Chapter 2
What Good Is a Set of Principles?

In law a man is guilty when he violates the rights of others.
In ethics he is guilty if he only thinks of doing so

– Immanuel Kant

Learning Objectives

Good business ethics should be a part of every business. There are many factors to consider. When a company does business with another that is considered unethical, does this make the first company unethical by association? Some people would say yes, the first business has a responsibility and it is now a link in the chain of unethical businesses. If a company does not adhere to business ethics and breaks the laws, they usually end up being fined. Many companies have broken antitrust, ethical, and environmental laws and received fines worth millions. The problem is that the amount of money these companies are making outweighs the fines applied. Billion dollar profits blind the companies to their lack of business ethics, and the dollar sign wins.

There are many tools for decision making, but few (secular) guides to indicate when situations might have an ethical implication. Yet this awareness is a crucial first step before decisions are made. Recognizing the moral context of a situation must precede any attempt to resolve it. Otherwise, what's to resolve? Ethical dilemmas rarely present themselves as such. They usually pass us by before we know it or develop so gradually that we can only recognize them in hindsight – a little like noticing the snake after you've been bitten. But what are the signs that a snake might be present? An ethical framework is like a "snake detector."

   We offer the following principles as landmarks – generic indicators to be used as compelling guides for an active conscience. They are NOT absolute rules or values. They are more like a rough measurement where an exact one is not possible. They often conflict with each other in practice, and some will trump others under certain circumstances. But as principles that need to be considered, they appear constant. These principles are compatible with the argument that we should simply follow our

intuition and rely on the "inner voice." However, that voice is not always audible, and today's society presents a wide range of complex circumstances that require more guidance than simply "concern for others" or "does it feel right?" And so these principles are offered effectively as a more detailed reference.

In a sense, the principles are outcomes of the mother of all principles – unconditional love and compassion – which appears in virtually all faiths and is expressed here as "concern for the well-being of others." (This principle is at the heart of the stakeholder model of ethics, i.e., what is my impact on others?) At first glance, they will appear obvious and perhaps trite or simplistic. Keep in mind that they are meant to be practical rather than groundbreaking and that many people have found them useful in the absence of other guides. The principles have been organized into three categories for ease of use: personal, professional, and global ethics.

2.1   Principles of Personal Ethics

Personal ethics might also be called morality, since they reflect general expectations of any person in any society, acting in any capacity. These are the principles we try to instill in our children and expect of one another without needing to articulate the expectation or formalize it in any way.

Principles of personal ethics include:

1. Concern for the well-being of others
2. Respect for the autonomy of others
3. Trustworthiness and honesty
4. Willing compliance with the law (with the exception of civil disobedience)
5. Basic justice; being fair
6. Refusing to take unfair advantage
7. Benevolence: doing good
8. Preventing harm

2.2   Principles of Professional Ethics

Individuals acting in a professional capacity take on an additional burden of ethical responsibility. For example, professional associations have codes of ethics that prescribe required behavior within the context of a professional practice such as medicine, law, accounting, or engineering. These written codes provide rules of conduct and standards of behavior based on the principles of professional ethics, which include:

1. Impartiality; objectivity
2. Openness; full disclosure
3. Confidentiality
4. Due diligence/duty of care

5. Fidelity to professional responsibilities
6. Avoiding potential or apparent conflict of interest

Even when not written into a code, principles of professional ethics are usually expected of people in business, employees, volunteers, elected representatives, and so on.

2.3   Principles of Global Ethics

Global ethics are the most controversial of the three categories and the least understood. Open to wide interpretation as to how or whether they should be applied, these principles can sometimes generate emotional response and heated debate.

Principles of global ethics include:

1. Global justice (as reflected in international laws)
2. Society before self/social responsibility
3. Environmental stewardship
4. Interdependence and responsibility for the "whole"
5. Reverence for place

Each of us influences the world by simply existing, and it is always wise to "think globally." An added measure of accountability is placed on globally influential enterprises such as governments and transnational corporations. (Responsibility comes with power whether we accept it or not.) One of the burdens of leadership is to influence society and world affairs in a positive way. Can a person, nation, or company truly be "successful" while causing human suffering or irreparable environmental damage? A more modern and complete model of success also considers impact on humanity and the earth's ecology.

2.4   Coexistence of Principles

Principles can only provide guidance. There are a myriad of situations that will never lend themselves to an easy formula, and the principles can only be used to trigger our conscience or guide our decisions. (As stated earlier, they are also useful for ethics education.)

It is important to note that principles of personal ethics are the first checkpoint in any situation, often overriding those at the professional and global levels. For example, when judging if a corporation has been socially responsible, we still need to consider principles of personal ethics as prerequisites. Contributions to charities and the like (doing good) may appear to be in the interests of society, but loses its significant if the corporation has not also taken responsibility to minimize the damage done by their core business operations (preventing harm). Similarly, trustworthiness is fundamental to professionalism and so on.

As well, there are many times when principles will collide with other principles. Let's say you are a scientist who has been coerced by a corrupt military dictatorship into designing a biological weapon. Since the project is top secret, you have a professional duty to maintain confidentiality. But if there were an opportunity to inform United Nations observers, global and personal principles would justify divulging confidential information to protect the overall good of humanity. (Compare this to selling confidential information for personal gain.)

Still, the scientist is faced with a tough decision since they or their family could be harmed as a result of the whistle blowing. This is where the principles must be viewed in the context of universality.

2.5 Principles Versus Absolute Rules and Universality

It is tempting to apply these principles selectively, or only within set boundaries, such as next-of-kin, countrymen, race, gender, etc. This is called cronyism. For example, I'm half Sicilian and also related to Gypsies. The Mafia will engage in despicable acts but has a rigid code of honor within their own "family." Trustworthiness is highly valued, and they have a strong (but perverse) sense of justice. Many a Gypsy will have no qualms about picking your pocket, but would never pick mine since I'm a relative. Limiting the application of ethical principles negates their value. They must *all* be applied to *everyone*.

There are also selective violations of the principles that society considers acceptable. Murder is illegal, unless we are fighting a (just) war. Lying is wrong, unless we are telling a child about Santa Claus or saving them from harm, and so on. These interpretive variations cause people to conclude that there are no universal standards for ethics and that moral responsibility is relative to cultural practices. This is a dangerous conclusion that relieves us of any responsibility other than what we choose in our own interests and what has been dictated by the rules of our faiths or governments, our personal values, or the local status quo.

