CONTRADICTIONS OF ETHICS IN POLITICS: PERSPECTIVES OF CORPORATE AND PERSONAL ETHICS

Thomas Otieno Juma ✉

Lecturer of Public Administration; Department of Humanities, University of Kabianga; Kericho, Kenya

thomasotienojuma@yahoo.com

Ibrahim Manyara

Assistant Lecturer of Political Science and International Relations; Department of Social Sciences and Development Studies, Catholic University of Eastern Africa; Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract

This paper attempts to examine the interwoven contradictions of ethics in politics from corporate and personal ethics. The application of political play often leaves many in the fields of governance, public policy, and by large International Relations in dilemma. Many utter; "Politics ought to be ethical yet in many instances it depicts contradictions". Whether the statement uttered has truth or not is questionable and answerable to the extent of epistemological dimensions through a microscopic scholarly view herein undertaken. This paper anchors itself on a qualitative approach by opening written thoughts of selected philosophers for readers and practitioners (business and political) to make informed perspectives of ethics. Based on generalizations; this paper argues on key themes relevant to the topic, finding role of ethics in societal ecology, then narrowing down to ethical theories and their applications to personal and business ethics and whether contradictions exist in politics. This discussion concludes that there exist positive and negative contradictions of ethics in politics. Contradictions of ethics in politics are majorly construed to; it's being relativity concept, being application based, and its epistemological dimensions. Similarly, its contradiction emanates from immoral citizenry – the breeding ground of political elite thus the output of unethical practice in politics.

Keywords: Ethics, Political Ethics, Dilemma in Ethics, Practical Ethics, Personal Ethics, Corporate Ethics

INTRODUCTION

Ethics: a Relativity Concept

Knowing the contentions in the concept, the study pre-empts to ask what really ethics is. From one perspective as stated by Velasquez, Andre, Shanks, S.J., and Meyer (2010), ethics is based on well-founded standards of right and wrong that prescribe what humans ought to do, usually in terms of rights, obligations, benefits to society, fairness, or specific virtues. The meaning of "ethics" is hard to pin down, and the views many people have about ethics are shaky. Nor should one identify ethics with religion since most religions, of course, advocate high ethical standards. Being ethical is also not the same as following the law although the law often incorporates ethical standards to which most citizens subscribe. Being ethical is not the same as doing "whatever society accepts." In any society, most people accept standards that are, in fact, ethical. But standards of behavior in society can deviate from what is ethical. An entire society can become ethically corrupt. Nazi Germany is a good example of a morally corrupt society. From the foregoing, there emerges an open window of conclusions to many; is it my feelings, my religious beliefs, the requirements of law, or the standards of behavior one society accept. Though premature to sum, the latter two insinuates what the wider practice would stand for:

Glancing Contradictions and Counter-Contradictions of Ethics through *Ancient – Contemporary* Political Thinkers

"To those who do business – theirs is business activity and it's ethics lies on how they do it for success and for preservation of life of others; Similarly, to those who engage in politics – as a high activity that also oversees business, the expectation of ethics is high fold beyond business."

The views of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and Cicero on ethics epitomizes the classical view of ethics meaning that the study of the conception of ethics by these philosophers will generally represent how ethics and ethical issues were conceived during the classical period. But before we look at their views, a glimpse at the ancient Greco- Roman and Judeo- Christian ethical traditions will suffice. The Greeks were possessed with the notion of fate such that they believed that if one was deprived of the opportunity to live well, nothing could compensate for it. Even those who believed in the afterlife were convinced that even there, one continued to endure the shame of not having been able to live/ lead a good life (Morrow, 2005; Lear, 1988). On the other hand, the Judeo- Christian tradition, held that there was abundant compensation in the afterlife for those who lived a virtuous life. Clearly, the two traditions held contrasting views on ethics.

