


Philosophy


by



greek

philosophy comes from the word philosophia which means the love of knowledge / wisdom, new way of trying to make sense in the world, it started in Greece.

BRANCHES OF PHILOSOPHY



Lesson = 1

What is philosophy? my definition

⇒ combining of 4 component


philosophy is an academic discipline where we examine our confusion about topics like science, history, literature etc.

value theory, epistemology, ethics, aesthetic, metaphysics, logic,

We as humans utilise 3 massive weapons to navigate the world around us. & they're all built in inside us. as a result we humans are the most sophisticated animal ever lived on earth.

don't have all of them. 7

So what are they?



* Our rationality is so powerful it can influence our instincts & emotions. like the marshmello test. as we are evolving as a species, our rationality is becoming more & more stronger.

Now philosophy is rational thinking. & philosopher are rational thinker.

religious

humans have developed afterlife that they could escape death

as philosophers was asking question & answering they this way they have give birth to so many other disciplines like, physics, Biology, chemistry, psychology

folktales & tales have been told so many times that they become a papers

epistemology: Study of knowledge. it comes from the word ^{greek} epistemic. it's kind of skepticism. "question your belief."
belief VS knowledge

metaphysics: what is beyond the physical world. where we study the nature of reality. 1
like → what kind of being am I?
Do I have a soul?

Is there any soul that will survive after I die?

value theory: It is divided into 2 parts.

ethics → How human should live with each other
How should I live?

"How u treat animal?"

aesthetics → Study of beauty & art?

What beauty is or whether it exist?

Logic : Reasoning

But if you truly boils down philosophers talked about physical world, the origin of life & human mind

⇒ what is the world & how does it work?

⇒ " " " mind & " " " " "

⇒ " " " mind " " " " " ?

as philosophers was asking question & answering they this way they have give birth to so many other disciplines like, physics, biology, chemistry, psychology

today they are some out of subject cause they have less idea about science & other disciplines which have arrived. Philosophy in general ask 2 question? —

what is? & How we know it?

how new

philosophy —

intuition is the new philosophy.

ontology & epistemology

according to Emmanuel Kant! we will never be able to understand reality as it goes through human mind.

empiricism is more british but rationalism is more european

⇒ the difference between Eastern & Western philosophy

⇒ Eastern philosopher wants to change themselves while western " " " " the world with

killing evil & following good.

of fate.

⇒ like eastern is more about acceptance & western is all about change.

① Western philosophy comes from Babylon, Rome, Egypt & there is very few written records about that.

② Eastern philosophy has its root in Indian civilization & Chinese civilization.

⇒ Eastern & Western both philosophy portrays their geographical influence over them.

⇒ Due to the geographical location of Rome, Babylon & Europe they were able to discover science & same happen with India & China. Their rivers & agriculture phenomenon force them to be localist & Eastern philosophy.

today example = Sadhguru

Save Soil

⇒ Greece geographical terrain allowed trade to flourish between various people. This had to do with their scarce food resources. They had to roam around for eating while Indian & Chinese were waiting their rivers to give them crop.

⇒ In Greece Marchants were the most important while in India farmers " " " " in society.

⇒ Due to this Western philosophy is open minded & Eastern is conservative & spiritual.

⇒ If Marchant don't like something they change but if farmer " " " they had to wait for next season of nature.

Now from this origin both philosophy has found their way & what they're doing today is the product of that.


like if you go to Europe they have build, church, university, Olympic games, science, psychology etc cause they had to do it for their survival.

likewise, eastern philosophy Budha, Hinduism has created meditation, discerning yourself etc.

Now

Einstein & Tagore's philosophy make sense as per their own culture.

Einstein talks about external world while Tagore talks about internal.



In western philosophy questioning your teacher was a virtue while eastern it is a form of disrespect.

⇒ Western philosophy has good & evil concept on their philosophy cause they had to fight for their survival. therefore in order to motivate their soldier they had to introduce it. this allows progress. it's more of a psychology rather a morality.


Both.

