

Chapter 1 : STRUCTURE magazine | The Ethics and Politics of Resilience

Politics compares the different forms of government and studies its constitutions in order to draw the picture of the best form of a government. Ethics on the other hand is a study of a man, his character, intention, and desire etc. in order to assess his conduct.

The Question and the Strategy 1. After Socrates asks his host what it is like being old and rich and rather rude, we might think Cephalus says that the best thing about wealth is that it can save us from being unjust and thus smooth the way for an agreeable afterlife. This is enough to prompt more questions, for Socrates wants to know what justice is. Predictably, Cephalus and then Polemarchus fail to define justice in a way that survives Socratic examination, but they continue to assume that justice is a valuable part of a good human life. Thrasymachus erupts when he has had his fill of this conversation, and he challenges the assumption that it is good to be just. The strong themselves, on this view, are better off disregarding justice and serving their own interests directly. See the entry on Callicles and Thrasymachus. The brothers pick up where Thrasymachus left off, providing reasons why most people think that justice is not intrinsically valuable but worth respecting only if one is not strong enough or invisible enough to get away with injustice. They want to be shown that most people are wrong, that justice is worth choosing for its own sake. More than that, Glaucon and Adeimantus want to be shown that justice is worth choosing regardless of the rewards or penalties bestowed on the just by other people and the gods, and they will accept this conclusion only if Socrates can convince them that it is always better to be just. So Socrates must persuade them that the just person who is terrifically unfortunate and scorned lives a better life than the unjust person who is so successful that he is unfairly rewarded as if he were perfectly just. The challenge that Glaucon and Adeimantus present has baffled modern readers who are accustomed to carving up ethics into deontologies that articulate a theory of what is right independent of what is good and consequentialisms that define what is right in terms of what promotes the good Foster, Mabbott, cf. Prichard. But the insistence that justice be shown to be beneficial to the just has suggested to others that Socrates will be justifying justice by reference to its consequences. In fact, both readings are distortions, predicated more on what modern moral philosophers think than on what Plato thinks. At the beginning of Book Two, he retains his focus on the person who aims to be happy. But he does not have to show that being just or acting justly brings about happiness. The function argument in Book One suggests that acting justly is the same as being happy. But the function argument concludes that justice is both necessary and sufficient for happiness, and this is a considerably stronger thesis than the claim that the just are always happier than the unjust. After the challenge Glaucon and Adeimantus present, Socrates might not be so bold. Even if he successfully maintains that acting justly is identical to being happy, he might think that there are circumstances in which no just person could act justly and thus be happy. This will nonetheless satisfy Glaucon and Adeimantus if the just are better off, that is, closer to happy than the unjust in these circumstances. See also Kirwan and Irwin. He suggests looking for justice as a virtue of cities before defining justice as a virtue of persons, on the unconvincing grounds that justice in a city is bigger and more apparent than justice in a person, and this leads Socrates to a rambling description of some features of a good city. This may seem puzzling. The arguments of Book One and the challenge of Glaucon and Adeimantus rule out several more direct routes. But Book One rules this strategy out by casting doubt on widely accepted accounts of justice. Socrates must say what justice is in order to answer the question put to him, and what he can say is constrained in important ways. Most obviously, he cannot define justice as happiness without begging the question. But he also must give an account of justice that his interlocutors recognize as justice: Moreover, Socrates cannot try to define justice by enumerating the types of action that justice requires or forbids. We might have objected to this strategy for this reason: But a specific argument in Book One suggests a different reason why Socrates does not employ this strategy. When Cephalus characterizes justice as keeping promises and returning what is owed, Socrates objects by citing a case in which returning what is owed would not be just. Wrongful killing may always be wrong, but is killing? Just recompense may always be right, but is recompense? So Book One makes it

difficult for Socrates to take justice for granted. What is worse, the terms in which Socrates accepts the challenge of Glaucon and Adeimantus make it difficult for him to take happiness for granted. If Socrates were to proceed like a consequentialist, he might offer a full account of happiness and then deliver an account of justice that both meets with general approval and shows how justice brings about happiness. But Socrates does not proceed like that. He does not even do as much as Aristotle does in the *Nicomachean Ethics*; he does not suggest some general criteria for what happiness is. He proceeds as if happiness is unsettled. But if justice at least partly constitutes happiness and justice is unsettled, then Socrates is right to proceed as if happiness is unsettled. In sum, Socrates needs to construct an account of justice and an account of happiness at the same time, and he needs these accounts to entail without assuming the conclusion that the just person is always happier than the unjust. Socrates can assume that a just city is always more successful or happy than an unjust city. The assumption begs no questions, and Glaucon and Adeimantus readily grant it. If Socrates can then explain how a just city is always more successful and happy than an unjust city, by giving an account of civic justice and civic happiness, he will have a model to propose for the relation between personal justice and flourishing. There must be some intelligible relation between what makes a city successful and what makes a person successful. It works even if it only introduces an account of personal justice and happiness that we might not have otherwise entertained. Although this is all that the city-person analogy needs to do, Socrates seems at times to claim more for it, and one of the abiding puzzles about the *Republic* concerns the exact nature and grounds for the full analogy that Socrates claims. At other times Socrates seems to say that the same account of justice must apply in both cases because the F-ness of a whole is due to the F-ness of its parts. Again, at times Socrates seems to say that these grounds are strong enough to permit a deductive inference: At other times, Socrates would prefer to use the F-ness of the city as a heuristic for locating F-ness in persons. Plato is surely right to think that there is some interesting and non-accidental relation between the structural features and values of society and the psychological features and values of persons, but there is much controversy about whether this relation really is strong enough to sustain all of the claims that Socrates makes for it in the *Republic*. Williams, Lear, Smith, Ferrari. Rather, it depends upon a persuasive account of justice as a personal virtue, and persuasive reasons why one is always happier being just than unjust. What Justice Is 2. So his account of what justice is depends upon his account of the human soul. According to the *Republic*, every human soul has three parts: This is a claim about the embodied soul. In Book Ten, Socrates argues that the soul is immortal and says that the disembodied soul might be simple, though he declines to insist on this and the *Timaeus* and *Phaedrus* apparently disagree on the question. At first blush, the tripartition can suggest a division into beliefs, emotions, and desires. But Socrates explicitly ascribes beliefs, emotions, and desires to each part of the soul. In fact, it is not even clear that Plato would recognize psychological attitudes that are supposed to be representational without also being affective and conative, or conative and affective without also being representational. The *Republic* offers two general reasons for the tripartition. First, Socrates argues that we cannot coherently explain certain cases of psychological conflict unless we suppose that there are at least two parts to the soul. The core of this argument is what we might call the principle of non-opposition: Because of this principle, Socrates insists that one soul cannot be the subject of opposing attitudes unless one of three conditions is met. One soul can be the subject of opposing attitudes if the attitudes oppose each other at different times, even in rapidly alternating succession as Hobbes explains mental conflict. One soul can also be the subject of opposing attitudes if the attitudes relate to different things, as a desire to drink champagne and a desire to drink a martini might conflict. Last, one soul can be the subject of opposing attitudes if the attitudes oppose in different respects. Initially, this third condition is obscure. The way Socrates handles putative counter-examples to the principle of non-opposition might suggest that when one thing experiences one opposite in one of its parts and another in another, it is not experiencing opposites in different respects. Stalley; Bobonich, 31; Lorenz, 23. That would entail, apparently, that it is not one thing experiencing opposites at all, but merely a plurality. The most natural way of relating these two articulations of the principle is to suppose that experiencing one opposite in one part and another in another is just one way to experience opposites in different respects. But however we relate the two articulations to each other, Socrates clearly concludes that one soul can experience simultaneously opposing

