

Does The End Ever Justify The Means?

Posted on September 20, 2019

Does the end ever justify the means? The response to this inquiry relies upon what the outcomes or objectives are and what implies are being utilized to accomplish them. If the goals and outcomes are noble and right, and the process we are using to perform them are equally excellent and fair, at that point, yes, the ends surely justify the means. However, that is not what many people mean when they use this statement. Most utilize it as a reason to accomplish their objectives through any method, any process, or any pathway, regardless of how unethical, unlawful, or dangerous the process might be. What this statement means for most people implies is something as it does not make a minute difference how you get something you want as long as you are getting it.

The 'ends justifying the means' usually implies accomplishing something positive end while supporting the bad process and then justifying the decent positive results. For example, aborting a girl child to save the marital life does not justify the killing. Although saving the marital life is ethically right, killing an innocent life is ethically wrong and cannot be justified in any way. Ends justifying the means are important ethical dilemmas in moral discourses. And it involves questions like this: "If you could spare the world by killing somebody, would you do it?" If the appropriate response of the person is "yes," at that point, an ethically right result legitimizes the utilization of unethical means to accomplish it. Be that as it may, there are three unique things to consider in such a circumstance: the morality of the ends, the decency of the means, and the morality of the person involved in the process. In this circumstance, the means (killing) is obviously unethical, and so is the killer. But the end is an enjoyable task that is sparing the world. Is it a good thing to allow the killers to kill anybody when they need to and then just justify the means? As in the given scenario, I strongly oppose the statement that 'Ends justify the Means.' If I were caught in a fictional situation, I would not take the drug that had been prepared by killing some innocent men (Lederman & Lederman, 2016).

Theoretical Background

Ethics, which is a vital facet of human research, is a practice as well as a discipline. In doing clinical research, it is essential to ethically justify the criteria for the research design, conduct the experiment, and review the clinical investigation. All must be identified by the requirements and obligations of both the researcher and the human subject. In medical ethics, there is a significant difference between two fundamental moral positions: deontology and consequentialism. Deontology states that whether an action is "great" or "terrible" relies on the actual nature of the action. Most people believe that there are specific activities that are intrinsically terrible, things as killing someone, plague, robbery, and so on. Some proponents of deontology, similar to Kant, have a firm belief that stealing something, for instance, is always awful. In other words, one cannot justify these actions. Consequentialism, on the other hand, states that whether an activity is "great" or "terrible" relies on

the outcome. According to them, there is a standard by which one can measure the results (generally “utility”) and propose that the best strategy is that increase utility. For consequentialists, the ends always justify the means.

The moral convictions and beliefs of the majority of individuals fall into the mixture of both philosophies. Numerous individuals hold the deontological belief and have an opinion that some actions like torturing or raping a person are never justified, while these same individuals also hold the viewpoint of consequentialists that it is occasionally alright to lie, just as a “white lie.” A third one is the utilitarian approach; according to this approach, decisions and choices are made based on the greatest good that is obtained for the greatest number of people. This is quite close to the consequentialist approach since this is too based upon the proposition that actions determine the morality of some intervention (Dashner, 2015). According to this approach, if the results are advantageous for a vast number of people, then it is ok to harm a few individuals.

This approach is normally guided by the computed advantages or damages for an action based on the empirical evidence. A few cases based upon the utilitarian approach in the clinical setting include using artificial respiration for premature babies or treating acid or fire burn victims based upon the availability of time. Although a wide range of people go with this approach, the only thing that is right in its original essence is the right way to evaluate it. As in the case of the given scenario, I would prefer to find another way rather than using a drug that has been made by killing innocent homeless people. For me, choosing the right path and living in peace is far better than preferring the decision where the means needed to be justified by the end.

Factual Examples of History

Nobody can apply awful means to any remarkable and high-end. It is just like a person who is constructing an extraordinary house by using terrible material – it is not an appropriate way. This given expression “the end legitimizes the means” has tricked all of us, and we have never focused on its true meaning carefully that what does it’s saying. What we neglect to find in this announcement is merely the end. We all deny to see and precisely look at the means and how they influence the conclusions. Is it possible that whatever the end is, we keep on ignoring the process? There is a significant measure of trouble and confusion when pitiful means are utilized to achieve excellent means. History has been filled with many examples that have focused on experiments on humans. However, proper guidelines are available for using humans in clinical trials. Although some clinical trials have resulted in the successful invention of medicines, there are many flop experiments that has been resulted in the deaths of subjects.

