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**Answer to the question no: 01 (Section- I)**

Immanuel Kant was born in 1724 in Germany and he was one of the earliest philosophers to take philosophy as a profession. He is considered as one of the most influential political philosophers, a major modern philosopher as well as a key figure of the European Age of Enlightenment.

Firstly, Kant’s thoughts are different than the Utilitarianism philosophy because according to Kant the outcome or result does not define whether the work was good or bad rather it can be judged by the motivation behind the work. Even if the consequences of a work are bad but the intention of the work was good, then it can be called as a good work and the person who took the action can be called as a morally good person. Immanuel Kant divided these works into two categories- Hypothetical Imperative and Categorical Imperative. To properly understand the difference between A Categorical Imperative and A Hypothetical Imperative, we will try to understand their definitions or meanings and relate with given examples.

* **Hypothetical Imperative:** It is a command or moral obligations that one can choose to obey or not. It is always conditional based. If I want ‘A’ then I must do ‘B’ but If I do not want ‘A’ then I can choose not to do ‘B’. For example- If I want to obtain good marks in this final examination, then I must write the answer to this question in such a way that it represents my proper understanding of the topics of this course. It appears as a means to an end.
* **Categorical Imperative:** Categorical Imperative is something that should have an unconditional requirement. There are no if-else conditionals in this. One does not get to choose to obey or disobey; it is a must to obey a categorical imperative. It should be done no matter what, it does not depend on the weather or mood of a person. There are two forms of this which are ‘Do the A thing’ and ‘Do not do the B thing’. For example- Always speak the truth, never tell a lie.

In short, hypothetical imperatives are not universal as one has the option to choose not no whereas categorical imperatives are unconditional. They key difference between these are that hypothetical imperatives are done to get something in return, it is done to achieve something. But the thing is totally the opposite for categorical imperatives. The consequence of a categorical imperative work does not matter as long as it is done with good intentions. So, it can be said that only categorical imperatives can be called as a morally good thing as Kant judges the intention behind the work.

Secondly, Kant says or believes that the Categorical Imperatives are goods without qualifications. Firstly, as I have mentioned earlier that it is called categorical imperative because it is a must to follow and added that there can be no exceptions. There are no qualifications on situation or what I want to do does not matter rather it should be done in every case and for everyone. According to Kant, categorical imperative tells us what I ought to be doing no matter what and therefore Kant associates it with good without qualifications. It does not depend on why one thinks or craves for. And there is only one categorical imperative that is good without qualifications is Good Will. In short It can be said that,

* **Good with Qualifications:** It is good for some people. It is good in some situations. It is good for some people under certain defined or countable circumstances.
* **Good Without Qualifications:** It is good for everyone, in every situation. No matter what the situation is or whoever the person is, it is always good for that person in that and every other possible situation.

Now, there are other goods that are intrinsically or extrinsically but why Kant does not regard all those as good without qualifications is an important thing. This thing can be easily understood by seeing and analyzing some examples based on moral and intellectual virtues. Intelligence, Bravery, Knowledge, Courage and so on. Let us take an example of a very intelligent chemist or chemistry teacher like Walter White on Breaking Bad series. There is no doubt that he is very intelligent, knows a lot about chemistry and chemical compounds. Now, intelligence is good, we think of him as a very important person for our country until we actually get to know what he is doing with his intelligence. This intelligent person is making Meth which is a very bad drug. Now adding that he is very brave and knocked out every other drug lords of the nation to spread his drug business. Also adding that he is very cunning and because of that the police cannot track him down. There are other examples like murdering people for happiness. Now, all these things, virtues, happiness is good, but the examples sound terrific because of the way these things are being used. One man helping a poor for getting fame and another man helping just to help can be another example. So, all these things depend on how they are being used and that depends on the will of the person who is doing. That is why Kant only regards good will as a good without qualification. The will behind the work is being judged as morally good or bad by Kant. That is what and why Kant regards Categorical Imperatives as Good Without Qualifications.

