IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

The Use Of Reflective Equilibrium In Ethical Medical Decision-Making

Harshika Mehta

LL.M student at Gujarat National Law University

Abstract: The process of making medical decisions frequently entails intricate ethical predicaments that necessitate careful contemplation and moral resolution. The paper commences by providing a comprehensive elucidation of the idea of reflective equilibrium, along with its historical evolution as a prominent method employed in the realms of moral and political philosophy. The use of reflective equilibrium in medical decision-making is then shown through detailed case studies of ethical dilemmas that often come up in healthcare settings. The aforementioned case studies encompass a diverse array of circumstances, including but not limited to end-of-life care, organ transplantation, resource allocation in times of pandemics, assisted reproductive technologies, and the issue of informed consent within clinical trials. This paper investigates the process of comparing and evaluating intuitions in relation to known ethical principles, including autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice, in order to reach a state of reflective equilibrium. This paper critically evaluates the benefits and limits associated with the application of reflective equilibrium in the field of medical ethics. Furthermore, this research examines the importance of attaining reflective equilibrium in the context of medical decision-making, highlighting its capacity to provide healthcare professionals and policymakers with a clear and coherent framework for addressing ethical challenges. In summary, the utilization of reflective equilibrium in the context of medical decision-making offers a potentially fruitful approach for addressing intricate ethical quandaries.

Index Terms **-** moral intuitions, reflective equilibrium, medical decision-making, ethical principles**.**

Concept of Reflective Equilibrium

The method of reflective equilibrium, developed by Nelson Goodman and John Rawls, is important in moral and political philosophy. The process rationalizes and improves moral and political beliefs by adapting our consciously analyzed moral intuitions, overarching moral principles, and specific moral judgements. This research examines reflective equilibrium's history, use in moral and political philosophy, strengths and weaknesses, and impact on current philosophical discussions. Nelson Goodman's "Fact, Fiction, and Forecast"[1] introduced reflective equilibrium. in 1954. Goodman used reflective equilibrium in epistemology and philosophy of science to address induction. The lack of a solid foundation for induction, which derives general principles or theories from specific data, has raised concerns. Reflective equilibrium provides a systematic way to reconcile actual facts with our conceptual framework to understand the universe coherently and rationally. In his seminal "A Theory of Justice"[2] (1971),John Rawls developed Goodman's reflective equilibrium method to justify justice. According to Rawls, a just society can be established by an equitable consensus formed by people in the "original position," where they are unaware of their own attributes and

[1] Goodman N, Fact, Fiction, and Forecast (4th edn, Harvard University Press 1983)

[2] John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (revised edn, Belknap Press 1999)

circumstances, the "veil of ignorance."[3] In the aforementioned hypothetical setting, people are unaware of their social status, benefits, or disadvantages, maintaining impartiality in decision-making. The Rawls technique of reflective equilibrium has three main components. Our conscientious moral intuitions and evaluations on specific occasions are its foundation. Our moral ideas and responses to moral dilemmas are reflected in these intuitions. Rawls also advances moral rules that can explain these purposeful intuitions and judgments. These principles organize moral debate. Reflective equilibrium involves iterating and refining our intuitions and overarching principles until they align and form a coherent and rational moral framework. Rawls sought to create a cohesive and defensible framework of principles, known as reflective equilibrium, to support a just and orderly society. Our informed judgements and ethical principles that guide our cognitive processes can interchange ideas using the above approach. Moral decision-making requires logical inquiry and minimizing bias and dogmatism. Reflective equilibrium also encourages moral principles to change through rational reflection and moral intuition.[4]

Reflective equilibrium has been widely used in moral and political philosophy. Coherence between moral intuitions and principles advances normative theories in ethics. In political philosophy, the concept justifies justice and helps create a socially equitable and unbiased social contract.[5] This approach has also been used in bioethics to address complex ethical issues related to medical interventions and life-initiation and termination. The main benefit of reflective equilibrium is that it emphasizes logical cognition and moral intuitions. By fostering a conversation between individual judgements and larger principles, it promotes egalitarian and comprehensive moral debate. The method encourages people to articulate and defend their moral intuitions and ideas, recognizing and valuing the spectrum of moral perspectives. More comprehensive and resilient moral conversation results. Reflective equilibrium has faced criticism and objections from several philosophical perspectives. Scholars argue that the approach is conservative because it relies on prior intuitions and notions, which may be influenced by cultural and societal biases.[6] This approach may not be sufficient for resolving disagreements between moral intuitions or examining specific moral predicaments with ambiguous or contradictory intuitions. Reflective equilibrium also requires a distinction between deliberate moral intuitions and overarching principles, which may not always be true. Due to the variability of human intuitions and cultural customs, critics question the method's ability to provide objective and universal moral truths.[7] The original stance and veil of ignorance in Rawls' reflective equilibrium have also been controversial. Many argue that the hypothetical scenario overidealizes and detaches from real-world realities, making its practical application to political and moral issues problematic.[8] Reflective equilibrium remains influential in moral and political philosophy despite its limits. The emphasis on reasoned reflection, discussion, and consistency in ethical philosophy and political thinking has made significant contributions. The method's adaptability and active engagement with a variety of moral perspectives ensure its relevance in ever-changing ethical situations.[9]

