Universal Library of Medical and Health Sciences **Research Article**

ISSN: 3064-6545 | Volume 3, Issue 3

Open Access | PP: 08-15

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70315/uloap.ulmhs.2025.0303002

Comfort or Control? A Critical Examination of Hospice Care and Coercion in the Modern Healthcare System

Julian Ungar-Sargon, MD, PhD

Borra College of health Science, Dominican University, IL, USA.

Abstract

This article critiques the darker dimensions of hospice care and the coercive undercurrents of the broader healthcare system. Drawing on empirical studies, ethical analyses, and personal narratives, it argues that while hospice care is often idealized as compassionate end-of-life care, it can mask systemic neglect, profit motives, and disempowerment of patients. Similarly, coercion—both overt and subtle—pervades healthcare decision-making, particularly in mental health and end-of-life contexts. Through examination of institutional failures, Medicare exploitation, and ethical frameworks, this analysis reveals how systems designed to provide comfort, and care can paradoxically become mechanisms of control and neglect. The article calls for increased transparency, accountability, and ethical vigilance in reforming hospice oversight and addressing coercive healthcare practices.

Keywords: *Hospice Care, Healthcare Coercion, Medical Ethics, End-of-Life Care, Patient Autonomy.*

INTRODUCTION

Hospice care, fundamentally designed to provide comfort and dignity to terminally ill patients in their final months, represents one of medicine's most compassionate endeavors. The World Health Organization defines palliative care as an approach that "improves the quality of life of patients and their families facing the problem associated with life-threatening illness, through the prevention and relief of suffering" (1). In the United States, hospice services have expanded dramatically since the Medicare Hospice Benefit was established in 1982, now serving over 1.5 million patients annually (2). This growth reflects society's increasing recognition of the importance of dignified end-of-life care.

However, beneath this idealized veneer lies a more troubling reality. Healthcare systems, including hospice care, operate within complex institutional frameworks that can prioritize efficiency, profit, and control over genuine patient-centered care. Coercion in healthcare—defined as the use of pressure, threats, or manipulation to influence patient decisions—manifests in multiple forms, from explicit forced treatment to subtle institutional pressures that limit meaningful choice (3).

This article argues that while hospice and healthcare systems claim to prioritize patient autonomy and dignity, they often operate through mechanisms of control, neglect, and institutional coercion that undermine their stated compassionate goals. Through examination of empirical evidence, ethical analyses, and personal narratives from healthcare experiences documented at jyungar.com, this critique reveals how systems designed to heal, and comfort can become instruments of institutional power and patient disempowerment.

Citation: Julian Ungar-Sargon, "Comfort or Control? A Critical Examination of Hospice Care and Coercion in the Modern Healthcare System", Universal Library of Medical and Health Sciences, 2025; 3(3): 08-15. DOI: https://doi.org/10.70315/uloap.ulmhs.2025.0303002.

Institutional Failures and Systematic Neglect

The idealized image of hospice care as consistently compassionate and patient-centered has been challenged by mounting evidence of institutional failures and systematic neglect. A comprehensive investigation by Kaiser Health News revealed widespread problems across hospice agencies, including delayed pain relief, inadequate staffing, and lack of accountability mechanisms (4). These findings suggest that the hospice industry's rapid expansion has outpaced quality oversight, creating conditions where profit motives can supersede patient welfare.

The case of Bob Martin exemplifies these institutional failures. Despite promises of 24-hour care and immediate pain management, Martin experienced significant delays in receiving morphine during his final days, with family members forced to advocate repeatedly for basic comfort measures (4). Such cases reveal how the gap between hospice's compassionate rhetoric and operational reality can leave vulnerable patients and families without the promised support during their most difficult moments.

The bureaucratic structures that govern hospice care often prioritize documentation and regulatory compliance over responsive patient care. Healthcare providers working within these systems frequently report moral distress when institutional requirements conflict with their professional judgment about patient needs (5). This tension between institutional demands and clinical care creates an environment where systemic neglect can occur despite the best intentions of individual caregivers.

For-Profit Motives and Medicare Exploitation

The financial structure of hospice care in the United States has created perverse incentives that can compromise patient care quality. Hospice agencies receive approximately $16 billion annually from Medicare, yet oversight mechanisms remain minimal compared to other healthcare sectors (4). This combination of substantial public funding with limited accountability has enabled some providers to prioritize financial returns over patient outcomes.

