

## Social , Legal And Ethical Issues of Euthanasia

Jayashree kuanr  
Research Scholar,  
MSCBD university,  
Baripada, Mayurbhnja, Odisha.  
Dr. Krutibas Sahu, Associate Professor of Philosophy,  
MPC Autonomous College, Baripada, Mayurbhnja, Odisha.

**DECLARATION::** I AS AN AUTHOR OF THIS PAPER / ARTICLE, HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE PAPER SUBMITTED BY ME FOR PUBLICATION IN THIS JOURNAL IS COMPLETELY MY OWN PREPARED PAPER.. I HAVE CHECKED MY PAPER THROUGH MY GUIDE/SUPERVISOR/EXPERT AND IF ANY ISSUE REGARDING COPYRIGHT/PATENT/ PLAGIARISM/ OTHER REAL AUTHOR ARISE, THE PUBLISHER WILL NOT BE LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE. . IF ANY OF SUCH MATTERS OCCUR PUBLISHER MAY REMOVE MY CONTENT FROM THE JOURNAL..

### ABSTRACT

In the current period, there is huge changes have occurred in convictions and works on relating to the start of life. Family arranging and anti-conception medication as opposed to being censured are currently acknowledged as an obligation and obligation. Presently early termination is lawful in specific conditions, on the off chance that fetus removal could be legitimate in specific conditions, why would that be no euthanasia law for individuals who have no desire for their life? All individuals have the crucial right to live. Notwithstanding, there is generally a situation associated with allowing the enduring individuals to pass on and killing the honest patient under a bogus appearance. It tends to be contended that the issues associated with euthanasia have a huge ramifications for the people in the public eye and to the policymakers. Many individuals implore that they won't outlast their handiness and turned into a weight to their next kinfolk, driving them to burn through enormous amounts of cash just to defer inescapable. Euthanasia is a disputable subject and individuals are becoming progressively mindful of the issues appended to it. Proof of this is the issue and contention being arranged in a rising volume of distribution workshops gatherings, court choices and official proposition. This work endeavor to invigorate conversation and proper activity in managing this current issue. This current work focuses on the ramifications engaged with the common freedoms to live particularly in the field of medication and furthermore targets exposing the issues of euthanasia from legitimate, social and moral points of view.

**Keywords:** Euthanasia, Ethical Issues, Legal Perspective

## **INTRODUCTION**

In ordinary circumstances patients are regularly dealt with in typical conditions, nonetheless, if there should be an occurrence of the extreme or last phase of a fatal illness, she/he can be either supported always in their own current agonizing conditions or can be permitted to bite the dust. The situation associated with fluctuating between these two choices is frequently a significant and begging to be proven wrong theme in every one of the ages and the ages to come. In these circumstances, questions can be raised from a moral, social, lawful and clinical viewpoint which should be tended to in a benevolent and wise way. In the event that we are going to end the existence of an honest patient who is in an excruciating condition however likes to live then the moral question emerges; how we can end the existence of others? This is against clinical morals. Also another inquiry is, regardless of whether it is moral to keep him/her alive on the grounds that we can't ethically let him/her bite the dust? Could his/her family demand keeping the patient alive or his/her life isn't to be proceeded? What are the lawful freedoms of the patient and his/her family? What is the obligation of the doctor in giving clinical consideration? Is it legitimate to stop the consideration? Would the patient herself be able to impact the choice taken with respect to her future clinical consideration? In this work, an endeavor has been made to examine these easily proven wrong issues which structure the foundation of this work. All the more regularly accentuation is put on the clinical calling at whatever point the inquiry with respect to the singular's life and related issues. The challenges emerge on account of critically ill patients where the moral discussion over the worth of life is of most extreme significance. Notwithstanding, these moral discussions must be seen alongside the legitimate examination of euthanasia.

