



Course Syllabus
Animal Ethics
ANZO 502, Three Credits
Spring 2017, Professor Paul Waldau

Office and Office Phone: HSC 201E, 716/888-2765

Email: waldaup@canisius.edu

Office Hours: By appointment (to set up a specific time, call my office *or* text 617/523-6116 *or* send an email about a time that works for you—I'll respond as soon as I can—text is the fastest way to reach me)

Course Description

This course immerses students in analysis of different approaches to ethics as a key human ability applicable to humans' inevitable and varied interactions with other living beings. The approach is interdisciplinary—we will look at discussions of humans' ethical abilities from different domains, cultures and historical eras. The intersection of ethics with science is also addressed in detail. The course relies on open discussion to promote evaluation of the issues we address. The course builds on the work done in ANZ 501 (Introduction to Anthrozoology) regarding other animals' realities and the constructed categories into which human have sorted themselves and other animals.

Course Objectives

At the conclusion of the course, each student will be able to:

- Explain the principal accounts or theories of ethics in the western cultural tradition, as well as ethics-intensive approaches drawn from other major cultural traditions and various indigenous peoples;
- Discuss how such accounts and theories are now used—or ignored entirely—in a variety of contexts where the principal task being

- attempted is description and analysis of humans' engagement with other-than-human animals;
- Recognize how the field of "animal ethics" is pursued today in ways that are both analytical and normative, such that animal ethicists regularly must deal with their own and others' judgments that human choices and actions are "good," "better," "worse," "bad," "right," "wrong," "moral" or "immoral."
 - Build on the critical thinking skills that are part of ANZ 501 in order to see how these critical thinking skills deployed regarding animals (whether human or nonhuman) play central roles in humans' exploration of (i) their own ethical abilities and (ii) the realities of other animals;
 - Understand the central roles that interdisciplinary considerations play in ethical analyses as they pertain to humans' awareness of the impact of human choices on living beings outside our own species; and,
 - Describe the place of ethics in the present ferment in worldwide developments regarding humans' relationship with other living beings.

Programmatic Learning Goals and Objectives

At the conclusion of the course, *each student* will be able to accomplish the following programmatic objectives (the list of all the objectives and learning goals for the Anthrozoology Master of Science program can be viewed at <http://www.canisius.edu/anthrozoology/learning-goals-objectives/>).

- Learning Goal 1: Students will exhibit strong critical thinking skills in their study of the interactions between humans and nonhuman animals and of the roles of nonhuman animals in human society. To achieve this goal, each student will
 - Objective A: Synthesize interdisciplinary information as it relates to anthrozoology.
 - Objective B: Identify strengths and weaknesses in arguments regarding human and nonhuman animals.
 - Objective C: Construct a literature review that evaluates a subset of scholarly anthrozoological publications.
- Learning Goal 2: Students will proficiently communicate anthrozoological information. To achieve this goal, each student will
 - Objective B: Construct a written, evidence-based argument on an anthrozoological topic.

Class Organization and Structure

The course is divided into three stages:

(1) **Introductory Week** (from Tuesday, January 17 to Wednesday, January 18) where there are three relatively simple tasks you are to perform;

(2) **On-Campus Component**—this is our four-day on-campus component (January 19-22); and,

(3) **On-line Component** composed of Weeks 2 through 15 of online communication that include lectures, student presentations, group discussions (online and also “live” through the use cameras in our synchronous Zoom sessions), and various additional activities.

Class participation is critical in this course because learning in general and, pertinent to this course, learning in the early 21st Century about humans’ ethical abilities and claims requires an active process—for these reasons, your *active* contribution through asking questions and participating in back-and-forth conversations with other students is vital.

In any course but particularly so at the graduate-level, students are expected to come to class fully prepared—a crucial way to prepare is to think *ahead of time* about the focus questions listed for each week. In any discussion of these specific questions and other issues, you *should* make an effort to cite assigned materials (when you cite such sources, be prepared to help others in the class follow your comments by *indicating specifics*, such as the language and page number of the reading you are citing).

Because this course is primarily conducted online, your feedback is important to me as an educator *and* important to your fellow students’ learning. So I will ask for feedback frequently throughout the class: what did you like, what did you not like, and why? What was clear and what was confusing? Are there suggestions you’d like to make about how we can communicate better?

As to assigned readings, again and again we will discover that not the final word on any subject—in fact, many of the readings have been chosen because they *invite* each of us to think *for ourselves* in this Anthrozoology graduate program about the questions and doubts such readings raise. So as you read and/or participate in discussions, always feel free to question claims being made.

Some Important Policies

Students with disabilities. The Office of Disability Support Services serves as the college's advocate for students with disabilities and is responsible for arranging necessary support. Any student who needs academic accommodations should contact the office at (716) 888-3748. If you have a

disability for which accommodations are necessary, please also inform the instructor. For more information about the DSS Office or academic accommodations, please visit www.canisius.edu/dss or call 888-3748.

