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1. The *right* action: actions are right if they maximise the good for the majority. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

2. The *good*: happiness/satisfaction is good.
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1. What does “for the majority” mean? 
   Who is referred to? everyone? a nation? a town? an ethnic group? the unborn? animals?

2. But “the end doesn’t justify the means” (Kant)
Criticisms of utilitarianism:


2. But “the end doesn’t justify the means” (Kant)
   — It’s possible to justify greater inequality of good,
Criticisms of utilitarianism:


2. But “the end doesn’t justify the means” (Kant)
   — It’s possible to justify greater inequality of good, against fairness or equality or redistributive justice
Criticisms of utilitarianism:


2. But “the end doesn’t justify the means” (Kant)
   — It’s possible to justify greater inequality of good, against fairness or equality or redistributive justice
   — or to punish the innocent for maximum gain,
Criticisms of utilitarianism:


2. But “the end doesn’t justify the means” (Kant)
   - It’s possible to justify greater inequality of good, against fairness or equality or redistributive justice
   - or to punish the innocent for maximum gain, against retributive justice
Criticisms of utilitarianism:


2. But “the end doesn’t justify the means” (Kant)
   — It’s possible to justify greater inequality of good, against fairness or equality or *redistributive justice*
   — or to punish the innocent for maximum gain, against *retributive justice*
   — or against duties of *truth-telling* or *promise-keeping*
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3. What of rights?
If A injures B, for the good of the majority, but may violate B’s rights.

4. A is on a bus party which is captured by bandits. The (honourable) bandit chief promises to release A + the rest if A agrees to shoot any member of the party.
If A refuses, then the bandit chief will shoot all.
Should A shoot 1 → the rest set free?
Utilitarianism missing a link to morality of the person.

P.S. See Peter Singer on next Monday’s Enough Rope with Andrew Denton (Channel 2 at 9:30 pm 4/10/04, the 47th anniversary of Sputnik 1’s launch).
### Efficiency v. Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Less efficiency, greater equality.</td>
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#### Status Quo Ante

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Less efficiency, less equality.</td>
<td>• Greater efficiency, less equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller cake, less even slices.</td>
<td>Larger cake, less even slices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Efficiency v. Equity or Fairness
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Proposed a limitation on utilitarianism:

*The Pareto Improvement Criterion:*

An action should be undertaken if it improves the welfare of at least one person, while making no-one worse off.

Consequences?