

**Candidate 6**

3 Kantian Ethics

Emmanuel Kant states we should essentially put ourselves first when making moral decisions. Kantian Ethics is a deontological theory meaning only the intent and motive of an action is what makes it moral or not, that consequences can be subsided and are not important.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Kant believes the only judge of morality is the intent, known as "The Good Will". Regardless of the consequence as long as a decision is made upon good intent it is considered moral. As Kant believes if we act upon emotion, things can still be considered un-moral, as you can have a happy robber or thief for example - just because they were happy while being a criminal doesn't make it right. Emotions can be deceiving. However, you can never know the reason why someone acts the way they do, someone may say for example - they handed in a missing wallet from an act of good will, but



ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>to conclude if something is moral or not. Maxims must be universalisable, meaning they are moral if it is absolutely okay for everyone to do it. For example a good universalisable <del>maxim</del> maxim would be "I must not litter again and always recycle" as if everyone did this it would help save the planet and have a positive impact globally - it is also acting upon good will for the benefit of everyone. However an example of an act that may seem moral, but to followers of Kantian ethics - absolutely not would be, eg. If faced with a gun and 500 people, if you kill one, everyone else walks free - if you don't they</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>all die and you too. Many, out of acting upon the opposition of K.E, utilitarianism would say this is okay to shoot one person as it would make the majority happy. However, if this was put into a maxim<sup>*^</sup> it cannot be universalisable as then it would make it okay for everyone to kill people. <del>This is</del> another issue with the maxim "it is okay to kill one, to save 500" is that it contradicts another, universalisable maxim of "I must not kill, killing is bad". As maxims cannot contradict one another, saying it is okay to kill to save 500 when another perfect maxim states under no circumstances - shall</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
you kill - no exceptions can be made, therefore you must let yourself and the other 500 die if following Kantian Ethics.	
Kantian Ethics also follows upon "duty not inclination" meaning we must act upon what we should do, <del>we</del> rather than what we feel we should. An example of this is finding a wallet on the street with a million pounds in it, <del>we</del> <sup>you</sup> may be inclined to keep it due to the fact your daughter is incredibly ill and that £1,000,000 could pay for life saving treatment for her, we may think on this occasion it is acceptable to keep - but again putting it into a maxim	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>it can't be made universalisable as if everyone kept wallets of money they found - some people would end up poor. and with no money or bank details. So forgetting inclination, and acting selfishly towards your daughter - Kant says we must return it to its rightful owner. <del>not</del></p>
	<p>In conclusion Kant's theory is weak as you don't know truly why someone is acting a certain way and cannot trust it is always upon the good will. It is detaching from real life as consequences <u>are</u> important upon many occasions as realistically as read in the example losing 500</p>

