

Final: 12/11, 8am - 11am

Paper #1: 11/4 @ 2pm

Paper #2: 12/6 @ 2pm

9/27: Introduction to Morality

- Science as an extension of the 5 senses, ex) can't witness morality
- Morality vs. Rationality
- Work up to an objective morality to account for differences in personal morality?
- Ethical theories of Kant and Aristotle, then philosophy of mind
- Question existence, purpose, reality

9/30: Practical Rationality

- Kant/Aristotle rely on practical rationality, difference in theories of it
- Practical Rationality: dependency on current situation, society's values, ingrained values
 - Most actions' pros and cons are directed toward the self, still hold regard for others
 - Can hold higher values than our own good, ex) directed toward nation/family/friends
 - Not always rational, can be practically irrational or arational
 - Wallet scenario
 - Looks upon self as one of many equals, build others into consideration
 - Changes based on the theorist
 - Practical- activity, good/bad, Rationality- reason
 - What are pros/cons defined by?
 - Why be moral at all?
 - Must first determine what is rational to do
 - What is rationality? How does it relate to the ends of human action?
 - What are the ends of human action?
 - Means-end reasoning: end is given to you, reason about the means, things are good because we desire them
 - Ex) you get hungry, reason about what to do to satisfy that need, you can't do anything to avoid it
 - More robust notions: we can reason about both the means and end, we desire an end because it is objectively good
 - Objectivity: can also be mind-dependent
 - Recognition of the end generates a desire for it, setting your own ends
 - X is good because we desire it vs. We desire x because it is good -> means-end vs. more robust
- Moral Rationality- subset of practical or same as practical, theoretical
 - 3 parts of a decision: intention, nature of the action, consequence
 - Intention- needs to be driven solely by the idea that it's the right thing to do, absent of selfishness
 - Either good for you or good overall
- Moral thing to do isn't necessarily self-beneficial, it's generally the "right" thing to do
 - Should produce a healthy society that is more productive, more positive than negative, therefore should align with self-interests with minor differences
- Eudaimonia- human flourishing, the good life, used by Kant to describe Plato/Aristotle

10/1: Arguments in Philosophy

- In general, what is a good argument in philosophy?
 - A good argument is one that deals with a question that is not definite/has no correct answer
 - Supported by evidence and logic - not always
 - Cite others' ideas
 - Incites discussion in a community
 - Create clarity in a topic as a whole, not in a single situation
 - Personal experience vs. others' experience
 - **Argument:** a series of statements in which one statement (the conclusion) is claimed to be supported by other statements (the premises)
 - **Statement:** A sentence with a truth value
 - No truth value - questions, commands - not a statement
 - **Deductively Valid Argument:** If all the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true
 - Can also be deductively valid if false premises lead to false conclusions
 - **Inductive Argument:** If all the premises are true, then the conclusion can still be false
 - Involves probability
- What is philosophy?
 - Raising/answering questions about life
 - Explaining subjectivity in an attempt to unify into objectivity
 - Asking questions on unclear topics
 - philo- love of
 - sophia- wisdom
 - Using logic to arrive at a conclusion

10/2: Nicomachean Ethics Book I

- Chapter 1
 - “Every skill and every inquiry, and similarly every action and rational choice, is thought to aim at some good; and so the good has been aptly described as that at which everything aims” - Aristotle’s view on practical rationality
 - Everything we do is to be aimed at a good
 - Not logical to judge an action as bad and to proceed to do it
 - Many goods (“aim at some good”) vs. a single good (“the good”)
 - 2 types of goods
 - Activities- the activity itself is the good/its own end, i.e. playing basketball, playing piano
 - Products of activities- the activity is a means to an end, end > means, i.e. dinner, fixing a car
 - Can be subjective, can be both
 - There are many goods vs. there is only one good > hierarchy of goods
 - Every action can lead to the question “Why do I want to be happy?”, hits a dead end, can no longer answer
 - Happiness is the end, goods form steps that lead to it
 - General goods encapsulate many other subordinate goods
 - If desires led to nothing, then they would be meaningless
 - Ultimate goal gives desires meaning

10/4: Nicomachean Ethics Book I

- Is there a single universal good or is there multiple goods that are completely distinct?
- Aristotle thinks all goods fall under the category of a more general good, and will eventually end up as “the good”
 - Must exist, otherwise actions are futile, “the good” gives good to subordinate goods
 - “The good” is desired for itself and because of what it is, we desire other things as a means to it
 - It is the best good
 - Once we know what “the good” is, we will be able to more actively/accurately target it
 - Ex) health, knowledge of what makes us healthy helps keep us healthy
- Chapter 2
 - Good of the city > good of the individual
 - Utilitarian- greatest good for the greatest number of people
 - Issues when conflict with good of the individual
 - Greeks- city-state serves as focus of identity, lack of identification of the self
 - People were just appendages, like hands to a body
- Chapter 3
 - Exact sciences like math vs. less exact sciences like rhetoric and morality
 - Can’t achieve 100% morality, too much to consider, never have perfect morality unless we are omniscient
 - Cannot be exact, closer is better
 - About action and knowledge, not just knowledge, must act to live well, not just know how
- Chapter 4
 - End of all action determined to be happiness
 - Eudaimonia= human flourishing “the good life”

10/7: Nicomachean Ethics Book I

- Chapter 5
 - Possibilities for happiness:
 - Life of gratification/pleasure/meeting of basic needs
 - Cannot be true, can be unhappy w/ needs satisfied
 - Rational thought makes us want more than simple needs
 - Aristotle- need a concept of self to be happy
 - Missing out on satisfaction of good of the whole
 - Life of political activity/life of honor
 - Cannot be true, too superficial
 - Depends on others, can be honorable, but have a different public image
 - Too dependant on others, happiness is about your own internal activity
 - Life of study
 - Forces contemplation of problems, can be painful
 - Skipped
- Chapter 6 skipped
- Chapter 7
 - We can find goods, but not “the good”
 - What is the good of each action or craft?
 - The good is always the end since it’s the “for the sake of which” everyone acts
 - End in relation to the means, a principle of practical reason
 - So if there is some end of everything achievable in action, the good achievable in action will be this end
 - 3 formal criteria of happiness- mark of happiness, not happiness itself, morality = happiness for Aristotle
 - Complete- an end that is chosen or done for its own sake
 - Choice-worthy- good in its own right chosen only for its own sake
 - That for the sake of all other ends are chosen
 - Chosen for its own sake vs. chosen only for its own sake

