



Legal Analysis of the Refusal of Medical Treatment Based on the Patient's Religious Beliefs

¹ R.Pratama, ² S.Wijaya

^{1,2} Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia

Article History :

Received date : 2025/04/12

Revised date : 2025/05/03

Accepted date : 2025/06/21

Published date : 2025/07/01



Copyright: © by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Abstract

Introduction: The intersection of religious freedom and medical law presents a profound legal and ethical dilemma when a competent patient refuses life-saving medical treatment based on deeply held religious beliefs. This study analyzes the legal boundaries, human rights protections, and judicial conflicts arising from such refusals. **Methods:** This study employs a normative legal research methodology, examining statutory regulations, constitutional provisions, human rights conventions, and relevant judicial precedents. **Results:** The legal framework establishes that while the principle of patient autonomy and religious freedom is heavily protected under constitutional and international law, this right is not absolute and faces significant constraints when state interests, the preservation of life, and the protection of minors or vulnerable third parties are compromised. **Discussion:** The discussion synthesizes the doctrine of informed refusal, the right to bodily integrity, and the constitutional guarantee of religious liberty against the state's *parens patriae* doctrine and the medical profession's ethical duty to preserve

life, highlighting a significant literature gap regarding uniform global legal standards. **Conclusions:** Courts generally uphold the refusal of competent adults but consistently intervene to mandate treatment for minors, indicating that the right to religious refusal is limited by the state's compelling interest in preserving human life and public welfare. **Keywords:** Medical Refusal, Religious Beliefs, Patient Autonomy, Normative Law, Right to Life.

Introduction

The conflict between state-sanctioned medical interventions and individual religious convictions stands as one of the most complex battlefields in modern medical jurisprudence. At the core of this legal dilemma is the tension between the constitutional right to religious freedom and the state's compelling interest in preserving human life and public health. This study addresses a critical problem, formulated as how the legal system balances the absolute right to bodily autonomy and religious freedom against the state's protective duties and medical ethics when a patient refuses life-saving care. The primary objective of this research is to delineate the legal boundaries of informed refusal based on faith, thereby providing a clear framework for healthcare providers and legal practitioners alike. The practical and theoretical benefits of this research lie in its utility for resolving urgent clinical-legal conflicts and enriching the academic discourse on bioethics and constitutional law. The underlying hypothesis posits that while competent adults enjoy a robust legal shield to refuse treatment, this right systematically dissolves when applied to minors or when it threatens broader public safety. The distinct research gap identified in current scholarship is the lack of harmonized guidelines that bridge domestic statutory mandates with international human rights standards during sudden medical emergencies. The novelty of this paper rests in its integrative legal analysis, which synthesizes human rights doctrines with medical liability frameworks to offer a modern resolution mechanism for contemporary pluralistic societies.

Methods

This research utilizes a rigorous normative legal research method, which is conducted by examining library materials, secondary data, and established legal

doctrines. The approach is deeply rooted in statutory analysis, conceptual evaluation, and comparative case law assessments to interpret how existing legislations govern medical refusals. The data sources consist entirely of secondary legal materials, categorizing primary legal sources such as constitutional texts, human rights conventions, and statutory laws, alongside secondary sources like academic journal articles, legal treatises, and medical law textbooks. The legal materials were collected through structured literature reviews and digital legal database queries, ensuring a comprehensive compilation of international and domestic precedents. The data analysis is performed qualitatively using deductive reasoning, allowing the study to draw specific legal conclusions regarding the validity of a patient's refusal by applying broader constitutional principles, human rights doctrines, and statutory provisions to the factual realities of medical practice.

Results

The normative legal analysis reveals that the right to refuse medical treatment based on religious beliefs is legally anchored in the principles of individual autonomy, bodily integrity, and freedom of conscience. In various jurisdictions, constitutional provisions explicitly protect citizens from forced medical interventions, recognizing the doctrine of informed consent as inclusive of the right to informed refusal. However, the legal system does not treat the right to religious refusal as an absolute or unrestricted liberty. The results demonstrate that courts routinely employ a balancing test, weighing the individual's religious freedom against four compelling state interests, which are the preservation of life, the prevention of suicide, the protection of innocent third parties, and the maintenance of the ethical integrity of the medical profession. Furthermore, the findings indicate a sharp legal distinction between competent adult patients and minors, where the law uniformly invokes the *parens patriae* doctrine to override parental religious objections when a child's life is in imminent danger, thereby prioritizing the child's independent right to survival over family religious traditions.

