

1 Categorical imperative

It will allow you to test if you are morally allowed to do something

2 The good will

Spending their whole life helping people from duty if we know the motive is not love

even the person who loves humanity is not morally “correct”

love is an inclination, morality must come from the rational, aka the good will.

Claim1: Only actions from duty have moral worth. Will must be moved by duty.

Claim2: Purpose is irrelevant, but we care about the maxim (the rule)

Motive → Action → consequences (consequentialism)

↙ ↘
Duty, inclination

Maxim is a rule, you can test if the rule is *inclination* or *duty*.

Claim3: Respect for the moral laws (not the country’s laws). Respect is not an inclination.

3 Moral reasoning

Moral laws are a science which come from reasoning, and those are universal truths of what is right or wrong. (No cultural relativism, anyone can get it right (although not everyone might))

Generalize from actions. All actions come from an implicit maxim. Use maxims to create the law.

It doesn’t matter what X, Y, or Z are. Z should be good:

- Action: In situation X, I consider Y to get Z.
- Maxim: Whenever in situation X, I do Y to get Z (subjective)
- Law: Whenever anyone is in X, they should do Y to get Z (objective, requires testing)

Golden rule (do to others what they want them to do to you) → Only do things that can be universalized.

4 Categorical imperative

What is a law? It commands. Do this, don't do that.

Imperative (*Do X!*)

↙ ↘
Hypothetical, Categorical (If...then), (One must, regardless of desires)

5 Humanity and Autonomy

Decision procedures for reaching universal laws

- The formula of universal law
- The formula of humanity
- The formula of the kingdom of ends

5.1 Formula of universal law

Consider an action → Formulate a maxim → Formulate a universal law →
Imagine a World in which Everyone Always Follows this Law → Is there a contradiction in conception, that is, would the maxim “necessarily destroy itself” when made a universal law?

If yes, the opposite of the law is a duty. The law is also forbidden.

If no, the action is permissible. (not meaning it is necessarily morally correct, just allowed)

5.1.1 Example

Should I make a false promise in order to get out of some difficulty → Whenever I am in difficulty, I may make a false promise in order to get out of it → Whenever anyone is in difficulties, they should make a false promise in order to get out of it → Imagine a World in which everyone always makes false promises to get out of difficulties → Is there a contradiction in conception?

Yes: in such a world, it makes no sense to lie to get out of difficulties, since no one would ever believe anyone else's promises

5.2 The formula of humanity

Treat other rational beings as rational beings (as ends), but never as a means (for your own interest).

5.2.1 Example

Asking someone the time, so they can act with their rational agency, instead of taking them by the wrist, where one'd solely use them as a means.

5.3 Autonomy

Giving laws to oneself. All rational beings are subjects and legislators simultaneously, so they give laws but also have to follow them. All rational beings will reach the same truths due to its objectivity.

We must respect the rational agency and autonomy of others.

6 Anthropology and the nature of women

Women are rational beings, but their relationship is in terms of men and the survival of the species, and cultivation/refinement (*Jane Austen, dancing, singing...*) of society.

Masters of the home. Politically subordinate to men.