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This course is open to graduate students and to upper-level undergraduate students who have successfully completed a core Perspective V requirement. Students with interest in the special responsibility of government to promote individual and community good are particularly encouraged to enroll.

COURSE GOALS
Through participation in class discussions, collaborative learning exercises, reading, independent research and writing, successful students will
1) gain a more complete understanding of the common moral system;
2) understand the special role and responsibility that government has in promoting the good;
3) appreciate how changes between 21st Century globalism and 17th Century nationalism have affected the role and responsibility of government;
4) understand internal limitations on the role and responsibility of government;
5) develop the analytic skill necessary for understanding different perspectives on important moral discussions of our time;
6) practice determining which actions are morally prohibited, morally required, morally permitted and morally encouraged;
5) demonstrate competence in primary ethics research and analysis;
7) practice listening and discussion skills by using a consensus model.

TEXTS
Gert, Bernard. Common Morality. This is a spiral bound book manuscript that we have the opportunity to use prior to publication. It is available at the bookstore. Or, if you prefer, I will e-mail the manuscript to you and you can print it out yourself.
Various handouts

EVALUATION
Grades will be determined by criteria weighted as follows:
40%: In-class exercises and homework
20%: Paper #1 Problem Identification (3-5 pages)
20%: Paper #2 Case Presentation (5-7 pages)
I expect that you will attend all classes and will prepare reading assignments prior to class. Class periods will include some combination of lecture, large group discussion, small group discussion and case analysis. You may be asked to write short in-class essays in response to reading assignments and class discussion. These essays are intended to sharpen analytic abilities, to help you know what you are thinking and to encourage careful preparation for class discussions. You will also be required to participate in discussions during class time and to be prepared for those conversations. Deadlines are firm (although you may turn in assignments early) and no opportunity will be given to make up work missed due to absence.

The three paper assignments are intended to add up to one well-written analytic paper. The point of writing a paper in three pieces over the semester is to give you the opportunity to take intellectual risk without fear of consequences. Learning requires attempts that sometimes succeed and sometimes fail. I will meet with you individually at least twice (during the weeks of 10/23 and 11/20) to facilitate the process of writing an analytic paper. Papers #1 and #2 with grades less than B must be rewritten before going on to the next stage. This guarantees that you have the data necessary to do analysis (Paper #3).

You may do the paper alone or may collaborate with one partner. I will grade all papers on the same criteria, regardless of how many people contribute to the effort. I know from my own experience that there are benefits and limitations to working alone and benefits and limitations to working with others.

A Note on Consensus and Discourse Ethics
It has recently occurred to me that ethics professors have a special responsibility to promote elements of civil discourse and group decision making. So, for the first time in my teaching, I will be working to facilitate discussions so that the group can move toward consensus. Consensus does not mean that everyone agrees, only that everyone can accept a range of morally permitted options. If you are used to dealing with disagreements and conflicts through argumentation or by simply ignoring the problem (this accounts for most of us), you will find working toward consensus to be a new and challenging approach. Working toward consensus requires excellent listening skills.

Here are some rules for discourse ethics that we will use:
1) Everyone is allowed to participate;
2) Everyone is allowed to express his or her attitudes, desires, needs, beliefs;
3) Everyone is allowed to question any assertion;
4) No one may prevent anyone from exercising 1-3.
These rules, and further explanation of discourse ethics can be found at http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/Cavaller/Forum/meta/background/HaberIntro.html

Other good sources on the process of working toward consensus can be found at http://www.starhawk.org/activism/consensus.html and http://www.co-intelligence.org/P-consensus.html.

**Protection of Human Subjects**
As you will be conducting primary ethics research, you will probably be collecting data that involves human participation. Research involving human participants is required, by Federal law, to have approval from the institution’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). I have sent a Research Methods Course Form to IRB for approval. This should cover most of your projects.

