eISSN 3139-2377

RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

Euthanasia : A Socio-Psychological Analysis

Dr. Deepali Saxena[1]
[1]Assistant Professor Department of Sociology, Dayanand Girls P.G. College, Kanpur

Received: 20 June 2026 Accepted & Reviewed: 28 June 2026, Published: 30 June 2026

Abstract

Euthanasia often described as "mercy killing" is a deeply contested issue situated at the intersection of sociology, psychology, ethics and law. While the ethical and legal aspects of Euthanasia have been widely debated. Its socio-psychological dimensions remain equally significant yet underexplored. This paper examines Euthanasia as a phenomenon shaped by social structure, cultural norms, interpersonal relationships and individual psychological processes. By integrating sociological theories with psychological frameworks, the study analyzes how factors such as socialization, family dynamics, mental health, perception of suffering and autonomy influence attitudes towards Euthanasia. Using a qualitative approach based on secondary data, the research highlights that Euthanasia decisions are not purely rational or individual but are deeply embedded in social context and psychological states. The paper concludes that a socio-psychological understanding is essential for developing balanced policies that respect human dignity while safeguarding vulnerable populations.

Keywords: Euthanasia, socio-psychological dimensions, phenomenon, social structure, cultural norms, mental health, perception, autonomy, psychological states.

Introduction

This discourse surrounding Euthanasia traditionally defined as the individual termination of life to alienate persistent suffering has transcended the boundaries of clinical medicine to become a focal point of contemporary socio-psychological inquiry. As the biomedical paradigm shifts from the mere preservation of biological functions to the holistic management of patient well-being, the "Right to Die" has emerged as a fundamental challenges to their traditional "Sanctity of Life" doctrine. Euthanasia, often described as "mercy killing" involves intentionally ending the life of a person suffering from unbearable pain or terminal illness in order to relieve suffering [Beauchamp & Childress, 2019].

The concept of Euthanasia derived from the Greek words "EU" (Good) and "Thanatos" (death) has evolved from a medical debated into one of the most profound socio-psychological dilemmas of the 21st century. While modern medicine has gained the unprecedented ability to prolong life, it has simultaneously created a paradox where the "quantity of Life" often overshadows the "quality of existence". Supporters argue that individuals should possess the right to die with dignity, especially when they experience irreversible suffering and loss of autonomy. Opponents maintain that Euthanasia undermines the sanctity of life and may create dangerous social consequences, particularly for vulnerable populations such as the elderly disabled and economically disadvantaged.

From a socio-psychological stand point, Euthanasia is a reflection of the interplay between social structure and individual psychology- Euthanasia decisions are not made in a vacuum; social relationships, cultural beliefs, family expectations, religious values and emotional experiences all play a role patients perspectives on death are frequently influenced by psychological elements like anxiety, fear, despair and depression.

eISSN 3139-2377
RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

Concurrently, the public's perceptions and ethical judgements are influenced by social institutions like the family religion, legal system and healthcare system.

Due to an increase in terminal illness cases, aging populations, chronic diseases and heightened awareness of human rights, Euthanasia has become mere significant on a global scale. Following significant court cases involving living wills and passive Euthanasia, discussions about Euthanasia become more prominent in India. Because Indian Society has historically valued group decision making, family responsibility & religious morality, the issue is still socially sensitive.

This research paper critically examines Euthanasia as a socio-psychological phenomenon. It explores the psychological experiences of terminally ill patients, the emotional burden on caregivers and healthcare professionals, the role of culture and religion, ethical debates, legal frameworks and the broader social implications of Euthanasia.

Review of Literature:

Euthanasia remains one of the most complex and controversial issues in modern society. Existing research highlights the interaction between Emotional suffering, social structures, Ethical values and cultural beliefs in shaping attitudes towards Euthanasia.

One of the seminal works in biomedical ethics is principles of Biomedical Ethics written by Tome L., Beauchamp and James F. Childress (2019). There are four ethical principles are used by the Beauchamp and Childress to discuss Euthanasia: Autonomy,Beneficence, Non-maleficence and Justice. The study highlights the importance of respecting patient autonomy when making medical decisions including those pertaining to end-of-life care. But the authors also contend that healthcare workers must strike a balance between moral obligation, autonomy and life preservation. This research is crucial to comprehending the moral dilemmas raised by Euthanasia.