For example, In 1898, Freund almost executed his subject under study while exploring different avenues regarding X-beams to evacuate hair on moles. In 1857, carbon tetrachloride was utilized as a human tranquilizer despite the fact that a couple of animal’s studies would have indicated it to be inadequate. In 1905, Fletcher employed the detainees of a crazy shelter to consider beriberi. Some

forty-three patients got the illness, and eighteen expired. The investigation is viewed as critical and is frequently referred to, yet nobody has said anything about the moral issues that were raised. In 1902 a progression of analyses was performed on twelve common administration representatives to decide the impacts of nourishment additives. However, there was no confirmation of worry for the subjects' welfare (Fyfe, 2013).

From 1932 to 1972, the scandalous "Tuskegee try" occurred utilizing dark guys to decide the normal course of syphilis despite the fact that treatment had existed for quite a long time. Positively the evilest, however, among the most useless investigations of all were those led by Nazi doctors on regular Jewish folks, detainees of war, and others entombed in inhumane imprisonments. All these deaths of innocent people do not justify the means.

Similarly, another example from history is the Soviet creation of an assortment of products (oil, steel, and so on), yet it came at a horrifying cost. A large number of Soviets passed on of open hunger, and thousands more were mistreated or sent to gulags during the Great Purge that accompanied the 5-year designs. It is not excessively troublesome, making it impossible to state that the sacrifice needed by the Soviet individuals was not worth primary pick up in the economy; be that as it may, it is not that straightforward. These changes in the Soviet businesses were expected, which made it possible for the Soviets effectively repulse Nazi Germany in WW II, hypothetically sparing billions of more lives (Herring, 2016).

Another great example from the history would be the Holocaust that was performed by the Nazi administration. Is this end commendable after every one of the incidents that occurred? The example of the great two World Wars is also another scenario. These problems are very occasionally found in the time of war and in the political field. On the other hand, governments were having no care of it as they just wanted to win by all means. They simply wanted triumph in spite of the fact that it implies losing numerous lives, property, and considerably more confidence. In these two major incidents, the main conclusion is the achievement, and any means that would add to progress is believed to be legitimized, yet not by everybody. Any success can be considered as the standard by which we as a whole measure the advantage of the means. Nonetheless, a few advantages are shallow and don't keep going long. The abuse of the expression "the end always justifies the means" disclaims Machiavelli's primary point – that "a ruler should consider future occasions and get ready for potential issues. On the off chance that a man truly thinks in a Machiavellian point of view, he or she would utilize vital intends to accomplish a conclusion to keep away from future confusions".

At the point when a man says, "normal rules don't apply in this situation" they are stating that if the final product is sufficiently honorable, it will legitimize whatever measures are taken to accomplish that objective. For instance, if you will likely spare lives, it's alright to cheat, take, and mislead to achieve your objective. All the more regularly, the situation is something less radical, for example, overstating one's aptitudes on a resume, keeping in mind the end goal to land a position that will accommodate one's family (Cote, Piff, & Willer, 2013).

The reason that “whatever it takes to get the job done, so be it” is such a moral quandary that it enables little corruption to happen with a specific end goal of accomplishing bigger moralities. Who cares whether you misrepresent a few pieces of information on the off chance that it implies your family will have sustenance to eat? Who thinks about taking from the rich fit that you can provide for poor people? An exceptionally basic inquiry in the moral level-headed discussions on this issue is, “Whether you could spare the world by killing somebody, would you do it?” Murder isn’t right, as we as a whole know. Sparing the world is a decent and good thing. In any case, what sort of world would we say we are sparing on the off chance that we spare it by killing somebody? Wouldn’t that open the way to a world where more outrages are defended?

The issue with the “whatever it takes to get the job done, so be it” theory is that it puts the law under the control of people and makes the law subjective. Most men and ladies are prodigies with regard to legitimizing our conduct. We can legitimize any activity if the inspiration for the objective is sufficiently solid. That is precisely why the closures can’t legitimize the methods—it is a formula for finish turmoil. Its legitimate result is that every individual, or gathering of individuals, chooses what is moral or improper because of the circumstance. The contrary circumstance is the place where an arrangement of ethics and standards are settled upon by everybody. This is the manner by which sound social orders work—by setting decisions that everybody must take after and afterward rebuffing guilty parties.

