

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
Case 1	2
Case 2	4
Soft Copy	12

Question/Case 1:

Elmer donated a pint of blood that his wife Doris needed during operation. Elmer and Doris were subsequently divorced. Several years after the divorce Elmer was in an accident and needed a pint of blood. His new wife, Cora, was of a different blood type, and thus could not contribute blood to Elmer. Doris still lived in the same area as Elmer, and there were no health-related reasons that would have prevented her from donating blood.

Was Doris morally obligated to donate a pint of blood to Elmer; “Yes”, “No”, or “It depends”? Whatever your response explain the reasoning behind it.

Answer:

Doris morally obligated to donate a pint of blood to Elmer. The reason for the respond is based on Utilitarianism and Judeo-Christian Morality.

According to utilitarianism, the action must be judge earlier and the good and bad produced or caused by the act should be first verified. And the action is considered as a moral action if the action produces ‘good’ more than ‘bad’. So for in this case;

At the end of Doris action which is donating pint of blood to Elmer, Doris had helped Elmer to be alive. She had saved Elmer’s life. While in another sense, she also had paid Elmer’s good deed which was ‘donating pint of blood to Doris when she needed’. This did may also encourage the title ‘Good deed will be paid by Good deed’. As everyone on earth believes on the title that what ever good deed you have did to this world, for sure u will be paid one day with the same manner.

In another point of view, the bad result will be, Cora who is currently wife to Elmer might not appreciate Doris’s help and she might called it as a trick for Doris to get back Elmer to her life. Anyway, this is just a rude side of it. While the good side can be said that Cora might appreciate Doris help and encourages them to be good friends in future.

Whatever the result is, when then good result compared with the bad result, where ‘saving Elmer life’ compared to ‘misunderstanding with Cora’, the good result overcomes the bad result. Therefore, Doris is obligated to donate a pint of blood to

Elmer. While by taking this into action, the good results solve any bad results as all religion stated that “saving people’s life is important”. And everybody knows you can do whatever bad thing you want to save a life except taking another life which means killing.

In all the sense, Doris action to donate her blood will always be rated as good deeds. And no one prefers to say that donating blood is a bad action.

To be more accurate with the result given, Doris act which is donating blood can be more clarified by using Judeo-Christian Morality. According to Judeo-Christian Morality, good are always good and bad are always bad. In general, the morality is simple as normally found in our society. In this society, in this current life style, almost every one of us knows that donating blood is right and good. And that is what similarly stated in Judeo-Christian morality that the act of helping someone will always considered as good deed. And there is no religion calling ‘helping’ as a bad deed.

The Judeo-Christian morality also states that ‘right’ must always be ‘right’ without even considering the result of the action. Although the act might cause a bad result, the act should be counted as right as its always right. Either we like it or not, it should be right. For example, when u are driving and you saw a pet such as cat crossing the road and you know very well if you continue the speed of your car, the cat might be killed by you. In such situation, you know it is right to save the life of the car (according to Judeo-Christian Morality) and therefore you placed a emergency break. This caused all cars while was following back of your car also placed emergency break, and some of the vehicles had banged into each other. You action is still considered as right although u caused a small accident as long as you had saved a life from being killed by yourself.

So, the similar case might be considered for this Doris situation. Doesn’t matter what is the result of Doris donating her blood as long as it is moral. Conclusion is she is obligated to donate a pint of blood to her ex-husband Elmer.

Question/Case 2:

You are a recruiter for an executive recruitment firm that has recently been retained by one of the largest corporations in the United States to find appropriate candidates for the position of President of the corporation. If the corporation hires one of the candidates you find then your firm will receive one third of the President's cash compensation- salary and bones, an amount in excess of \$750,000. Several weeks into recruitment process it becomes clear to you that the company has gone about the search in a severely flawed way, making it highly unlikely that it will find the kind of candidates it needs. The Board of Directors, in your judgment, has allowed the CEO to control the search. It is clear to you that he wants someone who will be deferential towards him, which, in your judgment, will make it extremely difficult to attract the most highly qualified candidates. You discuss the issue with your superior. She says that given the intensely competitive environment for executive search firms, it would seriously disadvantage your firm to offend the Board of Directors of one of America's largest corporations. She reminds you that the Board of Directors is responsible for hiring the President of the Corporation. A recruitment firm, she says, bears no legal liability if a candidate it presents to a company is hired and proves unsuccessful in his position.

