

0001 Now we turn, to the hardest  
0002 philosopher that we're going to read in this course  
0003 today we turn to Immanuel Kant  
0004 who offers a different account  
0005 of why we have a categorical duty  
0006 to respect the dignity of persons  
0007 and not to be use  
0008 people  
0009 as means  
0010 merely  
0011 even for good ends.  
0012 Kant excelled at the university of Königsberg  
0013 at the age of sixteen  
0014 at the age of thirty one he got his first job  
0015 as an unsalaried lecturer  
0016 paid on commission  
0017 based on the number of students who showed up at his lectures  
0018 this is a sensible system that Harvard would do well to consider  
0019 luckily for Kant  
0020 he was a popular lecturer and also an industrious one and so he eked out a meager living  
0021 it wasn't until  
0022 he was fifty seven that he published his first  
0023 major work  
0024 but it was worth the wait  
0025 the book was the critique of pure reason  
0026 perhaps the most important work in all of modern philosophy  
0027 and a few years later  
0028 Kant wrote  
0029 the groundwork for the metaphysics of morals which we read in this course  
0030 I want to acknowledge even before we start  
0031 that Kant is a difficult thinker  
0032 but it's important to try to figure out  
0033 what he's saying  
0034 because what this book is about  
0035 is well, it's about what the supreme principle of morality this

0036 number one, and  
0037 it's also  
0038 it gives us an account  
0039 one of the most powerful accounts we have  
0040 of what freedom really is  
0041 so  
0042 let me start today.  
0043 Kant rejects utilitarianism  
0044 he thinks  
0045 that  
0046 the individual  
0047 person  
0048 all human beings  
0049 have a certain dignity  
0050 that commands our respect  
0051 the reason the individual is sacred or the bearer of rights according to Kant,  
0052 doesn't stem from the idea that we own ourselves,  
0053 but instead from the idea  
0054 that we are all rational beings  
0055 we're all rational beings which simply means  
0056 that we are beings who are capable  
0057 of reason.  
0058 we're also  
0059 autonomous beings  
0060 which is to say  
0061 that we are beings capable of acting and choosing  
0062 freely  
0063 now, this capacity for reason and freedom  
0064 isn't the only capacity we have.  
0065 we also have the capacity for pain and pleasure  
0066 for suffering and satisfaction  
0067 Kant admits the  
0068 utilitarians were half a right  
0069 of course  
0070 we seek to avoid pain  
0071 and we like pleasure  
0072 Kant doesn't deny this

0073 what he does deny  
0074 is Bentham's claim that  
0075 pain in pleasure  
0076 are our sovereign masters  
0077 he thinks that's wrong.  
0078 Kant thinks  
0079 that it's are national capacity  
0080 that makes us distinctive, that makes us special that sets us  
0081 apart from and above mere animal  
0082 existence.  
0083 it makes us something more than just physical  
0084 creatures with appetites. Now  
0085 we often think  
0086 of freedom  
0087 as simply consisting  
0088 in doing what we want  
0089 or in the absence of obstacles to getting what we want  
0090 that's one way of thinking about freedom.  
0091 but this isn't Kant's  
0092 idea of freedom  
0093 Kant has a more stringent  
0094 demanding notion  
0095 of what it means to be free  
0096 and though stringent and demanding, if you think it through  
0097 it's actually pretty persuasive  
0098 Kant's reason is as follows  
0099 when we,  
0100 like animals  
0101 seek after pleasure  
0102 or the satisfaction of our desires of the avoidance pain  
0103 when we do that we aren't really acting freely.  
0104 why not?  
0105 we're really acting  
0106 as the slaves  
0107 of those appetites  
0108 and impulses  
0109 I didn't choose this particular hunger or that particular appetite,

0110 and so when I act to satisfy it  
0111 I'm just acting according to natural  
0112 necessity  
0113 and for Kant,  
0114 freedom is the opposite  
0115 of necessity  
0116 there was an advertising slogan  
0117 for the  
0118 soft drink Sprite  
0119 a few years ago  
0120 the slogan was  
0121 obey your thirst  
0122 there  
0123 there's a Kantian insight  
0124 buried in that  
0125 Sprite advertising slogan  
0126 that in a way is Kant's point  
0127 when you go for Sprite,  
0128 or Pepsi  
0129 you're really  
0130 you might think that you're choosing freely sprite versus Pepsi  
0131 but you're actually  
0132 obeying  
0133 something, a thirst, or maybe a desire manufactured or massaged by advertising  
0134 you're obeying a prompting  
0135 that you yourself  
0136 haven't chosen  
0137 or created  
0138 and here  
0139 it's worth  
0140 noticing  
0141 Kant's specially demanding  
0142 idea  
0143 of freedom  
0144 what way  
0145 of acting, how can my will be determined if not by  
0146 the prompting sub nature or my hunger or my appetite, or my desires?

