

ON THE PROBLEM OF COMPREHENSION OF ATYPICALITY: SOCIOCULTURAL ASPECT

© **Elena A. Agapova, Lyudmila V. Gushchina**

Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation

eagapova@sfedu.ru, lgushchina@sfedu.ru

The problem of atypicality as a biopsychosocial phenomenon on the one hand requires comprehension in the context of philosophical study and further search for a solution to problems in the field of socio-philosophical research. On the other hand, the polysemantic content and terminological uncertainty of the concept of "atypicality" implies the need to create classifications using a categorical approach that allows you to generalize and determine the social phenomenon in a sociocultural context. Modern conditions of social and political instability and uncertainty, the transition to a new paradigm for the development of society and social relations require the formation of a special attitude to another person and, moreover, to people with disabilities. In this regard, it seems necessary to rethink reality and abandon "Western models" of attitude to atypicality, which led to a formal attitude on the part of the state and society. The crisis in Russian society was created under the influence of Western European models, based not so much on humanism as on pragmatism and economic conditioning, which had a strong influence on the spiritual inculturation and involvement of people with disabilities in public life, as well as on the very attitude to atypicality in Russia with elements of intolerance and formalization at all levels of public and state power. To solve these problems, a different vector of development is needed in relation to atypicality and its comprehension: not denying the borrowing and adaptation of some technologies and methods, but designed to rely on traditional values embedded in the culture and mentality of the Russian person.

Key words: atypicality, traditional values, Russian culture, cultural code.

[Е.А. Агапова, Л.В. Гущина К вопросу осмысления нетипичности: социокультурный аспект]

Проблема нетипичности как биопсихосоциального явления, с одной стороны, требует осмысления в контексте философского изучения и дальнейшего поиска решения проблем в поле социально-философских исследований. С другой стороны, полисмысловое содержание и терминологическая неопределённость понятия «нетипичность» предполагает необходимость создания классификаций при помощи категориального подхода, позволяющего обобщить и определить социальный феномен в социокультурном разрезе. Современные условия социальной и политической нестабильности и неопределённости, перехода к новой парадигме развития общества и социальных отношений требуют формирования особого отношения к другому человеку и, тем более, к лицам с ограниченными возможностями здоровья. В этой связи представляется необходимым переосмысление реальности и отказ от «западных образцов» отношения к нетипичности, приведших к формальному отношению со стороны государства и общества. Решение комплекса задач по отношению к таким лицам обусловлено развитием, менталитетом и системой духовных ценностей каждого социума. Кризис в российском обществе создан под влиянием западноевропейских образцов, основанных не столько на гуманизме, сколько на прагматике и экономической обусловленности, оказавших сильное влияние на духовную инкультурацию и вовлечённость инвалидов в общественную жизнь, а также на само отношение к нетипичности в России с элементами нетерпимости и формализации на всех уровнях общественной и государственной власти. Для решения указанных проблем необходим иной вектор развития в отношении и осмыслении нетипичности: не отрицающий заимствования и адаптации некоторых технологий и методик, но призванный опираться на традиционные ценности, заложенные в культуре и менталитете русского человека.

Ключевые слова: нетипичность, традиционные ценности, русская культура, культурный код.

Elena A. Agapova – Ph.D. (Advanced Doctorate) in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation.

Lyudmila V. Gushchina – Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation.

Агапова Елена Анатольевна – доктор философских наук, доцент, Южный федеральный университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация.

Гущина Людмила Викторовна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Южный федеральный университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация.

Introduction

Addressing the problem of atypicality in modern society, it is extremely important, first of all, to trace the genesis of this phenomenon, given the fact that atypicality is most likely a biopsychosocial phenomenon. Consequently, the foundation of society's relations to people with atypical physicality is laid on the prevailing constructs and models of a socio-philosophical nature in a particular society [11].

Modern media form the image of a "disabled " person in such a way that the symbol of atypicality passes to his personality, making it handicapped and thereby denying its status of a cultural carrier. Perhaps this is due to the centuries-old representation in the European culture of physical ugliness in negative social significance with an indication of character traits and a lack of a moral personality. The physical anomaly was used as "a kind of social code or a cultural cipher in which the vices of mankind were hidden" [1, pp. 95-104], while a person with atypical physicality was perceived as a threat. As a result, there was a steady trend associated with assessing a person's social status by the presence or absence of atypicality [11].