As generic principles, these can be practiced in many different ways. For example, virtually all cultures value trustworthiness, but they have different views on truth telling. This is illustrated by Eastern vs. Western preferred values for harmony vs. forthrightness. An Asian being polite to maintain friendly relations may be perceived by an American as deceitful, although that is not the case. Both cultures agree in principle that deceit is unethical and trustworthiness is ethical, but misunderstandings can arise when the underlying principle is embodied in diverse ways that reflect different cultural values and virtues.

Morality can never be distilled into a universally acceptable list of absolute rules (even killing can be justified, viz., a sniper who refuses to negotiate). These principles are simply recurring patterns of ethically responsible behavior that our conscience can use as landmarks.

2.6 Qualifiers

It is important to understand that these principles are not the result of scholarly research, have not been proven in any way by empirical data or rigorous philosophical debate, and are not presented as an authoritative or complete list. In honoring the (professional) principle of full disclosure, I must state that I have no qualification as an ethicist. I created this framework primarily for my own use in business, where I found it difficult to get a clear idea of how ethics related to my everyday work. Like most business people, I had no time to study philosophy or theology in depth and simply needed a quick reference tool.

The framework is intended to be acceptable to anyone, anywhere, and from any walk of life. I have personally tested it on audiences from diverse backgrounds, with opposing objectives, people at both ends of the political spectrum, in small and large groups, etc. In every case I asked for feedback on any principles that might be objectionable, inappropriate, or unclear. (The "reverence for place" principle serves to test for shyness since it is not an obvious one, especially to Western audiences.) With one minor modification, the framework has so far stood the test of over a thousand people attending talks and seminars. I hope to refine it further through feedback on this document (http://www.ethics.ubc.ca/papers/invited/colero.html).

The history of business ethics is probably as old as business itself. Even in prehistoric societies there were most likely rules governing acceptable trade practices. Certainly the oldest known written legal code, the Code of Hammurabi (1700s BC), dealt considerably with issues concerning commerce, tariffs, and pricing.

Similarly, the laws of the Old Testament, including the Ten Commandments (approximately 1500 BC), applied moral rules to commercial activity.

By the fourth century BC, ethical issues related to business and trade had begun to receive academic treatment in the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. Plato's preoccupation with justice and morality in such works as the "Republic" often had significant implications for trade and commerce.

Aristotle directly addressed the morality of economic relations and responsibilities in his discussions of household management in his "Politics."

Throughout the Middle Ages, the Christian doctrines of the Catholic Church governed much of moral and legal considerations of commerce, though little systematic development of such ideas occurred.

In the thirteenth century AD, Thomas Aquinas considered some issues of borrowing and usury and reiterated much of Aristotle's discussion of these issues in light of church doctrine. Still, even Aquinas was somewhat inconsistent in his philosophical positions about such matters.

The history of business ethics also has its formative years in the reformation. Reformation figures like Martin Luther and John Calvin, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries AD, applied religious and moral considerations to trade and economics leading to the development of the Protestant work ethics. But in the

following two centuries, Enlightenment thinkers such as John Locke and Adam Smith began to separate religious doctrine from moral and ethical considerations of commerce and business.

Locke introduced the concept of property as a natural right, and Smith developed the foundation for modern economic theory by championing the moral value of self-interest in guiding and promoting the progress of markets. In the nineteenth century, theories like Smith's came under attack from Karl Marx and his followers, who saw the maximization of profit dictated by self-interest as necessarily exploitative of labor.

To this day, many of the issues and concerns raised by the religious, philosophical, and economic traditions have continued in various forms in discussions of ethics and morality in business practices. But business ethics as a separate, formal academic discipline is a fairly recent development.

In the midst of the changes in social attitudes that emerged in the 1960s, questions about the social and moral responsibilities of businesses and corporations began to emerge in academic and professional circles. Sociologist Raymond Baumhart was among the first academics to explicitly teach and study the ethics of business and commerce in the 1960s, and by 1974 there was enough of a developing discipline in the field to give rise to a landmark conference at the University of Kansas.

Since then, courses and organized studies in the field have emerged in universities throughout the world, even spawning subdisciplines such as marketing, accounting, and finance ethics. Meanwhile, noted theorists and academicians such as Norman Bowie, John Rawls, and Thomas Donaldson have made important contributions to the legitimization of the field as an academic discipline in its own right.

Today, the history of business ethics has led to an established area of theory and practice in both the professional and academic worlds. Many of the same issues considered since the earliest writings on the subject, some four thousand years ago, remain just as relevant today as ever (http://www.practical-business-ethics.com/history-of-business-ethics.html).

Aristotle was the most practical and business oriented of all philosophers who asked ethical questions. You may stop at the idea that a person who's been dead for nearly 2,400 years has anything practical to say about modern organizations. But Aristotle remains relevant because he is particularly interested in defining principles in terms of the ethics of leadership.

In his *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle concludes that the role of the leader is to create the environment in which all members of an organization have the opportunity to realize their own potential. He says that the ethical role of the leader is not to enhance his or her power but to create the conditions under which followers can achieve their potential (http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/submitted/otoole/business-ethics-aristotle.html).

Normative ethical systems can generally be broken down into three categories: deontological, teleological, and virtue ethics. The first two are considered deontic or action-based theories of morality because they focus entirely upon the actions which a person performs. When actions are judged morally right based upon their

consequences, we have teleological or consequentialist-ethical theory. When actions are judged morally right based upon how well they conform to some set of duties, we have a deontological ethical theory.

Whereas these first two systems focus on the question "What should I do?," the third asks an entirely different question: "What sort of person should I be?" With this we have a virtue-based ethical theory – it doesn't judge actions as right or wrong but rather the character of the person doing the actions. The person, in turn, makes moral decisions based upon which actions would make one a good person.

2.6.1   Deontology and Ethics

Deontological moral systems are characterized primarily by a focus upon adherence to independent moral rules or duties. Thus, in order to make the correct moral choices, we simply have to understand what our moral duties are and what correct rules exist which regulate those duties. When we follow our duty, we are behaving morally. When we fail to follow our duty, we are behaving immorally.

2.6.2   Teleology and Ethics

Teleological moral systems are characterized primarily by a focus on the consequences which any action might have (for that reason, they are often referred to as consequentialist moral systems, and both terms are used here). Thus, in order to make correct moral choices, we have to have some understanding of what will result from our choices. When we make choices which result in the correct consequences, then we are acting morally; when we make choices which result in the incorrect consequences, then we are acting immorally.