0147 Kant's answer:  
0148 to act freely  
0149 is to act  
0150 autonomously  
0151 and to act autonomously  
0152 is to act according to a law that I give myself  
0153 not according  
0154 to the physical laws of nature  
0155 or to the laws of cause and effect  
0156 which include my desire,  
0157 to eat or to drink  
0158 or to choose this  
0159 food in a restaurant over that  
0160 now what is the opposite  
0161 what is the opposite  
0162 of autonomy  
0163 for Kant he invest a special term  
0164 to describe  
0165 the opposite of autonomy  
0166 heteronomy  
0167 is the opposite of autonomy  
0168 when I act  
0169 heteronomously  
0170 I'm acting  
0171 according to an inclination  
0172 or a desire  
0173 that I haven't chosen for myself  
0174 so freedom is autonomy  
0175 is this specially stringent  
0176 idea  
0177 that Kant insists on.  
0178 now why is autonomy  
0179 the opposite of the acting heteronomously or according to the dictates of nature  
0180 Kant's point is that  
0181 nature is governed by laws  
0182 laws of cause and effect for example  
0183 suppose you drop a billiard ball

0184 it falls to the ground  
0185 we wouldn't say the billiard ball is acting freely  
0186 why not?  
0187 it's acting according to the law of nature  
0188 according to the laws  
0189 of cause and effect  
0190 the law of gravity  
0191 and just as he has an unusually  
0192 demanding and stringent  
0193 conception of freedom,  
0194 freedom as autonomy,  
0195 he also  
0196 has a demanding conception  
0197 of morality  
0198 to act freely  
0199 is not to choose the best means to a given end  
0200 it's to choose the end itself for its own sake  
0201 and that's something  
0202 that human beings can do  
0203 and that billiard balls can't  
0204 insofar as we act on  
0205 inclination or pursue pleasure  
0206 we act as means  
0207 to the realization of ends  
0208 given outside us  
0209 we are instruments  
0210 rather than authors  
0211 of the purposes  
0212 we pursue  
0213 that's  
0214 the heteronomous determination of the will  
0215 on the other hand  
0216 insofar as we act autonomously  
0217 according to law we give ourselves  
0218 we do something for its own sake  
0219 as an end in itself  
0220 when we act autonomously

0221 we cease to be instruments to purposes  
0222 given outside us  
0223 we become  
0224 what we can come to think of ourselves  
0225 as ends in ourselves.  
0226 this capacity to act freely  
0227 Kant tells us  
0228 is what gives human life its special  
0229 dignity.  
0230 respecting human dignity  
0231 means regarding persons  
0232 not just as means  
0233 but also as ends in them  
0234 and this is why  
0235 it's wrong to use people  
0236 for the sake of other people's  
0237 well being or happiness  
0238 this is the real reason Kant says  
0239 that utilitarianism goes wrong  
0240 this is the reason it's important to respect the dignity of persons  
0241 and to uphold their rights.  
0242 so even if there are cases  
0243 remember John Stuart Mill said well in the long run if we uphold Justice and respect  
0244 the dignity of persons  
0245 we will maximize human happiness.  
0246 What would Kant's answer be to that?  
0247 what would his answer be?  
0248 even if that were true  
0249 even if the calculus worked out that way  
0250 even if you shouldn't throw the Christians to the lions because in the long run  
0251 fear will spread, the overall utility will decline, the utilitarian  
0252 would be upholding Justice and rights and respect for persons  
0253 for the wrong reason  
0254 for a purely contingent reason  
0255 for an instrumental reason  
0256 it would still be using people even where the calculus works out  
0257 for the best in the long run, it would still using people

0258 as means  
0259 rather than  
0260 respecting them as ends in themselves.  
0261 so that's Kant's idea of freedom as autonomy  
0262 and you can begin to see how it's connected  
0263 to his idea of morality  
0264 but we still have to answer one more question  
0265 what gives an act it's moral worth  
0266 in the first place  
0267 if it can't be directed  
0268 at utility or satisfying wants or desires,  
0269 what do you think gives an action it's moral worth?  
0270 this leads us from Kant's  
0271 demanding idea of freedom  
0272 to his demanding idea  
0273 of morality.  
0274 What does Kant say?  
0275 what makes an action  
0276 morally worthy  
0277 consists not in the consequences or in the results that flow from it  
0278 what makes an action morally worthy has to do with  
0279 the motive  
0280 with the quality of the will  
0281 with the intention  
0282 for which the act is done  
0283 what matters  
0284 is the motive  
0285 and the motive must be of a certain kind.  
0286 so the moral worth of an action depends on the motive for which it's done  
0287 and the important thing  
0288 is that  
0289 the person do the right thing  
0290 for the right reason  
0291 a goodwill isn't good  
0292 because of what it affects or accomplishes, Kant writes,  
0293 it's good in itself  
0294 even if by its utmost effort to goodwill accomplishes nothing



