

A Narrative Review Of Ethics Theories: Teleological & Deontological Ethics

**Abderrahmane Benlahcene*, Ruslan Bin Zainuddin, Nur Syakiran
Akmal Bt. Ismail**

*Ghazali Shafie Graduate School of Government, University Utara Malaysia.
Corresponding Author: Abderrahmane Benlahcene*

Abstract: The study of ethics is a constant endeavor to analyze, examine, and scrutinize human behavior for the purpose of steering people towards the proper moral values. The primary purpose of this paper is to present a review of two major ethical paradigms namely: Teleological ethics and Deontological ethics. A narrative review of the relevant papers related to the study of ethics and moral values was conducted. The importance of ethics and moral values in personal and social life is self-evident; the quest for noble and higher moral values is an attempt to create and establish a better life. This paper provides a modest review of one of the two most influential ethical theories in the modern history. This paper offers an opportunity for novice researchers in the area of ethics to grasp and understand some of the basic foundations of Teleological & Deontological Ethics.

Keywords: Ethics, Moral Philosophy, Teleological Ethics, Deontological Ethics.

Date of Submission: 02-07-2018

Date of acceptance: 18-07-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of ethics has been variously defined that it appears to have desolated any universal definition. For instance, Steiner and Steiner (1999), define ethics as the study of good and bad, right and wrong, just and unjust. The study of ethics is the study that deals with fundamental human relationships; ethics is a set of roles that characterize right or wrong conduct (1). By the same token, De George (1999), defines ethics as an efficient endeavor to comprehend our individual social and moral experiences, so as to decide the standards that should guide human conduct, the values worth seeking for and the character attribute deserving advancement in life. Beauchamp and Childress (1983), stated that the study of ethics focuses on understanding the moral aspects of life, including norms about how society should behave. Further, Schwartz and Bilsky (1987), argue that ethical values are individual concepts or beliefs that function to guide selection or evaluation of behavior.(2)

On the other hand, according to McShane and Von Glinow (2000), ethics is the study of moral criteria or values that govern the rightness or wrongness, the good or evil outcomes of an action. Velasquez (1998) however, defines ethics as the activity of examining people's moral principles or a society moral principles and asking how these principles apply to our lives and whether these principles are reasonable or unreasonable. Solomon (1994), argues that ethics is the quest for, and understanding of the good life; a life worth living. He goes on to claim that it is generally a matter of perspective: putting every action and goal in its place, realizing what is worth doing and what is not worth doing, knowing what is worth wanting and having and knowing what is not worth wanting and having.(1)

Ethics is an intrinsic value of people which can possibly have an influence on behavioural intentions and actions (3). According to Cooke (1990), ethics tries to create rational standards of moral behaviour that are universally applicable (4). Furthermore, Richard Norman (1983), states that the area of philosophy traditionally known as "ethics" or "moral philosophy" is the attempt to arrive at an understanding of the nature of human values, of how we ought to live, and of what constitutes right conduct (5). Additionally, Tarik Ramadan (2010), argues that ethics is conceived in numerous ways; it emerges from various universes and locates its valid realization in its independence from both the object to which it is used and the subject which elaborate it.(6)

For a long time, the two concepts ethics and moral philosophy meant the same thing and were infact used interchangeably. Moral philosophy is a philosophical study of values and norms, about notions of good and bad, right and wrong, what ought to be done and what should not be done. This type of philosophical inquiry of moral issues also seeks for elucidating concepts, which help people to choose their own decisions of the most practical connotations (7). It is also the study of guidelines and values by which we lead our lives, as well as the

reasoning of these guidelines and values (8). The study of ethics begins when we take earnestly the need to make our ethical thoughts right.(9)

