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In this chapter, you be learning about a variety of **deontological** theories of ethics, according to which “doing the right thing” depends on things other than the consequences (so deontologists aren’t utilitarians!). There’s quite a bit of variety among deontological theories, but we’ll be focusing on three versions of deontology that have been especially influential: (1) the “Golden Rule”, (2) the “categorical imperative” of Immanuel Kant, and (3) the “pluralism” of WD Ross.
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# What does it mean to be “Deontic”?

According to **deontological** theories of ethics, whether an action is right or wrong depends on factors besides (or in addition to) the consequences. Specifically, deontological theories emphasize the importance of what a person *intends* (or “wills”) in the judgement of their action, and the “nature” of the action in question. Unlike the consequentialist/utilitarian, deontologists do NOT think that the “ends justify the means.” There are many different forms of deontological ethics. In this lesson, we’ll be looking at some of the most influential.

## The Golden Rule

One simple form of deontological ethics with which most people are familiar is the **“Golden Rule,”** which mandates that you treat others in the way that you would like to be treated. Something like this appears in most ethical/religious traditions we know about. While this principle agrees with consequentialist ethics in many cases (for example, both would agree that it is wrong to torture people for fun), it can also lead to different results. In particular, the Golden Rule seems to forbid killing/harming people for the greater good (something consequentialists would be fine with). After all, if YOU don’t want to be “sacrificed for the greater good” then you shouldn’t’ do this to others.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A Few Formulations of the Golden Rule** | |
| Buddhism: | “Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful.” (*Udana-Varga* 5:18) |
| Confucianism: | ‘Do not do to others what you do not want them to do to you.” (*Analects* 15:23) |
| Christianity | “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.” (Matthew 22:38) |
| Hinduism: | “This is the sum of duty: do not do to others what would cause pain if done to you.” (*Mahabharata* 5:1517) |
| Humanism: | “Don’t do things you wouldn’t want to have done to you.” (The British Humanist Society) |
| Islam: | “None of you [truly] believes until he wishes for his brother what he wishes for himself.” (#13 of Imam Al-Nawawi’s *Forty Hadiths*.) |
| Jainism: | “A man should wander about treating all creatures as he himself would be treated.” (*Sutrakritanga* 1.11.33) |
| Judaism: | “you shall love your neighbor as yourself.” (*Leviticus* 19:18) |
| Zoroastrianism: | “That nature alone is good which refrains from doing unto another whatsoever is not good for itself.” (*Dadistan-i-dinik* 94:5) |

List is adapted from <https://www.scarboromissions.ca/golden-rule> and <https://www.goldenruleproject.org/formulations>

**Golden Rule and “The Problem of Pluralism”.** While the Golden Rule can function as a good rule of thumb (hence its wide adoption across a wide range of traditions), it doesn’t quite work as an ethical theory, primarily because it defines good/bad actions in terms of the *desires of the person acting*. So, for example, a sadomasochist (who enjoys both suffering pain and causing it) could apply the Golden Rule to show that he or she *ought* to hurt people. This is a huge problem, as it suggests the Golden Rule can’t deal with the fact that people are *different.* For this reason, most contemporary deontologists adopt more complex theories. (However, most would agree that the Golden Rule is a good “rule of thumb”, even if it isn’t a complete ethical theory).

**Beyond the Golden Rule.** In the rest of this lesson, we’ll take a look at two of the more famous versions of deontology within philosophy: Kantian and Rossian deontology. Both build on the basic ideas already present in the Golden Rule. However, it’s important to remember that there are *many, many* versions of deontology. For example, just about every set of religious/social moral “rules” we know about might plausibly count as a separate version of deontology (since each will have a different set of rules). This is very different from utilitarian ethics, which is defined by the agreement on a single moral rule (maximize happiness).

## Kantian Ethics

**Immanuel Kant (1724-1804)** was a German philosopher, and was perhaps the most influential writer on ethical issues since Plato and Aristotle. He held that actions are moral if and only if they conform to the **categorical imperative.** He formulated three different “versions” of this rule, and claimed that they were equivalent (it’s not clear that he’s right about this):

* **Universal Law Formula—“**Always act according to that maxim whose universality as a law you can at the same time will." Kant’s example: If we lived in a world everyone lied, then there would be no longer be any point to lying, since no one would believe you anymore (so, lying is not “universalizable”). Kant suggests that this means you can NEVER EVER lie, even to a murderer who has come to your door, and asks where your children are. (Contemporary Kantians aren’t so sure about this).
* **Humanity Formula (the “Formula of the End in Itself”)—**“Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of another, never simply as a means but always at the same time as an end.” We’ll talk more about this formulation below.
* **Kingdom of Ends Formula--**“Act in accordance with the maxims of a member giving universal laws for a merely possible kingdom of ends.” While the wording here is a bit awkward, the basic idea is a simple one: You need to remember that each rational person (including yourself) has infinite moral value, precisely *because* you are the sort of person who can do things like understand and apply the Categorical Imperative. It is because of this that any violation of their **autonomy** (the ability of rational adults to “govern themselves”)isabsolutely forbidden. (In Kant’s words, we have a **strict duty** to respect the autonomy of others, which can never be overruled or ignored).

Kant argued that all three of these principles were equivalent ways of expressing the **“Good Will”** (the only fundamentally good thing in the universe, which consists in acting with the rights sorts of intentions toward *other* rational beings), but he didn’t provide many examples showing how this was supposed to work.

## What Does it Mean To Treat People as Mere Means? As Ends in Themselves?

“Now I say that the human being and in general every rational being exists as an end in itself, not merely as a means to be used by this or that will at its discretion; instead he must in all his actions, whether directed to himself or also to other rational beings, always be regarded at the same time as an end.” (Immanuel Kant)

The contemporary Kantian ethicist **Onora O’Neill[[1]](#footnote-1)** provides a good explanation of the Humanity Formula, which she argues can be an effective and easy-to-apply ethical principle. Here’s how you can apply the formula in your own life.

1. **Figure out which “maxim” you are acting on.** A **maxim** is the policy/rule that you are acting by. It is very close to what you **intend** by an action. So, for example, if you regularly steal things that you want/need from people, you would be acting by the maxim “Whenever a person wants/needs stuff, they should steal it from someone else who already has it [and thus deprive that person of it].” It’s important to make sure you describe your maxim honestly. For example, you couldn’t make stealing OK simply by formulating your maxim as “Whenever you need/want stuff, do your best to obtain it” (and leaving out all *explicit* mention of using other people). This is bad because it ignores the obvious harm you cause other people when you take their stuff.
2. **Determine whether your maxim treats people as “mere means.”** A maxim treats people as **mere means** if they could not (even in principle) consent to it. So, for example, a maxim of “stealing stuff from people when they are not looking” would use your listeners as mere means, since your successfully stealing *depends on them not knowing what maxim you are using.* By contrast, “giving money to the cashier to get what I want” treats the cashier as a *means* (you are using him/her “to get what you want), but not as a *mere means* (since they know what maxim you are acting by, and can choose to go along with it or reject it). Any action that treats people as mere means is **unjust.** Kant holds that we should *never* do unjust actions, no matter what the consequences.
3. **Determine whether your action treats people as “ends in themselves.”** It’s important to remember that other people have ends (or goals) just like you do. Occasionally, you need to spend some time/effort helping them achieve *their* goals, even if this means sacrificing some of your own goals. Kant does NOT claim you try to make *everyone* happy all the time (after all, this would leave you with no time to pursue your own ends). However, he thinks that you have do this *sometimes,* and especially for people with whom you have relationships. An action that treats people as ends in themselves is **beneficent.** Kant holds that we have a duty to do *some* beneficent actions, but we have a fair amount of discretion in determining how we do these, and who we end up helping. It’s plausible that we have stronger duties toward some people (family and friends) than to others (strangers).

