Library Progress International *Print version ISSN 0970 1052*
Vol.44 No. 4, July-December 2024: P. 1786-1792 *Online version ISSN 2320 317X*

Original Article *Available online at www.bpasjournals.com*

Euthanasia: A Possibility Of Its Practice In India

Dr Jayashree Kuanr
Researcher in Philosophy

How to cite this article: Dr Jayashree Kuanr (2024). Euthanasia: A Possibility Of Its Practice In India. *Library Progress International,* 44(4), 1786-1792

Abstract

Euthanasia, in general, is a practice of killing a person painlessly who wills to die because of his/her uncurable suffering from disease. The practice of euthanasia, which is also widely referred to as "mercy killing" has a very brief history in India. In this paper, the author dives into some issues of euthanasia on the basis of morality, legality, religiosity that are associated with the practice of euthanasia. Euthanasia is neither homicide nor suicide. There is clear distinction between them. There are different ways in which different religious beliefs, such as Sikhism, Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism, have influenced people's opinions on the matter of ending a life or kicking the bucket. Euthanasia is broken down into many categories, and it's possible uses are investigated across the many stages of human life. Critical problems such as death with dignity, the right to die, and the ethical considerations surrounding the freedom of choice in dealing with end-of-life decisions are at the centre of the conversation. In addition, this paper briefly studies development of legal frameworks that pertain to euthanasia, addressing concerns that are associated with human rights and medical ethics. With the help of this in-depth analysis, the purpose of this paper is to shed light on the varied character of euthanasia in India, offering insights into the historical backdrop of the practice as well as contemporary viewpoints on it.

Keywords: Euthanasia, Suicide, homicide, right to die, Ethical Consideration, Human Rights

Life is a valuable gift from God to humankind, and it is fundamental to safeguard and save it with generosity and dignity. Passing obliterates life and bereft humanity of the choicest favours of provision. Hence, overseers and clinical professionals are obliged to make vows to save the existence of each and every individual and not to kill them. Morals and ethics force a commitment on clinical specialists to help with keeping up with life liberated from sufferings and agonies, adjusting to one side to live.

Honourable life is a centre part of common society, and stately demise is likewise an imbued fixing. In situations where restoratively subjective life pacing into vegetative express, the spirit is freed from slow and terrible sufferings, prompting the option to pick speedy and simple demise, famously known as great passing or Wilful extermination. The moral and lawful discussion for wilful extermination includes issues like passing with poise, right to kick the bucket, opportunity of decision among life and finishing the life, and right to be killed. This paper investigates the necessities and circumstances where a "great demise" or "biting the dust well" could become vital. There might be contrasts between great passing and simple demise, as the individual closures their own life without anyone else, generally in mystery. Once in a while, an individual might find himself defenceless in a pitiable condition

emerging from physical or dysfunctional behaviour, illness, advanced age, or different circumstances that need the support of others.

The effect of wilful extermination on socio-legitimate and moral surface of society ought to be explored, including whether slow and terrible demise with deplorable sufferings is an infringement of the right of noble life, whether the decision of death when it becomes impending and undeniable falls inside the class of basic liberty as right to pass on, whether end of treatment of a patient in vegetative state is a method for safeguarding the common freedom to bite the dust, and whether regulation grants kindness killing.

The demonstration of killing or achieving the passing of an experiencing individual a hopeless infection or condition, especially a difficult one, can be viewed as wilful extermination. This is finished out of empathy for the person. This training, which is frequently alluded to as Kindness Killing, starts from the Greek expressions "eu" and "Thanatos," which can be interpreted as "great passing" or "simple demise." The act of overseeing prescriptions to a patient with the particular objective of taking the patient's life at the patient's solicitation is alluded to as wilful extermination. In a real sense, it suggests executing an individual without causing them any aggravation, especially in circumstances where the enduring is persistent or when life has lost all importance because of a psychological or actual debilitation. The expression "wilful extermination" is confined to the demonstration of killing patients by clinical experts at the patient's solicitation to let them free from anguishing torment or to ease the side effects of a terminal disease. The essential objective of killing is to give a less anguishing passing to an individual who has been languishing over a lot of time and is expected to die sooner rather than later.