We as human have good & bad our job is to understand this & act accordingly.

the biggest @lakes are western believes in progress & eastern believe in acceptance.

thus their way of life is make life easier by understanding science & make it more efficient

philosophy 2nd



Western philosophy

①st

Socrates



he is the pioneer of rational thinking uncomfortable truth.

before him there were many philosopher like pythagoras etc but he had made it into history due to his sacrifice for truth.

He sets the base for modern science according to him "there is only one good knowledge, & one evil ignorance"


§ Plato

as he was Socrates' student, he continued on Socrates' idea of truth.

his famous thought experiment about of a cave and shadows

that if you are away from the light source of fire your own shadow will be cast on the wall like people's reality,

not what it is






<https://youtu.be/1RWOpQXf1tA>

Plato thinks what we see outside isn't the actual rather what we see inside is. opposite of rational view


Sigmund Freud's dream interpretation can help us understand Plato more.

Now Plato has a strong political stand on. He was a democrat as Republican had killed his teacher.

His emphasis was put purpose before essence. as the result western philosophy is very purpose way of thinking. which emphasizes something's utility or use before anything.



So what's the purpose of life according to Plato → "Reach Perfection"



https://youtu.be/Kg_47J6sv3A

Epicurus wanted to know about happiness not rationality or truth.

He thought people have invented philosophy cause they fear death.

Some scholar believes we cannot include him on western philosophy directly.

Confucius is the founder of Confucianism mainly focus on philosophy not their religious practices.



Confucius

Taoism influence Japanese philosophy centers on the idea of not going against convention. This is why Japanese are not fighter in nature unlike Russian.



0 ..

He was from a very influential family but as he grew older he became bored of those shit.

You need a larger dose to give you the same high as previous small dose.

Budha

Solution = Detachment. {Nirvana (030)}

this is somehow similar to our

Schopenhauer's philosophy of the blind universal will which is a force which beyond our control.

Confucius while both Laozi & Buddha escaped society for some solitude & inner peace, he tried to solve some socio-political question & peace & harmony. To see this he focuses on how nature organizes things.



Schopenhauer

he believed everything starts with family. a solid family structure is the inception of a new society.

even though most of the eastern philosophy is socialistic some of the philosophers did talk about individualism.

Eastern philosophy vs Western philosophy
Spirituality vs Rationality
Society vs Individual
} main idea

Description about famous philosophers all around the world

1. Plato

Athens

Sparta



In 490-470 BC Sparta & Athens were the forces of Greece & together they fought war against Asiatic empire. Sparta provided the army & Athens the Navy.

after the war was over Sparta demobilized her troops & suffered the economic disturbance natural to that process. then

Sparta became agricultural hub

Athens

"

Marchants port, business hub

In politics they divided the schools into 2 thoughts.

⇒ One like Rousseau Argued that nature is good & civilization is bad; that by nature all man are equal. Becoming unequal only by class made institution & the law is an invention of the strong to chain & rule the weak.

⇒ other school nietzsche claimed that nature all man are unequal that morality is an invention of the weak to limit & deter the strong. power is the supreme virtue & supreme desire of a man & that all form of government the wishest & most natural is aristocracy.

this same things happend in Athens which was weathy minority aka oligarchical society in Athens. there democracy was a joke. Among 400,000 inhabitants 250,000 were slaves with NO rights.

During the great generation long peloponnesian war (430-400 BC) which sparta fought against Athens then conquer them.

teachings of plato &


- (I) think more, know yourself.
- (II) Let your lover change you. (true love is admaration)
- (III) decode the message of beauty & Art
- (IV) change democracy
- (V) King should become philosophers.

why democracy is a bad idea: voting is a skill & can't / shouldn't be performed by charlatans.

⇒ Western talks about nature while eastern think they are part of the nature.

⇒ eastern about spirituality, happiness, society, nationality
 → Western " technology, science, materialism individualism!"

Lesson - 2 Socrates introduce it 2400 years ago in Greece.



Plato believe most humans get control by Rational part of their Soul.


