UNIT 8: UTILITARIANISM: IT'S KINDS

UNIT STRUCTURE

8.1 Learning Objectives

8.2Introduction

8.3 Hedonism and its kinds

8.4 Altruistic Hedonism or Utilitarianism

8.4.1 Gross or Quantitative Utilitarianism

8.4.2 Refined or Qualitative Utilitarianism

8.5 Rational utilitarianism of Sidgwick

8.6 Ideal Utilitarianism of Rashdall and Moore

8.7 Act, General and Rule Utilitarianism

8.8 Let us Sum Up

8.9 Further Reading

8.10 Answer to Check Your Progress

8.11 Model Questions

8.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to

- Define Utilitarianism
- Describe its various kinds
- Explain Gross Utilitarianism
- Explain Refined Utilitarianism
- Describe Act and Rule Utilitarianism
- Distinguish Gross and Refined Utilitarianism

8.2 INTRODUCTION

This unit introduces to you Utilitarianism as a moral standard. The trend of modern ethics is generally altruistic or universalistic. In recent times none maintains the egoistic system as sufficient theory of morality and also feels unhappy about the deontological theories. Therefore, the natural alternative is the teleological theory called utilitarianism. It is the theory which holds that the sole ultimate standard of right, wrong and obligation is the

principle of utility. It says that the moral end to be sought in all we do is the greatest possible balance of good over evil in the world as a whole. According to it, actions are to be judged according to their utility or usefulness as means for the promotion of general pleasure and prevention of general pain. The theory presupposes a developed capacity of sympathy or fellow-feeling which will impel one to promote the good of others and deter him from injustice to them. Bentham and Mill are the two chief exponents of his view. In recent times Sidgwick, Rashdall, and Moore propounded ideal utilitarianism which is bases on reason as moral faculty.

William K. Frankena in his book "Ethics" distinguishes three kinds of utilitarianism. Some utilitarians are hedonists, who equates good with happiness and happiness with pleasure and some are non-hedonists. The three kinds of utilitarianism mentioned by Frankena are Act utilitarianism, General utilitarianism, and Rule utilitarianism.

8.3 HEDONISM AND ITS KINDS

There are different theories regarding the nature of the ultimate moral standard. They may be divided into -legal and teleological theories. According to legal theories, a law either internal or external is the ultimate moral standard. According to teleological theories, some end or good of the self is the ultimate moral standard. The teleological theories may be of different types according to the difference in the conception of self. Hedonism, Rigorism or Rationalism, perfectionism or Eudaemonism are different teleological theories. Rationalism regards the realization of the purely rational self to the suppression of the sensuous self as the ultimate moral standard. Perfectionism holds that self realization is the ultimate moral standard. Hedonism is the doctrine according to which, hedone or pleasure is the ultimate standard of morality. According to this theory, we should judge an act as right or wrong according as it tends to produce happiness or misery. Hedonism is based on two assumption,- metaphysical and psychological assumption. Hedonism based on metaphysical assumption that the self is purely sensuous in nature and hedonism based on psychological assumption

that man naturally seeks pleasure and avoids pain.

According to ethical hedonism, we ought to seek pleasure. Ethical hedonism may assume two forms, viz., Egoistic and Altruistic Hedonism. Both Egoism and Altruism may be of two types, gross and refined. According to Egoistic Hedonism, pleasure of the individual is the moral standard. According to Altruistic Hedonism, the greatest happiness is the moral standard.



LET US KNOW

According to Utilitarianism, actions are to be judged according to their utility or usefulness as means for the promotion of general pleasure and prevention of general pain. Hedonism is the doctrine according to which, hedone or pleasure is the ultimate standard of morality.

8.4 ALTRUISTIC HEDONISM OR UTILITARIANISM

According to Utilitarianism or Altruistic Hedonism, universal or general happiness is the ultimate moral standard. It is to Hume, Bentham, Mill and Bain that we owe the substitution of general happiness for the happiness of the individual as the true end of life. As Bentham (1748-1832) and Mill (1806-1873) are recognized as the two most distinguished exponent of this doctrine, in this unit we have discussed the view of both Bentham and Mill separately. Both hold that, universal pleasure is the supreme end in morals, but Universalistic Hedonism supposes that that we can represent possible future pleasures of ourselves and others in idea, compare them in respect of value, choose beforehand the best and adopt our best actions so as to realize the best. In other words, it requires an estimation of values of future pleasures. Now the question arises by what standard are we to estimate values of pleasures? Bentham holds that the only standard of value is quantity. But J. S. Mill holds that the quality of pleasures should also be taken into account. This is the main ground of difference between the system of Bentham and

Mill. The theory of Bentham is called gross or quantitative utilitarianism and the theory of Mill is called refined or qualitative utilitarianism.

