

## Non-Consequentialist Utilitarianism

Nir Eyal

Leading contemporary philosophers are confident that utilitarianism is a version of consequentialism. But it is not a version of consequentialism. *Utilitarianism*, as both classical utilitarians and contemporary philosophers understand it, says that an act is morally right if and only if it maximizes total utility. *Consequentialism*, as these leading contemporary philosophers understand it, says that an act is morally right if and only if it maximizes impersonally-defined good. Total utility need not be thought to represent a good, or the only good. You may consistently hold that a certain act is right because it maximizes utility, but that that act does not maximize impersonal good. Thus, non-consequentialist utilitarianism is a consistent philosophical stance, and utilitarianism is not simply a version of consequentialism. I address two replies to my claim, and I argue, provocatively, that John Rawls's social theory may be utilitarian and non-consequentialist.