But here are problems predicting future SO,

P_1 = Anna failed in physics midterm
 P_2 = Anna has been in physics class
 P_3 = " was in sociology class
 h' h
 Con: Anna dropped physics

① using past experience to make future prediction.

Drawing conclusion based on the explanation that explain a state of events rather than from evidence provided by premises.

P_1 = most men in ancient had beards
 P_2 = Socrates lived in " beards
 Con = Thus Socrates probably had a beard



① Using ^{valid} Premises to form conclusion




P_1 = all humans are mortal.
 P_2 = Socrates is human.
 Con = Socrates is mortal.

validity + all true premises

Plato & decaprio : the nature of reality. dream & reality

Neo & Rene Descartes : I think, therefore I am → I will have one base belief then build way up there.
I can't question my existence.
apple Basket

Locke, Berkeley, Empiricism : Locke believe into primary & secondary world into anything.



meaning of knowlage : the way philosophers argue is 2 things assertion & Proposition.

assertion is a linguistic act either written or spoken that has a truth value

A

cause you can have false belief but can't have false knowledge

what is knowlage in philosophical sense : Justified True Belief

most of them with testimony or that power that we have like when you read a book or you see the world. The problem is you have it with testimony, until Gettier shows up, he says that justified true belief is not a good account of knowlage, cause you can have a justified true belief that doesn't & shouldn't count as knowlage.



Jones
→ Smith & Jones both are up for promotion.
→ Smith has good evidence that Jones will get the promotion. (he somehow knows that Jones have 10 coins in his

Smith

Jones

III) thus, Smith concludes the Person who is gonna get the Promotion has 10 coin. (pocket).

But Smith is gonna get the promotion & he also has 10 coins in the pocket & it is true. it just dumb luck that what he beliefs happens to be true. therefore philosopher Gettier argues that Smith has a justified belief but doesn't have knowledge.

clock case :

Alice wants to know the time & she knows it's 1 o'clock by look at the watch.

But the clock she looked at was always on 1 o'clock due to inefficient battery charge. but that time she got lucky.

therefore she have belief but no knowledge

the sheep case : You look at something & see a sheep but that was a shadow of a dog but there was a sheep but not where you saw. but there is a sheep.

You got it only by chance. so you have belief not knowledge.

Karl Popper :

Science & Pseudo-Science
it disconfirms / it confirms

I) every false belief we discover is good cause eventually it takes us near to the truth

II) the only genuine test of a theory is one that's attempting to falsify it.


Modern science is all about testable, refutable, falsifiable

Karl suggests, you're to be able to open to the idea that your belief might be false cause that's the only way that holding onto them can really mean anything.

Philosophy of Religion :

Philosophy of religion is not-

- I) what your parents taught you
- II) study of bible/gita/koran
- III) religious anthropology




in 'sociology'
psychological understanding of our
reason for religious belief


philosopher Anselm said, "God is that than which no greater
can be conceived"

he tells, he can prove the existence of god cause so god
must exist.

Anselm



Gaunilo



well,

criticism says Gaunilo completely missthe point, that
this argument only works for neccery beings of which
there is only One GOD.

what we have right here is a classic exemple of the
fallaey knows as begging the Question.

Fallaey is a flaw in reasoning, something that weakens or
distroys an argument.

In 18 century german philosopher Immanuel kant, as he
put "Existence is not predicate"

predicate is something that's said another object

if god exists, then he must be the greatest being we
can imagine but doesn't mean that he does exist.

Predicate add to their essence of their Subject,
but they can't be used to Prove their existence.

later italian philosopher thomas Aquinas en counted Anselm's
Argument, but many others he just didn't buy it

Argument & it's nature

What an argument is

"The aim of an argument, or of a discussion, should not be victory but progress."

— Karl Popper

- The point of an argument is NOT to impress people, or to "win" or "lose". There are no "sides", and no "opponents".
- Arguments are tools for finding out which statements are right, and which are wrong
- We use arguments to discover what's true and false, and thus become less wrong. When presented with a really good argument, the rational thing to do is to accept the conclusion.

