Criticisms Of Utilitarianism: Untenability of the Felicific Calculus And Conflict with the Concept of Individual Rights

Utilitarianism instinctively conveys the impression of an incredibly attractive way of thinking. It is compatible with majorism, a belief that expresses the necessity of good work as an obligation in Christian teaching, which is supported by ethical governance frameworks. Also, utilitarianism offers a remarkable answer to the question of why they have to act with a specific goal without strict legitimation. In terms of common sense, utilitarianism is despised as impractical and even ridiculous (West, 2019). It has been argued that there are not enough methods to characterize joy, nor an appropriate strategy to assess the degree of joy. Some argue that the results are ethically wrong. Others relate to the decline in human experience in search of pleasure. The various reactions are too diverse to speak in detail here. Therefore, it will limit my conversation to two responses that are particularly prevalent in philosophical writing: the first identification with practical problems when using the idea of ??benefit is, how can we ever know the exact amount of benefit an action will produce and is it possible to measure the effects of an act before it is carried out? The other, manipulation of Concerns that arise from the consequences of the benefits test which at its core is the belief that pleasure can be quantified and graded. Many view this to be problematic and an arrogant way of thinking, because it fails to consider “preferences of persons through culture, religion and advertising? What about people's self-correction in terms of better information and hindsight?” (Chandra, 2013). Thus, due to an inability to predict maximum benefit, one could have intentions to do good but end up doing more harm than good. For example, if we look at the following scenario from a purely practical standpoint (which seems to be a common theme in Utilitarianism) and also not primarily focus on the argument for the sanctity of life. Imagine a person, you save from death, with good intention that this was a utilitarian act for wider society. However, this individual proceeds to cause much pain and death. In hindsight, Utilitarianism would argue in favour of not saving the individual, but how can one be expected to predict these turn of events, and proceed to act according to utilitarian law? Such impracticalities further outline the flaws of Utilitarian ideology.

Those in favour of Utility will argue that these alleged impracticalities are solely based on extreme circumstances. Thus it is unfair to nullify a belief based on highly unlikely events. Perhaps the “rough rule of arms approach” (Rawls 1971) introduced in A Theory of Justice, could be used to negate these impracticalities. Rawls argues it is difficult to calculate the exact effect of one’s actions. Thus, the solution is to base your actions on the things that most people would benefit from, “there are some primary goods that every rational person would want health, vigour, intelligence, imagination, political freedoms, social opportunities, adequate incomes and self-esteem” (Chandra 2013). Hence, a rough rule of arms approach, is acting in accordance to the most common beneficiary factors within society. This is to suggest that it is absurd to be too literal with utility, as it becomes impractical to measure the exact implications of our actions. The effects of our actions are infinite and thus unquantifiable, and any attempt to measure utility exactly, would defeat the initial purpose of the moral theory. Which is ultimately to provide the most benefit.

Impossibility the Untenability of the Felicific Calculus

(Yi, 2013) proposed a scientific equation to calculate how activity affects the level of joy, which he called useful analytical or mathematical analysis, known as ‘happy math’. Introduction to the Principles of Morality and Legislature, (Kroneisen and Heck, 2019) elaborated on his recipe. As he emphasizes, without considering these mathematic efforts, it is clear that weighting the results is more a question of mechanical than logical Count appears to be. ‘Happy math’ generally cannot represent different degrees of happiness or how many people are satisfied with different things and to varying degrees. (Nardin, 2015) We cannot examine people's brains and know exactly what will increase their joy. It is often difficult to predict the results of an activity, so it seems equally impractical to anticipate the consequences for happiness. For example, a utilitarian can claim that if it were possible to travel back in time, it would be perfectly acceptable to kill Hitler to avoid the death of a large number of people. In any case, it is inconceivable that they recognize the consequences. Perhaps an increasingly evil tyrant would gain power instead, which could cause fear and death in twice as many people. Given this problem, (Aydin, 2017) despises, among other things, cheerful and crazy math. It claims that utilitarians are caught in an endless calculation process, with the ultimate goal of determining every small outcome of their activities. A useful response to this allegation is that the benefit estimates have to be made according to sensitive inclusion points. If the calculation strategy constantly shook at this point, it would prove to be excessively expensive and outweigh the benefits that would result from the enumeration. Some argue people should take the rough rule-of-arms approach that Rawls chose in A Theory of Justice (McNamara, 2013).

