

# Candidate 2 evidence

Philosophy National 5 Resource Sheet			
Candidate Name		Scottish Candidate Number	
<p>Paragraph 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-GHP</li> <li>-Bentham</li> <li>-Hedonic calculus(Intensity, duration, certainty, propinquity, fecundity, purity, and extent)</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Mill</li> <li>-Act utilitarianism</li> <li>-Rule utilitarianism</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Criticisms of utilitarianism</li> <li>-Quantifying happiness</li> <li>-Evil pleasures</li> <li>-Problems with consequences(actual vs predicted, short vs long, global vs local)</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Kantianism</li> <li>-The categorical imperative</li> <li>-The universal law formulation</li> <li>-The end in itself formulation</li> <li>-The kingdom of ends</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Criticisms of Kant</li> <li>-Ignores other good motives</li> <li>-Conflicting duties</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Compare utilitarianism and Kantianism through the trolley problem</li> </ul> <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-State which theory you think is better(Kantianism)</li> </ul>			

Utilitarianism is a better moral theory than Kantian ethics.  
To what extent do you agree?

Utilitarianism is teleological meaning its goal based with the goal being the greatest amount for the greatest number of people. The way utilitarians believe this can be achieved is through the GPP which is made from three components:

- the equity principle - no ones happiness is more important
- the hedonic principle - the only consequence that matters is happiness
- the consequentialist principle - the only thing that matters when making moral decisions are consequences.

One Utilitarian called Jeremy Bentham believed that it was the quantity of pleasure that mattered and, so created the hedonic calculus in which multiple actions would be given a mark out of ten for each category (intensity, duration, certainty, propinquity, security, purity and extent). The action with the highest overall score would then be considered the most morally praiseworthy.

Another Utilitarian, however, disagreed with this and stated that it was the quality of pleasure that was to be valued, not the quantity. Mill came up with higher and lower pleasures, with a higher pleasure being something proportional to reading, whereas lower pleasures were something only a human could experience, whereas lower pleasures were pleasures any animal could experience, e.g. eating.

Mill believed people who, had experienced both pleasures and, chose the higher pleasures were to be considered competent judges.

Utilitarianism was split into two versions, act and rule. Act utilitarianism focuses on the short term consequences, the immediate pleasure, whereas rule focuses on the long term consequences.

criticisms of utilitarianism include:

- Evil pleasures - when pleasure is taken from an action that inflicts pain, e.g. rape.
- Tyranny of the majority - when the majority is favoured over the same minority.
- Problems with consequences:
  - actual vs predicted - when the actual consequences aren't always what they were predicted to be.
  - Global vs local - when the local consequences can vary from the global consequences.
  - Short vs long - when the short term consequences aren't the same as the long term, this is apparent when comparing act and rule.

One way of comparing the two theories is by applying them to a thought experiment, e.g. the trolley problem. The trolley problem is a scenario upon you have a choice between killing one person (by pulling a lever) or letting 5 people die by not. A utilitarian would pull the lever as it creates the most happiness in that moment. Whereas a rule utilitarian would not pull the lever as it would go against their own moral rules. A follower of Kantian ethics would not pull the lever as the maxim "Always kill" would create a contradiction in conception, giving them a perfect duty to never follow that maxim.

I believe Kantianism is the better moral theory as it only has one version, is consistent through all scenarios, and has rules that make sense on a moral sense.

Kantianism is deontological, meaning it's duty-based. Kant believed that an action was only morally good if we acted out of nothing but duty. This was because Kant believed in the good will, which is our own will to do good, which Kant stated was undeniably good. Kant formulated maxims, rules of behaviour, and applied them to the categorical imperative. For instance, if the maxim "always steal" was applied it would first be applied to the universal law formulation, in which, in every situation in which it could be applied, it is applied. This creates an illogical world as if we always stole, then the concept of property no longer matters. This is called a contradiction in conception, and we have a perfect duty to never follow that maxim. The other part of the categorical imperative is the end in itself, formulated meaning we cannot use someone as a mere means to an end as that would be disrespecting them as rational agents.

### ○ Criticisms of Kant include:

• Ignores other good motives - Kant states that if an action is performed out of anything other than duty, it is morally wrong, however, if I were to visit my grandparents, for instance, out of duty instead of love would that not make the action less morally valuable?

• Conflicting duties -