



ETHICS PROJECT REPORT

SUMMER 2020

COURSE TITLE :- INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS

COURSE NO :- PHI 104

SUBMITTED TO :-

DR. MD. MUNIR HOSSAIN TALUKDER (MNT)

30 SEPTEMBER 2020

COMPILED BY :-

UMMA SADIA NASRIN SATHI

1812187642

CONTENTS:

- INTRODUCTION ----- PAGE - 03
- CHAPTER 1 : COYOTE HUNTING CONTEST
 - 1.1. THEORY ANALYSIS : UTILITARIANISM ----- PAGE - 04
 - 1.2. PROBLEM ANALYSIS : COYOTE HUNTING CONTEST ----- PAGE - 05
 - 1.3. SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM ----- PAGE - 06
- CHAPTER 2 : DONATION FOR PLANTING TREES
 - 2.1. THEORY ANALYSIS : KANTIAN THEORY ----- PAGE - 07
 - 2.2. PROBLEM ANALYSIS : DONATION FOR TREES ----- PAGE - 07
 - 2.3. SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM ----- PAGE - 08
- CHAPTER 3 : PLASTIC WATER BOTTLE BAN
 - 3.1. THEORY ANALYSIS : ARISTOTLE'S VIRTUE ETHICS ----- PAGE - 08
 - 3.2. PROBLEM ANALYSIS : PLASTIC WATER BOTTLE BAN ----- PAGE - 09
 - 3.3. SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM ----- PAGE - 10
- CONCLUSION ----- PAGE - 11
- BIBLIOGRAPHY ----- PAGE - 12

INTRODUCTION :

Ethics are a system of moral principles and a branch of philosophy which defines what is good for individuals and society. At its simplest, ethics is a system of moral principles. They affect how people make decisions and lead their lives. Ethics is concerned with what is good for individuals and society and is also described as moral philosophy. The term is derived from the Greek word ethos which can mean custom, habit, character or disposition.

Ethics covers the following dilemmas:

- How to live a good life
- Our rights and responsibilities
- The language of right and wrong
- Moral decisions - what is good and bad

Ethical problems occur when a given decision, scenario or activity creates a conflict with a society's moral principles. Both individuals and businesses can be involved in these conflicts, since any of their activities might be put to question from an ethical standpoint. Nowadays there are lots of Ethical problems. Some of the problems that happening in the World are:

- Employment Practices and Ethics.
- Human Rights.
- Environmental Pollution.
- Corruption.
- Moral Obligations.

CHAPTER 1 : COYOTE HUNTING CONTEST :

1.1. THEORY ANALYSIS : UTILITARIANISM :

Utilitarianism is an ethical theory that determines right from wrong by focusing on outcomes. It is a form of consequentialism.

Utilitarianism holds that the most ethical choice is the one that will produce the greatest good for the greatest number. It is the only moral framework that can be used to justify military force or war. It is also the most common approach to moral reasoning used in business because of the way in which it accounts for costs and benefits.

However, because we cannot predict the future, it's difficult to know with certainty whether the consequences of our actions will be good or bad. This is one of the limitations of utilitarianism.

Utilitarianism also has trouble accounting for values such as justice and individual rights. For example, assume a hospital has four people whose lives depend upon receiving organ transplants: a heart, lungs, a kidney, and a liver. If a healthy person wanders into the hospital, his organs could be harvested to save four lives at the expense of one life. This would arguably produce the greatest good for the greatest number. But few would consider it an acceptable course of action, let alone the most ethical one.

So, although utilitarianism is arguably the most reason-based approach to determining right and wrong, it has obvious limitations.

1.2. PROBLEM ANALYSIS : COYOTE HUNTING CONTEST:

"Coyote Hunting Contests"—in which contestants compete for prizes to see who can kill the most coyotes in a specified period of time—are found across the west and Midwest. In Alberta, coyote hunters gather at bars the night before a hunt to bet on winning teams and take bets on who will kill the biggest animal. Unfortunately, these deadly competitions are spreading into the east as coyotes move back into territory from which they were driven by hunters over a century ago.

