CARLETON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

PSCI 3109
THE POLITICS OF LAW AND MORALITY

Thursdays 14:35 - 17:25
(304 Southam - please confirm on Carleton Central)

Instructor: Dr. R. Jhappan    Office: D697 Loeb
Office Hours: Wednesdays 12:00-14:00, Thursdays 12:00-14:00
Tel: 613 520 2600, ext. 2788    Email: Radha.Jhappan@carleton.ca

Course Description

This theory-focused course is intended to introduce students to the complex relationships between morality/ethics, politics (public policy), and law (regulation). The focus is primarily on the thinking that has influenced and perhaps ought to influence the formation of law and public policy, rather than on the range of specific applied policy options available. The core of the course examines some of the major conceptual, analytical, and normative questions that animate the substantive issues covered later, including moral/cultural relativism, secular moral theories (utilitarianism, deontology, natural law, virtue ethics, and legal positivism), the public/private distinction, and the appropriate role of the state in moral regulation. As most societies base their collective moralities on religious foundations, there will be a brief examination of the moral values of five major world religions (Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism). Thereafter, drawing predominantly upon the experience of Canada, but also of the United States and other jurisdictions, the course examines the ethics and the treatment in public policy and law of four of the following (to be chosen by the class): environmental ethics, non-human animals, genetic engineering/biotechnology, poverty, assisted suicide/euthanasia, assisted reproductive technologies, torture, pornography, prostitution, and polygamy. The course takes a multicultural and multidisciplinary approach to the topics covered, examining moral philosophy, religion, and political ideologies such as liberalism, feminism, and conservatism.

Through lectures, in-class discussions, required readings, and written assignments, students will be able to: engage key moral theories and debates; analyze and evaluate different approaches to morality and law; better understand the history and development of laws and policies in the area of 'moral regulation'; appreciate the complexity of the issues involved in some
of the key ethical debates prevalent in modern, technologically-driven societies; and refine their reading, writing, research, critical, and analytical skills.

**Course Requirements**

**Students must fulfil all course requirements in order to achieve a passing grade.** Failure to hand in any assignment will result in a grade of F. Failure to write the final exam will result in a grade of ABS. FND (Failure No Deferred) is assigned when a student's performance is so poor during the term that they cannot pass the course even with 100% on the final examination. In such cases, instructors may use this notation on the Final Grade Report to indicate that a student has already failed the course due to inadequate term work and should not be permitted access to a deferral of the examination. Deferred final exams are available ONLY if the student is in good standing in the course.

Students must complete each of the following components of the course in order to achieve a passing grade:

1. **Critical Analysis (6 pages)**  
   **20%**  
   Due **in class**, February 15, 2018

2. **Research Essay (12 pages)**  
   **35%**  
   Due **in class**, March 15, 2018 (with stamped, self-addressed envelope)

3. **Scheduled final examination**  
   **45%**  
   (based on readings and lectures)  
   (examination period April 14-26, 2018)

**Grading Formula**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>90-99%</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>Excellence in: evidence of original thought; strong, clear, logical argument; research and use of sources; organization of material; and writing skills (including superior composition, no grammatical errors or typos; formal elements of essay structure such as introduction, body, conclusion, correctly formatted footnotes and bibliography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>85-89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>80-84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>77-79%</td>
<td>GOOD (above average)</td>
<td>Mastery of material and solid writing skills (i.e. good syntax, organization, structure, very few grammatical errors or typos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73-76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>70-72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>67-69%</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY (average)</td>
<td>Clear understanding of material and adequate writing/organizational skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>63-66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>60-62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>57-59%</td>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY</td>
<td>Limited understanding of material and/or deficient writing skills (i.e. awkward syntax and/or frequent grammatical and other errors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>53-56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>50-52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>49 and below</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>Inadequate work in several or all areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of Lecture Topics

Part 1 of this course focuses on theory, including sources of morality, relativism, religion, positivism, and natural law. However, the course is designed to give students some choice regarding the specific moral issues to be discussed in lectures and for the purposes of the examination. Therefore, during the first session (Jan. 11), the class collectively will choose a list of four substantive topics; the results of the class choice will be announced by email and in class on Jan. 18.

Critical Analysis - 20% - Due on CuLearn by 4:00 p.m., February 15, 2018

Your critical analysis must be 8 double-spaced (numbered), typed pages in 12 point Times New Roman font with one-inch margins.


