

Indian River State College

INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS

PHI 2630

Instructor: Elliot D. Cohen, Ph.D.

Office: R204 (Main Campus)

Voice: 772-462-7680

E-Mail: ecohen@irsc.edu

[Home](#)

[Text](#)

[Syllabus](#)

[Learning Outcomes](#)

[Term Paper/Research Project](#)

[Selected Media Sources](#) for Term Paper

Required Text:

TEXTBOOK: Lewis Vaughn, *Doing Ethics* Second Edition (Custom Edition)

Syllabus & Reading Assignments

Part 1: Theories and Concepts of Ethics

[STUDY GUIDE FOR EXAM 1](#)

Ch. 1: Ethics and the Examined Life;

Ch. 4: The Power of Moral Theories;
Ch. 5: Consequentialist Theories: Maximizing the Good;
Ch.6: Non-Consequentialist Theories: Do Your Duty;
Ch. 7: Virtue Ethics: Be a Good Person

Readings: Mill, pp. 94-99; Kant, pp. 114-122; Aristotle, Baier pp. 142-158

Online Resources:

[Ethical Theories](#) (From E. Cohen & Gale S. Cohen, Ch. 1, The

Virtuous Therapist, Wadsworth 1999)

[Applied Ethics](#)

Kantian Ethics:

[Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals](#) (e-text)

Utilitarianism:

John Stuart Mill [Utilitarianism](#) (e-text)

Jeremy Bentham [Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation](#) (e-text)

Virtue Ethics

Aristotle [Nicomachean Ethics](#) (e-text)

Care Ethics

Heinz's Dilemma <http://virtual.park.uga.edu/cdesmet/eng101/heintz.htm>

Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development

<http://www.xenodochy.org/ex/lists/moraldev.html>

Critical Thinking: <http://www.philosophy.unimelb.edu.au/reason/critical/textbooks.html>

Part II: Contemporary Moral Problems

1. Euthanasia and Suicide

[STUDY GUIDE FOR EXAM 2](#)

Ch. 9: Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide

Readings: Rachels (239), Williams (243)

[The Criteria of Death](#)

[The Uniform Determination of Death Act \(1981\)](#)

Black's Law Dictionary Definition of Death:

"total stoppage of the circulation of the blood, and a cessation of the animal and vital functions consequent thereon, such as respiration, pulsation, etc."

[Redefining Death](#)

[Living Wills](#) (Florida Statute Ch. 765 Health Care Advance Directives)

[Permitting Suicide in Mental Health](#) (Cohen, Model Rules)

Permitting Suicide in Philosophical Counseling: <http://www.aspcp.org/ijpp/cohen.pdf>

[ACA Code rule on permitted suicide](#)

Case Presentations

[Oregon Death with Dignity Act](#)

[Recent Developments in Physician-Assisted Suicide](#)

[2006 Supreme Court Decision on Oregon Law \(NY Times Article\)](#)

[In Re Karen Quinlan](#)

2. Lawyers' Ethics

Pure Legal Advocates and Moral Agents (Appendix 1)

[A Reply from Memory And Ross](#)

[Pure legal Advocates and Moral Agents Revisited: A Reply to Memory and Ross](#) (PDF Format)

[Pure Legal Advocates and Moral Agents Revisited: A Reply to Memory and Ross](#) (MS Word Format)

[A Final Response from Memory and Ross](#)

In Defense of a Rapist (Wasserman) (Appendix 1)

American Bar Association, Model Rules http://www.abanet.org/cpr/mrpc/mrpc_toc.html (updated version)

<http://www2.law.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/foliocgi.exe/ModelRules/> (2001 version predates recent House of Delegates changes)

American Bar Association, Code of Professional Responsibility (1969)

http://www2.law.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/foliocgi.exe/Mdlcpr/query=*/doc/%7Bt2%7D/pageitems=%7Bbody%7D

Florida Bar Association Regulations

<http://www.flabar.org/>

In-Class Debate

3. HIV and Professional Confidentiality

Cohen, Lethal Sex: Conditions of Disclosure in Counseling Sexually (Appendix 2)

[Cohen, Confidentiality, Third Party Harm, & Clients who have HIV](#)

[Legal Case: Tarasoff v. the University of California Board of Regents](#)

