When Medicine Meets Mortality: Rethinking Medical Futility through a Cultural Lens

Rida Ghani, BSc

York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Correspondence: ridaghani2000@gmail.com.
Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflicts of interest to disclose

Keywords

medical futility; end-of-life care; cultural humility; medical ethics; palliative care

Abstract

Medical futility — treatment that is unlikely to produce meaningful benefit — generates some of health care's most difficult ethical conflicts. Physicians assess benefit through evidence-based metrics, whereas families interpret these situations through frameworks shaped by culture, faith, and personal values. This disconnect fuels tension, especially around end-of-life care, in which aggressive intervention may cause suffering even as families view withdrawal as abandonment. I examine how cultural attitudes influence these decisions and argue that certain models of "cultural competency training" — particularly those emphasizing generalized beliefs associated with specific demographic groups — may inadvertently worsen conflicts by encouraging stereotyping rather than fostering genuine listening. Effective navigation requires early communication, institutional flexibility, and acknowledgment of medicine's inability to answer questions about life's meaning.

A Moment That Changed Everything

Last year, I watched a family and medical team talk past each other for days. An elderly man with end-stage heart failure had occupied an ICU bed for weeks. His kidneys were failing, he needed maximum ventilator support, and cardiology had run out of options. The attending told us students that continuing care was "medically futile." The patient would die in the hospital regardless, and treatments were causing unnecessary suffering.

When the team suggested comfort measures, the daughter refused. She understood that her father was dying. She simply could not accept that stopping treatment was right. "We don't give up on our family," she said. For her, withdrawing support meant abandonment, perhaps even causing death rather than allowing disease to take its natural course.

Frustration built on both sides. Residents spoke of "wasted resources," a framing that reflects a clinical ethics of stewardship: finite ICU beds, ventilators, and nursing hours that could benefit other patients with more reversible conditions. From this view, prolonging care without the prospect of meaningful recovery may itself constitute harm. The attending and residents were not acting from indifference or efficiency alone. They were likely motivated by commitments to nonmaleficence — the duty to avoid causing harm — and to professional integrity, which includes honest prognostication. There may also have been a sense of obligation to the broader

patient population competing for scarce critical care resources.

Meanwhile, the daughter felt judged, as though her devotion to her father was an obstacle rather than an expression of love and duty. Neither side was wrong. They were just operating from incompatible frameworks about what was happening in that room.

That experience crystallized something: medical futility is not really medical. It is where medicine crashes into philosophy, culture, and deeply personal beliefs about life's value.

Why "Futility" Defies Definition

Medical futility sounds straightforward until you try to pin it down. Physiologic futility seems clearer: if someone has widespread cancer, failing organs, and is coding, CPR will not restore sustainable cardiac function. The intervention simply cannot achieve its basic goal.

Qualitative futility is where everything breaks down. Here, physicians say the outcome is not worth achieving. But that is a value judgment, not a medical fact. Someone on a ventilator in a persistent vegetative state has a beating heart. The machine works perfectly. Whether that constitutes life worth maintaining depends entirely on values, not science.

Doctors assess outcomes through specific lenses: survival duration, functional capacity, and cognitive ability. These may feel objective but reflect particular assumptions about what makes life worthwhile. A family viewing biological existence as inherently valuable is not irrational. They are weighing different factors and asking different questions.

When doctors declare treatment futile through a framework that prioritizes experiential quality of life and individual autonomy, and families demand continuation from a framework that emphasizes communal obligation, biological sanctity, or the moral responsibility of not withdrawing life, they are not disagreeing about facts. They start from incompatible beliefs about what benefit actually means. The conflict between nonmaleficence — avoiding harm — and a family's sense of moral responsibility to sustain life is not resolvable through better data. It is a genuine values conflict.

Death Is Not Universal

Your cultural assumptions about death stay invisible until you encounter someone who does not share them.

Western biomedical ethics treats death as fundamentally individual, emphasizing patient autonomy and frank prognosis discussions. We see dignity as involving acceptance once treatment stops helping. Pushing for intervention past that point reads as denial.

Yet many cultural and religious traditions approach death very differently. In numerous communities across East Asia, South Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America, death is understood as a communal event. When someone dies, it affects family honor, community cohesion, and spiritual well-being. Medical decisions ripple outward, affecting everyone. Some families view maximum treatment as fulfilling sacred obligations, not as prolonging suffering, but as honoring life. Withdrawal registers as betrayal.

Religious beliefs compound this complexity. Islamic teaching holds that only Allah determines life's end. For some Muslim families, withdrawing support feels like usurping divine authority. Hindu concepts of karma shape how families understand suffering's spiritual purpose and what constitutes a "good death." Catholic doctrine about life's sanctity can complicate comfort with "allowing natural death"

versus actively stopping treatment. These are not monolithic positions, because interpretation varies widely within each tradition, but they illustrate how profoundly religious frameworks shape what intervention means.

What strikes me is this: medical teams rarely recognize their own perspective as equally cultural. The bioethical principles taught in medical school — autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice — are not universal truths. They emerged from Western liberal thought and particular historical moments in medical ethics. When physicians frame their viewpoint as simply "medical" while describing families' convictions as "cultural beliefs requiring sensitivity," they miss something crucial. Both sides bring cultural frameworks. One just happens to dominate institutional culture.