Small towns and local motels often promote calling contests as a way to attract visitors. In fact, there is a circuit of contests that attracts semi-professional contest killers who take part in most of the best-known events. The most lethal even become celebrities of a sort, regaling their fans with war stories about coyotes they have shot while never once placing themselves in any danger. Contestants use two basic techniques, both involving mechanical, commercially manufactured- and marketed- calls. The first is to imitate the cries of coyotes in distress, and the second includes imitating a downed prey animal, usually a deer or rabbit. Coyotes then come to investigate what they perceive to be a fellow coyote in trouble or a possible meal. Waiting for the coyotes is a two-person team of hunkered-down, camouflaged killers—a shooter with a high-powered, long-range, tripod-balanced, scope-mounted rifle, often equipped with an electronic range finder; and a spotter using powerful binoculars to search the countryside for any signs of a coyote on a mission of mercy or in search of a meal. It is not unusual for several hundred coyotes to be killed in the course of a three- or four-day contest. How many are wounded by the difficult, long-range shots that are usually necessary and left to wander off and die slow, painful deaths is something that contest aficionados never talk about.

Coyote killers like to brag that they are protecting livestock and providing a service to ranchers. But this is just a smokescreen to disguise what they are really doing: killing for entertainment and prize money. According to wildlife biologist D. J. Schubert, "There simply are not enough predators killed in a concentrated area during predator contest killing events to have any impact. There are ways to protect livestock from coyotes that really do work, such as electric fencing, strobe lights, and guard animals—including dogs and llamas—who integrate very well into livestock herds. Killing coyotes for cash and kicks isn't one of them.

There are ways to protect livestock from coyotes that really do work, such as electric fencing, strobe lights, and guard animals—including dogs and llamas—who integrate very

well into livestock herds. Killing coyotes for cash and kicks isn't one of them. Hunting contests are the worst form of sports because the prizes they offer encourage and reinforce what the society considers immoral attitudes towards moral life. But the sponsors of the killing contests wrongly argue that these events help prevent coyotes from taking livestock and deer.

In Alberta, it's legal to shoot coyotes on private land as long as the landowner gives permission. No permit or license is required. The Alberta government should ban bounties on coyotes and wolves because they are inhumane and ineffective. A scientific review published in the international journal *Animals* argues that bounties should be outlawed because, despite a death toll of predators numbering in the thousands, the program doesn't work. When bounty hunters shoot, snare or poison coyotes, it often makes the situation worse for farmers and ranchers in the area because aggressive newcomers move in to take the place of the original predators. According to reports the bounty hunters in Alberta receive 15\$ for dead coyotes. The report says at least 16 Alberta municipal jurisdictions offer or have offered bounties. But this is not the solution. The bounty hunters killed over 25,000 coyotes in 5 years but they are all over the place.

1.3. SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM :

Coyote killing competitions, where contestants vie to shoot the most animals are unethical. Native wildlife targeted in killing contests play key roles in healthy, functioning ecosystems. Killing contests devalue native wildlife and glorify wasteful violence, while disrupting natural processes. They give ethical hunters a bad name and serve no legitimate management purpose. Moreover, they can actually exacerbate livestock depredation and human-wildlife conflict.

If we consider this Coyote hunting contest in the view of Aristotle's theory then this contest is against Aristotle's theory. We know that the virtue ethics is being honest, brave, just, generous and so on a person develops an honorable and moral character. This Coyote killing contests represent an unethical hunting. The bounty hunters who participate in this competition, they are doing this because of the price money. Doing something wrong for money is unethical and the person who is doing this is not honest and generous. Also the organizations who are arranging this kind of contests in name of the balance of wildlife and safety, they are just unethical people. So we all should ban this kind of unethical contests.

CHAPTER 2 : DONATION FOR PLANTING TREES

2.1. THEORY ANALYSIS : KANTIAN THEORY :

German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was an opponent of utilitarianism. Leading 20th century proponent of Kantianism: Professor Elizabeth Anscombe (1920-2001).

Kant, unlike Mill, believed that certain types of actions (including murder, theft, and lying) were absolutely prohibited, even in cases where the action would bring about more happiness than the alternative. For Kantians, there are two questions that we must ask ourselves whenever we decide to act: (i) Can I rationally will that *everyone* act as I propose to act? If the answer is no, then we must not perform the action. (ii) Does my action respect the goals of human beings rather than merely using them for my own purposes? Again, if the answer is no, then we must not perform the action. (Kant believed that these questions were equivalent).

Kant's theory is an example of a deontological moral theory—according to these theories, the rightness or wrongness of actions does not depend on their consequences but on whether they fulfill our duty.

