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**SECTION I: Response to the Question no. 1**

Categorical imperative is an ethical theory developed by Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804). It falls under the Deontological Ethics or duty-based ethics. According to Guyer (1998, pp. 189 - 191), categorical imperative leads to a maxim, which can be universalized and thus makes the maxim moral. Here, a maxim is understood as a policy or a set of thought or actions (p. 190). Categorical imperative finds whether that maxim is moral or not by checking that maxim through a three-step process.

Kantian ethics focuses much on categorical imperative. However, categorical imperative is not the only thing that Kant talked about. We need to know what is imperative at the first place. According to Wheeler (2008, p. 1), Kant says that imperative is a set of actions that should be performed universally in accordance to some law. How can one decide whether everyone ought to act upon a certain maxim – is the primary proposal of imperative (Velasquez, 2010, pp. 457 - 458). Additionally, this imperative can be divided into two parts – hypothetical and categorical (Hill, 1973, p. 429).

In terms of hypothetical imperative, it includes ‘if’ clauses with every maxim, which makes the morality of any maxim subjective with situation (Hill, 1973, pp. 429 - 433). This is completely different from categorical imperative. Singer (1954, p. 578) says that, though the difference between categorical and hypothetical imperative is very clear in Kantian ethics, the difference is widely misunderstood. To be specific, categorical imperative do not have any ‘if’ clause, where categorical refers to some commands that are unconditional and ‘good without qualification’ (pp. 578 - 581). Hypothetical imperative is result-based ethics, whereas categorical imperative is duty-based ethics. One should do the categorical imperative maxims no matter what. For example, let a maxim be – if you help the poor, you will be nominated for the election. In this case, helping becomes conditional, because, if someone is seemed to help the poor, that person will have the intension to get nominated for the election. In addition, the other group of people, who do not have the intension to get nominated for the election, would not help the poor. Since it includes an ‘if’ clause, has result based action which will not be universal, this maxim falls under hypothetical imperative. However, if the maxim was – you should help the poor, then the people would not have any choice but helping the poor. This time the action will be duty-based, unconditional and universal. This kind of maxim is categorical imperative which is always moral.

The categorical imperative is considered to be ‘good without qualification’, in Kant's opinion. According to Yang (2006, p. 121), Kant thinks that a good will is the sole good without qualification. He further adds that categorical imperative is itself a good will because it thinks about a universal good. As a good will is a good without qualification and a good will is itself a categorical imperative, categorical imperative turns out to be a good without qualification. Taking the above example, if the maxim is hypothetical, then in a particular situation, one will need to qualify if the action that s/he has taken is good or not. In this case, if the person helps the poor because s/he wants to get nominated in the election, then it will be a good will. Because s/he is helping the poor. On the other hand, if the person does not help the poor, then it will not be considered as a good will. So, we are qualifying the good here in different situation, thus hypothetical imperative becomes a qualified good. However, if the maxim is categorical imperative, then the action will not be based on the situation, it will be unconditional. Here, the person who helps the poor will have only the intension to help the poor and nothing else, which is a good will. Because of this, it becomes a good which does not need any qualification, thus categorical imperative is a good without qualification. It is such a good which is absolute in itself.

According to an article of Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, the first formulation of Kant’s categorical imperative states one needs to act in agreement with the maxim only in which one is able to act and that becomes a ‘universal law’ for all at the same time (Anonymous, 2004). In short, one needs to formulate a maxim at the first place and take action according to the maxim if the maxim can be universalized for all. The article further adds that, the test for checking if a maxim falls under categorical imperative has a three-step process, which is called the moral test. Firstly, one need to come up with the maxim or formulate the maxim. Secondly, the maxim should be universalized in a way that all should act on that certain maxim universally. Thirdly, one should check for any contradiction in that imagined situation. This third step includes two sub-steps; that is checking for any contradiction or checking if the maxim is even conceivable in the world universally at the first place, if no contradiction is found then checking if one would like to live in such world. Upon passing all the steps, it can be said that the maxim is moral. So, the idea of universalizing a maxim is the central concept of Kant’s categorical imperative (Velasquez, 2010, p. 459).

By applying the moral test on a maxim, one can find out if any action is a perfect duty or an imperfect duty on any particular situation. The third step helps us to decide if any maxim is a perfect duty or imperfect duty (Anonymous, 2004). It says that, if the maxim fails the first portion of the third test of finding contradiction, then we have a perfect duty of always or never doing that action. A perfect duty is that action which we need to do regardless of the situation, e.g., respecting your elders. However, if the test fails the second portion of the third test of finding contradiction, then we have an imperfect duty of doing the action and can choose when and how to do that action. An imperfect duty shows some flexibility, e.g., telling the truth in extreme situation when the truth can take somebody’s life. So, there is a part of categorical imperative which offers us flexibility of choosing and deciding if a maxim is morally right or wrong.