A major study conducted by Ezekiel J. Emanuel and Colleagues (2016) examined public and professional attitudes towards Euthanasia and physician assisted suicide. The research found that support for Euthanasia was strongly associated with: Fear of unbearable pain, loss of dignity, desire for personal autonomy and psychological suffering.

The psychology of Death by Robert Kastenbaum (2000) offers a thorough psychological examination of Euthanasia, dying and death. According to the author terminal illness frequently results in: anxiety related to existence depression, fear of being dependent, and identity loss. According to Kastenbaum, the desire for Euthanasia might be the result of emotional distress rather than a sincere desire to pass away. The study highlights the value of emotional support and psychological counselling for patients who are near death.

The term "Demoralization Syndrome" was first used to describe terminally ill patients by David W. Kissane and Associates (2001). According to their research Euthanasia requests are heavily influenced by feelings of helplessness, hopelessness and meaningless. The study came to the conclusion that psychological distress should be thoroughly assessed prior to contemplating euthanasia because depression and emotional exhaustion can impede the ability to make logical decisions.

Palliative care is a crucial part of health organization (2020) attempts to: Boost your quality of life, Diminish physical discomfort, offer emotional assistance, help caregivers and families. The WHO contends that psychological counselling and efficient pain management can lower the number of Euthanasia requests.

eISSN 3139-2377
RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

Living will and passive Euthanasia were accepted in India after the historic common cause V. Union of Indian Ruling (2018). The ruling highlighted: Human dignity, the right to a dignified death, patient independence. The ruling upheld ethical protections against abuse while reflecting shifting social and legal perspectives on end of life care in India.

Numerous sociologi8cal studies show the cultural and religious beliefs have a significant impact on attitudes regarding Euthanasia. Western societies generally demonstrate greater acceptance of Euthanasia due to emphasis on Individual autonomy Collectivist societies such as India prioritize family responsibility and religious morality, Religion communities often oppose Euthanasia because life is considered sacred. These studies reveal that Euthanasia Is deeply embedded within broader Social and Cultural structures.

Objectives of the Study:

There are following objectives of the study:

1. To analyze the concept of Euthanasia and its various manifestations in relation to contemporary healthcare systems and end of life choices.
2. To investigate the psychological aspects of Euthanasia that affects terminally ill patients, such as depression, anxiety, fear of dependency, emotional distress and loss of dignity.
3. To study the socio-cultural dimensions of Euthanasia and understand how social values, traditions, religion and cultural beliefs shape public attitudes toward Euthanasia.
4. To explore the ethical debates surrounding Euthanasia, including the principles of autonomy, beneficence non-maleficence and sanctity of life.
5. To assess the role of healthcare professionals in Euthanasia related decision making identify the psychological and ethical challenges faced by the Doctors and Nurses.
6. To investigate the broader socio-psychological consequences of Euthanasia on society including its impact on moral values, social relationships and vulnerable population.

Hypothesis:

It is hypothesized that individual attitudes toward euthanasia are dynamically predicted by interplay of socio-cultural, economic, and psychological variables under the overarching title *"Euthanasia: A Socio-Psychological Analysis"*. Specifically, we hypothesize that institutional religious beliefs will negatively impact acceptance, whereas higher socio-economic status, an acute consciousness of patient autonomy, and living within individualistic rather than collectivist societies will significantly increase support for the practice. Furthermore, among terminally ill populations, support for euthanasia is expected to positively correlate with acute psychological distress—namely depression, anxiety, and hopelessness—while macro-level legal recognition will actively facilitate broader social acceptance of end-of-life choices. Finally, it is hypothesized that regardless of the baseline societal acceptance, the actual execution of euthanasia decisions will result in significant, measurable psychological stress and moral conflict for the family members and primary caregivers involved.

