

Candidate 6 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>and led to more people discussing what we can know and sparked the debate between a priori vs a posteriori as a <u>foundational</u> knowledge base.</p>
4)	<p>Kant's moral theory is based on duty. He believed that as a society we have a duty to do the 'right' thing and behave morally. He believed that intentions are more knowable than consequences and so he highlights the importance of one's intentions regarding an action the rather than the actual consequences of that action. This makes Kant's moral theory a deontological one. Kant argued that reason is the sovereignty for when decision making. He</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Said that if every being used their reasoning process then all should come to the same conclusion about something. As said in the process above statement, I do not agree with the sentence - 'rational belief or reason is not helpful in real life moral decision-making' as everyone's reasoning process is different. What may be a logical reason to me may be different to another. I argue that as individuals most of us use our reasoning in different ways and therefore have a high chance of not ending on the same conclusion. as another being. This certainly also emphasises that the above statement is a fair criticism. As well as this</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>In real life situations, we all use our reasoning differently. When we are for example sad or excited. We may not use our reasoning as we normally do and therefore our reasoning cannot be relied on in all situations. Kant also said that we have categorical imperatives and hypothetical imperatives. Categorical imperatives are 'rules' that we must always abide by e.g. Do not kill and hypothetical imperatives are slightly more flexible ^{rules} e.g. If I want A then I must go to B. This could relate to the criticism above as one might say that they go by or follow these maxims (rules) rather than go through a reasoning process for example rather than thinking.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN.
	<p>about what we should do in a situation we may just follow categorical imperatives e.g. Do not kill no matter what even if you may come to a different conclusion if you were to use reasoning. However, to disagree with the above statement / criticism, reasoning is in situations more than just sticking to these categorical imperatives. For example should we follow the maxim 'Do not kill' if it was in a situation where we could kill Hitler to save 6 million Jews? It would be more morally acceptable in my opinion to kill Hitler meaning that now 6 million Jews are saved?</p> <p>Kant also created a formula for his moral theory. The first rule of his</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Formula is that something must be universalizable to everyone. You should not do something unless you want everyone to do the same. A strength of this is that it helps from making impulsive decisions, and may disagree with the criticism as if you were to stop and think about the universalisability principle then you may have more chance of using your reason to make a decision about something.</p> <p>Another rule of Kant's Formula is that you should never treat anyone as a means to achieving an end but is a means in himself (never use anyone). I believe a strength of this is that it is definitely morally good to never use anyone.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>and if you were to use your reason you would most likely want to not hurt anyone by using them to achieve something. However one may use their reasoning in a more sneaky manner and realize that someone could be helped to achieving for example their dream career and so they may use someone because they have used their reasoning to come to this. I believe it depends on the person's intentions whether or not they will use their reasoning in a moral way, this could be a strength and weakness. A weakness is that you never know what ones intentions are towards another and this is a weakness of</p>	

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 needed 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>	