1. Why did Kant think that a good will is the only thing that can be good absolutely?

Kant followed the idea that good will is the only absolute good for two primary reasons. Firstly, he believed that a good will is good in itself regardless of external factors and outcomes. A good will acts by the moral law or the "categorical imperative," which is the principle of acting in ways that can be willed into universal laws. Meaning that good will acts out of a sense of duty and not for personal gain or any other motive. Secondly, unlike other goods, such as intelligence, wealth, etc., good will is not conditionally good, meaning it cannot be used for sinister purposes. For example, someone who is intelligent and wealthy could use their resources to harm others, but a good will is intrinsically good and cannot be used for evil purposes because it is motivated solely by the moral law. Therefore, Kant concluded that a good will is the only thing that can be good absolutely.

2. What is the distinction Kant draws between actions performed in conformity with duty and action done from duty?

The primary distinction between actions performed in conformity with duty and action done from duty as defined by Kant are their relation with a sense of obligation. That an action performed in conformity with duty is done because of a sense of obligation to follow a moral rule. Not because they believe it's their duty but because of a desire to follow the rules (and avoid punishment). While an action done from duty is motivated by a sense of obligation and the moral law, apart from external factors and personal interests. While both actions are important, Kant believed only actions done from duty had any true moral worth.

3. What is the principle of universalizability and how does it work as a test of morally correct conduct?

The principle of universalizability, as described by Kant, states that an action is morally right if it can be willed as a universal law, meaning that if everyone were to act in the same way, the action would still be morally acceptable. It is a fundamental concept in Kant's moral philosophy and serves as a test to determine the moral correctness of actions. The principle of universalizability tests the consistency and coherence of moral rules, evaluating whether they can be applied universally without producing a contradiction. If a moral rule cannot be universalized without contradiction, then it is not a morally correct rule.

1. The first response emphasizes that a good will is absolute because it is motivated solely by the moral law, whereas the second response highlights that a good will is unconditionally good as there are no limitations, and that Kant values the intention and motivation behind an action.
2. The first response describes actions performed in conformity with duty as being done for the sake of duty, whereas the second response describes them as being motivated by external factors such as selfishness or fear of punishment.
3. The first response focuses on the principle of acting in ways that can be willed into universal laws, whereas the second response emphasizes the lack of limitations in universal imperatives and how they work as a test for morally correct conduct.

I find it interesting that in your response to the question “2. What is the distinction Kant draws between actions performed in conformity with duty and action done from duty?” focuses on motivations or reasons for the two types of actions. You note that actions done in conformity are done for external reasons, such as personal gain or avoidance of punishment, while actions done from duty are done because they are believed to be right according to moral principles and ethics. In my writing I placed the external factors on the action done from duty as a point that it was more important for these actions to be apart from them. While you wrote the importance of actions performed in conformity are done from these external reasons. Both have an important relationship with the greater world but I found it very interesting where you placed the focus.

Regarding the first question “Why did Kant think that a good will is the only thing that can be good absolutely?”I completely agree with the focus of your response being that moral law is internal and an important part of each person. While I focused on the idea that good will can be good absolutely, I believe you did a much better job in both explaining that idea as well as understanding Kant as to why he would write such ideas. Focusing more on the source than the finished product allows you to further understand the ideas of Kant from a deeper perspective.

I disagree with your definition of the principle of universalizability. I believe you miss out on the idea that the principle is not an absolute rule that can be applied to every situation instead should act more as a guide to identify actions that are consistent. Your example of killing someone doesn’t have many of the details of the real world, where it might be necessary to save someone else or yourself. Applying the principle as an absolute rule misses the importance of considering the context and any possible exceptions when applying it to specific actions or decisions.