

# ETHICS

## Contemporary Readings

Edited by

Harry J.Gensler, Earl W.Spurgin, and James  
C.Swindal

 Routledge  
Taylor & Francis Group

NEW YORK AND LONDON

First published 2004  
by Routledge  
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Simultaneously published in the UK  
by Routledge  
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group*

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s collection of thousands of eBooks please go to [www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk](http://www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk).”

Editorial matter © 2004 Harry J.Gensler, Earl W.Spurgin,  
and James C.Swindal. Original articles © the contributors.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*  
A catalog record for this book has been requested

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0-203-49566-7 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-56975-X (Adobe eReader Format)  
ISBN 0-415-25680-1 (hbk)  
ISBN 0-415-25681-x (pbk)

# JOHN STUART MILL

## Utilitarianism

John Stuart Mill, a British philosopher who lived from 1806 to 1873, has had a great influence on contemporary moral and political philosophy. So we thought it helpful to include excerpts from his *Utilitarianism*. His other writings include *On Liberty*, *Considerations on Representative Government*, and *The Subjection of Women*.

Mill defends a consequentialist ethics. He argues that the rightness or wrongness of an act is determined only by its consequences—more specifically, by whether it maximizes happiness.

As you read the selection, ask yourself whether acts should be evaluated by consequences alone. Could an act ever be wrong if it produced the best consequences possible under the circumstances? If you are familiar with Kant's theory, ask yourself how it differs from Mill's and which of the two seems better.

### The greatest happiness principle

Utility, or the Greatest Happiness Principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain and the privation of pleasure. Pleasure, and freedom from pain, are the only things desirable as ends; and all desirable things are desirable either for the pleasure inherent in themselves, or as means to the promotion of pleasure and the prevention of pain.

Such a theory excites in many minds dislike. To suppose that life has no higher end than pleasure they designate as a doctrine worthy only of swine, to whom the followers of Epicurus were compared.

The Epicureans answered that it is the accusers who represent human nature in a degrading light, since they suppose human beings to be capable of no pleasures except those of which swine are capable. Humans have

faculties more elevated and do not regard anything as happiness which does not include their gratification.

Some kinds of pleasure are more desirable and valuable than others. If I am asked what I mean by quality in pleasures, or what makes one pleasure more valuable than another, there is but one answer. Of two pleasures, if there be one to which almost all who have experienced both give a preference, irrespective of any feeling of moral obligation, that is the more desirable pleasure. If one is, by those acquainted with both, placed above the other, we are justified in ascribing to it a superiority in quality.

Those equally capable of appreciating and enjoying both, do give a marked preference to their higher faculties. Few human creatures would consent to be changed into a lower animal for a promise of its pleasures. A being of higher faculties requires more to make him happy and is capable of more acute suffering; but he can never wish to sink into what he feels to be a lower grade of existence.

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

Many capable of the higher pleasures, under the influence of temptation, postpone them to the lower. But this is compatible with an appreciation of the intrinsic superiority of the higher. Men often, from infirmity of character, make their election for the nearer good. They pursue sensual indulgences to the injury of health, aware that health is the greater good.

From the verdict of competent judges, there can be no appeal. There is no other tribunal, even on the question of quantity. What means are there of determining which is the acutest of two pains, except the feelings and judgment of the experienced?

### The good of everyone

The utilitarian standard is not the agent's greatest happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness altogether.

The ultimate end is an existence exempt as far as possible from pain, and as rich as possible in enjoyments, in quantity and quality. The standard of morality may be defined as the rules for human conduct, by the observance of which an existence such as has been described might be, to the greatest extent possible, secured to all mankind; and not to them only, but to the whole sentient creation.

The utilitarian morality recognizes in human beings the power of sacrificing their own greatest good for the good of others. It only refuses

to admit that sacrifice is in itself a good. A sacrifice which does not increase the sum total of happiness, it considers as wasted.

The happiness which forms the utilitarian standard is not the agent's own happiness, but that of all concerned. As between his own happiness and that of others, utilitarianism requires him to be as impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator. In the golden rule of Jesus, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of utility. To do as you would be done by, and to love your neighbor as yourself, constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality.