Reflective equilibrium is a popular moral and political philosophy method. Nelson Goodman proposed the idea, which John Rawls popularized. The strategy involves adapting conscientious moral intuitions and overarching moral concepts to create a consistent and well-founded moral framework. Reflective equilibrium promotes logical conversation and inclusiveness, yet its conservative tendencies and subjectivity have drawn

[3] Ibid.
[4] Norman Daniels, 'Wide Reflective Equilibrium and Theory Acceptance in Ethics' (1979) 76 Journal of Philosophy 256.
[5] Tom L Beauchamp and David DeGrazia, 'Methods and Principles in Biomedical Ethics' (2019) 45 Journal of Medical Ethics 672.
[6] Ibid.
[7] H Tristram Engelhardt, The Foundations of Bioethics (OUP 2011).
[8] TM Scanlon, 'Rawls on Justification' in Samuel Freeman (ed), The Cambridge Companion to Rawls (CUP 2002).
[9] David DeGrazia, Thomas A Mappes and Jeffrey Ballard, Biomedical Ethics (8th edn, McGraw-Hill 2020).

criticism. It influences current conversations and advances ethical frameworks and political ideologies as a crucial tool for moral deliberation and policy evaluation.[10]

The application of reflective equilibrium to medical decision-making.

Medical decision-making and bioethics use reflective equilibrium. Reflective equilibrium helps resolve ethical issues, justify medical interventions, and create healthcare policies. The first step is identifying ethical considerations including autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and fairness. These aspects pertain to moral intuitions that may occur in medical care decisions involving doctors, patients, and others.[11] After identifying ethical considerations, generic moral rules are formulated to explain and justify intuitions. These principles can be derived from utilitarianism, deontology, and virtue ethics. A beneficence principle could influence medical decisions to improve patient well-being. The moral intuitions and principles are then compared. If intuitions and principles conflict, a conversation is started to decide if intuitions or principles need to be changed. If a medical intervention that respects a patient's autonomy clashes with nonmaleficence (avoiding injury), it would be studied to discover a solution. Iterative adjustment and revision continue until reflective equilibrium is reached, where moral intuitions and derived principles are consistent and supportive. The goal is to find a balanced and consistent method that considers multiple moral factors and follows moral norms.[12]Reflective equilibrium can be used in end-of-life care, resource allocation, informed consent, and controversial medical procedures. Reflective equilibrium's open-ended and dialogical nature makes it ideal for bioethics debates with varied perspectives and ethical intuitions. Reflective equilibrium can help navigate bioethical dilemmas with conflicting values and considerations while honoring multiple perspectives. It is important to note that reflective balance in medical decision-making faces challenges.[13] Cultural, religious, and personal beliefs may skew moral intuitions and reflective processes. Reflective equilibrium may take time, and not all ethical dilemmas can be resolved.[14]

End-of-life care often uses reflective equilibrium. Healthcare personnel, patients, and families may face ethical problems when choosing end-of-life treatments. Reflective equilibrium permits moral intuitions about patient autonomy, non-maleficence, and well-being to be examined. A reflective process allows healthcare teams to assess ethical considerations and create an ethical treatment plan. This approach respects the patient's views and preferences, resulting in care tailored to their requirements.[15]

The allocation of scarce medical resources also depends on reflective equilibrium. During a pandemic or in places with limited resources, healthcare providers may have to make difficult decisions regarding how to distribute life-saving resources. Reflective equilibrium can assess moral intuitions about distributive fairness, utilitarianism, and prioritizing vulnerable individuals. This introspective process helps create impartial distribution frameworks and regulations that align with ethical principles, ensuring a more just and equitable resource distribution.[16]

Informed consent ensures that patients are well-informed and able to make treatment decisions. Reflective equilibrium is often used in this framework to reconcile ethical considerations about patient autonomy, beneficence (promoting well-being), and the need to offer relevant information. Reflective equilibrium helps