<https://youtu.be/xpAvcGcEc0k>

in this video

argument is for finding out the truth not to win the argument.

if you are doing so then you're just wasting time

A bit more formally:

1. You're arguing
2. If you're arguing, I must have paid
3. Therefore, I must have paid

The **conclusion** here is that he has paid

The statements "You're arguing" and "If you're arguing, I must have paid" support the conclusion

What an argument ISN'T

- An argument is not abuse
 - Attacking someone who disagrees with you is not an argument.
 - You need to give them substantive reasons that show that their claim is incorrect
- An argument is not just contradiction
 - Even if the other person says something that you know is wrong, saying "no it isn't" is not an argument.

① are the Promises true ② Does the conclusion

really follow from the premises

all this goal is to save time to filter void & sound argument

Examples

1. Richard Nixon was a polar bear
2. All polar bears are blue
3. Therefore, Richard Nixon was blue

Are the premises true?

No.

Does the conclusion follow from the premises?

Yes.



Examples

1. Richard Nixon and Elvis Presley were once in the same room
2. Best friends are sometimes in the same room
3. Therefore, Richard Nixon and Elvis Presley were best friends

Are the premises true?

Yes.

Does the conclusion follow from the premises?

No.



you can share your room with so many people without be a best friend.

2 question —

① are the premises true

② Does the conclusion follow from the premises

Examples

1. All platypuses are mammals
2. Mammals don't lay eggs
3. Therefore, platypuses don't lay eggs




Are the premises true?

No.

Does the conclusion follow from the premises?

Yes.

1. All cows are mammals
2. Some mammals lay eggs
3. Therefore, cows lay eggs



Are the premises true?

Yes.

Does the conclusion follow from the premises?

No.

Valid and Sound Arguments

- An argument is **valid** when the conclusion follows from the premises.
 - This means that *if* the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true
 - It does NOT mean that the premises actually are true. They might be, but they might not be.
 - Valid arguments might have false premises, and they might have false conclusions. But they CANNOT have true premises and a false conclusion.

Whether or not an argument is valid depends on the **form** of the argument.

The reason the Nixon/Polar Bear Argument is valid is because it has a valid form:

1. A is a B
2. All Bs are Cs
3. Therefore A is a C

Example

1. Richard Nixon was a polar bear
2. All polar bears are blue
3. Therefore, Richard Nixon was blue



- The conclusion follows from the premises. It's logically impossible for (1) and (2) to be true without (3) also being true.
- So, the argument is valid
- But the conclusion is still false, because the premises are false

Other valid forms of argument include:

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| 1. If P, then Q | 1. If P, then Q |
| 2. P | 2. Not Q |
| 3. Therefore, Q | 3. Therefore, not P |

Here are two more examples:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Either the baby is hungry, or it's sleepy | 1. Either the problem is fixable, or it isn't fixable |
| 2. The baby isn't hungry | 2. If the problem is fixable, then there's no point in worrying |
| 3. Therefore, the baby is sleepy | 3. If the problem isn't fixable, then there's no point in worrying |

A Bad Sound Argument

1. The Earth is round
2. Therefore, the Earth is round

The premise is true

The argument is valid — it's logically impossible for "the Earth is round" to be true and "the Earth is round" to be false

Therefore, the argument is sound

Back to Monty Python:

1. You're arguing
2. If you're arguing, I must have paid
3. Therefore, I must have paid



"Not necessarily. I could be arguing in my spare time"

- Tries to undermine premise (2), to avoid accepting the conclusion

- An argument is **sound** if it is valid and its premises are true
- Sound arguments always have true conclusions.
 - The premises are true, and the conclusion follows logically from the premises. So the conclusion can't possibly be false

Valid and Sound Arguments

Here are two more examples:

- | | |
|------------------|------------------|
| 1. Either A or B | 1. Either A or B |
| 2. Not A | 2. If A, then C |
| 3. Therefore, B | 3. If B, then C |