Socrates thought and practiced ethics throughout his entire life of philosophical inquiry. We should note however that we are referring to the historical Socrates as portrait by Plato and Xenophon as a saint and eventually a martyr and not Aristophane's account of Socrates as a worst Sophist. Socrates believed that the 'unexamined life is not worthy living'. In this famous quote, Socrates demonstrates his strong belief that man must seek knowledge and wisdom that he equates to virtue. Once man is equipped with the knowledge, he should strive to follow the dictates of his conscience and eventually he will attain true knowledge which will bring happiness, the greatest happiness. This aspect of attaining happiness through virtue was echoed by other classical philosophers.

Plato argued that happiness or wellbeing is the highest aim of moral conduct and thought and is attained through living a virtuous life (Levin, 2019). While Aristotle on his part maintained that the genuine pursuit of happiness and living a virtuous life are the same. Socrates believed that reason mediated knowledge in order to attain true knowledge, ultimate knowledge by arguing thus: reason is essential to a man's good life because true knowledge is promoted by doing what is right whereby what is right is obtained through true knowledge mediated by reason. Socrates was in essence arguing that a man will only do right things and take right actions when he has true knowledge, but one can only have true knowledge when he uses reason to make decisions. This reminds us of Plato's analogies of the just city and just soul. In the analogy of the just city, Plato argued that for the city to be just, it must be ruled by wise rulers who make intelligent decisions about the city guided by reason and each class to willingly accept to do their role without interfering with the role of other two classes. While in analogy of the just soul, he argued that for the soul to be just and virtuous, the element of reason within the soul should make decisions.

There is nowhere in the western philosophical tradition where the idea of putting thought into practice is demonstrated as in Socrates' refusal to escape prison after his drummed up charges, trial and conviction. In the Apology, Crito tried to persuade Socrates to escape prison to avoid the death sentence. He refused insisting that he must face his sentence because escaping prison will betray his moral principles (Lee, 1953). This portrayed Socrates as a man of strong moral and ethical character, a virtuous man. He was willing and ready to stoically face his death sentence in order to protect what he thought and believed in. Although Socrates thought that ethics and virtue lead to knowledge, he later argued that nobody knowingly can do what is wrong or evil and that even those who commit the most heinous crime always think that they are doing it for a good reason. This view contradicts his early position that a man will do good when he has knowledge, true knowledge. He was heavily criticized by Aristotle who called it moral weakness whereby one knows what is good but goes ahead to do evil.

Plato conceived ethics as virtue or living a virtuous life. He called these concepts Eudaimonia and Arête respectively. But for a man to achieve virtue or virtuous life he must have pure knowledge, the ultimate knowledge. This is the knowledge about knowledge's sake, the highest form of knowledge. His argument was echoed by Aristotle when he argued in his nicomachean ethics that its only Political Science that can answer the question of the good life for man because according to him, Political Science aims at achieving the highest good he equates to happiness or Eudaimonia. This takes us to Aristotlean ethics.

Much of Aristotle's ethics is captured in his Nicomachean ethics. Although Aristotle essentially dedicated nicomachean ethics to his son Nicomachus, it was in essence an attempt to answer the question what is good life for man. He argued that since man is a political animal in nature, man can only attain a good life within a society in which he lives because society provides much of the opportunity for living a good life (Lear, 1988). In order to achieve a good life, Aristotle maintained that nicomachean ethics gives a person a reflective understanding of how to achieve happiness by living an ethical life in society and that the reflective understanding is supposed to be practical in nature. This is emphasized in the following quote as captured by Jonathan Lear in: Aristotle- the desire to understand pg 155 thus: "*if there is some end of the things we do which we desire for its own sake [everything else being desired for the sake of this] clearly this must be the good and the chief good. Will not the knowledge of it then have a great influence on life?.*"

Aristotle emphasized his believe that ethics is based on the study of human desire because all human action is guided by human desire. But human desire refers to both the desires of the soul and the desires of the body. What human desire was Aristotle referring to? Did he mean body or desires of the soul? And herein lies the contraction in his ethics. Desires of the body are essentially basic physical needs of man such as need for food, shelter, clothing interlia. Such desires will not lead man to a virtuous life or happy life as he had early opined. . But if this is what he meant then perhaps he was stating what later Cicero called moral virtue or happiness arguing that virtue or ethics leads to happiness and that to be completely happy requires external goods which must be sought to perfect happiness (Cascellano, 2011).

