

The Ethics Workbook I: World History TAE

Introduction

The Ethics Workbook I: World History was written for younger students in typical secondary world history classes in grades 7–10 as a first introduction to ethical issues. It treats a wide array of topics and simplifies the thinking of the most common ethicists and philosophers across the span of civilization. It is a primer and pursues no thesis.

Students are naturally enthusiastic and have an inherent interest in real questions. Obviously a program centered on discussion is essential, but to proceed without adequate student preparation, or a clearly defined purpose, is pointless. Students will “discuss” endlessly without measurable progress toward any discernible goal. The most effective strategy is to embed the consideration of ethics into a broader study of history. In this way students become aware of the timeless nature of ethical questions, and see the emergence of some universal ideas. **The Ethics Workbook** traces the natural evolution of ethical thinking across the span of history. It presents to students, in a readily understandable way, the ethical ideas that have emerged over the centuries as a result of the never-ending human quest to balance individual freedom with group responsibility. It enhances a traditional study of world history by providing the teacher with a strategy to help students confront these timeless ethical issues.

Throughout history a series of recurring conclusions revolving around equality and reciprocity have emerged to become of the bedrock of ethics worldwide. In its simplest expression we call this the Golden Rule. It has appeared countless times and in many variations, as an innate expression of what mankind has determined to be the most basic ethical standard. The workbook is an examination of this principle, and a validation that it is indeed innate, and part of essential human nature. Just as the manipulative and deceitful tendency lurks within, so does the realization that only through reciprocity and equality can we maximize our individualism and insure our freedom.

The workbook is organized chronologically and represents a concise look at the unfolding of ethical thought over the span of recorded history. No effort was made to be inclusive since this would have lengthened of the work prohibitively. Within the limited topics chosen, no effort was made to be comprehensive, since this would have led to redundancy. Specific items were included only if they were commonly taught at the secondary school level and only in so far as they added something new. To make the reading easier, original passages were rewritten to simplify vocabulary and to increase comprehension of important concepts often found only in difficult texts and generally incomprehensible to younger secondary school students. The teacher's guide is an annotated copy of the student workbook. It includes enough predictions of student reactions to strategies, and suggestions for teacher responses, to be the basis for daily plans.

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Organizational Framework

Outline and Contents

Ancient Egypt 5
Book of the Dead
Ma'at

This chapter introduces the fundamental division of ethics into two areas of concern, an obligation to do no harm to others and an obligation to do good for others. A fundamentally Eastern view of the relationship between human beings and the natural world is considered. There is also an introduction of the idea of intent and the impact of surrounding circumstances on actions.

The Hebrews 10
Genesis
Deuteronomy

A fundamentally Western view of the relationship between human beings and the natural world is considered. There is an examination of the idea of law and of a divine source of right and wrong, as well as the efficacy of immutable ethical standards. The use of ethical dilemmas and a consideration of the special family relationship are presented.

Ancient Mesopotamia 16
Hammurabi's Code

This chapter considers the efficacy of relativity in ethical standards and makes a comparison with the Old Testament. There is an examination of the government as a source of ethical standards and an introduction of the idea of justice and fairness, as well as further consideration of the concept of intent.

Ancient Greece 23
Plato, Crito
Aesop, Fables
Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics

This chapter introduces the idea that the majority of the people should be the source of right and wrong. The relationship of individuals to the group is considered as well as the

idea of individual human rights; there is an introduction to the concepts of freedom, equality and reciprocity; a close consideration is also made of the concept of friendship.

Ancient China 39

Confucius, Analects

Liezi, Tales

Hanfeizi, Tales

This chapter introduces the idea that people play roles in life. The concept of role models, respect and propriety are considered, and the idea of duty is examined.

Ancient India 49

Ramayana

This chapter makes a careful consideration of the concepts of duty, obligation and self sacrifice.

Ancient Rome56

Arrian, Manual of Epictetus

Marcus Aurelius, Meditations

This chapter introduces the idea of natural law as a source of human laws. A more intense consideration of the concepts of duty and responsibility is made.

Christianity and Islam 62

Matthew, selections

Luke, Prodigal Son, Good Samaritan

Koran, selections

Sufi Stories, traditional

Emphasis in this chapter is on the responsibility to know what is right and wrong. There is a further consideration of doing good for others, and on the value of communal ethical standards. More careful consideration of the concepts of human dignity, compassion and hypocrisy are made.

The Middle Ages 78

Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica

This chapter deepens the examination of the impact of groups and group ethical standards on individuals. The nature and impact of lying is also considered.

The Renaissance 85

Nicolo Machiavelli, The Prince

Some thought is given in this chapter to fundamental human nature. Relativity in ethical standards is reconsidered as is lying, cheating and other types of deceitful behavior.

The Enlightenment 90

Benedict Spinoza, **Ethics**

Immanuel Kant, **Introduction to the Metaphysics of Morals**

The importance of natural law and human reason are the key ideas in this chapter. A very careful reexamination of the Golden Rule as well as the concepts of dignity and respect are made.

Public Ethics 100

John Locke, **Second Treatise on Civil Government**

Thomas Jefferson, **Declaration of Independence**

United States Constitution, **selections**

United States Supreme Court Rulings, **selections**

Constitutional systems for determining right and wrong based on natural human rights form the basis for this chapter. The United States Constitution and Bill of Rights are used as a model and case studies are presented.

Capitalism and Communism..... 113

The rise of two conflicting social-economic ethical systems, each appealing to one side of the innate human ethical sense is explored. Understanding of the importance of frame of reference in ethical determination is deepened.

Final Projects 130

10 individual or small group research projects within the scope of public ethics allow students to apply their comprehensive understanding of ethical principles to real situations.

The Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter One

Ancient Egypt

As a first step in our study of right and wrong, we are going to find out what kinds of things the Ancient Egyptians thought were good and bad. Then we're going to think about and discuss our opinions of what the Egyptians thought.

As you know, the ancient Egyptians believed strongly in a life after death. In order to get a deceased person ready for the afterlife, it was customary to embalm the body to preserve it in the form of a mummy. The body was treated chemically, and then wrapped with strips of linen. Woven into the linen were sheets of papyrus that had important writing on them. We know this writing today as the Book of the Dead. It is a very important document, which tells us a lot about what the ancient Egyptians believed. The Book of the Dead contained all of the instructions and magic spells needed to help the soul of the deceased get into the next life. Among the contents was a list of confessions, which the dead person would make before the gods. We are going to study some of these because they tell us what the ancient Egyptians thought was important.

We have put a few of the confessions into two groups. Each group represents a kind of behavior which is viewed as either right or wrong. See if you can find any key difference between the kind of behavior described in group one with the kind of behavior described in group two? In other words, what do the things in each group have in common, and what is the big difference between the groups?

Group One

I have not defrauded the poor of their property.

I have not committed theft.

I have not killed man or woman.

Group Two

I have given bread to the hungry man,

and water to the thirsty man,

and clothes to the naked man...

Book of the Dead, Chapter 125 rewritten and simplified

Now see if you can complete the following sentences in a way that shows that you understand the differences between the groups.

- 1. The actions in group one are about different things, but they are really all the same because...**

These are all concerned with doing harm to others.

- 2. The actions in group two are about different things, but they are really all the same because...**

These are all concerned with doing good for others.

These two thoughts are at the root of all ethical thinking. Try to write the two ideas in the form of rules for behavior by finishing the following sentences.

- 1. A person should try not to do things that...**

- 2. A person should try to do things that...**

But, like everything else in life, ethics isn't always that simple. Let's look at the Book of the Dead again where it says: **I have not committed theft. I have not killed man or woman.** *Is it always wrong to steal, or even to kill someone? Think about this, and then write your thoughts down in the space below. This is a way for you to get ready for a class discussion of this question.*

Here are a couple of ideas to help you get started: 1. Do the circumstances surrounding an action change whether that action is right or wrong? In other words, could the same action be both right and wrong depending upon circumstances? 2. Does the person's intention, or in other words what the person is trying to do, or wants to do, determine if that action is right or wrong?

The Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter Two

Hebrews

One of the greatest foundations for ethics is the Old Testament of the Bible. This writing comes to us from another ancient people, the Hebrews. The Hebrews were part of ancient Mesopotamian civilization. They lived at about the same time as the ancient Egyptians, but they had some very different ideas. Next we're going to compare some of the lines from the first part of the Old Testament, called the Book of Genesis, to some things we have already read from the Book of the Dead.

And God said, let the earth bring forth living creatures, cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth.

And God said: Let us make people and let them rule over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth.

And God blessed the people and said to them, multiply, and replenish the earth, and conquer it: and rule the fish of the sea, and the birds of the air, and every living thing that moves on the earth.

Genesis 1:24-28 shortened and simplified

What major difference can you see between the Egyptian and the Hebrew idea of the relationship of people to nature? Use the space below to outline your thoughts.

Judaic tradition is very fundamental to western philosophy, which stresses the right of humans to control all of nature and to use it for human benefit. It is very important for students to begin to recognize the enormous ramifications of this tradition.

As we continue to study ethics, we will see that there are two basic ways of looking at our relationship with the world around us. These two ideas have led to the growth of two very distinct kinds of ethical philosophies. The Hebrew idea that we read about in Genesis is very basic to our own western tradition. The Egyptian view is more basic to eastern philosophy. We'll learn more about this when we study China and India, but for now let's take a close look at our own western culture, which begins with the Hebrews, and includes other Mesopotamian civilizations. Let's see if the Hebrews and the Egyptians agree or disagree about other ethical ideas.

Another book from the Old Testament is called the Book of Deuteronomy. It contains lots of rules that can be compared to the words in the Book of the Dead.

**Honour your father and your mother.
Do not kill.
Do not steal.
Do not tell lies against your neighbor.**

Deuteronomy 5:16-20 shortened and simplified

There seems to be much agreement, even in these two very different cultures, about the basics of right and wrong. *Find some comparisons between these rules and the rules we read from the Book of the Dead.*

There is a clear thematic similarity. Don't injure others and do good for at least some people. Students should begin to think about special relationships, particularly the family relationship.

The Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter Three

Ancient Mesopotamia

When you studied about ancient Mesopotamia you learned that the land between the rivers Tigris and Euphrates was the home of many civilizations. Among the most important of these was ancient Babylonia. Its capital, Babylon, was at one time considered to be the richest, most beautiful, and advanced city in the world. Hammurabi was king of Babylon, and he is famous for issuing the first written code of laws. Hammurabi had his laws chiseled into a flat stone monument so that everyone would know exactly what the rules of Babylon were. We are going to study some of Hammurabi's laws, and carefully compare them to both the Egyptian Book of the Dead and to the Old Testament.