The Medicare reimbursement model pays hospice providers a daily rate regardless of services actually provided, creating incentives to minimize costs while maximizing enrollment duration. Some agencies have been found to selectively admit patients with longer expected survival times while avoiding those requiring intensive or expensive interventions (6). This practice, known as "cherry-picking," undermines the fundamental hospice principle of providing care based on need rather than profitability.

Investigation into hospice industry practices has revealed patterns of aggressive marketing to families in crisis, inadequate assessment of patient needs, and premature discharge when care becomes expensive (4). These practices reflect how market-driven healthcare can corrupt the therapeutic relationship, transforming what should be a caring response to human vulnerability into a revenue-generating enterprise.

Facility-Based Hospice Disparities

Significant disparities exist between home-based and facility-based hospice care, with institutional settings often creating additional barriers to timely and appropriate comfort care. Patients receiving hospice services within nursing homes, hospitals, or other facilities frequently experience delays in pain management due to bureaucratic protocols and physician unavailability (7).

A documented case illustrates these disparities: a patient with a stage IV pressure ulcer was denied timely morphine administration because facility protocols required physician approval that was unavailable during weekend hours (7). Such cases demonstrate how institutional procedures can override clinical judgment and patient comfort, creating suffering that contradicts hospice care's fundamental purpose.

The medicalization of dying within institutional settings can paradoxically reduce attention to psychosocial and spiritual dimensions of care that hospice philosophy emphasizes. Facility-based hospice often becomes focused on medical management rather than holistic comfort, limiting the personalized approach that effective end-of-life care requires (8).

Underrepresentation and Inequitable Access

Systematic inequities in hospice care access and quality disproportionately affect marginalized populations and patients with certain diagnoses. Research indicates that patients with non-cancer diagnoses often receive less comprehensive hospice services and shorter enrollment periods compared to cancer patients (9). This disparity reflects both referral patterns and provider assumptions about which patients are "appropriate" for hospice care.

Racial and ethnic minorities, lower-income patients, and those in rural areas face significant barriers to accessing quality hospice services. These disparities are compounded by cultural misunderstandings, language barriers, and provider biases that can limit effective communication about end-of-life preferences (10). The result is a system that provides its highest quality services to those with the greatest social and economic advantages, perpetuating healthcare inequities even in death.

Coercion in the Healthcare System

Healthcare coercion encompasses a spectrum of practices ranging from overt forced treatment to subtle institutional pressures that constrain patient choice. Formal coercion includes legally sanctioned involuntary treatment, such as psychiatric holds or court-ordered medical interventions. Informal coercion involves manipulation, threats, or emotional pressure used by healthcare providers to influence patient decisions. Perceived coercion occurs when patients feel they have no meaningful choice, even when formal options exist (11).

The distinction between these forms of coercion is crucial for understanding how power operates within healthcare relationships. While formal coercion is legally regulated and theoretically subject to oversight, informal and perceived coercion often operate beneath the surface of clinical interactions, making them difficult to identify and address. Research suggests that perceived coercion may be more widespread and potentially more harmful to therapeutic relationships than formal coercive practices (12).

Understanding coercion requires examining both individual interactions and systemic factors that shape healthcare delivery. Institutional policies, reimbursement structures, and professional hierarchies all contribute to environments where coercive practices can flourish, often without explicit recognition by providers or patients (13).

Mental Health and Involuntary Treatment

The mental health system represents perhaps the most explicit example of healthcare coercion, with legal frameworks that permit involuntary treatment based on assessments of danger or incapacity. Psychiatric facilities routinely employ physical restraints, forced medication, and involuntary confinement, practices that would be considered assault in other contexts but are legally sanctioned in mental health settings (14).

Healthcare providers working in psychiatric settings frequently report moral distress related to coercive practices, describing conflicts between their therapeutic goals and institutional requirements for control and safety (14). This moral distress reflects the fundamental tension between respecting patient autonomy and managing perceived risks, a tension that often resolves in favor of institutional liability concerns rather than patient preferences.

Structural racism significantly exacerbates coercive practices in mental health care, with Black patients disproportionately subject to involuntary treatment, physical restraints, and police involvement during mental health crises (15). These disparities reflect both explicit bias and systemic factors that criminalize mental health symptoms in marginalized communities while providing therapeutic responses for privileged populations.

