STEPHY Publishers

Current Investigations in Clinical and Medical Research

Short Communication

ISSN: 2770-6133

Paradise in the Fourth Age: A Bioethical Proposal for Pharmacological Pleasure in Institutionalized Elderly

João Carlos Holland de Barcellos*

São Paulo, Brazil

Abstract

An increasing number of elderly individuals live into very advanced age with significant physical or cognitive impairments, often in institutional care, suffering from isolation and diminished quality of life. This paper proposes the *Paradise in the Fourth Age (PFA)*, a regulated program to administer pleasure-inducing substances under medical supervision to consenting, severely impaired older adults who lack realistic prospects for functional recovery. The proposal explores ethical, social, and policy considerations, including resource allocation, risk of drug misuse, and the balance between autonomy and protection. We argue that the PFA could extend the philosophy of palliative care-not only reducing suffering, but actively promoting well-being in the final stage of life.

Keywords: Aging, Palliative care, Pleasure, Drug policy, End-of-life ethics

Introduction

Advances in public health and medicine have extended life expectancy, but many individuals at very advanced ages remain in poor health, suffering from neurodegenerative diseases, stroke sequelae, or other chronic disabilities. Though physically alive, their subjective quality of life may be severely compromised.

In the context of long-term care institutions, these elderly individuals often endure social isolation, boredom, and a profound lack of meaningful stimulation. Traditional palliative care tends to focus on symptom relief and comfort, but may not address the emotional and existential dimensions of suffering such as loneliness, apathy, or loss of agency.

Motivated by a personal observation of an 82-year-old parent with severe functional limitations, this proposal outlines a controversial program intended to enhance subjective well-being, by providing controlled access to pharmacological agents capable of producing pleasurable states.

The *paradise in the fourth age* program (PFA)

Purpose and rationale

The PFA would be a structured, voluntary program, ideally administered by a governmental or non-profit body, to offer pleasure-inducing pharmacological experiences to eligible elderly individuals in their "fourth age" (a phase of life marked by advanced age and severe impairment).

The objective is not to cure, but to *provide a dignified, pleasurable final phase of life* for those whose physical or cognitive conditions make meaningful engagement with the world increasingly difficult or impossible.

Substances and delivery

a. The program would preferably use a **standardized synthetic compound** designed for safety, reproducibility, and controlled pharmacokinetics.

b. Alternatively, well-known psychoactive substances (e.g., opioids, classical psychoactives) could be considered, but only under tight regulation.

c. Production, distribution, and administration must be strictly controlled, analogous to how governments manage highly regulated materials (e.g., controlled substances, sensitive chemicals).

d. Administration of the drug would occur in licensed facilities, by trained medical professionals.

Quick Response Code:

***Corresponding author:** João Carlos Holland de Barcellos, DTSibi, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

Received: 27 November, 2025 **Published:** 12 December, 2025

Citation: João Carlos Holland de Barcellos. Paradise in the Fourth Age: A Bioethical Proposal for Pharmacological Pleasure in Institutionalized Elderly: Short Communication. *Curr Inv Cln Med Res*. 2025;3(2):1–3 DOI:10.53902/CICMR.2025.03.000524

Safeguards and ethics

a. **Informed consent**: Only participants capable of understanding and consenting would be eligible; for cognitively compromised individuals, special procedures and ethical oversight would be necessary.

b. **Risk management**: Monitoring systems to track usage, detect diversion, and prevent misuse. Significant incidents (e.g., loss of control over distribution) could prompt suspension or termination of the program.

c. **Periodic review**: Ethics committees, geriatric experts, and patient advocates should evaluate the program regularly to ascertain its social, clinical, and moral outcomes.

Ethical and social considerations

Resource allocation

One central ethical challenge concerns **prioritization of public funds**. Critics may argue that resources should be devoted to addressing poverty, hunger, or basic healthcare, rather than pleasure for the elderly. However:

a. Democratic societies inherently make value-based decisions about resource distribution.

b. Public budgets already support wide-ranging initiatives (education, infrastructure, research) beyond basic welfare.

c. Philosophically, providing a dignified, pleasurable life to the elderly can be seen as a just allocation: the very old are a legitimate social group and deserve concern.

Autonomy and consent

- Autonomy is a core principle in medical ethics: individuals should have the right to decide about their care, including end-of-life support.
- The PFA promotes self-determination: participants choose to participate; it's not imposed.
- For those with cognitive decline: rigorous ethical frameworks will be needed (e.g., surrogate decision-makers, advanced directives).

Risk of social misuse and drug stigmatization

a. There is a real risk that such a program could **normalize psychoactive drug use**, possibly impacting societal perception of recreational drug consumption.

b. The **framing of the program** is critical: presenting it not as a reward, but as a **medical treatment** or palliative intervention, could mitigate the risk of social misuse.

c. Oversight, education, and prevention strategies would be essential to avoid unintended consequences.