2.6.3   Virtue Ethics

Virtue-based ethical theories place much less emphasis on which rules people should follow and instead focus on helping people develop good character traits, such as kindness and generosity. These character traits will, in turn, allow a person to make the correct decisions later on in life. Virtue theorists also emphasize the need for people to learn how to break bad habits of character, like greed or anger. These are called vices and stand in the way of becoming a good person (http://atheism.about.com/library/FAQs/phil/blfaq_phileth_sys.htm).

Kant begins his little book *The Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* by praising a goodwill: "Nothing in the world can possibly be conceived which could be called good without qualification except a good will." He proceeds to argue that power, health,

wealth, intelligence, wit, judgment, and other qualities are only conditionally good. What is needed to complete these qualities is a goodwill. For even a villain can have intelligence, sound judgment, and the rest. Osama bin Laden and Adolf Hitler could be described as intelligent; they cannot be described as having the requisite goodwill or character needed to make proper use of such gifts. A will is good, Kant says, not because of what it achieves. It is good solely because of its willing. In other words, it must be "good in itself" without regard for consequences. To illustrate his notion of a goodwill, he compares the morality of two merchants.

The merchants in question perform the same action by giving the correct change to their customers. Suppose you find out that one gave the correct change because he didn't want to suffer a bad reputation by cheating customers. Suppose further that the other gave the correct change because he thought it was his moral duty to do so. Which merchant's action had moral worth? Only the action done from a motive of duty had moral worth. The other action revealed a selfish concern with one's own business reputation and thus possesses no moral worth. Thus, for Kant actions leading to identical consequences do not have the same moral worth. The goodness of an action has everything to do with its motive (Kant calls it a "maxim") and nothing to do with what the action produces.

2.6.3.1   Acting from Duty: The Categorical Imperative

An agent acting from duty acts with respect for the moral law, according to Kant. This is the only attribute of a goodwill. Kant's basic moral principle is "Act according to that maxim which you can at the same time will to become a universal law." This is his famed categorical imperative.

It has also been called his universality principle. It requires that we act in a manner that we would will everyone to act. He gives four illustrations of duties to show how the imperative applies.

Deontological moral systems typically stress the reasons why certain actions are performed. Simply following the correct moral rules is often not sufficient; instead, we have to have the correct motivations. This might allow a person to not be considered immoral even though they have broken a moral rule, but only so long as they were motivated to adhere to some correct moral duty.

Nevertheless, a correct motivation alone is never a justification for an action in a deontological moral system and cannot be used as a basis for describing an action as morally correct. It is also not enough to simply believe that something is the correct duty to follow. Duties and obligations must be determined objectively and absolutely, not subjectively. There is no room in deontological systems of subjective feelings; on the contrary, most adherents condemn subjectivism and relativism in all their forms.

Perhaps the most significant thing to understand about deontological moral systems is that their moral principles are completely separated from any consequences which following those principles might have. Thus, if you have a moral duty not to lie, then lying is always wrong – even if that results in harm to others. For example, you would be acting immorally if you lied to Nazis about where Jews were hiding.

The word deontology comes from the Greek roots *deon*, which means duty, and *logos*, which means science. Thus, deontology is the "science of duty." Key questions which deontological ethical systems ask include:

1. What is my moral duty?
2. What are my moral obligations?
3. How do I weigh one moral duty against another?

2.7   Types of Deontological Ethics

Some examples of deontological ethical theories:

Divine Command: The most common forms of deontological moral theories are those which derive their set of moral obligations from a god. According to many Christians, for example, an action is morally correct whenever it is in agreement with the rules and duties established by God.

Duty Theories: An action is morally right if it is in accord with some list of duties and obligations.

Rights Theories: An action is morally right if it adequately respects the rights of all humans. This is also sometimes referred to as Libertarianism, the political philosophy that people should be legally free to do whatever they wish so long as their actions do not impinge upon the rights of others.

Contractarianism: An action is morally right if it is in accordance with the rules that rational moral agents would agree to observe upon entering into a social relationship (contract) for mutual benefit. This is also sometimes referred to as Contractualism.

Monistic Deontology: An action is morally right if it agrees with some single deontological principle which guides all other subsidiary principles.

2.8   What Business Could Address

When business people speak about "business ethics," they usually mean one of three things:

1. Avoid breaking the criminal law in one's work-related activity.
2. Avoid action that may result in civil lawsuits against the company.
3. Avoid actions that are bad for the company image. Businesses are especially concerned with these three things since they involve loss of money and company reputation.

In theory, a business could address these three concerns by assigning corporate attorneys and public relations experts to escort employees on their daily activities. Anytime an employee might stray from the straight and narrow path of

acceptable conduct, the experts would guide him back. Obviously this solution would be a financial disaster if carried out in practice since it would cost a business more in attorney and public relations fees than they would save from proper employee conduct. Perhaps reluctantly, businesses turn to philosophers to instruct employees on becoming "moral." For over 2,000 years philosophers have systematically addressed the issue of right and wrong conduct. Presumably, then, philosophers can teach employees that a basic understanding of morality will keep them out of trouble.

However, it is not likely that philosophers can *teach* anyone to be ethical. The job of teaching morality rests squarely on the shoulders of parents and one's early social environment. By the time philosophers enter the picture, it is too late to change the moral predispositions of an adult. Also, even if philosophers could teach morality, their recommendations are not always the most financially efficient. Although being moral may save a company from some legal and public relations nightmares, morality in business is also costly. A morally responsible company must pay special attention to product safety, environmental impact, truthful advertising, scrupulous marketing, and humane working conditions. This may be more than a tight-budgeted business bargained for.

We cannot easily resolve this tension between the ethical interests of the money-minded businessperson and the ideal-minded philosopher. In most issues of business ethics, ideal moral principles will be checked by economic viability. To understand what is at stake, we will look at three different ways of deriving standards of business ethics.

2.8.1 Deriving Business Ethics from the Profit Motive

Some business people argue that there is a symbiotic relation between ethics and business in which ethics naturally emerges from a profit-oriented business. There are both weak and strong versions of this approach. The weak version is often expressed in the dictum that *good ethics results in good business*, which simply means that moral business practices are profitable. For example, it is profitable to make safe products since this will reduce product liability lawsuits. Similarly, it may be in the best financial interests of businesses to respect employee privacy, since this will improve morale and thus improve work efficiency.

First, many moral business practices will have an economic advantage *only* in the long run. This provides little incentive for businesses that are designed to exclusively seek short-term profits. As more and more businesses compete for the same market, short-term profits will dictate the decisions of many companies simply as a matter of survival.