10/8: Aristotle 1

- Is the following a validly deductive argument?
 - If “experts” could always be trusted to make the right moral decision, then public participation would not be necessary -- but they cannot be, and so it is. - Carl Sagan
 - It is not a deductively valid argument, as the premises are false and the conclusion is true.
- In the first 2 chapters of Book 1, Aristotle makes the following argument:
 - 1. If there is a highest skill/activity, then there is a best good
 - 2. There is a highest skill/activity
 - 3. Thus, there is a best good.
 - Is it deductively valid? Also, explain the first 2 premises
 - Yes it is, it uses true premises to arrive at a true conclusion. The first premise means that a best good results from the existence of an optimal activity for someone to perform. The second states that an optimal activity does in fact exist, which, in Aristotle’s view, is political science (act of helping humanity as a whole).
- Why does Aristotle believe the conclusion in the argument from Question 2?
 - He believes that every action is driven by the existence of a greater good, and the absence of such a good makes desires meaningless.
- Why does Aristotle think, in Book 1, Chapter 3, that morality can never be a perfect science?
 - It is impossible to achieve a perfect morality because humans are not omniscient, and therefore it would be impossible to take everything into consideration that you would need to be a perfect moral being.
- Explain what Aristotle means by eudaimonia.
 - It’s defined as human flourishing of both happiness and morality, fulfillment of basic needs, stable, objective, and universal.
- Aristotle thinks that there is one best/final good. Do you agree or disagree with him? Discuss and come up with arguments for your view.
 - I think that there isn’t a final good because if we can’t identify a final good as humans, then I don’t think we have a reason to assume there is one. In addition, if we can never identify this final good, then there is no reason that as humans, we should even consider its exist
- If A then B, A, B → modus ponens
- **Sound:** All premises are true and the argument is valid
- Ask yourself: Are the premises true? Does the conclusion follow from the premises?
- Invalid: If A, not B → Not A → Therefore, B
- COUNTERARGUMENT

10/9: Nicomachean Ethics Book I

- Chapter 7
 - Self-sufficient- when you have it, you are not lacking anything
 - Need to be conscious to act on desires → happiness is an activity not a state
 - Consider if wanting more of something actually creates improvement in quality
 - How can we shape our desires and needs?
 - Everything is relative to the individual and their own flourishing
 - Since “the good” must be self-sufficient, there must only be one, otherwise you would be lacking the others
 - Once it’s achieved, gaining other goods wouldn’t improve your life
 - Function argument:
 - The good relates to the characteristic function or activity of an object

10/11: Nicomachean Ethics Book I

- Chapter 7
 - Qua = as
 - Function argument: a good X is one that performs its function well
 - Understood in relation to its ends
 - Standards of excellence: the relationship between the good and its functioning well
 - What if X is a human? What does it mean for a human to function well?
 - Can identify good function for a point guard, pianist, etc.
 - What about a human considered as a human?
 - Look at parts of the human being
 - A good eye sees well, different for humans vs. animals
 - A good heart pumps your heart, a good liver cleans your blood, etc.
 - All function to make the body function well
 - What is the body's function as a whole?
 - Not a craft, body's good is not independent of the activity, no activity = no happiness
 - Human instinct driven to self-preservation/self-propagation → preserves life
 - Living is a function, most likely not the end, a function of a living being, not a human being
 - Also a function of plants/animals
 - Humans also have rational thought/will
 - Rational activity is the function of the human being
 - Therefore a good human being reasons well
- Soul - the principle of life, distinguishes us from disorganized matter, brings life
- Human function is the activity of the soul in accordance with reason
- 3 parts of the soul:
 - Reason itself: virtues of thought
 - Non-rational 1: listens to reason, questions and desires that can be guided or partially controlled by reason, virtues of character
 - Non-rational 2: doesn't listen to reason, basic physiological functions and instincts
 - Ex) going to sleep, cannot talk yourself out of getting sleep, doesn't listen to reason, isn't reason itself
 - Ex) as a vegetarian, you can reason yourself into finding the smell of meat disgusting, alter reality based on reasoning
 - Reason- mind, non-rational 1: heart, non-rational 2: stomach (not literal)
 - The virtues are the standards of excellence, when we reason well, we have virtue

10/14: Nicomachean Ethics Book I

- Chapter 7
 - The function of a thing is the same as the function of the excellent version of that thing
 - An excellent one simply performs the function well
 - To be excellent with respect to some function is to be virtuous
 - A good life should last for the whole life, not for a temporary period of time
 - Human function = a certain kind of life, activities of the soul that involve reason
 - Function of an excellent human being is to do this well
 - Excellence of human function = virtue
 - The good (happiness) = activity of the soul in accordance with virtue
 - The best and most complete if there is more than one virtue
 - Also best over a complete life
- Chapter 8
 - 3 types of goods:
 - External goods: money, fame
 - Goods of the body: beauty, good birth/family
 - Goods of the soul: most holy goods
 - Actions + activities of the soul in accordance with virtue
 - These goods are internal to the human being, hard to take away, individual has absolute possession
 - Allows you to guide and govern your possession of other goods
 - Enjoyment required for virtue, end in itself, not a means to an end

