A relationship exists between law and ethics. In some instances, law and ethics overlap and what is perceived as unethical is also illegal. In other situations, they do not overlap. In some cases, what is perceived as unethical is still legal, and in others, what is illegal is perceived as ethical. A behavior may be perceived as ethical to one person or group but might not be perceived as ethical by another. Further complicating this dichotomy of behavior, laws may have been legislated, effectively stating the government’s position, and presumably the majority opinion, on the behavior. As a result, in today’s diverse business environment, one must consider that law and ethics are not necessarily the same thing.

Law can be defined as a consistent set of universal rules that are widely published, generally accepted, and usually enforced. These rules describe the ways in which people are required to act in their relationships with others in a society. They are requirements to act in a given way, not just expectations or suggestions to act in that way. Since the government establishes law, the government can use police powers to enforce laws.

There is a relationship between law and ethics, and this relationship is important in management. Managers must evaluate not only what is legal, but what they, their employees, and society consider ethical as well. Important here is that companies must also consider what behaviors their customers will and will not accept. The news is full of stories regarding the ethical issues with which companies are being confronted, such as the practices of Nike, as outlined above. No company wants to be forced to defend itself over ethical issues involving wages, the environment, working issues, or human relations.

Managers play a vital role in a company's legal and ethical performance. It is in part their responsibility to ensure that their employees are abiding by Federal, State, and Local laws, as well as any ethical codes established at the company. But most importantly, the managers
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must provide a positive example to their employees of proper behavior in light of laws and ethical codes.

Certainly, policies and procedures will never be developed to satisfy everyone, but the establishment of Codes of Ethics will at least provide a framework for ethical behavior, and allow customers to evaluate the type of company with whom they are doing business. With this knowledge, employees and customers must decide whether or not they are willing and able to conform to these Codes, as well as to the laws that have been enacted. Managers cannot simply limit their decisions to following the law. They must also consider the ethics of their employees and customers.

Ethics, Morality, & Law

A morality concern how one ought to live one’s life, and ethics refers to the codes of conduct governing social interactions. To live morally or ethically is to adhere to standards of right conduct, to act well, to be a good person, law is also a code of conduct. Ethics, morality, and law constrain what individuals may do, but in different ways. That an act is immoral or unethical is for many people sufficient reason not to commit it. For others, only the threat of legal punishment is sufficient. Laws are enforced by punishment is sufficient. Laws are enforced by punishment or damage awards, executed after a judicial determination according to procedures laid out by an authoritative governing body. Moral laws or principles have no similar enforcement mechanism, relying instead on individual conscience, social pressure, or perhaps the fear of God, although the philosopher Immanuel Kant (Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, 1785) held that if you refrain from acting badly because you fear God or legal punishment, you are not really acting morally- a moral act must be done for the sake of morality.

The relation between morality and law is complex and a matter of considerable disagreement. To what extent do or should they coincide? Some have argued that law properly targets immoral or unethical conduct. For example, in 1977 the United States enacted the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, making illegal the bribery of foreign officials. Recently the United States has urged other nations to follow suit. But many resist the view that government should use law to coerce people into being moral, and argue that law and morality must be separate and distinct; if we believe abortions are immoral, it does not necessarily follow that they should be illegal.
Natural law theorists regard law and morality as connected; law is not simply whatever legislatures enact in statutes. If what is called a law fails to meet the features that all morally proper laws should have, then it is called law only by mistake, and has no authority. For St. Thomas Aquinas (1226-1274), insofar as human law deviates from the law of nature, or reason, it is no law at all, but a perversion of law (Summa Theologica, Question 95).

