

Special Topics in Max Weber's Definition (Sep.16th, 2004)

Group 3: Hunjip Kim, Kiwon Jung, Jinyoung Kim, Sungjin Lee, Taehun Choi, Chang-ghone Kim, Soonyoub Kwon

Enjoying: Utility & Maximization of Individual Utility

(Basic Assumption in Economics)

1. What is Utilitarianism?

(Sungjin Lee)

1. Concept of Utilitarianism

In the notion of consequences the Utilitarian includes all of the good and bad produced by the act, whether arising after the act has been performed or during its performance. If the difference in the consequences of alternative acts is not great, some Utilitarians do not regard the choice between them as a moral issue. According to Mill, acts should be classified as morally right or wrong only if the consequences are of such significance that a person would wish to see the agent compelled, not merely persuaded and exhorted, to act in the preferred manner.

2. Basic theory of Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is among those moral theories, often called teleological (concerning ends or purposes), that derive judgments about right or wrong from judgments about the quality of certain states of affairs—*e.g.*, the quality of people's lives. Its main opposition comes from those moral theories, often called deontological (concerning duty or moral obligation), that maintain that, although some judgments about right can be derived from

judgments about desirable states of affairs, others cannot be. Prominent among the latter, according to deontologists, are certain judgments about justice. Mill saw justice as Utilitarianism's largest problem, and that opinion persists.

Many Utilitarians have met such objections by defining new forms of the theory. One range derives from differing attitudes toward the value theory. The classical form is hedonist, but one can employ values other than, or in addition to, pleasure (ideal Utilitarianism), or one can, more neutrally, and in a version popular in economics, regard anything as valuable that appears as an object of (rational or informed) desire (preference Utilitarianism). One can also deny parity to the two sides of the value scale, maintaining that avoidance of disutility is morally more important than promotion of utility (negative Utilitarianism). One can also apply the test of utility maximization directly to single acts (act, or direct, Utilitarianism), or to acts only indirectly through some other suitable object of moral assessment, such as rules of conduct (rule Utilitarianism).

In assessing the consequences of actions, Utilitarianism relies upon some theory of intrinsic value: something is held to be good in itself, apart from further consequences, and all other values are believed to derive their worth from their relation to this intrinsic good as a means to an end. Bentham and Mill were hedonists; i.e., they analyzed happiness as a balance of pleasure over pain and believed that these feelings alone are of intrinsic value and disvalue. Utilitarians also assume that it is possible to compare the intrinsic values produced by two alternative actions and to estimate which would have better consequences. Bentham believed that a hedonic calculus is

theoretically possible. A moralist, he maintained, could sum up the units of pleasure and the units of pain for everyone likely to be affected, immediately and in the future, and could take the balance as a measure of the overall good or evil tendency of an action. Such precise measurement as Bentham envisioned is perhaps not essential, but it is nonetheless necessary for the Utilitarian to make some interpersonal comparisons of the values of the effects of alternative courses of action.

2. Who was Utilitarians?

(Soon-youub Kwon)

(Mainly on two great scholars)

1. Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832)

British philosopher, political activist, lawyer, Jeremy Bentham is best known as the founder of British “utilitarianism”. Born into a wealthy family, he trained as a lawyer and was called to the bar in 1769.

In 1768, Bentham came across the phrase “the greatest happiness for the greatest number” and slowly began forming his utilitarian ideas. In his first book (1776), Bentham claimed that all laws, ancient and modern, should be evaluated according to the single ethical principle of “utility”. According to him, a law is good or bad depending upon whether or not it increased general happiness of the population.

In 1789, he published his most famous work, *“Introduction to the Principles of Morals”*, which has been widely regarded as the founding document of British utilitarianism. Bentham introduced the distinction between individual “hedonic calculation”(maximizing individual utility) and social calculation(maximizing total utility).