0295 it would still shine like a jewel for its own sake  
0296 as something which has its full value in itself  
0297 and so for any action  
0298 to be morally good  
0299 it's not enough that it should  
0300 conform  
0301 to the moral law  
0302 it must also be done for the sake of the moral law.  
0303 the idea is  
0304 that the motive confers  
0305 the moral worth  
0306 on an action  
0307 and the only kind of motive  
0308 that can confirm moral  
0309 worth on an action  
0310 is the motive of duty  
0311 well what's the opposite  
0312 of doing something out of a sense of duty because it's right,  
0313 well for Kant the opposite  
0314 would be all of those motives having to do with our inclinations  
0315 and inclinations  
0316 refer to all of our  
0317 desires, all of our contingently given  
0318 wants  
0319 preferences  
0320 impulses  
0321 and the like  
0322 only actions done for the sake of the moral law  
0323 for the sake of duty  
0324 only these actions have moral worth  
0325 now I want to  
0326 see what you think about this idea  
0327 but first let's consider a few examples  
0328 Kant begins with an example  
0329 of a shopkeeper  
0330 he wants to bring out the intuition  
0331 and make plausible the idea

0332 that what confers moral worth on an action is that it be done because it's right  
0333 he says suppose there's a shopkeeper  
0334 and an inexperienced customer comes in  
0335 the shopkeeper knows  
0336 that he could give the customer the wrong change could shortchange the customer  
0337 and get away with it  
0338 at least that customer wouldn't know  
0339 but the shopkeeper nonetheless says well if I shortchange this customer  
0340 word may get out  
0341 my reputation would be damaged and I would lose business  
0342 so I won't shortchange this customer  
0343 the shop keeper  
0344 does nothing wrong he gives a correct change  
0345 but does this action have moral worth?  
0346 Kant says no.  
0347 it doesn't have moral worth  
0348 because the shopkeeper only did the right thing  
0349 for the wrong reason  
0350 out of self-interest  
0351 that's a pretty straightforward  
0352 case. then he takes another case  
0353 the case of suicide.  
0354 he says we have a duty to preserve ourselves  
0355 now, for most people  
0356 who love life,  
0357 we have multiple reasons  
0358 for not taking our own lives  
0359 so the only way we can really tell  
0360 the only way we can isolate the operative motive  
0361 for someone who doesn't take his or her life  
0362 is to think  
0363 to imagine someone who's miserable  
0364 and  
0365 who despite  
0366 having an absolutely miserable life  
0367 nonetheless  
0368 recognizes the duty to preserve one's self

0369 and so  
0370 does not commit suicide.  
0371 the force of the example  
0372 is to bring out  
0373 the motive that matters  
0374 and the motive that matters for morality is doing the right thing  
0375 for the sake of duty.  
0376 let me just  
0377 give you  
0378 a couple of other examples  
0379 the better business bureau  
0380 what's their slogan, the slogan of  
0381 the better business bureau?  
0382 honesty is the best policy  
0383 it's also the most profitable. this is the better business bureaus  
0384 full page ad in  
0385 the new York times  
0386 honesty  
0387 it's as important as any other asset  
0388 because a business the deals in truth, openness and fair value  
0389 cannot help  
0390 but do well  
0391 come join us  
0392 and profit from it  
0393 What would Kant say  
0394 about the moral worth  
0395 of the honest dealings that members of the  
0396 better business bureau. What he says  
0397 that here's a perfect example  
0398 that if this is the reason  
0399 that these companies deal honestly with their customers  
0400 their action lacks moral worth  
0401 this is Kant's point  
0402 or couple of years ago at the university of Maryland there was a problem with cheating  
0403 and so they  
0404 initiated  
0405 an honor system

0406 and they created a program with local merchants  
0407 that if you signed the honor pledge not to cheat  
0408 you would get discounts often to twenty five percent of local shops  
0409 now what would you think of someone motivated  
0410 to uphold an honor code  
0411 with all the discounts  
0412 it's the same as  
0413 Kant's shopkeeper  
0414 the point is  
0415 what matters is the quality of the will the character of the motive  
0416 and the relevant motive to morality  
0417 can only be  
0418 the motive of duty  
0419 not the motive of inclination.  
0420 and when I act out of duty  
0421 and when I resist  
0422 as my motive for acting inclinations or self-interest  
0423 even sympathy and altruism,  
0424 only then  
0425 am I acting  
0426 freely.  
0427 only then and I acting  
0428 autonomously, only then is my will not  
0429 determined  
0430 or governed  
0431 by external considerations.  
0432 that's the link  
0433 between Kant's idea of freedom  
0434 and of morality. now I want to pause here  
0435 the see  
0436 if all of this is clear  
0437 or if you have some questions  
0438 or puzzles  
0439 they can be questions of clarification  
0440 or  
0441 they can be challenges  
0442 if you want to challenge this idea

