

Philosophy of ethics

1.0 Aristotle does give “an activity of the soul in relation to virtue “as the objective definition of happiness. He loathes the definition of happiness as a state of mind and he prefers to consider it as a way of life. He says it is an activity that has to be done by a happy person because it is common knowledge that a happy person is able to and only does “happy things.” To be able to do the “happy things” that Aristotle does talk of in the context a number of things have to be fulfilled at first. Initially the individual should depict the trait of being virtuous; able to realize when he has extremes and lows in relation to a set metric. Second one’s company should too be virtuous, have education and be physically fit in addition to being financially set and not ugly (Howard & Korver 56). Upon the satisfaction of these attributes of a happy person by Aristotle, then an individual can live happily. He says happiness is reserved for the aristocratic few who have bounty of the god’s blessings.

2.0 Virtue from the learner’s paradox definition is a character aspect that is always valued as being preferable in and of it. It is a success in good morals and as Aristotle puts it, it is “excellence of the morals.” Pride is a virtue. It is an individual’s character trait that the person has perfected on and that is excellently depicted both in the individual inner self and the outlook (Orksenberg 14). It is a personal trait that someone does perfect on and makes it an attribute that he or she has to be defined by and associated with all the time. The moral pride excellence is what makes it personal due to the variations that are in a person when compared to the other. Pride is a trait that is perfected and well applied in the context it deserves hence making it a virtue. According to the interactional and the edifying perspective, pride is an independent reflection of self. The personal status high sense that is likely to lead to judgment of the personality and traits an individual possesses. Vanity on the other hand is the possession of the excess pride. Pride is therefore the basic self-reflection of self while vanity is the unreasonable consideration of high social class and standards by an individual.

3.0 Voluntary action according to Aristotle is the acceptance of taking the responsibility. Actions could be reflex when they are prejudiced by a peripheral motive and secondly and one cannot be held responsible for actions done out of ignorance (Pakaluk 42). Thus, voluntary action is reliant of an individual reflection about the choices in the radiance of good. Any act that does fulfil Aristotle conditions cannot be voluntary. This is because if it has to be chosen. It has to be done with an intention but if the intent to act in such a way lacks then the action cannot be done voluntarily and it is involuntary in the light.

4.0 Deliberation is the act of carefully and with intent planning for a fortune. The process of doing things with a purpose and the intension of what you are out to achieve. A character trait that is tainted by contemplation in feat and the construction of decisions. It is possible that one can deliberate on an action and still fail to do it. This is because it has to be given the right room and atmosphere for thoughtfulness and evaluations in the light of good for one to really consider doing what he or she had deliberations. Just deliberating is not a guarantee of a plunge into actions.

Works cited

Howard, Ronald. & Korver, Clinton. Ethics for the Real World: Creating a Personal Code to Guide Decisions in Work and Life. NY: Harvard Business School Press. 2008. print

Orksenberg, Amelie. *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*. New York: University of California Press.1981.print.

Pakaluk,Michael. *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics: An Introduction*.Uk: Cambridge University Press.2005.print.