The problem of atypicality in society is a constant but changing phenomenon. Due to its eternity and constancy, it is philosophical in nature and therefore requires awareness at every stage of development and as a "philosophical problem," which is manifested in the need to develop some universal, common to humanity approaches and principles of solution.

Research methods

The main methods of studying the problem of atypicality were socio-philosophical and linguoculturological contributing to the identification of the specifics of comprehension of the atypicality phenomenon based on social cognitivism and sociocultural anthropology.

Results and discussion

Atypicality, being a state of a part of society, has variability due to a specific historical nature, since society itself changes, and the conditions of being are transformed. The emergence of new diseases and, accordingly, new forms of atypicality also implies the comprehension and further search for solutions to problems in changing social circumstances. Therefore, it seems necessary to include the problem of atypicality as a social phenomenon in the context of philosophical study, and, accordingly, the category of "atypicality" in the problematic field of socio-philosophical research.

In our opinion, the term "atypicality" has a polysemantic content and clear terminological uncertainty, which implies, among other things, the creation of classifications of the definition of the "atypicality" concept using a categorical approach that allows you to generalize and determine the social phenomenon in a socio-cultural context. It is also important in theoretical terms to create a philosophical discourse from the formulation of a problem to the logical completion and implementation in relation to the analysis of the phenomenon of atypicality in modern society.

Another problem that requires comprehension is the relationship between "atypical" and "typical" parts of society. The contradictions that arise at the same time, which largely develop along the lines of specific social existence, and the features of social and individual consciousness, in turn, require a dialectical approach in comprehension and assessment.

In modern conditions of social and political instability and uncertainty, the transition to a new paradigm for the development of society and social relations in Russia, the rejection of the ideology of pragmatism and blurring, and sometimes discrediting traditional values, the formation of a special attitude to another person and, moreover, to a disabled person becomes especially important. In this regard, it seems necessary to rethink reality and abandon "Western models" of attitudes to atypicality and related measures to improve the quality of life, which have developed under the influence of the ideology of pragmatism and utilitarianism, which led to formal relations both on the part of the state and society.

The area of interests related to the attitude of society to people with disabilities in the field of view of any state and the solution of a complex set of tasks in relation to such people are due to the development, mentality and system of spiritual values of each individual society. At the same time, all necessary decisions do not always directly depend on the policies and spiritual values that have developed in a particular society. All this sets only a certain vector and direction to achieve the goal. Most likely, in this case, the attitude to these problems of the social system in the complex and each individual included in this system of public relations and interactions is deterministic. Consequently, any state studies and analyzes those conditions that influence people with disabilities in society in order to form a competent social policy focused on their needs [14].

Unfortunately, despite all the efforts made by the Russian state, the situation of people with disabilities in the system of public relations remains difficult. According to A.I. Shevchenko, "this situation is probably connected not only with the resource capabilities of the state, but, most likely, is due to the attitude to the problem of disability in general, and to people with disabilities in society itself" [14]. Thus, in order to realize the goal of becoming people with disabilities as full value members of society, it is necessary to solve not only medical issues, but also the problems of their social adaptation to the conditions of modern society, the so-called socio-cultural inculturation and integration into the system of complex social relations" [14].

Obviously, in modern Russia it is necessary to use the full potential of the processes of humanization and spirituality of social relations, which were lost due to copying Western systems and forms of implementation of social policies regarding disability. The achievement of the set goals will be possible only through direct appeal to the problem of physical and moral health of a person, which undoubtedly becomes especially relevant against the background of the current events connected with a special military operation and socio-economic transformations and modernizations of the catching up nature of the last decades.

In our opinion, a transition from such a concept as "social utility" alien to the Russian mentality is necessary. And, perhaps, modern researchers should return to the study of the inclusion of "personality in public relations" [10], covered in the works of A.S. Makarenko, V.A. Sukhomlinsky and L.S. Vygotsky. Their ideas about the essence and nature of the connection between the social environment and the individual psychological, as well as physical development of the individual can become the methodological basis for rehabilitational, adaptational strategies and tactics against disabled people with various forms of health disorders [14]. This will create a favorable environment for the disclosure of human abilities and inclusion of everyone both in equal relations and in attitudes to everyone as "typical," and, at the same time, will increase a person's confidence in stability and will provide an understanding that with changes in health, he will receive state and ethical support in society itself, contributing to the achievement of the socialization norm.