What should you do in this situation, and why?

Answer:

In the given situation above, I will decide to not make it as an issue. Where means I will obey to the Corporation CEO's need which he prefer to select or choose candidate who can be deferential towards him. Although it is immoral in a sense, but in this business world, his act is definitely immoral to his organization which is that "largest Corporation". To make the explanation easier, I would like to name the "largest corporation" as "Corporation X". Here I explain more in detail which will let u know about how I made the decision and the reasoning beyond it.

The first reason for taking such decision is the moral status of a corporation or a formal organization is clearly stated that a corporation is not a 'moral agents'. Therefore, there is no rule which demands the corporation to be moral in all it's act. In general, we

may consider saying that Business is not subjected and affected by moral or immoral activities. The business itself is not evaluated with its morality or responsibility. As a corporation, it has the power to act either morally or immorally as long as the act to not harm the corporation itself.

To be clear about the above statement, here is another example of case:

Company Z wants to win a tender using a dirty manner which is bribery. This sounds to be so wrong and immoral. The company Z has successfully won the tender and paid the bribery, but they did not paid it straight and they name it as a 'commission' to the person involved in helping them to win the tender. This is very clear to our view that the corporation is acting immoral. But in the view of the company, it has paid the commission and not bribery. Therefore, it is right for the company itself. So the company is not a moral agent and it has no responsibility to be moral in its entire act.

Now the relative between this reason with the Corporation X is, none of the businesses, neither Corporation X nor "Executive Recruitment Firm" will be moral and none of them will be responsible for the act of the Corporation X's CEO. And I, the recruiter for the executive recruitment firm also take no responsibility on the Corporation X or the CEO's act.

Well the second reason is a business acts rationally according to a rational decision making procedures whereas the business will analysis its act in all point of view and consider to make a smart move or to act smartly. In another sense it is also known as acting morally. All of the organization acts are considered as logic and related as long as they bring benefits to the organization. The administrator or staff will take the responsible of judging the act rationally and it is up to the individual itself in judging the act and give it a reason for the act.

To be clear on the above statement, here is example of different case that shows that company and organization acts rationally before going into an action:

Company Z knows that its operational cost can be cut out to gain more profits. The way f doing it is by fire 50% of its staff and buy a new machine to do similar task as the workers and the cost of machine is much cheaper than the salary paid to those staffs. Therefore the company fired their staff and bought the machineries to replace the staffs with a cheap cost. In this case, the administrator had taken the decision. And it is clear to

us that firing staff suddenly and buying machinery to replace their position in doing task is totally wrong and unacceptable, but according to the business, the act is a rational act. The reason for it self is, a organization is fully profit orientated and the profit is being first motive of the organization rather than morality or humanity.

Now relating the reason to the Corporation X case, the Executive Recruitment Firm is acting morally already. Whereas if I, the recruiter of the firm may cause the my firm to loss profit if I offend the Board of Directors of Corporation X. According to my firm, our business is to help in recruiting a talented and most suitable or qualified staff for the President position. And I have been doing the right things by sending qualified candidates to the corporation X. While the CEO of Corporation X is looking forward a person that will be deferential towards him. Sending candidates for recruitment is only the work of my firm and performing morally by doing well in our firm's duty. While the act of the CEO is not going to rationally discussed as long as the CEO is not related to Executive Recruitment firm.

Being silent and not overacting for the scene is absolutely rational for the executive firm to avoid any misunderstanding or business deal problems between this firm with the corporation X. And this act is needed as it may not cause any negative consequences to the firm.