The philosophical debate of assumptions about good and bad, right and wrong, seen as general ideas as applied in individuals' private lives. During the history of philosophy, the term of moral philosophy has been utilized widely to encompass the debate of normative concepts such as value or what ought to be done; in social life or in private relationships and it also included legal and political philosophy. However, the moral philosophy inquiry is not able to reach definite answers. This implies that it cannot completely accomplish its primary goal of evaluating normative assumptions in a critical manner. Even though, partial answers can be of practical use. Philosophical discussion can reach resolute negative conclusions that one specific set of beliefs need to be rejected due to its intrinsic inconsistency or because it is based on a factual assumption which is wrong.(7)

Velasquez (1998), has attempted to make the concept of ethics more encompassing. He also criticized the idea of basing ethics on religious beliefs, feelings or the golden rule claiming that all these are insufficient sources for ethical standards. Therefore, the meaning of ethics is complex since there are multifaceted platforms for its roots. In other words, there is no premise on which its definition can be depicted clearly. However, one thing that is palpable is that ethics includes normative judgments (claiming either good or bad, right or wrong, ought to be or ought not to be, better or worse) which indicate to a value; it contains moral judgments demonstrating that ethics focuses on what is morally right or wrong, or morally good or bad (10). And this leads to a moral standard.

In an attempt to clear the long-standing controversies regarding the distinctive features of moral standard, Velasquez (1998) presented the following elements:

- Moral standards deal with issues that have or that is believed to have serious consequences on human well-being. Means that it concentrates on behaviours that can seriously harm or benefit people.
- Moral standards cannot be governed by the decisions of a particular authority. Instead, its validity is based on the reasons and justifications that support it, as long as these reasons are adequate, the standards will continue to be valid.
- Moral standards should transcend self-interest (we ought to adhere to these moral values especially when violating them would work for our own self-interest.
- Moral standards are established on unbiased consideration (it transcends individual interest to a "universal" stance in which all people's interests are impartially seen as equal).
- Moral values are linked with particular emotions and a particular vocabulary (when someone goes against a moral standard or ethical obligations he feels "ashamed" or "remorseful").(1)

Moore (1973) maintains that any discourse concerning ethics or ethical judgment should first identifies or answers the question "what is good?" in his book *Principia Ethica*, he stressed on the significant of this clarification before reaching any ethical conclusion. According to Moore, it is very important inquiry and a special attention should be devoted to it. How "good" is to be defined, is the most critical question in all ethics. Moreover, any mistake with respect to this notion entails a far larger number of erroneous ethical judgments than any other. Unless this question is completely clear and the answer is unmistakably understood, all the rest of ethics discourse is worthless from the standpoint of systemic knowledge. The most serious errors with regards to ethical judgments have been mainly because of beliefs in wrong answers. Thus, till the answer to this question is known, it is impossible to know the evidence for any ethical judgment. Ethics is a systemic science which means it provides correct evidence for thinking this or that is good, without a clear answer to this answer, such evidence cannot be given. Moreover, apart from the fact that a pseudo answer leads to pseudo conclusions, the current inquiry is a most needed and central part of the science of ethics.(11)

It is worth mentioning that reviewing all the previous work on ethics studies or moral philosophy is almost unattainable due to its vast and rich volume. However, within the last two centuries, ethical debates have contrasted on two major paradigms: one resting on duties (deontological view), and the other on goals and objectives (the teleological view). (12). We can categorize western theories of virtue and vice into two groups: utilitarianism theories and deontology "intrinsic" theories. Utilitarianism theories define virtue and vice in terms of the consequences or instrumental properties of these character traits. For instance, Julia Driver said that "a virtue is [simply] a character trait that produces more good..." On the other hand, intrinsic theories define virtue and vice in terms of the intrinsic properties of these character attributes. For example, Thomas Hurka stated that a virtue comprises in that attitude towards good or bad conditions that is intrinsically good in itself regardless of its consequences. Hurka argues that to desire good for other people for its own purpose is a virtue (13). The following table presents some of the prominent ethicist and moral philosophers and their most distinguished works.

