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**Answer to Question no 01:**

In such circumstances, Aslam should return the unspent money to the government as per according to the terms and conditions of the grant agreement. However, this action of Aslam will reflects his honesty with the government grant and also his efforts, as many of the NGO’s do not often return the unspent amount of money to the government and avoid any uncertainty by manipulating the financial records which is unethical and unjust. Respectively, Aslam must should provide a progress report to the government in which it must be stated that every possible effort has been made to put the children into school but unfortunately, parents of some children did not allow their children for school. Therefore, this report will justify the efforts of Aslam and also the reasons of a less number of children admission on order to avoid a stamp of in-effectiveness on his NGO.

**Answer to Question no 02:**

There are total seven suggestions which are provided by Nadir to Aslam. We will evaluate each suggestion one by one in accordance with ethics;

**1- if we return back the unspent back amount the government may not grant us for any project next year:** Considering this suggestion, it seems unethical because they were agreed with the terms and conditions of the grant agreement in which it was clearly stated that the unspent amount should be returned. Furthermore, this suggestion is not a powerful argument as there is always a probability that subject will either get the grant or not while applying for grant. Therefore, Aslam should ignore this suggestion.

**2- our reputation will be at stake and government will put our name in the category of in-effective NGO’s:** Considering this suggestion, it also seems unjust because perfection is no where and there are retardants which does not let the work be smoothen. Aslam should explain the reasons for less number of admissions in a repor.

**3- most of the NGO’s are having the same practice, no objection will be raised:** No doubt that most of the NGO’s are having the same practice to use the money for self interest but this is against justice and utilitarianism. One must should follow the proper rules and regulations of their desired work.

**4- we should consult a Charted Accountant to manipulate our Accounts book showing no amount left from the grant for project:** this suggestion totally unfair and strictly against the teachings of ethics. We know that manipulating the financial record is a crime that is why it should be avoided.

**5- Even, official in charge of this project will not come to us for an audit if a little percentage of grant is given to him:** Considering this suggestion, we know that to bribe someone is also a major crime. Although, the job of NGO is to work for the people best interest rather that their own best interest. Thus, Aslam should reject this suggestion

**6- we will not utilize a single penny on our personal needs, the remaining amount will be spent on street children only:** this suggestion is also seems to be inappropriate because the purpose of grant is to educate children so rather than education purpose this money should not be spent anywhere else. If they spent the money on street children then they would need to manipulate the records in order to maintain this particular amount.

**7- in brief, not returning unspent money is ethical and justifies:** this suggestion is totally wrong and inappropriate. If they do it so then it will be against the agreement which can damage their reputation. Thus, this suggestion should be rejected.

**Answer to Question no 03:**

**Justice Theory:**

There are many theories on justice but in a generally and philosophically, the Rawls (1921-2002) Theory of Justice is the most influential and well known. A thorough going attempt to formulate a general theory of justice is that of Professor John Rawls (b.1921) of Harvard University He writes mainly from the angle of philosophy and political science rather than of Law. Since its publication in 1971 it has received wide attention.

Professor Rawls assumes that society is a more or less self sufficient association of persons, who in their mutual relations recognize as binding certain rules of conduct specifying a system of co-operation Principles of social justice are necessary for making a rational choice between various available systems. The way in which a concept of justice specifies basic rights and duties will affect problems of efficiency, coordination and stability. This is why it is necessary to have a rational e conception of justice. Practical rationality has three aspects, namely value, right and moral worth.

In modern times, contractual nature of justice was explored by Kant that influenced John Rawls. A social contract test of political policies is, in Kant's view a way to secure that acknowledgement by hypothetically involving each member of the society in the assessment of those policies in a way that respect his interest and perspectives as an individual. Rawls also believes that a contract test takes the individual seriously in a way that utilitarian does not. Rawls justice is concerned not merely with human welfare but also with individual’s welfare. Rawls argues that adequate theory of justice must morally respond to, and preserve the "distinction of persons".

The idea of the "original position" and the "Veil of ignorance" as given by Rawls may be understood in the light of this interpretation that the people as negotiators have general wisdom but particular ignorance They strive to protect and promote their material interest, but in doing so they are unable to distinguish their interests with the interests of others They can protect and promote their interest by depending upon the system of law and justice of a country. The basic principles of justice are generalized means of securing certain generalized wants, "primary social goods", comprising what styled the "thin theory of the good", i.e. maximization of the minimum (as opposed to a "full theory"). These primary social goods include basic liberties, opportunity, power and a minimum of wealth. The first principle of justice is: "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". The basic liberties include equal liberty of thought and conscience, equal participation in political decision-making and the rule of law which safeguards the person and his self respect. The second principle is: 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 their fair equality of opportunity. The just savings principle is designed to secure justice between generations and is described as follows: Each generation must not only preserve the gains of culture and civilization, and maintain intact those just institutions that have been established, but it must also put aside m each period of time a suitable amount of real capital accumulation. With the aid of these principles, Professor Rawls seeks to establish a just basic structure of an equalitarian society. It can also be said that Rawls is not an egalitarian desiring equal distribution of social and economic advantages but he is an egalitarian as he is in favor of autonomy of each individual.

