James Rachel: The Debate over Utilitarianism

What I expect to learn: What is he debating about? Why utilitarianism? Who are the opposing sides between the debate?

Quote: “The happiness which forms the utilitarianism standard of what is right in conduct, is not the agent’s own happiness, but that of all concerned. As between his own happiness and that of others utilitarianism requires him to be strictly impartial as disinterested and benevolent spectator.”

I think this statement shows that there are the consequences of happiness. The question is that is that if happiness is the only important thing in our lives? To be honest I think anyone would debate over this issue. There are times that we do ask ourselves if our only significance is to make ourselves happy. Well have different obligations and responsibilities and not all of them gives us pleasure. Does this mean we have to quit these obligations are responsibilities in order to achieve happiness? If raising a child does not show any pleasure then must we give up on the child and find another source. We must also ask ourselves the consequences in the long run, we have to think what the outcomes in the short are and long run. There are times when it may seem un-pleasurable and undesirable but in the long run it pays.

What I have learned:

* Happiness and the other sides
* How it affects us
* What are the different possibilities