On the other hand, if he referred to the desires of the soul, then just like Socrates; he was referring to people who are already leading a happy and virtuous life in order to give them insight into the nature of their soul. This view also poses some problems, if his ethics is directed at people who already are living a virtuous life in society, what about the other people who are not yet living a virtuous life? This definitely contradicts his early argument that nicomachean ethics was supposed to guide man on how to live a good life in society where man refer to all men in society but not a section on men.

The ethics of Cicero, a Roman Lawyer, revolved around the Roman conception of citizens' obligation/ duty to society and the State. He defined ethics as the study of how to know and do what is good implying that one should first know what is good in order to know his obligations and how to discharge his dealings with others in society. In other words, ethics according to Cicero was concerned with determining what the correct course of conduct in society is ie whether an action is morally right or wrong and whether an act was geared towards achieving comfort and happiness (Cascellano, 2011). He called absolute good categorical good and utility the good which brings happiness or comfort.

Cicero rejected the notion of reducing moral duty to utility arguing that animalistic utility should not be the basis of human morality because human morality should be aimed at a higher good he called absolute or categorical good. Effectively like Socrates, he dismissed those who attempted to reduce morality to utility as lacking moral ground to teach ethics because they did not understand the true nature of moral duty. Cicero therefore believed that moral duty was the ultimate good or supreme good to which all men are duty bound and that this ultimate good was perfect when put to practice ie manifesting ethics in action. To this end Cicero appeared to contradict his early position that moral ethics is supposed to be absolute thought hence in advancing the argument of a practical aspect of ethics, he attempted to equate ethics to utility. This is because utility requires action that to a large extent will bring pleasure and satisfaction to the physical body. While moral duty or absolute good brings the desire for the truth and liberty and transcends world expediency and seeks things that are truly good in themselves because truth is the unqualified good while liberty is circumscribed by just rules of morality and laws in society (Cascellano, 2011).

Cicero like Socrates and Plato argued that wisdom is the highest and dearest of virtue for the human nature manifested in a natural desire to know the truth and avoid error. In other words, wisdom should make man aware of his moral duty and give him the ability to execute his duty to society, but he does not differentiate between wisdom as an intellectual value and wisdom as a moral virtue.

Is politics ethical?

The concepts of Politics and Ethics have been central to the discussions and discourses on what constitutes moral or ethical political practice throughout history of human civilization. Indeed from classical Greece, through modern period to contemporary times the theme has been subject to intense debate albeit from diverse perspectives. Socrates argued that politics and ethics are closely related such that without politics, ethics carries no value and without ethics politics will be harmful. He believed that people must learn political ethics because it

makes good and proper persons both public and private citizens and that the highest of all virtues is political ethics and Art which includes Statecraft that make a man good politician and good public official. Socrates therefore advanced the understanding that politics and political practice should essentially be ethical and virtuous (Morrow, 2005; Lutz, 1998). The views of Socrates about politics and ethics were reiterated by Aristotle in 'The Politics' when he argued that politics and ethics were closely linked and ethical and virtuous life is only available to a man who participate in politics and moral education. He emphasized this view in his Nicomachean Ethics thus: *"The ends or goal of politics is the best of ends and the main concern of politics is to engender a certain character in the citizens and to make them good and disposed to perform noble actions".*

Aristotle was in effect saying that the purpose of politics is to instill moral values in the people which will guide them in whatever action they take within the society in which they live. Actions that are guided by moral values performed by good persons are good actions accepted in society.