10/15: Aristotle 2

- What is the difference between “complete” and “choice-worthy” in the end of all ends? Is completeness necessary for choice-worthiness? Is choice-worthiness necessary for completeness?
 - Completeness is necessary for choice-worthiness, as a choice-worthy goal is the most complete goal. However, a good does not have to be choice-worthy to be complete. Something that is choice-worthy is done for the sake of itself and itself alone, while a complete good can be done for an end
 - Complete goods are the things that are the reason why everything else is chosen, while choice-worthy goods are goods where nothing else is to be chosen besides it
 - In terms of Aristotle, the choice-worthy good is happiness
- For Aristotle, is happiness (eudaimonia) an activity or a state?
 - According to Aristotle, it is an activity, ex) it is impossible to be happy in a coma
- Explain Aristotle’s function argument.
 - Aristotle states that in order for an object to be a good object, it must perform its intended function well.
- What is the function of a human being, according to Aristotle?
 - Aristotle says that the function of the human being is to have rational thought and use it in multiple virtuous ways across their entire life
 - You do not have to be aware of an activity while doing it for it to be considered an activity
- Define Aristotle’s conception of the soul and describe its 3 parts.
 - Aristotle’s 3 parts of the soul are reason itself (the mind), a part that is not reason itself, but listens to reason (the heart), and a part that is not reason itself and doesn’t listen to reason (physiological functions)
- Dualism is the view that the mind (or soul) is separate from the body. So there are at least 2 substances in the world for the dualist: physical stuff (the body) and non-physical stuff (the soul). It is generally agreed that Aristotle is not a dualist, that is to say, the mind/soul and body are made out of the same physical substance. Do you agree with the dualist or with Aristotle?
 - If the mind and body are separate, then either one could exist without the other. However, when the mind dies, the body does too, and vice versa, therefore they must be connected.

10/16: Nicomachean Ethics Book I + Book II

- Chapter 8
 - Someone is not just/generous if they don't enjoy doing just/generous things
 - Experience of pleasure tells us that our intentions are good
 - In order to be excellent/virtuous in regards to something, you must
 - Understand why the activity is good, see the value of the activity
 - Have the activity come easy, experience pleasure or joy when doing it
 - Happy life = life of virtue
 - The activity of your own soul (virtue) cannot be taken away from you
 - A life of virtue does not entail a lack of external goods
 - Ex) donating when you have a lot of money
 - Influenced by luck in birth, location, etc.
 - Virtue enables us to make the best of our lives to survive and succeed
- Chapter 10
 - Virtue helps people take advantage of their fortunes and bear misfortunes
 - Morality isn't a set of rules that you have to follow, it's a guideline for living a better life
- Chapter 13
 - 2 types of virtues:
 - Virtues of thought - correspond to the part of the soul that is reason itself
 - Virtues of character - correspond to the part of the soul that listens to reason, deal with emotion and desire
 - Courage, temperance, wit, etc.
- Chapter 1
 - You are habituated to virtues of thought early in life, you discuss them later in life
 - Are virtues of character something we automatically develop or do we have to be taught?
 - If they are natural, we are subjects of fate/genetics
 - Aristotle believes we learn virtues by practicing them as a skill
 - Just doing them is not enough, you must do them well to achieve the virtue
 - Practice doesn't make perfect, perfect practice makes perfect
 - It will form a character trait, establish stability and a firm/unchanging character (habituation)
 - You learn what's good about an action by doing it
 - Tension found in burning building example, doesn't make life better for yourself

10/18: Nicomachean Ethics Book II

- Chapter 1
 - Habituation allows us to make it easier to develop the right habits, performing an activity over and over creates a disposition towards performing that activity
 - Character - formed through habituation to certain actions
 - Involves a strength or proper structures of the soul developed through practice
 - Someone who sometimes acts well and sometimes doesn't has an unstable character, they are still forming their character
 - Doctrine of the mean - virtue is us in our most well-functioning state
 - Excess and deficiency tend to destroy this state
 - Moderate amount - produces, increases, and preserves each state
 - Ex) Excess: cowardice, virtue: courage, deficiency: rash
 - Excess/deficiency of fear
 - The mean can shift, sometimes more/less fear is appropriate
 - There are no excess/deficiencies of the points on the line
 - Excess/deficiency are vicious, there is no situation where they are ever virtuous
 - Mean - intermediate between 2 extremes
 - Relative to the individual and the situation
 - Virtuous actions are self-reinforcing, virtuous acts promote and preserve virtue

10/21: Nicomachean Ethics Book II

- Fear relates to courage, anger relates to justice
- Practical reasoning- reasoning about action
- Need the appropriate amount of fear, anger, etc. in order to get the most accurate perception of your environment
 - Either conscious or unconscious (instinct)
 - About the present, past, or future

10/22: Writing a Philosophy Paper

- 3 goals: writing clearly and concisely, analytical/critical thinking, understanding of Philosophy 3 concepts
- Pre-Writing:
 - Read/re-read the material
 - Attend the lectures
 - Think about the material
 - Ask questions in lecture, discussion, OH
 - Read and understand what the prompt is asking
 - Outlines can be very helpful
 - Think about the audience before writing
 - Best to assume it will be distributed to the undergraduate class in the next hall
 - Explain the main ideas clearly and concisely, always explain technical terms mentioned in the paper
- Structure:
 - Introduction
 - Body
 - Background
 - Your argument/objection/puzzle
 - Counterargument to your argument/objection/puzzle
 - Response to the counterargument
 - Note: not all papers need to follow this structure, but it is an example of one that shows critical thinking
 - Conclusion
- Introduction:
 - Should be very short, roughly 3-6 sentences
 - Give a brief roadmap of your paper
 - Most importantly, state your thesis clearly and precisely while using the least amount of words possible
 - This should be the only place where you don't need to explain any technical terms (must be explained later if used)
 - Every sentence in the introduction should matter
 - Avoid cliches
- Body - Aim:
 - Your main aim here is to answer the prompt as clearly and precisely as you can
 - Every word in your body should be doing some work to advance your thesis
 - You need to address everything in your intro
 - Any technical term or idea that you use should be explained and clarified
 - Keep in mind of the logical structure of your paper
 - Your arguments should flow logically
- Body - Topic Sentences:

