

I have interpreted this question as “if you are trying to improve the quality of life for a majority, is it okay if inequality arises in the process?”. To this, the answer is not as simple as a yes or no. It all depends on the situation. However, as stated above, absolute inequality is not inevitable. There is always going to be someone who is unequal to another. If we take communism as example again, it cannot work properly in practice if everyone should be 100% equal, one of the reasons being that the people still need a leader, and this leader usually ends up being a dictator in these communistic countries, thus having more power, wealth etc. than the rest of the people.

If we return back to the question, I do believe that it is okay with inequality to a certain extent, meaning that if the inequality is for example that people who are rich have to pay much higher taxes than those who are not, it is okay because the taxes go back to the members of society. However, it can also not be okay with inequality for improving the quality of life for a vast majority. It all depends on who you count as the vast majority of people. If you are speaking of a majority of people which is men, and the inequality is that women are given less rights because it is ‘convenient’ and ‘improves quality of life’ for the vast majority (which is men), I do not think that it is okay.

So to conclude my discussion, I do believe that inequality to a certain extent is inevitable, and that complete equality in some fields (as mentioned) would not be good in the long run. I also think that inequality that arises when improving the quality of life for a majority of people is okay depending on the situation and what you define as a majority. It should only occur to benefit the people (higher taxes for some) and not to please someone’s own opinionated desires (men having more rights than women).