For this, first of all, it is necessary to exclude in the consciousness of society a negative connotation of such terms as "*disability*," "*atypicality*," "*health limitations*," etc., determining social and legal isolation. Undoubtedly, all this requires the creation of new

theoretical prerequisites that can take into account all the diversity of atypicality as a complex socio-philosophical phenomenon.

It should be noted that humanity has been interested in problems related to atypicality since ancient times, while the attitude to a person with any deviations ranged from complete denial to acceptance.

So, in the early stages, with a fairly low level of spiritual and moral values in society, the attitude to atypicality was intolerant, which, in particular, demonstrates the experience of Sparta, where the cult of strength and endurance, the cult of the body were confessed and, therefore, any developmental abnormality were considered unacceptable. In addition, references to atypicality are observed in the legislative documents of antiquity, which clearly state that any deviations from the norm removed a person from the society and equated him with the status of an animal and a slave. For example, Aristotle in his work "*Politics*" clearly formulated the attitude of the ancient world to atypicality, stating that one should not feed and keep a cripple. In general, all the pedagogy of the ancient world was aimed at eradicating disabled people from society for eugenic and economic reasons. Thus, the Roman philosopher Seneca proposed to drown and kill freaks, following the rules of reason to separate the healthy from the spoiled. Consequently, neither ancient nor Roman law recognized anomalous people as capable, denying their right to exist.

The situation did not develop in the best way in the era of the Western European Middle Ages, when, according to S.V. Danilova, "Augustine's Christian Neoplatonism in philosophy and Catholic theology almost until the 13th century prevailed, determining the main trends of scientific thought" [4, p. 89-92]. It can be assumed that from the 5th to the 13th centuries. attempts to change the attitude to disabled people in society were not made. The eschatological orientation of early Christianity led away from questions of mercy and did not seek to soften the attitude to sick people. Thus, almost all European reformers (secular, church) ignored the disabled people or doubted their usefulness. The Western European Church, social morality and the law put disabled people in a desperate situation, not recognizing their equality even in the face of God, and thus condemned them to the existence deprived of civil rights. Dominant pragmatics proclaimed the protection of the healthy from all sorts of sick people, perhaps because disability was understood as a break of the system in which man is a likeness of God. In other words, atypicality was perceived as disability and did not deserve special attention and attitude, since any deviation was considered nothing more than "punishment for sins or interference in the fate of Satan" [4, p. 89-92].

Thus, society and church took a negative position to disabled people. A typical social norm of mass consciousness and part of the culture in Western European society was discrimination against people with any deviations from the norm. Such a unity of the so-called "normal" majority in relation to atypicality did not imply an alternative position of disabled people in society, which is confirmed by the lack of documentary sources testifying the desire of doctors or philosophers to change the existence of such people.

For centuries, Western civilization interpreted the words "disabled cripple" and "beggar" as synonyms, and literally until the 19th century the natural attitude to them was in almsgiving and squeamish treatment. In this regard, Western European attitude to people with mental disabilities, which lasted until the 18th century, which was entrenched in the term "idiot," originating from the Greek *idiotos*, which has the meaning of a person who does not take part in the life of society, uneducated, is indicative.

The first attempts in Europe to educate people with mental disabilities were made in France under the influence of a new view of human rights, which was a reaction to the ideals of universal equality declared by the Convention. However, they looked unconvincing and were superficial in nature, suggesting some kind of "revision" and

"compensatory" for the eugenic sentiments of the preceding periods of the history of Europe as the heiress of ancient civilization.

