Day by day we meet ethnic questions and it has to be solved morally or not. This is one beauty built-in in human who can exercise their consciences. Despite of the fact that human being is self interested as nature implanted in every animal, we do have a choice. This article is aiming in the ethically choice battling between the lover of money and the lover of just inside.

We are going to look in two most debating phenomena in the recent human society – the low paid child slavery (sweatpot) and TV programs (which is claimed to cause human degrades because of violent shows.)

I. SweatPot – Heartless Money Makers?

On a television show in the summer of 1996, Kathie Lee Gifford confessed that her WalMart outfits were made in Honduras by children earning 31 cents an hour. She tearfully vowed that she would try to clean up her purchasing act. Our international economy is impacted daily by other cultures. Many of the products we use in the United States, such as clothing, athletic equipment, toys, jewelry, and home accessories, are made in sweatshops by child labor in other countries. Some of these children are slaves; others may be blinded or maimed for crying or for trying to return home.

Former basketball star Michael Jordan, who earned up to 20 million dollars a year to endorse Nike sneakers, which are allegedly made in sweatshops in Indochina, disclaimed any moral responsibility for the manner in which the sneakers are manufactured. "My job with Nike," he told Time magazine, "is to endorse the product. Their job is to be up on that" (Nancy Gibbs, "Cause Celeb," Time, June 17, 1996, pp. 28 - 30).

The institution of sweat shops is one that, at first glance, most individuals would consider an unjust practice. However, individuals on a daily basis reap the benefits of this institution in the area of consumer goods. Furthermore, prominent individuals who endorse companies utilizing sweat shop labor oftentimes reject any responsibility for the poor working conditions. Some extremists even argue that the exploited labor class actually benefits by not starving. In light of these points, enclosed is an analysis of the morality of sweat shops from the standpoint of Herbert Spencer and from classical principles so as to draw a conclusion as to the justification of sweat shops.

It is the fact that poverty has made differences in moral standards throughout
human history. Many people would agree that when the resource is limited to a certain level it threatens life, morality can be compromised. Spencer showed this norm in his paper and he claimed that it was actually normal and moral action because it is only a temporary phenomenon as we know that the society will turn to a better way that fits its evolution when people's morality gains control over the less immoral doings. The sweatshop is just a product of less civilized cultures and it will be removed as people there become more educated and civilized, understanding the great harms that sweatshops would bring in. In addition they will realize there is no technological advancement in sweatshops and a better economic future is not foreseen. By that time this form of sweatshop labor will no longer be in practice. Therefore, Spencer noted it was not a wrong thing for outside countries to give work to the sweatshop owners; and it is not wrong for these owners to run a un-moral business because it is just a temporary product resulted in a society's evolution that required the less civilized country to make such a scarification.

Classical principles, on the other hand, very clearly refute the notion that poverty justifies the institution of sweat shops. Plato's contention that physical pleasures are the basest would indicate that the sweat shop management class was unjust and unenlightened. And though his arguments do not directly apply to people in extreme poverty, from a general standpoint it could be construed that since the sweat shop working class is not attempting to progress towards enlightenment, they too are contemptible from the standpoint of morality. Furthermore, the management class's extreme preoccupation with profit in wealth, causing them to inflict such poor working conditions on the laborers, is in direct violation of Aristotle's doctrine of the mean - the virtuous approach to happiness. Thus Aristotle would look unfavorably upon these individuals with regards to morality. He would probably not hold the exploited workers in contempt, but simply devoid of the fundamental building blocks by which a moral foundation can be built. Overall, classical principles morally argue against the institution of sweat shops, regardless of living conditions.

In summation, it can be concluded that the negative aspects of the institution of sweat shops outweigh the positive aspects. The fact that a Spencer-based analysis indicates that the exploitation involved in sweat shops is a natural phenomenon that will gradually morph into a more moral practice, still does not justify the negative working conditions currently in place. Rather, when viewing the situation from a snapshot in the present, as is done using a classical analysis, the practice is exposed not only as being immoral but also unjust. Because of this, the prevalence of poverty does not justify the intuition of sweat shops. Instead, a sweat shop is like candy; its output pleases the eye but it does not cure the hunger.