Table 1. Major Ethical Thought Development in Chronological Order

Ethical Philosophers	Era	Major Ethical Stance	Most Influential Works
Confucius	Axial age	Deontological and virtue ethics	Analects (compiled by neo-confucionist)
Plato	Axial age	Divine-command virtue ethics	Republic parmenides
Aristotle	Axial age	Virtue ethics	The Nichomachean ethics politics
St. Augustine	Axial age	Divine-command ethics	Confessions the city of god
Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)	Axial age	Divine-command ethics	Revealed scripture
Niccolo Machiavelli	1469–1527	Consequentialist utilitarian ethics	The prince
Thomas Hobbes	1588–1679	Aristotelian virtue ethics based on materialism	Leviathan
Immanuel Kant	1724–1804	Deontological ethics	Foundations of the metaphysics of morals
Jeremy Bentham	1748–1832	Consequentialist utilitarian ethics	Introduction to the principles of morals and legislation utilitarianism
John Stuart Mill	1806–1873	Consequentialist utilitarian ethics	On liberty
Friedrich Nietzsche	1844–1900	Master and slave morals (Consequentialist and utilitarian ethics)	Beyond good and evil thus spoke zarathustra
G.E. Moore	1873–1958	Metaethics	Principia ethica
W.D. Ross	1877–1970	Kantian deontological ethics	The right and the good
John Rawls	1921–2002	Deontological ethics	A theory of justice
Alasdair Macintyre	1929	Aristotelian virtue ethics	After virtue dependent rational animal

Adopted from (12). (Yazdani N, Murad HS (2015). Toward an ethical theory of organizing. Journal of Business Ethics).

Due to the broad spectrum of ethics; this paper focuses on two ethical streams, the Telological ethics and the Deotological ethics. For instance, Kakabadse et al. (2002), suggest that most of the research in ethics is established on two philosophical stances. The first philosophical position is teleological “contrasting the good of the individual with the good of the community”. The second philosophical view is deontological “the relative social norms, rights, and duties in various cultures and communities”. These two philosophical theories describe the current research into moral codes suggesting that such codes are helpful, yet might be too broad, excessively specific, deficient, conflicting, unworkable, obscure, unused, and might be distinctive in different contexts or cultures. Shortly, it appears that ethics studies have focused on the creation and application of ethical codes. Although, there is still something about ethical codes that we do not really understand. We are basically examining the relationship between codes and behaviours and we still did not achieve a sound understanding of the ethical code itself (14). These two theories are a major player in modern-day ethics, political, and religious discourse and, thus, is worthy of prudent examination.

II. TELEOLOGICAL ETHICS

Teleological ethics also known as consequentialist ethics is the theory of morality that draws moral obligations or duties from what is desirable or good as an end to be attained (teleological from the Greek term telos, “end”; logos, “science”) (15). The teleological perspective holds that an act is morally right if it produces a greater level of good over evil than any alternative act, and it is morally wrong if it does the opposite (16). The teleological theories accept utility as the basis for morality. According to this perspective, actions are right as

they produce and promote the greatest happiness, wrong as they promote unhappiness; happiness refers to pleasure and the absence of pain; unhappiness, on the other hand, means pain and the deprivation of pleasure. In order to understand clearly the moral standards of teleological theories we need to ask more questions. Mainly, what things fall under the umbrella of pleasure and pain; what is the meaning of these terms. However, these additional questions do not affect the basis of the teleological perspective, namely, that freedom from pain and suffering and the promotion of pleasure are the sole things desired as ends and all the desirable things are desired for the pleasure inherent in themselves or as a means to achieve happiness and prevent unhappiness.(17, 18)

In addition, the teleological perspective is a group of theories that are identified by one main conviction; that is the moral evaluation of actions, motives or rules is based on how much good they generate or how much bad they allow us to avoid (7, 19). Helms and Hutchins (1992), argue that the teleological perspective of ethics is emphasizing on the outcomes, despite the intent of individual behaviour (20). Teleology suggests that we have one prime basic duty; to do whatever maximizes the best consequences. We ought to seek for whatever makes about the greatest balance of pleasure over pain for all the parties affected by our actions. And it does not matter what sort of action we take (21). Consequentialism comes in various flavours, there are different classifications of teleological theories in the literature of ethics, yet the major ones are (1) ethical egoism, (2) act utilitarianism, and (3) rule utilitarianism.