1. Is morality relative to culture?
2. Are there moral facts?
3. Is morality subjective?
4. Is morality grounded in religion?
5. Do the ends justify the means?

Choose one of the first four debates (i.e. not the 5th). Provide a short summary or ‘abstract’ of each side of the debate to identify the theoretical perspective/approach taken, the overall arguments, and conclusions. Compare and contrast the two authors’ main arguments, particularly their views of the existence, source and purpose(s) of morality. What are the similarities in their approaches? Would they agree on any particular points? How do their views differ? Are the differences significant? If so, in what way/why? Can the two approaches be reconciled with one another, or are they fundamentally opposed? Which approach is the more compelling, in your view?

Though you need not answer all of the following questions directly, think about them as you craft your critical analysis as they will help you uncover the strengths and weaknesses of your chosen articles:

- What is the problematic each piece addresses?
- What is each author’s purpose in writing this text? What do you think he wants to accomplish? Put it into your own words.
- Who is the author and is his own social profile at all significant ré what he is saying and why he is saying it?
- Is the piece argued strongly or poorly, and according to what criteria?
- Does the author provide sufficient background information to support the argument?
• Are opinions presented as if they are facts?
• Does the author oversimplify complex ideas or make unsupported generalizations?
• Were any important pieces of information left out?
• Does the author represent the ideas of others fairly and accurately?
• Does the author appeal to prejudice or fear? If so, how?
• Does the author present a balanced picture of the issue?
• Does the author’s language, tone, or choice of examples reveal any biases? If so, do the author's biases reduce his credibility?
• Was the overall argument convincing? Why, or why not?

Although this is a think-piece rather than a research essay, it is highly recommended that you read one or two other articles on related themes from Part 1 of the course outline (e.g. Stephen Satris’ “Student Relativism” and Horace Miner’s “Body Ritual Among the Nacirema”) to give you a sense of alternative approaches and in order to help you evaluate each author’s argument. Take the time to really think about what is intellectually provocative for you about the articles.

The purpose of this assignment is to encourage you to engage thoughtfully with the readings, to take notes on what you read, and to be aware of different approaches to moral/ethical issues. This exercise also helps you to sharpen your reading comprehension and critical thinking skills.

Research Essay - 35% - Due on CuLearn by 4:00 p.m., March 15, 2018

The research essay, 12 double-spaced, typed, numbered pages in 12 point Times New Roman font with one-inch margins, will be an analysis of one of the following controversial public policy issues that have recently been a matter of constitutional challenge, subsequent policy response, and probably renewed constitutional challenge in Canada:

Choose either:

- **Prostitution:** in Dec. 2013 the Supreme Court of Canada struck down certain sections of the Criminal Code as violations of Charter rights in the Bedford decision. The Harper government subsequently introduced new legislation to criminalize the purchase rather than the sale of sex (Bill C-36, Protection of Communities and Exploited Persons Act, 2014).

  Or

- **Medical assistance in dying:** in Feb. 2015 the Supreme Court of Canada struck down the prohibition in the Criminal Code in the Carter decision, giving the government one year to pass new legislation that respects the Charter rights of those seeking physician-assisted dying. The newly elected Trudeau government’s response, Bill C-14 (June 2016), creates exemptions from various Criminal Code provisions to allow for medical assistance in dying.
The purpose and focus of the assignment is to assess the relationship(s) between the theoretical approaches to morality (covered in the first section of the course) and the law/public policy in the specific policy field in the Canadian context.

Your essay should be organized on the following basic structure:

1. Provide a brief analysis of the law/ Criminal Code section that was struck down. Briefly outline the moral issues surrounding your chosen area of public policy. What makes it a “moral” issue in particular? To which, if any, of the theoretical/ secular theories (moral/cultural relativism, utilitarianism, Kant, natural law, legal positivism, etc.) or religious approaches to morality covered in the first part of this course did the law most closely conform? How so?

2. Provide a brief analysis of the Supreme Court’s decision. To which, if any, of the theoretical/ secular or religious approaches to morality covered in the first part of this course did the legal decision most closely conform? How so?

We are looking for plausible applications based on the reasoning and historical context, rather than conclusive ‘proof’ that a given law/policy or legal decision was consciously and deliberately based on a particular theoretical approach.

3. To which, if any, of the theoretical/ secular or religious approaches to morality covered in the first part of this course did the legislative response (Bill C-36 or Bill C-14) most closely conform? How so?