## Rossian Pluralism

In the 20th century, the British philosopher **W.D. Ross (1877 – 1971)** proposed a somewhat more flexible version of deontology (sometimes called **Rossian Pluralism** or **Rossian Intuitionism**), which allowed for a bit more “wiggle room.” Like Kant, Ross thought that the rightness or wrongness of actions depended on things like the person’s intention and/or the nature of the action (i.e., doing the right thing wasn’t simply a matter of utilitarian calculation). However, like many others, he found Kant’s claim that consequences were utterly *irrelevant* to be too strong (so, for example, Ross would presumably say its OK to lie to save 1,000,000 people, unlike Kant). He opposed both Kant’s AND Mill’s ideas that there was only one “fundamental good.” Instead, he thought there were least four fundamentally good things: **virtue, knowledge, pleasure,** and **justice.**

**Ross’s Theory of “Right Action.”** In place of Kant’s strict duties, Ross offers a number of **prima facie** principles, which do NOT hold absolutely. Instead, they hold just so long as there isn’t some *other* moral principle which is more relevant to the particular situation you happen to be in. (So, a “prima facie” duty is NOT like a Kantian “strict” duty, which holds absolutely). Ross’s principles include the following:

* The **duty of fidelity,** which involves honoring one’s promises and agreements.
* The **duty of reparation** to make appropriate amends when one has done wrong.
* The **duty of gratitude,** or the duty to do good for those who have done good things for us in the past.
* The **duty to promote the aggregate good (or “beneficence”),** which is (roughly) the utilitarian idea that we ought to promote happiness and fight suffering for *everyone* affected by our actions.
* The **duty of nonmaleficence,** or the duty not to physically or psychologically harm someone.
* A responsibility to be **just,** and to distribute things (money, time, punishment, etc.) *fairly.*
* A responsibility to engage in moral **self-improvement,** and to become better at doing one’s duties.

In most cases, not every duty will be equally important or relevant. So, for example, according to many deontologists, the principle of nonmaleficence often “trumps” the other principle in many cases (e.g., it prohibits torture *even if this would allow us to fulfill other duties)*.

**Strengths and Weaknesses.** The major strength of Ross’s theory is probably it’s flexibility, since it allows you to take into account ALL of things that the other major ethical theories say are relevant. This flexibility is also it’s biggest weakness, according to critics: since Ross provides very little direction for how we are supposed to actually apply these principles in cases where they conflict, it seems like there is no way of determining what the “right answer” is. So, for example, a Kantian says “never lie”, a utilitarian says “lie if and only if this lie will maximize overall well-being in the long run.” A Rossian says something like “lies violate the principle of fidelity, so there’s a prima facie rule against lying. However, that rule might sometimes be overruled by other considerations. You’ll just have to consider the situation.” The worry here is that two Rossians placed in the same situation might have *very* different ideas of what the right answer is, and there doesn’t seem to be any way of deciding between them.

## Advantages and disadvantages of Deontology

Both Kant and Ross are **deontologists,** who thinks that the morality of an action depends on the nature of the action itself, and not on the consequences of the action, the life history of the person doing the action, or whatever. Other versions of deontological ethics include rules-based versions of religious ethics (“follow the Ten Commandments”), and principles-based ethics (“Always follow the following principles…”) Approaching ethics in this way has both advantages and disadvantages:

* **Advantage 1: Being ethical depends on you (and just you).** For Kant, the rightness or wrongness of action depends entirely on one’s maxim/intention, which is *entirely within your own control.* By contrast, other ethical theories say that morality depends on things that might be outside of your control, such as the long-term consequences of the action, your psychological dispositions, or whatever.
* **Advantage 2: Protecting the innocent.** Many (though not all) deontologists hold that there are **side constraints** that forbid mistreatment of others, no matter how good/noble our goals might be. For example, they believe that NO government should kill innocents, deceive the public, or torture, even if the people doing it firmly believe that “this is for the greater good.”
* **Advantage 3: Ethics to fit our lives.** Most versions of deontology hold that different people have fundamentally different obligations.For example, parents have obligations to take care of their *own* children, but not the children of others, while medical professionals have obligations to specific patients (and not just patients in general). By contrast, some other ethical theories (“Treat your neighbor as yourself” or “Maximize human happiness”) are committed to the idea that everyone has the *same* (very demanding!) moral obligation.

Deontology also has a number of widely recognizes disadvantages:

* **Disadvantage 1: Inflexibility and “Moral Purity”.** The deontologist idea that there are some things we should never, ever do has struck many people as overly demanding. For example, is it *really* the case that we can never kill one innocent person to save the lives of 1,000,000 others? The worry is that deontologists are overly fixated on keeping their own hands clean, as opposed to actually trying to make things better. In response to this, at least some contemporary deontologists have adopted so-called **“threshold deontology,”** according to which deontological rules can be violated if the consequences pass a certain threshold (for example, you can’t *usually* kill innocent people, but you could if doing so was the only way of saving 1,000,000 other people). Basically: deontology for most of our “ordinary” lives, but utilitarianism if the situation demands it.
* **Disadvantage 2: Children, animals, and incompetent adults.** Kantian Deontology identifies the heart of morality with respecting and supporting the ability of other rational creatures (e.g., most adult humans) to lead their own lives. However, it’s not at all clear about what this means for our treatment of children, animals, or incompetent adults (those who temporarily or permanently lack the ability to make rational decisions). Kant seems to see animals and children as something like property, and argued they didn’t have any intrinsic moral worth/dignity. Many contemporary Kantians disagree. However, once we give up on Kant’s idea about the infinite importance of rationality, it’s not clear *why* should accept his rejection of the utilitarian emphasis of happiness and suffering.
* **Disadvantage 3: Dealing with the “outsider.”** Most cultures and religions (both traditional and modern) have some form of deontological ethics—e.g., a list of rules that need to be followed, but which don’t always match up with utilitarianism. However, beyond some basic rules (“don’t kill other members of our tribe without a good reason”), these rules don’t agree with one another, and its not clear how a committed deontologist can decide which rules are right. Contemporary utilitarians have argued that many of the most fierce conflicts *between* cultures and groups are a result of these differing deontic systems. The solution, they suggest, is to abandon deontology and embrace utilitarianism, at least when it comes to dealing with people outside your own “circle.”