- You should have a topic sentence for each paragraph in your body
- Should be direct, clear, and concise
 - Every sentence in your paragraph should relate to your topic sentence, every topic sentence should play a role in advancing your thesis
- Body - Explanation/Clarification:
 - Examples are very helpful when explaining philosophical concepts
 - Use transitional phrases to further clarify complicated concepts/explanations: “In other words”, “In order to clarify”, etc.
- Body - Repetitive:
 - Avoid being repetitive
 - Don’t start a new paragraph in order to rewrite what you already wrote
 - Use your best judgement, if you think you have explained and clarified the main concept, move on
- Body - Your Argument:
 - You should be trying to prove your thesis
 - Your argument should be clear and well-explained
 - It should be guided by logic, reason, and critical thinking
 - Look up fallacies (Ex. straw-person)
 - Use philosophical/logical tools (Ex. principle of charity)
 - Provide counterargument(s) to your argument(s) and then formulate a response to that counterargument(s)
 - Thought experiments can be an effective way to argue for or against a view
 - Ex. Trolley problem, Einstein’s beam of light, Ship of Theseus, etc.
 - This is your chance to use your creativity but it should be guided by reason/logic
- Body - Citations:
 - If you only summarize Aristotle’s *Ethics* and/or lecture notes, you don’t need a works cited page
 - However, if you use a direct quote or paraphrase a certain part of the book, then provide the page number and last name
 - Ex. (Aristotle, p. 55) or (DeWitt, week 2)
 - All other sources should be cited and include a works cited page
- Conclusion:
 - Restate your thesis here and provide a very brief summary as to how you have argued for your thesis
 - You shouldn’t introduce any new ideas here
 - ~3-5 sentences
- Revision:
 - Proofread your paper, make sure there are no grammatical mistakes
 - Make sure you have answered your prompt and argued for your thesis
 - Make sure there’s a title on your paper
 - Make sure you have followed the guidelines from this lecture
 - Think about the feedback given to you

10/23: Nicomachean Ethics Book II

- Reason how it is best to act in a specific circumstance
- Evolution drives perception and reaction together, one is useless without the other
- Unity of virtue- in order to have one virtue, you must have them all
- Medial emotions and desires:
 - We must act/feel:
 - about the right things
 - towards the right people
 - for the right end
 - in the right way
 - at the right time
 - Missing one = vicious act, must hit mean

10/25: Nicomachean Ethics Book II

- Emotion is a state where we can analyze our situation, directs our attention to valuable factors
- Pleasure is related to desire, which is related to emotion
 - You can distort what is pleasurable/what is painful
 - Experience in moderation
 - If you desire but don't act, it's still bad, shows that not everything is committed to the value, resistance still exists
- Virtuous actions vs. virtuous character:
 - It is possible to do what virtue requires by accident, but it must be done with the right intentions, therefore you cannot accidentally do a virtuous action
 - For an action to be virtuous, an agent must be in the right state
 - He must know he is doing a virtuous act
 - He must do X because of X itself, because X is a good/virtuous action
 - He must act from a firm and stable character
 - You know when you are virtuous, you can't tell from the outside looking in
- Aim to get as close to the mean, knowing we will often miss it
- The virtues are basic elements needed to make our lives go well → virtue leads to good life

10/29: Aristotle 3

- What is character according to Aristotle?
 - Character is formed through habituation towards a certain action, it requires practice to develop, much like a skill
- What is the mean?
 - It is a point between points of excess and deficiency, relative to the individual and the situation, and is the only way to achieve virtue
- Is cowardice an excess of fear or a deficiency of courage?
 - Cowardice is an excess of fear, courage is the mean itself, not the underlying emotion
- Does everything have a mean?
 - No, the vices don't have a mean
- How do we find the mean?
- Would, or could, Aristotle describe Malala's actions as courageous? If so, how? Discuss.
- Character- formed through habituation to certain actions, involves a strong or proper structure of the soul, development through practice

10/30: Kant

- Empirical/a posteriori ethics vs. a priori (Kant)
- Empirical requires observation while a priori involves interactions within the mind
- We are hardwired to react to certain things certain ways
 - If morality is empirical, then morality is contingent (etiquette)
 - Something you should do, but won't be an issue if you don't
 - Therefore, morality is based on reason alone
 - Duty and the moral law suggest that morality is universal and necessary
 - Wrong is wrong for all people in all situations
 - For these to be the ground of obligation, they must hold for all rational beings
- Principle of utility: action is good if good for greatest # of people, vice versa
 - Can create a tyranny of the majority
- Correct/right/good in relation to values
 - If known, you can right form correctness/for moral law

11/1: Kant

- Unconditionally good - there is no situation where it is not good, good without limitation categorically, absolutely, exceptionless, and conditionless
 - Necessary rather than contingent
 - Necessarily good and so good in itself
 - Courage, health, happiness, etc. can be bad
 - Pursuit of and consequences can be bad
 - Everything is conditionally good, the condition is the good will (unconditionally good)

11/4: Kant

- The only unconditionally good thing is the good will
 - It is a will that knows what the right/correct thing to do is
 - It does the right/correct thing because it is right/correct
- The good will (and what motivates it - duty) will be central to Kant's account of morality
- Morality will be our way of guiding our desire for happiness so that we don't exploit others - correct our desire
- 2 options for what makes a good will good
 - What it affects or what it accomplishes (the will's utility or usefulness/productive power)
 - The will's volition (the motive/the intent of the action)
 - Good because of an intrinsic structure, quality, or characteristic of the will
 - i.e. The way in which the will wills
- If you are made to will against your will, your will ceases to exist → impossible
- Reason is assigned to the will as its governor
 - A good will is a will governed by (pure practical) reason, and such a will has a certain kind of volition/motive (to be motivated by duty)
- Reason can make you aware of what you don't have and what's wrong
- The closer we exist to our natural state (don't use reason to realize what you don't have/don't need), the happier we are

11/5: Kant 1

- Define and give an example of a priori and a posteriori
 - A priori focuses on theoretical interactions within the mind, while a posteriori relies on empirical thought and physical observation. An example of a posteriori thought is that I can see a red car, therefore I know the car is red, while an example of a priori is that I am taller than Adam, Adam is taller than John, therefore I am taller than John.
- Is Kant's theory a priori or a posteriori? How about Aristotle's? Explain
 - Kant's theory is an a priori theory, while Aristotle's is an a posteriori theory. Kant doesn't discuss physical interactions, and focuses more on pure reason and universal morality. Aristotle emphasizes observing physical objects and real-world interactions to develop and train morality.
- What are necessary and sufficient conditions? Give examples of each and something that is both
 - A necessary condition is required for something to be the case, like how someone must be a citizen of the US to be the president. A sufficient condition is enough for something to be the case, like how someone can be a citizen if they were born in the US. Necessary conditions are not all sufficient.
- Which approach to a moral theory do you think is more tenable, a deontological or consequential approach?
 - I think a consequential approach is the more tenable route, as the effect you have on the world has to be considered for a moral outcome. Every part of what you do should be considered in addressing the morality of your action.

