

Kant's Deontological Ethical Theory—Study Sheet

California State University, Fresno

Tim Black

Philosophy 120, Spring 2002

- A. State Kant's deontological ethical theory.

An act is right just in case

- B. *Contra* Aristotle and Mill, Kant thinks that happiness is *not* the true end. What is his argument for this claim?

1.

2.

3.

- C. How might Mill, for example, object to Kant's argument for the claim that happiness is not the true end? How might Kant then respond to Mill's objection?

- D. What, according to Kant, is the true end for human beings (and, in fact, for all rational beings)?

- E. What does it mean to have *a good will*?
- F. What does it mean to say that a good will is good *unconditionally*?
- G. What does it mean to say that a good will is *intrinsically* good?
- H. What, according to Kant, are right acts?
- I. Provide an example that shows how we would go about determining what we ought to do in a true-to-life situation. (The example that we discussed in class had to do with making a promise to your roommate that you had no intention of keeping.)

J. What is Kant's argument for the categorical imperative?

1.

2.

K. What are the three versions of the categorical imperative?

1. The categorical imperative:

2. The universal imperative of duty:

3. The practical imperative:

L. What does it mean to treat someone as a *mere means*? What does it mean to treat someone as an *end*? Provide an example of each.

- M. Compare the practical imperative to the Golden Rule.
- N. Explain the objection to Kant's theory—the one based on the idea that Kant's theory is non-consequentialist—that we discussed in class.