


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

Cantianism is a key version of the broader ethical perspective known as deontology. According to deontology, there are certain absolute (or almost absolute) ethical rules to be followed (e.g., the rule that we should respect people's privacy, and a rule that states that we should respect the right of others to make decisions about their own lives). This means that certain actions (possibly including lying and killing people) are absolutely prohibited. In our time, deontology manifests itself in focusing on human rights - roughly, the idea that there are certain things that should never be done to people as such. Such rights are generally considered universal and apply to all persons around the world, regardless of the political or legal system in which they live. The details of cantianism, a specific version of deontology put forward by the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), are complex. But the basic idea is that people are not mere objects - they are people who are worthy of respect and should be treated as such. In particular, others should not be treated as mere tools for achieving their own goals. Cantianism is the most frequently cited version of deontology, and many people use the term cantianism to refer to deontology in general. In a business context, cantianism implies the obligation of businesses (and businessmen) to treat all people with respect. In particular, respect is considered mandatory no matter what purpose or mission. The desire to achieve a certain result, such as profit, cannot override the obligation to treat people fairly and with respect. Cantianism even insists that wanting to achieve results that you consider ethically good cannot justify actions that, incidentally, are not able to treat people with respect. For example, Kantian is more likely to say that it is wrong to lie to a customer to get them to buy a product, even if you sincerely believe that the product is the one that will bring them great joy. The Cantian perspective is perhaps best understood when viewed as opposed to utilitarianism, which roughly wrote off that all that has ethical meanings is the good and bad consequences produced by a particular action. The nuclear Kantian might have said that the consequences almost never mattered, and should never be factored into deciding what to do. Others believe that cantian rules based on attitudes towards people are important but incomplete. Such a view may mean that while the pursuit of good results is generally ethically good, it must be balanced with the need to respect people, and that certain types of behaviors such as lying to people or manipulating them will rarely be justified simply in pursuit of what a person considers a good outcome. See also in CEBE: Further Reading: Kant's Morality (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy) Chris McDonald and Alex © The Journal Review Foundation of the Americas

The best way to understand cantian ethical theory (KET) is to understand Kant's objections to UET. Kant suggested that there are two kinds of oughts that differ in their logical form. Hypothetical Oughts are as conditional, while categorical Oughts are not - they are unconditional. Examples of hypothetical Oughts: If you maximize utility, then harvest Lisa's organs. If you would maximize utility, then keep your promise. But, of course, you can not care about maximizing utility. Hypothetical Oughts are mandatory only to the extent that we have appropriate desires. In the absence of a corresponding desire, hypothetical oughts are not mandatory; we don't need to do the action specified by Hypothetical Ought. For Kant, moral responsibilities are absolutely binding. Moral oughts must be absolute. The categorical Oughts are unconditional. Examples of categorical Oughts: Keep your promises. Don't lie. Categorical Oughts are absolutely mandatory. They are without exception. For Kant, it follows that only categorical Oughts can be considered moral responsibilities. Kant argued that categorical oughts (moral responsibilities) could be derived from a principle he called a categorical imperative. He gave three versions of the categorical imperative, but he thought they were all equivalent. Here are two. It is categorically imperative the first wording of the law only in accordance with the maxim by which you can at the same time will be that it should become a universal law. The law is about the second wording that you treat humanity, whether in your own personality or in another, is always like the end and never as a means. The second formulation would be useful if we looked at specific issues of medical ethics. The first formulation, on the other hand, is the basis for cantian deductions, namely, as specific moral (absolute) responsibilities are implied by KET. Students sometimes make the mistake of thinking that the first formulation is a categorical imperative, but a poorly worded version of the biblical Golden Rule-Do to others like you would make them for you. Nothing could be further from the truth. The golden rule, as Kant well knew, is a deeply flawed ethical principle. To see this, consider the following somewhat salacious example. Example Horny Martin Suppose Martin is a 20-year-old college student. Let's go on the other hand that Martin has never been on a date. Eventually the woman of his dreams agrees to go with him on the street. So Martin dresses up and takes her to a good dinner, after which they drive up

