

**Utilitarianism gives a more effective way to spread moral than Kantianism**

Johan S. Farfan

Salt Lake Community College

Introduction to Philosophy 1000

March 28th, 2019

Brandon Bowen

## **Ethical Theories**

Moral laws are difficult to define, something people can hardly agree on. The problem is everyone around the world has a different idea based on their culture and religions. There are some principles in moral that are universal in some way, they are present in almost every culture. Not to kill is an easy example, it can be considered universal at least in religions which happen to be the base of most moral rules on earth.

Not every ethical principle has been founded on religions though. Most philosophers and recognized intellectuals in history -regardless their metaphysical beliefs- had a version of what is good and what is wrong, a more thoughtful view instead of a heavenly mandate. Two main currents try to give a guide on morals, how to behave contemplating the possible variants.

Studying Kant's moral theory versus Utilitarianism it can be demonstrated that Utilitarianism gives a more effective way to spread moral than Kantianism.

### **Kant's Theory**

Immanuel Kant's wanted to reform the old view of morality coming from the will and mandate of God, he had a more rational perspective on it. Kant developed his theories having in mind a universal application of moral because having a religious concept of it leads to any kind of misconceptions and different interpretations.

In order to better understand Kant's theory it's convenient to mention how he categorizes behavior. **Hypothetical Imperatives** are the things that we do to satisfy our needs, something

that people do to obtain something they want. The **Categorical Imperatives** are the ethical part of our actions.

Categorical Imperatives are duties, self principles that should not be violated regardless any needs or desires. Kant highlighted how this moral is rational, all the formulations that come from the categorical imperative are deductible by intellect.

- Universalizability: this is, acting in a way so the principles you're using can be applied to similar situations without any contradictions -remember the rational part of Kant's moral.
- Humanity as an end in itself: any rational being cannot be used as a mere mean -or as a thing for your own benefit, instead they should be treated as an end.
- Formula of Autonomy: human beings are rational, everyone has an individual will. This principle states that everyone's autonomy should be respected.
- Kingdom of Ends: the last formulation refers to how a community assimilates a maxim -ethical principles, besides each individual have duties for the whole community, such maxims are to be taken as laws to govern each individual without treating anyone as a mere mean.

### **Bentham and Mill Utilitarianism**

Utilitarianism was officially proposed by Jeremy Bentham and John S. Mill in the 18th century, it has its background on Epicurean philosophy. This moral theory simply states that our

actions should go towards the maximum possible benefit they could produce. This can be translated in the maximum happiness, the maximum well being or even pleasure.

This doesn't mean it is an individualist or selfish philosophy, it also states that the maximum outcome -or benefits- of any action is considered towards the party involved, so it's definitely a moral theory. Kantians are supposed to put global interest over their own interest before acting.

### **Is there an Ultimate Moral Theory?**

To start, both of these standards of moral behavior try to set their bases in what is right to do. They have different paths because terms like "good" and "rightness" are abstract. Not everyone would consider something as "good" if you start asking different individuals, whom might have their thoughts in their own interest, interests of their party, uncertainty of outcomes and so on.

Kantianism doesn't care about forecasting if every action that is based on the purest moral will have a good end, it sort of assumes that just acting morally is not only the best to do but it will also bring the best end. Has every ethical action a positive outcome? A worthy end? Another question comes if the outcome was leaned to the worst scenario, was the initial moral action "good"?

Utilitarianism has a slight psychological advantage over Kantianism, it might be more predictable in non complex situations which ends up feeling more rewarding. This effect happens

due to our own ego. Yes, any of those theories aren't founded on ego, Kantianism puts moral over ego and Utilitarianism demands to consider collective interest over our interests -ego-, but certainly our ego will ever be there.

Why does our ego matters in morals anyways? Our moral is not something that we can set like a machine from utilitarian to kantian or just turn it off, and everything will turn out exactly as we set it. Because our ego, our emotions are a random variable affecting our behavior. If something goes out in a good way after our moral decision we'll feel protagonism, there's a mental reward on that and an incentive to keep doing what is right for the most part of the party.

Kantianism is not impossible but harder to execute in a constant manner. It is possible that someone whom has been trying to stick with pure rational moral without evaluating variables and outcomes starts to feel wasted after a succession of shortcomings.

Let's suppose that you're involved in a situation where the top most moral option is not a choice, what would you do? Would you take the highest morally available choice over the wellness of a party? That's probably the most evident difference -in a radical example- between those theories, and another example of how the meaning of "good" can be relative to the eyes of whom analyze it.

Going deeper in a dissection of Kantianism versus Utilitarianism, What is the value of moral if it doesn't affect our surroundings? What actually really matters, people. Kantians might have the power of influencing others giving their behavior as a testimony of their moral excellence, but it doesn't go beyond that. Before thinking about how utilitarians would have an

effect on others, let's keep in mind that not everyone is influenced by the same kind of examples or testimonials.

Utilitarians would also have the same quality of good influencers, because they also have a moral code. There's something else that they achieve, taking the population happiness over their own have a stronger effect on spreading moral and ethics. Utilitarians would give a most notorious example of moral, probably not always the best version of a moral behavior, but a more humanistic, factible and transmittable one.

## References

Wikipedia. Utilitarianism. Retrieved from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Utilitarianism>

Wikipedia. Kantian Ethics. Retrieved from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kantian\\_ethics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kantian_ethics)

CrashCourse (Nov 14, 2016). Kant & Categorical Imperatives: Crash Course Philosophy #35.

Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8bIys6JoEDw>

CrashCourse (Nov 21, 2016). Utilitarianism: Crash Course Philosophy #36. Retrieved from

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-a739VjqdSI>