


**Deontological ethics by immanuel kant**

I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

**Verify**

## Deontological ethics by immanuel kant

Author: Andrew Chapman
Category: Ethics
Count: 998
à €
œTrolley Problem
à € are philosophical thinking experiments in which we make an imaginary choice that usually ends up in someone to get, well, managed by a cart. Here we will use the problems of the trolleys to introduce the ethics Kantiana, which is the ethical theory developed by Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), and introduce ethical deontological theories in general.
1. Trolley problems
Imagine this: five people are tied to a tracer. A trolley out of control is going down to the track. The trolley cannot be stopped, but you can pull a lever to divert the trolley on a side track, saving five but killing one. [1] trolley problems: should it pull the switch? What should you do? Most people replied: Switch! We should try to save as many screws as possible. But consider a modification of this experiment: the story is the same, except now there is no switch and no lateral track. However, on a walkway, higher on the track, before five related individuals, it is a giant man premiumly perched. If you give the giant a boost, he will fight in the track, stopping the cart and saving the five souls linked. Cart problems: should the man push? What should you do? Most people insist: don't push. But in both cases, it's a life against five lives. If we worried only of a total life saved, then Donà €™ t switch and Donà €™ t push should be morally equivalent and switches and push should be morally equivalent. For real?
2. Kantian & amp deontology; Categorical imperative to many people, these actions do not seem to be equivalent, despite their consequences are the same. [2] Dontology is a kind of moral theory that denies that morality is only on the consequences. [3] The most famous deontological theory was developed by Immanuel Kant. [4] The ethics of Kant, and the general philosophical system in which it is incorporated, is vast and incredibly difficult, but we can see the ethics of him as tuning in view of what we are, ie people. Immanuel Kant
à € œThe metaphysics work of morals
à € According to Kant, people are essentially rational creatures that deserve respect. [5] This rationality justifies what Kant calls the categorical impress, the fundamental ethics rule from which all the particular ethical rules derive. This imperative is categorical as we must follow him, even if we don't want. [6] Kant claims that there is a categorical imperative that can be expressed in three different formulations, even if the first two are, by far, the most important. [7] The "first formulation" is based on the idea of a maximum: a principle to act in a certain way to achieve a certain objective. [8] If a maximum was a universal law, everyone would act on that maximum. In turn, Kant's first formulation so: Only act in accordance with the maximum through which you can at the same time become a universal law. The basic idea of this formulation is thatWrong to make a special exception to some rules for yourself. If your Maxim is,
à € ~ I find in a movie without paying, so I can watch the movie for free,
à €™ then you are trying to make a special exception for you: the maximum would not work if it were one Universal law, because almost no one would show movies, because it would not be profitable. But of course, "I would buy a ticket for a movie so you can see the film "It is perfectly universalizable: if everyone followed that maximum, the films could still exist. [9] Its
à € œsecond formulation
à € is this: act in such a way that treated humanity, both in your person and in the person of any other, never simply as a means for an end, but always at the same time of an end. This means that we are never authorized to simply use people: people must be respected as Fini in themselves. Using people like
à € œMere means
à € involves treating them as mere objects or in ways to which they could or would have consented, which is not to respect them. [10]
3. Apply the categorical imperatives
The
à € œsecond formulation
à € of the categorical imperative helps to justify the common intuitions of the wire-problem above. In the first experiment, while overturning the switch would kill someone, we do not use the person we kill. The death of him is an unfortunate and unwanted consequence of our attempt to save five lives. In the giant-man variant, pushing him in front of the train, like a simple bag of bones and walnuts, not better than a rock. This difference, says Kantian, represents our moral intuitions and the different moral condition of the two cases. To apply the
à € œprima formulation
à € here we must determine which rules we will follow with different action courses, such as the
à € œul rule killed to save screw
à €, which may not be universalizable. [11]
4. A objection were raised numerous objections to Kantian deontology, but we note only one. Kant claimed that, given the "second formulation" of the categorical impress, the lie always involves the use of someone as a mere means, since this manipulation does not respect their rationality. So, Kant claimed that even if a well-known murderer asks her where someone is (presumably, to kill them), it would be wrong to lie to the murderer on where that person is. But most people say that it is not morally necessary to tell the truth to the killer. At this point, the Kantian deontologist has two options. They can bite the bullet and insist that lying at the murderer is wrong. Alternatively, they can move away from the rigid deontology of Kant to a more moderate deontology, according to which it is good, in extreme cases, break the rules. You could take this last approach in a way that seeks to be compatible with the other opinions of Kant, claiming, for example, that The killer would be to treat the potential victim as a simple means.
5. Conclusion to many, it seems that there is something essentially right with a Kantian brand of ethics, that is, that is, Respect and rationality are fundamental to our ethical life. However, Kant's theory, like all ethical theories, has its theoretical and practical challenges. Footnotes