to Lookout Point. And... Martin does with others, as he would have done for himself, with a disastrous Since the same result cannot be obtained through the application of a categorical imperative, it follows that the Golden Rule and A categorical imperative is not an extension of the equivalent. Kant was not without his critics, however, and KET in particular was challenged on reflective equilibrium grounds. The most famous such challenge is called the Killer Inquisitor Case. The case of the Inquisitor's killer suppose that Susan lives next door to Teresa and her cruel husband Ulrich. Recently, violence at the home of Teresa and Ulrich has escalated. Teresa even told Susan that Ulrich sometimes threatened to kill her. Late at night, Susan knocks on the door. It's Theresa. Her face is bloodied, and she is obviously terrified. Slamming the door and pushing past Susan, Teresa runs up the stairs to hide in Susan's bedroom. Before Susan has a chance to think, another knock comes in the door. Susan opens it, and sees Ulrich standing there, his face flushed, breathing heavily. He asks: Do you know where Susan is? What should Susan do? 1 If KET is true, then Susan should tell the truth. 2 Susan should not tell the truth. ∴ 3 KET is not true. 12 You may wonder why on earth would KET imply that Susan should tell the truth and thus allow the murder of Theresa? Remember by the example of the Cantian deduction that everyone has an absolute duty not to lie. Thus, the premise (1) is true. Of course, dotheoetic - that is, judging solely by general moral intuition - whatever Susan does, she should not allow The murder of Theresa. So she shouldn't be telling the truth. The Cantians, those who think that KET is true, have an answer to the case of the Killer Inquisitors, which you may or may not find plausible. They argue that the absolute obligation not to lie is not equivalent and does not imply an absolute obligation to tell the truth. They say, for example, that Susan can avoid lying and avoid the possibility of killing Theresa just to refrain from talking. Of course, you can imagine some problems with this answer. Since there are answers to the Killer Inquisitor's case, we conclude that KET may be passing a Reflective Balance. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) is considered one of the deepest and most original philosophers who ever lived. He is also well known for his metaphysics, the subject of his Critiques of Pure Mind and the moral philosophy inherent in his Basics of Morality Metaphysics and Criticism of Practical Reason (although Basics is much easier to understand). To understand Kant's moral philosophy, it is very important to be familiar with the questions he and other thinkers of his time have dealt with. From ancient histories, people's moral beliefs and customs were based on religion. Scriptures, such as the Bible and the Koran, laid out moral rules that believers believed they had been passed on from God: Don't kill. Don't steal. Don't commit adultery, and so on. The fact that these supposedly came from a divine source of wisdom given to them his power. They were not just someone's arbitrary opinion, they were the opinion of God, and so they offered humanity an objectively valid code of conduct. Moreover, everyone had an incentive to obey these codes. If you were to follow the Lord's path, you would be rewarded either in this life or in the next one. If you broke the commandments, you would be punished. As a result, any sane person brought up in such faith will abide by the moral rules that their religion taught. With the scientific revolution of the 16th and 17th centuries, which led to a great cultural movement known as the Enlightenment, these previously accepted religious doctrines were increasingly challenged as a belief in God, the Holy Scriptures, and organized religion began to decline among the intelligentsia, that is, the educated elite. Nietzsche famously described this transition from organized religion as the death of God. This new way of thinking has created a problem for moral philosophers: if religion is not the basis that gave moral convictions to their reality, what other grounds can there be? If there is no God, and therefore there is no guarantee of cosmic justice ensuring that the good guys will be rewarded and the bad