia. Retrieved from <https://psychepedia.arabpsychology.com/?p=24705>

## Defining Euthanasia and Scope of Attitudes

Attitudes toward **euthanasia**, often defined as the intentional termination of a life by another person to relieve intractable suffering, represent one of the most complex and deeply divisive issues in contemporary psychology, ethics, and public policy. The scope of this debate is vast, encompassing nuanced distinctions that profoundly shape individual and collective opinions. Crucially, researchers must differentiate between **active euthanasia**, involving direct intervention (such as administering a lethal dose), and **passive euthanasia**, which entails withdrawing life-sustaining treatments like ventilation or feeding tubes. Furthermore, the voluntary nature of the request--whether the patient explicitly consents (voluntary) or is unable to provide consent (non-voluntary or involuntary)--introduces significant moral weights that determine the level of societal acceptance or condemnation. These definitional boundaries are not merely academic; they anchor the psychological frameworks people use to evaluate the morality and legality of end-of-life decision-making.

The intense scrutiny surrounding euthanasia stems from its confrontation with fundamental human values: the sanctity of life versus the right to self-determination and the alleviation of suffering. Public attitudes are rarely monolithic, instead forming a spectrum influenced by personal experience, cultural norms, and cognitive processing of fear and despair. Research consistently indicates that passive forms of euthanasia, particularly the withdrawal of futile care, garner substantially higher levels of public support than active forms, primarily because passive measures are often framed psychologically as allowing a natural death rather than causing one. This cognitive reframing highlights a critical area of psychological study: how language and categorization influence moral judgment regarding mortality. The debate forces individuals to reconcile their inherent desire for survival with the empathetic recognition of extreme, unrelievable pain in others, generating significant internal conflict that manifests as variable attitudes.

Psychological investigation into euthanasia attitudes seeks to uncover the underlying determinants that predict support or opposition. These determinants range from deeply held moral intuitions and religious convictions to more immediate factors such as perceived quality of life, locus of control, and personal proximity to terminal illness. Understanding these variables is crucial not only for predicting public opinion but also for informing ethical communication in clinical settings. The complexity is compounded by the fact that attitudes are often situational; an individual who opposes euthanasia in principle might support it passionately when confronted with the reality of a loved one's agonizing suffering. Therefore, the study of attitudes toward euthanasia must move beyond simple dichotomies, exploring the dynamic interplay between abstract ethical principles and concrete emotional realities, which ultimately dictates the societal conversation surrounding death with dignity.

## Key Ethical and Moral Frameworks

The ethical debate concerning euthanasia is primarily framed by two dominant philosophical traditions: **Utilitarianism** and **Deontology**, each offering profoundly different conclusions regarding the permissibility of ending life. Utilitarian approaches, focused on maximizing overall happiness and minimizing suffering, often provide a strong rationale for euthanasia. If an individual faces prolonged, irreversible suffering and death is imminent, the utilitarian calculus suggests that the termination of life, provided it is voluntary, is the action that produces the greatest good (i.e., the cessation of pain) for the patient and alleviates the distress of caregivers. This framework emphasizes compassion and the practical consequences of continued existence under intolerable conditions, prioritizing the quality of life over mere biological duration.

Conversely, Deontology, famously associated with the works of Immanuel Kant, posits that certain actions are inherently right or wrong, regardless of their consequences. From a strict deontological perspective, the intentional act of killing violates the fundamental moral duty to respect the inherent worth and sanctity of human life. This perspective maintains that life possesses an absolute, intrinsic value that cannot be forfeited, even by the individual themselves, and that the duty not to kill is a universal, non-negotiable moral law. Therefore, regardless of the patient's suffering or request, active euthanasia remains morally impermissible because it involves the direct transgression of this primary duty. Public attitudes often reflect this tension, with many people experiencing cognitive conflict between the compassionate desire to relieve suffering (utilitarian impulse) and the moral inhibition against taking a life (deontological constraint).

