

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Death

in a Hurry

The one certainty, taken seriously

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 31

Use It 36

Terms 40

Go Deeper 44

Notes and Sources 45

Bibliography 51

The Whole Thing in One Page

In one possibility, a person's heart has stopped, yet resuscitation may restore circulation. In another, a ventilator lifts a warm chest and a monitor shows a pulse, yet a complete neurological assessment can establish that the person has died. Visible signs mislead in both directions. Death is usually pictured as a switch because medicine, law and families need a line. Biology does not supply one in that form.

A living body is continuous work. It maintains temperature, pressure, chemical gradients, repair, defence and coordination. When that work fails beyond recovery, the organism dies, but its parts do not all stop together. Cells and tissues can remain viable after the person has died. Death is therefore biologically a process, institutionally a point and socially a transfer.

The line is justified through evidence and examination. Under the UK's current clinical standard, death is the permanent loss of the capacity for consciousness together with the permanent loss of the capacity to breathe, established through somatic, circulatory or neurological criteria. Other jurisdictions express and test the boundary differently. A cardiac arrest is an emergency before it is a verdict. Death diagnosed using neurological criteria is death, not deep coma. Coma, unresponsive wakefulness syndrome and the minimally conscious state occur in living people.

Dying has several broad shapes. It may be sudden. Cancer can produce a more visible final decline. Heart and lung failure often bring crises followed by partial recovery. Frailty and dementia can narrow life over years. In the last days, people commonly sleep more, eat and drink less, weaken and develop altered breathing or consciousness. No sign supplies a timetable. Palliative care treats pain, breathlessness, agitation, fear and other suffering while helping people decide which outcomes still justify treatment. Withholding or withdrawing treatment, proportionate palliative sedation and assisted dying where lawful are distinct acts, with different purposes and legal rules.

The certainty is also unequal. World Bank data for 2024 show about fifteen

years between average life expectancy in high-income and low-income economies. The World Health Organization's latest comprehensive estimates describe 68 million deaths in 2021, but mortality differed sharply by age, cause and income setting. Everyone dies. Public health, violence, wealth, environment and access to care help determine when and how.

After the line, the work changes hands. Death is confirmed. A cause is certified. The body is cared for, examined where necessary, and buried, cremated, donated or handled through another practice. Property, duties and records move. Ritual gives survivors a sequence for acknowledging that the person's future agency is gone while relationships and consequences remain.

No single philosophy follows. Epicurus attacks fear of being dead because there is no subject left to experience it. Deprivation accounts answer that death can still be bad by removing a future. Arguments about immortality ask whether endless continuation would preserve a life worth wanting. Near-death research can study reports from people who survived cardiac arrest; it cannot observe subjective experience after permanent death. Science can mark that limit without settling faith or metaphysics.

The arguments do expose the deadline. People can lose capacity before death, sometimes for years. Death makes any remaining or recoverable capacity for return, choice and revision permanently unavailable. Others then inherit both the decisions made and the ones avoided.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

Somebody may ask what should happen to a person who can no longer answer. The question may arrive in an intensive care unit, a care home, an ambulance bay or a quiet bedroom. It may concern a treatment that could prolong circulation without restoring awareness, a resuscitation attempt with little prospect of success, or a transfer to hospital that offers burden without recovery. The problem is deciding what the machinery is for.

Those decisions are made under pressure, often by people who have never heard the relevant terms until the day they must use them. A vague promise to do everything can conceal several incompatible aims: restoring a person to an independent life, gaining a little time for farewell, preventing suffering, or keeping organs functioning when recovery is no longer possible. Understanding death cannot choose among those aims. It can stop them being confused.

Death matters before anyone dies because modern medicine can separate events that once arrived together. A heart can stop and be restarted. Breathing can be supplied by a ventilator. Circulation can continue after the brainstem has permanently lost the functions required by the UK's neurological criteria. A person can be alive while unable to respond, and a person whose death has been diagnosed neurologically can remain warm, pink and connected to monitors. Those facts are clinically manageable. They are emotionally brutal when encountered without a map.

The map changes ordinary life too. Most people carry a switch model: alive on one side, dead on the other, with a clear second between them. Biology is less tidy. Dying usually involves a sequence of failures, and different tissues stop at different times. Medicine therefore needs criteria that convert a process into a defensible status. That line governs when resuscitative treatment ends, when donation after death may proceed, who may certify the cause, and when the body enters a different system of care. The line is not arbitrary, but neither is it a glowing boundary placed in nature for us to discover.

There is another reason to care, and it is less technical. Death is universal while the timing is not. In World Bank data for 2024, the life-expectancy gap between high-income and low-income economies was about fifteen years. Within countries, occupation, income, housing, discrimination, violence, pollution and access to care alter both the age and the manner of death. One certainty can conceal an enormous distribution of preventable loss.

Then comes dying itself. Public imagination alternates between two bad pictures: a gentle fading in perfect calm, or unbearable pain that medicine

cannot touch. Real dying is more variable. Symptoms can be severe, uncertainty can be frightening, and care can fail. Yet pain, breathlessness, agitation, nausea and fear can often be reduced. Palliative care does not require pretending that death is welcome. It changes the question from how long can this body be made to continue to what would count as good care now.

Finally, death explains a surprising amount about the living. A death certificate, a washed body, a funeral, an empty chair, a will, a name spoken years later: these are ways a society handles the fact that one person's future agency is no longer recoverable while their relationships and effects remain. Biology stops maintaining the person. Other people begin maintaining the meaning, obligations and record.

The subject attracts confident nonsense because evidence has a hard limit. People can report experiences remembered around cardiac arrest only if they survive. Nobody can return from a loss already established as permanent. That boundary leaves room for philosophy and faith, but it also tells us when a scientific claim has outrun its sample.

Taking death seriously does not mean thinking about it constantly. It means understanding enough that denial does not make the largest decisions by default. The certainty is fixed. What happens before it, around it and because of it remains open.

The Core Ideas

Life Is Maintenance, Not Possession

A living body looks stable because it is working. Temperature stays within a narrow range. Oxygen moves from lungs to blood and from blood to tissue. Cells keep different concentrations of salts on either side of their membranes. Damaged molecules are repaired or replaced. Waste is moved, acidity controlled, infections resisted, blood pressure adjusted and glucose rationed. This stability requires continuous expenditure. A large share of cellular energy is spent maintaining gradients that disappear quickly when oxygen and fuel fail. Health's stillness is misleading. It resembles a cyclist held upright by motion: stability is an achievement renewed each second.

That gives the first useful model of death. Life is not a substance stored in the body, waiting to depart. It is an organised activity that the body keeps producing. The old image of a vital spark made intuitive sense because a living person differs so completely from a corpse, yet no single spark has been found. What disappears is coordinated self-maintenance.

The coordination has levels. A cell can remain viable for a time after the organism has died. Hair and nails do not continue growing, though drying skin can retract and create that appearance. Some tissues tolerate interruption of blood flow longer than others. A heart removed for transplantation can retain biological capacity outside the person under controlled conditions. Sperm, corneas, skin and bone can remain usable after death. None of this means the person is partly alive. It means organism, organ, tissue and cell are different units.

The distinction matters because death cannot sensibly mean the simultaneous extinction of every living cell. That event arrives far too late and unevenly. Clinical standards are concerned with the loss of the living human being, although jurisdictions differ over the functions and formulations used to establish that loss. Decomposition is evidence that death occurred earlier, not the event itself.

This model also prevents the opposite mistake. Calling death a process does not mean a person can remain indefinitely suspended between alive and dead. Processes can cross thresholds. A fire goes out even while embers remain hot. A company can cease trading while its computers still run. The comparison is imperfect, but it separates the whole from its surviving parts. The body may contain living cells after it can no longer function as a living person.

What counts as integration is partly a biological question and partly a philosophical one. Some accounts centre the organism's capacity to regulate itself. Others centre consciousness and breathing. Different legal systems have encoded different formulations. The practical requirement is less negotiable: the criterion must identify a loss from which the person will not return, and it must be applicable with enough reliability that treatment, duties and rights can change.

The false public image is a body that owns life until a final second, then loses it. The stronger image is a body continually earning its next moment through organised work. Dying can begin while repair remains possible. Death is reached when the governing loss has become permanent under a justified standard and the person will not return.

Biology Gives a Process; Institutions Require a Point

Dying can take minutes, days or years. Death still has to be recorded at a time.

The apparent contradiction comes from asking one word to do two jobs. Biologically, death describes a transition in which circulation, breathing, brain function and cellular maintenance fail in a sequence. Institutionally, death is a status. A clinician stops treating a patient as recoverable. A family or authorised service takes responsibility for the body. A registrar creates a record. Property can pass. An office becomes vacant. A criminal investigation may begin. None of those systems can operate on the answer that death is somewhere in progress.

The line needs three layers. First comes a concept: what human loss counts as death? Second come criteria: what bodily state establishes that loss? Third come tests: what observations show that the criteria have been met in this case? Confusing the layers creates much of the argument. A disagreement about an apnoea test may concern procedure rather than the meaning of a person. A disagreement about consciousness may concern the concept rather than any bedside measurement.

Current UK clinical guidance defines death as permanent loss of the capacity for consciousness combined with permanent loss of the capacity to breathe. It permits confirmation through somatic, circulatory or neurological criteria. Somatic criteria cover unmistakable changes such as decomposition or injuries incompatible with life. Circulatory criteria apply after circulation and breathing have permanently stopped. Neurological criteria apply after brainstem function has permanently stopped under tightly specified conditions. This is an authoritative UK clinical standard, not a universal philosophical settlement. Other countries use different formulations and procedures. One concept within the standard, several routes to its application.

