

# PHI 2397E

January 7, 2016 12:32 PM



## Syllabus

# PHI2397E: BUSINESS ETHICS

## Winter 2016, Room MCD 146

Tuesdays 1PM – 2:30PM, & Thursdays 11:30AM – 1PM

Professor: Jon C. Miller  
Office: DMS 8109 Hours: Tuesdays 11AM – 12NOON  
✉ [jmiller@uottawa.ca](mailto:jmiller@uottawa.ca)

### Required Text

*Ethical Issues in Business*, by Peg Tittle. ISBN: 1-55111-257-4  
Available at: Benjamin Books, 122 Osgood Ave. ☎ 613-232-7495

### Course Outline

Jan 12 <sup>th</sup> and 14 <sup>th</sup>	Introduction to Business Ethics
Jan 19 <sup>th</sup> and 21 <sup>st</sup>	Utilitarianism and Kantianism: pgs. 38–44, 46–48, 49–50
Jan 26 <sup>th</sup> and 28 <sup>th</sup>	Profit and Product Safety: pgs. 307–332, 135–164
Feb 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> , and 9 <sup>th</sup>	Employee/Employer Wants and Rights: pgs. 205–224, 236–266
Feb 11 <sup>th</sup>	<b>Midterm Exam #1 (11:30AM – 12:30PM)</b>
Feb 16 <sup>th</sup> and 18 <sup>th</sup>	<b>Reading Week (No Classes)</b>
Feb 23 <sup>rd</sup>	Ethical Relativism: pgs. 54–57
Feb 25 <sup>th</sup>	Justice and Equality: pgs. 50– 54
Mar 1 <sup>st</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup>	Canadian Business Issues and Globalization: pgs. 340–377, 385–411
Mar 8 <sup>th</sup> and 10 <sup>th</sup>	Egoism and Virtue Ethics: pgs. 36–38, 44–45
Mar 15 <sup>th</sup> and 17 <sup>th</sup>	Health and the Environment: pgs. 443–468, 420–431
Mar 22 <sup>nd</sup>	<b>Midterm Exam #2 (1PM – 2PM)</b>
Mar 24 <sup>th</sup>	Business Ethics and the University
Mar 29 <sup>th</sup> and 31 <sup>st</sup>	Advertising: pgs. 94–117
April 5 <sup>th</sup> and 7 <sup>th</sup>	Whistleblowing: pgs. 70–85
April 12 <sup>th</sup>	Review

- Attendance at lectures is not mandatory but is strongly recommended for success.
  - I do not provide notes to students who miss lectures.
- Date/Time/Location of the Final Exam is to be determined by the University.
- Exams will be based on all material covered in the lectures, videos, and assigned readings.
  - Students are responsible for frequently checking their uOttawa.ca email account and the Blackboard website for news and info concerning the course.

### Course Evaluation

2 Midterm Exams (20% + 20% = 40%) + Final Exam (60%)

⊗ Students missing any midterm exam will receive zero for the missed exam unless I receive a doctor's note within 5 work days. To defer a missed final exam, the student must contact the Faculty of Arts: [arts@uottawa.ca](mailto:arts@uottawa.ca) ☺

### **Rules Regarding Exams**

1. The Midterm Exams should be written in blue or black pen. No Midterm Exam written in pencil will be re-marked (this includes Midterm Exams first written in pencil by the student and then written over in pen). The Final Exam can be written in either blue or black pen, or pencil.
2. Any student who is more than 15 minutes late for a Midterm Exam will not be allowed to write that Midterm Exam. Any student who is more than 30 minutes late for the Final Exam will not be allowed to write the Final Exam.
3. No student is allowed to leave the room during the Midterm Exams until they finish writing the Midterm Exam (Each Midterm Exam will be one hour long). No student is allowed to leave the room during the Final Exam until they finish writing the Final Exam (The Final Exam will be two hours long). (i.e., there are no bathroom breaks allowed during any of the exams).
4. No books, papers, or electronic devices are allowed during any of the Exams.
5. Students must leave the room once they have finished each Midterm Exam, handed it in, shown their University of Ottawa student ID, and signed the attendance sheet (see rule 6).
6. All students must present their University of Ottawa student ID card and sign the attendance sheets at both the Midterms and Final Exams. Students who do not show a valid university of Ottawa student ID card will not be allowed to write the Exam (and if they have already written the Exam, it will not be marked).
7. Students must write the Exams for the class and section they are registered in on order to receive a mark.
8. Students are strongly advised to consult the University's policy on Cheating/Plagiarism: <http://www.uottawa.ca/academic-regulations/academic-fraud.html>

---

☺ Students are responsible for doing the assigned readings, taking notes during lectures, and having fun learning new things. ☺

Teaching Assistants: TBA

# Week 1

January 12, 2016 1:06 PM

More - mark Osborne

This course is about answering 2 important questions

1. What is a successful business
2. What is a successful life

Business: Whenever you offer a product or service to another.

Business began when civilization began. (10-20 thousand years ago)

What did it mean to be civilized?

Up until that time, life was about survival, nothing else.

Civilization began when we started to specialize in trades.

Morals and ethics: when civilization began certain rules began to appear

1. It is wrong to kill people,
2. It is wrong to steal

Morals/ Ethics, Business and life are all linked together in a sense of increasing our quality of living

Morals are the codes of behaviour, within a culture, (within a specific time and place - this point is controversial)

Ethics is your own *personal* code of behaviour, what you think is right and wrong.

Ethics is about the ancient art and science of decision making

"How do I know what is the right thing to do, what is the good thing to do?"

What is the criterion for knowing what is the right or good thing to do is?

There is no right or wrong answers, there are theories that help explain.

You want to have a good life. You want to know what are the right things to do in order to have that good life.

A successful life is a meaningful life.

What does it mean to have a meaningful life?

You don't want to live a meaningless existence, yet a lot of people do feel that they live that way "ex. Depression"

"you don't want to live a life that sucks, and it's your own fault if your life sucks, and if your life sucks its because you suck"

A person's life is the sum of their decisions making.

A lot of people in this world hate their lives and their jobs. "most people choose a life they don't want to live"

Many people live the 90/10 life

90% of your time doing something you hate so you can have the money to spend 10% of your life doing something you love.

"Let's listen to a successful person" - Arnold 6 tips to success

1. Trust yourself
  1. Who do you want to be, what makes you happy
2. Break the rules
  1. Not the law but break the rules, it is impossible to be a true original if you are too well behaved
3. Don't be afraid to fail
  1. Always be willing to fail
  2. You can't always win but don't be afraid of making decision
  3. You have to keep pushing yourself
4. Don't listen to the nay-sayers
  1. I do it and that means I am the first one who has done it
  2. Listen to self and said yes you can
5. Work your butt off
  1. I don't count my sit ups- I only start counting when it starts hurting
  2. No pain no gain
  3. Sleep faster
6. Give back
  1. Whatever path that you take in your life you must always find time to give something back to your community, your country

You want to live your potential. It's a tragedy when you don't live to your full potential, you'll realize that you've squandered your potential

The economy loses billions of dollars every year in workers taking time off, low productivity etc. because the workers do not enjoy their work. If you want your business to thrive and you want to thrive as a person, you have to enjoy the work

Business ethics is about how to know what decisions to make to have a successful business and a successful life. .