But first we need to review the discussion we had about the difference between western and eastern ideas about how people relate to nature. *Take a few minutes to look back at the first part of Chapter Two and see if you can finish the following sentences:*

1. Ancient Egyptian ideas are basic to eastern philosophy because...

They stress the importance of finding a balanced existence with nature.

2. Hebrew ideas are basic to western philosophy because...

They stress the idea that man should control nature and that nature exists only for man's benefit.

Now read some lines from Hammurabi's Code and write a paragraph telling if Hammurabi's Code is more western or eastern in its philosophy. Treat this like a test to see if you really understand.

If any one be too lazy to keep his dam in proper condition, and the dam breaks and all the fields are flooded, then shall he in whose dam the break occurred be sold for money, and the money shall replace the corn which he has caused to be ruined. If he can't replace the corn, then he and his possessions will be divided among the farmers whose corn he has flooded.

If any one opens his ditches to water his crop, but is careless, and the water floods the field of his neighbor, then he will pay his neighbor corn for his loss.

If a man lets in the water, and the water overflows the plantation of his neighbor, he must pay ten gur of corn for every ten gan of land.

Hammurabi's Code 53-56 simplified

This shows western thinking since man is expected to control nature and make it beneficial.

Now let's do some more comparisons. *Read the following rules from Hammurabi's Code and compare them to the Old Testament.*

If a man puts out the eye of another man, his eye will be put out.

If he breaks another man's bone, his bone will be broken.

If he puts out the eye of a freed man, or breaks the bone of a freed man, he must pay one gold mina.

If he puts out the eye of a man's slave, or breaks the bone of a man's slave, he will pay one-half of its value.

**If a man knocks out the teeth of his equal, his teeth will be knocked out.
If he knocks out the teeth of a freed man, he will pay one-third of a gold mina.**

Hammurabi's Code 196-201 simplified

This introduces students to the idea of relativity in ethical standards since the law does not apply evenly to everyone

We call what's happening in Hammurabi's Code a **relative** ethical standard because circumstances change the outcome. We have already begun to talk about this, and you have developed some views on it. We are going to talk about it some more.

What kinds of circumstances are changing the outcome here in Hammurabi's Code? Does this seem right or wrong to you?

Students will naturally expect circumstances to cause the relative standard, but here it is a different standard for different people. It's who you are that counts.

Hammurabi's Code is very different in the way it applies the rules. Compare the following lines from Hammurabi's Code with similar lines from the Old Testament. *Look back at Chapter Two and compare them carefully. What's the difference?*

If after a judge tries a case, and presents his judgment in writing, an error appears in his decision, and it be through his own fault. Then he shall pay twelve times the fine set by him in the case; and he will be publicly removed from the

judge's bench, and never again will he sit there to render judgment.

Hammurabi's Code 5 simplified

There is accountability on the part of the authorities. The beginnings of the concept of fundamental fairness is present.

Remember the importance of the family relationship in the Old Testament and the son who disobeyed his parents? Here is a similar case from Hammurabi's Code. *Compare the two.*

If a man wants to put his son out of his house, and declares before the judge "I want to put my son out," then the judge will examine into his reasons. If the son is guilty of no great fault, for which he can rightfully be put out, the father will not put him out.

If he is guilty of a grave fault, the father must forgive him the first time; but if he is guilty of a grave fault a second time the father may put him out.

Hammurabi's Code 168-169 simplified

Reciprocal obligations and fundamental fairness are basic; power alone is not enough.

This is a whole new idea in ethics. *See if you can figure out what it is. Finish the following sentence with one word.*

The rules must be_____.

fair

See how this principle shows up again and again in Hammurabi's Code:

If a man is captured, and he has the means to buy his freedom, he will buy himself free; if he has nothing in his house with which to buy himself free, he will be bought free by the temple of his community, if there is nothing in the temple with which to buy him free, the court will buy his freedom. His field, garden and house will not be given for the purchase of his freedom.

Hammurabi's Code 32 simplified

If anyone takes over a field to till it, and obtains no harvest from it, it must be proved that he did no work on the field before he must deliver to the owner of the field.

Hammurabi's Code 42 simplified

If anyone owes a debt for a loan, and a storm destroys the grain, or the harvest fail, or the grain does not grow for lack of water he pays no rent for this year.

Hammurabi's Code 48 simplified

If a man marries a wife, and she be seized by disease, if he then wants to marry a second wife, he cannot put away his first wife, who has been attacked by disease. He must keep her in the house that he has built and support her so long as she lives.

Hammurabi's Code 148 simplified

In the space below write a short essay about what being fair means. Try to describe in your own words why it has been a cornerstone of ethical thinking since earliest times.

Ethics workbook I: World History

Chapter Four

Ancient Greece

You have already learned that the ancient Greeks gave birth to the idea of democracy. They believed that a vote of the people was the best way to make and to enforce the laws. While we saw that earlier civilizations had kings like Hammurabi to hand down laws, and used judges to decide cases, the Greeks introduced juries who voted by majority rule. This was an important change, and an improvement for most people. The Greeks believed that right and wrong were basically what the majority of people thought were right and wrong. This idea is called a *group ethic*, and it is still a big part of ethical thinking today. We're going to look carefully at both the up and the down side of this.

One of the most famous Greeks was Socrates. Socrates was a teacher who lived in Athens during the height of Greek civilization. He had ideas and opinions with which the majority of Athenians disagreed, and he was accused of trying to overthrow the government by promoting his views with the young students of the city. Socrates was convicted by a jury and ordered to drink a cup of poison and die.

One of Socrates students was Plato. Plato wrote a famous account of the death of Socrates. His account was written as a kind of skit in which he tells what people said to each other. In order to make this conversation easier to understand it has been shortened and simplified.

There are two characters in the play: Socrates and his friend Crito. *First we'll read, or act out, the play and then we'll discuss some of the important ideas in it.*

Scene: A prison cell

While Socrates waits for the hour of his execution, his good friend Crito visits him.

**Socrates: Why have you come so early Crito?
What time is it anyway?**

Crito: It's after sunrise.

Socrates: It's a wonder that they let you in. Why didn't you wake me up?

Crito: I was amazed at how peacefully you were sleeping, considering that you've been sentenced to death.

Socrates: At my age dying doesn't seem so bad. Why did you come Crito?

Crito: I came to convince you to take my advice and escape from here while you can. If you won't do it for yourself then do it for me. If you die I will lose my best friend, and people will blame me for not saving you.

Socrates: Why should you care what people think or say?

Crito: You should know why best of anyone Socrates since it was the opinion of the majority that condemned you to die. And if you're worried that your friends will get into trouble by helping you, forget it. We'll have no problem paying off the right people. Just say the word and we'll smuggle you off to where you'll be safe. Listen to me Socrates, you can't betray your friends, and your children and yourself by letting yourself die when you could so easily get away.

Socrates: You're a good friend Crito, but I don't see it the way you do. I don't care about the opinion of the majority, even if they can kill me.

Crito: But isn't that the point Socrates?

Socrates: Maybe so but that can't be the reason why I escape. I must know I am right in escaping. Will you help me think it through Crito?

Crito: I'll try.

Socrates: Would you agree with me when I say that we should do no wrong?

Crito: Yes, of course.

Socrates: If someone injures us should we try to injure him or her back?

Crito: No.

Socrates: Then we shouldn't try to pay evil back with evil?

Crito: No.

Socrates: Well we agree on everything so far. But that's not what most people would say is it?

Crito: True.

Socrates: Well then, it seems we shouldn't do what people want but what we hold to be right. Would you agree with that my friend?

Crito: Yes, we should do what we think is right.

Socrates: Then is it right for me to run away against the command of the law of Athens?

Crito: I don't know, I suppose it depends on if the law were just and the sentence fair, which you know they're not.

Socrates: Well what would be the result if people decided for themselves which laws to obey and which to disregard?

Crito: But the sentence is still unjust.

Socrates: All right then what about our rule that it's wrong to pay back evil with more evil? Would you want me to destroy my country to get revenge? Besides, when I agreed to live here in Athens and benefit from its laws I also agreed to abide by those laws. I have clearly made a pact with the laws of Athens and I can't go back on my pledge. I will obey the law and I will gladly accept my fate.

Crito was speechless. As the fateful moment neared, other friends arrived to be with Socrates at the end. Suddenly the jailer appeared carrying a cup of deadly poison. He handed it to Socrates who calmly drank it. His friends began to cry, and Socrates asked them to be quiet and let him die in peace.

Socrates walked about until his legs began to fail and then he lay on his back. The man who gave him the poison pressed his foot hard and asked him if he could feel; he said no and the man said that when the poison reached the heart he would be dead.

Socrates: Crito, I owe a chicken to Asclepius, will you remember to pay the debt?

Crito: The debt will be paid. Is there anything else?

There was no answer to this question.

Let's think about and discuss some of the ideas in this play. First of all, do friends owe friends something? Is Crito right to worry that people expect him to help Socrates?

Socrates says it's wrong to retaliate against someone who does you wrong. Compare this with Hammurabi's Code or the Old Testament where "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" were the rule. *Why is it natural to believe in the need to pay back equally for what you receive, good for good and bad for bad? What happens if you don't fight back against someone who hurts you? What if you never repay your friends for being loyal? But why does Socrates disagree with this?*

The ideas of equality and reciprocity are very basic in the history of ethical thinking, and show up in a myriad of ways. They form the basic theme of this study of ethics, and as such should be kept constantly in mind as a readily comprehensible start for sound ethical decision making.

What is a feud or a vendetta? How does this kind of behavior lead to a never-ending cycle? What examples of feuds can you give? According to Socrates how do you break out of the feud-revenge cycle?

Is it ever right to disobey the law? Socrates says no. Can you state his reasons in your own words? Do you agree?

There is of course considerable opportunity here to pursue the idea of resistance to wrong through civil disobedience.

Socrates makes a big point of keeping his word and meeting his obligations. *Why does he think this is so important? What do you think about keeping one's word and meeting one's obligations?*

the bird and said “Hello friend rooster have you heard the good news?”

“No” said of the rooster “What is it?”

“All the animals have made a peace treaty, and have promised never to hurt each other again.”

“What” said the rooster, “That's great!”

“Why don't you come down and celebrate with me?” asked the Fox.

