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

Ans; He should not return the money but instead use it for another year because its a common practice practice in pakistan if he return the money he will not get the same amount of money next year.

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

**And;**

There is ethical issue in Nadir suggestion but unfortunately we are living in an environment where such types of practice or common. If he give the same amount of money to Edhi that will be more justified and moreover we have roshni school system which can work at night. Although its a malpractice and unethical but what to do to with the system.

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

**And;**

**-** justice theory:

A Theory of Justice is a 1971 work of political philosophy and ethics by the philosopher John Rawls, in which the author attempts to provide a moral theory alternative to utilitarianism and that addresses the problem of distributive justice (the socially just distribution of goods in a society).

There are two principle of this theory:

1. Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all".[3]

2. "Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both:

(a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, consistent with the just savings principle, and

(b) Attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity.

Distributive justice:

Distributive justice deals with the employees' concerns of the fairness of outcomes they receive. Perhaps the main motivation for issues with representative profitability or confidence is when workers feel that their organization needs reasonableness.

Ethical egoism is the normative theory that the promotion of one's own good is in accordance with morality. In the strong version, it is held that it is always moral to promote one's own good, and it is never moral not to promote it.

Distributive justice concerns the socially just allocation of resources. ... In social psychology, distributive justice is defined as perceived fairness of how rewards and costs are shared by (distributed across) group members.

Justice is a concept of moral rightness based on ethics, rationality, law, natural law, religion, equity or fairness, as well as the administration of the law, taking into account the inalienable and inborn rights of all human beings and citizens, the right of all people and individuals to equal protection

For example:

Sarah has worked at Cheap Plastic Toys for over a year. She has just found out that she will be receiving only a 1% raise this year. She does not feel that this is a fair outcome. Organizations can provide equal distributive justice by educating, communicating, and enacting fair employment practices with the organ.

**Question 4;**

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

**Answer;**

Teleology is the process of explaining something through its function or purpose, rather than what caused it, or the thing itself. There are several aspects or “genres” of teleology, and I’ll try to explain a few:

Teleology is a common practice in ethics. Like the definition implies, using teleology in ethics means you consider and explain actions based on the end result. Some might consider stealing bad, but a teleological thinker may say, “but in the end, I’m stealing to feed my family, which is good, so the action is good.” In other words, an action’s “goodness” is based off the outcome.

A second example of teleology is in philosophy. Early philosophers used intrinsic teleology to explain most aspects of the world by saying objects exist to serve their purpose: an acorn is created to turn into an oak tree; man was created to rule the earth; apple trees exist to provide food for people. Intrinsic teleology explains things through what they do or are “meant” to do, and is debated among religious and philosophical groups.

Finally, another, more-concrete aspect of teleology is extrinsic teleology. Just like intrinsic teleology implies things have “natural purposes,” extrinsic teleology is explains objects based on what purpose was “forced” upon them (ex = outside, a purpose imposed upon it.) A fork exists to eat with; a car exists to drive; houses exist to live in.

Egoism is self-respect.  
A person who respects him/herself can respect the rights of others.  
A person who does not respect her/himself cannot and does not respect the rights of others.

Let me illustrate with a question. Who is the egoist here?  
I love Rachmaninov, but let us assume for this question that I hate his music. Let us assume that Bob loves Rachmaninov.

So: Bob can do one of two things.

1. Bob can pretend that he hates Rachmaninov to keep me happy.
2. Bob can argue with me until I agree that Rachmaninov is the best composer ever.

Which would make Bob an egoist?

NEITHER

If he were an egoist, he would continue to love Rachmaninov and accept/ignore my dislike.  
Bob would probably avoid discussing the music with me, but in private, Bob would be listening to "Caprice Bohemian" and "The Island of the Dead."

Self-respect that leads to acceptance of others' rights...