attitudes in relation to the same thing, but only if different parts of it are the direct subjects of the opposing attitudes. Socrates employs this general strategy four times. In Book Four, he twice considers conflicting attitudes about what to do. First, he imagines a desire to drink being opposed by a calculated consideration that it would be good not to drink *a*€”d. We might think, anachronistically, of someone about to undergo surgery. This is supposed to establish a distinction between appetite and reason. Then he considers cases like that of Leontius, who became angry with himself for desiring to ogle corpses *e*€”b. These cases are supposed to establish a distinction between appetite and spirit. In Book Ten, Socrates appeals to the principle of non-opposition when considering the decent man who has recently lost a son and is conflicted about grieving *e*€”b cf. Austin and when considering conflicting attitudes about how things appear to be *c*€”b cf. Moss and Singpurwalla. These show a broad division between reason and an inferior part of the soul Ganson ; it is compatible with a further distinction between two inferior parts, spirit and appetite. In the Protagoras, Socrates denies that anyone willingly does other than what she believes to be best, but in the Republic, the door is opened for a person to act on an appetitive attitude that conflicts with a rational attitude for what is best. How far the door is open to *akrasia* awaits further discussion below. First, what kinds of parts are reason, spirit, and appetite? Some scholars believe that they are merely conceptual parts, akin to subsets of a set Shields , Price. They would object to characterizing the parts as subjects of psychological attitudes. At face value, Socrates offers a more robust conception of parts, wherein each part is like an independent agent. Indeed, this notion of parts is robust enough to make one wonder why reason, spirit, and appetite are parts at all, as opposed to three independent subjects. But the Republic proceeds as though every embodied human being has just one soul that comprises three parts. No embodied soul is perfectly unified: She must, as we shall see, in order to be just. But every embodied soul enjoys an unearned unity: It is not as though a person is held responsible for what his reason does but not for what his appetite does. There are questions about what exactly explains this unearned unity of the soul see E.

Chapter 2 : Plato's Ethics and Politics in The Republic (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Not that ethics and politics exhaust the concerns of the Republic. The account in Books Five through Seven of how a just city and a just person are in principle possible is an account of how knowledge can rule, which includes discussion of what knowledge and its objects are.

Sep, By David L. With the establishment of the U. The idea is that we should design structures to be more resilient in the face of the natural disasters to which we anticipate they will be exposed. It is proposed that we design buildings to performance objectives higher than the current code mandates. The present basis of design within the building code is, in general, based on Life Safety. Risk is a part of life, so the establishment of a proper level of risk was required. Seismic risk is a bit more complicated, involving seismology, geology, fragility curves, etc. But for most of the U. This seems reasonable since the Constitution of the United States gives the government a role in protecting the lives of the public. Therefore, when we design and build structures that others will enter, it is proper that the government mandate that the design and construction comply with a Life-Safety objective, with risks properly considered. So, it is natural to ask "should the government impose mandates on private citizens that require higher resilience in privately owned buildings? This question cannot be answered independently of political philosophy. Those with a more liberal political view argue that this clause gives wide latitude to the government to impose more regulations on property owners given larger societal concerns. Local governments essentially rely on this clause as they enforce zoning regulations, etc. On the flip side, conservatives argue that free market forces should be adequate to move the construction industry towards resilience. For example, insurance companies are among the best evaluators of risk. If they price insurance commensurate with building resilience, there is a free market force at work. If the perception of risk changes such that the public demands more resilient buildings, then lease rates for those buildings will bring higher profits and building owners will move toward providing such buildings. Now, if resilience is to be sold on the free market, how ought we to approach this? Are there ethical considerations? This is where it gets a bit thorny. As educated professionals, society affords us some respect with regards to understanding risks associated with the design of buildings. We are bound, by our code of ethics, to communicate the risks to society in a truthful manner. But, as we enter into this realm of design beyond the current code, there is a new issue that we are faced with. There are many ways to present findings when statistical probabilities are involved. And so, various people looking at the same data might assess the uncertainties differently and arrive at different conclusions. Risk will always be a part of life. And so, people have different levels of tolerance for risk. Therefore, as we communicate with those whose money must be spent to increase building resiliency, we need to understand that their level of risk tolerance may be different than ours. Wealthy people might have the resources to spend more to reduce risks related to building resiliency. How should we respond if owners do not want to spend more money on their building? I think that if we are too invested in advocating for resilience, we might tend to overstate the risks, overstate the amount of possible future savings, and undervalue the present value of the money that must be spent. I also fear that we might decide that, since we are so smart, we must protect the general public from themselves and therefore move toward mandating resilience through government force. As we find ourselves involved in discussions regarding resilience, we must understand the repercussions of advocating for code changes that will increase building performance beyond basic life safety. If we choose to advocate for increased resilience, we must carefully consider whether or not we want it to be brought about through free market forces or government intervention. And if by government intervention, then we must acknowledge that we are advocating for some level of infringement on the rights of American citizens.