Codes of Ethics: : <http://www.counseling.org/resources/ethics.htm#ce>

Laws:

[Florida's Disclosure of Confidential Information Statute:](#)

Florida's Statute on Confidentiality and Privileged Communication

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=Ch0491/SEC0147.HTM&Title=->2002->Ch0491->Section%200147

State Conviction Laws

<http://www.thebody.com/apla/may00/law.html>

Court Cases:

<http://www.ama-assn.org/special/hiv/library/readroom/other98/alp2.htm#c49>

Professional Associations' views:

<http://www.safersex.org/news/focus.dutytowarn.html#reading>

HIV Partner Counseling and Referral Services (US Dept. of Health & Human Services)

<http://216.239.51.100/search?q=cache:Y-5yBpB9JQUC:www.cdc.gov/hiv/pubs/pers.pdf+%22Guide+to+Public+Health+Practice:+HIV+Partner+Notification+Strategies%22&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>

In-Class Debate

4. Sexual Morality

Ch. 12: Sexual Morality and Marriage

Readings: Scruton, Goldman, Mohr

[Paraphilias \(Sexual Disorders\)](#)

Case presentations

5. Terrorism & Civil Liberties

Ch. 17: Terrorism and Torture

Readings: Luban, Dershowitz

[Patriot Act](#)

[Wire Tapping and the War on Terrorism](#) (New York Times)

Media Issues

[Selected Media Sources](#)

Media Propaganda

[Prepackaged News](#) (New York Times)

[Covert News](#) (LA Times)

Internet Freedom

[Web of Deceit](#)

[Legal Reform](#)

6. Abortion

Ch. 8: Abortion

Readings: Noonan, Thomson, & Warren

[Fetal Homicide Laws](#)

COURSE OBJECTIVES

This course teaches traditional ethical theories and methods of ethical analysis as applied to several contemporary moral/social problems.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Students are required to do all assigned readings, take notes, and be prepared to respond in class to all review/discussion questions or case analysis questions contained in each assigned chapter in the required text. Note that chapters 1-7 and the appendix readings in the required text have review and discussion questions whereas the other assigned chapters each present three cases followed by case analysis questions. Students are expected to do all three sets of case analysis questions in each assigned chapter.

Examinations:

There will be three or four unit examinations. Each Examination will count equally and will be graded according to the following grading scale:

A = 90 - 100

B = 80 - 89

C = 70 - 79

D = 60 - 69

F = 50 - 59

Class Participation and Attendance:

Class participation, good attendance, and written work are considerations in determining final grades in borderline cases. For these purposes, a borderline case will be defined as no more than one percentage point less than the next grade category (for example, 79% or 89%). Excessive absences can affect final grades (see attendance policy for details).

Term paper/research project (counts 20% of final grade):

Students will be required to do original Internet research to find a story that has not received adequate mainstream media attention, and which raises, or has the potential to raise, an "ethical problem" for the American people. For purposes of this assignment, such a problem can be any issue that can have a significant negative impact on the welfare, interests, or needs of the American people, for example, stories related to government, corporations, the military, medical research, the energy problem, and health care.

There are many independent news sources that can found online, which cover stories that are not covered or not sufficiently covered by the main stream media. These sources are listed on the Project Censored and can be found here:

[Selected Media Sources](#)

This assignment has two parts: Part 1 of this assignment involves conducting media research to find a story as described above, vetting the story (checking it for accuracy and credibility), and writing a 200-300 word synopsis of the story. Part 2 involves writing a 700-800 word paper providing an ethical analysis of the ethical problem raised by the story.

Part 1: Research, Vetting, and Synopsis of Story

The first part of this assignment will be undertaken according to the guidelines established by Project Censored at Sonoma State University. Project Censored is a 32-year-old, student-driven research project which publishes annual reports of the top 25 news stories each year that have been neglected by mainstream media. This yearbook is distributed to major bookstores throughout the United States including Barnes & Nobles and Borders. The Project was previously conducted by students and faculty at Sonoma State University in California but is now a national research project. This class will partake in this national search. [Details for conducting the research can be obtained here.](#)

The following provides a general outline of the process:

Students in class search independent and foreign news sources for important news stories not covered in the US corporate media. Stories are reviewed in class and prioritized for importance to the American people.