It seems possible to assume that among all cumulative sources the fascist ideas about superhuman and disabled people who are subject to destruction originate from, as evidenced by the European history of genocide of the 20th century, originate. Unfortunately, nowadays a number of countries have actually legalized Nazi methods of killing people, in fact, continuing the policy of the Third Reich, the first to introduce euthanasia by the program "Aktion T4" ("Tiergartenstraße-4"). As M. Zakharova notes, "the Nazis, in addition to racial prejudices, proceeded from economic layouts. It is expensive to support people who needed treatment, this is a tax burden" [cited by: 7]. The opportunity to save money led to the adoption of such practices in Canada and a number of Western countries, in which euthanasia services are used not only by patients with incurable diseases, but also by homeless people with diabetes, as well as people with cognitive and psychiatric diseases such as dementia, depression or schizophrenia, even if they lack terminal conditions [16]. In addition, the Dutch law allowed euthanasia to be applied to minors, setting the minimum age for "voluntary care" at 12 years, and amendments made by the Belgian law in 2014 legalized child euthanasia without age restrictions. These facts are covered by foreign media, in particular, by "The Washington Post", which states the fact that children are killed in Belgium ("*Children are being euthanized in Belgium*") [16], as well as "Spectator", which discusses why Canada kills the poor ("*Why is Canada euthanizing the poor?*") [17]. Yu.I. Zhu notes that "since last year, Canadian legislation in all its majesty has allowed both the rich and the poor to kill themselves if they are too poor to continue to live with dignity. In fact, the ever-generous Canadian state is even willing to pay for their deaths. But it will not spend money to allow them to live..." [16]. Unfortunately, such facts about such "kindness" are presented exclusively as the progressiveness of Western countries, and, in fact, are a fascist understanding of eugenics, which has been legislated, in particular, in the Canadian law.

A completely different attitude is demonstrated by the situation in Rus'. Moral ideas about cripples were formed even before the advent of Christianity. So, the wanderer (traveler, cripple) had an influence and was perceived as an adviser and a wise person who had seen life. We find the first mention of disabled people known in Kievan Russia in epics, for example, about Ilya Muromets, who had been sitting on the furnace for 33 years and whom only passing cripples could raise to his feet in order to save Rus'. Alyosha Popovich, according to some sources was lame, which, however, did not affect the exploits to the glory of the Fatherland.

In general, people with any kind of deviations were considered by society as "God's" and surrounded by the halo of holiness. In this regard, at the early stages of the formation of the Kyiv state, a unique phenomenon appears, namely: public charity (i.e., care and guardianship) of such people and the manifestation of mercy. Thus, the first known official document "Charter on the Orthodox Church," approved in 996 under Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavovich, obliged the church to provide assistance and care to people with deviations. This charter also influenced the spread in Russia of educational institutions, which were mainly at the monasteries, which is also mentioned in the Tale of Bygone Years.

In 1551, an article on the care of all the poor and unreasonable was introduced in "Stoglav" ("The Book of 100 Chapters") under Ivan the Terrible, and almshouses were opened at monasteries and institutions.

It should be noted that the traditions of caring attitude to atypical people followed both under Peter I and during the reign of Catherine II, continuing to create institutions for caring for mental and physical disabled people and orphans. At the same time, Russian

society was suspicious of the idea of secular philanthropy that originated in Western Europe, preferring the usual Christian mercy and charity.

Obviously, in the Russian Empire, this trend developed in the church direction. This is the main feature of the attitude to people with disabilities, which was reflected not only in state and church relations, but also received a special response from representatives of the Russian thought who sharply reacted to social problems in society. Thus, the representative of the Russian literature and philosophy N.A. Dobrolyubov, focusing in a special way on the conditions of social existence and the causes of social problems and inequality, tried to attract the public to the fate of children with disabilities. Such Russian philosophers as L.M. Arkhangelsky, E.V. Ilyenkov, I.A. Ilyin, G.P. Fedotov, P.A. Florensky and others addressed the topic of holy fool and blessed.

Conclusions

Undoubtedly, modern civilization has created a lot of works analyzing the relationship between society and people with disabilities. However, even at the modern stage, the methods of denoting atypicality, sociocultural interactions and practices remain blurred, since today it is quite difficult to distinguish the boundaries between society and personality in the description of atypicality.

We consider the crisis in Russian society to be created under the influence of Western European models, based not so much on humanism as on pragmatism and economic conditionality, which had a strong influence on the spiritual inculturation and involvement of people with disabilities in public life, as well as on the very attitude to atypicality in Russia with elements of intolerance and formalization at all levels of public and state power.

