

INTRODUCTION

UTILITARIANISM is the ethical theory that the production of happiness and reduction of unhappiness should be the standard by which actions are judged right or wrong and by which the rules of morality, laws, public policies, and social institutions are to be critically evaluated. According to utilitarianism, an action is not right or wrong simply because it is a case of telling the truth or lying; and the moral rule against lying is not in itself correct. Lying is wrong because, in general, it has bad consequences. And the moral rule against lying can be subjected to empirical study to justify some cases of lying, such as to avoid a disastrous consequence in saving someone's life.

Utilitarianism is one of the major ethical philosophies of the last two hundred years, especially in the English-speaking world. Even if there are few philosophers who call themselves utilitarians, those who are not utilitarians often regard utilitarianism as the most important alternative philosophy, the one to be replaced by their own. Examples of the latter are intuitionists, such as E. F. Carritt¹ and W. D. Ross,² early in the twentieth century, and, more recently, John Rawls, whose book *A Theory of Justice*³ contrasts his principles of justice with utilitarian principles and contrasts his contractarian foundation for his principles with the grounds for utilitarian principles. Some of the most prominent ethical philosophers of recent years have

¹ E. F. Carritt, *Ethical and Political Thinking*.

² W. D. Ross, *The Right and the Good*.

³ John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*.

An Introduction to Mill's Utilitarian Ethics

explicitly considered themselves utilitarians. Examples would be Richard Brandt,⁴ J. J. C. Smart,⁵ and R. M. Hare.⁶ Nearly all introductory courses in ethics include utilitarianism as one important theory to be considered. And public policy is often based on cost-benefit analysis, perhaps not using pleasure and pain as the measures of utility but rather using some proxies for welfare and harm, such as consumer or voter preference or economic goods. Thus utilitarianism has an important place in contemporary ethics.⁷

John Stuart Mill's essay entitled *Utilitarianism*⁸ is the most widely read presentation of a utilitarian ethical philosophy. It is frequently assigned in introductory courses on ethics or moral philosophy in colleges and universities and included as an examination topic at both graduate and undergraduate levels. It has been the subject of numerous disputes in books and in philosophical periodicals regarding its proper interpretation, and it has been the subject of numerous attacks and defenses by those who disagree or agree with its conclusions and supporting arguments.

⁴ Richard B. Brandt, *A Theory of the Good and the Right; Facts, Values, and Morality*, and other writings.

⁵ J. J. C. Smart, "An Outline of a System of Utilitarian Ethics," in *Utilitarianism: For and Against*, by J. J. C. Smart and Bernard Williams, eds.

⁶ R. M. Hare, *Moral Thinking: Its Levels, Method, and Point*, and other writings.

⁷ A textbook illustrating this is William H. Shaw's *Contemporary Ethics: Taking Account of Utilitarianism*.

⁸ John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism*. References to *Utilitarianism* will be in parentheses in the text. In quoting from Mill, an effort will be made to add the feminine pronoun when the masculine is used to refer to a representative human being. About this Mill says: "The pronoun *he* is the only one available to express all human beings; none having yet been invented to serve the purpose of designating them generally, without distinguishing them by a characteristic so little worthy of being the main distinction as that of sex. This is more than a defect in language; tending greatly to prolong the almost universal habit of thinking and speaking of one-half the human species as the whole." *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive* (bk. 6, ch. 2, sec. 2, n. 837).

Introduction

The present work is conceived as a contribution to those disputes, both of interpretation and of the merits of Mill's philosophical position. It is an effort to present an interpretation of the work as a whole and of its constituent parts, taking into consideration many of the conflicting interpretations found in philosophical literature, and to defend the essay against many of the objections that have been presented against it or its utilitarian philosophy. It is my belief that Mill's version of utilitarianism is far clearer and more consistent than it is often made out to be, and that his version of utilitarianism is a plausible if not a totally defensible ethical theory. A complete defense of utilitarianism would require a refutation of all alternatives to it, or at least a discussion of other serious alternatives to show the superiority of utilitarianism. I am not sure that such a comparison is possible, because alternatives may rest on metaphysical or dogmatic assumptions that are beyond rational discussion; but, in any case, it is not my aim to do that. Nevertheless, it is my aim to answer many of the standard objections to the theory. Thus this is a work of substantive moral philosophy as well as exegesis of a text.