4. Each of these acts is likely to be challenged under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. What, in your view, is the best approach to public policy in the area given the various competing considerations and interests involved?

You should check statutes either currently before or passed by Parliament (Criminal Code); the relevant constitutional cases decided at the Supreme Court of Canada level [see sites such as http://scc.lexum.org/en/index.html; http://www.scc-csc.gc.ca/home/index_e.html; or http://www.canada.justice.gc.ca/]; and secondary scholarly analyses in journals and books.

A good argument will be supported by sound secondary academic books and journal articles (at least 6), as well as a number of primary sources (bills, government papers/reports, position papers by interest groups etc.). Read materials in the sections in the course outline on the relevant topic. DO NOT use Wikipedia or other questionable Internet sources. You have limited space, so address the core substantive issues and avoid getting lost in the weeds of the regulatory and administrative details.

The essay must follow the recognized format in the citation of sources and bibliographic form. A document entitled “Essay Tips” is on CuLearn; it is required reading. You will be penalized for avoidable errors, so read it carefully.
If you need help with writing, please make use of the free writing tutorial service offered by the university. Note that general criteria that will influence grading include thesis statement (your main argument), organization of the material, use of evidence, development of argument, quality of research, number and appropriateness of bona fide sources actually used and cited in the text, spelling, grammar, footnote and bibliographic citation formats, and general presentation.

**Submission and Return of Term Work**

Both the critical analysis and the research essay must be submitted as an electronic copy uploaded to CuLearn by 4:00 p.m. on the due date. This will eliminate a variety of problems by proving that the work in question was completed and submitted on time. DO NOT put essays under Instructors’ door under any circumstances. They may be filed in the trash by the cleaning staff.

- There is no penalty for submitting essays before the due date.
- Students must meet all the course requirements for term work and the examination in order to achieve a passing grade. A grade of ‘F’ will be assigned where term work is incomplete.
- Subject to earlier course deadlines, no term assignment submitted after the last day of classes (April 11, 2018) will be accepted.

*It is NOT acceptable to hand in the same assignment for more than one course.*

**Late Paper Policy**

You may have an extension automatically. However, marks will be deducted for late submissions at the rate of one third of a letter grade per day e.g. B+ to B, with weekends counting as two days. If you have serious extenuating circumstances that would warrant an extension without penalty (such as illness or death in the family), medical documentation detailing the extent of your incapacitation is required: i.e. the medical note need not record your diagnosis, but it must tell me what you are consequently unable to do, e.g. cannot write, see, etc. However, you MUST inform me before the due date. The medical documentation must be dated at least 5 business days before the deadline. This means you cannot go to the doctor a day or two before the deadline.

You will have had 6 weeks and 8 weeks respectively to complete the essays.

I am under no obligation to accept a late paper unless it has been cleared with me ahead of time. If you cannot contact me in person during lectures or office hours, leave a message on my voice-mail at 520 2600, ext. 2788. Retroactive extensions will not be granted. Therefore, you are strongly advised to begin early so that you can get sources from the library (and help if you need it). You should aim to complete your paper a few days before the deadline. This will give you time to handle computer, printer, and other problems.
N.B. I will not grant extensions without penalty for reasons of time mismanagement, workload, stress, or anything other than medically documented ailments. If you cannot manage your schedule to produce the deliverables on time, do not take this course.

You MUST keep a hard copy of your paper, as well as an electronic file, complete with early drafts in case of misadventure (e.g. dying computers) – SAVE OFTEN and in more than one place. As the Instructor may require students to pass a brief oral examination on the research essays (see the section on 'Plagiarism' below), you should keep all notes, outlines, working drafts, hard disk files, floppy disks and other research materials at least until you have received your final official grade for the course.

**Final Examination - 45%**

The final examination is to be scheduled by the Registrar any time from April 14-26. *If you are not going to be available during the formal examination period, do not take this course.* All requests for deferrals must be channeled through the Registrar’s Office according to the formal process. The 3-hour final examination will consist of two sections: one is a short-answer or mini-essay section in which students will be required to define, contextualize, assess the significance, and give examples where possible of a number of key terms or concepts covered in the course; the other is an essay section in which students will be required to answer two questions.

N. B. Examination questions will be based on both readings and lectures, so students are strongly advised to attend all lectures.

**Approval of final grades**

Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by an instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Dean.

