

FINAL TERM-FALL SEMESTER 2020

**SUBJECT:
BUSINESS ETHICS**

**SUBMITTED BY :
SHEHLA KHATTAK**

**ID#
13981**

**SUBMITTED TO:
WAJAHAT GUL**

**DATE:
29/6/2020**

Q1. Should Aslam return back the unspent money to the government from the grant or not? Justify

Ans: Yes, Aslam should return the unspent money back to the government because it's not his money and it's ethically and morally wrong no matter what intentions Aslam has but still the money belongs to the government, he can get charged for committing this crime and spend time in prison even if he doesn't one shouldn't cheat in such a soft matter. I think returning the money back to the government is not the best decision but the right decision to make. God knows maybe he gets a bigger project for his honesty and integrity. Most NGOs would take the money and do something like Nadir suggested but maybe the government officials recognize this act of purity as a plus point and grant Aslam a bigger project for his righteous decision. Apart from all that it's the most lawful thing one should do in a situation like this and what makes a right man, that's what we learn in Business Ethics. If everyone acted the way I am suggesting Aslam to do the world would have been a much better place.

Q2. Do you see any ethical issues in Nadir's suggestions? Explain your opinion.

Ans: Yes, Nadir's suggestions are justified but not ethical in a way that contains bribery over the matter of street children education money that gets into the pocket of an official incharge. A lot of NGOs are doing the same practice but it's not ethically correct. Another thing that irritates me is that hiring a CA to manipulate the Accounts Book showing no amount left from the grant for the project is a fraud is also unethical, not the best practices of a right person to make his career keep going. In my perspective returning the money back to the government won't ruin the image of Aslam's NGO in a way that the decision I am suggesting him is rare and if I was an government official I would've preferred his NGO more over the NGOs that utilized the money given to them and would make him a trustworthy person and the statistic would be crystal clear. And the money was actually spent on the right cause!

Q3. Explain Justice theory and its types? What is distributive justice? Give example.

Ans: JUSTICE THEORY:

Justice is the primary righteousness of social organizations, as truth is of frameworks of thought. A hypothesis anyway rich and prudent must be dismissed or modified in the event that it is false; in like manner laws and organizations regardless of how proficient and very much masterminded must be changed or annulled on the off chance that they are out of line. Every individual has a sacredness established on justice that even the government assistance of society overall can't abrogate. Consequently justice prevents that the misfortune from claiming opportunity for some is made right by a more prominent great shared by others. It doesn't permit that the penances forced on a couple are exceeded by the bigger entirety of favorable circumstances appreciated by many. In this way in an equitable society the freedoms of equivalent citizenship are taken as settled; the rights made sure about by justice are not dependent upon political bartering or to the analytics of social interests. The main thing that grants us to submit in an incorrect hypothesis is the absence of a superior one; similarly, an injustice is average just

when it is important to keep away from a much more noteworthy injustice. Being first ethics of human exercises, truth and justice are solid. These suggestions appear to communicate our natural conviction of the essential of justice. Most likely they are communicated too firmly. On any occasion I wish to ask whether these disputes or others like them are sound, and if so how they can be represented. To this end it is important to work out a hypothesis of justice in the light of which these attestations can be deciphered and evaluated. I will start by thinking about the job of the standards of justice. Allow us to expect, to fix thoughts, that a general public is a pretty much independent relationship of people who in their relations to each other perceive certain guidelines of lead as authoritative and who generally act as per them. Assume further that these guidelines indicate an arrangement of participation intended to propel the benefit of those partaking in it. At that point, albeit a general public is a helpful endeavor for common preferred position, it is regularly set apart by a contention just as by a character of interests. There is a character of interests since social participation improves conceivable a life for all than any would have if each were to live exclusively independently. There is an irreconcilable situation since people are not apathetic with regards to how the more noteworthy advantages delivered by their coordinated effort are circulated, for so as to seek after their closures they each lean toward a bigger to a lesser offer. A lot of standards are required for picking among the different social game plans which decide this division of focal points and for guaranteeing a concession to the best possible distributive offers. These standards are the standards of social justice: they give a method of doling out rights and obligations in the fundamental establishment of society and they characterize the suitable dissemination of the advantages and weights of social participation.