Euthanasia dates back to the Hippocratic Oath. Before Hippocrates, it was believed that doctors had the right to end patients' lives without their consent, and this practice interfered with patient-physician confidentiality. During the Nazi era also, Hitler ordered physicians to perform "mercy deaths" on incurable patients, believing that such life was 'unworthy of life'. The program began with infants under three with serious hereditary diseases, and expanded to older children. The program gradually used advanced techniques for killing, and doctors carried out all killings.

Euthanasia proponents argue that individuals should have the last say in their own lives, and they have the entitlement to choose when to pass away if they find themselves in an intolerable circumstance with no chance of recovery. Australia became the first nation to legally allow euthanasia in 1996, while the Netherlands allowed it in 2001. Euthanasia proponents believe that individuals should have the last say in their own lives. Similar activities were made possible in Montana in 2009 by a court decision with a view that there was no constitutional obstacle to assisted suicide.

However, Oregon, Washington, and Vermont have laws requiring patients to have a terminal physical illness to be eligible for Physician Assisted Suicide (PAS), unlike European countries. Various countries have various harsh regulations regarding euthanasia, making it crucial for medical professionals to uphold the idea of medical interventions rather than callous killings.

Euthanasia is considered in its various forms: a) Active Euthanasia, that is, taking steps to take a life in order to relieve suffering—often by administering a deadly dosage of drugs; b) Passive Euthanasia, that is, denying or stopping medical care in order to let a patient die

naturally; c) Voluntary Euthanasia, that is, with complete consent from the patient, euthanasia is carried out;
d) Involuntary Euthanasia, that is, when a patient is incapable of making decisions, or when their intentions are not honoured, euthanasia is carried out; e) Physician-Assisted Euthanasia, that is, a physician giving a patient the tools to take their own life; and f) Legitimate Medical Euthanasia, that is, treating a patient in order to alleviate their suffering, even if doing so unintentionally speeds up death.
From Indian perspective, Indian culture is overwhelmingly strict, with Hinduism being the most generally followed religion. The custom of supplicate upavasa, or fasting to death, is viewed as alright just in specific conditions. Different customs, like Sati, have additionally shown the shams of killing, like the act of Samadhi and Jal Samadhi. These practices are as yet common among strict and supernaturally arranged people.
In Hindu way of thinking, it is accepted that an individual can accomplish salvation from the pattern of resurrection in the event that they kick the bucket in normal ways. Shraadha and Tarpan are given to the spirit of the departed who passes on in common manner and in the standard course of occasions. Be that as it may, the spirit of an individual destined to death coincidentally, ends it all, or has been killed by somebody isn't qualified for these advantages. Jainism perceives wilful extermination as Santhara. Santhara has various thoughts and implications. It is, generally, accepted to be drilled starting from the groundwork of Jainism and is just a question of passing on with nobility and could be embraced in instances of terminal disease, up and coming demise, starvation, and old age.
Sikhism is totally against wilful extermination, seeing it as impedance in God's arrangement. Christians accept that birth and demise are important for the existence processes made by God, and ought to regard them. The Islamic socio-overall set of laws is completely against wilful extermination, as it proclaims human existence as holy and sacred. In the Quran, killing any individual is viewed as the killing of entire humanity. Sharia holds that God alone, not the person, is the provider and taker of human existence. Baha'i is completely silent about the practice of mercy killing.
India's lawful position is guided and affected by its constitution, which draws from different unfamiliar constitutions. Wilful extermination and kindness killing are unlawful in India, as they fall under statements first of Segment 300 of the Indian Punitive Code, 1860. Notwithstanding, instances of deliberate killing (where the patient agrees to death) would draw in Exemption 5 to Area 300, while non-wilful and compulsory killing would be struck by stipulation one to Segment 92 of the IPC.
Helped self-destruction is certainly not an accessible "right" in India, however it is culpable under the India Corrective Code, 1860. The right to life is a vital right revered in the Constitution of India, and Article 21 ensures the right to life in India. Nonetheless, the High Court's choice in Gian Kaur v. Province of Punjab laid out that the "right to life" ensured by Article 21 does exclude the "right to bite the dust." The Indian Clinical Board Act, 1956 likewise resolves this issue, permitting the Clinical Committee of India to recommend principles of expert direct and morals for clinical specialists.
The new decision in Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Association of India by our Honourable High Court made the way for the authorization of helped self-destruction. Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug is in a persevering vegetative state (P.V.S.), is basically oblivious, and has an

almost dead mind. For this situation, a request was submitted to the High Court mentioning consent for killing. The High Court framed a group to look at the patient medicinally to decide the issue. To wrap things up, the Court denied the request Shanbaug had documented, noticing that while dynamic wilful extermination is unlawful, uninvolved killing is sometimes permitted under severe lawful oversight. The court likewise proposed that the Indian Reformatory Code's punishments for self-destruction endeavours be eliminated, decriminalizing the demonstration. In such manner, the Court laid out the standards that will apply until Parliament passes regulation resolving the issue,