**Plagiarism**

The University Senate defines plagiarism as “presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own.” This can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another’s data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another’s works and/or failing to use quotation marks;
• handing in "substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.

Plagiarism is a serious offence that cannot be resolved directly with the course's instructor. When an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized, the Associate Deans of the Faculty conduct a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student. Penalties are not trivial. They include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of "F" for the course.

Students should be especially careful about full citation of sources downloaded from the Internet. For greater clarity, see the "Essay Tips" document on CuLearn and the Undergraduate Calendar. For their own protection, all students are required to keep a complete dossier of their notes, rough drafts, research materials (other than returnable library books) and a hard copy of their final draft, as well as computer files as records of 'dates created' and 'dates modified' for essay files. Failure to keep such materials could result in a failing grade.

**Oral Examination:** At the discretion of the instructor, students may be required to pass a brief oral examination on research papers and essays.

**Copyright and Academic Integrity**

Classroom teaching and learning activities, including lectures, discussions, presentations, etc., by both instructors and students, are copy protected and remain the intellectual property of their respective author(s). All course materials, including PowerPoint presentations, notes made available by instructors via CuLearn or any other means, outlines, and other materials, are also protected by copyright and remain the intellectual property of their respective author(s).

Students registered in the course may take notes and make copies of course materials for their own educational use only. Students are not permitted to reproduce or distribute lecture notes and course materials publicly for commercial or non-commercial purposes without express written consent from the copyright holder(s).”

**CuLearn Email Accounts**

All registered students should have an email account through the CuLearn system. I will be using the CuLearn service to post electronic versions of course readings, as well as to make announcements and convey course-related information. Students are responsible for checking their CuLearn email accounts frequently for such information.

Please do not send substantive questions relating to course material via email. If you have questions, please see me during office hours.

**Use of Laptops and other electronic devices during lectures**
You may use a laptop for the purpose of taking notes, but please be aware that the use of laptops and other electronic devices can be distracting, both for yourself and for those around you. Please read:

Michael Oliveira, “Students' use of laptops in class lowers grades: Canadian study”, Ottawa Citizen, 15/08/13:
http://www.ottawacitizen.com/technology/Students+laptops+class+lowers+grades+Canadian+study/8788540/story.html

Please SWITCH OFF or destroy other electronic devices such as cell phones, ipods, tablets etc.

Presence is a course requirement!

Conduct of the Class

This course addresses sensitive and controversial moral, political, and social issues through a variety of approaches. These matters have been vigorously debated for many years, and are bound to give rise to disagreement. Carleton’s Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy states that: “The University requires tolerance, civil conduct, and respect for the rights of others. It endeavours to provide a safe environment, conducive to personal and intellectual growth, which is not only free of discrimination, injustice and violence but is also characterized by understanding, respect, peace, tolerance, trust, openness and fairness. Membership in the University community entails certain rights and responsibilities, including an obligation to deal ethically and fairly with other members and to not discriminate or harass. All members of the University community share responsibility for ensuring that the University’s educational, work and living environments respect these commitments”.

Incivility, disrespectful, discriminatory, harassing, or disruptive communication and/or conduct will not be tolerated.

Official Course Outline

The course outline posted to the Political Science website is the official course outline.
Please note that by choosing to take this course, you are agreeing to all of the above requirements and conditions. It is your responsibility to make sure you have read the entire course outline carefully, and to submit deliverables on time via the methods specified above.

**Reserved Readings**

There is no textbook to be purchased for this course. Instead, the items listed under topic headings below are on reserve. You will find them in cuLearn under “Library: View Course in Ares”.

The library will not place government documents on reserve, so you should look for them in the Documents Division on the second floor of the library under the call number I have provided.

**Lecture Notes**

As I do not wish to use valuable class time imparting factual data, I may make certain lecture notes/overhead materials available on CuLearn, but only IF CLASS ATTENDANCE IS CONSISTENTLY HIGH, i.e. over 90%.

The notes are NOT a substitute for class attendance – you will not be able to understand the context and meaning of the notes without the explanations and discussion offered during lectures. So if you choose not to attend class, you are choosing not to have the notes made available, for yourself and everyone else.

The data in these notes have been compiled from many different sources over years. These notes are my personal property: you are welcome to use/print them for your own use in this course, but for no other purpose.

**Course Topics and Readings**

You will notice that multiple readings are listed for each topic covered in this course. **Required readings are marked with an asterix (*) and are in purple.**

Other materials listed under each topic are there as supplemental readings for those who are interested in pursuing further reading, and to give you a sense of the range of issues explored in the literature. Obviously, the more you read, the better prepared you will be for examinations and research papers.