Relationship to Palliative Care

The PFA proposal can be viewed as an extension-or perhaps a radical evolution-of palliative care philosophy:

i. Traditional palliative care focuses on **relieving suffering** (pain, dyspnea, nausea, emotional distress).

ii. However, there are limits: some patients experience **existential suffering**, social isolation, or emotional emptiness that are resistant to standard interventions.

iii. Sedation therapy (such as palliative sedation) is sometimes used in refractory cases. Ethical frameworks for it emphasize proportionality, intent, and autonomy.[1]

iv. The PFA does *not* seek unconsciousness (as in deep sedation), but *enhanced consciousness*, with pleasurable experience.

From a research perspective, quality-of-life trajectories at end of life have been studied using joint statistical models.[2] This kind of modeling could help evaluate whether PFA meaningfully improves well-being.

Ethical Risks and Objections

Medicalization of aging

I. There is a risk that the PFA contributes to the **medicalization of aging**, treating old age as a condition that must be pharmaceutically "fixed."

II. Scholarship warns of this trend: psychotropic use in the elderly may be driven by social pressures, not only medical need.[3]

III. It is crucial that the PFA be carefully regulated to prevent overuse, coercion, or pathologization of natural aging.

Bioethical conflicts at the end of life

I. End-of-life care is rife with bioethical tension: between prolonging life (dysthanasia), respecting autonomy (euthanasia/assisted death), and allowing natural death (orthothanasia).[4]

II. PFA introduces a new axis: **pleasure as a form of care**. This raises questions: Is pleasure a moral good in this context? Does offering pleasure risk undermining dignified dying?

Social justice and equity

I. Who qualifies to participate? Only the very old? Does this risk inequality (e.g., younger disabled individuals are excluded)?

II. Would the program be available only in wealthy countries or regions, deepening global health disparities?

III. Ethical governance must ensure fair access, transparency, and participatory decision-making.[5-9]

Proposed governance framework

To responsibly implement PFA, a strong governance structure is necessary:

I. **Ethics committees:** Multidisciplinary panels including geriatricians, pharmacologists, ethicists, patient advocates, and legal experts.

II. **Regulatory oversight:** Governmental health authorities to license production, distribution, and administration of the substance.

III. **Research component:** Ongoing empirical evaluation (clinical trials / observational studies) to monitor outcomes (quality of life, adverse effects, mortality).

IV. **Public engagement:** Transparent public consultation to discuss risks, benefits, and social acceptance.

V. **Safeguards:** Clear criteria for eligibility, revocation, and exit; mechanisms to detect diversion; policies for consent, especially in cognitively impaired individuals.

Conclusion

The *Paradise in the Fourth Age* program proposes a paradigm shift in how society cares for its oldest and most vulnerable members. Rather than merely alleviating suffering, it aims to **enhance subjective well-being** at the end of life through regulated, medically supervised access to pleasurable experiences.

While the proposal is ethically controversial, it is grounded in core values: **autonomy**, **dignity**, and the right to a meaningful and emotionally rich final phase of life. The challenges-ethical, regulatory, social-are significant, but not insurmountable. The PFA deserves serious public and academic debate, research, and thoughtful policy design.

Acknowledgments

None.

Funding

This Short Communication received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

References

1. National Ethics Committee, Veterans Health Administration. The ethics of palliative sedation as a therapy of last resort. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*. 2006;23(6):483-491.
2. Li Z, Frost HR, Tosteson TD, et al. A semiparametric joint model for terminal trend of quality of life and survival in palliative care research. *arXiv*. 2016;36(29):4692-4704.
3. Medeiros MOSF, Meira MV, Ribeiro Fraga FM, et al. Bioethical conflicts in end-of-life care. *Revista Bioética*. 2020;28(1).
4. Lima MLF, Almeida ST, Siqueira-Baptista R. Bioethics and end of life care. *Rev Soc Bras Clin Med*. 2015;3(4):296-302.
5. Neves FGO, Paula Ed, Monteiro HC, et al. Medicalização da morte no Brasil: impactos e repercussões do consumo farmacológico sob a ótica do cuidado paliativo. *Brazilian Journal of Implantology and Health Sciences*. 2023;5(5):1465-1480.
6. Morita T, Imai K, Tsuneto S. Ethical validity of palliative sedation therapy: a multicenter, prospective, observational study in Japan. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2005;30(4):308-319.
7. Py L, Burlá C, Limoeiro CS, et al. Palliative and end-of-life care of older people. *Sociedade Brasileira de Geriatria e Gerontologia*. 2010.
8. Possas ICP, Birchal TS. Terminalidade da vida: a morte medicamente assistida como cuidado respeitoso. *Sapere Aude*. 2024;5(29):54-75.
9. Py L, Burlá C, Limoeiro CS, et al. Cuidados paliativos e cuidados ao fim da vida na velhice. (Tradução / versão em português) *Sociedade Brasileira de Geriatria e Gerontologia*. 2010.