## **MEANING AND DIFFERENT TYPES OF EUTHANASIA**

As per Black's Law Dictionary (eighth version) euthanasia implies the demonstration or practice of killing or achieving the demise of an individual who experiences a serious sickness or condition, esp. a difficult one, because of reasons of leniency. Reference book of 'Wrongdoing and Justice', clarifies euthanasia as a demonstration of death which will give a help from an upsetting or grievous state of living. Essentially euthanasia is the act of kindly taking an

individual's life to let the individual out of a hopeless sickness, terrible affliction, wretchedness and torment of the life. The term euthanasia was gotten from the Greek words "eu "and "thanatos "and that signifies "great passing" or "simple demise ".It is otherwise called Mercy Killing. Euthanasia has been characterized as the organization of medications with the unequivocal expectation of taking the patient's life, at the patient's solicitation . Euthanasia in a real sense implies putting an individual to effortless demise particularly if there should arise an occurrence of serious misery or when life becomes purposeless because of mental or actual handicapS. Euthanasia or kindness killing is the act of killing an individual for giving help from hopeless agony or enduring or permitting or causing effortless demise when life has become trivial and obnoxious . In the cutting edge setting euthanasia is restricted to the killing of patients by specialists in line with the patient to free him of horrendous torment or from terminal sickness. In this way the essential aim behind euthanasia is to guarantee a less agonizing passing to a regardless going individual to bite the dust after a significant stretch of misery. Euthanasia might be delegated follows:-

- (1) Active or Positive
- (2) Passive or negative (also known as letting-die)
- (3) Voluntary
- (4) Involuntary
- (5) Non-Voluntary

**Active or Positive:** - Active euthanasia includes effortlessly killing people for forgiving reasons, as when a specialist regulate deadly portion of prescription to a patient.

**Passive or negative:** - Euthanasia is passive when demise is caused on the grounds that a treatment that is supporting the existence of the patient is held off and the patient bites the dust thus thereof. For instance, pulling out life supporting gadgets from a genuine patient, eliminating which, the patient passes on. In "passive euthanasia" the specialists are not actively killing anybody; they are just not saving him.

**Voluntary:** - It is voluntary when the euthanasia is rehearsed with the communicated want and assent of the patient. voluntary euthanasia is basically worried about the right to decision of the

in critical condition patient who chooses to end their life, decision which serves his/her wellbeing and furthermore that of every other person.

**Involuntary:** - at the point when the patient is killed without a communicated wish with this impact, it is a type of involuntary euthanasia. It alludes to cases wherein a capable patient's life is finished against the desires of that patient that go against euthanasia; and would obviously add up to kill.

**Non-Voluntary:-** it alludes to finishing the existence of a not intellectually skillful individual to make an educated solicitation to bite the dust, like an incapacitated patient. In Non-Voluntary euthanasia the patient has left no such living will or given any development orders, as he might not have had a potential chance to do as such, or might not have expected any such mishap or possibility. In instances of non voluntary euthanasia, it is generally expected the relatives, who settle on the choice.

There are various ways for euthanasia. The most popular methods include –

1. Lethal injection - Injection of a deadly portion of a medication, like a known toxic substance, KCl, and so on
2. Asphyxiation - The most well known gas utilized is Carbon monoxide (CO). Nerve gases like sarin and tabun and so forth are likewise included limited quantities to completely guarantee demise. One of the techniques is likewise Dr. Jack Kevorkian's passing machine (mercitron, thanatron). He is otherwise called Dr.Death. It's a novel strategy where an individual can take his life himself. With the utilization of this machine an individual can take his life himself easily at the time picked by the patient.

## **EUTHANASIA FROM LEGAL PERSPECTIVE**

The constitution of law is one of the solid mainstays of human culture (Edor and Odok 2010). Individuals should submit to the law to have a serene society. If not, society will be in bedlam. Unconditioned activity isn't free activity. An activity can't be considered as free except if and until it is gone before by some fundamental condition. Each activity in a general public can be viewed as one or the other correct (Akwaaji and Paschal 2018). Smart activity gets the

endorsement of the general public though some unacceptable activity gets dissatisfaction from the general public. To disallow some unacceptable activity done by an individual and to shield others from being a casualty of it, state laws have been outlined. On the off chance that an individual plays out an activity not endorsed by the general public, such activities are considered as off-base activities and the state upholds laws to forestall such activities, either by discipline or by renewal. The reasoning behind state's lawfulness is to keep a quiet environment in our general public and furthermore to help in maintaining great human relations. Henceforth, an endeavor to problematize the issues associated with authorizing euthanasia as right or wrong is thought of as here.

