

RESOLUTION 12.2022-36 (A-23)
NEUTRAL STANCE ON MEDICAL AID IN DYING

ISMS Board Action Taken on 01/28/2023

Approved to Reaffirm Existing Policy and Not Adopt Resolution 12.2022-36 (A-23).

Medical Legal Council Recommendation to ISMS Board on 01/28/2023

The Council was provided with a copy of the resolution, including relevant ISMS policy, the results of a member survey, an AMA Code of Medical Ethics opinion, and AMA policy. Two of the authors attended the meeting and engaged in a thoughtful discussion with the Council. This difficult issue has been considered numerous times – and three times in the past four years – by the Council:

- Resolution 12.2020-27 (A-21), Neutral Stance on Medical Aid in Dying.
Recommended not adopt:

RESOLVED, that the Illinois State Medical Society, in order to better reflect the 51 diverse opinions of its membership, adopt a position of engaged neutrality regarding legislative efforts to authorize medical aid in dying provided that physicians shall not be required to perform medical aid in dying if it violates personally held ethical principles.

- Resolution 01.2020-43 (A-20), Neutral Stance on Medical Aid in Dying.
Recommended not adopt:

RESOLVED, that the ISMS adopt a position of engaged neutrality regarding legislative efforts to authorize medical aid in dying provided that physicians shall not be required to perform medical aid in dying if it violates personally held ethical principles in order to represent the opinions of its membership; and be it further

RESOLVED, that should medical aid in dying become legal in Illinois, the ISMS will educate its members about the law and advocate for physicians who choose to participate as well as those who opt out; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ISMS reject use of the terms “physician-assisted suicide” or “assisted suicide” in official communications when referring to the practice of medical aid in dying.

- 41 • Resolution 09.2019-12 (A-20), Reaffirmation of the Most Recent Position
42 Regarding Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide. *Recommended adoption:*

43
44 RESOLVED, that the Illinois State Medical Society (ISMS) reaffirm its
45 position which “opposes and declares as unethical physician participation in
46 active euthanasia or physician-aided suicide”; and be it further

47
48 RESOLVED, that the ISMS reaffirm its lengthier position statement on
49 euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide which was affirmed first in 1998.

50
51 AMA policy states the following:

52
53 Physician Assisted Suicide H-140.952

54
55 “It is the policy of the AMA that:

56
57 (1) Physician assisted suicide is fundamentally inconsistent with the physician's
58 professional role.

59 (2) It is critical that the medical profession redouble its efforts to ensure that
60 dying patients are provided optimal treatment for their pain and other discomfort. The
61 use of more aggressive comfort care measures, including greater reliance on hospice
62 care, can alleviate the physical and emotional suffering that dying patients experience.
63 Evaluation and treatment by a health professional with expertise in the psychiatric
64 aspects of terminal illness can often alleviate the suffering that leads a patient to desire
65 assisted suicide.

66 (3) Physicians must resist the natural tendency to withdraw physically and emotionally
67 from their terminally ill patients. When the treatment goals for a patient in the end stages
68 of a terminal illness shift from curative efforts to comfort care, the level of physician
69 involvement in the patient's care should in no way decrease.

70 (4) Requests for physician assisted suicide should be a signal to the physician that the
71 patient's needs are unmet and further evaluation to identify the elements contributing to
72 the patient's suffering is necessary. Multidisciplinary intervention, including specialty
73 consultation, pastoral care, family counseling and other modalities, should be sought as
74 clinically indicated.

75 (5) Further efforts to educate physicians about advanced pain management techniques,
76 both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, are necessary to overcome any
77 shortcomings in this area. Physicians should recognize that courts and regulatory bodies
78 readily distinguish between use of narcotic drugs to relieve pain in dying patients and
79 use in other situations.”

80 In addition, the AMA has a Code of Medical Ethics Opinion on the issue:

81

82 Code of Medical Ethics Opinion 5.7 Physician-Assisted Suicide

83

84 “Physician-assisted suicide occurs when a physician facilitates a patient’s death by
85 providing the necessary means and/or information to enable the patient to perform the
86 life-ending act (e.g., the physician provides sleeping pills and information about the
87 lethal dose, while aware that the patient may commit suicide).

88

89 It is understandable, though tragic, that some patients in extreme duress such as those
90 suffering from a terminal, painful, debilitating illness may come to decide that death is
91 preferable to life. However, permitting physicians to engage in assisted suicide would
92 ultimately cause more harm than good.

93

94 Physician-assisted suicide is fundamentally incompatible with the physician’s role as
95 healer, would be difficult or impossible to control, and would pose serious societal risks.

96

97 Instead of engaging in assisted suicide, physicians must aggressively respond to the
98 needs of patients at the end of life. Physicians:

99

- 100 (a) Should not abandon a patient once it is determined that cure is impossible.
101 (b) Must respect patient autonomy.
102 (c) Must provide good communication and emotional support.
103 (d) Must provide appropriate comfort care and adequate pain control.”

104

105 The preamble to the above opinion states in part “Thoughtful, morally admirable
106 individuals hold diverging, yet equally deeply held, and well-considered perspectives
107 about physician-assisted suicide. Nonetheless, at the core of public and professional
108 debate about physician-assisted suicide is the aspiration that every patient come to the
109 end of life as free as possible from suffering that does not serve the patients deepest self-
110 defining beliefs. Supporters and opponents share a fundamental commitment to values
111 of care, compassion, respect, and dignity; they diverge in drawing different moral
112 conclusions from those underlying values in equally good faith. Guidance in the AMA
113 Code of Medical Ethics encompasses the irreducible moral tension at stake for
114 physicians with respect to participating in assisted suicide. Opinion E-5.7 [Physician-
115 Assisted Suicide] powerfully expresses the perspective of those who oppose physician-
116 assisted suicide. Opinion 1.1.7 [Physician Exercise of Conscience] articulates the
117 thoughtful moral basis for those who support assisted suicide.”

118 Past discussions have noted the complexity and divisiveness of the issue, and also
119 remarked that there are cogent arguments to be made on both sides. The authors
120 expressed that the issue was last debated two years ago, and recent surveys have
121 indicated increasing support amongst physicians. One of the authors informed the
122 Council that one quarter of US patients live in a jurisdiction where medical aid in dying
123 is authorized. Council members noted that the majority of comments in the member
124 survey were supportive of existing policy, and a concern exists over the creation of a
125 slippery slope. The Council therefore recommends reaffirming existing policy in lieu of
126 adopting Resolution 12.2022-36 (A-23), which states that the ISMS “opposes and
127 declares as unethical physician participation in active euthanasia or physician-aided
128 suicide”.

129

130 The Medical Legal Council recommends that the ISMS Board of Trustees reaffirm
131 existing policy and not adopt Resolution 12.2022-36 (A-23).