Thirdly, First formulation of the categorical imperative by Kant is ‘The Formula of Universal Law’. According to Kant, first we have to get or set a maxim on which we will act on. Then the act will be universalized, that everyone is able to do this. And I can not do something that I want or can do but I will not let anyone else do that. I can not make any exception for myself. I can not expect to be the prime minister of every country in the world and other people will be my servants or I can not universalize lie. Suppose I am universalizing lie, now I am lying, everyone else is lying. I am asking my doctor if my health condition is okay and he is replying that I am perfectly fine which is a lie and later that day I die of a stroke. Now, I can make an exception in this for myself only, If I say I am poor I might be able to get free medicine from any healthcare organization, but I do not want them to tell me a lie that they can not help me even though they have medicines. It conflicts with other laws. I do not want to live in such a world like this. As because I cannot make an exception only for myself for it to work and to universalize it, It cannot be universalized and according to Kant this cannot be morally correct thus it cannot be a categorical imperative. In short diagram,
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Fourthly, the ways of coming to a contradiction by following the first formulation give rise to two kinds of duties. According to Kant, they are- 1. Perfect Duties and 2. Imperfect Duties. The distinction between them can be easily understood by the definition and examples below-

* **Perfect Duties :** Perfect duty is something that we or everyone should do always no matter what. For example- Speaking the truth. The possibility of universalization works here. If murdering a person anytime is a perfect duty, then everybody can do it anytime and the end will be here in no time.
* **Imperfect Duties:** These duties or actions are not mandatory to do. It is something that I may chose when and how to do. For example- I can write things well when I am in a comfortable mood, but I only write answers when the deadline is near, and the pressure is immense. I am choosing this, and I am choosing this do to for the rest of my life. It is a decision I can live with or without it.

So, the difference is clear here.

Finally, we will see a complete moral test using the ‘The Formula of Universal Law’ of the first formulation of the categorical imperative to see why cheating in an examination would be a violation of a perfect duty.

Now, we will use our text box that we have seen earlier and follow it accordingly. Suppose I am cheating in an exam because I was unable to prepare myself for the test or I just forgot today was an examination. At this situation I can think of my friend who is well prepared for the exam and I can copy from him or I can go to the corridor and find the answers in book. Now, our maxim is cheating in exam which is basically breaking the rules. The second step is to universalize it without any exception for myself only. In this step, everyone can break the rules. And we take the example of medical exams where the students who pass will become doctors. In the third step, we can think of so many contradictions. There will be so many quacks thus the healthcare system will fall, and if everyone keeps breaking the law then the world will be full of chaos and destructions. Without any doubt it is immoral according to the law. Thus, it is clear that cheating in an examination would clearly constitute a violation of a perfect duty according to the moral test we have just completed by following Kant’s first formulation of the categorical imperative.
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**Answer to the question no: 04 (Section – II)**

Jeremy Bentham was a British philosopher who was born in 1748. He is the founder of the Utilitarianism theory . He introduced his idea of utilitarianism in his book “An Introduction to the principles of Moral and Legislation”, the book is considered as the base of modern utilitarianism. According to his theory, an action is judged by the consequences or outcome it brings. An action is good when the outcome of the action is good and oppositely an action or work is considered as bad or wrong when the outcome of the action is bad. So, it is not the action or the will behind the action which will be judged rather it is the outcome of the action which matters.

Firstly, Hedonism came from the Greek word ‘hedone’ which means pleasure. It has two major normative, Utilitarianism and Egoism. Egoism says about one’s self interest or personal benefits whereas in utilitarianism an action is considered as good when the outcome of the action brings happiness to the maximum number of people. The name of the theory holds the meaning why it is called utilitarianism. It says the utility of our action, if it is good then the action is morally good. Here utility is defined as a form of pleasure. According to utilitarianism the number of happiness counts, the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people is the best happiness. In order to count or differentiate the amount of happiness, Jeremy Bentham introduced a measurement of happiness which is known as ‘Hedonic Calculus’. Hedons are the quantitative unit of measuring pleasure or pain. So, hedonic calculus is an algorithm or process to calculate the amount or degree of pleasure that a particular action has. The calculus has 7 components, these are- 1. Intensity, 2. Duration, 3. Certainty, 4. Propinquity, 5. Fecundity, 6. Purity and 7. Extent. Now we will see what these actually mean.