Mill's essay is often read only in excerpts, and that can be misleading. For example, Mill introduces utilitarianism in the following way: "The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, 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" (210 [II, 2]). This formula is ambiguous in several ways. First, it appears to apply to each act that an agent might consider doing, case by case. Such an interpretation is what has been called "act-utilitarianism," in contrast to "rule-utilitarianism" or other more complex versions of utilitarianism. In Chapter 5 of *Utilitarianism* and in other writings, it is clear that Mill is not an act-utilitarian. One chapter of this book will be devoted to a discussion of that issue, drawing on the data in *Utilitarianism* and remarks by Mill in his correspondence. Another ambiguity is what is meant by the expression, "right in proportion as

An Introduction to Mill's Utilitarian Ethics

they tend to promote happiness.” One interpretation is that a particular act has some consequences that promote happiness and other consequences that produce unhappiness. An act, then, has a net tendency when the tendency to promote unhappiness is subtracted from the tendency to promote happiness or vice versa.⁹ Given an act-utilitarian interpretation of the formula, one could then say that an act is right if it in fact has a greater net tendency to promote greater happiness (or less unhappiness) than any alternative. This is the sort of act-utilitarianism defended by J. J. C. Smart in *Utilitarianism: For and Against*. This is not only act-utilitarian but “actual consequence” utilitarianism in contrast to “foreseeable consequence” utilitarianism. But another interpretation of “tends” in the formula is possible. It is that a *kind* of action tends to promote happiness to the extent to which that kind of action *usually* promotes happiness. The tendency, then, is the probability that actions of that kind have been found to promote happiness. Such an interpretation will be defended in this work. Many objections to utilitarianism are directed against act-utilitarianism and against actual-consequence utilitarianism. Mill’s theory is much more complicated, and it is not subject to many of those objections.

Sometimes Chapter 2 of *Utilitarianism* is read without the chapter on the “sanctions” that motivate morality, the chapter on the “proof” of hedonism, and the chapter on justice. These are all controversial chapters, but taken together they help to interpret Mill’s version of utilitarianism. Understanding the “sanctions” requires an understanding of Mill’s psychological theories, which are found in his notes to an edition of his father’s psychology textbook. Understanding the “proof” is aided by his comments in a letter to a correspondent. The chapter on justice shows that Mill took rights very seriously.

⁹ This is the interpretation given by Roger Crisp, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Mill on Utilitarianism*, 104. Crisp also interprets Mill as an act-utilitarian (113) and as an actual-consequence utilitarian (99–100).

Introduction

In the chapters of this work, these chapters are interpreted in the light of Mill's correspondence and other writings. In *Utilitarianism* Mill gives little attention to alternative moral theories. Chapter 2 is devoted to showing that Mill had reasons to reject other theories, as well as the positive arguments for utilitarianism found in the essay.

Mill derived his utilitarianism from his father, James Mill, and from Jeremy Bentham, the eighteenth-century founder of the utilitarian tradition in moral philosophy. Mill was critical of Bentham in two early essays on Bentham, and in his essay *Utilitarianism* he revises Bentham's quantitative analysis of pleasures and pains by introducing a qualitative dimension to the analysis. The tone of Mill's essay also differs from the tone of Bentham's writings. Bentham writes polemically to attack the current moral thinking that appealed to moral feelings, which he called "caprice." Mill also rejected any appeal to a moral sense, but in this essay, he is out to show that utilitarianism is supportive of most commonsense morality. Many interpreters have been led to emphasize the differences between Mill and Bentham. My reading of Mill, on the other hand, will emphasize the similarities. Mill, like Bentham, was a reformer. He was an advocate of women's rights and of better wages and voting rights for the working classes. He opposed aristocratic privileges. He thought that Christianity was a source of perverted ethical doctrines. And Mill, in spite of the greater complexity of his analysis of pleasures and pains, like Bentham was a hedonist. Mill revised and perhaps broadened and softened Benthamism, but he never deserted it.