11/8: Kant

- Suppress natural emotions, focus on pure reason, hyper-rationality —> not the full picture
 - Can you still act if all desires are stripped away? If yes, then there is something other than our inclinations driving us
- 4 examples - purpose
 - Tells us types of duties
 - Suggests a 2nd motive independent of inclinations is possible
 - Why that 2nd source of motivation is valuable as a moral motive
 - a) Inclinations are contingently good
 - b) Inclinations are sporadic
- Duty is then the 2nd source of motivation
 - = The moral motive
 - = A source of motivation, a variable available only to rational beings that can “act on principle”
 - End - Means (actions) - Motive
 - End - goal
 - Means - action taken
 - Motive - the why
 - Happiness vs. duty
 - Maxim - motive - action - end
- 2 types of principles of action
 - 1) Objective principles - hold for all rational beings (not ones we act in directly)
 - 2) Subjective principles - principles of the subject - the ones we actually act on

11/13: Kant

- A maxim is all factors need to understand an action
- Kant has 2 intents - morality and happiness
- Happiness can take the form of self-love, which undermines your own happiness
- Same physical action with different intentions are different actions
 - The judgement of what is ok is what we act on, not the underlying desire
 - Gives humans a sense of freedom
- Maxim - we represent our action to ourselves and then gauge whether it is a good/bad action; that judgement is what motivates the action
- How do we judge a maxim to be good or bad?
 - By comparing our proposed action to a norm or standard of correctness
 - The good will allows us to do this
 - The good will has a standard of correctness
- 2 possible motives: happiness and morality
 - In accordance with duty (from happiness but in a way that's compatible with an alignment with duty)
 - Act from duty (not happiness, it is good because it is correct)
 - Better because morality is consistently > happiness
 - In conflict with duty (from happiness, ignores duty)
- The naturally beneficent man is motivated by happiness, he enjoys helping others
 - Acting on sympathy or compassion can lead people astray, therefore acting on purely duty is the optimal way forward

11/15: Kant

- 2 sources/types of motivation
 - From self-interest/self-love/happiness
 - Not moral, doesn't guarantee the correctness of the action, or that one will always do the correct thing
 - From duty
- Acting from duty involves the consideration of if the action is a moral action → motive
 - Intending to be moral vs. happening to be moral
- 2 objective principles - standards of correctness - imperatives:
 - Objective principle: principles that hold for everyone, abstract until chosen to operate on (speed limit)
 - Hypothetical imperative: a standard of correctness willing for self-love or happiness (inclinations)
 - If you want E, will to do A
 - If you want coffee, walk to LaValle, you can choose to walk or not, the end is optional
 - You don't have to will the action, if you don't, you give up the end
 - These are therefore discretionary ends, it doesn't matter if you get them or not, usually physical or a state of affairs
 - Regulatory ends: ways of acting
 - E.g. cheapest vs. fastest vs. tastiest
 - Not material
 - What is an end?
 - Something of value, can value coffee or value cheap > fancy
 - Is a principle of prudential reasoning - based on our happiness
 - Categorical imperative: the standard of correctness that is willing period, holds for all actions, at all times, in all places, for all people
 - Certain actions are objectively necessary, independent of any ends we may have
 - Ex: honesty is good in and of itself, it can command unconditionally
 - Just do A, period
 - The CI is to be obeyed at all times and in all situations regardless of the particular ends you might have
 - Unconditional → imperative of morality
 - The CI is the principle of pure practical/moral reasoning
 - Governs our higher nature (morality) vs. lower nature (happiness/a posteriori)
 - Is universal and necessary

11/18: Kant

- Goal of the text is to find the moral law, to judge whether actions are moral or immoral
 - It must be a categorical imperative
 - Formula of universal law: Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law
 - When you make the CI the principle of your will, you act from respect for the moral law (acting from duty)
- 2 types of duties:
 - Narrow/perfect (negative)
 - Easily specified, consists of actions we must refrain from
 - Contradiction in conception: we cannot conceive of a world in which everyone acts on a maxim to make a false promise
 - Wide/imperfect (positive)
 - Not easily/fully specifiable because it is situation/context dependent
 - Contradiction in willing
- We can only lie to rational beings and we cannot think about ourselves as anything except a rational being
- Common challenge: Nazi Germany, hiding Jews, when asked, telling the truth is immoral
 - Kant often treated as a moral absolutist

11/19: Kant 2

- What is a good will?
 - Governed by the moral law and motivated by duty
 - Governed by pure practical reason
 - Reason that governs your will as a whole
 - Good will always knows what the correct action is, therefore intentions alone are not enough to make an act good
- What makes a good will good?
 - 2 options:
 - What it affects or what it accomplishes, usually makes the subject happy
 - The will's volition, you did it out of your own free will, done because of the will itself
 - It is unconditionally good because of the will's volition
 - Good because of an intrinsic structure quality or characteristic of the will
 - Wills because of its correctness, and therefore cannot be incorrect
 - Volition is going to be the motive of duty, to will what is correct because it is correct
- What is the purpose of reason according to Kant?
 - To govern the will and make it morally good
 - To be happy
 - Governing the will is more important, would be chosen in the case of conflict
- Is the good will the only thing that is good?
 - No because Kant thinks that all the other things that make us happy are still good but they're not unconditionally good
 - They become bad when they conflict with morality
- What are the 4 kinds of duties?
 - Perfect duties: duties you must do, imperative
 - Imperfect duties: depends on the circumstances and other variables
 - We can have perfect duties to oneself, perfect duties to others, imperfect duties to oneself, imperfect duties to others
- What are 2 main problems with inclinations being the source of motivation for moral actions?
 - They are conditionally good, therefore are capable of making you do something immoral
 - They don't have the correctness of action built into them
 - Our inclinations are sporadic, they come and go
 - If we are required to act morally all the time, then we have to find a source of motivation that requires us to act morally all the time
- So what is the second source of motivation for Kant?
 - Duty: it is the moral motive
 - It is a source of motivation available only to rational beings that can act on a principle
- What does it mean to act on a principle?

