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**Answer to the question no.: 1**

The deontological theory of ethics called duty ethics and the teleological theory of ethics called utilitarianism differ from each other in many ways. Firstly, duty ethics follows absolutism, whereas utilitarianism follows relativism. Duty ethics is absolute in the universe, it will remain the same for a course of action regardless of the situation and context. In contrast, utilitarianism is relative, meaning it suggests a person to take different ethical approaches on a particular course of action based on the context and circumstances. For example, duty ethics will always tell one to help others regardless of the situation, while utilitarianism will suggest one to help others if that brings him/her advantage and not to help otherwise. Secondly, utilitarianism or the teleological approach focuses on the consequences while judging some action to be right or wrong. On the contrary, duty ethics does not emphasize on the consequences of any action, it judges whether that action is morally just or not by itself. For example, duty ethics will always say that stealing is immoral without seeing the result or outcome, whereas teleological ethics would ask for the context first. If the stolen goods from the rich are being used to help the poor, then the consequence of stealing is good, it would not harm the rich much and thus stealing is moral in that circumstance and immoral if the consequence was bad, like making bombs out of the goods to make a massacre. Therefore, duty ethics and utilitarianism are very different from each other.