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Kant asks for his moral-philosophical revolution, and put forward two reasons. One is that moral consciousness must be illuminated, the other is that he claims for the new formula, i.e. the fundamental principle of pure, practical reason (the categorical imperative)

A philosophical ethics has three tasks. In addition to the tasks of providing the moral standard and of formulating moral judgment, the third task is that the categorical imperative consists of a “should” that challenges one to a corresponding action.

Whereas the Groundwork provides several, almost confusing formulae with all of them treated as if equal, the section devoted to the categorical imperative in the Critique of Practical Reason, the Typology of the Pure Practical Reason, emphasizes only a single formula, which means there may be a tension or contradiction between them. In fact it demonstrates only a somewhat different thematic interest. The privileging of the natural-law formula in the Typology is based on the task to be accomplished. This task is not fundamentally new over against the Groundwork. Only the Typology works out the characteristic, mediating role of the categorical imperative, and to that end the natural-law formula achieves an exclusive role.

Two examples of the criterion for morality:

Example 1: Prohibition of Lying

Kant considers what is decisive of moral maxims is the maxims themselves, because the universal maxims are based not on anything special about their mentions but on the “concept of action in itself”. Whereas the consequentialist interpretation goes wrong because it misjudges this foundational determination of the will. It misjudges Kant’s entirely convincing point that a false promise is morally forbidden not first because of specific consequences but already in itself. In order to convince Kant’s point, one must reconstruct it and understand it.

Example 2: A Deposit

Kant uses the famous deposit-example to examine what form of maxim itself applies to a general legislation. By the interpretation of Kant’s treatment about the deposit example, Dr. Höffe responses Hegel’s critique and indicates that Hegel has entirely missed the point: Kant is not interested in the particular case but in the fundamental maxim that applies to the situation.

In the Chapter 2.5, Dr. Höffe regarded the maxim ethic as the most important notion in categorical imperative. The statement divided into three parts. Firstly, Dr. Höffe claims the difference between categorical imperative and the principle of universalizability, and the core elements must be the maxim. Then, Dr. Höffe described the expression of maxim in the early modern by La Rochefoucauld. Following with the criticism of Hegelian to Kant. Dr. Höffe wrote against the criticism in the second part, in which author carried out three mainly character of maxim including: subjective; something that the individual himself establishes as a rule; As foundational principles that govern several rules, maxims are under examination “for our entire lives”. Thirdly, Dr. Höffe maintained that a maxim ethic is superior to this widely embraced rule- or norm-ethic, and he gave his reason into five point including: 1. The foundational principles of the will ignore changing conditions, thus he corresponded to Aristotle’s second theoretical concept for ethics and point out the important consequences of this process. 2. A frequent criticism that Kant is indifferent to the consequences of actions and to the well-being of concrete persons is contradicted by his maxim-ethic. 3. A maxim-ethic is meaningful for the wide domain of moral identity and moral integrity, including moral development and the judgment of human beings. 4. A maxim valid for all persons cannot be applicable to everyone or cannot be thought to be valid. 5. Only a maxim ethics allows examination of the escalation of acting out of mere agreement with duty (legality) to acting out of duty (morality).