8.4.1 Gross or Quantitative Utilitarianism

According to Bentham, the value of pleasure consists entirely in the quantity of agreeable experience it gives. Like Aristeppus, Bentham also recognizes no qualitative distinction among pleasures. All pleasures whether physical and mental are alike. He holds that "Push pin is as good as poetry", if they are equal in quantity of pleasure they produce. Thus the only standard of valuation of pleasure is quantitative according to Bentham. But quantity takes different forms. It takes seven dimension of value, viz.,

(1) Intensity- One pleasure is more intense than the other and more intense pleasure is preferable to a less intense one.

(2) Duration- Of two pleasures otherwise equal, the more durable, will be the better.

(3) Proximity- An immediate pleasure is preferable to a remote one. Present should not be sacrificed to the future.

(4) Certainty- A certain pleasure is preferable to an uncertain one.

(5) Purity- A pleasure is pure when free from pain. Apure pleasure is to be preferred to an impure one which is mixed with pain.

(6) Fecundity- A pleasure has fecundity when it gives rise to a number of other pleasures. A fecund pleasure is preferable to a barren pleasure which does not give rise to other pleasures.

(7) Extent- A pleasure of greater extent, i.e., a pleasure which is enjoyable by a large number of persons is preferable to one of less extent.

The first six criteria, viz., intensity, duration, nearness, certainty, purity, and fruitfulness may be accepted by both egoistic and altruistic hedonism. Bentham, as an advocate of Altruism adds another criterion viz., extent

which means the number of persons who will be affected. He holds that we should be very careful to calculate the interests of the number of persons affected by an act. The interest of the community, he says, is the supreme end in morals. Thus, according to him, the lines of action that should be pursued or avoided by us are indicated by these dimensions taken together. His advice to us is, "Weigh pleasures weigh pains, and as the balance stands, will stand the question of right and wrong."

Bentham's utilitarianism may be called gross or sensualistic, because he does not admit qualitative differences among pleasure. Another characteristic of Bentham's philosophy is that it involves the doctrine of psychological hedonism. Though Bentham is an altruist and says that we should seek the happiness of others, yet he clearly states that we naturally seek our own happiness. The object of every rational being is to obtain the greatest portion of happiness for himself. Bentham holds that man is naturally egoistic. Bentham is of opinion that the word 'happiness' is not always appropriate, because it represents pleasure in an elevated form. If we take away pleasure and pain, 'happiness' will be reduced to an empty sound.

Bentham believes in hedonistic calculus. According to him we can weigh pleasure and pain and the question of right and wrong should be decided according as the balance stands. An action is right if it gives pleasure in excess over pain and wrong if it gives excess of pain over pleasure. Bentham gives purely hedonistic criterion of right and wrong. However in calculating pleasure and pains we take into consideration the seven dimensions of quantity of pleasure.

Bentham's utilitarianism is called gross or sensualistic altruism or utilitarianism .His view is gross as it does not recognize any qualitative difference among pleasure. Though he mentioned about 'purity' as dimension of pleasure, by it he means that pleasure which is unmixed with pain. His view is altruistic because he takes into account the extent of pleasures, .i.e., the number of persons affected by them. Bentham by including 'extent' as a dimension of pleasure introduces altruism into his doctrine. Though

Bentham is an advocate of altruistic hedonism, he clearly recognizes the natural egoism of man. Bentham explains this transition from egoism to altruism by means of four external sanctions-physical or natural, social, political, and religious. These four external sanctions are external pressures upon the individual so as to compel him to sacrifice his own interest to those of society. Thus, according to Bentham, the individual passes from egoism to altruism under the pressure of external sanctions.