The objectors to utilitarianism sometimes say it is too much to require that people shall always act from the inducement of promoting the interests of society. But this is to confound the rule with the motive. The motive has nothing to do with the morality of the action, though much with the worth of the agent. He who saves a fellow creature from drowning does what is morally right, whether his motive be duty, or the hope of being paid.

Sometimes utility is called a godless doctrine. The question depends upon what idea we have formed of the moral character of the Deity. If God desires, above all things, the happiness of his creatures, and this was his purpose in their creation, utility is not only not a godless doctrine, but more profoundly religious than any other. A utilitarian who believes in the perfect goodness and wisdom of God, necessarily believes that whatever God has revealed on morality must fulfill the requirements of utility in a supreme degree,

Utility is often given the name Expediency, to contrast with Principle. But the Expedient generally means what is expedient for the agent himself or for some temporary purpose, but violates the greater good. The Expedient in this sense is hurtful. It would often be expedient to tell a lie. But the cultivation of a sensitive feeling on veracity is very useful. The violation, for a present advantage, of such a rule is not expedient. Yet even this sacred rule admits of exceptions, as when the withholding of information from a malefactor would prevent evil, and this can only be effected by denial. The principle of utility can weigh these conflicting utilities against one another.

### The proof of the principle

The utilitarian doctrine is that happiness is desirable, and the only thing desirable, as an end; all other things being only desirable as means to that end.

The only proof that an object is visible is that people see it. The only proof that a sound is audible is that people hear it. In like manner, the sole evidence that anything is desirable is that people desire it. If the end which the utilitarian doctrine proposes were not, in theory and in

practice, acknowledged to be an end, nothing could ever convince any person that it was so. No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person, so far as he believes it to be attainable, desires his own happiness. This, being a fact, we have not only all the proof which the case admits of, but all which it is possible to require, that happiness is a good, that each person's happiness is a good to that person, and the general happiness, therefore, a good to the aggregate of all persons. Happiness has made out its title as one of the ends of conduct and criteria of morality.

But it has not proved itself to be the sole criterion. To do that, it would need to show, not only that people desire happiness, but that they never desire anything else. Now they seem to desire things distinguished from happiness, for example, virtue and the absence of vice. And hence the opponents of the utilitarian standard infer that there are other ends of human action besides happiness, and that happiness is not the sole standard.

Utilitarianism maintains that virtue is to be desired, disinterestedly, for itself. The mind is not in the state most conducive to the general happiness, unless it loves virtue as a thing desirable in itself. The ingredients of happiness are various, and each of them is desirable in itself. Virtue, according to the utilitarian doctrine, is not originally part of the end, but it can become so.

There is nothing originally more desirable about money than about any heap of pebbles. Its worth is solely that of the things which it will buy. Yet money is, in many cases, desired for itself; the desire to possess it is often stronger than the desire to use it. From being a means to happiness, it has come to be a principal ingredient of the individual's conception of happiness. The person thinks he would be made happy by its mere possession. It is included in his happiness.

Virtue is a good of this description. And with this difference between it and the love of money—that there is nothing which makes a person so much a blessing to others as the cultivation of the disinterested love of virtue. The utilitarian standard, while it approves other acquired desires, up to the point where they would be more injurious to the general happiness than promoting of it, requires the cultivation of the love of virtue to the greatest strength possible, as being above all things important to the general happiness.

So there is nothing desired except happiness. Whatever is desired otherwise than as a means to some end beyond itself, is desired as a part of happiness. Those who desire virtue for its own sake desire it either because the consciousness of it is a pleasure, or because the consciousness of being without it is a pain, or for both reasons united.

We have now an answer to the question, of what sort of proof the principle of utility is susceptible. If human nature is so constituted as to

desire nothing which is not either a part of happiness or a means of happiness—we can have no other proof, and we require no other, that these are the only things desirable. If so, happiness is the sole end of human action, and the promotion of it the test to judge of human conduct.

Whether this is so can only be determined by observation. This evidence will declare that desiring a thing and finding it pleasant, aversion to it and thinking of it as painful, are two different modes of naming the same psychological fact; to think of an object as desirable (unless for the sake of its consequences) and to think of it as pleasant are one and the same thing.

But if this doctrine be true, the principle of utility is proved. Whether it is so or not must now be left to the consideration of the thoughtful reader.