Each calling as a wheel spins with a specific moral code as its support. It suggests specific goals are moral and certain objectives are legitimate which is ensured by the state. Clinical calling in one such calling which includes both moral and lawful codes. Indeed, even the issues relating to euthanasia brings up issues like: regardless of whether the doctor, patient or family members reserve the option to choose the utilization of euthanasia? It is an official choice of a person during the last phases of his/her life, so it is of unnecessary significance to break down the issues associated with authorizing euthanasia, so it tends to be kept from being mishandled. Different gatherings might say that there is no requirement for legitimate authorization to apply euthanasia. Be that as it may, on the off chance that euthanasia is authorized, there might be an answer for the inquiries like whether the people or patients reserve the option to live or kick the bucket. In any case, euthanasia, in the event that authorized will be mishandled; on the off chance that it isn't sanctioned the patient needs to go through proceeded with sufferings. Thus, there are moral and legitimate situations engaged with sanctioning euthanasia.

There are states which authorized euthanasia like Belgium, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Oregon, Montana and Washington.

In Switzerland rehearsing dynamic euthanasia is acknowledged and is sanctioned (Hurst and Mauron 2003). As per it, the specialist can oversee deadly infusion to the patient in light of his/her assent. Here, there is no responsibility of a criminal demonstration from the specialist's side. Euthanasia isn't authorized in Britain (Hurst and Mauron 2003). Walk 2012, review specifies that 180 British individuals were managed euthanasia in Switzerland, in view of their

living assent. This type of death is known as 'dignitas', and that signifies 'self destruction the travel industry' (Lorenzl et al., 2017).

Netherland is the main country to legitimize euthanasia for certain agreements. The standards that must be trailed by the doctor in the Netherlands for rehearsing euthanasia are referenced beneath:

1. The patient's enduring is agonizing.
2. The illness is serious.
3. Patient's condition is terminal.
4. Patient's solicitation for death.

In numerous nations the wave towards legitimizing utilization of euthanasia is by all accounts in an expanded request. The primary endeavor made in the twentieth century in authorizing euthanasia is by the United States of America. The idea of euthanasia was first presented in the Ohio lawmaking body in the time of 1906. Be that as it may, the endeavor was bombed due of the absence of allies (Tarabeih et al., 2020). In the political race directed for authorizing euthanasia, just 22 individuals casted a ballot for intentional euthanasia out of 78, thusly the bill was dismissed and the possibility of willful euthanasia was dropped. The endeavor to authorize euthanasia has both positive and negative sides. Hardly any gatherings dismissed and not many different gatherings acknowledged the sanctioning. The majority of individuals from the strict gatherings dismissed the utilization of euthanasia and a part of specialists likewise dismissed it. The acknowledgment or dismissal essentially relies on the way of life and moral standards of that country.

## **EUTHANASIA FROM A SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE**

Euthanasia as a social issue has its effect on social, practical and political viewpoints. It considers the freedom of the general public. Socially the people have a few fixed qualities and standards and the people need to observe those ethics in a general public. The perishing individual and the family members of the patient likewise need to follow specific normal practices and qualities. Despite the fact that, the patient is experiencing excruciating infection

and misery; his family members need to think about the accepted practices. In any general public there are a few convictions about the singular's life, which can't be overruled. In the present circumstance, assuming euthanasia is authorized it will prompt social discussions. The cherished one's misery and trouble will be an agonizing sight to the family members, yet according to the lawful viewpoint there is a bad situation for the ethical standards and qualities. A lot of advanced age homes, homes for restoration focuses and simple-minded have been arising in the contemporary society. The mercilessness and savage type of living existed during the pre-development time frame may sneak in the current circumstance there by cautions about the challenges in administrating euthanasia which will make a disorder in the general public. In this setting moral issues will emerge in leniency killing.

At the point when euthanasia is sanctioned the patient's independence will be in a difficult situation. Where in there will be imbalance in independence when the family members request the patient to pass on. Which will inturn, straightforwardly or by implication thinks about the patient's presence. Mentally, they will be baffled. Great family and society is the foundation of person's great activity and backing. It incorporates enthusiastic, down to earth and monetary help of the person. In not so distant future, there may be a circumstance where individuals will be considered as simple examples in leading lab tests for the sake of euthanasia. Thusly, euthanasia will open the doors in letting the social disasters to its maltreatment and danger, for the human life in the society. A clear conversation relating to euthanasia is significant in this viewpoint. A similar case can be seen according to a humanistic perspective.