Criticism: Bentham's theory is open to the following objections:

(1) Bentham, though an altruist, believes in psychological hedonism. So, his doctrine suffers from all the defects of psychological hedonism. According to psychological hedonism we naturally seek pleasure. But it is not true we desire pleasure. On the contrary, we seek the desired object, which when attained gives pleasure. Moreover, the more we hanker after pleasure, the less we get it. This is the fundamental paradox of hedonism. Besides this, even if we naturally seek pleasure, it does not follow that we ought to seek pleasure.

(2) The hedonistic calculus, mentioned by Bentham, is impracticable. He looks upon pleasure and pain as concrete things which can be added and subtracted and thus quantitatively measured. But feeling of pleasure and pain are purely subjective states of mind and cannot be weighed on the two sides of a balance like material things. They are variable in character.

(3) Bentham clearly recognizes the egoistic nature of man; but still he advocates Altruistic Hedonism. He does not offer any argument for altruism. He failed to explain satisfactorily the transition from egoism to altruism. He introduces altruism into his doctrine by taking into account the extent of pleasure, i.e., the number of persons affected by them. But he gives no reason why the pleasures of greater extent are preferable to those of smaller extent.

(4) Bentham altruism is gross or sensualistic, because he does not recognize qualitative difference of pleasures. However, he has mentioned 'purity' as one of the dimensions of the quantity of pleasure. But introduction of this dimension has not been able to elevate his doctrine. By 'purity' he has not meant any superior quality. It only means 'freedom from pain'. There is no qualitative difference among pleasures. All pleasures are equally alike in kind or quality. But this cannot be accepted. Intellectual pleasure, artistic enjoyment, and spiritual bliss are decidedly higher in quality than the pleasures of eating and drinking.

(5) Bentham has mentioned four external sanctions to explain the social feelings in man who are by nature egoistic. But the external sanctions can never explain the transition from egoism to altruism. We choose to obey the laws of Nature, Society, State and God not for their sake, but for our good. These external sanctions can create physical compulsion, but never moral obligation.

8.4.2. Refined or Qualitative Utilitarianim

J.S. Mill advocates qualitative altruistic hedonism. He says very explicitly that the standard is not the agent's own happiness, but happiness in general. In his book "Utilitarianism", he declares that "the happiness which forms the utilitarian standard of what is right in conduct is not agent's own happiness, but that of all concerned." According to Mill, actions are right in proportion as they tend to produce 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 privation of pleasure. Mill uses the term 'pleasure' and 'happiness' as synonymous. He does not regard them as intrinsic value .He gives hedonistic criterion of right and wrong Rightness consists in conduciveness to pleasure and wrongness consists in conduciveness to pain.

Mill bases his hedonism on psychological hedonism. According to Mill, desiring a thing and finding it pleasant are, the two modes of naming

the same psychological fact. Mill's ethical hedonism is based on the psychological assumption that we always desire pleasure, therefore pleasure is desirable. On the analogy that an object is visible because people actually see it, and a sound is audible because people hear it, Mill conduces that a thing is desirable, because people do actually desire it.

But the question arises how can we prove that general happiness is desirable? Mill's answer is that each person's happiness is a good to that person and general happiness, therefore, is a good to the aggregate of all persons. A's happiness is good to A; B's happiness is a good to B; C's happiness is a good C. Therefore, the happiness of A, B, C i.e., general happiness is good to A+B+C i.e. , aggregate of all persons. He holds that we are bound to promote the general happiness because of sanctions of morality.

According to Mill, there are two kinds of sanction for altruistic conduct - external and internal. Bentham recognizes four external sanctions- physical, social, political and religious. Mill has added to these external sanctions the internal sanction of conscience. This internal sanction, according to Mill, is sympathy, fellow- feeling, social feeling of mankind, a desire to be unity with our fellow creatures and a feeling of pain attendant on the violation of duty.

J.S Mill has offers a psychological explanation of the transition from egoism to altruism. Altruism grows out of egoism- sympathy or fellow feeling grows out of self-love according to the laws of association and transference of interest. At first we were egoists and relieve our pain. Then by repetition our own interest was transferred from the end to the means. We forgot our own pleasure, and came to take delight in relieving the miseries of others, and thus acquired sympathy. Thus sympathy is acquired by the individual in his own life time.

