

**FORMULATIONS ( FORMULAS) OF THE CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE [USING DENIS'S ABBREVIATIONS]**

1. *Universal Law* (FUL): Act only on that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it become a universal law (81)

1a. *Universal Law of Nature* (FUL/N): Act as if the maxim of your action were to become by your will a universal law of nature (81).

[Q: what does FUL/N add to FUL?]

2. *Humanity* (FH): So act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other, in every case at the same time as an end, never as a means only (88).

3. *Autonomy* (FA): the idea of the will of every rational being as a will giving universal law (90) [this statement is not in “categorical imperative” form but it implies that form]

3a. *Kingdom of Ends* (FKE): All maxims ought, by their own legislation, to harmonize with a possible kingdom of ends as with a kingdom of nature (not stated explicitly until 96 but discussed starting p. 90).

+++++

**FORMULA OF UNIVERSAL LAW (FUL):**

O’Neill/Herman/Rawls account of how it works:

1. the agent formulates her maxim, which contains an action/policy and a goal to be sought in that action.
2. the agent universalizes the maxim.  
“universalize” means to apply to all human or perhaps rational beings (persons). But in practice this means applying to all persons who are in the same situation as the agent whose maxim is being tested for universalization—for example, everyone in a situation of contemplating engaging in a promise she does not intend to repay in order to secure something from the promisee (example from 82).
3. we/the agent looks to see if both 1 and 2 can coherently be willed simultaneously.

Questions or criticisms that have been made against FUL/N as an adequate test for morality:

1. it seems to rest on the agent’s self-interest
2. it seems to rest on the undesirability of certain consequences (Mill’s criticism)
3. Hegel’s criticism (see Korsgaard, 86-87): there is no contradiction in the absence of a practice such as depositing money, or promising, just an absence
4. overinclusivity problem: seems to rule out some permissible maxims: “if everyone went into nursing, that would be bad, so I should not go into nursing.”
5. underinclusivity problem: some immoral maxims seem able to be universalized: “I will steal from the Central Sq CVS store on October 15 if I am in need of cash that day.”
6. the maxims ruled out in the “contradiction in will” test seem too indeterminate to give much real world advice.
- (7. [discussed in 9/22 class]: FUL/N can only tell us what we can’t do—act according to ununiversalizable maxims—not what we should do.)