

Worksheet-5

Submitted by : Tasnim Rahman Moumita

ID : 22301689

Course code : HUM103

Date of submission : 01.04.2022

Answer to the question No-1

The moral virtue or negativity of an action is determined by one of two conflicting ethical theories, teleological or deontological ethics. Deontological ethics evaluates the action itself to determine whether it is good or bad, as compared to teleological ethics, which evaluates the action's effects. Their basic principles, moral beliefs, and methods to defining what is right or wrong differ. However, The main difference between teleological and deontological ethics lies in this.

Utilitarianism (Teleological theory) :

A consequentialist ethical theory known as utilitarianism evaluates actions according to their ability to bring about the most happiness or joy for the largest number of people. Utilitarianism holds that the moral value of an act is based on its result or effects.

According to the idea of utilitarianism, the morality of an action is determined by how it works out. The basic idea behind utilitarian moral principles is founded on Bentham's theory: maximize utility and give importance to the happiness of everyone in society. According to Bentham, the standard by which the morality or immorality of a course of action should be determined is the level of pleasure that a large number of people experience. Because everyone's satisfaction or pleasure is similarly important, utilitarianism indicates the significance of impartiality. Also, it

places a higher priority on collective happiness than on individual happiness because society as a whole is considered as being more important than the happiness of any one person.

For example, the majority of people believe that lying is bad, teleological ethics (utilitarianism) might argue that this behavior is acceptable if it would not cause damage and would help protect or make someone pleased. It is not always simple to figure out possible results or impacts of our actions, though. As a consequence, this is utilitarianism's weak point.

Duty ethics (Deontological theory):

The ethical theory known as deontology, which focuses more emphasis on the rightness or wrongness of acts themselves than on their effects or other elements. Consequently, this theory does not consider the consequences of an action when choosing if it is beneficial or harmful. Here, the moral choice is influenced by actions. In other words, deontologists state the significance of moral responsibilities, whereas those who favor utility emphasize the significance of actions' results.

Immanuel Kant, a philosopher, believed that moral behavior should abide by general moral rules, such as not lying, cheating, or robbing. Deontology thereby argues people to follow the rules and act out their duties. This theory also maintains freedom of discrimination and a lack of clarity.

For example, Since we are taught as children that killing anyone, including an animal, is a bad act, we all view killing or assassination as the worst human action. For instance, if a murderer were to be found in our society, everyone would hate and blame the person for what they had done. But we are unclear of the details of the circumstance. It's possible that the person murdered someone else for protection, self defense. Deontology, thereby, refers to the idea of determining what is correct and incorrect without taking into account the potential outcomes of an individual's choices.

So, in conclusion, it can be said that according to deontologists, moral duties and obligations are ones that people have to follow no matter what happens as consequences. They think it's everyone's duty to honor others, be truthful, and maintain their commitment to them. On the contrary, utilitarians overlook moral responsibilities and duties in order to avoid consequences, and they believe that people should act in a way which brings about the most satisfaction or happiness. To put it simply, teleology (utilitarianism) is about outcomes while deontology (Duty ethics) is about rules or duties.

Answer to the Question No-2

The idea of “Good” is an essential part of Kantian Deontology. He also categorizes the “good” in two types.

1. Qualified good and
2. Unqualified good

To begin with, a "qualified good" is something that is believed to be beneficial but comes with certain limitations or requirements. This indicates that while the thing or activity may have some good qualities, it might also have flaws that lower its value. To put it another way, a qualified good is something that only makes sense in certain situations or situations.

The qualified good is basically the moral thing that really engages people in acts that are good under certain circumstances. So, qualified good according to Kant's theory is a very important term to define and describe the philosophical explanation about joy, pleasure, satisfaction. The phrase "qualified good" states that nothing is perfect and that even beneficial objects have faults. When making choices and judging the advantages of something or someone, it is important to take these qualities into account. In this way, the idea of qualified good encourages critical thinking and a careful method of analyzing the world we live in.

