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**Question No. 1 (Section- I)**

Most people agree that Immanuel Kant, who is a German philosopher sometimes credited with creating modern critical philosophy, is an important figure in contemporary philosophy. The idea that underlying assumptions affect how people view the outside world is claimed to be the basis of morality. Numerous definitions of hypothetical and categorical imperatives were offered by Kant. Deontological moral guidelines known as categorical imperatives are used when a claim's veracity does not need to be further justified(The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2016). For example, if you want to be loved, do not steal. The prohibition against stealing, however, is a categorical one. In a variety of ways, Kant claimed that there was only one categorical obligation. Kant contends that the hypothetical imperative is morally incorrect even if we are capable of performing the right thing (The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2020).

Kindness is central to Kant's ethical philosophy (All Answers Ltd, 2021). In actuality, it serves as the basis for his moral philosophy. According to Kant, this makes roles necessary. According to Kant, there is a higher purpose for our lives. This goal needs to be connected with a desire to do good in order to be effective. A person's good intentions can never be either good or wicked, no matter what. Is not the lack of a flaw sufficient proof? No value is effectively conveyed in this context. Resources like cash, bravery, and faith are examples of things that can be abused. It is not a poor quality as a result. They might be referred to by Sir David Ross as a "fake Prima". Currently, it is unknown where Kant stands on this key problem. Kant contends that, “while these benefits may occasionally exist, they do not actually exist. I am open to all possibilities when it comes to relationships. In fact, positive objectives cannot stay superb even when applied to actual situations because they are already good in nature.” It's absurd to imagine that good intentions could ever be corrupted. This would seem to be an obvious contradiction, corrupting in "good faith." Inconsistently good or bad depending on the circumstance. Moral understanding depends on the idea of responsibility, and Kant broadens the notion of "good" to include the will.

The "law of nature hypothesis" is the name given to the first categorical statement. According to the Universalization Rule, a decision should be made universally if it is morally advantageous. As if our actions had been elevated to the status of international law. However, if someone else shared similar traits, they could be able to pull off the same feat. For instance, a Kantian may agree to pay back money borrowed from another person. A Kantian must acknowledge the universality of their deeds before taking a promise. But what if someone took money from me, vowed to pay it back, and then made up the repayment? Engagements would not accumulate significantly over a short period of time. Because they had no faith in one another, no one could borrow money from anyone else. Society would suffer as a result. Therefore, stealing is wrong. A detractor can claim that Kant effectively conveys a certain consistency when he considers the results of an activity to judge whether or not it should be universalized. Also we need to keep in mind that similar situations frequently result in the behavior. The degree of precision with which cosmic law functions is determined by individuals, or "maxima," as Kant calls them. The general rule or maximum might be something like, in this instance, “Whoever borrows money and promises to pay it back should lie and breach the payment agreement.” But what about the person who was abandoned together with his or her family members? Changing the law and adding language that reads, “There should be no reneging on his obligation to refund anybody who borrows money and agrees to repay it but is unable to repay it owing to extreme poverty,” it would become a proper course of action. Particular behaviors are only allowed under certain circumstances. The progress of universalization might be aided by this.

In general, defective responsibilities cannot be applied, but neither can perfect obligations be enforced. In many of his articles (1690), Locke emphasizes "imperfect responsibilities," since they are not upheld in liberty. Due to legal obligations like the duty to benefit or be charitable, we are not free to use our own money to achieve our own goals. As a result, we are compelled to adopt other people's goals and pursue them using our own resources. Of course, Locke acknowledges in other works (1667) that partial obligations may be met if they are necessary for everyone to continue existing (Schwartzman, 2005). Mill's (2020) claim that moral actions are impractical has an impact on utilitarianism. Morally righteous behavior, according to Mill, shows that people should, whenever feasible, follow their actual goals when acting( The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2018 ). According to Mill, the accumulation of legally binding obligations, even if we add a subset for pragmatic or practical considerations, the list of legal requirements, or legal duties in general, is exhaustive. Proper obligations concern the rights of all defined persons, whereas imperfect obligations only concern the rights of one person, hence perfect obligations are applicable but imperfect obligations are not. There is a gap between acceptable and inappropriate duties. We must decide whether to accept a flawed commitment and the conditions of doing so. In contrast to his investigations under the legal theory he created in the field of social rights, on welfare and redistribution through his investigation on moral obligations (The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2016b). In this work, according to Kant, the coercive monopoly of the state must be weighed against each person's freedom as a fundamental right. He also contends that the state must unconditionally remove its citizens from poverty(Varden, 2006). According to Holtman (2004) and Ripstein (2004), the state must combat poverty, but in various ways, utilizing Kant's notion of public rights. Kantians have increasingly expressed concerns about global economic justice and redistribution. Peter Singer and other utilitarians shouldn't claim that we can control the outcome of unfinished activities like John Stuart Mill did.