II. Television – The master spammer?1

In 1977 Ronny Zamora, a 15 year-old, shot and killed his 82 year-old neighbor. Zamora’s lawyer entered a plea of not
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guilty, arguing that Zamora had become habituated to violence until he could no longer tell right from wrong. “If you judge Ronny Zamora guilty,” his lawyer stated, “television would be an accessory.”

There is a large body of evidence suggesting a strong link between television viewing and aggression. According to Reed Hundt, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, “there are substantial risks of harmful effects from viewing violence throughout the television environment.”

Studies show that Americans, on average, spend about one-third of their free time watching television. A 1992 study in the Journal of the American Medical Association, found that the average child in the U.S. will have watched 40,000 murders and 200,000 acts of violence by age 18. Brandon Centerwald of the University of Washington hypothesizes that the sharp increase in murder rates in the U.S. beginning in 1955 is the result of viewing television.

In addition to fueling violence, studies show that the more violence people watch on television, the more they feel threatened by violence in their own lives – a situation that has been labeled the “Mean World Syndrome.” Women and members of minority groups are most likely to grow up feeling they are vulnerable because television programs disproportionately portray them as victims of violence. “For every white male victim of violence there are 17 white females. . . and 22 minority females. . . Villains are disproportionately male, lower-class, young and Latino or foreign.”

Engrossed in a nation where the value of the printed word is rapidly diminishing and multimedia entertainment reigns king, a disturbing link has been identified between violent television and violent acts. Highlighted first in 1977 with the murder case of Ronny Zamora, in which his lawyer stated that “television [was] an accessory,” extensive studies regarding this link have since been conducted. The evidence supporting the connection between acts of violence and violent television has proven substantial. Nonetheless, following the utilitarian principles of John Stuart Mill, it is our contention that violent television is not the root of the problem. Rather, the individuals engaging in this violent behavior, and deviating from utilitarian principals, are the true problem. Thus censoring television is not justified.

At the heart of utilitarian theory is the notion that moral judgment should be based upon consequences and not morals. The fact that Ronny Zamora murdered his neighbor was condemnable, no more or less because he allegedly engaged in this activity because of television. Mill states that “all rational creatures go out upon the sea of life with their minds made up on the common questions of right and wrong.” Television should not change this, but even if it does, that still does not make television the cause of acts of violence. Television is a source of communication, a looking glass through which humans can view other experiences, digest them, and then dynamically shape their own moral standards. It is a messenger, of sorts. And as the old saying, “don’t shoot the messenger” goes, the root
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of the problem lies in deviations from utilitarian behavior and not television.

For one thing, Americans are watching too much television. Studies state that the average American spends one-third of his or her free time watching television. To this, Mill would retort that, “it is better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied.” Simply involving oneself in activities more cognitively engaging than watching television would substantially break the link between media violence and violent acts. It would allow individuals to identify television as mere entertainment and a source of communication rather than a set of morals by which to live. This choice would have to be made by the individual, though, and under normal circumstances a voluntary decision to watch less or no television seems unlikely. This, then, allows one to delve deeper into the problem and identify both formal and informal education as a problem. Mill proposes teaching the link between personal happiness and the good of the whole as a way of seamlessly assuring adherence to utilitarian theory. Although seemingly drastic, this really is just a way of guaranteeing consistent acts of individuals for the greatest good. And even partially following this notion would allow Americans to base their actions on a set of morals proposing happiness over violence.

Apparently, the link between violent television and violent acts is apparent. This link seems to indicate that television is making Americans meaner and less secure. However, the root of the problem is not television itself but individuals’ convention to the images that television presents. Thus, through Mill’s utilitarian principles it can be seen that a violent act is morally wrong regardless of motives, whether they be related to television or not; simply watching less television would break the link between media violence and violent acts; and altering conventional American thought patterns by using a utilitarian frame of reference would encourage individuals to break this link. Perhaps, in light of this information, television has helped to identify a larger problem – the way Americans think.

In summary, it is obvious that human beings act in the way to pursue their self interests for better lives. There is a no doubt and non stop methods in good and evil ways to pursue such a want and greed. However, we should keep in mind that if we want a better lives, we need to restrain ourselves first that will give the power to overcome the bad influences created by others. It is possible because history, overtime, will give us the experiences we need to see what is good and evil.
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“Your father kicked in the screen and threw the set out the window. He feels violence on TV is a bad influence.”