Today’s Agenda

1. Homework debrief.
2. Guest lecturer: Damian Grace
3. Beyond Borders: doing business abroad
Today’s handouts

Lecture overheads (Bob’s)

Lecture overheads (Damian’s)

(A volunteer for the Course Evaluation tomorrow?)
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Are These True?

1. The moral deed cannot be practical;

2. What is good and moral differs from what one wants to do;

3. Self-interest invariably undermines social order and well-being;

4. Reason and emotion are opposing forces;

5. Worthy research and art are incompatible with money and business.
Questions for the filmed vignettes.

1. What are the facts?

2. What are the issues?

3. Who is the actor and what are his/her options?

4. What would you do?

5. What would have helped at the time?

Four clips: John (S.E. Asia), Roberto (Europe), Kay (Latin America), and Carter (the Middle East).
Cross-Cultural Ethics

from Damian

Ethical Relativism:

at one level it’s true *descriptively*:

Societies do differ in cultural beliefs (about killing, property, education, about the rôles of the sexes, religious observance, foods, etc).

... and ER has Strengths and Weaknesses —
Ethical Relativism — the strengths

- ER encourages tolerance
- ER encourages openness
- ER allows people to choose the values that suit them best
- ER allows for morality to change
- ER encourages respect for other individuals and societies
Are these strengths unique to Relativism?

Aren’t tolerance and respect for others aspects of other ethical frameworks?

Anyway, isn’t relativism more about indifference than respect?

And doesn’t relativism require us to be less committed to our own ethical values?
Descriptive versus Normative

Does ethical relativism base its “norm” of respect for others on the fact that cultures *do in fact* differ?

Does ethical relativism assert that some things *ought to be done* and that others *should not be*, on the basis of difference?

Remember the logical distinction between *what is* and *what ought to be*. 
Some implications of ethical relativism

• We cannot criticise other cultures (none is best), but nor can we learn from them or they from us.
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- We cannot criticise other cultures (none is best), but nor can we learn from them or they from us.

- There can be no moral progress.

- There is no reason to be concerned for people in other cultures, or to work towards change (such as ending child labour or making poverty history), but instead there is reason to be unconcerned or indifferent. ("Different strokes for different folks.")
International Ethical Comparisons


• **2007 Corruption Perception Index:**
  Denmark & Finland & NZ (=1), Sweden & Singapore (=4), Iceland (6),
  Netherlands & Switzerland (=7), Norway & Canada (=9), Australia (=11), UK (=12), Ireland (=17), France (19), US (20), S.Korea (=43),
  China & India (=72), Lebanon (=99), Indonesia (=143), Myanmar (=179).
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• **2006 Corruption Perception Index:**
  Finland & Iceland & NZ (=1), Denmark (4), Singapore (5), Sweden
  (6), Switzerland (7), Norway (8), Australia & Netherlands (=9) UK
  (=11), Canada (14), France & Ireland (=18), USA (=20) S. Korea (=42),
  Lebanon (=66), China & India (=70), Indonesia (=130), Haïti (163).
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- **2006 Corruption Perception Index:**
  Finland & Iceland & NZ (=1), Denmark (4), Singapore (5), Sweden (6), Switzerland (7), Norway (8), Australia & Netherlands (=9) UK (=11), Canada (14), France & Ireland (=18), USA (=20) S. Korea (=42), Lebanon (=66), China & India (=70), Indonesia (=130), Haïti (163).

- **2006 Bribe-Payers Index:**
  Switzerland (1), Sweden (2), Australia (3), Canada (5), UK (6), US (=9), France (15), S. Korea (21) China (29), India (30).
De George’s Code for Trans-National Business Ethics

- Do no intentional harm in the host country.
- Benefit the host country and its development.
- Respect the human rights and dignity of workers.
- Respect the values, culture, and laws of the host country so long as these don’t involve moral inconsistency or the abridgement of human rights.
- Help to build background institutions that are just in the host country and internationally.

*Competing with Integrity in International Business*, OxfordUP, 1993
Or else ... 

Classic consumer-led campaigns against:

- Nestlé (infant formula)
- Nike (sweatshop labour)
- Shell (oil pollution, inequity)
- McDonalds (many)
- . . . who else?
Where the “floor” is much lower ...

Wages: Should the MNC (multi-national company) pay wages in the host country equal to those paid at home?

Working Conditions: should the MNC provide similar conditions for employees from host countries?

Environmental Standards: should the MNC maintain (higher) home country standards?

Should MNCs exploit the natural resources of developing countries? (Shell in Nigeria? BHP in PNG?)
Confucian Ethics

Kongfuzi or Confucius (550–479 B.C.) has influenced over 2000 years of thought in China and beyond.

Master Kong developed the three principles of *Li*, *Ren*, and *Junzi*.

*Li*: the ideal standards of conduct: religious, moral, and social.

*Ren*: the virtues of goodness and benevolence; a recognition of value and concern for others. (*Jen* in Giles-Wade.)

The Silver Rule:
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Kongfuzi or Confucius (550–479 B.C.) has influenced over 2000 years of thought in China and beyond.

Master Kong developed the three principles of *Li, Ren*, and *Junzi*.

**Li**: the ideal standards of conduct: religious, moral, and social.

**Ren**: the virtues of goodness and benevolence; a recognition of value and concern for others. (*Jen* in Giles-Wade.)

The Silver Rule:
“Don’t do unto others what you would not like them to do to you.”

*Li* provides a structure for social interaction
*Ren* makes it a moral system.
Junzi

Junzi (or Chun-Tzu, ruler’s son, in Giles-Wade):

the true or virtuous gentleman or person
he who lives by the highest ethical standards,
and displays the five virtues:

1. self-respect
2. generosity
3. sincerity
4. persistence
5. benevolence
Junzi

Relationships:

- as a son: loyal
- as a father: just and kind
- as a husband: righteous and just
- as an official: loyal and faithful
- as a friend: faithful and tactful

Note: Confucius held that we are inherently good creatures.

Against Christianity: ?
Junzi

Relationships:

as a son  loyal
as a father  just and kind
as a husband  righteous and just
as an official  loyal and faithful
as a friend  faithful and tactful

Note: Confucius held that we are inherently good creatures.
Against Christianity: ? Original sin.

see http://www-chaos.umd.edu/history/ancient2.html for discussion of his disciples Meng Zi and Xun Zi and the schools of Literati and Legalism and of yin-yang and of Mo Zi.
Essay Topics

These were handed out last Tuesday.

Individual work, due by 4pm on October 5th.

Choose one topic only.

Maximum: 2000 words, in a critical essay.

See Notes on Essay-writing, at