Plato was convinced that only a few people should participate in the deliberations of State matters or politics of the State. He identified such people as those with knowledge and wisdom .In the 'Republic, book five' he argued that only those who are trained and have good knowledge and wisdom should be allowed to lead and manage the affairs of the State in what he famously referred to as the philosopher king [Lee, 1953]. This according to him is when the State will truly be just and the citizens will get justice because the philosopher king will govern guided by public interest. Plato's position was supported by his student Aristotle when he argued in the 'Politics' that only some people can beneficially study politics such that women and slaves can never benefit from the study of politics and should not be allowed to participate in politics. Equally he singled out young men as being ill equipped to be students of politics because they have no experience in the actions which life demands of them and that those actions form the basis and subject of political discussion. Hence they will act on the basis of their emotions instead of reason and such action will not constitute what entails politics (Morrow, 2005).

From the above discussion, it is apparent that classical political thinkers were unanimous that politics and political practice was supposed to be ethical and virtuous and that it [politics] is supposed to be practiced by a few people who have knowledge and wisdom and not the entire population. This is by virtue and because such people will manage public affairs guided by public interest leading to a just society. But this position is not necessarily shared by modern and contemporary political thinkers.

Although modern political theorists were preoccupied with the constitution of the State and the interrelationship between the State and the people, they nevertheless had their own view of politics. John Locke conceptualized the State as formed through the consent of the people and that it must be ruled by the will of the people who should essentially be supreme. The supremacy of the people according to him is exercised through the legislature who should make laws that truly reflect the will of the people. This pegs the question, do members of the legislature ie politicians consult the people before enacting laws? The answer is both yes and no. Yes because there are a few instances in developed democracies when members of Parliament gather public views before taking a position regarding specific legislation. But even when they do consult the public, it is not all the people who are consulted but a few social elites. No because the people are not consulted in most of the legislations passed by most Legislatures world over.

In such circumstances, members of the legislatures usurp the full responsibilities and make decisions purportedly on behalf of the people when in essence such laws passed advance their own interests and do not reflect the true will of the people. J J Rousseau as if borrowing from Locke argued that the State is founded and ruled by the general will. Hence the general will must be translated into the laws of the State meaning that the laws of the State should be made to reflect the will of the people. However, it is doubtful whether politicians indeed make laws that truly reflect the will of the people. This is perhaps true going by Gibson Boyce's comment on Rousseau's conception of the General Will (Gibson, 2017). Gibson observed that the rich and powerful feeling threatened by the poor, and aware of the ignorance of the poor masses, came up with the conspiracy of forming the commonwealth. Through the commonwealth, they made laws that legalized their wealth and legitimized the inequalities in society. This means that in any society, politicians make laws that essentially protect the interests of the rich and powerful in respective society. In essence, the politics or political process through which laws are made to protect interests of a few in societies cannot be ethical. Perhaps this view is propagated elegantly by most contemporary political theorists.

Heywood defines politics as the affairs and activity of the State through which people in the State make, preserve and amends general laws that govern the State. David Easton argues that politics is the authoritative allocation of values meaning that politics refer to formulation of formal policies and decisions that govern society. Benard Crick in 'in defense of Politics' argued that politics is the Art of the possible, the Art of solving conflict in society by compromise, conciliation and negotiation. This position was echoed by Annah Arendt when she said that political power refers to acting in concert. The Marxist conception of politics is perhaps the most comprehensive thus politics is the process of acquiring power in a State through whatever

means, consolidate the power and use the power to produce and distribute national resources to improve the welfare of the people (Kupar, 2012; Heywood, 2015). From this perspective, it can be argued that politics is ethical to the extent that it is aimed at improving the welfare of the masses of the people while at the same time it is unethical to the extent that the process of acquiring power may involve use of force and bloodshed.