Aragón Aranda, (2017) argued that even though they were necessary, the estimates were completed just in the past of the human species and have now managed to formulate some of our ethical principles. In this sense, they don't need to decide to determine the outcome of each activity beforehand. Obviously, in one way or another, it will be conceivable to say, of course, what brings the best happiness. Unfortunately, ‘Happy math’ is not always a compelling value tool, and even current individuals seem to have ruled it out (Tom and Werkhoven, 2017).

Conflict with the Concept of Individual Rights

The recently discussed utilitarianism mainly affects the interests of the majority of the network. It is an absolute horror for people who affirm the idea of ??individual rights as something crucial. For example, (Eggleston, 2012) admitted that ethical reasons for wider society is better than any other ethical reasoning. Despite recognizing the populist and just nature of utilitarianism and realizing that utilitarian restriction takes into account the privilege of each resident, but illustrates that being treated as the equivalent of another, (Scarpi, 2012) continues to raise this question complicated and without much effort could lead to the violation of individual rights. Explain how to defend racial isolation under the guidance of joy on the assumption that separation can be a good substitute for white law, as this would ensure their propensities even though a minority would exist. (Barrow, 2018) condenses its position comfortably when composing. If someone has the opportunity to achieve something, it is not right for the legislature to try to deny it, although it would be a general enthusiasm to do so. It has been argued that the consequentialist idea of ??the hypothesis implies that all kinds of violations of rights and monstrosities can be supported by utilitarian research. If the end legitimizes the methods for providing a current model at this stage, is it satisfactory to torture an oppressor because he fears that he will receive data on the location of a bomb? Is it worth torturing their family to put pressure on the psychological oppressor to speak? If the agony causes a bomb to be discovered, which is then deactivated and saves many lives, the supply position would likely

exacerbate the suffering in both cases. Again, Human rights theorists would think that torture is a violation of the rights of the terrorist who will never be legitimized. Also, the average individual would instinctively rebel at the idea of ??agony if it was not the psychological oppressor at that time, probably from the family of the trafficker of fear. It is difficult to see how utilitarianism can be adapted to human meaning under such conditions (Driver, 2014).

A standard Individual would try to solve this problem by declaring that torture if used in doubt, would have such an impact on society that its use cannot be defended according to the best policy of its kind. Agony can be justified in a lonely situation. However, the fear and misfortune that would arise due to a commonly used approach to qualification throughout the network would outweigh the current rapid benefits. (Asheim, 2017) also argued that there was a useful incentive to safeguard the rights as it would create great joy. It is a fascinating competition. Demonstrating the benefits of whatever it sounds would undoubtedly recognize the torment as ethically authentic. Then what about the mighty monstrosities? One could say that a consistent approach has been used to legitimize many of the world's most terrible humanitarian violations. (Djeriouat and Trémolière, 2014) relies on the fact that, as part of rigorous utilitarian research, it is reasonable to make sure that a limitless number of people endure and kill, as a more significant number would ultimately be beneficial. However, he pointed out that from a practical point of view, it is essential to be extremely certain that the next group of people will benefit from it. Since it is probably not challenging to be sure of what will happen, utilitarianism supports the outrage with no certainty. Also, they could anticipate the future with absolute conviction, the possibility that an exceptional barbarism of scale will bring a scale advantage sufficient to overcome the disgust it causes is so far removed that the public eye would be more inclined than unlikely—censorship of monstrosity (Gawronski et al., 2017) .

Unfortunately, this cautious argument serves to repeat one of the reactions recently proposed: to be precise. The challenges are inalienable to anticipate the results of his activities. It is important to acknowledge that they cannot predict the outcome of frustration, and leaves the utilitarian hypothesis open to claim that there are many activities for which they cannot predict the result, which it would recommend that it is excessively uncertain to always move at all. Moreover, a utilitarianist may have to accept uncertainty and oblivion, obviously, depending on their experimental attitude, this avoids any responsibility given the convention of observation, which is ultimately utilitarian (Miller, 2012).