Be that as it may, shouldn’t something be said about individual ethical qualities? Imagine a scenario in which we experience this predicament in an individual circumstance that does not include the rule that everyone must follow. Maybe we believe we have to mislead secure somebody’s emotions. Perhaps we believe we can undermine our life partner since they’ve made us despondent. Perhaps we’re right with running up our charge cards because the objective is to purchase Christmas presents. It is very likely, on the off chance that we each were to look at our lives, that we would see ourselves supporting the finishes with the methods everywhere.

Conclusions

So, based upon all the debate, if there is a homeless man who wants to participate in the experiment himself, then it is based on his consent. No one can object, but if the willingness of a person is not included, then it is not right. It is also not right at the end of Doctors. If they keep on adding people without even asking them, and they are not allowed to leave the experiment, then obviously, whatever good you are doing, you cannot justify it.

Any broad explanation, for example, is more terrible than useless in overseeing human activities when it concerns the lives of others. It advances group attitude and vigilante activity. In all conditions where a man’s life is in a critical position, each different case must be painstakingly weighed. What makes an individual “bothersome,” and to whom would they say they are unnecessary? What results will the murdering of the individual being referred to have upon others? Who will be influenced

positively, and who will be impacted negatively? No comprehensive explanation, similar to “the end legitimizes the means,” ought to ever be utilized by the sensible mastermind. There is an almost negligible difference between death and murder, and “means” utilized can be disastrous at times, more than anything the “troublesome” could do.

Individuals who seek after their fantasies and their objectives will probably take a way that is loaded with complications. It is realized that objectives are accomplished through assiduous work. The way to achieve such objectives is unique concerning the objectives itself. One thing must be remembered, however: both the ends and the means need to be honorable and excellent. What I have demonstrated is that the conclusions or goals of any specific person can directly be sustained by the ways used to accomplish them if they are sufficiently admirable. As Machiavelli calls attention, Be that as it may, to practice keenness, the ruler must read histories and concentrate there on the activities of distinguished men, to perceive how they have borne themselves in war, to analyze the reasons for their triumphs and thrashing, to keep away from the last mentioned and mimic the previous. There are a lot of horrendous cases in defending indecent, illegal, and wrong means, yet Machiavelli shows us to learn from our past that one should try to achieve ends through honorable and great means.

All in all, we are everything except people who fail more often than not. The qualities that we have as people are what makes us people. Any methods we utilize that abuse our impression of ethics and uprightness can never legitimize the end of the objectives, regardless of how commendable they may appear to be. As found in the Martin Luther King Jr. case, there is the inevitability of a thousand tactics to accomplish one single end, and it is reliant upon you whether you go and achieve the ends through honorable means or immoral means.

To close, there are numerous situations where the means legitimize the ends. However, with the moral rules and morals sheets set up, the members are, as a general rule, appropriately ensured. In the present case scenario, I am against harming others to research them, but if the proper informed consent is taken, minimal risk is maintained, and everything is done without hurting others, then there is no harm in it. Moreover, if researchers and experimenters are finding new drugs and medications without harming others, then this is, of course, a greater good.

And clearly, the ends do not justify the means.

References

Cote, S., Piff, P. K., & Willer, R. (2013). For whom do the ends justify the means? Social class and utilitarian moral judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(3), 490-503.

Dashner, J. (2015). *The Death Cure “The Ends Justify the Means”: Utilitarianism and Trolley Problems*. Retrieved from

<http://www.gradesaver.com/the-death-cure/study-guide/the-ends-justify-the-means-utilitarianism-and->

trolley-problems

Fyfe, A. (2013). Do the ends justify the means. Retrived from
<http://atheistethicist.blogspot.com/2008/12/do-ends-justify-means.html>

Herring, J. (2016). *Medical Law and Ethics*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Lederman, N.G. & Lederman, J.S. (2016). Do the Ends Justify the Means? Good Question. But What Happens When the Means Become the Ends? *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 27, 131.