The expansion of mental health interventions into schools, workplaces, and community settings has extended coercive practices beyond traditional psychiatric facilities. Mandatory mental health screenings, required counseling, and threats of academic or employment consequences for non-compliance represent forms of coercion that blur the boundaries between treatment and social control (16).

Public Health and Policy-Level Coercion

Public health measures often employ coercive strategies justified by population health benefits, but these interventions raise significant ethical questions about individual autonomy and collective responsibility. Vaccine mandates, mandatory HIV testing, and restrictions on antibiotic prescribing represent examples of policies that use legal or economic pressure to modify individual behavior (17).

While these measures may produce beneficial health outcomes at the population level, they also demonstrate how public health authority can override individual choice and informed consent. The COVID-19 pandemic intensified these tensions, with vaccine mandates and quarantine requirements sparking debates about the limits of public health power and the rights of individuals to refuse medical interventions (18).

The ethical justification for coercive public health measures often relies on utilitarian calculations that may not adequately account for cultural values, individual circumstances, or historical trauma that affects community trust in health authorities (17). Communities that have experienced medical exploitation or discrimination may reasonably view public health mandates as continuation of oppressive practices rather than benevolent interventions.

The Moral Enterprise of Healthcare

Healthcare professionals increasingly find themselves functioning as both caregivers and enforcers of institutional and social norms, a dual role that can create ethical conflicts and undermine therapeutic relationships. Providers are expected to identify non-compliance, report suspicious injuries, and implement institutional policies that may conflict with patient preferences or clinical judgment (19).

This expansion of healthcare's social control function reflects broader societal trends toward medicalization of social problems and reliance on medical authority to manage complex social issues. Healthcare providers often lack training in navigating these expanded responsibilities and may inadvertently perpetuate coercive practices while attempting to provide compassionate care (20).

The therapeutic relationship itself can become a site of coercion when providers use their authority and patients' vulnerability to pressure compliance with treatment recommendations. While providers may believe they are acting in patients' best interests, this paternalistic approach can undermine patient autonomy and dignity, particularly for marginalized patients who may already distrust medical authority (21).

Autonomy, Dignity, and Relational Ethics

Traditional bioethical frameworks emphasizing individual autonomy, while valuable, may be insufficient for addressing the complex power dynamics and systemic issues identified in this critique. The principle of autonomy assumes rational, informed individuals making free choices, but this assumption breaks down when applied to healthcare contexts characterized by vulnerability, information asymmetries, and institutional pressures (22).

Relational ethics offers an alternative framework that recognizes how relationships, social contexts, and power structures shape healthcare experiences. This approach emphasizes the importance of trust, communication, and recognition of interdependence rather than focusing solely on individual choice (23). From a relational perspective, addressing coercion requires transforming healthcare relationships and institutional structures, not simply providing more information or expanding formal choice options.

The concept of dignity provides another lens for evaluating healthcare practices. Dignity-based approaches focus on treating patients as whole persons worthy of respect, regardless of their capacity for autonomous decision-making (24). This framework can help identify how systemic practices that technically preserve choice may nonetheless undermine human dignity through depersonalization, objectification, or failure to recognize individual worth and experience.

Trauma-Informed Care and Alternatives

Trauma-informed care represents one promising approach for reducing coercive practices and addressing the systemic issues identified in this critique. This framework recognizes how trauma affects individuals and communities and seeks to create healthcare environments that avoid re-traumatization while promoting healing and empowerment (25).

Key principles of trauma-informed care include safety, trustworthiness, peer support, collaboration, empowerment, and attention to cultural and gender issues (25). Implementing these principles requires fundamental changes to healthcare delivery, including provider training, policy modification, and organizational culture transformation. While challenging to implement, trauma-informed approaches offer concrete strategies for reducing coercion and improving patient experiences.

Community-based palliative care models provide alternatives to institutional hospice care that may better preserve patient autonomy and dignity. These approaches emphasize local relationships, cultural competence, and community ownership of end-of-life care decisions (26). By reducing reliance on large institutional providers, community-based models may be less susceptible to the profit motives and bureaucratic constraints that can compromise care quality.