Academic Misconduct: Students are expected to abide by the Canisius College Honor Code. Academic misconduct includes a variety of violations of academic ethics including cheating, plagiarism, using or interfering with another student's work, buying or selling papers or examinations, etc. The college and this graduate program actively seek to impose penalties on violators of academic ethics. Penalties include failure of an assignment, failure of the course, or suspension or expulsion from the College. See the Academic Catalog, section Academic Misconduct, for further descriptions of what constitutes misconduct, procedures for handling cases of misconduct and penalties.

Assigned Materials

Required Textbooks:

(1) Waldau, Paul 2013. *Animal Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press (this text is referred to below as *Animal Studies*)

(2) Rollin, Bernard 2006. *Science and Ethics*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Additional assigned readings will be available at the course website in the form of .pdf files—see entries below for individual sessions for a list.

Additional audio and video will also be assigned (these will also be available at the course website).

Grading

There are four grading elements in this course:

- (1) two short assignments count for 20% (10% each) of your grade;
- (2) participation through the Discussion Board and synchronous sessions counts for 25% of your grade;
- (3) each student's presentation to the whole group counts for 15% of the grade; and
- (4) the final paper counts for 40% of the final grade.

The possible grades in this course are A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+ and C.

In an important sense, *I grade more rigorously in this course than I do in ANZ 501*. This is so because I want you to *build* on the skills acquired in that introductory course (namely, critical thinking, seeing and taking responsibility for one's own assumptions and language habits, assessing the quality of arguments and the utilization of evidence claimed to be relevant in

a variety of disciplines, factoring in other animals' individual and social realities, and more). Developing such skills leads to both rigor and interdisciplinary breadth in our thinking about animals (whether they are nonhuman *or* human). My goal is to push you to recognize how these and other skills play a role in ethics that rivals the central role these skills play in both the natural and social sciences.

The two short assignments—a rubric is posted at the course website (under the Contents tab) that provides guidelines regarding content, length, document format and citation format.

- **Assignment #1 will be due in Week 4.** The topic, which is described further in the Week 3 entry below, is the relationship, if any, of academic discussions of ethics to humans' actual, day-to-day relationships in their local worlds with other living beings.
- **Assignment #2 due in Week 12**—each student will explain how her or his final paper will meet the six course objectives stated above in this Course Syllabus.

Participation in Discussion Boards and weekly Zoom sessions, which will count for 25% of your grade, will be discussed during the OCC. I plan to make both of these a larger part of the course than they were in ANZ 501 (both will be active through Week 13 but then will be shut down so that you have maximum time to work on your final paper). The course website (under Contents tab) has a **rubric for participation**.

Student Presentations (15% of your grade)—Weeks 8 and 9 are set aside for individual student presentations to the whole class. The course website at D2L (under the Contents tab) has a rubric for these presentations, including guidelines for length and format.

The topic for these presentations is to analyze and challenge (that is, *problematize as inadequate in some way*) a major ethical theory or formulation that is used in discussions of animal ethics (here are the candidates: utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, welfare versus rights, professional ethics).

These presentations are discussed more fully in the Week 6 entry below. We will discuss during the OCC how to carry out these presentations through Zoom.

The Final Paper will due on or about May 9 (Tuesday after the end of classes—this date will be agreed upon the class), and will count

for 40% of your grade. The course website at D2L (under the Contents tab) has a rubric for grading of papers—this rubric sets a guideline length of 20 pages and will include details regarding things like document format and citation format.

Schedule

Introductory Week

(January 17 to January 18)

There are four tasks to accomplish during these few days prior to the On-Campus-Component.

(1) Read Handout #1 “Ethics, Invitations and Root Questions” in Week 1 folder at D2L—this contains an exercise we will pursue in this first session at the OCC. The Week 1 folder also contains a copy of the image for *The New Yorker* mentioned as Handout #1 describes this group exercise.

(2) Read Annie Dillard, “Living Like Weasels”, Chapter 1 from *Teaching a Stone to Talk* (.pdf at D2L)—we will discuss this reading during our second OCC session.

(3) Think about specific topics and fact scenarios or problems you would like to suggest for possible inclusion in the course. During the OCC we will have a discussion about your suggestions and what you want out of this course.

Recommended only—if you want to get a sense of how many different meanings can be given to the phrase “animal ethics,” I’ve included at the course website a recording of a 50-minute lecture which I gave at Yale University’s Interdisciplinary Center for Bioethics in July of 2009 (the recorded lecture is in the Week 1 (pre-OCC) folder—there are both mp3 and m4a versions of this recording in the folder).

On-Campus Component

(January 19-22)

January 19 (Thursday), 1010-1110, Learning to Talk to Each Other—Sharing What We Now Understand About Ethics

We will go through the exercise that was part of your pre-OCC work. My goal in this session is to *start* us on a course-long discussion about how we understand the human abilities that are reflected in terms like “ethics,” “morality,” “principled action,” “moral rights,” “caring about others,” “ought implies can,” “can implies ought,” “making community is making morals,” “knowing something to a moral certainty,” and much more.

Assigned Reading: Handout #1 from pre-OCC assigned readings

Focus Question: Think about the terms listed above, and also feel free to suggest other terms or ideas that you use (or find others *in your local*

world using) in discussions about ethics, morality and related human abilities.

January 20 (Friday), 9-10. Sharing More of What We Now Understand About Ethics

In this session, we further our communal exploration of the abilities on which we focus in this course—we continue to explore the issues raised in our Thursday session in terms of the focus questions below.