The word permanent carries weight. It means function will not return spontaneously and will not be restored by intervention. Some literature distinguishes permanence from irreversibility, reserving irreversible for a state that could not be reversed even with any available intervention. In practice, what matters is not every imagined machine. It is whether further treatment could benefit this patient and whether circulation or brain function could return in the clinical circumstances. A decision not to attempt futile or unwanted resuscitation does not make death fictional. It helps define the context in which permanence is judged.

This is why a time of death is better understood as a warranted declaration than as a camera's capture of nature's hidden instant. The declaration must follow evidence. It can be wrong if criteria are applied badly. Yet its precision should not be mistaken for a claim that every system in the body changed at that minute. Similar precision appears elsewhere in medicine: a tumour

stage, a blood-pressure threshold or a viability rule turns continuous variation into categories because decisions require categories. The category earns authority from the quality of its purpose and tests, not from pretending nature came labelled.

The same problem appears at the beginning of life, where fertilisation, implantation, viability, birth and independent respiration supply different boundaries for different purposes. Nature supplies continuous development and decline. Institutions select defensible thresholds because action cannot remain continuous.

A good line therefore has to satisfy rival demands. It must protect living people from premature declaration. It must not demand useless treatment to prove what is already permanent. It must be clear enough for families and professionals to trust. It must work across emergency departments, homes and intensive care units. No definition removes judgement. The aim is disciplined judgement, visible enough to challenge and stable enough to use.

The Brain Changed the Boundary

For most of history, the practical signs of death travelled together. Breathing stopped, the pulse disappeared, the skin cooled and no machine could keep circulation going for long. The heart looked like the obvious centre because its arrest announced the end.

Mechanical ventilation separated the events. Polio epidemics and the development of positive-pressure ventilation showed that breathing could be supplied for long periods when the body could not provide it. Intensive care then made it possible to preserve circulation through brain injuries that would previously have brought heart and breath to an end together. A ventilator can move air when the brain no longer drives breathing. Oxygenated blood can keep the heart beating because the heart has its own pacemaker tissue. Warmth and colour may remain. Intensive care therefore created a case ordinary experience had not prepared people to see: under the UK's neurological standard, a person can have died while the chest rises

and a pulse continues through technological support.

Neurological criteria answer that case. In the UK, the relevant loss is permanent cessation of brainstem function. The brainstem supports the capacities for consciousness and breathing, and supplies reflexes used in the examination. Clinicians must establish a devastating brain injury of known cause, allow an adequate assessment period, exclude reversible influences such as sedative drugs, severe cooling and major metabolic disturbance, and satisfy detailed preconditions. At least two suitably qualified doctors work together. They perform two complete sets of clinical tests, including two apnoea tests, and each must be willing to document the diagnosis. The recorded time of death is ordinarily completion of the second set, when all involved are satisfied that the criteria are met. Other jurisdictions use whole-brain formulations, different numbers of examinations or different ancillary tests. International guidance narrows variation without eliminating it.

Death diagnosed using neurological criteria is not coma. A person in coma is alive. Some brain function remains, and recovery may be possible depending on cause and severity. Unresponsive wakefulness syndrome, formerly called the vegetative state, can include sleep-wake cycles and independent breathing despite no reliable behavioural evidence of awareness. A minimally conscious person shows limited but reproducible signs of awareness. These conditions can be devastating, and decisions about treatment can be hard. They do not meet neurological criteria for death.

Nor does diagnosis by neurological criteria require every neuron to be destroyed. The standard concerns permanent loss of the functions required by the governing definition. Spinal reflexes can remain because the spinal cord can generate movements without the brainstem. Hormonal activity or isolated cellular activity may persist. Such findings can look incompatible with death if the observer expects total biological silence. They are compatible with the distinction between the death of the person and persistence in some parts of the body.

The emotional difficulty is not evidence against the diagnosis. It shows that ordinary signs were learned in a world without ventilators. Families see a warm body and a monitor displaying a heartbeat. Clinicians see that the brainstem has permanently ceased functioning and that technology is maintaining circulation after the capacities for consciousness and breathing have been permanently lost under the UK definition. Trust depends on explaining both views without treating either as foolish.

The stakes intensify when organ donation is possible, which is why boundaries must remain explicit. Donation does not create the definition of death, and the diagnosis must be independent of organ retrieval and allocation. Yet the proximity can generate suspicion, especially where consent, communication or public understanding is weak. Separation of roles and criteria protects the dying patient, the family and the legitimacy of transplantation.

The brain did not replace the heart as a mystical seat. Technology exposed that neither organ alone is a soul detector. The clinical question is which permanent losses satisfy the governing definition of death even while machines preserve selected bodily functions. The philosophical question of why those losses should count remains open to argument, which is why the jurisdiction must stay visible.

Dying Has Patterns, Not a Script

Death may be certain, but dying has no single shape. A sudden fatal injury can compress the process into seconds. Many cancers produce a period of relatively stable function followed by a more visible decline. Heart or lung failure may bring repeated crises, partial recoveries and no clear final turning point until late. Frailty and dementia can narrow life across years. These broad trajectories help services anticipate needs. They do not predict an individual's calendar.

The routes also shape opportunity. Sudden death may allow no conversation at all. Cancer can provide months of warning. Organ failure creates repeated false endings. Frailty can make the final period so long

that families exhaust themselves before anyone calls it dying. Services designed around one route can fail people on another.

That uncertainty explains why recognising the last days is difficult. Reduced appetite, increasing sleep, less interest in surroundings, weaker circulation, altered breathing, confusion and declining urine output can accompany dying. They can also have reversible causes. A person may appear close to death and stabilise. Another may speak in the morning and die that evening. Clinical guidance therefore combines signs with repeated assessment, communication and a willingness to revise.

The body often reduces its demands near the end. Hunger and thirst may diminish. Swallowing can become unsafe. Breathing may alternate between rapid, shallow and paused patterns. Secretions in the throat can produce a wet sound commonly called the death rattle. It often alarms listeners; the sound alone does not show that an unresponsive person is distressed. Skin may cool or become mottled as circulation changes. Agitation can result from pain, urinary retention, medication effects, organ failure or delirium, so comfort requires assessment rather than one sedative answer.

Pain is important, but it is not the whole experience. Cicely Saunders used the phrase total pain to connect physical symptoms with fear, isolation, dependence, damaged relationships and spiritual distress. St Christopher's Hospice, which she founded in London in 1967, joined symptom control with nursing, family support, teaching and research. The modern hospice movement grew from the claim that dying people remained patients with needs, not failed treatments awaiting departure.

Palliative care carries the same principle beyond hospices. It aims to improve quality of life for people facing serious illness and for those close to them. It can begin while disease-directed treatment continues. A patient may receive chemotherapy and palliative symptom control, or heart-failure treatment and help with breathlessness and planning. The contrast is not cure versus care. Care changes its target as the possible benefits and burdens of treatment change.

Some suffering remains refractory, meaning adequate efforts have not relieved it without unacceptable effects. Proportionate palliative sedation may then reduce consciousness under clinical and ethical safeguards. Current European guidance centres refractoriness, patient autonomy, a stepwise approach and the least depth needed for relief. The governing purpose is relief of suffering, not production of death. Evidence about effects on survival is difficult to interpret because patients are seriously ill and practice varies. Purpose alone does not settle every ethical question, but purpose, proportionality and method distinguish the intervention from one designed to end life.

Withholding or withdrawing treatment, palliative sedation and assisted dying answer different questions. The first concerns whether a medical intervention should start or continue; when death follows, the underlying disease or injury takes its course. The second alters consciousness to relieve otherwise refractory suffering. Assisted dying, where lawful, deliberately provides an eligible person with a route to end their life under a defined legal process. Terminology, eligibility and procedure differ sharply among jurisdictions. Keeping the categories separate does not decide the moral argument. It prevents one charged phrase from hiding differences in purpose, means and causation.

A good death is not one aesthetic. Some people want alertness even at the cost of discomfort. Others value relief even if medication increases sleep. Some want relatives present; others protect privacy. Home may matter until symptoms or care demands make hospital or hospice preferable. Control can mean choosing every detail, or trusting a named person to decide.

Patterns are useful because they make preparation possible. Scripts are dangerous because they turn variation into failure. Dying should be recognised, treated and discussed, but never forced to perform the calm sequence observers hoped to see.

Certainty Is Distributed Unequally

Everyone dies. That sentence is equal. The probabilities underneath it are not.

Life expectancy is a population measure, not a timer attached to a newborn. It estimates the average years a baby would live if current age-specific death rates continued. It can rise because fewer infants die, because adults survive infections and injuries, because older people live longer, or through all of them. It says nothing certain about one person. It says a great deal about the conditions surrounding a population. Demographers also use age-standardised rates when populations have different age structures. Without that adjustment, an older country can appear less healthy merely because more of its citizens have reached ages at which death is common. The denominator is part of every mortality claim.

World Bank data for 2024 put life expectancy at birth at about eighty years in high-income economies and sixty-five in low-income economies. Those group averages are descriptive, not a causal decomposition. The gap is produced through different mixtures of infant and maternal mortality, infection, injury, conflict, chronic disease and access to prevention and treatment. No one factor explains every country. Biological certainty is filtered through institutions and resources long before the final illness.

Causes differ too. The World Health Organization's latest comprehensive global estimates used here describe 68 million deaths in 2021, with the ten leading causes accounting for 39 million, or 57 per cent. Ischaemic heart disease, stroke, chronic lung disease, respiratory infections, dementia, diabetes and cancer sit among the leading causes, but their rank and age pattern vary by income group. Communicable, maternal, neonatal and nutritional conditions form a larger share of deaths in low-income countries. In high-income countries, chronic diseases and dementia account for more of the leading burden. Success against one form of death changes the distribution rather than abolishing mortality.