Humans like all other living forms have within them matter, life, mind, intelligence and bliss. It is noteworthy that matter is succeeded by life, life by mind and mind by intelligence. The highest form of attainment is the divine state which man has the ability to attain by his workings in nature. Man by virtue of his intelligence is aware of this universal reality and the cosmic process that is operating the whole scheme of nature. Further, he has tended to master the material world by passing the divine spark of consciousness that is the illuminating factor present within him. According to Bhagavad Gita, a man is a complex multidimensional being multidimensional being, including in him various attributes by which he performs all his actions in the society. These may divine or remains undisturbed amid sorrow and joy, honour and ignominy, free from passion, fear and anger; moreover, they perform all their obligatory duties in a selfless manner. The divine persons are spiritually evolved, their mind is stable, serene, and actions are directed towards the welfare of all. On the contrary, demonic persons hold the view the world is unreal and without any basis. All acts are directed towards self and full of hypocrisy, ego and arrogance. The goal of these men is enjoyment of life but the society cannot function in peaceful manner, as morality, ethics and law are the foundation of the society. This is only possible when there is feeling of love, oneness and doing good for others. ? Thou Art that? is the aphorism of the Vedanta philosophy. According to it, Thou art one with the Universal being, and as such, every soul that exists is your soul, and every body that exists in your body. And in hurting anyone, you hurt your self. As soon as a current of hatred is thrown outside, whomsoever else it is bound to come back to you. For I am the Universe, this Universe is my body. I am the Infinite, only I am not conscious of it now. But I am struggling to get this consciousness of the Infinite. This is the state of perfection and eternal Bliss. There will be ethics, morality and law in the global village.

The problem of the nature and source of law’s normativity is a major preoccupation of legal philosophy. H L A Hart’s The Concept of Law\(^2\) centred its criticism on the failure of Austinian legal positivism to adequately account for the obligatory character of legal rules.
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His notion of the “internal point of view” which plays a critical role in Hart’s legal positivist concept of law as the union of primary and secondary rules directly addresses this aspect of legal normativity. Furthermore, his conception of legal validity based on the identification of formal conditions for the existence of valid law (rule of recognition) and the sharp distinction drawn between law and morality are regarded as basic features of this theory which set it over against the traditions of natural law theory.

Since the appearance of The Concept of Law, beginning with Hart’s own “minimum content of natural law”, the dividing line between legal positivism and natural law on the question of the relationship between law and morality has become increasingly blurred. Neo-Hartians such as Neil MacCormick see a more-than-contingent connection between law and morality. And “soft positivists” even believe it possible to have moral elements as part of the criteria for valid law whilst still maintaining a positivist account of legal validity.

From the other side of the natural law/legal positivist divide John Finnis has made us re-examine the view that natural law theories are founded on logical or another philosophical error. His revised Aristotelian-Thomist theory challenges legal positivism by defending a version of natural law theory which adopts the analytical tools of positivist legal philosophy and some of its concepts, including a view of legal validity compatible with legal positivism. To a “post-positivist” such as Neil MacCormick, therefore, Finnis’s natural law holds some attractions. Neopositivists have moved away from Hart’s attempt at a “descriptive sociology of law” based on ordinary language analysis towards an account of law as a form of practical reasoning. MacCormick, as one of the leading figures in this movement, finds common ground in Finnis’s interpretation of the normative (natural law basis) of positive law as the fulfillment of the requirements of practical reasonableness.

4 Hart himself admitted to being a soft positivist. See above n 1, 250-251.
5 See Chapter 2, J Finnis Natural Law and Natural Rights (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1980), 23-55, where he defends Thomistic natural law against the accusations of deriving natural law from human nature and “ought” from “is.”
6 Consider, for example, the way in which he applies the analytical concepts of the “central case” and “focal meaning” to Hart’s concept of the “internal point of view.” Above n 4, 11-18.
7 See his comments in the foreword to second edition of Legal Reasoning and Legal Theory (Oxford University Press: Oxford 1994), ix, xiv-xvi, where he describes how he has moved away from some aspects of Hartian theory into a “post-positivist” phase.
8 MacCormick, however, maintains his positivist stance by rejecting Finnis’s cognitivist “metatheoretical” stance that asserts the self-evidence of his basic goods as the foundation of his natural law theory of law. For
Whilst the natural law/legal positivism divide may have become less certain, the debates over legal normativity itself have not been less vigorous. Whether or not Fuller’s “inner morality of law” is correctly categorised as a natural law theory the issues involved in his sharp disagreement with Hart’s positivism over the status of Nazi law are still of interest. More recently, Ronald Dworkin has launched a sweeping attack on Hartian legal positivism in which he rejects the positivist (“conventionalist”) view of valid law as independent of morality and replaces it with an “interpretive” conception of law founded in the normative requirement of integrity.

A relationship exists between law and ethics. In some instances, law and ethics overlap and what is perceived as unethical is also illegal. In other situations, they do not overlap. In some cases, what is perceived as unethical is still legal, and in others, what is illegal is perceived as ethical. A behavior may be perceived as ethical to one person or group but might not be perceived as ethical by another. Further complicating this dichotomy of behavior, laws may have been legislated, effectively stating the government’s position, and presumably the majority opinion, on the behavior. As a result, in today’s diverse business environment, one must consider that law and ethics are not necessarily the same thing.

