

Angelica Hutchinson

Professor Jeffrey Dueck

PHI 101: Introduction to Philosophy: NA

31 March 2023

Kant

Kant thinks the only good thing truly good “in itself” is a good will. Why does he think this is? Because he believes that good will is solely motivated by a sense of duty and is governed by morality. He contends that other things that we often see as good, such as knowledge, power, or riches, may be utilized for wicked deeds and cannot, therefore, be regarded as good in and of themselves. But regardless of the outcomes or circumstances, a good person always acts in accordance with the moral law.

Acting out of self-interest, natural inclination, or conformity with duty is not the same as acting with the motive of duty. Kant defined acting out of a feeling of responsibility as doing so without regard to any other ulterior motives, such as self-interest or a person's natural tendency. This entails accepting the moral law as a definitive standard that directs our behavior and voluntarily deciding to abide by it out of a sense of what is morally appropriate. This is distinct from acting out of self-interest, which involves engaging in a course of action that will benefit us in some manner, or acting from a natural inclination, which entails taking a course of action that we feel naturally drawn to or inclined to perform. In order for an action to be really morally good, it must possess the true feeling of responsibility that is necessary for moral value. Even acting in compliance with duty, which refers to following the moral law's requirements without an inward commitment to them, is insufficient. In the view of Kant, an action has moral

value based on its underlying principle rather than the goal it serves. This implies that, regardless of whether the activity leads to a desirable result, an action is only morally good if it is carried out out of a sense of responsibility toward the moral law. To put it another way, a good result does not excuse bad conduct, and vice versa, if an action was taken out of a feeling of responsibility, a terrible result does not necessarily make it immoral. Kant believed that the moral worth of an action was determined by the underlying principle rather than the results. And he also stated that the only thing that is genuinely good in and of itself is a good will, which acts out of a sense of obligation or the understanding that the moral law is a fundamental standard that should govern all of our behavior.

Immanuel Kant's two versions of the categorical imperative both serve as criteria for determining moral obligation. According to the first version, we should only take actions that we might envision becoming fundamental principles of nature. Therefore, we must only behave in a manner that we would want others to behave in a similar situation. We are acting immorally if we do something that we wouldn't want done to everyone.

And in the second formulation, we should never view people (including ourselves and others) as just means to an end, but rather as ends in and of themselves. This means that we should constantly respect people's intrinsic dignity and autonomy as rational beings rather than using them as simple tools to further our own objectives. People should be valued for their own sake rather than being used as tools to accomplish our goals. Both formulations are significant because they emphasize the importance of respecting our own and others' dignity and autonomy. The first formulation stresses the significance of consistency and universality in our activities, whereas the second highlights the significance of considering people as goals in themselves

rather than as means to our own objectives. They form a complete framework for ethical decision-making that emphasizes the relevance of logic, consistency, and human dignity.

Mill

In accordance with John Stuart Mill's "Greatest Happiness Principle," commonly referred to as the principle of utility, deeds are morally just in proportion to how much happiness they bring about and incorrect to the extent that they bring about pain or sadness, which is the antithesis of happiness. In Mill's view, the maximization of pleasure for the largest number of individuals is the ultimate aim of human behavior.

To underline the value of intellectual pleasures above sensual pleasures, Mill uses the saying "Better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied" in his essay. He believes that intellectual pleasures, such as those experienced by Socrates, are more desirable than physical pleasures because they are of higher quality and may even be accompanied by discontent or discomfort. On the other hand, a fool is living a poorer life if they are satisfied with only bodily pleasures.

According to Mill, there are different types of happiness, some of which are of higher quality than others. He contends that although lower-quality happiness is linked to base or vulgar pleasures, such as sensory enjoyment, higher-quality happiness is linked to more elevated or refined pleasures, such as intellectual activities. Even though it could be more challenging to achieve, higher-quality enjoyment is preferable, according to Mill. He believes that the amount of happiness and unhappiness caused by an activity cannot be simply added up to determine how happy or unhappy someone is. Instead, it necessitates taking both the quantity and quality of the

happiness produced into account. In other words, maximizing pleasure in terms of quantity is not sufficient; one must also take happiness in terms of quality into account.

Finally, Mill proposes that prior human history and the experience of wise and competent individuals can assist us in determining which behaviors are most likely to create the greatest degree of happiness. We may learn what works and what does not work in improving human well-being by analyzing the accomplishments and failures of previous communities and people. This understanding may then be applied to our own behaviors to optimize the satisfaction we generate.