

# Text analysis



Ethics, Values and Morality Academic The case study describes an issue with ethical choices with the division made by making a choice over foundational beliefs or by understanding different perspectives of the situation. To approach the case study, there was an understanding of morality from different perspectives, including laws, religion and foundational beliefs. Understanding how each individual would be affected was also analyzed. The decision which was made was to follow the basic laws as this also provided a positive outcome for those involved.

1. Morality is reliant on personal beliefs, religious thoughts and how one acts. If an individual believes something is right, or moral, they will act in a way to show the belief. When one is immoral, they will deliberately break belief and create an opposing viewpoint of morality through conscious actions. The concept of amoral is when one won't make a judgment based on the moral distinction with lack of sensibility toward right or wrong. Action toward personal preference or situation is done instead. The last application to morality is of nonmorality. When one is acting with nonmorality, there is no sense or judgment of right or wrong (Thiroux, 2006).

2. Consequentialist, or teleological ethics, is based on ethics in which one acts upon as a sense of duty and rules. A nonconsequentialist, or deontological view of morality won't act out of duty or responsibility. Instead, the actions come from the belief that acting in a certain way is the right thing to do and is because one values something. The difference between these two is based on the intent and thought process. While the end action is the same, the thought process of why the morals should be implemented differs.

3. With ethical egoism, one takes a moral position based out of self –

interest, profit, return or benefit. The contract to this is psychological egoism, which states that an individual always acts or reacts to a situation out of their self – interest or happiness. The difference in situations is based on the desired outcomes. With ethical egoism, the self interest is to get a benefit while the psychological egoism is based on the happiness one believes they will get by acting in an ethical way while psychological egoism has self benefits from the mind.

4. The cost – benefit analysis, or end – justifies the means approach to morality is one which an individual uses logic of what will happen in the end to approach actions. For instance, one will decide on actions that are either moral or immoral with the belief that in the end, people will benefit from the actions. The morals are compromised specifically because there is the belief that outcome creates the morality. The cost benefit is to create the ideology that something is moral because the outcome will be beneficial.

5. The concept of morality is relative. When looking at the absolute interpretation of morality, it means there is no flexibility and that there is a right and wrong with no grey areas (Ignatieff, 2004). However, if one is in a situation that constitutes specific actions, the morality becomes relative. One can act in the same manner and will ultimately cause loss or other immoral actions to be taken. At times, morals have to change or be altered because it can create more consequences, whereas a different behavior will lead to safety or a benefit.

6. The concept of virtue ethics originated from the philosophers of Plato and Aristotle. The Greek philosophy stated that one should not think of the consequences or outcomes from specific actions taken. Virtue ethics implies that one should act according to the belief that is held and what one sees as

virtuous. Even if the outcome is consequential, the virtue of doing what one believes is right will reverse the situation (Darwall, 2005).

#### References

Ignatieff, Michael. (2004). " The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror". Democratiya (2).

Darwall, Stephen. (2005). " Virtue Ethics." Australasian Journal of Philosophy (83), (4).

Thiroux, Jacques. (2006). Ethics: Theory and Practice New York: Prentice Hall.