Just then the Fox noticed that the rooster seemed to be looking intently off into the distance and asked: “What are you looking at?”

“Nothing much,” answered the sly rooster, “only a pack of hounds running this way very fast.”

“Oh no!” said the fox suddenly, “I just remembered something important and I have to go!”

“Why in such a rush friend fox” said the rooster mockingly, “we'll tell them about the new peace treaty, and you'll be safe, you'll see. “

But the fox ran as fast as he could and never looked back.

This story is obviously about lying, and what lying leads to. In what ways does this story show the same reasoning as Socrates used to explain why he wouldn't break the laws of Athens?

By obeying the laws people were freed from the endless violence of the revenge cycle. People will seek equality and will act reciprocally. Aesop is saying the same thing. If people expect to be lied to, everyone will lie.

The Lion and the Mouse rewritten

One day a lion was sleeping soundly in his lair when a little mouse came along and thought he would have some fun. The mouse climbed up the lion's mane and danced on the lion's nose. As the big beast snored, his mouth opened and closed, and the mouse delighted in jumping back and forth across the dangerous gap. The happy little mouse didn't notice the lion's eye slowly open until he suddenly felt the huge teeth tighten around his little body.

"Please don't kill me." pleaded the pitiful mouse. "If you let me go I'll never forget you and someday I will repay you."

The lion was amused by the thought of this tiny mouse helping him, the king of beasts, but he admired the little animal's courage and gently put him down.

"You may go friend mouse, but next time be more careful where you play."

Many years later when the lion was old and walking slowly in the forest, he was caught in a net some hunters had set up. The lion struggled all night with the thick ropes but couldn't get free, and as morning came he smelled the approaching hunters. Thinking he was doomed, the lion roared a mighty roar. Nearby, that very same mouse heard him roar and came running.

"Here's my chance!" thought the mouse as his sharp teeth gnawed through the thick strands of

because it represents the natural way of these animals. Animals actually can't do wrong because they are ruled by instincts and don't really make choices about what they do. A good lion is good at killing gazelles, while a good gazelle is good at escaping lions.

It's different for people. People are ruled by reason, and they do make choices. What makes them human is this fact. Humans are above animals because they can control their emotions and instincts, and decide logically what to do. Aristotle believed that this was what made us human, and to be a good human you had to be good at it.

Aristotle based his ethical ideas more on doing what was right rather than not doing what was wrong. He believed that to be good was the same as being excellent at what ever you are supposed to be excellent at, something like the lion and the gazelle. For example: if you are a good athlete you are skilled and successful in contests. If you are a good doctor you cure your patient's illness. But this was only part of it for people. People also must be good human beings. This means that people must exercise the characteristic which sets them above animals. That means being governed by reason, and not by instincts or emotions. When you do this, Aristotle said, you avoid the extremes of behavior and act in a moderate way. Aristotle believed that it was the extremes of behavior that were bad, and the middle choice was good. He called this kind of behavior a *virtue*. Everyone should learn to live by virtues. Only humans can achieve virtues because humans alone can choose what they do. In other words, being virtuous is being truly human. Neat argument isn't it?

Here's an example of how it works:

Aristotle says that courage is a human virtue because it is midway between the extremes of behavior that a human could choose when faced with danger. At one extreme a person could be **fool hardy** and daring at the other extreme a person could be **cowardly**. These two extremes are bad. The person should choose the middle and be **courageous**. Being courageous is a virtue.

For Aristotle being good means living according to all of the human virtues. **Generosity** is another virtue Aristotle thought good people possess. *Try to think of the bad behaviors at both ends of this scale. Think of some other virtues you think are good for humans to possess and what the extremes might be for them.*

One last point about virtues before we move on. Aristotle believed that these virtues were learned through doing them over and over until they became a habit.

Students should respond richly to this. Endless openings will emerge to direct discussion to key ethical concepts.

Let's see if you agree with Aristotle about friendship. Aristotle says there are three kinds of friendship. One is true and lasting and the other two are false and fleeting. One of the false friendships is based on utility, or the idea of usefulness. People become friends in order to get something useful from each other. They sort of provide each other with a service. For example, a person without a car might become a friend with a person who had a car but needed money for gas. This kind of friendship lasts only as long as it provides usefulness. Aristotle says old people often make this kind of friendship.

The second false friendship is based on pleasure. Two people become friends because they have fun together. For example, two people both like to swim, so they become friends and go to the beach together. Again this friendship lasts only as long as the fun lasts. Aristotle said young people fall into this kind of false friendship.

True friendship is lasting and is not based on what you personally get out of it but on what your friend gets. One friend is rewarded by seeing the other friend happy. Sounds great, but how can it happen? Well, Aristotle says it can't unless the two people can really identify with each other and for this to happen certain conditions must be met.

Let's see if we can understand his reasoning, and if we agree with his conclusions, by reading some more of his book. We've condensed and reorganized it a little, and simplified some of the words to make it easier to understand.

Perfect friendship happens between people who are good and alike in their virtue. People who wish their friends well for their sake, and not because they themselves will get something out of it, are the truest friends.

Nicomachean Ethics Book 8, Chapter 3 paraphrase

Of course these friendships don't happen very often because most people are not capable of it. They also require time to develop. To be true

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 5

Ancient China

Now we are going to trace the idea of virtues from Greece across the world to China, and learn about a famous philosopher named Confucius. Confucius lived even longer ago than Socrates and Aristotle, and he was a teacher who had a lot to say about right and wrong. Remember that eastern civilizations like Egypt stressed balance between humans and the world around them. People were not expected to control nature, but to live in harmony with it. Keep this idea constantly in mind.

When Confucius was growing up, China was a dangerous and unpredictable country. It was very violent and governments were corrupt. Confucius was worried about how people could live safe and happy lives, and like Socrates and Aristotle, Confucius believed that good government was the key.

Confucius loved formality, and what he called propriety. He believed that people should be polite to each other, and should be treated with respect. This rule was the most important rule people could live by. All human relationships had rules of propriety or a formal code of behavior that dictated the roles people must play. How a father should act toward his son, for example, or how a younger friend should behave toward an older friend were all mapped out by Confucius. To upset this would be to upset the balance of nature. This idea is very typically Eastern in its way of looking at life. Confucius's ideas became very influential in China and all over Asia. He wrote a set of rules for people to live by that was supposed to result in a well ordered, stable and happy society.

Let's see if we can figure out, from some of Confucius's words, more about what he believed in and then compare his ideas with the ideas of Socrates and Aristotle. This will be a good way to better understand the society Confucius was trying to create, and to decide what we think about it.

The duke asked Confucius about government. Confucius replied, "there is government, when the Prince is Prince, and the minister is minister; when the father is father, and the son is the son."

Confucius, Analects

Here's that part about roles that we just mentioned. Think about this idea. Do people play roles in life? How important is it to play the part you're supposed to play? See if you can give an example.

Students should as much as possible relate concepts to their real lives and discuss issues among themselves.

Here is more of what Confucius has to say:

A man asked the master what was the first thing to consider when establishing a government and the master replied, " names."

If names are not correct, language is not in accordance with the truth. If language be not in accordance with the truth, affairs. cannot be carried on to success.

When affairs cannot be carried on to success, proprieties ... do not flourish. When proprieties do not flourish, punishments will not be properly given. When punishments are not properly given, the people do not know how to move hand or foot.

Confucius, Analects

Now here's that part about formality and politeness. How important do you think it is to be polite and respectful? What good does it do? What about names? Is it important what people call each other?

Obviously many openings for discussion will emerge. Follow the discussion wherever students take it.

was a great philosopher who studied right and wrong, and he was seeking a lasting way for all people to be happy. *If you believe, as Confucius did, that people are vastly unequal in all respects, what sort of system do you think would promote peace and harmony? See if you can predict Confucius's answer.*

A man asked about government and the master said, “the requisites of government are that there be enough food, enough military equipment, and the confidence of the people in their ruler.” The man said: “if it cannot be helped and one of these must be lost, which of the three should be given up first?” “The military equipment,” said the master.

The man asked again, “if it cannot be helped, and one of the remaining two must be lost, which of them should be given up?” The master said, “part with the food. People die; but if the people have no faith in their rulers, the state itself will die.”

Confucius, Analects

Knowing what you do about Confucius's view of average people, why do you think he believed that the ruler needed their approval? Think about the eastern way of looking at things.

Everyone has a place in society and everyone should be happy in it. Discord will lead to conflict and a breakdown of harmony.

Confucius believed that certain superior people should lead society by example. They should serve in government, and provide the leadership society needs. To be successful these superior people must be virtuous, and act with propriety.

The master said, “he who exercises government by means of his virtue may be compared to the North Pole Star, which keeps its place and all the stars turn towards it.”

Confucius, Analects

What virtue do you think Confucius saw in this kind of behavior?

Steadfast adherence to one’s duty.

There are three principles of conduct which the man of high rank should follow: that in his words and actions he keep from violence; and he be sincere; and that he avoid bad language.

Confucius, Analects

How important is it for government officials to set a good example? What about other role models like athletes and entertainers, do they have any influence? Do you agree with Confucius that people are generally molded by what they see and hear?

This is obviously a rich invitation to discussion. Try to avoid following the same strategy. For example, reports on heroes and role models might work here.

**The Master said, ‘if the people be led by laws, which rely on punishments, they will try to avoid the punishments, but have no sense of shame.’
If they be led by virtue, and by the rules of propriety, they will have the sense of shame, and moreover will become good.**

Confucius, Analects

The superior people display great virtues and lead by example. This sounds a lot like Aristotle doesn't it? *Read each of the following quotes from Confucius and explain why you think Socrates or Aristotle would agree or disagree. Treat this like a test. Be as specific as you can. Try to quote something directly from Socrates or Aristotle in your answer.*

The master said, “perfect virtue is according to the constant mean!”

Confucius, Analects

Who does this sound like? Remember, be specific.

This coincides perfectly with Aristotle’s concept of the Golden Mean. Students should be expected to support generalizations with specific evidence and quotes from the readings.

The master said, “by nature, men are nearly alike; by practice, they get to be wide apart.”

Confucius, Analects

What would Aristotle say?

Again this is very much in keeping with Aristotle’s view that ethics is learned through practice and ingrained into habit.

“What is called a great minister, is one who serves his prince according to what is right, and when he finds he cannot do so, retires.”

Confucius, Analects

Does this sound like Socrates? What do you think?

This corresponds well to Socrates conclusion that he must obey the law or get out of the society.

