

CLASSICAL UTILITARISM ABOUT HAPPINESS

ISHCHUK Natalia

In Happiness And Contemporary Society : Conference Proceedings Volume (Lviv, March, 20-21, 2020). Lviv: SPOLOM, 2020. P. 125-126.

ISBN 978-966-919-593-7

ISHCHUK Natalia

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy, Bioethics and History of Medicine,
Bogomolets National Medical University (Kyiv, Ukraine)
The Ukrainian Institute for Happiness Research

CLASSICAL UTILITARISM ABOUT HAPPINESS

Classical utilitarianism is a eudemonistic doctrine oriented toward the attainment of happiness. Its main representatives Jeremy *Bentham* and John Stuart Mill consider that the basis of all human actions is in the desire of people for happiness, understood as “an existence which is the freest from suffering and the richest in pleasures” [1], [2]. According to Bentham’s anthropology, nothing more concrete can be said about a person, than the fact that he has a desire for happiness, and also that he has the ability to rationally determine the components of happiness and how to achieve it. In fact, from the point of view of Bentham, any state of an individual, if he agrees that a certain state of affairs brings him maximum pleasure can be accepted as a state that can be called happiness. Bentham confirms this thesis by the fact that ideas about happiness vary markedly from generation to generation, from nation to nation. The only thing that in this case can be considered as happiness is what the majority considers as true to be happiness. Utilitarianism sees its main goal precisely in achieving “greater happiness by the greatest number of people” [4, p. 507], [5, p. 1737]. If each person has his own idea of happiness, his position is not considered significant. Mill’s opinion on this issue diverges from Bentham’s. According to Mill, man as a creature, which is different from all other creatures of nature, possesses the features inherent only to him. He calls such an exceptional feature of a person “nobility of character” [2], meaning primarily the development of “self-respect” [2], without which the achievement of happiness by an individual becomes impossible. Hence there is a certain elitism of his teachings, the belief that both individuals and communities can be mistaken in the ways of achieving happiness. The task of combining “both pleasant and beautiful” at the same time [1] should be entrusted to experts, the people who value and use both the first (pleasant) and the other (useful), but are able to choose between them according to a situation [1].

Only happiness is valuable of itself. All other life events, actions, deeds are of value only insofar as they contribute to the realization of happiness in an individual life. From this follows the conclusion that morality can exist only as a means of achieving happiness, therefore it is dependent on this goal, as part of the whole. Bentham’s and Mill’s principles of usefulness are associated with the desire for happiness, when those actions and phenomena that contribute to the achievement of happiness are recognized as useful and those that prevent the achievement of happiness are recognized as harmful. The principle of usefulness is the only principle that must be followed in order to achieve the desired goal. Rationality is a prerequisite and condition for forming the ethics of utilitarianism. It is result-oriented. The result is positive if those actions have led to increased happiness. The degree of effectiveness depends on the pleasure to which “intensity”, “duration”, “certainty”, “proximity”, “fertility”, “purity” and, finally, what kind of “distribution” it gives rise to. In that case, Bentham proclaims, if some action

leads to pleasure or is accompanied by it, it must be perfect. If this action leads to suffering or is accompanied by it, it is necessary to refuse to commit it. Bentham's attention is concentrated precisely on a separate act and on the influence that it exerts on the realization of the interests of people affected by it. The "moral arithmetic" proposed by Bentham extremely rationalizes moral practice and, in his opinion, provides grounds for the unmistakable determination of the best available alternatives [3, c. 42-44]. Mill, on the contrary, considers the requirements of Bentham's "moral arithmetic" to be initially unfeasible and contrasts them with another prevailing method of practical orientation, namely, the observance of rules of behavior that have a utilitarian foundation. Subsequently, this approach, brought to its logical purity, was called the utilitarianism of the rule. When discussing "moral arithmetic", Mill pointed out that its application is confronted with a number of difficulties. How can we define what really contributes to happiness in situations involving an indefinite and unlimited number of interacting elements? How to calculate the result of one or another action if other people and circumstances are involved into it. Can anything planned be corrected by random events? Mill's position is the following: there is no need to calculate the result before committing each act. An act can and should be preceded not by calculation, but by turning to experience, one's own or another's [2].

Regarding the main goal of utilitarianism – to achieve "the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people", the conclusion is that it is impossible to take into account the interests of all people. We can only talk about finding a balance of interests, which is a difficult task. And Bentham and Mill approached this question differently. If Bentham insists on prioritizing the happiness of the prevailing group or community [1], then Mill places emphasis on the happiness of all mankind and even, as he puts it, "global good" [2], which sounds quite utopian. Summarizing briefly, the ideas of utilitarianism are not new, and their origins go into the eudemonistic tradition of ancient philosophy. However, utilitarianism has significant achievements. Among them are: consistency and an attempt to create a humane paradigm based on rationality, as well as returning ethics to the status of a practical philosophy designed to be a guide for people in their everyday life and communication with society and the state.

REFERENCES

1. Бентам И. Введение в основания нравственности и законодательства/ И. Бентам. https://platon.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/istorija_prosveshhenie/bentam_i_vvedenie_v_osnovaniya_nravstvennosti_i_zakonodatelstva_1998/11-1-0-1586
2. Милль Дж.С. Утилитаризм/ Дж.С. Милль. <https://klex.ru/pj8>
1. З.Сен А. Развитие как свобода/ А. Сен. – М.: Новое издательство. – 432 с.
3. Этика: Энцикл. словарь / Под ред. Р.Г.Апресьяна и А.А.Гусейнова. М.: Гардарики, 2001. – 671 с.
4. Encyclopedia of Ethics / Ed. by L.C.Becker, C.B.Becker. Vol. I–III. N.Y.–L.,2001. – 2016 p.