## Review Questions

1. In your own words, how would you describe the different between deontological approaches to ethics (such as the Golden Rule, Kant, and Ross) and consequentialist ethics?
2. Look over the formulations of the “Golden Rule” given above. Which version do you think are the best/most useful? Why? Do you think it is possible to reformulate the Golden Rule to avoid the “problem of pluralism?”
3. Kant argues that lying is always wrong, since it treats people as a “mere means.” Do you agree with Kant? Why or why not? In your answer, be sure to explore different *types* of lies (“the malicious lie,” “the white lie,” “the lie to prevent a greater harm,” “the lie for the person’s own good”).
4. To what extent do deontological considerations (e.g., acting according to a set of rules or principles) govern your own moral decision-making? To what extent do utilitarian/consequentialist ideas?
5. One well-known example of a deontological side-constraint is illustrated in many action movies, when the hero refuses to kill the villain because “that would make me just like them…” Of course, the villain inevitably escapes, and goes on to cause more harm and chaos. What do you think the hero *ought* to do in these circumstances? What would Kant say? What about a utilitarian? What do you say?

# Reading: How Mengzi came up with something better than the Golden Rule (by Eric Schwitzgebel)[[2]](#footnote-2)

There’s something I don’t like about the ‘Golden Rule’, the admonition to do unto others as you would have others do unto you. Consider this passage from the ancient Chinese philosopher **Mengzi** (Mencius):

That which people are capable of without learning is their genuine capability. That which they know without pondering is their genuine knowledge. Among babes in arms there are none that do not know to love their parents. When they grow older, there are none that do not know to revere their elder brothers. Treating one’s parents as parents is benevolence. Revering one’s elders is righteousness. There is nothing else to do but extend these to the world.

One thing I like about the passage is that it assumes love and reverence for one’s family as a given, rather than as a special achievement. It portrays moral development simply as a matter of extending that natural love and reverence more widely.

In another passage, Mengzi notes the kindness that the vicious tyrant King Xuan exhibits in saving a frightened ox from slaughter, and he urges the king to extend similar kindness to the people of his kingdom. Such extension, Mengzi says, is a matter of ‘weighing’ things correctly – a matter of treating similar things similarly, and not overvaluing what merely happens to be nearby. If you have pity for an innocent ox being led to slaughter, you ought to have similar pity for the innocent people dying in your streets and on your battlefields, despite their invisibility beyond your beautiful palace walls.

**Mengzian extension** starts from the assumption that you are already concerned about nearby others, and takes the challenge to be extending that concern beyond a narrow circle. The Golden Rule works differently – and so too the common advice to imagine yourself in someone else’s shoes. In contrast with Mengzian extension, Golden Rule/others’ shoes advice assumes self-interest as the starting point, and implicitly treats overcoming egoistic selfishness as the main cognitive and moral challenge.

Maybe we can model Golden Rule/others’ shoes thinking like this:

1. If I were in the situation of person *x*, I would want to be treated according to principle *p*.
2. Golden Rule: do unto others as you would have others do unto you.
3. Thus, I will treat person *x* according to principle *p*.

And maybe we can model Mengzian extension like this:

1. I care about person *y* and want to treat that person according to principle *p*.
2. Person *x*, though perhaps more distant, is relevantly similar.
3. Thus, I will treat person *x* according to principle *p*.

There will be other more careful and detailed formulations, but this sketch captures the central difference between these two approaches to moral cognition. Mengzian extension models general moral concern on the natural concern we already have for people close to us, while the Golden Rule models general moral concern on concern for oneself.

Top of Form

Bottom of Form

I like Mengzian extension better for three reasons. First, Mengzian extension is more psychologically plausible as a model of moral development. People do, naturally, have concern and compassion for others around them. Explicit exhortations aren’t needed to produce this natural concern and compassion, and these natural reactions are likely to be the main seed from which mature moral cognition grows. Our moral reactions to vivid, nearby cases become the bases for more general principles and policies. If you need to reason or analogise your way into concern even for close family members, you’re already in deep moral trouble.

Second, Mengzian extension is less ambitious – in a good way. The Golden Rule imagines a leap from self-interest to generalised good treatment of others. This might be excellent and helpful advice, perhaps especially for people who are already concerned about others and thinking about how to implement that concern. But Mengzian extension has the advantage of starting the cognitive project much nearer the target, requiring less of a leap. Self-to-other is a huge moral and ontological divide. Family-to-neighbour, neighbour-to-fellow citizen – that’s much less of a divide.

Third, you can turn Mengzian extension back on yourself, if you are one of those people who has trouble standing up for your own interests – if you’re the type of person who is excessively hard on yourself or who tends to defer a bit too much to others. You would want to stand up for your loved ones and help them flourish. Apply Mengzian extension, and offer the same kindness to yourself. If you’d want your father to be able to take a vacation, realise that you probably deserve a vacation too. If you wouldn’t want your sister to be insulted by her spouse in public, realise that you too shouldn’t have to suffer that indignity.

Although Mengzi and the 18th-century French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau both endorse mottoes standardly translated as ‘human nature is good’ and have views that are similar in important ways, this is one difference between them. In both *Emile* (1762) and *Discourse on Inequality* (1755), Rousseau emphasises self-concern as the root of moral development, making pity and compassion for others secondary and derivative. He endorses the foundational importance of the Golden Rule, concluding that ‘love of men derived from love of self is the principle of human justice’.

This difference between Mengzi and Rousseau is not a general difference between East and West. Confucius, for example, endorses something like the Golden Rule in the *Analects*: ‘Do not impose on others what you yourself do not desire.’ Mozi and Xunzi, also writing in China in the period, imagine people acting mostly or entirely selfishly until society artificially imposes its regulations, and so they see the enforcement of rules rather than Mengzian extension as the foundation of moral development. Moral extension is thus specifically Mengzian rather than generally Chinese.

Care about me not because you can imagine what you would selfishly want if you were me. **Care about me because you see how I am not really so different from others you already love.**

## Questions

1. What is the Menzgian extension? How does it differ from the Golden Rule?
2. In your own words, explain ONE of the author’s arguments for preferring the Mengzian extension over the Golden Rule?
3. Which principle—the Mengzian extension or the Golden Rule—do you think works better? Why?

# Reading: Why sexual desire is objectifying – and hence morally wrong (By Raja Halwani)[[3]](#footnote-3)

The 18th-century philosopher Immanuel Kant believed that human beings tend to be evil. He wasn’t talking about some guy rubbing his hands and crowing with glee at the prospect of torturing an enemy. He was thinking about the basic human tendency to succumb to what we want to do instead of what we ought to do, to heed the siren-song of our desires instead of the call of duty. For Kant, morality is the force that closes this gap, and holds us back from our darker, desiring selves.

