Steveatkinson@gmail.com steveatkinson@...

Utilitarianism vs. Deontological Ethics in Modern Policy Decisions

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid:::3618:128533029

Submission Date

Feb 23, 2026, 10:02 AM GMT+5

Download Date

Feb 18, 2026, 10:27 AM GMT+5

File Name

Utilitarianism vs. Deontological Ethics in Modern Policy Decisions.pdf

File Size

135.3 KB

4 Pages

726 Words

4,056 Characters

0% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

Match Groups

0 Not Cited or Quoted 0%
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks

0 Missing Quotations 0%
Matches that are still very similar to source material

0 Missing Citation 0%
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation

0 Cited and Quoted 0%
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

0%   🌐 Internet sources

0%   📖 Publications

0%   👤 Submitted works (Student Papers)

Match Groups

0 Not Cited or Quoted 0%
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks

0 Missing Quotations 0%
Matches that are still very similar to source material

0 Missing Citation 0%
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation

0 Cited and Quoted 0%
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

0% 🌐 Internet sources

0% 📖 Publications

0% 👤 Submitted works (Student Papers)

1

Utilitarianism vs. Deontological Ethics in Modern Policy Decisions

Name

Institution Name

Course Name

Instructor Name

Date

Utilitarianism vs. Deontological Ethics in Modern Policy Decisions

Deontological and utilitarian ethics are two opposite normative theories that significantly influence current policymaking, particularly in situations where moral trade-offs are inevitable. Based on the philosophical tradition of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, utilitarianism considers an action according to its effects to maximize the overall well-being or happiness of the least number of people. On the other hand, deontological ethics, which is a form based on the works of Immanuel Kant, evaluates the morality of actions by the rule of observing duties and principles regardless of consequences (Iyioke, 2024). These incompatible standards result in different decision-making logics of policy design and, in turn, implementation, which provide policymakers with conflicting prescriptions about what is seen as ethical action. Modern policy consists of utilitarianism and deontological ethics, which focus on the welfare of the collective and moral obligations due to obligations to the populace, respectively, necessitating an ethical balance approach that incorporates outcomes with rights to ensure that difficult issues impacting society are effectively overcome.

One of the strengths of utilitarianism in policymaking is the focus on the wider benefit of society. Many modern cost-benefit analyses employ utilitarian reasoning to guide popular decisions in medical care, environmental policies, and the distribution of resources with an aim of maximizing the total social utility. Utilitarian reasoning is frequently found to justify policies in the field of public health according to which scarce medical resources, such as vaccines or hospital beds, should be allocated to the policies that achieve the highest number of lives saved or life-years, respectively (Patrão Neves, 2022). This methodology can explain the justification of the policies that ensure aggregate benefits rather than rigidly following the rules, so that flexibility and pragmatism are applied in a crisis when results matter.

Nevertheless, the emphasis on aggregate outcomes poses severe ethical issues to utilitarianism. According to critics, the maximization of the welfare of the majority can involve a

serious violation of the rights or interests of minorities, thus compromising the principles of justice and individual dignity (Dano, 2022). In policymaking, the issue is clearer in the case of environmental justice, where, in utilitarian analyses of cost-benefit, one can put a discount on how many of the vulnerable population bear the costs to achieve net benefits to society. These situations exemplify how utilitarianism can be used to justify morally dubious trade-offs that are ethically counterintuitive to its justifications of fairness and human rights.

Conversely, deontological ethics predicts the moral importance of obligations, rights, and principles irrespective of the outcomes. In administration, this direction safeguards the entitlements of individuals and demands inviolability of a sequence of moral regulations, like the laws against discrimination or coercion, when manipulation of the regulations could result in greater advantages to the group. Deontological reasoning, therefore, frequently supports international human-rights systems and the law, which opposes the outcome-driven compromises at the cost of fundamental rights, in that certain actions ought not to be undertaken.

Nevertheless, deontological rigidity may hinder proper policy reactions in complicated real-world conditions. Even during crises, which usually move quickly, like the one in the illness of a population, rigid adherence to responsibility or principle can hold interventions that could save numerous lives to embarrass any morality with the helplessness of pragmatism (Tseng & Wang, 2021). This conflict is particularly acute when the utilitarian interests of staffing to relocate employees in and out of facilities collide with the deontological interests of staffing to the individual autonomy and non-maleficence, which exemplifies that moral obligations may at times limit the effectiveness of responses.

However, despite such strengths and weaknesses, modern scholars are increasingly meant to see integrative or pluralistic ways of approaching policy ethics that integrate the observations of the two systems. Instead of giving precedence to one theory, these hybrid models prompt policymakers to both factor in consequences and moral responsibilities, thus producing policies

that are not only outcome effective but also allow them to be ethically held to account (Tseng & Wang, 2021). In practice, this may mean procedural protection mechanisms that guarantee transparency and protection of rights in otherwise utilitarian cost-benefit approaches.

In conclusion, utilitarian and deontological ethics provide alternative yet complementary approaches to considering a contemporary policy decision. Outcome-based logic of utilitarianism can be very useful in fostering the common good, but it can also underestimate the significance of individual rights, whereas deontological ethics can guarantee the strict adherence to the obligations at the expense of practical flexibility. An ethical policy orientation is a delicate way to acknowledge the value of both theories as well as their shortcomings and aims to reconcile social well-being with embracing the fundamental moral values.