Review Questions:

1. Explain Kant’s account of the good will.

According to Immanuel Kant, it is impossible to conceive anything at all in the world, or even out of it, which can be taken as good without qualification, except good will. He explained that goodwill is not considered good because of the outcome but it is considered good because it is based on how we do it to be able to have a good outcome.

1. Distinguish between hypothetical and categorical imperatives.

According to Immanuel Kant, Categorical Imperatives refer to our moral obligations. It is where we derive all our duties. It is absolute and is justified until then end. Hypothetical Imperative on the other hand, is not absolute because nobody knows the outcome unless the condition or goal is given.

1. State the first formulation of the categorical imperative (using the notion of a universal law), and explain how Kant uses this rule to derive some specific duties toward self and others.

***“Act only on that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law”***

I think the first formulation of the categorical imperative wants us to treat our action like it’s a universal law. We much perform our duty well to any extent. For example, making commitment with others. Since we already made commitments we should make sure that we do whatever we commit to that other person no matter what happens.

1. State the second version of the categorical imperative (using the language of means and end), and explain it.

***"Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end and never merely as a means to an end."***

The second version, basically wants to tell us that we should not use the first imperative to bring end to other people.

Discussion Questions:

1. Are two versions of categorical imperative just different expressions of one basic rule, or are they two different rules? Defend your view.

I think they are two different rules. If we analyze both categories, the first one simply wants us to treat our action as if it is a universal law. But the second rule, though it is patterned after the first, wants to tell us that we should not use the first rule as an excuse to be a mean of end for other people.

1. Kant claims that an action that is not done from the motive of duty has no moral worth. Do you agree or not? If not, give some counterexample.

I kind of agree with Immanuel Kant that doing something that does not follow the motive of duty has no moral worth. For example, you promised a friend that you will lend him some money. After some time, you decided not to lend him money and use the money instead for shopping. Because of what you did he wasn’t able to pay his tuition fee, resulting for him to stop studying for a while.

From the example, we can see that the person who broke the promise has no moral worth. Since he already promises that he will lend his friend some money he already has a duty towards him. By not fulfilling his promise therefore he neglected the duty that he himself created.

1. Some commentators think that the categorical imperative (particularly the first formulation) can be used to justify non-moral or immoral actions. Is this a good criticism?

Yes. I think that the categorical imperative can be used to justify non-moral or immoral actions. Based from the situations given in the chapter, we can see that categorical imperative gives fair judgement of what is non-moral or immoral actions.