- Knowing that an argument is valid doesn't tell you that the premises are true
- It only tells you that *if* the premises are all true, *then* the conclusion must be true
- If an argument is **valid** and its conclusion is false, then it must be that one of the premises are false.
- The job then is to figure out which of the premises is false

Examples:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. If today is Thursday, then we have class today | 1. If we had milk, it would be in the fridge |
| 2. Today is Thursday | 2. There isn't any milk in the fridge |
| 3. Therefore, we have class today | 3. Therefore, we don't have any milk |

1. Lassie is a dog
2. All dogs are animals
3. Therefore, Lassie is an animal



Example

1. George Washington was a U.S. President
2. All U.S. Presidents are politicians
3. Therefore, George Washington was a politician


- The premises are true
- The argument is valid
- Therefore, the argument is sound

a sound argument always have conclusion

Kant's Philosophy

Who is Kant?

- German philosopher
- Lived 1724-1804
- Argued space and time were in our minds
- Analyzed how we reason and conceptualize the world
- Created a system of ethics now known as "Kantianism"



he is kind of Sheldon
kind of a guy who love
rules & follow them
religiously. & he believes
morality is a duty which
has to be followed.

He was kind of a government
exam asperent rather than
some cool entrepreneur

What is Kantianism?

- Kantian Ethics is a form of Deontology
 - Deontology takes an action to be right or wrong based on whether or not it follows certain *rules*
 - Right and wrong therefore have nothing to do with *consequences*
 - If you were following the moral rules, then you were acting morally.
 - If you were violating the moral rules, then you were acting immorally
 - An action can be morally right even if everything turns out terribly

What is Kantianism?

- Example: Bridge Version of the Trolley Problem
 - Deontologists usually think you should NOT push the large person, because there's a moral rule that you should not kill innocent people
 - Pushing people off of bridges is against the moral rules, so it would be wrong to do it *even if it would save more lives*
- Usually deontology takes intentions to matter; this is largely due to Kant's influence
 - The rules are things like "don't lie", "don't break promises", "don't kill innocent people"
- Kant's Ethics is based on Rationality and Duty
- Kant wants to know what we're morally obligated to do: what our moral duties are
- Kant thinks we can discover what's right and wrong simply by using reason
 - Thinking rationally about morality will lead us to the right answer
- Kant thinks that our duties are moral obligations that are imposed on us by reason/rationality alone
 - If we just think rationally, we'll eventually realize that rationality forces us to act ethically in all cases
- Kant thinks that duty is the basis for morality: the only acts that have moral worth are those that are performed with regard to duty
 - An action is only morally good if you did it because you had a moral duty to do it.
- Doing something out of kindness or sympathy is NOT morally valuable to Kant: it's only morally good if you did it because you had a moral obligation to do it
 - This is why intentions are important in Kantian ethics

now my question is
how to evaluate them
how to use this
shit?

What is Kantianism?

- Duties come from rationality
- Duties arise because not following them would lead to a contradiction.
 - It is irrational to accept a contradiction, so it is irrational not to follow and obey your moral duties.
- This is how rationality imposes moral obligations on us, according to Kant:
 - Failing to live up to our moral obligations requires us to accept a contradiction, which is irrational. So being rational requires us to obey our moral obligations.
 - For Kant, if something is immoral then there is a proof that believing it's permissible would lead to a contradiction.
- For example, we have a duty not to break promises, because "it's okay to break promises" leads to a contradiction:
 - The point of a promise is that it guarantees that you will do whatever you promised to do
 - If it's okay to break promises, then a promise doesn't guarantee that you'll do whatever you promised to do
 - If it's okay to break promises, then there's really no such thing as a promise
 - If there are no promises, then if you can't break promises
 - You can't break things that don't exist
 - Therefore, if it's okay to break promises, then you can't break promises
 - Contradiction
- Therefore, you have a duty to keep your promises
- For Kant, rationality leads us to discover the Categorical Imperative, and then forces us to follow it
- An imperative is something that we must obey; something you *have* to do
 - "It is imperative that you do as I say" — People in movies sometimes
 - "Imperative" just means necessary to do
- Two kinds of imperatives: Hypothetical and Categorical
 - Hypothetical Imperatives are things you have to do *if* you have a certain goal or desire
- For Kant, rationality leads us to discover the Categorical Imperative, and then forces us to follow it
- An imperative is something that we must obey; something you *have* to do
 - "It is imperative that you do as I say" — People in movies sometimes
 - "Imperative" just means necessary to do
- Two kinds of imperatives: Hypothetical and Categorical
 - Hypothetical Imperatives are things you have to do *if* you have a certain goal or desire

What is Kantianism?