The phrase premature death makes the moral structure visible. WHO

estimated that noncommunicable diseases caused more than 43 million deaths in 2021, including about 18 million before age seventy. Roughly 82 per cent of those premature noncommunicable-disease deaths occurred in low- and middle-income countries. The category is statistical, and age seventy is not a natural frontier between tragedy and acceptance. It is useful because it marks a large field in which prevention, earlier diagnosis and treatment frequently aim to delay death.

Inequality persists within wealthy countries. Dangerous work, insecure housing, violence, environmental exposure, unequal care and accumulated disadvantage alter risk. A national average can improve while a neighbourhood falls behind. Longer life can also mean more years with disability, so mortality and morbidity must be read together. The objective is not merely to postpone a date at any cost. It is to enlarge the chance of reaching later life with function and choice.

Death statistics are produced, not found. A clinician writes a causal sequence on a certificate. Coding rules select an underlying cause. Multimorbidity complicates the chain. Countries differ in registration coverage and diagnostic capacity. During an epidemic, excess mortality may reveal damage that named causes miss. The numbers are indispensable, but they are records made by institutions with uneven sight.

The universal language of death can comfort because nobody is exempt. It can also conceal responsibility. Some deaths are difficult to prevent with present knowledge. Others follow a road design, a delayed diagnosis, a war, a contaminated water supply or a price that kept treatment out of reach. Taking death seriously requires holding certainty and preventability in the same frame.

Death Transfers Work to the Living

Death makes any remaining or recoverable agency permanently unavailable. Social existence does not vanish at the same speed.

First comes the body. Language changes immediately. The patient becomes the deceased; a bed becomes a place another patient will need;

touch shifts from treatment to care of remains. Yet staff and relatives may continue using the person's name, explaining what they are doing and protecting privacy. The person has died while moral habits built around them continue. The body must be identified, handled, stored, examined where necessary, washed or prepared, moved and eventually buried, cremated, donated or treated according to another lawful practice. The sequence varies by culture, religion, jurisdiction and circumstance. Its existence does not. A corpse is biological material and somebody's remains, and systems fail when they recognise only one half.

Then comes the record. Confirmation establishes that death has occurred. Certification records a medical account of why. These are different tasks. A cause-of-death statement is meant to show the disease or injury that began the fatal sequence, with intermediate conditions and the immediate cause where known. Writing cardiac arrest alone usually says too little because every circulatory death ends with the heart stopping. The useful question is what caused the arrest.

The distinction matters beyond paperwork. Mortality statistics, safety rules, product recalls, public-health responses and family understanding depend on the causal record. Where a death is unexplained, violent, suspicious or falls into another defined category, an independent investigation may be required. The exact routes differ across legal systems. The shared principle is that the dead cannot correct the account, so other people acquire duties of evidence and fairness.

Property, contracts, offices and permissions also have to move. A bank freezes or releases access. An employer ends a role. A household loses income or care. A digital account remains active until somebody changes it. Debts and assets enter legal processes. The practical burden often arrives while those responsible are least able to think clearly. Death therefore exposes the quality of prior administration with unusual speed.

Ritual performs a different kind of work. It gives the body a route and the community a timetable. A funeral may affirm doctrine, display status, repair relationships, assign kinship duties, express protest or provide a public fact

around which private disbelief can organise. No single function is universal. Some traditions act quickly; others revisit remains or hold extended mourning periods. Some keep the dead close through graves and household memorials; others place distance at the centre. The common problem is how to acknowledge a changed relationship without pretending the relationship never existed.

The dead can retain social power. Ancestors may authorise land, lineage or obligation. National leaders become symbols detached from the complicated person. Victims' names can organise campaigns. A scientist's paper, a parent's habit, an artist's work or a founder's rules can keep producing effects. Memory is selective, and institutions often preserve the version that suits the living. Death permanently removes the subject's ability to answer, revise or correct, which makes posthumous reputation both durable and vulnerable.

This is why societies protect graves, regulate remains, investigate desecration and argue over monuments. The body cannot be harmed in the ordinary experiential sense, yet treatment of the dead can harm survivors, violate prior wishes, damage public trust and express contempt for a group. Respect is directed through the body towards relationships and shared rules.

Death is therefore a handover. Biology stops coordinating one organism. Families, professionals and institutions begin coordinating what follows. The quality of that transfer determines whether certainty becomes chaos, concealment or an intelligible ending.

Finitude Makes Preparation Possible and Delay Costly

The fact that life ends does not tell you what life means. Philosophers have spent more than two thousand years demonstrating the gap.

Epicurus argued that death should not be feared as an experience. While we exist, death is absent; when death is present, we no longer exist to suffer it. The argument attacks the image of being trapped inside non-existence. It

says less about dying, separation or losing a future. A person can rationally fear pain before death and regret projects that death will prevent without imagining an eternal experience of being dead.

Thomas Nagel supplied a famous modern reply. Death can be bad through deprivation. Sleep can be dreamless without being harmful because the sleeper wakes. Death removes goods the person would otherwise have had. On this account, an early death is often worse than a late one because more possible life is lost. The harm need not be experienced at the time it occurs, just as betrayal can matter before it is discovered.

Bernard Williams pressed in the other direction. An endless life might not be an endless gift. If a person's character and projects remained recognisably theirs, eternity could exhaust the desires that made continuation attractive. If they changed without limit, the distant survivor might no longer be the same person in the sense that mattered. Mortality may constrain life, but immortality is not automatically a cure.

These arguments do not converge because they ask different questions. Is being dead an experience? Can deprivation harm someone? How much identity must persist for survival to count? Is the evil death itself, the process of dying, the timing, or the damage to others? A clear discussion separates them rather than demanding one emotional verdict.

Tolstoy's Ivan Ilyich gives the practical version. His terror comes partly from pain and extinction, but also from the suspicion that a socially approved life was badly chosen and cannot now be revised. Death becomes unbearable as an audit delivered after the deadline. The story works because the deadline is real.

Mortality does not guarantee clarity. Fear can narrow a decision to immediate control, while status and habit can survive any reminder of death. The usefulness of the subject depends on reflection before crisis, when alternatives can still be considered and no emergency has taken command.

That leads to a restrained use for mortality. Finitude converts postponement into a decision. Time spent on one project cannot be reclaimed for another.

A relationship left unrepaired may outlast the chance to repair it. Values that exist only in private intention may never reach action. This does not require constant optimisation. A life treated as a productivity contest can be wasted with impressive efficiency. It requires recognising that later is a limited resource.

Preparation follows the same logic. Advance care planning works best as a conversation about values, acceptable outcomes, fears and trusted decision-makers, revisited as health changes. A static list of procedures cannot anticipate every condition, and research shows that preferences can change. Documents matter, but they work better when the people who may have to decide understand the reasoning behind them.

The loop now closes. Life is maintained activity. While that activity supports consciousness and decision, a person can choose, revise, speak, forgive, appoint and refuse. Illness may remove some or all of those abilities before death. Death makes their loss final and removes any possibility of return. Nothing about mortality dictates a purpose. It does remove the fantasy that every purpose can be deferred without consequence.

How It Actually Works

The sudden route

A sudden collapse begins as an emergency, not a death. Current UK guidance tells a rescuer to call 999 for any unresponsive person, then assess breathing while the call connects. If the person is not breathing normally, cardiac arrest should be assumed, chest compressions started and an automated external defibrillator used when available. Agonal gasps can look like breathing even though circulation has failed.

Cardiac arrest means the heart is no longer producing effective circulation. It is a condition, not yet a verdict. Chest compressions move a limited amount of blood towards the brain and heart. Ventilation supplies oxygen. A defibrillator analyses the rhythm and shocks only when an organised electrical reset may help. It does not restart every stopped heart, and it does

not shock a flat line back into cinematic life. Ventricular fibrillation and pulseless ventricular tachycardia can be shockable because electrical activity is chaotic but present. Asystole and pulseless electrical activity require other measures and treatment of causes. The machine analyses this distinction because a shock delivered to the wrong rhythm adds no rescue.

Some people regain spontaneous circulation. Many do not. Outcome depends on cause, delay, rhythm, health before arrest, speed of treatment and what damage occurred while blood flow was absent. Resuscitation can also produce injury and may restore circulation without restoring the person to a state they would accept. That is why a decision about CPR is a decision about one treatment, based on likely benefit and wishes, rather than a general instruction to stop caring. Survival statistics from one setting cannot be transferred cleanly to another. A witnessed arrest caused by a treatable rhythm in a previously well person is unlike an unwitnessed arrest during advanced multi-organ failure. The words cardiac arrest describe the event, not the chance of return.

Where an arrest follows overwhelming injury or unmistakable post-mortem change, resuscitation is not appropriate. Where a valid decision has been made not to attempt CPR, clinicians still provide other treatment and comfort. Where neither applies, the default emergency response is action because the boundary has not yet been crossed.

The cancer route

Many cancers create the clearest of the broad dying trajectories. Function may remain relatively stable through treatment, then decline more steadily as disease advances. This shape can give time for prognosis, symptom control, conversations and practical preparation. It can also create a cruel series of revised forecasts in which each treatment offers another interval without restoring the old horizon.

Palliative care can enter long before the final days. Pain may require several approaches because tumour pressure, nerve injury, inflammation and movement can produce different pain. Breathlessness may respond to

treatment of a reversible cause, positioning, airflow, calm explanation, medication or oxygen where low blood oxygen is part of the problem. Nausea, constipation, fatigue, anxiety and loss of appetite each need their own reasoning. Comfort is a clinical task, not a mood.

