

Utilitarianism the question is whether the consequentialism

Government, Military



Utilitarianism is the possibility that the ethical worth of an activity is exclusively controlled by its commitment to general utility in expanding bliss or joy as summed among all individuals. The essence of utilitarianism lies in his concept of pleasure and suffering. The philosophy of utilitarianism regards everything as “ good” that increases pleasure and reduces suffering. In other words, utilitarianism begins from the premise that joy and satisfaction are inherently important, that agony and suffering are not valuable, and that whatever else has esteem just in its causing bliss or forestalling enduring. Since utilitarianism is a form of consequentialism where the value and correctness (morally right) of an action is determined by the result, it would be correct (better) to initially consider the advantages and disadvantages of immediate consequentialism. Evaluation of the effect that based only on the results and consequences, is effective and easy to apply. The question is whether the consequentialism is morally right or not. Nowadays, because of the simplicity of understanding and application, most of the political and judicial decisions mainly taken based only on the results, and consequently on consequentialism. However, this only confirms the effectiveness and simplicity of the method. Theoretically, judicial and political decisions are based not only on consequentialism but also on deontology where, unlike utilitarianism, the action is more valuable than the result. However, in practice it is extremely, difficult to assess a person’s intentions and, even more so, to consider intentions as a basis for evidence. This is one of the main problems of deontology. On the other hand, consequentialism propagates the idea that “ the end justifies the means”, that is, if the goal is very important, then any way to achieve it is acceptable.

Most people will not support this statement because for example, killing one person to save the lives of two (survival lottery) conflicts with accepted moral norms, contradicts the principle of natural selection and do consider the value of each person for society. The value of human life is measured by many parameters such as: the benefits to society, personal qualities, abilities, etc.

Asserting that the value of the life of two people is more valuable than the life of one person, we equate life to a unit of measurement. It is impossible to accurately determine the value and potential of a person; therefore, we do not have the right to kill someone to save others. Moving from consequentialism to utilitarianism, which claims that act is morally right if and only if it acts maximizes the good (pleasure) or happiness, it can be argued that the problem of utilitarianism is its emphasis on pleasure or happiness, and not on what is really a boon. Human happiness depends on many factors, and it is impermanent. For instance, if you take two children, one of whom grew up in a wealthy family, and another in a poor then the concept of happiness for them will be very different.

The more pleasure we get, the harder it is to make us happy. The law of decreasing effect can be observed in drug addicts who, in the course of time, switch from lighter drugs to heavier drugs. Moreover, in the long run, even if people want to be happy, difficulties and problems can be much more useful than pleasure and happiness. Many great people formed themselves and achieved success thanks to difficulties, because problems force people to do

something rather than sit still. Some doctrine affirms that good cannot exist without evil, and happiness cannot exist without suffering and difficulties.

The pursuit of happiness and pleasure has always harassed and enslaved people. Drugs, prostitution, theft and more are the result of people's desire to satisfy their desires. So, can we say that pleasure is the most important thing for a people? In order to illustrate the imperfection of utilitarianism, one can imagine a war between China with a population of 1.5 billion and the South-African Republic with a population of 55 million people. Given the military power of China, this war will not be long but will lead to the death and destruction of tens of millions of people. Capture and extermination of the population of the Republic of South Africa will make China the possessor of huge deposits of minerals such as gold, silver, diamonds, etc., therefore, as a result, this will maximize the good (pleasure) or happiness of more people. However, the killing of 55 million people is unacceptable and morally wrong, even if it will meet the needs of the entire Chinese people.

In this issue, an important role is played not so much by the number of people, but by how much the level of people's satisfaction. The suffering of the people of the South African Republic cannot be justified by meeting the needs of the Chinese people because material wealth is not equivalent to human lives. Here the question arises as to who and how should evaluate the equivalence of the costs and benefits received. If the goal does not justify the means, then can we assume that an action brings about the best consequences? To date, often the result of actions becomes decisive in assessing the action itself, but this is only true provided that the rights and

foundations of other people have not been violated during the action. Based on the above, we can assert the fallacy of the idea of utilitarianism. Despite its simplicity and effectiveness, in some situations when the funds spent are not justified, this theory ceases to work and becomes absurd.

However, utilitarianism can be used as a basis for the development of more complex theories. Some people believe that you can create a universal methodology that would allow you to judge quickly and impartially and resolve different situations. However, such a technique cannot be simple because it must consider everything (all): factors influencing and driving a person, values for a period of time, and much more.

It is incredibly difficult to assess the actions of a person because every time we will stumble upon new causes and consequences. Human behavior is more dictated by society; therefore, a person does not bear full responsibility for his actions. Nature has endowed man with the ability to adapt and adjust.

For example, if a person grew up in harsh conditions where from very birth he would have had to struggle for survival, his moral foundations would have gone to the background, and he would not be fully responsible for his actions because this society made him so, and his instinct only helps him to survive.

In conclusion, based on the foregoing, utilitarianism is not a universal technique, which can always be guided. There are a lot of nuances that are not taken into account in utilitarianism, and therefore we cannot argue that an action that brings about the best consequences is a morally good action.

Such moral theories as consequentialism and deontology are not always true. However, they can serve as a basis for new more complex but perfect theories that will allow a more qualitative assessment of the action and make more correct decisions.