Definitions

Law can be defined as a consistent set of universal rules that are widely published, generally accepted, and usually enforced. These rules describe the ways in which people are required to act in their relationships with others in a society. They are requirements to act in a given way, not just expectations or suggestions to act in that way. Since the government establishes law, the government can use police powers to enforce laws. The following chart defines the terms in the definition of law above.

Consistent – If two requirements contradict each other, both cannot be termed a law, because people cannot obey both.
Universal – The requirements must be applicable to every one with similar characteristics facing the same set of circumstances.

Published – The requirements have to be published, in written form, so that they are accessible to everyone within the society.

Accepted – The requirements have to be generally obeyed.

Enforced – Members of society must be compelled to obey the law if they do not choose to do so voluntarily.

The word ethics is derived from the Greek word ethos (character), and from the Latin word mores (customs). Together they combine to define how individuals choose to interact with one another. In philosophy, ethics defines what is good for the individual and for society and establishes the nature of duties that people owe themselves and one another. The following items are characteristics of ethics:

Ethics involves learning what is right and wrong, and then doing the right thing.

Most ethical decisions have extended consequences.

Most ethical decisions have multiple alternatives.

Most ethical decisions have mixed outcomes.

Most ethical decisions have uncertain consequences.

Most ethical decisions have personal implications.

It is important to note that there is also a difference between ethics and morality. Morality refers both to the standards of behavior by which individuals are judged, and to the standards of behavior by which people in general are judged in their relationships with others. Ethics, on the other hand, encompasses the system of beliefs that supports a particular view of morality.

**The Relation Between Law and Ethics**
Ethical values and legal principles are usually closely related, but ethical obligations typically exceed legal duties. In some cases, the law mandates ethical conduct. Examples of the application of law or policy to ethics include employment law, federal regulations, and codes of ethics.

Though law often embodies ethical principles, law and ethics are far from co-extensive. The law does not prohibit many acts that would be widely condemned as unethical. And the contrary is true as well. The law also prohibits acts that some groups would perceive as ethical. For example lying or betraying the confidence of a friend is not illegal, but most people would consider it unethical. Yet, speeding is illegal, but many people do not have an ethical conflict with exceeding the speed limit. Law is more than simply codifying ethical norms.

**The following diagram shows the relationship between law and ethics.**

[Diagram showing the relationship between law and ethics]

Establishing a set of ethical guidelines for detecting, resolving, and forestalling ethical breaches often prevents a company from getting into subsequent legal conflicts. Having demonstrated a more positive approach to the problem may also ensure that punishment for legal violations will be less severe. Federal sentencing guidelines passed in 1991 permit judges to reduce fines and jail time for executives proportionate to the ethical measures a company has taken.

**The Legislation of Ethics**
Numerous laws have been enacted to protect employees against what society perceives as unethical behavior in the workplace. These laws are administered by the United States Department of Labor. Generally, these laws reflect the ethical standards of the majority of society. An example is the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). According to the ADA:

"No covered entity shall discriminate against a qualified individual with a disability because of the disability of such individual in regard to job application procedures, the hiring, advancement, or discharge of employees, employee compensation, job training, and other terms, conditions, and privileges of employment."

Most citizens would agree that it would be unethical to deny employment or promotion to a disabled applicant, solely on the basis of that disability, especially when that disability would not affect their work performance. Legislators reacted and have enacted the ADA in order to make it illegal to engage in such discrimination. Yet even with this legislation, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate provisions of the ADA and its definition of disability.

**Ethics Regulations for Federal Employees**

Executive branch employees are subject to statutes and regulations commonly referred to as "ethics" standards. Through these statutes, the government has established legally enforceable rules on ethical behavior. The two basic sources of these standards are the criminal conflict of interest statutes and the administrative standards of ethical conduct.

