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Ans: 1

Yes, Alam should return the unspent money. Firstly, manipulating the Accounts book is an illegal act and cannot be judged on the basis of Alam's intention. If Alam is caught, he won’t be able to continue with the NGO work. Alam works for the society to make it better. He convincing other to join them & to help underprivileged street children. To take them out from poverty and give bright future, So if Aslam not return the money to government he will commit illegal act and for this he will be funish. So in my opinion it’s the right option to return the unspent money.

Ans: 2

No, there is no any unethical issue, But suggestion are illegal by Nadir, He said in suggestions that he should consult a Chartered Accountant to manipulate Accounts Book, showing that all money has been utilized and no amount left from the grant for the project.this is unethical and illegal act. He also convinced Alam that the unspent money can be used on the betterment of underprivileged children in the future and further he said We will not utilize a single penny on our personal needs the remaining amount will be spent on street children only. He had think about sreet children and for their betterment, But the way he want to follow it was illegal act they both be cought for this act and the can’t be no longer for social working.

Ans: 3

**Theory of Justice:**

A Theory of Justice is a 1971 work of [political philosophy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_philosophy) and [ethics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethics) by the philosopher [John Rawls](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Rawls), in which the author attempts to provide a moral theory alternative to [utilitarianism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Utilitarianism) and that addresses the problem of [distributive justice](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Distributive_justice) (the [socially just](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_justice) distribution of goods in a society). The theory uses an updated form of [Kantian philosophy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kantian_philosophy) and a variant form of conventional [social contract](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract) theory. Rawls's theory of justice is fully a political theory of justice as opposed to other forms of justice discussed in other disciplines and contexts.

The resultant theory was challenged and refined several times in the decades following its original publication in 1971. A significant reappraisal was published in the 1985 essay "[Justice as Fairness](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Justice_as_Fairness)", and a subsequent book under the same title, within which Rawls further developed his two central principles for his discussion of justice. Together, they dictate that society should be structured so that the greatest possible amount of liberty is given to its members, limited only by the notion that the liberty of any one member shall not infringe upon that of any other member. Secondly, inequalities either social or economic are only to be allowed if the worst off will be better off than they might be under an equal distribution. Finally, if there is such a beneficial inequality, this inequality should not make it harder for those without resources to occupy positions of power  for instance, public office.

**Types of Justice of Theory:**

* **Distributive justice:**

Distributive justice, also known as economic justice, is about [fairness](http://changingminds.org/explanations/needs/fairness.htm) in what people receive, from goods to attention. Its roots are in social order and it is at the roots of socialism, where equality is a fundamental principle.

If people do not think that they are getting their fair share of something, they will seek first to gain what they believe they deserve. They may well also seek other forms of justice.

* **Procedural justice:**

The principle of [fairness](http://changingminds.org/explanations/needs/fairness.htm) is also found in the idea of fair play (as opposed to the fair share of distributive justice).

If people believe that a fair process was used in deciding what it to be distributed, then they may well accept an imbalance in what they receive in comparison to others. If they see both procedural and distributive injustice, they will likely seek restorative and/or retributive justice.

* **Restorative justice:**

The first thing that the betrayed person may seek from the betrayer is some form of restitution, putting things back as they should be.

The simplest form of restitution is a straightforward apology. Restoration means putting things back as they were, so it may include some act of contrition to demonstrate one is truly sorry. This may include action and even extra payment to the offended party.

Restorative justice is also known as corrective justice.

* **Retributive justice:**

Retributive justice works on the principle of punishment, although what constitutes fair and proportional punishment is widely debated. While the intent may be to dissuade the perpetrator or others from future wrong-doing, the re-offending rate of many criminals indicates the limited success of this approach.

Punishment in practice is more about the satisfaction of victims and those who care about them. This strays into the realm of revenge, which can be many times more severe than reparation as the hurt party seeks to make the other person suffer in return. In such cases 'justice' is typically defined emotionally rather that with intent for fairness or prevention.

**Distributive Justice with example:**

Distributive justice concerns the [socially just](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_justice) allocation of resources. Often contrasted with [just process](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Procedural_justice), which is concerned with the administration of law, distributive justice concentrates on outcomes. This subject has been given considerable attention in philosophy and the social sciences.

In [social psychology](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_psychology), distributive justice is defined as perceived fairness of how rewards and costs are shared by (distributed across) group members.

For example, when some workers work more hours but receive the same pay, group members may feel that distributive justice has not occurred. To determine whether distributive justice has taken place, individuals often turn to the [behavioral expectations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_norm) of their group. If rewards and costs are allocated according to the designated distributive norms of the group, distributive justice has occurred.

Ans: 4

**Teleological Theory of Ethics:**

Teleological ethics also known as consequentialist ethics is the theory of morality that draws moral obligations or duties from what is desirable or good as an end to be attained (teleological from the Greek term telos, “end”; logos, “science”). The teleological perspective holds that an act is morally right if it produces a greater level of good over evil than any alternative act, and it is morally wrong if it does the opposite. The teleological theories accept utility as the basis for morality. According to this perspective, actions are right as

they produce and promote the greatest happiness, wrong as they promote unhappiness; happiness refers to pleasure and the absence of pain; unhappiness, on the other hand, means pain and the deprivation of pleasure. In order to understand clearly the moral standards of teleological theories we need to ask more questions. Mainly, what things fall under the umbrella of pleasure and pain; what is the meaning of these terms. However, these additional questions do not affect the basis of the teleological perspective, namely, that freedom from pain and suffering and the promotion of pleasure are the sole things desired as ends and all the desirable things are desired for the pleasure inherent in themselves or as a means to achieve happiness and prevent unhappiness. In addition, the teleological perspective is a group of theories that are identified by one main conviction; that is the moral evaluation of actions, motives or rules is based on how much good they generate or how much bad they allow us to avoid. Helms and Hutchins (1992), argue that the teleological perspective of ethics is emphasizing on the outcomes, despite the intent of individual behavior. Teleology suggests that we have one prime basic duty; to do whatever maximizes the best consequences. We ought to seek for whatever makes about the greatest balance of pleasure over pain for all the parties affected by our actions. And it does not matter what sort of action we take. Consequentialism comes in various flavours, there are different classifications of teleological theories in the literature of ethics, yet the major ones are (1) ethical egoism, (2) act utilitarianism, and (3) rule utilitarianism.

**But here we define 1) Ethical Egosim.**

**Ethical Egoism:**

Ethical egoism says that an individual‟s action is considered ethical or unethical depending on its possibility to achieve personal interests. Egoism suggests that we ought to do whatever to maximize our own self-interests, regardless of how our actions might affect others. The interests of others are not the main goal of the egoism perspective, others are seen as merely a medium by which our interest might be maximized. In this case, all other effects of the action are not relevant to the ethical decision. An action is thus considered as ethical only if the outcomes of that action are more beneficial to the person than any other alternative action. Generally speaking, egoism tells us to desire and accept that X harm us if this would maximize his self-interest. However, we cannot accept or desire this, thus, we cannot consistently agree on this principle. Hence, egoism cannot be accepted as a rational perspective about the way how we should live. The inconsistency of the egoism perspective gives a strong basis for rejecting its ethical stance. The problem with ethical egoism is that it is self-defeating. Whilst egoists give an importance to their own happiness, the egoistic view, in fact, is virtually guaranteed to make them unhappy. When following egoism, we will get despised by others and we will perhaps end up disdaining ourselves. As a matter of fact, there are conflicts between the personal good and the general good than many people can expect.

The End