A pivotal concept in medical ethics, and one highly relevant to public attitudes, is the principle of **autonomy**. The increasing emphasis on patient autonomy in modern medicine suggests that competent individuals should have the ultimate authority over their bodies and medical decisions, including the right to refuse treatment or request aid in dying. Proponents of euthanasia emphasize that denying a terminally ill patient the option to choose the timing and manner of their death constitutes a profound violation of their personal freedom and dignity. However, this autonomy must be balanced against the principles of **beneficence** (acting in the patient's best interest) and **non-maleficence** (doing no harm). Opponents argue that while respecting autonomy is vital, the act of actively ending a life falls outside the scope of acceptable medical practice and constitutes the ultimate harm, regardless of consent.

Furthermore, the contentious "slippery slope" argument introduces a consequentialist ethical concern that significantly influences opposition to legalization. This argument posits that if voluntary active euthanasia is permitted for the terminally ill, society will inevitably slide down a slope where protections are eroded, leading to non-voluntary or involuntary euthanasia for the vulnerable, such as the disabled, the elderly, or those suffering from mental illness. While empirical evidence from jurisdictions where euthanasia is legal (such as the Netherlands or Belgium) shows

careful regulation, the psychological fear of governmental or medical overreach remains a powerful deterrent in public opinion. This fear taps into deep anxieties about control, power dynamics within the healthcare system, and the societal devaluation of life deemed less productive or desirable.

## Psychological Determinants of Attitudes

The psychological landscape governing attitudes toward euthanasia is heavily influenced by individual differences in **death anxiety**. According to Terror Management Theory (TMT), humans manage the pervasive fear of mortality by investing in cultural worldviews and self-esteem, which provide symbolic immortality. For individuals with high death anxiety, supporting euthanasia might be perceived as confronting mortality too directly or granting control over a process (death) that is inherently uncontrollable, leading to greater opposition. Conversely, for others, supporting euthanasia might represent an attempt to regain control over the dying process itself, viewing it as an affirmation of personal agency even in the face of inevitable biological decline. The level of comfort an individual has discussing mortality and their personal history with loss significantly mediates how they process the ethical implications of end-of-life choices.

**Empathy** and the perceived suffering of the patient are potent psychological drivers of support for euthanasia. Individuals who score highly on measures of empathy are more likely to support the option of assisted dying, as they are better able to internalize the pain and distress experienced by a person with a terminal, agonizing illness. This empathetic response often overrides abstract moral objections, shifting the focus from the sanctity of life principle to the compelling necessity of alleviating extreme human misery. However, empathy can also introduce psychological distress for the observer, leading to defensive avoidance or emotional distancing. When the suffering is perceived as overwhelming, supporting euthanasia becomes a mechanism for resolving the emotional discomfort associated with witnessing prolonged, futile pain, framing the act as merciful rather than destructive.

Personal experience operates as a powerful modulator of attitudes. Individuals who have served as **caregivers** for terminally ill loved ones or who have personally witnessed uncontrolled suffering often exhibit significantly higher rates of support for euthanasia and physician-assisted dying compared to the general population. This is due to the lived experience transforming the abstract debate into a concrete, emotionally charged reality. The prolonged burden, the feeling of helplessness, and the direct observation of the failure of palliative measures can erode prior moral objections rooted in theoretical principles, replacing them with a practical, compassionate desire to end suffering. Conversely, positive experiences with comprehensive palliative care can sometimes reduce support for active euthanasia, demonstrating that the perceived effectiveness of alternatives heavily influences attitude formation.

Cognitive factors, particularly the framing effect and the reduction of **cognitive dissonance**, also

play a role. When the concept is framed as "death with dignity" or "relief from suffering," support generally increases; when framed as "killing" or "assisted suicide," support tends to decrease. Furthermore, individuals often strive for internal consistency. If a person values autonomy highly but simultaneously believes that life must be preserved at all costs, they experience dissonance. Supporting voluntary euthanasia provides a means of resolving this conflict by prioritizing the value of self-determination over the absolute preservation of biological life, thereby achieving internal psychological coherence on the issue.

Finally, attitudes are often linked to one's **locus of control**. Individuals with a strong internal locus of control--those who believe they are masters of their own destiny--are more likely to support voluntary euthanasia, viewing it as the ultimate expression of control over one's own life narrative, including its termination. In contrast, those with an external locus of control, who attribute outcomes to fate, God, or powerful others, are more likely to oppose euthanasia, seeing death as an event that should be determined by external forces rather than personal choice. This psychological orientation deeply influences how individuals weigh the value of personal agency against the inevitability of natural processes.