Chapter 11 of Title 18, United States Code is an example of a Criminal Conflict of Interest Statute. The conflict of interest statutes prohibit a Federal employee from engaging in certain types of activities that would place the employee’s own personal interests above the Federal Government’s interests. According to this Statute, a Federal employee:

Is prohibited from acting in an official capacity on a matter in which the employee (or certain others) has a financial interest;

May not represent the interests of private parties in matters in which the United States is a party or has an interest;
Is prohibited after leaving the Government from engaging in certain activities on behalf of other persons or entities;

May not accept private compensation for performing official duties

The Code of Federal Regulations Part 2635 is an example of Administrative Standards of Ethical Conduct Regulation. The standards of conduct regulation establish principles of ethical conduct for employees within the executive branch. The regulation not only identifies the principles but also provides easy to understand examples of how the principles apply. The standards of conduct cover such topics as:

gifts from outside sources

gifts between employees

conflicting financial interests

impartiality in performing official duties

seeking other employment

misuse of position

outside activities

Codes of Ethics

Private Companies, organizations, and associations frequently establish their own Codes of Ethics. These may be formally written or understood. Although the government does not enforce these Codes, they are enforced internally. Violation of the Codes alone can, in some instances, be grounds for termination. The following tables show examples of such Codes.

The Jet Propulsion Laboratory Ethics Program

I will conduct all business dealings with fairness, honesty and integrity.

I will protect all information and resources available to me from loss, theft, and misuse.

I will avoid even the appearance of conflict of interest or any other impropriety.

I will treat my fellow employees fairly and with dignity and respect.
I will help create and sustain an atmosphere conducive to the spirit of this code.

**AMA Principles of Medical Ethics**

A physician shall be dedicated to providing competent medical service with compassion and respect for human dignity.

A physician shall deal honestly with patients and colleagues, and strive to expose those physicians deficient in character or competence, or who engage in fraud or deception.

A physician shall respect the law and recognize a responsibility to seek changes in those requirements which are contrary to the best interests of the patient.

A physician shall respect the rights of patients, of colleagues, and of other health professionals, and shall safeguard patient confidences within the constraints of the law.

A physician shall continue to study, apply, and advance scientific knowledge, make relevant information available to patients, colleagues, and the public, obtain consultation, and use the talents of other health professionals when indicated.

A physician shall, in provision of appropriate patient care, except in emergencies, be free to choose whom to serve, with whom to associate, and the environment in which to provide medical services.

A physician shall recognize a responsibility to participate in activities contributing to an improved community.

**Potential Conflicts**

Some activities and beliefs may be legal, but not perceived as ethical. Marriott Corporation maintains very comprehensive ethics standards to which their employees must abide. Their Corporate Dress Code is an example. Several years ago, the orientation program at Marriott Corporate Headquarters included a presentation on what was and was not considered acceptable appearance in the company. Some requirements included:

- Women could not wear skirts any shorter than 4 inches above the knee.
- Women could show no bare leg. Either long pants or hose were required at all times.
- Women’s shoulders could not be exposed.
Men’s hair could not reach their collar, except for religious reasons.

Men could not wear earrings.

Although these rules were part of company policy, there is nothing illegal about any one of these items. However, in the Marriott Corporate culture, each was considered unethical.

Another example is the manufacturing practices of Nike, one of the largest manufacturers of athletics sportswear in the world. Nike produces the majority of its goods in South East Asia. Despite the profits of the Nike organization, its foreign workers are paid substandard wages and work long hours in appalling conditions. In 1996, the entry-level wage at one of these factories was $2.20 a day. Labor groups estimate that a livable wage in Indonesia is about $4.25 a day. Compare this with the pay of one of Nike's celebrity promoters, Michael Jordan, who gets $20 million a year to promote Nike sneakers. Jordan's compensation alone is more than the annual income of 20,000 workers who make Nike shoes.

Nike’s manufacturing practices are not illegal. There is nothing that says a company cannot take its manufacturing operations outside the United States. And as long as the company is meeting the minimum wage standards of the host country, there is nothing illegal about paying low wages. However, most Americans would look at these practices as unethical, especially considering the profits of Nike and their spending on celebrity promoters.

On the other hand, there are some behaviors which are illegal, but widely perceived as ethical. One example is taking office supplies from the company supply cabinet for personal use. Legally, this is considered theft, but many people see no moral or ethical problem and do it anyway.

Another example is buying a copyrighted software program and installing it on multiple computers. Technically, this violates Federal copyright laws. Yet, the piracy of software is widespread, even in corporations that consider themselves ethical.

