

Is There a Morally Significant Difference Between Active and Passive Euthanasia?

Introduction

The difference between active and passive euthanasia has occupied an important position in debates of medical ethics, importantly regarding whether intentionally causing death is morally different from allowing a person to die. Active euthanasia involves a deliberate act intended to end a person's life, such as administering a lethal injection, whereas passive euthanasia involves withdrawing or withholding life-sustaining treatment, allowing death to occur from the underlying condition. Although many legal systems permit some forms of passive euthanasia while prohibiting active euthanasia, philosophers have questioned whether this distinction represents a genuine moral difference or merely reflects historical attitudes towards killing and responsibility.

The traditional view argues that active euthanasia is morally worse because it involves directly causing death, whereas passive euthanasia allows nature to take its course. However, critics such as James Rachels argue that this distinction is ethically inconsistent because the consequences and intentions behind both actions may be identical.¹ This essay will examine arguments supporting and challenging the moral distinction between the active and the passive euthanasia. It will argue that although the distinction has practical importance in law and medicine, there is not always a morally significant difference between the two. Instead, factors such as intention, autonomy, suffering, and consequences provide stronger foundations for ethical evaluation.

The Traditional Distinction Between Killing and Letting Die

Supporters of the distinction between active and passive euthanasia generally argue that there is an important moral difference between killing and allowing death. According to this view, actively ending a person's life violates a fundamental moral prohibition against intentional killing, whereas withdrawing ineffective or burdensome treatment simply recognises that medicine cannot preserve life indefinitely. John Keown argues that the prohibition against intentional killing is essential for protecting human dignity and preventing vulnerable individuals from being harmed.²

¹ James Rachels, 'Active and Passive Euthanasia', *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 292.2 (1975), pp.78–109

² John Keown, *Euthanasia, Ethics and Public Policy: An Argument against Legalisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 34–67.

This argument is closely associated with the sanctity-of-life principle, which holds that human life possesses intrinsic value and should not be intentionally destroyed. Within Christian ethics, particularly Roman Catholic thought, there is a distinction between causing death and allowing death to occur naturally. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* accepts that patients may refuse excessively burdensome treatment but maintains that directly intending death is morally unacceptable.³

The distinction also has significance within medical practice. Traditionally, doctors have been understood as healers whose primary responsibility is to preserve and improve life. Allowing physicians to actively end patients' lives may therefore appear to undermine public trust in the medical profession. The concern is that if doctors become involved in intentionally causing death, vulnerable patients may fear that their lives are viewed as less valuable because of disability, age, or illness.

Rachels' Criticism of the Distinction

The strongest philosophical challenge to the difference between active and passive euthanasia comes from James Rachels. In his influential article 'Active and Passive Euthanasia', Rachels argues that there is no morally relevant distinction between killing and letting die when the intention and outcome are the same.⁴

Rachels uses the example of two individuals, Smith and Jones, who both desire the death of a child in order to gain an inheritance. Smith deliberately drowns the child, while Jones allows the child to drown by failing to intervene. Rachels argues that both individuals are equally morally responsible because both acted with the same intention and produced the same result. The fact that one person acted and the other failed to act does not create a meaningful moral difference.⁵

Applying this reasoning to euthanasia, Rachels argues that passive euthanasia may sometimes be morally worse than active euthanasia. If a terminally ill patient is suffering unbearably, withdrawing treatment may result in a slow and painful death, whereas active euthanasia could provide a quicker and more compassionate outcome. Therefore, if the purpose of euthanasia is to relieve suffering, the method by which death occurs should not be considered morally decisive.

Rachels' argument challenges the assumption that actions are always morally worse than omissions. He argues that what matters ethically is not whether death occurs through an action or a failure to act, but whether the decision is justified by the circumstances and respects the interests of the patient.

³ Catholic Church, *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2nd edn (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994).

⁴ Rachels, 'Active and Passive Euthanasia', pp. 78–90.

⁵ Ibid., p. 91–120

Intention and the Doctrine of Doble Effect

Despite Rachels' criticism, defenders of the traditional distinction argue that intention remains morally important. The Doctrine of Double Effect, developed from the work of Thomas Aquinas, maintains that an action producing both good and bad consequences may be morally permissible if the bad consequence is not intended.⁶

This principle is often applied to palliative care. A doctor may administer strong pain-relieving medication to a dying patient, knowing that it could unintentionally shorten the patient's life. According to the Doctrine of Double Effect, this differs morally from administering medication with the direct intention of causing death because the doctor's purpose is to relieve suffering rather than kill the patient.

However, it can be argued that the distinction between intending and merely foreseeing death is difficult to maintain in practice. If a doctor withdraws a ventilator knowing that death will inevitably follow, it may appear artificial to claim that death is merely a side effect rather than an intended outcome. Consequently, the Doctrine of Double Effect has been criticised for creating a distinction that may not reflect the realities of medical decision-making.

Autonomy, Consequences, and the Value of Patient Choice

A further challenge to the moral distinction between active and passive euthanasia arises from arguments based on autonomy and consequences. Contemporary medical ethics places considerable importance on respecting competent patients' decisions about their own bodies and medical treatment. According to Tom Beauchamp and James Childress, respect for autonomy is one of the four central principles of biomedical ethics, alongside beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice.⁷

From an autonomy-based perspective, a patient suffering from a terminal illness may have a strong moral claim to decide how and when their life ends. If a competent individual voluntarily requests euthanasia because their suffering has become intolerable, preventing that choice may be seen as failing to respect their autonomy. On this account, the moral issue is not whether death is caused by an act or omission, but whether the decision reflects the informed and voluntary wishes of the patient.