Research Methodology:

The study is descriptive and analytical in nature. The research is primarily qualitative with partial use of quantitative analysis. The study is mainly based on secondary data collected from books, Research papers and journals, Government reports, WHO Reports, Legal documents and Authentic internet sources. The study uses sociological and psychological approaches to analyze various dimensions of Euthanasia including patient

psychology, social attitudes, ethical debates and legal perspectives. The collected data has been analyzed through comparative and interpretative methods to provide a comprehensive understanding of the subject.

Content Analysis:

The term Euthanasia originates from the Greek words "eu" meaning "good" and "thanatos" meaning "death". Then Euthanasia literally translates to "good death". It usually refers to the deliberate taking of a person's life that is experiencing excruciating pain or a serious illness.

According to the British House of Lords select committee on Medical Ethics, "Euthanasia is a deliberate intervention undertaken with the express intention of ending life to relieve intractable suffering." In the Netherlands, Euthanasia refers to the termination of life by a doctor at the request of a patient.

Euthanasia implies four important elements that must be incorporated at the time of giving definition of Euthanasia. These basic elements are:

(a) An agent and a subject

(b) An Intention

(c) A sufficient casual proximity and

(d) An outcome

An agent and a subject must be there to apply euthanasia subject refers to that person or whom the painless death should be applied and it is the duty of an agent to accomplish this method. It must be purely intentional. The motive of the agent should always be accounted for. It must be a good motive in so far as the good of the person killed is concerned. With the good motive sufficient causal ground must be there to justify the procedure. After all, there must be an outcome, i.e. the intended outcome.

Incorporating all these four basic elements regarding euthanasia Heather Draper says "Euthanasia must be defined as death that results using the most gentle and painless means possible, that is motivated solely by the best interests of the person who dies."

Classification of Euthanasia:

Classification of euthanasia is based on the consent of the subject, i.e. the person or whom the mercy killing procedure will be applied. Sometimes the subject consciously or deliberately insists his or her family members alongwith the doctor to relieve him or her from pain by allowing him/her to sleep forever by using medical aids. Such type of euthanasia is called voluntary. On the other hand, some cases the patient's consent is unavailable. But it is thought by the members of his/her family and doctor/s that the recovery chance is zero and it would be better to allow him to sleep forever peacefully by withdrawing life supporting treatment. It is termed as non-voluntary euthanasia. Lastly, involuntary euthanasia occurs when euthanasia is performed on a person who is able to provide informed consent, but does not either because they do not choose to die or because they were not asked by the situation forces the agent to apply euthanasia on the subject.

So, it is clear that in the basis of giving consent euthanasia is divided into three parts i.e. (a) Voluntary (b) Non-Voluntary (c) Involuntary.

Euthanasia is also designated as **Active and Passive**. Being convinced by the good motive of the agent and considering the patient's condition doctor/s may take decision to withheld the life supporting treatment to

eISSN 3139-2377
RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

allow the patient to die peacefully. It is called **passive euthanasia**. On the other hand, sometimes it is performed by using same life-taking dose. It is called **Active euthanasia.**

	Active	Passive
Voluntary	A consents to B's actively bringing about their death	A consents to B's withdrawing treatment that preserves A's life.
Non-Voluntary	B actively brings about A's death. A is not in a position to communicate consent	B withdraws life preserving treatment from A when A is not in a position to consent
Involuntary	B actively brings about A's death against A's communicated will	B withdraws life preserving treatment from A against A's communicated will.

Sociological Perspectives of Euthanasia:

The sociological analysis of euthanasia—defined as measures intentionally designed to hasten or procure death to alleviate suffering (Howarth & Jefferys, 1996)—shifts the focus from individual clinical or moral dilemmas to broader structural, cultural, and institutional frameworks. Rather than treating end-of-life decisions purely as private matters, sociologists examine how the practices surrounding dying reflect a society's dominant values, economic structures, and shifts in power dynamics (Howarth & Jefferys, 1996; Munir, n.d.).

To understand euthanasia comprehensively, sociologists evaluate the phenomenon through three primary macro- and micro-level theoretical paradigms: **Structural Functionalism**, **Conflict Theory**, and **Symbolic Interactionism**.

