

## Meeting Notes #1:

Readings:

*Critique of Pure Reason* (pgs. 172-185)

*Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals* (ch. 1)

-Time and space do not belong to 'a priori?'

'A priori' vs 'A posteriori'

-A priori: something that can make things available through mere intuition; you just know it without exploring the world or oneself

-Analytic vs synthetic concepts:

-Analytic: semantic meaning (e.g.,  $A=A$ ) – more similar to 'a priori'

-Synthetic: knowing things in reference to other concepts – how do these concepts work together. (e.g.,  $A = B$ ) – more similar to 'a posteriori.' What concepts are attached to a specific concept?

## MATH - is it an analytical or synthetic concept?

-Idea of synthetic 'a priori' = something we do not have experience in reference to, but must know that it is true.  $2 + 2 = 4$

-Is an understanding of numbers analogous to an understanding of words?

-Kant on numbers and meaning:

"...no matter how long I analyze my concept of such a possible sum [of seven and five] I will still not find twelve in it."

"One must go beyond these concepts [of seven and five], seeking assistance in the intuition that corresponds to one of the two, one's five fingers, say...and one after another add the units of the five given in the intuition to the concept of seven...and thus see the number 12 arise."

-Kant may believe that there is some sort of intuition that makes 7 and 5 pair together to become the quantity of 12. — But what does it mean to have that intuition?

## *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals:*

-Kant on intention – we cannot predict consequences

-Ex: If you intend to save someone and they die, but your intentions were moral

Good intentions + bad consequences = moral

Bad intentions + good intentions = immoral

(according to Kant)

-However, will can change, so if one's intentions become immoral, an action will then be deemed by Kant as immoral.

-CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE: fulfilling a duty in it being moral (based off of a maxim)

-Maxim: concepts that we base on  
\*Actions can be moral and not virtuous.

-The intend to act and whether it is moral:  
Is lying moral if we intend to help others?

Kant would most likely say yes, because the meaning of the action is based on whether one's intentions are good or bad. HOWEVER, Kant believes that an act can still be moral even if you are doing it to fulfill your own ego, as long as you do not lie to others about your intentions to perform these actions.

-Kant believes in a set end goal – but how deep should we go into the meaning of our intentions? Are our intentions infinitely complex?  
-Are we helping others merely to fulfill our own ego? Do our intentions have a deeper meaning?

-CLASSIC THOUGHT EXPERIMENT: 'Lying to the Nazi at the Door' – classical example of whether something is moral or immoral.

REVISION OF THE CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE:

(adds in extra concepts)

-Mere mean: using someone as instrumental, not seeing them as a human being.

-Mean: using someone to fulfill a goal, but recognizing their agency

-Principle of Ultimate Action: giving someone the choice of autonomy in reference to an action  
ex: lying, but letting someone decide whether they think we are truthful or not, and by extension, and by extension, whether they think that our actions are moral or immoral.

**-For next meeting!\*\***

possible idea: readings: Giorgio Agamben – short essays – magic and happiness, profanations