**Kinds of Justice:**

Concept of justice is not static as it varies from person to person. Keeping in view the various concept of justice, justice may be classified into certain kinds, namely - natural justice, economic justice social justice, political justice, legal justice, distributive justice and corrective justice.

**Natural Justice:** Man as a member of society has to mould his behavior so that he can act in a proper way without disturbing the feelings of others Thus to mould the behavior of an individual to his fellow beings in accordance with the laws of nature implies natural justice.

The word "nature" literally means the innate tendency or quality of things or object and the word "just" means upright, fair or proper. So the expression "natural justice" would mean the innate quality of being fair. It is another name of common sense justice meaning thereby natural of what is right and what is wrong.

**Economic Justice:** The concept of economic justice is very wide. Economic justice is nothing but a corollary of social justice. It evolves equal economic values, opportunity and right for all and prohibition of economic discrimination between man and woman in economic matters. No other form of justice is realizable without being associated with economic justice. The very concept of economic justice involves the idea of a socialistic pattern of society.

**Political Justice:** Political justice prevails in a society where everyone has a share in the political process. The state should establish political justice by creating conditions under which all including the minorities find scope for exercising their political rights in pursuance of a system of Universal Adult Suffrage, rule of law, achievement values as opposed to astrictive values.

**Social Justice:** Social justice may be regarded as an important factor of social transformation. Social justice implies the absence of discrimination on the basis of caste, color, religion etc. It also prohibits forces creating artificial social barriers. Social justice demands equality along with liberty. Moreover, protection and improvement of the weaker and downtrodden sections of the people, equitable distribution of the necessities of life etc.

**Legal Justice:** Justice must be supported by law. Legal justice implies justice given according to law which again implies equality before law. It means no one can be above the law and everybody should be equally punished for equal crimes.

**Distributive Justice**

Distributive justice is a concept which emphasizes the ownership of goods in a society. It assumes that there is a large amount of fairness in the distribution of goods. Equal work should provide individuals with an equal outcome in terms of goods acquired or the ability to acquire goods. In addition, distributive justice is absent when equal work does not produce equal outcomes or when an individual or group acquires a disproportionate amount of goods. Respectively, in a nut shell, everyone should be served equally with respect to their efforts and devotion.

**For example:** Suppose 30 people survive a plane crash, and make their way onto a small, deserted island. The group places a priority on determining what resources are available to them, including natural resources of the island and the sea, and resources that may have washed ashore from the wreck. What would be the best way to ensure those resources are shared among the survivors in a fair and equitable fashion?

In order for a division of resources to be fair and impartial, one must apply what he calls “the envy test.” In this evaluation of distribution, none of the survivors would prefer, or envy, someone else’s resources. If this system of distributive justice is used, however, the final allocations may meet the test, but still appear biased or unfair.

**Answer to Question no 04:**

According to William H. Shaw’s book “Business Ethics,” which says, that according to teleological theories, the moral rights of an action are determined solely by its results. If its consequences are good then the act is right, if they are bad then the act is wrong. Consequentialists (moral theorists who adopt this approach) determine what is right by weighing the ration of good to bad that an action will produce. The right action is the one that produces or will probably produce at least as great a ratio of good to evil as any other course of action open to the agent.

One question that arises here is, Consequences for whom? Should one consider consequences only for oneself? Or the consequences for everyone affected? The two most important consequentialist theories, egoism and utilitarianism, are distinguished by their different answers to this question. Egoism advocated individual self-interest as its guiding principle. Utilitarianism holds that one must take into account everyone affected by the action. But both theories agree that rightness and wrongness are solely a function of an action’s result.

**Ethical egoism:**

Ethical egoism claims that one may morally ought to perform some action if and only if, and because, performing that action maximizes one’s self-interest. More generally, ethical egoism is a normative theory and a sub branch of teleological theory, it recommends, favors, praises a certain type of action or motivation, and desires another type of motivation. Similarly, a decision made with ethical egoism is the self-interest of one self and benefits a particular body. It has two versions: individual ethical egoism and universal ethical egoism. In the first version one ought to look out for one’s own interests while in the second version, everybody ought to act in their own best interest, and they ought to be concerned about others only to the extent that this also contributes to their own self interest.

Egoism, however, requires us to do whatever will best further our own interests, and doing this sometimes requires us to advance the interests of others. In particular, egoism tells us to benefit others when we expect that our doing so will be reciprocated or when the act will bring us pleasure or in some way promote our own good. For example, egoism might discourage a shopkeeper from trying to cheat customers because it is likely to hurt business in the long run. Or egoism might recommend to the chair of the board that she hire as a vice president her nephew, who is not the best candidate for the job but of whom she is very fond. Hiring the nephew might bring her more satisfaction than any other course of action, even if the nephew doesn’t perform his job as well as someone else might.