2.2. PROBLEM ANALYSIS : DONATION FOR TREES :

There is a problem which is the man who lives in Saskatchewan, where the tremendous Saskatchewan is going door to door to raise funds to plant trees throughout the city and province. The volunteer who comes to the door for \$50 donation, and he thinks that we should think about homeless shelter less people first than thinking about plants. In the reply the volunteer said that trees can change our environment and also can provide many homes for many kinds of animals. And if he can't give money than he can give his time and volunteer with them. So there is a problem that the money that for planting trees which is a good attempt but there are other problems in our society like homeless people, uneducated children, etc. So what should he do now from my perspective? I'm going to discuss this in the next segment.

2.3. SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM :

Donation for planting trees. According to Kantian ethics refers to a deontological ethical theory developed by German philosopher Immanuel Kant that is based on the notion that: "It is impossible to think of anything at all in the world, or indeed even beyond it, that could be considered good without limitation except a good will." So the given problem can be solved by Kantian ethics. If the person thinks about Kantian ethics, then he can donate that money for tree plantation because Kantian says that it is impossible to think about everything in the world. Still, he can do good without limitation except for goodwill. Also, he can volunteer if he believes that this donation is not worthy of money. By volunteering, he can also contribute to charity.

CHAPTER 3 : PLASTIC WATER BOTTLE BAN

3.1. THEORY ANALYSIS : ARISTOTLE'S VIRTUE ETHICS :

Virtue ethics is mainly a philosophy developed by Aristotle. Aristotle's virtue ethics doesn't look for list of items that are good. The principal idea with which Aristotle begins is that there are differences of opinion about what is best for human beings, and that to profit from ethical inquiry we must resolve this disagreement. He insists that ethics is not a theoretical discipline: we are asking what the good for human beings is not simply because we want to have knowledge, but because we will be better able to achieve our good if we develop a fuller understanding of what it is to flourish. In raising this question—what is the good?—Aristotle is not looking for a list of items that are good. He assumes that such a list can be compiled rather easily; most would agree, for example, that it is good to have friends, to experience pleasure, to be healthy, to be honored, and to have such virtues as courage at least to some degree. The difficult and controversial question arises when we ask whether certain of these goods are more desirable than others. Aristotle's search for the good is a search for the highest good, and he assumes that the highest good, whatever it turns out to be has three characteristics:

- Its desirable for itself
- it is not desirable for the sake of some other good and,
- All other goods are desirable for its sake.

Aristotle thinks everyone will agree that the terms “eudaimonia”. To be eudaimon is therefore to be living in a way that is well-favored by a god. But Aristotle never calls attention to this etymology in his ethical writings, and it seems to have little influence on his thinking. No one tries to live well for the sake of some further goal; rather, being eudaimon is the highest end, and all subordinate goals—health, wealth, and other such resources—are sought because they promote well-being, not because they are what well-being consists in. But unless we can determine which good or goods happiness consists in, it is of little use to acknowledge that it is the highest end. To resolve this issue, Aristotle asks what the ergon of a human being is, and argues that it consists in activity of the rational part of the soul in accordance with virtue. One important component of this argument is expressed in terms of distinctions he makes in his psychological and biological works. The soul is analyzed into a connected series of capacities: the nutritive soul is responsible for growth and reproduction, the locomotive soul for motion, the perceptive soul for perception, and so on. The biological fact Aristotle makes use of is that human beings are the only species that has not only these lower capacities but a rational soul as well. The good of a human being must have something to do with being human; and what sets humanity off from other species, giving us the potential to live a better life, is our capacity to guide ourselves by using reason. If we use reason well, we live well as human beings; or, to be more precise, using reason well over the course of a full life is what happiness consists in. Doing anything well requires virtue or excellence, and therefore living well consists in activities caused by the rational soul in accordance with virtue or excellence.

3.2. PROBLEM ANALYSIS : PLASTIC WATER BOTTLE BAN ;

Plastics bottles are everywhere and are a big source of pollution. But banning them might create another problem for the environment. Early forms plastics have existed since the mid-1800s. But when WWII came along, scientists diverted all their plastics technology to help with the war effort. So after the war, all this plastic needed to go somewhere, so why not the American consumer? What we got was a plastic explosion, and it's never really stopped. That's why today, it's estimated that humans have created over 8 billion tons of plastic, most of which still exist. See, plastic doesn't ever really break down completely or biodegrade-- it just breaks apart into smaller and smaller pieces over time. These tiny bits