Chinese Tales

Folk stories, tales and fables are a way to teach moral lessons. You already read some fables from ancient Greece by Aesop. *See if you can figure out the message in the following tales from ancient China.*

That's True

Two men who had been arguing asked Confucius to settle the dispute.

“We disagree about whether the sun is closer to us at dawn or at noon. I say the sun is nearer to us at dawn,” one man said, “because when it comes up over the horizon it's much bigger than it is when it's overhead at noon. Everyone knows that a thing looks smaller when it's further away.”

“True” said Confucius.

“Wait a minute,” the other man said, “I say its closer at noon because when it first comes up, at dawn, it's cool compared to how hot it is at noon. Everyone knows a hot object feels hotter when you get closer to it.”

“That's true too” said Confucius. “I guess I can't help you with this.”

Liezi, rewritten

To get the right answer you must ask the right question.

A Perfect Fit

A man needed a new pair of shoes and wanted them to fit perfectly, so he measured his feet very carefully. Writing down the length, width, height and circumference. He even checked his arch and the distance between his ankle and his heel.

Later that day when he stopped at the shoe store to buy the shoes he realized that he had forgotten the paper with the measurements on it.

“I can't buy shoes today,” he told of the shoemaker. “How will I know if they will fit?”

“Why don't you try them on?” the shoemaker said.

“I wouldn't dare trust that!” the man answered.

Hanfeizi, rewritten

Don't make things overly complicated.

Ghosts

One day a man asked a great painter what the hardest thing was to paint.

“People, faces, people's pets, anything very common, and familiar,” he answered.

“What's the easiest thing to paint then?” was the next question.

“Ghosts,” the painter said.

“Why so?” the man asked.

“Because they have no shape,” the painter explained, “they’re invisible, and no one has ever seen one. They’re very easy to paint.”

Hanfeizi, rewritten

It’s most difficult to meet the expectations of others.

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 6

Ancient India

This idea that harmony can only be maintained in a society where everyone carries out his or her duty was also basic to ancient India. Remember, eastern cultures stress that life is interrelated, and that people are not superior to other living things. This blending of people, animals and gods into a single coexistence is typical of Indian culture. If a person acts in a way that is contrary to his or her rightful role in life, the delicate balance of nature would be affected. A good way of thinking of this is to imagine life to be like a band playing a song. When every musician plays the right notes at the right time, beautiful music results. But this only works if everyone cooperates and coordinates. Playing your notes at the right time is your *dharma*. In fact, in the case of important people, like princes and kings, great national catastrophes such as floods or droughts might occur if they don't do their *dharma*. This duty to play your part is very important in India.

Indian people like to tell the story of a prince named Rama who lived even before Confucius. This tale is called the Ramayana, and it provided lessons for Indian children. Rama was the model for boys to follow, and his beautiful bride, Sita, was the model for girls.

Like Aesop's fables, the Ramayana was told and retold countless times and exists in many versions. We're going to retell some of the story. Your job will be to figure out from it what some of the duties of the characters were by analyzing their actions. In other words, what was their *dharma*, and would you have acted the same way.

As you read or listen to the Ramayana make some notes on the following key characters. Each of them does his or her dharma all of the time. See if you can describe in your own words what each one's dharma is. Also think about your opinion of their decisions.

Students need the greatest amount of work on the concept of duty and obligation. This study should be expanded and enriched with as much contemporary and personal example as possible.

Rama

Sita

Dasaratha

Lakshmana

Bharata

Ramayana
Rewritten segment

Long ago there was a peaceful and happy Kingdom named Kosala. The people of Kosala always did

their dharma. Kosala , which was ruled by a wise king named Dasaratha, was protected by walls and moats, and was not threatened by the demons that ravaged the countryside around them. The ruler of these demons was Ravana, the vicious king of Lanka, who had magic powers which made it impossible for any human to kill him. The god Vishnu, who protected the universe, got tired of Ravana's evil ways and decided to destroy him. To do this, he needed to take on a human form, and was reborn as Dasaratha's this eldest son, Rama. Acting through Rama, Vishnu planned to end the muderous career of the evil king.

Rama was strong and handsome with all of the qualities of a great prince. He and his brother Lakshmana often ventured into the lawless land around Kosala to fight Ravana's demons and protect the people. One day the two brave brothers went deep into the forest until they reached of the land of King Janaka, whose daughter, Sita, was known far and wide for her beauty and grace.

"You have heard," said King Janaka, "that the man who marries my daughter must be a prince of the perfect virtue? I believe you might be that prince."

Rama smiled thinking of the beautiful Sita and the honor of having her as his bride.

"The test is this," challenged Janaka. "Only the strongest and most righteous young man can lift and string the mighty bow of Shiva. This test will tell if you are to marry Sita."

Sita watched from her throne as Rama waited in a huge assembly hall while a thousand warriors dragged the huge bow forward. She loved the handsome prince at first sight, and when their eyes met she knew he loved her too. Every one but Sita was stunned as Rama easily lifted the bow and strung it. She knew that the gods had brought them together. The people chanted, "Rama, Rama, Rama," and the wedding ceremony was held immediately.

The same chant echoed everywhere when Rama returned to Kosala with his bride. Rama and Sita were deeply in love, and they were incredibly happy. Old king Darsaratha saw this and decided to retire. "I will leave my crown and my kingdom to you Rama and your bride Sita," he told his son. But when he told this to his third wife, who was Rama's stepmother, she was not pleased.

"Why are you angry," asked Desaratha, "Is it not my duty to retire when my eldest son is ready to become king?" The queen, who wanted her own son to possess the throne said: "do you remember a solemn oath you swore to me when I saved your life many years ago? You said you would grant me any two wishes. Do you remember?"

"Yes," the king answered.

"Well here are my wishes. First you will declare my son, Bharata, to be king, even though he is the youngest, and then you will banish Rama into the forest for fourteen years."

"Please don't hold me to this" the King pleaded. But the queen did not listen.

The sad king could not go back on his word, and so he told Rama that he had changed his mind; Rama would not be king, and he must leave Kosala at once.

Rama looked into his father's eyes and said, "yes father." As he turned to leave, his brother Lakshmana said:"I will stand by your side, and we will take this throne by force.

"No," answered Rama, "I must do as father said."

"I will go with you then," said Lakshmana, "but Sita must remain here where it's safe."

"Yes," said Rama.

"No!" cried Sita, her eyes filled with tears, "I will go wherever you go, forever and always!"

“Stop,” cried Bharata. “I should not be king, you are the true king, come back.”

“I cannot,” said Rama “I will keep my word, I am banished for fourteen years.”

“I will set your sandals on the throne so the people will know that you are the true king, and I will rule only in your name until you return. “ said Bharata.

And so Rama and Sita and Lakshmana walked sadly into the forest.

Now, the evil king knew that the three were in the forest and he used his magic to lure Rama and his brother away while he kidnapped Sita, and brought her to his castle. He tried every trick he knew to fool Sita into thinking Rama was dead. He wanted the beautiful princess to fall in love with him and be his bride. But she did not fall for his tricks and remained true to her beloved Rama.

Meanwhile Rama and his brother made a plan to attack Ravana’s stronghold to free Sita. Rama knew that Ravana and his demons were protected by the gods, and could not be killed by humans, so he made an alliance with the monkey king, Hanuman, and invaded Ravana’s kingdom with an army of monkeys. Rama and Lakshmana and the monkey army fought many bloody battles with the ferocious demons. Ravana used all of his magic spells to defeat Rama, but in the end Rama was invincible, and using a magic arrow he killed Ravana. Standing over the dead body of his evil enemy he said “I order an honorable burial for Ravana, for though he was evil, he is now dead and death erases all enemies. He is now my brother, and deserves an honorable funeral. “

Sita, dressed in a silken gown, and looking more beautiful than ever, ran into Rama’s arms; the two lovers cried with joy. They were together again at last and the long years of exile had passed.

But when they returned to Kosala, Rama sensed that something was wrong. “Why aren’t the people happy?” he asked his brother.

“The people believe that Sita is bringing disgrace to Kosala,” said Lakshmana

“But why?” asked Rama.

“They believe that she has lost her virtue because she lived with Ravana. No one understands how you can take her back after she lived with another man.”

“But she was faithful” Rama replied “These are lies, all lies.”

“Yes, but everyone believes them, and you know you can’t allow this to go on,” said the prince’s brother.

Rama thought for a long time before he made his decision. “Take Sita into the forest and leave her.”

“But she will surely die” protested Lakshmana.

Rama only nodded and said “do as I say.”

The following day it rained, and fog covered the land. Lakshmana brought Sita into the forest.

“Why must this be?” cried Sita.

Tears ran across Lakshmana’s face as he turned to go “You may return to Rama only by leaving him now.”

Review your notes and prepare to discuss each character’s dharma.

Remember that this is only an opening to encourage students to think about their own responsibilities and obligations.

Write a short statement about the last episode of the story. Why does Rama send Sita off when he obviously loves her very much? What more important value was being

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 7

Ancient Rome

The most important ethical philosophy that came from ancient Rome was called Stoicism. It influenced all later ethical thinking and added some very big new ideas about where the law comes from. Let's review briefly. Remember how Socrates believed the law came from the people and refused to disobey the will of the people even when it resulted in his own execution? Now, the problem with this is that if you believe the law is whatever the people say it is, there is no such thing as an unjust law, as Socrates found out. This was an area where the Stoics added something significant called *natural law*. We'll study this in more detail later, but for now, let's find out more about what the Stoics believed in generally.

In the first place, they were practical. They wanted to live effective happy lives in the real everyday world. One of the leading Stoics was a man named Epictetus who wrote a "handbook" for life. According to Epictetus, the first lesson to learn is to distinguish between things, which are within our control, and things which are not.

Some things are in our power and some are not. What are in our power are our desires, thoughts and actions. Not in our power are the actions and opinions of others. Pay attention only to what's in your power. If it's not in your power, don't be concerned with it.

Arrian, Handbook of Epictetus

Stoics believed that a person should be indifferent to anything he or she can't influence. What kinds of things are, and are not, in our power?

This can be somewhat depressing for some students who may conclude that Stoicism is pessimistic. Try to work through this.

The next quotation from Marcus Aurelius is particularly important because it introduces us to that very big idea that Stoics had, the idea that the law is not something handed down to us, but is a part of the nature of things.