Epictetus and Epicurus

Epictetus lived in 1st century AD

Epicurus lived in the 3rd century BC

They had their own theories about what is a successful life.

Epicurus was a successful business man, and around the time he was 40 he had a lot of money and he decided he had to get out of there, and he left Athens and started his own garden and lived the life he wanted to live.

A meaningful life is when you live according to your own rules and within your own created system

Epictetus said the opposite, he believed a meaningful life embrace yourself within some system that already exists. These people are the kind of people who like a uniform, they like having the structure, they love living according to someone else's rules and system.

You have to ask yourself what are you, and nowadays we call this a personality type, (Psychology)

Personality types. Who are you, what do you like? what do you hate?

Happiness is the goal.

Watching another movie about another successful person

Steve jobs 2005 Stanford

Knowing you're going to die someday is the best way to make the right decisions, according to Steve jobs, is the best way to make the right decisions about your life.

***Memento Mourie*** - one day you are going to die

If something has nothing to do with morals/ethics then it is amoral

Amoral - has nothing to do with moral

Immoral - you're doing the wrong or bad thing

Ethics/Morals is not The Law.

The law tells you what you can do

Ethics tells you what you should do

After all, laws may be wrong, that is what laws get changed.

Ethics is about *shouldness* "I should do this"

Ethics and morals are about values, no necessarily facts.

Science deals with the facts, ethics deals with values and there's a debate about how they relate to each other

Good/bad, right/wrong. There is a difference between saying something is good and something is right.

# Week 2

January 19, 2016 1:04 PM

Elon musk 10 rules to success

1. Never give up
2. Really like what you do
3. Don't listen to the #littleman
4. Take a risk
5. Do something Important
6. Focus on signal over noise
7. Look for problem solvers
8. Attract great people
9. Have a great product
10. Work super hard

This week we will be looking at two major theories about decision making

1. You want to perform a certain action and you want to know what choice to make
2. Most popular choice of decision making is "do what you think will bring about the best consequences"
3. The other theory (next class) is "do what is right regardless of the consequences"

Consequentialism = what will bring about the best consequences

It's about wants and desires

It is not about rights

It's important to distinguish between wants and rights

Epicurus -4th century BC Greek - consequentialist

The guy who comes up with the most popular answer

What do you want from a meaningful life?

- i. Happiness
  - i. Whatever you like, that is what life is about

Epicurus had 3 rules about getting happiness

1. Real friends
2. Freedom
3. Enough money to satisfy your wants/needs etc.

Hedonism - pleasure seeker

Some people criticize that because some people look at it as a trivial life

These are all **feelings** your decision will be based on **emotion** because it is **natural** (Natural is in that which is self-evident)

1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 ... natural numbers because they are self-evident - counting stuff

During Enlightenment in Europe -17th century to the early 19th century

It was about decision making, before that, you would ask the church. During this period, people asked themselves what to do

Jeremy Bentham - 18th century English man

He wanted to know how do we make decisions

"on the nature of things" - Lucretius a translation of epicurus's philosophy

It was moral and political, what sort of society do we want to live in

It is from this we get Utilitarianism

We want to seek the good in life and avoid the bad

The good is

- a. Happiness
- b. Utility - usefulness
  - i. No such thing as useless and good, anything useful is good
- c. Usefulness = happiness = good

We naturally seek pleasure and avoid pain.

Our criteria for decision making is the pain/pleasure principle

This is naturalism (not in the context of the 20th century)

What is the greatest good?

The greatest good is the good for the greatest number.

The most happy thing is when you have the most happy people

That is the Utilitarian principle

1 rule

1. Act so as to create the greatest good for the greatest number

It's not just humans that follow this moral system

Animals are moral beings equal in many ways to people. (Bentham first proposed this)

Peter Singer - Australian

Wrote the animal rights book

John Stuart Mill - 19th Century

Utilitarianism - agrees with Bentham a lot, but says Bentham misses something, he says Bentham focused upon quantity, and that is a mistake. According to Mill, intellectual pleasures are superior to animal pleasures (base pleasures). Quality of pleasure is at least if not more important than just the quantity.

Reading, writing, doing math > sex, eating, drinking

People would prefer to be an unsatisfied human rather than a satisfied pig.

Main argument against utilitarianism is that it is for the greatest good for the greatest number,

Aka please the majority

Inherently democratic

Leads to "Ends justify the means"

Whatever makes the majority happy, it is justified.

Machiavelli - 14th century Italian

How to be powerful and keep that power

Book is called "the prince"

You've got to be ruthless, you've got to justify the means

Machiavellianism is usually seen as a negative thing

**Documentary**

**The examined life 30 mins**

## **Does the end justify the means**

If the benefits are large enough can any political decision be justified?

Dam in Malaysia - destroy rainforest, 30 villages moved

It is important that we make a difference in the world - peter singer

There is no point in sticking to a principle without consideration for the outcome of what you're doing

Bentham - maximize pleasure and minimize pain for society

The only way to reason is to predict the outcomes on everything as far into the future as possible and see if the benefits will truly outweigh the costs on the people, the animal, the ecosystem

Can a sacrifice of one group's pleasure be justified for the benefit of another ? -pf

Mills was a compromising thinker, and he tried to combine many theories

Mills then deviated from Bentham; as seen above, quality matters

Egoism - why should I care about others?

---

Consequentialism was last lecture's topic - business is inherently consequentialist, it's about making money

Major problem with consequentialism is that it leads to end justifies the means

Your life is the sum of the decisions you make

people believe that business is just about money

A lot of people don't really think about why they make decisions, if you choose to be in business but you pick it because you just want job security then you'll probably end up living the 90/10 style of life"

## **Video**

### **What matters to me**

What would you do if money were not a factor?

It is better to have a short life filled with what you like doing than a long life spent in a miserable way

The person speaking in that video was Alan Watts - 1911-1975

He specialized in eastern philosophy

"if you asked yourself what would you do in life if money were no object" chances are you're not doing that right now, chances are it's not office work.

"You are spending your life doing something you don't like so you can go on doing something you don't like" -Alan Watts

Then on weekends or when you're old you can really start to live your life, which kind of sucks.

Retirement usually means boredom, lack of energy, and if you want to know what retirement is really like then go to the casino. Is that a good life?

Do what you like to do, try to not live the 90/10 life. Living the 90/10 life even affects the economy.

Most philosophers and many successful people say that happiness is the goal you want.

The idea is to make lots of money AND be happy

The next person we look at is Immanuel Kant

German 18th century philosopher, he lived in a time where you did what is good, not what the right thing to do.

It was about wants, and good over bad decisions

You use reason to choose right over wrong decisions

Kant was one of the first to go against nature, about doing what is right regardless of how you feel about it, it is about duties and obligations.

Kant came up with a secular argument for moral rights.

We call that whole philosophy **Kantian Ethics**

Kantian ethics does not like the ideas of

End justifies the means,

The probabilistics of consequentialism because we cannot know the future. This is inductive, and that's a problem because if its based on morals and how those affect your life you have to base it on certainties.

Happiness- if you base your decisions on happiness then there is a problem with it, disagrees with "if it feels good then it is good"

If feelings are what constitutes morality, then justice cannot exist.

Kant asked "What is morality?"

