

Aaron Lu

### Response to Keaton Whitehead's paper

If I understand your thesis correctly, the purpose of your paper is trying to prove that the way Utilitarianism is structured, it is insufficient to lead to the best possible outcomes all the time. And I agree with your notion here, I believe your argument is built on a fundamental misunderstanding of the Theory of Right Action. You describe here that Theory of Right Action in this example dictates that someone is morally obligated to choose the choice that immediately causes the most amount of net utility. Traditional Act Consequentialist Utilitarianism dictates that one should do the act that *directly* causes the best possible outcomes which I believe is different from performing the action that causes the best immediate consequences. To use your example, it can be argued by a utilitarian that option B of eating enough fish so that fish could be used in the best is just as much of a direct consequence of the action as option A and therefore would result in the best possible outcome. In which case Utilitarianism would need any additional cases negating your argument, which is what I believe John Mill would argue for based on the arguments he outlines in the reading assigned to us.

I'm still a little unclear of whether you are trying to reject the Theory of Right Action or you believe it should just be amended a little so that it does produce the best possible outcome each time, but either way I believe a better way of tackling the problem would be to appeal closer to rule consequentialism. Maybe, I'm just totally misunderstanding your paper, and this is in fact what you are trying to do, and if so, you should clarify the importance of rules in your thesis and make it a little more explicit in your conclusion. But if not, the beauty of rule consequentialism could provide a potentially better outcome than direct rule consequentialism, but at the cost of having some units of utility be completely unrecognized. This perfectly fits with the example that you have provided since it deals with the morality of an action when dependent on external factors such as whether or not other people fish more than ecologically sustainable amounts. This then places the moral responsibility on each individual as whether or not the best possible outcome be completely realized. Again, stated before, I believe that if we play the role of a benevolent dictator in this scenario, a Mill Utilitarian would still choose option B.

I also believe that there is potentially a lot more to be written on this subject, and an increase in length would help strengthen your paper. That being said, your abstract and introduction are a little gratuitous and I think it takes away from the set up to your thesis. There are a lot more counter examples to address and I believe that it would be beneficial to address more than one of them. A good way to structure your paper could be to split it up more in sections representing your argument and obvious objections, non-obvious objections, and then your response to non-obvious objections and the conclusion.