As decline continues, the question shifts from whether an intervention can alter a scan or laboratory number to whether it can produce a benefit the person can experience. A treatment that adds days in hospital may be worthwhile to one person and an unacceptable exchange to another. The medicine cannot supply the value judgement. It can clarify the likely trade.

Place changes the trade. Home can preserve familiarity and control, but it depends on available carers, equipment, medicines and rapid support when symptoms change. Hospice can concentrate expertise without the pace of an acute ward. Hospital can offer investigations and rescue treatments while disrupting sleep, privacy and family routines. Preferred place of death is therefore a conditional preference, not a moral grade awarded afterwards. This is where prognosis should become conditional rather than theatrical. A clinician may be unable to say how many days remain, yet able to say that further chemotherapy is unlikely to restore independence, that another infection is probable, or that returning home will require more care than one relative can safely provide. Useful uncertainty still has shape.

The organ-failure route

Heart failure, chronic lung disease and some other organ failures often produce a different shape. A person deteriorates sharply, receives treatment, recovers part of the lost function and returns home. The cycle repeats. Each crisis may be survivable, yet the baseline can fall. Death may occur during a crisis that looked much like the previous one.

This pattern makes timing hard. A clinician who predicts imminent death may be wrong because treatment works again. A clinician who avoids the subject may leave the patient and family unprepared because one crisis eventually will not reverse. Planning must therefore proceed under uncertainty. The useful conversation concerns what matters if recovery

becomes less likely, which burdens are acceptable, and who should speak if the patient loses capacity.

The interrupted trajectory also explains why hospital treatment and palliative care should not be treated as enemies. Diuretics, antibiotics or ventilation may relieve symptoms and restore time. The same patient may need discussion of limits, home support and relief of fear. The goal can change from crisis to crisis without anyone having lied earlier. Repeated rescue can also create a timing trap. Each recovery seems to disprove the need for planning, while each crisis leaves less reserve for the next conversation. The best time to discuss a final deterioration is often after a recovery, when the patient can participate and the family is no longer deciding beside an alarm.

The long dwindling

Frailty and dementia can narrow life slowly. There may be no single terminal diagnosis with a predictable slope. Mobility declines, infections recur, swallowing becomes difficult, weight falls and dependence grows. A small disturbance can have a large effect because reserve is low. Recovery may restore only part of the previous state.

The long trajectory distributes dying across caregivers and institutions. Decisions arrive as apparently separate problems: another admission, another course of antibiotics, help with eating, treatment after a fall, a move from home, a change in who controls money. Taken together, they describe a life becoming more medically and practically dependent.

Capacity may fluctuate or be lost. Earlier statements then matter, but a sentence written years before cannot decide every new case. A trusted proxy needs to know the person's values, not merely their preferred machines. The relevant question is often what outcome treatment could return this person to, rather than whether the treatment can alter the immediate problem. Eating and drinking show the difficulty. Difficulty swallowing may reflect advancing disease, delirium, infection or fatigue. Hand feeding can provide pleasure and contact even when calories fall.

Tubes can deliver nutrition without reversing the condition that made eating unsafe. The intervention solves transport of food; it may not solve dying.

The last days

The last days are recognised through a pattern rather than one sign. The person may spend more time asleep, withdraw from conversation, eat and drink less, have difficulty swallowing, pass less urine and need more help with movement. Circulation can become weaker, leaving hands and feet cool or skin mottled. Breathing may become shallow, irregular or punctuated by pauses.

Reduced intake is often part of the body's decline rather than starvation imposed from outside. Offering sips, mouth care and food the person wants may provide comfort. Pressing food or fluid can cause distress if swallowing is poor. Clinically assisted hydration can help in some circumstances and burden in others through swelling, secretions or repeated procedures. Good care treats this as an individual decision, reviewed rather than ritualised.

Noisy respiratory secretions occur when a weak or unconscious person can no longer clear fluid from the throat. Repositioning, reviewing fluids and medication may help in some cases. The sound can be alarming to relatives, who may assume the person is choking. Sound alone does not establish that an unresponsive patient is distressed, and the patient's experience cannot be inferred with certainty. Explanation is part of care because distress in the room may belong chiefly to those listening.

Restlessness needs a search for causes. Pain, a full bladder, constipation, medication effects, low oxygen, organ failure and delirium can look alike from the doorway. Some causes can be corrected. Others need sedating medicine, and refractory suffering may justify proportionate palliative sedation under safeguards. The aim is neither maximal alertness nor maximal sleep as a rule. It is the state that best serves the person's priorities while relieving suffering. Medicines also need review because kidneys and liver may clear them differently as organs fail. A dose that was useful days earlier can become excessive, while stopping a necessary drug can allow

pain or seizures to return. The last days demand active prescribing, even when many routine medicines are discontinued.

Hearing is often said to be the last sense to go. The stronger advice is less dramatic: do not assume an unresponsive person hears nothing, and do not promise relatives that every word is received. Speaking calmly, identifying oneself and avoiding distressing conversation over the bed are low-cost forms of respect under uncertainty. The same discipline applies to touch. Turning, mouth care, washing and repositioning can comfort, but repeated observations or procedures can become burdens when they no longer change care. Last-days medicine often improves by doing fewer things with clearer reasons.

When circulation stops

When dying reaches cardiorespiratory arrest and resuscitation will not be started, or has been attempted and stopped, confirmation follows a structured examination. Under the current UK code, the examiner must be physically present for at least five minutes and be satisfied throughout that unconsciousness, breathing and circulation remain absent. Pulse and breath sounds need not be checked without interruption for the whole interval, but the patient must be observed throughout. After five minutes, the examiner confirms absent pupillary responses and no motor response to supraorbital pressure, with corneal reflexes added when confirmation follows soon after arrest.

Five minutes is not the duration required for every cell to die. It is the minimum UK observation interval used to establish continuous absence and allow the possibility of spontaneous return of circulation to pass under that protocol. Evidence on autoresuscitation comes mainly from monitored arrests and controlled withdrawal of life support. Uncontrolled situations create different uncertainties, so the interval should not be detached from its preconditions, examination and setting and treated as a universal biological law.

Somatic criteria cover cases where the condition of the body already makes

death unequivocal, such as decomposition or injuries incompatible with life. Their existence is a reminder that tests are selected for circumstances. Nobody needs a stethoscope to establish what advanced decomposition has already shown.

Under the current UK code, death is confirmed when the examiner is satisfied that all relevant circulatory criteria have been met. The recorded time can therefore differ from the last observed breath. It is not an assertion that every biological function ended then. Recording practice varies elsewhere. Monitors can assist, but confirmation remains a clinical act. Electrical activity on an electrocardiogram does not by itself prove effective circulation. A mechanical heart device can complicate ordinary pulse checks. The examiner must use criteria suited to the patient and equipment rather than treating one waveform as life itself.

When the brain has permanently stopped

Diagnosis using neurological criteria occurs in a different scene. The patient is on a ventilator, circulation persists and a devastating brain injury of known cause has created suspicion that death has occurred. Before testing, clinicians must allow an adequate assessment period and exclude reversible factors. Sedative drugs, muscle paralysis, severe hypothermia and major metabolic disturbance can suppress responses. Testing too early or without those exclusions would make the conclusion unsafe.

The clinical examination assesses brainstem functions. Pupils do not respond to light. Corneal and other specified reflexes are absent. There is no motor response in the cranial nerve distribution to adequate stimulation. An apnoea test assesses whether rising carbon dioxide triggers an effort to breathe under controlled conditions. In the UK, two qualified doctors work together through two complete sets of tests, including two apnoea tests. Death is ordinarily recorded when the second set is complete and all involved are satisfied. Ancillary investigations may support the diagnosis when the full clinical process cannot be completed, but they are not interchangeable stamps. Each has technical limits. Qualifications, test numbers and ancillary methods differ across countries and patient groups.

The safe general rule is that death diagnosed neurologically rests on a complete jurisdictional standard, not one scan or one absent reflex.

A spinal movement does not reverse the diagnosis because the spinal cord can generate reflexes without brainstem function. A monitor may still display a heartbeat because ventilation and intensive care support oxygenation and circulation. These facts should be explained before testing where possible. Otherwise the family can be told that death has been diagnosed while every visible cue appears to say alive.

Once the applicable neurological criteria are correctly met, death has occurred under that standard. Continuing ventilation for a short period may allow relatives to arrive, complete donation arrangements where authorised, or bring intensive care to an orderly close. In the UK account used here, the machine is temporarily supporting organs after the person's death, not treating coma as death.

The administrative handover

Confirmation answers whether death has occurred. Certification answers what caused it. Registration creates the civil record. Investigation asks whether the account needs independent scrutiny. The same professional may perform more than one task, but the questions remain distinct.

A medical certificate usually records a causal sequence. The immediate cause sits above the disease or injury that produced it, with the underlying cause at the root. Pneumonia may be the immediate cause after a stroke impaired swallowing; the stroke may be the underlying cause. Writing heart failure or cardiac arrest without the disease behind it often contributes little to public knowledge.

Jurisdictions create different checks. In England and Wales, a statutory medical examiner system has operated since 9 September 2024. Every death receives independent scrutiny through either a medical examiner or a coroner. For non-coronial deaths, the medical examiner scrutinises the proposed cause and offers the deceased person's representative a conversation in which concerns can be raised. The system illustrates a

wider need: certification must serve the family, public statistics and justice at once.