Thalaikoothalis a social practice behind which there is a thought process in killing the old individuals (Pousset 2018). In Tamil Nadu, Virudhunagar region and another southern pieces of Tamil Nadu there is a set up friendly practice named thalaikoothal. This is applied on the older or to the critically ill individuals. These older individuals are given a formal oil shower, after that they will be taken care of delicate coconut water. Which will cause pneumonia and in the long run lead them ridiculously. Once in a while they will add poison for rushing the passing. Their super rationale will be to snatch the property. One such occurrence was accounted for in Virudhunagar region. Where an eighty year elderly person got away from his home since his kids planned to direct the thalaikoothal capacities for him. The entire relatives were associated with



the dishonest social practice. This thusly infers that assuming euthanasia is authorized, there is plausible of abusing them on the guiltless individuals with no shadow.

Absence of mindfulness is the main justification behind abusing euthanasia and larger part of individuals don't have the information about euthanasia. Certain individuals are not taught and furthermore they are taken advantage of in explicit circumstances. Once in a while patients appear to be a weight to the family members, so they will apply euthanasia without the edge of the patient. The patient may not know about the thing will occur and he might kick the bucket accidentally. The point of the family members might be snatching the property and remembering from the weight. Due to these reasons the helpless people lose their life. As indicated by Dr. Amit Agarwal, oncologist of Fortis Hospitals.

Noida Delhi, India communicated with regards to his predicament of the layman's consciousness of euthanasia as;

Outright absence of public mindfulness and obvious legitimate bearings on finish of-life terminal consideration. At whatever point we are in a circumstance where nothing will be exhortation by forceful, life supporting treatment in a terminal sick patient, we genuinely tell the patient and the family and take in to thought what the patient would have needed. We likewise do everything to make the patient as agreeable and torment free as could be expected (Umasekar 2010, p. 6).

Euthanasia isn't just a legitimate and moral issue yet a social issue too. Social issues are examined by Lord Brock (London). He didn't go against euthanasia yet examinations the humanistic point of view of euthanasia. Whenever euthanasia is legitimized, the public authority will deal with the issue of applying euthanasia on the grounds that the public authority should take care of the issue in the wake of sanctioning euthanasia. The public authority experiences the difficulties like: Who will perform euthanasia? Where will it be drilled or where will we practice it, home or medical clinic? How could be finished? Master Brock trusted that the specialists and attendants would not do this since they have the obligation to save a patient's life and not to kill.



In public activity it is frequently considered as a weight for the family and the person, with regards to the instance of an infected and impaired individual. So their life will become debased and they will be a weight to their family members. They, when all is said and done, feel that they are weight to their family members and furthermore to the general public. On account of the defenselessness in life they imagine that they are not valuable to the general public. Since their life isn't important, they are compelled to kick the bucket. Here, the patient's independence is of no worth since a ultimate choice is taken by the family members. Society is constantly worried about the singular's personal satisfaction. So society has the obligation of ensuring and giving them great quality life. Once in a while society likewise bombs in this perspective. The ailing individual will confront more mental tensions. So the most ideal choice is to pick passing. Passing is the main approach to getting away from the terrible circumstance and furthermore from the enduring of agonizing sickness. Here, the patient might select intentionally or purposely yet not with 'pressure'.

The public authority and the general public have the obligation to get the existence of debilitated people. A few extraordinary havens must be apportioned for the debilitated individuals. Yet, this will make confinement of the crippled individuals for example on account of AIDS patients. When society begins segregating the AIDS patients, it will become practice. Individuals actually imagine that AIDS is a weak illness. This disconnection will segregate the association between conventional man and the patients. This kind of segregation will influence the patient mentally. So they will believe that there is of no expectation of recuperating, and they will be discouraged and powerfully take the choice for applying euthanasia. Be that as it may, the general public additionally has the obligation to help the segregated patient. This seclusion of the patient or old individuals persuades them for biting the dust. The general public has the obligation to secure the old individuals. One such disengaged place is an advanced age home.

The difficult sight of the patient will make bitterness in the existence of their direct relations because of the absence of basic encouragement and monetary help so just a decent family can deliver great people to the general public. The enthusiastic connection of the relatives will make

stresses to the impaired individual. It will be one reason for picking euthanasia by the patient. The inquiry is who will perform euthanasia? Normally specialists practice it in certain conditions. In some cases in view of the patient's solicitation, others may perform euthanasia. However, whenever euthanasia is sanctioned, a predicament will be opened. Applying euthanasia can be defended under certain conditions in the clinical field. Yet, in the public eye it isn't right. To apply euthanasia it prompts numerous contentions. The public authority needs to distinguish explicit spot to perform euthanasia clinic or another spot. Assuming somebody kills the other individual for property, the public authority can not sentence that individual. Since it has authorized killing and can't rebuff individuals. This multitude of sorts of situations are to be experienced by the public authority.

