Hume thinks that reason allows us to access descriptions of how the world is; however he argues that from such knowledge, we cannot infer how the world ought to be. This would imply that reason is silent on practical matters, and it only comes into play in a subservient role to desire. Explain how Kant rejects Hume's view of practical reason, and his (Kant's) thesis that moral considerations are in fact subject to reason

When bringing forth his famous *is-ought* problem, David Hume shook ethics and morality to their cores and left things at a very uneasy position where it was very hard to argue against the idea that all we ought to do is subservient to desire and nothing else. Immanuel Kant saw this issue, analyzed it, and whilst admitting that Hume had a very good point when bringing forth the *is-ought* problem, came up with a response that nullified Hume's say on the matter of practical reason. In this essay we will be seeing Kant's interpretation and accurate redefinition of the *is-ought* problem, and how Kant metaphorically bridges the gap between *is* and *ought* in order to give his response for the problem of morality.

Kant saw that when we look at how the world *is*, we are dealing with factual matters - things such as mathematics and the sciences, things that are indisputable such that you would be committing an intellectual, logical error in disagreeing with. This is the world of pure reason, a realm that makes part of the self where one can use his mind freely and think logically. Here there is no disagreement between Kant and Hume. Their idea of the world of pure reason, or of what *is* are one in the same.

Likewise, when Kant digested Hume's idea of when we decide what *ought* to be, he concluded that this does indeed relate to practical matters - issues such as "what should I do should I wish to study law in university?" where a reasonable answer would be along the lines of "you should study and achieve the appropriate qualifications in order to do so". Kant devised this kind of reasoning as part of the world of practical reason, a type of reasoning which as its name implies, deals with real world matters and how we should act when brought up against certain situations. However it is at this point Kant points out an area of reasoning Hume failed to notice when providing his dissertation on ethics.

Kant agreed that questions such as the previous example which require practical reason to work out, are in fact subservient to desire. With the previous example, the phrase "*should I wish*" clearly indicates that the issue is a matter of desire, however Kant's argument is that not all practical matters are subservient to desire, and some are overriding such that you are obliged to perform the actions they entail. These types of imperatives are best explained by example: Person 1 exclaims "I promised my cousin that I would visit him in hospital, but I will not go because I do not want to". Person 2 replies, saying "You ought to go whether you want to or not, because you promised them". Here it is easy to see that through the use of reasoning, we can see that Person 1 has to go because the fact that they promised to do so overrides any of their desires regarding the situation. It is here Kant introduces the bridge between pure reason and practical reason, by identifying the situations self where practical problems require pure reason to devise what ought to be done - a realm he devised as *pure practical reason*. At the same time, Kant devised two types of imperatives which beckon a person to do something: hypothetical imperatives and categorical imperatives. The former relies entirely on matters of practical reason, where desire is involved - Think of the "what should I do should I wish to study law in university?" example. On the other hand, categorical imperatives relate to the realm of pure practical reason because they have a quality in them which is overriding - a quality which makes a person's desire irrelevant, much like the "I promised my cousin…" case.

It is with this newfound knowledge about categorical imperatives and their reliance on the use of pure practical reason that we can see exactly why Kant was so sure that moral considerations with an objectively correct decision did exist and were something we could act upon. Kant's retort to Hume showed us that morality (and therefore reason) does have a play in practical situations where desire is not a consideration, and through the use of our free mind, we can decide what the right thing to do is. Furthermore, according to Kant, the act of willing the right thing to happen and attempting to act it out in the real world is what defines our moral worth.