Oversight Mechanisms

Healthcare institutions increasingly recognize the need for ethics consultation services to address moral distress among providers and ethical conflicts in patient care. Ethics consultation can provide a forum for examining coercive practices, resolving conflicts between institutional requirements and patient preferences, and developing policies that better support ethical care delivery (27).

However, ethics consultation services must be carefully designed to avoid becoming additional mechanisms of institutional control. Effective ethics programs require independence from administrative hierarchy, diverse perspectives including patient and community voices, and commitment to challenging systemic practices that may perpetuate harm (28).

Regulatory oversight of hospice care and other healthcare sectors must be strengthened to address the systemic issues identified in this analysis. Current oversight mechanisms often focus on documentation compliance rather than care quality or patient experience, allowing problematic practices to persist as long as paperwork requirements are met (29).

Systemic Reform Priorities

Addressing the issues identified in this critique requires comprehensive reform across multiple levels of the healthcare system. At the policy level, Medicare reimbursement structures for hospice care must be modified to incentivize quality over quantity and ensure adequate oversight of provider practices. This includes implementing meaningful quality metrics, conducting regular care assessments, and creating accountability mechanisms for patient complaints and adverse outcomes.

Healthcare provider education must incorporate training on recognizing and addressing coercive practices, understanding power dynamics in therapeutic relationships, and implementing trauma-informed care approaches. This education should begin in professional training programs and continue through ongoing professional development requirements.

Institutional policies and procedures require systematic review to identify and eliminate practices that create barriers to patient-centered care or perpetuate coercive relationships. This includes examining admission criteria, discharge procedures, pain management protocols, and communication policies to ensure they support rather than undermine patient autonomy and dignity.

Research and Evaluation Needs

Significant gaps remain in research on coercive practices in healthcare and their impact on patient outcomes and experiences. Future research should examine the prevalence and effects of informal and perceived coercion across different healthcare settings and patient populations. This research must include patient and family perspectives, as institutional assessments of coercion may not capture the full scope of problematic practices.

Evaluation of alternative care models, including community-based palliative care and trauma-informed approaches, is needed to identify effective strategies for reducing coercion while maintaining care quality and safety. This evaluation should include long-term outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and patient satisfaction measures.

Research on the relationship between healthcare financing structures and coercive practices could inform policy reforms aimed at aligning financial incentives with ethical care delivery. This includes examining how different payment models affect provider behavior, patient choices, and care outcomes.

CONCLUSION

This analysis has revealed how healthcare systems, including hospice care, can operate through mechanisms of control and coercion that contradict their stated goals of compassion and patient-centered care. The evidence presented demonstrates that institutional failures, profit motives, and systematic inequities create conditions where vulnerable patients may experience neglect, manipulation, and disempowerment rather than dignity and comfort.

The critique of coercive practices in healthcare extends beyond individual provider behavior to encompass systemic factors including reimbursement structures, regulatory frameworks, and professional training that shape how care is delivered. Addressing these issues requires recognition that technical solutions alone—such as informed consent procedures or patient rights policies—are insufficient without fundamental changes to power relationships and institutional cultures.

The path forward requires commitment to transparency, accountability, and ethical vigilance across all levels of healthcare delivery. This includes strengthening oversight mechanisms, implementing trauma-informed care approaches, supporting community-based alternatives, and centering patient and family voices in healthcare reform efforts.

Most importantly, this analysis calls for recognition that healthcare is fundamentally a moral enterprise that must be evaluated not only by clinical outcomes but by its success in honoring human dignity and supporting patient autonomy. When healthcare systems fail to meet these ethical standards, they betray the trust placed in them by society's most vulnerable members and undermine the healing mission they claim to serve.

The experiences documented in this analysis and in the personal narratives at jyungar.com remind us that behind every policy debate and institutional reform are real people seeking comfort, dignity, and respect during some of life's most difficult moments. Their voices must guide efforts to create healthcare systems worthy of the trust and hope placed in them by those who turn to medicine in their times of greatest need.