Assigned Reading: (1) “The Myth of Universal Love” by Steven Asma, from *The New York Times* January 5, 2013 (.pdf in OCC Week folder at D2L).

(2) Annie Dillard, “Living Like Weasels”, Chapter 1 from *Teaching a Stone to Talk* (.pdf at D2L)

Focus Questions:

- (1) Can human ethical abilities reach the whole human race? If so, does this count as “universal”?
- (2) Are the abilities we have been discussing *exclusively* **human** abilities?
- (3) Do we find that one culture has developed more of these special abilities, or perhaps developed existing abilities to a greater level, than have other cultures?
- (4) Do only a few, or perhaps most, even all, of contemporary academic disciplines address humans’ ethical abilities?
- (5) What are the possible roles of these abilities beyond the species line?

January 21 (Saturday) 9-10, Examining How A Prominent Voice in Our American Society Talks about a Specific Case

Assigned Reading: “A Dog’s Right to Life?” from The Ethicist column, *The New Times Magazine*, January 8, 2012 (.pdf at D2L)

Focus Questions: We will look at the assigned reading for the purpose of asking questions and making observations about how we generally frame ethical issues that involve nonhuman animals (FYI, my take is that this journalism piece features (i) simply *wonderful* Anthrozoology/Animal Studies issues, (ii) central issues found in virtually *any* ethical scheme, and (iii) important issues about professional ethics as well).

January 22 (Sunday) 905-955, Where we are going?

We discuss the upcoming online segment of the course. Our particular focus will be (i) our week-by-week topics and how we handle the Discussion Board (we’ll look closely, for example, at the focus questions for Week 2), (ii) our Zoom schedule and the use of cameras in these synchronous

sessions, (iii) the student presentations in Weeks 8 and 9, and (iv) Assignment #1 which is due in Week 4.

Online Component—Weeks 2-15

Part 1: Options in Animal Ethics—Weeks 2-9

Week 2 (begins January 23). **Issues in the Post-Darwinian World—morality beyond the idea that the world was designed *just* for humans.**

We begin by exploring what I've called “the exceptionalist tradition” in *Animal Studies*. The first reading includes three different passages dealing with the exceptionalist tradition and how it plays out in the practice of science today and in contemporary politics and policymaking. The second, third and fourth readings are Rachels' Introduction, a short excerpt from Chapter 2, and Chapter 5 addressing the implications of Darwin's work because that body of work is clearly one of the most important discoveries in the history of science. Also included as recommended reading only is the balance of his second chapter setting out Rachels' opinion that historical developments shape the principal options for ethics in light of the evolutionary connections set out by Darwin in his 1859 *On the Origin of Species*.

Assigned Reading

(1) *Animal Studies* pp. 6-9, 66-71, and 97-99

(2-4) Three excerpts (.pdf files in Week 2 folder at course website) from Rachels' *Created From Animals: The Moral Implications of Darwinism*. New York: Oxford University Press): Introduction; Chapter 2's pp. 86-91 (the rest of this chapter is *recommended*), and Chapter 5.

Focus Questions

1. What relevance might ethical systems, claims, and viewpoints developed *before* Darwin's work have today?
2. I often heard from science-based researchers during my decade at Tufts Veterinary School that “ethics is just mere opinion.” What is your sense of what is at issue in such claims?

Discussion Board—one question for this first week after the OCC to begin building our ability to use the virtual sphere to carry on our discussion of the complex issues we are addressing.

Synchronous session this week (at time agreed upon during OCC): Our principal task in this first synchronous session is to nurture further the “culture” we started at the OCC and, additionally, get familiar with this medium because it is so crucial to our post-OCC work. **We will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Week 2 Discussion Board.**

Week 3 (begins January 30). Major Euro-American Ethical Traditions I—Consequentialism/Utilitarianism

We examine in this and the coming weeks three approaches often said to constitute the principal approaches in the western ethical tradition. Familiarity with these will help you recognize principal ways of speaking about ethics that one encounters in many industrialized countries today. We do not focus on religious ethics in particular, especially the variety known as “divine command ethics” (that is, where the religious tradition features a claim that some document, like the Hebrew Bible or the New Testament or the *Qur’an*, contains the command of a divinity that certain rules be followed). As we go forward with these major approaches, keep in mind that *each* approach features many different variations (in other words, there are many different ways of explaining utilitarianism, many ways of explaining deontology, etc.).

Assigned Reading

(1) From the horses’ mouths—Jeremy Bentham excerpt “The Principle of Utility” and William Godwin excerpt “The Archbishop and the Chambermaid” (these excerpts are taken from Singer, Peter, ed., 1994. *Ethics* (in the *Oxford Readers* series), New York: Oxford University Press, pages 306-313. (Note: both excerpts are in the same .pdf file at D2L)

(2) Handout on Utilitarianism (.pdf at D2L)

Focus Questions

1. It is commonly said that everyone uses utilitarian calculations each day of their life—for example, page 308 of the Bentham excerpt features this sentence: “By the natural constitution of the human frame, on most occasions of their lives men in general embrace this principle, without thinking of it....” Do you agree? If so, what examples can you draw from your life? If not, explain why you disagree.