However, unless you have prior and separate approval from me (and from the IRB), you may not use human participants in your study who are under 18 years of age. You may not use material that is not provided to you voluntarily by the relevant human participant. If information disclosed in the interview could be reasonably predicted to place the human participant at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to that person’s financial standing or employability or if the research deals with sensitive aspects about the person’s own behavior, or if intended participants are members of a vulnerable population, a separate IRB request will need to be submitted for your project. It should be evident from your abstract (due) if a separate IRB request needs to be prepared before your project can move forward. Regardless, I will review and approve human participants, interview questions and data collection techniques.

**A FINAL NOTE**
I am concerned about meeting the special needs of individuals. If you require some accommodation or if you are simply not comfortable with the teaching/learning style, I encourage you to discuss that with me.

**Weekly Schedule**

**Week I**  9/4  Introduction to class, methods  
**Research Ethics**

**Week II**  9/9  Government and Liberty  
**LEARNING GOALS DUE**

*Reading Assignment:*
  Review Mill & Taylor, *Utilitarianism*
  and *On Liberty*
  LoFollette, Hugh, "Licensing Parents" (handout)
  Gert, Bernard, *Common Morality*, Part II, pp 46-57 (begin
with Morality as an Informal Public System)
Gert, Bernard, Chapter 14, Morality and Society (handout)

9/11 Government and Liberty, continued

Week III
9/16 finalization of course topics/reading and research marathon
PEC Presents

9/18 NO CLASS – INDEPENDENT READING/RESEARCH

Week IV
9/23 Systematic Moral Analysis
ABSTRACT DUE
Schedule tutorials
Reading Assignment:
Gert, Bernard, Common Morality, entire manuscript

9/25 NO CLASS – PROJECT TUTORIALS

Week V
9/30 The War on Terrorism and Patriotism
ABSTRACT DUE
Reading Assignment:
Elliott, Deni, "Terrorism, Global Journalism and the Myth of the Nation-State" (handout)
Frey, R.G. & Christopher Morris, "Terrorism"
Wolfe, Alan, "Moral Freedom or Moral Anarchy?" (handout)
(many other readings to come)

10/2 continued

Week VI
10/7 Government and Education
Reading Assignment
Wisconsin v. Yoder (handout)
(C/K) Part I, School Vouchers
PEC Presents

10/9 Continued

Week VII
10/14 Government and The Good Life – Health
Reading Assignment
PAPER #1 DUE

10/16 Continued
Week VIII 10/21 Government and The Good Life – Arts
Reading Assignment
   (C/K) Part II, Government Support of the Arts
Schedule Tutorials
PEC Presents

10/23 NO Class – PAPER #1 TUTORIALS

Week IX 10/28 Government and Censorship – Pornography and Dangerous Materials
Reading Assignment
   (C/K) Part III, Pornography and the Law

10/30 Continued

Week X 11/4 Government and Limitations on Liberty – Drugs
Reading Assignment
   (C/K) Part V, Drug Legislation
   Szasz, “The Ethics of Addiction: An Argument in Favor of Letting Americans Take Any Drug They Want.” (handout)
   Shapiro, “Addiction and Drug Policy.” (handout)
PEC Presents

11/6 continued

Week XI 11/11 NO CLASS – VETERAN’S DAY

11/13 Government and Limitations on Liberty – Guns
Reading Assignment
   (C/K) Part VI, Gun Control

   PAPER #2 DUE

Week XII 11/18 Killing and Allowing to Die – Death Penalty and PAS
Reading Assignment
   (C/K) Part VII, Death Penalty
   (many other readings)
PEC Presents

11/20 continued

Week XIII 11/25 continued
11/27 No CLASS – THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY

Week XIV 12/2 Justice and Equity – Affirmative Action
Reading Assignment
(C/K) Part IX, Affirmative Action
PEC Presents

12/4 continued

Week XV 12/9 TBA
12/11 TBA

Week XVI EXAM WEEK Tuesday, December 17 8-10 a.m.

PAPER #3 DUE