of plastics make their way into oceans, creating a plastic soup of pollution that can get into bellies of all kinds of marine animals like fish, pelicans and turtles. Some research studies predict that by 2050, pound for pound, plastics in the oceans will outweigh all fish. About 70% of plastic water bottles bought in the U.S are not recycled, and so end in the oceans. On top of that, plastic bottles are made from fossil fuels. In fact, the Pacific Institute found that it took about 17 million barrels of oil to produce enough plastic for the bottles of water consumed by Americans in 2006. And since then, consumption has increased by 65%, meaning Americans need over 28 million barrels of oil to fuel their plastic water bottle need for one year. But banning plastic bottles altogether can have unintended consequences. After the University of Vermont instituted their ban on selling single use plastic water bottles on campus, total shipments of all plastic bottles actually increased 20 percent as people bought other plastic bottles beverages like soda and juice instead. And switching to alternatives like glass or more fossil fuels and creating more pollution.

3.3 SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM :

Plastic water bottles are not the only means to obtain water and stay hydrated. There are a variety of alternative water bottles, which include:

Reusable water bottles

Reusable water bottles are made from several different materials, including ceramic, glass, and stainless steel. These materials offer a number of benefits over plastic. For instance, all of these materials will last for years, and glass can be recycled an infinite number of times.

Biodegradable water bottles

Even bottles that aren't edible may be biodegradable. Taking the water bottle maker cue, which has produced a 100% biodegradable water bottle and a label made with non-toxic inks and glue. The bottles can be composted and will theoretically break down even if they end up in a landfill or Ocean, though it's unclear how long that process will take.

Boxed water

Paper bottles still draw on environmental resources after all, paper comes from trees, but they are 100% recyclable and may be less toxic than plastic bottles. Make no bones about it, plastic water bottles wreak havoc on ecosystems around the globe. But whenever possible, people can choose not to use plastic water bottles and opt for reusable options instead. In the process, we can all play a part in saving our planet.

CONCLUSION

The discussion of ethics provides an understanding of human behavior and decision making. The presentation of ethics in this paper reveals the crucial component moral principles play in society. Each and every person has to be aware how our actions affect people directly or indirectly. Personal and professional ethics influence each other and provide an indication of individual character.

Our actions and decisions in any situation define how society views us. Such as Coyote Hunting Contest, Donation for Planting trees, Plastic Water Bottle Ban we must be mindful about how others view us, our decisions, and our actions. Negative ethical decisions are noticed more frequently and provide a basis for judgment rather than positive ethical decisions. Each individual has a distinct responsibility to make the right and moral choice each time an ethical situation arises.

In every area of society, ethics play a major role in decision making. Personal integrity and ethical choices can influence a successful life and career. Many societal views correlate ethics with integrity. Integrity is the single most important attribute a person can have; a trait that can be a powerful weapon. Compromising personal principles in any way impacts your ability to conduct life in a moral fashion. A person's core values reflect honesty and truth and focuses on the ability to make the right and just decision. This paper will discuss the origin of ethical principles, personal and professional morals, and ethics in relation to policing.

Ethics is the study and examination of what constitutes good or bad conduct. Ethics is the classification of specific behaviors as right or wrong within a person's personal or profession life. Ethical behavior provides the guidelines which are the foundation for success or failure in each person's life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<https://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/glossary/virtue-ethics#:~:text=Virtue%20ethics%20is%20a%20philosophy%20developed%20by%20Aristotle%20and%20other%20ancient%20Greeks.&text=This%20character%2Dbased%20approach%20to,an%20honorable%20and%20moral%20character.>

<https://www.humanesociety.org/resources/coyote-calling-contests>

<https://e360.yale.edu/features/coyote-carnage-the-gruesome-truth-about-wildlife-killing-contests>

<https://edmontonjournal.com/business/alberta-should-ban-bounties-on-coyotes-wolves-researcher>

<https://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/glossary/utilitarianism#:~:text=Utilitarianism%20is%20an%20ethical%20theory,wrong%20by%20focusing%20on%20outcomes.&text=Utilitarianism%20holds%20that%20the%20most,justify%20military%20force%20or%20war.>

<https://www.csus.edu/indiv/g/gaskilld/ethics/kantian%20ethics.htm>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bottled_water_ban#:~:text=Legislation%20banning%20the%20sale%20of,effect%20on%20January%201%2C%202013.

<https://www.procon.org/headlines/should-bottled-water-be-banned-top-4-pros-and-cons/>

<https://www.kqed.org/education/532653/would-banning-plastic-bottles-help-or-hurt-the-planet>

<https://www.waterlogicaustralia.com.au/blog/banning-the-plastic-water-bottle-and-bottled-water-culture/>