

utilitarianism theory

by Tlowe Tlowe

Submission date: 25-Jul-2021 04:43PM (UTC-0400)

Submission ID: 1623864271

File name: Utilitarianism.edited.edited.docx (18.94K)

Word count: 916

Character count: 4936

Institutional Affiliation

Student's Name

Date

Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is a theory that focuses on the consequences of actions. Actions are either ethical or unethical depending on their outcomes or consequences. An act is right if it brings more happiness and less harm for the greatest number of people. Utilitarianism is also called teleontological theory and aims at promoting happiness rather than harm. From a utilitarian point of view, an activity is moral if it leads to the most important happiness for the most significant number of people. What makes utilitarianism unique is its approach to create an expanded explanation of moral judgment and moral guidance based on that insight. Thus, utilitarianism considers the happiness of all the parties or individuals affected by the given action. Utilitarianism can help us make decisions in case of a moral dilemma such as human rights. In this paper, I argue against the use of animals for food from a utilitarian point of view.

The first principle of utilitarianism is that the sole desirable end, the final good, is happiness, defined as pleasure. Under this principle, every pretty thing exists either as a source of joy or as a way of obtaining happiness. Pleasures are fundamentally similar, yet they can be classified according to their power, duration, precision, contextual proximity, fruitfulness, and pureness. Higher pleasures turn out to be eventually superior and, as a result, should be favored based on this principle. Quantitative distinctions can also be made between pleasures.

The second principle of utilitarianism is the greatest happiness principle. Each person's pleasure is equally important to everyone else's. Utilitarianism is not a kind of ethical egoism in that it does not force anyone to pursue their happiness. The principle is more commonly applied to increase the total quantity of joy. It does not follow that an action that provides a lot of universal utility is a moral act. Again, it does not follow that an activity that causes broad

disutility is not a moral act. All of the options, including doing nothing, could be awful, and the action could be the 'least harmful' choice.

The third principle under utilitarianism is that the cost-benefit analysis method is utilized to evaluate which action should be taken. The approach consists of five steps: selecting different courses of action, analyzing the implications of the chosen activity, assigning values to the outcomes, and calculating implementation costs based on how much pleasure is lost or produced. Finally, each alternative's net benefit or worth is determined, and the option that maximizes net benefits is chosen.

A person with a moral dilemma should consider taking the action that results in maximum happiness. If all the alternatives available result in displeasure, then the action with minimal adverse consequences should be taken. For example, the use of animals to carry out medical tests may result in its death. Still, if the test becomes successful, many individuals would be happy since it will positively impact human health.

According to utilitarianism, every individual's well-being is essential; this aspect also applies to the well-being of animals. It is morally wrong to kill animals for food because it results to pain and suffering. Just the way humans suffer from pain, so should nonhumans like animals be treated. The use of animals for food and other purposes would only be acceptable if the exploitation of their exploitation brings more happiness than harm. According to utilitarianism, a lot of suffering occurs to produce monetary pleasures from animals, hence harm exceeds happiness. Any act in which the harm is more than the happiness is morally wrong from a utilitarian perspective.

Speciesism is wrong and hence does not defend animal rights. Utilitarianism forbids discrimination towards sentient animal creatures who have good and negative experiences or preferences. Utilitarianism considers all forms of misery and enjoyment, including the experiences of both animals and humans. As a result, the rights of animals should be treated equally to those of humans. Because it takes so much suffering to achieve such fleeting joys as eating animal products, exploiting animals does not raise, but rather significantly reduces, the quantity of happiness in the world. As a result, such exploitation cannot be justified; hence according to utilitarianism, such exploitation is morally illegitimate.

The nature of rights theory has profoundly influenced the animal rights movement. The rights approach calls for the immediate cessation of animal exploitation, yet this is just impractical. The approach is also similar to the utilitarianism approach of protecting the interest of animals. Total victory, i.e., the complete abolition of animal exploitation, cannot be achieved in a single step; hence it is vital to embrace the moral orthodoxy of animal welfare as a series of critical requirements toward animal rights. Animal welfare theory is similar to utilitarianism in that both allow for the trade-off of all animal preferences as long as the required accumulation of outcomes suggests so. As a result, it is prudent to support progressive adjustments based on welfare reform that would ostensibly assure that the human advantage of animal exploitation surpasses the pain and suffering experienced by laboratory animals.

In conclusion, using animals for food, testing and other purposes is morally wrong from a utilitarian point of view. According to utilitarian theory, actions are morally right if they bring more happiness than harm. In a kind of weighing balance between costs and benefits, an act is right if the benefits exceed the costs. In animal testing and exploitation for food, the harm exceeds happiness and hence the act is morally wrong.

utilitarianism theory

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 2%