[10] Henry S Richardson, 'Specifying Norms as a Way to Resolve Concrete Ethical Problems' (1990) 19 Philosophy & Public Affairs 279.
[11] DW Brock, 'The Ideal of Shared Decision Making between Physicians and Patients' (1991) 1 Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal 28.
[12] Michael Parker, *Ethics and Community in the Health Care Professions* (Routledge 2009).
[13] S Joffe and RD Truog, 'Consent to Medical Care: The Importance of Fiduciary Context' (2010) 31 Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics 259.
[14] Dominic Wilkinson and Julian Savulescu, *Ethics, Conflict and Medical Treatment for Children: From Disagreement to Dissensus* (Elsevier 2018).
[15] Stephen Wear, *Informed Consent: Patient Autonomy and Physician Beneficence within Clinical Medicine* (Kluwer Academic Publishers 1993).
[16] Ibid.

healthcare workers improve informed consent, patient comprehension, and respectful, collaborative decision-making.

Reflective balancing applies to disputed medical procedures. Genetic testing, organ transplants, and experimental treatments require careful ethical consideration.[17] Reflective equilibrium can help examine moral intuitions about the risks and benefits of these strategies and the principles of beneficence and non-maleficence. In complex and ethical situations, reflective equilibrium helps healthcare professionals reach more nuanced and well-justified conclusions.[18] In research ethics, reflective equilibrium is often used. This paradigm helps medical researchers balance participant liberty, beneficence (maximizing benefits), with the ethical need to limit dangers. Reflective equilibrium allows researchers to design ethical experiments that protect participants' rights and welfare, ensuring the integrity and ethics of human research.[19] Reflective equilibrium can also assess the ethical implications of new medical advances. Rapid medical technology advancement raises ethical questions about AI in healthcare and gene-editing. Healthcare practitioners and governments can handle ethical challenges related to appropriate implementation of new technology by considering moral intuitions about their benefits and risks.

Clinical instances of the application of reflective equilibrium to medical decision-making

Instances of reflective equilibrium in medical decision-making and bioethics in real-world scenarios:

The Terry Schiavo Case[20]

The Terri Schiavo case is a 1990–2005 judicial struggle over life-sustaining measures in the US. In 1990, Florida woman Terri Schiavo became unconscious after cardiac arrest, causing oxygen starvation and brain damage. The patient was diagnosed with persistent vegetative state after 2.5 months of comatoseness. This disease causes full cognitive loss but allows the patient to breathe on their own. Michael Schiavo requested legal authority to remove Terri's feeding tube. He argued that Terri, based on their pre-illness talks, would not have wanted lifelong unconsciousness. Terri's parents, Robert and Mary Schindler, opposed this treatment because they believed their daughter was conscious and could improve with therapy. Terri's parents and siblings fought for her life, but her husband argued that removing the feeding tube was better for her. Judges, physicians, and ethicists gave their opinions in several judicial proceedings. The case raised major ethical and legal issues. The "right to die" movement, which holds that people have the right to refuse medical assistance even if they kill themselves, gained attention after Terri Schiavo's case. The court case has raised questions about how spouses and parents should make medical decisions for people who cannot. Should the spouse or parents be closest relatives? The case raised questions about appropriate living standards. Does the quality of life warrant living for those in a persistent vegetative state without hope of recovery? After a lengthy court battle, Terri Schiavo's feeding tube was removed in March 2005, resulting in her death on March 31, 2005. The case sparked debate about end-of-life care, death choice, and medical decision-making for incompetent people. This occurrence also led to legislative changes in Florida and other states, allowing more people to create living wills or advance directives to express their end-of-life medical treatment preferences.

Analysis of the Terry Schiavo Case from Rawlsian perspective

When considering the issue of Terri Schiavo, a Rawlsian perspective employing the method of reflective equilibrium would entail the careful weighing and reconciliation of the principles of justice that are relevant to the situation. These principles may encompass the values of upholding individual autonomy, safeguarding life, and mitigating pain. According to a Rawlsian perspective, the concept of justice that holds utmost significance is the respect for individual autonomy. It is commonly claimed that individuals possess rationality and agency, enabling them to autonomously make decisions pertaining to their own life. If Terri Schiavo had explicitly expressed her desire to not continue living in a state of chronic vegetative condition prior to her

[17] Ibid.
[18] ED Pellegrino and AS Relman, 'Professional Medical Associations: Ethical and Practical Guidelines' (1999) 282 JAMA 984.
[19] GJ Annas, *American Bioethics: Crossing Human Rights and Health Law Boundaries* (OUP 2004).
[20] *In re Schiavo*, 780 So 2d 176 (Fla Dist Ct App 2001) (commonly known as the Terry Schiavo Case).