Nigeria, have a few social, culture and moral standards. These are standards restricting our law. In the event that this sort of killing gets authorization from the law, no one needs to rehearse it. In Nigeria euthanasia can't be changed to the patients. It is a social issue. The public authority needs to select specialist and police for killing. It infers executioners are additionally required in our general public. Assuming euthanasia is legitimized socially it will be abused. For the sake of euthanasia the patient will be taken advantage of for organs. The world we are residing is ending up being more materialistic, childish and separated where everybody is looking forward just for the cash and no one frets over affection and enthusiastic sentiments like holding and connection. In the current setting there is plausible of killing a PVS patient or mind dead understanding for the point of eliminating the organs and we realize that such cases have been accounted for in the underdeveloped nations and particularly in a nation like Nigeria where populace is out of hand and destitution is found all over the place.

The fundamental difficulty which the general public will confront is the distinction among haves and the less wealthy. There is an opportunity for killing the poor person individuals for some reasons. In the contemporary world many individuals are living on trail. The public authority and society likewise don't acknowledge them as residents. Some time they might be killed for the political reasons. The social orders should give significance to the advancement of the recovery

habitats for elderly folks individuals, for youngsters, for patients and simple-minded people. Individuals likewise should feel mindful alongside the public authority. In the event that euthanasia will be rehearsed, there is no need of any qualities in the general public. In Nazi Germany, euthanasia was drilled for killings individuals with sickness. Whenever euthanasia is authorized, then, at that point, it genuinely does right by any general public. Maybe Hitler's point was to diminish the financial weight yet here the point is unique.

Simultaneously both for the family members and for the clinical foundations, the patient turns into a weight. In these conditions, the doctor encourages to family members to reclaim the patient. On the off chance that family members give the request to the foundation, they can permit the patient to remain in the emergency clinic. Here, both the family members and the foundation might feel the weight. One reason is monetary.

### **PERSPECTIVE IN FAVOUR OF EUTHANASIA AS UNETHICAL**

Morals is the judgment of human activities, an activity which is correct or wrong will be chosen by the setting in which the move should be made. Here, morals become family member and situational. As indicated by Joseph Fletcher's, morals manages ideal and science manages conceivable and plausible. Morals is the ethical activity of individuals in the general public wherein they are arranged. Morals can be applied distinctly in the circle of the homo sapiens and not among the creature circle or heavenly circle. Society is comprised of certain principles and guidelines. These principles and guidelines are essential for morals, assisting the people with making their personality great (Esikot et al., 2019). Each individual is soaked up for certain moral characteristics for sure, even a criminal doesn't need morals. It is profoundly difficult to disregard morals from the human circle which is the support of the human establishment. For example in the field medication, the expert set of principles frames the culmination of that calling, where the specialist's excellent obligation is to save life, which is reflected in the Hippocratic Oath (Askitopoulou and Vgontzas 2018).

In the current world individuals have not given inclination to the profound quality and they are carrying on with in their own way of life with their own ideas without profound quality. They are contemplating their own specific manners of foundation. They are killing others for the childish purposes. They don't worry about different people groups psyche and issues. Killing others for egotistical purposes and applying euthanasia isn't right or dishonest. Each individual has a characteristic propensity for long life alongside his dear and close to ones. Simultaneously assuming that they are enduring with any hopeless sickness they will be the weight for their family. The patient will contemplate the family's monetary circumstance moreover. So in such cases they will pick to pass on. Euthanasia seems, by all accounts, to be the most ideal answer for such patients. One of the cases depicted underneath will clarify the previously mentioned circumstances.

The strict view says that, euthanasia is unscrupulous in light of the fact that their conviction that the life is made by god. So ending the life back is the sole right of God. So in the event that we kill the individual or the life, or the obliteration of life then it is the dismissal of a heavenly gift. Religion says that we reserve no privilege to end the daily routine yet we have obligation to experience the life till god ends our life back.