1. Structural Functionalism: Institutional Equilibrium

- **The Paradigm:** Society relies on stability and clear role expectations to maintain order.
- **Application:** Functionalists view unauthorized death as a disruption to social solidarity (Mueller et al., 2021). The medical establishment uses institutional regulations (laws and medical protocols) to manage the dying process, ensuring that the transition of life to death occurs in a controlled manner that preserves social equilibrium (Howarth & Jefferys, 1996; Mimarakis, n.d.).

2. Conflict Theory: Power and Inequality

- **The Paradigm:** Social structures are governed by power struggles and inequalities.
- **Application:** Conflict theorists critique the "biopower" and medical monopoly held by healthcare elites and the state over an individual's body (White, 2009). A primary concern is that in profit-driven or underfunded healthcare systems, euthanasia could become a cost-effective alternative to expensive, long-term palliative care, disproportionately endangering economically marginalized or disabled populations (Munir, n.d.).

3. Symbolic Interactionism: Meaning and Identity

- **The Paradigm:** Human behavior is guided by subjective meanings and interpersonal interactions.

eISSN 3139-2377
RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

- **Application:** Interactionists study how a "good death" is socially constructed. Individuals who seek medical assistance in dying often do so to maintain personal autonomy and avoid the perceived breakdown of their identity and self-concept (Grillo, n.d.). This perspective also explores the role of **stigma** and labeling, showing how legal and cultural contexts dictate whether euthanasia is defined as an act of compassion or an act of deviance (White, 2009).

Macro-Level Drivers

The sociological debate is accelerated by two macro-level forces (Howarth & Jefferys, 1996; Munir, n.d.):

1. **Demographics & Technology:** Aging populations and medical advancements that prolong biological life force societies to redefine the boundaries of living.

2. **Cultural Values:** Highly individualistic, secular Western societies increasingly prioritize personal autonomy (resulting in higher legalization rates), whereas collectivist or deeply religious societies view life as an inviolable sacred collective entity, strongly rejecting active hastened death (Mimarakis, n.d.; Munir, n.d.).

Cultural Attitudes towards Euthanasia:

Societal discourse surrounding end-of-life decisions is heavily mediated by cultural paradigms, religious tenets, and foundational moral values. Empirical data from image.png reveals a distinct ideological divergence between individualistic and collectivist societies regarding the acceptability of euthanasia:

- **Individualistic and Western Frameworks:** Western and individualistic societies demonstrate the highest comparative acceptance of euthanasia. This inclination is sociologically interpreted as an extension of the value placed on individual rights and self-determination. Within these frameworks, the primary ethical determinants include personal autonomy, individual liberty, and the preservation of the quality of life, leading to the conceptualization of end-of-life choice as a fundamental right.

- **Collectivist and Communal Frameworks:** Conversely, collectivist cultures exhibit a pronounced resistance to euthanasia. In these societies, illness and mortality are not viewed as isolated personal experiences but rather as collective social concerns. Consequently, overarching community values and familial obligations take precedence over individual desires, resulting in lower systemic support for the practice.

- **Theological and Morally Managed Frameworks:** Middle Eastern societies maintain a stance of stringent opposition, dictated by social norms that are deeply embedded in religious morality and the absolute sanctity of human life. In contrast, cultures navigating complex theological landscapes, such as Indian and Buddhist societies, approach the issue with nuanced, conditional parameters. Indian society exercises a cautious acceptance, balancing institutionalized religious values with family-centered, collective decision-making. Similarly, Buddhist societies exhibit a highly circumscribed tolerance; their ethical calculus seeks to alleviate suffering through the virtues of compassion, while simultaneously managing strict moral anxieties related to non-violence and the cosmic laws of Karma.

