Lecture 6
Workable Ethical Theories I
Participation Quiz

Pick an answer between A – E at random.

What answer (A – E) do you think will have been selected most frequently in the previous poll?
Recap: Unworkable Ethical Theories

• What is an ethical theory?
• What do we mean by a workable theory?
• What does each unworkable theory consist of?
  – subjective relativism
  – cultural relativism
  – divine command
  – ethical egoism
2.6 Kantianism

- Key goal: derive morality from more basic principles
- Is anything good regardless of its consequences?
- Immanuel Kant: Only thing in the world that is good without qualification is a good will (desire to do the right thing)
  - other things we might call good (e.g., giving to charity) really depend on consequences
- Reason should cultivate desire to do right thing. Make this precise?
Categorical Imperative (1st Formulation)

Act only from moral rules that you can at the same time will to be universal moral laws.
Illustration of 1\textsuperscript{st} Formulation

- **Question:** Can a person in dire straits make a promise with the intention of breaking it later?
- **Proposed rule:** “I may make promises with the intention of later breaking them.”
- The person in trouble wants his promise to be believed so he can get what he needs.
- **Universalize rule:** Everyone may make & then break promises
- Everyone breaking promises would make promises unbelievable, contradicting desire to have promise believed
- **The rule is flawed. The answer is “No.”**
Categorical Imperative (2\textsuperscript{nd} Formulation)

Act so that you treat both yourself and other people as ends in themselves and never only as a means to an end.

“This is usually an easier formulation to work with than the first formulation of the Categorical Imperative.”

…but it depends critically on the “only”. IMO, it’s “unworkable”.
Second formulation follows from the first

From Wikipedia ("Categorical Imperative"):

*The free will is the source of all rational action. But to treat it as a [means to an end] is to deny the possibility of freedom in general. Because the autonomous will is the one and only source of moral action, **it would contradict the first formulation to claim that a person is merely a means to some other end, rather than always an end in themselves.***
Case for Kantianism

• Rational
• Produces universal moral guidelines
• Treats all people as moral equals
Perfect and Imperfect Duties

- **Perfect duty**: duty obliged to fulfill without exception
  - Examples: Telling the truth

- **Imperfect duties** are still duties that can be inferred by the application of “pure reason”: i.e., the first or second formulations of the categorical imperative. But they’re:
  - Activities you couldn’t keep doing forever; never “done”
  - Cause for praise if you do it; not cause for blame if you don’t.

- **So what *are* imperfect duties?**
  - Examples: helping others; developing your talents.

- **More generally:**
  - Furthering the ends of ourselves and others.
  - Not following maxims that lead to undesirable states of affairs (as distinct from logical contradictions) when universalized

- Not everything we think of as “good” is even an imperfect duty (e.g., doing my chores)
Case Against Kantianism

• Sometimes no rule adequately characterizes an action
• Sometimes there is no way to resolve a conflict between rules
  – In a conflict between a perfect duty and an imperfect duty, perfect duty prevails
  – In a conflict between two perfect duties, no solution
  – Doesn’t allow for tradeoffs between moral imperatives
• Kantianism allows no exceptions to perfect duties
• Second formulation of the categorical imperative is really easy to misuse (as, indeed, is Kantianism in general)
Exercise

• In groups of four, identify two ethical issues at the intersection of computers and society:
  – One that is ethical from a Kantian perspective
  – One that is not

• Be prepared to explain your reasoning, using the categorical imperative.
Principle of Utility

- Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill
- An action is good if it benefits someone
- An action is bad if it harms someone
- Utility: tendency of an object to produce happiness or prevent unhappiness for an individual or a community
- Happiness = benefit = good = pleasure
- Unhappiness = cost = evil = pain
Principle of Utility
(Greatest Happiness Principle)

An action is right (or wrong) to the extent that it increases (or decreases) the total happiness of the affected parties.
Act Utilitarianism

- Utilitarianism
  - Morality of an action has nothing to do with intent
  - Focuses on the consequences
    - A “consequentialist” theory

- Act utilitarianism
  - Add up change in happiness of all affected beings
  - Sum > 0, action is good
  - Sum < 0, action is bad
How useful is act utilitarianism?

- discuss
Case for Act Utilitarianism

• Focuses on happiness, which is intuitive
• Down-to-earth (practical)
  – Straightforward to apply
  – Can therefore be helpful in resolving disputes
• Comprehensive
  – Allows an agent to trade off different aspects of a situation
  – Contrast with Kantianism: we needed to find one rule
Case Against Act Utilitarianism

• Unclear whom to include in calculations
  – Utilitarians might say you should never exclude anyone...

• Too much work
  – But it’s OK to follow a “rule of thumb” most of the time.

• Ignores our innate sense of duty
  – Suppose I make a promise, but can get $1 for violating it.
    • Seems to miss the sense that I care about my word.
  – Author claims: “Note that it does no good for an act utilitarian to ... say that the hard feelings caused by breaking my word to A will have a negative impact on total happiness of –N units, because then all I have to do is change the scenario so that breaking my promise to A enables me to produce 1,001 + N units of good for B. We’ve arrived at the same result.”
    – But is this a problem?

• Susceptible to the problem of moral luck
  – Whether an action is moral depends on outcome, which can depend on circumstances beyond your control
Rule Utilitarianism

• We ought to adopt **moral rules** which, if followed by everyone, will lead to the greatest increase in total happiness
  – Act utilitarianism applies Principle of Utility to individual actions
  – Rule utilitarianism applies Principle of Utility to moral rules