

Kant vs mill



23 March What is Kant's view? Kant's philosophy fundamentally revolves around the deontological ethics. He has presented a philosophy regarding the duty, or moral obligation of an individual. According to Kant, an act can be deemed as appropriate and right if the individual originally did the act considering it as his/her moral obligation. In view of Kant, it is just nothing else but duty that can entitle an act as right (Schwartz). Kant thinks that duty essentially makes the actions morally sound and justified as compared to their maxims. However, maxims can also be right provided that it is possible to universalize them. What is Mill's view? Unlike Kant, Mill's visualization of the concept of moral philosophy is fundamentally teleological. He believes in the consequences of actions. As long as they are good, every action is justified. Mill does not pay any regard to the will or intention behind committing an act. To Mill, it is the act's consequence that matters at the end of the day. Mill says that an act is right as long as it gives rise to pleasure or relieves pain. Which view do you think is stronger, and why? Mill's philosophy is not as likely to be beneficial as Kant's philosophy. Mill holds the belief that it is ok for one to do anything one likes as long as it makes the society happy and relieves its pains. This view of Mill conflicts with the teachings of most religions. No religion would ever allow its followers to tell lies. However, if Mill's philosophy is followed, one can lie in situations where lying makes the other person happy, or if not that, it at least it saves the other person from pain. But this is not right from a religious point of view. Religion lays the standards, norms and trends for its believers. Therefore, it is quite rational to evaluate Mill's philosophy on the scale of religious teachings. According to Kant, one can cheat on one's wife and tell her lie in order to keep her happy. But lie is, in all circumstances, a lie and

<https://assignbuster.com/kant-vs-mill/>

can not be justified on the basis of Mill's philosophy. Likewise, it would have been ok to swear upon wrong things had Mill's philosophy to prevail as long as swearing would maintain a happy environment. Mill is not able to prove the greatest principle of happiness. He makes a drastic shift from the descriptive claim to the prescriptive without sufficiently explaining the relation between them. In addition to that, I believe in rationalism instead of empiricism. I do grant that others' experiences make a great source of education for us, though I maintain that our personal experiences play the biggest role in developing our beliefs. I completely agree with the distinction Kant makes between the nominal and the phenomenal reality. There is no doubt in the fact that what offers pleasure is often morally correct, but this is never always the case. Taking this into consideration, I would favor Kant's philosophy in comparison to Mill's. By saying this, I do not mean that Kant's is the ultimate philosophy, though I consider Kant's philosophy as quite logical and consistent. Also, the social repercussions of Kant's philosophy are quite admirable. Works Cited: Schwartz, Marques. "Kant vs Mill." 18 Dec. 2000. Web. 24 Mar. 2011. .