When you get up in the morning, and you don't want to, think about this. I am rising to do the work of a human being. Why wouldn't I want to do the things I was by nature intended to do? Or, maybe I was made to lie in bed and accomplish nothing? Can you look at the bees and ants, spiders and birds working diligently at their natural tasks and say you don't want to do the work for which you were created?

Marcus Aurelius, Meditations

There are laws, which are a natural part of life. The life of every living creature is an unfolding of that creature's nature. *Do you recognize some of Aristotle's ideas in this?*

This is an important philosophical concept in ethics. It leads to the natural law and social contract philosophy of the Enlightenment, which is the basis for the American Constitution.

Humans too are governed by these natural laws which the Stoics began to consider being the basis for all human laws as well. In other words, human laws had to be in keeping with natural laws. Or, put a different way, people have a right to live a natural human life without anyone interfering with that. This idea is huge because it says that people have rights, which are bigger than all laws. Did *Socrates have any rights?*

Ancient Greeks lacked this concept.

The most basic of these natural laws involved the right to live and to be free. It's really simple. People, because of the kind of beings they are, have a right to defend themselves against anyone who wants to kill or to enslave them. The Stoics said this was the basis of all law, and it answers the question that Socrates death raised: who says what the law is? The answer for the Stoics was, all human law comes from nature, and must be consistent with nature. We're going to see this idea again later, because it is the foundation for our own Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Students have no problem understanding the concept of their own rights. Try to refocus them on the idea of natural rights and if there is such a thing.

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 8

Christianity and Islam

Another powerful ethical teaching, which emerged during ancient Roman times was Christianity. Christianity is a religion in the same tradition as Hebrew Judaism. We read about the Hebrew law in the Old Testament, and learned that it was strict and unbending. Christianity was an extension and variation of this tradition. Christianity added a New Testament to the Bible. This book has some important new ideas that we're going to learn about.

Remember the Old Testament commandment, ***“Thou shall not kill?”*** Let's start by looking at the New Testament variation of it from the Book of Matthew.

You have heard it said thou shalt not kill, and if you do you will be punished. But I say to you that whoever is angry at his brother without cause will be punished, and whoever speaks hatred to his brother will be punished, and whoever calls insults will be punished.

Matthew 5, 21-22

Is it as wrong to utter threats and insults as it is to actually do an act of violence? Think about and be prepared to discuss this. Try to use some present-day examples of how certain words, and even thoughts might seem to be as wrong.

This discussion will ignite students. Let it go naturally.

This also introduces us to the idea of intent, or the reason why a person does something. Christianity takes the reason why you do things very seriously. Here is another quote from Matthew:

A good tree bears a good fruit, but a corrupt tree bears evil fruit.

Matthew 5, 17

What do you think this means? Do you agree?

Let's look at some more comparisons.

You have heard it said an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I say don't fight back against evil; if someone hits you on the right cheek, let him also hit you on the left.

Matthew 5, 38-39

You have heard it said that you should love your neighbor and hate your enemy but I say love your enemies and do good for them even if they hate you.

Matthew 5, 43-44

We first saw the idea of getting revenge on your enemies as being wrong expressed by Socrates who believed that it was wrong because it only leads to more violence. The Greeks replaced revenge with public laws. Christianity also sees it as bad and for a very similar reason. But Christianity's answer is different. Evil is overcome by good, not by laws and punishments.

Do you think that this will work? What strength does it have? How might you argue that this is the only way to overcome evil? Can you apply this idea to an everyday situation?

Parables

A parable is a short story that has an ethical message in it about what's right and what's wrong. We saw this teaching technique used all through history. Remember Aesop's Fables or the Ramayana. The New Testament has many important parables. One of the most important is called of the *Parable of the Prodigal Son*. Prodigal means wasteful, so it's a story about a wasteful son, and his relationship to his father and his brother. *After you read, or listen to, the story, try to figure out what the moral message in it is and explain it in your own words.*

Parable of the Prodigal Son simplified

One day the younger of two brothers said to his father, 'I would like my inheritance now, so that I can be free and make my own life.' The father was sad to see his youngest son go but he agreed, and gave his son his share of the estate. The younger son went off to a distant land and there he led a wild life, and wasted all of the money. Soon he was homeless and starving. Sorry for his actions, he decided to return home. He wanted his father to give him a job as a servant or a farmhand.

His father saw him coming and ran into him. Before the boy could speak, the father hugged and kissed him, and said to his servants, "Get robes and sandals, put rings on his fingers, and prepare a great feast. We must celebrate the return of my lost son!"

Meanwhile, the older son, tired and sweating, returned from working in the fields, and saw the

In loving a friend we love what is good for us because each makes an equal return of good to the other; for friendship is said to be equality.

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics book 8 chapter 13

Now it's noble to do good for others without expecting repayment, but it's in receiving that the benefits lie. Therefore you should give back the equal of what you get.

This idea is so common in humans that it has been called the most basic rule of ethics. Some people believe it has been ingrained in us through millions of years of living in social groups. *Do you agree?*

There is a body of evidence to suggest that humans have developed a genetic predisposition to living in groups, and to striving for equality therein. The ideas of equality and reciprocity will be basic to our consideration of ethics.

Now let's look at the idea of hypocrisy one more time, only in a different form.

A *hypocrite* is a person who condemns someone else for doing something, and then secretly does the same thing.

Here's what Matthew says:

You will be judged by the same rule you use to judge others. Why do you point out the flaws in your brother when you don't look at your own flaws? How can you tell someone else how to act when you are just as bad? You are a hypocrite, clean up your own act before you try to tell others what to do.

he was a wise teacher. We are going to read, or listen to, some of the Nasrudin's adventures and see if we can understand the ethical messages in them.

It All Depends

One day a man came to Nasrudin's door and said: "Nasrudin, you are a judge and are wise. May I ask you a legal question?"

"Of course," said the mullah.

"If a man's ox kills another man's ox, is the owner of the first ox liable to pay damages to the owner of the dead animal?"

"Well that depends on many things." Nasrudin answered. "Can you tell me more?"

"Yes," the man retorted, "Your ox has just killed mine."

Nasrudin looked very serious and said: "well, it's clear that an ox cannot think and is not responsible for its actions. If the ox is not responsible, the ox's owner cannot be held liable."

"Oh" said the man "You are very wise indeed. I agree. The owner cannot be held responsible for the actions of a dumb animal."

Nasrudin smiled until the man added: "I made a mistake. I should have said that my ox killed yours."

Nasrudin paused and then said: "maybe I should think about this case some more. Let me consult my law books, and I'll get back to you."

What is this story telling us about the law as a way of deciding what's right and wrong?

The law is just a man-made set of rules that can be manipulated to suit circumstances.

You Are Right

Two men came before the mullah to have him decide a lawsuit. After the plaintiff completed his testimony Nasrudin said: “I believe you are right.” The man smiled thinking he had won.

But when the defendant told his side, and was very convincing, Nasrudin said: “I believe you are right.”

The two men looked puzzled and one said: “What do you mean? We can't both be right.”

Nasrudin nodded and said: “Yes, I believe you are right.”

What do you think this story is telling you about the law?

Even if the laws are only a set of rules to play the game by, and have no real universal basis, it is still necessary to decide what is going to be considered right and wrong. Nasrudin must decide. Row v Wade is a good example of a decision to live according to the rule that a woman has certain rights concerning abortion. This rule could easily change, and obviously conflicts with the universal ethical standards of some people.

Who Me?

Nasrudin's house was broken into and many valuables were stolen. The mullah's wife was very angry.

"It's your fault," she said to Nasrudin, "You should have locked the door."

Before Nasrudin could answer, his sister-in-law added, "and you left all of the windows opened, you should have made sure they were locked."

"You should have expected it since there have been many burglaries lately. Why didn't you leave the dog home to guard the house?" added a neighbor.

"Wait up," said Nasrudin, "Why are you all the blaming me?"

"Who else should we blame?" answered his wife.

"How about the thief?" said the mullah.

Who is responsible? Why do you think people look for complicated explanations for wrongdoing rather than holding the doer responsible? Can you think of any examples of this from your own experiences or from recent events?

This predilection to deny individual responsibility is so prevalent in society today that it should be easy for students to find many contemporary examples. It is important to discuss this in many contexts, especially trying to find excuses for personal failure.

Judge Not

Nasrudin saw a beggar on the street and stopped to talk to him.

“Why are you begging?” the mullah asked.

“Because I have no money.”

“Why don't you have any money?” said Nasrudin.

“Because I drink and gamble at cards every day and if I have any money I try to get to the racetrack to bet on horses.”

“I see,” said Nasrudin, and he gave the man a gold coin.

Just then a second man appeared and asked for money.

“Are you wasteful too?” asked Nasrudin.

“Oh no,” answered the beggar.

“Do you drink and gamble?”

“Absolutely not, I live very simply. I don't require much, and I pray everyday.”

This question speaks directly to the most fundamental ethical question and should generate considerable discussion. The teacher should try to encourage as complete a consideration of the issue as possible.

Feudalism

After the fall of Rome, the rule of law disappeared, and Europe became a dangerous and lawless place. People naturally banded together and formed groups for their own protection. The land was divided into many small territories, which were defended by castles. Nobles and knights ruled, while peasants and serfs farmed the land. This so-called feudal system lasted for over a thousand years.

Feudalism's ideas of right and wrong were based on what would best hold together a strong group. We call this idea *communalism*. A commune is a group of people living together and sharing what they have.

In feudal society people freely agreed to be ruled by other people, and to do what they were told in return for protection. To seal these personal agreements, it was common to swear an oath of allegiance. The greatest crime that you could commit was to go back on your word, and not stand by your oath. This was called a felony. The word felony is still used today to describe the most serious crimes.

Let's look at one of these feudal oaths.

I swear before God that I will be your true and faithful servant and be at your command. I will love what you love, and hate what you hate. I will not think or do anything of which you disapprove. In return you will stand by me, and protect me in all the ways we agreed to at the time I submitted myself to your authority.

Composite of several typical feudal oaths.

An oath is like a promise to do something. How important is it to keep your promises? Should promises be kept no matter what?

It is important for students to continually consider this kind of question.

One question that puzzled people who believed in communalism was whether a person should make a profit by selling something for more than it was worth. Here is what Aquinas said:

It is wrong to sell a thing for more than its just price because it is deceiving and injuring your neighbor. Buying and selling is intended for the common advantage of both parties. Therefore there must be equality between them.

Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica II-II,77 simplified

The concept of “just price” will be difficult for some students to gasp. Some further explanation and examples may be helpful. The full impact of extreme group ethical standards should stand out for students.