1. **Intensity :** The first one is intensity. It counts the intensity of the pleasure. The more intense it is the more units of pleasure the work has. In the same way, the less intense the pleasure is, the less units of pleasure it has.
2. **Duration:** This is the simplest one among all. It answers to the question of ‘How long the pleasure lasts?’. The greater the number, the more units of pleasure the happiness has. A work which has 5 minutes duration of pleasure in it is has more pleasure in it than a work which has only 2 minutes of pleasure, it is as simple as that.
3. **Certainty:** It counts the certainty of the pleasure. The higher the number of probabilities is, the more pleasure it has in it. In numbers, 60% certainty is not as good as 90% certainty.
4. **Propinquity:** According to when the pleasure will occur, it counts the units of pleasure the act has. The sooner the pleasure occurs the more amount of pleasure it has than the pleasure which will occur one month after the first one.
5. **Fecundity:** It counts if one pleasure leads to another pleasure. Such as, getting good marks helps obtaining good CGPA, good CPGA leads to scholarship. So, one pleasure leads to another pleasure. The more pleasure it leads to, the more units that pleasure has.
6. **Purity:** Whether the pleasure is totally pure, or it has some pain or other secrets mixed in it is measured in the purity section. Suppose, eating 50 chilies gives me pleasure as I like spicy foods. But this happiness brings in some severe pain with it.
7. **Extent:** It counts the number of people who are getting this pleasure. The greater the number, the more pleasure or good it is.

So, According to Jeremy Bentham, the answer of all these question can give us the quantitative measurement to calculate the utility as a way of evaluating the ethical consequences of the actions we take.

John Stuart Mill was a student of Jeremey Bentham. He is considered as one of the most influential English-speaking philosophers of the 19th century. He strived to save Utilitarianism from the charge of being a ‘Pig Philosophy’ which we will briefly discuss now. This explanation will let us understand the differences of understanding of Jeremy Bentham and Stuart Mill. Stuart Mill redefined or expanded the theory of utilitarianism. According to Jeremy Bentham, the hedons or total greater number of pleasures mattered. But Mill says different, according to him, human beings are different as we have rational faculties. Not all pleasure gives the same amount of happiness of feelings is what he said. Jeremy Bentham did not divide pleasure in any categories whereas Stuart Mill divided pleasure in the following categories-

* **Higher-order Pleasure:** These are intellectual, aesthetic, philosophical activities.
* **Elementary Pleasure:** These are physical or sensual pleasure. For example- Eating my favorite food, sleeping more than 10 hours a day etc.

According to Mill, it is better to be a dissatisfied human being rather than being a totally satisfied pig. A healthy, rational human being will never give up the intellect, thinking and rational capabilities to become a pig who eats, sleeps in mud, and has the chances of getting slaughtered. Even though as a pig one could have all the sensual pleasures but still it is not as pleasurable as it can be as a human being. This is what Mill said or added that was previously unavailable in Bentham’s utilitarianism thoughts. According to Bentham the more the better but Mills said no, quantity cannot always become the major part here. This is the main difference between their understandings, and this is how Mill attempted to rescue the theory from the charge of a ‘Pig Philosophy’

Finally, In order to understand and give a detailed explanation of how ‘Act utilitarian’ solution will be different than ‘Rule utilitarian’ solution, we have to understand both terms clearly and I will try to differentiate both with a single example.

* **Act Utilitarianism:** This idea comes from Jeremy Bentham. It mainly counts the quantity of pleasure, how many people are feeling pleasure or getting benefited. As long as any act or work gives pleasure to the maximum number of people and brings happiness, it is considered as good or right. If it fails to do so, then the action is wrong or bad. Let us see an example- Rapid Action Battalion kills accused rapists on spot. This gives relief and happiness to most of the people of our country. We all think a criminal died. This is not just an example, but this happened when someone named ‘Hercules’ murdered two accused rapists. Almost everyone was happy seeing this act. As it gave majority of people happiness thus it is a good work according to Act Utilitarianism.
* **Rule Utilitarianism:** This idea comes from the thoughts of Stuart Mill. This should not have the wrong implications of Act Utilitarianism. According to this, An action is right when It produces more pleasure, but it has to follow some certain rules. The example will help to understand it better. Now, even though the act of Rapid Action Battalion or that imposter ‘Hercules’ gave pleasure to the majority of people, but it cannot be considered as a right act because it violates law. Killing accused people who were not proved guilty can no be a good thing, what if they kill innocent people. This action can not be called as justice, it is undoubtedly murder, coldblooded murder.