- Kant thinks that lots of moral theories reduce ethics to hypothetical imperatives, and thinks that's bad
 - Utilitarianism [we'll talk about it next week] says that something is morally good if it maximizes total happiness in the world
 - But maybe you don't care about maximizing happiness
 - It seems possible for a rational person not to want to maximize happiness
 - Utilitarianism makes morality relative to a specific goal, which it's possible for someone not to want
- Kant thinks morality is a categorical imperative because it's placed on us by rationality, and you can't opt out of being a rational agent
 - Rational agents are fundamentally what we are as human beings
 - If you're a person, you're rational
 - Thus if something is necessary for all rational agents, then it's necessary for you
 - Absolutely no exceptions
- Since morality is forced on us by rationality, moral rules are categorical imperatives: they apply to everyone, everywhere, always and forever
- Kant thinks that if utilitarians are right, then you only have to do the right thing if you want to maximize happiness
 - If you don't want to maximize happiness, then you have no reason to be morally good
- This gives you a way to opt out of morality: just give up the desire to maximize happiness
- Kant thinks you shouldn't be able to opt out of morality: morality is supposed to apply to everyone, always, all the time
- To do that, morality has to be a *categorical* imperative, not a hypothetical imperative
- So what is the Categorical Imperative that we must obey?
 - Kant gives different versions, but we'll only talk about one: The Principle of Ends in Themselves
 - Rationality forces this principle on us, and the principle tells us what our moral duties are in any given situation
 - If something violates the Principle of Ends in Themselves, then it is irrational and morally wrong.
- The Categorical Imperative: an obligation that applies absolutely and unequivocally, to everyone, always, no matter what
 - Categorical imperatives are absolute and unconditional requirements for our actions
 - Must be obeyed in all circumstances
 - You have to obey the imperative no matter what. It doesn't matter what your goals are, or what you want
 - Following the rule is necessary, full stop. Necessary regardless of what your goals are
 - You can't opt out of the categorical imperative
- Principle of Ends in Themselves:
 - It is not permissible to use human beings as mere means; you always have to treat people as ends in themselves.
 - There are means, and there are ends ("the ends justify the means"); the end is the goal you have, and the means is the tool/method for reaching that goal
 - To use someone as a "mere means" is to treat them as nothing more than a tool for reaching your own goals
 - To treat someone as an "end in themselves" is to treat them as a rational agent with their own goals; to take their desires and goals into account

- Hypothetical Imperatives:
 - Obeying the hypothetical imperative is only necessary if you want to achieve the goal
 - Following the rule is necessary for achieving some goal
 - Obey a hypothetical imperative isn't necessary *simpliciter*, it's only necessary for some end
 - If you don't have the goal, then it's not necessary for you to obey the hypothetical imperative
- Hypothetical Imperatives:
 - "If you want to pass the class, then you have to turn in your assignments"
 - If you don't care whether or not you pass the class, then you have no reason to turn in the assignments
 - But if you *do* want to pass then class, then you *must* turn in the assignments
 - Turning in the assignments is a *hypothetical imperative*: it's necessary for you to do it, if you have a certain desire/goal (passing the class)



Utilitarianism 1. Deontology vs Consequentialism

Plan for this week:

- Deontology vs. Consequentialism
- What is Utilitarianism?
- Why be utilitarian?
- Utility Monster
- Experience Machine

deontology is kind of morality
prescription, utilitarian is morality
description or rule

this is kind of a similar point
apply to Kant but it has
to give consequences

Recap: Kantianism/Deontology

- Deontology only cares about whether or not you follow the rules
- Consequences don't determine what is morally right or wrong
- Even if following the rule will cause terrible things to happen, you still have to follow the rule
- Some philosophers have argued that this is a mistake, and that we should look at *consequences* when deciding what's right and wrong

In my opinion
this shit is
useless.

