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**Ethics and Public Policy**

**Introduction**

 The ethical policy analysis manifests several methods to be deployed in the public sectors to address the issues related to ethics and morality. The primary theories and concepts are underpinned as utilitarianism, Kantianism and Prudent Pragmatism. These theories can be applied in intricate and general situations to reach a solution. Each of these theories is dated back to the European philosophy. The utilitarianism approach harnesses the values of self-interested individualism and majoritarian individualism for the efficient resource consumption. The Kantian approach highlights the moral worth of the individuals in the society. The theory of prudent pragmatism illustrates both the disdain of Americans pertaining to the disembodied entities and the recognition that the paradigm of values is untidy and multifaceted.

 To begin, utilitarianism was stipulated by Bentham to reflect the traditional moral belief and the goodness in an act ought to be critically examined. It lies at the very heart of observing its ramifications on community instead of observing the intentions. In the contemporary age of enhanced democratization, both political and social paradigms of these assumptions postulate that the social good can be manifested by adding the contributions of the individuals. A critical appraisal of utilitarianism reveals that the policymakers and stakeholders limit the spectrum of choices which maximizes the worth of social value in the future. The recent frauds committed by the companies in the United States can be evaluated as pert h values of the utilitarianism approach. For instance, the adverse impact of these frauds on the stock market offers ample proof of the wisdom of the approach as the rule utilitarian approach. If the actors refrain from trusting each other in true letter and spirits, the capital markets may not be able to function potentially.

 Moreover, the act utilitarianism is the simplest manifestation of the philosophy. It states each moral value seeks the calculation of the quantity of the fundamental social benefit. For instance, the questions as should the funds be utilized to improve and expand highways or a better structure of mass transportation should be developed relies on the present benefits. The incumbent policymakers have the prerogative to use the available evidence to assess the comparative productivity of these two choices as the grounds of their decision. However, utilitarianism struggles to address the concerns thoroughly. It will never postulate the long-term impacts of the decision. In addition, it will also not answer the factor related to threat of the pollution arising from the construction for the future generation.

**Kantianism (Deontological Ethics)**

 This concept advances to discern between the good from the right thing independently. In essence, it states certain acts are either wrong or right irrespective of the consequences. The primary aim of Kant’s problem was the identification of a regulation that complies with the free agency. Lying, as pet the theory, is a behavior which can never be universalized in absence of contradiction. The absolute distinction between the good and wrong will be essentially desecrated. The major provision of the deontological theory is based on the paradigm that human emotions are not backed with laws and thus can be wrong. Furthermore, Kantianism is an ethical philosophy which calls for the availability of rights and offers the individuals autonomy in the values of American society (*hn4u2ikv8bkbif3ifncfp1iij5---Bluhm-and-Heineman-A-Framework-for-Ethical-Policy-Evaluation.pdf*, n.d.).

Both Kantian and Ethicists tradition played an instrumental role in the previous decades to gives patients the autonomy in the decision making of medical settings. Similar confrontation is witnessed these days related to the controversy of making abortion legal and defending life. In the recent years, the ethicists have advanced to establish hybrid structures of both the utilitarian and deontological values. All these endeavors are aimed at minimizing issues of ethics to explore a defined system of rules.

**Prudent Pragmatism**

 As per the postulates of Aristotle, the universal moral ideas as adultery, murder and lying underpin themselves to be evil. The crux of the ethical problem lies at making the decision to applying the universals and not in merely identifying them. For instance, people are not obliged to be enlightened that lying is wrong. Instead, the need to comprehend the acts that constitute the occurrence is the key. An intricate mater is worth mentioning here. these acts are not definite or absolute. The acts can have distinguished moral interpretations. For instance, the cynics of death penalty argue legal execution can never be justified and also equals murder. Kovesi also calls for the similar demonstration of values as the interpretation of the acts instead of the moral significance (*hn4u2ikv8bkbif3ifncfp1iij5---Bluhm-and-Heineman-A-Framework-for-Ethical-Policy-Evaluation.pdf*, n.d.).

 Nowadays, the robust paradigm of technological advancement has constructed a similar requirement for the innovative maxims and paradigms of actions. Several dramatic concerns have also been produced amid the technological changes. For instance, a recent lawsuit demonstrates this objective. Court was asked to disinherit the last wife of father, the person who underwent a sex transformation. The son demanded the right that as she was not inherently women, she possessed no right for inheritance.

**A Critical Appraisal**

 The prudent pragmatism values can never guarantee an absolute answer to the ethical question. Irrefutably, it is a spectrum of reasoning and process comprising a dilemmatic case which is the crux of the ethical decision making. A prudent person can rarely contemplate critical questions related to public policy in vacuum. Assumptions and speculations are an ineffective tool to reach a potential solution to the problem. To reach an ethical conclusion, it is imperative to traverse a wide spectrum of possibilities and options. For instance, the onus lies on the incumbents to consult with each other whether they are administrative officials promulgating a policy, legislators in a constitutional settings and citizens voting for the rival candidates in the election.

**Discussion Questions**

What is the primary ethicality of the Oregon statue?

The Oregon law stipulates that a patient may attain a prescription for a critical medicine if two doctors give their consent on the suffering of patients as a terminal disease. The patient is bound to take both the requests in writing and orally while waiting for a period of fifteen days between both the requests. The residents of Oregon are the sole beneficiaries of the stature. However, it is critical to determine the validity of the statute as the other states always advance to establish similar policies. It raises a potential question as is it plausible to name the actions which are made legal by a certain connotation as suicide. The act in essence confronts the usage of that name in the law. Nowadays, the vigorous advancement in the medical sciences has opened ways to determine the remaining lifespan of an ill person.

 The utilitarian objectives of saving money in medical settings in critical questions are a potential controversy. The deontological emphasis of the equal distribution of resources is also noticeable. Besides, the ethicality can be measured on the basis of the incentives offered to the patients to exercise the right to supervise the time of death and honoring the patient’s autonomy. Honoring life ought to be consider a central theme of making prudent decisions to preserve life. All these instances can be investigated to reach a conclusion to determine the ethicality of the Oregon statute. Several schools of thoughts will prefer to either accept or nullify the need of the statute based on the ethical theory. These ethical theories, as discussed above, play their part in devising policies and changing perceptions of the public.

As per Kant, an act of a person inspired by personal emotions or feelings is immoral. Why?

 The fundamental interpretation of Kant nurtures the values of personal feelings and acts as selfish and imprudent. The other primary aspects of the deontological ethics stem from this element. The natural law is omnipresent and every other person has to obey it. Since the world around us is governed by regulations, Kant stated that nature of people ought to be examined and governed. Kant believed that humans should not be hindered from exercising their will under any circumstances. However, certain limitations and provisions were also tied with the theory. The act of a person, which must be free, should be credible and fulfill the requirements to be promulgated as a law. The free will of humans is deemed universal and same is the case with laws.

Besides, the discussion reveals that deontological theory addresses the manifestations of humans’ actions to be right and flawless. When humans get influenced by emotions, they are likely to commit actions which are immoral. Thus, Kant calls for evaluating the actions of humans as per the laws which must be universal and devoid of any ambiguity. The deontological theory highlights the need of formulating laws to promulgate the truthful and universal policies. It is the foremost aspect which contributes to strengthen the moral values and ethics related to the availability of justice. Therefore, Kant manifests that the feelings of humans are not supplemented with laws and thus can be immoral or wrong. References
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