## Sociodemographic and Cultural Variations

Sociodemographic variables consistently demonstrate predictive power regarding attitudes toward euthanasia. Education level is a key factor; individuals with higher levels of education tend to express greater support for voluntary euthanasia, often linked to a stronger emphasis on individualism, critical thinking about religious dogma, and adherence to principles of personal autonomy. Furthermore, political orientation is highly correlated: those identifying as politically liberal or progressive show significantly higher support rates than those identifying as conservative, reflecting broader differences in views on social regulation, bodily autonomy, and the separation of church and state. Age presents a more complex picture; while older individuals might theoretically be closer to the demographic most likely to utilize assisted dying, studies show mixed results, often moderated by religiosity and generational experiences with medical technology.

Significant cultural variations exist, primarily reflecting differences between individualistic Western societies and more collective Eastern or traditional cultures. In Western nations (e.g., the Netherlands, Canada, Switzerland), where individual rights and self-determination are paramount, the concept of death with dignity through assisted dying has gained considerable legal and social traction. The emphasis is placed on the individual's right to control their suffering and exit. Conversely, in many Asian, African, and Latin American cultures, where family interdependence and communitarian values are prioritized, decisions about end-of-life care are often made collectively. In these settings, active euthanasia may be strongly opposed, not only due to religious beliefs but also because the act is perceived as undermining the communal responsibility to care for the vulnerable, viewing the dying process as a shared experience rather than a solitary choice.

The influence of medical infrastructure also shapes attitudes. In cultures where palliative care is robust, universally accessible, and highly effective, the perceived need and support for active euthanasia may be slightly lower, as alternative means of pain control and comfort are readily available. However, in regions where quality palliative care is nascent or inaccessible, euthanasia may be viewed by the public as the only viable option for escaping agonizing pain, thereby increasing public support out of necessity rather than philosophical conviction. These infrastructural disparities highlight that attitudes are not purely moral judgments but are also pragmatic responses to the perceived failures or successes of the existing healthcare system in managing terminal suffering.

## The Role of Religion and Spirituality

Religion and spirituality represent arguably the single most powerful predictors of opposition to euthanasia across global demographics. Most organized religions hold theological doctrines that emphasize the sanctity of life, viewing it as a divine gift or creation that only God has the authority to terminate. For adherents of Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, life is often seen as a period of testing, and suffering may be interpreted as having redemptive or spiritual value. Therefore, intentionally shortening life, even to relieve suffering, is considered an encroachment upon divine prerogative. High levels of intrinsic religiosity--where faith is deeply integrated into daily life--are consistently correlated with strong opposition to both active euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide.

Specific religious traditions articulate their opposition differently. Roman Catholicism, for example, strongly condemns active euthanasia but generally permits the refusal or withdrawal of extraordinary, burdensome life-sustaining treatments (passive euthanasia), viewing this as accepting the natural course of death rather than intentionally causing it. Islamic jurisprudence holds a firm stance against active euthanasia, deeming it prohibited (haram), emphasizing the duty to endure suffering as part of God's will. Judaism, while valuing life immensely and strongly opposing active intervention to end it, places great emphasis on relieving suffering, leading to complex discussions regarding the timing and extent of passive measures, but rarely supporting active termination.

However, the relationship between spirituality and attitudes is more nuanced than simple religious adherence. Individuals who identify as "spiritual but not religious" (SBNR) often exhibit attitudes closer to non-religious populations, prioritizing personal meaning, inner peace, and self-determination over institutional dogma. For this group, support for euthanasia often aligns with the spiritual quest for a meaningful and dignified death, viewing the termination of life as a final, conscientious act of agency. This distinction underscores the difference between institutional religious belief, which focuses on adherence to external rules, and individualized spirituality, which emphasizes internal experience and personal meaning-making in the face of death.

The psychological impact of religious belief lies in the provision of a comprehensive worldview that manages the fear of death. Religious frameworks offer narratives of an afterlife, purpose in suffering, and a fixed moral code, which serve as protective buffers against the anxieties of mortality. When this fixed framework is challenged by the concept of self-chosen death, the resulting psychological threat often leads to a defensive rejection of euthanasia. Consequently, the public debate must acknowledge that for many individuals, opposition is not merely a political stance but an integral component of their psychological and existential security.