Once desire becomes suspect, sex is never far behind. Kant implicitly acknowledged the unusual power of sexual urges and their capacity to divert us from doing what is right. He claimed that sex was particularly morally condemnable, because lust focuses on the body, not the agency, of those we sexually desire, and so reduces them to mere things. It makes us see the objects of our longing as just that ­– objects. In so doing, we see them as mere tools for our own satisfaction.

Treating people as objects can mean many things. It could include beating them, tearing into them, and violating them. But there are other, less violent ways of objectifying people. We might treat someone as only a means to our sexual pleasure, to satisfy our lust on that person, to use a somewhat archaic expression. The fact that the other person consents does not get rid of the objectification; two people can agree to use one another for purely sexual purposes.

But don’t we use each other all the time? Many of us have jobs – as cleaners, gardeners, teachers, singers. Does the beneficiary of the service objectify the service provider, and does the service provider objectify the recipient by taking their money? These relationships don’t seem to provoke the same moral qualms. Either they do not involve objectification, or the objectification is somehow neutered.

Kant said that these scenarios weren’t really a problem. He draws a distinction between mere use – the basis of objectification – and more-than-mere use. While we might employ people to do jobs, and accept payment for our work, we don’t treat the person on the other side of the transaction as a *mere* tool; we still recognise that person’s fundamental humanity.

Sex, though, is different. When I hire someone to sing, according to Kant, my desire is for his or her talent – for the voice-in-action. But when I sexually desire someone, I desire his or her body, not the person’s services or talents or intellectual capabilities, although any of these could enhance the desire. So, when we desire the person’s body, we often focus during sex on its individual parts: the buttocks, the penis, the clitoris, the thighs, the lips. What we desire to do with those parts differs, of course. Some like to touch them with the hand, others with the lips, others with the tongue; for others still, the desire is just to look. This does not mean that I would settle for a human corpse: our desire for human bodies is directed at them as living, much like my desire for a cellphone is directed at a functioning one.

But, one might object, don’t we do sexual things because we love our partners, and want them to feel pleasure? Of course we do. But if we did so when we didn’t want to in the first place, then we do not do it out of sexual desire. And if we don’t do it out of sexual desire, then the problem of objectification does not present itself. We can enjoy sexually pleasing someone else. But you can think of the other person as a sophisticated instrument: to give the maximum pleasure, we have to please it. Just because I have to oil and maintain my car for it to work does not mean it is any less of an instrument.

Sex doesn’t just make you objectify your partner. It also makes you objectify yourself. When I am in the grip of sexual desire, I also allow another person to reduce me to my body, to use me as a tool. Kant saw this process of self-objectification as an equally, if not more, serious moral problem than objectification directed outwards. I have duties to others to promote their happiness, but I also have a duty to morally perfect myself. Allowing myself to be objectified opposes this precept, according to Kant.

Top of Form

Bottom of Form

But really, what’s the big deal? Yes, we objectify each other in sex and let ourselves be objectified. Worse things have happened and will happen. At least with sex there is pleasure (if all goes well) and lots of it (if all goes really well). Whatever is wrong with sexual objectification can’t be that bad, surely?

But there’s a snag. The capacity to reason is what makes people ends in themselves, worthy of moral respect, according to Kant. And what’s objectifying about sexual desire is its ability to numb a person to reason, both in themselves and in others. Its power is such that it makes our reason its servant: our rationality becomes the means to satisfy its goals. It has been the downfall of kings and leaders; the ruination of relationships; the seedbed of lies in the pursuit of getting laid (‘Me too! I love atonal music!’). In my pursuit to fulfil it, I cheat, I deceive, I pretend to be not who I am – and not just to the other person, but to myself, too. I set aside the other’s rationality, and in doing so, set aside their humanity. *That* is not my concern; his or her body is.

Is it possible to have sex without objectification? Of course. Prostitutes do it all the time. So do many long-term couples. They have sex with people whom they do not desire. And with no desire, there is no objectification. Not even love can fix it. When the desire is high, when the sexual act is in full swing, my beloved is a piece of flesh. (Though love does lead to occasional cuddling, which is nice.)

I agree with Kant that sexual desire and objectification are inseparable, and a force that morality must reckon with. Sex is like any good dessert: delicious but with a price.

## Question

1. In what way did Kant think that sexual desire “objectify” other people? Why did he think this was a moral problem?
2. Kant himself (who was never married…) thought the “solution” to sexual desire was to never act on it—e.g., never masturbate or have sex out of marriage (married couples could safely have sex since their were acting on “duty” and not “desire”). Many modern Kantians disagree, though they acknowledge sexual desire can cause people to behave badly. What do YOU think a good Kantian should think about sexual desire? What sort of actions/relationships should they be OK with?
3. Sexual desire has always been a major driver of bad behavior. However, it can also lead people to acts of heroism/bravery. How would you describe the relationship between “doing something out of sexual desire” and “doing the thing that I morally ought to be doing?”

# Reading: Kantian Ethics (By Mark Dimmoc and Andrew Fisher)[[4]](#footnote-4)

*In spite of its horrifying title Kant’s*Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*is one of the small books which are truly great; it has exercised on human thought an influence almost ludicrously disproportionate to its size.*[**1**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-034)

## An Introduction to Kantian Ethics

**Immanuel Kant** was born in 1724 in Königsberg in East Prussia, where he died in 1804. Kant is famous for revolutionising how we think about just about every aspect of the world — including science, art, ethics, religion, the self and reality. He is one of the most important thinkers of all time, which is even more remarkable by the fact that Kant is a truly awful writer. His sentences are full of technical language, are very long, and are incredibly dense. You have been warned!

Kant is a rationalist writing during the Enlightenment (1685–1815). He thinks that we can gain knowledge from our senses and through our rational capacities. This means his general philosophical approach starts by asking what we can know *a priori.*

This is key to understanding his work but also makes his writing on ethics seem a bit odd. We think the study of ethics — unlike say maths — ought to direct our eye to what is going on around us in the world. Yet Kant starts by turning his eyes “inward” to thinking about ethical *ideas*.

Kant believes that in doing this people will come to recognise that certain actions are right and wrong irrespective of how we might feel and irrespective of any consequences. For Kant, actions are right if they respect what he calls the Categorical Imperative. For example, because lying fails to respect the Categorical Imperative it is wrong and is wrong irrespective of how we might feel about lying or what might happen if we did lie; it is actions that are right and wrong rather than consequences. This means that Kant’s theory is deontological rather than teleological. It focuses on our *duties* rather than our ends/goals/consequences.

There is, however, something intuitive about the idea that morality is based on reason rather than feelings or consequences. Consider my pet cat Spartan. He performs certain actions like scrabbling under bed covers, meowing at birds and chasing his tail. Now consider my daughter Beth, she performs certain actions like caring for her sister and helping the homeless.

Spartan’s actions are *not*moral whereas Beth’s actions are. Spartan’s thinking and actions are driven by his desires and inclination. He eats and plays and sleeps when he desires to do so, there is no reasoning on his part. Beth, in contrast, can reflect on the various reasons she has, reasons to care for her sister and the homeless.