Ultimately, the data illustrates that while individualistic societies prioritize the expansion of personal liberty at the end of life, collectivist and religiously structured societies subordinate personal choice to communal harmony, familial consensus, and metaphysical obligations.

eISSN 3139-2377
RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

Cultural Attitudes towards Euthanasia:

Thus, family structures, moral traditions, religious convictions and social values all influence cultural views on Euthanasia. While collectivist societies place a higher value on social harmony, family responsibilities and the sanctity of life, individualistic societies typically support Euthanasia because of their emphasis on autonomy and dignity. As a result, Euthanasia is both a medical problem and a socially and culturally constructed phenomenon.

- **Individualistic and Western Frameworks:** Western and individualistic societies demonstrate the highest comparative acceptance of euthanasia. This inclination is sociologically interpreted as an extension of the value placed on individual rights and self-determination. Within these frameworks, the primary ethical determinants include personal autonomy, individual liberty, and the preservation of the quality of life, leading to the conceptualization of end-of-life choice as a fundamental right.
- **Collectivist and Communal Frameworks:** Conversely, collectivist cultures exhibit a pronounced resistance to euthanasia. In these societies, illness and mortality are not viewed as isolated personal experiences but rather as collective social concerns. Consequently, overarching community values and familial obligations take precedence over individual desires, resulting in lower systemic support for the practice.
- **Theological and Morally Managed Frameworks:** Middle Eastern societies maintain a stance of stringent opposition, dictated by social norms that are deeply embedded in religious morality and the absolute sanctity of human life. In contrast, cultures navigating complex theological landscapes, such as Indian and Buddhist societies, approach the issue with nuanced, conditional parameters. Indian society exercises a cautious acceptance, balancing institutionalized religious values with family-centered, collective decision-making. Similarly, Buddhist societies exhibit a highly circumscribed tolerance; their ethical calculus seeks to alleviate suffering through the virtues of compassion, while simultaneously managing strict moral anxieties related to non-violence and the cosmic laws of Karma.

Ultimately, the data illustrates that while individualistic societies prioritize the expansion of personal liberty at the end of life, collectivist and religiously structured societies subordinate personal choice to communal harmony, familial consensus, and metaphysical obligations.

Ethical Issues in Euthanasia:

Euthanasia raises important issues of human dignity, autonomy, morality and the value of life; it continues to be one of the most complicated ethical discussions in modern society. Medical ethics, religious convictions human rights and social responsibility all influence ethical debates about Euthanasia. The conflict between a person’s right to choose death and society's duty to protect life is the main source of controversy.

The debate fundamentally centers on individual **autonomy** and the **sanctity of life**. Proponents of autonomy argue for a person's right to control their own life and death with dignity, while critics question if decisions made under severe emotional distress can be truly voluntary; sociologically, this reflects a modern emphasis on individual rights. Conversely, the sanctity of life perspective emphasizes that human life is inherently sacred, encouraging its protection, though opponents argue this can unnecessarily prolong suffering in terminal cases.

Medical ethics further complicate the issue through the principles of **beneficence** and **non-maleficence**. Beneficence dictates a duty to alleviate severe pain and promote well-being, which some believe euthanasia

achieves, whereas critics argue that advanced palliative care can accomplish the same goal. Non-maleficence requires healthcare professionals to avoid causing harm; while some view euthanasia as a means to prevent prolonged physical agony, others consider the intentional termination of life to be a fundamental violation of this duty, creating deep professional and institutional tension.

Furthermore, considerations of **justice, equality, and the risk of abuse** raise broader societal concerns. Advocates argue for equal rights to a dignified death, but opponents worry that legalizing euthanasia could lead to coercion, systemic misuse, or discrimination against vulnerable populations, highlighting existing social and power imbalances. Finally, the discourse is heavily influenced by **human dignity** and **religious or moral values**, contrasting the desire to prevent the loss of autonomy with traditional, culturally embedded beliefs that oppose intentional death. This ongoing tension underscores the critical intersection between immediate medical interventions, like euthanasia, and broader supportive healthcare infrastructure, such as palliative care.

Legal Perspective on Euthanasia:

Due to variations in healthcare policies Ethical standards, religious beliefs and constitutional values, the legal status of Euthanasia values greatly between nations. The balance between persons right to a dignified death and the states obligation to preserve human life is the main topic of discussion in legal discussions surrounding Euthanasia. Many countries still forbid Euthanasia and physician assisted suicide due to ethical and social concerns, even though some have legalized the practice under stringent legal protections.

