

Conflicting obligations

[Philosophy](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Conflicting Obligations Conflicting Obligations The following are the conflicting obligations for the inquiries numbers 8, 10, 12, 15, 16 and 18. In inquiry number 8, the researcher has the obligation of reporting to the police the theft of car rings in the slum and the researcher has the obligation of not reporting to the police. In inquiry 10, the executive has the obligation of taking action against his company's pollution violation and the executive has the obligation of not taking action against his company's pollution violation. In inquiry number 12, the druggist has the obligation of not filling the prescription as instructed by her physician and the druggist has the obligation of filling the prescription. In inquiry number 15, the psychiatrist has the obligation of informing the police of the crime committed by the violent man and the psychiatrist has the obligation of not informing the police of the crime committed by the potentially violent man. In inquiry number 16, the company president has the obligation of firing her executive following an angry letter from high government official that she criticized official policy positions and the president has the obligation of not firing her executive following an angry letter. In inquiry number 18, the carpenter has the obligation of doing the job though he is aware that the walls could warp due to architect's specification violation and the carpenter has the obligation of not doing the job though he is aware the wall could warp due to the architect's specification violation.

The law of contradiction, also referred to as the law of the excluded middle, involves the law of thought that something can be and cannot be at the same phenomena. In plain terms, it states that two contradictory statements cannot be true at the same phenomena, or that something cannot receive an affirmation and receive a denial at the same time. The law is quite significant <https://assignbuster.com/conflicting-obligations/>

in ethical analysis and reasoning. The law helps one to think critically of the consequences of any actions pursued. It helps in determining the correct, ethical action by deciding the one that brings greatest balance of beneficial consequences over the bad consequences. This calls for critical consideration of a situation and classifying the negatives and the positives of the situation. When reconciling conflicting obligations, one has to identify the beneficial and the grave of each of the conflicting obligations. One should look at the positive consequences in choosing any of the obligations, and if the obligation chosen fulfills the intended purpose. The consequence of choosing an obligation varies from person to person, and hence, one chooses an obligation that best fits his or her consequence. We should avoid both relativism and absolutism because they both have weaknesses. They both contradict each other, in that absolutism and relativism together create an undividable unity. Critically taking both concepts, one realizes that absolutism has no meaning without involving the relativism, and relative values are only dissimilar between absolute factors (Ruggiero, 2008, p. 100).

Reference:

Ruggiero, V. R, (2008), *Thinking Critically about Ethical Issues*, (7th), New York: McGraw-Hill