He argued that virtually all humans seek to maximize their “happiness”, defined as the surplus of pleasures over pains and also thought that all human actions arise from the

maximizing individual utility. Bentham also correlated happiness with the means to happiness. The wealthier a person is, the greater the happiness he can attain. However, he recognized the principle of diminishing marginal utility, i.e. that the greater the amount of utility a person already has, the smaller will be the utility gain of any extra addition of wealth.

The critical question Bentham puzzled over was whether the unrestricted pursuit of individual happiness could be reconciled with morality. The only ethical principle he accepted was that increasing general happiness is "good", while decreasing it is "bad". But what is general utility of a society? Bentham argued it was no more and no less than the sum total of individual utilities of all members of a society. According to him, the definition of "society" depends on our sphere of consideration. It may be a nation, it may be all of humanity. It may be confined to living adult voters, or it may embrace all people and generations yet unborn.

2. John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)

British philosopher, economist, John Stuart Mill was born in London. He was educated entirely by his father, James Mill who was an economist. His father didn't permit him to associate with other boys of his age. From his earliest years, he was subjected to a strict system of intellectual discipline. As a result of this system, according to him, he believed this discipline gave him an advantage of a quarter of a century over his contemporaries.

When he was fifteen or sixteen, he was greatly influenced by reading Bentham's work. In his work "*utilitarianism*"(1863), he claimed actions are right as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. Following his predecessors, Bentham, he refers to this as the principle of utility.

Mill also explained the relation between Justice and Utility. Critics of utilitarianism argue that morality is not based on consequences of actions (as utilitarians suppose), but is instead based on the universal concept of justice. Mill sees this as the

strongest attack on utilitarianism, and he offers two counter arguments. First, he argues that all moral elements in the notion of justice depend on social utility. There are two essential elements in the notion of justice: punishment, and the notion that someone's rights were violated. Punishment derives from a combination of vengeance and social sympathy. Vengeance alone has no moral component, and social sympathy is the same thing as social utility. The notion of rights violation also derives from utility. For, rights are claims we have on society to protect us, and the only reason society should protect us is because of social utility. Thus, both elements of justice (i.e. punishment and rights) are based on utility.

3. The History of Utilitarianism

(Hun-Jip Kim)

In G.E. Moore's book, *Principia Ethica* 1903, ideal Utilitarianism is beautiful experiences and relations of friendship that have intrinsic value. Therefore, it ought to be praised and promoted. Also, Intrinsic disvalues mean not only the consciousness of pain, hatred, contempt of what is good or beautiful, but also the love admiration and enjoyment of what is evil and ugly. These intrinsic disvalues should be prevented from the world.

Intrinsic Value

Many things have instrumental values. That is, they have values as means to an end. These instrumental values have some meaningful values themselves. This is what we call intrinsic value. Four principles following have the intrinsic values.

- **Pleasure** : Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) defined "Pleasure" as "The enjoyable feeling we experience when a state of deprivation is replaced by fulfillment". Bentham believed that we should try to increase the overall amount of pleasure in the world.
- **Happiness**: John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) believed that happiness, not pleasure, should be the standard of utility.
- **Ideal Values**: G.E. Moore(1873-1958) suggested that we should fight to maximize ideal values, such as freedom, knowledge, justice and beauty. Moore said, "The world may not be a better place with more pleasure in it, but it certainly will be

a better place with more freedom, more knowledge, more justice and more beauty”.

- **Preferences:** Kenneth Arrow, a Nobel Prize winning Stanford economist, argued that what has intrinsic value is preference satisfaction. This means that it lets people choose, for themselves, what has intrinsic values; it simply defines intrinsic values as whatever satisfies a person’s preferences.

Jeremy Bentham said, “A moral theory according to which an action is right if and only if it conforms to the principle of utility”. Bentham formulated the principle of utility in *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* in 1789. An action conforms to the principle of utility only if its performance will be more productive in pleasure, or happiness, and more preventive in pain, or unhappiness, than any alternatives. Instead of “Pleasure” or “happiness”, the word “welfare” would also be suitable in the principle of utility: The value of the consequences of an action is determined solely by the welfare of individuals.

