The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

Active and Passive Euthanasia: A Critical Analysis of Law, Ethics, and Human Rights

-Deeksha Chhipa

Abstract

Euthanasia sits right at the crossroads of medicine, law, and ethics and few topics spark more debate. The classic line between "active" and "passive" euthanasia the stuff of philosophy classes and courtroom battles has shaped laws and what doctors actually do all over the world. But here's the thing: philosophers and judges have never really agreed on whether this distinction is meaningful, legally or morally. In this paper, I take a close look at where that line came from, how different countries interpret it, the main ethical camps for and against it, and what all this means for human rights, especially the right to life and the right to die with dignity. I draw on big cases, India's Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab and Common Cause v. Union of India, the UK's Airedale NHS Trust v. Bland, and the Terri Schiavo saga in the US. The argument is pretty straightforward: this supposed moral divide between active and passive euthanasia is shakier than most legal systems care to admit. Instead, laws that truly focus on autonomy and dignity—while still holding back reckless abuses offer a clearer path forward. In the end, I argue that moving toward tightly controlled, patient-centered physician-assisted dying laws makes more sense than clinging to this old act-versus-omission rule.

Keywords: euthanasia, right to die, passive euthanasia, active euthanasia, human rights, medical ethics, autonomy, dignity

1. Introduction

"Euthanasia" comes from the Greek for "good death." These days, it usually means deliberately ending a person's life to relieve their suffering often at their request, and usually with a doctor's help. The way medicine has advanced in recent decades has changed the end of life, sometimes turning what used to be a quick biological process into a drawn-out one.

Machines like ventilators and feeding tubes can keep bodies alive long after any real hope of recovery has disappeared. So, the hard question is: when (and who) gets to decide to let someone go, or to help them die?

Medical and legal experts have always split euthanasia into two camps. “Active” euthanasia is a clear action like giving a lethal injection that causes death. “Passive” euthanasia is letting death happen: doctors stop or withhold some treatment, and the patient dies from the underlying illness. This line matters because many countries treat them very differently under the law. Usually, “active” euthanasia is a crime like murder or manslaughter, but “passive” euthanasia sometimes gets the green light especially when patients say they don’t want more treatment, or when treatment won’t help.

But is this split actually justified philosophically or legally or is it, as some bioethicists claim, just empty logic that makes things muddier? This paper digs in. First, it sets up the main concepts and breaks down sub-categories (like voluntary, involuntary, and non-voluntary euthanasia). Then, I look at different legal approaches around the globe, dive into key ethical arguments, and explore how human rights law is evolving on this front especially balancing the right to life against the growing idea of a right to die with dignity. Finally, I offer some thoughts on policy and where we might go from here.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1 Defining Euthanasia and Its Types

There are two basic ways to classify euthanasia. First is how death happens: “active” means a direct action (like a lethal injection), while “passive” means stopping or withholding treatment letting nature take its course. The second is about consent: “voluntary” is when a capable patient asks for it, “non-voluntary” is when someone else decides because the patient can’t (think of someone in a permanent coma), and “involuntary” is when it happens against the patient’s wishes—this last one is condemned everywhere as murder.

Closely tied to passive euthanasia is the idea of “letting die” taking away things like feeding tubes or ventilators. There’s also the “double effect” idea, where a doctor gives pain medicine knowing it will hasten death, but the real aim is to stop suffering, not to kill. Another related idea is physician-assisted suicide: the patient is the one who takes the final step, often using drugs prescribed by a doctor, rather than the doctor doing it directly.

2.2 The Act-Omission Distinction

At the heart of this debate is the old “act vs. omission” rule, the claim that there’s a real moral difference between killing someone and simply letting them die. Supporters say the two are fundamentally different: if a doctor withholds treatment, it’s the disease that kills; if the

doctor gives a lethal injection, it's their action. Critics like philosopher James Rachels[1] attack this: if the intention and the outcome match, shouldn't the morality be the same? Say a doctor turns off a ventilator on purpose so a patient dies, is that really any less responsible than giving a lethal shot? I'll revisit this argument further on.

3. Comparative Legal Perspectives

3.1 India

In India, the law on euthanasia comes mostly from courts, not from Parliament. In Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab (1996)[2], the Supreme Court said that the right to life doesn't mean a right to die, so helping someone end their life is still a crime. But the door was left slightly open: could a dying person have a right to die with dignity?

