

# Defining ethical and moral standards philosophy essay

[Experience](#), [Human Nature](#)



Morality is a conveniently flexible term to begin with, one which could be stretched and sculpted according to most anyone's ulterior motives. This in turn renders moral standards almost completely irrelevant and they should be regarded with skepticism, especially when it comes to those in power; because what is moral behavior to one person is indignation to another person.

I think we can define ethical and moral standards as guidelines for an ethical and moral behavior. And in its turn, ethical and moral behavior of a person (or a group) can be defined as a way of interaction with a society which is the least disturbing, or better, pleasing to the other members of a society.

Societies function much more effectively, efficiently, and responsibly when politicians and elected officials are expected to follow the "rule of law" more so than the rather subjective definition of a "higher moral standard".

After all, how can so many people glamorize Che Guevara and his noble and "moral" legacy of fighting for social justice, but turn a blind eye to his ordering the execution by firing squad of hundreds of people, including innocent student protestors, without the due process of law in a single month at La Cabaña prison 50 years ago? And what else other than moral relativity could explain why so many of his T-shirt wearing acolytes claim to be "morally outraged" by former President George W. Bush's similar crime of the suspension of habeas corpus for Guantanamo Bay prisoners, of which none were executed?

Which is why the rhetoric and pseudo-philosophizing of morality is still popular in communist nations such as Cuba whose totalitarian regime continues to push the false and deluded hope that communism will one day triumph again for those with the “moral courage” to endure needless sacrifice. This “morality above reality” mindset and rationale is explicitly illustrated in archived film footage where Fidel Castro was asked if he wore a bulletproof vest considering the various attempts on his life. He joked by opening his shirt, proudly displaying his bare chest and belly, bellowing a laugh and responded “No, I wear a moral vest”.

Sure he did. As possibly did other murderous tyrants such as Ho Chi Min, Pol Pot, and Idi Amin to name a few. If their “higher moral standards” are what people expect to be ruled and led by, we may as well rebuild our collapsing economy by constructing our own concentration camps replete with gas chambers and ovens, and printing our monthly food supply ration booklets, like the ones Cubans carry with them to this day. One would figure they would simply register these via internet nowadays, only they are still not allowed by law to have internet access in their homes.

On one hand, we should admit that high ethical and moral standards are probably one of aspects to judge an effective leader. Track back to the history, we can find many famous leaders with high ethical and moral standards. For example, Winston Churchill and Abraham Lincoln they were well known not only because of their marvelous contribution to their nations but also for the good reputation they built. It is the highly ethical manners lead them to serve the people they led in the correction direction. On the

contrary, Adolph Hitler, who maybe can also called an effective leader of Germany in World War 2. He conquered half of the Europe and decimated thousands of Jews with Nazi army, caused great damage to Jews and the world due to his prejudice and lack of ethical standards.

On one hand, we should admit that high ethical and moral standards are probably one of aspects to judge an effective leader. Track back to the history, we can find many famous leaders with high ethical and moral standards. For example, Winston Churchill and Abraham Lincoln they were well known not only because of their marvelous contribution to their nations but also for the good reputation they built. It is the highly ethical manners lead them to serve the people they led in the correction direction. On the contrary, Adolph Hitler, who maybe can also called an effective leader of Germany in World War 2. He conquered half of the Europe and decimated thousands of Jews with Nazi army, caused great damage to Jews and the world due to his prejudice and lack of ethical standards.

Finally, the effective leaders are also human beings. No human beings could be perfect, everyone makes mistakes from time to time, as a famous saying goes "to err is human", and so does the leader. But a few flaws such as some personal affairs would not efface the splendid achievements they make as an effective leader. Bill Clinton, the former president of America is the best evidence. Despite the sex scandal and his perjury in court, which nearly resulted in his impeachment, there is no doubt that he is an effective leader in the eyes of American people. He has fight back the economic recession in the U. S. and promoted peaceful progress in Israel-Palestinian relationship.

All of these great achievement to U. S. even the world persuasively prove him as an effective leader. Everyone has his/her own pettiness; the leader is not exception either. Hence as long as it is within his/her people tolerance, some flaws on ethic cannot prevent him/her to be an effective leader.

It is precisely because of the infinite number of quandaries that a “ higher moral standard” poses that makes such a prerequisite obsolete for elected officials in comparison to their obeying the rule of law. And chances are, if they respect and obey the rule of law to begin with, they’re bound to have higher moral standards that are genuine and socially reciprocal. Most of us, who obey laws, don’t just do so because we’re afraid of being caught if we don’t. We do so because they make sense to our survival.

Considering how poor a job morality alone has done to ensure our survival, let alone our rights, we need to look further beyond mere moral standards as criteria in electing our leaders. No matter how high a moral standard politicians profess to set for themselves, and much less the rest of us whom they ultimately work for.

Finally, the effective leaders are also human beings. None of human beings could be perfect, anyone makes mistakes some times, as a famous saying goes “ to err is human”, and so does the leader. But a few flows such as some personal affairs would not efface the splendid achievements they make as an effective leader. Bill Clinton, the former president of America is the best evidence. Despite the sex scandal and his perjury in court, which nearly resulted in his impeachment, there is no doubt that he is an effective leader

in the eyes of American people. He has fight back the economic recession in the U. S. and promoted peaceful progress in Israel-Palestinian relationship. All of these great achievement to U. S. even the world persuasively prove him as an effective leader. Everyone has his/her own pettiness; the leader is not exception either. Hence as long as within his/her people tolerance, some flaws on ethic cannot prevent him/her to be an effective leader.

In conclusion, as long as supported by the people he/she serves, the public official does not have to maintain the highest ethical and moral standards, but to do so will make them more admirable.

\*

To be an effective leader, a public official must maintain the highest ethical and moral standards.

Finalizing everything I've said I have to disagree with the original statement.

It appears to be not necessary for a public official to maintain highest ethical and moral standards if he wants to be an effective leader. He just have to be able to sufficiently deliver power of organization he represents to the people he suppose to lead.