The Cultural Competency Paradox

Medical education has long emphasized "cultural competency," broadly understood as training focused on acquiring knowledge about generalized beliefs and practices associated with particular cultural or demographic groups. The goal is that if doctors understand diverse perspectives on death and illness, they will navigate conflicts more skillfully. We learn that certain Asian cultures prioritize collective decisions, Jehovah's Witnesses refuse blood products, and Orthodox Jewish communities hold specific beliefs about brain death.

This approach creates the very problems it aims to solve. My critique here is directed primarily at simplified or older models of cultural competency, and at the informal or hidden curriculum that persists in many clinical environments, rather than at the best current curricula, some of which already emphasize cultural humility, reflexivity, and open-ended inquiry. The problem arises when training, whether formal or informal, treats culture as predictive.

Real humans resist categorization. Two Muslim patients might hold opposite end-of-life views, both rooted in Islamic interpretation. Someone from a collectivist culture might have thoroughly individualized beliefs. Well-intentioned demographic preconceptions become sophisticated stereotyping.

Framing futility conflicts as cultural misunderstandings also obscures what is actually happening. Sometimes, culture is not the issue at all. Families from identical backgrounds make opposite decisions because of different personalities, health care experiences, trust levels, or ways of processing grief. When we attribute every conflict to culture, we miss other dynamics that matter more.

Here is what troubles me most: teaching "about" cultures through generalizations creates illusions of understanding. You complete a module on Hispanic families preferring family-centered decisions, and suddenly, you think you understand the specific family sitting across from you. That assumption interferes with genuine listening. You stop hearing them. You are just fitting what they say into predetermined categories.

Cultural awareness matters deeply. But the goal should not be accumulating facts. It should be cultivating a fundamentally different stance: approaching every patient expecting surprise, staying curious about individual perspectives, and remaining alert to how your own assumptions shape what seems obviously natural or correct.

What Actually Helps

Start conversations earlier. Many conflicts escalate because critical discussions happen only during crises. When someone is actively dying, families

cannot process information clearly. Beginning conversations about values and goals before serious illness emerges gives everyone time to absorb difficult realities gradually. This requires acknowledging uncertainty explicitly rather than presenting prognoses as more definitive than they actually are.

Recognize value conflicts for what they are. Sometimes families understand the medical situation perfectly but disagree about what should happen. That is not failed communication. It is a genuine ethical disagreement. Recognition changes everything. Value conflicts may never fully resolve, but you can navigate them with mutual respect intact.

Involve palliative care sooner. Palliative specialists excel at eliciting what matters to people rather than persuading them toward predetermined decisions. But they typically enter only after curative treatments have clearly failed, which frames palliative care as surrender. Early involvement alongside other treatments might prevent conflicts from escalating in the first place.

Create flexible institutional policies that explicitly account for the structural realities of health care. Hospitals operate with finite resources: ICU beds, ventilators, and specialist time. A family's right to have their values respected must coexist with the institution's obligations to other patients and to clinical staff. Effective policies emphasize how conflicts get resolved rather than predetermining outcomes. In practice, this might include mandating timely ethics consultation, outlining time-limited trials of aggressive intervention with preagreed reassessment points, facilitating transfers to providers willing to continue care, and creating clear processes for unilateral clinical decisions when consensus is genuinely impossible. The goal is to structure disagreement without simply empowering physicians to override families, or families to demand indefinite continuation of care, without institutional accountability.

Reconceptualize competency itself. Emphasize cultural humility over cultural knowledge. Recognize the limits of your understanding. Commit to continuous learning. Constantly examine your own assumptions. Frame awareness as an ongoing practice you inhabit, not information you acquire once and move on from.

Living at the Boundary

Medical futility fascinates me precisely because it resists resolution. No algorithm produces the right answers. Better science will not settle these disputes. Clearer ethical reasoning will not either. Questions about life's meaning are not medical questions, and different answers are not more or less correct. They are fundamentally incommensurable.

These situations will arise constantly in my future practice. Patients will die. Families will demand treatments that, by clinical judgment, cause harm. My assessment will clash with deeply held religious convictions. I will feel institutional pressure around resource allocation and the needs of other patients. I will not resolve these tensions neatly, maybe ever. What I am trying to develop now is the capacity to stay present in impossible moments without demanding resolution: to listen without assuming someone's background tells me what they think, to admit uncertainty instead of hiding behind medical authority, and to recognize my values about dignity and quality of life as exactly that — my values, not universal truths everyone should obviously share.

Perhaps what matters most is not cultural fluency but ethical maturity. Can I acknowledge deep disagreement without dismissing it? Can I respect positions I personally find troubling? Can I maintain

genuine relationships with people whose choices disturb me? Can I accept that some tensions exist to be managed thoughtfully rather than solved definitively? Medicine operates where technical expertise meets existential questions, right at the boundaries of human experience. Learning to inhabit that uncomfortable space without demanding false certainty might be the most crucial skill I can develop, not because it makes difficult situations easier — they will remain agonizing no matter what — but because that kind of presence, the willingness to show up fully for people when there simply are not good options available, might be what patients and their families actually need most from their physicians.

The daughter in that ICU did not need her medical team to agree with her decision. She needed them to respect it, to treat her as someone making a profoundly difficult choice from a legitimate moral framework, not as an obstacle to delivering good medical care. Respect, in this context, means something specific: it does not require the team to endorse her choice, to abandon their clinical judgment, or to continue treatment indefinitely. It means treating her reasoning as worthy of genuine engagement, not as irrational resistance to be overcome, and explaining honestly what the institution can and cannot do, and why. The space between agreement and respect is exactly where medical futility's real work happens.