The question sharpened with Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India (2011)[3], a heartbreaking case of a nurse left in a vegetative state for decades. The Supreme Court allowed passive euthanasia but only under strict conditions a medical board had to recommend it, and the High Court had to approve. Active euthanasia stayed illegal.

Things changed more in Common Cause v. Union of India (2018)[4]. Here, the Supreme Court recognized the right to die with dignity as part of the right to life, and it legalized "living wills"—documents where people spell out their wishes about end-of-life care ahead of time. The Court also made the rules for ending life support less complicated in later rulings. So India now allows passive euthanasia and living wills, but active euthanasia is still a crime.

3.2 United Kingdom

British law also splits things along passive/active lines. In Airedale NHS Trust v. Bland (1993)[5], the House of Lords said doctors could withdraw hydration and nutrition from a patient in a vegetative state, as long as it was in the patient's best interests. The key point: this counted as an omission, not an act, so it wasn't murder. Active euthanasia and assisted suicide are still crimes under the Suicide Act 1961, though the prosecutors have some leeway when people act out of compassion. As of 2025, Parliament is actively debating an Assisted Dying Bill for terminal patients, showing just how much pressure there is for change.

3.3 United States

---

[1] Rachels, J. (1975). Active and Passive Euthanasia. New England Journal of Medicine, 292(2), 78–80.
[2] Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab, (1996) 2 SCC 648 (Supreme Court of India).
[3] Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India, (2011) 4 SCC 454 (Supreme Court of India)
[4] Common Cause v. Union of India, (2018) 5 SCC 1 (Supreme Court of India).
[5] Airedale NHS Trust v. Bland, [1993] AC 789 (House of Lords, UK).

In the US, the Supreme Court's Cruzan case (1990)[6] said people can refuse unwanted medical treatment, but states can demand strong evidence of those wishes. Another case, Washington v. Glucksberg (1997)[7], ruled there's no fundamental right to doctor-assisted suicide, the states get to decide. Some states, led by Oregon in 1997, have allowed physician-assisted dying under strict rules. The Terri Schiavo case made headlines as her family fought over whether to remove her feeding tube, highlighting just how complex and emotional these cases can get.

3.4 Netherlands, Belgium, and Canada

The Netherlands and Belgium lead the way with the most permissive laws: both active euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide are allowed under clear requirements unbearable suffering, clear consent, an independent doctor signs off, and so on. Canada came later, but in 2016 it also legalized both euthanasia and assisted suicide. Since then, Canada has drawn criticism and close attention for expanding access, even beyond cases of terminal illness. In these countries, the old active-passive line just doesn't matter so much; instead, they build in lots of safeguards to make sure vulnerable people aren't being pushed into a decision.

4. Ethical Analysis

4.1 Utilitarian Perspectives

Utilitarianism says what matters is overall happiness or suffering. From this angle, euthanasia is morally OK if it ends suffering that outweighs any possible benefit from continued life. The method, active or passive, is pretty much a side note; what counts is whether suffering is reduced. Sometimes, a quick active death is actually kinder than withdrawing treatment and letting someone linger.

4.2 Deontological Perspectives

Deontological ethics (think Kant) focuses on duties and the inherent worth of people. There are two big camps: one says life is sacred, so ending it no matter how is wrong, unless you're just letting nature do its thing. The other camp, also drawing on Kant, insists on respecting people's choices if someone wants to end unbearable suffering, denying that could be the real moral wrong.

4.3 Religious and Sanctity-of-Life Perspectives

Most major religions, from Catholicism to Islam and Hinduism, stress that life is sacred. Active euthanasia crosses a big moral line, but stopping too-burdensome treatment (passive

[6] Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health, 497 U.S. 261 (1990).
[7] Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U.S. 702 (1997).

euthanasia) sometimes passes muster, as long as the goal isn't to kill but to stop needless suffering. Across these traditions, the active/passive split often matters, even when the logic behind it remains shaky.

4.4 Autonomy and Dignity-Based Perspectives

A growing number of bioethicists focus on autonomy and dignity. The argument here is simple: competent adults have the right to decide what gets done to their own bodies, especially at the end of life. Keeping people alive against their wishes when they're suffering and beyond recovery can damage their basic sense of dignity. Just keeping a body alive, absent any meaningful experience, isn't enough.