Discussion

The legal discourse surrounding the rejection of medical care on religious grounds requires an extensive literature review of autonomy doctrines, human rights

frameworks, and medical ethics jurisprudence. Scholarly literature consistently emphasizes that the modern concept of patient autonomy evolved from the historic judgment in *Schloendorff v. Society of New York Hospital*, which established that every human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with his own body. In the context of religious objections, such as Jehovah's Witnesses refusing blood transfusions or Christian Scientists rejecting conventional therapies, academic writers observe that the refusal is not a desire to die, but a profound commitment to spiritual purity. This distinguishes informed refusal from suicide, as the patient welcomes health but rejects the specific therapeutic modality that violates their covenant with the divine. Legal scholars point out that under international human rights instruments, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the freedom to manifest one's religion may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals.

The profound complexity deepens when the state's interest in preserving life collides directly with this manifested faith. Academic analysis shows that when a patient is a fully competent adult, the law almost universally honors the refusal, even if it results in certain death, because forcing a competent person to accept intrusive treatment violates their dignity and constitutes a civil battery. However, the literature reveals a significant judicial shift when analyzing the status of minors and dependents. Legal experts widely discuss the tension between parental rights in religious upbringing and the state's duty to protect children who cannot legally consent for themselves. Courts consistently rule that parents may become martyrs themselves if they wish, but they are not permitted to make martyrs of their children, a doctrine solidified in *Prince v. Massachusetts*. The research gap filled by this discussion underscores that while mature minors are increasingly recognized in some legal systems as having a voice, the threshold for overriding a life-saving refusal remains incredibly high. Ultimately, the literature emphasizes that the medical profession's ethical duty to heal must bend to the legal reality of an adult's informed refusal, provided that competency is verified, the refusal is entirely voluntary, and no third-party dependencies are critically harmed.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the legal analysis of refusing medical treatment based on religious beliefs hinges on a delicate, contextual balancing act between individual constitutional rights and the protective mechanisms of the state. While the legal system heavily favors and protects the autonomy and religious freedom of fully competent adults, allowing them to legally refuse life-saving interventions, this right is strictly bounded and ceases to apply when it infringes upon the rights of minors or conflicts with public health mandates. To bridge the gaps identified in medical law and practical healthcare application, it is highly recommended that statutory laws be updated to include explicit, standardized protocols for clinicians dealing with religious refusals, ensuring that hospital ethics committees can be bypassed or convened rapidly during critical windows. Furthermore, the state should develop clearer legal definitions for the medical autonomy of mature minors, establishing uniform judicial expedite procedures to safeguard vulnerable children while still respecting the underlying cultural and religious fabric of a diverse society.

References

- Appelbaum, P. S. (2007). Assessment of patients' competence to consent to or refuse treatment. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 357(18), 1834-1840.
- Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of biomedical ethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Cantor, N. L. (1973). A patient's decision to decline life-saving medical treatment: Bodily integrity versus the preservation of life. *Rutgers Law Review*, 26, 228-264.
- Faden, R. R., & Beauchamp, T. L. (1986). *A history and theory of informed consent*. Oxford University Press.
- Gostin, L. O. (2014). *Global health law*. Harvard University Press.
- Holder, A. R. (1987). The minor's right to consent to medical treatment. *Connecticut Medicine*, 51(9), 579-583.
- MacLean, A. (2009). *Autonomy, informed consent and medical law: A relational challenge*. Cambridge University Press.

Orentlicher, D. (1989). The right to refuse life-sustaining medical treatment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 262(14), 1934-1935.

World Health Organization. (2021). *Guidance on human rights and bioethics in medical care*. World Health Organization Guidelines.