In general, any act of Corporation X will not affect the executive firm. Therefore the firm is expected to not react to the scene and do the task perfectly by placing rational decision in the position. Any task or action that may cause damage to the Executive Recruitment firm should be avoided straightly from taking place into action. The only sense for the firm is to be safe in its environment. Thus, this rational decision which is to keep silent will be a plus for the firm to continue their recruiting business with corporation X and it will not be affected by any other organizations. But trying to offend the Board of Directors will be an irrational thing as it may cause the firm to loss its business with the corporation X, and damage to the firm's prestige, and loss of revenue which is the commission from the recruitment.

The firm need to be very silent in this matter and do not take any action in this matter so the firm can continue its operation without any interruption or affects from its act. And this is fully considered to be right and rational for the firm.

The third reason is the responsibility. It is very clear in this business world that it is ethical for us to do only the job that we are hired for. What I mean by the above statement is, the responsibility of the staff is only toward his or her job towards the organization which hired him or her. No action is required or needed to show our responsibility towards other organization and its action in any case.

To be accurate to the statement, we are hired and paid only to do a specific task which is our job, and no one in this business world expects you to be responsible to the task or job which is not at all related to you or to the organization itself.

To be more clear on the above statement, here is example case that may extract the key-points straightly to the above statement:

When a doctor is conducting an operation which is related to a CEO of a company whereas the doctor need to help the CEO to stay alive by under going this operation. In this case, the job or task of the doctor is to help the CEO to be alive by under going operation. If the operation failed and the CEO had passed away and it was unable to survive him, the doctor or the hospital will not take any responsibility as the CEO is not related to the organization. According to doctor, his job is just to help him survive. But the CEO did not survive. Therefore the act of doctor is so right where he tried his best to help the CEO to survive. He was so responsible to his job. He did his job perfectly by unfortunately the CEO did not survive. This do not make any affect to the doctor. For him, he had done perfect work. He had completed his task. And the death of CEO will not affect him in any sense.

Now relating the case above to the Corporation X case, as mentioned in above paragraph, nothing is affect the staff as long as he or she did their work. They are hired only to do the task and completing the task is the only motive should be set in their mind. In corporation X case, it is my responsible to find candidates for recruitment. I am doing the task perfectly with no problems or interruption and I am being paid for this job. So, it is my responsible to find the candidates for recruitment and I am doing it right. So in all sense, I should not be responsible for any of Corporation X act or its CEO's act as long as I am not hired by them. I work for executive recruitment firm and my task are being completed in a right manner on a right time.

It is my responsibility to find the candidates and I should be only doing it. I should never care about the Corporation X. I am paid for the job that I am hired to do. Overdoing the job is not going to be profitable for me. And overdoing my job may also bring problems to the executive recruitment firm which I am working for because the corporation X will be against my firm if in case the act of the CEO is being mentioned as an issue between both parties here.

In general, overdoing my work is so wrong and I am doing my given task very correctly and I should be doing the same thing for the good of my firm and myself. My responsibility will not be made as an issue as long as I am complete and involving in this CEO's matter and judging his act against his Corporation X will only waste me. I should be staying away from overdoing my job.

The fourth reason is, the one who is responsible within the firm or organization must be known when it's about to do moral judgment or blaming. What I mean here is, the one who should be taking moral action are those who are related or responsible toward a firm or organization. For example, only staff of company Y can be responsible for the company Y's moral action while the staff of company Z can be responsible for the company Z's moral action. The layout is very straightforward that the staff or worker is only responsible toward the organization which hired them.

To be clear with the statement above, here is an example of a case:

When an agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is written between company Y and company Z and the companies are about to sign it. The one who should be considered about signing the MOU is not the Managing Director (highest administrator) but the manager who is related to the project should be responsible. This sentence means that only the Manager of company Y must be responsible for knowing and understanding the company Z's performance before going into signing the agreement. And the manager of company Z should be doing the same on the opposite way. But the Manager of Company Y is not responsible for company Z and the manager of company Z is not responsible for company Y. They are both separated in their own way although they are about to go for an agreement.

Now the statement above being related to the Corporation X's case, the executive recruitment firm is not responsible for the act of Corporation X's CEO. For my firm, I

am the one responsible while for Corporation X, the CEO is responsible. There is no inter-relationship between both parties here. My firm do not care for Corporation X else for the revenue. And the Corporation X do not care for my firm else than working for them to find the perfect candidates for the President position.