illness, then upholding her autonomy would entail acknowledging her preferences and discontinuing the use of the feeding tube. Rawls acknowledged the need of safeguarding fundamental rights and liberties in the preservation of life. The right to life is often regarded as a fundamental human right. If there existed a plausible probability of Terri Schiavo's potential recovery or if her cognitive status was not as severely impaired as previously perceived, the act of prolonging her life may be interpreted as a fundamental principle of fairness and equity. The topic of minimizing suffering was not explicitly addressed by Rawls in his books. However, his theory places significant emphasis on the necessity of meeting the needs of the most disadvantaged individuals within society. From this particular standpoint, in the event that Terri Schiavo was actually experiencing ongoing agony with no foreseeable possibility of recuperation, one could posit that the principles of justice would necessitate the mitigation of her suffering through the removal of the feeding tube. The approach of reflective equilibrium involves decision-makers engaging in a process of carefully considering and balancing several principles, as well as their own informed assessments, in order to reach a choice that aligns with a comprehensive conception of justice. From a Rawlsian standpoint, the decision to withdraw Terri Schiavo's feeding tube may perhaps be rationalized if it was established that she was in a state of permanent vegetative condition without any prospects of improvement, and if it was considered that this course of action aligned with her presumed desires. Nevertheless, it is imperative to thoroughly evaluate and assess the decision in question, taking into account the fundamental tenets of justice and the existing body of evidence. Rawls' theoretical framework places significant emphasis on the critical role of deliberate and rational thinking in the process of decision-making pertaining to concerns concerning justice.

The Dax Cowart case[21]

The Dax Cowart case raises important questions about patient autonomy, informed consent, and healthcare professionals' medical decision-making duties. A 1973 propane gas explosion severely injured 25-year-old ex-Air Force pilot Donald "Dax" Cowart. The bomb killed his father and burned 65% of Dax's body. The patient was in excruciating pain and begged for euthanasia, but doctors prioritized his survival. Dax underwent months of difficult medical interventions and surgeries despite repeatedly expressing his desire to forgo treatment and seek euthanasia. The individual received large amounts of analgesics, resulting in partial consciousness and inability to make decisions. Dax survived a long convalescence and went on to practice law, advocating for patient rights. However, the individual maintains that he should have been allowed to refuse medical intervention, arguing that sustaining his life against his wishes violated his autonomy and right to control his healthcare decisions. The Dax Cowart case raises important ethical issues. Medical ethics upholds patient autonomy, which is respecting a patient's right to self-determination in medical treatment. Dax continually stated his desire for a natural death without medical intervention. Should his wishes have been respected, even if it meant his death? Medical ethics requires healthcare workers to actively improve their patients' well-being. The medical personnel treated Dax's burns and tried to save him, believing their efforts were in his best interest. Despite Dax's wishes, was this the right move? In terms of informed consent, Dax was in severe pain and taking a lot of analgesics while considering his treatment options. Could he make informed healthcare decisions? If not, who should have made such decisions for him?

Healthcare practitioners are crucial to medical decision-making. Does it ethical for healthcare providers to always obey their patients' wishes, even if they think their choices are bad? Should healthcare professionals intervene and make decisions for patients when it's in their best interest? The case of Dax Cowart is often studied in medical ethics. It has been extensively studied in articles, novels, and films. This statement highlights the challenges of making medical decisions for patients without decision-making capacity, raising questions about patient autonomy and healthcare practitioners' roles in decision-making.

[21]*The Case of Dax Cowart*, although holds significant importance in the field of medical ethics, does not possess the characteristics of a legal ruling per se.

Analysis of the Dax Cowart case from Rawlsian perspective

The primary focus of John Rawls' views pertains to the concepts of social fairness and the organization of society, as opposed to individual considerations within the realm of medical ethics. Nevertheless, several ideas derived from his theoretical framework can be effectively employed in analyzing the Dax Cowart instance. The Principle of Equal Liberty, as posited by Rawls, asserts that every individual possesses an equal entitlement to the broadest range of fundamental freedoms that can coexist harmoniously with comparable freedoms for others. This perspective can be construed as endorsing the autonomy of Dax Cowart and his entitlement to exercise agency over his medical treatment choices, even if such choices result in his demise. The Difference Principle, as articulated by Rawls, represents the second principle of justice. It posits that social and economic inequalities ought to be structured in a manner that maximizes the advantages for those who are least privileged. This principle generally focuses on addressing social and economic disparities, but it can also be construed in a broader sense to propose that medical decisions should prioritize the well-being of the patient, even if this contradicts the preferences of the medical team or society as a whole.