1. In request to end life support, a choice should be made, and this choice can be made by the guardians, the companion, or other direct relations. In the event that these people are not generally present, a choice can likewise be made by an individual or gathering going about as a next companion. Besides, it is workable for the going to doctors to take it themselves. It is fundamental, nonetheless, that the choice be made in an earnest way and in view of the patient's wellbeing.
2. Consequently, regardless of whether a choice is made to pull out life support by the patient's direct relations, specialists, or next companion, this choice should be endorsed by the High Court worried, as expressed on account of Airedale (supra). This is significantly more significant in our country since we can't preclude the likelihood that the patient's family members or others will participate in wickedness to acquire the patient's property.

Inside the setting of this specific case, the inquiry that is being viewed as by the Court is what part of the law permits the Court to allow endorsement for the withdrawal of life backing to an awkward person. In this way, the Court reached the resolution that, as per Article 226 of the Constitution, the High Court has the position to concede assent for the most common way of pulling out life support from an awkward person. As indicated by Article 226 of the Constitution, the High Court has the position to give writs as well as to make bearings or orders. This authority can't be detracted from the High Court. As per the ongoing case, when such an application is presented, the Main Equity of the Great Court is expected to promptly shape a Seat comprising of something like two appointed authorities who will choose whether or not to give endorsement. Preceding setting out on this game-plan, the Seat should initially look for

the exhortation of a panel comprising of three profoundly respected doctors, who will be selected by the Seat in the wake of talking with any clinical specialists or professionals that it might see as proper. There ought to be one nervous system specialist, one therapist, and one doctor among the three clinical experts. The nervous system specialist ought to be the most favoured choice. It is the obligation of the board comprising of three doctors who have been picked by the Seat to lead an exhaustive assessment of the patient, as well as to really look at the patient's clinical record and to request the assessments of the emergency clinic work force. The board ought to then introduce its discoveries to the High Court Seat. After hearing the State and direct relations of the patient, like their folks, spouse, siblings or sisters, etc, as well as, if these people are absent, the patient's closest companion, the seat of the Great Court ought to then deliver a decision. The methodology depicted above must to be stuck to all through the aggregate of India until the Parliament passes regulation about this. As per the idea of 'wellbeing of the patient' that was laid out by the Place of Rulers on account of Airedale (over), the High Court should go with its choice and relegate clear justification for

it.

From the specific case of Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug, it can be inferred that the Article 21 of the Indian Constitution i.e., “Right to Life” has a scope of incorporating “Right to death”, because, right to live means to live with dignity.

There are certain problems associated with the practice of euthanasia specially in India. Positively, (i) Advocates for the legalization of physician-assisted suicide (PAS) and euthanasia contend that giving terminally ill people the choice to end their suffering is a humanitarian act. They contend that people ought to be allowed to make choices about their own lives, particularly when they are near death and must endure excruciating pain and suffering. Legalization of PAS is thought to be a means of relieving patients' and their families' protracted suffering. (ii) Proponents of PAS and euthanasia claim that allowing these procedures will honour patients' autonomy and their freedom to choose their own medical care. They contend that if a person has a fatal condition and feels that their quality of life is unacceptable, they should be allowed to decide when and how to pass away. The legalization of PAS and euthanasia gives patients more autonomy over their own lives by enabling them to make decisions that are consistent with their beliefs and values; and negatively, (iii)The sacredness of life and the possibility of abuse or compulsion are ethical problems raised by opponents of PAS and euthanasia. They contend that if these techniques are made legal, society values that place a high priority on life preservation may be compromised. Concerns have been raised about vulnerable people—the elderly and the crippled, for example—being coerced into
selecting PAS or euthanasia over true autonomy because of monetary or psychological hardships. (iv) The legalization of euthanasia and PAS has drawn criticism for creating a "slippery slope" effect that could eventually lead to abuse and larger interpretations of the procedures. They worry that what begins as a choice for patients who are near death might eventually be extended to people who have long-term illnesses, impairments, or mental health issues. This growth may weaken safeguards for susceptible groups and drastically change public perceptions of the worth of human life.