This is different isn't it? Let's look closer at what Aquinas said. First of all he uses the term *just price*. This term means the same thing as fair price. But what does that mean? Well, for people at that time, it meant that if you were selling something to make a living, you could set your price only as high as was necessary to pay your living expenses. In other words, you could expect to live comfortably at the level you were already at. You could not get rich by making big profits. For example, shoemakers had a certain lifestyle, as did carpenters and farmers and so did everyone else. You could sell your goods only at a price that kept you at that level. The just price would change with people and places, but it was always intended to keep people from moving up, or down, the social ladder.

To sell anything for more than it is worth, or to buy anything for less than it is worth, is wrong and unlawful.

Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica II-II,77

Compare this with the way trade is carried on today.

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 10

Renaissance

After about a thousand years of feudalism, people began to question some of its basic ideas. This new period in history is called the Renaissance. It was a time of change in the way people looked at their relationship with the community they lived in. Communalism was losing ground to the idea of individualism. Individualism stresses the importance of the individual people, and places them above the group. People began to believe that there was nothing wrong with striving to get things for themselves, and they became less concerned about their obligations to others.

The Renaissance was the beginning of what we call modern times. We still live in the modern age, and our society today still stresses individualism. So, this is a very important idea for us to study. It's a new way to look at life, and it changes things a lot.

All through the Middle Ages it was assumed that, for the most part at least, people try to do the right thing. In other words, people were by nature basically good. This was one idea that was seriously questioned by Renaissance thinkers. One famous philosopher at this time was an Italian named Nicolo Machiavelli. He wrote a book called **The Prince** which gave advice to political leaders. Let's see what Machiavelli said about the natural goodness of people.

In general, people are ungrateful, unreliable, false, cowardly and greedy. They will promise you anything, and then turn their back on you if things go wrong. And don't think that the person who is closest to you is more reliable. Friendship is based on obligations, and people break obligations most easily.

Nicolo Machiavelli, The Prince, Chapter XVI simplified

What to do you think? Are people basically good or basically bad? Is Machiavelli right?

A wide variety of opinion will emerge. Students should reflect honestly on themselves.

Here is some of what Machiavelli wrote:

Everyone says that the leader should be honest and trustworthy and not be sneaky. But it's easy to see that in the past leaders who get things done have paid little or no attention to this idea. They have simply outsmarted the others, especially those who keep their word. We all know that there are two ways of getting what you want. The first is through the rules, and the second is to take it by force. The leader must do both. The leader should be half lion and half fox. The lion can't see the traps, and the fox can't fight off the wolves. Great leaders don't rely on either one or the other, but use both. Therefore, the wise leaders do not keep their word if it will hurt them or prevent them from getting what they want.

If people were good this rule would not hold. But, because they are bad, and will lie and cheat you, you are not obligated to be fair and honest with them.

But, it is necessary to disguise your dishonesty and to pretend to be good. People like to think that they are upright, and they are very easy to trick. You must appear to be virtuous, but only a fool actually is virtuous. Pretend to be kind, reliable, fair, honest and loyal. But be ready to do the exact opposite, as long as you don't get caught. It's always best to stay with the good if you can, but only if it works, if not, you must be ready to change tactics. Remember, people must believe you are virtuous, so never give any hint that you are not. People only see what you show them, not what's really there.

Nicolo Machiavelli, The Prince, Chapter XVIII simplified

What was Machiavelli's opinion of hypocrisy?

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 11

Enlightenment

After the Renaissance, individualism was a powerful new force in the world. This was a time when people began to try to figure out for themselves how the natural world worked. They stressed logical thinking and scientific experimentation. This period in history is called the Enlightenment. People became curious about everything, and wanted to study everything, including themselves. As part of this, they began to look again at ideas about right and wrong. But this time, they saw people as being part of nature, and subject to the same natural laws as everything else.

Benedict Spinoza

One important ethical thinker of this time was Benedict Spinoza. Let's see what he had to say.

People living in nature have a right to life, and a right to do whatever is necessary to protect and better their life. In other words, people will always protect themselves by trying to get what they think is good, and trying to avoid what they think is bad. This is just common sense. Problems arise because people are ruled by their emotions. Emotions are powerful urges that motivate actions. Because emotions are not carefully thought out, they are unpredictable and dangerous. When people are ruled by emotions, they often argue and fight with each other. The only way to protect yourself from violence is to threaten greater violence in return. This is why nature is so insecure.

Spinoza, Ethics 4,XXXVI Note II, Paraphrase

Here is one last quote from Spinoza:

People who are governed by reason don't want anything for themselves that they don't want for the rest of mankind, and because of this, they are just, faithful, and honorable in their conduct.

Spinoza, Ethics 4 VIII

Why does this look so familiar? Do you see a theme developing in the history of ethical thought? What is it? Prepare to discuss this.

Again, this shows striving for equality through reciprocity.

Immanuel Kant

Remember we said that the Enlightenment was a time of science when people tried to figure things out by studying nature. Not all people believed that right and wrong could be understood that way. One very important philosopher of that time was Immanuel Kant. He believed that he could figure out rules of ethics with pure logic, and reason, without looking at the real world at all. Kant believed that if people studied the real world to figure out rules for right and wrong they would end up with different answers because they would be reasoning from different particular situations. He wrote long and very complicated books trying to prove this. His works became the most famous ever written about right and wrong.

Kant's writing is complicated, but his conclusions are very simple. He wanted to find one rule everyone must obey all the time. He gave this rule a fancy name, the **Categorical Imperative**. We will call it *The Rule Everyone Must Obey All the Time*. Here's how Kant said it:

I should never do anything unless I can honestly say I believe everyone else should always do the same thing.

Immanuel Kant, Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals, section 1

What he came up with sounds a lot like the Golden Rule we've been seeing over and over again. Only Kant believed he improved upon it.

Here's how Kant said it works:

If I'm in trouble is it OK to make promises that I don't intend to keep? It may be profitable in the short run to lie, but is it right? Let's word this in a different way, and then apply our ethical rule. Should I lie to get out of a tight spot? Will this hold up as a rule that everyone must follow all the time? Can I say, "everyone should lie to get what they want?" If we put it this way, it's clear that I couldn't say this because it would mean that all promises would be no good. No one could ever trust anyone else, and this would destroy society.

Immanuel Kant, Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals, section 2

The key to using Kant's rule is that you must think carefully and logically. Kant and Spinoza both thought that as long as everyone relied on reason they would always agree. Here are some more examples Kant gave to test his rule:

A man is very disappointed with his life and asks himself if it's OK to commit suicide. The man says: "I want to act in my own best interests, since I see only pain and suffering ahead, I will shorten my life." Then he asks: "can this be a rule everyone must obey all of the time?" The answer is no, because it's a contradiction to say I will destroy a life in order to do what's best for that life.

Immanuel Kant, Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals, section 2

You can also see what Kant means by logical thinking, and reason. Let's read another of his examples:

A man is rich and comfortable. He wonders if he should help poor and suffering people. He says: "why should I care? I don't take anything from poor and suffering people, and so I'm not obligated to give them anything either." Can this be a law everyone must obey all the time? The

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 12

Public Ethics

So far we have concentrated on the ethics of private relationships. Now we're going to look at how people act as a society.

People generally live under the authority of a government. Governments enact laws which tell people what's right and what's wrong. Governments have power and they can force people to obey. The right and wrong of government actions is a whole new area called *public ethics*.

How do we know what's right and wrong to do as a whole community?

There has always been a question about what gives a government the right to tell people what to do. Remember how Socrates answered this? He believed that the majority of people decided what was right and that was it. Later people rejected the idea that the majority was always right. You read about how the ancient Romans Stoics, for example, believed that there was a natural law that determined right and wrong. This idea survived for many centuries and finally became well established during the Enlightenment. This idea became the basis for our own Constitution, and is very important for us to understand.

John Locke

One of the most important Enlightenment thinkers who wrote about this was John Locke. He lived in England about a hundred years before the American Revolution and his work had a big impact on the American Constitution. Let's see how he said government got its right to rule.

Locke tried to imagine what life was like before any governments were formed. He called this a state of nature, and he believed that natural law ruled. In this state of nature, Locke thought all people had a right to protect themselves. This was a natural right. In other words, people could use force to protect their life and freedom. No one can kill or injure or make someone a slave. These were natural rights. A person had them automatically. This wasn't a new idea, but Locke added something to it. Locke said people also have a natural right to own things, and to use force to protect what they have. This was new. Let's see how Locke reasoned from the natural right to life and freedom to a right to own property.

In the beginning, nobody had a right to anything in nature. But whatever a man removes from nature through the work of his hands is his. He has mixed his labor with it and this makes it his property.

John Locke, Second Treatise on Government Chapter 5 simplified

Locke believed that people had a natural right not to be enslaved. A slave is someone who is forced to work for someone else. To take something from a person that that person created by his or her labor would be the same as making that person a slave. Locke reasoned from this that people had a natural right to own property. This meant that there were three basic natural human rights: life, freedom, and property.

What do you think of Locke's reasoning? Does it make sense?

Part of Locke's thinking was based on a belief he held about the natural world.

It doesn't injure one person when another takes property out of nature because there is so much land that there is always enough left for others. It is impossible for anyone to acquire so much wealth that it injures others.

John Locke, Second Treatise on Government Chapter 5 simplified

Explain what Lock meant in your own words.

Do you think Locke was a right? If so, is he still right today?

Locke thought that the need to protect property complicates the ability of individuals to protect themselves. This led directly to the creation of the governments, Locke said.

People freely agreed to join together into a community to secure the enjoyment of their property. So then everyone agrees to make one government and to place himself or herself under the rule of that government.

John Locke, Second Treatise on Government Chapter 8 simplified

Now compare this with the words of Thomas Jefferson from the Declaration of Independence.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it...

As you can see the United States government was founded directly upon the ideas of the Enlightenment. The protection of people's natural rights was the fundamental reason for government. People rely on government to guarantee them these rights. This system has become very well established as a way to promote public ethics. People have natural rights; they establish governments to protect them; governments pass laws; and the courts settle the issue of who's right and what's fair.

Let's look now at the United States Constitution Bill of Rights and see some specific rights the law says people have.

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

The problem is to say exactly what this means. This is where the courts come in. The courts decide how the law works in specific cases and people agree to go along with its decisions. This is how the system works. The law is like a set of rules to play a game. *But right and wrong are still what the society says they are. How is this any different from what Socrates said?*

There are individual rights that are greater than the laws, and laws cannot go against these. Therefore individuals and minorities are protected from the government itself. This is an extremely important point which students should master.