- All intentional actions that we knowingly do are actions on a principle
- Kant calls this a maxim, so to act on a principle is to act according to some maxim
- What is a maxim?
 - A maxim has 3 parts:
 - End- the goal
 - Means- action taken
 - Motive- the why
 - Motive can be grounded in morality or happiness
 - Happiness is the sum satisfaction of the set of all your desires
 - Ex) End: Wake up, Means: Drink coffee, Motive: To be happy
 - We formulate these principles every time we plan to do something, making them deliberate
 - Humans have the power to look at a maxim, judge if it is right or wrong, and then decide to act or not (unlike animals)
- What are the 2 types of principles of action?
 - Objective principles: hold for all rational beings, not ones we act on directly
 - Subjective principles: principles of the subject
 - Ex) speed limit: holds for everyone, but an individual can choose to follow it, and action turns it into a subjective principle
- Are maxims objective or subjective principles?
 - Maxims are subjective principles, the particular actions we act on
 - There's also going to be an objective principle, the moral law, but we will make this our own so it will become subjective as well

11/20: Kant

- Type B - general policies like “never help anyone”
 - Contradiction in willing - if you need help or you will die, you must will for help and therefore contradict your policy
 - Hypothetical Imperative - if you will the ends, you must will the means
 - It is irrational to not will the means to an end that you cannot give up
- Giving up your life is preferable to compromising morality
 - Happiness < Morality
- If everyone can act on your maxim, then it may be a universal law/morally permissible action
- 3 types (1st formulation of CI)
 - Morally required actions
 - Morally forbidden actions
 - Morally permissible actions
 - Distinguish by testing the opposite of your maxim
 - Forbidden and required are opposite
 - If the maxim and its opposite both pass the CI, then it's permissible
- Pick an end, find a means, motivated by happiness
 - The end + the pleasure that comes with it are the subjective ends of action
 - Need to be able to generate an objective principle instead of a subjective principle
 - What does the good will will?
 - Must be a universal end, something that every rational being wills
 - Cannot be empirical, subjective, material

11/22: Kant

- A regular maxim cannot be set as a universal law, because the ends are not ideal for everyone
 - Therefore cannot be the good will - requires that the end is a universal end
- What does a good will will?
 - Whatever it is, it must be a universal end, something that every rational being wills
 - If duty is unconditional, there must be something universally moral that every rational being must will
 - The end must be objectively good or good in itself
 - So the end of the good will is an end with absolute worth - end in itself
 - To be an end is to be something of value
 - Material objects are only of value because people want them/they serve a purpose
 - This has its own intrinsic value, and we respond to it because of that
 - This ends up being our humanity - rational nature in a rational being
 - Source of our ability to do anything
 - It is not an end to be produced, acts in a different way because it is valuable
- Objective ends:
 - Like a subjective end because it is a thing, not a way of acting
 - Not like a subjective end because you don't make it actual
 - Like a regulative end because it gives us reasons to act in a certain way - e.g. respectfully
 - Not like a regulative end because it's not dependent on having other ends
 - The subjective object itself gives us the regulative ends, we do not value the regulative end by itself
- What is it to treat our rational nature appropriately?
 - 2nd formula of CI = Formula of Humanity (FOH)
 - "So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means"
 - How to use humanity appropriately:
 - Never merely as a means
 - Always at the same time as an end
 - Can use as a means (getting taught by a teacher), but also must be treating it as something of value in itself
 - There is a choice where both sides arrive at the same end (not forcing other people to adopt your agenda)

- Forcing other people to do things violates the idea that people need to be the source of their own actions
- Humanity/Rational Nature is the very thing by which we formulate plans and then act on them
- FoH in terms of false promising:
 - When you lie, you are manipulating someone else's will
 - You provide them with an alternate set of facts that alters their decision, therefore you are the cause of their decision
 - You are using their will as a tool for your own purposes
 - If the deception wasn't necessary, the lie wouldn't have been necessary
 - When you lie, you disregard the fact that they are a person with their own interests, and are therefore disrespecting their humanity
 - When you address someone else's humanity, you are taking on their intentions as your own subjective ends, and, at the very least, not interfering with them for your own purposes
- Positive duties are secondary to negative duties
 - If the only way to follow a positive duty is to be immoral, it is not necessary

11/25: Aquinas

- 1. Initial question
 - Usually answered with a yes or no
- 2. Objections to the answer he will give
 - Answers or arguments for the other side
- 3. On the contrary
 - Arguments from various authorities
- 4. I answer that,
 - Aquinas' actual position
- 5. Replies to the objections
 - Specific replies to the objections in #2
- What is the soul, mind, self, or I?
 - Are these distinct?
 - How do these concepts relate to the body?
- What are the characteristics of the soul?
 - 1. The soul is what is responsible for our immortality
 - 2. The soul is what makes me a person
 - a) My soul accounts for my unique/particular existence
 - b) My soul is also what accounts for self-consciousness
 - 3. The soul is immaterial (controversial)
- Soul
 - 1. Principle of life - that which explains and differentiates living things from nonliving things
 - Even if you have a vegetative soul, it explains your organization and function (plants)
 - 2. Principle of thinking
- Theories of the mind:
 - Dualisms - substance and property dualism (Descartes)
 - Not everything is physical
 - Materialisms - reductive and non-reductive materialism
 - Reductive - the mind is nothing but the brain, all conscious experiences are a product of the brain
 - Non-reductive - the mind is constituted by the brain, but not the same thing as the brain
- Metaphysics - the study of what exists
- Hylomorphism:
 - Substance - something that exists in its own right
 - Composite - substances composed of both form and matter (physical substances)
 - Simple - substances composed of pure form without matter, don't exist in any place
 - Form and matter:
 - A statue is made of marble and has a certain shape

