

# Is mill your cup of tea

[History](#)



of the of the of the Is Mill Your Cup of Tea? QUESTION: Why didn't he, say, found the idea of democracy on religion instead? ANSWER: Mill founded the idea of democracy over religion because according to his instance of democracy every individual possessed sovereignty of his particular rights and was not to be harmed by any other person or thought or action. While Christianity and many other religions emphasize upon the sovereignty of God and maintain the principle that if any one slaps you on one side of your face then the other side should also be put in front of that person. This thought is not encouraged by Mill. Mill stresses that injustice should not be done with an individual at any cost and if it is not his fault in a particular scenario then he should never be unjustly treated. QUESTION: But, irrespective of its factual inaccuracy, what about the claim itself? Why does Mill say his first principles are a better basis for democracy than Christian (or any other religion's) principles? ANSWER: Mill Argues that his principles of democracy are better than those of any other religion including Christianity because he maintains the notion of the preservation of sanctity of rights for each being as an individual and a society as a whole. Mill emphasizes that as long as an individual does not harm another person or things around himself it is okay for him to exercise whatever he wants to do. QUESTION: But what about unpopular minority viewpoints or the viewpoints of (oftentimes obnoxious) nonconformists? Mill in fact states that there are at least 4 good reasons why their views (despite being noxious) should be given a fair hearing. What are these 4 reasons? ANSWER: If all mankind is at one side and a single individual is on the other, then either the man would be so powerful that he would overpower the rest of the world with his thought or would otherwise get crushed by their thought paradigm. The disadvantage of putting a

<https://assignbuster.com/is-mill-your-cup-of-tea/>

certain viewpoint to silence would result in the following scenario: Either the point of view being silenced be correct or would be incorrect. If it is incorrect then the benefit of truth would not be delivered to that person since he would forcefully be silenced. On the other hand, if the viewpoint that has been silenced is true in nature then this would be an act of depriving an entire race of mankind with the truth that could so very rightfully be delivered to them. Truth can never be suppressed on the whole. It would always re-emerge despite multiple silencing attempts in one form or the other. Being heretic opens mind and assists mental development. Those practicing otherwise never got to escape their behavior. Another reason why non conformists should be listened to is personal intellect makes a person a great thinker. Great thinkers are often only in minorities. By hearing others' point of view and pondering over it actually leads towards great thinking.

QUESTION: Mill wants to place restrictions upon the state. But what kinds of restrictions? Would he think laws against private gun ownership are consistent with a liberal democracy? Would he think laws against gay marriage are consistent with a liberal democracy? Would he think laws against drunk driving are consistent with a liberal democracy? Would he think laws that mandate seat belts while operating an automobile are consistent with a liberal democracy? Although Mill doesn't address these questions specifically in ' On Liberty' (he's writing in the pre-automobile age!), you should be able to have a pretty good idea why he answers with an unqualified \_\_\_\_!!!! To each and every question above. What do you think? Would he answer YES to them all? Or NO to them all? (It really is all or nothing here.) What is the basis for you selecting either YES or NO? (Just to be clear: I'm not asking you whether YOU think these are good laws or not; <https://assignbuster.com/is-mill-your-cup-of-tea/>

I'm asking whether you think MILL thinks these are good or bad laws. Once we get Mill sorted out, then you can go back to the drawing board in terms of your own thoughts on the matter.) ANSWER: In my opinion Mill would have the following respective instances about each of the questions asked above: Mill would think that laws against private gun ownership are not in line with a liberal democracy. He would say that it should be permissible for every individual to privately own a gun so as to protect himself the possible threat of harm being caused to him by oppressors or unjust people. Mill would believe that laws against gay marriages should not be there. He wanted to emphasize that as long as an individual's actions do not harm others around him he should be permitted to execute them. Thus, according to Mill Laws against Gay marriages are not in line with liberal democracy. Laws against drunken driving would definitely be considered in line with liberal democracy. This is because drunk driving may result in the possible injury of not only the individual himself but also of many others. A drunk driver may hit his car to others on the road and may even harm other sitting with him in the vehicle. This there should be no means by which drunk driving should be permitted. Laws that mandate seat belts are not consistent with liberal democracy because they do not safeguard the safety of the individual himself. Liberal democracy, according to Mill, emphasizes that one should not be restricted by scuffling him in seat belts. One's sanctity should be given utmost priority. Thus mandatory wearing of seat belts is not in line with liberal democracy. Thus the answer to all put questions in a unified NO!

WORKS CITED: Mill S. John, " On Liberty". 1859. Web. September 14, 2011. Cave Peter, " Birthday Special: John Stuart Mill". 2006. Web. September 14, 2011. Democracy Web. " Majority Rule/Minority Rights: Essential Principles." <https://assignbuster.com/is-mill-your-cup-of-tea/>

n. d. Web. September 14, 2011 Todd Robert. " Chapter One-Critical Thinking." 2004. Web. September 14, 2011. White, T. J. " The non-Conformist's Bible" December 04, 2004. Web. September 14, 2011.