Vilfredo Pareto in his theory of circulation of elites argued that people are essentially unequal by nature in society such that it is elites who dominate and lead society because they possess attributes of courage and conning. He equated these attributes with a lion and fox observing that leaders who are foxes rule by deceit, cunning and manipulation while those who are lions rule using force through a small group. His view was supported by Robert Michels in his iron law of oligarch arguing that a small group will always rule any organized society regardless of its structural arrangements. In essence Pareto and Michel's are advancing a powerful argument that in any State, it is the political elites who determine the policies and laws of the community by dominating the political discourses of the State. Such elites as Pareto points out will cunningly and deceitfully manipulate the masses in order to continue sustaining themselves in power. The deceitful manipulation may take the form of voter buying during an election, influence through cash handout or outright rigging of an election. This grim picture of politics is perhaps well captured by Heywood (2015) when he says that for many people, politics is simply dirty and involving deception, dishonesty and corruption. He adds that politicians are held in low esteem because they are perceived to be power-seeking hypocrites who conceal personal ambition behind the rhetoric of public service and ideological conviction.

Apparently, the above discussions projects politics as a two- faced concept – good politics and bad politics. Good politics is at play when the political class or the ruling class attempt to execute policies and laws guided by public interests and such politics can said to be ethical at face value as advocated for by classical political theorists. On the other hand, bad politics is at play when the ruling elites formulate and execute public policies and laws driven purely by greed and personal interests and such politics are indeed unethical.

Understanding Ethics: Ethical theories and their applications to personal and business ethics

This is a confusing subject to students of politics, law, religion, and much more in business world. Because of this dilemma people have often taken ethics as a relative peradventure both in practice and much more theoretically. Ethics is a popular discourse in the practice of business and most often a synonym to business ethics. Norman (2013) in explaining the concepts says, business ethics is a concise, but in many ways misleading, label for an interdisciplinary field

covering a vast range of normative issues in the world of commerce. The label lends itself most directly to a core set of questions about how individuals in the business world ought to behave, or what principles they might appeal to in order to negotiate moral dilemmas at work. These core issues about individual virtues and ethical decision-making are surrounded by layers of issues involving organizations and institutions. In other words, business ethics in the broadest sense also inquires about the most appropriate or just designs for firms, markets, market regulations, and political oversight in a democratic society and a globalized economy.

Business ethicists have focused much less on justifying the departures from everyday ethics which may be required by optimizing institutions than have their colleagues who theorize about legal ethics. All business ethicists who have focused on the ethics of the individual businessperson have worked within the virtue-ethics tradition. It is also natural to think that an ethical businessperson will have to be adept at decision- making when faced with difficult and constrained options (Markovits, 2008).

According to Markkula Center for Applied Ethics - Santa Clara University (2011), Ethics is sometimes conflated or confused with other ways of making choices, including religion, law or morality. Many religions promote ethical decision - making but do not always address the full range of ethical choices that we face. Religions may also advocate or prohibit certain behaviors which may not be considered the proper domain of ethics, such as dietary restrictions or sexual behaviors. A good system of   law should be ethical, but the law establishes precedent in trying to dictate universal guidelines, and is thus not able to respond to individual contexts. Law may have a difficult time designing or enforcing standards in some important areas, and may be slow to address new problems. Ethics provides a set of standards for behavior that helps us decide how we ought to act in a range of situations. In a sense, we can say that ethics is all about making choices, and about providing reasons why we should make these choices.

Ethical theories are often broadly divided into three types: First there is the *consequentialist theories*, which are primarily concerned with the ethical consequences of particular actions; Secondly there is *non- consequentialist theories*, which tend to be broadly concerned with the intentions of the person making ethical decisions about particular actions; and thirdly the existence of *agent - centered theories*, which, unlike consequentialist and non-consequentialist theories, are more concerned with the overall ethical status of individuals, or agents, and are less concerned to identify the morality of particular actions (Northern Colorado, 2008).

