

Determine Whether or Not the Consumption of Pornography Would Be Morally Permissible

Posted on May 24, 2018

Introduction

Humans are all born from the same procedure, which is the only yet natural way to be born. But we are all different in behavior, color, thoughts, paradigms of society, culture and norms, which make us different. Even if two brothers from the same parents behave oppositely in major cases it is very rare when they behave the same way they will still be different in some traits. We all have different rules, and our rationale determines the good and bad we can see in our lives. Some would like to flirt and feel it is fine for themselves and is a regular thing, but some will consider it prohibited due to religious beliefs, social nourishment, or their own rationale.

Pornography is one of the booming industries in beauty shaping after cosmetics beauty. Pornography is an industry based on developing sexual content using visual, audio, and writing with the only motive to arouse sexual excitement. Also, we can see different statistical reports for the utilization of this industry, and there is a big debate in the world about whether it is moral or immoral. In many moments people are fighting to make it legal and somewhere illegal. Still, it is banned in many countries, but it is accessible with one click to everyone nowadays, and youth are partially using it too much. and it is breaking debate in a different field on porn-watching because it is mostly seen people use to see more than listening to audio or reading erotic books or novels.

There are two famous philosophical [schools of thought](#), i.e., Utilitarianism and Kant's 2nd formulation of the categorical imperative. Under this, we will try to identify whether it is moral or immoral and whether the government should legalize it (Wood and Hughes).

Discussion

Utilitarianism theory

This theory belongs to normative ethics and can be said to be another form of consequentialism that originated with Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart, English philosophers of the 19th century. It is one of the most historically influential moral theories that is still practiced while always facing criticism. It originated with changes but still seems to be the critical component in the theological perspective of

moral study. It says that every action is right if it spreads happiness and every action is wrong if it gives unhappiness to anyone. This theory assesses wrong or right with the resulting outcome, not on the motives behind it and it considers human happiness more than anything else. They also believe the effect is on the wide circle, not the individual and they are against egoism where a person goes with their self-interest it has to be looked to everyone.

Under this theory, there are different debates, but what matters for us to highlight our topic under this statement is to go further by asking these questions from ourselves in a wide perspective. Does pornography give happiness to us? Does it have a good impact on our lives? Is there a benefit to developing a sustainable life? All can be YES and NO because we all think differently, but let's see it from a wide perspective. Utilitarianism fully considers the moral act is watching porn because it gives happiness to many people and helps them in their mode of sexual excitement and helps them to know about sex and different techniques which can help them to strengthen their sexual relationship with their partner. While it can be immoral child porn, and animal abuse in porn, some categories make torches on male and female pornstar like Fetish, Gangbang, etc. because they are not a natural way to conduct this activity. Let's look it up into the matter of legalization. Utilitarianism will support it because everyone has the right to happiness and their choice of what gives them pleasure. Everyone can avoid what they do not like or feel bad about and should not do. While utilitarianism mostly decides the activity's effect if health issues increase, they would support banning it and making it illegal(Sandin).

Kentan 2nd formulation of Categorical Imperative

Now, looking to Kant's 2nd formulation of the Categorical Imperative which was initiated or presented by Immanuel Kant a German philosopher who gave the idea of universal morality it rejected and prohibited all kinds of punishments, thefts and murders considered illegal. The Kantian theory asks you to act on something if you are satisfied with answering questions, so you should act on that thing. Firstly, will every one act as I propose? The second one is, Does my action respect the goal of a human being I am using for my purpose? The 2nd formulation of the categorical imperative in Kant's Theory says we should not be using a person as an object but respect them in their value Besides instrumental values we should focus on inherent values.

If we see pornography under this theory, it is considered an immoral act, and we will not even support legalizing it because if we take it as a universal behavior, the majority do not like to go for it. They consider it as unhealthy for their children and other humans. There are side effects highlighted people who watch porn movies also viewed with some health deficiencies in which they lose their sexual control on their self. So, under this theory, it would be immoral and illegal to be conditioned by the government(Reynolds and Bowie)t.

Conclusions

Porn is not a solution to sexual excitement we cannot say it is immoral because everyone has the right to enjoy their life in their way such content should be limited and things like child porn should be banned because it is child abuse as they are unable to be good with that activity. Also touching women or kind of activities like this should be banned because it can be rising the marital rape ratio.

Works Cited

Reynolds, Scott J., and Norman E. Bowie. "A Kantian Perspective on the Characteristics of Ethics Programs." *Business Ethics Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 2, Apr. 2004, pp. 275-92. *Cambridge Core*, doi:10.5840/beq200414214.

Sandin, Per. "Virtual Child Pornography and Utilitarianism." *Journal of Information, Communication, and Ethics in Society*, vol. 2, no. 4, Nov. 2004, pp. 217-23. *emeraldinsight.com (Atypon)*, doi:10.1108/14779960480000254.

Wood, Michael, and Michael Hughes. "The Moral Basis of Moral Reform: Status Discontent vs. Culture and Socialization as Explanations of Anti-Pornography Social Movement Adherence." *American Sociological Review*, vol. 49, no. 1, 1984, pp. 86-99. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2095559.