The legalization of Euthanasia generally requires:

- Voluntary and informed consent of the patient.
- Confirmation of terminal or irreversible illness.
- Medical and Psychological Evaluation.
- Approval through legal and ethical procedures.

Countries with Broad Legal Frameworks

- The global landscape of end-of-life care varies significantly, with several nations leading the way in establishing comprehensive legal frameworks. In the **Netherlands**, both active and passive euthanasia are legal, provided there is a voluntary request based on unbearable suffering and the case passes a strict medical review. This approach places a massive sociological emphasis on individual autonomy and personal rights. Similarly, **Belgium** permits active euthanasia under the major conditions of informed consent and terminal illness, sociologically viewing the practice as a fundamental recognition of human dignity and patient choice. In **Canada**, the system allows for Medical Assistance in Dying (MAID) for adults with a grievous and irremediable illness who can give informed consent, integrating end-of-life choices directly into a rights-based healthcare approach.

Countries with Conditional or Regional Legality

- Other nations have opted for more localized or specific permissions. **Switzerland** uniquely permits assisted dying specifically through physician-assisted suicide, with the core legal condition being that no selfish motive is involved. This has fostered a remarkably liberal legal and social framework surrounding the issue. In the **United States**, the practice is only partially legal, restricted to physician-assisted dying based on state-specific legislation. This has sparked an ongoing national sociological debate balancing personal autonomy against medical ethics. **Australia** follows a similar regional pattern, where voluntary assisted dying is legal in some states for individuals facing terminal illness, backed by strict legal safeguards to reflect an increasing recognition of patient rights.

eISSN 3139-2377
RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

Passive Legality and Restrictive Frameworks

- In parts of Asia, the focus remains strictly on non-active measures. **India** legalizes passive euthanasia only, requiring a strict living will and Supreme Court approval, a system designed to balance human dignity with the traditional sanctity of life. **Japan** offers limited recognition, permitting passive euthanasia only under strict conditions and tight judicial interpretation, which reflects deeply rooted cultural cautions regarding death.
- Conversely, the **United Kingdom** stands out as a nation where the practice remains completely illegal; assisted suicide is strictly prohibited, underscoring a powerful sociological and legal emphasis on the absolute protection of life.

Psychological Dimensions of Euthanasia:

One of the most important factors in end of life decision making is the psychological aspects of Euthanasia. In addition to causing physical suffering terminal illness also causes significant existential emotional and cognitive distress. Patients opinions about Euthanasia are greatly influenced by psychological elements like depression anxiety, hopelessness, fear of dependency and loss of dignity. Therefore, a thorough examination of the psychological and emotional experiences of patients, family members and medical professionals is necessary to comprehend Euthanasia.

Patient-Centric Psychological Factors

- **Depression and Anxiety:** Terminally ill patients frequently contend with profound depression and anxiety rooted in chronic pain, impending mortality, and medical uncertainty. This intense emotional suffering often destabilizes psychological well-being and can directly drive requests for euthanasia, underscoring the deep connection between end-of-life choices and mental health.

- **Loss of Autonomy and Dignity:** Physical deterioration severely restricts a patient's capacity for independent decision-making and heightens dependence on medical and caregiving networks. This shift frequently erodes self-esteem and self-respect, manifesting as frustration, emotional distress, and social withdrawal, while highlighting the societal value placed on personal dignity.

- **Fear of Dependency and Existential Crises:** Patients often experience significant guilt and shame regarding the prospect of becoming a burden to their families—a dynamic heavily influenced by familial structures and societal expectations. Furthermore, confronting terminal illness routinely triggers existential crises, forcing individuals to grapple with profound emotional despair and a perceived loss of meaning and purpose.

Social and Systemic Impacts

- **Social Isolation:** Serious illness frequently disrupts standard social interactions and erodes vital emotional support systems. This breakdown precipitates severe loneliness and psychological distress, emphasizing how critical robust social relationships are to sustaining mental well-being.