He came up with 2 requirements to morality

1. Reason, if you don't have the ability to reason then you will only go with what feels good,
2. Freewill

Morality ethics is the ability to reason and the ability to have freewill

And if that is the case then there is only one place to find that, which is in human beings.

In other words, then if morality is made of reason and freewill, then human beings ARE morality.

If we want to be true to who we really are, we have to take morality seriously.

What are the duties and obligations on us in order to take morality seriously?

Kant believes in being deductive, rather than inductive (based on probability)

Categorical Imperative - the deductive moral laws that everyone follows.

1. Act so as to treat all people as ends, never as means to an end. (never use people)
2. Act so as to treat all personal maxims as if they were universal laws. (equality and justice)

Morality is an end in itself. If decision making is morality, then there is nothing higher than morality.

If you treat people as a means to an end, then you treat morality as a means to an end.

When you think about reasoning, reasoning is like logic, and logic is like mathematics.

It's like if you came up with a mathematical formula it has to fit in with the rest of mathematics.

Golden rule: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Moral rights, if you were treated unfairly then you would cry about it and speak about it.  
Human rights, etc.

Human equality is based on how we value one another.

What people have been trying to do for the last few centuries is build a bridge between consequentialism and Kantian ethics

A lot of people say that egoism and selfishness is the path to success but those people usually end up upset

### **Video**

**What is morality, to be moral is to obey the rules set by church, or an authority.  
During the enlightenment instead of listening to the authority, people were urged to ask and develop for themselves a decision.**

### ***Can rules define morality***

**Kant was a lecturer and a billiards pro,  
Kant taught physics, mathematics, philosophy, and geography**

**Kant argued that we cannot prove the existence of god with reason, but reason can prove justification in the belief of god**

**It is impossible to think of anything in the universe that is good without qualification except for will. Goodness lies within itself.**

**Dignity means that they [person] will choose what they do**

**Temptation to allow for lying is constant, if a murderer asked you wh**

**were a victim was hiding and you knew, Kantian ethics would say you've done the right thing.**

**^ This is a criticism with Kantian ethics**

# Week 3

January 28, 2016 11:33 AM

Movie opener: **network** (1975) **lesson**; the world is a business, money is what the world is all about  
You have to let money do what it does, flow back and forth

Business is about making profit. **Consequentialist**

Capitalism is often justified by saying that it is the best economic system because it delivers the goods for society

Goods = more than stuff, it means education, healthcare,

It bring about all this stuff more than communism, and all the other isms

It is morally justified to seek profit,

Morally justified because it brings about the greatest good, that makes it utilitarian

Milton Freidman - 20th century economist

Business is amoral

Rockney Jacobsen article (reading) - 1 fundamental distinction that is confusing standard of living with quality of life

Standard of living = money

Quality of life = ????

(QoL) profit motive, want to make money, but at what cost to society.

Example, in the world today everything seems to have a dollar value.

Does a human life have a dollar value?

## Movie #2

Fight club (Car company recalls,  $A*B*C=x$  if  $x$  is less than the cost of a recall then they don't do a recall.)

Reduce the cost of human life down to making jokes about people burning to death in a car

## Movie #3

Ford commercial featuring a horse (pinto)

9/11/1970

Americans made a cheap car to compete with the good on gas Japanese cheap cars

Problem was that in rear end collisions, the gas tank would blow up. Since they made it thinner, the car would crumple, and lock the driver and passengers in, and they were doomed to burn to death

At least 1000 people burned to death

Around 1977 a whistleblower got a hold of something that is now famously known as the "Ford Memo"

Shown among top executives when they knew about the fires and the crashes

Page 6/8 the magic formula. **(table 3)**

Ford chose to let the people burn because the lawsuits only were projected to be 49.5\$ million, but a recall (\$11 part) would cost 100+ million dollars

Did ford do the right thing?

Product safety, a lot of people say that ford did the wrong thing.

Milton Freidman says; nobody could accept the principle that an infinite money should equal a human life.

"There is no such thing as the 100% safe product" People would not buy it because it is too expensive, if you wanted to be safe, you should buy a dump truck.

People often do not wish to pay much for their own safety.

The risk of your car exploding is .01%, as per the memo. So knowing that, is ford truly in the wrong? If that's a 1 in a million then it's acceptable to the consumer

When you cross the street it is possible that you get killed. Everybody gambles with their lives.

In the world of capitalism, everything is made by the lowest bidder, (he who can bid the lowest cost and the fastest)

And they get lowest bid by sacrificing labour and quality

How much are you willing to pay for your safety

# Week 4

February 2, 2016 1:01 PM

Role of the employee and the employer

Employee rights = employee wants

## **Video; the third man**

Criminal is selling watered down medicine to childrens hospitals

"look at all the people down there, theyre like little ants, if I paid you to get rid of one would you?"

Ferris wheel scene - brings idea of empathy,

The golden rule - do unto others as you would want them to do unto you

Empathy - putting yourself into other people's shoes

David Hume - 18th century Scottish -> yes we have empathy, and anyone without it is missing something human, but not everyone has it. We have a Natural empathy, which is ruled by distance in time and space.

If you see someone face to face, that's a human being, and you wouldn't kill them for money, but from the top of a ferris wheel theyre just little dots.

In other words, not everyone gives equal empathy.

There is a point outside of a certain circle where people start being numbers

Ex. A bus goes over a cliff in a country ive never been to, carrying no one I know

Hume showed that it is natural for us to treat people as numbers if they are far away from us

If someone you know right now dies then that bothers you much more than someone who dies across the world

A world where everyone has empathy for everybody wouldn't be livable.

A business is the same way, ex. The ford memo wasn't as cold hearted as it may seem.

Human nature is what philosophers call it, but they mean psychology. We don't follow the golden rule, we don't individually nor do businesses.

In business people are numbers, that is a realization that must be made. You may not know what your number is, but when you buy something, or sign something you accept that this is your price. There is no such thing as a priceless human being, or object.

---

Employee: one point we talked about is how the world is a business, if you believe money is the most important thing then you will do anything for money.

Is that really true? If that is really true then you have to figure out what is your price.

Does everyone have their price?

Aka I can get you to do anything I want, provided I hit the right number.

Drug addicts are the people of the world who really seem to live that way.

Everyone else *I think* puts the breaks on somewhere.

Ex. I wouldn't sell my children to a child molester, but a drug addict would.

When we choose a job, we tend to choose that job that pays the most.  
That's a big mistake, because they discount the role of the work environment.

Employee wants = money + work environment  
A lot of people wait much too long in life to learn that one

## Video 2; American Beauty

Server quits while he's out smoking with Kevin Spacey

KS learns how to quit.  
A lot of people don't do that  
Why don't people quit when the job sucks?  
Only slaves and prisoners can't quit  
A surprising thing is that people do not understand that

If you want to know why most people hate their lives and hate their jobs it's because they feel that they can't quit

People paint themselves into a corner  
Ex. Bangladesh, garment factory that collapsed, (1000 people died)

Before the factory collapsed, people walked out and managers came out and said come back in or you're fired.  
And the employees went back in. why would people make that choice, to re-enter a collapsing building, rather than walk away.

50,000 serious work injuries per year in Canada. -> most cases are someone using a dangerous machine or doing something dangerous. The labour laws don't actually help you

Is unemployment really the worst thing in the world?  
If someone says ill accept any job, then don't expect them to have a happy life.