It goes further to disintegrate consequentialist further into three categories; *utilitarianism, egoistic, and common approach*. In this sense, utilitarianism argues that the best life is one that produces the least pain and distress. It is concerned with decisions of consequences that

concern large groups of people, in part because it instructs us to weigh the different amounts of good and bad that will be produced by our action. The egoistic approach unlike the utilitarian approach is known as ethical egoism, or the ethics of self-interest. It is often the good for oneself, the pursuit of self - interest which is leading to the benefit of society, although the benefit of society is seen only as the fortunate byproduct. It further suggests that the Common Good Approach who argues that the best society should be guided by the "general will" of the people is best for the people as a whole. Non- consquentialist approach include; *duty - based approach*, sometimes called deontological ethics, *rights approach to ethics, fairness or justice approach*, and *the divine command approach*. Agent-centered theories however, include *the virtue approach and the feminist approach*.

Making good ethical decisions (Distance Education Report, 2008) requires a trained sensitivity to ethical issues and a practiced method for exploring the ethical aspects of a decision and weighing the considerations that should impact our choice of a course of action. Having a method for ethical decision making is essential. When practiced regularly, the method becomes so familiar that we work through it automatically without consulting the specific steps. This is one reason why we can sometimes say that we have a "moral intuition" about a certain situation, even when we have not consciously thought through the issue.

Chonko, (Undated) suggests, utilitarian ethical theories are based on one's ability to predict the consequences of an action. To a utilitarian, the choice that yields the greatest benefit to the most people is the one that is ethically correct. There are two types of utilitarianism, act utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism. Act utilitarianism subscribes precisely to the definition of utilitarianism a person performs the acts that benefit the most people, regardless of personal feelings or the societal constraints such as laws. Rule utilitarianism takes into account the law and is concerned with fairness. A rule utilitarian seeks to benefit the most people but through the fairest and most just means available.

In addition to utilitarianism, the rights in ethical theories based on rights which are established by a society, essentially these are protected and given the highest priority. Rights are considered to be ethically correct and valid since a large population endorses them. Individuals may also bestow rights upon others if they have the ability and resources to do so. Further, exploring the virtue ethical theory judges a person by his/her character rather than by an action that may deviate from his/her normal behavior. It takes the person's morals, reputation, and motivation into account when rating an unusual and irregular behavior that is considered unethical. One weakness of virtue ethical theory is that it does not take into consideration a person's change in moral character.

Applications of Ethical Theories: 'Politics setting super standards'

Ethical theories whether ancient or contemporary discuss a domain that is constant "*ethics*". What changes is where it is practiced, by whom it is practiced, and for what objectives. The interference with the permanence of ethics in its original nature only destroys self – the proprietor of its justification.

Different disciplines apply ethics to their domains differently, but we can we can make conclusive refocus using business for our discourse. Business ethics is a specialized branch of ethics focusing on how moral standards apply to business organizations and behavior (Velasques, 1998). As such, it cannot be understood separately from the general ideas of ethics, and the general ethical theories apply to business ethics as well (Lahdesnati, 2005). Normative ethical theory offers different moral theories, each prescribing a set of moral rules that individuals can apply in the process of deciding whether an action is morally right or wrong in various situations (Alder, Schminke, Noel, & Kuenzi, 2008). By the very nature of politics in a state, it is the overriding playmaker hence beholder of morals. This means, it must set the pace for moral standards within its domain. It has 'the ethical instruments' and monitors it through an institutionally mandated system.

The role of ethical theories is less dominant in the field of ethical decision making. Only a few ethical decision-making models rely directly on ethical theories. One example is Hunt and Vitell's (1986) ethical decision making model according to which the evaluation phase of a decision-making process is carried out through a combination of utilitarian and deontological assessments. Using examples of deception as an ethical issue around us and our business environments, numerous inferences can be arrived at;

First, in the case of deception, if the situation raises no serious concerns in regard to the welfare of employees, future harmful consequences to the agent, to the organization or to others, individuals will employ deontology principles in order to reason their decision not to deceive. A decision not to deceive can also rely on reasoning which is based on rights theory or the theory of justice. Fritzsche & Becker (1984) and Premeaux (2004) showed that respondents used the theory of rights to explain their reluctance to deceive. Redenbacher and Robin (1990) highlight the role of fairness and justice in decisions that involve deception against customers.