Federal copyright law protects software from the moment of its creation. This is stated in the Copyright Act, Title 17 of the US Code. The Act gives the owner of the copyright "the exclusive rights" to "reproduce the copyrighted work" and "to distribute copies ... of the copyrighted work". It also states that "anyone who violates any of the exclusive rights of the copyright owner ... is an infringer of the copyright", and sets forth several penalties for
violation of a copyright. Those who purchase a license for a copy of software do not have the right to make additional copies without the permission of the copyright owner, except to:

copy the software onto a single computer, or

make another copy for archival purposes

Although many people would write off the impact of software piracy in order to justify their belief that it is ethical, an annual study on global software piracy shows that the impact is great. The study estimates that, of the 615 million new business software applications installed worldwide during 1998, 231 million, or 38%, were pirated. They estimate that this resulted in an $11 billion loss to software companies.

How are we to behave toward one another? Morality is a social phenomenon. Think about this. If a person is alone on some deserted island would anything that person did be moral or immoral? That person may do things that increase or decrease the chance for survival or rescue but would those acts be moral or immoral? Most of what we are concerned with in Ethics is related to the situation in which humans are living with others. Humans are social animals. Society contributes to making humans what they are. For humans there arises the question of how are humans to behave toward one another.

What are the rules to be? How are we to learn of them? Why do we need them?

WHY BE MORAL?

Consider what the world would be like if there were no traffic rules at all. Would people be able to travel by automobiles, buses and other vehicles on the roadways if there were no traffic regulations? The answer should be obvious to all rational members of the human species. Without basic rules, no matter how much some would like to avoid them or break them, there would be chaos. The fact that some people break the rules is quite clearly and obviously not sufficient to do away with the rules. The rules are needed for transportation to take place.

Why are moral rules needed? For example, why do humans need rules about keeping promises, telling the truth and private property? This answer should be fairly obvious. Without such rules people would not be able to live amongst other humans. People could not make plans, could not leave their belongings behind them wherever they went. We
would not know who to trust and what to expect from others. Civilized, social life would not be possible. So, the question is: **Why should humans care about being moral?**

**REASONS:** There are several answers.

**Sociological:** Without morality social life is nearly impossible.

**Psychological:**

People care about what others think of them. Reputation and social censure

Some people care about doing the right thing. Conscience

**Theological:** Some people care about what will happen after death, to their soul or spirit. For many religions there is an afterlife that involves a person’s being rewarded or punished for what they have done.

So, that is out of the way. We know that we should be moral and so should others and without some sense of morality it would be very difficult if not impossible for large numbers of humans to be living with one another. Now to the questions that deal with the rules of morality and all the rules which govern human behavior. First, some terms need to be clarified.

**Mores- customs and rules of conduct**

**Etiquette** – rules of conduct concerning matters of relatively minor importance but which do contribute to the quality of life. Violations of such rules may bring social censure. Etiquette deals with rules concerning dress and table manners and deal with politeness. Violations would bring denunciations for being, RUDE or CRUDE or GROSS. Friendships would not likely break up over violations of these rules as they would for violating rules of morality, e.g., lies and broken promises! These rules are not just “made up by a bunch of old British broads” as one student once volunteered in class. But they are made up by people to encourage a better life. In each society there are authorities on these matters and there are collections of such rules. Many books are sold each year to prospective brides who want to observe the proper rules of decorum and etiquette. There are newspapers that have regular features with questions and answers concerning these matters.

This deals with matters such as when do you place the napkin on your lap when you sit at a dining table? How long do you wait on HOLD on a telephone call with someone with call
waiting? Should you use a cell phone at the dining table? Should you have a beeper on or a cell phone on in class? In a movie theatre?

(check on the answers to these questions-Hint-There are books on etiquette and now you can also surf the internet – the answers are out there!)

**Morality**- rules of right conduct concerning matters of greater importance. Violations of such can bring disturbance to individual conscience and social sanctions.

**Law**- rules which are enforced by society. Violations may bring a loss of or reduction in freedom and possessions.

What is the relation of law to morality? They are NOT the same. You can NOT equate the two. Just because something is immoral does not make it illegal and just because something is illegal it does not make it immoral.

You can probable think of many examples to support this view once you think about it.

**Things that are illegal but are thought to be moral (for many)!**

Drinking under age.

Driving over the speed limit.

Smoking marijuana.

Cheating on a tax return.

Splitting a cable signal to send it to more than one television.

People do not think of themselves or of others as being immoral for breaking these laws.

**Can you think of other examples??**

**Things that are immoral (for many) but are not illegal.**

Cheating on your spouse.