1. Ethical Egoism

Ethical egoism says that an individual's action is considered ethical or unethical depending on its possibility to achieve personal interests (22). Egoism suggests that we ought to do whatever to maximize our own self-interests, regardless of how our actions might affect others (21). The interests of others are not the main goal of the egoism perspective, others are seen as merely a medium by which our interest might be maximized (23). In this case, all other effects of the action are not relevant to the ethical decision. An action is thus considered as ethical only if the outcomes of that action are more beneficial to the person than any other alternative action.(24)

Generally speaking, egoism tells us to desire and accept that X harm us if this would maximize his self-interest. However, we cannot accept or desire this, thus, we cannot consistently agree on this principle. Hence, egoism cannot be accepted as a rational perspective about the way how we should live. The inconsistency of the egoism perspective gives a strong basis for rejecting its ethical stance. The problem with ethical egoism is that it is self-defeating. Whilst egoists give an importance to their own happiness, the egoistic view, in fact, is virtually guaranteed to make them unhappy. When following egoism, we will get despised by others and we will perhaps end up disdaining ourselves. As a matter of fact, there are conflicts between the personal good and the general good than many people can expect.(21)

2. Utilitarianism

In the utilitarianism doctrine, an act is considered right if it is useful for boosting happiness. Happiness according to utilitarianism is a sum of pleasures; pleasure is good and pain is bad. An act is right if it produces good and prevents the bad. Thus, the actions which we ought to do are the one that seems to promote the greatest possible sum of happiness (7). Utilitarianism gets its name from "Utility". The principle of utility induces that we always ought to seek for the greatest happiness of the greatest quantity. So in making choices and making decisions, we should find out which action or decision will produce the utmost happiness compared with unhappiness or pain, and that is the decision we ought to make. However, if we do not, we have made the wrong decision.(25)

To utilitarians there is only one standard that recaps all moral duties. That is to do whatever will produce the greatest balance of happiness over pain or suffering for everyone who will be affected by our act. This moral principle of utility is misleadingly simple. The principle contains a combination of three ideas: firstly, in deciding what we ought to do, we should be directed by the consequences of our acts, moreover, we should act in a way that promotes the best consequences. Secondly, in deciding what are the best consequences, we should give priority to the greatest possible happiness or unhappiness that should result and we ought to do whatever will result in producing the greatest happiness or the least pain or suffering. Thirdly, the principle presumes that the happiness of an individual is equally important to everyone else's.(26)

Utilitarianism has three basic characteristics. Firstly, it is consequentialist: this means that the results or consequences of the action that count in deciding whether it's right or wrong. Secondly, it holds that happiness/utility is good in itself: this means that happiness is worth pursuing and increasing for its own sake. Another way of putting this is to say that happiness is intrinsically, or inherently, good. Everything else is good merely insofar as it is a means to the production of happiness, which is the ultimate goal. So things such as money, power, friendship, and so on are only instrumental goods because they are ways and means of achieving happiness. Thirdly, the principle of utility (greatest happiness principle) is the most fundamental moral principle

according to utilitarianism, and by applying it to your actions you can find out whether they are right or wrong.(25)

3. Act Utilitarianism

Act consequentialists believe that morally right actions are those that do or are expected to create either the absolute best outcomes or adequately good outcomes, as compared to all other choices available for an individual at a given time (19). The form of act utilitarianism is autonomous of rules, whether or not they are referred to. However, rules might serve as a guideline but not rigidly form part of the moral action (16). Act utilitarianism says that each action is assessed in terms of its possibility to produce the greatest amount of happiness for the largest number of individuals.(22, 27)

