

I recently heard a thought experiment where you have to ask yourself whether to either save the lives of 50 children, or one man who will end up curing cancer. Which one would you choose? I'd probably rescue the man, but other people WOULD know my reasoning after finding out my decision, right? I'd be praying the saved man wasn't perceived as just some regular guy otherwise people would be like '... Simon's evil'. I'm wondering what the limit of child deaths would be for me, morally speaking. The guy curing cancer would save millions of children, so the thought experiment could be taken way further. It should go like 'what would you rather, save the lives of one million children or one man who will end up curing cancer?' I would be truly sick if I chose the man, right? Again, I'd be desperate to give an explanation! Is it very likely one man will end up curing cancer, though? My understanding of laboratories is that it's a team effort. What, does only one person work in such places at a time? Stop funding future moon missions, (we've been there already and now we REALLY know it's grey and dusty), and get more than one person trying to cure one of the world's deadliest diseases! Thank God the experiment doesn't ask you to kill everyone personally, otherwise I'd throw up.

Here's an idea, I save the lives of the 50 children and then explain to them they better be (expletive) grateful, as one man had to die. All of them must get doctorates in medicine and at least one of them needs to find a cure. Otherwise they'll end up living lives that are at very least relatively pointless (when compared to the man who could have cured cancer). Is that what you want?!?! The shouted question shows how desperate I'd be, it's not the kind of thing most normal people have to deal with, is it? The same thought experiment later goes 'If you do choose the man curing cancer to live, you later find out he gets greedy and demands millions of pounds for the cure. Would you still choose him?' For me, that makes absolutely no difference at all. I'd be like '... couldn't give a toss...' Maybe I misunderstood the experiment and wasn't truly listening. If I was listening properly... well I mean... surely he deserves the money?? Make him the ruler of the world for all I care, he's a great man! And think how many billions of pounds he'd be saving the healthcare services, too. Again, make him the ultimate ruler and give him the money, if he doesn't deserve it, who does??

Here's an important point: Never explain the thought experiment to a serial killer, he does not have people's best interests. He'd be like 'So I FINALLY have the option to kill a man and people would respect me for it? Christmas.' I also find sharing the experiment with an extremely sensitive person on antidepressants to be cruel, and you should also never ask the question to a paranoid schizophrenic with access to firearms. He could be like 'Why is someone asking me to cause the death of so many children? This person is the devil and I need to stop him.' Thinking other people are devils is a common delusion, so the person explaining the experiment needs to be exceptionally cautious, obviously. I mean yeah, don't even bother. And before you go thinking to yourself 'But Simon is a paranoid schizophrenic...' first up I'm treated successfully, second I don't have any guns! What else messed up have you been thinking about me? 'I bet he'd kill EVERYONE without even saving a single person.' That's very offensive and now it's your turn to make an apology! If you don't, I'll do it for you, I've already apologised on behalf of Alan Sugar, I can VERY easily do it again.

Speaking of schizophrenics, you probably shouldn't explain the thought experiment

where a cat is alive and dead at the same time, to such a person. That could result in some very interesting behaviours, couldn't it? A crazy guy could see a cat being run over and then take it home for himself thinking it's still a valid pet, even after everyone else says its died. The madman may think he's doing the right thing, everyone else thinks he's on his way to becoming the next Jeffrey Dahmer. I'm no scientist, but I'm fairly sure the experiment doesn't just involve cats, actually technically all living organisms can be alive and dead at the same time. Do you want to explain THAT to a delusional person? Again, just don't. I don't know if this would work, but say a manic depressive animal lover is going through an episode of mania and then sees a dead cat. Would that put a downer on him, curing him? I'm not saying people should try it and see, but it is another interesting thought experiment, isn't it? Unless the manic depressive is REALLY manic, thinks he has Godlike powers and believes he can save the creature. Again, maybe when he realises he can't save animals, that could cure him. Call me a traditionalist, but I say medicate the person, instead. And on that insightful note... bye!