Students research the prioritized news stories for coverage in the US corporate media using the following databases (if available) Lexis-Nexis, Proquest, Google, and Factiva.

News stories not covered by US corporate media are vetted by campus faculty or community experts for accuracy and credibility.

News stories rated as accurate, credible and not covered by the corporate media are candidates for submission to the annual Project Censored vote process.

Submissions: Classes would nominate 10 or more news stories by January 1, 2009 (early nominations encouraged)

Nominations are to be submitted electronically as 200-300 word summaries of the news story with direct links to the original source URL. Summaries should include the names and contact information of the student researchers, and faculty/expert evaluators.

All nominations will be posted on the Project Censored interactive website www.projectcensored.org for comment and review prior to the final vote in March 2009.

All class participants and faculty/community evaluators would be eligible to vote on-line in March for final selection of the top 25 most important censored news stories to be published in the Censored 2010 yearbook (Fall 2009).

The names of all students and faculty participating would be listed in the acknowledgments of the annual yearbook. Personal attributions for those individuals whose stories make the final list would also be published.

Project Censored seeks to honor all nominations fairly, but reserves the right to do final edits, mergers, and analysis.

Part 2: Analysis of Story

Once the student has reached, vetted, and synopsised his or her story, the student will write a 700-800 word paper analyzing it.

Here are some questions to consider in writing the paper: What is the ethical problem/s raised by the story? Why is it an ethical problem? How would different ethical approaches (utilitarianism, Kantian ethics, care-based ethics, virtue ethics) address the problem? What, if any, codes of ethics have been violated? Were there any conflicts of interest involved—for example, someone on the board of an oil company setting energy policy? Were there any violations of public trust of government, media, or other public institutions? What ethical concepts were called into question? For example, was there informed consent? Was there deception, manipulation, violation of rights, physical harm, emotional harm, malicious intentions?

For example, in 1998-2000, [Bayer CropScience](#) paid 16 students £450 each to consume a dangerous pesticide. Why was this unethical? How might Kant's "Categorical Imperative" be applied to this case? These students were in need of the money; so was their consent to the experiment really freely given or was it coerced? Should a person be permitted to "consent" to such dangerous experiments or should there be laws that forbid such experiments regardless of such consent. What would codes of human experimentation such as the Nuremberg Code say about this? What is the role of the media in reporting this story?

In October, 2003, under pressure from CropScience and other giants in the insecticide industry, the [Environmental Protection Agency](#) (EPA) announced that it intended to conduct experiments that would test insecticides on children ages 0 to 3 years in Jacksonville Florida. The EPA accepted \$2 million from the industry for the experiments, which were designed to determine how much exposure a child could have before it became toxic. This would apparently have allowed the industry to increase levels of toxicity and thereby to increase the effectiveness of their product. The families targeted were poor families, and they were offered \$970 each plus a camcorder, a T-shirt, and a framed certificate of appreciation. They were not given information about the risks of exposure to the chemicals in question. While the EPA announced its intentions to conduct the experiments in October 2003, the Washington Post did not cover the story until November 14, 2004. In 2005, plans to conduct the experiments were cancelled. What were the duties of the EPA? Was there any violation of public trust? What ethical principles were violated by these experiments? What does this say about the role of the mainstream media in protecting the public? Did the media do its job in this case?

Along the above lines, in writing term papers students are expected to provide careful philosophical analysis of the problems at hand and to argue convincingly for their conclusions. They should pay careful attention to analyzing and defining key notions, examine questionable assumptions, look for inconsistencies or double standards, provide evidence for their own positions, and defend their positions against opposing viewpoints or possible objections.

Students who plagiarize their papers will fail the course.

You may elect to use any consistent style sheet (APA, MLA, etc.). The paper should be typed, doubled spaced and (if sent as an e-mail attachment) saved as an MS Word document or an RTF (rich text format) file. Word count should be no less than 700 words and should not exceed 1000 words. Include a cover paper displaying your name, course number (PHI 2630 A1W), word count, and the title of your story. On the first page, provide your synopsis of the story. Follow the form of the "Sample Synopsis" on the [Project Censored Guidelines](#). On the next page begin your Analysis of the Story.