Employee want?

The causes for people not feeling free.

1. Not having the resources to back up your freedom
  - i. Everyone should have at least one year of freedom money (pay off bills for one year)
  - ii. This is why people say that they cannot quit
    - 1) Why does it suck to be poor?
      - a) Life is a struggle
      - b) You have to live paycheck to paycheck in order to pay off your bills
    - 2) What's interesting is when people have money, but they have to live like you're poor.
      - a) Financial advisor advises to put your cash towards lowering debts asap
    - 3) If you don't have that freedom money then you're poor, even if you have a nice house, a nice car.
      - a) Fall for the trap that says "only have savings once you pay off all your debts"
        - i) Then you'll never have any savings
2. Employee stress - psychological problems more than physical
  - i. JM has his freedom money so he doesn't have the stress/worry of losing his job therefore he doesn't have to take shit from the university
3. When you live paycheck to paycheck you have worry, which leads to bad health problems that lead to burnout.

Break free of the cycle; I am going to live my life in the future  
Tragedy is that it never happens

Allan watts - animated by south park

Rush through life chasing objectives but at the end you realize that you missed your whole life.

Retirement is also a hoax, you don't actually get to take on the projects that you wanted to do because now you don't have the energy

That's why you find so many old people at the casino

What is a successful life?

1. There is no big prize waiting for you at the end of the race, because you think you're in a race, right?
2. Do not spend your freedom money at any cost.
  1. It's very important to your psychological health

Stanford Prison Experiment (1970) - student volunteers to play prison, some pretended to be prisoners and some were guards and told they could quit at anytime

1. Nobody quit, people for some weird reason don't quit
2. The university actually had to step in and stop it

Employer wants - profit, high productivity, and yet they behave in such a way that it goes against that

If you're a slave driver then employees won't give 110%

# Week 5

February 9, 2016 12:57 PM

Movie - Death of a salesman

Play by Arthur Miller in the 1940's  
We saw the 1966 version

Classic scene because it speaks the truth about something a lot of people do not see

When you go to work somewhere and you work hard for that place you get this notion that they owe you, they respect you ect.

But in reality the management is looking at the numbers and how much money is being brought in, a lot of people who worked 30-40 years will just get fired

The reality is that Business is business. Then there is no loyalty or justice etc.

In this movie, Willy Loman thinks he will be the exception, that he will be kept forever.

**"a man is not a piece of fruit."** if business is business is followed, then you are just that.

Business will expect loyalty from you, but that does not mean you will get loyalty from them.

A concept of justice is that since you worked hard in the past you will be taken care of in the future.

Justice - Compensatory

Employee/Employer relationship. In death of a Salesman, the firing is nothing but a business transactions.

This raises a question of quality of life. Workplace environment- it is important that you like the people there.

A lot of people will go for the money, but not the workplace environment. This leads to depression in the workplace.

To avoid depression in the workplace, you must enjoy the environment

---

Mike Henderson - Employee rights

It is arbitrary for business to let their employees to have rights.

Employee and employer wants. We have a better understanding of that than rights

1. Right to employee information
2. Right to fair pay - employers will try to pay the least amount possible, but what they don't understand is that you get what you pay for.
3. Right not to be fired for invalid reason - valid reasons are still acceptable, invalid can be discrimination, I just want to get rid of you because my friend needs a job, etc.
4. Right to be free from unjust discrimination

---

Video:

Situation about the unpaid internship: criticisms are that you mostly get the bullshit jobs, not actual work experience

Risk takers: Successful people are risk takers

The queen of Versailles  
Jackie segal -miss florida.

Retirement is looked at like prisoners talk about parole

---

Using Animals

If you really want products that are safe for people, then you test on people.

We should be using humans for medical experiments.

If all that matters is money, imagine how much money you would make if you experimented on people.

Read the article about why to use animals - jameson article

### **Midterm**

It is on everything (textbook readings, lectures, videos).

1 hour long,

Must have student ID with you

Write in pen preferred

There is no bathroom breaks

Format - Long answers (Mini- Essays)

20 marks

Closed book

# Midterm cutoff

March 20, 2016 5:11 PM

# Week 6

February 23, 2016 1:00 PM

Retirement Commercial - Manulife, Scotiabank, etc.

Ethical Relativism- nobody has the right to tell another culture what to do, or especially force them to do something that you believe is right

Is there a universal standard for right and wrong? Each culture has their own values

If you are an ER, morals are not universal standards, but are only rules related to particular times and places

Anthropologists (people who study cultures) [where do morals come from] - all morals are really just pragmatic rules ( what is true, what is right, what works, if you believe in whatever works best you're a pragmatist)

If morals are relative then they are really nothing but fashion

If you say that people in the past just didn't know any better, then you are saying that you believe in some kind of standard. AKA you're a moral relativist, then moral progress does not exist. If you're a relativist, then you cannot judge the past, nor can you judge other cultures.

1 attempt to define a moral standard is to trap it into feelings and emotions - all people feel the same about stuff

a. Emotivism

- a. Problem is that evidence shows that this is not true, and people do not have the same feelings about actions and behaviours

Another attempt is that people intuitively know right and wrong, they believe that they don't need Kant or the church to tell them right or wrong. Its part of their human nature

- a. People do not have the same intuitions about right and wrong, so this theory also doesn't universally work.

Rationalism - our ability to reason - our shared rational nature.

- a. We should be able to use reason to deduce what right and wrong are, for everybody.
- b. Kant would be a rationalist.

Human Nature: are human beings fundamentally rational or emotional

- i. Ancient greeks felt that we were rational beings
- ii. The last 300 years has evidence that seems to point to the fact that we are emotional beings
  - a. We do what we *feel* is right

Because of this, we have a big problem establishing the universal standard. In history it's been whoever is in power establishes what is right.

What is (*if there is*) a universal standard for morals?

**Movie** - about moral relativism - the examined life - is morality relative

*If tastes and values differ among individuals, then it varies even more between countries  
A moral relativist is somebody who thinks that there is no single true morality, but a variety of possible moralities*

*And isn't that we should abandon morality the way an atheist abandons religion, but rather we should accept a morality but accept that it is not the only true morality.*

*Ex. The evolving role of marriage, and male and female roles*

*Moral relativism is that there is no single correct view on morality. And that we should respect other people's morality*

*But that there are parts that are universal to everybody*

*Our own moral background determines how we see other people*

*Ex. Dutch man who smuggles drugs into Singapore - he was to be executed as punishment but the Dutch find that practice barbaric*

*Many different cultures make the world more interesting*

*Relativists believe that since cultures change the morals of a country, what are the limits*

*Does local custom excuse the genocide of human beings? - thought on Rwanda*

*Lessons to learn from relativism - don't assume that every practice of moral is the proper standard for a culture*

*Ex. We are wearing clothes, this is a cultural matter, there would be nothing morally wrong if this guy did his interview naked*

*Once you realize that, you are free to consider more important things that rest on nothing more than cultural prejudices*

*EX. Homosexuals being terrible evil people*

*Doing the right things means doing the things the best thing for human welfare*

*Human welfare being defined is a value question*

*Science is different from ethics*

*In science there are methods to determine if something is true.*

*In ethics there is no way to prove the validity*

*Facts versus feelings*

*All moral judgements are expressions of feelings and emotions*

*An expression of emotion is neither true nor false*

*Emotivism - moral statements have too many functions (emotions and morals)*

---

Years ago there was a big issue - we should end child slavery

We don't hear about it anymore, why?

