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 **Utilitarianism**

Utilitarianism is recognized as one of the most powerful ethical theory in the paradigm of philosophical history. The theory underpins the belief that the morally right deed is the action which manifests the most productive element. The classical advocates of the theory were John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham. However, the theory witnessed several changes over the years to remove the plausible controversies present in the theory. The cynics have highlighted several adverse ramifications of the ethical theory. The fundamental complexity is the comparison between value of time and the potential of human beings to postulate the ramifications of the actions.

Both Mill and Bentham were fundamentally cornered with social and legal reform in order to provide a basis to end corrupt social practices and laws. For Bentham, utilitarianism was based on the greatest happiness principle. He held that an individual must always act in a manner, within reason, which would result into the maximum greatest happiness. Conversely, Mill formulated his idea of utilitarianism based on a qualitative distinction between pleasures. Both sought to answer the question about what makes a policy, law, or an act a fundamentally moral one; for utilitarians, it was the lack of utility. The ethical theory proposed by Bentham was grounded on the presumption that human actions have to be evaluated according to the consequences they produce, and the only consequences which matter are those that help achieve happiness, in the sense of achieving maximum pleasure and minimizing or avoiding pain.

Mill's utilitarianism was thus not hedonistic and significantly departed from Bentham's theory; however, he still accepted good to exist in the psychological state of pleasure. This led him to understand the rationale for having rights to be utility, which was in contrast to the indiscriminate hedonistic view of Bentham, and to many seems more plausible to be institutionally implemented. Since the middle 20th century, it has been recognized as Consequentialist because only a few philosophers have agreed to the principles of the classical utilitarianism potentially. The classical approach was shunned by Moore and he presented an innovative account of the theory. For instance, he pursued the belief that beauty is always intrinsic (Driver). Good is not generally constituted in the consciousness of a person. The good will and courteous deed committed by a person is not different or superior from the good deeds performed by other members in the society. It is the moral obligation of the human beings to promote the moral good regardless of the circumstances. Individuals should never believe that the preservation of good values is a particular trait which is solely perpetuated by them.

 First, several moral complexities are encountered related to the popular ethical theory of utilitarianism. It postulates that humans possess the tendency to measure the ramifications of their consequences. The error of judgment is significant and the humans are not equipped with the tendency to determine the fate of their consequences. The problem with utilitarianism is opposite to those of deontology. The challenge to comprehend the moral calculus is very rare to be overcome. The moral system can never answer each question in detail. The maximization of happiness cannot be accomplished without plausible adversities. For instance, the principles of utilitarianism will suggest that when humans find a way to make pleasant robots, then the moral duty will assert that they must be constructed in great numbers. Since the major aspect is maximizing the happiness, the whole universe will have to be filled with the robots.

 In addition, utilitarianism specifies that pleasure is the perception of humans. It is apparent that the best life lived by people is not essentially the pleasurable one. They are faced with detrimental adversities to adhere to the moral principles and accomplish their ambitions. The consequences of actions cannot be predicted based on the circumstances and will. Thus, the predictability of a good or bad deed is not in control of human beings. If utilitarianism is deemed the rationale approach, humans may never advance to discern the extent of the moral behavior. However, the major pillar of ethical values is shunning the immoral act and commending the courteous moral values. Utilitarianism will struggle to manifest the ethical worth of deeds which cannot be controlled by the humans. Thus, it appears to offer a distorted account of ethical values.

 Besides, the ramifications of actions are persistently changing under the influence of certain intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The paradigm of utilitarianism will permit the actions to keep alternating with time. The actions of humans must be measured and accounted by using a definite and prudent instrumental approach. As the consequence and actions are not static, the utilitarian approach cannot precisely predict the values of actions to be bad or good. It is one of the most highlighted criticisms made by the opponent of the utilitarian approach.

 Each ethical theory is criticized by the schools of thoughts. Similarly, each theory has advocates and staunch supporters. Utilitarianism, in essence, is a peculiar paradigm which receives the least amount of criticism in comparison to the rest of the theories. The pursuit of happiness and the investigation of the investigation of the moral values make it the optimal theory to be applied in every walk of life. However, it does not state that the theory is flawless. None of the ethical theories can be implemented in the world without complexities, ambiguities and conflicts. Similar is the case with utilitarianism. For instance, not each action is capable to maximize happiness even when it is not wrong. The standards of righteousness promulgated in the theory are mystical in the contemporary age.

 In the contemporary age, the moral competency of happiness cannot be taken into account. Pleasure and the good will are critical matters which cannot be explicitly measured as highlighted in the utilitarianism approach. The fundamental problem of the theory lies at the heart of justice and discrimination. A standard criticism is made as it requires the violation of standards of justice. The theory fails to recognize whether humans can adhere to obligations or duties. The moral values and ethical values cannot be identified as per the paradigm of utilitarianism. Moreover, happiness is considered subjective in nature. The theoretical framework of utilitarianism cannot claim that happiness has a definite form.

 Humans cannot identify whether or not the happiness of other person is transparent. Nevertheless, utilitarianism cannot understand the nature of human in terms of happiness. It is a subjective matter which cannot be identified by any of the theories. Therefore, it is a contentious matter which cannot be working

Utilitarianism is the theory which focuses on the all the possible outcome of the action. The main aim of the theory is to provide the happiness to most of the people. It emphasize over the mutual interest rather than the self-interest. In other words, while making decision people simply follow the greatest happiness for maximum number of people. Besides lots of strong points theory have some drawback as well. For instance, Utilitarianism approach tries to predict the significances of the behavior and action; in reality it is not possible. Also the approach also fails to indicate the actual rules and obligation that individual should follow for others. Happiness is the main goal of the approach but unfortunately not everyone happiness lies on the same outcome. In other word an action can make someone happy but it is also possible that someone else find that action offensive. Therefore, the concept of mutual happiness or happiness for majority is not exactly possible. Lastly, this approach uses hedonic calculus to measure the level of happiness for the greatest number which is actually impractical.
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