Vehicle searches

Acting on a tip from a student that another student was selling marijuana, a school official searched the boy's car. He founded a pager and a notebook with a list of names and amounts of money. In the trunk of the car he found a locked briefcase. He opened it and found marijuana.

Without any factual evidence, the tip alone would not be probable cause. But, the court said it created enough reasonable suspicion for the school to search the boy's car. State v Slattery 1990

Drug sniffing dogs

The court has ruled that student lockers and cars can be randomly sniffed by dogs. But, dogs cannot randomly sniff the students themselves. *What reasoning do you think the court used here?*

Horton v Goose Creek Independent School District 1982

Jennings v Joshua Independent School District 1989

The court made a distinction between sniffing inanimate objects and actually sniffing a person. The court felt that sniffing a person without probable cause was too personal and an invasion of privacy even for students in school.

Drug testing

The school said that to play on athletic teams students had to agree to take a random urine test for drugs. One boy's parents objected and refused to sign the consent form. The school officials admitted that they did not suspect the boy of drug use, but refused to let him play football unless his parents signed. The parents said it was an unnecessary invasion of their son's personal privacy. *Who do you think was right? Does the same reasoning about personal privacy used by the court for sniffing dogs also apply here?*

Acton v Vernonia School District 47J 1991

The court said no. The school could keep the boy off the team because a urine test was not an unreasonable invasion of privacy for an athlete. Athletes accept less personal privacy because of the nature of athletics.

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 13

Capitalism and Socialism

Adam Smith

At about the time of the American Revolution, scientific innovation led to the invention of many new types of machines. This started an industrial revolution which became part of a new way to organize a country's economy called Capitalism. A man named Adam Smith in a famous book called The Wealth of Nations first suggested the capitalist system. In his book Smith said that if people were left alone to compete with each other to make and sell things that this competition would lead to the best possible products at the lowest possible prices. Smith believed that competition would balance everything out and that the best of economy would be created. He called this idea the *law of supply and demand*.

When the quantity of any commodity brought to market falls below the demand, people will be willing to pay more for it and the price will go up. When the price goes up more money can be made selling it so people start to produce more. When this happens more product enters the market and the process reverses itself. This happens over and over until the price and quantity settle at the perfect point.

The Wealth of Nations book 1, chapter seven, simplified and rewritten

Smith believed a kind of *invisible hand* pushed and pulled prices and quantities of products until they came into a perfect balance. Economists call this market equilibrium. The best way to run a country's economy, Smith said, was to do nothing and just let it happen. This policy came to be called *laissez-faire*, which is the French name for it.

of *Wealth* which was a set of rules that he thought all rich people should live by for the good of everyone.

Think about some of the things Carnegie said and tell why you agree or don't agree with him.

We assemble thousands of workers in the factory. We employers know little or nothing about them and they know nearly nothing about us. We have no relationship with each other and this breeds ignorance and mutual distrust.

Carnegie, The Problem of the Administration of Wealth, simplified and rewritten

We accept and welcome the inequality that results from the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few because it is essential to the future of society.

Carnegie, The Problem of the Administration of Wealth, simplified and rewritten

All civilization depends on the right to own private property. The poor man has a right to his hundred dollars and the rich man has a right to his millions.

Carnegie, The Problem of the Administration of Wealth, simplified and rewritten

So Carnegie definitely believed in Capitalism and thought that great wealth could only be produced if people got to keep what they earned. This was the incentive that drove the economy and everyone benefited by the success of the rich. Giving someone something for nothing would take away the incentive to work hard and would promote laziness. For this reason, Carnegie, like many others of this time, was opposed to charity for the poor. He believed people should be helped to help themselves but not given anything for free, and this opposition to charity extended to the rich as well. Carnegie saw the inheritance of family fortunes by the children of the rich as equally bad and this was where his gospel of wealth came in.

Of all the forms of taxation, taxing inheritance seems to be the wisest. Men who continue hoarding great sums all of their lives when they could do good for the community should be ashamed of themselves. The state should tax estates heavily at death and use the money for the general good.

Carnegie, The Problem of the Administration of Wealth, simplified and rewritten

Carnegie believed that if the rich knew that their fortunes would be taken by the state when they died, they would donate their money to worthy causes that would benefit the poor. In this way they would control what was done with their money and this would be better than losing it.

Why didn't Carnegie think letting the children of the rich inherit their parent's wealth was a good idea? What do you think?

Carnegie thought that this simple idea would solve the problem of inequality in society.

This policy would work powerfully to induce the rich man to use his wealth for the benefit of the people. This will provide the solution to the temporary unequal distribution of wealth and will reconcile the rich with the poor.

Carnegie, The Problem of the Administration of Wealth, rewritten and simplified

What do you think? Could this work today?

Socialism

The system of early Capitalism left individuals alone to fend for themselves and this led to much poverty. In order to survive many families were often forced to send their small children into the mills to work. The factory owners saw these children only as low cost labor to be exploited and consequently accepted no responsibility for their welfare. The children in the poor houses of Great Britain were herded into the mills by the thousands. The problem rose to the level of national disgrace and in 1832 Parliament took up the issue. Here are some excerpts from testimony at its hearings.

. . . that it was the regular custom, to work children in factories thirteen hours a day, and only allow them half an hour for dinner; . . . and that in many factories they were worked considerably more. . .

[The children] are generally cruelly treated; so cruelly treated, that they dare not hardly for their lives to be late at their work in the morning.

I have seen some children running down [at 5 A.M.] to the mill crying, with a bit of bread in their hand, and that is all they may have till 12 o'clock at noon. . . .

British Parliamentary Papers, 1831-2, XV, No. 706 (Report of Committee on the Labor of Children in Factories)]

Robert Owen

Some people began to advocate other ideas about how a society should function. They said that complete freedom creates too many problems and that ultimately these problems would become insurmountable and would destroy the society. A whole new system was needed. One of these so-called *socialists* was a mill owner named Robert Owen. He owned a big textile mill in New Lanark Scotland that employed several hundred people including many small children. Owen wanted to create a community that would care for and educate these children rather than just use them for labor. He believed that what a person becomes is the product of his or her environment and that early education is very important. Owen called his school *The Institute for the Formation of Character*.

We can see the roots of social constructivism that underpins Socialism in the view that the individual is the product of society and benefits from the good of the group.

Here are some more of Owen's ideas about on education. *See if you agree with him.*

Children ... prevented from ... learning... are likely to acquire (bad) habits by continually associating with those as ignorant ... as themselves.

There will be no difficulty in teaching ... what is right and proper... the real and only difficulty will be to unlearn those (bad) habits ...

Owen's school was radically different from schools at that time. He believed children should start as soon as they could walk **and in this their chief occupation will be to play and amuse themselves.** Owen believed making children happy was a key to educational success.

Do you agree? Why?

Communism

Robert Owen and others like him wanted to improve the living conditions for poor people and they thought that if they created successful model communities based on Socialism that this would prove that Capitalism should be changed. Other socialists thought that this was doomed to fail because it was too limited and that only large scale change would work. These later socialists were more scientific about why they thought Capitalism was bad.

Karl Marx and his friend Fredrick Engels began a socialist movement called Communism. They thought Capitalism was the cause of poverty and called for a society where the workers owned the factories and other means of production. They believed that the workers produced the wealth and were cheated out of their fair share by the owners of the factories who paid them very low wages. They called for a revolution to right this wrong. During the 20 Century, after communist revolutions in many countries, one half of the world's population lived under a communist government. *Here are some of the ways Engels answered questions about his ideas, see if you agree or disagree.*

When asked: Haven't there always been poor people he said: **There have always been poor and working classes... But there have not always been workers and poor people living under conditions as they are today.** He blames this on **free unbridled competitions.**

Frederick Engels, The Principles of Communism

On balance, do you think competition is a good or a bad thing in your life ?

Ethics Workbook I: World History

Chapter 14

Final Projects

Now that you've made a comprehensive study of ethics, it's time to apply your knowledge to a new situation. On the following pages there are student guides for ten research report topics. You will find a lot of information on them in your school's library, and on the Internet. Select one, and working alone or in a small group, research it. Don't take a side. Learn as much as you can about both sides. Then prepare a presentation for the class that helps them understand what you've learned. Be sure to be even-handed in your presentation. Challenge yourself not to tip the class off to what your conclusions are. Then lead the class in a general discussion. Let everyone have his or her say. At the end, tell class what you believe and why you believe it.

It is recommended that the projects be undertaken in groups of two or three. Students should be challenged to make a thorough and objective study of the problem. They should also demonstrate knowledge of ethical principles, and be capable of applying classic ethical standards studied in this workbook. Criteria for evaluation might include the student's ability to apply specific understandings such as Kantian respect, natural law, Aristotle's excellence, or Confucian propriety, among many others.

Adoption Confidentiality

Should people who have been adopted have a right to know who their birth parents are? Or, should the natural birth parents have a right not to be identified if they don't want to be?

Framing the question

Sometimes when adopted children grow up and reach adulthood they may want to know about their natural parents. Many states seal the original birth certificate, and make this impossible. The adoptees argue that they have a right to know the truth about their genetic, ethnic and cultural background. Many people who disagree say that the birth parents have a right to privacy and that the government promised not to reveal their identity. It would be wrong to go back on this promise.

Stating the ethical issues

Is there a right to privacy? Is it a natural right? Is it protected by the Constitution? Is privacy the same as anonymity?

Is there an agreement between the birth mother and the government, acting on behalf of the infant adoptee, to keep the adoption a secret?

Is there a violation of the principle of "equal protection of all law" since only adopted citizens are denied access to their original birth certificates?

Is there a natural right to know who you are? Does your genetic, ethnic, and cultural heritage define who you are?

Does it violate the ethics of equality to let only the adoptee decide if the adoption facts will be revealed?

Problems to ponder

Is it possible to reveal relevant information about the person's heritage without telling exactly who the birth parents are?

What are *adoptive search of registries*? Are they an adequate and fair way to solve this problem?

What responsibilities does the government have to resolve this?

Affirmative Action

It seems clear that throughout our history some groups of people such as Blacks and women have been discriminated against. They have not received fair treatment in getting an education or a job. Does this injury entitle them to recover damages?

Framing of the question

Many people believe that a good way to right this wrong would be to give preferential treatment to these groups of people at school and at work. We call this idea affirmative action. Others say it is wrong to give preferential treatment to any group. They call affirmative action “reverse discrimination,” and they say two wrongs don't make a right.