Chapter 1 will give a brief statement of biography for those unfamiliar with the life of the man whose *Autobiography* is a classic work of that genre of literature and whose other works were important contributions to philosophy of science, economics, and political theory. This chapter will also place J. S. Mill's work in the tradition of utilitarianism stemming from Jeremy Bentham. Those familiar with Mill's life and Bentham's philosophy may wish to skip that chapter and go on to Chapter 2.

An Introduction to Mill's Utilitarian Ethics

Chapter 2 presents Mill's criticism of alternative ethical theories found, not in *Utilitarianism*, but in other writings. In those writings, Mill attacks the appeal to Nature, to God's commands, and to a moral sense, as the foundation for ethics.

Chapter 3 analyzes Mill's controversial evaluation of pleasures and pains on the basis of "quality" as well as "quantity." Many critics have claimed that Mill has deserted hedonism in making this distinction. I argue that Mill is correct to distinguish between pleasures and pains on the basis of qualitative phenomenal differences and that this is not a desertion of hedonism. But I also argue that he has not successfully made out his claim that those who have experienced pleasures that employ the distinctively human faculties consistently prefer them.

Chapter 4 states Mill's theory of the sanctions that motivate moral behavior and explicates the psychological theory that is their background.

In Chapter 5, the question whether Mill is properly interpreted as an "act-utilitarian" or as a "rule-utilitarian," or as neither, is discussed. My conclusion is that neither formulation captures the structure of Mill's position. Mill wants rule-utilitarian reasoning to be used in some contexts; act-utilitarian reasoning to be used in others; and he has an important role for rights and for a distinction between duty and supererogation (actions that are meritorious, beyond the call of duty).

Chapter 6 sets out and defends Mill's "proof" of the Principle of Utility. Mill's argument for hedonism is usually attacked as committing a number of fallacies. I defend it against these charges and claim that it is a persuasive argument.

Chapter 7 restates Mill's theory of the relationship between utility and justice, showing that, on the analogy of rule-utilitarian reasoning, the role of rights and of justice in Mill's system is consistent with his utilitarianism.

An appendix gives an outline of the structure of *Utilitarianism*, in the order of the chapters of the essay, summarizing Mill's arguments. For those unfamiliar with the work, for those who have read it but without confidence in following the arguments,

Introduction

or for those who want a quick review, a reading of the appendix before reading the remainder of the book will be helpful.

This book is intended for a wide audience, from the reader first becoming acquainted with Mill's philosophy to the professional philosopher or even the Mill scholar who is familiar with the controversies surrounding Mill's work. For those who are unfamiliar with Mill, I strongly recommend that after reading Chapter 1 and perhaps Chapter 2, they read Mill's essay *Utilitarianism* or at least the appendix that summarizes it, before attempting to study Chapters 3 through 7.

1

MILL'S LIFE AND PHILOSOPHICAL
BACKGROUND

UTILITARIANISM as a distinct tradition in ethical thought was founded by Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832). The principle of utility, that the production of happiness and elimination of unhappiness should be the standard for the judgment of right action and for the criticism of social, political, and legal institutions, was proposed by many writers in the eighteenth century, but it was Bentham who attempted to build a complete system of moral and legal philosophy upon that basis, and it was Bentham whose doctrine became the basis of a reform movement in the nineteenth century. A brief statement of Bentham's philosophy will be given at the end of this chapter.

