

## From Switzerland

**Professor Frederic Stiefel** Psychiatry Service and Division of Palliative Care, University Hospital Lausanne, Switzerland

Professor Stiefel is a Professor in psychiatry working as a liaison psychiatrist in a general hospital and part time in palliative care. He is Chairman of the Swiss Association for Palliative Care.

The view of the EAPC Ethics Task Force summarized in 10 statements clearly is – as expected – a position against euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide. From my point of view, this position paper is weakened because

- Ethical arguments supporting the position are missing; this is a curious lack given the fact that the position paper has been elaborated by the Ethics Task Force of the EAPC.
- While some terms are explicitly defined in the introduction, ‘autonomy’ remains undefined, but is utilized as an underlying principle in the arguments (paragraph 4.8).
- The broader context – for example, the question as to whether opposition to euthanasia is hampering the value of pluralism in our societies – is not discussed in the paper.
- No single argument supporting euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide is articulated.
- The fact that there is a lack of evidence for certain assumptions (e.g., paragraphs 4.2 and 4.7) is not stated.
- ‘Strong’ statements are introduced by rather ‘weak’ sentences; e.g., . . . If euthanasia is legalized in any society, then the *potential* exists for . . . (paragraph 4.7).
- The problem of patients suffering from psychiatric disorders is not addressed.
- The family and significant others of patients are not mentioned in the text.

These weaknesses can be utilized by supporters of euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide to – once more – accuse palliative care specialists that their stance is based on ideology rather than logic and ethical arguments.