Consequentialist arguments similarly question whether active euthanasia is morally worse than passive euthanasia. Utilitarian thinkers argue that the morality of an action

⁶ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, trans. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benziger Bros, 1947)

⁷ Tom L. Beauchamp and James F. Childress, *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, 8th edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 51–103.

should be judged by its consequences, particularly whether it increases or decreases overall suffering. John Stuart Mill's defence of individual liberty suggests that individuals should generally be free to make decisions concerning their own lives when those decisions do not unjustly harm others.⁸ Applying this principle to euthanasia, it can be argued that allowing a person to choose a peaceful death may be preferable to forcing them to endure prolonged and unnecessary suffering.

However, it can be argued that autonomy alone cannot justify active euthanasia. It can be said that that society has an interest in protecting life and preventing vulnerable individuals from feeling pressured to request death. For example, elderly, disabled, or seriously ill individuals may worry that they have become a burden on their families or society. Therefore, it can be argued that legalising active euthanasia could create social pressures that undermine genuine choice.

Legal Implications and the Importance of the Distinction

The continuing legal distinction between active and passive euthanasia demonstrates that the difference remains significant in practical contexts. English law has historically treated actively causing death as a criminal offence while recognising circumstances in which treatment may lawfully be withdrawn.

The leading case of *Airedale NHS Trust v Bland* concerned Tony Bland, a patient who had been left in a persistent vegetative state following injuries sustained during the Hillsborough disaster. The House of Lords permitted the withdrawal of artificial nutrition and hydration, concluding that continuing treatment provided no medical benefit and that allowing the patient to die was not equivalent to intentionally killing him.⁹

The judgment illustrates the legal importance of distinguishing between acts and omissions. The court considered that doctors were not under an absolute obligation to preserve biological life regardless of the patient's condition. Instead, withdrawing treatment was understood as allowing the underlying condition to take its course.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that the legal distinction is morally unstable. If a doctor removes life support knowing that death will follow, the practical outcome is no different from administering a lethal drug. From the perspective of the patient's experience, both decisions result in death. Therefore, it can be said that the law may be maintaining a distinction that lacks a convincing ethical foundation.

A Critical Evaluation

⁸ Mill, John Stuart, *On Liberty* (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1859)

⁹ *Airedale NHS Trust v Bland* [1993] AC 789 (HL).

The debate demonstrates that there are both similarities and differences between active and passive euthanasia. The strongest argument against the distinction is that the moral significance of an action depends primarily on intention and circumstances rather than the physical method used. If a doctor withdraws treatment because death is considered the most compassionate outcome, it is difficult to argue that this is morally superior to actively ending life in an equally compassionate manner.

Rachels' argument is persuasive because it highlights that omissions can involve deliberate choices. Allowing a patient to die is not necessarily a morally neutral act; it can involve a conscious decision that death should occur. Therefore, the simple claim that killing is always worse than letting die does not adequately explain why the two cases should be judged differently.

However, completely rejecting the distinction may ignore important ethical concerns. The prohibition against intentional killing serves a protective function within society. A clear moral boundary against deliberately causing death may help protect vulnerable people and maintain confidence in healthcare institutions. Furthermore, active euthanasia places a greater direct responsibility upon another individual to cause death, which many people regard as morally significant.

Therefore, the difference between active and passive euthanasia may not be absolute, but neither is it entirely meaningless. The method of bringing about death should not be the only factor considered, but it remains one relevant factor among others. Ethical evaluation should consider the patient's wishes, the level of suffering involved, the intentions of those providing care, and the wider social consequences.

Conclusion

The question of whether there is a morally significant difference between active and passive euthanasia remains deeply contested. Traditional arguments maintain that actively causing death is morally distinct from allowing death because killing violates a fundamental moral prohibition, whereas withdrawing treatment respects the natural limits of medicine. This view is supported by religious, legal, and professional traditions that emphasise the importance of preserving human life.

However, critics such as James Rachels have demonstrated that the distinction between killing and letting die is not always morally decisive. When the intention, circumstances, and outcome are identical, the difference between action and omission appears considerably weaker. Arguments based on autonomy and reducing suffering further challenge the idea that active euthanasia is necessarily more immoral than passive euthanasia.

Ultimately, active and passive euthanasia cannot be distinguished solely by whether death results from an action or omission. While the distinction has practical importance for law and medical practice, moral evaluation requires a broader consideration of intention, patient autonomy, suffering, and social consequences. Therefore, there is not always a morally significant difference between active and passive euthanasia, although the distinction may continue to serve important protective and legal purposes.

Bibliography

Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologiae*, trans. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benziger Bros, 1947).

Beauchamp, Tom L., and James F. Childress, *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, 8th edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019).

Catholic Church, *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2nd edn (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994).

Keown, John, *Euthanasia, Ethics and Public Policy: An Argument against Legalisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Mill, John Stuart, *On Liberty* (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1859).

Rachels, James, 'Active and Passive Euthanasia', *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 292.2 (1975), 78–80.

Airedale NHS Trust v Bland [1993] AC 789 (HL).