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***Philosophy: Immanuel Kant ideology***

**Immanuel Kant** is widely regarded as the central figure in modern philosophy. His work focused on strengthening the better and more reasonable aspects of our nature to overcome our innate weaknesses and selfishness. Kant saw himself as developing a secular and rational version of what religions had, **very imperfectly always attempted to do - help us to be good.**

To do so, he came up with some philosophical ideas. One of them, **CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE**, revolved around the concept of **" do unto others as you would have them do unto you."** Primarily used to test the morality of an action by imagining how you would feel if it were generally practiced on you. Another interpretation of this concept is **"to act to treat people always as ends in themselves, never as mere means."** In simple terms, using others for one's convenience, only to cast them at the end of their service. For example, some of the controversial issues in society include human experimentation and criminal punishment.

What if both parties benefit from the interaction, is it morally permissible then? For instance, waiters rely on tips from customers, while customers rely on waiters to provide them with food. Similarly, professors use students to test their ideas, while students rely on professors to gain knowledge and expertise. However, some argue that treating someone as a mere means is morally wrong, as it is inhumane. Me personally don’t see an issue with this, but when one feels benevolent and seeks praise for an act that was pure selfishness, then it becomes unnatural, and can even be seen as a psychological disorder, as it involves **objectifying and commodifying individuals**, a behavior that is highly associated with **psychopathy**. In response to this dilemma, Kant refined his theory to state that **using someone as a mere means is morally impermissible and wrong.** **But what exactly is wrong?**

That may hold some truth for crusades, jihad, and witch hunts, which are all atrocities committed in the name of good. **But are they morally good deeds?** Moral values are the standards of good and evil. **Moral foundation theory**, initially proposed by Haidt and Joseph in 2004, suggests that an action can be deemed wrong due to various reasons, such as being harmful, unfair, or unjust, displaying disloyalty to a group, showing disrespect to authority, or being impure or gross. Although this description may seem sufficient, it doesn't even scrap the concept but rather diverges the topic to**: Who are you to/ Who should decide whether something is universally right or wrong?** A heavy question indeed.

Even if we say that we, as humans, innately know what is right, **embodying righteousness and doing what is right at the expense of oneself and others is hypocrisy.** It might as well pass as the **pinnacle of madness**. Imagine the apostles going through persecution and enduring torture **for a lie**. That would be irrational, right**? Their willingness to die for their claims has tremendous evidential value, falsifying any possible argument against their beliefs**. Living only the question: was what they believed true? In the case of religion, it would be to please God or gain eternal salvation. **Making the deed itself matters more than the outcome**. As it should for them, **since life on earth becomes a means to eternity**. But for others, **the outcome justifies the means**, defines morality. Every act of evil is justified as long as the outcome is righteous.

In Christianity, the supreme being is all-knowing and a fair judge who sees through the intentions of an actions. Defined morality as **doing the right thing, regardless of the cost, and believing that it will lead to a better outcome, even if it's not the desired one.** A difficult feat that not even the holiest of holy dream to achieve. Choosing to follow this path requires one to deprive oneself of desire, and this is highly exemplified in both the followers and the rubies of this teaching. One might ask**, what good does having such a moral value do?** The only possible scenario where society can function following it is if everyone abides by it, which is **utopian**.

 This can also be considered as a counterargument for one of the dilemmas proposed by him, "If a sinister-looking man carrying an axe knocked on your door and asked you where your best friend was would it be morally acceptable to tell a lie?" Surprisingly, Immanuel Kant thought it wouldn't**. He thought that telling the truth was an absolute duty, without exceptions.** Since telling a lie might also result in the same outcome, only making you responsible. One may ask, if honesty was what is required, shouldn't your response be," I am under no obligation to reveal the whereabouts of my friend to an unknown individual wielding an axe?" This may result in an even worse outcome, both your and your friend's death. There for, in this scenario **honesty itself can be considered selfishness**, for it is not for the sake of honesty itself but to remove the burden from oneself. But then again that is if the person who put you in that position is **worth it**.

Among all the arguments presented, the only one that seems rational is to **mirror others and let them be the judge of their own actions**. However, this itself is immoral as it **involves performing an act that one has deemed wrong**. Considering this, although Immanuel Kant tried to replace the second commandment in Christianity, stated in Mathew 37:38 **"Love your neighbor as yourself."** It is nothing but **a poor imitation when compared to the original verse**. But this is no surprise as his work itself revolves around the teachings he deemed imperfect, that he himself was unable to grasp the message: Obtaining **eternal salvation**.
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