A deontological ethical principle is the Golden Rule(Fieser and Dowden, n.d.). The old adage “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you” can be seen as a command or obligation. A number of actions that breach academic ethics include plagiarism, development, and other forms of academic misconduct. To determine whether a behavior is morally right or bad, the various moral reasoning techniques should be compared. And there are those who assert that specific behaviors violate some arbitrary moral standard. An Immanuel Kantian would argue that such behavior breaches the Categorical Imperative because we cannot permit individuals to act unethically in their interactions with others. Relying on other people to do what we want them to do is wrong, according to Kant's code of ethics. In order to accomplish our goals or make money from dishonesty, for example, we expect people to be honest. Unfortunately, this won't reveal any important information. However, it appears that we will not transgress the golden rule by being disrespectful to others. Therefore, cheating on an exam is against the categorical imperative's first assertion.

Relying on other people to do what we want them to do is wrong, according to Kant's code of ethics. In order to accomplish our goals or make money from dishonesty, for example, we expect people to be honest. Unfortunately, this won't reveal any important information. However, it appears that we will not transgress the golden rule by being disrespectful to others. Therefore, cheating on an exam is against the categorical imperative's first assertion.
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**Question No. 4 (Section- II)**

The English philosopher Jeremy Bentham is much to thank for the modern utilitarian movement. He holds that morally upright behavior and unethical conduct are incompatible. The utilitarian school of thought asserts that it can define what is meant by a good deed. This makes the case that we ought to engage in behaviors that have a purpose, i.e., those that successfully arouse pleasure and almost always produce the desired outcome.

The definition of utility theory must be clear and stated from the beginning because it acts as the foundation for this subject. Every theory that either favors or rejects a path of action is subject to the utility hypothesis (Bentham, n.d.). This pattern predicts that the group's happiness would either increase or decrease whenever its demands and pleasures are satisfied. I keep an eye on all activities, both official and unauthorized.

The utilitarian viewpoint, according to which pleasure and suffering are indicators of rightness or wrongness, is supported by utilitarian calculus. Bentham provided seven standards for assessing the potency, duration, certainty, proximity, fecundity, purity, and vastness of a measuring procedure. It is how much pain or pleasure is present, which determines the intensity. The time a person spends in a state of pleasure or pain is referred to as their "period." The expectation of pleasure or agony is certainty. The "prospect" of a person is his or her potential happiness or misery in the future. Fecundity demonstrates that it is possible to enjoy oneself while also making others happy. A state of purity prevents one sorrow from leading to another. Moreover, the extent to which joy affects people.

**Intensity(I):** Despite the fact that psychology suggests a greater threshold for enjoyment, he believes that the intensity scales from 0 to infinity. As a result, the range may also include an ordinal relationship between 0 and 10. Similarly pleasure and suffering may be judged(BRAC University, n.d.).

**Duration(D):** Nano **s**econd, minute, hour, and other examples are some of the several units of time. the interval between the alleged beginning and conclusion of pleasure.

**Certainty(C):** The assigned likelihood can be calculated using first-person accounts and historical data. What is the time required for these details to properly register? For instance, the Epicureans noted that it is uncommon for tremendous joys afterward comes other pleasures(BRAC University, n.d.).

**Propinquity( nearness or remoteness )(N):** It is possible to create a curve representing future disinterest for a "store of pleasure" like money(BRAC University, n.d.). It is more bearable if you have to wait a long time to receive something since the wait will be rewarding.

**Fecundity(F):** It is possible to forecast the likelihood that a given joy or agony would lead to later pleasure or anguish by looking at the past events that other people have gone through.

**Purity(P):** For the virtue of each grief that seems to have evolved after the first anguish, according to Jeremy Bentham “The fecundity of original suffering and the impurity of initial joy.”

**Extent(E):** Total quantity of usefulness or enjoyment for each person who is impacted by this behavior can be determined in the same manner.

They both thought it was enjoyable to determine the moral significance of an act. Unlike Bentham, Mill looked at the consistency and magnitude of pleasure. The utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham was cited as the source of the "only swine-worthy" argument. He did not distinguish between human and animal pleasures. Push-pin is comparable to poetry in terms of pure enjoyment, according to GE Moore (Vergara, 2011). Mill (2019) takes great pleasure in avoiding this criticism by utilizing a great deal of repetition and time. In his books, Mill contrasted bigger and smaller pleasures. Higher delights have a "intrinsic superiority," according to Mill, over lower ones. In spite of the fact that Mill's theory more precisely captures human nature, it is much harder to measure playing now that it incorporates the intangible qualities of pleasure and quantity.

