

# Waking ned devine

[Business](#), [Industries](#)



A utilitarian would say to do it because having that money would bring them more leisure, but an ethnologist would say that they must not commit fraud in order to get the money because that would be lying and according to the categorical imperative we should never lie. The second categorical imperative comes into play as well because it would be using a human as a means to an end rather than an end in itself (although with Ned being dead, one could have an argument that that doesn't come into play).

Jackie makes the decision to lie because he has a dream and he believes that Ned has come to him and wants him to have the money. Cackle and Annie, as well as Jackie and Michael's friendship both fall under Aristotle's category of friendship based on goodness. In both friendships, each person wants what is best for the other person, and all things are shared with each other. Both Jackie and Nannies marriage and Jackie and Michael's friendship include benefiting from the other and pleasure from the other's company, but they have that important thing where each wants to help the other reach their goals.

This is shown in the case of Jackie and Annie when Annie finds out Jackie and Michael's plan to get the money. She is upset because she doesn't want Jackie or Michael to go to jail for fraud. She doesn't think that will be what is best for either of them. The amount of winnings matters to Annie because when she finds out how much money it actually is she realizes how much it can help themselves, and the whole town.

I think that the moral significance of the act does change when Cackle includes the whole town, because rather than being selfish and keeping it all,

he is helping the whole town and I do believe that is what Ned would have wanted. He is attached to the town and would have been more than happy with what Jackie and Michael ended up doing with it. Although, if an ethnologist were to look at the situation, there's no way they would change their position, because lying is lying, and that is wrong.

This fits perfectly into the situation where Kant says you should tell the truth even when you want to lie, and only then are you truly free. The mean old woman is a character that always seems to be looking for ways to get what she wants at the expense of others. She tries to get two loaves of bread for half price, she tries to get her toaster back without paying for it, and finally she threatens Jackie, Michael, and Annie by saying that she will call the office of the lottery if she doesn't get more money.

I think that the priest is right to be worried of what will happen to the town with all that money because these people have lived simple lives for so long, that who knows what will happen when they come into money like this. It ends up looking like he noticed that was an immediate change after they were sure of getting the money is when Fin promises Maggie to quit pig farming even though he claims to like it. If everyone stops their farming, what is going to happen to the village?

Ultimately, yes, I think that Maggie does make the right decision when she chooses not to collect all the money for her son. When living in a tight knit community like that, everyone seems like family anyways. And like Jackie tells her, having a father is worth more than any amount of money, and if she were to claim the money for her son, Fin would have to continue pig farming

and her son would still not have a father. As far a Aristotelian ethics goes, I think she climbed a bit on the hermeneutic circle and became a better person.