J.S Mill recognizes the kinds of pleasure or qualitative difference of pleasures. The most important point in Mill's ethical system is his doctrine

of a gradation of pleasures in respect of quality. It is Mill's chief innovation that he introduces a distinction of quality in addition to the distinction of quantity. As has been said before, Mill holds, in opposition to Bentham, that pleasure differ in quality as well as in quantity. He holds that in estimating happiness, we should take into account differences of quality and quantity. According to Mill "some kinds of are more desirable and valuable than others."Epicurus also referred to the kinds of pleasures, but did not recognize the qualitative superiority of mental pleasure. Though Bentham recognizes purity of pleasure, he does not mean by it qualitative superiority, but freedom from pain. The highest good, according to Mill, lies not in intense or durable enjoyment, but in the enjoyment of noble, dignified and elevated pleasures, even though these to be of small intensity and duration. Hence Mill's doctrine is called Refined Utilitarianism or qualitative utilitarianism.

Regarding the test of quality, J. S. Mill appeals to the 'verdict of component judges'. The verdict of persons, who are acquainted with, and equally capable of enjoying both forms of pleasure, naturally goes in favour of intellectual pleasures. Competent judges always prefer intellectual pleasures to bodily and sensual pleasures. From this verdict of component judges there can be no appeal. If there is a conflict of opinion among component judges, we should abide by verdict of majority of them. In this response he refers us to the "sense of dignity", which is natural to man. It is on account of its existence that no man would consent to be changed into any of the lower animals capable of sensual pleasure only. He says, "It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied". It is on account of this sense of dignity that competent judges prefer noble pleasure to physical pleasure.
It is in the above ways that J. S. Mill endeavors to strengthen the system of Hedonistic Ethics. T he additions and modifications by means of which he tries to purify or refine Hedonism are three which we have mentioned in the above discussion are-

(1) Substitution of general happiness for the happiness of the individual, as the end of life and standard of rectitude.

(2) His doctrine of gradation of pleasures, in respect of quality.

(3) His view that the true sanction of morality is internal, and not external.

He tries in this ways to free the Hedonistic doctrine from charges of egoism and sensualism.

Criticism: Mill's refined utilitarianism is open to the following objections:

(1) J. S. Mill's doctrine is hedonistic. Hedonism is based upon a one-sided view of human nature. It considers man as essentially a sentient being. Therefore, it conceives the end of his life as sentient satisfaction of pleasure. But the true end of life must be the satisfaction of the complete total self rational as well as sentient.

(2) According to Mill, 'happiness' and pleasure are synonymous, but happiness is not the same thing as pleasure. Pleasure is transient, while happiness is abiding. Pleasure arises from the gratification of a single desire. But, happiness is a feeling that arises out of systematization of desires.

(3) According to Mill, we actually desire pleasure therefore pleasure is desirable; here Mill commits the fallacy of figure of speech. He confounds the word 'desirable' with the word 'capable of being desired'. Again, sound is audible or an object is visible because we actually hear or see it. But on this analogy we cannot say that a thing is desirable because we actually desire it. Desirable is different from audible and visible. Desirable means 'what we ought to desire, and not 'what is capable of being desired'.

(4) In support of altruism Mill argues that because each person desires his own happiness, therefore general happiness is desired by aggregate of all persons. But this argument involves two fallacies- fallacy of composition and fallacy of fallacy of division. Here, we argue from the distributive to the collective use of the term. Hence it involves the fallacy

of composition. Secondly, general happiness is a good to the aggregate of all persons; therefore, general happiness is good to each person. Here, we pass from the collective to the distributive use of term and hence involves the fallacy of division.

(5) J. S. Mill cannot offer a reasonable explanation of moral obligation or sense of duty or oughtness. As external sanctions cannot account for the feeling of moral obligation, Mill adds to it the internal sanction of conscience. But, this internal sanction of conscience is, in his view the subjective feeling of sympathy. Subjective feeling is variable, and cannot be the source of moral obligation. When Mill says that conscience is a feeling of pain attendant on violation of duty, he seems to covertly appeal to reason, and therefore introduces rationalism in his doctrine.

(6) Mill's admission of qualitative difference among pleasures seems to be an extra- hedonistic calculus in measuring the worth of pleasures. Of two pleasures if one is considered to be qualitatively superior to the other, then the quality, according to which we judge between the two, is not certainly a feeling of pleasure. When we recognize one pleasure as superior in quality to another, we do so by appeal to reason. But this admission amounts to an abandonment of the hedonistic position.