The characteristic of Bentham's theory is that the rightness of an action entirely depends on the value of its consequences. This is why the theory is also called as Consequentialism. Bentham's theory assumed distinctively that the standard of value is pleasure and the absence of pain, and that an action is right if it does tend towards the optimal outcome.

Since the 1960s, many writers have used Consequentialism, instead of Utilitarianism because of their viewpoints that the rightness of an action entirely depends on the value of its consequences.

At present, while Utilitarianism appears in various and complicated formulations, criticisms are very popular in the following manners:

- Utilitarianism often demands that we put aside self-interest.
- Utilitarianism is concerned almost exclusively about consequences, not intentions.
- By concentrating exclusively on consequences, utilitarianism makes the moral worth of our actions a matter of luck. We must await the final consequences before we find out if our action is good, or bad. This seems to make the moral life a matter of chance, which runs counter to our basic moral intuitions.

Therefore, the majority of people, now, believe that Utilitarianism is most appropriate

for policy decisions, as long as a strong notion of fundamental human rights guarantees that it will not violate rights of small minorities.

4. What is capitalism?

(Kiwon Jung)

Capitalism is a **social system based on the principle of individual rights**. The term capitalism is used here in the broader *philosophical* political sense, and not in the narrower *economic* sense, i.e. a free-market.

1. Historical Development of Capitalism

Economic system based on private ownership of the means of production, in which personal profit can be acquired through investment of capital and employment of labor. Capitalism is grounded in the concept of free enterprise, which argues that government intervention in the economy should be restricted and that a free market, based on supply and demand, will ultimately maximize consumer welfare.

These principles were most notably articulated in Adam Smith's treatise, *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), in which he opposed the prevailing theory of [mercantilism](#). Capitalism has existed in a limited form in the economies of all civilizations, but its modern importance dates at least from the [Industrial Revolution](#) that began in the 18th cent., when bankers, merchants, and industrialists—the bourgeoisie—began to displace landowners in political, economic, and social importance, particularly in Great Britain. Capitalism stresses freedom of individual economic enterprise; however, government action has been and is required to curb its abuses, which have ranged from slavery (particularly in Britain and the United States) and apartheid (in South Africa) to monopoly cartels and financial fraud.

Capitalism does not presuppose a specific form of social or political organization: the democratic socialism of the Scandinavian states, the consensus politics of Japan, and the state-sponsored rapid industrial growth of South Korea while under military dictatorship all coexist with capitalism. Yet despite the capitalist ideal of “hands-off” government, significant government intervention has existed in most capitalist nations at least since

the Great Depression in the 1930s. In the United States, it exists in the form of subsidies, tax credits, incentives, and other types of exemptions. Though private production plays a major role in the economies of Germany and Japan, both nations have centrally planned industrial policies in which bankers, industrialists, and labor unions meet and seek to agree to wage policies and interest rates; these countries reject the idea of letting the market wholly determine the economy. The collapse of the Soviet Union and its satellite states in Eastern Europe (1989–91) left those countries with a heavy burden and an uncertain future, and represented a substantial retreat in the power of capitalism's traditional economic opponent, socialism. Also uncertain is the future course of China's economy, in which small-scale capitalism is increasingly allowed within a strictly Communist political framework.

2. Capitalism: The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism

Modern Capitalism vs. Traditionalism

- Greed has always existed
- Adventure capitalism: the acquisition of wealth through piracy or military conquest or speculative adventures e.g. Columbus expedition

Note 1: Weber does not divide history into the same set of stages as Marx and thus speaks about capitalism prior to *modern* capitalism. Thus there is for him capitalistic activity in the time of what Marx would call the Feudal mode of production. But this activity is still traditional and quite different from *modern capitalism*.