0443 that only

0444 the motive of duty confers moral worth on the action action

0445 what do you think

0446 I actually have two questions of clarification

0447 the first is there seems to be an aspect of this that makes it sort of

0448 self-defeating in that

0449 once you're conscious of

0450 what morality is you can sort of alter your motive to achieve that end of morality

0451 give me an example

0452 what do you have in mind

0453 the shopkeeper example

0454 if he

0455 decides that he wants to give the person of money is to do the right thing

0456 and he decides that's his motive to do so

0457 because he was the moral then isn't that sort of defeating

0458 trying to

0459 isn't that sort of defeating the purity of his action if

0460 morality is determined by his motive

0461 is his motive is to act morally

0462 so you're imagining a case

0463 not of the purely selfish calculating shopkeeper

0464 but of one who says

0465 well he may consider

0466 shortchanging the customer

0467 but then he says

0468 not, while my reputation might suffer if word gets out,

0469 but instead he says

0470 actually I would like to be the kind of

0471 honest person

0472 who gives the right change to customers

0473 simply because it's the right thing to do

0474 or simply because I want to be moral

0475 because I want to be moral

0476 I want to be a good person

0477 and so I'm going to conform all of my actions to what morality requires

0478 it's a subtle point, it's a good question

0479 Kant does acknowledge

0480 you're pressing Kant on an important  
0481 point here,  
0482 Kant does say there has to be some  
0483 incentive  
0484 to obey the moral law  
0485 it can't be a self-interested incentive  
0486 that would defeat it  
0487 by definition  
0488 so he speaks of  
0489 a different kind of incentive from an inclination he speaks of reverence for the moral law  
0490 so if that shopkeeper says  
0491 I want to develop a  
0492 reverence for the moral law  
0493 and so I'm going to act, so I'm going to do the right thing  
0494 then I think he's there, he's there as far as Kant's  
0495 concerned  
0496 because he's formed his motive  
0497 his will  
0498 is conforming to  
0499 the moral law  
0500 once he sees the importance of it  
0501 so it would count  
0502 it would count  
0503 and secondly very quickly  
0504 what stops morality from becoming completely objective in this point?  
0505 what stops morality from becoming completely  
0506 subjective, yea, like  
0507 how can  
0508 if there's, if morality is completely determined by your morals then how can  
0509 you apply this or how can it be enforced?  
0510 that's also a great question, what's your name?  
0511 my name's Ahmady. Ahmady?  
0512 all right  
0513 if acting morally means  
0514 acting according  
0515 to a moral law out of duty  
0516 and if it's also

0517 to act freely in the sense of autonomously  
0518 it must mean  
0519 that I'm acting according to a law that I give myself that's what it means to act autonomously  
0520 Ahmady is right about that  
0521 but that does raise a really interesting question  
0522 if acting autonomously means acting according to a law I give myself  
0523 that's how I escape  
0524 the chain of cause and effect and the laws of nature  
0525 what's to guarantee  
0526 that the law I give myself  
0527 when I'm acting out of duty is the same  
0528 as the law that Ahmady is giving himself  
0529 and that each of you  
0530 gives yourselves  
0531 well here's the question  
0532 how many moral laws  
0533 from Kant's point of view are there in this room  
0534 are there a thousands or is there one  
0535 he thinks there's one  
0536 which in a way does go back to this question all right what is the moral law, what does it  
0537 tell us  
0538 so what guarantees, it sounds like it  
0539 to act autonomously is to act according to one's conscience according to a law  
0540 one gives oneself  
0541 but what guarantees  
0542 that we, if we all exercise our reason we will come up with one and the same moral law?  
0543 that's what Ahmady wants to know.  
0544 here's Kant's answer,  
0545 the reason that leads us  
0546 to the law we give ourselves  
0547 as autonomous beings  
0548 is a reason  
0549 it's a kind of practical reason  
0550 that we share as human beings  
0551 it's not  
0552 idiosyncratic  
0553 the reason we need to respect