(7) Sympathy or fellow -feeling which, is purely an altruistic feeling can never be derived from pure egoism or self love. What the laws of transference of interest and association can do is to convert egoism to ego-altruism, but not to pure altruism. Hence, it is absurd to hold that altruism is developed out of egoism in the life time of individual under the influence of psychological laws.



LET US KNOW

Bentham (1748-1832) and Mill (1806-1873) are recognized as the two most distinguished exponent of Utilitarianism. Bentham holds that the only standard of value is quantity. But J. S. Mill holds that the quality of pleasures should also be taken into account.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q1: What is Hedonism?

.....

Q2: What are the seven dimension of pleasure according to Bentham?

.....

Q3: Why Bentham's utilitarianism is called gross or sensualistic?

.....

Q4: What is internal sanction according to Mill?

.....

Q5: According to Mill how many kinds of sanction for altruistic conduct?

.....



Activity 8.1

1. Explain the difference between Bentham and Mill's Utilitarianism?

Ans: .....

.....

.....

8.5. RATIONAL UTILITARIANISM OF SIDGWICK

Henry Sidgwick accepts the theory of Utilitarianism but he has founded it on intuitional basis. He attempts to reconcile the claim of Egoism and Altruism, Hedonism and intuitionalism. He holds that pleasure is the only intrinsic value, which is good in itself. It is the only rational object of desire and it is therefore ultimately desirable. It is deliverance of conscience or moral reason. Like Kant he identifies conscience with practical reason. Practical reason dictates that pleasure is the true end, and ought to be persuade. Knowledge, beauty, virtue, etc., are means of pleasure. They have extrinsic or instrumental value. He does not distinguish between pleasure and happiness. The ultimate good is pleasure or happiness.

Bentham and J. S. Mill advocate psychological hedonism and hold that men always seek pleasure and avoid pain. But Sidgwick urges that this doctrine involves paradox of hedonism. He says "The impulse towards pleasure, if too predominant, defeats its own aim." Sidgwick, therefore, rejects psychological hedonism in favour of ethical hedonism. Mill says that pleasure is desirable, since it is normally desired by men, but Sidgwick argues that reason tell us that pleasure is the highest god which is desirable in itself. It is an intuition of reason.

Sidgwick holds that it is intuition of conscience or practical reason that pleasure or happiness is the highest good. Conscience gives us intuition not only of the ultimate good, but also supplies us with the principles of its distribution of happiness. The highest good, according to him, is sentient in nature, which consists in a desirable state of consciousness called pleasure or happiness. But the knowledge of it given by rational intuition, and not by experience, and the principles of its organization are also supplied by practical reason. Thus, as Sidgwick blends Utilitarianism with Rationalism or intuitionalism, so his theory is called Rational Utilitarianism as distinguished from Bentham and Mill's empirical utilitarianism.

He gives three rational principles - prudence, benevolence and

justice. Prudence or Rational Self-love guides us in choice and enjoyment off our own pleasure in which our good consists. Benevolence lifts us high above the plane of self-love or egoism to altruism. This principle tells us that the good of others should be considered as of equal weight with our own. Justice directs us to be impartial in the matter of distribution of happiness and tells us to satisfy the demands of the competitors according to their importance, merits and rights.

Criticism:

(1) Sidgwick wrongly holds that pleasure to be the ultimate good. Pleasure or sentient good cannot be ultimate good because it cannot satisfy the self. Self is both sentient and rational.

(2) Sidgwick unable to reconcile egoism with altruism, because he regards the sentient good as highest good. According to Sidgwick, prudence and benevolence are both teaching us that egoism is as reasonable as altruism. But prudence sometimes conflicts with benevolence, that egoistic impulses conflict with altruistic.