Chapter 3 : Center for Ethics in Government | Governmental Ethics Issues

Judy Nadler, Senior Fellow in Government Ethics and former mayor of the city of Santa Clara, moderated the panel. The "rule of three" served as a theme for both presenters, each of whom outlined three central talking points, similar in concept but with different perspectives.

Passages in Aristotle are cited as follows: Politics is abbreviated as Pol. Most translations include the Bekker page number with column letter in the margin followed by every fifth line number. Oxford University Press, Princeton University Press, University of Chicago Press, , revised edition. Harvard University Press, University of North Carolina Press, Saunders, Politics I&II Also of interest is the Constitution of Athens, an account of the history and workings of the Athenian democracy. Although it was formerly ascribed to Aristotle, it is now thought by most scholars to have been written by one of his pupils, perhaps at his direction toward the end of his life. A reliable translation with introduction and notes is by P. Ethics and Politics , London: Cambridge University Press, Keyt, David, and Fred D. Kraut, Richard, and Steven Skultety eds. Critical Essays, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, Lockwood, Thornton, and Thanassis Samaras eds. A Critical Guide, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, University of California Press, Methuen, ; reprinted, New York: Frank, Jill, A Democracy of Distinction: Aristotle and the Work of Politics, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Keyt, David, Nature and Justice: Nichols, Mary, Citizens and Statesmen: University of Chicago Press, , pp. Susemihl, Franz, and R. Hicks, The Politics of Aristotle, London: Veogelin, Eric, Order and History Volume 3: Louisiana State University Press, Studies of Particular Topics 1. Fundamentals of the History of His Development, Oxford: Cambridge University Press, , pp. Oxford University Press, , pp. Rowman and Littlefield, , pp. Aristotelian Political Philosophy Volume 1 , Athens: International Center for Greek Philosophy and Culture, , pp. Critical Essays, Lanham MD: Reprinted in David Keyt, Nature and Justice: Rowe and Malcolm Schofield eds. SUNY Press, , pp. Pennsylvania State University Press, Reason or Rationalization, Chicago: Hintikka eds Discovering Reality: Political Economy Ambler, Wayne H. Foundational Thinkers and Business Ethics, Chicago: Oxford University Press, pp. Cambridge University Press, , â€” In David Keyt, Nature and Justice: Fondation Hardt, , pp. Brooks and James Bernard Murphy eds. Essays Presented to G. Akademie Verlag, , pp. University of California Press, , pp. Vander Waert, Paul A. Education Burnyeat, Myles F. Cornell University Press, Law Brooks, Richard O. Hamburger, Max, Morals and Law: Yale University Press, Living Well and Living Together, Chicago: Chicago University Press, State University of New York Press, University of Notre Dame Press, , â€” Bruce Douglas, Gerald M. Mara, and Henry S. Richardson eds Liberalism and the Good, London: Den Uyl, Liberty and Nature: University of Notre Dame Press,

Chapter 4 : Aristotle: Politics | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

"Ethics in politics" seems to many a contradiction in terms, even though many politicians try to give their best for the common cause of a country or the international community.

It has been said that the Ethics is still the best springboard for the consideration of ethical problems and dilemmas. The purpose of ethics for Aristotle is simply to find the ultimate purpose of human life, once again demonstrating his emphasis on teleology. Ethics falls under the category of practical sciences, since its concern is not knowledge for its own sake but rather for the purpose of application. Aristotle first recognizes that happiness is the ultimate good, since all other goods are intermediate while happiness is final. We pursue other goods to achieve happiness, but happiness is valuable in itself. The problem then becomes the question of how to achieve happiness. Pleasure is undeniably the motivation behind many actions, but it puts humans on the level of animals. Honor is another possibility, but it places too much emphasis on the praise of others. Aristotle concludes that the means of happiness—and hence the purpose of human existence—is virtue. Virtue involves habit and choice. By making the proper decisions, we eventually develop a virtuous habit or disposition, so that we need not run through the catalogue of options every time a moral dilemma presents itself. Rather, we act according to our disposition, which has been cultivated by past choices. The question then arises: For Aristotle, the virtuous choice was the mean between two extremes: For example, between profligacy and insensibility there lies self-discipline; between obsequiousness and coldness there lies friendliness. Aristotle goes on to discuss the concept of justice, of which he recognized two forms: Particular justice is further divided into distributive and remedial: Another central tension in the book is the issue of continence and incontinence—that is, the strength or weakness of the will. While Socrates believed that all wrongdoing arose from ignorance, Aristotle took the more intuitive view: To show how an incontinent person does know the good, Aristotle allows that the person possesses the knowledge potentially but not actually. In an incontinent person, desire prevents the potential knowledge from becoming actualized during the critical moment. Aristotle concludes the Ethics with a discussion of the highest form of happiness: Since reason is what separates humanity from animals, its exercise leads man to the highest virtue. As he closes the argument, he notes that such a contemplative life is impossible without the appropriate social environment, and such an environment is impossible without the appropriate government. Thus the end of Ethics provides the perfect segue into the Politics.

Chapter 5 : SparkNotes: Aristotle: Ethics and Politics, page 2

On November 4, , the Government Department sponsored a discussion on ethics, power and politics with Oscar-winning actor Kevin Spacey and Georgetown government faculty member Ron Klain (C'83).