Grading of Assignment:

The assignment (both parts) will receive a single grade of 4 (=95), 3 (=85), 2 (=75), 1 (=65) based on the following rubric:

Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

by Peter A. Facione. Noreen C. Facione (The California Academic Press, 1994).

4 Consistently does all or almost all of the following:

Accurately interprets evidence. statements. graphics. questions. etc.
Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view.
Draws warranted. judicious. non-fallacious conclusions.
Justifies key results and procedures. explains assumptions and reasons.
Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.

3 Does most or many of the following: .

Accurately interprets evidence. statements. graphics. questions. etc.
Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view.
Draws warranted. non-fallacious conclusions.
Justifies some results or procedures. explains reasons.
Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.

2 Does most or many of the following:

Misinterprets evidence. statements. graphics. questions. etc.
Fails to identify strong. relevant counter-arguments.
Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.
Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions.
Justifies few results or procedures. seldom explains reasons.
Regardless of the evidence or reasons. maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.

1 Consistently does all or almost all of the following:

Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others.
Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.
Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.
Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims.
Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.
Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.
Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.

Plagiarism Policy:

The penalty for plagiarism, broadly construed as submitting for credit the work of others, in whole or part, without due credit to the true author, is a failing grade for the course.

GORDON RULE REQUIREMENT

In fulfillment of the Gordon Rule requirement, students are required to do a substantial amount of writing in this course. Satisfactory completion of the term paper and questions for analysis will satisfy this requirement.

ATTENDANCE POLICY:

Attendance is required. Three (3) unexcused absences will result in the lowering of final grades by one letter grade (10 points). All absences must be documented. Ordinarily, a student will be allowed a maximum of three (3) excused absences.

EXAMINATION MAKE-UP POLICY

Students are encouraged to take exams at the time they are administered in class. With the discretion of the instructor, a student will be permitted to make up no more than one exam. Exams not taken will be given a failing grade.

LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR PHI2630

Upon satisfactory completion of this course, students should be able to do the following:

1. Develop awareness of diverse ethical perspectives.

- Discuss different ethical theories such as utilitarianism, Kantian ethics, care ethics, and virtue ethics
- Discuss different social issues such as abortion, euthanasia, physician assisted suicide, and sexual morality.
- Discuss the legal aspects of such social issues.
- Discuss professional ethics such as those of lawyers and physicians.
- Discuss selected provisions of different professional codes of ethics such as those of lawyers and health care providers.
- Discuss pertinent case law related to professional ethics.
- Discuss the role of key concepts in professional ethics in forming rational ethical decisions such as confidentiality and informed consent.
- Discuss the role of moral principles such as beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice in making moral judgments.

5. Understand and exhibit civic engagement and social responsibility.

- Discuss political issues such as terrorism and civil liberties
- Discuss key legislation related to political issues such as the Patriot Act.
- Discuss provisions of the United States Constitution that are relevant to such key legislation such as the First and Fourth Amendments of the United States Constitution.
- Discuss the role of the media in a democracy.
- Discuss key legislation and case law related to social issues such as Roe v. Wade and the Schiavo Case.

3. Demonstrate tolerance for a wide range of global, social and cultural points of view:

- Discuss how different theories, principles, and rules as applied to the same moral issue can generate alternative ethical perspectives.
- Discuss the ways in which cultural and religious perspectives relate to ethical decision making.
- Demonstrate moral sensitivity to human welfare, interests, and needs by identifying and discussing moral problems in ordinary life contexts.
- Identify and discuss the manner in which prejudice and biases can and has influenced social policy and moral judgment.

2. Apply critical thinking through problem solving:

- Discuss the nature and structure of moral reasoning as it applies to particular moral problems.

- Distinguish between moral positions that are backed by evidence and personal emotional reactions.
- Identify fallacies of moral reasoning such as the slippery slope and blind conformity.
- Use different ethical theories to help clarify a moral problem.
- In class--as part of class discussion or group activity--argue, analyze, critique, and/or debate a particular moral position.
- Write an essay analyzing a moral problem and/or defending a particular moral position.

4. Make use of technology to organize, acquire, and convey information:

- Use a computer, a basic computer operating system, and a word-processing program
- Use an e-mail system to send and receive messages.
- Use the Internet to link to and download course information.
- Use the Internet to research and gather information to form enlightened ethical judgment.