2. For some, it is “obvious” that, theoretically at least, calculations done under the principles of utilitarianism can make the theory very relevant to nonhuman animals. I want you to play “the devil’s advocate” by arguing that this statement creates false hopes in some way.

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

Note carefully: Assignment #1 (10% of your grade) **due late in Week 4**. The topic is your analysis of the relationship of (i) academic discussions of ethics to (ii) humans’ actual, day-to-day relationships in their local worlds with other living beings. The point of this exercise is to prompt you to think as carefully as you can—analytically, practically, realistically,

academically—about the intersection of (a) our course themes and (b) education of graduate students like yourself regarding the day-to-day realities that real individuals face because of the inevitable intersection of humans and nonhumans.

Week 4 (begins February 6). **Major Euro-American Ethical Traditions II—Deontology and Virtue Ethics**

We turn to two more of the principal approaches in the western ethical tradition. The first two articles, which can be found in *A Companion to Ethics* edited by Peter Singer (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1993), have very basic information and questions about key theories in western ethics. Tellingly, these articles include very few uses of the word “animal” (in other words, these articles barely consider the question of the relevance of these approaches to nonhuman animal issues)—that alone is suggestive given that the editor of the volume is the pioneer animal ethicist Peter Singer.

Note: **Assignment #1 is due this Week 4.**

Assigned Reading

- (1) Davis “Contemporary Deontology” (.pdf file)
- (2) Pence “Virtue Theory” (.pdf file)
- (3) Handout on Deontology and Virtue Ethics by Paul Waldau that raises animal issues in relationship to these ethical theories (.pdf file)
- (4) Recommended only—NYT 2016Jan28, “What does a Parrot Know about PTSD?”, by Charles Siebert (.pdf file)
- (5) Recommended only—Chapter 1 from Andreas Weber’s 2015 *The Biology of Wonder* (.pdf file)

Focus Questions

1. What is your personal take on deontology as a moral theory (feel free to answer this question with regard to this approach’s strengths/weaknesses regarding either humans or nonhumans)?
2. Which, if any, of the three major ethical theories we have looked at impresses you the most as a description of humans’ ethical abilities?
3. Which of the three major ethical theories do you think offers the most potential for getting people to agree to protect nonhuman animals?

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

Week 5 (begins February 13). **Ethics and Realism 1: Philosophy, Rationality, and Caring—Kohlberg, Gilligan, and Feminist Ethics of Caring.**

We turn to ethics in the western philosophical tradition by looking at some of the grand assumptions that drive this important tradition (in many ways, the western philosophical tradition has shaped the program we are in more than have *all* other philosophical traditions combined). In particular, we address the common claim (in the western philosophical tradition) that ethical abilities are integrally tied to, even led by, “reason” and “rationality.” We then turn to the claim that ethics is more properly understood as anchored in caring.

Assigned Reading

(1) *Teaching the Animal*, Chapter 5 “Examined Lives: Teaching Human-Animal Studies in Philosophy” by Mylan Engel, Jr., and Kathie Jenni in DeMello 2010 (pages 60-102) (.pdf file in Week 5 folder)

(2a) Excerpt from Lawrence Kohlberg’s work (.pdf file)—the key passage on Kohlberg’s six moral stages is at pages 17-19. The rest of this excerpt is background—Lawrence Kohlberg 1981. *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), Introduction (pages xxvii-xxxv) and Chapter 1 (pages 6-28)

(2b) **Recommended only**—more background is available in Lawrence Kohlberg 1984. *The Psychology of Moral Development: The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984), Chapter 2 (you need read only pages 170-180—the balance is provided in case you are interested in going further) (.pdf file)

(2c) **Recommended only** if you want to look at a secondary reading to help you follow Kohlberg’s original readings) W.C. Crain. (1985). *Theories of Development*. Prentice-Hall. pp. 118-136. (.pdf file)

(3) Excerpt from Gilligan, Carol 1982 (.pdf file). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development*. Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, Introduction (pages 1-4) and Chapter 1 (pages 5-23)

(4a and 4b) Excerpts from Donovan, Josephine and Carol Adams, eds., 2007 (.pdf files). *The Feminist Care Tradition in Animal Ethics: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, Introduction (pages 1-15) and Chapter 16, “Caring to Dialogue” by Josephine Donovan (pages 360-369)

Focus Questions

1. Given what Engel and Jenni write in their article, do you see philosophy courses at the *undergraduate* level as valuable contributions to the goal of getting modern societies to adopt more informed views of nonhuman

animals? If so, why? If not, why not?

2. What do you make of Kohlberg's claim that the pattern he has identified is universal?
3. What do you see as the relevance of other animals' realities to these approaches?
4. Which of these varied approaches (Kohlberg's, Gilligan's, or that of feminist care ethics) appeals to you most, and why?

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

Week 6 (begins February 20). Contemporary Academic Discussions of Ethics—Nussbaum's Capabilities Approach and Appiah's Overview of Modern Ethics

We look at (1) the influential “capabilities” view of ethics advanced by Martha Nussbaum and her work on the “frontiers of justice” as that applies beyond the species line, and (2) the work of Anthony Appiah regarding both the content of modern ethics and the importance of nonhuman animal issues.