Now, the situation here is that one person who has no relatives or family came to the hospital to donate a pint of blood. As the man is healthy, his heart, kidney and liver can be transplanted to the three sick men dying in the same hospital. The ratio here looks like 3 vs 1 but it is not. The sick people have family members. So, the actual ration is 3+ vs 1. If we run a calculation according to the hedonic calculus. The total joy is much more than the total wrong or sadness. Now if we follow the Act Utilitarianism of Bentham then we can not let the majority die and feel sad. So, the doctor is right here as it looks like the act is giving pleasure and benefiting the maximum number of people. If so, then we can gather all the criminals in the world, murder them and collect their organs to cure other people. This satisfies the Act Utilitarianism thus this would be the solution. But the solution would be totally different if we follow Rule Utilitarianism. Even if the sick persons live, there is no guarantee of them feeling happy after hearing what has been done to save their lives. Most importantly, murdering an innocent men is a crime, it violates the law and in most nations the penalty is death. So, it is clear that Rule Utilitarianism will not accept this. Even though Rule utilitarianism is not benefiting the maximum, yet this would be the appropriate act. Murdering the people violated Rule Utilitarianism so the solution here would be not to kill the healthy men, and which is the total opposite of Act Utilitarianism. This is a perfect example of how Rule Utilitarianism differs from Act Utilitarianism and also refines or refreshes Jeremy Bentham’s Utilitarianism theory. To conclude, after seeing the examples and analyzing the whole idea, the explanation is given to differentiate how A Rule Utilitarian Solution would be different from An Act Utilitarian solution.
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**Answer to the question no: 5 (Section- III)**

In the case, A photographer took some photos of a five-year old dead body of a drowned boy and his family member’s grieving. The photographer took the photos without permission for his own interest and to raise public awareness as it would serve as a warning to the readers. The dilemma here is if the decision of the photographer was right or the process invades the family’s right to privacy. We will get different answers from different perspectives. At first, the question will be answered from Utilitarian, Kantian, and Egoist perspective and then the explanation of why I agree with Kantian perspective.

Firstly, According to Utilitarianism perspective or thought, any act is permissible or good if the result of the act benefits the highest number of people. It does not care about privacy or any other moral scales to define whether any act is good or bad. As long as the outcome or an act is bringing pleasure or helping the maximum number of people, the act is considered as good. The reason or will behind the work do not have any influence here. As it is mentioned that the photographer intended to publish the photographs in newspaper to raise public awareness, It will warn a large number of people of our riverine country which is definitely a good thing according to utilitarianism. So, the action was right according to the utilitarian perspective.

Secondly, According to Kantian perspective this action can be divided or more specifically judged by relating it to Perfect and Imperfect duty. In shorty, Perfect duty is something that one should follow in every case and there is no exception to that. On the contrary, Imperfect duty is something that one can choose to do or not to do, It is not a must like perfect duty. Undoubtedly, invading someone’s privacy does not fall under perfect duty. Raising public awareness on the other hand is a thing one should do but it is not mandatory neither a must. So, according to the Kantian perspective, the photographer did not do the right thing. The act of the photographer was wrong.

Thirdly, Egoism talks about one’s self-interest or own benefit. The photographer took the photo to raise public awareness, but he also did this because his intention was to gain personal benefit as a photo like this might win a prize for him and the paper. And this might lead to his promotion in the newspaper company. If we analyze this from the egoist perspective, this action has been taken for his betterment. Egoism totally support this kind of behavior. So, the action of taking the photos without consent and using those for own benefit is supported by egoist perspective.

In my opinion, I agree with Kantian perspective. I think the best thing to do here would be following Kantian Ethics. There are few reasons behind my answer. Firstly, I also think invading or not respecting someone else’s privacy is a very bad thing to do. Secondly, the intention in this situation would be to raise public awareness which can be achieved in other ways. It was not necessary to take photos of the dead body neither it was an ethical decision to take photos of his family members in such an unfortunate situation, without their consent. He could take photographs of the lake, especially some dangerous areas in the lake to add as a picture for attention. Lastly, I think it is not a wise decision to expect reward from a situation which is very unfortunate for someone. So, keeping all these things in mind I stand by Kantian Perspective. To conclude, my thinking and reasons go with Kantian perspective that is why I agree with Kantian Perspective and think this would be the best decision among all other perspectives.