Note 2: the idea of there always being capitalism is an aspect of ideology. It de-historicizes the present by making it seem as if things have always been the way they are now.

Illustrative example of the difference between traditionalism and modern capitalist

economic motivations: in areas dominated by traditionalism, a capitalist strategy to increase economic productivity was frequently seen to fail. A piecework payment scheme is introduced which in theory could significantly increase the pay of workers significantly beyond what they have been earning. However, rather than increasing productivity and the worker's wages, it often actually resulted in a decrease. Why? Because the workers instead of working faster and longer to make more money simply worked as long as it took to receive the wage they were accustomed to and regarded as normal and necessary for their needs. Thus Weber concludes:

'A man does not "by nature" wish to earn more and more money, but simply to live as he lives and as he is accustomed to live, and to earn as much as is required to do so.'

The modern capitalist attitude of wanting at all costs to make more and more money is *not only not natural* (this is part of capitalist ideology) but positively *irrational*.

The question then arises as to what produced such a motivation as common among people. According to Weber, the answer lies in the evolution of protestant belief.

The 'spirit of modern capitalism' is characterized by the devotion to the earning of wealth together with the avoidance of the use of this income for personal enjoyment.

- Weber has demonstrated that *the rationalization of economic life in modern capitalism*

connects up with irrational elements.

Causality: Two ways of interpreting Weber in this work

1) Direct refutation of Marx: the Reformation caused modern capitalism to evolve. This is overly simplistic and not Weber's intention. He is much more modest.

2) The picture given in the *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* is: *the 'flip side of the same coin'*. There is partial causality involved and mutual causality. We could thus interpret Weber's work here as expressive of the other side of the dialectical relationship between economy and religion. *What is refuted* by this work is *naive* economic determinism and *naive* historical materialism.

5. Definitions

(Hun-Jip Kim)

1. Utility

Jeremy Bentham, in *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789), pointed out, "...that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness...or...to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness". Economists say that utility is his, or her, preferences. This means that the satisfaction, from the consumption of goods and services, is called "Utility".

2. Total Utility

Total utility is the total benefit or satisfaction that a person gets from the consumption of goods and services. Because more consumption means higher degree of total utility, it depends on the quantity of a person's consumption.

3. Marginal Utility

When the consumption of goods increases, marginal utility decreases. This is what we

call the diminishing marginal utility principle. Marginal Utility is the change in total utility resulting from a unit increase in the quantity of goods consumed.

4. Utility Maximization

Utility maximization is the process, or goal, of obtaining the highest level of utility from the consumption, or use of goods and services. It is based on the presumption that people have unlimited wants and needs in the scarcity of resources. An individual income and goods' prices limits an individual's utility obtained from consumption, or use of goods and services. Therefore, he, or she, tries to maximize the benefits, or total utility.

6. Economical Approach (Effects of Utilitarianism in Economy):

(Taehun Choi)

In [economics](#), **utility** is a measure of the happiness or satisfaction gained from a good or service. The concept is applied by economists in such topics as the [indifference curve](#), which measures the combination of a basket of commodities that an individual or a community requests at a given level(s) of satisfaction. The concept is also used in [utility functions](#), [social welfare functions](#), [Pareto maximization](#), [Edgeworth boxes](#) and [contract curves](#). It is a central concept of [welfare economics](#).

The doctrine of [utilitarianism](#) saw the maximisation of utility as a moral criterion for the organisation of society. According to utilitarians, such as [Jeremy Bentham](#) (1748-1832) and [John Stuart Mill](#) (1806-1876), society should aim to maximise the total utility of individuals, aiming for 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number'.

