


UTILITARIANISM PART 2

PROBLEMS WITH BENTHAM'S UTILITARIANISM


THE EMPIRICAL REQUIREMENT

The emphasis on observation to decide which pleasures are worth pursuing lands Bentham's Utilitarianism into a difficulty. He must accept that whatever people find pleasurable, they must pursue, even if such pleasures seem disagreeable.



MILL'S IMPROVEMENTS


JOHN STUART MILL [1806 - 1873]



QUALITY AS WELL AS QUANTITY OF PLEASURES


What's wrong with Bentham's ethics is it only accounts for the quantity of pleasures, not their quality. And because of this, Bentham fails to account for 'higher' pleasures.

PLEASURE OF SOCRATES OR PLEASURE OF THE PIG?



“It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied, better to be a Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. And if the fool, or the pig, is of a different opinion, it is because they only know their own side of the question. The other party to the comparison knows both sides.”

HOW TO DECIDE WHICH PLEASURE IS HIGHER?



“Of two pleasures, if there be one to which all or almost all who have experience of both give a decided preference, irrespective of any feeling of moral obligation to prefer it, that is the more desirable pleasure.”


DIFFICULTIES WITHIN UTILITARIANISM

UTILITARIANISM IS TOO DEMANDING


MILL'S REPLY

*But this is to mistake the very meaning of a standard of morals, and to confound the rule of action with the motive of it. It is the business of ethics to tell us what are our duties, or by what test we may know them; but no system of ethics requires that the sole motive of all we do shall be a **feeling of duty**; on the contrary, ninety-nine hundredths of all our actions **are done from other motives, and rightly so done, if the rule of duty does not condemn them.***

– John Stuart Mill




¶ INTENTION VS MOTIVE



The morality of the action depends entirely upon the intention – that is, upon what the agent WILLS to do. But the motive, that is, the feeling which makes him will so to do, when it makes no difference in the act, makes none in the morality.

¶ SUPEREROGATORY ACTS

SACRIFICE



[Utilitarianism] only refuses to admit that the sacrifice is itself a good. A sacrifice which does not increase, or tend to increase, the sum total of happiness, it considers as wasted. The only self-renunciation which it applauds, is devotion to the happiness, or to some of the means of happiness, of others; either of mankind collectively, or of individuals within the limits imposed by the collective interests of mankind.

THE IMPARTIALITY CLAUSE

Utilitarianism requires absolute impartiality. But such impartiality can result in difficult to make decisions.

PROBLEMS

MILL BEGS THE QUESTION

If we ask how Mill knows he/she is not competent to judge, Mill can only say, because that person chose the “wrong” kind of pleasures. In other words, Mill has assumed all along that the **intellectual pleasures** are superior and therefore preferable.

THE ISSUE OF JUSTICE