Second, some moral business practices may not be economically viable even in the long run. For example, this might be the case with retaining older workers who are inefficient, as opposed to replacing them with younger and more efficient workers.

Third, and most importantly, those moral business practices that are good for business depend upon what *at that time* will produce a profit. In a different market, the same practices might not be economically viable. Thus, any overlap that exists between morality and profit is both limited and incidental.

The strong version of this profit approach takes a reverse strategy and maintains that, in a competitive and free market, the profit motive will in fact *bring about* a morally proper environment. That is, if customers demand safe products, or workers demand privacy, then they will buy from or work for only those businesses that meet their demands. Businesses that do not heed these demands will not survive. Since this view maintains that the drive for profit will create morality, the strong version can be expressed in the dictum that *good business results in good ethics*, which is the converse of the above dictum. Proponents of this view, such as Milton Friedman, argue that this would happen in the USA if the government would allow a truly competitive and free market.

But this strong view also has problems, since it assumes that consumers or workers will demand the morally proper thing. In fact, consumers may opt for less safe products if they know they will be saving money. For example, consumers might prefer a cheaper car without air bags, even though doing so places their own lives and the lives of their passengers at greater risk, which is morally irresponsible. Similarly, workers may forego demands of privacy at work if they are compensated with high enough wages. In short, not every moral business practice will simply emerge from the profit principle as suggested by either the weak or strong views.

2.8.2   Business Ethics Restricted to Following the Law

A second approach to business ethics is that moral obligations in business are restricted to what the law requires. The most universal aspects of Western morality have already been put into our legal system, such as with laws against killing, stealing, fraud, harassment, or reckless endangerment. Moral principles beyond what the law requires – or *supra-legal* principles – appear to be optional since philosophers dispute about their validity and society wavers about its acceptance. For any specific issue under consideration, such as determining what counts as responsible marketing or adequate privacy in the workplace, we will find opposing positions on our supra-legal moral obligations. It is, therefore, unreasonable to expect businesses to perform duties about which there is so much disagreement and which appear to be optional.

The unreasonableness of such a moral requirement in our society becomes all the more evident when we consider societies that *do* have a strong external source of morality. Islam, for example, contains a broad range of moral requirements such as an alms mandate, prohibitions against sleeping partners that collect unearned money, and restrictions on charging interest for certain types of loans, particularly for relief aid. Thus, in Muslim countries that are not necessarily ruled by Islamic law, there is a strong source of external morality that would be binding on Muslim businesses apart from what their laws would require.

Similarly, Confucianism has a strong emphasis on filial piety; thus, in Chinese and other Confucian societies, it is reasonable to expect their businesses to maintain a respect for elders even if it is not part of the legal system. In Western culture, or at least in the USA, we lack a counterpart to an external source of morality as is present in Muslim or Confucian societies. One reason is because of our cultural pluralism and the presence of a wide range of belief systems. Even within Christianity, the diversity of denominations and beliefs prevents it from being a homogeneous source of Christian values. In short, without a widely recognized system of ethics that is external to the law, supra-legal moral obligations in our society appear to be optional, and it is unreasonable to expect business people to be obligated to principles which appear to be optional.

In our culturally pluralistic society, the only business-related moral obligations that are majority-endorsed by our national social group are those obligations that are already contained in the law. These include a range of guidelines for honesty in advertising, product safety, safe working conditions, and fair hiring and firing practices.

In fact, the unifying moral force of businesses within our diverse society is the law itself. Beyond the law we find that the moral obligations of businesses are contextually bound by subgroups, such as with a business that is operated by traditional Muslims or environmental activists. In these cases, the individual businesses may be bound by the obligations of their subgroups, but such obligations are contingent upon one's association with these social subgroups. And, clearly, the obligations within those subgroups are not binding on those outside the subgroups.

2.8.3   Deriving Business Ethics from General Moral Obligations

The third approach to business ethics is that morality must be introduced as a factor that is external from both the profit motive and the law (Laczniak 1983).

The most convenient way to explore this approach is to consider the supra-legal moral principles that philosophers commonly offer. Five fairly broad moral principles suggested by philosophers are as follows:

1. *Harm principle*: Businesses should avoid causing unwarranted harm.
2. *Fairness principle*: Business should be fair in all of their practices.
3. *Human rights principle*: Businesses should respect human rights.
4. *Autonomy principle*: Businesses should not infringe on the rationally reflective choices of people.
5. *Veracity principle*: Businesses should not be deceptive in their practices.

The attraction of these principles is that they appeal to universal moral notions that no one would reasonably reject. But, the problem with these principles is that they are *too* general. These principles do not tell us *specifically* what counts as harm, unfairness, or a violation of human rights. Does all

damage to the environment constitute harm? Does it violate an employee's right to privacy if an employer places hidden surveillance cameras in an employee lounge area? Does child-oriented advertising mislead children and thus violate the principle of veracity?

The above principles are abstract in nature. That is, they broadly mandate against harm and broadly endorse autonomy. Because they are abstract, they will be difficult to apply to concrete situations and consequently not give clear guidance in complex situations. An alternative approach is to forget the abstract and focus instead on concrete situations that affect the particular interests of consumers, workers, stockholders, or the community. The recent *stakeholder* approach to business ethics attempts to do this systematically. It may be expressed in the following:

2.8.3.1   Stakeholder Principle

Businesses should consider all stakeholders' interests that are affected by a business practice. A stakeholder is any party affected by a business practice, including employees, suppliers, customers, creditors, competitors, governments, and communities. Accordingly, the stakeholder approach to business ethics emphasizes that we should map out of the various parties affected by a business practice. But this approach is limited since proponents of this view give us no clear formula for how to prioritize the various interests once we map them out.

Although corporate codes of ethics are often viewed cynically as attempts to foster good public relations or to reduce legal liability, a corporate code of ethics is a reasonable model for understanding how we should articulate moral principles and introduce them into business practice. The practical advantage of this approach is that it directly stipulates the morality of certain action types, without becoming ensnared in the problem of deriving particular actions from more abstract principles, such as the harm principle.

But, the limitation of the corporate code model is that the principles offered will appear to be merely rules of prudence or good manners unless we can establish their distinctly *moral* character. And this requires relying on more general principles of ethics described above, which, we've seen, comes with its own set of problems.

We have looked at three approaches to business ethics, and we've seen that all three have limitations. If we hope to find an approach to business ethics that is free from conceptual problems, we will not likely find any. Ethics is a complex subject and its history is filled with diverse theories that are systematically refuted by rival theories.