After the record begins, other systems move. Identity must be preserved. Personal effects are documented. Donation may proceed only under its own consent and clinical rules. A funeral director, religious community or family takes responsibility for care and disposition. Insurers, banks, employers and public agencies require evidence. The person has left medicine, but their death has entered administration. That handover can feel abrupt to relatives. Monitors are silenced, lines removed or retained for investigation, the bed area changes, and familiar staff may be replaced by bereavement offices and funeral services. Good systems explain the sequence before requiring decisions. Practical efficiency without explanation can make a correct process feel like expulsion. An autopsy may be requested to answer a clinical question, or directed under legal authority when cause or circumstances require investigation. It can reveal disease missed during life, test the proposed causal chain and contribute to family risk information. It can also conflict with wishes about the body, which is why consent, authority and necessity must be kept distinct.

What the body does next

Without circulation, heat production and distribution stop. The body cools towards the surrounding temperature, though clothing, body size, air movement, water and room conditions alter the rate. Gravity draws blood into dependent vessels, producing post-mortem lividity. Muscles initially relax, then stiffen as energy-dependent chemical processes fail, and later relax again as tissues break down.

Cells begin self-digestion as membranes fail and enzymes escape. Microbes, especially from the gut, contribute to putrefaction. Colour changes, gas, fluid movement and tissue breakdown follow. Embalming, refrigeration, cold weather, heat, injury and burial conditions alter the sequence.

Popular forensics treats cooling, lividity and rigor as hands on a clock. They

are better understood as overlapping observations with wide ranges. A pathologist combines them with the scene, environment, medical evidence and later changes. Precise time-since-death estimates are often less precise than television requires.

Care of the body can slow or direct these processes. Washing, closing the eyes where possible, supporting the jaw, removing or retaining devices according to investigation and family needs, dressing, wrapping, refrigeration and ritual preparation turn an unmanaged biological change into an organised passage. The work is practical, but its manner communicates whether the dead person still belongs to a human community. Embalming is common in some places and unusual in others. Cremation can reduce the body quickly to processed bone fragments, while burial gives decomposition a longer protected setting. Donation to medical education can delay funeral rites and divide the body among teaching purposes. None is a neutral disposal method. Each joins material control to an account of respect.

How we know

Death is studied from unequal vantage points. Intensive care provides detailed monitoring of circulation, drugs, temperature and reflexes, but it overrepresents technologically supported deaths. Hospice and home-care research sees ordinary decline more closely, yet signs are recorded by different observers and prognosis remains uncertain. Post-mortem studies reveal tissue change after the person can no longer report experience.

Definitions shape findings. The UK brainstem standard used for clinical detail here is authoritative within its jurisdiction; whole-brain formulations and testing rules elsewhere are not interchangeable with it. Cardiac-arrest studies concern people who might be resuscitated. Near-death research concerns survivors and cannot test subjective experience beyond permanent death. Death-certificate statistics depend on diagnostic access, registration coverage and coding rules. Dying trajectories describe groups and should not become individual schedules.

Confidence is strongest where current clinical codes, systematic reviews and completed population datasets address the claim at the same scope. It weakens where a result is transferred between countries, care settings or definitions. The hardest empirical boundary is subjective experience near loss of consciousness: reports can be collected only from people who return, and the timing of memory cannot always be mapped cleanly onto measured brain and circulatory states.

What People Get Wrong

"Death is a single instant"

A time on a certificate creates the impression that death happened between two seconds. The record is necessary, but biology does not change everywhere at once. Circulation, breathing, brain function and cellular viability fail on different schedules. Some tissues remain usable after the person has died.

The correction is not that nobody can be declared dead until decomposition. Clinical standards use somatic, circulatory or neurological criteria to identify the permanent loss specified by their governing definition. The current UK standard uses all three routes; other jurisdictions differ. The line is evidence-based and action-guiding, while the underlying biological transition remains a process.

This matters because both errors are dangerous. A switch model makes supported neurological death look impossible. An endlessly gradual model makes every declaration sound arbitrary. Death can be a process that crosses a defensible threshold. This also explains why different observers can name different moments without all being careless. The final heartbeat, the completion of a neurological examination, the clinician's confirmation and the later registration answer different questions. The governing record should make clear which event it means. Clocks organise responsibility: teams need to know when treatment ended, certificates need a time and later events may depend on it. Trouble begins when administrative precision

is mistaken for complete physiology.

"A stopped heart always means a person is dead"

Before resuscitation, cardiac arrest and death were almost inseparable in practice. The language remained after the technology changed. Today, a stopped heart creates an emergency in which circulation may sometimes be restored through CPR, defibrillation, drugs and treatment of the cause.

Success is far from guaranteed, and restarting circulation does not guarantee recovery of the brain or return to an acceptable life. That is why resuscitation decisions concern likely benefit, burden and wishes. A DNACPR recommendation addresses CPR; it does not cancel antibiotics, pain relief, nursing or other appropriate treatment.

The distinction matters outside hospital. Current UK guidance says to call 999 for any unresponsive person, then assess breathing while the call connects. If breathing is abnormal, cardiac arrest should be assumed and emergency guidance followed. Confirmation of death belongs later, after the relevant criteria have been met. Cardiac arrest also differs from a heart attack. A heart attack is loss of blood supply to heart muscle and may occur while the person remains conscious and the heart keeps pumping. It can cause arrest, but the terms are not interchangeable. Films strengthen the error by treating defibrillation as a restart button. A shock interrupts certain dangerous rhythms; it cannot treat every cause, reverse prolonged oxygen deprivation or make every arrest recoverable.

"Brain death is a kind of coma"

The warm body, heartbeat and moving chest make this misconception understandable. Ventilation can preserve oxygenation and circulation after brainstem function has permanently ceased. The machine supplies a visible sign that once depended on the brainstem.

Coma, unresponsive wakefulness syndrome and the minimally conscious state are disorders in living people. Their remaining brain functions, prospects and ethical questions differ. What is commonly called brain death

is, in current UK terminology, death diagnosed using neurological criteria. Reversible causes must be excluded and the complete two-stage examination performed before that conclusion is reached.

Vague phrases such as life support can hide two opposite cases: treatment supporting a living patient, and technology temporarily maintaining organs after the person's death under the applicable standard. Families deserve the exact case and the jurisdictional basis for it. They also deserve time to reconcile the diagnosis with what they can see. Tests must be explained through ventilation, reflexes, permanence and the two examinations, not presented as an appeal to authority. Coma has also become a popular synonym for absent personhood. Some living patients who cannot show awareness are misdescribed as nearly dead, while people whose death has been diagnosed neurologically are described as merely unconscious. Those errors pull moral concern in opposite and unsafe directions.

"Dying is normally an agony medicine cannot touch"

Bad deaths exist. Pain, breathlessness, delirium, fear and isolation can be severe, and access to skilled care is unequal. The myth becomes false when possibility is turned into inevitability.

Palliative medicine can often reduce symptoms through careful diagnosis, drugs, nursing, positioning, communication and support for those close to the patient. When suffering remains refractory, proportionate palliative sedation may be considered under safeguards, using depth matched to need rather than unconsciousness as an automatic target. No honest clinician can promise a painless or peaceful death, and comfort can conflict with alertness.

The correction matters because terror can drive people towards unwanted treatment or away from necessary conversation. It also exposes a policy failure: suffering that could have been relieved is not proof that dying is untreatable. Dramatic deaths are retold while ordinary symptom control is private, but the myth also reflects real gaps in training, medicines and

access. Correcting it should raise expectations and widen the target beyond pain: breathlessness, panic, delirium, dry mouth, loneliness and family conflict can dominate. Comfort may require social or spiritual help rather than another dose.

"Everyone passes through five stages"

Elisabeth Kübler-Ross's 1969 work drew attention to the voices of seriously ill patients and described denial, anger, bargaining, depression and acceptance. Popular culture converted those responses into a universal staircase, then applied it to bereavement as well.

Evidence does not support a fixed order through which everyone must pass. People may feel several responses together, revisit them, feel none, or remain frightened and unaccepting. A label can help someone recognise an emotion. It becomes harmful when relatives or professionals judge a person for grieving or dying incorrectly.

The original achievement was attention, not a timetable. Human reactions to death are patterned enough to discuss and varied enough to resist choreography. Acceptance is especially easy to moralise. Calm can be treated as maturity and anger as unfinished work, even when anger fits the loss. A model intended to make patients visible then becomes another standard they are expected to satisfy for observers. The same warning applies to the phrase closure. Some losses are integrated rather than closed. Here the error is imposing emotional progress on someone who is still dying.

"Near-death experiences prove what happens after death"

People revived after cardiac arrest sometimes report vivid perceptions, a sense of separation from the body, light, peace, review of life or other striking experiences. The reports deserve study and respect. Their existence is not in doubt merely because their interpretation is disputed.

The evidential limit is decisive. Studies such as AWARE II examine people

who survive in-hospital cardiac arrest and can later be interviewed. They cannot interview people after death has been confirmed as permanent. The timing of a memory may be hard to place within unconsciousness, reduced circulation, resuscitation and recovery. Physiological and psychological explanations remain active areas of study.

These findings neither prove an afterlife nor disprove one. They describe recalled experience around a crisis from which the participant returned. Turning them into reports from permanent death asks the evidence to cross the boundary under investigation. Nor does one proposed brain mechanism explain every report. Timing, mechanism, recurring features and cultural variation remain open questions. Reports from survivors are not direct evidence of experience after permanent death.

"Palliative care means giving up"

Palliative care became associated with the final days because hospices made neglected dying visible. The association now delays help. Palliative care can begin alongside treatment intended to control disease or prolong life, especially when symptoms, uncertainty and difficult choices appear early.

Its governing question is what will improve life for this person under serious illness. That can include pain control, help with breathlessness, family support, planning, rehabilitation and treatment of reversible problems. Sometimes it supports another course of treatment. Sometimes it clarifies that more treatment offers burden without a benefit the patient values.