Religion accepts that we have right to live. The religions accept that occasionally the patients who are in a vegetative state because of head injury or some other cerebrum illness don't know fine cases for euthanasia. For these lethargic patients' assuming appropriate clinical consideration and life emotionally supportive network is given not many months, they will be inexplicably swung back to recuperation and continued life so the strict are tenets for applying euthanasia. The strict announcement like 'Don't take' 'Don't kill' and 'Don't lie'. This is the main moral judgment. The strict and moral frameworks maintains the idea of morals and the strict masterminds likewise telling it's bad in light of the fact that our life is endowment of god so we reserve no option to take life.

## CONCLUSION

The point which I am attempting to commute home from this work is that subsequent to investigating advantages and disadvantages of euthanasia from legitimate, social and moral viewpoint, obviously that it is exceptionally difficult to sum up whether euthanasia is more right than wrong to wrong. There is dependably a moral difficulty engaged with concluding whether it is fortunate or unfortunate, observing a general or outright arrangement is a fantastical thought this work. Nonetheless, that doesn't imply that it isn't in a situation to investigate it, offsetting with the benefits and bad marks of euthanasia, I can't help suspecting that euthanasia must be seen with the displays of three sixty degree. The lived insight of patient alongside the climate in which he is arranged ought to be the measuring stick in choosing the benefits and negative marks of euthanasia. Most importantly as indicated by the circumstance and the setting where the issue emerged must be seen from various points prior to taking any choice, in this setting it must be seen from clinical grounds, legitimate, social and moral grounds prior to taking any choice. Such an answer will be levelheaded just as moral and furthermore a way locator.

## REFERENCES

1. Askitopoulou, H., & Vgontzas, A. N. (2018). The relevance of the Hippocratic Oath to the ethical and moral values of contemporary medicine. Part II: interpretation of the Hippocratic Oath—today's perspective. In *European Spine Journal* (Vol. 27, Issue 7, pp. 1491–1500). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-018-5615-z>
2. Byars, S. M., & Stanberry, K. (2019). *Business ethics*. Houston, TX: OpenStax College, Rice University.
- Esikot, I. F., Bessong, P. K., & Ette, E. E. (2019). An Examination of Spinoza's Moral Philosophy. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, 2(1), 10-19.
3. Hurst, S. A., & Mauron, A. (2003). Assisted suicide and euthanasia in Switzerland. *BMJ*, 327(7405), 52–53. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7405.52-c>
4. Lorenzl, S., Butzhammer, L., & Nübling, G. (2017). Assisted Suicide of patients with parkinsonian syndromes in Switzerland – the need of early and continuous integration of palliative care and dignity therapy. *Movement Disorders*, 32(suppl 2).

5. Ogar, T. E., & Ogar, J. N. (2018). Globalization in Africa and Beyond: The Quest for Global Ethics. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, 1(2), 38-47.
6. Tarabeh, M., Bokek-Cohen, Y., Abu Rakia, R., Nir, T., Coolidge, N. E., & Azuri, P. (2020). Religious observance and perceptions of end-of-life care. *Nursing Inquiry*, 27(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/nin.12347>
7. Glenn, R. A. (2003). *The right to privacy: Rights and liberties under the law*. Abc-Clio.
8. Young, R. (2007). *Medically assisted death*. Cambridge University Press..
9. Pojman, L. P. (2000). *Life and death: a reader in moral problems*. Wadsworth Publishing.
10. Hockey, L. (1987). The End of Life: Euthanasia and Morality. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 13(1), 50. John Keown, J. (2018). *Euthanasia, ethics and public policy: an argument against legalisation*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Young, R., Van Beinum, M., Sweeting, H., & West, P. (2007). Young people who selfharm. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 191(1), 44-49.
12. Grisez, G. G., & Boyle, J. (1979). *Life and death with liberty and justice* (pp. 59-85). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
13. Paterson, C. (2008). *Assisted suicide and euthanasia: a natural law ethics approach*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
14. Rachels, J. (1986). *The end of life: euthanasia and morality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
15. Paterson, C. (2008). *Assisted suicide and euthanasia: a natural law ethics approach*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
16. Callahan, D., & White, M. (1996). The legalization of physician-assisted suicide: creating a regulatory Potemkin village. *U. Rich. L. Rev.*, 30, 1.
17. Umasekar, S. (2010, February 14). The Fight for Dignity in Death. *The Hindu Daily News Paper*, pp. 1-19.

\*\*\*\*\*