

**Kant, "Duty and Reason as the Ultimate Principle" - pp. 506-512**

1. Explain why Kant thinks the only thing truly good "in itself" is a good will.

Let's start with what Kant means by "will." He's referring to our ability to make choices and decisions based on what we think is right or wrong. A good will, then, is one that always chooses to do what is morally right, regardless of any personal gain or benefit. Kant believes that other things that we might consider "good," like intelligence, wealth, or good health, can actually be used for bad purposes. For example, someone who is very intelligent might use their intelligence to deceive others or gain power over them. So, these things aren't inherently good in themselves. On the other hand, goodwill is always good, because it's motivated by a sense of duty to do what is right. It doesn't matter what the outcome is, or whether the person benefits from their actions or not. The fact that they did what was right is what makes their will good. So, for Kant, the only thing that is truly good in itself is a good will. Everything else can be used for good or bad purposes, depending on how it's used. But a good will is always good, no matter what.

2. What does Kant mean by doing our actions "from the motive of duty"? How is this different from acting out of self-interest, or out of natural inclination, or even just in "conformity" with duty?

According to Kant, doing our actions "from the motive of duty" means that we do something simply because it is the right thing to do, and not because of any other reason. We don't do it because it benefits us in any way, or because we feel like doing it, or wrong. Even just acting in "conformity" with duty isn't enough, according to Kant. Conformity means doing something

because we feel like we should, or because it's what's expected of us by society or other external factors. But this still doesn't involve a sense of personal obligation or duty to do what is right. So, for Kant, the only truly moral actions are those that are done "from the motive of duty." This means that we do something simply because it's the right thing to do, and not because of any personal benefit or inclination. By doing this, we're acting purely out of our sense of moral obligation to do what is right, which is what Kant considers to be the only truly moral motivation.

3. What does it mean for an action to have moral worth based on its principle, not based on the end it achieves?

An action has moral worth if it's done based on the principle behind the action, and not just based on the end result it achieves. This means that what really matters is the motivation behind the action, rather than just the outcome. For example, let's say someone gives money to a homeless person. If they do it just to look good in front of others or to feel good about themselves, then the action doesn't have moral worth according to Kant. But if they give money to the homeless person because they believe it's the right thing to do, and they feel a sense of duty to help those in need, then the action does have moral worth, regardless of whether the homeless person is helped or not. Kant believed that our actions should be guided by moral principles that are based on reason, rather than just emotions or self-interest. So, even if the outcome of an action isn't what we hoped for, if we acted based on a moral principle that we believe is right, then the action has moral worth.

4. Explain in your own words Kant's two formulations of the Categorical Imperative, on 510 and 511-512:

a) I ought never to act except in such a way that I can also will that my maxim should become a universal law

b) Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end

The Categorical Imperative is a moral principle put forward by Kant. It's a way of determining whether an action is morally right or wrong, regardless of the specific circumstances. Kant believed that this principle should apply to everyone, and that it should be based on reason rather than just personal preference or emotion. The first formulation of the Categorical Imperative states that we should never act in a way that we wouldn't want everyone else to act in the same way. This means that we should consider whether our actions would be desirable if everyone in society acted in the same way. For example, if we were considering lying to get out of trouble, we should ask ourselves whether we would want everyone else to lie in the same situation. If the answer is no, then we shouldn't do it ourselves. The second formulation of the Categorical Imperative states that we should always treat people as ends in themselves, and never simply as a means to an end. This means that we should never use other people to achieve our own goals, without considering their own interests and desires. For example, we shouldn't manipulate or deceive others to get what we want, because that would be treating them to our own end. Instead, we should always respect their dignity and value as human beings.