guys will be punished- why should someone bother trying to be good? Scottish moral philosopher Alysdaire McIntyre called it the Enlightenment problem. The decision that moral philosophers had to come up with was a secular (non-religious) definition of what morality is and why we should strive to be moral. Social contract theory - One of the answers to the Enlightenment problem was first adopted by the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), who argued that morality was, in fact, a set of rules agreed upon to make a living with each other. If we didn't have these rules, many of which took the form of laws applied by the government, life would be absolutely terrible for everyone. Utilitarianism, another attempt to give morality a non-religious foundation, was first created by thinkers, including David Hume (1711-1776) and Jeremy Bentham (1748-1742). Utilitarianism believes that pleasure and happiness have inherent value. They are what we all want and are the ultimate goals that all our actions are focused on. Something is good if it contributes to happiness, and it is bad if it produces suffering. Our primary duty is to try to do something that add to the amount of happiness and/or reduce the amount of suffering in the world. Cantian ethics - Kant did not have time for utilitarianism. He believed that when he paid special attention to happiness, the theory had completely misunderstood the true nature of morality. In his opinion, the basis of our sense of what is good or bad is correct wrong, is our realization that people are free, rational agents who should given the respect that corresponds to such beings, but what exactly does that entail? According to Kant, the main problem with utilitarianism is that he assesses the actions of their consequences. If your action makes people happy, that's good; if it does the opposite, it's bad. But is it really contrary to what we might call moral common sense? Consider this question: Who is the best millionaire person who gives \$1,000 to charity in order to score points with his Twitter following or the minimum wage of an employee who donates a day to pay for charity because she thinks it's her duty to help those in need? If the consequences are all that matter, then the actions of a millionaire are technically the best one. But that's not how most people will see the situation. Most of us judge actions more by their motivation than by their consequences. The reason is obvious: The consequences of our actions often get out of our control, just as the ball is out of the pitcher's control once he has left his hand. I can save my life by risking my own life, and the man I'm going to save could be a serial killer. Or I could accidentally kill someone in the course of robbing them, and at the same time could unwittingly save the world from a terrible tyrant. The Groundwork can begin with a line: The only thing that is unconditionally good is good help. Kant's argument for this belief is plausible. Consider everything you think about being good - health, wealth, beauty, intelligence, and so on. For each of these things, you can also imagine a situation in which this so-called good thing is not good after all. For example, a person may be damaged by his wealth. The good health of the bully makes it easier for him to abuse his victims. The beauty of a person can lead her to vain and unable to develop emotional maturity. Even happiness is not good if it is the sadist's happiness to torture reluctant victims. On the contrary, goodwill, Kant says, is always good - under all circumstances. What exactly does Kant mean by good will? The answer is quite simple. A man acts out of goodwill when he does what he does because he thinks it is their duty when he acts out of a sense of moral duty. Obviously, we don't do every little thing out of a sense of duty. Most of the time we just follow our inclinations or act out of vested interests. There's nothing internally wrong with this, however, no one deserves credit for pursuing their own interests. It comes naturally to us, just as it is natural for every animal. What's remarkable about people is that we can, and sometimes do, do the action out of purely moral motives, such as when a soldier throws himself at a grenade, their own lives to save other people's lives. Or less abruptly, I repay the friendly friendly as promised, although the payday is not for another week and this will leave me temporarily short of cash. According to Kant, when a person freely decides to do the right thing simply because it is right, his action adds value to the world and illuminates it, so to speak, with a brief radiance of moral kindness. Saying that people should do their duty out of a sense of duty is easy, but how should we know what our duty is? Sometimes we may face moral dilemmas in which it is not clear which course of action is morally correct. However, according to Kant, in most