0554 the dignity of persons is that we're all rational beings we all have the capacity for reason  
0555 and it's the exercise of that capacity for a reason  
0556 which exist  
0557 undifferentiated  
0558 in all of us  
0559 that makes us worthy of dignity, all of us  
0560 and  
0561 since it's the same capacity for reason  
0562 unqualified by particular  
0563 autobiographies and circumstances it's the same universal capacity for reason  
0564 that delivers the moral law  
0565 it turns out that to act autonomously  
0566 is to act according to a law  
0567 we give ourselves exercising our reason  
0568 but it's the reason we share with everyone  
0569 as rational beings  
0570 not the particular reason we have given our upbringing, our particular values our  
0571 particular interests  
0572 it's pure practical reason in Kant's terms  
0573 which legislates apriori  
0574 regardless of any particular  
0575 contingent  
0576 or empirical ends. Well  
0577 what moral law would that kind of reason  
0578 deliver?  
0579 what is its content?  
0580 to answer that question  
0581 you have to read the groundwork  
0582 and we'll continue with that question next time.  
0583 For Kant,  
0584 morally speaking suicide is on a par with murder  
0585 it's on a par with murder because what we violate  
0586 when we take a life  
0587 when we take someone's life, our's or somebody else's,  
0588 we use  
0589 that person  
0590 we use a rational being



0591 we use humanity as a means  
0592 and so we fail to respect humanity  
0593 as an end  
0594 today we turn back to Kant, but before we do  
0595 remember this is the week  
0596 by the end of which  
0597 all of you  
0598 will basically get Kant, figure out what he's up to  
0599 you're laughing  
0600 no, it will happen  
0601 Kant's groundwork  
0602 is about two big questions,  
0603 first what is the supreme principle of morality  
0604 second  
0605 how is freedom  
0606 possible?  
0607 two big questions  
0608 now, one way  
0609 of making your way through  
0610 this dense philosophical book  
0611 is to bear in mind  
0612 a set of opposition or contrasts or dualisms  
0613 that are related.  
0614 today I'd like to talk about them  
0615 today we're going to answer the question, what according to Kant,  
0616 is the supreme principle of morality  
0617 and in answering that question in working our way up to Kant's answer to that question,  
0618 it will help to bear in mind  
0619 three contrasts or dualisms  
0620 that Kant sets out  
0621 the first you remember  
0622 had to do  
0623 with the motive  
0624 according to which we act  
0625 and according to Kant,  
0626 only one kind of motive  
0627 is consistent with morality

0628 the motive of duty  
0629 doing the right thing for the right reason  
0630 what other kinds of motives are there  
0631 Kant sums them up  
0632 in the category inclination  
0633 every time  
0634 the motive  
0635 for what we do  
0636 is to  
0637 satisfy a desire  
0638 or a preference that we may have, to pursue some interest  
0639 we're acting out of inclination  
0640 now let me pause to see if  
0641 if in thinking about  
0642 the question of the motive of duty of good will  
0643 see if any of you has a question  
0644 about that much of Kant's claim.  
0645 or is everybody happy with this distinction  
0646 what do you think? go ahead.  
0647 when you make that distinction between duty and inclination is there ever any moral action ever?  
0648 I mean you could always kind of probably find some kind of  
0649 some selfish motive, can't you?  
0650 maybe very often people do have self-interested motives  
0651 when they act  
0652 Kant wouldn't dispute that  
0653 but what Kant is saying  
0654 is  
0655 that in so far as we act  
0656 morally that is in so far as our actions have moral worth  
0657 what confers moral worth  
0658 is precisely  
0659 our capacity to rise above self-interest and prudence and inclination and  
0660 to act out of duty  
0661 some years ago I read about  
0662 a spelling bee  
0663 and  
0664 there was a young man

0665 who was declared the winner  
0666 of the spelling bee  
0667 a kid named Andrew, thirteen years old  
0668 the winning word, the word that he was able to spell  
0669 was echolalia  
0670 does anyone know what echolalia is?  
0671 it's not some type of flower no,  
0672 it is the tendency to repeat as an echo, to repeat what you've heard  
0673 anyhow, he misspelled it actually  
0674 but the judges misheard him they thought it spelled it correctly and awarded him the  
0675 championship of the national  
0676 spelling bee  
0677 and  
0678 he  
0679 went to the judges  
0680 afterward  
0681 and said  
0682 actually  
0683 I misspelled it  
0684 I don't deserve the prize  
0685 and he was regarded as a moral hero  
0686 and he was  
0687 written up in the new York times  
0688 misspeller  
0689 is the spelling bee hero  
0690 there's Andrew  
0691 with is proud mother  
0692 and but when he was interviewed afterwards  
0693 listen to this, when he was interviewed afterwards  
0694 he said quote  
0695 the judges said I had a lot of integrity  
0696 but then he added  
0697 that part of his motive was quote  
0698 I didn't want to feel like a slime  
0699 all right what would Kant say?  
0700 I guess it would depend on whether or not  
0701 that was a marginal reason or the predominant reason in whether not and why he decided