**Mill, "Happiness as the Foundation of Morality" pp. 512-517**

1. Write out and explain Mill's "Greatest Happiness Principle".

The Greatest Happiness Principle is a moral principle put forward by the philosopher John Stuart Mill. It's also known as the principle of utility, or the principle of the greatest good for the

greatest number. It states that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, and wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. In other words, the goal of morality should be to maximize happiness and minimize suffering. Mill believed that happiness is the ultimate goal of human existence, and that all other goals and desires are ultimately aimed at achieving happiness. He also believed that happiness is a subjective experience, and that each person's happiness is of equal value. Therefore, he argued that we should seek to maximize happiness for the greatest number of people possible. Mill believed that we should base our actions on the consequences they are likely to have, and that we should always choose the action that will produce the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people. He argued that this principle is not only a moral principle, but also a practical guide for making decisions in our daily lives. However, Mill also recognized that there are some situations where the greatest happiness principle may conflict with other moral principles or individual rights. In those cases, he believed that we should weigh the competing interests and choose the action that will produce the greatest overall happiness in the long run. In summary, Mill's Greatest Happiness Principle is a moral principle that states that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, and wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. The goal of morality should be to maximize happiness and minimize suffering, and we should base our actions on the consequences they are likely to have for the greatest number of people.

2. What does Mill mean when he writes, "Better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied"?

When Mill wrote this statement, he was trying to emphasize the importance of intellectual and moral development, and the pursuit of higher pleasures, rather than just seeking immediate pleasure and satisfaction. He believed that there are different kinds of pleasures, and that some are more valuable and desirable than others. For example, he believed that intellectual pleasures,

such as reading and learning, are more valuable than physical pleasures, such as eating and drinking. He also believed that some people have a higher capacity for experiencing these higher pleasures, and that those people should strive to cultivate those pleasures, even if it means sacrificing immediate satisfaction. So when Mill wrote, "Better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied", he meant that it is better to be a wise person who is not fully satisfied with their life, but is constantly striving to learn and grow, than to be a foolish person who is completely satisfied with their life, but is not interested in personal growth or learning. In other words, Mill believed that it is better to live a life of intellectual and moral development, even if it means experiencing some dissatisfaction, than to live a life of immediate pleasure and satisfaction without any higher goals or aspirations.

3. How does Mill discuss quality and kinds of happiness in contrast to calculating the quantity of happiness?

Mill believed that not all pleasures are created equal, and that some kinds of happiness are more valuable and desirable than others. He argued that the quality of our happiness is just as important as the quantity, and that we should strive to maximize the overall quality of our happiness, rather than just focusing on the quantity. According to Mill, some pleasures are "higher" than others, because they are more intellectual, moral, or spiritual in nature. These higher pleasures are more valuable and desirable than lower pleasures, which are more physical or sensual in nature. For example, Mill argued that the pleasure of reading a great work of literature is a higher pleasure than the pleasure of eating a delicious meal. While both activities may bring us pleasure, the pleasure of reading is more valuable because it engages our intellectual and emotional capacities and can lead to personal growth and development.

Mill also believed that the quality of our happiness depends on the individual's unique tastes and preferences. He argued that we should not try to impose a universal standard of happiness on everyone, but rather allow individuals to pursue their own unique interests and passions and find their own sources of happiness. In contrast to calculating the quantity of happiness, Mill believed that we should focus on the quality and kinds of happiness that we are experiencing. He believed that the ultimate goal of morality should be to maximize the overall quality of happiness for the greatest number of people, by promoting higher pleasures and allowing individuals to pursue their own sources of happiness.

4. What role does all of previous human history and the experience of wise and competent people play in figuring out what will bring the most happiness in our actions?

For Mill, the accumulated wisdom and experience of previous generations and competent people played an important role in determining what actions would bring the most happiness. He believed that by studying history, philosophy, and the insights of wise and competent individuals, we could gain a better understanding of what kinds of actions tend to promote human flourishing and well-being.

Mill argued that while individual experiences and preferences are important, they are not the only factors that should guide our actions. He believed that we should also draw on the collective wisdom of humanity and learn from the successes and failures of past generations. In other words, we should not reinvent the wheel every time we face a new ethical dilemma or decision, but rather use the accumulated knowledge of humanity to guide us. However, Mill also recognized that not all previous wisdom and experience was equally valuable. He believed that

we should critically evaluate the insights of past generations, and only accept those that stand up to rational scrutiny and empirical evidence. He argued that some ideas and practices may have been appropriate in the past but are no longer relevant or helpful in the present context.