

AN ETHICAL ARGUMENT FOR REPLACING HUMANS WITH MACHINES IN MEANINGLESS WORKPLACES.

Abstract

According to this research paper, work can be considered a prudential good, and thus contributes to well-being in a positive or negative manner under the following philosophical theories of well-being: Desire-Fulfillment Theories, Objective List Theories, and the Objective Goods Perfectionist theories of well-being. In this report I argue that meaningless work contributes negatively to well-being and that there is therefore an ethical argument to replace humans with machines in meaningless workplaces. I defend the lack of definition of meaningless work on the grounds that whatever the accepted construal of this notion is, it does not contribute to well-being. In terms of the paternalistic nature of my argument, I claim that under some circumstances, governments make decisions that may limit the autonomy of their citizens in one respect, to guarantee freedom in another respect, and I claim that the benefits of a moderate and limited amount of paternalism greatly outweigh its drawbacks. Finally, I discuss what types of work human beings are good at; not all meaningless work can be done by machines today.