Kant

* Good will is the only thing good without justification
* The only moral acts are those done out of duty.
* Hypothetical Imperative- declare a possible action to be practically necessary as a means of attainment of something else that one wants.
  + Does not matter whether the end is reasonable and good, only about what one would have to do to attain it.
* Categorical Imperative- one that represented an action as itself objectively necessary without regard to a further end.
* Rules of skill, counsels of prudence, or commandments (laws) or morality
* All rational beings must judge their actions in accordance with those maxims which they themselves will that they should serve as universal laws.
* Must be something of absolute worth: *a human being is an end in himself. They are objective ends. Rational nature is an end in itself. Act in such a way that you treat humanity whether in your own person or in any other person always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means.*
* Kant’s view actually restrains people because the will of every rational being is a will that legislates universal law. Other moral codes view morality as laws given to a will. However the will must find a stimulus to act in conformity with it. Thus interest would guide morality.
  + Kant’s view: The laws are based in no interest. The will provides its stimulus to act because it viewed an action as one it willed and willed to be followed as a universal law.

Rachels

* Argues that there’s no difference between active and passive euthanasia and both should be allowed. Man is dying of incurable cancer and will die within a few days but wants to end it now. Doctor would agree to withhold treatment justified by the fact that it would be wrong to prolong suffering needlessly. Once it’s decided, wouldn’t active euthanasia be better since the goal is to prevent needless suffering.
* View: people view killing someone ismorally worse than letting someone die. Is it?
  + Smith is second in line to fortune, six year old boy is first. Smith sneaks in and drowns the boy for the money.
  + Jones also sneaks in to kill the boy for the inheritance but the boy slips as he enters and hits his head while Jones stands by doing nothing and watches as the boy dies.
* Argues that both are just the same. Thus if killing is wrong, then letting die carries the same weight. So if an exception can be made for passive euthanasia than one can be made for active euthanasia also.
* Most common argument: “difference is that a doctor does not do anything to bring about a death in passive, but must do something to end a life, kills a patient, in active euthanasia.”
  + Doctor does do something, he lets the patient die. It may still be morally assessed as wise, unwise, right or wrong.
  + The reason killing is bad is because death is regarded as great evil. If it has been decided that euthanasia, even passive, is desirable, then it is decided that death is nogreater an evil than the patient’s continued existence.