



## \* Hobbes: (materialistic perspective)

- Human is mechanistic (attraction / aversion) - laws of motion
- To understand human, must understand nature (both subject to law of motion)
- Attraction (something that acts upon me / move towards) - desire
- Aversion (something caused me to avert / move away from) - hate
- Understanding of knowledge: (facts and consequences)  
If we have no access to the world unless it acts upon me  
= consequences (we have limited access to facts)

We experience the world as consequences on us

- Reasoning is addition or subtraction of ideas that are impressions (received)
- Thinking process is nothing but a 2<sup>nd</sup> consequence of observation
- Moving from state of nature → State of government.

Reasoning: adding ideas to know if we need government.

- State of nature: state of war of all against all

- Main aim: central desire: self-preservation

Any threat to self-preservation we tend to move away or destroy

- Reasoning is equal to all, we reason that some things are good & some are not
- Ind. desire change from day to another, ind. desires will eventually clash
- Good and evil are vacuous terms (no objective morality)

- Nothing is good or bad in itself (individualistic)

- State of nature = state of war (but doesn't satisfy our ultimate desire)

- Right of nature = liberty to use ones power to preserve his life

- Law of nature = by reasoning to do the best to preserve all lives

- Pursuing right of nature immediately breaks law of nature

- So the law of nature will let us want to seek peace & follow it

⇒ need of governance (only rule is rule of terror)

- Choice of 2 evils (state of war or political community)

lesser evil







All must be willing to lay down their rights of nature  
(problem with this is trust)

In state of nature there is fear but no trust

- Terror in us equally  $\Rightarrow$  identify someone (sovereign) and transfer our rights to him (transference)
- ~~only~~ can preserve right of life (can't ask me to kill myself)

One-time authorization

- All good, evil, just, unjust are decided by the sovereign
- Give him right to decide to preserve our lives
- State of nature  $\longrightarrow$  civilization  $\longrightarrow$  needs a contract
- Contract makes sense only if someone makes sure it's applied
- Sovereign is the result of contract but not subject to it
  - $\hookrightarrow$  in this case, it is the sovereign
- One-time election, majority votes, those who dissent must consent.







## \* Locke:

- State of nature: right to do what you will, acc. to what you think is right (state of equality + perfect freedom)
- Reason is god given
- Perfect freedom  $\Rightarrow$  state of licence (Hobbes: liberty = licence)
- Freedom is subject to reason (reason governs you)  
Hobbes: liberty served by reason
- Law of nature maintaining right of nature
- Reason suggests cooperation not aggression (common good)
- 4 cardinal issues: life, health, liberty, possessions
- Reason teaches those who consult  $\Rightarrow$  become their own legislator  
Equal in power and in executing this legislation.
- If everyone has reason  $\Rightarrow$  all ought to not harm anyone in life, health, liberty, possessions
- Those who don't consult reason i.e. harm in one of 4  
 $\Rightarrow$  place themselves in state of war with me  
(others will see him a potential threat as well)
- Harm me in one of 4 = lose their rights of state of nature = I can react anyway I see fit (harm or destroy them unless there's a reason to keep them alive e.g. slavery)
- Can react without using reason } reason governs you unless  
Can't act without using reason } someone puts himself in a state of war with you
- Hobbesian state of nature: no property
- Locke: everything naturally existing without labor = public property  
" you worked for or in, you can claim its property (have labor over it)
- 3 inconveniences in state of nature:
  - ① Lack of clearly & explicitly stated laws (all are legislators)
  - ② Lack of executive power (legislator  $\neq$  can execute the law)
  - ③ Lack of unbiased arbitrator





All legislators  $\Rightarrow$  a lot of injustice (react differently)  
Need power to back up & support a correct sentence  
People all fear their self-preservation since it is uncertain  
and unsecure  $\Rightarrow$  enter society for mutual preservation  
of life, health, liberty + possession

- Public property won't stay public for long with no governance
- Whoever governs us, must have reason

part of their role: protect my property

\* if gov. harms my property  $\Rightarrow$  place themselves in state of war with me.

- Move to state of civic society

Social contract: elect group of people that will do  
legislation on our behalf

Election: transfer our legislative part partially to them  
and executive power fully to them

- All of this for public good

- As a citizen can't do the law

- Legislative partially: right of choosing who legislate  
is still there

Either do their job or elect others

Judiciary: subject to the law (objective 3rd party)  
they are the ones that make sure contract is applying

- Locke presents money as representation for labor  
Money doesn't spoil, natural things spoil







\* Kant:

- Synthetic theory: central issues from both empiricism & skepticism (he is neither, it's a 3rd option)
- Realm: can know them
- Kant agrees with empiricist, what you sense is true, but it's not all <sup>what it is</sup>
- Unless reason knows what to do with data, data is useless
- No way of knowing noumena (world in itself)  
can know phenomena (world experienced as human beings)
- Reason looks for similarities in results of some experiments  
Look for causality
- Connections between things isn't observable
- In mind there are categories to know what to do with data
- Knowledge comes from what reason does with sense received
- Self: something you can't learn by experience  
Experiences within your lifehood → experiencing lifehood  
This is a category of mind that is undefinable
- Take sense to get data, use reason to understand data
- Theory of knowledge highlights problematic in morality

sense perception (descriptive)



can't be perceived (normative)

Statements of knowledge:

① Analytic a priori (independent of experience)

A is B  
↑  
restatement of

② Synthetic a posteriori (post experience)

A is C  
↑  
x

Moral statement is synthetic a priori (independent of experience)

- Method: start from orderly philosophical knowledge (analytic) to supreme principle of morality (synthetic) (application)



insight  
club

↳ Gives us principle that allows us to do/don't, doesn't tell us what to do/don't

- Morality is agent centered not act centered

↳ Only thing that's good in itself & allows us to recover morals: good will

- Manner of its willing not consequence of its willing

- Duty to respect law, good will: act based on duty

↳ 4 attitudes to duty:

insight  
club

(bad will) ① Contrary to duty

(not good will) ② from inclination in accordance with duty

(good will) ③ from duty in acc. with inclination

(highest illustration of good will) ④ from duty <sup>(contrary)</sup> not in acc. with inclination

- Grounding on inclination = grounding moral principles on something unstable

- Willing  $\Rightarrow$  rationalize not just follow inclination

- Rational duty & inclination are both natural in humans (coexist)

- Set up duty for myself rationally & abide by it

It is a priori since we don't have enough experience <sup>to decide</sup> moral or not

↳ Acting out of inclination  $\neq$  free act

- Acting from duty = freely formulating my own laws (moral laws of reason)

- Reason formulates 1 ideal principle & all duties come from it:

Maxime that you act upon, you accept it as a maxime for everyone

$\rightarrow$  people should do thing since it's good, not for its consequence

(one categorical imperative)

- Reason isn't product of natural acculturation (isn't affected by environment)

① Act as an end in itself not a means to an end

② Will it to become universal law  $\Rightarrow$  it is rational

- Kant: utopian thinker (not down-to-earth; admit)