

## Candidate 7 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
4.	<p>According to deontologists the morality of an action is found within itself.</p> <p>Kant believed that consequences should not be considered in morality as they cannot be controlled. Instead, the morality of an act comes from something intrinsic rather than extrinsic.</p> <p>Kant also emphasised the sovereignty of reason as by creating a moral philosophy based entirely on reason, he would create a moral philosophy that is necessarily true. <sup>He also stated</sup> that morality should be universal, so <del>that</del> right and wrong is the same for everyone.</p> <p>Kant's theory is also known as 'duty ethics'. Your duty is 'what you ought to do' and has nothing to do with consequences. <del>That</del> Kant also rejects other things many feel should be taken into consideration for morality such as intelligence and pleasure. However, the nazis used their intelligence and some people find pleasure in hurting others.</p> <p>Kant also states that morality</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>should <del>not</del> be based on inclinations. To act from inclination is to do so because of your genetics or upbringing. He believes we should not be praised for acting from inclination as we cannot control this. Instead, we should only be praised for what <del>we</del> we have chosen to do; this is our duty.</p> <p>However, one philosopher argued that Kant's philosophy forces people into a battle between reason and their emotion. He argued that it is unnatural for humans to disregard their feelings and give in to reason. I believe this is a fair criticism of Kantianism that highlights how his reliance on reason is not helpful in real life moral decision making as by not addressing this tension between emotion and reason, Kant does not give people a reason to follow his moral laws. I also agree with Mill, who states that Kant's reliance on reason gives utilitarianism a</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>stronger intuitive grounding than Kantianism. This emphasises that reason is not helpful in real-life moral decision-making as it is much easier for a person to understand something is morally right because it produces the most pleasure than because it is their 'duty'.</p> <p>So what is our duty? Kant created the categorical imperative as a test for duty. He stated that every <del>action</del> situation had one moral act and that this could be found through reason. The first formulation of the categorical imperative is that "one could will it that one's action becomes a universal law." This means that we should all follow maxims, which are general rules of morality. <del>These maxims must be followed by everyone as it is their duty</del></p> <p>However, in some maxims, the hypothetical world created loses the meaning of the maxim. This is</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
called a contradiction <del>in</del> in conception.	
For example, in the maxim 'everyone should	
make false promises', 'promise' loses its	
meaning as there would be no trust.	
It therefore becomes a perfect duty to do	
the opposite.	
Some maxims pass the contradiction in	
conception, yet are maxims no one would	
want to happen. This is known as a	
contradiction in will. In the maxim	
'no one should help anyone' the	
contradiction in will occurs when the	
person willing the maxim needs	
help.	
However, some philosophers argue that	
the contradiction in conception offers	
for improved acts. In the maxim	
'everyone should help the poor',	
'poor' loses its meaning as eventually	
there would be no poor people	
left to help. <del>Therefore</del> I agree <del>that</del> it	
is a fair criticism of Kant as it	
shows his reliance on reason is not	
helpful in real life decision making.	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>The contradiction in conception makes charity immoral, which highlights how Kant's reason differs from real life emotions. This makes it a very fair criticism of Kant as it shows his reliance on reason is not helpful as it differs from real life feelings of what is right such as helping the poor.</p>
	<p>The second formulation of the categorical imperative links back to Kant's idea that humans are unique due to <del>their rationality</del> reason. He <del>states</del> <sup>argues</sup> that we all have intrinsic worth due to our ability to reason. He states <del>we</del> that we should <del>not</del> <del>act</del> <del>in</del> <del>such</del> <del>a</del> <del>way</del> as to "treat each other as an end in themselves and not a means to an end." This means that we should treat each other with value and respect. If we manipulated and used someone we would be acting as though they have no value</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
09	Worth

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
has value and this belief has	
been helpful all around the world	
as it influenced our human	
rights.	

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 <del>the</del> potentially wrong acts to be justified. For example, if <del>committing a crime</del> <del>needs</del> the murder of an innocent man would lead to more pleasure <del>as</del> overall, it would be considered moral under Act Utilitarianism. However, rule Utilitarianism comes the general rule of 'never kill' and so it would prevent <del>more</del> 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>	