Breaking a promise to a friend.

Using abortion as a birth control measure.

People can not be arrested or punished with imprisonment or fines for doing these things.
Can you think of other examples??

What is the relation of morality to law? Well, when enough people think that something is immoral they will work to have a law that will forbid it and punish those that do it.

When enough people think that something is moral, they will work to have a law that forbids it and punishes those that do it repealed or, in other words, if there is a law that says doing X is wrong and illegal and enough people no longer agree with that then those people will work to change that law.

Moral Philosophy to understand and to justify moral principles

Ethics to establish principles of the GOOD and those of right behavior Ethics deals with the basic principles that serve as the basis for moral rules. Different principles will produce different rules.

Meta Ethics- discussion of ethical theories and language

So, ethics and morality are not the same things! A person is moral if that person follows the moral rules. A person is immoral if that person breaks the moral rules. A person is amoral if that person does not know about or care about the moral rules.

A person is ethical if that person is aware of the basic principles governing moral conduct and acts in a manner consistent with those principles. If the person does not do so they are unethical.

Here is a glossary of general terms in ethics.

Here is a glossary of general terms in ethics.

Law vs Ethics

Ever since we were kids and became aware of our surroundings, our parents and elders have instilled in us a fundamental awareness of what is right and wrong. Â It is actually an inherent trait of all humans and grows from our desire to get along well with each other in order to live a harmonious life.
To achieve this goal we understand that we must do to other people what we expect them to do to us in return. For this, we try very hard to do what we feel and see as the right things to do in certain situations. This is the foundation of ethics. They are rules of conduct that shows how our society expects us to behave and are the guiding principles behind the creation of laws.

Based on society’s ethics, laws are created and enforced by governments to mediate in our relationships with each other. Laws are made by governments in order to protect its citizens. The judiciary, legislature, and public officials are the three main bodies in a government that are assigned to the task of the creation of laws.

Laws have to be approved and written by these three branches of government before they are implemented and enforced by the police and the military, with the help of the legal system consisting of lawyers and other government servants.

While laws carry with them a punishment for violations, ethics does not. In ethics everything depends on the person’s conscience and self worth. Driving carefully and within the speed limit because you don’t want to hurt someone is ethical, but if you drive slowly because you see a police car behind you, this suggests your fear of breaking the law and being punished for it.

Ethics comes from within a person’s moral sense and desire to preserve his self respect. It is not as strict as laws. Laws are codifications of certain ethical values meant to help regulate society, and punishments for breaking them can be harsh and sometimes even break ethical standards.

Take the case of the death penalty. We all know that killing someone is wrong, yet the law punishes people who break the law with death. With this comes the argument about whether laws are necessary at all. But it is important to note that without laws people are aware of the chaos that might reign in society.

Ethics and laws are therefore necessary to provide guidance and stability to people and society as a whole.

**Relation between Law and Morality or Ethics**

Law is an enactment made by the state. It is backed by physical coercion. Its breach is punishable by the courts. It represents the will of the state and realizes its purpose.
Laws reflect the political, social and economic relationships in the society. It determines rights and duties of the citizens towards one another and towards the state.

It is through law that the government fulfils its promises to the people. It reflects the sociological need of society.

Law and morality are intimately related to each other. Laws are generally based on the moral principles of society. Both regulate the conduct of the individual in society.

They influence each other to a great extent. Laws, to be effective, must represent the moral ideas of the people. But good laws sometimes serve to rouse the moral conscience of the people and create and maintain such conditions as may encourage the growth of morality.

Laws regarding prohibition and spread of primary education are examples of this nature. Morality cannot, as a matter of fact, be divorced from politics. The ultimate end of a state is the promotion of general welfare and moral perfection of man.

It is the duty of the state to formulate such laws as will elevate the moral standard of the people. The laws of a state thus conform to the prevailing standard of morality. Earlier writers on Political Science never made any distinction between law and morality.

Plato's Republic is as good a treatise on politics as on ethics. In ancient India, the term Dharma connoted both law and morality. Law, it is pointed out, is not merely the command of the sovereign, it represents the idea of right or wrong based on the prevalent morality of the people.

Moreover, obedience to law depends upon the active support of the moral sentiments of the people. Laws which are not supported by the moral conscience of the people are liable to become dead letters.

For example laws regarding Prohibition in India have not succeeded on account of the fact that full moral conscience of the people has not been aroused in favor of such laws.

