Exporting capital – business ethics

Business, Business Ethics

Exporting capital Is the removal of capital from the country in which it Is originally held and It's transfer for Investment In an Importing country willing to meet the demands of the company. (encyclopedia. Overconfidently. Com). At the basic definition of this practice, I take a libertarian way of thinking on this. If this Is what a company needs to do to be profitable, government should not have the ability to interfere with this system.

However, this is not how exporting capital happens in today's world or at any time in history for that matter. Companies are getting away with low wages, long hours, little to know regulation on labor laws and unfavorable working conditions. For these reason, I do believe constraints are not the answer because exporting capital is good for both parties when executed in an ethical way. Taking the utilitarian theory, this is finding the greatest good over bad for the majority of the people.

Exporting helps companies remain profitable and help the people and the economy of the country receiving the export. If both side benefit and there are no extremes to either side then exporting can be beneficial to all parties. . Export commodities which have been banned from sale In the united StatesI believethere should a ban on commodities that are banned in the United States simply because it is a dangerous practice. If it's not safe for citizens in the US then it is not safe for citizens anywhere.

That is Just common sense and ignoring this logic is clearly unethical. According to act utilitarianism, we must ask ourselves what the consequences of a particular act in a particular situation will be for all those affected. (Shaw & Berry 2013). It may savemoneyto for the companies that produced the reduces and they may even make a profit but exporting a commodity that Is banned is unsafe for those receiving the goods. Cant's theory also states, the basis of obligation - must not be sought In human nature, or In the circumstances of the world.

It should be a parlor. (Shaw & Berry 2013). Just because we don't know what the result of use of a banned commodity in another country doesn't mean it's a good thing to do. Sometimes downsizing is unavoidable in order for a company to survive economic times of difficulty. As unpleasant as it may be, laying off hundreds people so more can keep their Jobs is seen as a small sacrifice. If downsizing is done for this reason and in this manner, it helps more people in the long run. The maxima rule is applied in these situations.

Making a decision based on the worse possible outcome of one action is the better than the worse possible action outcome of another (Shaw & Berry 2013). Utilitarian theory also supports the decision to downsize in the face of economic difficulty. The action that will produce the greatesthappiness, we must consider unhappiness or pain as well as happiness. (Shaw & Berry 2013) If the act of downsizing will save Jobs for others, keep the company from going bankrupt and verbal add to the overall stability of the economy, than this is best action to take.

During the 2008 economic downturn, many companies had massive layoffs. At the time, many people did not see this as a small sacrifice but as the higher executives staying rich while the people on the bottom suffered the most. These executives were not depicted in a good light for keeping the companies open for business but greedy because they were awarded millions in bonuses for these actions. It seems as if they had their own economic interest in mind and not the interest of all. This is offered to as business egoism which is defended on utilitarian grounds. (Shaw & Berry 2013).

However, according to John Rail's theory of distributive Justice, social and economic inequalities these executives acted unethical because their gain did not benefit all Just themselves (Shaw & Berry 2013). Their actions are not supported by this theory. 4. Break union contracts in the face of economic difficulty This question is a difficult one for me to answer because I am not in the union but I have friends andfamilythat are unions. I see the benefits of the unions but as someone that works in the private sector, I also see it as unjust. Unions leave the people they service at their mercy when things do not work in their favor.

In New York we also experience the effects of labor strikes because of union contracts being negotiated like Toronto experienced with their transit strike. I beg to question if unions benefit the community they provide services for or Just the community that work within the unions. In my personal opinion, breaking union contracts in the face economic difficulty should be treated like any company that is experiencing economic difficulty. If a company without a union has the right to lay off employees to save the many, then I don't feel like union workers are above this rule.

Lay-offs are unfortunate no matter how they happen and if they can be avoided then all parties involved should do so. Rule utilitarianism would make decisions based on strictly upon morals that would make everyone happy. That is the purpose of union contract negotiations. (Shaw & Berry 2013) For unions, who is the " everyone" that is being considered during these negotiations? Are union workers simply looking out for their am answering a question with a question but this is a moral dilemma that doesn't have one answer.