To conclude, it can be said that there are many different perspectives on euthanasia in India, including legal, ethical, cultural, and religious ones. Despite the deep-rooted belief in the sanctity of life in Indian society, end-of-life care and the right to a dignified death are becoming increasingly important topics of discussion. The Indian Supreme Court authorized passive euthanasia in 2018, which marked a change in the country's euthanasia laws. But actual euthanasia is still illegal, indicating a cautious approach shaped by moral and religious values. Thorough thought and discussion are necessary to address the many ethical issues surrounding euthanasia, such as striking a balance between a person's autonomy and the interests of society. Healthcare workers are essential in helping patients receive compassionate treatment and maintaining medical ethics while resolving these moral conundrums. Going forward, addressing cultural diversity, guaranteeing protections against abuse and compulsion, and enhancing access to palliative care services will be necessary for any effective change of India's euthanasia legislation. Through transparent communication, stakeholder consultation, and international best practices, India can create a legislative system that upholds individual autonomy, safeguards the weak, and encourages humane end-of-life care. The ultimate objective is to guarantee that those who are suffering from a fatal disease

or excruciating pain have the choice to pass away with dignity, in line with their beliefs and desires.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, P., & Sawlani, K. (2022). Euthanasia and Article 21: A Review on its Constitutional Validity with Special Reference to Religious Practices. Available at SSRN 4501968.
2. Aggarwal, V. (2020). Euthanasia in India-An Anaylytical Study. Supremo Amicus, 19, 635.
3. Anthony, F. V., & Sterkens, C. (2019). Religion and the right to (dispose of) life: A study of the attitude of Christian, Muslim and Hindu students in India concerning death penalty, euthanasia and abortion. Euthanasia, Abortion, Death Penalty and Religion- The Right to Life and its Limitations: International Empirical Research, 13-63.
4. Boruah, J. (2021). Euthanasia in India: A Review on Its Constitutional Validity. LEX HUMANITARIAE: JOURNAL FOR A CHANGE, 1-10.
5. Deguma, J. J., Deguma, M. C., Añora, H. C., Loremia, V. Z., Cabigon, A. F. P., & Case,
H. S. (2020). Why is it Better to Suffer and Not to Die through Euthanasia? A Multi-perspective Analysis. A Multi-perspective Analysis (May 12, 2020). Journal of Social and Political Sciences, 3(2).
6. Deshmukh, C. D., & Polshettiwar, S. A. The Euthanasia-A Boon or Curse: An Understanding.
7. Dubey, A. (2021). A Critical Analysis of Right to Live v. Right to Die in the Context of Euthanasia in Reference to Aruna Ramachandra Shanbaug v. Union of India via a Socio-Legal Lens. Issue 5 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human., 4, 1020.
8. Grove, G., Lovell, M., & Best, M. (2022). Perspectives of major world religions regarding euthanasia and assisted suicide: a comparative analysis. Journal of religion and health, 61(6), 4758-4782.
9. Kannan, R., & Thottath, D. (2021). Death on Demand; A Comparison between Euthanasia Laws in the Netherlands and India, 2001 to 2020. Journal of Research on History of Medicine, 10(3), 185-194.
10. Karumathil, A. A., & Tripathi, R. (2022). Culture and attitudes towards euthanasia: An integrative review. OMEGA-journal of Death and Dying, 86(2), 688-720.
11. Kothari, A., Premarajan, K. C., & Adinarayanan, S. (2020). Assisted dying and voluntary euthanasia: awareness and perception among health care professionals in a tertiary care centre, South India. International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health, 7(6), 2280.
12. Kumar, A., Mehra, A., & Avasthi, A. (2021). Euthanasia: A Debate—For and Against. Journal of Postgraduate Medicine, Education and Research, 55(2), 91-96.
13. Pandey, S. (2022). Position of Euthanasia in India: Legal Perspective. Part 1 Indian J. Integrated Rsch. L., 2, 1.
14. Sanghi, G., & Pandey, A. (2018). Euthanasia: A Good Death. Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human., 1, 35.
15. Shekhawat, R. S., Kanchan, T., Setia, P., Atreya, A., & Krishan, K. (2018).

Euthanasia: Global scenario and its status in India. Science and engineering ethics, 24, 349-360.