Secondly, in the case of deception, if the deception upholds potential to violate a contract or other people rights, individuals will use rights theory to reason their decision not to deceive. Again, in the case of deception, if the deception is to be held against a weak party or will create an unjust distribution of goods, individuals will use the theory of justice to reason their decision not to deceive. Sometimes the dilemma of deception arises when the organization is experiencing hard times and facing the threat of failure and possible layoffs. These situations

could have a strong effect on the relationship with employees. Lahdesmati (2005) found that mangers present their duty to take care of their employees as one of their ethical duties. Shultz and Brender – Ilan (2004) and Schumann (2001) also stress the importance of fostering special relationships with employees when managing human resource issues within organizations.

Thirdly, in the case of deception, if the deception can settle serious concerns in regard to the welfare of employees, individuals will use the ethics of care to reason their decision to deceive. Utilitarian ethical reasoning emphasizes the consequences of a decision. When a deception has the potential to harm the company's image or its reputation so that the total negative results of the deception outweigh its positive results.

Fourth and fifth, in the case of deception, if the chances are high that the deception will damage the organization's future successes, individuals will use utilitarian theory to reason their decision not to deceive. In the case of deception where chances are high that the deception will have a significant net positive effect, individuals will use utilitarian theory to reason their decision to deceive. Some ethical dilemmas dealing with deception present a conflict between obedience to a superior against a concern for personal integrity. Ward's dilemma used by Fritzsche & Becker (1984) and Premeaux (2004) and Evelyn's and Roger's dilemmas used in Weber's (1990) research all present a scenario of this kind.

Lastly, in the case of deception, if the deception raises the issue of obeying the boss or being loyal to the organization, individuals will use egoism theory to reason their decision to participate in a deception as already discussed.

CONCLUSION

From the corporate and personal perspectives, contradictions of ethics in politics indeed arise. Observably according to Horton (2019), the system of moral and ethical beliefs to business organizations and individuals include; the values, behaviors, and decisions of an enterprise called business ethics. Some of these are coded into various sets of law; business environment regulations, maximum/minimum wages, and conflict of interest which set minimum standards for operations. He opines that the management team sets the tone for organizational daily running. And often, when the management philosophy is based on acceptable practices and behavior, organization leaders can direct employees by example and guide them in making beneficial decisions to them as individuals and in addition to the whole organization.

From Horton's assertion, we can deduce that from business perspectives, the ethical systems should; take cognizance to organization and individuals, underscore that ethics are common beliefs and ought to be coded touching key areas of common good, and ensure that leadership must have a philosophy around such ethics to aptly lead. Hence those even not

subscribing to the philosophy of the existing ethical systems morally exclude themselves from leading. Melissa Horton further adduce that with business ethical systems rolling out and practiced we would experience better decisions in less time with business ethics, based on honesty and integrity the whole organization benefits, and high standard of business ethics in all facets means more likely of management and staff to perform their job duties at a higher level.

Why ethics as practiced in corporates never find foot in politics is a contradiction itself. Why? Political leadership is the supreme leadership above all businesses. It is never subordinate but ordinate in its jurisdiction – the state. Contradictions of ethics in politics are majorly construed to; it's being relativity concept, being application based, and its epistemological dimensions. Similarly, its contradiction emanates from immoral citizenry – the breeding ground of political elite thus the output of unethical practice in politics.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since people define ethics, so do systems, but above all there is silent *metasystem* to 'all ethically conscious beings'. *All beings ought to be ethical*. The starting point in ethical practice *is the personal lenses* before the other. *Through systems we create our breakers* (breaking systems/walls) of non-ethics and we furnish them with guiding norms in form of constitutions and bylaws then enforcing agents to make our resolves active. It is possible, with time, some of our breakers may look archaic or unfulfilling hence retreating to drawing boards often are necessary.

REFERENCES

Alder, G.S., Schminke, M., Noel, T.W., and Kuenzi, M. (2008). Employee Reactions to Internet Monitoring: The Moderating Role of Ethical Orientation Journal of Business Ethics, 80:481-498.

