

Candidate 5

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	Section 2:	
Q1.	<p>Kant's moral theory, or "Kantianism", is a very strict and rigorous belief system. Also known as a deontological theory, Kantianism is non-consequentialist, meaning it doesn't take consequences into into account when deciding the moral worth and validity of an act — this is unlike something like utilitarianism, where consequences are the most important part. Rather, Kantian ethics uses the will behind an act to decide whether it's good or not. This is because Kant believed that the good will, or good intentions, was the only incorruptible thing. This means that as long as you're doing an action simply from the goodness of your heart, it is morally praiseworthy. If it's for any other desire, however, it no longer becomes praiseworthy. For example, helping an old woman across the road, simply to be</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	helpful, is good, whereas helping her
	because you think she'll give you
	money in return, is not. Even
	if the actual <u>action</u> is the same,
	the motivation behind one is
	corrupt.
	Kantian ethics also focuses very heavily on
	duty, believing that certain things are
	your duty to do, or to not to,
	Kant calls this his categorical
	imperative. an example of this is
	it's your duty not to lie, or
	steal, or murder. these individual
	rules are known as Kant's "maxims"
	Kant believes that we should make
	moral decisions operating by these
	maxims, and he also believes that
	maxims are <u>never</u> to be broken,
	no matter the circumstance. He also
	believes that our motives behind
	moral decisions should always be pure,
	or else we are not actually deciding
	morally. For example, if a friend

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	asked you to lie to a teacher for
	them, Kant would condemn this, as
	no matter how much it would help
	your friend, it would break to
	maxim "never lie", and this is
	is morally reprehensible. # finally,
	Kant says we must only act on
	beliefs which would be reasonably universal-
	isable, i.e. would be okay if
	everyone were to operate on that
	premise. An example of this is the
	duty of not lying again. If everyone
	were to lie all the time,
	truth would become unknowable, and
	the world would be a worse
	place. on the contrary, # we
	<u>should</u> act on something such as
	"treat everyone with kindness", as
	if everyone were to go by this,
	the world would be a better
	place for it. As such, Kant
	says we should only act on
	things we believe to be universal-
	isable.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p> Kantian ethics, will always very respectful of the law, is also vehemently against killing in any form. As such, a follower of Kantian ethics would likely be initially inclined to vote against this law. </p> <p> However, things deeper, however, complicates things more. on the one hand, this law would be entirely voluntary, and so universalizability is not a great concern, as it's not like should this be universalised, everyone would be given the drug. The will behind this is also good, allowing people who are in extreme pain to painlessly die, thus ending their suffering. i.e. The main goal of this law is to lessen suffering, and so the will would not be corrupt. on the other hand; however, the Kant says that killing is one of the worst things possible to do, which leaves the dilemma, even if killing, in this instance </p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	would help someone, would is it
	still the categorical imperative not to
	kill? Finally, and arguably most
	importantly, Kantian ethics is NOT
	consequentialist, and Thus a
	believer in Kantian ethics would likely
	ignore the fact that the consequence
	may be good, and focus on
	the fact that the act involves
	killing, as this is how Kantian
	ethics applies to the situation.
	Altogether, this leads to me to
	believe that despite the good will,
	and the good consequences, due to
	this law breaking. the maxim of
	"do not kill", a follower of
	Kantian ethics would likely vote
	AGAINST this change coming into
	effect.
	Here we can see highlighted a
	large flaw with Kantianism; its
	inhumanity. This is a large

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	criticism of Kant's philosophy as a
	whole. its inhuman and emotionless.
	Even in a case like this
	where the motive is good and
	outcome is good; an end to
	people's suffering, Kantianism's strict
	maxims forbid it from happening.
	This wholly exemplifies the emotionlessness
	of Kantianism, in this case it's
	arguably causing more pain for
	people than good, and yet
	a deontologist would rather not
	break their moral values to
	and ^{cause} lesser pain.
	As such, I believe that Kantianism
	does badly in relation to this
	change, its rules and maxims ending
	up with the philosophy being
	portrayed in a bad light. This
	example highlights the large flaws
	with Kantian ethics, namely its
	inhumanity and black and white,
	emotionless thinking. and All in all

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>means it is less time consuming than Act Utilitarianism which requires you to assess each possible consequence. Act Utilitarianism also uses the hedonic calculus which is too impractical to use especially when all the possible consequences are unknown. Act Utilitarianism can also allow for the potentially wrong acts to be justified. For example, if committing a crime results the murder of an innocent man would lead to more pleasure as overall, it would be considered moral under Act Utilitarianism. However, rule Utilitarianism comes the general rule of 'never kill' and so it would prevent more acts such as murder from occurring. However, rule Utilitarianism can lead to too many exceptions of rules. This can make the rules become meaningless and would ultimately lead to act Utilitarianism if there were too many singular rules. Overall, Rule Utilitarianism is an improvement on Act Utilitarianism as it is more practical and prevents possibility of morally wrong acts such as 'tyranny of the majority.'</p>	