8.6. IDEAL UTILITARIANISM OF RASHDALL AND MOOORE

Ideal Utilitarianism of Rashdall: Rashdall also found his utilitarianism on reason. The moral faculty is reason. Like Kant, he regards it as moral reason or practical reason. It intuitively apprehends the highest good. Virtue, Knowledge and Culture, Beauty and Happiness constitute the highest good. Moral judgments are judgments of value. They decide what is good. Right is a means to the good. An action is right, if it is conductive to the universal well-being or eudaemonia. Virtue is the supreme value. Knowledge, Beauty, and Happiness are subordinate to it. Some pleasures are good, while some are bad and good pleasures approved by moral Reason constitute Happiness. Rightness of an action depends upon of its consequences. If it is conducsive to universal well-being, it is right. If it is subversive of it, it is wrong. Therefore, Rashdall's doctrine is called

Utilitarianism. But he regards Happiness as one o the constituents of well-being of mankind subordinate to virtue, so, his doctrine is called Ideal Utilitarianism. However it is non-hedonistic as it does not look upon Happiness as the sole Good.

Virtue is supreme value, which satisfies our intellectual nature. Beauty satisfies our aesthetic nature. Pleasures satisfy our sensuous nature. Happiness satisfies our higher nature. These elements constitute the eudaemonia or well being of humanity. Therefore it amounts to the recognition of self-realisation as the highest good. However Rashdall does not admit that self-realisation is the realization of supreme value of the self.

G. E. Moore's Ideal Utilitarianism: G. E. Moore regards the notion of 'good' as simple, unique and indefinable, which is known immediately or intuitively. He says " 'good' is a simple notion, just as 'yellow' is simple notion; that just as you cannot explain to one who does not already know it, what yellow is, so you cannot explain what good is."Goodness has a unique meaning; it is simply goodness. It cannot be described in terms of non-value. It has 'intrinsic value' or 'intrinsic worth'. According to Moore only complex things or notions can be defined as they have different properties and qualities. But good is simple notion, composed of no parts and so unanalysable. Hence, good is indefinable.

Rightness does not attach motive or intentions. If motives or intentions are good, but the actual consequences of an act calculated beforehand are bad, the act cannot be right. Consequences should be taken in a broad sense. The good that ought to be maximized includes the good of all persons without any invidious distinction. As an intuitionist he maintains that rightness is apprehended by intuition. Moore maintains that intrinsically good objects are organic whole and explains it in terms of value. He does not advocate hedonistic utilitarianism, because hedonism equates good with pleasure, which is a particular mode of experience. According to Moore hedonist commits 'Naturalistic Fallacy' as they identifies good with some natural property of what has goodness. Moore advocates ideal utilitarianism

like Rashdall. He regards an act 'right', if it is 'productive of greatest possible amount of good.' Rashdall gives hierarchy of goods. But Moore does not assign an order of goods.

Moore regards the concept of 'good' as simple, unanalysable, and indefinable. But 'good' may be defined by connecting it with the concept of value. Again, Moore overdoes the naturalistic fallacy when he explains 'good' by reference to particular modes of action or experience. Moreover, Moore regards intrinsically good things are organic whole and defines in terms of value. But value does not clearly state the connotation of organic whole. Further, since the rightness of an act depends on its total consequences, it cannot be known intuitively, but can be known by rational calculation of actual consequences of various acts and of their comparative intrinsic values. Again, intrinsically good things have no moral value apart from their contribution to self-realisation.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q6: Who propounded Rational Utilitarianism?

……

Q7: Name the three rational principles given by Sidgwick?

……

Q8: Who is the philosophers that advocated Ideal Utilitarianism?

……

Q9: Fill in the blanks

(a) Sidgwick blends Utilitarianism with Rationalism or Intuitionalism, so his theory is called……

(b) Virtue, Knowledge, Culture, Beauty and Happiness constitute the ……

(c) According to Moore hedonists commits……

(d) Moore regards the concept of…… as simple, unanalysable, and indefinable.

Q10: Why according to Moore hedonist commits 'Naturalistic Fallacy'?

……



Activity 8.2

1. Is there any difference between the Ideal Utilitarianism of Rashdall and Moore?

Ans: .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

8.7 ACT, GENERAL AND RULE UTILITARIANISM

William K. Frankena in his book Ethics holds that all utilitarian theories hold that what is morally right or wrong is ultimately to be wholly determined by looking to see what promotes greatest general balance of good over evil. So he distinguishes three kinds of utilitarianism each of which includes a family of views hedonistic or non-hedonistic. These are Act, General and Rule Utilitarianism.

