

Foot 'Morality as a System of Hypothetical Imperatives'

1. Compare the following claims:

- (a) If you want to get to Park St, you should take the Red Line.
- (b) You should pay your taxes.
- (c) You should not burp at the dinner table.

How are these often thought to be similar/different? How *are* they similar/different? How does Foot see the matter?

2. What do you make of someone who says, 'Sure, morality requires that I pay my taxes. Indeed I ought to pay my taxes. But I see no reason to go along with the dictates of morality.' Can we charge him with inconsistency, irrationality, or something else? What is Foot's view and what reasons does she give for it?

3. What does it mean to say that to be truly moral you must act "out of respect for the moral law"? Explain Foot's discussion of this.

4. What is Foot's conclusion? How radical is it? E.g., does her view somehow rob morality of its distinctive "authority"? Does it threaten to make morality *trivial* in a way that we might feel etiquette is?

5. When a person grows up they often step back and examine the rules of etiquette they were imbued with and see them for what they are. The result is often a loss of motivation to follow the rules or even a desire to flout them. Some might worry that adopting Foot's view would have the same effect. What does Foot say about this?

6. Suppose I'm not sure what to do as I'm not sure which ends to adopt. How might I resolve this? What advice could Foot offer me?

MIT OpenCourseWare
<https://ocw.mit.edu/>

24.401 Proseminar in Philosophy II
Spring 2020

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <https://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.