Assigned Readings

- (1) Nussbaum, Martha 2003. Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice. *Feminist Economics* 9(2–3), 2003, 33–59 (.pdf file)
- (2 and 3) Excerpts from Nussbaum, Martha 2006. *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Cambridge Mass.: The Belknap Press; Harvard University Press—Introduction (pages 1-8) and Chapter 6, Beyond ‘Compassion and Humanity’: Justice for Nonhuman Animals (pages 325-407, plus footnotes) (.pdf files at D2L)
- (4) Appiah, Kwame Anthony: “What will future generations condemn us for?”, Washington Post, Sunday, September 26, 2010 (.pdf file at D2L)
- (5) *The New York Times Sunday Book Review* (October 22, 2010) of two books by Anthony Appiah (.pdf file at D2L)
- (6) excerpts from Appiah, Anthony 2008. *Experiments in Ethics*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press—Prologue (pages 1-3) and Chapter 1 “Introduction: The Waterless Moat” (pages 5-33) (.pdf file at D2L)
- (7) Recommended only— Kwame Anthony Appiah, “Should I Speak Up for a Pet Pig?”, NYTimes 2016Feb17(.pdf file)

Focus Questions

1. What's your take on Nussbaum's capabilities approach? Is it adequate to the basic issues *you* think are involved in animal ethics?
2. Consider Appiah's list of what future generations will condemn us for—

does the list make sense to you? Is there an entry on the list that you think should *not* be on the list? If you had to add something, what would it be?

Student Presentations will be presented in Weeks 8 and 9. Each student will present to the whole class during our Zoom sessions. Here's the assignment—analyze *and challenge* one of the following major ethical theories or formulation commonly used in academic discussions of animal ethics: utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, welfare versus rights, professional ethics. By *and challenge*, I mean that you should problematize the theory you choose as inadequate in some way.

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

Week 7 (begins February 27). **Ethics in Small Scale Societies.**

Assigned Reading

(1) Silberbauer, George 1993. 'Ethics in Small-scale Societies', in Singer 1993, 14-28 (.pdf file at D2L)

(2) The Ecology of Magic (Chapter 1 in David Abram's 1966 *The Spell of the Sensuous* (.pdf file at D2L)

(3) A Recommended Book *if* you are curious about the relationship of religion and ethics in small scale societies (the book is a famous series of lectures that suggests, in the words of the respected comparativist Ninian Smart, "in many small societies there is often little, if any connection between living religion and morality"): Macbeath, Alexander 1952. *Experiments in Living: A Study of the Nature and Foundation of Ethics or Morals in the Light of Recent Work in Social Anthropology*. London: Macmillan, 1952 (Note: this book is printed version of the prestigious Gifford Lectures for 1948-1949 delivered at the University of St. Andrews).

Focus Questions

1. How convincing to you is Silberbauer's account, and why? Does it describe the local communities in which *you* have lived and learned how ethics worked?
2. What do you make of Abram's argument that indigenous peoples noticed that their world was populated by many awarenesses? Is this realistic in your view? Is it practical in your view? Is it just vague writing about an elusive subject, or is it perceptive (if you think the latter, add a comment or two about why it seems perceptive to you)?

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

Week 8 (begins March 6). **We'll have student presentations.**
No Discussion Board.

Spring Break—No Classes the Week of March 13-17

Week 9 (begins March 20). **We'll have student presentations.**
No Discussion Board.

**Part 2: Realistic Appraisals of Establishment Ethics—
Weeks 10-12**

Week 10 (begins March 27). **Science and Ethics I—Values**

We engage the powerful western science tradition as it has made claims about its relationship with our ethical abilities.

Assigned Reading

- (1) Rollin 2006, Chapter 2, “Scientific Ideology and ‘Value Free’ Science”
- (2) Griffin 1998 “From Cognition to Consciousness” (there is a .pdf copy of the original 1998 article at D2L; this essay also appears in *A Communion of Subjects* at pp. 481-504)
- (3) Bekoff essay “Wild Justice, Social Cognition, Fairness, and Morality” (there is a .pdf copy of this article at the course website; this essay also appears in *A Communion of Subjects* at pp. 461-480)

Focus Questions

1. Do you find any weaknesses in Rollin’s arguments about “scientific ideology” and its values?
2. What strengths and weaknesses do you see in Bekoff’s article?

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

Week 11 (begins April 3). **Science and Ethics II—Nonhuman Animals as Research Tools**

We examine a range of questions that can be asked of the American research establishment that now uses annually in the range of 100-200 million nonhuman animals as research tools (FYI, the numbers and species are discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 28ff., of Waldau 2011/ *Animal Rights*). In the research establishment, the notion of ethics as we have been studying it is often considered “mere opinion” that is contrasted with the “hard facts” of science. We will consider how the term “research ethics” is used in various settings where the moral propriety of using nonhuman animals as research tools has long been deemed an important form of *pro-human* ethics.

We also examine the ethical significance of the claim that the establishment's research ethics promote better conditions, often called "welfare," for the laboratory animals. We ask, for example, if this is a robust sense of "ethics," or a weak sense.