Act Utilitarianism (AU): Act utilitarians hold that in general or at least where it is practicable, one is to tell what is right or obligatory by appealing directly to the principle of utility. Here, one tries to see which of the actions open to him will or likely to be produce the greatest balance of good over evil in the universe. Generalizations like "Telling the truth is probably always for the greatest general good" or "Telling the truth is generally for the greatest general good" may be useful on the basis of past experience. But the question arises whether telling truth in this case is for the greatest general good or not. But in some exceptional situations there

arise some grounds for thinking that it would be for the greatest general good not to tell the truth in a particular case. Bentham, G. E. Moore and perhaps even Mill, probably held such a view. Today J. J. C. Smart and Joseph Fletcher hold this view and prefer to call it "situation ethics".

For Act Utilitarianism, one must include among the effects of an action any influence it may have, by way of setting an example. Pure Act Utilitarianism not allows us to use any rules or generalization from past experience. But it would insist that each and every time we calculate anew the effects of all actions open to us on general welfare, have rules of some kind. Modified Act Utilitarianism which also does not allow us to use rules of thumb based on past experience, by following some arguments committed the same mistake. Thus act utilitarianism is unsatisfactory from the moral point of view.

General Utilitarianism (GU): The second kind of utilitarianism is General Utilitarianism. I t holds that one is not to ask in each situation which action has the best consequences, but it does not talk about rules. This type of utilitarianism gives importance on consequences on collective actions not on individual one. The idea behind General Utilitarianism is that if something is right for one person to do in a certain situation, then it is also right for anyone else who is similarly situated to do. Hence, one cannot ask simply what effects one's proposed actions will have in a particular case. Therefore one must ask what consequences would be if everyone were to act likewise in such cases. This view has been stated by M.G. Singer.

General Utilitarianism by giving the example of poor man, can allow that the poor man's act may produce the greatest general balance of good over evil in his particular situation, and yet maintain that he ought not to do it because of what would happen if all the poor and needy were to steal from the rich. The General Utilitarianism must be an appeal to the principle that if an action is right for me to do in my situation, then it is right for everyone to do who is similarly situated in relevant respects. Now, this principle cannot be derived from the principle of utility, but is independent of

it and so one might think that in appealing to it the General Utilitarianism is appealing to another moral principle besides that of utility. This additional principle is the principle of universazability. The question arises here that whether the General Utilitarianism must recognize any basic moral principle of universalizability and principle of utility which is doubtful according to Frankena. Again, regarding the example of poor man, also objection arises.

Rule Utilitarianism(RU): Rule Utilitarianism emphasizes the certainty of rules in morality and insists that we are generally(not always), to tell what to do in particular situation by appeal to like truth telling rather than by asking what particular action will have the best consequences in the situation in question. It holds that we are always to determine our rules by asking which rule will promote the greatest general good for everyone. That is, the question is not which action has greatest utility, but which rule has. So, the principle of utility comes in but not in determining what particular action to perform, but in determining what the rules shall be. Rules must be selected, maintained, revised and replaced on the basis of their utility and not on any other basis. The principle of utility is still the ultimate standard, but it is to be appealed to at the level of rules rather than at the level of particular judgment. This view has been advocated by a number of writers from Bishop Berkley to R. B. Brandt. This view is attributed to Mill also.

Rule Utilitarianism may take various forms, depending on how it conceives of rules. These are primitive-rule -utilitarianism (PRU), actual-rule-utilitarianism (ARU), ideal-rule-utilitarianism (IRU). Ideal utilitarianism is gain two forms. Primitive-rule-utilitarianism is like general utilitarianism with a new dress. Actual-rule-utilitarianism holds that an action is right if it conforms to the accepted or prevailing moral rules or wrong if it does not. One kind of ideal rule utilitarianism holds that an action is right, if and only if it conforms to a set of rules general conformity to which would maximize utility. The other holds that an act is right, if and only if it conforms to a set of rules general acceptance of which would maximize utility.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q11: Name the author of the book 'Ethics'.

.....

Q12: How many kinds of Utilitarianism according to Frankena?

.....



