# Concept Of Virtue And Moral Goodness: Theories Of Kant And Aristotle

## Introduction

“It is the destiny of every human person to decide.”[footnoteRef:1] Human beings are destined to decide on every aspect of living, irrespective of the nature of choices to fall in the category of being morally right or irrational. These choices are either genuinely spontaneous of inevitably determined, trivial, momentous, settled, or reasoned. The preferences cannot be ascertained as possible the best or morally upright excepting from the purview of holding good faith and intention to it. [1: Stuart C. Hackett, A Philosophical and Critical Ethic (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009), 1.]

Over the years, there has been a considerable increase in questioning about a moral character that has recently managed to occupy a central place within the notions of philosophical discussion. The basis of deciding and ethics can be traced through the thoughtful diction presented by Aristotle and Kant that helps in arguing the fact that Kantianism and utilitarianism help in understanding the western moral philosophy. It further places a foundation for focusing on the nature of virtue. The virtue and character of deciding and ethics involved further responses towards the emerging philosophies, and that is an indirect result of a more practical turn in political philosophy.

Hence, this response paper aims to explore specific aspects associated with ethics and the development of virtues that have been propagated by Aristotle and Kant. The response paper will also discuss the notions of the individual, who tends to acquire a sense of justice and how they eventually develop psychological foundations towards virtue and contributions made by the community and meaningful work towards a good moral worldview.

## Discussion

In his theory of moral virtue, Aristotle seeks to achieve a real happiness-based society that will thrive in terms of more conducive to understanding happiness (Eudemonia).[footnoteRef:2] The thriving society will be a better society for civilization's sustainable development. Aristotle suggests that by understanding how to perfect the attitudes of the responses in similar situations, a thriving society can be accomplished. If an individual continues to repeat the ideal reactions to a particular scenario, they will get the habit of going through the virtuous behavior within the scenario, making society a more virtuous and more prosperous society. [2: (Han 2015)]

Kant believes that a person's actions should be based on practical reasoning instead of instincts or wishes.[footnoteRef:3] (Herman 2016). A behavior is right in the sense of Kantian if the individual completes the duty virtuously. In the Kantian context, the fulfillment of one's obligation requires that the actions take place in line with the moral ethics called imperatives. Kant's categorical imperatives help to understand the condition of the individual in whom they are engaged and how the imperatives can contribute to the development of moral and ethical

society. Virtue ethics states that in any circumstance, 'right' action is an action that a virtuous individual would act under the given circumstances. In other words, the morality of an action is determined by the integrity of the personality of the person who does and wants to perform it. In conjunction with the actions of individuals, the categorical imperative helps to develop one's understanding of society and the social impacts of his or her actions. The Kantian philosophy aims, above all, at explaining in the practical sense, the need for perfect action to achieve an ideal society. [3: (Herman 2016)]

Kant's and Aristoteles ' theories, though proposed differently, are based on experience rather than abstract hypotheses of the situation. The connection of Aristotelian with Kantian moral goodness is the assumption that, on the principle of ethical actions of individuals based on the collection of ground laws, they strive to attain the virtuous society that is established by the categorical criteria of the Kantian logic and Aristotelian emotional balance. The philosophers ' two logics are based on a combination of basic moral rules, according to which the creation of a perfect society is dependent on the adherent to the ethical code of conduct of society in the response from individuals in a given scenario.[footnoteRef:4] [4: (Steven 2014)]

Critically analyzing from a diverse set of perspectives and argumentative statements, making choices is a pre-destined instinct the drives human beings to indulge in unavoidable decision-making processes, considering that a natural responsibility. Kant states that nothing in this world can be regarded as morally upright or ethically right, expecting the development of internal goodwill.[footnoteRef:5] [5: Heinemann, Robert A. Aristotle, and moral realism. Routledge, 2018.]

The principles of ethical acting tend to drive the human mind to participate in moral actions delivering manifestations of intelligence, judgment, mental capability, and perseverance. Goodwill of morally upright activities is determined not by the performance that it offers or the aptness of application but by volition that is grounded within the substance of ethics and morality.[footnoteRef:6] [6: Korsgaard, Christine M. Aristotle and Kant on the Source of Value. Ethics 96, no. 3 (1986): 486-505.]

Substantiating Kant’s vision of the moral good, Aristotle defines the cause and effect relation between moralities to be the occurrence of the excellent product conducted through activities of the rational soul. According to him, a man is born with qualities of virtue and vice bestowed upon divine power. This spiritual endowment inspires the inner soul to perform distinctive activities of human good, implying the presence of goodness.[footnoteRef:7] [7: Hutchinson, Douglas S. The virtues of Aristotle. Routledge, 2015.]

