

# Kant on milgram's perils of obedience



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Stanley Milgram conducted a study through a laboratory set-up to evaluate the perils of obedience of different subjects and participants of the study. One of significant results of his study entails that ordinary people, his participants, actively performs his or her job without any hostility and regard in their participation on something wrong done. (Milgram, 1974). To some evaluated participants, the case describes their disobedience with the standards of morality given the provision of a governing or instructing authority.

Participants who were made to do wrong at some point, would derive satisfaction from the wrongness by knowing that they obeyed the authority commanding their actions. Milgram mentions that obedience can be defined as the ability of an individual to disassociate his responsibility on the wrong act because he only granted his authority's wishes (Milgram, 1974).

Moreover, a subordinate would feel shame or pride depending on how he has followed an authority's instructions. The reality this reflects in the society maintains that loyalty, duty and discipline are significantly strained with the emotional and obedience conflicts.

A subordinate's defined role is does not necessarily instill his morale, but rather socially construct his role based on the social provisions, including defiance of his role in the perspective of his authority. Obedience in some cases also reflects a defense for people to do wrong things, as explained in the article, many participants who became the teacher in the set-up, punished the learner because they were following the instructions of the experimenter, and assured of no responsibility with the learner. People

heeds to authority without discerning their own stance or the consequences of their actions.

Based on Kant's model of society, all disobedience from the supreme legislative power, or the authority and law, is considered as the greatest and most punishable crime of mankind because it inhibits the very foundations of society. Kant's position on obedience does not allow the challenge of authority, and rejects the right of revolution or rebellion. (Williams, 1983)

The evidence is shown through the study conducted by Milgram. Kant strictly attributed authority with the same governing laws and constitution of a society, thus disallowing any form of disobedience.

Realized through Milgram's article is the conflict which arises from following the authority with personal moral issues within an individual.

Kant's philosophy on this maintains the duty of all individual to hope for both moral and positive law to be achieved. (Williams, 1983) Kant defined obedience as a requirement of pure reason from individuals and makes them cohere with the law of an authority, while maintaining their freedom within and among their fellows. (Williams, 1983) The system of an authority demands strict adherence from the subjects of the state, because that makes individuals be the subject of authority.

However, Kant subjects a restriction to an individual to resist conflict of the morality of one's own, with his adherence to the authority. The arguments resolved by Milgram on his study entails how individuals refer to their morality with obedience to authority. Evidently, emotions and moral issues comes in conflict with being submissive to authority, but in the end, people

act even in contrast with their emotion because the pride and satisfaction of doing what can be considered as wrong, comes from following the directives of the authority.