

## Summary

### ***“Logical Relations Between Kant’s Categorical Imperative and the Two Golden Rules”***

by Hans-Ulrich Hoche & Michael Knoop

On the basis of traditional deontic logic, Takahashi stated that there is an (admittedly all-to weak) moral principle on which defenders of the Categorical Imperative as well as defenders of the Universalised Golden Rule could agree (sect. I). By making use of an integrated logic of believing and willing (‘doxastico-theletic logic’), which is more fertile than deontic logic in that it permits us to lay open also the *internal structure* of moral ‘ought’-judgements (sects. II–IV), and by stipulating the exclusion from ethical reasonings of morally indifferent actions (‘adiáphora’), which seems demanded for both historical and issue-related reasons (sect. V), I endeavour to show that there exists a still closer and much more significant logical relation between the Categorical Imperative and the Universalised Golden Rule, to wit, that the latter is *entailed* by the former (sect. VI). But the Universalised Golden Rule is likewise entailed by the Singular Golden Rule (sect. VII). Hence we can also state, in allusion to Takahashi’s finding, that there is a moral principle both advocates of the Categorical Imperative and advocates of the Singular Golden Rule can agree upon, namely, the Universalised Golden Rule. As the latter is an analytical truth and hence provable in the strictest possible sense, whereas I cannot see any satisfying method at all for justifying the other two principles, it seems advisable to take the Universalised Golden Rule somewhat more seriously (sect. VIII).