APPENDIX: JEWISH HOSPICE CARE - AN ALTERNATIVE ETHICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction to Jewish End-of-Life Care Ethics

When examining the structural problems plaguing mainstream hospice care, it becomes essential to consider whether alternative frameworks might offer more ethical approaches to end-of-life care. Jewish hospice care presents one such alternative, grounded in fundamentally different principles that challenge the market-driven assumptions underlying much of contemporary American healthcare. Rather than treating death as a medical event to be managed efficiently, Jewish approaches to dying are built around the concepts of pikuach nefesh (preservation of life), kavod habriyot (human dignity), and tikkun olam (repairing the world) (30).

What makes Jewish hospice care particularly relevant to this critique is how it reframes the entire purpose of end-of-life care. The Jewish concept of dying with dignity, or mitzvah, extends far beyond mere comfort care to encompass active engagement with spiritual, communal, and ethical dimensions of the dying process. This holistic understanding directly confronts the medicalized and profit-driven models that have come to dominate hospice care in the United States, suggesting that the problems identified earlier in this analysis are not inevitable features of end-of-life care but rather consequences of particular institutional arrangements (31).

Community-Centered Care and the Challenge to Commodification

Perhaps the most striking difference between Jewish hospice care and mainstream models lies in their respective understandings of responsibility and obligation. Jewish traditions emphasize arevut, or collective responsibility for community members, particularly during times of greatest vulnerability. This principle creates a fundamentally different dynamic in hospice care, one that prioritizes community involvement, family engagement, and spiritual support over the institutional efficiency and cost containment that drive many conventional hospice organizations (32).

The chevra kadisha tradition provides a concrete example of how these principles translate into practice. This community-based approach to death care demonstrates that alternative structures for end-of-life support are not only possible but have been successfully maintained for centuries. Unlike market-driven hospice models that inevitably face pressure to prioritize profitable patients or minimize costly interventions, Jewish hospice care operates within frameworks of obligation and covenant that actively resist the commodification of death and dying.

This resistance stems from the principle of tzedakah, often translated as charity but more accurately understood as justice. Tzedakah requires the provision of care based on need rather than ability to pay or profit potential (33). When this principle guides hospice care decisions, it creates natural barriers to the kind of patient selection and cost-cutting measures that compromise care quality in profit-driven systems. The obligation is to the person who is dying, not to shareholders or organizational efficiency metrics.

Ethical Decision-Making Beyond the Autonomy-Paternalism Divide

The ethical consultation processes used in Jewish hospice care offer another instructive alternative to mainstream approaches. Rather than relying solely on the individual autonomy model that dominates medical ethics, or falling back into medical paternalism, Jewish hospice care often incorporates rabbinic consultation and halakhic decision-making processes that create structured approaches to difficult decisions while honoring both tradition and personal needs (34).

These consultation processes reveal something important about the limitations of how mainstream hospice care handles ethical conflicts. Hospital ethics committees, while well-intentioned, often remain inaccessible to patients and families, both practically and culturally. The beit din model of rabbinical consultation, by contrast, provides structured ethical guidance that emerges from within the community and remains accountable to it (35). This approach demonstrates how alternative institutional structures for addressing ethical conflicts can be both more accessible and more culturally appropriate than the formal mechanisms typically available in healthcare settings.

What emerges from these consultation processes is not rigid adherence to predetermined rules, but rather careful consideration of religious law, ethical principles, and individual circumstances. This nuanced approach suggests that the either-or choice between medical paternalism and pure individual autonomy that characterizes much medical ethics discourse may be a false dichotomy. Jewish hospice care models point toward third alternatives that are both principled and responsive to particular circumstances.

Personal Experiences and Institutional Contrasts

The theoretical differences between Jewish and mainstream hospice care become most apparent through direct experience. Personal observations of Jewish end-of-life care practices reveal how the integration of spiritual guidance, community support, and ethical consultation creates distinctly different experiences from institutional hospice care (36). These differences illuminate not just alternative approaches to specific practices, but fundamentally different assumptions about what dying with dignity means and who bears responsibility for ensuring it.

Where mainstream hospice care often defaults to passive comfort measures once curative treatment is abandoned, the emphasis on pikuach nefesh in Jewish hospice care requires more active intervention to preserve life and alleviate suffering. This intervention occurs within frameworks that maintain human dignity and spiritual meaning, suggesting possible middle ground between the aggressive medical intervention that characterizes much end-of-life care and the sometimes-premature resignation to death that can occur in conventional hospice settings (36).