In general, the person that should be considered as wrong and be blamed is the Corporation X's CEO. The CEO is so wrong for not being responsible to his corporation to recruit the highly qualified for the position but he tries to select a candidate that will be deferential towards him. He is so irresponsible to the corporation that hired him and gave him the important task which is to select the right and qualified candidate for the President position. Besides this, the Corporation X can be also considered as wrong for allowing the CEO to control the search.

Although many parties can be blamed for the case, I and my firm can't be blamed for being irresponsible with the recruitment as long as we are doing our task perfectly. Thus, the act of Corporation X is not something to be bothered by my firm. In this case I and my firm cannot be blamed, therefore we take no place in the matter of recruitment the right and qualified person as long as selecting the candidate is subjected to the CEO's responsibility.

The fifth reason is, an organization must not harm anyone. If in case they know that they are harming, they has moral obligation to make thing right. This means, there is a part of an organization's responsibility to take action immediately to correct it if they know that they have producing harm to any parties. This can be either done by producing a harming product or giving an incorrect service.

Here is example of a case to make the above statement clear:

In a barber shop, it is the responsible of the worker to do the hair cut for their customers. The organization which is the barber shop, responsible for the act of its service ('hair cut') and takes responsible over its staff too. When a worker had done a wrong hair cut for the customer, and the customer outputs his dissatisfaction about it, the organization need to take an immediate action to correct. Most probably they will compensate their mistake by paying back the hair cut fee. In this case, the organization had given a service which had harmed one of its customers. Therefore they acted immediately and corrected their mistakes.

Taking the main point of the above statement to the Corporation X case, the executive firm will be responsible if it has harmed. But in corporation X case, the firm have not harm the corporation X ('customer') by not selecting the qualified candidate. According to executive firm, we have not harm the corporation X because we have been forwarding highly qualified candidates for recruitment, but it is the fault of the CEO for not selecting them. So, the firm is not harming the corporation X.

In general, as said by the superior, the firm bears no legal liability if the candidate selected failed to success in his position. This is because firm's service is to collect candidates, and the firm is doing well with it. But the problem is the CEO who is not selecting the right candidate but going for some one who will be referential towards him. So, the firm is doing a perfect thing. There is no wrong done to be corrected.

Final reason is, an organization is profit based. An organization is brought to alive to make it move well. In a company, its main motive is to keep their company moving well and alive to do business operations. The main motive of bringing an organization alive is to make profit out of it. None of the business organization is not a profit orientated organization. In this business world, first should be money and second should be prestige. Losing a company's prestige is worst than losing its money. This is because, when a money or profit is lost, the organization will attempt to gain back their profit from involving into another business or by going for Joint-Marketing or Joint-Venture. But the case will be harder and worst if the company lost its prestige. This is because when a company lost its prestige, all the other companies which related to the organization will try to avoid from them. This will make their business deal to be come dull. And if they happen to lost all their business deals, there is no way they can survive because no one will come forward to do Joint-Marketing or Joint-Venture with the company causes it to directly fail in this business world.

The relative of the statement with this case is, any of my act might cause the firm to lose its business deal with the corporation X. Because the Board of Directors of Corporation X will definitely won't agree the mistake of the CEO. They will not agree the mistake because they don't want to lose their prestige in this business world. Because when a statement such as "CEO of Corporation X had done mistake", the Corporation X's prestige will be affected. And they might move or react aggressive against my firm.

And this might cause my firm's prestige fall and all other business dealings fall. Besides, the extreme competition between the recruitment firms will cause it hard for my firm to survive once if the prestige falls.

Thus leaving the matter alone and helping the CEO to continue recruit the president of the Corporation X will be benefit to the firm. This is because; Corporation X is one of the largest corporations in the United States. Having a successful business deal with them will help the firm's prestige to increase with full of pride besides earns a good profit for the firm which will encourage the firm to expand more widely.

Conclusion is, leaving the matter alone and not taking any action about the matter will make the situation better than taking an action that might cause problem to both of the firm and me. I will not make it an issue and leave the matter just as it is.

SOFF COPY :