## Legal and Policy Influences on Public Opinion

The legal landscape significantly shapes public attitudes, primarily through the visibility and normalization afforded by policy debates and landmark cases. High-profile legal battles, such as those involving Dr. Jack Kevorkian in the United States or the ongoing legislative efforts in various Australian states, bring the abstract ethical dilemma into sharp public focus. These cases serve as powerful cognitive anchors, polarizing public opinion by either emphasizing the compassionate intent of the practitioner or highlighting the potential for abuse and the violation of professional ethics. Media portrayal of these events often dictates whether the public views the act as an expression of mercy or a dangerous criminal undertaking.

Policy distinctions between **Physician-Assisted Suicide (PAS)** and **Euthanasia** are critical in determining public support. PAS typically involves a physician prescribing lethal medication that the patient self-administers, placing the final act of agency entirely with the patient. Euthanasia, conversely, involves the physician or another party administering the lethal agent directly. Public opinion polls consistently show greater support for PAS than for active euthanasia, largely because PAS maintains a clear line of patient autonomy and reduces the cognitive burden on the physician, who is seen as aiding, rather than causing, the death. Legal frameworks, such as the Oregon Death with Dignity Act, utilize PAS, and the careful implementation of such policies often leads to a gradual increase in acceptance as the public observes that the predicted "slippery slope" outcomes are mitigated by stringent regulatory oversight.

The introduction of legislation often serves to legitimize the conversation, shifting the focus from whether death should be hastened to under what conditions it should be allowed. In jurisdictions that have legalized forms of assisted dying, studies have documented a tendency toward normalizing the practice among the general population and reducing the associated stigma. The formalization of safeguards--such as requirements for multiple physician confirmations, psychological evaluations for competence, and waiting periods--reassures the public that the process is carefully controlled and reserved for the truly terminally ill and mentally sound. Consequently, legal precedent acts not just as a boundary but as an educational tool that gradually modulates societal comfort levels with end-of-life choices.

## Clinical and Professional Perspectives

Attitudes toward euthanasia within the clinical community--physicians, nurses, and palliative care specialists--are often more conflicted and complex than those found in the general public, due to the direct confrontation with professional duties and ethical codes. Physicians, in particular, are bound by the Hippocratic Oath, which historically emphasizes the preservation of life and the avoidance of harm. This professional imperative creates significant moral distress when confronted with a patient's autonomous request for death, forcing a conflict between the duty to relieve suffering (beneficence) and the duty not to kill (non-maleficence).

Surveys of medical professionals often reveal that while a significant minority may personally support the concept of voluntary euthanasia, a smaller proportion are willing to participate actively, reflecting the deep psychological barrier against taking a direct life-ending action. Palliative care specialists, whose professional focus is on maximizing comfort and quality of life until natural death, frequently show the strongest opposition to active euthanasia, arguing that effective palliative care, including sophisticated pain management and psychological support, renders the request for hastened death unnecessary. They emphasize that such requests often stem from fears of pain, loss of control, or becoming a burden, which can often be addressed through compassionate, comprehensive care.

The potential for **moral injury** and burnout among healthcare providers involved in end-of-life decisions is a critical psychological concern. Even in jurisdictions where euthanasia is legal, the emotional toll on the administering physician can be profound, requiring robust psychological support and counseling. The decision to participate requires overcoming deeply ingrained professional and personal inhibitions, and the act itself can lead to long-term emotional consequences, regardless of the ethical justification. This highlights that the debate is not just about the patient's right to die, but also about the provider's psychological capacity to facilitate that death.

Improving communication and training is paramount in shaping clinical attitudes. Education focusing on effective communication skills, particularly how to address patient fears and clarify misunderstandings about prognosis and pain control, can significantly reduce the frequency of requests for euthanasia. Furthermore, professional guidelines emphasize the necessity of ensuring that the patient's request is truly voluntary, informed, and stable over time, ruling out reversible factors such as treatable depression or inadequate pain management. Ultimately, the clinical perspective underscores that attitudes toward euthanasia are inextricably linked to the perceived success or failure of the healthcare system in providing compassionate, comprehensive care throughout the entirety of the dying process.