Too different vectors of civilizations development are determined by the origins and features of their existence: one is characterized by a careful and tolerant attitude to any kind of disabled people as "God's people," often surrounded by a halo of holiness, the other is characterized by the proclamation of eugenic principles of attitude to the person from the very beginning of his formation.

All this, in our opinion, gives rise to the development of our own developments (without relying on Western European experience) in the field of spiritual and physical inclusion of people with disabilities in social processes, as well as, no less important, the deployment of spiritual and moral vaccination of public consciousness from the standpoint of traditional cultural values rooted in the Russian cultural core. Through the revival of the traditional culture as a pillar inherent in the Russian man it is necessary to rethink the experience of thirty years copying individualism, pragmatism and atomism of Western civilization, which, through the media, deforms and destroys the cultural core of Russian civilization, broadcasting what it is necessary for a human-consumer to strive for and what standards to meet (success, wealth, beauty), completely ignoring the spiritual component.

Thus, we see a different vector of development and overcoming the European crisis for Russia in relation to and understanding atypicality, which does not deny the borrowing and adaptation of some technologies and methods, but is designed to rely on traditional values embedded in the culture and mentality of the Russian man.

Литература

1. *Абросимова Л.С., Богданова М.А.* Нетипичная телесность: трансформации в восприятии тела инвалида // Практики и интерпретации. 2019. № 1. С. 95-104.
2. *Аристотель.* Никомахова этика // Соч.: В 4-х т. Т. 4. М., 1984. С. 53-293.
3. *Гуревич А.Я.* Категории средневековой культуры. 2-е изд. М.: Искусство, 1984. 350 с.

4. *Данилова С.В.* Путь человечества к мысли о необходимости призрения, воспитания и обучения детей с ограниченными возможностями здоровья // Вестник Калужского университета. 2017. № 3. С. 89-92.
5. *Деларю Ж.* История Гестапо. Смоленск: Русич, 1993. 479 с.
6. *Добролюбов Н.А.* Избранное. М.: Правда, 1989.
7. «Если слишком бедны – умирайте»: Захарова раскрыла факты о «доброй» Канаде [Электронный ресурс]: https://rostov.tsargrad.tv/news/esli-slishkom-bedny-umirajte-zaharova-raskryla-fakty-o-dobroj-kanade_671619 (дата обращения 25.11.2022).
8. *Ильин Н.А.* Свобода духа в России. Простецы по природе и юродивые во Христе // Собрание сочинений: В 10 томах, Т. 6. Кн. 3. М.: Русская книга, 1997.
9. *Малофеев Н.Н.* Западная Европа: эволюция отношения общества и государства к лицам с отклонениями в развитии. М., 2003.
10. *Москвичева Н.А.* Альтернативные модели социализации детей-инвалидов в современном обществе: социально-философский анализ: автореф. дис. ... канд. философ. наук. Ростов-на-Дону, 2007. 27 с.
11. *Русанова А.А.* Конструирование нетипичной телесности: социально-философский анализ: диссертация ... канд. философ. наук. Томск, 2020. 124 с.
12. *Флоренский П.* Философия культа (Опыт православной антропологии). М.: Мысль, 2004.
13. *Хайдеггер М.* Европейский нигилизм // Время и бытие. М.: Республика, 1993. С. 63-176.
14. *Шевченко А.И.* Человек с ограниченными возможностями в современном обществе (социально-философский анализ): диссертация ... д-ра философ. наук. Краснодар, 2014. 267 с.
15. *Ярская-Смирнова Е., Романов П.* Образ власти и власть образа. Больное тело в культуре // Теория моды: одежда, тело, культура. 2011. № 18. С. 91-116.
16. *Lane Ch.* Children are being euthanized in Belgium // The Washington Post. 2018. August 6 [Электронный ресурс]: https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/children-are-being-euthanized-in-belgium/2018/08/06/9473bac2-9988-11e8-b60b-1c897f17e185_story.html (дата обращения 25.11.2022).
17. *Yuan Yi Zhu.* Why is Canada euthanizing the poor? // Spectator. 2022. April 30 [Электронный ресурс]: <https://www.spectator.com.au/2022/04/why-is-canada-euthanising-the-poor> (дата обращения 25.11.2022).