We might think then that humans are moral beings not because we have certain desires but precisely because we are *rational.* We have an ability to “stand back” and consider what we are doing and why. Kant certainly thought so and he takes this insight as his starting point.

**[Brendan: What do you think about the idea that only “rational” beings have actions that can be judged as moral or immoral?]**

## Some Key Ideas

### Duty

Kant’s main works in ethics are his *Metaphysics of Morals*(1797) and the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*(1785). Neither give practical advice about particular situations but rather through rational reflection, Kant seeks to establish the supreme principle of morality.

He starts from the notion of “duty” and although this is a rather old-fashioned term, the idea behind it should sound familiar. Imagine, your friend has told you that she is pregnant but asks you to promise to keep her secret. Through the coming weeks this juicy bit of gossip is on the tip of your tongue but you do not tell anyone because of your promise. There are things we recognise as being required of us irrespective of what we (really) desire to do. This is what Kant means by duty.

But this raises the question. If it is not desires that move us to do what is right (even really strong desires), what does? In our example, why is it that we keep our promise despite the strong desire to gossip? Kant’s answer is “the good will”.

### Good Will

Kant gives the following characterization of the good will. It is something that is *good irrespective of effects*:

*A good will is good not because of what it effects or accomplishes — because of its fitness for attaining some proposed end: it is good through its willing alone — that is, good in itself*.[**2**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-033)

It is also good without qualification.

*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 a good will*.[**3**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-032)

What does Kant mean? Well, pick anything you like which you think might make an action good — for example, happiness, pleasure, courage, and then ask yourself if there are any situations you can think of where an action having those features makes those actions worse?

It seems there are. Imagine someone who is *happy* when kicking a cat; or someone taking *pleasure* in torture; or a serial killer whose courage allows her to abduct children in broad daylight. In such cases the happiness, pleasure and courage make the actions worse. Kant thinks we can repeat this line of thinking for anything and everything, except one thing — *the good will*.

The good will unlike anything else is good *unconditionally* and what makes a good will good is willing alone; not other attitudes, or consequences, or characteristics of the agent. Even Kant thinks this sounds like a rather strange idea. So how can he (and we) be confident that the good will even exists?

Consider **Mahatma Gandhi**’s (1869–1948) non-violent protest for Indian independence. He stood peacefully whilst the British police beat him. Here is a case where there must have been an overwhelming desire to fight back. But he did not. In this type of action Kant would claim that we “see” the good will — as he says — “shining like a jewel”.[**4**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-031) Seeing such resilience in the face of such awful violence we are humbled and can recognize, what Kant calls, its moral worth. Obviously not all actions are as significant as Gandhi’s! However, Kant thinks that any acts like this, which are *performed despite conflicting desires*, are due to the good will. Considering such actions (can you think of any?) means we can recognize that the good will exists.

**[Brendan: Do you think there is such as the “good will” that allows us humans to “do the right thing” even when we would rather not do so?]**

## Acting for the Sake of Duty and Acting in Accordance with Duty

From what we have said above about the nature of duty and good will we can see why Kant says that to act from good will is acting for the sake of duty. We act despite our desires to do otherwise. For Kant this means that acting for the sake of duty is the *only* way that an action can have moral worth. We will see below what we have to do for our actions to be carried out for the sake of duty. However, before we do this, we need to be really clear on this point about moral worth.

Imagine that you are walking with a friend. You pass someone begging on the street. Your friend starts to weep, fumbles in his wallet and gives the beggar some money and tells you that he *feels* such an empathy with the poor man that he just has to help him.

For Kant, your friend’s action has *no* moral worth because what is moving him to give money is empathy rather than duty! He is *acting in accordance with duty*. However, Kant does think your friend should be applauded as such an action is something that is of value although it wouldn’t be correct to call it a *moral*action.

To make this point clearer, Kant asks us to consider someone who has no sympathy for the suffering of others and no inclination to help them. But despite this:

*…he nevertheless tears himself from his deadly insensibility and performs the action without any inclination at all, but solely from duty then for the first time his action has genuine moral worth*.[**5**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-030)

In contrast to our friend, this person is acting *for the sake of* duty and hence their action is moral. We must be careful though. *Kant is not telling us to become emotionally barren robots*! He is not saying that before we can act morally we need to get rid of sympathy, empathy, desires, love, and inclinations. This would make Kant’s moral philosophy an absurd non-starter.

Let us see why Kant is not saying this. Consider an action such as giving to others. We should ask whether an action of giving to others *would have* been performed *even if* the agent lacked the desire to do so. If the answer is “yes” then the act has moral worth. This though is consistent with the agent *actually having* those desires. *The question for Kant is not whether an agent has desires but what moved the agent to act*. If they acted *because* of those desires they acted in accordance with duty and their action had no moral worth. If they acted for the sake of duty, and just happened to have those desires, then their action has moral worth.

**[Brendan: Give an example of an action done “for the sake of duty” and another done “in accordance with duty.” Which sort of action has moral worth, according to Kant?]**

## Categorical and Hypothetical Imperatives

If we agree with Kant and want to act for the sake of duty what should we do? His answer is that we have to act out of *respect for the moral law*. He has two examples of how this works in practice: lying and suicide. We will consider Kant’s example of suicide at the end of this chapter. However, before doing this we need to get a sense of what Kant has in mind when he talks about acting out of respect for the moral law.

The moral law is what he calls the “Categorical Imperative”. He thinks there are three formulations of this.

CI-1: *…act only according to that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law*.[**6**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-029)

CI-2: *So act that you use humanity, in your own person as well as in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means*.[**7**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-028)

CI-3: *…every rational being must so act as if he were through his maxim always a lawmaking member in the universal kingdom of ends*.[**8**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-027)

We will consider these in turn, showing how they are linked. Consider then, CI-1.

Kant’s idea is that we use this “test” to see what maxims are morally permissible. If we act in accordance with those then we are acting from duty and our actions have moral worth. Let us look at what this means.

Initially it is worth considering what “categorical” and “imperative” mean. An imperative is just a command. “Clean your room!” is an imperative I give my daughter every Saturday. “Do not park in front of these gates!” is a command on my neighbour’s gate. “Love your God with all your heart, mind and soul” is a command from the Bible.

What about the “categorical” part? If a command is categorical then people ought to follow it irrespective of how they feel about following it, irrespective of what consequences might follow, or who may or may not have told them to follow it. For example, the command “do not peel the skin of babies” is categorical. You ought not to do this and the fact that this might be your life’s ambition, or that you really want to do it, or that your teacher has told you to do it, is completely irrelevant.

Contrast this with **Hypothetical Imperatives**. If I tell my daughter to clean her room, this is hypothetical. This is because whether she ought to clean her room is dependent on conditions about her and me. If she does not care about a clean room and about what her dad thinks, then it is not true that she ought to clean her room. Most commands are hypothetical. For example, “study!” You ought to study only *if* certain things are true about you; for example, that you care about doing well, that you want to succeed in the test etc.