**Topics are not listed by calendar weeks, nor will equal lecture time necessarily be devoted to each.** Some sections may take more lecture time than others, and the Instructor reserves the right to delete certain topics, subject to time constraints.
Part 1: Sources of Morality, Relativism, Religion, Philosophy

Relativism

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “It is two and a half minutes to midnight: 2017 Doomsday Clock Statement”: https://thebulletin.org/sites/default/files/Final%202017%20Clock%20Statement.pdf

* Stephen Satris, TAKING SIDES: CLASHING VIEWS ON CONTROVERSIAL MORAL ISSUES, 4th edition, Part 1, "Fundamental Issues in Morality" (a series of five debates)

Judith A. Boss, ed. PERSPECTIVES ON ETHICS, (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1998):
  • * Stephen Satris, “Student Relativism”: 51-54
  • * Ibn Khaldun, “The Muqaddimah”: 67-70
  • * Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, “Hitler’s Willing Executioners”: 80-86
  • * Martin Luther King Jr., “Letter from a Birmingham Jail, 1968”: 87-91


Wesley Cragg and Christine Koggel, eds., CONTEMPORARY MORAL ISSUES, 5th edition, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 2005), ch. 11:
  • * David Wong, “Relativism”: 603-609
  • * Annette C. Baier, “The Need for More than Justice”: 610-619

  • Egbeke Aja, “Changing Moral Values in Africa: An Essay in Ethical Relativism”: 40-48
  • Margaret Urban Walker, “What Does the Different Voice Say?: Gilligan’s Women and Moral Philosophy”: 523-531
  • Adamantia Pollis and Peter Schwab, “Human Rights: A Western Construct with Limited Applicability”: 60-71

  • * Editors, Harvard Law Review, “What’s Culture Got to Do with It?: Excising the Harmful Tradition of Female Circumcision”: 108-116
'WESTERN PHILOSOPHIES ('THINKERS')

  • * Aristotle, “Nichomachean Ethics”: 30-36
  • * Thomas Hobbes, “Leviathan”: 37-44
  • * David Hume: “An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals”: 44-54
  • * Immanuel Kant, “The Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals”: 55-64
  • * John Stuart Mill, “Utilitarianism”: 65-73
  • * Friedrich Nietzsche, “The Genealogy of Morals: An Attack”: 75-82


Marcus Aurelius, “The Meditations” (167 A.C.E.): Book 1
http://classics.mit.edu/Antoninus/meditations.1.one.html

Nelson Mandela's First Court Statement, “Black Man in a White Court” – 1962:
http://www.nelsonmandela.org/omalley/index.php/site/q/03lv01538/04lv01600/05lv01624/06lv01625.htm


REligious Sources of Morality (believers)

http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/08/08/gods-blog


Judith A. Boss, ed. PERSPECTIVES ON ETHICS, (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1998):
  • Kai Nielsen, “Religious Ethics Versus Humanistic Ethics”: 154-163

Andrew Bernstein, “Religion versus Morality”, The Objective Standard, 7.3 (Fall 2012): p29+

  • Plato, “Euthyphro”: 240-241
  • William Lane Craig and Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, “God and Objective Morality: a Debate”: 248-252


Christopher Hitchens, GOD IS NOT GREAT: HOW RELIGION POISONS EVERYTHING, (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 2007)


Video: “Sam Harris simply destroys Christianity”
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AcO4TnrskEO

Video: The Quran Project: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=STz2FrpZnpw

Video: Bible or Quran Experiment: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fCQOsBFUUU
**Part 2: Applied Ethics**

**ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS**


- Lynn White, “The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis”: 5-10
- * Christopher Stone, “Should Trees Have Standing? Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects”: 85-89
- * David Schmidtz, “Are All Species Equal?”: 114-121
- * Aldo Leopold, “The Land Ethic”: 124-128
- Ramchandra Guha, “Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique”: 145-152
- V. Rukmini Rao, “Women Farmers of India’s Deccan Plateau Challenge World Elites”: 194-201
- David Schmidtz, “A Place for Cost-Benefit Analysis”: 387-400

* Willis Jenkins, “The Turn to Virtue in Climate Ethics: Wickedness and Goodness in the Anthropocene”, *Environmental Ethics*, 2016, 38, 1: 77-96