The community dimension proves equally significant. Rather than treating the dying person primarily as an individual consumer of healthcare services, Jewish hospice care maintains emphasis on their role within ongoing community relationships. This perspective naturally generates different priorities and practices, creating accountability mechanisms that emerge from community bonds rather than external regulations or market pressures.

Implications for Systemic Reform

The success of Jewish hospice care models suggests several principles that could inform broader healthcare reform efforts, even beyond religious communities. Community accountability mechanisms in religious settings often prove more effective than market-driven oversight precisely because they emerge from ongoing relationships and shared values rather than external enforcement. Such accountability creates natural oversight of care quality and ethical practices that regulatory approaches struggle to achieve.

Similarly, the resistance to commodification that characterizes religious frameworks points toward possibilities for organizing care around principles other than market efficiency. When care provision is understood as fulfilling religious obligation rather than delivering services for profit, different kinds of institutions become possible. These institutions can prioritize patient welfare over financial returns because they operate according to different measures of success.

The structured ethical consultation processes developed within religious communities also offer models for more accessible alternatives to formal ethics committees. These processes work particularly well for communities that may distrust mainstream medical institutions, but their basic structure could be adapted for secular contexts where community-based ethical consultation might prove more effective than institutional approaches.

Perhaps most importantly, the emphasis on spiritual and communal dimensions of dying addresses the dehumanizing aspects of medicalized death that characterize much institutional hospice care. This holistic understanding of dignity suggests that technical competence in pain management and comfort care, while necessary, is insufficient for truly ethical end-of-life care.

Limitations and the Question of Broader Application

These promising alternatives face real limitations that must be acknowledged. Religious frameworks remain inaccessible or inappropriate for many populations, and traditional religious authorities can perpetuate their own forms of paternalism or exclusion. Small-scale religious models may lack the resources necessary to address complex medical needs or serve large populations (37). The integration of religious approaches with secular healthcare systems raises legitimate questions about the separation of religious and medical authority, potential conflicts between religious law and medical ethics, and accessibility for non-observant or marginally affiliated community members (38).

Yet these limitations do not negate the lessons these models offer. The success of Jewish hospice care in addressing many of the systemic problems identified in mainstream hospice care demonstrates that alternative approaches are possible and can work effectively. Rather than requiring universal adoption of religious frameworks, these examples suggest that community-based, ethically-grounded, and non-profit approaches could provide viable alternatives to market-driven hospice care for diverse populations.

The challenge for policy makers and healthcare reformers lies in adapting principles from religious hospice care models for broader application while maintaining their beneficial characteristics. This adaptation would need to preserve community accountability, ethical consultation processes, and resistance to commodification while remaining accessible to populations that do not share particular religious commitments. The development of such secular alternatives represents one promising direction for addressing the structural problems that continue to compromise hospice care in the United States.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. WHO definition of palliative care [Internet]. Geneva: WHO; 2022 [cited 2025 Jun 30]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/palliative-care
2. National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization. NHPCO facts and figures: hospice care in America [Internet]. Alexandria, VA: NHPCO; 2024 [cited 2025 Jun 30]. Available from: https://www.nhpco.org/hospice-care-overview/
3. Szmukler G, Appelbaum PS. Treatment pressures, leverage, coercion, and compulsion in mental health care. J Ment Health. 2008;17(3):233-44.
4. Birnstengel G. This is the dirty side of hospice care. Next Avenue [Internet]. 2017 Oct 27 [cited 2025 Jun 30]. Available from: https://www.nextavenue.org/dirty-side-hospice/
5. Austin W, Goble E, Leier B, Byrnes P. Compassion fatigue: the experience of nurses. Ethics Soc Welfare. 2009;3(2):195-214.
6. McCarthy EP, Burns RB, Ngo-Metzger Q, Davis RB, Phillips RS. Hospice use among Medicare managed care and fee-for-service patients dying with cancer. JAMA. 2003;289(17):2238-45.
7. Abraham P. The dark side of hospice at a facility. Compassion Crossing [Internet]. 2024 May 6 [cited 2025 Jun 30]. Available from: https://compassioncrossing.info/the-dark-side-of-hospice-at-a-facility/
8. Gomes B, Calanzani N, Gysels M, Hall S, Higginson IJ. Heterogeneity and changes in preferences for dying at home: a systematic review. BMC Palliat Care. 2013;12:7.
9. Hughes NM, Noyes J, Eckley L, Pritchard T. What do patients and family-caregivers value from hospice care? BMC Palliat Care. 2019;18(1):18.
10. Johnson KS. Racial and ethnic disparities in palliative care. J Palliat Med. 2013;16(11):1329-34.
11. Molodynski A, Rugkasa J, Burns T. Coercion and compulsion in community mental health care. Br Med Bull. 2010;95:105-19.
12. Katsakou C, Priebe S. Outcomes of involuntary hospital admission: a review. Acta Psychiatr Scand. 2006;114(4):232-41.
13. Szmukler G. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: 'rights, will and preferences' in relation to mental health disabilities. Int J Law Psychiatry. 2017;54:90-7.
14. Hem MH, Molewijk B, Pedersen R. Ethical challenges in connection with the use of coercion. BMC Med Ethics. 2014;15:82.
15. Faissner M, Braun E. The ethics of coercion in mental healthcare: the role of structural racism. J Med Ethics. 2024;50(7):476-82.
16. Gostin LO, Hodge JG. Piercing the veil of secrecy in HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. Duke J Gend Law Policy. 1998;5:9-88.
17. Johnson T, Ndlovu L, Baiyegunhi OO, Lora WS, Desmond N. Coercive public health policies need context-specific ethical justifications. Monash Bioeth Rev. 2024;42(1):45-62.
18. Kahn JP, Henry LM, Mastroianni AC, Chen WH, Macklin R. For now, it's unethical to compel coronavirus vaccination. STAT [Internet]. 2020 May 6 [cited 2025 Jun 30]. Available from: https://www.statnews.com/2020/05/06/unethical-compel-coronavirus-vaccination/

