



palgrave▶pivot

**Politics and Policies in the
Debate on Euthanasia**
Morality Issues in Portugal

Inês Santos Almeida
Luís F. Mota

palgrave
macmillan

Politics and Policies in the Debate on Euthanasia

Inês Santos Almeida • Luís F. Mota

Politics and Policies in the Debate on Euthanasia

Morality Issues in Portugal

palgrave
macmillan

Inês Santos Almeida
Research Unit on Governance
Competitiveness and Public Policies
(GOVCOPP)
University of Aveiro
Aveiro, Portugal

Luís F. Mota
IJP-IPLeiria - ESTG
Instituto Politécnico de Leiria,
Polytechnic University
Leiria, Portugal
member of GOVCOPP
Aveiro, Portugal

ISBN 978-3-031-44587-3 ISBN 978-3-031-44588-0 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-44588-0>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Paper in this product is recyclable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Just like the legalization of euthanasia in Portugal, the process of writing this book was also long and complex. When the challenge to write this book arose, we thought it would be easy and quick. Inês's master dissertation had already covered the analysis of the first round of debates on euthanasia, and we thought it would just be a question of updating the analysis for the second round and for a quick third round that was about to start. Little did we know that the legislative process would last two more years and so would constant need to update our analysis, aggravated by challenging professional and health periods in both our lives.

But these difficulties did not discourage us, and we managed to complete this goal. This would not be possible nevertheless without the support of some people.

First, we would like to thank the editorial team at Palgrave Macmillan for continuing to believe this endeavour would come to an end and for extending the initial deadlines.

Second, we would like to thank all the colleagues who provided comments on our ongoing study of morality policies in Portugal in general, and of euthanasia in particular.

Third, we express our appreciation to the representatives of political parties and civil society movements who agreed to be interviewed and spend some of their time sharing their views on the legislative process with us.

But our greatest gratitude goes to our families, for their continuous support and patience in this and other academic endeavours.

On an institutional level, we would also like to stress this work was financially supported by the Research Unit on Governance, Competitiveness and Public Policy (GOVCOPP-UA) (UIDB/04058/2020) + (UIDP/04058/2020), funded by national funds through FCT—Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia—and by a research fellowship attributed by FCT to Inês S. Almeida (2021.06378.BD).

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
1.1	<i>The Research Object and Its Relevance</i>	2
1.2	<i>Methodological Strategy</i>	5
1.3	<i>Structure of the Book</i>	7
	<i>References</i>	8
2	Policy Formulation, Morality Issues and Euthanasia: A Literature Review	11
2.1	<i>Public Policy Formulation: The Main Important Actors in Portugal and Dynamics of Interaction Between Them</i>	12
2.1.1	<i>Policy Formulation</i>	12
2.1.2	<i>Policy Formulation Actors in Portugal</i>	15
2.2	<i>Euthanasia as a Morality Issue</i>	21
2.2.1	<i>Morality Issues: Concept, Types and Factors Explaining Policy Change and Stability</i>	21
2.2.2	<i>Euthanasia: Types of Regulation and Main Arguments Against and in Favour</i>	24
	<i>References</i>	34
3	The Parliamentary Debate on Euthanasia in Portugal: A Tale in Six Rounds	39
3.1	<i>The First Round of the Parliamentary Debate on Euthanasia in Portugal</i>	41
3.1.1	<i>Petition 'Right to Die with Dignity'</i>	41

3.1.2	<i>Petition ‘All Life Has Dignity’</i>	42
3.1.3	<i>The Bill from the People-Animals-Nature (PAN) Party</i>	43
3.1.4	<i>The Bill from the Left Bloc (BE)</i>	44
3.1.5	<i>The Bill from the Socialist Party (PS)</i>	44
3.1.6	<i>The Bill from the Green Party (PEV)</i>	44
3.1.7	<i>Comparison of the Four Bills</i>	45
3.1.8	<i>Discussion and Voting of the Bills of the ‘First Round’</i>	47
3.2	<i>The Second Round of the Parliamentary Debate on Euthanasia in Portugal</i>	48
3.2.1	<i>The Bill from the Left Bloc (BE)</i>	48
3.2.2	<i>The Bill from the People-Animals-Nature Party (PAN)</i>	48
3.2.3	<i>The Bill from the Socialist Party (PS)</i>	49
3.2.4	<i>The Bill from the Green Party (PEV)</i>	49
3.2.5	<i>The Bill from the Liberal Initiative (IL)</i>	49
3.2.6	<i>Comparison of Bills</i>	50
3.2.7	<i>Discussion and Voting of the Bills and Conciliatory Text</i>	51
3.2.8	<i>Rejection by the Constitutional Court</i>	52
3.3	<i>The Third Round of the Parliamentary Debate on Euthanasia in Portugal</i>	52
3.3.1	<i>The Approval of a Revised Version</i>	53
3.3.2	<i>The Presidential Veto</i>	54
3.4	<i>The Fourth Round of the Parliamentary Debate on Euthanasia in Portugal</i>	54
3.4.1	<i>The Proposal of the Referendum from the Enough! Party (CH)</i>	55
3.4.2	<i>Voting and Discussion of the Bills of the ‘Fourth Round’</i>	56
3.4.3	<i>The (Second) Rejection by the Constitutional Court</i>	57
3.5	<i>The Fifth Round of the Parliamentary Debate on Euthanasia in Portugal</i>	58
3.5.1	<i>The Approval of a Revised Version</i>	58
3.5.2	<i>The (Second) Presidential Veto</i>	59
3.6	<i>The Sixth Round of the Parliamentary Debate on Euthanasia in Portugal</i>	59
3.6.1	<i>The Confirmation of the Bill</i>	59
3.6.2	<i>Promulgation</i>	60
3.7	<i>The Final Version of the Law</i>	60