4. Rule Utilitarianism

Rule utilitarianism holds that morally right actions are those that fit with the optimal social rules, where such rules are those that would produce the best results were they very widely endorsed or adhered to (19). Rule utilitarianism is an adjusted form of utilitarianism. It refuses hedonism which says that only pleasure is intrinsically good. Alternatively, it promotes a pluralistic perspective of values; it accepts that many things are inherently good, including knowledge, virtue, life, pleasure, and freedom. The rule utilitarianism perspective also suggests that we should do what is approved by the rules with the best consequences for individuals in society to try to follow. It claims that we will have a better life if we are guided by strict rules in certain areas like murder or drugs. In the absence of rules, we will get involved in doing irrational things.(21)

Rule utilitarianism claims that people follow behavioral patterns as well as rules, and applies the approach to those rules rather than to the individual actions. In this type of utilitarianism, we compare the utility of individuals in society by following different potential rules rather than acting in different ways. Hence, the moral reasoning becomes more about the design of a society governed by different rules, practices, and institutions; and we ought to choose the rules, practices or institutions that will produce the greater happiness, rather than about the governing of individual conduct. The rule utilitarianism does not ignore the controlling of the individual conduct, no moral theory did. Yet, the governing of individual conduct is indirect through following the rules rather than by direct calculation of the act utilitarianism form. In order to find out what is the best action to take as an individual, one ought to know what rule it would be the best for everyone to follow in a similar situation, then act in accordance with that particular rule.(9)

III. DEONTOLOGICAL ETHICS

Deontological theories can be depicted as duty-based ethical theories. The word “Deon” originates from the Greek word “Duty”. They focus on the nature of the action itself and also on its motive in order to figure out if it is right or wrong. In contrast to the situation with utilitarianism; consequences do not matter in deciding which act is morally right; it is the rules that determine what motive to act from and what action you should make, i.e. what your ethical duty is.(25)

Deontological ethics “Non-consequentialism” suggests that some types of actions such as breaking a promise or killing innocents are wrong in themselves, and not simply wrong because they have bad consequences. Such actions might be exceptionlessly wrong or might simply have some autonomous moral weight against them (21). The notion that there are moral limitations on the pursuit of recognized needs such as love, happiness, and peace is a classical deontological argument. Deontology advocates believe that particular actions are intrinsically morally right or wrong. That is, many actions possess the moral character they do by virtue of their own nature, considered totally separated from the consequences they produce. There is something about killing, intentional cheating, or humiliation, which makes these actions wrong by their nature (19). Moreover, deontologists construct their judgments in light of “moral rights” that individuals are believed to have; generally speaking, any person has a right to be treated in ways that guarantee his dignity, respect, and independence.(4)

The most prominent deontologist is the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). The test he formulates to decide whether an act is intrinsically wrong is based on the intellectual requirement of logical consistency. Kant claims that if we contradict ourselves then we are inconsistent. He added, when an act is intrinsically wrong, we will contradict ourselves if we claim it is not (Barcalow, 2007). In addition, deontological ethics agree that the end does not justify the means. Historically, most non-consequentialist ethics have been part of a religious worldview. In religious ethical view, duty is often a key ethical concept; those who have religious ethical view would claim that the ultimate source of our duties is God’s commands. And human beings are understood not only to have ethical duties to others but a religious duty to God. But, the deontological theorists Kant have attempted to support a duty-centered ethic without relying upon a religious framework.(28)

Kant in his masterpiece *Foundations of The Metaphysics of Morals*; begins with the words “nothing in the world, indeed nothing even beyond the world can possibly be conceived which could be called good without

qualification except a Good Will.” Characters like bravery, diligence, persistence; talents such as strength, intelligence, endurance; goods like fortune, power, and fame are all good, however, they are not good without qualification since they can be used for evil ends. Wealth can be used to harm people; strength and intelligence can be used to kill; bravery can be used for burglary. All of these kinds of goods can be used for wrong ends unless if the person has a good will. Thus, only good will can be good without qualification. (29)