- P.S. Elder, “Legal Rights for Nature: the Wrong Answer for the Right(s) Question”: 98-106

Christopher G. Framarin, HINDUISM AND ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS, (London: Routledge, 2014)


John A. Grim, ed. INDIGENOUS TRADITIONS AND ECOLOGY, (Harvard U. P., 2001)


The Gaia Theory: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yvqMamiu2b4

Arne Naess and the Deep Ecology Movement: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GJz2zVW9WHM

NON-HUMAN ANIMALS

Canadian Criminal Code, sections 444-447, “Cattle and Other Animals”, “Cruelty to Animals”

• * Peter Singer, “All Animals are Equal”: 49-59
• * Mark Sagoff, “Animal Liberation and Environmental Ethics: Bad Marriage, Quick Divorce”: 59-65
• Holmes Rolston III, “Values in and Duties to the Natural World”: 66-84

• * Tom Regan, “Honey Dribbles Down Your Fur”: 430-441
• * Jan Narveson, “Against Animal Rights”: 441-445

• * William F. Baxter, “People or Penguins”: 480-485
• * Carl Cohen, “The Case for the Use of Animals in Biomedical Research”: 458-466

  * Bonnie Steinbock, “Speciesism and the Idea of Inequality”: 137-142


  * C. Sunstein, “Introduction: What Are Animal Rights?”: 3-14
  * Lesley Rogers and Gisela Kaplan, “All Animals Are Not Equal: the Interface Between Scientific Knowledge and Legislation for Animal Rights”: 175-204


Katherine Willis Perlo, KINSHIP AND KILLING: THE ANIMAL IN WORLD RELIGIONS, (New York: Columbia U.P., 2009)

Video: Frans de Waal: “Moral behavior in animals” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QoJxRqTs5nk
10 Animals that Saved other Animals: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NTcwOl2d2aq
Unbelievable Animal Friendships Compilation 2017: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_NPOD92a78I
POVERTY, THE RIGHT TO WELFARE AND THE DUTY TO ASSIST


- * Peter Singer, “Rich and Poor”: 316-323
- * Garrett Hardin, “Lifeboat Ethics: the Case Against Helping the Poor”: 324-333

- * Mark Sagoff, “Do We Consume Too Much?”: 205-221
- Henry Shue, “Global Environment and International Inequality”: 394-404
- * Holmes Rolston III, “Feeding People versus Saving Nature”: 404-416


- Stephanie Kaza, “How Much is Enough?: Buddhist Perspectives on Consumerism”: 39-61

Satris, TAKING SIDES: CLASHING VIEWS ON CONTROVERSIAL MORAL ISSUES, 4th edition, “Does Society Have an Obligation to Care for the Less Well Off?”
- Irving Kristol, “Two Cheers for Capitalism”: 159-165


- Onora O’Neill, Kantian Approaches to Some Famine Problems”: 553-564

Peter Singer, THE LIFE YOU CAN SAVE: ACTING NOW TO END WORLD POVERTY, (Random House, 2009)
GENETIC ENGINEERING/ BIOTECHNOLOGY


* Vandana Shiva, *BIOPIRACY: THE PLUNDER OF NATURE AND KNOWLEDGE* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1997), Introduction and chs. 1, 2


Brian Tokar, ed. *REDESIGNING LIFE?: THE WORLDWIDE CHALLENGE TO GENETIC ENGINEERING*, (McGill-Queen’s, 2001):
- * Marcy Darnovsky, “The Case Against Designer babies”: 133-149
- * Alix Fano, “If Pigs Could Fly They Would: the Problems with Xenotransplantation”: 182-194
- * Sarah Seton, “If Cloning is the Answer, What Was the Question?”: 158-170


*Science and Engineering Ethics* 13(1)

A case for a duty to feed the hungry: GM plants and the third world

*Authors*

- Lucy Carter

*Source Information*

March 2007Volume, 13(Issue1)Page, p.69To-82

- Mickey Gjerris, “Animal Biotechnology: the ethical landscape”: 47-69


- David T. Wasserman, “My Fair Baby: What’s Wrong with Parents Genetically Enhancing their Children?": 99-110


Julie S. Bach, BIOMEDICAL ETHICS: OPPOSING VIEWPOINTS, (Greenhaven Press/ Nelson Canada, 1987), ch. 1, Sharon McAuliffe, "Is Genetic Engineering Ethical?": 16-63
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