### Study questions

- 1 Formulate the greatest happiness principle. Use an example to illustrate how it works.
- 2 How does Mill respond to those who say that his view is worthy only of swine?
- 3 On Mill's view, are mental pleasures higher because they contain more pleasure? How do we decide which pleasures are superior?
- 4 Can some people experience both higher and lower pleasures and yet prefer the lower pleasures?
- 5 Whose happiness are we to consider when applying the greatest happiness principle?
- 6 Under what conditions should we perform self-sacrificing acts?
- 7 Do the golden rule and the "Love your neighbor" principle conflict with utilitarianism?
- 8 Must all our actions be motivated by the goal of promoting the good of society?
- 9 How does Mill respond to the charge that utilitarianism is a "godless" doctrine of "mere expediency"?
- 10 How does Mill argue that (the general) happiness and it alone is desirable as an ultimate end?
- 11 Is virtue desired only as a means to pleasure?
- 12 How are these three related: "I desire X for its own sake," "I find X desirable for its own sake," and "I regard X as pleasant"?

### For further study

This selection has excerpts, sometimes simplified in wording, from the public domain version of John Stuart Mill's 1863 *Utilitarianism*. For an

important opposing view, see Immanuel Kant's 1789 *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, edited by H.J.Paton (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1948). Harry Gensier's *Ethics: A Contemporary Introduction* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998) examines consequentialism in Chapter 10.

Related readings from this anthology include Singer and Smart (who defend utilitarianism); Finnis, Kant, Rawls, Ross, Williams, and O'Neill (who oppose it); Brandt (who defends rule utilitarianism); and Nagel and Slote (who challenge Mill's claim that we need to consider everyone's happiness on an equal basis).



# J.J.C.SMART

## Defending Utilitarianism

J.J.C.Smart, an Australian philosopher born in 1920, works in ethics and philosophy of science. His *Philosophy and Scientific Realism* defended a physicalist view of mind. This present selection is taken from his defense of utilitarianism in *Utilitarianism: For and Against*, co-authored with Bernard Williams.

After distinguishing various types of utilitarianism, Smart opts for actutilitarianism. He hopes that our widely shared desires to promote everyone's happiness may lead others to become act-utilitarians too.

As you read the selection, note the different types of utilitarianism. Do you find Smart's argument for act- over rule-utilitarianism convincing? Ought consequences alone to determine whether individual acts are right or wrong? Should other factors be considered?

### Method

Act-utilitarianism is the view that the rightness of an action depends only on the total goodness or badness of its consequences, i.e. on the effect on the welfare of all human beings (or perhaps all sentient beings). The best exposition of act-utilitarianism is Sidgwick's *Methods of Ethics*, but Sidgwick stated it within the framework of a cognitivist<sup>1</sup> metaethics which supposed that act-utilitarian principles could be known to be true by intellectual intuition. I reject Sidgwick's metaethics for familiar reasons, and will assume the truth of some such "noncognitivist" analysis as that of Hare's *Language of Morals*, or possibly that of D.H. Monro in his *Empiricism and Ethics*. Both imply that ultimate ethical principles depend on attitudes or feelings. In adopting such a metaethics, I renounce the attempt to *prove* the act-utilitarian system. I shall be concerned with stating it in a form which may appear persuasive to some people, and to show how it may be defended against objections.

In setting up a system of normative ethics, the utilitarian must appeal to ultimate attitudes which he holds in common with those whom he is addressing. The sentiment to which he appeals is generalized benevolence, the disposition to seek happiness or good consequences for all mankind, or perhaps for all sentient beings. His audience may not initially be in agreement with the utilitarian position. For example, they may have a propensity to obey the rules of some traditional moral system into which they have been indoctrinated in youth. Nevertheless the utilitarian will have some hope of persuading the audience to agree with his system of normative ethics. He can appeal to the sentiment of generalized benevolence, which is surely present in any group with whom it is profitable to discuss ethical questions. He may be able to convince some people that their previous disposition to accept non-utilitarian principles was due to conceptual confusions. He will not be able to convince everybody, but that is not an objection. It may well be that there is no ethical system which appeals to all people.

#### Act—and rule-utilitarianism

I am here concerned to defend act-utilitarianism. Act-utilitarianism is to be contrasted with rule-utilitarianism. Act-utilitarianism is the view that the rightness of an action is to be judged by the consequences, good or bad, of the action itself. Rule-utilitarianism is the view that the rightness of an action is to be judged by the goodness and badness of the consequences of a rule that everyone should perform the action in like circumstances.

