# Does Virtue Ethics Give Us Enough Direction About How To Live?

 Virtue ethics is a collective term for theories on the emphasis of the role of character as well as virtue in the philosophy of moral as opposed to either doing an individual’s duty or acting out for positive results (South &Irwin 156). In most cases, the inspiration of the theories of virtue ethics is from Aristotelian philosophy that declared that a parson of virtue is one in possession of ideal personality traits. The derivation of these traits is from natural internal tendencies and warrants nurturing even though stability is attainable upon establishment. Therefore, virtue ethics is important in offering directions about how to live, even though it does not provide enough (South &Irwin 157). For instance, the theories of virtue ethics offer provisions for ethics conception, which is self-centered since the view of human flourishing is as an end in itself and cannot offer sufficient considerations for the extent that an individual’s actions could affect others. Moreover, it fails to provide guidance on how people should act with no clear principles to offer guidance on ones actions apart from how a virtuous person would act given the situation (South &Irwin 158). Therefore, virtue ethics does not offer enough directions on how people should live.

 Virtue ethics in many instances tend to be self-centered. As a matter of facts, morality is in design to be about other people since it is a dealing of an individual’s actions to the extent of their effects on others (South &Irwin 158). The attribution of moral praise as well as blame is on the grounds of behavior evaluation towards other people as well as the ways for exhibiting or failure to exhibit the concerns for others’ wellbeing. However, virtue ethics is self-centered since its chief concern involve the own character of an agent. Therefore, its essential interest is in acquiring virtues as a portion of the wellbeing of an agent as well as flourishing (Byrne & Thompson 120). Morality warrants the consideration of others for their own sake as opposed to how they can be beneficial to us. The factors shows that virtual ethics is self-centered hence cannot offer enough directions on how to live.

 Moreover, virtual ethics is not only a reflection of the imprecise character of ethics through the possession of flexibility as well as situation sensitivity but also has the element of being action guiding by the observation of the instance of virtuous agent (Byrne & Thompson 123). The virtuous agent is in reference to one who has full development of moral character and is in possession of the virtues as well as accordance acts hence has the knowledge of an expectation by example. Furthermore, virtual virtues emphasizes considerably on moral judgment development. The knowledge of life’s expectations does not involve internalization of a principle, but is a longstanding moral learning process that offers clear solutions to the attainment of moral maturity (Byrne & Thompson 128). Virtue ethics, therefore, is not able to offer as solution that is simple and instant because such answers are inexistence.

 Similarly, virtue ethics has been in the view that it leaves people as hostages to luck since morality concerns responsibility as well as the appropriateness of blame besides praise. However, the society only offers praises as well as blames to agents for their actions undertaken in a conscious state (Van Hooft 32). The way leading to a virtuous life is not only arduous hence; many factors outside the conscience control can easily go wrong. In a similar way that the right education as well as habits alongside influences among others has the ability to offer promotions to virtue development, wrong factors of influence are vital promoters of vice. The few lucky individuals, however, are recipients of help as well as encouragement necessary for the achievement of moral maturity as opposed to the unlucky majority (Van Hooft 32).

 Whenever the development of virtue, as well as vice, becomes subject to luck, the fairness is in praises to the virtuous, and blames to the vicious, but only for factors within individual control as opposed to the statements of virtue ethics. Moreover, some virtue accounts depend on external goods availability (Van Hooft 34). Therefore, friendship offer to other agents of virtue is chief to Aristotelian virtue stating that a life with no virtuous friendship lacks in eudaimonia. However, no one has the control over the availability of the accomplices of choice. Therefore, virtue ethics does not offer directions on offering praises to the virtuous with blames on vicious in case their development as well as the concerned virtue and vices is not within their control.

## Conclusion

 Virtue ethics does not offer enough directions on how people should live owing to very many reasons (Van Hooft 32). For example, the theories of virtue ethics are in provisions for ethics conception, which is self-centered since the view of human flourishing is as an end in itself and cannot offer sufficient considerations for the extent that an individual’s actions could affect others. Moreover, it fails to provide guidance on how people should act with no clear principles to offer guidance on ones actions apart from act as a virtuous person would act given the situation (South &Irwin 158).
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