Synthesizing Rights and Utility: John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)

Mill’s Harm Principle

“The object of this essay is to assert one very simple principle, as entitled to govern absolutely the dealings of society with the individual in the way of compulsion and control, whether the means used be physical force in the form of legal penalties or the moral coercion of public opinion. That principle is that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him happier, because, in the opinions of others, to do so would be wise or even right.”
Mill’s Harm Principle

“These are good reasons for remonstrating with him, or reasoning with him, or persuading him, or entreating him, but not for compelling him or visiting him with any evil in case he do otherwise. To justify that, the conduct from which it is desired to deter him must be calculated to produce evil to someone else. The only part of the conduct of anyone for which he is amenable to society is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.”

The Rights-Utility Synthesis

FREEDOM

UTILITY
The Rights-Utility Synthesis

FREEDOM

TRUTH

UTILITY

Mill and Freedom of Speech

“First, if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may, for aught we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility.

“Secondly, though the silenced opinion be an error, it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of truth; and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied.”
**Mill and Freedom of Speech**

“Thirdly, even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth; unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will, by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds. And not only this, but, fourthly, the meaning of the doctrine itself will be in danger of being lost, or enfeebled, and deprived of its vital effect on the character and conduct: the dogma becoming a mere formal profession, inefficacious for good, but cumbering the ground, and preventing the growth of any real and heartfelt conviction, from reason or personal experience.”

**Problems with Defining Harm**

“In many cases, an individual, in pursuing a legitimate object, necessarily and therefore legitimately causes pain or loss to others, or intercepts a good which they had a reasonable hope of obtaining. Such oppositions of interest between individuals often arise from bad social institutions, but are unavoidable while those institutions last; and some would be unavoidable under any institutions. Whoever succeeds in an overcrowded profession, or in a competitive examination; whoever is preferred to another in any contest for an object which both desire, reaps benefit from the loss of others, from their wasted exertion and their disappointment. But it is, by common admission, better for the general interest of mankind, that persons should pursue their objects undeterred by this sort of consequences. In other words, society admits no right, either legal or moral, in the disappointed competitors, to immunity from this kind of suffering; and feels called on to interfere, only when means of success have been employed which it is contrary to the general interest to permit, namely, fraud or treachery, and force.”
Problems with Defining Harm

“Again, trade is a social act. Whoever undertakes to sell any description of goods to the public, does what affects the interest of other persons, and of society in general; and thus his conduct, in principle, comes within the jurisdiction of society: accordingly, it was once held to be the duty of governments, in all cases which were considered of importance, to fix prices, and regulate the processes of manufacture. But it is now recognised, though not till after a long struggle, that both the cheapness and the good quality of commodities are most effectually provided for by leaving the producers and sellers perfectly free, under the sole check of equal freedom to the buyers for supplying themselves elsewhere. This is the so-called doctrine of Free Trade, which rests on grounds different from, though equally solid with, the principle of individual liberty asserted in this Essay.”

Mill’s Harm Principle

“The object of this essay is to assert one very simple principle, as entitled to govern absolutely the dealings of society with the individual in the way of compulsion and control, whether the means used be physical force in the form of legal penalties or the moral coercion of public opinion. That principle is that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him happier, because, in the opinions of others, to do so would be wise or even right.”
Is the Harm Principle Inherently conservative?

“An opinion that corn-dealers are starvers of the poor, or that private property is robbery, ought to be unmolested when simply circulated through the press, but may justly incur punishment when delivered orally to an excited mob assembled before the house of a corn-dealer, or when handed about among the same mob in the form of a placard. Acts of whatever kind, which, without justifiable cause, do harm to others, may be, and in the more important cases absolutely require to be, controlled by the unfavourable sentiments, and, when needful, by the active interference of mankind. The liberty of the individual must be thus far limited; he must not make himself a nuisance to other people. But if he refrains from molesting others in what concerns them, and merely acts according to his own inclination and judgment in things which concern himself, the same reasons which show that opinion should be free, prove also that he should be allowed, without molestation, to carry his opinions into practice at his own cost.”

Ambiguity in the Harm Principle

“These are good reasons for remonstrating with him, or reasoning with him, or persuading him, or entreating him, but not for compelling him or visiting him with any evil in case he do otherwise. To justify that, the conduct from which it is desired to deter him must be calculated to produce evil to someone else. The only part of the conduct of anyone for which he is amenable to society is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.”
### Variation in the Definition of Harm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG INTERPRETATION: INTENTIONALIST</th>
<th>WEAK INTERPRETATION: CONSEQUENTIALIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUDED</td>
<td>INTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Execution</td>
<td>mens rea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain wartime killing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legal Execution**

- mens rea
- Drunk Driving
- Professional standard of care
- Attractive nuisance
- Statistical rape
- Good Samaritan laws
### Variation in the Definition of Harm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG INTERPRETATION: INTENTIONALIST</th>
<th>EXCLUDED</th>
<th>INTENT</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTIVE INTENT</th>
<th>NEGLIGENCE/ &quot;REASONABLE PERSON&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Execution</td>
<td>mens rea</td>
<td>Drunk driving</td>
<td>Professional standard of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certain wartime killing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attractive nuisance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG INTERPRETATION: INTENTIONALIST</th>
<th>EXCLUDED</th>
<th>INTENT</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTIVE INTENT</th>
<th>NEGLIGENCE/ &quot;REASONABLE PERSON&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Rape</td>
<td>Legal Execution</td>
<td>mens rea</td>
<td>Drunk driving</td>
<td>Professional standard of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Rape</td>
<td>Certain wartime killing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attractive nuisance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAK INTERPRETATION: CONSEQUENTIALIST</th>
<th>STRICT LIABILITY</th>
<th>FAILURE TO STOP HARM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory rape</td>
<td>Good Samaritan laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thalidomide
## Variation in the Definition of Harm

**Strong Interpretation: Intentionalist** | **Weak Interpretation: Consequentialist**
--- | ---
**Excluded** | **Intention** | **Constructive Intent** | **Negligence/Reasonable Person** | **Strict Liability** | **Failure to Stop Harm**
Legal Execution | mens rea | Drunk driving | Professional standard of care | Attractive nuisance | Statutory rape | Good Samaritan laws
Certain wartime killing |  |  |  |  |  |  
Marital Rape |  |  |  |  |  |

**Legal Execution**

**Discrimination**
### Variation in the Definition of Harm

**STRONG INTERPRETATION: Intentionalist**

- **EXCLUDED INTENT**: Legal execution, mens rea
- **CONSTRUCTIVE INTENT**: Drunk driving
- **NEGIGENCE/"REASONABLE PERSON"**: Professional standard of care
- **FAILURE TO STOP HARM**: Attractive nuisance

**WEAK INTERPRETATION: Consequentialist**

- **STRICT LIABILITY**: Statutory rape
- **FAILURE TO STOP HARM**: Good Samaritan laws

---

**Legal Execution**

**Certain wartime killing**

**Discrimination**