For example, under a specific situation, social media is one kind of qualified good. To elaborate, it is beneficial because it enables communication with people, information sharing with one another, and keeping up the connection with current affairs. But it can also be time-consuming, and have a detrimental impact on mental health. As a result, social media should only be used sparingly and carefully. Therefore, it can be seen that social media is only good depending on some conditions.

The other type of good is “Unqualified good”. Which means good for anyone under any circumstances. It is used to describe something or someone that is entirely considered good or useful without bounds or qualifiers. It indicates the thing or person in question is perfect and ideal in every aspect. Action becomes a universal good in these methods, and kindness is the unqualified good. Our fair will, which comes from moral obligation, is something within us that drives us to act morally and guides our decisions. This idea of the unconditional good is connected to the concept of eudaimonia, also known as the "good life," in some intellectual traditions. This is a condition of happiness and wellbeing achieved through ethical actions and good behavior. Unqualified goods are seen as vital components of getting a decent life, which is seen as the ultimate goal of humanity.

Namely, Education is a fact that is unqualified good since it is useful or beneficial for anybody Remaining in any situation, under any type of conditions. Education helps people to develop their thoughts, moral and practical beliefs, also provides facilities to improve their skills and broadens their knowledge.

So, the main difference between “qualified good” and “unqualified good” can be seen from the above discussion that both goods occur under different conditions. The term “unqualified good” is a tough and controversial idea. Although it symbolizes the best examples of human ethics, it is also suitable for criticism and conflict. Whereas “qualified good” is linked to something that is only good under particular criteria or in particular cases. By analyzing and understanding the basic differences between these, people can become more successful in making best ethical decisions in any situation in their life.

Answer to the question No-3

Immanuel Kant is the author of the Deontological ethical theory, a well known branch of ethical philosophy, which places more importance on obligations, promises, and ideals than on the outcomes of actions. According to Kant, the obligation to fulfill commitments, which is a part of both the categorical imperative and the perfect duty, is one of the most fundamental moral obligations.

The categorical imperative is a fundamental concept in Kant's deontological ethical theory. It is a moral principle based on reasoning that applies to all rational creatures without exception. Kant claimed that even when doing so went against their own goals or interests, people were bound to behave morally righteously by the categorical imperative. It goes against the categorical imperative to break commitments because doing so indicates utilizing others as means. Basically, it does not have any "If" clause. Which means it is the will that binds an individual unconditionally.

According to Kant, keeping one's promise is the ideal obligation because it cannot be modified and cannot be changed. This means that a person must always keep their promise, regardless of the circumstances. On his idea of respect for people, which he views as the basis of moral obligations, Kant supports his argument of the significance of keeping promises. Treating others with respect means considering them as goals in and of themselves rather than just as a means to an aim. In order to ensure their consent to a future action or event, we use another individual

when we make a promise as a means to a goal. Kant argues that when we use someone in this manner, we have committed to them and are required to keep our end of the deal out of regard for their value as rational people. For instance, Kant argues that even if breaking an agreement would result in a higher benefit, like preserving someone's life, the obligation to maintain the agreement would still be applicable.

Promises, in Kant's view, are a perfect obligation, and this idea is connected to his more general view of the moral law. According to Kant, the moral law is a set of basic, universal rules that control all rational creatures. The moral law serves as the foundation for all moral duties, including the duty to uphold promises. Therefore, breaking a pledge goes against morality and personal effort.

According to Kant, an intelligent person must never break a promise because doing so not only goes against the conditions of the deal but also damages social harmony and religious belief.

If individuals broke their promises, society would fall apart because it would be impossible to depend on others or reach an agreement. The result would impact society as a whole.

Again, Kant acknowledges that there may be rare situations in which keeping promises may be difficult or result in greater harm. For instance, if someone makes a promise to commit a crime, they are not required to do so because doing so would go against the morality of the situation. Kant believes that it might be acceptable to break a commitment if keeping it would cause more harm than breaking it, but only if there is no other option that would enable us to keep our promise without causing damage to others.

To sum up, rational people should never break their word or restrain from making misleading commits because doing so is a perfect responsibility that is essential for maintaining morality and keeping societal order. By keeping our promises and treating others with respect, we abide by universal moral principles and encourage harmony in humanity.