11/26: Kant 3

- What is a hypothetical imperative?
 - This is the standard of correctness willing for self-love or happiness
 - If you want E, will to do A
 - The end is optional (if)
 - Since we have reason, HI implies the best way to achieve A (regulatory ends, valuing ways of acting). Ex) get coffee close by, not far away
- What is a categorical imperative?
 - Means it holds unconditionally in all cases
 - You must do A
 - The standard of correctness willing and some actions are objectively necessary
 - It is good in itself
 - It must be obeyed at all times and situations by rational agents
 - It is the imperative of morality and grounds Kant's ethics
- What is the first formula of CI?
 - Formula of universal law
 - "Act according to that maxim through that at the same time you can will that it becomes universal law"
- Can we act on this principle, the moral law (CI) directly?
 - You cannot act on it directly, because once you act on it it becomes subjective
- How do we test a maxim from FUL?
 - You imagine a world in which the law was followed universally, and see what contradictions it generates
 - It's not a "would/could" but "does" actually act on the maxim
- Explain contradictions in A type cases (perfect duties, easily specified because the actions are actions you must refrain from): "contradiction on conception"
 - We can't even conceive of a world in which everyone acts on the maxim to make false promises
- Explain contradictions in B type cases (imperfect duties, general policies)
 - Contradiction in willing, we can conceive of a world in which the maxim is universalized, we cannot ourselves will it without a contradiction
 - We not only will our duty, but also our own happiness as rational beings
- What are the 3 possible types of actions?
 - Morally forbidden, morally required, and morally permissible (you could do them but not required to)
 - If 1 and 2 check out when testing your maxim, then it is 3
 - If 1 doesn't check out, then it is 2 and vice versa
- How is rational nature an end in itself?
 - We all share the same rational nature, meaning it is universal and objective
 - End in itself acts as a limiting condition to our subjective ends (this is how we get the form for our actions)
- What is it to treat humanity appropriately?
 - To treat them never purely as a means, but as an end at the same time

- “So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means”
- FOH tells us how we are to treat our humanity in ourselves and others
- What is it to treat humanity as a means?
 - Using a cook to make your meal
 - Must be free will on both sides, mutual agreement
 - Violated when coerced/deceived
- We keep from treating humanity merely as a means by always at the same time treating it as an end
- What is it to treat it as an end?
 - An end is something of value, but the value of humanity is absolute unconditional value (dignity)
- Humanity/rational nature: the thing in us by which we formulate plans and act on them
- Prompt 2:
 - Main question: Do these duties actually conflict, and if they do, is it a problem for Kant's theory?
 - Thesis:
 - Mention perfect/imperfect duties duty to help, duty to not lie

12/2: Aquinas

- Substance - 2 types, composite and simple
 - Composite substances are those composed of form and matter (physical substances)
 - Simple substances are pure form without matter (non-physical substances - angels)
- Form and Matter
 - Rough analogy between natural substance and statue
 - Statue is composed of two elements, the marble and the shape or form
 - These two distinct elements become apparent when we consider what happens when the statue is crushed
 - The marble remains even though the statue is destroyed
 - The marble cannot form the statue without the dimensions, and the statue cannot exist without the physical matter
- The difference between natural substances and the statue
 - Form - the principle that makes something what it actually is
 - It is the primary source of a thing's characteristic qualities, activities, and behavior
 - It is not just the shape
 - The marble is a composite substance itself, yet it has now definite outward shape or color
 - The form is that which makes this chunk of rock marble rather than granite or slate
 - It is a constitutive principle that determines a thing to be a thing of a particular sort
 - Matter - pure potentiality
 - The marble is matter, but is secondary matter - already informed and possessing of some determinate characteristics
 - Strip away all the form of marble-ness and all its subsidiary forms, and we are left with something purely indeterminate - primary matter (has the potential to be hard, cold, shiny, etc.) - pure potentiality
- Article 1 - Whether the soul is the body?
 - Answer = no, the soul is the principle of life, it is what distinguishes animate from inanimate objects
 - Therefore plants have a soul
 - If the soul were the body, then all bodies would be alive
 - It may be a principle of life, but not the first principle
 - Soul - the first principle of life, the act of the body

12/3: Discussion

- Pre-writing:
 - I did not wait until the last minute to start this paper
- Introduction:
 - I avoid cliché statements
 - I have given the reader a brief roadmap of what to expect in my paper
 - I have a thesis statement that tells the reader the main objective of my paper
 - I have stated my thesis clearly and succinctly
 - All my sentences are precise and necessary for the advancement of my paper
- Body of the Paper
 - I have included the information relevant for responding to the prompt, for every question I have provided an answer
 - If I have provided a quotation or paraphrase
 - It is properly cited
 - I have explained the ideas presented
 - I have explained the importance of including it
 - All my sentences are precise and necessary for the advancement of my thesis
- Conclusion:
 - I have briefly restated my thesis and outlined how my argument supports the thesis
 - I have not raised any new issues regarding the points discussed in my paper
 - All my sentences are precise and necessary for the advancement of my thesis
- Revision:
 - I have proofread my paper twice
 - There are no grammatical errors
 - I have included all relevant information
 - All my sentences are precise and necessary for the advancement of my thesis
- Aquinas Background
- What are the 3 characteristics of the soul, according to Aquinas?
 - The soul is responsible for our immortality - it exists eternally, past our physical body's life
 - The soul is what makes me me - is it what makes me a unique/particular human being with self-consciousness
 - The soul is immaterial
- What were the 2 typical general conceptions of the souls in the time Aquinas was alive
 - Principle of life - differentiates living things from non-living, it explains the function and organization of us
 - In contemporary science, this is no longer necessary
 - Do plants and animals have souls?
 - Yes, but they are vegetative in nature, they do not have the rational part of the soul