So, we should expect to find controversies when applying ethics to the specific practices of business. However, following *any* of the above three approaches to business ethics will bring us closer to acceptable moral behavior than we might otherwise be. Close attention to one's profit motive and the moral interests of consumers might in fact generate some morally responsible business decisions. We can

indeed find additional moral guidance by looking at the laws that apply specifically to businesses.

In addition to the above three approaches to business ethics, it also helps to examine stories of businesses that have been morally irresponsible. By citing specific cases deceptive advertising, environmental irresponsibility, or unsafe products, we can learn by example what we should not do. Such cases often reveal blatantly crude, insensitive, or reckless attitudes of businesses, which we can view as warning signs of unethical conduct.

The moral challenge for businesses in the USA is difficult enough when balancing one's profit interests against the needs of employees, consumers, governments, and special interest groups. The moral challenge is even more intense for multinational companies who need to live up to moral expectations both in the USA and in host foreign countries. In developed countries, the moral expectations of the host country are as stringent as our own. With third world host countries, though, the moral expectations are often more lax, and multinationals are tempted to lower their standards when situations permit. In this chapter we will look at three areas of moral concern for multinationals: bribery, influencing foreign governments, and exploiting third world countries.

Case Study One

The Collapse of Lehman Brothers

On September 15, 2008, US-based Lehman Brothers (Lehman), one of the top five investment banks in the USA, filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy sending shock waves through the financial sector the world over. As per the details filed by Lehman in its bankruptcy filings, it held assets worth US$639 billion, whereas its total liabilities stood at US$613 billion. With this, Lehman earned the dubious distinction of having filed the biggest bankruptcy ever in the world. The bank reported a loss of US$2.8 billion in the second quarter of 2008 ending May 2008, its first loss since it went public in the year 1994.

However, on September 10, 2008, Lehman again reported a net loss of US$3.9 billion (after provisioning for US$5.6 billion in write-downs) for the third quarter ending August 2008 (Refer to Exhibit I for the financial highlights of Lehman Brothers between 2003 and 2007). To turn around its operations, the bank announced a restructuring plan that intended to sell a majority stake in its investment management business (Refer to Exhibit II for the business segments of Lehman Brothers). The plan also included spinning off a majority of its remaining commercial real estate holdings that had gone bad, into a new public limited company.

The Korea Development Bank (KDB) which had earlier evinced an interest in purchasing a 25 % equity stake in Lehman announced that it had withdrawn this offer. KDB backed off stating that the price Lehman quoted was too high and hence it was not interested in purchasing the stake because of bad market conditions.

Lehman's shares plunged by almost 45 % from US$14.15 to US$7.79 after KDB's announcement. Lehman could not manage to restore confidence in the

markets and raise capital by selling a part of its equity stake and eventually had to file for Chapter 11 bankruptcy.

While many analysts attributed different reasons for the collapse of Lehman, most of them agreed that the then ongoing subprime crisis was a root cause. Analysts claimed that the move by JP Morgan Chase (JP Morgan) to freeze Lehman's assets days before the bank filed for bankruptcy was one of the factors responsible for Lehman's collapse.

They claimed that the bankruptcy could have been avoided if JP Morgan had not frozen Lehman's assets, which had led to a liquidity crisis.

The Subprime Crisis

In order to overcome the crisis caused by the dot com burst and 9/11 attacks, the US government adopted a policy of credit-driven consumption-led growth for its economy. To stimulate consumption, American policy makers started slashing interest rates to ease the liquidity in the system from late 2001. Industry experts blamed the subprime crisis and the resultant collapse of Lehman Brothers on the global macroeconomic imbalance that the USA had created. The US economy had a savings rate close to zero in 2007. Experts opined that with the huge fiscal deficit and balance of payment deficit the USA had, the US dollar (dollar) would have depreciated unless it was a global currency.

Case Study Two

Lockheed Scandal

A dramatic example of bribery naivete involves the Lockheed Corporation, which in the 1970s was caught offering a quarter of a billion dollars in bribes overseas. A major US defense contractor, Lockheed fell on hard times for both economic and technological reasons. The US government commissioned the company to design a hybrid aircraft, but, after one crashed, the government canceled orders. Lockheed received other contracts based on bids that they made that were far lower than the cost of producing the project. As a consequence, they lost money on the projects. They tried to move into the commercial jet aircraft market by making planes with engines built by Rolls Royce. Rolls Royce went bankrupt, and Lockheed lost 300 million in canceled orders. They believed that the solution to their financial woes was to expand their overseas sales. To get the contracts, they made a series of payoffs to middlemen from various countries, including the Netherlands, Japan, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Italy, and Spain. Still on the verge of bankruptcy, they requested a loan of 200 million dollars from the US government, which meant opening their records for scrutiny. Government investigators discovered the extent of Lockheed's bribery. They also discovered that Lockheed offered bribes that totaled ten times more than the bribes made by other US companies. Lockheed's chairman and president were forced to resign. However, to avoid compromising national defense, the US government chose not to cancel its contracts with Lockheed.

Case Study Three

Multinational Coercing in the Third World

A vivid illustration of this is International Telephone and Telegraph's (ITT) interference in the Chilean government during the 1970s. At the time, ITT was the 8th largest Fortune 500 company, with 350,000 employees in 80 countries, including Chile. The South American country of Chile was poor but politically stable. A presidential candidate named Salvador Allende campaigned on a communist platform, emphasizing the issue of land reform and indicating a desire to take control of privately owned Chilean telephone companies because of their inefficiency. Government acquisition policies work two ways. First, a government might buy controlling shares of private companies, paying them at a fair market price. Alternatively, a government might nationalize or simply take ownership of the company with no compensation, as happened with private businesses in Cuba and Peru during their communist takeovers.

ITT feared the worst and tried to stop Allende from being elected, part of which involved an offer of one million dollars to the CIA for support. The scandal surfaced, and critics worldwide attacked ITT for interfering in the activity of a foreign government. Some of ITT's property was even bombed in protest. Allende was elected anyway, and in retaliation, he nationalized ITT's Chilean property. Allende did not nationalize other firms, however, even though some had to sell the government shares of its stock. Allende was assassinated shortly after, and ITT later sued for losses.

The actions of American multinationals in foreign markets have a direct effect on the image on the USA itself. People around the world see the USA as an economic imperialist, ready to gobble up the resources of small foreign countries. The situation is made worse when multinationals coerce foreign governments especially in third world countries.

