Objection: "To suppose that life has (as they express it) no higher end than pleasure -- no better and nobler object of desire and pursuit -- they designate as utterly mean and groveling, as a doctrine worthy only of swine..."

Response: It is those who offer this objection "who represent human nature in a degrading light, since the accusation supposes human beings to be capable of no pleasures except those of which swine are capable." Whereas, in fact, human beings are capable of many pleasure inaccessible to swine -- and it is the possibility of enjoying these pleasures that makes a human being's life so much richer. Not only are these pleasures different -- more permanent and easier to obtain -- they are better. To see that they are better, just ask those who have experienced both the sort of physical pleasures available to pigs and the mental pleasures peculiar to humans.

The details of this response cover pages 7-12. Mill clearly thought the objection worthy of careful rebuttal.

Objection: Happiness is unavailable.

Response: Once the connection between morals and happiness is understood in a reasonable way (as not involving eternal bliss, and as including prevention of pain), the objection is clearly false.

Objection: If people are taught to consider happiness as the end of life, they would not be satisfied with the moderate share that would likely be theirs.

Response: "When people are tolerable fortunate in their outward lot do not find in life sufficient enjoyment to make it valuable to them, the cause generally is caring for nobody but themselves. To those who have neither public nor private affections, the excitements of life are much curtailed, and in any case dwindle in value as the time approaches when all selfish interest must be terminated by death; while those who leave after them objects of personal affection, and especially those who have also cultivated a fellow-feeling with the collective interests of mankind, retain as lively an interest in life on the eve of death as in the vigor of youth and health."

Objection: Utilitarianism sets too high a standard by requiring that people always act "from the inducement of promoting the general interests of society."

Response: The objection rests on misunderstanding utilitarianism. Nothing in the theory requires that people always act from a feeling of duty. Utilitarianism doesn't say the rightness of an act depends on why you perform it. "...it is a misapprehension of the utilitarian mode of thought to conceive it as implying that people should fix their minds upon so wide a generality as the world, or society at large."
Response: When men and women are cold and unsympathizing, as they often are, it is the fault of the person and not the fault of their being utilitarians. In fact, one feature of utilitarianism is that it can explain just what is wrong with being cold and unsympathizing -- being so reduces the over-all happiness.

Objection: Utilitarianism is a godless doctrine.

Response: If God is all good, and wills the happiness of His creation, then Utilitarianism is perfectly in line with religion. "In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of utility. 'To do as you would be done by,' and 'to love your neighbor as yourself,' constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality" (p. 17). Moreover, some theory or other is needed to interpret the will of God.