

**This is a graded discussion: 10 points possible**

**due Oct 9 at 1:59am**

### Week 3 - Discussion 1

1


Your initial discussion thread is due on Day 3 (Thursday) and you have until Day 7 (Monday) to respond to your classmates. Your grade will reflect both the quality of your initial post and the depth of your responses. Refer to the Discussion Forum Grading Rubric under the Settings icon above for guidance on how your discussion will be evaluated.

### **Week 3 Discussion [WLOs: 1, 2, 3] [CLOs: 3, 4, 5]<**

Post on at least three separate days. This week our main discussion will focus on explaining and evaluating the deontological ethical theory as discussed in Chapter 4 of the textbook. Your instructor will be choosing the discussion question and posting it as the first post in the main discussion forum. The requirements for the discussion this week include the following:

- You must begin posting by Day 3 (Thursday).
- You must post a minimum of four separate posts on at least three separate days (e.g., Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, or Thursday, Friday, and Sunday, or Thursday, Saturday, and Monday, etc.).
- The total combined word count for all of your posts, counted together, should be at least 600 words, not including references.
- You must answer all the questions in the prompt and show evidence of having read the resources that are required to complete the discussion properly (such as by using quotes, referring to specific points made in the text, etc.).
- In order to satisfy the posting requirements for the week, posts must be made by Day 7 (Monday); posts made after Day 7 are welcome but will not count toward the requirements.
- Be sure to reply to your classmates and instructor. You are encouraged to read posts your instructor makes (even if they are not in response to your own post) and reply to

your instructor makes (even if they are not in response to your own post) and reply to those as a way of examining the ideas in greater depth.

- All postings (including replies to peers) are expected to be thought out, proofread for mechanical, grammatical, and spelling accuracy, and to advance the discussion in an intelligent and meaningful way (i.e., saying something like “I really enjoyed what you had to say” will not count). You are also encouraged to do outside research and quote from that as well.
- For more information, please read the **Frequently Asked Questions** .

This discussion will be assessed on a 10-point scale and is **worth 4% of your final grade**.

← Reply

[CLICK TO EXPAND / COLLAPSE](#)



**Cora Moore** (<https://ashford.instructure.com/courses/73114/users/4924>)

8:32am



### **Week 3 Discussion #1: Applying the Categorical Imperative**

*To ensure that your initial post starts its own unique thread, do not reply to this post. Instead, please click the "Reply" link above this post.*

This discussion runs from Tuesday, October 5, 2020 - Monday, October 11, 2020.

Initial post due Thursday by midnight, October 8

last day to participate is Monday, October 11

You must post 4 posts over 3 days.

*Please read the general discussion requirements above, as well as the announcements explaining the discussion requirements and answering the most frequently asked questions. If you are still unsure about how to proceed with the discussion, please reply to one of those announcements or contact your instructor*

discussion, please reply to one of those announcements or contact your instructor.

Please carefully read and think about the entire prompt before composing your first post. This discussion will require you to have carefully read Chapter 4 of the textbook, as well as the assigned portions of Immanuel Kant's (2008) *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*.

Kant's text and the textbook discuss two "formulations" or ways of expressing Kant's Categorical Imperative, the "Formula of Universal Law" and the "Formula of Humanity." For each formula, Kant considers four test cases to explain how it applies: Suicide, False Promises, Cultivating One's Talents, and Beneficence.

### 1. Engage with the text:

Choose one of these test cases (it can be from either formula), and explain in your own words the reasoning that leads to the conclusion Kant defends. You should first explain the Categorical Imperative itself, focusing on the particular formula you are considering, and then carefully show how that principle leads to a particular conclusion.



If so, explain why. If a utilitarian would there be a variation in the  
e to different conclusions?

### 1. Reflect on yourself.

Do you agree with Kant's conclusion? If not, explain the flaws in his reasoning. If you do agree, and you think a utilitarian would come to a different conclusion in this or a slightly varied case, why do you think that Kant's reasoning is superior to the utilitarian's? (You may want to consult section 4.3, "Challenges to Kant's Theory" for help with this section).

### 1. Discuss with your peers:

Consider whether your peers have provided different analyses and/or responses than you did (or would, if it's a different topic). If it is, raise some questions about their view that could lead to good discussion about your differences. If your responses were similar, think about a problem or worry that could be raised about your views, and discuss with your peer how to address it.

You must have 4 posts: 1 initial post and 3 participation posts.