2.8.3.2 Business and the Environment

The greatest damage done to the environment is inflicted by business and industry and not from domestic activities. Businesses extract the greatest tolls in terms of energy consumption, toxic waste, air and water pollution, and deforestation. Increasing amounts of industrial toxic waste contaminates groundwater, which in turn becomes harmful for human consumption. Oil spills from petroleum industries destroy shorelines and kill millions of sea animals. The burning of fossil fuels such as oil, gas, and coal produces excess carbon dioxide, which adds to global warming through a greenhouse effect. Fluorocarbon gasses used in making domestic products such as refrigerators and styrofoam deplete the Earth's ozone layer, which shields the Earth from the sun's life-destroying ultraviolet rays. Some of these problems are expensive nuisances, such as oil spills and toxic waste. Others, though, threaten the survival of life on our planet, such as carbon dioxide production and the release of fluorocarbon gasses. In this chapter we will look at some of the causes of environmental irresponsibility in businesses and some theories about why businesses should be more responsible.

2.8.3.3   Businesses' Resistance to Environmental Responsibility

Although businesses don't consciously set out to harm the environment, several factors create an unfortunate situation, which in many cases is worse than it needs to be. First, large businesses and industries are inherently imposing on nature. They take pieces of nature and reshape them into things that didn't exist before, such as automobiles, skyscrapers, television sets, and shopping malls. Not only are the end products artificial, and in that sense unnatural, but the means of producing these things are taxing on natural resources. Second, it is easy to disregard natural resources that are held in common and seem abundant, such as air and water. It doesn't seem wrong to pollute the air if, technically, no one owns the air and the particular damage that I do isn't too noticeable. Environmentalists sometimes refer to this phenomenon as a *tragedy of the commons*, that is, a disaster that happens to things that are held in common. Given the size and complexity of businesses in industrial countries, such as the USA, it is not surprising that they contribute heavily to this tragedy.

Third, businesses are driven by the motive to make a profit. Stockholders demand a return on their investment, and this mandate transfers down through the management hierarchy. Part of making a profit is to reduce costs, and environmental responsibility is highly costly, with few immediate financial rewards. Finally, government environmental watchdog agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, are limited in what they can do in imposing restrictions on businesses. To protect their financial interests, businesses lobby for support at all levels of government, and agencies such as the EPA must be politically compromising. Agencies such as the EPA say that they know that they do their jobs correctly when everyone is angry with them. That is, businesses feel that the EPA restricts them too much, and environmental advocates such as the Sierra Club will feel that the EPA does too little to protect the environment.

On a global level, many of the environmental offenders are businesses in third world countries. Underdeveloped countries are trying to catch up to the economic level of industrialized countries and certainly have a right to do so. However, they cannot play catch up in a way that is both economically feasible and environmentally responsible. Maintaining a balance between economic development and energy conservation is far more difficult for poorer countries than it is for wealthier ones. For example, developed countries can shift to energy sources that give off less pollution, but developing countries cannot do so easily.

Environmental problems are intensified in third world countries because of growth in population, which doubles about every 70 years. Increased population places increased demand on the utilization of land, which, in turn, leads to deforestation. It is not effective to simply encourage developing countries to do better. Recommendations from world organizations, such as the United Nations, have only limited leverage. Sometimes developed countries, such as the USA, try to assist developing countries by offering them free technology. But this is only partially effective.

Since the 1960s, our society has become increasingly more environmentally conscious, and now we simply take it for granted that we all are responsible for

maintaining the integrity of the environment. However, conservative businesses people commonly feel that their responsibility to the environment is limited. Typically, they give two distinct arguments for their views. First, they argue that businesses do not have an obligation to protect the environment above what the law requires. Although laws are strict concerning environmental regulation, they are not perfect and they allow for many kinds of environment judgment calls. If businesses showed special concern for the environment beyond what the law requires, then this would interfere with their ability to compete. Ultimately, they argue, environmental responsibility rests with consumers. If consumers are not interested in favoring businesses that have environmentally friendly policies, then it is not up to businesses to champion environmental policies on their own. The problem with this view is that environmental responsibility cannot be left to what consumers are willing to tolerate. Most consumers will be attracted to the least expensive consumer products, irrespective of moral considerations surrounding the manufacturing of those products. Even if I knew that a pair of tennis shoes was manufactured in a third world sweatshop, my purchase decision might still be motivated only by the price tag. This is so too with my motivation to purchase products that are manufactured by environmentally unfriendly companies. In a sense, businesses need to save consumers from succumbing to their most thrifty inclinations.

Second, if businesses agree that they have an environmental responsibility beyond what the law requires, they often take a "good ethics is good business" approach and emphasize areas of environmental responsibility that will generate a profit. For example, they might push recycling, which they can indicate on their packaging and thereby attract environmentally conscious consumers. They might also update older energy-hungry heating or production units if the investment has the right payoff. However, as noted above, what is best for the environment is not always financially best for business. When cases of conflict arise between the environment and profit motive, the "good ethics is good business" approach quickly appears deceptive and shallow.

2.8.3.4 Examples of Environmentally Unsound Business Practices

Although most companies are guilty of varying degrees of environmental irresponsibility, some extreme cases vividly illustrate irresponsibility at its worst. A first case involves resistance to air pollution control measures. In the early 1950s, Union Carbide built a series of metal and chemical plants in the Ohio Valley, between Ohio and West Virginia. Mountains on both sides of the valley trap in soot, ash, and other air pollutants, which resulted in increased incidents of respiratory disease among local residents. During the 1960s, Union Carbide refused to participate in public discussions about the problem and ignored a governmental request for an on-site inspection.

The company soon became a symbol of corporate resistance to pollution control. Part of their resistance owes to the fact that the environment was not an issue in the 1950s and new pollution control measures were both expensive and untested.

Also, Union Carbide was less susceptible to consumer boycotts since only 20 % of its products were direct consumer goods that we might purchase in a department store, such as antifreeze. In 1970s they became the target of the investigation by the newly formed Environmental Protection Agency, which instructed Union Carbide on several pollution control measures. Union Carbide responded by shutting down a boiler plant and laying off workers, claiming that was the only way they could comply with the required pollution reduction. Critics charged that Union Carbide's tactics amounted to environmental blackmail, threatening to cut jobs if they had to be environmentally responsible. Ultimately, Union Carbide restructured their company and adhered to pollution control standards.