From the discussion above we came to know that, perfect duty is that action which we must do all the times. In this perspective, cheating on a test would be viewed as a breach of a perfect duty. For proving this, we must go through the moral test of the first version of Kant’s categorical imperative. Let us go step by step:

1. Formulating the maxim: Cheating in an examination.
2. Universalizing the Maxim: Imagining everyone to cheat in exams as a universal law that people must obey.
3. Checking if there is any contradiction: There is two segments of this test. They are:
4. Checking for contradiction and if it is conceivable universally: Yes, there is a contradiction. If cheating in exams is universalized, then there will remain no use of taking exams.
5. Checking if one would like to live in such world: No one would like to live in such world where everybody cheats in exams. Because, cheating makes the process of examination useless and the evaluation of one’s credibility doubtful. Nobody would then trust on the result of any examination.

Since we have found out a contradiction in the first portion of the third test, the action cannot be a perfect duty and would constitute a violation of a perfect duty.

To sum up, categorical imperative is a suggested theory by Immanuel Kant over is another theory of hypothetical imperative. Categorical imperative is a duty-based ethics, which depends on universalizing a maxim. If a maxim can be universalized, it becomes good itself and can be said good without qualification. In addition, Kant prescribed a moral test by which we can discover the morality of any action and find the distinction between a perfect and an imperfect duty. In Kantian ethics, we should always take the moral test to check if our taken action is moral or not and adjust our maxim thereby.

**References**

Anonymous. (2004, Feb 23). *Kant’s Moral Philosophy*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved August 21, 2022, from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/#:~:text=Kant's%20first%20formulation%20of%20the,(G%204%3A421)>.

Guyer, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Hill, T. E. (1973). The Hypothetical Imperative. *The Philosophical Review*, 82(4), pp. 429–450. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2183709>

Singer, M. G. (1954). The Categorical Imperative. *The Philosophical Review*, 63(4), pp. 577–591. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2182292>

Velasquez, M. (2010). *Philosophy: a text with readings* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Wheeler, R. C. (2008). *Kantian form and phenomenological force: Kant's Imperatives and the directives of contemporary phenomenology*. Washington, D.C.: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Yang, X. (2006). Categorical imperatives, moral requirements, and moral motivation. *Metaphilosophy*, 37(1), pp. 112–129. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24439648>

**SECTION II: Response to the Question no. 4**

Utilitarianism is known to be one of the normative ethical theories. It falls under the ethical philosophical theory names hedonism. According to an article of Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy about hedonism, the highest good is pleasure – which is the main idea of hedonism (Anonymous, 2013). As utilitarianism is a hedonic idea of philosophy, it should also include pleasure as the highest good possible and the aim of human life. Utilitarianism is the concept of highest good possible as pleasure; however, the specialty is the pleasure should be for the greatest number of people possible (Velasquez, 2010, p. 441). It is said to be founded by an English philosopher named Jeremy Bentham (1748 - 1832). There were a few amendments of this theory in the later time by his godson and a student named John Stuart Mill (1806 - 1873).

Bentham has developed his principle of utility as the foundation of the present work (Bentham, 2000, p. 14). He added that actions should be guided by pain and pleasure, which are the two sovereign masters of nature (p. 14). He has also mentioned in his book that let it be any sort of action like education, combat or defense, one should prioritize the highest good achievable, to discard unhappiness and acquiring happiness (pp. 14 - 18). Pojman and Fieser (2016, p. 96) states that, Bentham’s principle of utility says that the sole thing which is good intrinsically is some sort of state like pleasure, welfare, happiness, etc. and also says that pain is the only thing that is evil. Furthermore, the good should be for the greatest amount of people possible.

Bentham has also developed the hedonic calculus as a component to calculate utility in order to measuring, quantifying and evaluating our actions and its ethical consequences. It has a seven-step quantifier (Bentham, 2000, pp. 31 - 34), which includes the work’s:

1. Intensity: How strong the feel of pleasure could be.
2. Duration: For how long the pleasure stays.
3. Certainty or Uncertainty: How likely the pleasure may occur.
4. Propinquity or remoteness: When the pleasure could arrive.
5. Fecundity: Whether it will cause any further pleasure.
6. Purity: How likely it could repel pain.
7. Extent: What number of people would be influenced.

Through this process of evaluating our action in an ethical way, we can find out the intrinsic utility of our action and act thereby.

