



THE SURVIVAL LOTTERY

Suppose that organ transplant procedures have been perfected. Suitable donors are put into a computer system. Organs are needed for two dying patients. The lottery would mean picking one suitable donor, killing them, while saving the other two. In essence, saving more lives than lost.

UTILITARIANISM AND THE SURVIVAL LOTTERY

- Utilitarianism is the ethical doctrine that virtue is based on utility, and that conduct should be directed toward promoting the greatest happiness of the greatest number of persons.
- The survival lottery causes death, but maximizes life
- The end justifies the means

ARGUMENT 1 FOR THE SURVIVAL LOTTERY

- Saving two lives is more beneficial than saving one, in regards to survival
- It is a moral duty to preserve the maximum amount of human lives
- The Survival Lottery guarantees more lives saved than lost
- Saving lives is morally permissible
- Therefore, since the Survival Lottery saves lives, it is morally permissible

ARGUMENT 1 AGAINST THE SURVIVAL LOTTERY

- People healthy enough to donate organs have a say in their future
- Killing those healthy enough to donate organs deprives them of a future like ours
- Depriving someone from a future like ours deprives them of the benefits of life. Benefits of life include pleasures, family, community, self-actualization, purpose, mystery, discovery, and being an individual person
- Every person deserves a chance to create a future like ours
- The survival lottery takes away people's future like ours
- Therefore, the survival lottery is morally unacceptable

IF NO ONE KNOWS IT'S HAPPENING THEN WHO IS GETTING HURT?

Imagine the survival lottery is done secretly. Neither donors, receivers, nor their families know exactly how the organs get where they are. If this is the case, patients don't have the guilt of knowing an innocent person's death was the result of their new organ, and donors would not be capable of knowing they were being killed for the sake of saving others.

ARGUMENT 2 FOR THE SURVIVAL LOTTERY

- If a person is unaware that they are being lied to, then they have no knowledge that they are being harmed
- Lying to people about the survival lottery blinds them from knowing of any harm
- Ignorance is bliss
- Ignorance to the survival lottery creates happiness
- Happiness is preferable
- Therefore the survival lottery is morally acceptable

ARGUMENT 2 AGAINST THE SURVIVAL LOTTERY

- Organ failure can be caused by personal choices, genetics, or other factors
- Each person is responsible for maintaining a healthy lifestyle
- The survival lottery omits the benefits of personal responsibility
- Omitting the benefits of personal responsibility takes away freedom
- Taking away freedom is morally impermissible
- Therefore, the survival lottery is morally impermissible

QUESTIONS

Would you like to live in a world where The Survival Lottery exists?

If it did exist, would you live in fear, or would you live each day as if it were your last?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<http://www.donatelife.net/index.php>

Harris, John *The Survival Lottery*

<http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&hid=15&sid=ce13f29b-2884-4942-9a9a-6cd5dffb025%40sessionmgr10>

http://www.kidney.org/news/newsroom/fs_new/25factsorgdon&trans.cfm