

In a problem, there are two ways of thinking of a decision. Categorical thinking is the act of using pre-determined principles and values to guide one's actions. One example of this is the American law system, where principles including life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness are prioritized over economic gain. Regardless of circumstances or degree of necessity. Consequentialist thinking is the act of using predicted outcomes to guide one's actions. The motive of consequentialist thinking is to maximize happiness and limit pain, and achieve "the greatest good for the greatest number". In a lawsuit of the 19th century featuring the Queen of England and Dudley, Stevens, and Brooks, these two ways of thought are debated over. The case was about the three sailors previously mentioned and a cabin boy being trapped in a ship for twenty days. All four sailors underwent starvation, during the fifteenth day, the three sailors decided together to consume the cabin boy in order to satiate their extreme necessity of food. Their decision based on consequentialism was more reasonable, because they were forced by the degree of necessity to commit the crime and more people benefited from this decision. Preview what you will use.

Firstly, humans have a hierarchy of needs, where they cannot proceed to higher needs like values and principles without basic needs such as food and security being fulfilled. This concept is of human nature and also found in Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. On the boat, the three sailors had no food for two weeks. They were deprived of basic needs, and it was the sailors' duties to replenish them. Even though this act goes against human values of life, it is completely justifiable and necessary.

Secondly, this decision benefited most people. If the three sailors did not consume Parker, then all four of them would die. Furthermore, unlike Parker, they had families in England, who were dependent on them and would greatly suffer if they died. Hence, in favor of majority, this decision is the right decision.

In opposition to the previous claims, some would say that the sailors returning home may cause harm to the society, and therefore making the positive

consequence of saving more people negative. This thought shows how the outcomes of their decision are very difficult to measure and that consequentialism is very dependent on circumstances. However, this is a matter of probability. The expected outcome of the contributions of these three men when alive is higher than when they are dead. Hence, this decision is reasonable and more helpful to society.

In conclusion, the decision of consuming Parker is reasonable both in the perspectives of the sailors and in perspective of society. One factor of this decision is the consent of Parker. With consent, moral principles like integrity are secured. Consent also enables the decision to be categorically reasonable and makes the decision better as a whole. If they were not granted consent, then it is a case of balance. The values of life, equality, and love of each other simply cannot be

activated in the three sailors when they do not have access to food. It would be too extreme if the three sailors would base their decision on categorical thinking, though that may be beneficial in other cases. Hence, their decision of killing Parker is justifiable and reasonable.