Recap: Kantianism/Deontology

- Deontology says that "morally right" = "following the moral rules"
- Kant says we can use rationality to determine what the moral rules are
- Kant thinks rationality also forces us to obey the moral rules

- Kant thinks we can derive all moral rules from the "Principle of Ends in Themselves"
 - Example: Bridge Case
 - Pushing the large person to save 5 people is wrong because you use the large person as a *mere means* to save the lives of the 5 people

- Kant thinks that we cannot break the moral rules *under any circumstances*
- There is a moral rule not to lie
- If a murderer asks you where their victim went, and you know, then you have to tell the murderer where they went
- You cannot lie **even though lying would save a life**

Consequentialism

- Utilitarianism is a form of *Consequentialism*
- **Consequentialism**: it's the consequences or outcomes of an action are what make it moral or immoral.
 - Better outcome = better action
- Whether an action is right or wrong depends solely on what happens because of the action

- Consequentialism is **impartial** and **impersonal**

- Consequentialism doesn't care about your intentions, or your beliefs, or what rules you were following or trying to follow

- Consequentialism says Schuyler and Tryne are equally good

Matters:

- Outcomes

Doesn't matter:

- Intentions
- Rules that you're following
- Who's doing the action
- Why they did the action


→ this is your action & its impact on the world.

Utilitarianism is what makes an action good or bad is how much utility is produced by that actions.

⇒ ^{is the} morally best actions is that which maximize utility.

this is consequentialist because the amount of utility produce is one of the consequence of an action.

Utilitarianism




Utilitarianism

- Utilitarians accept "The Greatest Happiness Principle"
 - Mill: "actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness."
- Morally right = produces happiness
- Morally wrong = produces unhappiness

my question is what's the definition of happiness.

according to this, real happiness is pleasure & unhappiness is

- What is happiness?
 - Mill: "by happiness is intended pleasure, and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain, and the privation of pleasure."
- Happiness = pleasure and no pain
- Unhappiness = pain and no pleasure

then comes some rubbish theory.  who was the sucker

Utilitarian thinks the total amount of happiness is all that matters to morality

- The more pleasure an action causes, the more ethically right the action is
- The more pain an action causes, the more ethically wrong the action is
- An action that produces lots of pleasure and a little pain might be better than an action that produces no pleasure and no pain

it's not about how happy other people is? it's about you.

- No one person is special; your happiness doesn't matter more than other people's
- It's the total amount of happiness in the world, regardless of who has it or how many people it's divided across

now my question is why?

now why be utilitarian? why anyone should follow it.

According to Aristotle —

is the ultimate goal of all human actions" ^{happiness}

like ask yourself-

why do you want that?

Don't agree?

Why be utilitarian?

- In other words: what we *really* want is pleasure without pain.
- Everything else we say we want is just a tool to get pleasure or to avoid pain
- Pleasure is good, pain is bad.
- So if you want to do good things, do whatever increases pleasure and decreases pain.
- Mill: "According to the Greatest Happiness Principle, as above explained, the ultimate end, with reference to and for the sake of which all other things are desirable (whether we are considering our own good or that of other people), is an existence exempt as far as possible from pain, and as rich as possible in enjoyments, both in point of quantity and quality"

— but it's biological. it's kind of a survival trick.

But do we really need happiness or just it's an illusion that we're chasing?

Utility Monster

- Imagine a person that has the capacity to feel more happiness than all other people combined
- If we put all our resources into making this person happy, that will maximize happiness
 - Even if millions of people starve to death
 - The utility monster feels more happiness than they ever would, so we have to let them starve

Utility monster is a thought experiment raised as an objection to utilitarianism.

it comes from a political