As Green put it, "In attempting to enforce an unpopular law, a government may be doing more harm than good by creating and spreading the habit of disobedience to law. The total cost of such an attempt may well be greater than the social gain."

Although law and morality are interdependent yet they differ from each other in their content, definiteness and sanction.
Some points of distinction between law and morality may be brought out as follows:

**Law:**

1. Law regulates and controls the external human conduct. It is not concerned with inner motives. A person may be having an evil intention in his or her mind but law does not care for it.

   Law will move into action only when this evil intention is translated into action and some harm is actually done to another person.

2. Law is universal in a particular society. All the individuals are equally subjected to it. It does not change from man to man.

3. Political laws are precise and definite as there is a regular organ in every state for the formulation of laws.

4. Law is framed and enforced by a determinate political authority. It enjoys the sanction of the state. Disobedience of law is generally followed by physical punishment.

   The fear of punishment acts as a deterrent to the breach of political law.

5. Law falls within the purview of a subject known as Jurisprudence.

**Morality:**

1. Morality regulates and controls both the inner motives and the external actions. It is concerned with the whole life of man.

   The province of law is thus limited as compared with that of morality because law is simply concerned with external actions and does not take into its fold the inner motives.

   Morality condemns a person if he or she has some evil intentions but laws are not applicable unless these intentions are manifested externally.

2. Morality is variable. It changes from man to man and from age to age. Every man has his own moral principles.

3. Moral laws lack precision and definiteness as there is no authority to make and enforce them.
4. Morality is neither framed nor enforced by any political authority. It does not enjoy the support of the state. Breach of moral principles is not accompanied by any physical punishment.

The only check against the breach of morality is social condemnation or individual conscience. 'Moral actions are a matter of choice of inner conscience of the individual; laws are a matter of compulsion'.

5. Morality is studied under a separate branch of knowledge known as Ethics.

We may conclude the discussion in the words of Gilchrist, "The individual moral life manifests itself in manifold ways. The state is the supreme condition of the individual moral life, for without the state no moral life is possible.

The state, therefore, regulates other organizations in the common interest. The state, however, has a direct function in relation to morality."

**Points to Remember**

Laws may be defined as external rules of human conduct backed by the sovereign political authority. Law and morality are intimately related to each other.

Laws are generally based on the moral principles of a particular society. Some points of distinction may be brought out as follows:

(a) Laws regulate external human conduct whereas morality mainly regulates internal conduct.

(b) Laws are universal; morality is variable.

(c) Laws are definite and precise while morality is variable.

(d) Laws are upheld by the coercive power of the state; morality simply enjoys the support of public opinion or individual conscience.

(e) Laws are studied under Jurisprudence but morality is studied under Ethics.
Summary:

1. Ethics are rules of conduct. Laws are rules developed by governments in order to provide balance in society and protection to its citizens.

2. Ethics comes from people’s awareness of what is right and wrong. Laws are enforced by governments to its people.

3. Ethics are moral codes which every person must conform to. Laws are codifications of ethics meant to regulate society.

4. Ethics does not carry any punishment to anyone who violates it. The law will punish anyone who happens to violate it.

5. Ethics comes from within a person’s moral values. Laws are made with ethics as a guiding principle.
Conclusion

Clearly, there is a relationship between law and ethics, and this relationship is important in management. Managers must evaluate not only what is legal, but what they, their employees, and society consider ethical as well. Important here is that companies must also consider what behaviors their customers will and will not accept. The news is full of stories regarding the ethical issues with which companies are being confronted, such as the practices of Nike, as outlined above. No company wants to be forced to defend itself over ethical issues involving wages, the environment, working issues, or human relations.

Managers play a vital role in a company's legal and ethical performance. It is in part their responsibility to ensure that their employees are abiding by Federal, State, and Local laws, as well as any ethical codes established at the company. But most importantly, the managers must provide a positive example to their employees of proper behavior in light of laws and ethical codes.

Certainly, policies and procedures will never be developed to satisfy everyone, but the establishment of Codes of Ethics will at least provide a framework for ethical behavior, and allow customers to evaluate the type of company with whom they are doing business. With this knowledge, employees and customers must decide whether or not they are willing and able to conform to these Codes, as well as to the laws that have been enacted. Managers cannot simply limit their decisions to following the law. They must also consider the ethics of their employees and customers.