We look as well at sociological realities of those who work in research settings and yet perhaps might want to challenge one or more accepted practices.

Assigned Reading

(1) Cohen, Carl 1986. 'The Case for Biomedical Experimentation', *New England Journal of Medicine*, 315 (14), 865-70. (.pdf file at D2L)

(2) "The Benefits and Ethics of Animal Research." *Scientific American* 276(2), February 1997 (.pdf file at D2L)

(3) Rollin 2006, Chapter 5 ("Animal Research")

Focus Questions

1. What is your personal take (appreciation? reaction? something else?) to Cohen's article and its arguments?
2. As you reviewed the overview of IACUCs at iacuc.org, did you have any impressions of how closely or remotely related this approach is to any of the forms or theories of ethics described in previous readings?
3. In your opinion, is there any substance to the claim that "science is value free"?

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

Note: **Assignment #2 is due next week.**

Week 12 (begins April 10). Professional Ethics: The Case of Veterinary Ethics

Note: **Assignment #2 is due this week.**

We look at the role of ethics in veterinary medicine. Given that society allocates a very special role to this profession (healing the treasured nonhuman animals we so often consider family members), it is natural that ethical issues will be *inherent* in what this profession does. We will contrast the "professional ethics" of American veterinary medicine with the social ethics called out by Rollin (keep in mind that the code promulgated by American Veterinary Medical Association, which is the veterinary profession's official national organization in the United States, is distinct from the research ethics that we discussed in Week 11).

We discuss whether professional veterinary ethics, on the one hand, and social ethics, on the other, risk giving science "a pass" in the manner that many religious believers give their own religion "a pass" (said another way,

while some religious believers readily accept extraordinary claims, like miracles, made by their own faith, but are far more skeptical about the claims made in *other* religions, cultures, and the secular world—is there any sense in which the veterinary profession is refusing to look at issues with an open mind?).

We use this discussion to underscore the applicability of the “question everything” tradition to ethics as a field—this “question everything” tradition in western science makes it clear that no single science-based position is a sacred cow, as it were, but rather a working and replaceable part of a larger enterprise that has many important, powerful tools that can be subjected to critical thinking of many kinds. We will also discuss whether science’s own history and terms require constant re-examination and realism about the possibility that the history of science may well be just as full of intrigue and fraud and bias as has been the history of religion or the history of politics.

Assigned Readings

- (1) Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics of the American Veterinary Medical Association (taken 2014Jan9 from the AVMA website) (.pdf)
- (2) For Rollin’s views regarding the obligations of veterinarians, look at Rollin’s 1999 *An Introduction to Veterinary Medical Ethics: Theory and Cases*, pp. 32-75 (used in ANZO 501) (.pdf file in Week 12 of this course)
- (3) “Review of Ethics and Law Education in Veterinary Schools with Respect to the Human Animal Bond” (.pdf) [FYI: when I was the ethicist at Tufts School of Veterinary Medicine, this article was solicited by the editors of the *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education* for inclusion in a special issue focusing on “the human-animal bond.” But the article was never published because, according to the reviewer of the manuscript, he failed to submit comments to the editor on time. I was told the editors agreed the article would be published in a later volume (that did not happen)—I have never been confident I knew the full story of what happened. My vague impression was that the journal editors feared the veterinary establishment would not like the claims or tenor of the article.]
- (4) Background on contemporary veterinary medicine was provided in a Handout in ANZ 501, Week 10—this was comprised of some comments and reflections from Chapters 1 and 3 of *Animal Studies* regarding today’s veterinary profession. The .pdf from ANZ 501 is again included in this week’s materials so you can get a sense of various complexities and tensions that individual veterinarians can face when they advocate animal protection measures that go against prevailing practices.

Focus Questions

1. Which provisions of the Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics do you consider to be the most ethically informed (you can replace “informed” with other words such as “astute” or “on target” or “responsive”—what I’m looking for is your opinion on which provisions of this official statement of the national American veterinary organization impressed you in a good way).

2. Which provisions of the Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics do you consider to be the least ethically informed (what I'm looking for are your comments on which specific provisions most surprised you because they do *not*, in your opinion, accord with your understanding of "ethical").
3. What is your opinion of the *ethical* content of the AVMA's oath as described in the JVME piece (Reading #3 this week)?

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

A Special Aside on Professional Ethics: Business Ethics, Other Professions' Ethics

Although we do not have space in this course to study other professions' ethics (or the field called "business ethics"), here are some recommended materials for those who would like to begin a study of these important areas of "ethics."

First, in order to grasp features (such as the extent, tenor and limits) of how different professionals use the term "ethics," one can look at forms of thinking and reasoning that some very influential professional communities (law or medicine, for example) deem to be completely "ethical" even though these discussions historically do not speak *at all* about harms to nonhuman animals. One of the key features of ethics reflection is bringing to light various hidden assumptions that drive discussions of "ethics." Notice how this function (shedding light) has affinities with the scientific tradition's efforts to (i) make reasoning plain and public and (ii) provide evidence that others can duplicate.