Giving up abandons the person. Palliative care changes the object of effort when cure, time, comfort and function no longer move together. It should not be collapsed into withdrawal of treatment, palliative sedation or assisted dying; those decisions have different purposes and rules, though they can arise in the same illness. The phrase fight the disease can make this harder by turning death into personal defeat. Disease-directed treatment can be brave, and stopping it can be brave. Courage is not measured by the number of interventions accepted. Nor is palliative care a guarantee that

every preference can be met. Home care may become unsafe, symptoms may resist treatment, and beds or medicines may be unavailable. The right conclusion is that access and skill matter, not that the philosophy failed whenever death remained hard.

Use It

Separate the questions

Arguments about death often contain several disputes hidden inside one word. Is the disagreement about the biological condition, the clinical criterion, the accuracy of the test, the law, the treatment plan, the handling of the body, or the meaning assigned to the event? Those questions can produce different answers without contradiction.

A relative may say that a ventilated person does not look dead. That is an observation about ordinary signs. A clinician may say neurological criteria have been met under the governing standard. That is a clinical judgement with a jurisdiction. Another person may ask whether ventilation should continue until family arrive. That is a question about care after diagnosis. Treating all three as one fight over whether the person is dead creates heat without clarity.

The useful move is to name the layer before defending a position. What loss is being claimed? Which criterion applies? What evidence establishes it? What decision follows? Precision does not remove emotion. It prevents emotion from being forced to carry technical work it cannot perform.

Ask what the intervention can deliver

Modern medicine makes action look like benefit. A machine can support blood pressure, move air, filter blood or deliver nutrition. The missing question is what state those actions can return the person to, for how long and at what burden.

This is clearest around CPR. The physical possibility of attempting resuscitation says little about the chance of restoring a life the person could

experience and value. The same applies to repeated hospital transfer in advanced frailty, ventilation in progressive disease or another treatment when previous lines have failed. Refusing, withholding or withdrawing an intervention can be a judgement about what it can deliver, not a decision to cause death.

Ask for the best likely outcome, the worst plausible outcome and the most probable one. Ask what function may return, which burdens are expected and what uncertainty remains. Then compare those outcomes with the person's priorities. Medicine supplies probabilities. It should not conceal value choices inside technical verbs such as treat, support or do everything.

Plan in values, not hardware

Procedure lists age badly. A person may say they never want a ventilator, then face a reversible pneumonia where brief ventilation offers a good recovery. They may request every treatment, then develop a condition in which treatment can prolong circulation without restoring awareness. The same machine can serve different ends.

Advance care planning works better when it records the reasoning beneath the preference. What abilities make life worth continuing for this person? Which losses would be acceptable temporarily but not permanently? How much uncertainty would they tolerate for a chance of recovery? Does alertness matter more than relief from pain? Where would they prefer care if home became unsafe or exhausting for others?

Preferences can change with age, illness and lived experience. Revision is not inconsistency. It is evidence that planning is a continuing conversation. A useful review can follow a major diagnosis, hospital admission, loss of function or change in who provides care. The trigger is altered reality, not an annual ceremony performed for the file. A document remains useful, especially when capacity is lost, but its strongest content is a map of values that can guide an unforeseen case.

Give uncertainty an owner

A crisis becomes worse when nobody knows who may decide. Families then confuse closeness with authority, clinicians receive incompatible accounts, and old remarks are promoted into instructions. The person at the centre may have left no way to distinguish a settled value from something said after a bad television documentary.

Name a trusted decision-maker where the law allows, and make sure that person understands the role. Their task is not to choose what they personally want. It is to represent the patient's values and interests under facts that may never have been discussed. That requires conversation before paperwork and occasional revision afterwards.

Uncertainty also needs an evidential owner. One clinician should explain prognosis and its limits. One record should carry the current plan. Changes should be visible. This is less dramatic than a final wish, but many failures at the end of life are failures of coordination rather than failures of affection.

Build the handover while it is easy

Death triggers administrative work at the moment a household has least attention to spare. Basic preparation reduces avoidable disorder. Important documents should be findable. Accounts and obligations should not depend on one person's memory. Digital access, insurance, dependants, pets, business responsibilities and funeral preferences may all need a named route.

The aim is not to script one's own memorial from beyond the grave. It is to avoid converting grief into an investigation of passwords, debts and private intentions. A short, current explanation can be more useful than an elaborate file nobody knows exists.

The social handover includes permission as well as property. People may need to know whom to contact, which rituals matter, whether donation was considered, and what should not be done. Some wishes cannot be guaranteed because law, cost, condition of the body and needs of survivors

intervene. Stating priorities still helps others distinguish what mattered from decorative preference. It can also reveal conflicts early. A religious requirement, desire for donation and wish for rapid burial may not all fit together in every circumstance. Discovering that tension before death allows informed priorities rather than hurried improvisation.

Treat time as a budget, not a scoreboard

Mortality makes time scarce, but scarcity can be mishandled. The anxious response is to optimise every hour, count achievements and convert leisure into failure. That treats life as a warehouse whose purpose is maximum throughput.

A finite budget asks a different question: what is this hour for? Rest can be its intended use. Repetition can be the substance of love. A long conversation may produce nothing except the relationship it maintains. Mortality gives choices weight because alternatives are excluded, not because every choice must look impressive.

The practical test is regret under a realistic horizon. Which commitments would still deserve the time if status and habit were stripped away? Which postponements depend on an imaginary unlimited later? The answer should alter a few decisions, not fill every morning with awareness of death. A useful mortality practice should return attention to life. If it produces only dread, compulsion or contempt for ordinary days, it has become another form of avoidance.

The limits

Understanding death does not make bereavement orderly, dying painless or clinical judgement infallible. Definitions differ across jurisdictions. Prognosis can fail. Access to palliative care is unequal. A good plan can be overtaken by an accident, a new diagnosis or family conflict. Philosophical clarity may disappear under fear.

This book also cannot tell a particular person which treatment to accept or refuse. That requires their condition, probabilities, values, legal setting and

clinical advice. Nor can a secular account settle religious claims. Evidence can mark where a medical inference ends; it cannot decide every metaphysical question beyond it.

Mortality should not be used to bully. Telling an ill person to accept death, a grieving person to move on, or a healthy person to live as though today is their last can be another way of refusing their reality. Taking death seriously includes knowing when not to turn it into a lesson.

The one thing to keep

Keep the handover in view.

Life is maintained from moment to moment. During some of it, the organism can support attention, choice and revision. Illness may remove those capacities before death; death makes any prospect of their return permanently unavailable. The person's body, records, duties and effects then pass into the care of others. That transfer will occur whether it has been considered or not.

The practical difference lies before the line. While you can still answer, you can explain what matters, appoint someone trustworthy, organise what others will need, repair what should not be left to chance and spend time according to purposes you would recognise as your own.

Death offers no instruction about what those purposes must be. It gives one hard constraint: the opportunity to revise them is temporary. The certainty deserves neither obsession nor denial. It deserves a place in the decisions that become irreversible when you no longer make them.

Terms

Mortality. Death in a population, usually expressed as counts or rates over time. Mortality describes who dies, at what ages and from which recorded causes.

Morbidity. Illness, disability or reduced health rather than death. A

treatment can lower mortality while increasing time lived with morbidity, so the measures answer different questions.

Life expectancy. The average years a person would live under a population's current age-specific death rates. It is a statistical summary, not an individual prediction or biological limit, and it depends on the mortality rates and data quality used.

Lifespan. The length of an individual life, or the possible range within a species. Maximum lifespan, average lifespan and healthy lifespan should not be treated as synonyms.

Homeostasis. The body's active regulation of internal conditions such as temperature, acidity, glucose and fluid balance. Life appears stable because homeostasis continually corrects disturbance.

Assisted dying. An umbrella term used differently across jurisdictions for legally regulated assistance that enables an eligible person to end their life. It must not be treated as a synonym for withholding or withdrawing treatment or for palliative sedation; its precise legal meaning depends on local law.

Dying trajectory. A broad pattern of functional decline before death. Sudden death, cancer, organ failure and frailty often produce different trajectories, though individuals can depart from all of them.

Cardiac arrest. Cessation of effective circulation because the heart is not pumping usefully. It may be reversible with immediate treatment and therefore does not by itself always establish death.

Cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Emergency efforts to preserve circulation and oxygenation after cardiac arrest, usually through chest compressions, ventilation, defibrillation where indicated, drugs and treatment of the cause.

Return of spontaneous circulation. Restoration of an effective heartbeat and blood flow after cardiac arrest, often shortened to ROSC. It marks a resuscitation result, not guaranteed neurological recovery.

Permanence. In death determination, loss of function that will not return spontaneously and will not be restored by intervention in the circumstances. Its exact relation to irreversibility remains debated, especially where treatment could restore function but is not appropriate or wanted.

Irreversibility. A loss that cannot be reversed. Some standards distinguish this from permanence, which can include a justified decision that attempted restoration would offer no benefit or should not occur.

Circulatory criteria. Clinical criteria confirming death after circulation and breathing have permanently ceased. They require a defined observation and examination appropriate to the jurisdiction and setting.

Neurological criteria. Criteria used to diagnose death after the brain functions required by the governing definition have permanently ceased. The UK standard centres permanent cessation of brainstem function; whole-brain formulations and testing details are used elsewhere.

Brainstem. The lower part of the brain connecting it with the spinal cord. It supports wakefulness pathways, breathing and reflexes central to UK neurological determination of death.

Coma. A state of unresponsiveness in a living person who cannot be awakened. Cause, depth and reversibility vary. Coma is not death diagnosed using neurological criteria.

Unresponsive wakefulness syndrome. A living condition with wakefulness cycles but no reliable behavioural evidence of awareness. It was formerly called the vegetative state and differs from coma and death.