Because there isn't a solution for it. We free the children, then what? They starve

Ronald Dworkin - American Philosophy of law

He is against ethical relativism

- a. If you say that you are not allowed to judge another culture when they do something that you believe is wrong, it means you don't really believe in your own moral beliefs.
- b. ER claim to be against universal moral principles
  - a. However, to say ALL cultures have a right to their own moral values, then that IS a universal principle.

Genocide is not a cultural practice, it is when cultures break down

VIDEO 2

*Delhi - 1/6th of the world's population lives in India.*

*The economic progress that India has enjoyed has not been shared with everyone, India might be the largest home of child slaves.*

*Lots of children work in producing saris - at the top end of the market they can sell for more than 1000 pounds.*

### **Business Ethics Feb 25**

Superheroes are supposed to represent justice

What exactly do we mean by "that's not fair"

Justice, fairness and equality

What are the problems with the term 'equal'

We use it in a factual sense, this thing weighs the same as the other

When equality is used as facts = sameness

Moral values and human equality we are technically not equal

We have some similarity, our shared homo sapiens = the wise man

But we are actually the homo credulous= believing man

We have a share nature to a certain extent but we're not equal, and we not clones

Resorting to a myth some are better looking, smarter, etc.

There are sociologists and divided and tested them and it shows that we are not the same, we have our differences

When we talk about human equality in a moral sense = it becomes about values and not facts

Consequentialism – it becomes about feelings. Morals are based on pain and pleasure principle

Pain and pleasure are facts

But bad and good are values

David Hume 18<sup>th</sup> Century Scottish Philosopher

Is/ Ought Fallacy

- You cannot derive a value from a fact
- Aesthetic values- we see something as beautiful and ugliness
- Sunsets: light rays go through water droplets and...
  - o Then why does say it's beautiful
  - o The facts don't lead to it being beautiful
  - o Is- Fact – value. Values are shouldness, good and bad
  - o They are committing a fallacy
  - o N

Naturalistic Fallacy

G.E. Moore- 20<sup>th</sup> century English philosopher

Pain and pleasure do not automatically mean that bad and good

There are some things that some people find a pleasure from but that's not necessarily good

Ex. Child Molester

There are arguably such thing as bad pleasures

## Equality as a value

The facts that don't equal to value therefore, values will be as equality

## 2 THEORIES CLASSIC FOR HUMAN EQUALITY

1. Aristotle- we are equal in our differences
2. Kant- we are equal regardless of our differences

This is not saying there are no differences but we are different because of them

Aristotle 4<sup>th</sup> century BC Greek- Ideas of humans being equal was ridiculous,

- Treat equal people equally, and unequal people unequally
  - o Means that everything in the universe were defined by their function, it's what you do in life that determines your value
  - o Your value is determined by your merit
- The function of the state or the family, pragmatic goal, make it work
  - o Most important thing: make life to make us flourish as much as possible
  - o Human flourishing- eudomenia
  - o He's a consequentialist
  - o Everything in life was about this goal, when each person does best what they're good at
  - o Ex. Water wheel, made of different parts, factually speaking they are of a different values.
- When all the different unequal parts work together to accomplish the goal, then they are equal in the their equal in their differences
  - o It doesn't mean that everyone has a fair share of their duties
- The king is equal to the slave when each is functioning in their best way
  - o When the king can be the best king he can be and slave, the best slave he can be

Kant- naturally we are moral being. We have reason and free will

- Treat all people as ends and never as means: where human equality comes form
- Also treat all personal maxims as if they were universal laws, your rules apply to everybody else – Equality
- People are equal regardless of our differences

That's where we get moral equality, human rights etc. etc.

If you support those ideas it's called: Egalitarian

There's never a question is how equal is equal?

What do people deserve?

Justice- is a person receiving their due

- On what basis and to what extent?
- If you work harder than someone else, you should be getting more money
- Should the government tell the business what do?

## 2 Fundamental types of justice

- Compensatory justice: you deserve compensation after having been wronged, your equality was violated somehow
- Distributive justice: you deserve equal access to the good of society. Equal distribution of goods

Discrimination- is actually a good thing, just means to choose.

- Unjust discrimination
  - o There are such things as just discriminations
- Economics- how far should the goods of society be distributed?

John Rawls 20<sup>th</sup> Century American

- He argued for equal distribution of goods in a strict sense, sharing of wealth
- 1971- Theory of justice
- Response to Marxist critiques of Capitalism
- Marxism is really a theory that argues for human equality
- You can have a capitalist society and human equality

Capitalist equality

Adam Smith- society flourishes best when each person pursues their own self interest

Veil of ignorance-

- Put a group of rational people into a room, each are pursuing their self interest
- They get to decide they want to live in
- But they don't get to decide their roles in that world
- His claim that is that he would choose a world that everything was equal
- People would choose for those who have merited more to help those who are struggling= taxation

Veil of ignorance-you do not know who you are or what makes you who you are you do it knowing thing that make you different from others

You cannot create a society from an unjust foundation

Robert Nozick- 20<sup>th</sup> century American

Rawl's system was unjust. The basic premise to Rawls' argument is that it violates your just entitlement to the property you have justly acquired. Against taxation

Taxation is really legalized theft. Violates your right of entitlement

The entitlement theory

Liberals, Democrats - They tend to supporters of Rawls

Conservative, Republicans – supporters of Nozick

With regard to the equal distribution of goods, how far should it go

From <<https://d.docs.live.net/67d2fc4a26672cf3/University/Year%203/Semester%202/PHI%202397E%20-%20Business%20Ethics/Business-Ethics-Feb-25.docx>>

# Week 7

February 26, 2016 11:38 AM

## Justice video

- Showed video of Super friends intro vs family guy parody (no context given, they are just superheros)

## **Justice, Fairness and Equality**

- Equality as facts = Sameness
  - However this does not account for equal needs
- Human Equality
  - Some similarities factually but actually human beings are NOT equal
  - We are all Homo Sapiens (means wise man) (prof does not believe this)
  - Prof believes we are Homo Credulous = Believing man
  - Human equality is a myth (some are smarter than others, better looking etc.)
  - We have our difference ("that's the TRUTH" - JMills)
- Equality in the moral sense = Values

## Values and Facts

- Values and Facts are not the same thing
  - Consequentialism – morals are based on the pain/pleasure principle
  - Pain and Pleasure = facts
  - Bad and good = values
  - David Hume – 18<sup>th</sup> century Scottish
  - Is/Ought Fallacy
    - Just because some IS the right way does not mean it OUGHT to be good
    - Is = Fact
    - Ought = Value
  - You cannot derive a value from a fact
  - Aesthetic values – beauty vs. ugliness
  - Naturalistic Fallacy
    - G.E Moore – 20<sup>th</sup> English
    - Pain and pleasure do not automatically mean bad and good
    - Example: Child molesters feel good doing what they do but that does not make it good
    - Arguably such thing as bad pleasures
  - Equality as a value
    - Two theories classic for human equality
1. Aristotle – We are equal in our differences
  2. Kant – We are equal regardless of our differences

