

BUSINESS ETHICS NOTES

- What is virtue?
 - For Aristotle virtue is something that has to be 'put' or taught to people at an early age
 - Aristotle thought that virtue is a mean state between two vices
- 
- For Aristotle, a virtue will always be a 'middle' state.
 - Aristotle thought that for 'courage' is a virtue that can only be used in the war. Fighting for a sickness is not being courageous.
 - Aristotle thought that virtues are pro social; i.e cancer and war example
 - Emotions are ok in virtue ethics, although they aren't as keen as care ethicists. People can be trained.

- Emotions are non-rational faculties that can be trained
- Main issue with virtue ethics
 - Not action guiding, it says very little about what we have to do
 - Virtue ethicists are not action guiding. In the trolley scenario they don't have any rules
 - Only humans of certain ability are able to be virtuous; women, disabled people and children
 - Cases when virtuous people are doing something wrong
 - Terms are vague

Solomon Business ethics and virtue

1. Ni type of ethics is not the right way to approach virtue ethics

* Moral Luck

- * one of the main objection against virtue ethics

* Neo-Aristotilian

- * It has nothing to do with how wealthy you are
- * you can be virtuous even when you're poor
- * No necessity of external goods

* Business Ethics and Virtue - Robert Solomon

* Aristotle

- * The virtues have to be pro-social

BUSINESS ETHICS NOTES

- He says that there is a duty of loyalty to your company even if its not reciprocal
- Makes comparison to parent and child loyalty. The child cannot protect the adult
- Sometimes blowing the whistle is the loyal act b/c it will save the company
- ✓ We sometimes don't see whistle blowers cause they believe that someone else will say something about it

Employees/Workers Rights

Machan (libertarian) – believes in no government intervention

- He says that employees have rights; minimum wage, maximum hours that workers should be subjected to
- He asks the question whether there are certain types of rights
- He rejects the idea that there is a subset of rights called 'workers rights' -> all rights are just derivatives of 'human rights'
- Human rights: John Lockes idea of rights; humans are born with natural rights to life, liberty and property.
 - As a human being you cannot enslave anyone
- We don't need an additional right for workers, human rights are enough
- Workers rights violates human rights
 - They could be justified but are not entitlements that workers have
- Positive and Negative rights
 - Negative rights: rights of non interference; if you have a right to life then don't kill. If you have right to liberty, don't take away my liberty
 - Positive rights require provisions; health care, education (workers' rights)
 - f says that all rights are negative rights. If you can't afford health care, then too bad.
 - Whenever we have provisions then we are violating the employed rights
 - If there is a free market, then why would people settle for less
- Employees have the right to have access to everything about the job
- Access to information and no deception (Milton freidman type) employers cant deceive workers
- Open market competition without the government interfering; the ethical responsibility.

Final Exam

- Posted on the 3rd of January (Wednesday) afternoon
- Due on the 8th of Jan by 7pm (Israel time) Sarah@mail.tau.ac.il
- WORD file
 - Format
 - 2/3 essay questions

BUSINESS ETHICS NOTES

is not just about calling out a body, but shows you consider women as sexual objects, and that because you have the power of the dominant group you can "rate" women.

- The above means that all women suffer at the fault of sexual harassment = GROUP HARM
- sexual harassment follows women in all positions, and has meant that women have gotten worse opportunities

The subjective and the objective definition:

- As it is now the woman has to prove that she was bothered by something. and because it is so subjective it puts the burden of proof on the woman.
- Therefore, she wants objective definitions: general rules that can always be used. wants to get rid of the cases where women "put up with it"

V - The implication of the objective definition:

HOW I SEE HER LOGIC

she is more objectifying to what could be called "power sexual harassment". The reason she only talks about man on woman as the case on point is because the men are the dominant group - historically and physically they have the power and use that power to show control over women. and when any man use this power: cat calling, demeaning, boss/secretary it becomes harassment against all women because its harmful to all women is society that this toxicness continues - this is also what justifies the objective definition.

HER PROBLEM: she doesn't leave room for non-classical power sexual harassment. I believe that you CAN argue for the objective definitions benefits (Although it would be discriminatory) but you should not automatically dismiss sexual harassment of other constellations.

ADVERTISING

Machan

Deception in advertising