As per the notions of the given proposition, it is likely that the ethics propagated by Aristotle and Kant help in the foundation of a cluster of criticism that is prevalent against all previous moral philosophies. It is to be noted that the moral-philosophical foundation carried out by Kant helps in implying the fact that the moral philosopher tends to rest mainly on his perspective on the presence of ethical theory.[footnoteRef:8] The analytical aspects offered by Kant based on the Aristotelian notion of ethics are further considered to be historically inaccurate, and the criticism is often considered to be invalid. It is to be noted that, the blame is further focused in such a way that they tend to distract from other fundamental issues necessarily. The very core of the Kantian criticism is based on the contention that Aristotle’s theory is fatally flawed and that it fails to provide any significant foundation of duty, which helps in the distinction between prudence and morality, where it is severely blurred.[footnoteRef:9] [8: Homiak, Marcia. Moral

character. 2003.] [9: Barnes, Jonathan. The Nicomachean Ethics. Penguin, 2004.]

The primary advantageous aspect associated with objectivism is its help in the proper explanation of the beliefs that are associated with the subjectivist account. It cannot help in the accommodation for philosophical principles. It is imperative to note that the rationalist view propagated by Aristotle helps in understanding the reasons for the adaptation of an end. The central argument that Aristotle tends to provide based on his notion of ethics lies in the fact that the contemplation of life fundamentally rests on the claim that happiness needs to a final qualification of the political activity that helps in understanding that there is a significant distinction between fidelity and diction. The philosophical dictionary carried out by Aristotle helps in understanding that there is some loose end in the theoretical perspective of the philosopher. Further, Kant propagates the failure of the academic discussion produced by him. The definition of happiness propagated by Aristotle helps in understanding the fact that it is considered an activity of soul that eventually follows or rather implies a definite rationalist principle.[footnoteRef:10] [10: Klinke, Willibald. Kant for everyman. Routledge, 2016.]

When contemplating the real-world application of ethics as per Aristotle in the daily lives, the critical attribute is found to be derived from his views on ethical virtue as disposition. In daily lives, we come across the importance of pleasure to human life, and as per Aristotle, if an individual experiences pleasure in his state of sickness in his process of restoring to health, the pleasure felt by the person is caused because he or she is no longer ill. Thus, some part of him or her is in a natural state, and some of him or her is acting without impediment.

On the other hand, as per the notions presented by Aristotle in the foundation of ethics and decision, it is to be noted that, the theory tends to amount to prudential policy for the attainment of well-being. The major arguments are further conveniently organized based on the Kantian critique that the criticisms are explicitly applied to the ethical theory propagated by Aristotle.

Another perspective, which comes into being tends to state the fact that there has always been a possibility towards the natural debate, which helps in calming morality and desire to be the dialectic emergence of principles of righteousness. It is to be noted that both Aristotle and Kant tend to frequently contrast with each other to gain proper attention towards the moral theory that is to be presented. It is further essential to be able to distinguish between the ends and motives for there have been significant distinctions between the facets that a man aims and the reasons behind doing so.[footnoteRef:11] The primary area of difference that cost between the philosophical dictionary provided by Aristotle and Kant lies in the car that the analytical perspectives are considered to be morally right and has motivational concerns towards the necessity of describing morality as an objective principle and not as an imperative. It necessarily appears in the form of an essential and helps in securing pleasure and happiness.[footnoteRef:12] [11: Sullivan, Roger J. “The Kantian critique of Aristotle’s moral philosophy: An appraisal.” The Review of Metaphysics 28, no. 1 (1974): 24-53.] [12: Willaschek, Marcus. “Why the Doctrine of Right does not belong in the Metaphysics of Morals: On some Basic Distinctions in Kant’s Moral Philosophy.” In Immanuel Kant, pp. 49-71. Routledge, 2017.]

## Conclusion

After an extensive assessment, it is essential to consider certain definite aspects that both philosophers tend to provide. It is to be noted that the approaches promulgated by Kant and

Aristotle help in the foundation of a plan that tends to challenge the usual charges of formalism and rigorous that helps in rescuing the dimensions of the human prospects. The philosophical dictionary carried out by Kant and Aristotle further shows the virtue san nature of ethics and how they further merge into the emphasis on the interpretation of Kant’s ethics and character.

Hence, it can be concluded by stating the fact that the presence of ethics and decking onto human virtues help in the establishment of a definite foundation that is based on the passivity of the notions. To summarize the above discussion, the concept of virtue and moral goodness is associated with the existence of morality in humans. Aristotle considers a moral and ethical person who is ordinary and possesses a combination of passions and deliberations within the habitual aspect. Kant, on the other hand, relates to morality to be a revisionist idea where human beings are capable of no more than continence and capture the attainment of deliberation over passions.

## Bibliography


1. Carr, David. 'Two Kinds of Virtue.' Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series, 85 (1984): 47-61. http://www.jstor.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/stable/4545020.
2. Korsgaard, Christine M. 'Aristotle and Kant on the Source of Value.' Ethics 96, no. 3 (1986): 486-505. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2381067.
3. Sullivan, Roger J. 'The Kantian Critique of Aristotle's Moral Philosophy: An Appraisal.' The Review of Metaphysics 28, no. 1 (1974): 24-53. http://www.jstor.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/stable/20126582.
4. Stuart C. Hackett, A Philosophical and Critical Ethic (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009), 1.