## Aristotle – 4<sup>th</sup> century BC Greek

- "Treat equal people equally, and unequal people unequally"
- The meaning derives from the notion that a person is defined by their function
  - Your value is determined by your merit
  - What you do is greater than who you are
  - Example: you make more than a homeless and therefore deserve more
- Function of the State or the Family, pragmatic goal, make it work
- Aristotle believe that the goal of life was for human beings to flourish – Eudemonia

- Consequentialist
- Example: Water Wheel – Made of different parts, factually speaking they are of different values
- When all the different unequal parts work together to accomplish the goal, then they are equal in their differences
- Example: The janitor and the president of the university both help the university function, making them equal in their differences.
- Essentially the king is equal to the slave when each is functioning in their best way – Jmoney

#### Kant

- Naturally we are moral beings, we have reason and free will
- Treat all people as ends and never as means – equality
- Treat all personal maxims as if they were universal laws – equality
- People are equal regardless of our differences
- Moral Equality

#### Egalitarian

How equal is equal? What do people deserve? Leads into Justice

#### Justice

- A person receiving their due
  - On what basis and to what extent?
- Should government tell businesses what to do
- 2 fundamental types of justice
- 1. Compensatory Justice
  - a. You deserve compensation after having been wronged
- 2. Distributive Justice
  - a. You deserve equal access to the goods of society
  - b. Equal distribution of goods
- Discrimination
  - Often misunderstood
  - “It’s a good thing, a necessary thing, just a means to choose” – Jdawg
  - Unjust discriminations – Kantian
    - Can’t base decisions on certain aspects because we are equal regardless (race, gender, etc.)
  - There are such things as Just discriminations

Economics – How far should the goods of society be distributed?

- Realistic to think health care should be equally distributed yet unrealistic to believe wealth/income should be equally distributed
- John Rawls – 20th Century American
  - Equal distribution of goods in the strict sense. Sharing of wealth
  - His book – Theory of Justice (1971), written as a response to Marx’s critiques of Capitalism
    - Marxism – Theory that argues for human equality
  - Rawls argued that capitalism was equal
- Capitalist Equality
  - Adam Smith (18<sup>th</sup> century Scottish) – Society flourishes best when each person pursues their own self interests
- Veil of Ignorance (Adam Smith Hypothetical Theory)
  - You do not know who you are, or what makes you who you are, what makes you different from others is unknown

- This theory assumes you do not know anything about yourself (race, status, career)
- Put a group of rational people into a room. They get to decide the world they want to live in, but they don't get to decide their role in that world
- Claim behind this hypothetical is that this group would choose a world where everything was equal
- The belief that people for those who have merited more to help those who are struggling (essentially a common taxation argument)
- You cannot create a just society from an unjust foundation
- Robert Nozick – 20th century American
  - States Rawls' system was unjust; the basic premise to Rawls' arguments is that it violates your just entitlement to the property you have justly acquired. Against taxation
  - Argues that Tax is legalized theft, meaning it violates your rights of entitled
- Liberals + Democrats – supporters of Rawls'
- Conservatives + Republicans – supporters of Nozick

With Regards to equal distribution of goods, how far should it go

- Rawls' is like a Kantian (argues equality without sacrificing freedom)
- Nozick is an Aristotelian (capitalism goes too far, government unjustly takes income away "because they say so")

# Week 8

March 1, 2016 3:25 PM

Business Ethics March 1, 2016

Wal-Mart

It's about Wal-Mart being a bad guy and destroying things

Why is Wal-Mart successful?

- Because people shop there

But why is this happening?

- The very people who don't want Wal-Mart there to destroy their town
- They want their town to be preserved
- The ones destroying the town are the ones shopping at the Wal-Mart

Money vs. Culture

Is your culture for sale at a price?

Does everything have a monetary value? A price?

They have tried to stop Wal-Mart from being built.

Human psychology is being dealt.

People don't want to accept the fact of certain things, they want to blame others

Canadian Issue and international issue

You are making a choice, even when they choose to shop at Walmart

Quebec= have their national identity = culture vs Economy

They don't like a lot of change but change is what brings financial change

International Business

China's involvement in Africa

China is bringing lots of money into Africa but there's lots of tensions going on

Zambians are hating Chinese chicken farms because of competition

Mining, people over there are upset. And don't want them to open it there

The potential damage to society, economy, culture and government regulation

Should there be government interference

Jean Pasquero

- Believes he has the answer
- Culture vs Economy question
- He believes that Quebec had the solution
  - o It involves socialism
  - o And government regulation
- In Quebec:
  1. Identity Preservation
  2. Economic assertion as a form of nationalism (protection the existing culture)

- a. The economy serves the nation
  - b. Create business institutions that promote francophone control
  - c. Government controlled institutions that award projects to francophone companies. Hydro Quebec
  - d. Award engineering project to Francophones first
  - e. Thus government has direct control over business
3. Focus on the social aspect of the society. Business is tied to a social context. Business are not just entrepreneur they are catalysts that help promote social solidarity
- a. Sociability: Business have to understand that there is a strong sense of social solidarity in the culture. Long tradition of family run businesses and the Catholic church
  - b. Businesses have to support that social environment for the welfare state
  - c. Development of co-op businesses. Desjardin Credit Union.
    - i. Designs a place for people to invest money but goes back to the public interest
  - d. Concertation- formation of business groups that work closely with the government to form policy
    - i. Employers Council of Quebec

From <<https://d.docs.live.net/67d2fc4a26672cf3/University/Year%203/Semester%202/PHI%202397E%20-%20Business%20Ethics/Business-Ethics-March-1.docx>>

---

Watched South Park episode (parodying Wal-Mart)

- Wal-Mart is successful because people shop there
- People complain that the Wal-Mart is ruining small businesses as they must go out of business
- This is ironic because it is the people complaining that they do not want the Wal-Mart to destroy their town who must be shopping at Wal-Mart, because a majority of people must be supporting it. Otherwise WM would close

Money vs. Culture

- Is your culture for sale
- Does everything have a price/monetary value?
- Human psychology behind this
- Canadian and International issue
  - Criticism that every country is “going western”
  - Happens because people like to buy
- Quebec = National Identity (culture) vs. Economy
  - People argue they should fight for French in Canada, but they must wager their economic standing to support this campaign so they eventually back off it
- International Business
  - China’s involvement in Africa

BBC documentary – About China’s involvement in Africa

- Chinese chicken farmers enter Zambia and succeed by using cheaper methods and charging lower prices. This puts local farmers out of business so Zambians complain
  - BUT Zambians are the Chinese farmers client bases. So how do you support and protest something at the same time
- Another complaint is that “They shouldn’t be ruining business, they SHOULD help the economy”
  - The problem with this complaint from the woman in doc is that the economy is thriving from the Chinese contribution
- Chinese also penetrated the Zambian mining industry
- Documenter tries to explain that this benefits the economy, but the Zambians counter

with “Chinese should provide Zambians with jobs”

- Fears of potential damage to society, economy, culture
- What’s the answer? To not allow foreign business in the country (Unrealistic)
- Government Regulation
  - Should there be government interference in business