Kant says that one has a good will if one tries to do one’s duty. But Kant emphasised that for a will to be truly good, it must try to do its duty from a purely moral motive, rather than from a self-interested motive. That purely moral motive is the desire to do one’s duty out of respect for moral law. A person with a good will respects the moral law and tries to act dutifully because he or she desires to act in ways that conform to what his duties are.(25, 26)

Additionally, according to Kant, doing one’s duty does not involve gaining pleasure and happiness for oneself; it involves simply doing one’s duty, and sometimes that is quite difficult. Absolute duties as described by Kant might be called “heavy-duty” duties, with ethical duties there are no ifs, ands, or buts. Kant offered a different deontological solution to the problem of the origins of ethics. For Kant, we have ethical duties but not because we have been commanded by God. Kant attempted to provide a deontological ethical theory that does not make references to God or religion. In Kant’s view, the solution to the problem of human nature is not that human beings are made in the image of God, but that human beings have rationality, and through that rationality they have freedom. For Kant, freedom is the cornerstone to morality.(28)

Kant asserts that we should look for the ultimate source of morality in the way how human out to behave not in how human actually behave. Moral principles are universal and essential; hence, they always impose the same course of behaviour to all people. Human behaviour, however, arises in particular circumstances, relies on distinctiveness, and oftentimes go against moral commands. Therefore, any anthropological examination of human nature will not give us a reasonably adequate account of morality. Moral principles find their ground in our rationality and this is because our reason works in terms of universality and necessity. Thus, Kant suggests that we have to explore the role of reason in setting moral standards and principles. Morality requires that we behave rationally. The function of reason in morality is to guide our behaviours. Hence, morality guides the human will in order to make it a goodwill. Therefore, good will is the one that follows the order of reason. Goodwill is the only thing that is unquestionably or certainly good. The goodness of other human characteristics are dependent on the goodness of the will. The moral value of goodwill rests in itself but not in its results of consequences.(17)

Kantian deontology arises from the claim that we are rational beings and we acquire the ability to reflect and ponder about laws and to take action according to reason. Therefore, a moral imperative does not rely upon our particular and subjective desires or preferences; it is unqualified or categorical. The moral principal that depends on individual inclinations and desires is only conditional or hypothetical, which make it not proper to work as a moral imperative. Kant, like utilitarians, argued that morality can be based on one supreme moral principale, from which all obligations and duties are derived. Only a categorical imperative can work as the ultimate principle of morality. This moral version is very different from the utilitarians’ principle of utility because it does not focus on the consequences of the acts. According to Kant, the important is not the consequences but doing one’s duty.(17, 26)

As shown above, what makes the deontological theory a distinctive moral theory is the centrality of notions such as moral falseness of actions, the sovereignty of individuals, rights or ownership, moral boundaries between people, and so forth. However, other theories of ethics have attempted to account for these ideas, yet they did so by elucidating them by some more fundamental notions. For example, for utilitarianism, these notions are significant and reasonable if acting on them will produce the greater happiness than if we act in an alternative way. On the contrary, the Kantian deontology believes that the existence of fields of authority in which a rational individual has the right to a particular type of rational control over his thoughts and behaviours is a basic character of morality, which needs no further explanations in other terms (9, 17, 26). There are two main groups of deontological theories in the literature: (1) rule deontology, and (2) act deontology.

