**Topic**

You are in charge of an organ transplant program at a city hospital. Your program has just obtained one liver for transplant and now you must decide which candidate will receive it. The odds are that whoever does not receive the liver will die before another compatible organ becomes available. There are five candidates described below. What do you do? How would each theory approach making a decision?

Bob- a 40 year old unemployed, homeless man with a severe drinking problem and a criminal record. He was first to sign up for the transplant.

Joe- A 42 year old extremely wealthy businessman. He was the last to sign up but has offered 100 million dollar donation to the hospital.

Sarah- A 26 year old single mother with six school age children.

Karen- A 60 year old world renowned Nobel Prize wining medical researcher currently working on AIDS research.

Chris- An 8 year old who is the sickest of the candidates. Without the transplant, he’ll mostly like die within a week.

**Submission**:

This is a dire situation and whatever the decision is made, someone is going to die. But here I would like to think which life or lives I could save.

Based on the utilitarian approach which compels us to make decision considering a choice which leads us to greater good i.e. which decision will help improve maximum lives, I would like to choose Karen, because her research can potentially save many lives. But since we cannot predict the future, it is very difficult to know for certainty whether Karen will succeed in her research and save lives of AIDS patients.

Considering Kant's categorical imperative, which denotes an absolute, unconditional requirement that must be obeyed in all circumstances. First cum First serve is the fairest rule. Although in this situation an alcoholic homeless man with criminal record will be saved. But this is a very rare situation we come across with. If we think in a longer run, this is the most unbiased and fair system. Making decision solely based on this theory might give us a straightforward reasoning, but it does not consider what impact the decision is going to have. We are humans, most of the actions we make are based on love and compassion, which this theory neglects.

The golden rule is the most difficult approach to apply in this scenario, since all seems to be a fair candidate if I consider myself in the situation. For instance, Sarah can be the best choice, since other lives are dependent on her. She is the only person who is taking care of six other lives. Her children are left without any financial, emotional support without her. Chris could be another choice, since he is the sickest of all and will die if he didn’t get the transplant immediately.

In my opinion if would like to use a combination of Utilitarian and golden rule approach and will choose Sarah since six other lives which are directly dependent on her are at stack, thus making the choice for the greater good with the feeling of need for her children.