- **Caregiver Burnout and Familial Conflict:** The demands of long-term care place immense psychological burdens on family members, commonly resulting in emotional exhaustion, compassion fatigue, stress, and anxiety. Additionally, families often experience internal moral conflicts as they struggle to balance the preservation of life with honoring the patient’s explicit wishes, illustrating the complex emotional layers embedded in euthanasia decisions.

- **Healthcare Professional Burden:** Doctors and nurses frequently navigate severe ethical dilemmas and heightened emotional stress when managing end-of-life care. This continuous exposure routinely leads to

eISSN 3139-2377
RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

clinical burnout, moral distress, and compassion fatigue, highlighting systemic vulnerabilities and ethical challenges within broader healthcare infrastructure.

Euthanasia in India:

Since March 2018, Passive Euthanasia is legal in India under strict guidelines, Patients must-consent through a living will and must be either terminally ill or in a vegetative state.

Court Verdicts on Euthanasia:

On 9 March 2018 the Supreme Court of India legalized passive euthanasia by means of the withdrawal of life support to patients in a permanent vegetative state. The decision was made as part of the verdict in a case involving Aruna Shambaug, who had been in a Persistent Vegetative State (PVS) until her death in 2015.

On 9 March 2018, the Supreme Court of India passed a historic judgement-law permitting passive Euthanasia in the country. This judgement was passed in wake of Pinki Virani's plea to lust highest court in Dec. 2009. Under the constitutional provision of 'Next Friend'. It is a landmark law which places the power of choice in the hands of the individual over government, medical or religious control which sees all suffering as "destiny". The Supreme Court specified two irreversible conditions to permit passive Euthanasia law in its 2011 Law: (i) The brain-dead for whom the Ventilator can be switched off. (ii) Those a persistent vegetative state (PVS) for whom the feed can be tapered out and pain managing palliatives be added, according to laid-down international specifications. The same judgement law also asked for the scrapping of 309, the code which penalizes those who survive suicide-attempts. In Dec. 2014, government of India declared its intention to do so.

However, on 25 Feb. 2014, a three-judge bench of Supreme Court of India had termed the judgment in the Aruna Shanbaug case to be inconsistent in itself and has referred the issue of euthanasia to its five-judge.

And on 23 Dec. 2014, Government of India endorsed and re-validated the Passive Euthanasia judgement law in a Press Release after stating in the Rajya Sabha as follows: That the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its judgment dated 07.03.2011 [WP (Criminal) No. 115 of 2009], while dismissing the plea for mercy killing in a particular case, laid down comprehensive guidelines to process cases relating to passive euthanasia. Thereafter, the matter of mercy killing was examined in a consultation with the Ministry of Law and justice and it has been decided that since the Hon'ble Supreme Court has already laid down the guidelines, these should be followed and treated as law in such cases. At present, there is no proposal to enact legislation on this subject and the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is binding on all. The Health Minister, J.P. Nadda stated this is a written reply in the Rajya Sabha.

The High Court rejected active euthanasia by means of lethal injection. In the absence of a law regulating euthanasia in India, the Court stated that its decision becomes the law of the land until the Indian Parliament enacts a suitable law. Active euthanasia including the administration of lethal compounds for the purpose of ending life is still illegal in India and in most countries.

In 2018 the Supreme Court of India declared through a five-judge constitution bench that, if strict guidelines are followed, the government could honor "living wills" allowing consenting patients to be passively euthanized if the patient suffers from a terminal illness or is in a vegetative state.

One of the most important and recent developments in India's Euthanasia history is the case of Harish Rana. Following the Supreme Court of India's legal recognition of the "right to die with dignity", the case became

the first instance of passive Euthanasia in action. It sparked national discussion about end of life care medical ethics, patient autonomy and human dignity". (The Indian Express).