John Stuart Mill was a direct heir of Bentham's philosophy. His father, James Mill (1773–1836), had moved from Scotland to become a freelance journalist in London, where he edited two journals, translated books, and in the period of John Stuart's childhood wrote a multivolume *History of British India*. This became the standard work on the subject and earned him a post with the East India Company, which, as a quasi-governmental bureau, managed British colonial interests in India. Soon after moving to London, James Mill became acquainted with Bentham. John Stuart writes in his *Autobiography* that his father was "the earliest Englishman of any great mark, who thoroughly understood, and in the main adopted, Bentham's general views of ethics, government, and law."¹

¹ John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, reprinted in *Autobiography and Literary Essays*, vol. 1 of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, J. M. Robson and Jack Stillinger, eds., 55 (ch. II, par. 11). References to the *Autobiography* in this chapter will be in parentheses in the text.

Mill's Life and Philosophical Background

James Mill became an exponent of the utilitarian philosophy in articles for journals and for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, applying Benthamite principles to such subjects as government, education, liberty of the press, and colonial policy. He also did much to define the policy of a group of reformers known as the “philosophical radicals,” which included some members of Parliament and various intellectuals, such as the economist David Ricardo and the legal philosopher John Austin. Major works by James Mill, in addition to his *History of British India*, were *Elements of Political Economy* (1821), a presentation of Ricardian economic theory, and *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind* (1829), a treatise of psychology drawing heavily upon the work of David Hartley (1705–57). But James Mill is most famous for the education that he gave his son John Stuart, which could appropriately be regarded as one of his chief works.

John Stuart Mill was born May 20, 1806, his parents' first child. He never attended school in the usual sense. With the exception of a few months at age fourteen, when he visited Bentham's brother's family in France, and the following year, when he studied law with John Austin, John Stuart was taught exclusively by his father, beginning in infancy. He began learning Greek at the age of three, from vocabulary cards with the English equivalent; so he already at three knew how to read English! By the time that he was eight, he had already read, in Greek, several classics of Greek history, including the whole of Herodotus and six dialogues of Plato. All of this was done in the room in which his father was writing the several volumes of his monumental *History of British India* as well as all else that he wrote to support his family. At twelve, John Stuart began the study of logic, working through Aristotle in Greek and scholastic logic in Latin, which he began to learn when he was eight; and in the year that he reached the age of thirteen, his father took him “through a complete course in political economy” (31 [I, 18]).

All of this is reported in detail in the *Autobiography*. There Mill gives the teaching of political economy as an example of

An Introduction to Mill's Utilitarian Ethics

his father's method. His father had him read the works of David Ricardo and Adam Smith, "and in this reading it was one of my father's main objects to apply to Smith's more superficial view of political economy, the superior lights of Ricardo, and detect what was fallacious in Smith's arguments, or erroneous in any of his conclusions" (31 [I, 19]).

Mill praises this method. "Most boys or youths who have had much knowledge drilled into them," he says, "have their mental capacities not strengthened, but overlaid by it. They are crammed with mere facts. . . . Mine, however, was not an education of cram. My father never permitted anything which I learnt, to degenerate into a mere exercise of memory. . . . Anything which could be found out by thinking, I was never told, until I had exhausted my efforts to find it out for myself" (33–5 [I, 22]).

The education was no doubt rigorous. "[N]o holidays were allowed, lest the habit of work should be broken, and a taste for idleness acquired. . ." (39 [I, 24]). And he was kept from any association with other boys to avoid contagion by vulgar modes of thought and feeling.

Because John Stuart was so much under the tutelage of his father, with regard to modes of both thought and feeling, it is of interest to notice his account of his father's moral attitudes. He says that his father's moral inculcations were at all times mainly those of the Socratic virtues as prescribed by Cicero: "justice, temperance (to which he gave a very extended application), veracity, perseverance, readiness to encounter pain and especially labour; regard for the public good; estimation of persons according to their merits, and of things according to their intrinsic usefulness; a life of exertion, in contradiction to one of self-indulgent sloth" (49 [II, 7]). James Mill's standard of morals was utilitarian, taking as the exclusive test of right and wrong the tendency of actions to produce pleasure and pain. But, John Stuart reports, he had "scarcely any belief in pleasure" (49 [II, 9]). He deemed few pleasures worth the price that, at least in the present state of society, must be paid for