TWO PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE:

- 1) Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others.
- 2) Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all.[The Difference Principle]

By method of general remark, these standards fundamentally apply, as I have stated, to the essential structure of society. They are to administer the task of rights and obligations and to direct the appropriation of social and monetary focal points. As their detailing recommends, these standards surmise that the social structure can be isolated into two pretty much unmistakable parts, the primary guideline applying to the one, the second to the next. They recognize those parts of the social framework that characterize and secure the equivalent freedoms of citizenship and those that indicate and set up social and monetary imbalances. The essential freedoms of residents are, generally, political freedom (the option to cast a ballot and to be qualified for open office) along with the right to speak freely of discourse and get together; freedom of inner voice and opportunity of thought; opportunity of the individual alongside the option to hold (individual) property; and opportunity from subjective capture and seizure as characterized by the idea of the standard of law. These freedoms are totally required to be equivalent by the main rule, since residents of a fair society are to have similar essential rights. The subsequent guideline applies, in the principal estimate, to the circulation of salary and riches and to the structure of associations that utilize contrasts in power and obligation, or levels of leadership. While the conveyance of riches and salary need not be equivalent, it must be for everybody's potential benefit, and simultaneously, places of power and workplaces of order must be available to all. One applies the second standard by holding positions open,

and afterward, subject to this requirement, orchestrates social and monetary disparities with the goal that everybody benefits. These standards are to be masterminded in a sequential request with the main guideline preceding the second. This request implies that a takeoff from the organizations of equivalent freedom required by the primary rule can't be legitimized, or made up for, by more noteworthy social and financial points of interest. The dissemination of riches and pay, and the chains of command of power, must be steady with both the freedoms of equivalent citizenship and balance of chance.

Obviously these standards are somewhat explicit in their substance, and their acknowledgment lays on specific suspicions that I should in the long run attempt to clarify and legitimize. A hypothesis of justice relies on a hypothesis of society in manners that will get obvious as we continue. For the present, it ought to be seen that the two standards (and this holds for all plans) are an extraordinary instance of a progressively broad origination of justice that can be communicated as follows.

All social values—liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect—are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any, or all, of these values is to everyone's advantage. Injustice, then, is simply inequalities that are not to the benefit of all. Of course, this conception is extremely vague and requires interpretation.

As an initial step, assume that the fundamental structure of society appropriates certain essential merchandise, that is, things that each normal man is dared to need. These merchandise ordinarily have an utilization whatever an individual's normal arrangement of life. For straightforwardness, accept that the central essential merchandise at the air of society are rights and freedoms, forces and openings, pay, and riches. These are the social essential merchandise. Other essential products, for example, wellbeing and energy, insight and creative mind, are normal merchandise; despite the fact that their ownership is impacted by the fundamental structure, they are not all that straightforwardly under its influence. Envision, at that point, a theoretical beginning plan where all the social essential products are similarly dispersed: everybody has comparative rights and obligations, and salary and riches are uniformly shared. This situation gives a benchmark to making a decision about upgrades. In the event that specific disparities of riches and authoritative forces would improve everybody off than in this speculative beginning circumstance, at that point they accord with the general origination. Presently it is conceivable, at any rate hypothetically, that by surrendering a portion of their major freedoms men are adequately remunerated by the subsequent social and monetary additions.