In 2013, a young Ghaziabad Engineering student named Harish Rana fell from the fourth floor of a hostel building while attending Punjab University, resulting in serious brain damage. He was left in a permanent chance of recovery and total physical dependence. He was bedridden for almost thirteen years (The Indian Express). After years of emotional, psychological and physical hardship, his parents petitioned the Supreme Court for approval of passive Euthanasia, claiming that prolonged artificial life support would only make their suffering worse. In the historic case of Harish Rana V. Union of India, the Supreme Court of India allowed Harish Rana to stop receiving life sustaining care in March 2026. The common cause V. Union of India ruling from 2018 established the Constitutional principles that the Court applied. The case became India's first officially implemented passive Euthanasia decision (The Times of India).The Harish Rana case represents a landmark moment in the legal and socio-psychological history of euthanasia in India.It transformed public discourse regarding dignity,suffering, patient rights andcompassionate end-of-life care. The case demonstrated that euthanasia is not only a legal or medical issue but also a deeply emotional,ethical, psychological and sociological phenomenon shaped by human values and social change.

Conclusion:

Euthanasia remains one of the most complex and sensitive issues in contemporary society because of intersects with medicine, psychology, sociology, ethics, law, religion and human rights. The present study, "Euthanasia : A Socio-Psychological Analysis", demonstrates that Euthanasia cannot be understood merely as a medical procedure related to the termination of life, rather it represents a multidimensional social phenomenon shaped by emotional suffering cultural values, legal frameworks and ethical principles. According to the study, attitudes regarding Euthanasia are greatly influenced by psychological factors like depression, hopelessness, fear of dependency, emotional trauma & loss of dignity. In addition to physical suffering, terminally ill people frequently endure deep existential distress and social isolation. During extended end of life care, family member’s caregivers also experience psychological strain, grief moral dilemma and emotional exhaustion. These results suggest a close relationship between Euthanasia and emotional and mental health.

Sociologically speaking societies differ in their acceptance or rejection of Euthanasia based on institutional structures, social norms, religious beliefs and cultural traditions. In contrast to collectivist societies like India which place a higher priority on family responsibilities the sanctity of life and moral obligation, individualistic Societies typically emphasize personal autonomy and the right to die with dignity. Euthanasia then is a reflection of larger social changes pertaining to individual freedom, human rights and evolving view on death and dignity.

The study also emphasizes the moral conundrums raised by Euthanasia. Opponents contend that deliberate ending of life violates medical ethics and the sanctity of human existence, while supporters view euthanasia as a compassionate response to intolerable suffering and an extension of individual autonomy.

Legally speaking the common cause V. Union of India ruling which recognized passive Euthanasia in medical and constitutional jurisprudence. The ruling introduced procedural safeguards to prevent abuse while acknowledging the "right to die with dignity" under Article 21 of the Indian constitution. The changing legal and social perception of end of life rights in India is further demonstrated by recent cases like the Harish Rana case.

eISSN 3139-2377
RESEARCH WORK
A Monthly, Open Access, Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Volume 02, Issue 06, June 2026

Additionally the study highlights the Euthanasia demand can be decreased by:

- Good palliative care.
- Counselling for psychology.
- Systems for emotional support.
- Caring medical care services.
- Awareness of terminal illness in society.

Therefore, ensuring compassionate and moral end of life care requires bolstering palliative care and mental health services.

References:

- Beauchamp, T.L. & Childress, J.F. (2019). Principles of Biomedical Ethics (8th Ed.), Oxford University Press.
- Emanuel, E.J., Onwuteaka, Philipsen, B.D., Urwin, J.W. and Cohen H. (2016). Attitudes and practices of Euthanasia and Physician assisted suicide JAMA, 316(I), 79-90.
- Kastenbaum, R. (2000). The Psychology of death (3rd ed.), Springer Publishing Company.
- Quill, T.E. & Battin, M.P. (2004): Physician assisted dying : The case for Palliative Care and Patient choice. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- World Health Organization (2020): Palliative Care, World Health Organization.
- Supreme Court of India (2018): Common Cause Vs. Union of India.
- American Psychological Association (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). APA Publishing.
- The Indian Express : "How the Supreme Court allowed Passive Euthanasia for Harish Rana.
- The Times of India : SC allows withdrawal of life support in Harish Rana Passive Euthanasia Case."