5. Human Rights Dimensions

5.1 The Right to Life

Documents like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights[8] promise a right to life mainly as a limit on the state's power to kill. This has been used to back criminal laws against killing and assisting suicide. But courts have started to see things differently. Forcing someone to endure agony, when no recovery is possible, doesn't really fit the spirit of the right to life.

5.2 The Emerging Right to Die with Dignity

European courts have wrestled with whether people have a right to choose how and when they die, especially under the umbrella of personal privacy (Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights). Courts have been careful, but they increasingly say that individual autonomy matters, and that wanting to avoid a humiliating or painful death is a legitimate part of human rights. India's Supreme Court has taken a similar line. The upshot: dignity counts, not just biological survival.

5.3 Protecting the Vulnerable

Of course, human rights law also has to protect at-risk groups, the elderly, those with disabilities, people without good care who might feel pushed into dying early. Disability advocates worry that when assisted dying laws go too far, offering lethal means can seem easier (and cheaper) than giving people the real support and care they need. Any good law has to strike a balance: making room for autonomy but putting up real guardrails so nobody feels pressured to end their life.

6. Critical Analysis: Does the Active-Passive Distinction Really Hold?

[8] United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

A lot of legal systems lean on the difference between acts and omissions active versus passive because it just feels right: doing something bad seems worse than just letting it happen. You act, you cause, you're responsible. But this gut feeling runs into trouble under the microscope. Take Rachels' famous example: picture one person who drowns a child on purpose, and another who stands by, watching as the same child drowns, when saving them would've been easy. Both want the kid gone for identical, selfish reasons. Is the bystander really less blameworthy? If you swap in euthanasia, this thinking gets even trickier. Is there a real moral gap between a doctor who removes a patient's ventilator to end suffering and one who injects a lethal dose, when both want the same outcome and both succeed?

This distinction starts to look worse the closer you look, especially in medical practice. Sometimes, so-called "passive" euthanasia, like withdrawing food or water can cause drawn-out, miserable deaths, while an "active" intervention could be quicker and arguably kinder. So why do laws tend to favor the more traumatic option just because it's an omission, not an act? And then there's the doctrine of double effect: doctors can give strong pain meds that might hasten death, as long as their main goal is to relieve pain, not kill. Is that really any different? Or is it just clever legal wordplay that lets euthanasia slip through the back door?

But even if the active-passive gap doesn't hold up morally, it's not useless. It gives doctors and courts a clear rule to follow, one based on what you did, not what you meant, which is a lot easier to prove. It also keeps a bright line: doctors can treat, relieve pain, and even let patients die, but they can't directly cause death. That wall might seem a little wobbly, but it helps keep public trust in medicine and protects against abuse. Still, the world's changing. More places are writing new laws that tackle physician-assisted dying head-on, setting rules about who qualifies, how consent works, and how to oversee the process. That's a more transparent way forward than twisting old rules about acts and omissions to fit new realities.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The act-omission distinction in euthanasia law has been a convenient shortcut. It lets societies preserve some patient choice at the end of life, while drawing a hard, comforting line against doctors deliberately causing death. But when you look closer, especially when omission and action are driven by the same intention, and the results for the patient are no better, the line just doesn't hold up. The legal fiction gets harder to defend, and it's clear from looking around the world that rigid rules based on this divide are slowly giving way. More countries are moving to laws that deal directly and openly with requests for assisted dying, setting out who qualifies and what safeguards are needed.

From a human rights angle, the right to life isn't an order to prolong suffering no matter what, or to disregard a person's own choices. It needs to sit alongside dignity and autonomy especially for those who are dying or permanently incapacitated. At the same time, any move to loosen euthanasia laws must come with real protection for vulnerable people, major support for palliative care, and independent oversight to prevent coercion or abuse.

So, it makes sense for countries still holding on to the active-passive line to start shifting toward robust, transparent laws. Look at models from Oregon, the Netherlands, Belgium, or Canada—but improve on them. Require that patients get palliative care consults, psychiatric assessments if needed, time for reflection, and regular legislative reviews. That way, we abandon a philosophical distinction that no longer works in practice, and build a legal framework that's honest, safeguards rights, and puts compassion at the center of end-of-life care.