The application of reflective equilibrium entails the evaluation of these principles in light of the specific context of the situation and the decision-makers' well-thought-out moral assessments. One could argue that upholding Dax Cowart's autonomy and his entitlement to decline medical intervention can be perceived as congruent with the ideal of equal liberty, even in the event of his demise. However, it might be argued that the medical team's choice to disregard Dax's desires and administer therapy aligns with the difference principle, as it aimed to promote the well-being of Dax, who was in a significantly disadvantaged state during that period. The determination of whether to uphold Dax Cowart's autonomy and honor his refusal of treatment, or to supersede his desires and provide therapy, hinges on the assessment of the principles of justice in relation to the specific circumstances of the case. Rawls' theory does not offer a definitive response to this inquiry, as its primary focus lies in the examination of societal organization rather than individual medical determinations. Nevertheless, the utilization of the reflective equilibrium approach can contribute to the elucidation of the ethical principles involved and result in a more deliberate and defensible choice.

The Aruna Shanbaug case[22]

Sohanlal Bhartha Walmiki, a ward boy, sexually assaulted and chained Indian nurse Aruna Shanbaug. This tragedy occurred at Mumbai's King Edward Memorial Hospital on November 27, 1973. The victim was vegetative for her remaining years after the abuse. Shanbaug was found in the underground the next morning, and evidence showed that oxygen deprivation had caused neurological damage. The person lost eyesight, hearing, and awareness. The patient was moved to a hospital ward and received treatment for 42 years until her 2015 death. The Aruna Shanbaug case illuminated euthanasia in India. In 2009, journalist Pinki Virani petitioned to end force-feeding and let Shanbaug die. After Virani wrote a Shanbaug case book, this request was made. Virani claimed that Shanbaug was in a permanent vegetative state with no chance of recovery, and that keeping her alive was inhumane. This lawsuit addressed the legal rights of incapacitated patients and the appropriate legal power to make decisions for them. Shanbaug's biological kin had abandoned her, while her longtime caregivers fought the euthanasia request on the grounds that they were her legitimate custodians. In 2011, the Supreme Court of India denied euthanasia but allowed passive euthanasia (withholding medical help) in certain cases. The court upheld passive euthanasia for brain-dead or chronically vegetative patients with little hope of recovery. The patient's family or "next friend," with High Court approval, must decide on passive euthanasia. Aruna Shanbaug died of pneumonia on May 18, 2015, after 42 years in vegetative state. The case highlighted the need for clear legal limitations on euthanasia and end-of-life healthcare in India, leading to a legislative reform. It also raised awareness of sexual assault and the need for healthcare worker safety.

[22] Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v Union of India, (2011) 4 SCC 454.

Analysis of the Aruna Shanbaug case from Rawlsian perspective

Rawls proposes the utilization of a process known as 'reflective equilibrium' to assess these principles in light of the specific circumstances of a case and one's own conscientiously formed views regarding moral correctness. In the case of Aruna Shanbaug, a comprehensive analysis would entail a careful evaluation of the principles of equal liberty and the difference principle in light of the particularities of the case. These factors encompass Aruna's medical condition, the preferences expressed by her caregivers, and the legal and ethical frameworks governing euthanasia and end-of-life treatment. An argument can be made that the endorsement of passive euthanasia, specifically the withdrawal of life support, aligns with the ideal of equal liberty by upholding the autonomy of the patient or their legal representatives. Nevertheless, an alternative perspective could posit that the act of prolonging life through the utilization of life support systems aligns with the principle of difference, as it places emphasis on prioritizing the welfare of individuals who are least privileged or disadvantaged.

The determination of whether to persist or terminate life-sustaining measures in a situation such to that of Aruna Shanbaug hinges upon the manner in which one assesses the principles of justice vis-à-vis the specific circumstances of the case. Rawls' theory does not offer a definitive response to this inquiry, as its primary focus lies in the examination of societal organization rather than individual medical determinations. Nevertheless, the utilization of the reflective equilibrium approach can contribute to the elucidation of the moral principles involved and result in a more deliberate and defensible determination.

Legal Framework forActive and Passive Euthanasia

The USA

Active euthanasia refers to the deliberate and intentional actions taken by medical professionals to bring about the death of a patient, typically through the administration of a deadly dose of medication. The practice of active euthanasia is prohibited by law in every state inside the United States. Passive euthanasia refers to the practice of permitting a patient to expire spontaneously by refraining from or ceasing life-sustaining interventions, such as the discontinuation of artificial nourishment or hydration, or the deactivation of a ventilator. Passive euthanasia is typically deemed permissible across the United States, contingent upon its adherence to the desires of the patient or, in cases when the patient is unable to communicate, the wishes previously expressed in advance directives such as a living will. In the absence of an advance directive, the responsibility of making decisions is typically entrusted to the individual's next-of-kin or legal guardians. However, it is important to note that conflicts may occur in such circumstances, perhaps necessitating the intervention of the court.