4	Ayes Or Noes: Positions and Arguments used by Political Parties in the Parliamentary Debates	67
4.1	<i>The Ayes: Parties in Favour of the Decriminalization of Euthanasia</i>	69
4.1.1	<i>Green Party</i>	69
4.1.2	<i>The Left Bloc</i>	71
4.1.3	<i>The Socialist Party</i>	73
4.1.4	<i>The People-Animals-Nature Party</i>	76
4.1.5	<i>Liberal Initiative</i>	78
4.1.6	<i>The Free Party</i>	80
4.2	<i>The Noes: Parties Against the Decriminalization of Euthanasia</i>	80
4.2.1	<i>The Communist Party</i>	80
4.2.2	<i>The Social Democrat Party</i>	83
4.2.3	<i>The Popular Party</i>	87
4.2.4	<i>The Enough! Party</i>	89
4.3	<i>A Comparison of the Positions and Arguments Used by Political Parties</i>	92
5	The (Un)used Consultation Processes: Positions and Arguments from Organizational Experts	97
5.1	<i>The Often-Consulted Organizational Experts</i>	98
5.1.1	<i>National Council of Ethics for Life Sciences</i>	98
5.1.2	<i>Order of Physicians</i>	102
5.1.3	<i>Order of Nurses</i>	103
5.1.4	<i>Order of Portuguese Psychologists</i>	105
5.1.5	<i>Order of Lawyers</i>	106
5.1.6	<i>High Council of the Judiciary</i>	108
5.1.7	<i>High Council of the Public Prosecution Service</i>	109
5.2	<i>The Less Commonly Consulted Organizational Experts</i>	110
5.2.1	<i>Director General of Health</i>	110
5.2.2	<i>Portuguese Association of Palliative Care</i>	110
5.2.3	<i>Portuguese Association of Bioethics</i>	111
5.2.4	<i>Portuguese Association of Insurance Providers</i>	112
5.2.5	<i>Speciality Council on Clinical and Health Psychology of the Order of Portuguese Psychologists</i>	113
5.2.6	<i>Centre of Studies on Bioethics</i>	114

6	Does My Voice Also Count?: Positions and Arguments by Interest Groups in the Parliamentary Debates	117
6.1	<i>The Petitioners</i>	118
6.1.1	<i>Civic Movement for the Decriminalization of Assisted Death</i>	118
6.1.2	<i>Portuguese Federation for Life</i>	120
6.1.3	<i>First Subscribers of the Petition 48/XIV/1—Referendum on Euthanasia</i>	122
6.2	<i>The Interest Groups Focused on Specific Causes</i>	123
6.2.1	<i>Movement STOP Euthanasia</i>	123
6.2.2	<i>Portuguese Cáritas</i>	124
6.2.3	<i>Together for Life Association</i>	125
6.2.4	<i>The Voiceless Children Movement</i>	126
6.2.5	<i>Miguel Ricou—Coordinator of the European Platform ‘Wish to Die’</i>	126
6.2.6	<i>Civic Movement ‘Coimbra for Life’</i>	127
6.2.7	<i>Hurray-for-Life Association</i>	127
6.2.8	<i>InFamily Association</i>	128
6.2.9	<i>Association for the Defence and Support of Life—Aveiro</i>	129
6.3	<i>Religious Groups and Religion-Oriented Professional Associations</i>	129
6.3.1	<i>National Commission for Justice and Peace</i>	129
6.3.2	<i>Association of Portuguese Catholic Physicians</i>	130
6.3.3	<i>Interreligious Working Group on Religion & Health</i>	131
6.3.4	<i>Portuguese Association of Catholic Jurists</i>	132
6.3.5	<i>Portuguese Union of Seventh-Day Adventists</i>	133
6.3.6	<i>Portuguese Buddhist Union</i>	133
6.3.7	<i>Portuguese Association of Catholic Psychologists</i>	134
6.3.8	<i>The Lisbon Jewish Community</i>	135
7	The Extra-Parliamentary Public Debate on Euthanasia: Positions Expressed by the Top Echelon of the Portuguese Catholic Church and in the Written Media	137
7.1	<i>The Participation from the Top Echelon of the Portuguese Catholic Church</i>	138
7.2	<i>Opinion Articles Published in One Mainstream Newspaper</i>	141

8	Advocacy Coalitions in the Debate on Euthanasia	155
8.1	<i>Coalition Strategies in the Agenda-Setting Process</i>	156
8.2	<i>Coordination among Political Parties</i>	160
8.2.1	<i>Coordination Between Political Parties in Favour of Decriminalizing Euthanasia</i>	160
8.2.2	<i>Coordination Between Political Parties Against Decriminalizing Euthanasia</i>	162
8.3	<i>Coordination Between Political Parties and Civic Movements</i>	163
8.3.1	<i>Political Parties and Civil Society Movements in Favour of Euthanasia</i>	163
8.3.2	<i>Political Parties and Civil Society Movements Against Euthanasia</i>	165
9	Conclusions and Final Remarks	167
	<i>References</i>	173
	References	175