

Candidate 1

	Section two	
2.	kent's philosophy is a	
	deontological approach. this	
	means they believe the moral	
	worth of an action is in	
	the action itself. For kent	
	he specifically looks at the	
	intentions ^{and} is motives behind	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	the action.
	Kent says you need three things to be a good person:
	The first one is Good Will. This is the desire to do good. Kent believes this is the only human emotion that cannot be used for evil. Strength ^{and} intelligence can both be used for evil but the desire to be good can't.
	The second is duty. This is when you do something not good, not because you want to but, because you know it's the right thing to do. Kent says

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	that following your duty over
	inclination (doing good instinctively
	is and not knowing why)
	makes you a better person.
	The last is Sovereignty
	of Reason. Kant says that
	morality is rational. He
	believes that saying morality
	comes through experience
	puts people who haven't
	experienced much at a
	disadvantage. He says that
	everyone can think rationally
	and find the the correct
	action to take by thinking.
	There are criticisms about
	these. People say that he
	discounts many good acts. By
	Putting your head away from

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Doing something good, instinctively, doesn't make you a good person according to Kant. There is also the issue of conflicting duties. In this scenario you have a duty to always tell the truth but you also have a duty to keep a promise to your friend. Which one should you follow? Kant never tells us how to decide.</p>	
	<p>Kant then moves onto Maxims. These are rules/laws to follow. You can put an action through a maxim and see if it fits the maxim or not. For this</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	that you could will to be
	a universal law. would you
	want it to be a universal
	law that everyone lied to
	the teacher to protect their
	friend? If this happened then
	no teacher would ever believe
	anything a student told them.
	The next step is the
	contradiction of conception.
	This is when there is
	a logical flaw in the
	maxim ^{and} it it becomes
	self is defeating. This maxim
	wouldn't pass the contradiction
	of conception. If all students
	lied to protect their friends
	from teachers, no teacher
	would believe any students

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>don't follow the maxim. one of his categorical imperatives (rules you have to follow/do) is never lie. By lying the ^{you're} is breaking a categorical imperative and using the teacher as a means to an end. You take away her ^{their} right to decide what to do in that situation. You are telling them to let your friend off & not giving the teacher a say. It's also a self defeating maxim that you would be unable to do if everyone did it. Kant would advise to tell the teacher the truth. You may be betraying your friend but the maxim</p>	