Recommended Readings

- (1) "Ethicists at the gate: Can Harvard Business School make its graduates behave." By Charles Duhigg, *Boston Globe*, December 8, 2002 (.pdf file at D2L)
- (2) From the online journal *Business Ethics*, Putnam, Mark S. 2002. "Ethical Values for Business Success" (.pdf file at D2L)
- (3) From the online journal *Business Ethics*: "Corporate Citizenship at McDonald's: 10 Lessons Learned", by Bob Langert, Vice President, Corporate Social Responsibility, McDonald's (dated July 6, 2011) (.pdf file at D2L)
- (4) Joel Marks 2004. "'There's No Room in the Worksheet' and Other Fallacies about Professional Ethics in the Curriculum." *Teaching Ethics: The Journal of the Society for Ethics Across the Curriculum* (v. 4, n. 2, Spring 2004, pp. 77-88) (.pdf file at D2L)

Questions to Ponder

1. Can you detect any fallacies in the readings?
2. Do you think the prospects good or bad for using business ethics to help modern societies arrive at more informed views of other animals?
3. If you think that what we call “business ethics” needs to do and be more for other animals, what are the mechanisms by which change could be brought to this field? If you do not think what we call “business ethics” needs to do and be more for other animals, list generally which non-business groups now threaten to do the greatest harm to business ethics.

Part 3: The Issue of Holistic Ethics—Weeks 13-15

Week 13 (begins April 17). **Environmental Ethics**

Intuitively, we recognize that (1) environment-level ethics needs a broad vision, and (2) such a vision ideally complements the limited things that any one individual can do in her/his own life in their own local world regarding other living beings. In this week’s work, we build on the work done regarding sciences, values and ethics during your ANZO 501 course where we engaged in a preliminary way (i) conservation, (ii) the environmental movement, and (iii) the implicitly ethical features of conservation biology’s core commitments. Through such engagement, we glimpsed that some sciences heavily involved in animal issues pursue their work with both implicitly and explicitly *ethical* commitments involving other-than-human animals.

Recall that Rollin has challenged all of us to think out the recurring claim in many scientific circles that science is “value-free, hence ethics free” (this quote is from Rollin’s article in *A Communion of Subjects* at page 520, column A, where he notes that this is best described as “scientific ideology”). In fact, many different sciences have goals and other commitments that plainly are ethical in connection, if not in nature.

We mulled over in ANZO 501 this issue—since conservation biology seems to have ethics or ethics-like commitments as a heartbeat, does this help us see that Anthrozoology (*even when it is conceived as a science*) and Animal Studies more generally (which does not claim to be *exclusively* a science) rightly consider ethical issues as core inquiries?

In this week and next, we continue to explore the environmental movement to assess its relationship to ethics-informed work on nonhuman animal issues. And we again ask, *Can science be totally free of values?* We go further as well by inquiring about *when* approaches that aspire to be value-free are a good thing, and when and why value-free approaches might be wanting.

Some additional background (there are copies of the following readings in the Week 13 materials for this course)—in ANZO 501, we reviewed the following ethics-related environmental materials:

(a) Callicott’s 1980 “Animal Liberation: A Triangular Affair” and his 1994 qualification of his 1980 claims;

(b) the Waldau piece “Venturing Beyond the Tyranny of Small Differences: The Animal Protection Movement, Conservation and Environmental Education” in Bekoff’s *Ignoring Nature*; and

(c) three chapters from the 4th edition of Primack’s *A Primer of Conservation Biology*. You may recall this dedication in Primack’s book: This book is dedicated to those who teach conservation biology, ecology, and environmental sciences, whose efforts will inspire future generations to find the right balance between protecting biological diversity and providing for human needs.

We also noted the “Ethical Principles” on pages 13ff of Chapter 1, and the section “Ethical Arguments Supporting Preservation” beginning on page 65 of Chapter 2. Finally, we looked at the third excerpt beginning at page 245 of Chapter 8 dealing with what on its face seems an *inherently* ethical issue, namely, restoring ecosystems we consider damaged.

In addition, there are many passages in *Animal Rights* that mention environmental issues. These are listed in the Index at page 223—notice (i) how many different passages there are, and also (ii) how many different ways there are either actual or potential overlaps between these two worldwide social movements.

Assigned Readings

(1) Varner 1998, Chapter 5, “Can Animal Rights Activists Be Environmentalists?”

Review as much as you can of the materials we looked at in ANZ 501:

(2) Callicott’s 1980/1994 “Animal Liberation: A Triangular Affair”

(3) Waldau 2013 “Venturing Beyond the Tyranny of Small Differences: The Animal Protection Movement, Conservation and Environmental Education” in Bekoff’s *Ignoring Nature*; and

(4) chapters from 4th edition of Primack’s *A Primer of Conservation Biology*

Focus Questions

Recall two things: (a) we have already dealt with claims about certain enterprises being “value free”; and (b) the focus questions during ANZO 501 explored the questions “What is(are) the relationship(s) of the animal protection movement to ecology/the environmental movement?” and “What in your opinion *should* be the relationship(s) of these movements?”

With this background in mind, consider these questions:

1. *When* are approaches that aspire to be value-free a good thing in scientific efforts?
2. Is there any place *in ethics* for approaches that aspire to be value-free?

3. In what kinds of *science* cases can value-free approaches be inadequate?

Discussion Board—one question for this week to be announced.

