

Outline

Path: 1

Topic: The conflicting responsibilities a company holds between shareholders and employees.

Intro

This dilemma could arise:

Conflicting responsibilities between shareholders and employees

1. Responsibility to shareholders/profits - The company may feel obligated to reduce costs, including layoffs, to maintain profitability, satisfy investors, or stay competitive in the industry.
2. Responsibility to employees - Employees rely on the company for their livelihood, stability, and well-being. Laying them off could cause financial hardship, stress, and loss of trust.

Part 1

What a relativist would say (define keywords like relativism, eg: things done in different industry cultures)

Relativism Definition: All moral rights and wrongs are subjective to an individual, group, or culture.

Since layoffs are culturally normal within this industry, the company has no moral issues when deciding to lay off employees.

Relativism is wrong, we should be Objectivist

Objectivism Definition: Moral rights and wrongs are objectively right or wrong regardless of one's own opinions or culture

Why is objectivism better?

An objectivist believes that at least some actions have objective moral value and this applies universally, regardless of whether others see it or not

A relativist has the chance to be presented with a culture that says all morally incorrect actions are actually right. Even if they are in a culture that gets all moral rights and wrongs correct, they do not truly understand why something is morally right or wrong.

My Argument

Removing an employee's source of income in order to please shareholders is morally wrong.

Part 2

My Argument (Plausible Facts)

Employees rely on income for basic needs

- health
- house
- education
- food

Shareholders are not the only ethical concern

Alternate solutions exist

Identify Moral Principle

Respect for employees' rights

Explain / Justify argument

(eg: why do we care about privacy)

Someone keeping their income should be held more important than someone increasing theirs

Apply the principle to your case

(how does it violate my case, consequences of worker autonomy, how the other option is better to adhere, consider both option)

The moral principle of respecting an employee's rights is violated when an employee is removed from their position in order to please shareholders. This treats employees as a means to an end rather than a person with inherent value.

Part 3

(another argument, a utilitarian would disagree)

Objection!

(A utilitarian would disagree with me, why, define utilitarianism, apply both options)

Utilitarian Definition: Moral rights and wrongs are decided by which option provides the most overall pleasure versus the pain presented.

A utilitarian may also disagree with my argument. Since the possibility of greater pleasure could exist on either side of the employee / shareholder relationship, they may see laying an employee off as morally correct due to the pleasure imbalance.

A utilitarian may also disagree since keeping staff could lead to a greater overall pain. Such as the company going bankrupt.

Part 4

Why is the utilitarian wrong, particularly about this dilemma

(here's about why i am right and they are wrong)

A utilitarian is wrong because their reasoning is extreme and is unlikely to happen. Due to the profit these companies make it is clear that the chance of bankruptcy is low if resources were used better.