Physician-Assisted Suicide (PAS) refers to a type of active assistance in the process of dying, which should be distinguished from active euthanasia. PAS involves the provision of methods by a medical practitioner to enable a patient to autonomously terminate their own life, generally through the prescription of lethal drugs, while refraining from actively administering the lethal intervention. The practice of physician-assisted suicide has been deemed lawful in a number of states within the United States, namely California, Colorado, Hawaii, Maine, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, and the District of Columbia. The regulations, protections, and processes pertaining to PAS exhibit variation across different states. Montana currently lacks a dedicated legislative provision explicitly permitting PAS. However, a ruling by the state's Supreme Court offers physicians a potential legal recourse to defend themselves against any accusations of assisting in a patient's demise.

The majority of jurisdictions acknowledge the legal validity of Advance Directives and Living Wills, which serve as instruments via which persons can articulate their preferences concerning medical treatment and care throughout the final stages of life, should they experience incapacitation that renders them incapable of decision-making. At the federal level, there is currently no comprehensive legislation that directly regulates

euthanasia. However, the federal government possesses the ability to indirectly shape state policies by means of financial determinations.

India:

The practice of active euthanasia continues to be prohibited by law in India. In accordance with the Indian Penal Code (IPC), any intentional act undertaken with the purpose of terminating a life is regarded as culpable homicide or murder, unless it qualifies for specific exceptions such as self-defense. Facilitating an individual in the act of terminating their own life, even when motivated by altruistic motives, may be subject to legal prosecution. The entire framework of passive euthanasia was established by the Supreme Court of India in its 2011 verdict on the Aruna Shanbaug case and subsequently in the 2018 "Common Cause"[23] case.

In the Aruna Shanbaug Case of 2011, the Supreme Court made a distinction between active and passive euthanasia. The prevailing viewpoint asserted that passive euthanasia was deemed acceptable under specific conditions, albeit necessitating a rigorous authorization process from the judiciary. In the present instance, the request for euthanasia was denied, nonetheless, it served as a catalyst for a broader discourse surrounding the subject matter.

In the Common Cause Case of 2018, the Supreme Court rendered a decision that resulted in the legalization of passive euthanasia, subject to strict guidelines. The court rendered a verdict affirming the entitlement of adults to write a "living will" or "advance directive." This document provides individuals with the opportunity to make a pre-determined decision regarding their preference for receiving life-sustaining medical interventions in the event of a terminal disease or irreversible coma.

The 2018 judgment provides guidelines pertaining to passive euthanasia that the utilization of an advance directive, sometimes known as a living will, enables adults to articulate their preferences pertaining to medical interventions in the event of potential future incapacitation. The execution of this directive should be undertaken willingly and without any form of coercion. Additionally, it is recommended that a signature from a Judicial Magistrate of First Class (JMFC) be obtained, since it serves as confirmation that the individual possesses the requisite ability and understanding to make such a decision.

The act of execution entails the requirement for the executor to affix their signature on the directive document, while being observed by two attesting witnesses, preferably individuals who are impartial and not affiliated with the matter at hand. Additionally, the jurisdictional JMFC must provide their countersignature on the document.

The individual has the ability to cancel or change the directive at any given time, utilizing the same technique as that of creating a new directive. In the event of an individual's terminal illness, it is imperative for the attending physician to notify either the designated executor or the individual's appointed guardian or close relative. In the event that the instruction is to abstain from or discontinue medical intervention, an evaluation by a medical board would be conducted to appraise the determination. In the event that the board grants approval, the Chief District Medical Officer will provide their countersignature. In situations when an individual lacks an advance directive, the hospital has the authority to establish a medical board. If the members of this board reach a consensus, the legal guardians are then able to petition the High Court to request the cessation of life-sustaining interventions. The legality of active euthanasia in India continues to be a subject of debate and is currently prohibited. However, passive euthanasia, which adheres to strict protocols and precautionary measures, is acknowledged as a lawful practice. It is advisable to get guidance from legal experts in India in order to obtain the most current and precise information.