The notion of the theory of marginal utility is that someone will go on buying more of a commodity at a given price, so long as its utility is greater than the price, but the utility of each new product purchased declines as the buyer gets "saturated". Contrariwise, a buyer will sell a product at a price so long as the utility of the money for him is greater than the price. Given this simple idea, it becomes an easy matter to generate hundreds of differential equations which connect various factors involved in exchange of commodities, money supply and so on, all of which, in one way or

another rest on hypothetical, unrealistic models of human psychology as implied in the previous paragraph, and all of course, in the name of science.

Utility theory assumes that humankind is [rational](#). That is, people maximize their utility wherever possible. For instance, one would request more of a good if it is available and if one has the ability to acquire that amount, if this is the rational thing to do in the circumstances.

Cardinal and ordinal utility

There are mainly two kinds of measurement of utility implemented by economists: cardinal utility and ordinal utility.

Utility was originally viewed as a measurable quantity, so that it would be possible to measure the utility of each individual in the society with respect to each good available in the society, and to add these together to yield the total utility of all people with respect to all goods in the society. Society could then aim to maximise the total utility of all people in society, or the average utility per person. This conception of utility as a measurable quantity that could be aggregated across individuals is called 'cardinal utility'.

Cardinal utility quantitatively measures the preference of an individual towards a certain commodity. Numbers assigned to different goods or services can be compared. A utility of 100 units towards a cup of vodka is twice as desirable as a cup of coffee with a utility level of 50 units. The concept of cardinal utility suffers from the absence of an objective measure of utility when comparing the utility gained from consumption of a particular good by one individual as opposed to another individual. For this reason, [neoclassical economics](#) abandoned utility as a foundation for the analysis of economic behaviour, in favour of an analysis based upon [preferences](#). This led to the development of tools such as [indifference curves](#) to explain economic behaviour.

In this analysis, an individual is observed to prefer one choice to another. Preferences can be ordered from most satisfying to least satisfying. Only the ordering is important: the magnitude of the numerical values are not important except in as much as they

establish the order. A utility of 100 towards an ice-cream is not twice as desirable as a utility of 50 towards candy. All that can be said is that ice-cream is preferred to candy. There is no attempt to explain why one choice is preferred to another; hence no need for a quantitative concept of utility.

It is still possible, given a set of preferences which satisfy certain criteria of reasonableness, to find a **utility function** that will explain these preferences. Such a utility function takes on higher values for choices that the individual prefers. Utility functions are a useful and widely used tool in modern economics.

A utility function to describe an individual's set of preferences clearly is not unique. If the value of the utility function were to be, eg, doubled, squared, or subjected to any other strictly monotonically increasing function, it would still describe the same preferences. With this approach to utility, known as **ordinal utility** it is not possible to compare utility between individuals, or find the total utility for society as the Utilitarians hoped to do.

Utility in game theory

In game theory utility is represented as a function representing the anticipated payoff of each player corresponding to their selected strategy. The domain of any utility function is defined below.

Consider a system ζ of entities u, v, ω

A player has an anticipation in ζ for any given move and their utility function has a natural operation defined as:

$$\alpha u + (1 - \alpha)v$$

where $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and the probability of u is $\alpha(u)$

and the probability of v is $(1 - \alpha)(v)$.

The correspondence of utility and preference is denoted by:

$$u \rightarrow \alpha = V(u)$$

u being the utility and $V(u)$ the value attached to it.

The following axioms are required:

1) $u > v$ implies $V(u) > V(v)$ and is a complete ordering of ζ

2) u and v can exist only in three mutually exclusive orderings:

$$u > v; u < v; u = v;$$

and all ζ are fully transitive of order

- 3) $u > v$ implies that $u > \alpha u + (1 - \alpha)v$
- 4) $u > v > \omega$ implies that there exists an α such that
 $\alpha u + (1 - \alpha)v > \omega$
 therefore $\alpha(\zeta)$ is continuous

- 5) entities in ζ can be combined algebraically such that
 $\alpha u + (1 - \alpha)v = (1 - \alpha)v + \alpha u$
 and
 $\alpha(\beta u + (1 - \beta)v) + (1 - \alpha)v = \gamma u + (1 - \gamma)v$
 where $\gamma = \alpha(\beta)$

7. Legal Approach (Effects of Utilitarianism in Law):

LEGAL APPROACH

(Chang-Ghone, Kim)

- Application of Utility to Law.