8.8. LET US SUM UP

In this unit we have discussed the different Utilitarian theories. The important points are:

- Hedonism is the doctrine according to which, hedone or pleasure is the ultimate standard of morality.
- Utilitarianism is the theory which holds that the sole ultimate standard of right, wrong and obligation is the principle of utility.
- According to Utilitarianism or Altruistic Hedonism, universal or general happiness is the ultimate moral standard.
- Bentham's utilitarianism may be called gross or sensualistic, because he does not admit qualitative differences among pleasure.
- Bentham holds that value of pleasure consists entirely in the quantity of agreeable experience it gives which takes seven dimensions of value, viz., Intensity, Duration, Proximity, Certainty, Purity, Fecundity, and Extent.
- J.S. Mill advocates qualitative altruistic hedonism.
- Bentham recognizes four external sanctions- physical, social, political and religious with them Mill has added to these external sanctions the internal sanction of conscience.

- Sidgwick advocates Rational Utilitarianism and holds that it is intuition of conscience or practical reason that pleasure or happiness is the highest good.
- Rashdall and Moore's Utilitarianism is called Ideal Utilitarianism.
- Rashdall regards Happiness as one of the constituents of well-being of mankind subordinate to virtue, so, his doctrine is called Ideal Utilitarianism.
- G. E. Moore regards the notion of 'good' as simple, unique and indefinable, which is known immediately or intuitively.
- According to Moore hedonist commits 'Naturalistic Fallacy' as they identifies good with some natural property of what has goodness.
- William K. Frankena in his book Ethics distinguishes three kinds of utilitarianism- Act, General and Rule Utilitarianism.

8.9 FURTHER READING

1) Sinha Jadunath, (1969)A Manual of Ethics, Sinha Publishing House Limited, 39, S. R. Das Road, Calcutta-26
2) Chatterji, P. B., (1952)Principles of Ethics, 32, Beadon Street, Calcutta.
3) William K. Frankena(2003), prentice Hall of INDIA, New Delhi.

8.10 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q1: Hedonism is the doctrine according to which, hedone or pleasure is the ultimate standard of morality.

Ans.2. The seven dimensions of value, according to Bentham are Intensity, Duration, Proximity, Certainty, Purity, Fecundity, and Extent.

Ans.3. Bentham's utilitarianism may be called gross or sensualistic, because he does not admit qualitative differences among pleasure.

Ans.4. The internal sanction according to Mill is the internal sanction of conscience.

Ans.5. Two kinds of sanctions according to Mill are - internal and external.

Ans.6. Henry Sidgwick

Ans.7. The three rational principles GIVEN BY Sidgwick are - prudence, benevolence and justice.

Ans.8. Rashdall and G. E. Moore

Ans.9. Fill in the blanks

(a) Sidgwick blends Utilitarianism with Rationalism or Intuitionalism, so his theory is called Rational Utilitarianism

(b) Virtue, Knowledge, Culture, Beauty and Happiness constitute the highest good.

(c) According to Moore hedonists commits "Naturalistic Fallacy"

(d) Moore regards the concept of 'good' as simple, unanalysable, and indefinable.

Ans.10. According to Moore hedonist commits 'Naturalistic Fallacy' as they identify good with some natural property of what has goodness.

Ans.11. William K. Frankena

Ans.12. According to Frankena there are three kinds of utilitarianism - Act, General and Rule Utilitarianism.

8.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very short Questions

Q1: "The greatest possible balance of good over evil"- which theory is associated with this statement?

Q2: Is 'pleasure' and 'happiness' synonymous according to Mill?

Q3: "Some kinds of are more desirable and valuable than others."- Who is associated with this statement?

Q4: Like Kant who identifies conscience with practical reason?

Q5: Is'good' definable according to Moore?

B. Short Questions (Write in about 100-150 words)

Q1: What is seven dimensions of values according to Bentham?

Q2: What do you mean by 'verdict of component judges'?

Q3: What are three rational principles according to Sidgwick?

Q4: How the Hedonists commit "Naturalistic Fallacy' according to Moore?

C. Long Questions (Write in about 300-500 words)

Q1: Explain Bentham's gross or sensualistic hedonism?

Q2: Explain critically J. S. Mill's utilitarianism?

Q3: Critically discuss Sidgwick's Rational Utilitarianism.

Q4: Discuss briefly Ideal Utilitarianism of Rashdall and Moore.

Q5: Write a brief note on Frankena's distinctions of Utilitarianism.

*** ***** ***