I have argued elsewhere the objections to rule-utilitarianism. Briefly they boil down to the accusation of rule worship: the rule-utilitarian advocates his principle because he is ultimately concerned with human happiness: why then should he advocate abiding by a rule when he knows that it will not in the present case be beneficial to abide by it? To refuse to break a rule in cases in which it is not beneficial to obey it seems irrational and to be a case of rule worship.

#### Hedonistic and non-hedonistic utilitarianism

An act-utilitarian judges the rightness of actions by the goodness and badness of their consequences. But is he to judge the goodness and badness of consequences solely by their pleasantness and unpleasantness? Bentham, who thought that quantity of pleasure being equal, the experience of playing pushpin was as good as that of reading poetry, could be classified as a hedonistic act-utilitarian. Moore, who believed that some states of mind, such as knowledge, had intrinsic value independent of their pleasantness, can be called an ideal utilitarian. Mill

seemed to occupy an intermediate position. He held that there are higher and lower pleasures. This seems to imply that pleasure is a necessary condition for goodness but that goodness depends on other qualities of experience than pleasantness and unpleasantness. I propose to call Mill a quasi-ideal utilitarian.

The utilitarian addresses himself to people who likely agree with him as to what consequences are good ones, but who disagree that what we ought to do is to produce the best consequences. The difference between ideal and hedonistic utilitarianism in most cases will not lead to disagreement about what ought to be done.

Let us consider Mill's contention that it is "better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied." A hedonistic utilitarian, like Bentham, might agree with Mill in preferring the experiences of discontented philosophers to those of contented fools. His preference for the philosopher's state of mind, however, would not be an *intrinsic* one. He would say that the discontented philosopher is useful in society and that the existence of Socrates is responsible for an improvement in the lot of humanity generally.

Again, a man who enjoys pushpin is likely eventually to become bored with it, whereas the man who enjoys poetry is likely to retain this interest throughout his life. Moreover reading poetry may develop imagination and sensitivity, and so as a result a man may be able to do more for the happiness of others than if he had played pushpin and let his brain deteriorate. In short, both for the man immediately concerned and for others, the pleasures of poetry are, to use Bentham's word, more *fecund* than those of pushpin.

#### Average and total happiness

Another disagreement can arise over whether we should try to maximize the *average* happiness or the *total* happiness. I have not yet elucidated the concept of total happiness, and you may regard it as a suspect notion. But for present purposes I shall put it in this way: Would you be quite indifferent between (a) a universe containing one million happy sentient beings, all equally happy, and (b) a universe containing two million happy beings? Or would you, as a humane and sympathetic person, give a preference to the second universe? I myself feel a preference for the second universe. But if someone feels the other way I do not know how to argue with him.

This disagreement might have practical relevance. It might be important in discussions of birth control. But in most cases the difference will not lead to disagreement in practice. For in most cases the most effective way to increase the total happiness is to increase the average happiness, and vice versa.

### Rightness of actions

I shall now state the act-utilitarian doctrine. For simplicity of exposition I shall put it forward in a hedonistic form. If anyone values states of mind such as knowledge independently of their pleasurable or painfulness he can make appropriate verbal alterations to convert it from hedonistic to ideal utilitarianism.

Let us say, then, that the only reason for performing an action *A* rather than an alternative action *B* is that doing *A* will make mankind (or, perhaps, all sentient beings) happier than will doing *B*. This is so simple and natural a doctrine that we can expect that many readers will have some propensity to agree. For I am talking, as I said earlier, to sympathetic and benevolent men, that is, to men who desire the happiness of mankind. Since they have a favorable attitude to the general happiness, surely they have a tendency to submit to an ultimate moral principle which expresses this attitude. It is possible, then, that many sympathetic and benevolent people depart from a utilitarian ethical principle only under the stress of tradition, of superstition, or of unsound philosophical reasoning.

The utilitarian's ultimate moral principle, let it be remembered, expresses the sentiment not of altruism but of benevolence, the agent counting himself neither more nor less than any other person.