An Introduction to Law and Economics,

A. M. Polinsky

1. Utility and Efficiency

For each legal application considered, we will determine what legal rule or policy would best promote certain goals with the primary focus on the goal of *efficiency*. The concept of Utility in Economics can correspond to that of Efficiency in Law.

2. Nuisance Law

Output of Factory	0	1	2	3
Additional profits of Factory	-	\$10,000	\$4,000	\$2,000
Total Profits of Factory	\$0	\$10,000	\$14,000	\$16,000
Additional Damages of Resident	-	\$1,000	\$15,000	\$20,000
Total Damages of Resident	\$0	\$1,000	\$16,000	\$36,000
Total Profits Less Total Damages	\$0	\$9,000	-\$2,000	-\$20,000

3. Breach of Contract

S is the seller: S's cost to produce the widget is \$150.

B1 is the initial buyer: B1's value of the widget is \$200.

B1's reliance expenditure is \$10

B1 pays S the contract price in advance.

B2 is the second buyer: B2's value of the widget is \$0 or \$180 or \$250

4. Automobile Accident (1) - Driver's Care Affects Expected Accident Cost

Behavior of driver :	Drive rapidly	Drive moderately	Drive slowly
Total Benefit to Driver	\$120	\$80	\$50
Total Expected Accident cost to Pedestrian	\$100	\$40	\$20
Total Benefit Minus total cost	\$20	\$40	\$30

Automobile Accident (2) - Driver's Care Affects Expected Accident Cost

Behavior of driver :	Drive rapidly	Drive moderately	Drive slowly
Total Benefit to Driver	\$120	\$80	\$50
Total Expected Accident cost to Pedestrian	\$100(walks) \$110(runs)	\$40(walks) \$50(runs)	\$20(walks) \$30(runs)
Total Benefit Minus total cost	\$20(walks) \$10(runs)	\$40(walks) \$30(runs)	\$30(walks) \$20(runs)

5. Law Enforcement (1) - Residents Risk Neutral

Total Enforcement Costs (1)	\$500,000	\$50,000	\$500
Probability of Detection (2)	1.0	.1	.001
Fine (3)	\$10	\$100	\$10,000
Expected Fine (4)	\$10	\$10	\$10

Law Enforcement (2) - Residence Risk Averse

Amount in dispute: \$10,000

Plaintiff's belief about the probability that he will prevail at trial: 80%

Plaintiff's litigation costs: \$3,000

Plaintiff's expected net winnings at trial: $\$5,000 = (80\% \times \$10,000) - \$3,000$

Defendant's belief about the probability that plaintiff will prevail at trial:

80% (when plaintiff and defendant agree)

Defendant's litigation costs: \$3,000

Defendant's expected total payment at trial: $\$11,000 = (80\% \times \$10,000) + \$3,000$

Size of settlement range: \$6000 ($= \$11,000 - \$5,000$)

8. Random Approach (How People find happiness in life?)

(Jin- young Kim)

Application of Utilitarianism to Current Issues

New type of social problems arises as the structure of modern society is getting more complicated. With the change of society the theoretical and ideological transformation is undergoing. It results the confusion of values and difficulty in applying the theories to the current issues. We will discuss on moral issues such as end-of-life decision and abortion adjusting Utilitarianism as one of the theoretical standards of decision.