Jean Pasquero

- Culture vs. Economy question
  - Proposes that Quebec has a solution (strong Socialist idea)
4. Identity Preservation
  5. Economic assertion as a form of nationalism (protecting the existing culture). Create business institutions that promote francophone control. Government controlled institutions that award projects to Francophone companies. (Ex. Hydro Quebec, awards engineering projects to francophones first as oppose to the best price). Thus government has to direct control over business
  6. Focus on the Social aspect of society. Business is tied to a social context. Businesses are not just entrepreneurs; they are catalysts that help promote social solidarity. Social solidarity has 3 main components:
    - a. Sociability: Businesses have to understand that there is a strong sense of social solidarity in the culture. (Proof = A long tradition of family run business, and the Catholic Church). Businesses have to support that social environment: support for the Welfare state
    - b. Development of Co-op businesses: Desjardin Credit Union – profits of the company go directly towards public interests
    - c. Concertation: Formation of business groups that work closely with the government to form policies: Employers Council of Quebec.
-

# Week 9

March 8, 2016 1:04 PM

A beautiful Mind

John Nash

The sole of self-interest in Success  
Self-interest with Selfishness

Egoism - the most important thing in life is myself  
Virtue Ethics - Character

Forget about actions, but ask yourself who you want to be, what sort of person do you want to be

Adam Smith 18th century Scottish

Wrote "the wealth of nations" [part 2 to "A theory of Moral Sentiments"]  
Wealth is not money, but rather what the nation can produce

Success for the group is achieved when each member of the group pursues their own self-interest -  
(paraphrased) Adam Smith

What Nash said was "Success for the group is achieved when each member pursues what is best for themselves and the group."

Ayn Rand - 20th Century Russian/American

Wrote "the fountainhead, Atlas Shrugged" really strongly believes in selfishness

Thomas Hobbs - 17th Century English man  
Wrote "The Leviathan"

Argues that we live in a very mechanized world, material is all there is, and in that world, human beings are driven by their own self-interest.

Psychological Egoism - you are hardwired to be selfish

Psychological Altruism - you are hardwired to think of Others before yourself

Ex. You give money to charity, a psychological egoist will say "you donated to make yourself feel good"

Ethical Egoism - you choose to be selfish

Aristotle - 4th century BC Greek - Student of Plato

Virtue Ethics

Cultivating Virtues

You can only learn to be virtuous from your own life experience

Virtue comes from practice

Courage, Honesty, Benevolence, etc.

Socratic/Platonic virtues

Wisdom, Fortitude, Temperance, Justice

## 4 chief virtues

Aristotle: To be virtuous is to seek the Golden mean (average) between two extremes

Cowardice	Courage	Foolish
No Self-Sacrifice	Self-Sacrifice	Sacrificing yourself ++
	Subway Hero Dives under a subway to save a stranger	Youtube guy who films himself hanging from places
Selfish	Self-Interest	
Miser	Wise with Money	Spendthrift

Virtue Ethics: can people actually choose to be courageous.

The Bystander effect:

Most people's behaviour is governed by group pressure

The Ash Experiment: which line is the same length as the example line?

People will knowingly choose the wrong answer to conform

Human beings are **very** conformist

Human children and chimps both are willing to help

---

## Business Ethics March 10, 2016

Ayn Rand-

- Argued for cowardly success. It means to be a coward. Be a successful coward
- Does selfishness actually bring success?

Classic argument for selfish behaviour as a path to success = plato's republic

- Socrates is always the hero, and is talking to students ( Glaucon and Thracymachus)
  - Why shouldn't we be selfish?
  - The best way to life is to be selfish
  - Myth of Gyges: myth that says, a person that finds a ring, and ring allows him to be successful
    - o If you could make yourself invisible, (to the gods as well) then, morality would not exist.
1. Isn't it true that if you give an invisibility ring to a good man, it will eventually make him evil (selfish)
  2. Isn't it true that we all admire to a certain extent the successful selfish person and despise the unsuccessful good person
  3. Isn't it true that we would all prefer to be the evil person that everyone thinks is good, than vice-versa?
  4. Isn't it true that evil/selfishness is actually favored by the gods?
    - a. Religion is designed to allow evil. They favor evil.

Therefore, Socrates is it true that only frightened and ignorant people choose to be good?

Socrates:

1. We do not act good merely out of fear of punishment. Foundation for morals is empathy
2. A selfish person will never be successful in the true sense. Because true success requires a balanced mind. Justice.

Wealth of Nations- Adam Smith

Richard Dawkins- 1976 the Selfish Gene

BBC- Nice guys finish first

Nature is not selfish, Reciprocal Altruism: you help me, I help you

Law of favours: I do you a favour, and you do me a favour in return and if you stiff me, then I will never help you again

That is the path to success

Ned Flanders

Golden Rule:

5. do unto others as you would have them do unto you
6. Selfishness. Only care about yourself
7. Reciprocal Altruism. Law of Favours

It is in your self-interest to help others

Ayn Ran- Altruism was evil. It stunned your growth to be successful

Computer Contest:

Prisoner Dilemma

- Game Theory:
- 8. Rat on your friend and you will go free
- 9. If you don't rat on your friend, he will rat on you and only he will go free
- 10. Both of you rat on each other and both will receive lighter sentences
- 11. Both keep quiet and you both go free

Brings out the idea of trust. As opposed to selfishness. Asking you to be selfish

Selfishness does not lead to success

12. Nature shows it is false
13. Computer experiments show it is false
14. Demonstrations of the Prisoners Dilemma also appear to show it is false

Socrates- true success requires a stable balanced life and mind

Self and how it relates to Others

To seek self interest is important

Business for years have relied on the myth of teamwork for success,

There is self-interest but no complete abandonment to individuality

Steve Wozniak- Inventor of the Apple Computer

- Does not work well in groups
- 

From <<https://d.docs.live.net/67d2fc4a26672cf3/University/Year%203/Semester%202/PHI%202397E%20-%20Business%20Ethics/Business-Ethics-March-10.docx>>

# Week 10

March 17, 2016 11:28 AM

March 15<sup>th</sup>

Sanya Notes

Business Ethics- March 15, 2016

Resnik- Ethics of Human Gene Patenting

Spinello- Ethics in the Pharmaceutical Industry

Business Ethics and the Environment

Gene Patents

Monsanto

Should someone or something (company) own life?

Nature was something you could not own.

You could own land, but you can't own the dirt

With patents, companies are starting to own life.

What about owning human beings? It's also called slavery

There are now companies who own life, but they won't own a full grown human being,

Organ Donation, we might have people who will patent that.

We would own clones, and just take the organs that we need from them.

Depends on the value we place on human life, business only care about business

Businesses own trees, they will only care for some of the trees.

Loss of diversity in the world. Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) → Frankenfoods etc.

When we buy foods, a lot of them are going to be genetically modified.

Property of Nature/God

Depends if they own the product. There is a sentimental value.

The environmental issues, Mont Santo made a new type of potato to be grown.

Evolution → higher diversity and when you take away of diversity there won't be any evolution.

Property will be with personal freedom

Communism and capitalism:

- Marx: Abolition of private property
- Capitalism= Acquisition of private property
- There' a lot of misunderstanding about it

Land is rented from the government when you purchase it. Increase right of usage. The real owner is the government.

When you violate the right of usage, then it'll be taken away from you. You do own yourself.

