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 Harm From Terrorism

Harm is the physical injury or the mental injury. In some other cases, harm is something that is obtained when someone or something is hurt, broken, or generally damaged. For example, a person has suffered serious physical harm. It means that someone might have been injured. The term harm is usually associated with terrorism. The problem stated is about whether terrorism cause harm. The thought that terrorism causes harm, therefore, makes terrorism become morally wrong.

Terrorism, judging from its definition, has four generic wrong making. It threatens violence, causes terror; it coerces and uses an individual to perform terror. Terrorism first started at the French revolution as a way of reshaping both the society and the human nature. This was met by completely removing the old regime and conquering all the enemies of the revolutionary government. (p.269, Cahn) The term terrorism later took bad connotations from people. People related terrorism to abuse of power and to tyranny as the rule was based on fear. I stand in to agree that, the act of terrorism is morally wrong as it causes harm. The broadened argument that needs to be discussed is as follows:

1. If terrorism causes a total harm than other alternatives, then terrorism is morally wrong.
2. Terrorism causes a total harm than other alternatives.
3. Therefore, terrorism is morally wrong.

The above argument is a valid argument because it has been presented in proper modus ponens form. From the argument, the term terrorism is described as the use of the indiscriminate violence for achieving a certain goal intentionally. The goal can be a political, religious, or ideological aim. Different people to give a particular meaning can use this term. It can be seen as a bad or a good thing. It can be good meaning that it is useful at times; nevertheless, it can be expressed as bad due to its way of causing violence. The term “more total harm” as used in the argument brings the essence of the level of damage caused. The level it causes is compared to a high level. The term “morally wrong” as written in the argument refers to the fact that someone or something that is not in accord with the set standards of good conduct. For instance, terrorism is morally wrong, just like violence is not accepted in the society. Violence is not a right conduct.

 In the first argument, the theory of utilitarianism comes into this argument. This is because terrorism is considered wrong as it causes harm, which means people do not want to be hurt and they just need happiness. Utilitarian is based on the results of certain actions no matter the action is morally right or wrong. (p.271, Cahn) The argument is based on utilitarianism because the argument suggests that terrorism is wrong. People would not want terror because of its effect of causing harm than other alternatives. What’s more, it shows the effect is painful. The society will prefer other alternatives rather than terrorism. If the society prefers terrorism, the people will have much pain instead of happiness. Most people usually want to have happiness and pleasure rather than get involved into painful experience.

The second premise, which states “terrorism causes more harm than other alternatives”, explain the level of which terrorism is the poor alternative as it causes harm. For instance, when comparing two nations, one nation is influenced and the other nation is not in any case affected by terrorism. The results are that there would be several killings of people in the nation affected by terrorism due to violence’s while the other nation is living in peace with no killings. This comparison makes the statement true because terrorism is not preferred by any society because it causes harm.

When examining between terrorism and the level of harm is causes, it shows that the society will eventually prefer other alternatives than terrorism. This is due to the level of the pain expected from terrorism. This shows that the society fails to know that the advocates of the action of terrorism may not only bring the pain. Therefore, the cause of harm cannot lead the society’s actions if they do fully know the real consequences.

The society cannot know the future. Hence, they should not subject only that terrorism cause harm. For example, maybe the nation affected by terrorism might have used terrorism to remove the reign of a bad rule in the nation. This shows that the expectation of harm is eliminated. Therefore, it is not necessarily that terrorism is morally wrong as it causes harm. For example, one cannot just escape medication because it is painful but he/she should focus on the other result of getting well by enduring the pain.

Terrorism is the better choice than other alternatives. For instance, in the case where people use terrorism to remove a reign of poor performing government, based on the utilitarian theory, terrorism will provide a greater level of happiness than pain. This is due to the result that will be generated out of the action of terrorism. This is s good choice also because instead of people having pain because of the state of their government.

In the example of the individual undergoing medication, the results obtained from medication are good. It is that no matter which way gets employed to treat the person but eventually the results will be better. Hence, terrorism will be a good choice as it eventually brings happiness. The way might be different but the end will be similar. That is called happiness. The result of allowing terrorism is that there will be no harm but happiness.

From the objection that harm is not the real result of terrorism, the examples show that harm can also result in happiness. The objection will be right if the immediate result is taken into account but not the entire event. The objection will be false. This is because when a society prefers terrorism, they will not be sure of the happiness expected it may result in real harm.

Based on utilitarian alternative, happiness is the biggest result even when someone undergoes some pain. The existence of justice will undermine the happiness that people ever wanted. The law does not tolerate any act of terrorism and this will make terrorism cause a total harm.

Terrorism brings more harm because it involves more of force and violence. The three objection of premise two will therefore be false. This classifies terrorism as a cause of harm. For example, through the involvement of terrorism to take over power, the terrorism causes harm but not the willingness of happiness. This shows that since terrorism is the cause of harm, there is no way that terrorism will cause a happy end.

Terrorism is morally distinctive as it seeks to exploit violence in a way that it will bring social disorder. Therefore, there will be no case where it leads to happiness rather it causes harm. Because of this, the world will follow the fact that terrorism is morally wrong. There will be no existence of an argument of debating if terrorism is wrong or right.
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