1. Euthanasia and The end-of-life decision

Utilitarian refuse to say that depriving a person of his/her life is fundamentally immoral. It is not because they want to justify a murder or killing a person but because they deny that there is an ultimate good or fundamental evil. Thus Utilitarianism emphasizes consequence of action. The action is wrong only when the death brings about a negative effect. That is, even a murder can be justifiable if it doesn't cause any bad results. On the other hand, saving life can be wrong if it arose some pain. For the utilitarian, morality is about producing good consequences, not having good intentions. The fundamental imperative of utilitarianism is –acting in the way that will produce the greatest overall amount of good in the society. Consequently, the emphasis is on consequences, not intentions.

The pain makes the negative result while the pleasure is the only mean which results the positive consequence. The negative result arises when the killed body and others around him experience frustration of individual desires. Then what kind of frustration

can arise? There is no doubt that death breaks down someone's desire to live and his family's desire to interact with the dead. However, the more important standard of morality in Utilitarianism is result of the action. If the result were good enough to countervail the individual frustration, the action of killing would be right.

We'll look into euthanasia issue from the utilitarian point of view. Assume that a patient desires to die without a pain from incurable disease, and he is no more profitable to his family and society. In Utilitarianism a good death is a painless and happy one. As mentioned above, utilitarian believes if euthanasia results the greatest happiness and the least frustration, the action is right. The greatest happiness depends on how many people will be affected negatively and positively and how intensely they will be affected. It is because it asks us to choose the action that produces the greatest overall amount of utility. Considering his death relieves his own and family's mental and economic pain, utilitarian would conclude the action is right because his desire influences other people positively. In opposite case, patient has a strong desire to avoid pain and shame by choosing death, but there is a considerable possibility of beneficial contribution to his family and society. His death is not morally right because he has ability to influence others positively in spite of frustration of his individual desire to die.

2. Abortion

The basic tenet of Utilitarianism is that it always asks us to do the most, to maximize utility, not to do the minimum. As mentioned above, morality of individual action is about producing good consequences, not having good intentions. The purpose of morality is to make the society a better place. Utilitarian believe that the individual pursuits happiness not only to realize personal happiness but also to actualize social happiness. Each member of society pursuits maximization of individual utility, consequently, the whole society comes to the level of the greatest happiness. We should do whatever will bring the most benefit to all of humanity and society.

Assume that there is an unmarried couple and they both want abortion because they are not ready to be parents. From utilitarian respect, one man/woman means one unit. Everyone's suffering counts equally, and we must count the consequences for everyone. We need to calculate how many people will be affected, negatively as well as positively as a result of abortion. For negative side, if the embryo or fetus is considered as one unit, he/she has a right to survive. Positive result includes that both parents' pain will

be removed, and the baby has no danger to be raised in undesirable circumstance due to unprepared parents. Abortion case involves two units and an imperfect unit. Utilitarian calculus verifies that an incomplete unit can be sacrificed for the bigger desire of two people. Consequently there arose more positive results, and the abortion is morally right.

3. Concluding Assessment

Utilitarianism has been criticized that it has no fixed standard to measure social morality. Although morality should stand on the base of objective standard, Utilitarianism has a subjective standard, thus the calculus result will be different each time because the standard depends on variable condition like group of people who does calculating. Typically, the count differs depending on who does the counting. In addition, the theory only stresses economic solution when it deals with ethic and moral issues, as a result, morality or importance of life can be ignored in the process of calculating.

Although this theory has some weak points, Utilitarianism can be a standard in making a value judgment and law. Two conflicting possibilities emerge when we decide to legitimate euthanasia or abortion. One is suffered people will escape from an unnecessary pain while the other is that some innocent lives can be sacrificed due to abuse of the law. If we stand on the side of Utilitarian we need to choose the action that produces the greatest overall amount of utility. Through comparing both possibilities, the community chooses an action whatever will bring a more positive influence to the society. We must seek a common ground in the way that emphasize former possibility and minimize the later one. Utilitarianism is most appropriate for policy decisions, as long as a strong notion of fundamental human rights guarantees that it will not violate rights of small minorities.

----The End----