Mill, a student and godson of Bentham, advocated developing the utilitarianism theory further. He also believed in the principle of utilitarianism, which is pleasure as the greatest good for the highest number of people. However, he came up with some additional ideas and amended the theory. Because of the amendment, the idea of utilitarianism is still a strong ethical philosophy till date. Because of the amendment that Mill has made, the classical idea of utilitarianism divided into two types (Pojman & Fieser, 2016, p. 98). In this place there constituted some difference in understanding utilitarianism between Bentham and Mill. The two types are described as:

1. Act Utilitarianism: This is the version of utilitarianism that Bentham talked about. According to this type of the ethical theory, an act will only be moral if and only if it produces the highest good possible to highest number of people among all the available alternatives (Pojman & Fieser, 2016, p. 98). So, in this kind of utilitarianism, the only thing that matters is the greatest good to the maximum amount of people. The intrinsic morality of the action itself is not considered here. This type of utilitarianism is seemed to be focused on short term pleasure than long term achievement.
2. Rule Utilitarianism: This version of utilitarianism is developed by Mill upon further amendments on the act utilitarianism. So, it is an extended version of the previous sort of utilitarianism. Mill (2001, pp. 9 - 27) says that, as the concept is utilitarianism which focuses on the maximum good for the highest number of people, however the morality of that taken action should also be checked before applying that and the action should qualify under certain moral test that will be fruitful in the long run. Hence, rule utilitarianism says that an act is morally just if and only if the action is examined by certain rules and thus have acceptance to produce highest utility in the long run to the greatest number of people (Pojman & Fieser, 2016, pp. 98 - 100). So, rule utilitarianism supposedly excludes the flaws of act utilitarianism and follows the moral rules that will generate more pleasure and less pain in the long run (Velasquez, 2010, p. 443).

From the discussion, it is clear that the main area of difference in the understanding of utilitarianism between Mill and Bentham is, Bentham thinks about high morality in short term whereas Mill thinks that of long term.

There is an obvious reason behind the amendment of utilitarianism by Mill. Bentham’s type of utilitarianism is act utilitarianism, where short term highest utility is given preference. However, there is a problem with this ethical philosophy. Let us assume a situation, where 10 kids are bullying 1 kid. In this case, 10 kids are having fun and 1 kid is getting pain. So, the amount of pleasure among most of the people is maximized here, hence it is moral in the sense of act utilitarianism. However, bullying someone is never an ethical thing to do. Thus, following act utilitarianism, unethical things might also take place as it has the ability to produce greatest pleasure. This is exactly the problem of act utilitarianism. For that, utilitarianism started to lose its appeal in the age of Bentham, it was even called ‘pig philosophy’. Mill argued in this situation that – whether it is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied or Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied (Mill, 2001, p. 13). In case of act utilitarianism, a pig or a fool enjoying their life would generate higher morality than slightly dissatisfied Socrates or human being (Pojman & Fieser, 2016, p. 97). But we all know that a satisfied pig or fool does not even make any difference to the world in the long run, whereas a human being or Socrates can change the world. However, act utilitarianism is not giving them any heed, which is why utilitarianism started to be called as ‘pig philosophy’. To redeem utilitarianism from this situation, Mill promoted his type of utilitarianism, where that human being or Socrates would be given preference, as that will produce long term utility and will be a moral act to do. That is how Mill rescued the theory of utilitarianism from being called a ‘pig philosophy’.

In the provided scenario, the doctor used organs of a healthy but not useful person to cure three useful human being who was sick. Now the solution to the moral dilemma will vary from act utilitarianism to rule utilitarianism. The solution will be morally correct from the perspective of an act utilitarian, because three men are getting well in sacrifice of only one. As the pleasure is three times more, it will generate more utility and thus permissible by ac utilitarianism. In contradiction, rule utilitarianism will never support this act. Because, let there be three sick man getting healthy life, one healthy man is being sacrificed. Besides, taking one’s organ without permission is not morally right. So, the action is not morally just according to rule utilitarianism and hence that action is never recommended by rule utilitarianism. Rule utilitarianism does it because, if that action is allowed then the healthy people will always be in a fear of losing their life for the sake of unhealthy people. Also allowing such action will set example in the society and a group of people might take unethical advantage of such example. That is how rule utilitarianism will have different opinion with act utilitarianism while providing solution for the given moral dilemma.

To sum up, Bentham’s principle of utility is constituted of act utilitarianism, which says an act is moral if it produces the highest good for the highest number of people. Bentham even made a seven-step measuring quantifier to evaluate the intrinsic utility of an action. However, due to some shortcoming of this theory, utilitarianism started to lose popularity and used to be called ‘pig philosophy’. However, Bentham’s student and godson Mill rescued this ethical theory by amending it and introducing his new kind of utilitarian theory called rule utilitarianism. Rule utilitarianism is a better utilitarian theory to come up with solutions to moral dilemmas.
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