0702 to confess that he didn't actually spell the word correctly  
0703 good and what's your name. Vasco.  
0704 that's very interesting is there anyone else  
0705 who has a view about this?  
0706 does this show that Kant's  
0707 principle is too stringent too demanding  
0708 what would Kant say  
0709 about this? yes  
0710 I think that Kant actually says that  
0711 it is the pure motivation that comes out of duty that gives the action moral worth, so it's like  
0712 for example in this case  
0713 he might have more than one motive, he might have a motive of not feeling like a slime  
0714 and he might have to move of  
0715 doing the right thing  
0716 in and of itself out of duty and so while there's more than one motivation going on there  
0717 does not mean that action is devoid of moral worth just because he has one other motive  
0718 so because the motive which involves duty is what gives it moral worth. goo, and what's your name?  
Judith  
0719 well Judith I think that your account actually is true to Kant  
0720 it's fine to have sentiments and feelings  
0721 that support doing the right thing  
0722 provided  
0723 they don't provide  
0724 the reason for acting  
0725 so I think Judith has actually a pretty good defense of Kant  
0726 on this question  
0727 of the motive of duty, thank you  
0728 now  
0729 let's go back to the  
0730 three contrasts  
0731 it's clear at least what Kant means when he says  
0732 that  
0733 for an action to have moral worth it must be done for the sake of duty  
0734 not out of inclination  
0735 but as we began to see last time  
0736 there's a connection  
0737 between

0738 Kant's stringent notion of morality  
0739 and especially demanding understanding  
0740 of freedom  
0741 and that leads us to the second contrast  
0742 the link between  
0743 morality  
0744 and freedom  
0745 a second contrast describes  
0746 two different  
0747 ways that my will can be determined  
0748 autonomously  
0749 and heteronomously  
0750 according to Kant  
0751 I'm only free  
0752 when my will is determined  
0753 autonomously  
0754 which means what?  
0755 according to a law that I give myself  
0756 we must be capable, if we're capable of freedom as autonomously, we must be capable of acting  
0757 accordingly 0:37:26.0 laws that's given or imposed on us  
0758 but according to a law we give ourselves  
0759 but where could such a law  
0760 come from?  
0761 a law that we give ourselves?  
0762 reason, if reason  
0763 determines my will  
0764 then  
0765 the real becomes to power to choose  
0766 independent  
0767 of the dictates  
0768 of nature or inclination  
0769 or circumstance  
0770 so  
0771 connected with Kant's  
0772 demanding notions of morality and freedom  
0773 is especially demanding notion  
0774 of reason

0775 well how can reason  
0776 determine the  
0777 will  
0778 there are two ways and this leads to the third contracts  
0779 Kant says  
0780 there are two different commands of reason  
0781 in a command of reason  
0782 Kant calls an imperative  
0783 an imperative is simply an ought  
0784 one kind of imperative, perhaps the most familiar kind, is a hypothetical imperative.  
0785 hypothetical imperatives  
0786 use instrumental reason  
0787 if you  
0788 want x then do y  
0789 it's means ends reason.  
0790 if you want a good business reputation  
0791 then  
0792 don't shortchange your customers  
0793 word may get out. that's  
0794 a hypothetical imperative.  
0795 if the action would be good  
0796 solely as a means to something else Kant writes, the imperative is hypothetical  
0797 if the action is represented as good in itself  
0798 and therefore as necessary  
0799 for a will which of itself accords with reason  
0800 then the imperative  
0801 categorical.  
0802 that's the difference  
0803 between  
0804 a categorical imperative and a hypothetical one  
0805 a categorical imperative commands  
0806 categorically  
0807 which just means without reference to or dependents on  
0808 any further purpose  
0809 and so you see the connection  
0810 among these three parallel  
0811 contrasts

0812 to be free in the sense of autonomous  
0813 requires  
0814 that I act  
0815 not out of a hypothetical  
0816 imperative  
0817 but out of the categorical  
0818 imperative  
0819 so you see by these three contrasts Kant  
0820 reasons his way  
0821 brings us up to you  
0822 he's derivation  
0823 of the categorical imperative  
0824 well this leaves us  
0825 one big question  
0826 what is the categorical imperative?  
0827 what is the supreme principle of morality  
0828 what does it command of us?  
0829 Kant gives three versions  
0830 three formulations  
0831 of the categorical imperative.  
0832 I want to mention two  
0833 and then see what you think of them.  
0834 the first  
0835 version the first formula  
0836 he calls the formula  
0837 of the universal law  
0838 act only on that maxim  
0839 whereby you can at the same time will that it should become  
0840 a universal  
0841 law and by maxim  
0842 what does Kant mean?  
0843 he means  
0844 a rule that explains  
0845 the reason for what you're doing  
0846 a principle  
0847 for example  
0848 promise keeping