Kant thinks that moral “oughts” — for example, “you ought not lie” — are *categorical*. They apply to people irrespective of how they feel about them.

The next thing we need is the idea of a “maxim”. This is relatively simple and is best seen through the following examples. Imagine I’m considering whether to make a false promise. Perhaps I think that by falsely promising you that l will pay you back I will be more likely to get a loan from you. In that case my maxim is something like “*whenever I can benefit from making a false promise I should do so”*.

Imagine I decide to exercise because I feel depressed, then I may be said to be acting on the maxim “*Whenever I feel depressed I will exercise”*. A maxim is a general principle or rule upon which we act. We do not decide on a set of maxims, perhaps writing them down, and then try to live by them but rather a *maxim is the principle or rule that can make sense of an action whether or not we have thought about it in these terms.*

**[Brendan: Give an original example of a “hypothetical imperative” that’s relevant to your life. How does this differ from a Kantian “categorical imperative”?]**

## The First Formulation of the Categorical Imperative

Let’s put these bits together in relation to CI-1

*…act only according to that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law*.[**9**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-026)

The “test” that CI-1 prescribes is the following. Consider the maxim on which you are thinking about acting, and ask whether you can either (i) conceive that it become a universal law, or (ii) will that it become a universal law. If a maxim fails on either (i) or (ii) then there is no good reason for you to act on that maxim and it is morally impermissible to do so. If it passes the CI test, then it is morally permissible.

Kant is *not* saying that the CI-1 test is a way of working out what is and what is not moral. Presumably we can think of lots of maxims, which are non-moral, which pass the test, for example, “whenever I am bored I will watch TV”.

Equally he is not saying that if a maxim cannot be universalized then it is morally impermissible. Some maxims are just mathematically impossible. For example, “whenever I am going to exercise I will do it for an above the average amount of time”. This maxim cannot be universalized because we cannot conceive that everyone does something above “average”.

Finally, it is worth remembering that the maxim must be able to be *willed*as a universal law. This is important because maxims such as “if your name is Jill and you are 5ft 11, you can lie” will fail to be universalized because you cannot will that your name is Jill or that your height is 5ft11. It has to be possible to will as a universal law and for this to be true it must be at least possible for it actually to come about. This shows that the common concern that we can get any maxim to pass the CI-1 test by simply adding more and more specific details, such as names, heights or locations, *fails*. This is very abstract (what did we tell you about Kant’s work!). Let us consider an example.

### Perfect and Imperfect Duties

Recall the example of making a false promise to secure a loan. The maxim is “*whenever I can benefit from doing so, I should make a false promise*”. The question is whether I could conceive or will that this become a universal law.

I could not. If everyone followed this maxim then we would all believe everyone else could make a false promise if it would benefit them to do so. Kant thinks such a situation is not conceivable because the very idea of making a promise relies on trust. But if “whenever it is of benefit to you, you can make false promises” was to become a universal law then there would be no trust and hence no promising. So by simply thinking about the idea of promising and lying we see the maxim will fail the test and, because we cannot universalize the maxim, then making a false promise becomes morally impermissible. This is true universally for all people in all circumstances for anyone can, in principle, go through the same line of reasoning.

A maxim failing at (i) is what Kant calls a *contradiction in conception*, and failing at (i) means we are dealing with what Kant calls a ***perfect (or “strict”) duty***. In our example we have shown we have a perfect duty not to make false promises.

Consider another example. Imagine that someone in need asks us for money but we decide not to help them. In this case our maxim is “whenever someone is in need and asks for money do not give them money”. Does this pass the CI-1 test?

No it fails the CI-1 test. Although it is true that the maxim passes (i) not giving to the needy does not threaten *the very idea* of giving money away. Kant thinks that anyone thinking about this will see that that maxim will fail at (ii) and hence it is morally impermissible. Here is why.

You cannot know if you will be in need in the future and presumably you would want to be helped if you were in need. In which case you are being inconsistent if you willed that “people should not help those in need” should become a universal law. For you might want people to help those in need in the future, namely, *you*.

So we cannot will the maxim “whenever someone is in need do not help them” to become a universal moral law. Again this is a thought process that *anyone*can go through and it means that this moral claim is true universally for all people in all circumstances. Failing at (ii) is what Kant calls a *contradiction in will*, and failing at (ii) means we are dealing with what Kant calls an ***imperfect duty*.**

It is absolutely key to recognize that CI-1 is not simply asking “what if everyone did that?” CI-1 is *not a form of Utilitarianism*. Kant is not saying that it is wrong to make false promises because if people did then the world would be a horrible place. Rather Kant is asking about whether we can *conceive or will* the maxim to become a universal law.

**[Brendan: Describe the difference between perfect and imperfect duties and, if you can, try to give an example of each.]**

## Second Formulation of the Categorical Imperative

The second formulation (CI-2) is the following:

*So act that you use humanity, in your own person as well as in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means*.

Kant thinks that CI-1 and CI-2 are two sides of the same coin, though precisely how they are related is a matter of scholarly debate. Put very simply CI-2 says you should not use people, because if you do, you are failing to treat them as a rational agent and this is morally wrong.

For example, if I use your essay without your knowledge then I have not treated you as a rational agent. I would have done had I asked you for your essay and you had freely chosen to let me have it. But given that I did not ask you, I was in a sense *making choices on your behalf* and thus did not treat you as a rational agent. So according to Kant I should always treat you as an end not a means. I should always treat you as a free rational agent.

Kant’s theory then has a way of respecting the ***dignity*** of people. We should treat people with respect and with dignity purely on the basis that they are rational agents, and not because of their race, gender, education, upbringing etc. From this you can also see that Kant’s theory allows us to speak about **“rights”.** If someone has a right then they have this right irrespective of gender, education, upbringing etc. For example, Jill has a right to free speech because she is a person, consequently that right will not disappear if she changes her location, personal circumstances, relationship status, political viewpoint etc. After all she does not stop being a person.

Importantly, CI-2 does not say that you *either* treat someone as a means *or* an end. I could treat someone as an end*by*treating them as a means. Suppose that you have freely decided to become a taxi driver. If I use you as a means by asking you to take me to the airport I am also treating you as an end. But Kant does not believe this to be morally wrong because I am respecting you as a rational agent; after all, you *chose* to be a taxi driver. Of course, if I get into your car and point a gun at your head and ask to be taken to the airport then I am not treating you as an end but rather solely as a means, which is wrong.

**[Question: Give an original example of treating someone as a “mere means.” Now, explain how you instead treat them as an “end”]**

## The Third Formulation of the Categorical Imperative and Summary

The final formulation of the Categorical Imperative is a combination of CI-1 and CI-2. It asks us to imagine a kingdom which consists of only those people who act on CI-1. They never act on a maxim which cannot become a universal law. In such a kingdom people would treat people as ends, because CI-2 passes CI-1. This is why CI-3 is often called the “Kingdom of Ends” formulation:

*…every rational being must so act as if he were through his maxim always a lawmaking member in the universal kingdom of ends*.[**11**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-024)

In summary, we have seen that Kant thinks that acts have moral worth only if they are carried out for the sake of duty. Agents act for the sake of duty if they act out of respect for the moral law, which they do by following the Categorical Imperative in one of its formulations.