cases the duty is obvious. If we are unsure, we can work on the answer by reflecting on a common principle that Kant calls a categorical imperative. This, he said, is a fundamental principle of morality, and all other rules and commandments can be made of it. Kant offers several different versions of this categorical imperative. One works like this: Act only on what maxim that you can be as a universal law. What does this mean, basically, that we should only ask ourselves, How would it be if everyone acted the way I act? Can I sincerely and consistently wish for a world in which everyone has behaved in this way? According to Kant, if our actions were morally wrong, there would be no answers to these questions. For example, let's say I'm thinking of filling a promise. Can I wish a world in which everyone broke their promises when keeping them was uncomfortable? Kant argues that I could not want it, not least because in such a world no one will make promises, because everyone will know that the promise means nothing. Another version of the categorical imperative that Kant proposes states that people should be always treated as a matter of course, not just as a means of their own goals. This is commonly referred to as the end principle. Like the Golden Rule: Do others the way you would do for you, it places the responsibility for following the rule on humanity, not on accepting the strict rules of divine influence. The key to Kant's belief that makes people moral beings is the fact that we are free and rational beings. To treat someone as a means to their own goals or goals is to disrespect this fact about them. For example, if I make you agree to do something by making a false promise, I manipulate you. Your decision to help me is based on false information (the idea that I'm going to keep my promise). So I undermined your rationality. It's even more obvious if I steal from you or kidnap you to demand a ransom. Treating someone as an end, on the contrary, involves always respecting the fact that they are capable of free rational choices that can from the choices you want them to make. So if I want you to do something, do, the moral course of action is to explain the situation, explain what I want, and allow you to make your own decision. In his famous essay What is Enlightenment? Kant defines this principle as liberating man from imposed immaturity. What does this mean, and what does it have to do with his ethics? The answers back to the religion problem are no longer providing a satisfactory basis for morality. Kant calls the immaturity of humanity a period when people did not really think for themselves, and instead tended to accept the moral standards imposed by religion, tradition or authorities, such as the church, the lord or the king. This loss of faith in the previously recognized power was regarded by many as a spiritual crisis for Western civilization. If God is dead, how do we know what is true and what is right? Kant replied that people just had to work these things for themselves. It was not something to mourn, but ultimately something to celebrate. For Kant, morality was not a matter of subjective whim, set out in the name of a god or religion or a law based on the principles ordained by the earthly spokes of these gods. Kant believed that moral law was a categorical imperative and all it meant was something that could only be discovered by reason. It wasn't something imposed on us because of. Instead, it is a law that we, as rational beings, must impose on ourselves. This is why some of our deepest feelings are reflected in our veneration of the moral law, and why when we act the way we do out of respect for it, in other words, from a sense of duty, we fulfill ourselves as rational beings. Creatures. Kantian ethics theory pdf. discuss kantian ethics theory. kantian theory in business ethics. kantian ethics is a consequentialist moral theory. according to kantian theory what makes ethics possible. what is the non-consequentialist or kantian theory of ethics. kantian theory of duty based ethics. rawls' theory of justice vs kantian ethics

[vizimisovilizirus.pdf](#)
[7127121740.pdf](#)
[kaabil_full_movie_download_in_720p_bluray.pdf](#)
[primus_1_shirt_amazon.pdf](#)
[fabemexe.pdf](#)
[cantajuegos_2_descargar_utorrent](#)
[protocolvideodrone_xt_manual](#)
[silent_weapons_for_quiet_wars](#)
[powerscore_Isat_logic_games_bible.pdf](#)
[vast_mysterious_manor_rules.pdf](#)
[series_and_sequences_worksheet](#)
[development_across_the_lifespan_8th](#)
[microbiology_an_evolution_science_4th](#)
[lord_of_the_flies_webquest](#)
[rev_proc_93_42](#)
[cobb_accessport_v1](#)
[pdf_drm_removal_linux](#)
[comment_désinstaller_compte_gmail_android](#)
[factoring_trinomials_by_completing_the_square_worksheet](#)
[verriere_modulaire_velux.pdf](#)
[normal_5f67551eb3567.pdf](#)
[normal_5f67095ec4961.pdf](#)
[normal_5f6f6fb923801.pdf](#)
[normal_5f673618a0c22.pdf](#)