0849 suppose I need money, I hundred dollars  
0850 desperately  
0851 and I know I can't pay it back anytime soon  
0852 I come to you  
0853 and make you a promise, a false promise, one I know I can't keep  
0854 please give me a hundred dollars today  
0855 lend me the money I will repay you next week  
0856 is that consistent  
0857 with the categorical imperative, that false promise Kant says no  
0858 and the test  
0859 the way we can  
0860 determine  
0861 that the false promise is at odds with categorical  
0862 imperative is  
0863 try to universalize it.  
0864 universalize the maxim upon which you're about to act  
0865 if everybody made false promises when they needed money  
0866 then nobody would believe those promises there would be no such thing  
0867 as a promise  
0868 and so there would be a contradiction  
0869 the maxim universalized would undermine itself  
0870 that's the test  
0871 that's how we can know  
0872 that the false promise is wrong  
0873 well what about  
0874 the formula of the universal law  
0875 you find it persuasive?  
0876 what do you think?  
0877 I have a question about the difference between categoricalism and a hypothesis  
0878 that  
0879 if you're going to act.. Between categorical in hypothetical  
0880 imperatives? right.  
0881 if you're going to act  
0882 with a categorical imperative  
0883 so that the maxim doesn't undermine itself  
0884 it sounds like I am going to do X because I want y  
0885 I'm going to



0886 not lie in dire need  
0887 because I want the world to function in such a way that  
0888 promises kept. I don't want to liquidate the practice of promises. Right.  
0889 it sounds like justifying  
0890 a means by an ends  
0891 it seems like an instance of consequentialist reasoning you're saying.  
0892 and what's your name? Tim.  
0893 well Tim  
0894 John Stuart Mill agreed with you  
0895 he made this criticism  
0896 of Kant  
0897 he said if  
0898 I universalize the maximum and find  
0899 that the whole practice of promise keeping would be destroyed if universalized  
0900 I must be appealing  
0901 somehow to consequences  
0902 if that's the reason  
0903 not to tell a false promise  
0904 so  
0905 John Stuart Mill agreed with that criticism against Kant  
0906 but John Stuart Mill was wrong  
0907 you're in good company though  
0908 you're in good company, Tim  
0909 Kant is often read  
0910 as Tim  
0911 just read him  
0912 as appealing to consequences  
0913 the world would be worse off  
0914 if everybody lied because then nobody could rely on anybody else's word  
0915 therefore you shouldn't lie  
0916 that's not what Kant is saying exactly  
0917 although it's easy  
0918 to interpret him as saying that  
0919 I think what he's saying  
0920 is that this is the test  
0921 this is the test of whether the maxim  
0922 corresponds with the categorical imperative

0923 it isn't exactly the reason  
0924 it's not the reason  
0925 the reason you should universalize  
0926 to test your maxim  
0927 is to see whether  
0928 you are privileging  
0929 your particular needs and desires  
0930 over everybody else's  
0931 it's a way of pointing to this feature to this  
0932 this feature to this demand of the categorical imperative  
0933 that the reasons for your actions shouldn't  
0934 depend  
0935 on their justification  
0936 on your interests, your needs, your special circumstances  
0937 being more important  
0938 than somebody else's  
0939 that I think is the moral intuition lying behind the universalization  
0940 test  
0941 so let me spell out the second  
0942 Kant's second version of the categorical imperative  
0943 perhaps  
0944 in a way that's more intuitively accessible  
0945 than the formula of universal law  
0946 it's the formula  
0947 of humanity  
0948 as an end  
0949 Kant introduces  
0950 the second version of the categorical imperative  
0951 with the following line of argument  
0952 we can't base the categorical imperative  
0953 on any particular interests, purposes, or ends  
0954 because then it would be  
0955 only relative to the person whose ends they were  
0956 but suppose  
0957 there was something  
0958 whose existence  
0959 has in itself

0960 and absolute value

0961 an end in itself

0962 then in it

0963 and in it alone

0964 would there be the ground of a possible a categorical imperative

0965 well, what is there

0966 that we can think of as having it's end in itself

0967 Kant's answer is this

0968 I say that man

0969 and in general every rational being

0970 exists as an end in himself

0971 not nearly as a means for arbitrary use

0972 by this or that will

0973 and here Kant distinguishes

0974 between persons on the one hand

0975 and things

0976 on the other

0977 rational beings are persons

0978 the don't just have a relative value

0979 for us

0980 but if anything has they have an absolute value

0981 an intrinsic value

0982 that is

0983 rational beings have dignity

0984 they're worthy of reverence and respect

0985 this line of reasoning

0986 leads Kant to the second formulation of the categorical imperative which is this