Consequently, Kant thinks that acts are wrong and right universally, irrespective of consequences and desires. If lying is wrong then it is wrong in all instances. From all this, it follows that we cannot be taught a set of moral rules for each and every situation and Kant believes that it is up to us to work it out for ourselves by thinking rationally.

There have been, and continue to be, many books and journal articles written about Kant’s ethics. He has a profound and deep insight into the nature of morality and he raises some fundamental questions about what it is to be human. Kant’s moral theory is radically *Egalitarian* as his theory is blind to individual personal circumstances, race, gender and ethnicity. Everyone is equal before the moral law!

Related to this, his theory respects the rights of individuals and, relatedly, their dignity. Any theory that is to have a hope of capturing our notion of rights needs to be able to respect the thought that a right is not something that disappears if circumstances change. Jill has a right to life, period; we do not say Jill has a right to life “if…” and then have to fill in the blanks. This is precisely something that Kant’s theory can give us. CI-1 generates maxims which do not have exceptions and CI-2 tells us that we should *always* treat everyone as an end in themselves and *never*solely as a means to an end. It tells us, for example, that we ought not to kill Jill, and this holds true in all circumstances.

There are, though, a number of tough questions that Kant’s work raises. We consider some of these below. However, as with all the philosophical ideas we discuss in this book, Kant’s work is still very much alive and has defenders across the world. Before we turn to these worries, we work through an example that Kant gives regarding suicide.

## Kant on Suicide

Kant is notoriously stingy with examples. One he does mention is suicide. This is an emotive topic and linked to questions about mental health and religion. An attraction of Kant’s view is the ability to apply his Categorical Imperatives in a dispassionate way. His framework should allow us to “plug in” the issue and “get out” an answer. Let’s see how this might work.

Kant thinks that suicide is always wrong and has very harsh words for someone who attempts suicide

*He who so behaves, who has no respect for human nature and makes a thing of himself, becomes for everyone an Object of freewill. We are free to treat him as a beast, as a thing, and to use him for our sport as we do a horse or a dog, for he is no longer a human being; he has made a thing of himself, and, having himself discarded his humanity, he cannot expect that others should respect humanity in him.*[**12**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-023)

But why does he think this? How does this fit with Kant’s Categorical Imperatives? We will look at the first two formulations.

Fundamental to remember is that for Kant the motive that drives *all* suicide is “avoid evil”. By which he means avoiding suffering, pain, and other negative outcomes in one’s life. All suicide attempts are due to the fact that we love ourselves and thus want to “avoid evils” that may befall us.

Imagine then that I decide to commit suicide. Given what we have just said about my motives this means I will be acting on this maxim: “From self‐love I make as my principle to shorten my life when its continued duration threatens more evil than it promises satisfaction”.[**13**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-022)

Following CI-1 the question then is whether it is possible to universalise this maxim? Kant thinks not. For him it is unclear how we could will it that all rational agents as the result of *self-love* can *destroy themselves* when their continued existence threatens more evil than it promises satisfaction. For Kant self-love leading to the destruction of the self is a *contradiction*. Thus he thinks that we have a *perfect*(rather than an imperfect) duty to ourselves not to commit suicide. To do so is morally wrong. This is how Kant puts it:

*One sees at once a contradiction in a system of nature whose law would destroy life [suicide] by means of the very same feeling that acts so as to stimulate the furtherance of life [self-love], and hence there could be no existence as a system of nature. Therefore, such a maxim cannot possibly hold as a universal law of nature and is, consequently, wholly opposed to the supreme principle of all duty.*

Notice a few odd things here in relation to CI-1. The point about universalisation seems irrelevant. Kant could have just said it is a contradiction to will from self-love the destruction of oneself. It seems that there is nothing added by asking us to consider this point universalised. It does not add weight to the claim that it is a contradiction.

Second, it is not really a “contradiction” at all! It is different to the lying promise example. In this it seems that the very concept of a promise relies on trust, which lying would destroy. In contrast in the suicide case the “contradiction” seems more like a by-product of Kant’s assumption regarding the motivation of suicidal people. So we can avoid the “contradiction” if we allow for the possibility that suicide need not be driven by self-love. If this were true then there would be no “contradiction”. Hence, it seems wrong to call the duty not to kill oneself — if such a duty exists — a “perfect” duty. So the first formulation does not give Kant the conclusion that suicide is morally wrong.

Moving to the second formulation. This helps us understand Kant’s harsh assessment of people attempting suicide. Remember he calls such people “objects” or “beasts” or “things”. So, what is the difference between beasts or objects or things, and humans? The answer is that we are *rational*. Recall, that for Kant our rationality is of fundamental value. If anyone’s actions do not recognize someone else’s rationality then they have done something morally wrong. This amounts to treating them as merely means to our own end. Given all this you can see what Kant is getting at. For him committing suicide is treating yourself as a mere means to some end — namely the end of avoiding pain and suffering etc. — and not an end in itself. You are treating yourself as a “beast” a “thing” an “object”, not as a human being with the gift of reason. This is morally wrong.

Moreover, if you do this, then others treating you with respect *as a rational person* can conclude that you also want others to treat you in this way. Because if you are rational then you must think that it is OK to universalise the maxim that we can treat others as objects, beast and thing. They can thus treat you as a beast, object, and thing and still be treating you with respect as a rationale agent. With regard to attempting suicide your action is wrong because you have ignored your own rationality. You have treated yourself as a mere means to an end.

But, like the first formulation this is very weak. It is unclear why in attempting suicide you are treating yourself as a mere means to an end. You might think you are respecting your rationality *by* considering suicide. Recall, Kant says that it is sometimes fine to treat people as a means to an end, e.g. a taxi driver. It is fine where people have given consent for you to treat them that way. In that case, suicide might be like the taxi driver case. We have freely decided to treat ourselves as a means to an end. We are, then, treating ourselves as a rational agent and not doing something morally wrong by committing suicide.

There are some other things that Kant says about the wrongness of suicide that do not link to the Categorical Imperatives. For example, he talks about humans being the property of God and hence our lives not being something we can choose to extinguish. However, we need not discuss this here.

There is a consensus between Kant scholars that, as it stands, Kant’s argument against suicide fails. There are some though who use Kant’s ideas as a starting point for a more convincing argument against suicide. For example, see **J. David Velleman** (1999) and **Michael Cholbi** (2000).

## Problems and Responses: Conflicting Duties

If moral duties apply in *all* circumstances, then what happens when we have duties which conflict? Imagine that you have hidden some Jewish people in your basement in Nazi Germany. Imagine then that an SS officer knocks at your door and asks if you are hiding Jews? What might Kant’s theory tell us to do? Our duty is to refrain from lying so does this mean we are morally required to tell the SS officer our secret? If this is the conclusion then it makes Kant’s theory morally repugnant.

