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**Ethics: Violence**

The debate of violence assumes a contentious debate in the ethical paradigm. A wide range of researchers and philosophers have stipulated contrasting views pertinent to the morality, bases and justification of violence. The ultimate quest to comprehend the manifestations of violence requires a critical analysis of the views postulated by various philosophers. It is imperative to assimilate the nature of violence by considering it in a different dimension as violence in religion, gender-based violence and epistemology of violence. Essentially, Dale Jacquette draws the distinction between the metaphorical and literal violence by associating it with a kind of action performed by the agent. Besides, philosophers have advanced to both confront and commend the existence of violence in human nature. Violence is, irrefutably, morally wrong and problematic as it requires critical justifications rather than been termed morally permissible.

To begin, violence poses grave consequences for the study of ethics, rationality and rightfulness. The essence of ethics lies at the very heart of not affecting others regardless of the circumstances. For instance, if a human being is affected and subjected to violence because of a morally wrong act committed by him, it is deemed the person was treated rightfully. Meanwhile, it raises the critical question as forgiving others and refraining from spreading violence in the society is the principle which must be pursued under any circumstances. There exists a spirited disagreement related to the right and wrong nature of violence (*Are Human Beings Naturally Violent And Warlike? | Issue 105 | Philosophy Now*). Such contentious are the questions posed by violence in the paradigm of ethics.

Besides, Coady underpins three fundamental definitions of violence. Restricted, wide and legitimist are the three primary branches with further expand the assessment of violence. The restricted aspect refers to the individuals who always prefer to focus on the positive interpersonal acts of coercion generally comprising the infliction of physical harm. The second aspect, wide, highlights the individuals who deem violence an extension of the social inequalities and injustices. The element of physical force is abandoned and the instances of structural and institutional violence are glorified. The last element as legitimist stipulates violence to be irrational, discriminatory and tyrant in true letter and spirits (Alfieri). Since all acts of violence are inclined towards committing a violation, the very existence of violence is evil and unjustified. Violation, here, is stated as the significant element which is subjected to violence as a primary intention of transforming wrongful acts into violence. For instance, a person borrows a book from a library but fails to return it on time. The person has committed a wrong act but not each act can be violent similar to this case(“Arguments for Liberty”). The wrongful treatment of the person never implies the act can be characterized as violent. In addition, Buffachi conceives a framework to sketch the intricacies of violence by blaming it for desecrating the fundamental spirits of integrity.

Furthermore, a critical appraisal of the matter states that violence is harmful and each harmful act is manifested in prima facie wrong. In several circumstances, violence is given a destructive nature and since destruction fuels harm, violence in essence is harmful and detrimental. However, not all acts of violence can be called harmful. If a person, for instance, who aims at punching the other person on the face but misses and fells on the ground, the other person will laugh and be amused (*Defining Violence | Issue 66 | Philosophy Now*). Hence, the act of violence did not inflict harm. There exist several other instances where violence can manifest in productivity. Suppose a person's legs need to be amputated with an ax in order to free him from the immense burden, violence as amputation is considered viable as it is the only choice.

In regards to various ethical theories, violence is critically assessed based on the outcomes and the needs of action. Utilitarianism, proposed by Jeremy Bentham, at its core examines the significance and moral of action by making comparison with the possible outcomes. The complexity of circumstances and violence must be committed if they cause a greater good for the vast majority of people. Utilitarianism condones violence but at the very heart of the theory lies a contentious debate. It postulates argument cannot be established on the existence and non-existence of violence when the greatest number is being benefited potentially. However, the philosophical structure of this theory lacks accuracy. During World War II, a wide range of Germans allied to combat the Germans and advanced to kill millions of Jews as it was the majority conceded to the action. In essence, the majority aimed at subjecting a ruthless genocide of innocent Jews that is utterly overlooked by Utilitarianism school of thought. Thus, Utilitarianism condones violence but struggles to maintain an equilibrium between the voices and rights of minority and majority. An intricate thought is derived from justification that the majority and minority are always experiencing a continuous change which causes the minority to become a part of the majority in later stages(Thi and P). The establishment of a new majority enhances the likelihood of previously prohibited actions to become rational. For instance, wars can be initiated and havoc can be wreaked under the acceptance of a majority regardless of the ramifications and adversities faced by the minority. The ethical theory of Utilitarianism condones violence by sanctioning the right and rationality of the radical actions to the majority while overlooking the harm and challenges posed by it to the minority and other groups of society.

In addition, the ethical theories other than Utilitarianism advance to assess violence by considering the implications of action as creating right or wrong in morality rather than examining the ramifications of the action. Kant's deontological ethical theory harnesses the essence of the action and if it is violent it may be nullified in the first place to exterminate the need of critically assessing the benefit or harm inflicted upon the minority or majority. The deliberated ethical paradigm of theories pertinent to violent offers a contentious debate on whether or not violence is justified. However, it is imperative to examine the root of violence manifested in human nature. Violence, inherently, is rooted in the nature of humans which can be viewed in the light of historical instances. Wars, crimes and injustices have remained a potential part of human history and provide an explicit illustration of the perceived reality that human evolution has breed violence. They have progressed to innovate and engage in warfare to perpetuate violence which is justified by their needs. Such critical are the manifestations of violence embedded in the inherent nature of humans.

To conclude, various ethical theories and philosophers have stipulated contrasting and contentious views on the need and justification of violence. The fundamental principle breeding violence is the provision of justification, productivity and the nature of human beings. However, these provisions cannot cultivate the existence of violence to be ethical or moral. Violence becomes, meanwhile, imperative in certain cases to save the other person from greater harm as amputating the leg of a person whose leg is stuck under an immense log that cannot be moved. The bottom line is that violence poses grave adversities for the study of ethics and eventually causes moral challenges.

Works Cited

Alfieri, Anthony V. “The Ethics of Violence: Necessity, Excess, and Opposition.” *Columbia Law Review*, edited by Austin Sarat and Thomas R. Kearns, vol. 94, no. 5, 1994, pp. 1721–50. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/1123163.

*Are Human Beings Naturally Violent And Warlike? | Issue 105 | Philosophy Now*. https://philosophynow.org/issues/105/Are\_Human\_Beings\_Naturally\_Violent\_And\_Warlike. Accessed 19 Apr. 2019.

“Arguments for Liberty: Utilitarianism.” *Libertarianism.Org*, https://www.libertarianism.org/media/free-thoughts/arguments-liberty-utilitarianism. Accessed 20 Apr. 2019.

*Defining Violence | Issue 66 | Philosophy Now*. https://philosophynow.org/issues/66/Defining\_Violence. Accessed 19 Apr. 2019.

Thi, Nguyen C., and Zagal José P. *Good Violence, Bad Violence: The Ethics of Competition in Multiplayer Games*. 2016, http://www.digra.org/wp-content/uploads/digital-library/paper\_39.pdf.