1. Rule Deontology

Rule deontology argues that in all situations people ought to be guided by a set of predetermined rules or principles, thus, the action is judged to be ethical or unethical as compared to the rules themselves, not by the consequences of that action (22). Kant formulated an ultimate moral standard, he called it “the categorical imperative”. Yet, he sets up two distinctive foundations for this moral principle. The first ground for this principle as demonstrated by Kant in his metaphysics of morals (1785), goes like this: “Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law”.(26)

This foundation explains the procedure for considering whether an action is morally acceptable or right. When we are regarding a specific action, we ought to ask what rule we would be following if we were to do it. Then we ought to ask whether we are willing for that rule to be followed by everyone all the time. (This would make it a universal law in the pertinent sense.) In this case, and if the rule is consistent with these

statements, then the rule might be followed, and the action is morally permissible. Nonetheless, if we would not be willing for everyone to follow that rule then the action is morally inadmissible. This illustrates the centrality of the virtue of our rationality with regards to the moral law. Rationality requires consistency, and it would not be consistent to take an action based on a maxim that we would not be willing for everyone to follow as well. Moreover, Kant believed that consistency requires that we interpret moral rules as having no expectations. Thus, Kant endorsed an entire set of prohibitions, covering a whole range of issues from lying to suicide.(26)

2. Act Deontology

According to act deontology, people are obligated to act toward others in a specific way simply because they are human beings. There is a duty or responsibility to take in account others' dignity and rights no matter what are the consequences so that the focus is on the moral value embedded in the act per se (30). This can be understood in Kant's second foundation of the categorical imperative, which says: "Act so that you treat humanity whether in your person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only." This implies that since we are rational beings, our reason envisages ends and leads us to achieve these ends through different means. This categorical imperative formulation argues that as rational beings we are ends in ourselves but not means for others. Consequently, we are persons, not things. Our value is unqualified and categorical, not partial or dependent on the needs or desires of others. Hence, according to act deontology, we have to respect others' dignity and their unconditional value by always treating them as ends in themselves and never as just means.(17)

Kant gives an example to illustrate what does it mean to consider others as ends in themselves and never as means. For instance, let us assume that you need a certain amount of money, in order to get that money you need to get a loan, but you know that you are not able to repay it. So since you are desperate, you will think of giving false promise to repay that money just to convince a friend into giving you that money. What would you do? Maybe your intention is to use that money for good purpose, very good one, actually, you may ponder about it and you will be convinced that lying in this case is justified. However, if you lied to your friend, you would simply be deceiving him, and using that friend as a means to your end. This is what Kant means when he says: "rational beings...ought to always be esteemed also as ends, that is, as beings who must be capable of containing in themselves the end of the very same action.(26)

IV. CONCLUSION

No system is created and nurtured by unethical values can flourish for long. This is due to the inherent problems that continuously impend the contingency of such a system. The fact that people can survive at any costs but recognize that such a system ultimately falls apart should discourage any organization from neglecting the consequences of unethical values(1). The importance of ethics and moral values in personal and social life is self-evident; the quest for noble and higher moral values is an attempt to create and establish a better life at the macro or micro level of people's life. Morality requires close attention to one's behaviors and actions. As stated by Ignatieff Michael (2012), moral life is a process of justification and providing reasons for views, reasons for behavior to those who do not share our perspective and then changing both our points of view and our behavior when we feel our arguments failing us. The basis of moral life is this process of repeated, recurred, conduct-changing justification. The process requires standards; a global ethic produces the view from nowhere, global ethics produces a view from somewhere and if sides in conflict accept the standard, they contend with each other, not past each other, and if they accept the standard, then they are more inclined to accept the responsibility to change when justification fails (31).