However, *there is no requirement in Kant’s theory to tell the truth*, there is just a requirement *not to lie*. Lying is about intentional deceit, so maybe in this example there is a way not to lie. For example, if we simply stayed silent (see [Chapter 13](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch13.xhtml#_idTextAnchor593)).

Even if we respond in this sort of way in this example, presumably we can engineer an example that would not allow for this. For example, perhaps we are in a law court and the SS officer asks us under oath. In that example, silence would not be an option. This certainly would seem to count against Kant’s theory for it does seem morally wrong to reveal the location of the Jewish people.

The main point though is that Kant thinks we need to take the features of each individual situation into account. He does not just want us to mindlessly apply generic rules whilst paying no attention to what is before us. So **Peter Rickman** writes regarding these types of cases:

*…it should be plain that more than one imperative/moral principle is relevant to the situation. Certainly we should tell the truth; but do we not also have a duty to protect an innocent man from harm? Further, do we not have an obligation to fight evil? We are confronted with a conflict of values here. Unfortunately, as far as I know, there is no explicit discussion of this issue in Kant. One could assume, however, that his general approach of distinguishing the lesser from the greater evil should be applied. I think Kant might say that although lying is never right, it might be the lesser evil in some cases*.[**14**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-021)

So the point is not that these sorts of examples are “knock down” criticisms of Kant’s theory but rather that Kant’s theory is underspecified and fails to give guidance with these specific sorts of cases. In fact, we might think that this is an advantage of his theory that has given us the supreme principle of morality and the general way of proceeding but has left it up to us to work out what to do in each situation. We will leave the reader to see if this can be done and in particular, whether it can be done in a way consistent with the other aspects of his moral theory.

## Problems and Responses: The Role of Intuitions

One of the most common criticisms levelled at Kant’s theory is that it is simply counter intuitive. For example, lying, for him, is morally impermissible in all instances irrespective of the consequences. Yet we seem to be able to generate thought experiments that show that this is a morally repugnant position.

However, in Kant’s defence we might ask why we should use our intuitions as any form of test for a moral theory. Intuitions are notoriously fickle and unreliable. Even if you pick the oddest view you can think of, you would probably find some people at some point in time that would find this view “intuitive”. So how worried should we be if Kant’s theory leads to counter intuitive consequences? This then raises a more general methodological question to keep at the forefront of your mind when reading this book. What role, if any, should intuitions have in the formation and the testing of moral theory?

## Problem and Responses: Categorical Imperatives and Etiquette

Kant argues that what we are morally required to do is a matter of reason. If people reason in the right way then they will recognise, for example, that lying is wrong. However, some philosophers, for example **Philippa Foot** (1920–2010), have worried about this link to reason. The strength of Foot’s challenge is that she agrees that morality is a system of Categorical Imperatives but says that this *need not be due to reason*.

Foot uses the example of *etiquette*to motivate her argument.[**15**](https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0125/ch2.xhtml#footnote-020) Rules of etiquette seem to be Categorical Imperatives but are *not* grounded in reason. Consider an example. I had a friend at university who was a sportsman. He was in many teams, his degree was in sports and exercise and if there were ever a spare minute he would be running, on his bike or in the pool. Unsurprisingly he wore a tracksuit and trainers all the time!

During our second year at university a mutual friend died. There was a big formal funeral arranged. My friend decided to go to this funeral in his tracksuit and trainers. I asked him about this and his response was that it was what he liked wearing. However, to my mind at least, this reason, which was based on his desire, did not change the fact that he really ought not have worn a tracksuit. Foot would agree and thinks that rules of etiquette are categorical because they are not dependent on any particular desires someone would have.

However, even if they are categorical, Foot thinks that rules of etiquette are not rules of reason. We do not think that if we reasoned correctly we would recognise that we ought not to wear tracksuits to funerals, or (to think of some other rules of etiquette) we ought not to reply to a letter written in the third person in the first person, or we ought not to put our feet on the dinner table during a meal etc. It is not simply a matter of thinking in the right way but rather to recognise these “oughts” as part of a shared cultural practice.

So although this does not show that Kant is wrong, it does throw down a challenge to him. That is, we need independent reasons to think that the *categorical* nature of moral “oughts” are based on *reason* and not just part of a shared cultural practice. To respond to this challenge, the Kantian would have to put forward the argument that in the particular case of moral “oughts”, we have a good argument to ground the categorical nature in reason rather than institutional practices.

## Problems and Responses: The Domain of Morality

Kant thinks that the domain of morality is merely the domain of reasons and as far as we are agents who can reason then we have duties and rights and people ought to treat us with dignity. The flip side of this is that non-rational agents, such as non-human animals, do not have rights and we can, according to Kant, treat them as we like!

The challenge to Kant’s theory is that the scope of morality seems bigger than the scope of reasons. People do think that we have moral obligations toward non-rational agents. Consider someone kicking a cat. We might think that *morally* they ought not to do this. However, Kant’s theory does not back this up because, as far as we know, cats are not rational agents. Despite it not being wrong to treat animals in this way, Kant *still thinks that we should not*, because if we did, then we would be more likely to treat humans in this way.

## Summary

Kant’s moral theory is extremely complicated and badly expressed. However, it is hugely influential and profound. As a system builder Kant’s work starts with rational reflection from which he attempts to develop a complete moral system.

He starts from the notion of duty. He shows that what allows us to act for the sake of duty is the good will, and that the good will is unconditionally good. If we want to act for the sake of duty we need to act out of respect for the moral law and this amounts to following the Categorical Imperative. Kant argues that in following the Categorical Imperative, agents will converge on what is morally permissible. Hence Kant can talk about absolute and objective moral truths.

**COMMON STUDENT MISTAKES**

* Confusing acting in *accordance with* duty and acting *for the sake of* duty.
* Thinking that Kant’s theory has no room for emotions.
* Thinking that Kant’s Categorical Imperative can be summed up in the question: “how would you like it if everyone did that”?
* Thinking that the Categorical Imperative is a form of Utilitarianism.
* Thinking Kant believes you can never treat someone as a means to an end.

## Issues To Consider

1. Think about your life. Do you think there are things you “ought to do”?
2. Do you think that there are things you ought to do irrespective of your desires and inclinations?
3. What are Categorical and Hypothetical Imperatives? Do you think that rules of etiquette are categorical or hypothetical?
4. How might Kant respond to the SS officer example?
5. Can you think of some examples where you might be treating someone solely as means-to-an-end?
6. Would capital punishment pass the CI-2 test?
7. How might CI-2 relate to prostitution? Do you think that Kant would say that it is morally permissible?
8. Why might Kant’s theory be well placed to respect people’s rights?
9. Do you think we have any moral obligations towards animals? What would Kant say?
10. What role do you think intuitions should have in assessing moral theories?
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