

Consequentialism assignment



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The consequential approach to distributive Justice Consequentiality states that an action may only be right if its consequences have good results or are better than that of a different action which includes not doing anything.

Therefore one can conclude that consequentiality is that the validation of actions is to be found in consequences. The consequential approach has both positive and negative sides to it.

Some of the arguments for consequentiality are: * Many may see actions as being a temporary thing that is soon forgotten or has separated for all time, therefore one may reason that in the long-term just the results remain, hence, the main aspect that mainly matters with regards to an action is its results. In this case consequentiality seems so be grasped but consequentiality states that actions are important because they are amongst their own consequences, and that in the long-term, results do not remain and are not certain.

In the case of Julius Male, he profited unfairly and inappropriately from the manipulation of profitable public works contracts, he did not think about the long-term results therefore the results or consequences were uncertain and this exulted in his detractors not trusting him. If Julius Male had taken a consequential approach he would have considered the end results or consequences that could have happened therefore enabling him to make better decisions. * Morality is another argument for consequentiality.

Being moral involves doing your greatest to do what is right as well as being concerned about people both equally and without bias as you can I. E.

Benefiting people as much as you can. In the case of Shawn Insane, she

made illegal decisions for her own gain. She was given tenders worth REAR million with regards to the city's contentious legislation which remits it to avoid the normal tender processes which may have been the reason as to why she was able to give a cash transfer of RE. 63 million so that she could get back some of her confiscated vehicles.

She was also caught for overstating invoices in order to decrease her tax bill and for giving in incorrect documents so that she could get Construction Industry Development Board grading that were used to get tenders of REAR million. She was also caught for influencing a state witness to interfere with evidence against her. She made all these decisions based on what she can get out of it and not about others that may be affected. She was being immoral in the sense that she did not care about Benefiting other people Just herself.

If she made decisions as a consequentialist, she would have made good decisions which would have kept her away from being convicted. * Another argument for consequentiality is reasons for action which states that whatever one does is done in order to receive some positive result that is the main reason that he/she performs that particular action. The results may not always be positive but the overall positive result is what is important and Justifiable, I. E. One should do whatever does the most positive overall.

Some arguments against consequentiality are: * Distributive Justice: Direct consequentiality would appear to support several distributions of goods, in spite of unfairness, as long as it is equivalent to the ideal result in relation to the overall good. Consequentialism might assert that such an unequal

distribution is very doubtful when maximizing the good. They assert that one would get decreased returns in relation to happiness or fulfillment from goods (CB. Smart); and this would require that the highest overall happiness or fulfillment would be accomplished by equal distribution. * Instinctively unjust or awful acts:

Consequentiality can ethically assist someone to, for example kill a person, or torment a person, if that best helps minimization. Some consequentialness assert that if the mediator does not have the ethical meaner to do the ethically necessary but awful act, then this, although it is sternly an ethical shortcoming, would nevertheless be good long-term even by consequential lights. They say this on the basis that such 'squeamishness' (Smart) raise the long-term probabilities that the mediator will cease from undertaking awful acts on times when it is conflicting to consequential morality.

Impartiality the meaningful life: Consequentiality appears to allow no reserved place for actions not subsiding under the duty to maximize, where one is ethically allowed to follow those 'assignments' that one recognizes, and which make one's life particularly one's own. This acute viewpoint may aim to a disadvantaged idea of the subject or agent on consequentialness part: not as much as a being (a person with their own tasks, worries, relationships etc.), but more as an input-output network for the overall good. * Personal Rights: Consequentiality might involve people meddling too much into other people's business.

For example, we could possibly do the best overall by stopping people from blowing their time and energy on useless or dangerous things by force. It is imperative that people are welcome to make choices for themselves, even unfortunate decisions, because that is the only way that people improve their power of character and because continuous testing is the only way civilization can acquire the knowledge about the numerous opportunities of life. Therefore consequentiality would appear to ask us to support laws that protect personal freedom against a lot of meddling by our neighbors or our government.