Why say that happiness rightly trumps justice when the two values conflict?

Because, say the Utilitarian’s, happiness is the only intrinsic, independent value. All other values – justice included – are valuable only because, only when, and only to the extent that, they contribute to happiness. So, in those rare cases where justice is not contributing to happiness, it has no value.

Opponents: Justice is itself an intrinsic value, independent of its effect on happiness.

In cases of conflict:

Justice should trump happiness (Kant & Others)

A judicious decision must be made as to which value outweighs the other in the particular circumstance (Ross and Others)

1. Immanuel Kant
   1. Deontologist
      1. Non-consequentialist
   2. Focus is on motives intentions, intentions, policies, etc – “the will” guiding the activity.
   3. It is our duty to obey the **Moral Law**.
      1. Moral Law
         1. Universal code of conduct binding on all **autonomous** beings – all persons.
         2. Autonomy - ‘Auto’ + ‘Nomos’
            1. Auto – self
            2. Self Rule/Law
            3. Means self directed / rational choosers / Capable of being, if not the authors always, but the endorsers of rules, guidelines, etc that govern our conduct
            4. Moral law is reason telling us what is good / bad.
            5. If you are addicted to something, you’re no longer autonomous. Example: Heroin addict
            6. You’re a slave to your own addiction
            7. It is our duty to obey the **categorical imperative**

The “one” command or “must” statement issued by reason and done so categorically than hypothetically/conditionally.