Minimally conscious state. A living disorder of consciousness in which limited but reproducible signs of awareness appear. Assessment can be difficult, and the condition is not neurological death.

DNACPR. A recommendation or decision not to attempt cardiopulmonary resuscitation if cardiac arrest occurs. It concerns CPR and does not mean that other appropriate treatment or care stops.

Advance care planning. Discussion of values, goals, fears and preferences for future care if illness later prevents the person from deciding or communicating.

Advance decision. A legally recognised refusal of specified future treatment in some jurisdictions, subject to formal rules. Names, scope and validity requirements vary, so local advice matters.

Proxy decision-maker. A person authorised or recognised to help make decisions when a patient lacks capacity. The role is to represent the patient's values and interests, not the proxy's preference.

Palliative care. Care aimed at quality of life and relief of physical, psychological, social and spiritual suffering during serious illness. It can accompany treatment intended to prolong life and should be based on need rather than an assumed final timetable.

Hospice. A service or philosophy specialising in care near the end of life, often across inpatient, community and home settings. Hospice eligibility and organisation differ between health systems.

Palliative sedation. Proportionate reduction of consciousness to relieve suffering that remains refractory despite adequate efforts. Its clinical purpose is relief, with a stepwise approach, safeguards, and depth and duration matched to need.

Agonal breathing. Abnormal gasping that can occur during cardiac arrest. It is not normal breathing and should not delay emergency recognition and resuscitation where these are appropriate.

Terminal respiratory secretions. Noisy breathing caused by fluid a weak or unconscious dying person can no longer clear from the throat. It often troubles observers; the sound alone does not show that the unresponsive patient is distressed.

Confirmation of death. The clinical act of establishing that death has occurred under accepted criteria. It is distinct from recording the medical cause and completing civil registration.

Medical certificate of cause of death. The clinician's formal causal account of the diseases or injuries leading to death. It should identify the underlying cause, not stop at cardiac arrest.

Post-mortem examination. Examination of a body after death to determine disease, injury or cause. An autopsy may be clinical or legally directed, depending on circumstances and jurisdiction.

Go Deeper

Kathryn Mannix, *With the End in Mind: Dying, Death and Wisdom in an Age of Denial* (William Collins, 2017). Start here for dying as observed by a palliative-care doctor rather than imagined from a distance. Mannix uses clinical stories shaped to protect privacy, so they should be read as explanatory narratives rather than case reports. They show recurring physical patterns, communication failures and the difference skilled care can make. The book is warm without pretending every death is serene. Its strongest contribution is pattern recognition: changes that frighten relatives become less mysterious when someone explains what the body is doing and what can be treated. The setting is largely British palliative practice, so its service context should not be treated as universal.

Atul Gawande, *Being Mortal: Medicine and What Matters in the End* (Metropolitan Books, 2014). Read this for the decision problem created when medicine can extend survival without restoring the life a person values. Gawande moves through ageing, residential care, surgery and terminal illness, using patients and his own family to test what good treatment is for. It is accessible and unsentimental. The central question, what a treatment is expected to make possible, is the best practical extension of this book's distinction between biological continuation and a life the patient can still inhabit. The institutional examples are mainly American, where payment and service structures differ from those elsewhere.

Allan Kellehear, *A Social History of Dying* (Cambridge University Press, 2007). Read this when the clinical model feels too small. Kellehear

traces how subsistence, religion, cities, institutions and modern health care altered the social organisation of dying. The scale is ambitious and the categories invite argument, which is part of its value. It also corrects the idea that death moved in one direction from communal acceptance to modern denial; social forms change unevenly and retain older practices inside newer institutions. It is a scholarly synthesis rather than a bedside guide, and some broad historical patterns deserve to be held as models rather than universal stages.

Leo Tolstoy, *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*, translated by Anthony Briggs (Penguin Classics, 2006). Read the fiction last. A senior official develops a fatal illness and discovers that correct social performance offers no protection from terror, loneliness or the possibility of a badly chosen life. It compresses the philosophical and relational problem better than a treatise because the deadline acts on a particular person. Watch how euphemism, professional status and family discomfort isolate Ivan before pain does, and how recognition arrives when revision is almost unavailable. It is short, severe and more useful than a comforting book.

Notes and Sources

The current medical, legal-administrative and statistical material in this manuscript was checked on 4 September 2026. UK diagnostic and certification examples are identified as such because terminology, law and protocol vary. Population figures retain the year observed rather than borrowing the later publication date of the source.

The organising distinction. The Academy of Medical Royal Colleges' 2025 code states that biological death is a process while medicine still needs a point at which death can be diagnosed and confirmed. It defines death in the UK through permanent loss of the capacity for consciousness and permanent loss of the capacity to breathe, and supplies three routes to confirmation: somatic, circulatory and neurological. The manuscript's phrase "biologically a process, institutionally a point and socially a transfer" is an organising synthesis rather than wording taken from the code.

Life as maintained integration. Standard physiology supports the account of homeostasis, energy-dependent membrane gradients and coordinated self-maintenance. The distinction among organism, organ, tissue and cell is also reflected in transplantation and forensic pathology: selected cells and tissues can retain viability after the person has died. The manuscript deliberately avoids exact post-mortem viability windows because they vary by tissue, preservation, donor condition and intended use. Pollak, Saukko and Knight support the corrections on hair, nails, decomposition and the limits of post-mortem timing.

Concept, criteria and tests. The three-layer distinction is conventional in death-determination scholarship. The Academy of Medical Royal Colleges' 2025 code is the authority used for current UK practice. It states that the UK has no statutory definition of death, while courts have recognised the biomedical brainstem account and the Academy's criteria as authoritative. Greer and colleagues' World Brain Death Project supplies the broader international comparison. Law, terminology, whole-brain and brainstem formulations, test numbers and ancillary investigations vary. The manuscript therefore does not convert the UK code into a universal biological or metaphysical definition.

Permanence and irreversibility. The AoMRC code uses permanence as the decisive standard and distinguishes it from the claim that every biological function is incapable of restoration under every imagined technology. Philosophical and clinical literature continues to debate the relationship between permanence, irreversibility, treatment decisions and the dead-donor rule. The manuscript retains only the practical distinction needed for a general reader and does not claim that the wider debate is closed.

The brain and intensive care. West's history of the 1952 Copenhagen poliomyelitis epidemic supports the importance of positive-pressure ventilation in the development of intensive care. The Academy code supports the UK prerequisites, two-doctor requirement, two complete sets of clinical tests and the ordinary recording of death at completion of the second

set. Giacino and colleagues support the distinctions among coma, unresponsive wakefulness syndrome and minimally conscious state. Those disorders of consciousness are clinically difficult and sometimes misdiagnosed, but they occur in living patients and should not be merged with death diagnosed using neurological criteria.

Dying trajectories. Murray, Kendall, Boyd and Sheikh set out broad trajectories associated with cancer, organ failure and frailty, alongside sudden death. These are planning models derived from groups, not clocks for individuals. The manuscript makes the counterexample visible: mixed illness, treatment response and unexpected events can disrupt every trajectory.

The last days. NICE guideline NG31 supports the account of increasing sleep, reduced intake, altered breathing, respiratory secretions, delirium, uncertainty, hydration decisions and repeated review. NICE advises assessing likely causes of noisy secretions and treating them when they distress the dying person; the sound does not establish subjective distress in someone who cannot report it. General Medical Council guidance supports decisions based on benefit, burden, capacity, wishes and communication. Neither source makes a particular sign a reliable countdown.

Palliative care and total pain. The World Health Organization defines palliative care through quality of life and the prevention and relief of suffering for patients and families facing life-threatening illness. It does not confine palliative care to the final days. Clark traces Cicely Saunders's development of total pain and the integration of physical, psychological, social and spiritual distress. St Christopher's Hospice opened in 1967. The manuscript treats this as a history of a clinical model, not a claim that one institution invented all care of the dying.

Palliative sedation. Surges and colleagues' 2024 revision of the European Association for Palliative Care framework supports refractoriness, proportionality, patient autonomy and a stepwise approach. It is a European consensus framework rather than a universal law or a trial establishing

effects on survival. The text therefore states purpose, method and safeguards without claiming that intention alone resolves every ethical question or that outcomes are settled in every setting.

Treatment withdrawal and assisted dying. General Medical Council guidance distinguishes decisions not to start or continue treatment from an intention to bring about death and requires attention to benefit, burden, capacity and the patient's views. Assisted-dying terminology and law vary by jurisdiction. An official equality-impact summary published on 28 August 2026 states that assisted dying was not legal in England and Wales on the verification date, while a 2026 private member's bill remained contingent on becoming law. The body text keeps this issue conceptual and leaves legislative design, safeguards and political argument outside scope.

Sudden collapse and resuscitation. Resuscitation Council UK's 2025 guidance changed the public sequence: call 999 for any unresponsive person, then assess breathing while the call connects; abnormal breathing should trigger the assumption of cardiac arrest, chest compressions and AED use where available. The account of shockable rhythms is limited to the mechanism required here. Outcome percentages are omitted because arrest location, cause, witness status, rhythm, delay and prior health make headline averages easy to misuse. The 2016 joint guidance from the British Medical Association, Resuscitation Council UK and Royal College of Nursing remains published and supports the distinction between a CPR decision and decisions about other treatment, but Resuscitation Council UK marks it as under review.

Circulatory confirmation and autoresuscitation. The Academy code requires the examiner to be physically present and observe the patient for a minimum of five minutes while continuous unconsciousness and absence of breathing and circulation are established, followed by the specified neurological checks. It does not require uninterrupted palpation or auscultation throughout the interval. Zorko and colleagues' systematic review supports the discussion of autoresuscitation after circulatory arrest. Evidence is strongest in monitored settings and controlled withdrawal of life

support. The five-minute interval is therefore presented as one jurisdiction's complete protocol, not the biological duration of death or a free-standing public instruction.

