

Western philosophers include historical figures like Baruch Spinoza, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, John Locke, philosopher, David Hume, and Immanuel Kant etc. i would like to jot down about Immanuel Kant and his ideas and principles that he adhered to. Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) is that the central figure in modern philosophy. He synthesized early modern rationalism and empiricism, set the terms for much of nineteenth and twentieth century philosophy, and continues to exercise a major influence today in metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, political philosophy, aesthetics, and other fields. the basic idea of Kant's "critical philosophy" – especially in his three Critiques: the Critique of Pure Reason (1781, 1787), the Critique of Practical Reason (1788), and therefore the Critique of the ability of Judgment (1790) – is human autonomy. He argues that the human understanding is that the source of the final laws of nature that structure all our experience; which human reason gives itself the moral law, which is our basis for belief in God, freedom, and immortality. Therefore, knowledge domain, morality, and spiritual belief are mutually consistent and secure because all of them rest on the identical foundation of human autonomy, which is additionally the ultimate end of nature in line with the teleological worldview of reflecting judgment that Kant introduces to unify the theoretical and practical parts of his philosophy. The most important belief about things in themselves that Kant thinks only practical philosophy can justify concerns human freedom. Freedom is vital because, on Kant's view, moral appraisal presupposes that we are free within the sense that we've the power to try to to otherwise. To see why, consider Kant's example of a person who commits a theft (5:95ff.). Kant holds that so as for this man's action to be morally wrong, it must be within his control within the sense that it absolutely was within his power at the time to not have committed the theft. If this wasn't within his control at the time, then, while it should be useful to punish him so as to shape his behavior or to influence others, it nevertheless wouldn't be correct to mention that his action was morally wrong. Moral rightness and wrongness apply only to free agents who control their actions and have it in their power, at the time of their actions, either to act rightly or not. in line with Kant, this is often just wisdom. On these grounds, Kant rejects a kind of compatibilism that he calls the "comparative concept of freedom" and associates with Leibniz (5:96–97). (Note that Kant incorporates a specific style of compatibilism in mind, which i will be able to check with simply as "compatibilism," although there could also be other sorts of compatibilism that don't fit Kant's characterization of that view). On the compatibilist view, as Kant understands it, i'm free whenever the reason for my action is within me. So i'm unfree only something external to me pushes or moves me, but i'm free whenever the proximate reason for my body's movement is internal to me as an "acting being" (5:96). If we distinguish between involuntary convulsions and voluntary bodily movements, then on this view free actions are just voluntary bodily movements. Kant ridicules this consider a "wretched subterfuge" that tries to resolve an ancient philosophical problem "with a bit quibbling about words" (ibid.). This view, he says, assimilates human freedom to "the freedom of a turnspit," or a projectile on the wing, or the motion of a clock's hands (5:96–97). The proximate causes of those movements are internal

to the turnspit, the projectile, and therefore the clock at the time of the movement. This can not be sufficient for moral responsibility.