Suppose we could predict the future consequences of actions with certainty. In order to help someone to decide whether to do *A* or to do *B* we could say to him: "Envisage the total consequences of *A*, and think them over carefully and imaginatively. Now envisage the total consequences of *B*, and think them over. As a benevolent and humane man, and thinking of yourself just as one man among others, would you prefer the consequences of *A* or those of *B*?" That is, we are asking for a comparison of one (present and future) *total* situation with another (present and future) *total* situation. So far we are not asking for a *summation* or *calculation* of pleasures or happiness. We are asking only for a comparison of total situations. And it seems clear that we can frequently make such a comparison and say that one total situation is better than another.

When we look at our ordinary decisions, we see that most people think that we can weigh up probabilities and advantages. A man deciding whether to migrate to a tropical country may well say to himself, for example, that he can expect a pleasanter life for himself and his family in that country, unless there is a change in the system of government there, which is not likely, or unless one of his children catches an epidemic disease, which is perhaps more likely, and so on, and thinking over all these advantages and disadvantages and probabilities and

improbabilities he may come out with the statement that on the whole it seems preferable for him to go there.

Maybe we have not any precise methods for deciding what to do, but then our imprecise methods must serve.

### The place of rules

The utilitarian position is here put forward as a criterion of rational choice. We may choose to habituate ourselves to behave in accordance with certain rules, such as to keep promises, in the belief that behaving in accordance with these rules is generally optimific, and in the knowledge that we often do not have time to work out pros and cons. The act-utilitarian will regard these rules as mere rules of thumb and will use them only as rough guides. He acts in accordance with rules when there is no time to think. When he has to think what to do, then there is a question of deliberation or choice, and it is for such situations that the utilitarian criterion is intended.

There is no inconsistency in an act-utilitarian's schooling himself to act, in normal circumstances, habitually and in accordance with rules. He knows that we would go mad if we went in detail into the probable consequences of keeping or not keeping every trivial promise: we will do the most good if we habituate ourselves to keep promises in all normal situations. Moreover he may suspect that on some occasions personal bias may prevent him from reasoning in a correct utilitarian fashion. If he trusts to the accepted rules he is more likely to act in the way that an unbiased act-utilitarian would recommend than if he tried to evaluate the consequences himself.

This is not the law worship of the rule-utilitarian, who would say that we ought to keep to a rule that is the most generally optimific, even though we *knew* that obeying it in this instance would have bad consequences.

Nor is this utilitarian doctrine incompatible with a recognition of the importance of warm and spontaneous expressions of emotion. Consider a case in which a man sees that his wife is tired, and from a spontaneous feeling of affection he offers to wash the dishes. Does utilitarianism imply that he should have stopped to calculate the various consequences of his different possible courses of action? Certainly not. This would make married life a misery and the utilitarian knows well as a rule of thumb that on occasions of this sort it is best to act spontaneously and without calculation. There are good utilitarian reasons why we should cultivate in ourselves the tendency to certain types of warm and spontaneous feeling.

### Some further examples

We are here considering utilitarianism as a *normative* system. The fact that it has consequences which conflict with some of our particular moral judgments need not be decisive against it. The utilitarian can contend that since his principle rests on something so simple and natural as generalized benevolence it is more securely founded than our particular feelings, which may be subtly distorted by traditional and uncritical ethical thinking.

The chief argument in favor of utilitarianism has been that any deontological [rule-based] ethics will always, on some occasions, lead to misery that could, on utilitarian principles, have been prevented. Thus if the deontologist says that promises always should be kept (or even if, like Ross, he says that there is a *prima facie* duty to keep them) we may confront him with a situation like the well-known "desert island promise": I have promised a dying man on a desert island, from which subsequently I alone am rescued, to give his hoard of gold to the South Australian Jockey Club. On my return I give it to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which badly needs it for a new X-ray machine. Could anybody deny that I had done rightly without being open to the charge of heartlessness? (Remember that the promise was known only to me, and so my action will not weaken the general confidence in the social institution of promising.) Think of the persons dying of painful tumors who could have been saved by the desert island gold!

Normally the utilitarian is able to assume that the remote effects of his actions tend rapidly to zero, like the ripples on a pond after a stone has been thrown into it. Suppose that a man is deciding whether to seduce his neighbor's wife. On utilitarian grounds it seems obvious that such an act would be wrong, for the unhappiness which it is likely to cause in the short term will be obvious. The man need not consider the possibility that one of his remote descendants, if he seduces the woman, will be a great benefactor of the human race. Such a possibility is not that improbable, considering the number of descendants after many generations, but it is no more probable than that one of his remote descendants will do great harm, or that one from a more legitimate union would benefit the human race. It seems plausible that the long-term probable benefits and costs of his alternative actions are likely to be negligible or to cancel one another out.

