**EVERYONE COUNTS**

In utilitarianism you must weigh the benefit & harm to everyone who might get benefit or harm. Utilitarianism is not just about sheer numbers. Everyone who experiences consequences counts. Each person counts as one person. The benefit to that person might be sacrificed for overall benefit of everyone, but that person does get counted. Even guilty people count, or rather, utilitarianism

does not consider guilt or innocence. Utilitarianism does not discount the benefits & harm to people just because they are to blame.

“SOCIETY” does not get counted.

Act Utilitarianism, and rule if it is ethical, is about real flesh and blood human beings & animals, maybe the trees & earth too, but not about society. The abstract concept of society is often used to blur the reality, make the people count less. Utilitarianism is tough to swallow at times in the ways the individual seems sacrificed for overall good. It is even tougher if real people are discounted in the name of an abstract society. As is, we are dividing all the real people into groups. Bentham would have liked us to be able to point and consider every single real human being. Well, we'll have to group, but we do not have to ever make it about society.

BENEFIT/HARM TO COMPANIES RARELY MATTERS:

When it comes to money, utilitarianism rarely makes a call one way or other unless money goes from rich to poor. Only time money is a benefit is if it goes from rich to poor. Only time money is a harm is when it goes from poor to rich.

In a competitive environment, you can never discuss the benefit to any company while ignoring the harm to its competitors. You can never discuss the harm to a company unless you discuss the benefit to its competitors. In a competitive market economy, money just changes hands, balancing out: company x gets $$? Then Company y loses $$. But there are rare exceptions to this general rule that benefit/harm to companies cancels out. If a company has a monopoly that is not harming anyone, then they have no competitors. Facebook currently has such a monopoly. But be careful. You must still consider that those who work in these companies get very little value for, say $100. compared to that $100. in the hands of poor people. The one hundred dollars just means more in their lives. There is a point at which you have so much, a few hundred dollars means nothing to you, but it means very much to a poor person.

DO NOT APPEAL TO RIGHTS. DO NOT APPEAL TO ISSUES OF PRIVACY.

**Utilitarianism only looks at real consequences of real actions**. Privacy is not a consequence. Privacy is an abstract concept of a certain philosophical view, namely, rights. Only the consequences of loss of privacy can be harms, but then, you must frame the loss outside of the abstract conceptual view of rights: data breaches can have consequences and only those possible consequences count, such as losing your money, ridicule, losing your job, identity theft, spouse asking for divorce, being stalked. Those are real consequences, they count under utilitarianism. Privacy is just a state of being isolated. Isolation can be a benefit but it could also be a harm. There is nothing

inherent about privacy that makes it either a consequence or a benefit or a harm. Just be careful that you do not slip into rights mentality when you try to show benefits & harms. Never assume something is a benefit because it sounds ethical. Instead you have to discuss real harm.

“DISGRUNTLED” IS NOT A SUFFICIENT HARM.

People are often disgruntled. Indeed, given nothing to be disgruntled about, people will invent something. Utilitarianism cannot control for “upset” or “disgruntled”. Instead, stick with more direct & controllable consequences.