[23] (2018) 5 SCC 1, AIR 2018 SC 1665

The process of attaining a reflective equilibrium

Ethical argument begins with people expressing their instant moral intuitions or judgments about the problem or situation. These intuitions are instantaneous and reflect people's initial responses to morality. Autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and fairness are also considered fundamental ethical principles that guide morality.[24] Comparison and analysis are used to examine intuitions in relation to ethical rules. This investigation seeks to evaluate if these intuitions align with or contradict ethical standards. The technique involves examining intuition-principle interactions for inconsistencies, conflicts, and contradictions. The tendency to favor autonomy may conflict with beneficence, which promotes well-being. This phase aligns intuitions with ethical principles to provide consistency and coherence. When differences or disputes arise, intuitions or principles are revised to resolve them. This approach may involve reevaluating the principles to fit the intuitions or refining the intuitions to fit the principles. The goal is a cohesive ethical framework.[25] In some circumstances, intuitions might trigger ethical reevaluation. To better address the situation or context, ethical principles may need to be adjusted, refined, or specified. This may require a more holistic understanding of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice that embraces intuitions while maintaining ethical rigor.[26]

Back-and-forth iteration is dynamic because it involves oscillations between intuitions and ethical standards. Each iterative change is carefully assessed for its impact on the ethical framework. This cyclical process seeks reflective equilibrium, where intuitions and principles interact and reinforce each other cohesively and balancedly. The ethical framework and its results are critically assessed throughout the process. This review evaluates whether the updated ethical framework addresses initial intuitions while adhering to ethical standards. It also entails a thorough review of whether the new framework solves the ethical issue. A well-justified and reasoned judgment from reflective equilibrium concludes the procedure. Ultimate determination is based on refined intuitions and ethical principles, resulting in a unified and equitable ethical stance. This judgment provides a comprehensive framework for ethical decision-making, upholding both immediate intuitions and broader ethical principles that underpin morality.[27]

Benefits and limits associated with the application of reflective equilibrium in the field of medical ethics

Reflective equilibrium can help medical ethics students understand difficult moral dilemmas. However, like every procedure, it has pros and downsides. This method can effectively address Medical ethical issues are often complex since they include many concepts and particular circumstances. Reflective equilibrium allows for an iterative process that balances both elements and prevents neglect. This strategy is flexible and can handle new facts and considerations. This versatility makes it relevant in medicine's ever-changing landscape. Given its multiplicity, medicine requires thoughtful balance to incorporate multiple moral intuitions and standards. Critically evaluating and clarifying moral intuitions is encouraged.[28] Due of the importance of emotional and intuitive responses, this method is valuable in medical ethics. Reflective equilibrium, which compares and adjusts principles and conclusions, encourages dialogue and thought. This technique promotes lively discussion and deepens ethical understanding.[29] Limits are a fundamental math notion that describes subjectivity. The technique relies heavily on personal intuitions, which vary widely. This may raise questions about the conclusions' impartiality and completeness. Individuals' intuitions may be modified by their cultural or social settings. Dependence on intuitions may reinforce biases. The achievement of a reflective equilibrium does not imply morality or objectivity, but simply logical consistency. Cognitive biases like confirmation bias and status quo prejudice can affect human reflection. In quickly changing medical contexts, time constraints may make it difficult to practice reflective equilibrium, especially in emergencies. A focus on coherence may

[24] Ruth Macklin, *Against Relativism: Cultural Diversity and the Search for Ethical Universals in Medicine* (OUP 2000).
[25] Joshua Cohen, 'For a Democratic Society' in Samuel Freeman (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls* (CUP 1993).
[26] Ibid.
[27] John Rawls, 'The Independence of Moral Theory' in Samuel Freeman (ed), *Collected Papers* (Harvard University Press 1999).
[28] ED Pellegrino and DC Thomasma, *The Virtues in Medical Practice* (OUP 1993).
[29] DB Resnik, *The Ethics of Research with Human Subjects: Protecting People, Advancing Science, Promoting Trust* (Springer 2012).

overlook other important aspects of moral thought, such as the consequences of actions or the value of moral ideas. The possibility of reaching equilibrium based on unethical ideas is worrisome.[30]