Bentham's theories highlighted the significance of utility in all behaviors and situations. That is to say, these horrific acts have been approved (James, 2021). In other words, consent has been given for these heinous acts. For example, if two torturers' joy outweighs the suffering they inflict on the victim, their actions might be justifiable. Mill offered a practical law as a workaround. A utilitarian theory of morality was advanced by Mill. Never physically assault another person . There are instances when breaching the law is preferable to not breaking it at all, according to Mill. Exaggerating the laws won't be able to accomplish this. We must eliminate any chance of regulating worship by turning utilitarianism from theory to practice.

Two people have already stated that, despite the seeming ridiculousness of instantaneously convicting an innocent guy, at its essence, this conduct would be morally and ethically acceptable. British intellectuals Jean Stuart Mill(1748–1832) and Jeremy Bentham(1748-1832) supported the creation of an educational system and were proponents of the utilitarian moral philosophy. They were agnostics and atheists who wanted to develop a spiritual philosophy based on what they thought were universal truths: the desire for pleasure and indifference to suffering. Epicureanism, which predominated in the first century B.C., was essentially updated by utilitarianism. Bentham's beliefs were strengthened by J.S. Mill's response to some of the criticism that was leveled at him. He first made a distinction between happier and less pleasurable occurrences. The most expected "bigger" joys are those that are abstract, involve nature, or involve deception (Mill, 1873). Mill contrasted this from Carlyle's criticism of the “pig philosophy”. Thus, Mill can say, “ It is preferable to be an unhappy human than a comfortable pig; rather than a content dumb, it is preferable to be dissatisfied with Socrates.” Unfortunately, this distinction has rendered Bentham's calculus of pleasure outdated. Utilitarianism is regarded as an atheistic philosophy since it rejects both morality and God. It has a cold, cold feeling about it. Due to their addiction to pleasure and dread of suffering, they are cowards when faced with difficulty and lack any understanding of what it means to be a human. The pig's assumption is correct. The utilitarian philosophy of Thomas Carlyle earned the nickname "pig philosophy" for its straightforward approach to ethics that prioritized happiness over suffering (New World Encyclopedia, n.d.). The moral foundation for this project's ethical goal was the overwhelming majority of people's desire to enjoy swine. Carlyle rejected the idea, and John Stuart Mill

reiterates it: “They portray life as an absolute meaning and an oak-tree grove; as a source of joy and noble aspiration”(Perry et al., 2021).

Based on the scenario, three people would pass away due to the failure of their respective organs. The fourth, a physically fit man who was prepared to give blood, showed up. While saving three lives at once could be beneficial to many others, it might also be detrimental to just one.

The Act Utilitarian criteria permits it if many people stand to gain from it. A fourth man's sacrifice may result in the recovery of three seriously ill patients and the replacement of their organs with healthy ones. Three people who are essential to the life of their families could be saved by a single dose. Families are also rescued when a patient is saved. Their family will be able to support themselves if they live. One person can save three entire families when they give the ultimate sacrifice, in addition to their own life. The sacrifice-maker also doesn't have any competing interests. This approach will benefit more people and assure their wellbeing. A sufficient supply is always guaranteed by utilitarian principles. This represents positive growth in terms of quantity.

The Utilitarian Rule states that everyone's welfare and well-being should be safeguarded. Thus, it falls within the category of partiality if a sizable number of people's health is threatened. Because everyone's schedules need to be changed. Quality is endangered when someone's convenience is in jeopardy. Quality is also always preferred when it comes to satisfying the needs of the general public. Under utilitarian law, this sacrifice is unacceptable.

I don't think a healthy individual should die to save the lives of three other people who are dying. Although you have landed on this planet, you will eventually have to leave... In terms of common sense, this is an established fact. There is no medical rationale or assurance that they will survive after a transplant, even if they are capable of doing so. Because this method involves matching tissues. It is unknown that a stable and healthy person's tissue could be effectively matched to that of three patients. Consequently, it can be a danger rather than a resource, and no certainty can be assured. According to me, in order to preserve the utilitarian principle, the lives of four people must be prioritized over the lives of three others. It is necessary to keep the quality level high.

As a result, we may examine how to use measures and which aligned rules to apply in such crucial situations because we have comprehensive knowledge. Apply some common sense and politeness before letting your emotions rule your judgment to make a wise choice. Rule utilitarian principles can be used to create stability.
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