### Killing the innocent

It is not difficult to show that utilitarianism could, in exceptional circumstances, have horrible consequences. H.J. McCloskey has considered such a case.<sup>2</sup> Suppose that the sheriff of a small town can

prevent serious riots (in which hundreds of people will be killed) only by "framing" and executing (as a scapegoat) an innocent man. In actual cases of this sort the utilitarian will usually be able to agree with our normal moral feelings. He will point out that there would be some possibility of the sheriff's dishonesty being found out, with consequent weakening of confidence and respect for law and order in the community, the consequences of which would be far worse even than the painful deaths of hundreds of citizens. But as McCloskey is ready to point out, the case can be presented in such a way that these objections do not apply. For example, it can be imagined that the sheriff could have first-rate empirical evidence that he will not be found out. Someone like McCloskey can always strengthen his story to the point that we would have to admit that if utilitarianism is correct, then the sheriff must frame the innocent man.

Now though a utilitarian might argue that it is empirically unlikely that some such situation would ever occur, McCloskey will point out that it is *logically* possible that such a situation will arise. If the utilitarian rejects the unjust act he is giving up his utilitarianism. McCloskey remarks: "As far as I know, only J.J.C.Smart among the contemporary utilitarians is happy to adopt this 'solution.'" Here I must lodge a mild protest. McCloskey's use of the word "happy" makes me look reprehensible. Even in my most utilitarian moods I am not *happy* about this consequence of utilitarianism. Nevertheless, however unhappy about it he may be, the utilitarian must admit that he might find himself in circumstances where he ought to be unjust. Let us hope that this is a logical possibility and not a factual one.

No, I am not happy to draw the conclusion that McCloskey quite rightly says that the utilitarian must draw. But neither am I happy with the anti-utilitarian conclusion. For if a case *did* arise in which injustice was the lesser of two evils (in terms of human happiness and misery), then the anti-utilitarian conclusion is a very unpalatable one too, namely that in some circumstances one must choose the greater misery, perhaps the *very much* greater misery, such as that of hundreds of people suffering painful deaths.

Among possible options, utilitarianism does have its appeal. With its empirical attitude to means and ends it is congenial to the scientific temper and it has flexibility to deal with a changing world. This last consideration is, however, more self-recommendation than justification. For if flexibility is a recommendation, this is because of the utility of flexibility.

### Study questions

- 1 Does Smart believe in objective moral truths? How does he propose to defend utilitarianism?
- 2 Explain the difference between act- and rule-utilitarianism. Construct an example that illustrates this difference.
- 3 Why does Smart reject rule-utilitarianism?
- 4 How do hedonistic and ideal utilitarianism differ? Is there much difference between them in practice?
- 5 Why does Smart call Mill a “quasi-ideal” utilitarian?
- 6 How does Smart formulate and apply act-utilitarianism?
- 7 Explain why Smart thinks it is consistent for one who is an act-utilitarian to habituate oneself to follow certain rules.
- 8 Explain the objection to utilitarianism illustrated in McCloskey’s “sheriff” example. How does Smart respond to the objection?

### For further study

This selection has excerpts, sometimes simplified in wording, from John Jamieson Carswell Smart’s *Utilitarianism: For and Against* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), pages 4–5, 7, 9–10, 12–16, 27–8, 30–3, 39–40, 42–5, 56, 62, 64–5, and 69–73; this book was co-authored with Bernard Williams. Harry Gensler’s *Ethics: A Contemporary Introduction* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998) examines utilitarianism in Chapter 10.

Related readings in this anthology include Brandt, Mill, and Singer (who defend versions of utilitarianism); Finnis, O’Neill, Rawls, Ross, Slote, and Williams (who criticize utilitarianism); Hume (who also appeals to sympathetic feelings), and Hare (whose analysis of ethical terms Smart assumes).

### Notes

- 1 Smart uses the term “cognitivist” to refer to views that recognize objective moral truths and moral knowledge. Smart rejects such views.
- 2 H.J. McCloskey, “A note on utilitarian punishment,” *Mind* 72 (1963): 599. [Note from Smart]