Find out more about government ethics and scandals Introduction to Government Ethics What is ethics and what does it have to do with government? In our daily lives we are constantly faced with important questions about what to do. Should I keep my promise or should I not? Should I report a lost wallet, or simply keep the money inside? Should I give to the panhandler or keep my change? Ethics, as a field of study, attempts to find principles and rules for answering such questions. Professional Codes of Conduct An important field of study in ethics is professional codes of conduct. These codes of conduct set out very clear guidelines of what are considered right and wrong behaviours within the particular profession. Government ethics, therefore, involves rules and guidelines about right and wrong behaviours for a host of different groups, including elected leaders such as the Prime Minister and Cabinet Ministers , elected representatives such as Members of Parliament , political staff, and public servants. These groups are faced with a variety of difficult and very unique ethical questions. Should elected representatives be allowed to accept expensive gifts from lobby groups? When can a public official divulge personal information about citizens? How should public servants treat their co-workers and subordinates? Government ethics identifies what are correct behaviours in each of these situations and establishes rules of conduct for public officials to follow. One reason often cited is the importance of government ethics to democratic participation. If, however, Canadians came to believe that politicians and governments were generally unethical or corrupt, they might develop a strong sense of apathy towards their democracy. This, in turn, may result in people withdrawing from democratic participation altogether. You may have heard comments such as: They are all crooks anyway. By setting out clear rules that public officials must abide by, and by holding persons accountable when those rules are broken, Canadians can have confidence in their elected representatives and political system. It goes without saying that there will always be scandals that violate ethics. However, Canadians can take some comfort in knowing that when unethical behaviour does occur, appropriate actions are taken to punish the person s responsible. Moreover, governments are responsible for providing very important services to citizens, such as social services, public utilities, police services, and national security. Citizens, therefore, have a strong interest in ensuring this public money and property, as well as services upon which they depend, are managed as efficiently and effectively as possible. This requires taking precautions against activities that cause widespread government waste and inefficiency. Government ethics, properly enforced, can be a valuable means for protecting against government waste and ensuring effective public administration. Such a code can prohibit many of the activities that lead to waste, including theft by public officials and use of government property for private gain. It can also address issues such as bribery and conflicts of interest; activities that can lead public officials to sacrifice the public interest in the administration of programs and services for private gain and benefit. With respect to government and public officials, several different sorts of conduct are often held to be unethical: This includes everything from land and buildings, to vehicles and aircraft, to office equipment and furniture. One of the more serious ethical issues in government is theft of public property by public officials. Such theft can range from the trivial, such as taking home office supplies, to the more grave, such as stealing millions of dollars from the public purse. Fraud is one of the most common, and costly, forms of theft by public officials. Often referred to as theft by deception or trickery, fraud occurs when an individual deliberately deceives others in order to unjustly gain money, property, or services. There are many different ways in which public officials attempt to defraud government and taxpayers. They may, for example, submit false expense reports for costs they did not incur, or provide inflated work invoices for services they did not render. In the most extreme situations, public officials may participate in elaborate schemes of deception to divert large amounts of public funds from government programs and services into their own pockets. Improper Use of Government Property Theft and fraud, however, are not the only ethical concerns regarding government property. Another important issue is the use of public property by public officials for private benefit. Such abuses of government

property are not exactly theft. The public official is not actually stealing the office telephone or the government vehicle. Instead, the issue concerns the purpose for which the government property is being used. There is an expectation that equipment and transportation will be used only for activities associated with the performance of public duties, and not for purely personal reasons or for private benefit. Bribery occurs when a person of authority is offered, and accepts, some personal benefit in exchange for performing some action. A public official may, for example, be offered money, property, or free services. Regular forms of bribery involve a private individual or group approaching a public official and attempting to buy interests. Bribery and influence peddling can be very detrimental to public perceptions of government, as well as effective public administration. In a democracy, we tend to view our bureaucrats and elected officials as being responsible to, and servants of, the general public. The concern here is often the same as with bribery and influence peddling. When there is conflict of interest, however, there is a concern that the public official may favour some interest other than the general public. Conflict of interest arises in many different situations. Self-dealing is one of the most obvious ones. Concerns over conflict of interest can also arise when public officials deal with persons with whom they have close relations, such as family members, close friends, and business partners. The concern here is that the public official will place the interests of this particular individual above the greater interests of the public. Many countries have implemented conflict of interest rules. Public officials may be required, for example, to divest their business interests prior to taking office. This may involve selling the interest, or placing it temporarily under the control of someone else for example, placing it in a trust. Officials may also be required to take certain precautions when dealing with situations that potentially involve conflict of interest. They may, for example, be required to excuse themselves from certain government decisions where they have a private interest at stake, or, at the minimum, disclose the nature of their interest publicly. An important area of government ethics is concerned with the conduct of public officials in regard to this sensitive information. Generally speaking, there is often an expectation that public officials will keep this information confidential and will not inappropriately divulge what they know. Confidentiality can be important for different reasons, depending on the situation. In the case of military secrets, confidentiality is often viewed as essential to the physical security of the nation and its people. In the case of personal information, confidentiality is important to personal privacy and dignity. In many countries individuals have the right to keep personal information private; government officials are obliged to respect that privacy. Improper Conduct Post-Employment To this point, much of the discussion has focused on unethical activities by public officials while in office. Another developing area in the study of government ethics, however, focuses on the conduct of public officials as they make the transition from the public service to private employment. There are many potential issues here, ranging from conflict of interest, to improper use of confidential information, to bribery and influence peddling. Prior to leaving office, for example, a public servant or elected official may grant favours to certain individuals or groups as a means of securing future employment. The desire to secure future employment may lead the public official into a conflict of interest situation, or, in more serious cases, into situations of bribery or influence peddling. Another concern is the activities of government officials once an individual is in the private sector. Such individuals may have confidential information about a future government policy; this information could offer the former public servant a distinct advantage in the marketplace with respect to investing, for example. Former officials may also use their connections to gain preferential treatment or privileged access to government after leaving office. Often there is a moratorium on working with particular clients, or with a given industry. Immoral Conduct by Public Officials One of the more controversial areas of government ethics is the personal moral conduct of public officials. This would cover issues such as sexual harassment, discrimination, drug abuse, and extra-marital affairs. The underlying concern here is whether the public servant or elected official is a person of good moral character and worthy to hold public office. For example, public officials are often expected to treat co-workers and subordinates with a certain level of respect, and are prohibited from engaging in certain activities such as sexual harassment or discrimination on the basis of gender, race, religion, or sexuality. Public officials are also often expected to be honest in relations with superiors and the public in general. Lying by a public servant can often be grounds for dismissal. In many countries, public officials are expected to adhere to high moral codes in all aspects of their