A second case of environmental irresponsibility involves nuclear power accidents. There are currently around 400 nuclear power plants worldwide, providing about 15 % of the world's electricity. For the past few decades, the nuclear power industry has been under attack by environmentalists and few new plants have been started. Ironically, the original intent of nuclear power was to provide a safe, clean, and cheap alternative to coal and oil, which are notoriously damaging to the environment. Nuclear power produces no smoke or carbon dioxide, and only harmless steam. It also doesn't require environmentally intrusive mining or drilling efforts. Two major disasters contributed to the now tarnished image of the nuclear power industry, both the result of safety violations and human error.

Case Study Four

Environmental Disasters

The first incident occurred at the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. In 1979, a series of mechanical and human failures contributed to a partial core meltdown to one of its reactors. Radiation was released into the local community, and, although connections with health problems were difficult to prove, a family of a Down syndrome child received 1 million dollars in compensation. A much more serious nuclear power disaster occurred in 1986 in the Ukrainian city of Chernobyl, then part of the Soviet Union.

Partly from negligence and partly from design problems, a steam explosion and fires threw tons of radioactive material into the environment. 31 people were killed and 1,000 injured from direct exposure to radioactive material by means of inhaling radioactive gasses and dust and ingesting contaminated food or water. 135,000 people were evacuated from the surrounding area, hundreds of square miles of land were contaminated, and the long-term health effects of the accident are still being assessed. Financial losses reached $3 billion, and countries throughout Europe claimed losses into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Although the Soviet government owned the Chernobyl plant – and not private industry – the disaster had a decisive impact on the entire nuclear power industry. In addition to the risks of catastrophic disasters such as Chernobyl, nuclear power plants create other environmental problems that involve nuclear waste disposal. Nuclear waste is deadly to animal life and remains toxic for a very long time.

After Three Mile Island and Chernobyl, critics called for a moratorium on the construction of all future nuclear power plants and a systematic closing of the ones currently in use. Defenders, though, argue that nuclear energy is necessary in view of the limitations of alternative energy sources, such as coal, oil, and solar technology. They also argue that nuclear waste sites need to confine wastes for only a few thousand years since after 1,000 years the ingestion toxicity is comparable to that of the original uranium from which the wastes were derived. Finally, defenders say that we can reasonably expect a decrease in nuclear accidents even if we increase nuclear power use, similar to how airline travel has increased while their accident rate has decreased. Defenders recommend that clustered reactors provide better operational support, security, and handling of wastes.

A third and final case of environmental disaster involves large-scale oil spills. In 1989, an Exxon oil tanker called the Valdez *struck a reef in Alaska's Prince William Sound and created the largest crude oil spill in US waters. The captain of the ship, 42-year-old Joseph Hazelwood, was with Exxon for 20 years. He had a reputation as a drinker, which some departments at Exxon knew about, and at the time of the disaster his blood alcohol level was .06. The tanker trip was part of a routine convoy from Alaska to Long Beach California that was successfully made by other tankers over 8,000 times. Hazelwood assigned the piloting of the vessel to a less experienced officer and then retired to his quarters. Icebergs were in the path of the ship, which an ineffective radar system failed to detect earlier.*

The ship was so large that it took a full minute to respond to steering changes. Attempting to navigate around an iceberg, the piloting officer miscalculated and ran the ship into a reef. Oil poured from the ship and, when the weather changed, it sloshed onto the beaches for hundreds of miles. Initially viewing it as only a public relations problem, Exxon was slow to respond with cleanup efforts, which made the situation worse.

The spill had a terrible impact on plant and animal life in the area, which the news media vividly captured in pictures and on television. The cleanup was also expensive; the average cost of rehabilitating a seal was $80,000. Hazelwood was ultimately fired for not being on the bridge at the time of the disaster and was convicted of negligent discharge of oil, with a punishment of 1,000 h of community service in the cleanup. Exxon paid in excess of two billion dollars in the cleanup efforts and, just as significantly, suffered an almost irreplaceable loss of reputation because of the disaster. 40,000 Exxon credit card holders destroyed their cards.

2.8.3.5 Three Philosophical Theories of Environmental Responsibility

As noted earlier, some businesses argue that their environmental responsibility is confined to what the law requires and what will yield a profit. However, ethicists typically argue that businesses need to look beyond profit motive and legal regulations to find more persuasive reasons for environmental responsibility. We will

consider three of these theories, each of which yields substantially different conclusions about the environmental responsibility of businesses.

The first of these theories is *anthropocentric* or human centered. Environmental anthropocentrism is the view that all environmental responsibility is derived from human interests alone. The assumption here is that only human beings are morally significant persons and have a direct moral standing. Since the environment is crucial to human well-being and human survival, then we have an indirect duty towards the environment, that is, a duty that is derived from human interests. This involves the duty to assure that the Earth remains environmentally hospitable for supporting human life and that its beauty and resources are preserved so human life on Earth continues to be pleasant.

Some have argued that our indirect environmental duties derive both from the immediate benefit which living people receive from the environment and the benefit that future generation of people will receive. But, critics have maintained that since future generations of people do not yet exist, then, strictly speaking, they cannot have rights any more than a dead person can have rights. Nevertheless, both parties to this dispute acknowledge that environmental concern derives solely from human interests.

A second general approach to environmental responsibility is to base it on the moral consideration that we owe to animals, a position that we will call the *animal rights view*. On this view, higher animals qualify as morally significant creatures, such as dogs, cats, cows, horses, pigs, dolphins, and chimpanzees. Animal rights advocate Peter Singer goes a step further and argues that even lower animals, such as chickens, deserve equal moral consideration insofar as they are capable of experiencing physical pleasure and pain, just as humans are.

The third theory is that of *ecocentrism,* which is that we have direct responsibilities to environmental collections, such as animal species and rain forests, just as we have direct responsibilities to humans. Even if there is no direct human consequence of destroying environmental collections, we still have a moral responsibility to those collections anyway. Ecocentrists use various terms to express this direct responsibility to the environment. They suggest that the environment has *direct rights*, that it qualifies for *moral personhood*, that it is deserving of a direct duty, and that it has *inherent worth*. Common to all of these claims, though, is the position that the environment by itself is on a moral par with humans.

2.8.3.6   Implications for Businesses

Each of the above theories has different implications on business's responsibility to the environment. From the anthropocentric perspective, businesses have an obligation not to damage the environment in ways that negatively impact on human life. From the animal rights perspective, businesses have an obligation to avoid harming animals either directly or indirectly. They need to avoid harming animals directly, such as they might do through animal testing or inhumane food production techniques.