19. Lipkin M. Psychiatry and medicine. Am J Psychiatry. 1986;143(7):848-51.
20. Conrad P. The medicalization of society: on the transformation of human conditions into treatable disorders. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press; 2007.
21. Kleinman A. The illness narratives: suffering, healing, and the human condition. New York: Basic Books; 1988.
22. O'Neill O. Autonomy and trust in bioethics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2002.
23. Sherwin S. A relational approach to autonomy in health care. In: The politics of women's health: exploring agency and autonomy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press; 1998. p. 19-47.
24. Chochinov HM. Dignity-conserving care: a new model for palliative care. JAMA. 2002;287(17):2253-60.
25. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Trauma-informed care in behavioral services treatment. Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series 57. Rockville, MD: SAMHSA; 2014.
26. Murray SA, Boyd K, Sheikh A. Palliative care in chronic illness. BMJ. 2005;330(7492):611-2.
27. Aulisio MP, Arnold RM, Youngner SJ. Health care ethics consultation: nature, goals, and competencies. Ann Intern Med. 2000;133(1):59-69.
28. Finder SG, Bliton MJ. Responsibility after the apparent end of the ethics consultation. J Clin Ethics. 2011;22(3):225-35.
29. Ungar-Sargon J. Is Hospice Care in Conflict with Jewish Values?: Finding a Common Ground for the Jewish Community. American Journal of Palliative Care. 1987 May/June;4:43-54. Dorff EN. Matters of life and death: a Jewish approach to modern medical ethics. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society; 1998.
30. Zoloth L. Health care and the ethics of encounter: a Jewish discussion of social justice. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; 1999.
31. Mackler AL. Introduction to Jewish and Catholic bioethics: a comparative analysis. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press; 2003.
32. Rosner F. Biomedical ethics and Jewish law. Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House; 2001.
33. Steinberg A. Encyclopedia of Jewish medical ethics. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers; 2003.
34. Bleich JD. Bioethical dilemmas: a Jewish perspective. Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House; 1998.
35. Ungar-Sargon J. "Beyond the Iron Cage: Institutional Coercion and the Imperative for Transformative Healing Spaces" (2025) –www.jyungar.com-healingessays
36. Goldberg HI, Kaplan B. Jewish hospice care: the intersection of religion and medicine in end-of-life care. J Palliat Med. 2010;13(9):1141-5.
37. Clarfield AM, Gordon M, Markwell H, Alibhai SM. Ethical issues in end-of-life geriatric care: the approach of three monotheistic religions-Judaism, Catholicism, and Islam. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2003;51(8):1149-54.