

PHL 379A ETHICS & DECISION MAKING: VISIONS, VALUES AND VIRTUES FOR LEADERSHIP

Review for the First Test to be given on Monday, October 3, 2005

There will be **three sections** on this test. Pick one question (out of 3) from Section I; pick one question (out of 3) from Section II; and pick one question (out of 3) from Section III. Once you pick a question, answer all parts of the question. For example, if you chose question 2, you must answer 2a, 2b, and 2c. Each question is worth 6 points; each [a, b, c] sub-question is worth 2 points. The entire test is worth 18 points. Answer carefully, thoughtfully, accurately. Take c. 20-25 min. for each question.

**Not everything on this review sheet is on the test,
but everything on the test is on this review sheet.**

Things that were to be memorized and remembered evermore . . .

1. **Class mission** – to come to life more fully so as to act more wisely and more effectively to reduce suffering and to promote possibility for our common life – [common life will be expanded to what is Good for the Whole and Fair to the Participant Parts. This leads to the Traffic Light Model]
2. **Wisdom Chant:** There are at least TWO ways to relate to anything: a small-minded way and a large-minded way. Choose large mind!
[Note: this links with fundamental distinction What and WURT. And it links to the notion of **practice as recognition of small mind** (or WURT) – partial, asleep, enslaved, reactive **and ability to shift to LARGE MIND** (or WURT) – more whole, more awake, more free, more response-able.]
3. Definitions: **Manipulative Persuasion, Paternalism & Respectful (Non-Manipulative) Persuasion.**
4. The **one sentence mini-method:** To say “Z is ethically wrong.” Is equivalent to saying “There is reason and reason enough based on ethical criteria and the facts of the case to disapprove doing Z by myself and others.”
5. The Six Seductive S’s of the Modern Worldview and their reversal in the Emerging Ecological View:
separate substances or selves (these 2 S’s can be taken as one) vs. **interconnection**
– relational fields and participant-parts
viewed under conditions of **scarcity** vs. **intersufficiency**
prizing of **seen only** vs. **interweaving of seen and unseen** (more subtle)
prizing of **short term only** vs. **intergenerational time (short and longer term valued)**
leadership as **superiority over** vs. leadership as **intercollaboration**

More generally,

Know and be able to explain the following: (a) Our class mission and the definition of ethics implicit in our Class Mission, (b) The fundamental distinction is between (i) on the first or ground floor level -- **what is happening** and (ii) on the second floor level -- **how we are relating to** [whatever is happening].). “How we are relating to” (whatever is happening) can be expanded to the notion of a WURT = a **Way of Understanding and Responding To** [whatever is happening]. This shows the language or meaning aspect and the emotional or value aspect. (c) the Wisdom Chant. Give and explain the criteria by which some ways are small-minded and other ways are large-minded.

Be able to discuss why ethics involves commitment, criteria and careful and compassionate thinking.

Know the **Traffic Light Model** in its two forms: (A). **Traffic Light in the sense of Minimal ethics** with Double criteria on ACTIONS or POLICIES + Double criteria on BLAMEWORTHINESS (R=XXF) knowledge (opposite of deception) & free consent (opposite of coercion) -- together informed consent. and (B) **the Traffic Light in the sense of Aspirational ethics** ---

From negative – thou shalt not . . . to positive = contributions to community and persons
From extrinsic factors (reward/punishment; praise/blame) to intrinsic factors
(pointing to the nature of communities (wholes) and to persons (participant parts)
From everything seen in terms of ME vs. commitment to the WE perspective.

Be able to show how on the Traffic Light model, one can separate question one: **How destructive was the action?** And question two: **How responsible was the agent?** Give the dual criteria for answering each question. Show how "deception / fraud" on the one hand and "coercion / force" on the other both diminish ethical responsibility

Concerning the Traffic Light Model: How might the "whole" be of different sizes? How might a policy be good for the whole and not fair to its parts or members? How might a policy be fair but not good for the whole? How might something be good for the whole (say, a family) and fair to its parts, but not good for a wider whole (e.g. the nation)? How could something be good for the whole (say a nation) and fair to its parts but not good for the planet?

Be able to explain the interpersonal domain, the institutional domain and the planetary domain. (On the nature of institutions, see Appendix VI.) Know the Lake Analogy and how it can apply to any domain.

At planetary level the paradigm of Modern epoch with its six seductive S's is moving to the emerging Ecological epoch with its interbeing, intersufficiency, interweaving of seen and subtle aspects, intergenerational time and intercollaboration.

In what ways has the modern paradigm brought great gifts? Why is it that many believe that the modern paradigm also has unhealthy and addictive aspects?

Be able to give the technical definition of manipulation (also called manipulative persuasion-- MP) as found in our enrichment material. What is the view of the person that underlies MP? Be able to show that MP is always ethically wrong (though to differing degrees) because it is non-reversible. Be able to give the technical definition of non-manipulative persuasion (NMP). What is the underlying image of the person here? Is NMP reversible? Be able to give the precise definition of paternalism that we have been using. Claims of paternalism are not always justified. Give a case of justified paternalism and explain why it is justified. Give a case where you would argue paternalism is not justified and explain why it is not.

In light of the one sentence mini-method of philosophical ethics [i.e. There is reason and reason enough . . .], compare and contrast philosophical ethics and religious ethics in terms of starting points and criteria and revisability. Compare and contrast philosophical ethics with law in terms of starting points, sanctions, attitude and scope.

Be able to go through the six steps of the Star of David Model. What does it mean to put a proposal into standard form? How can a proposal or action be put into absolute standard form or into qualified standard form. Be able to give three reasons why it is valuable to put a proposal into standard form. What are the "Golden Rule" tests? What are the social utility tests?

What does it mean to shift our thinking

(i) **from** seeing a one-to-one relationship as 2 people (and nothing more)

to (ii) seeing two and thinking three --Think partnership first and then you and me.

How does seeing a relationship from the point of view of the relationship itself differ from seeing it from the points of view of the two partners? What might one learn in doing this?

How can seeing a one-to-one relationship under the imagery of bowl and then boat and then garden and then kingdom or commonwealth aid us to make that shift? Once we see relationships as potential partnerships, then we can invoke the Chinese archetypes of the ministers to see how the relational field may be supported. Be able to list the five archetypes and be able to explain how one can "apprentice to each archetype and give gifts or exercise functions for the good of the whole from each Minister.

To find our calling is to find the intersection between our own deep gladness and the world's deep hunger. Frederick Buechner