lives. Even in Western democracies, voters often hold elected politicians to high moral standards. Some may argue, for example, that persons whom engage in extra-marital affairs in their private lives or who have had past drug abuse problems have poor moral character, and cannot be trusted as public officials. On the other hand, it could be argued that judgement of public officials should be limited to their professional qualifications and work, not their private lives. This view would hold that public officials have a right to a certain level of privacy in their personal lives, and should be allowed to withhold some aspects of life from the public record. The following section provides an introduction to these important issues and debates. Establishing a Code of Ethics In establishing a Code of Ethics to regulate the ethical conduct of public officials, the particular rules and guidelines to be recognized are of prime importance. Most agree that a government Code of Ethics should include prohibitions against severe and clear cases of unethical conduct, such as theft, fraud, treason, bribery, self-dealing, and so forth. However, there is often debate on what else should be included. Some argue, for example, that ethical guidelines for public officials should go much further, prohibiting certain activities even when no actual unethical behaviour has occurred. One example of this would be a complete prohibition on public officials receiving gifts from private individuals, no matter the value of the gift, and regardless of whether or not it involves an actual case of bribery, influence peddling, or conflict of interest. One might support this broader ethical code of conduct on the grounds that permitting any sort of gift receiving, no matter how trivial or benign, encourages more serious unethical conduct. One might also argue that such ethical rules are important in maintaining a positive image of government amongst citizens. The idea here is that a perception by the public that government is corrupt or unethical is just as harmful to society as actual instances of corruption. Another controversial issue is whether or not government codes of ethics should include rules of good moral character for public servants and elected officials. There are several different options available: One means of setting out ethical rules for public officials is through criminal law for example, through the Criminal Code of Canada. Under such an approach a violation of an ethical rule is considered a criminal offence, one that would be punishable by severe sanctions and penalties, such as imprisonment. Ethical rules for public officials may also be enshrined in formal pieces of legislation passed by the government.

Chapter 6 : Aristotle's Political Theory (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Ethics and Politics. Aristotle's Ethics and Politics remain two of his most relevant works. It has been said that the Ethics is still the best springboard for the consideration of ethical problems and dilemmas.

Ethics in Government Richard Baron tries to be good in government. This article considers some of the ethical questions that arise in the conduct of government, in the light of two leading approaches to ethics. The two approaches will throw light on the questions, and the questions will reveal some features of the approaches. I will start by outlining the approaches to ethics, utilitarianism and deontology. Utilitarianism tells us to promote happiness. Deontology tells us to do our duty. I will then set out some relevant features of the government of large democracies. Finally I will analyse the questions. I will cover whether a government may mislead the public without actually lying; how far civil servants should maintain political neutrality; whether civil servants should leak information to the press and whether a government should avoid getting legal advice that it might not like. The questions are drawn from the world of the politician and the policy-making civil servant, the world in which new laws are proposed and new policies are decided. All of the questions arise in practice. I will refer to features of the British governmental system, but the same issues will arise under other systems.

Approaches to ethics The basic principle of utilitarianism is that the right thing to do is whatever will promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people. It is the results of our actions that matter, and those results are measured by reference to the condition of people generally. The purest form of utilitarianism is act-utilitarianism. Each action should be evaluated by reference to its consequences, given all the circumstances. Will our hearers make serious mistakes if we lie and thereby mis-inform them? Will telling a lie save their feelings? If they feel better because of our lie, will they be kinder to the next people they meet? While act-utilitarianism should lead to the right answer every time, at least if we accept utilitarian principles, it is clearly impractical to calculate consequences every time. Rule-utilitarianism offers an alternative. We start by identifying rules that will, on the whole, promote human happiness. A rule that we should tell the truth would be a good candidate. Having selected our rules, we then resolve to follow them without calculating the consequences of every action. Deontology has no truck with calculations of consequences. It tells us that we have certain duties, and we must perform those duties regardless of the outcome. How we arrive at our list of duties is another matter, and different philosophers will offer different lists. But a list of duties that might be given to those in government is quite likely to include a duty not to mislead people, a duty to act within the law, a duty not to cover up outrageous conduct and a duty to keep the promises one made when accepting employment – promises to do the job required and to keep government secrets. We will see some of these duties come into conflict.

Large democracies In a large democracy, we elect politicians every few years. Some of them form the government and become ministers responsible for different areas of policy – education, defence and so on. Of course, ministers cannot govern by themselves. They set general objectives. Civil servants then come up with specific policy options which ministers accept or reject. In this sort of system, no one person understands everything that is going on. Everyone, including the minister, is a cog in a big machine. That in itself can generate ethical difficulties. On the one hand each person owes a duty to the machine to perform his or her function and help the machine to achieve its greater purpose. On the other hand each person must decide what is right and what is wrong, on the basis of his or her personal values. The system will only work with a politically-neutral civil service, ready to serve any government. The top layer of civil servants may be political appointees, who change when the government changes, but it would be impractical to change most of the policy-making civil service. In Britain, all civil servants stay in post when a new government takes office. The civil service must therefore be loyal to the government, but without being wedded to the political party that forms the government. This tension can give rise to ethical conflicts. Against this background, I will now turn to the ethical questions themselves.

Misleading the public Democratic governments do not often tell outright lies. If a minister states that 27 new public hospitals were built last year, you can be confident that the statement is true. However, the minister may tell the truth while not mentioning other relevant information. For example, the minister might not mention that 30 old hospitals were closed last