Stating the ethical issues

Is giving preferential school admissions to minorities or women unfair to those white men who are better qualified but denied a job or admission to the school? In other words, is affirmative action a violation of the “equal protection” clause of the 14th Amendment?

Is it fair to base hiring and school admissions decisions only on grades and test scores? Are there other equally important factors?

Are the questions on standardized tests biased against women and minorities making the tests unfair to these groups?

Past discrimination against minorities and women has damaged the educational and employment status of these groups, is affirmative action a fair way to even the score?

Problems to ponder

Has affirmative action benefited minorities and women?

Have the percentages of minorities and women enrolled in medical schools, law, and other professional schools increased under affirmative action?

Have minorities and women narrowed the income gap with white males?

Has affirmative action reduced poverty?

Has affirmative action led to more jobs for minorities and women? Has it reduced minority unemployment rates?

Animal Rights and Welfare

Should animals be protected by law and enjoy some or all of the same rights as humans?

Framing the question

Today many people have become concerned for the welfare of animals. They point to inhumane practices sometimes seen in farming, hunting, trapping, medical research and even in the circuses and zoos. This has led to efforts to improve the conditions under which animals live. Some people say animals should have rights to protect them just like people do. But others say that animals exist for the benefit of humans, and if they had rights, humans couldn't use them. They say that animals should be treated humanely, but not given actual rights.

Stating the ethical issues

Aren't rights just human inventions that don't apply to animals?

Do animals have the same natural right to live and be free that is claimed for humans? If not, what is the distinction between humans and animals?

If the animals have rights simply because they are living creatures then wouldn't insects and plants have rights too?

Are rights based on intelligence? If so wouldn't this reasoning be applied to humans also?

Could animals be entitled to rights because they can feel pain and can suffer?

If animals have no rights, does the human use of animals create a responsibility toward them? If so what is it?

Problems to ponder

Is there an ethical difference between important uses of animals for such things as food and medical research, and entertainment uses such as for hunting or circuses?

Does it matter if the animal is of an endangered species?

Does it matter if the animal is tame or wild?

Is it OK to genetically alter animals to make them more useful to man?

Can the perceived importance of certain medical research justify inhumane treatment of animals?

Capital Punishment

The United States is one of the few Western democracies which has not yet abolished the death penalty. This political issue is an ongoing controversy.

Framing of the question

The majority of Americans believe that the death penalty should not be abolished. They say that it helps protect society, and that it is an appropriate way to punish murderers. Opponents argue that the death penalty does not deter murderers, and is just a form of revenge that may actually lead to an increase in violent crime.

Stating the ethical issues

Is the death penalty unfairly applied to Blacks and poor people?

Is the death penalty a “cruel and unusual punishment,” making it unconstitutional?

Is it right for the government to sanction the killing of human beings?

Is the death penalty ethical if life in prison with no possibility of parole will equally protect society?

Does executing murderers actually say that killing is OK under some circumstances?

Is it ethical to pursue the death penalty when we know that at least a few of the executions will kill innocent people?

Problems to ponder

Does the family of the victim have a right to get revenge?

Does the death penalty put too much focus on the killer and neglect the needs of the victim's family thereby reduce the value of human life?

Do executions actually increase murders because potential killers identify with the executioner and not with the convicted murderer?

Is the death penalty justified because the murder victim could have justifiably killed the murderer in self-defense?

Enhancement drugs

Drugs have been developed that can enhance the human body in powerful ways. Human growth hormone can cause a normally short person to grow taller. Anabolic steroids can make muscles stronger, and can increase athletic performance. Many people believe that these drugs can also help them look more physically attractive.

Framing the question

Is it ethical to use artificial substances to alter the normal size and strength of the human body? Is there a difference between treating a person who is “abnormally” short or weak to make him or her more “normal”, and treating someone of average height or strength to make him or her the very tall or very strong?

Stating the ethical issues

Is it fair to allow athletes who use anabolic steroids to compete against athletes who don't?

Doesn't everyone have a right to take risks and to decide personally which risks to take?

Is it the performance enhancement aspect of anabolic steroid use which is most objectionable, or is it the potential they have for damaging one's health? In other words, is it a sports competition issue or a health issue?

Don't people have a right to enhance their bodies if this will make them happy?

Is there any real difference between taking a pill to help you lose weight and taking one to help you gain?

Problems to ponder

Is it ethical for society to promote the desirability of being tall, strong and athletic, and then punishing people who try to achieve this?

Should doctors, coaches and teachers admit that anabolic steroids do enhance strength and performance, even if this seems to encourage their use? Or, should they only stress the negative side effects, and possible health risks, in the hope of discouraging use?

Genetic Engineering

The United States Supreme Court decided in 1980 that new forms of life created by scientists through genetic manipulation could be patented. This has set off a massive effort to “invent” new animals, plants and micro-organisms that could be useful or profitable.

Framing the question

Is it ethical to genetically modify plants, animals or micro-organisms, and to introduce them into the world without knowing how they will impact the environment? Do the risks of mutation or disease that may threaten the delicate balance of nature outweigh the advantages that might be gained? Is it possible to trust profit driven pharmaceutical and chemical companies to make decisions that will protect the environment and society?

Stating of the ethical issues

Is it ethical to mix embryonic cells of humans with other animals to create a mixed animal-human species?

Is it ethical to genetically engineer headless animals specifically for organ and cell transplants? Is the creation of headless humans ethical?

Is it ethical to alter genetic makeup to create “perfect” children?

Is it ethical to prevent scientific research that could lead to cures for terrible diseases or solutions to world hunger?

Problems to ponder

Will genetic engineering lead to a widening in the gap between the “haves” and the “have-nots” in society, since people with the financial resources could ensure superior characteristics for their children? Will this lead to an increase in class conflict?

Homelessness

In recent years a new social problem has appeared in America. Hundreds of thousands, maybe even millions, of people have no place to live. They survive on the streets, sleeping in cardboard boxes or plastic trash bags. They are poor, often physically ill, sometimes drug or alcohol addicted and always socially isolated.

Framing the question

Do people have a right to be homeless if they want to? And, if so, what legitimate rights do they have to use the public spaces in towns and cities? What is the balance between the rights of these homeless people to live in public places and the rights of the community to be free from the nuisance and sometimes crime they cause? Can the community push these people out in the name of protecting the public welfare?

Stating of the ethical issues

Is it right to punish a person for a condition he or she can't control? Are poverty and homelessness involuntary conditions or do the homeless often choose to be homeless?

Does the community have the right to set standards of public behavior that restrict the ability of the homeless people to eat, sleep and relax in public places?

Problems and to ponder

Is it possible for some people to prefer being homeless on the street among other homeless friends to living alone in a shabby rooming house?

Is most homelessness caused by addictions to drugs, alcohol or gambling?

What is the relationship of homelessness to mental illness?

Is homelessness an acceptable "lifestyle" that should take its place as part of American diversity?

Human Cloning

Since the successful cloning, in Scotland, of Dolly the sheep, the chances for human cloning in the near future have greatly increased.

Framing the question

Most people believe that there is a vast difference between cloning animals and cloning human beings. They see only negatives from human cloning, and argue that such identical copies would not be truly human. Visions of armies of robotic clones being turned out of laboratory test tubes is repulsive to many who say there are no ethical reasons to clone a human being.

Stating the ethical issues

Is it ethical to go forward with a scientific experiment when the outcome is unknown, and when it may be a disastrous mutation or otherwise lead to suffering?

Is it possible to clone a child without wanting that baby to become a predetermined kind of adult? Wouldn't this often lead to parents using their children to further their own desires?

Can a cloned child be psychologically normal knowing that he or she is an identical copy of someone else?

Is it ethical to outlaw cloning, and thereby take away a person's right to reproduce by any means he or she chooses?

Problems to ponder

Who are the actual parents of a cloned baby? Isn't the clone actually a twin of the person from whom it was cloned? Wouldn't this mean that the clone's parents are the same as the parents of the person being cloned? Doesn't this confuse and undermine the traditional family structure?

Would it be ethical to create a clone for the purpose of obtaining perfectly matched organs for transplants?

Legalization of Drugs

Is it right for society through the government to restrict people's freedom to use drugs?

Framing the question

Many people today believe that drugs are a root cause of crime, and that drugs can completely undermine the stability of the society. They say that only prohibition can work, and that the legalization of drugs will only lead to a massive increase in drug use, and to the problems associated with this. Others argue that it's actually the enforcement of these laws that creates a criminal environment and leads to the problems.

Stating the ethical issues

Does the society have an ethical obligation to protect people from themselves? If so, how far can society go? What is the balance between the freedom of the individual, and the rights of society to protect itself? Does it do any good either for the individual or for society to enforce the prohibition against drug use?

Problems to ponder

If drug use would increase due to legalization would it also lead to a reduction in alcohol and tobacco use and thereby offset the harm?

Do drug laws drive up the price of drugs and thereby force drug users into committing crimes?

Do drug laws generate violence by promoting gangs?

Do drug laws cause death from poisonous drugs and overdoses by forcing drug users to use unregulated drugs ?

Do drug laws cause death by creating an environment where dirty needles spread the AIDS virus?

Do drug laws create an environment that leads to the corruption a law enforcement officials?

Does the enforcement of drug laws lead to disregard for individual civil and human rights by law-enforcement officials?

School Prayer

Does the Constitution prevent students from praying in school?

Framing the question

Should the schools be allowed to start the day with a prayer if the students and teachers want to and the community agrees? This question has sparked a long debate in America because the Supreme Court has said no. Many people don't understand this, and argue that the Constitution guarantees people this right. While many others say the opposite, that the Constitution forbids it.

Stating the ethical issues

How far can government go in limiting the freedom of one person to protect the freedom of another?

The Constitution says that all citizens are guaranteed the "free exercise of religion." Doesn't this mean that the government can't stop praying in schools?

The Constitution says that there must be a "separation of church and state." The government runs schools. Doesn't this mean that any religious activity must be outlawed in schools?

Is there a difference between prayer, which is an official part of the school program, and prayer done privately by individuals?

Problems to ponder

If the prayers cannot be used to start the day, is it OK to have a moment of silence? What did the Supreme Court say? What do you think?

Can individual students pray in the school if they do it on their own? What did the Supreme Court say? What do you think?

Can religious holidays like Christmas be celebrated in school? What did the Supreme Court say? What do you think?