Cascellano, Daniel J. (2011). Foundations of Ethics Vol.1: Stoicism in Cicero.

Chonko, Larry Ph.D. (Undated). Ethical Theories. DSEF - The University of Texas at Arlington. Distance Education Report (2008). Understanding Ethical Frameworks for E- Learning Decision- Making, December 1.

Distance Education Report (2008).

Fritzsche, D.J., & Becker, H. (1984). Linking Management Behavior to Ethical Philosophy - An Empirical Investigation. Academy of Management Journal, 27(1): 166-175.

Gibson, Boyce W. R. (2017). "British and Continental Philosophy", lecture to Melbourne University Philosophical Society in 1962. The slogan had earlier been used by Passmore in A Hundred Years of Philosophy. Melbourne University, UK.

Heywood, A. (2005). Political Theory. An Introduction. 4th Ed. Palgrave Publishers.

Heywood, Andrew (2000). Key concepts in Politics. Palgrave Macmillan Publishers.

Horton, Melissa (2019). The Importance of Business Ethics. Feb 25, Investopedia.

Hunt, S.D. and Vitell, S.A.(1986). A General Theory of Marketing Ethics. Journal of Macromarketing, 8(2), 5-16.

Kapur, Chand Anud (2012). Principles of Political Science. Chand and Co. ltd. New Delhi.

Klosko, George (2002). History of Political Theory: An Introduction. Thomson Learning Inc. USA.

Lahdesmaki, M. (2005). When Ethics Matters – Interpreting the Ethical Discourse of Small Nature – Based Entrepreneurs. Journal of Business Ethics, 61: 55-68.

Lear, Jonathan (1988). Aristotle- the desire to understand. Cambridge University Press. New York.

Lee, H. D. P. (1953). The Republic. Penguin Books.

Levin, N. (Ed). (2019). Introduction to Ethics: An Open Educational Resource. N.G.E. Far Press."

Lutz, Mark J. (1998). Socrates Education on Virtue. State University of New York Press.

Markkula Center for Applied Ethics (2011). Ethical Awareness in International Collaborations: A Contextual Approach. Dialogue and debate in the seminar Making Choices: Ethical Decisions at the Frontier of Global Science, Brown University spring semester.

Markovits, D. (2008). A Modern Legal Ethics: Adversary Advocacy in a Democratic Age. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Morrow John (2005). History of Western Political Thought. A thematic Introduction 4th Edition. Palgrave Macmillan. London.

Norman, Wayne (2013). The International Encyclopedia of Ethics. Edited by Hugh LaFollette, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, print pages 652–668. DOI: 10.1002/ 9781444367072.wbiee719.

Northern   Colorado   (2008).   Ethical   Frameworks   for   Academic   Decision-   Making www.mcb.unco.edu/ced/frameworks/stages- virtue.cfm).

Premeaux, S.R. (2004). The Current Link Between Management Behavior and Ethical Philosophy. Journal of Business Ethics, 51: 269-278.

Reidenbach, R.E. and Robin, D.P. (1990). Toward the Development of a Multidimensional Scale for Improving Evaluations of Business. Ethics. Journal of Business ethics, 9:8, 639-653.

Russo Michael S. (Undated). Introduction to Socratic Ethics. Sophia Project.

Schumann, P.L. (2001). A Moral Principles Framework for Human Resource Management Ethics, Human Resource Management Review, 11: 93-111.

Shultz, T. and Brender-Ilan, Y. (2004). Beyond Justice: Introducing Personal Moral Philosophies to Ethical Evaluations of Human Resources Practices. Business Ethics: A European Review, 13:4, 302-316.

Velasquez, M.G. (1998). Business Ethics: Concepts and Cases (4th ed). Upper Saddle River. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Weber, James (1990). Managers' Moral Reasoning: Assessing Their Responses to Three Moral Dilemmas. Sage Journals, July 1; https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679004300705.