Neurological confirmation. The clinical detail is based on the Academy code, with Greer and colleagues used to test external validity. Reversible causes must be excluded, prerequisites satisfied and two complete clinical examinations performed by the required doctors. Spinal reflexes and continuing heartbeat under ventilation do not by themselves contradict death under the UK neurological standard. Donation is kept conceptually and procedurally separate from diagnosis; the doctors diagnosing death must be independent of organ retrieval and allocation.

After the line. Confirmation of death, medical certification of cause, civil registration and independent investigation answer different questions. Department of Health and Social Care guidance supports the England and Wales system introduced on 9 September 2024: every death receives independent scrutiny through either a medical examiner or a coroner, and medical examiners scrutinise non-coronial causes and offer a conversation to the deceased person's representative. This is a jurisdictional example rather than a global sequence. Kellehear and Laqueur support the broader account of bodies, funerals, memory, property and duties moving into the hands of survivors. The Lancet Commission on the Value of Death supplies a cross-disciplinary interpretation, not a universal ethnography.

What the body does next. Cooling, lividity, rigor, autolysis and putrefaction are standard post-mortem changes described in forensic pathology. Their timing varies with body, environment, clothing, illness, injury and handling. The manuscript therefore rejects exact television-style clocks and does not provide operational time-since-death rules. Detailed forensic investigation belongs to *Forensics in a Hurry*.

Unequal mortality. World Bank World Development Indicators for 2024 give rounded life expectancy at birth of about eighty years in high-income economies and sixty-five in low-income economies. These are income-group aggregates, not forecasts for an individual, claims about

every country or a decomposition of the gap's causes. WHO's latest comprehensive global cause estimates used here refer to 2021, when an estimated 68 million people died and the ten leading causes accounted for 39 million, or 57 per cent. WHO's noncommunicable-disease material gives more than 43 million deaths in 2021, about 18 million before age seventy, and roughly 82 per cent of those premature deaths in low- and middle-income countries. Publication dates, observation periods, denominators and income classifications are kept separate.

The five stages. Kübler-Ross's *On Death and Dying* described denial, anger, bargaining, depression and acceptance in work centred on people facing death. Later popular accounts converted the responses into a fixed sequence and exported them to bereavement. Stroebe, Schut and Boerner examine the weak evidential basis and harmful uses of stage theory in grief. Avis, Stroebe and Schut show how internet accounts continue to present the stages while often omitting limitations and criticism. The manuscript credits the original achievement of listening to dying patients while rejecting a compulsory emotional timetable.

Near-death experiences. Parnia and colleagues' AWARE II study investigated consciousness and electroencephalographic activity during in-hospital cardiac arrest and interviewed survivors. Such research can examine reports remembered around arrest and resuscitation. It cannot interview people beyond permanent death, and it does not establish exactly when every memory formed. The text therefore treats afterlife proof, afterlife disproof and one-mechanism certainty as claims beyond the study design.

Advance care planning. Murali, Poco and Malhotra's 2025 systematic review found instability in end-of-life goals and preferences across a material share of included studies. That result supports an ongoing, revisable planning process. It does not make documents useless. The manuscript gives documents a narrower role: preserving refusals, appointments and value-based guidance when the person cannot speak, under the relevant local law.

Philosophy and literature. Epicurus supplies the non-experience

argument. Nagel's "Death" develops the deprivation account. Williams's "The Makropulos Case" challenges the assumption that endless life would remain desirable for a recognisably continuous person. These are rival arguments, not empirical findings. Tolstoy's *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* is used as literary evidence of a problem a person can face, not as data about all dying.

How we know. Death research has a built-in boundary. Physiology, monitors, examinations, records, autopsy, population data, observation of dying and testimony from survivors can be studied. Subjective experience after permanent death cannot. Cause-of-death data depend on certification, coding and registration systems whose coverage is unequal. Confidence is highest where a claim matches the jurisdiction, population, setting, definition and observation period of its source, and lowest where measurable events are converted into metaphysics.

Bibliography

Primary and literary works

Epicurus. "Letter to Menoeceus." In *The Epicurus Reader: Selected Writings and Testimonia*, translated by Brad Inwood and L. P. Gerson. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994.

Tolstoy, Leo. *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*. Translated by Anthony Briggs. London: Penguin Classics, 2006.

Clinical guidance, official data and institutional sources

Academy of Medical Royal Colleges. *A Code of Practice for the Diagnosis and Confirmation of Death: 2025 Update*. London: Academy of Medical Royal Colleges, 2025.

British Medical Association, Resuscitation Council UK, and Royal College of Nursing. *Decisions Relating to Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation*. 3rd ed., 1st revision. London: BMA, RCUK and RCN, 2016.

Department of Health and Social Care. "Guidance for Medical Practitioners Completing Medical Certificates of Cause of Death in England and Wales." GOV.UK, 8 April 2025. Accessed 4 September 2026.

General Medical Council. *Treatment and Care Towards the End of Life: Good Practice in Decision Making*. London: GMC, 2010. Updated 13 December 2024.

Ministry of Justice. "Terminally Ill Adults (End of Life) Bill 2026: Equality Impact Assessment - Summary." GOV.UK, 28 August 2026. Accessed 4 September 2026.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Care of Dying Adults in the Last Days of Life*. NICE guideline NG31. London: NICE, 2015.

Resuscitation Council UK. *Adult Basic Life Support Guidelines*. London: RCUK, 2025.

World Bank. *World Development Indicators: Life Expectancy at Birth, Total (Years)*. 2024 data. Accessed 4 September 2026.

World Health Organization. "Noncommunicable Diseases." Fact sheet. Accessed 4 September 2026.

World Health Organization. "Palliative Care." Fact sheet. 5 August 2020. Accessed 4 September 2026.

World Health Organization. "The Top 10 Causes of Death." Global Health Estimates using 2021 data. Accessed 4 September 2026.

Research and modern works

Avis, Kate A., Margaret Stroebe, and Henk Schut. "Stages of Grief Portrayed on the Internet: A Systematic Analysis and Critical Appraisal." *Frontiers in Psychology* 12 (2021): 772696. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.772696.

Clark, David. "Total Pain, Disciplinary Power and the Body in the Work of Cicely Saunders, 1958-1967." *Social Science & Medicine* 49, no. 6 (1999): 727-736. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00098-2.

Gawande, Atul. *Being Mortal: Medicine and What Matters in the End*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2014.

Hall, John E., and Michael E. Hall. *Guyton and Hall Textbook of Medical Physiology*. 15th ed. Elsevier, 2025.

Giacino, Joseph T., et al. "Practice Guideline Update Recommendations Summary: Disorders of Consciousness: Report of the Guideline Development, Dissemination, and Implementation Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology; the American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine; and the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research." *Neurology* 91, no. 10 (2018): 450-460. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000005926.

Greer, David M., et al. "Determination of Brain Death/Death by Neurologic Criteria: The World Brain Death Project." *JAMA* 324, no. 11 (2020): 1078-1097. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.11586.

Kellehear, Allan. *A Social History of Dying*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Kübler-Ross, Elisabeth. *On Death and Dying*. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Laqueur, Thomas W. *The Work of the Dead: A Cultural History of Mortal Remains*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Mannix, Kathryn. *With the End in Mind: Dying, Death and Wisdom in an Age of Denial*. London: William Collins, 2017.

Murali, Shravya, Louisa C. Poco, and Chetna Malhotra. "Instability in End-of-Life Goals and Preferences of Patients Who Are Seriously Ill: A Systematic Review." *JAMA Network Open* 8, no. 11 (2025): e2541264. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.41264.

Murray, Scott A., Marilyn Kendall, Kirsty Boyd, and Aziz Sheikh. "Illness Trajectories and Palliative Care." *BMJ* 330, no. 7498 (2005): 1007-1011. doi:10.1136/bmj.330.7498.1007.

Nagel, Thomas. "Death." *Noûs* 4, no. 1 (1970): 73-80.

Parnia, Sam, et al. "AWAREness during RESuscitation - II: A Multi-Center Study of Consciousness and Awareness in Cardiac Arrest." *Resuscitation* 191 (2023): 109903. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2023.109903.

Pollak, Stefan, Pekka Saukko, and Bernard Knight. *Knight's Forensic Pathology*. 5th ed. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 2026.

Sallnow, Libby, et al. "Report of the Lancet Commission on the Value of Death: Bringing Death Back into Life." *The Lancet* 399, no. 10327 (2022): 837-884. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02314-X.

Stroebe, Margaret, Henk Schut, and Kathrin Boerner. "Cautioning Health-Care Professionals: Bereaved Persons Are Misguided Through the Stages of Grief." *OMEGA - Journal of Death and Dying* 74, no. 4 (2017): 455-473. doi:10.1177/0030222817691870.

Surges, Séverine M., et al. "Revised European Association for Palliative Care (EAPC) Recommended Framework on Palliative Sedation: An International Delphi Study." *Palliative Medicine* 38, no. 2 (2024): 213-228. doi:10.1177/02692163231220225.

West, John B. "The Physiological Challenges of the 1952 Copenhagen Poliomyelitis Epidemic and a Renaissance in Clinical Respiratory Physiology." *Journal of Applied Physiology* 99, no. 2 (2005): 424-432. doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.00184.2005.

Williams, Bernard. "The Makropulos Case: Reflections on the Tedium of Immortality." In *Problems of the Self*, 82-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Zorko, Deana J., et al. "Autoresuscitation after Circulatory Arrest: An Updated Systematic Review." *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia* 70 (2023): 699-712. doi:10.1007/s12630-023-02411-8.