You can be fully free when someone owns you

Say if:

Monsanto modifies the kidney

Agent Orange; used in the Vietnam War

3 Million people were contaminated

Dioxin caused huge illnesses, and birth defects in Vietnam

They can transplant Midney then it'll not be yours

Human genes being patented:

- If someone owns pieces of us, they could patent us
- 1. Genetic Testing by employers and insurance companies (Lose of freedom)
- 2. Possible harm to future generations
- 3. Loss of diversity
- 4. Creation of biological weapons

Huge potential good

Utilitarian, it will create the greatest good.

Kantian- full human beings become patented= slavery

From <<https://d.docs.live.net/67d2fc4a26672cf3/University/Year%203/Semester%202/PHI%202397E%20-%20Business%20Ethics/Business-Ethics-March-15.docx>>

---

Braden Notes

## **Health and the Environment**

### Gene Patents

- Researching/Modifying/Discovering genes in the human body and attempting to own a patent on it
  - Companies try to argue the modification is an invention
- Should someone or something (company) own forms of life?
- Nature is not something you can't own
  - Ie. You could buy a horse, legally you do not
- What about owning human beings?
  - This is Slavery
- Under U.S patent law (since 1980) it has been deemed you CAN patent any life form made in a lab, aside from a birthed human being
- Will we eventually own humans too? If clones exist could we own them for organ donation purposes (Prof uses Never let me go book/movie as example)

### Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO's)

- Frankenfoods (not very helpful in the issue)
  - Foods altered at genetic level (can't be 100% sure on long term impact)
- Loss of diversity due to these modifications
- Some argue there is property of Nature/God that should not be touched
  - They have sentimental value (Culture, etc.)
  - This is no longer the case, companies patent all these products now
- Take away diversity, you get in the way of evolution

### Philosophical Issue of Property

- Associated with Freedom (freedom to be true owner of things)

- Communism and Capitalism
  - Communism → Marx → Abolition of private property
  - Capitalism → Acquisition of private property
- Land is rented from the government when you purchase it
  - Even an entirely paid off piece of property, although legally yours, is not fully yours as you still have to abide by government restriction (they have the right to take it away upon breaking these restrictions)
- You do own yourself
  - Ex: the government can never tell you “you must give up your kidneys”
- If someone creates a patented modified kidney, and you get it transplanted, they technically own your kidney and can therefore legally regulate it
- 
- 
- 
- Monsanto
- Company know for patenning PCB’s and damaging grounds
- Caught being the reason for multiple cases of cancer due to the pollution of their PCB dumping in a small city.

Chemical company in ww2 when the us army went to Vietnam  
 Agent orange; a chemical they used over orange fields  
 It left the US soldiers and viet citizens to have mutations, birth defects, and disabilities  
 Dioxin  
 Point was that they lied about the potential harms of the chemicals after the fact: they tried to test like a survey group

"imagine if corporations had patented your organs-if they can transplant a kidney into you then they would technically own it, and by effect, you."

Resnik article – Ethics of Human Gene Patenting

- Support Human Gene Patents
  - Acknowledges possible dangers:
5. Genetic testing by employers and insurance companies
  6. Possible harm to future generations
  7. Loss of diversity
  8. Creation of biological weapons
    - Still argues huge potential good
    - Potential human organ production, among other things
    - Movie examples: Repomen, Never let me go, Gattaca(?)

Spinello article – Ethics in the Pharmaceutical Industry (next class we will discuss)

---

Midterm Cut-off

---

March 17, 2016

Business and environment

Deals with  
Climate change  
Global Warming

Predominantly Man made global warming

"There are some people who still deny that but if you look at all the evidence now, you'd be looking pretty dumb" -J. Milly

Business reaction (they downplay it)

Fossil fuel business = oil, gas, etc. (any business that throws shit into the air is to be blamed)

Green Business

Video: **PBS Frontline: Heat**

Intro

Congress does not want to debate anything that will increase gas prices

If we don't do anything to reduce co2 emissions we will cook the planet (sounds a bit dramatic but ok)

Main

[nature panoramas and mountain landscapes]

The Himalayas (the earth's third pole)

Checking the melting of a glacier

Guy got piggybacked through a river, camera man didn't do that shit

The frozen river of ice flowing from mt. Everest as seen in 1921 is now melted, like 40% of its ice melted.

Ice cores from glaciers all around the planet are stored in Columbus Ohio.

The guy who studies them speaks:

The farmlands of the mountain ranges are getting more water (bc melting ice) which is good for agriculture, but more water brings more settlers, more people means more heat, means more melting (vicious cycle)

As glaciers dry up, some major glaciers might dry up. This can be bad news for China etc.

Other problems

More violent storms

Big dead zones in the ocean

Failing fisheries

Bigger deserts

Global warming doesn't cause the problems, just makes the problems much more likely.

The history of the Us is a history of cheap energy. Coal is the rock that built America. [praise that coal for a bit], but we've got to taper off it fam,

China is the proverbial teenager [the body is growing faster than the brain]

China opens two new coal plants every week.

The ceo only knows how to say "yes"

Your capacity has grown 80% last year, "yes"

He says that "we will deal with the society, if we can"

"our goal is to create money, as a Ceo I must please the shareholders"

Factories in India are pumping out SUVs for that middle class

Big old success story for India

The process of making cement is the 3rd largest contributor to greenhouse emissions. India uses a

lot of that.

They roast a combo of limestone and clay (or some other shit like that) - this produces greenhouse gases

Can India reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% in 2050?

"maybe not 80%, we can maybe do 10%..."

-Captain India, CEO of concrete

If every Indian lived as an American, the world would be doomed [shots fired]

Dr, Pachari (I think)

He laid the smack down on the US to tell them that they're setting a shit-tier example for the world.

America was like "We will make no cuts in our emission reductions measures"

Then the developing countries were like "we will make efforts to have a major climate agreement"

America was like "nah we still don't wanna do it"

Then EVERY country booed them

America then was like "ok we can do it too fam"

Chinaman smile

"I can't wait to solve one of the greatest crises that the world has yet to face" - Ya boi Barak during his campaign

Will all the momentum bring real change though?

For a long time we ignored it, then ran from it, now we take it slowly.

Americans consume over a billion tons of coals

Shovel a million tons a day

Every 24 hours there are 35 miles of trains loaded with coal

Coal shipments make up half the shipments of traffic over rail

[Ironic because coal trains were replaced only to be used to transport more coal than ever lol]

There are 600 coal fired power plants in the US - a large plant will burn through 1 whole train load in 12 hours

It takes 1 pound of coal to power your tv for 4 hours

American Politicians say burn more coal!! "clean coal" lmao

See commercial

The video guys went to Florida to see this "clean coal"

Process of turning coal into a cleaner gas

In theory they can capture co2, compress it and inject it into the ground.

They haven't done any testing of carbon capture of co2

Banks are getting worried about the costs for co2 capture.

Arnold just crushed a car as part of his governor of California campaign

Detroit was pretty mad about the fact that he endorsed going green

WERE ONLY HALFWAY THROUGH THIS MOVIE WTF ITS BEEN THE WHOLE CLASS

The movie was published in 2008

-----  
Businesses using their gov contacts are good at preventing environmental laws that will hurt their business

Coal is a major source for the production of electricity

The west is largely to blame for all this, so they should have to bear the burden. Why should the west be to blame ?