[1] These thought experiments are a work of hypotheticalal fantasy intended to hide your ethical intuitions. Leave aside any implausibility and note that these situations are at least possible. In addition, to assume that all persons linked are morally equivalent, for example, it is not the case that one is a murderer and another is going to cure cancer. Finally, let us assume that the choices presented are the only possible choices. For the original presentation of the trolley problem, see Foot (1978.) For an extensive analysis, see Thomson (1976.) [2] Consequentialism is a moral theory that evaluates actions exclusively in terms of consequences. A consequentialist would argue that since the consequences in terms of lives saved are the same in Donàt Switch and Donàt Push and Switch and Push, we have morally equivalent pairs. See Shane Gronholz's Consequentialism for an overview of this popular moral theory. [3] The Greek root, deont, means a certain necessity and has been interpreted as a duty or obligation. A certain characterization of deontological ethics is that these kinds of theories deny in any case that only consequences are counted to determine the morality of actions: deontology can also be understood as non-consequentialism. [4] See above all the basic work of the Metaphysics of Morals, the Metaphysics of Morals, and the Critique of Practical Reason, all in Kant (1999). While here we will see only the most famous deontological ethical theory, there are many other deontological theories. Some of them are modifications of the account of Kant, and some of them explicitly non-Kantian. For an overview and taxonomy of such theories, see Alexander & Moore (2012.) [5] It's a mistake to read "people" as Homo sapiens. In the ethical sense of Kant, any self-conscious, motivating, autonomous creature will count as a person in the relevant sense. As a result, some nonhuman animals, such as monkeys, could count as people. Likewise, potential future artificially intelligent computer systems could count as people. Finally, some Homo sapiens, for example, the very young and severely mentally infebled, will not count as persons in the relevant moral sense. For the related discussion, see Specieisim by Dan Lowe. In relation, you might wonder what it is about people who make us so worthy of value. The basic answer, for Kant, is that rational beings are the only creatures who can act with good will: to acknowledge the existence of moral motives and act in such a way that the reason for acting is that the action is morally necessary. [6] Categorical imperatives, which we must follow independently of what we want, with hypotheticalal imperatives, rules that we must follow only if we have certain desires. Consider the rule, "Working on difficult math issues everySomeone should follow that rule only if you want to learn to learn challenging mathematics. If you don't want to, you don't have to follow that rule and study mathematics. A rule like "don't lie to other people and manipulate them for their own personal report" is a categorical rule, at least according to Kant: You have to follow that rule, even if you do not want. [7] The third formulation is very similar to the first, but emphasizes the role of a person as a choice or will rather than simply being bound by the rules or the existence of these rules. [8] Here we follow Russ Shafer-Landau (2012: 157-9 s.) in our specific definition of a maximum. [9] For example, if someone is going to steal (for fun), its maximum or rule could be: "I will steal what I want, so that I can get it." Can it be desired, as a universal law, which all follow? It is not true The explanation of Kantà ¡ for which one cannot want, however, is not that it would result negative consequences from all, but that whoever does it would erase the idea of the theft: If everyone could steal what they want, then nothing really belongs to anyone (no one really owns anything), and so the whole idea of ownership, which the theft requires, is compromised. On the other hand, the rule "helping people in grave need, when it is possible, to benefit them" can be desired as a universal law: We can want everyone to do it. [10] All people are like you in their rational abilities, and therefore deserve respect. Treating them differently, all the evidence of the opposite is to treat them incorrectly, denying them the same thing that makes them moral people, be lying to themselves, abuse their own rationality. Thanks to R. Jenkins and D. Purves for putting pressure on this point.
11 For example, because everyone would be killed, so everyone would die anyway, so there would be no one to save. Kant's discussion of why killing violates the first formula is a little darker, but he says that there could not be a world where the same principle would take you and put an end to life. References
Alexander, Larry, and Michael Moore. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. University of Stanford, 2016. < Foot, Philippa and Doris Schroeder. "The problem of abortion and the doctrine of double effect." Critical concepts in philosophy. Ed. it's Ruth Chadwick. Flight. 2. New York: Routledge, 1978. Kant, Immanuel. Practical philosophy. Trans. Allen W. Wood. Cambridge, United Kingdom: UP, 1999. Shafer/Landau, Russ. 2012. The Foundations of Ethics, Second Edition. Oxford, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Thomson, Judith Jarvis. «To kill, to let die and the problem of the cart». Monist 59.2 (1976): 204-17. Related Essays
Introduction to Shane Consequentialism]John Rawls
¡ «A theory of justice» by Ben Davies Responding to moral defectsPhilosophy and Philosopby by Victor Fabian Abundez-Guerra and Nathan Nobis Thanks to Addison Ellis, Ryan Jenkins and Duncan Purves for helpful comments on an earlier version of this essay. Review This revision 6/29/2020 is of an article originally published on 6.9.2014. The main update also includes the "first formulation" of the categorical Impress. That old version's here. Download this essay in PDF format. About the author
Andrew is a professor of philosophy at the University of Colorado, Boulder. He earned a PhD in Philosophy from the University of Colorado, Boulder, a Masters in Philosophy from the University of Northern Illinois and a Bachelor of Philosophy and a BM in Bassoon and Sound Recording Technology from Ithaca College. He specializes in epistemology, metaetics and history of philosophy (especially Kant and the Anglo-ponic traditions of the 20th century and Phenomenological). When not philosophical, Andrew is skiing, hiking, listening to great music, or playing the bassoon. AndrewDChapman.org Follow the 1000-Word philosophy on Facebook, Twitter and subscribers to receive email notifications of new essays at 1000WordPhilosophy.com 1000WordPhilosophy.com