The general origination of justice forces no limitations on what kind of imbalances are passable; it just necessitates that everybody's position be improved. Presently the subsequent guideline demands that every individual advantages from admissible disparities in the fundamental structure. This implies it must be sensible for each important agent man characterized by this structure, when he sees it as a going worry, to incline toward his possibilities with the imbalance to his possibilities without it. One isn't permitted to legitimize contrasts in salary or authoritative forces on the ground that the inconveniences of those in one position are exceeded by the more noteworthy focal points of those in another. Considerably less can encroachments of freedom be balanced along these lines. Applied to the fundamental structure, the standard of utility would have us boost the total of desires for delegate men (weighted by the quantity of people they speak to, on the old style view); and this would allow us to make up for the misfortunes of some by the increases of others. Rather, the two standards necessitate that everybody profits by financial and social disparities.

TYPES OF JUSTICE:

1) Procedural Justice:

Procedural justice is the possibility of decency in the procedures that settle debates and apportion assets. One part of procedural justice is identified with conversations of the organization of justice and legitimate procedures.

2)Distributive Justice:

Distributive equity concerns the socially only designation of assets. Frequently stood out from a simple process, which is worried about the organization of law, distributive equity focuses on results. In social brain science, distributive equity is characterized as the reasonableness of how rewards and expenses are shared by (disseminated over) bunch individuals.

For example: When a few specialists work more hours yet get similar compensation, bunch individuals may feel that distributive equity has not happened. To decide if distributive equity has occurred, people regularly go to the social desires for their gathering. In the event that prizes and expenses are apportioned by the assigned distributive standards of the gathering, distributive equity has happened.

3)Retributive Justice:

Retributive justice is a hypothesis of discipline that when a wrongdoer violates the law, justice necessitates that they endure consequently. It likewise necessitates that the reaction to a wrongdoing is corresponding to the offense. Avoidance of future violations or recovery of the wrongdoer are different motivations behind discipline.

4) Restorative Justice:

Restorative justice is a way to deal with justice where one of the reactions to wrongdoing is to sort out a gathering between the person in question and the guilty party, at times with agents of the more extensive network.

5) Global justice:

Global justice is an issue in political way of thinking emerging from the worry about shamefulness. It is here and there comprehended as a type of internationalism.

Q4. What do you mean by teleological theory of ethics? Explain ethical egoism.

Ans: TELEOLOGICAL ETHICS: it is basically a strong belief that the action is only right or wrong on the basis of its outcomes. In this theory a person looks at the results of what is done, to decide if it's wrong or right? The action is justified basically on the end result. It focuses on consequences rather than the intentions.

An ethical hypothesis is viewed as teleological to the degree that it characterizes and clarifies right activities as far as realizing some great situation. For instance, an ethical hypothesis that keeps up that the rightness of an activity is one which accomplishes the objective of amplifying joy is considered a teleological hypothesis.

For example: if a man steals something, stealing is basically considered wrong no matter what the situation is but in teleology a person thinks stealing isn't bad because he is doing it to feed his family which is a good thing.

ETHICAL EGOISM: It is a theory based on "self interest ". According to this theory it is acceptable to make a decision or choose an action that benefits your own self. Self interest is the foundation of this theory.

Ethical egoism claims I ethically should play out some activity if and just if, and on the grounds that, playing out that activity boosts my self interest. Normal vanity asserts that I should play out some activity if and just if, and on the grounds that, playing out that activity amplifies my self interest . (Here the "should" isn't confined to the good "should".)

This theory is clearly not acceptable in islam because its against the principles of islam to help others only if it benefits your own self interest and makes your self happy.

Egoism is against altruism, which states that individuals should act in manners that help other people. Egoism is every now and again connected with the early Greek epicureans, whose point was seeking after delight and keeping away from torment. Ethical doesn't, nonetheless, require moral operators to hurt the interests and prosperity of others when making moral consideration

TYPES OF ETHICAL EGOISM:

Personal ethical egoism: it is a belief that one should act from the motive of self interest. This one says it's me and the others are totally irrelevant.

Individual ethical egoism: in this one says everyone should act in his self interest.

Universal ethical egoism: in this one says that everyones should pursue their own interests exclusively.

Rational egoism: in this one says that every person should act in a way that promotes long term pleasure.

*****THANK YOU*****