They need to avoid harming animals indirectly, such as they might do by destroying animal environments. For example, we should not control pests through

poisoning, since this causes animals to suffer; instead, we should prefer a sterility chemical. This is especially pertinent given that the environment is the immediate habitat of animals and damage to the environment harms animals more than it harms humans. Finally, from the ecocentrist perspective, businesses have a direct obligation to protect the environment since it is wrong to harm members of the moral community, and the environment is a member of the moral community.

In many cases the anthropocentric, animal rights and ecocentric interests overlap. For example, toxic waste, air and water pollution, excess carbon dioxide, and release of fluorocarbons equally affect humans, animals, and environmental collections. In many cases, though, the interests of the three do not overlap. For example, sometimes when businesses are found legally responsible for polluting a stream, several corrective options may be open to them. First, they may restore the stream, which costs a lot of money, or they may pay off a community in compensation for living with the polluted stream, which might cost them less money.

Although the anthropocentrist will be satisfied with paying off the community, this would not touch the concerns of the animal rights and ecocentrist. To use another example, suppose that a business considered building a factory on a site that, if constructed, would destroy a breeding ground for birds. Typically, from the anthropocentrist position, the business would only need to take into account the recreational value that the bird breeding ground would have to human bird watchers. For the animal rights advocate and ecocentrist, though, this reasoning ignores the needs of animals and the integrity of the ecosystem itself.

In view of these various theories of environmental obligation, what should businesses do? First, businesses will automatically be bound by the environmental regulations that are required by law. Although this covers much ground, it doesn't cover everything. Second, businesses should at least be sensitive to environmental concerns from both the anthropocentric and animal rights perspectives. Animal rights and environmental lobby groups today are becoming increasingly more influential, and, as a matter of good public relations and even survival, companies need to take this into account. Many environmental problems lend themselves to graphic portrayal by the media – such as sea animals covered in oil – which intensifies negative public opinion towards a company. If companies do not respond properly, they appear to be arrogant and uncaring, which greatly harms their reputation (http://www.utm.edu/staff/jfieser/vita/research/Busbook.htm).

Case Study Five

The Bhopal Gas Tragedy in India

In the early morning hours of December 3, 1984, a poisonous gray cloud (40 tons of toxic gases) from Union Carbide India Limited's (UCIL's) pesticide plant at Bhopal spread throughout the city. Water carrying catalytic material had entered methyl isocyanate (MIC) storage tank No. 610. What followed was a nightmare. The killer gas spread through the city, sending residents scurrying through the dark streets. No alarm ever sounded a warning and no evacuation plan was prepared. When victims arrived at hospitals breathless and blind, doctors did not know how to treat them, as UCIL had not provided emergency information.

It was only when the sun rose the next morning that the magnitude of the devastation was clear. Dead bodies of humans and animals blocked the streets, leaves turned black, and the smell of burning chilli peppers lingered in the air. Estimates suggested that as many as 10,000 may have died immediately and 30,000–50,000 were too ill to ever return to their jobs.

The catastrophe raised some serious ethical issues. The pesticide factory was built in the midst of densely populated settlements. UCIL chose to store and produce MIC, one of the most deadly chemicals (permitted exposure levels in USA and Britain are 0.02 parts per million), in an area where nearly 120,000 people lived. The MIC plant was not designed to handle a runaway reaction. When the uncontrolled reaction started, MIC was flowing through the scrubber (meant to neutralize MIC emissions) at more than 200 times its designed capacity. MIC in the tank was filled to 87 % of its capacity while the maximum permissible was 50 %.

MIC was not stored at zero degree centigrade as prescribed and the refrigeration and cooling systems had been shut down 5 months before the disaster, as part of UCC's global economy drive. Vital gauges and indicators in the MIC tank were defective. The flare tower meant to burn off MIC emissions was under repair at the time of the disaster and the scrubber contained no caustic soda. As part of UCC's drive to cut costs, the workforce in the Bhopal factory was brought down by half from 1980 to 1984. This had serious consequences on safety and maintenance. The size of the work crew for the MIC plant was cut in half from 12 to 6 workers. Following the accident, the Government of India filed a compensation lawsuit against the UCC for an estimated US$3 billion. However, UCC felt that the Government of India was to blame for the disaster. In December 1986, UCC filed a countersuit against the GoI and the state of Madhya Pradesh.

The Settlement

Within months after the disaster, the Government of India issued an ordinance appointing itself as the sole representative of the victims for any legal dealings with UCC as regards compensation. The ordinance was later replaced by the Bhopal Gas Leak (Processing of Claims) Act, 1985.

2.9   Study Questions for "Business and the Environment"

Introduction

1. What are some of the life-threatening environmental issues connected with business and industry?

Businesses' Resistance to Environmental Responsibility

2. What are the four reasons why businesses have such a negative impact on the environment?
3. Why do many businesses in third world countries pose big environmental problems?

4. What is wrong with businesses saying that their environmental responsibility is confined to what the law requires?
5. What is wrong with businesses saying that their environmental responsibility is linked with what will generate a profit?

   Examples of Environmentally Unsound Business Practices

6. What is "environmental blackmail"?
7. What are some of the environmental problems associated with nuclear power plants?
8. What reasons do some people give in defense of nuclear power plants?
9. What were some of the negative consequences for Exxon resulting from the Valdez accident?

   Three Philosophical Theories of Environmental Responsibility

10. What is the basis of our environmental responsibility according to anthropocentrism?
11. What is speciesism? Discuss critically.
12. What is the basis of our environmental responsibility according to ecocentrism?

   Implications for Businesses

13. On what environmental issues do anthropocentrism, animal rights, and ecocentrism overlap?
14. Why should businesses be sensitive to environmental concerns from the anthropocentric and animal rights perspectives?

References

A Framework for Universal Principles of Ethics, Larry Colero, Crossroads Programs Inc. http://www.ethics.ubc.ca/papers/invited/colero.html

Advice from Aristotle, James O'Toole, Santa clara University. http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/submitted/otoole/business-ethics-aristotle.html

Deontological, Teleological and Virtue Ethics: Types of Ethical Systems. http://atheism.about.com/library/FAQs/phil/blfaq_phileth_sys.htm

Lacznaik G (1983) Business ethics – a managers primer. Business, January–March; as cited in Reddy YRK, Ethics, corporate governance, and the state – the need for greater convergence; Founder Trustee-Academy of Corporate Governance and Chairman-Yaga Consulting Pvt. Ltd. http://www.academyofcg.org/archives/sep-2002.htm