year, or that the new hospitals were all very small. Is it acceptable to do this, misleading by silence? An act-utilitarian will try to work out the consequences, and might very well conclude that they would not be serious. People who really care about the state of public medical care, for example because they want to campaign for higher public spending, because they are making business plans to supply equipment to hospitals or because it is the one issue that will decide how they vote at the next election, will need much more information, so they will do their own research anyway. An act-utilitarian would not necessarily say that it was acceptable to mislead the public by silence, but he or she might well do so. Of course an act-utilitarian could equally well argue that politicians should not mislead by silence, because we gradually become aware that they do so and start to ignore their soundbites, reducing our interest in politics. But that argument is not likely to rule out any one misleading soundbite, because only an accumulation of misleading soundbites will have the adverse effect. The focus of act-utilitarianism on each act limits its ability to deal with cumulative effects. An act-utilitarian could strongly object to one misleading soundbite if it would be the last one needed to tip the public over the edge from respect for politicians to contempt for them. But it would be very hard to show that we were close to the edge, and in any case there would probably be a gradual slope of declining public confidence rather than a cliff-edge. Rule-utilitarianism is better than act-utilitarianism at taking a longer-term view. The adverse consequences of a whole string of misleading soundbites could justify a general rule against misleading by silence. Politicians should avoid misleading the public, not because it is always better not to mislead, but because never to mislead produces a better result than misleading the public whenever a politician can persuade himself that it would be justified. We cannot work out the consequences of every action, and act-utilitarianism is not good at taking a long-term view. That presents a risk. If rule-utilitarianism is merely a practical substitute for the ideal of act-utilitarianism, it becomes easy for a politician to argue for exceptions. The purpose of the rule is to reduce the danger of making mistakes, a great danger if we consider actions one by one. But here the benefits of breaking the rule are so obvious that there could not be any mistake. Few of us would trust politicians with such an easy get-out clause. To be really safe from dubious act-utilitarian arguments, we would need something stronger than rule-utilitarianism. Under a deontological approach, if you should avoid misleading people, you should do so because it is your duty, not because of the consequences. There is no space to plead that the current case is a special one in which the normal rules should be suspended. However, while deontology appears to offer a better guarantee of complete and consistent honesty than utilitarianism, it only does so if people believe that honesty is a duty. Most people do believe that. Politicians could still argue for get-out clauses, even if they first had to argue for an exemption from the deontological rule against pleading that the current case was a special one. For example, some would say that duties are prescribed by God. Political neutrality Civil servants should serve any government that has been elected. The Government was chosen by the people to carry out the policies in its manifesto. But democracy would be in danger if civil servants worked to ensure that the Government stayed in power, rather than leaving all parties on a level playing field at the next election. What should a civil servant do when he or she is asked to promote the party-political cause of the Government? This can easily happen. For example, when a document outlining a new policy is published, it is likely to include an account of policy to date. That account will invariably put the Government in a good light. Thus a document on education policy will point out how many more people are now achieving qualifications than a few years ago. While the statistics in such documents may be unbiased, the documents also have a blatantly promotional purpose. And they are written by civil servants, who write in a promotional style because that is what ministers want. Deontology puts the issue most starkly, but it does not offer easy answers. It recognises the conflict, and makes it plain that whatever the civil servant does, whether accept or refuse an instruction to work on a promotional document, he or she will fail to perform one duty or another. This illustrates a key difference between deontology and rule-utilitarianism, even though they are alike in giving us a set of rules. Rule-utilitarianism is a practical substitute for computing the consequences of every action individually. If it breaks down because rules conflict, that is a failure of the computational rule of thumb. We can then shrug our shoulders and fall back on act-utilitarianism. But in deontology, a conflict of duties is real, painful and potentially irresolvable. Utilitarianism, unlike deontology, holds out the promise of making it clear what to do. Act-utilitarianism

suffers, as usual, from the impracticality of working out all of the consequences of our actions. However a rule-utilitarian code for civil servants could be very helpful. For example, one could argue for a rule that civil servants should only write boring documents that stated policies and the thinking behind them in a flat and neutral way. Ministers would have to write separate documents, paid for by their political party, if they wanted to promote themselves. Rule-utilitarianism might appear to resolve this ethical question, but only if we can find the right rules. The rule that civil servants should only write documents that state policies in a neutral way looks like a very good rule. However, it would not be difficult to argue for a different rule, that civil servants could write documents which engaged in a moderate amount of promotion.

Chapter 7 : Ethics, Politics, and Economics < Yale University

A dialogue on ethics, politics and government: produced for a conference for public officials, May 14, ; sponsored by The Alabama Committee for the Humanities and Public Policy.

The work as a whole has been criticized for being disorganized and disjointed, but other scholars have questioned whether the traditional ordering of the books is how Aristotle would have intended it since it is based loosely on a lecture series. Aristotle begins with a discussion of the city-state. He prefers this smaller unit to a national state because his ideal government must allow all citizens to meet in a single assembly. The most basic unit is actually the family, and households join together to form villages. Villages join together to form a city-state, which is the ultimate form of association because it can be self-sufficient. The development of the city-state is natural, and moreover this kind of association is the natural end for the individual. Thus the argument becomes teleological again: An individual who does not participate in such a community, who can flourish in solicitude, must either be an animal or a god. Participation in a community is the natural end of the human because it is the only way to exercise his or her faculties and thus find fulfillment. Keeping in line with his teleological reasoning, he believes that slaves are simply meant to be ruled and used as tools or property. On the other hand, he shows signs of ambivalence in his reasoning: Moreover, he recognizes that there are practical difficulties in determining who is naturally meant for slaveryâ€™ in particular the problem of enslavement as the result of war. Since only citizens are to participate in the city-state, this excludes not only slaves, but also resident aliens as Aristotle had been in Athens , children, women, and sometimes the working class, which did not have the leisure time for continuous and full participation. Aristotle offers his opinion of the various government systems and constitutions. Since the individual is meant to participate in the city-state, the government in turn must promote the good life in its citizens. This immediately rules out such forms as oligarchy government by a few , since in practice such a system would inevitably be based on wealth and its promotion. Aristotle instead advocates some form of democracy, though he is careful to emphasize the protections that must accompany it. The state that he suggests for the practical world indeed has elements of oligarchy, or at least aristocracy, for Aristotle thought it necessary to make distinctions among the citizenry for competence. The remainder of the books continues this discussion of oligarchy and democracy, while also touching on such issues as revolutions and education. Since virtue requires the development of habit and the cultivation of reason, education is the fundamental element for the success of citizens and, in turn, of the city-state. The direct relevance of the Politics is difficult to judge. In some senses it is outdated, as the age of the city-state is long past.

Chapter 8 : SparkNotes: Aristotle: Ethics and Politics

Published: Wed, 07 Jun Ethics and morality form a central position in the functioning of the government. Under normal circumstances, it is the role of the government to ensure a just society where order and harmony exist.