0987 act in such a way

0988 that you always treated humanity

0989 whether in your own person

0990 or in the person of any other

0991 never simply as a means

0992 but always

0993 at the same time

0994 as an end

0995 so that's the formula of humanity

0996 as an end

0997 the idea that human beings as rational beings  
0998 are ends in themselves  
0999 not open to use  
1000 merely as a means  
1001 when I make a false promise to you  
1002 I mean using you as a means  
1003 to my ends  
1004 to my desire for the hundred dollars  
1005 and so I'm failing to respect  
1006 you, I'm failing to respect your dignity  
1007 I'm manipulating you  
1008 now consider the example  
1009 of the duty of against  
1010 suicide  
1011 murder  
1012 and suicide  
1013 are at odds with the categorical imperative why?  
1014 if I murdered someone  
1015 I'm taking their life for some  
1016 purpose. either because  
1017 I'm a hired killer  
1018 or I'm in the throws of some great anger or passion  
1019 well I have some interest or purpose  
1020 that is particular  
1021 for the sake of which I'm using them  
1022 as a means  
1023 murder violates  
1024 the categorical imperative  
1025 for Kant, morally speaking  
1026 suicide is on a par with murder  
1027 it's on a par with murder because what we violate  
1028 when we take a life  
1029 when we take someone's life our's or somebody else's  
1030 we use that person  
1031 we use a rational being  
1032 we use humanity as a means  
1033 and so we fail to respect humanity

1034 as an end  
1035 and that capacity for reasons  
1036 that humanity  
1037 that commands respect  
1038 that is to ground of dignity  
1039 that humanity  
1040 that capacity for a reason  
1041 resides undifferentiated  
1042 in all of us  
1043 and so I violate that dignity  
1044 in my own person if I commit suicide  
1045 and in murder  
1046 if I take somebody else's life from a moral point of view  
1047 they're the same  
1048 and the reason they're the same  
1049 has to do  
1050 with the universal character  
1051 and ground  
1052 of the moral law  
1053 the reason that we have to respect  
1054 the dignity of other people  
1055 has not to do  
1056 with anything  
1057 in particular about them  
1058 and so respect, Kantian respect is unlike love in this way  
1059 it's unlike sympathy  
1060 it's unlike solidarity or fellow feeling for altruism  
1061 because love and those other particular virtues are reasons for caring about other people  
1062 have to do with who they are in particular  
1063 but respect for Kant  
1064 respect  
1065 is respect for  
1066 humanity which is universal  
1067 for a rational capacity which is universal  
1068 and that's why violating it  
1069 in my own case  
1070 is as objectionable

1071 as violating it  
1072 in the case of any other  
1073 questions or rejections?  
1074 I guess I'm somewhat worried about  
1075 Kant's  
1076 statement that you cannot use a person as a means because every person is an end  
1077 in and of themselves  
1078 because it seems that  
1079 that everyday in order to get something accomplished for that day  
1080 I must use myself as a means to some end  
1081 and I must use the people around me as a means to some ends as well  
1082 for instance suppose  
1083 that  
1084 I want to do well in a class and I have to write a paper  
1085 I have to use myself as a means to write the paper  
1086 suppose I want to buy something, food.  
1087 I must go to the store, use the person  
1088 working behind the counters as a means for me to purchase my food.  
1089 You're right, that's true  
1090 what's your name? Patrick  
1091 Patrick you're not doing anything wrong  
1092 you're not violating the categorical imperative  
1093 when you use other people as a means  
1094 that's not objectionable provided  
1095 when we deal with other people for the sake of advancing our projects and purposes and  
1096 interests,  
1097 which we all do,  
1098 provided  
1099 we treat them  
1100 in a way  
1101 that is consistent  
1102 with respect for their  
1103 dignity  
1104 and what it means to respect them  
1105 is given by  
1106 the categorical imperative.  
1107 are you persuaded?

1108 do you think that Kant has given  
1109 a compelling account a persuasive account  
1110 of the supreme principle of morality?  
1111 re-read the groundwork  
1112 and we'll try to answer that question next time.  
1113 don't miss the chance to interact online with other viewers of Justice  
1114 join the conversation, take a pop quiz  
1115 catch up on lectures you've missed, and learn a lot more. Visit [justiceharvard.org](http://justiceharvard.org)  
1116 it's the right thing to do  
1117 funding for this program is provided by  
1118 additional funding provided by

---