In line with that, Rodin David(2012), argues that it should be evident that as the world globalizes, more and more problems that were once local or regional come within the realm of global ethics. In current time, numerous of our most critical policy concerns are global. For example, climate change and environmental degradation; management of the trade and financial systems; management of the water, agricultural, food, and forestry policies; preventing and treating contagious illnesses, including pandemics; preventing the proliferation and usage of weaponry of mass destruction; preventing armed conflict and genocide; eradicating poverty; management of the oceans; and guaranteeing the security of cyberspace. This is an overwhelming (yet still unfinished) list of quite devilish dilemmas. This clearly demonstrates why the development of practical principles of global ethics is among the most serious intellectual tasks of our time (32). A sound understanding of the different ethical paradigms opens new paths for the development and the assurance of a civilized world where people from different traditions and backgrounds can accept standard moral foundations which can be a guideline in combatting many local and global problems.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Kate Nwadiogwa Nnabuiife E. Defining and enforcing ethical leadership in Nigeria. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*. 2010;1(1):25-41.
- [2]. Hobkirk M, Deuchar N. Values in managerialism and leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services*. 2011;7(2):109-18.
- [3]. Mohd Ghazali NA. The influence of a business ethics course on ethical judgments of Malaysian accountants. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*. 2015;9(2):147-61.
- [4]. Debeljak J, Krkac K, Ragab Rizk R. Back to basics: an Islamic perspective on business and work ethics. *Social Responsibility Journal*. 2008;4(1/2):246-54.
- [5]. Norman R. *The moral philosophers: An introduction to ethics*. UK: Clarendon Press Oxford 1983.
- [6]. Ramadan T. *The quest for meaning: developing a philosophy of pluralism*: Penguin Uk; 2010. Raphael DD. *Moral philosophy*. 1994.
- [7]. Boss JA. *Analyzing moral issues*. 2001.
- [8]. Bennett C. *What is this thing called Ethics?: Routledge*; 2015.
- [9]. Velasquez MG. *Business Ethics, concepts and Cases 4 ed*: Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.; 1988.
- [10]. Moore GE, Baldwin T. *Principia ethica*: Cambridge University Press; 1993.
- [11]. Yazdani N, Murad HS. Toward an ethical theory of organizing. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2015;127(2):399-417.
- [12]. Calder T. Against consequentialist theories of virtue and vice. *Utilitas*. 2007;19(02):201-19.
- [13]. Wallis SE. Developing effective ethics for effective behavior. *Social Responsibility Journal*. 2010;6(4):536-50.
- [14]. Britannica TEoE. Teleological ethics. *Encyclopedia Britannica* 2016.
- [15]. Frankena WK. *Ethics*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc; 1973.
- [16]. Gregory WT, Giancola D. *World Ethics*: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning; 2003.
- [17]. Sher G. *Ethics: essential readings in moral theory*: Routledge; 2012.
- [18]. Shafer-Landau R. *Ethical theory: an anthology*: John Wiley & Sons; 2012.
- [19]. Helms MM, Hutchins BA. Poor quality products: is their production unethical? *Management decision*. 1992;30(5).
- [20]. Gensler HJ. *Ethics: A contemporary introduction*: Routledge; 2011.
- [21]. Rallapalli K, Vitell S, Barnes J. The influence of norms on ethical judgments and intentions: An empirical study of marketing professionals. *Journal of Business Research*. 1998;43(3):157-68.
- [22]. Shaw B, Post FR. A moral basis for corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 1993;12(10):745-51.
- [23]. Hunt SD, Vitell S. A general theory of marketing ethics. *Journal of macromarketing*. 1986;6(1):5-16.
- [24]. Stewart N. *Ethics: Polity*; 2009.
- [25]. Rachels J, Rachels S. *The right thing to do: Basic readings in moral philosophy*: McGraw-Hill; 2003.
- [26]. Regan D. *Utilitarianism and Cooperation* Clarendon Press. Oxford; 1980.
- [27]. Mizzoni J. *Ethics: The Basics*. 2013.
- [28]. Cordner C. Three contemporary perspectives on moral philosophy. *Philosophical investigations*. 2007;30(1):65-84.
- [29]. White TI. *Right and wrong: A brief guide to understanding ethics*. 1988.
- [30]. Ignatieff M. Reimagining a global ethic. *Ethics & International Affairs*. 2012;26(1):7-19.
- [31]. Rodin D. Toward a global ethic. *Ethics & International Affairs*. 2012;26(1):33-42.

A. HADDACH An Overview of Methodologies for Evaluating Global Performance of Supply Chains.” *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*. vol. 23 no. 07, 2018, pp. 31-38.