References

1. *Abrosimova L.S., Bogdanova M.A.* Netipichnaya telesnost: transformacii v vospriyatii tela invalida. Praktiki i interpretacii [Atypical physicality: transformations in the perception of the body of a disabled person. Practices and interpretations]. 2019. No. 1. pp. 95-104 (in Russian).
2. *Aristotle.* Nikomaxova etika [Nicomachean Ethics]. Written works: In 4 volumes. V. 4. Moscow. 1984. pp. 53-293 (in Russian).
3. *Gurevich A.Ya.* Kategorii srednevekovoj kultury [Categories of medieval culture]. The 2nd edition. Moscow: Iskustvo. 1984. 350 p. (in Russian).
4. *Danilova S.V.* Put chelovechestva k mysli o neobxodimosti prizreniya, vospitaniya i obucheniya detej s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorovya [The path of humanity to the thought of the need for charity, education of children with disabilities]. Bulletin of the Kaluga University. 2017. No. 3. pp. 89-92 (in Russian).

5. *Delarue J.* Istoriya Gestapo [History of Gestapo]. Smolensk: Rusich, 1993. 479 p. (in Russian).
6. *Dobrolyubov N.A.* Izbrannoe [Favourites]. Moscow: Pravda. 1989 (in Russian).
7. "If you are too poor, die": Zakharova revealed the facts about "kind" Canada. Available at: https://rostov.tsargrad.tv/news/esli-slishkom-bedny-umirajte-zaharova-raskryla-fakty-o-dobroj-kanade_671619 (accessed: 25 October 2022).
8. *Ilyin N.A.* Svoboda duxa v Rossii. Prostecy po prirode i yurodivye vo Xriste [Freedom of spirit in Russia. Commoners by nature and holy fools in Christ]. Collected works: In 10 volumes. V. 6. Ch. 3. Moscow: Russian book. 1997 (in Russian).
9. *Malofeev N.N.* Zapadnaya Evropa: evolyuciya otnosheniya obshchestva i gosudarstva k liczam s otkloneniyami v razvitii [Western Europe: the evolution of the attitude of society and the state towards people with disabilities]. Moscow. 2003 (in Russian).
10. *Moskvicheva N.A.* Alternativnye modeli socializacii detej-invalidov v sovremennom obshchestve: socialno-filosofskij analiz [Alternative models of socialization of disabled children in modern society]: Ph.d. Dissertation Abstract. Rostov-on-Don, 2007. 27 p. (in Russian).
11. *Rusanova A.A.* Konstruirovanie netipichnoj telesnosti: socialno-filosofskij analiz [Construction of atypical physicality: socio-philosophical analysis]: Ph.d. Dissertation. Tomsk, 2020. 124 p. (in Russian).
12. *Florensky P.* Filosofiya kulta (Opyt pravoslavnoj antropodicii) [Philosophy of cult (Experience of Orthodox anthropodicy)]. Moscow: Mysl. 2004.
13. *Heidegger M.* Evropejskij nigilizm. Vremya i bytie [European nihilism. Time and being]. Moscow: Respublika. 1993. pp. 63-176 (in Russian).
14. *Shevchenko A.I.* Chelovek s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami v sovremennom obshchestve (socialno-filosofskij analiz) [A person with disabilities in modern society (socio-philosophical analysis)]: Ph.d. Dissertation. Krasnodar. 2014. 267 p. (in Russian).
15. *Yarskaya-Smirnova E., Romanov P.* Obraz vlasti i vlast obraza. Bolnoe telo v kulture. Teoriya mody: odezhda, telo, kultura [Image of power and power of image. Sick body in culture. Fashion theory: clothing, body, culture]. 2011. No. 18. pp. 91-116 (in Russian).
16. *Lane Ch.* Children are being euthanized in Belgium. The Washington Post. 2018. August 6. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/children-are-being-euthanized-in-belgium/2018/08/06/9473bac2-9988-11e8-b60b-1c897f17e185_story.html (accessed: 25 October 2022).
17. *Yuan Yi Zhu.* Why is Canada euthanizing the poor? Spectator. 2022. April 30. Available at: <https://www.spectator.com.au/2022/04/why-is-canada-euthanising-the-poor> (accessed: 25 October 2022).

29 November, 2022