**ETHICAL EGOISM**

1. **Common-sense Egoism:** According to this view, egoism is a vice. It involves putting one’s own concerns over those of others. One’s behavior is egoistic if it involves putting one’s own interests over those of others to an immoderate degree.
2. **Psychological Egoism**
   1. **Argument For**: Human agents always, at least on a deep-down level, are all egoists insofar as our behavior, explainable in terms of our beliefs and desires, is always aimed at what we believe is our greatest good (Baier, 1991, p. 203).
   2. **Objection**: The psychological egoist confuses egoistic desires with motivation. An agent may act contrary to his desires and what is in his own best interest. People often act in ways that they know are detrimental to their well being. Moreover, what one most wants may not be in their own self-interest (e.g., giving money to Amnesty International rather than buying a new CD). MacKinnon adds that, "Even if it were shown that we often act for the sake of our own interest, this is not enough to prove that psychological egoism is true. According to this theory, we must show that people always act to promote their own interests" (p. 23). If we can find only one counterexample to psychological egoism, then it is not true.
3. **Egoism as a Means to the Common Good**
   1. **Argument For:**According to the economist, Adam Smith, when entrepreneurs are unimpeded by legal or self-imposed moral constraint to protect the good of others, they are able to promote their own good and, as a result, provide the most efficient means of promoting the good of others (Baier, 1991, p. 201; see MacKinnon, p. 24). Such a view leads to the doctrine that, "if each pursues her own interest as she conceives of it, then the interest of everyone is promoted" (Baier, 1991, p. 200).
   2. **Objection**: Apart from positing an "invisible hand" guiding the market processes, the common-good egoist makes the fallacy, ascribed to J.S. Mill, that if each person promotes her own interest, then everyone else’s interests are thereby promoted. "Clearly, this is a fallacy, for the interests of different individuals or classes may, and under certain conditions (of which the scarcity of necessities is the most obvious), do conflict. Then the interest of one is the detriment of the other" (Baier, 1991, p. 200).
4. **Rational Egoism:**Rational egoism is concerned with reasonable action.
   1. **Strong Rational Egoism:** It is always rational to aim at one’s own greatest good, and never rational not to do so (Baier, 1991, p. 201).
   2. **Weak Rational Egoism:**It is always rational to aim at one’s own greatest good, but not necessarily never rational not to do so (Baier, 1991, p. 201).
   3. **Argument For:**When doing something does not prima facie appear to be in our interest, our doing said act requires that we justify our action by showing that it is in our interest, thereby justifying our action.
   4. **Objection**: Such an approach to justifying actions in our own interest may be abused if we do not have criteria established to determine what the interests of agents amount to. If such criteria are established, such actions may be reasonable so long as they do not result in conflicts between agents. In such cases, creative middle ways are called for.
5. **Ethical Egoism:**Coupled with ethical rationalism"the doctrine that if a moral requirement or recommendation is to be sound or acceptable, complying with it must be in accordance with reason"rational egoism implies ethical egoism (Baier, 1991, p. 201).
   1. **Strong Ethical Egoism:** It is always right to aim at one’s own greatest good, and never right not to do so (Baier, 1991, p. 201).
   2. **Weak Ethical Egoism:**It is always right to aim at one’s own greatest good, but not necessarily never right not to do so (Baier, 1991, p. 201).
   3. **Argument For: I**f we accept rational egoism, and if we accept ethical rationalism, then we must accept ethical egoism. This is the case because if acting in one’s own self-interest is reasonable, then it is a moral requirement that one acts in one’s own self-interest.
   4. **Objection: E**thical egoism is incompatible with ethical conflict-regulation. Consider the following example from Kurt Baier, regarding the problem over whether it would be morally wrong for me to kill my grandfather so that he will be unable to change his will and disinherit me (1991, p. 202):

Assuming that my killing him will be in my best interest but detrimental to my grandfather, while refraining from killing him will be to my detriment but in my grandfather’s interest, then if ethical conflict-regulation is sound, there can be a sound moral guideline regulating this conflict (presumably by forbidding this killing). But then ethical egoism cannot be sound, for it precludes the interpersonally authoritative regulation of interpersonal conflicts of interest, since such a regulation implies that conduct contrary to one’s interest is sometimes morally required of one, and conduct in one’s best interest is sometimes morally forbidden to one. Thus, ethical egoism is incompatible with ethical conflict-regulation.

**ARGUMENTS FOR ETHICAL EGOISM**

1. An altruistic moral theory that demands total self-sacrifice is degrading to the moral agent.

Objection: This is a false dilemma: there are many non-egoistic moral theories that do not demand total self-sacrifice.

2. Everyone is better off if each pursues his or her self-interest.

Objection: (a) This probably is not true in practice; and (b) True egoism isn't concerned with what will make everyone better off.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST ETHICAL EGOISM

1.         Provides no moral basis for solving conflicts between people.

2.         Obligates each person to prevent others from doing the right thing.

3.         Has the same logical basis as racism.

4.         The egoist cannot advise others to be egoists because it works against the first egoists interest.

5.         No one person can expect the entire world’s population to act in such a way as to produce the most benefit (pleasure) for that one person.