Conclusion and suggestions

In sophisticated medical decision-making, the effects are significant. The complicated link between life, death, and wellbeing requires decision-making that balances scientific data, patient choices, and ethics. Reflective equilibrium is crucial in this complicated intricacy. The philosophical framework of ethics guides this iterative effort to reconcile moral intuitions with overarching principles. The framework provides healthcare professionals and politicians with a clear and logical way to address the many ethical challenges in their professions. The process of making medical decisions is rarely binary. These entities often operate in murky areas where ethical principles contradict. The ethical dilemma emerges when patient autonomy conflicts with physician obligation. A patient may decline a life-saving intervention based on personal beliefs, even if the doctor believes it is best for them. Reflective equilibrium applies here. The essay compares concrete judgments, such recognizing a patient's decision, to more general goals, like preserving life or supporting individual autonomy. Healthcare practitioners can develop a unified viewpoint by iteratively aligning, ensuring that their activities are in line with particular cases and ethical norms. Clarity is essential in medicine. Without it, judgments may become ambiguous, leading to conflicts and injury. Reflective equilibrium and its methodical approach guide this setup. Healthcare personnel constantly examine, analyze, and articulate their ethical perspectives to align their intuitions with ethical standards. Reflection strengthens ethical beliefs and decision-making. The diverse patients, practitioners, and surrounds of medicine reflect this. The tapestry boldly displays equilibrium's inclusion. It spontaneously shows respect for multiple perspectives and beliefs by including diverse moral intuitions. The inclusive nature of reflective equilibrium means that policies produced through this method will be complete, taking into account the different needs and ethical considerations of all stakeholders, which is important for policymakers. Medicine is dynamic, with advances in technology, medicines, and illness knowledge. Therefore, ethical systems must be adaptable. The reflective equilibrium approach's iterative nature suits this aim. The continual practice of contrasting specific judgments with overarching concepts helps absorb new information. The constant changes in medicine guarantee ethical decision-making's significance. Building Trust and Consensus: Trust is crucial to medical success. However, modern society occasionally shows this frailty. Today, a trustworthy and understandable ethical framework is important. Reflective equilibrium's focus on coherence and transparency promotes professional consensus and patient trust. When patients believe healthcare decisions are ethical, their trust in the system grows. Policymakers confront more difficulties. These individuals analyze issues involving population-level effects, resource allocation, and their mandates' ethical implications. In this scenario, reflective equilibrium provides insight. It helps people balance conflicting factors. Reflective equilibrium might help policymakers balance pressing demands like saving lives with ethical values like justice and equity when distributing vaccines during a pandemic.

[30] JF Childress and others, 'Public Health Ethics: Mapping the Terrain' (2002) 30 Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics 170.

References

1. Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v Union of India, (2011) 4 SCC 454.
2. David DeGrazia, Thomas A Mappes and Jeffrey Ballard, Biomedical Ethics (8th edn, McGraw-Hill 2020)
3. DB Resnik, The Ethics of Research with Human Subjects: Protecting People, Advancing Science Promoting Trust (Springer 2012)
4. Dominic Wilkinson and Julian Savulescu, EthicsConflict and Medical Treatment for ChildrenFrom Disagreement to Dissensus (Elsevier 2018).
5. DW Brock, The Ideal of Shared Decision Making between Physicians and Patients(1991) 1 Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal 28.
6. ED Pellegrino and DC Thomasma, The Virtues in Medical Practice (OUP 1993)
7. ED Pellegrino and AS Relman, Professional Medical Associations: Ethical and Practical Guidelines' (1999) 282 JAMA 984.
8. GJ Annas, American Bioethics: Crossing Human Rights and Health Law Boundaries (OUP 2004)In re Schiavo, 780 So 2d 176 (Fla Dist Ct App 2001) (commonly known as the Terry Schiavo Case.
9. Goodman N, Fact, Fiction, and Forecast (4th edn, Harvard University Press 1983)
10. H Tristram Engelhardt, The Foundations of Bioethics (OUP 2011).
11. Henry S Richardson, 'Specifying Norms as a Way to Resolve Concrete Ethical Problems(1990) 19 Philosophy & Public Affairs 279.
12. John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (revised edn, Belknap Press 1999)
13. John Rawls, The Independence of Moral Theory' in Samuel Freeman (ed), Collected Papers (Harvard University Press 1999)
14. Joshua Cohen, For a Democratic Society' in Samuel Freeman (ed)The Cambridge Companion to Rawls (CUP 1993).
15. Michael Parker, Ethics and Community in the Health Care Professions (Routledge 2009)
16. Norman Daniels, 'Wide Reflective Equilibrium and Theory Acceptance in Ethics(1979) 76 Journal of Philosophy 256.
17. Ruth Macklin, Against Relativism: Cultural Diversity and the Search for Ethical Universals in Medicine (OUP 2000)
18. S Joffe and RD Truog, 'Consent to Medical CareThe Importance of Fiduciary Context (2010) 31 Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics 259.
19. Stephen Wear, Informed ConsentPatient Autonomy and Physician Beneficence within Clinical Medicine (Kluwer Academic Publishers 1993)
20. Tom L Beauchamp and David DeGrazia, 'Methods and Principles in Biomedical Ethics(2019) 45 Journal of Medical Ethics
21. TM Scanlon, Rawls on Justificationin Samuel Freeman (ed), The Cambridge Companion to Rawls (CUP 2002)