- Principle of thinking - the notion of the mind, the self, or first-person perspective, we are conscious beings
 - What it's like to be a bat, we can't imagine what it's like to be a rock
 - The "I" or self means that you have a unique perspective of space and time
 - This continues through time, my identity remains constant
 - Functionalism: to have a mind is to have a certain set of functions
- A good theory of the soul/mind would be able to explain what?
 - How is it that we have a mind
 - How is it that we are conscious
 - how we are the subject of thoughts and experiences
 - What it is to be a self (e.g. be self-conscious)
- What is Dualism of the mind?
 - Dualists claim that not everything is physical
 - There are physical substances and mental substances
 - There are mental properties and physical properties
- What is Materialism of the mind?
 - Everything is physical

12/4: Aquinas

- Lots of principles of life
 - Ex) the eye is a principle of life because it's a principle of vision
 - The body is a principle of life, not the principle of life
 - If it were, anything with a body would be alive
 - The principle of life is the soul
- Article 2:
 - Whether the soul is something subsistent
 - Is the soul a substance?
 - If something is a substance, it is able to exist in its own right
 - 2 senses of subsistence
 - 1) Complete substances
 - Exists in its own right (Descartes)
 - 2) Subsists in virtue of being a part of a complete substance
 - Aquinas places the soul in this category
 - Form can't exist on its own, except for angels
 - Marble isn't dependent on the statue for its existence, the color of the sweater is
 - The soul can continue to live on, operation of the soul doesn't depend on the body
 - The soul has an operation of its own right, can do something without the body
- As a person, we are a soul/body composite
 - Part of our operations depend on the body
 - Both required for a complete human being
 - Needs the soul to be separable to survive bodily death
- Principle of intellectual operation (not the principle of life)
 - A principle that is incorporeal (no body) and subsistent
 - The intellect has an operation per se
 - Per se - through itself
 - The principle that doesn't rely on the body is that it thinks
 - Therefore it remains after bodily death
- Article 3: If the human soul is subsistent, are the souls of animals also subsistent?
 - No, animals don't possess a rational soul
 - They only possess the vegetative and sensitive aspects of a soul
 - Their souls die upon bodily death, all aspects of it rely on the body
- Article 4: Whether the soul is man?
 - 1) Man is soul (in general)
 - False, the soul is man in general, but not this particular man
 - The definition of man is form and matter (soul and body)
 - 2) This soul is this man (Descartes - you are a soul tethered to your body)
 - False, you are in some sense identical with your body
 - Only true if all operations of your soul didn't rely on the body

- You are not your soul, you are your form + matter
- Article 5: Is the soul composed of form and matter?
 - Would be true if the soul was a complete substance
 - When prime matter takes on a physical form, it takes on dimensions
 - No, the soul is pure form, it makes the body act, actuality vs. potentiality
- Article 6: Is the human soul incorruptible?
 - Can the soul itself be destroyed?
 - No
 - It is incorruptible, once it is in existence as a form/matter composite, it will live on forever
 - An apple is corruptible and the matter gains the form of a person when eaten
 - The form of the apple ceases to exist when eaten, the apple can't think
 - You can't learn anything new upon death, but you can continue to think
- Human beings are composites of form/matter
- The soul explains what we are (human beings) and how we are
 - It is solely responsible for our thinking
- We are not our souls
- The soul is the form of our body
- When we die, the soul ceases to be the principle of life

12/6: Descartes

- Father of modern philosophy
- Substance-interactive dualism of the mind
- What can I absolutely know for sure?
- Radical skepticism, if there's any remote doubt, cast it out
- First Meditation:
 - Argument from illusion - sometimes things can appear to us in ways that they actually aren't
 - Properties of objects are things we can doubt, because we know our senses sometimes deceive us, so we exclude all sensory knowledge
 - If you doubt an object's properties, you don't doubt that object's existence
 - Dreaming argument - questions all sense experience
 - All sense experience is unreliable and doubtful
 - You could be dreaming that an object is in existence
 - Doubt your own body, you don't know if your body exists
 - We still know objective, abstract concepts ($2 + 2 = 4$, square is still a square)
 - A priori knowledge
 - Evil Demon argument - an evil demon makes us think that we know objective facts, when we don't (numbers don't exist for sure)
 - God holds concepts such as numbers etc.
 - Questions eternal truths
- Second Meditation:
 - Everything we see could be false, our memories could be lies
 - The thoughts that I am having are either created by me or given to us by God
 - I know that I am nothing, so long as I think that I am something
 - For there to be a thinking, there must be a thinker
 - For an evil demon to deceive us, we must be in existence
 - In the act of deception, I prove my existence
 - I think; I exist
 - By thinking, we prove our existence
 - Only a necessary truth if thought from the first-person perspective
 - Not you think, therefore you exist
 - What's so special about thinking that can make this true
 - Thoughts aren't external, we have direct access to them
 - We can't hallucinate our own mind, but can hallucinate other things
- Has thinking stuff driving physical stuff through the pineal glands
 - You are your thoughts
- No separation between the "I" having the thought and the thought itself
- Our minds are mental substances with mental properties
 - These properties are the thoughts we are having
- Must consider what the "I" is

- Is it a man?
 - Leads to more questions that can't be answered
- Is it a physical body?
- Is it my soul?
 - Something tenuous, ethereal
- Thought he knew what the body was for certain and his soul was indeterminate
 - Develops to question the body and to know the soul's existence
- Functions of the soul:
 - Living thing, moving thing, thinking, perceiving thing
 - Things that depend on the body cannot be known
 - Therefore thought is the only thing for sure
 - I = mind = reason = intellect = soul
 - I am only a thinking thing
- Knowing that I am a thing that thinks:
 - If I can understand X apart from Y, then X does not depend on Y
- A thing that thinks - i.e. thing that doubts, understands, affirms, is willing and unwilling, and also imagines and has sensory perceptions