What is the Relationship between Ethics and Politics? Article shared by The subject matter of politics is to describe the structure and function of the government. Politics prescribes laws for the citizens in order to regulate their conducts so that public good can be realized. Man is not only a social being but also political beings. The individual and the state are inter dependent. Political science determines the duty of the individual to the state and also duty for the state with regard to the individual. Rights and duties are maintained by the state and as such moral life is intimately connected with the political life. Ethics and politics are intimately related. Both are normative sciences. Ethics aims at the supreme good of the individual whereas Politics aims at public good. Public good can be attained through individual good; therefore politics aims at the establishment of an ideal welfare state where more perfection of the citizens can be realized. Similarly individual good can be achieved through public good. Politics is a practical science but ethics is not. However, the influence of ethics on the practical life can not be ignored. Aristotle, however, wrote two separate treatises on politics and ethics and thereby differentiated the scope of the subjects. There is of course a difference of opinion among the thinkers regarding the relation between ethics and politics. Gandhi for example, advocates that a happy marriage should be instituted between politics and morality. High politics must have a moral base. On the other hand, Machiavelli and Luther hold that politics has no connection with ethics. The will of the sovereign is law. The power must be exercised on the people at any cost of their own protection. Hence, it need not have any connection with morality. Hobbes and his followers claim that good conduct is imposed by the state and therefore ethics is only a branch of politics. Opinion differs regarding the relation between ethics and politics. In spite of these differences of opinion one thing is certain that there is a mutual dependence of ethics and politics Moral philosophers have tried to influence state politics. Politicians in their turn have played an important role in changing the moral outlook of the state. Grayeff points out that politicians have often influence moral views mainly through medium of opinion. Infact, political leaders and thinkers like Karl Marx or Mao Tze Tung have been responsible for changing the moral religious and cultural outlook of the state through their official philosophies. The above point is strengthened by the fact that there are some concepts which are equally important both for the political thinker and the moralist. The concepts like justice, liberty, right duties etc. Of course the approaches to these concepts differ. While the politician says right implies duties, what he says is that it is purely out of the civic sense that one must do something for others if he expects others to do something for him. The moralist on the other hand, cannot impose any penalty nor does he recommend any penalty for the violation of norms. Hemerely defines what is right and does not approve of the act of taking away everything without doing anything for the society. Though there lies some similarities between politics and ethics, still then there are some differences between the two. Political philosophy is a study of the different forms of government and their operations. Politics compares the different forms of government and studies its constitutions in order to draw the picture of the best form of a government. Ethics on the other hand is a study of a man, his character, intention, and desire etc. The scope of ethics in this sense is wider and altruistic. Both ethics and politics are concerned with the ideas of duty, responsibility etc. The moral thinker makes a theoretical and analytical study in order to consider what responsibility is and what is not. The politician also does the same job but the extra work that he does is to fix up responsibility and recommend the quantum of penalty on the wrong door. He does it for the smooth running of the government. The moralist instills a sense of discrimination between right and wrong but can not recommend anything. The laws of the state are externally imposed upon the people but moral laws are self-imposed. Muirhead have correctly pointed out that you can not make men moral by acts of parliaments. Politics is basically a descriptive and factual science as it studies functioning of government at the time of peace and war. Ethics studies the human conduct with reference to a particular norm. Thus it is a normative science. It studies what ought to be, not what actually occurs or what is the case. The aim of politics is to

attain public good or expediency at any cost. It gives more emphasis on the end not on the means always. Barring a few exceptions like Gandhiji, who consider means to be important than the end, politicians in general aim at the end, that is the public good. The moralist on the other hand, aims at the moral excellence of the individual, with a view to set a standard before other people. The aim of the moralist is that each man should be a better man. The authority of ethics is higher than that of politics. In civilized modern states the political laws are grounded on ethical considerations which are nothing but the latent will of the people.

Chapter 9 : Ethics in Government | Issue 54 | Philosophy Now

In modern times, ethics in government have become not only something of great public interest, but also an important area of study in the academic fields of politics and government. This article introduces the basic concepts, issues, and debates surrounding government ethics.

Courses Director of undergraduate studies: Peter Swenson, Prospect St. We have to understand the technical complexities of economic and statistical analysis at the same time that we think critically about basic moral and political choices. Constructive responses to such problems as coping with natural and social hazards, allocation of limited social resources e. The major in Ethics, Politics, and Economics joins the analytic rigor of the social sciences and the enduring normative questions of philosophy to promote an integrative and critical understanding of the institutions, practices, and policies that shape the contemporary world. The concentration is developed in consultation with the director of undergraduate studies and should culminate in a senior essay written in the area defined by the concentration. Introductory courses Introductory courses provide a basic familiarity with contemporary economic analysis and survey central issues in ethics and political philosophy. Such a background is necessary to understand theories that combine different approaches to the three areas of inquiry ethics, politics, economics and to assess policies with complex political, economic, and moral implications. The introductory courses include one course from each of the following five topics: The DUS can offer guidance regarding appropriate courses to fulfill this requirement. The Economics core comprises courses offered by Economics as the primary department, or Political Science courses cross-listed with Economics. Areas of concentration Each student defines an area of concentration in consultation with the DUS. The concentration enables students to frame an important problem and shape a systematic course of inquiry, employing analytical methods and substantive theories drawn from the three fields. Students should not only recognize the accomplishments of varied interdisciplinary efforts, but also attempt to represent and in some cases further develop those accomplishments in their own work. For many students, the concentration treats a contemporary problem with a substantial policy dimension domestic or international , but some students may wish to emphasize philosophical and methodological issues. Areas of concentration must consist of four courses appropriate to the theme, including the seminar or independent study course in which the senior essay is written see "Senior Requirement" below. In designing the area of concentration, students are encouraged to include seminars from other departments and programs. The DUS will also require students to show adequate competence in data analysis when the area of concentration requires it. The following are examples of possible areas of concentration: However, students may wish to frame their own concentration more precisely. Such courses count as non-A grades in calculations for Distinction in the Major. The senior essay reflects more extensive research than an ordinary Yale College seminar paper and employs a method of research appropriate to its topic. Some papers might be written entirely from library sources; others may employ field interviews and direct observation; still others may require statistical or econometric analysis. The student should consult frequently with the seminar instructor or adviser, offering partial and preliminary drafts for criticism. Senior essays written in the fall term are due on Monday, December 3, Senior essays written in the spring term and yearlong essays are due on Monday, April 15, One-term essays are normally expected to be forty to fifty pages in length; yearlong essays are normally expected to be eighty to one hundred pages in length. Advising and Application to the Major Application to the major Students apply to enter the major at the end of the fall term of their sophomore year. Applications must include the application cover sheet, a current CV, a transcript of work at Yale that indicates fall-term courses, and a brief application essay, all submitted in a single PDF file. If possible, applicants should include a copy of a paper written for a course related to the subject matter of Ethics, Politics, and Economics. Permission to enroll is required from the instructor as well as the appropriate representative of the graduate or professional program. Note that not all professional school courses yield a full course credit in Yale College. In an era of global interdependence and rapid technological change, we must think practically about the institutional dynamics of power and governance. We need to understand the technical complexities of economic and statistical analysis as we think