Synchronous Session—we will discuss both the assigned readings and your posts at the Discussion Board.

Week 14 (begins April 24). **Beyond the Holism of Environmental Ethics: The Possibilities and Realities of Bioethics and Biotechnology Concerns**

In the holistic spirit of the environmental ethics connections with animal protection that we have been exploring, we turn briefly to some additional ethics-based notions. The first reading supplies some perspective on environmental ethics and what is called “applied” or “practical” ethics. We then turn to the important field called “bioethics” and also to the important concept of biotechnology—both of these areas have actual and potential impacts on nonhuman animals that raise complex ethical questions.

Assigned Reading

(1) Rollin 2006, Chapters 6-8

(2) “Bioethics—The Basics”, 2-page supplement by Paul Waldau (.pdf)

(3) Table of Contents, *Bioethics—Basic Writings on the Key Ethical Questions the Surround the Major Biological Possibilities and Problems*, Edited by Thomas A. Shannon, Fourth Edition, Paulist Press, 1993

(4) **Recommended only** as background: “What is bioethics?” This is a summary dated 2000 from the American Bioethics Advisory Commission—while this is a 75-page document, the explanatory text ends at page 47. Focus on the early pages (1-3, for example) which contain some broad considerations—the balance of the document has important history and information about the government-based bioethics work. I do not require you to read the whole document, but I do recommend it because one can see easily that government-based definitions of academic topics are distorted by the profound human-centerednesses that are the heartbeat of contemporary public policy and law. This feature can be seen if you search the word “animal” in the document (the .pdf file at the course website is in a format that permits you to search words).

(5) **Recommended only** as background: Rollin essay “Ethics, Biotechnology and Animals” in *A Communion of Subjects*

Focus Questions for Zoom session (Discussion Board will not be active this week or next)

1. In your opinion, what should the field of bioethics cover?
2. What do you make of Rollin’s arguments about biotechnology?
3. What place or emphasis, if any, should be given in Anthrozoology to ethics-based critiques of technology (including genetic modification)?

Week 15 (begins May 1). Ethics and Realism 3: Evaluating Holistic Approaches

In this final session dealing with “ethics and realism,” we ask if *animal ethics focusing specifically on animal protection* is (i) a special form of ethics or (ii) to use a biological image, is better understood as just one of many different species in the genus “ethics.” In other words, we will inquire if animal ethics/animal protection has truly special features, such that this particular form of ethics might be a key to environmental ethics, bioethics, practical ethics, or other types of ethics more.

We will also underscore that the study of ethics has as a principal task a special role in bringing assumptions out into the open—this task also belongs to certain philosophical approaches (logic, for example, might take this role, as might linguistics through examination of language and meaning). We will discuss that the field of ethics has a particularly important role in examining the justifications explicitly provided by an actor or perhaps just implied by a particular action.

To examine the pressures that human exceptionalism puts on modern discussions of ethics, we will look at the one assigned reading for this week (a humor-laced chapter entitled “The Snout” from Loren Eiseley’s *The Immense Journey*) which bring out the relationship of human lives to all other lives on Earth and in this sense provides a vehicle for discussing the future of ethics. To carry out a robust consideration of the future, we will need a variety of critical thinking skills at every juncture—we will discuss how these skills are drawn from many different areas of human endeavor.

Lastly, we will discuss how ethics-based work through its efforts to ferret out hidden values and unnoticed realities can upset certain people who are satisfied with the status quo—this is but one of the reasons that open-minded, frank inquiries into ethically charged issues can be, among traditional animals, a risky venture. Recall the adage “ought implies can” (remember, this is originally a *logical* point directed at how the word “ought” operates)—we discussed whether the reverse (“can implies ought”) might in some circumstances be a rule governing a moral actor’s choices.

Assigned Reading: Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*, Chapter 3, “The Snout” (.pdf at course website)

Focus Questions for Zoom session (**Discussion Board will not be active this week**)

1. Is animal protection an isolated form of ethics (separate from other forms of ethics such as human-to-human relations or environmental connections)?
2. In your mind, is animal protection a key to understanding environmental ethics, bioethics, practical ethics, and more?

3. See if you can give an example that explains how ethics-based analysis takes up the task of bringing assumptions out into the open.
4. In what contexts have you noticed that a person who raised ethical questions thereby took what amounted to political risks?
5. Evaluate this argument—assessing what acts each of us is capable of *requires* each of us to search not only our own realities, but also inquire into the realities of others. This is true because, if we are to take *full* responsibility for the consequences of our own choices, we have to know the impacts of our actions. Knowing the impact of one's actions on, say, a squirrel or an elephant or a community in the nearby woods *requires* information about, respectively, the squirrel (or her species at least) or the elephant or the community in the nearby woods. Finally, such a search requires humility, if only because it is often hard to learn such things (and at times impossible, as the micro/macro division suggests). This requires candor about our human abilities, which can put one at odds with traditional accounts of the special place already accorded by many to members of the human species.
6. What would be the future of ethics without humans?

Final Paper will be **due on or about Tuesday, May 9** (final grades **MUST** be submitted to Canisius' Registrar by May 17, 9AM)