

Argumentative essay on utilitarianism

Here you have an argumentative essay on utilitarianism with Pdf. You can download it from here and take advantage of many more essays.

Introduction

What constitutes right and wrong has been a constant issue for centuries. Philosophy was developed because of the conflicting arguments that surrounded the moral crisis. As a result, various schools of thought have developed conflicting ideas supporting what constitutes character. It is a philosophical concept of how people should act; its primary purpose is to make results. So, in theory, the action is right when it expresses greater happiness than the highest value. However, philosophy is characterised by several errors that often attract rejection in the world of knowledge.

The concept of Utilitarianism

Utilitarian philosophy was developed by Jeremy Bentham and later acquired by David Hume. According to Green, action is appropriate if it can produce a large amount of happiness for most people. Therefore, it is suitable for a person to perform an act with the highest personal service when the work is calculated according to the production of happiness in general. The author argues that a good deed is the sum of all the joy that results from an act that removes the suffering involved in a particular situation. As a product of consequentialism, the theory of Utilitarianism states that the effects of any action are the basic principles of determining what is right and what is wrong.

Arguments Against Utilitarianism

There are a few arguments that undermine the actual value of Utilitarianism. First, the rejection of Utilitarianism is based on its very fabrication of ethics. According to a school of thought, the value of goodness is propagated to increase happiness in society. The theory is not true because it considers ethical principles from the point of view of the cost-effectiveness of other parts of human action. There are a few good deeds but evil ones done through a flawed process.

Second, philosophy can promote social injustice. Since the concept links morality with what brings happiness to many people, a few will likely suffer as they develop a greater joy for more people. In this context, the view may promote the exploitation and violation of human rights as theoretically focused on the satisfaction of the masses. Moreover, the concept would justify slavery because free labor would satisfy the needs of many.

The theory is also unforgivable because it says that jobs can be called reasonable if they promote happiness. Similarly, actions are considered harmful if they cause sadness or grief. Today, it is obvious that not all good deeds can lead to happiness. Therefore, adopting a work ethic may encourage diversification and crime in society. For example, the practice of stealing can bring a measure of joy

Performdigi

to a gang of thieves, but morality does not excuse theft. In this context, an in-depth examination of resource statements reveals several illegal activities that often promote happiness in a group of people, which is why it limits philosophy.

In addition, philosophy tends to promote human rights violations because it prioritises the welfare of the population through the loss of the plight of the few. The idea has a few employers who seem to be violating human rights. For example, the act of forcibly evicting a person from their place of residence to provide a place to build a school can be considered morally justified under the practical perspective. However, this view is incorrect because it infringes on property ownership rights. While forcible removal may promote the well-being of most people in the community, it is immoral to give up human rights without following proper legal procedures.

In addition, the school of thought often undermines the dignity and worth of human beings. In theory, the results of an action are more critical when compared to the process of achieving specific outcomes. Equally important, the school of thought states that action is appropriate if it promotes the good of a particular class of people. Thus, an idea is dangerous because it balances a moral code with activities that would lead to happiness among the masses. Standing is also wrong because it can damage the system for achieving community goals. For example, it is immoral for a government official to defraud a customer to obtain a church donation. Although the gift is good and produces satisfaction for many people, the process is flawed as accepting donations was poor.

Besides, this theory is misleading because it promotes values. Therefore, limiting morality to happiness can lead to defining what is right and wrong. Philosophy, therefore, does not have a literal amount of knowledge when the creation of the universe takes a prominent place in the interpretation of morality. In such a case, the proper view of ethics should have a straightforward approach and limit the performance.

Therefore, a true definition of ethics should include a critical examination of all objective factors. In this case, an assessment of the action itself, the situation, and the motive for the behaviour should be considered instead of emphasising the effect of the action. One can define moral character by applying established ethical standards about the practice itself.

In addition, the setting under which the conduct is conducted is essential in determining what constitutes good and evil. Finally, motivation for work should be considered when defining ethics. In this case, the outcome of the action will not matter in the definition of behaviour as the purpose can be a direct measure of whether the step is right or wrong. Thus, Utilitarianism is misleading because the act can increase happiness for many and increase the net well into a small number of people whose happiness is not increased.

In conclusion, the moral dilemma has been going on for years. The concept is not genuine because it considers ethics from consequentialism. As a result, philosophy can promote social injustice and promote social discord and crime. In addition, the school of thought often endangers the human environment and the sanctity of life. Therefore, the notion of Utilitarianism is wrong and absurd because it promotes egoism, thus threatening human well-being in society.

Also Read,

Performdigi

- [Argumentative Essay on Physical Education in schools in 600 Words | Pdf](#)
- [Argumentative essay on female education in 750 Words | free Pdf](#)