critically about basic moral and political choices. The major in Ethics, Politics, and Economics studies individual, societal, and international issues, joining the social sciences with philosophy to promote an understanding of the institutions, policies, and people that shape the world. Students apply to the major at the end of the fall term in their sophomore year, and selection is competitive. Prospective majors are encouraged to begin study with one or more introductory courses.

ECON or Econometrics: Political Science Jonathan Reuning-Scherer Statistical analysis of politics, elections, and political psychology. Problems presented with reference to a wide array of examples: Concepts, tools, and methods for constructing and justifying solutions to moral problems that students may face as professionals.

Social Sciences Jonathan Reuning-Scherer Descriptive and inferential statistics applied to analysis of data from the social sciences. Introduction of concepts and skills for understanding and conducting quantitative research. Topics include changing conceptions of private and public spheres, the content and domain of individual freedom, and ethical and political limits to the market. Key topics and findings include: Challenges and threats of globalization: Readings in philosophy are paired with analytic methods from economics. Some discussion of American economic inequality, Nordic social democracy, and the politics of inequality. Standard solution concepts in game theory; case studies from important episodes in the history of international relations, including World War II, the Cuban missile crisis, and the U. Students trace the influence of the evolution in thinking on actual changes that have taken place in successful development strategies, as practiced in fast growing developing countries, and as illustrated in case studies of fast growth periods in Japan, South Korea, Brazil, China, and India. Religions are considered to constitute not just theologies but also sets of institutions, networks, interests, and sub-cultures. Emphasis on the role of politics. National and subnational officials who work to attract investments or not and who set policies regulating global firms and their investments. Focus on less-developed countries. Issues of temporality, policy feedback, and policy substance.

WR, SO W 1: Theoretical and policy perspectives as well as empirical debates in central banking. The recurrence of financial crises in market economies. Monetary policies that led to economic stability in the period prior to the collapse of the Euro. The emergence of democracy and the forces that led to the unprecedented increase in inequality in the twentieth century. Topics include institutional design, historical legacies, corruption, clientelism, and violence. Concepts employed by game theorists, such as Nash equilibrium, subgame perfect equilibrium, and perfect Bayesian equilibrium. Problems of cooperation, time-consistency, signaling, and reputation formation. Political applications include candidate competition, policy making, political bargaining, and international conflict. No prerequisites other than high school algebra. Topics include matching, bargaining, cost allocation, market games, voting games, and games on networks. Particular attention to the ways in which assumptions about science influence models of political behavior, the methods adopted to study that behavior, and the relations between science and democracy. Readings include works by both classic and contemporary authors. The sacred and profane binaries that animate the civil sphere are studied, as are such civil sphere organizations as polls, mass media, electoral system, law, and office. United States presidential elections, immigration and its controversies, the civil rights movement, the crisis of contemporary journalism, recent controversies over church pedophilia, the financial system, telephone hacking, and the challenge of de-provincializing civil sphere theory.

HU, SO W 1: As with the major itself, the seminar is deliberately inter-disciplinary in order to give students the opportunity to put together for themselves, as world citizens and future leaders, a broad platform of usable knowledge. Overarching theme is the place of bureaucratic ambitions and capacities in shaping African trajectories. In the first half of the course, we study some of the most important conceptual and empirical literature on culture in the social sciences. We also discuss the role of culture for socioeconomic, political, and business behavior. We devote time to study experimental interventions and case studies aimed at improving behavior and business ethics in the public and private sectors. Emphasis on legal reasoning and analysis through close reading of statutes, regulations, and case law. Final project is a legal brief on behalf of a client. Students examine his ideas on race and on the colonial experience and compare them to those of Mohandas Gandhi and Franz Fanon. Examination of Mandela as a global celebrity, as well as the political career of Winnie Mandela. Plato, Aristotle, Cicero Daniela Cammack An opportunity to read, or to re-read, the most significant political statements of three foundational figures in Western political thought,

paying attention to both historical context and philosophical argument. Particular focus on the relationships between a the just to dikaios and the advantageous to sympheron and b the honourable honesta and the useful utilis. Some experience of political theory or intellectual history is expected. HU, SO T 3: The course surveys and explores some of the main normative factors relevant in determining the moral status of a given act or policy features that help make a given act right or wrong. Brief consideration of some of the main views about the foundations of normative ethics the ultimate basis or ground for the various moral principles. Use of theoretical-analytical tools to examine the modes violence assumes and the functions it performs in modern political life as well as the meanings and possibilities of nonviolence in politics. Topics include abortion, assisted reproduction, end-of-life care, research on human subjects, and stem cell research. Concepts include institutional analysis, democratic consent, property rights, market failure, and common pool resources. Topics of policy substance are related to human use of the environment and to U. WR, SO Th 9: Emphasis on the origins of progressivism in the early decades of the twentieth century, with attention to latter-day manifestations and to changes in the progressive impulse over time. Constitution and debates over free exercise and establishment of religion. Focus on ways in which different classes and coalitions affect, and are affected by, democratic distributive politics. Open to juniors and seniors. Understanding the role of potential bias at various levels and the competing interests of protecting speech, due process, and the innocent. The main formulations of the problem of evil; proposed ways of solving or mitigating the problem and criticism of those solutions. Skeptical theism, the free-will defense, soul-making theodicies, and doctrines of hell. Issues include the grounds of normativity and rightness and the role of the virtues.