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Executive Summary and Recommendations

The Review Panel convened in Corvallis for a full day on Friday, May 17 2013. Appendix 1 is the schedule for the site visit, indicating the diversity of individuals with whom we met. Additionally, we were provided with the self-study (with the addition of one CV not initially included) and also the original 2003 proposal for the initiation of the MA in Applied Ethics.

Overall Recommendation

Restructure and expand the Program

Summary of Recommendations

A. Program Structure/ Thesis Option: The faculty should consider allowing for a degree option that is not a thesis but a written description of the practicum or culminating experience/project.

B. Program Structure/ Online options. Online courses should be developed and offered.

C. Program Direction: We recommend that the faculty hold a retreat next year to decide whether the MA in Applied Ethics is a terminal degree or a stepping stone, or both. Further, the program faculty need to consider the relationship of Applied Ethics to the new proposal for an interdisciplinary major in Environmental Humanities. In addition, the faculty should consider the initiation of a non-degree graduate certificate program.

D. Administration: We recommend the establishment of a Community Advisory Board comprised of a diversity of community leaders and some OSU representatives.

E. Size: The program must grow in order to be sustainable.

F. Funding: Faculty should take advantage of Ecampus and the INTO Pathway for international students as revenue sources for the program.

G. Recruitment: Faculty should target a diversity of prospective students locally, nationally, and globally (e.g., via INTO Pathway or by creating a collaborative arrangement with Pacific Rim institutions or through Ecampus marketing).

G. Integration: Faculty should seek collaborations and connections with forestry, education, agriculture, businesses, and public health. In addition, the popular and successful Ideas Matter program should be revived, and new activities, such as student-led or faculty-led workshops, instituted.

H. Diversity. The program needs to expand its diversity through some of the above suggestions, such as establishment of the Community Advisory Board, the connection with the Center for Civic Engagement, involvement with Ecampus, and the connection with INTO.
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Charge

The external review team was charged with the following: help the program to develop additional options for meeting the challenges described below. The program especially wishes to create options that leverage a partnership in the School of History, Philosophy, and Religion with the faculties of History and Religious Studies, because these disciplines offer illuminating context for the study of ethical issues and practices. The program would also like to develop partnerships with other programs in the College of Liberal Arts which emphasize social justice; and since interest in ethics is a university-wide affair, the program would also like to open up partnerships and conversations besides those internal to the School.

The program identified at least five challenges the details of which are on pages 5 and 6 of *Self-Study Report of Graduate Program in Applied Ethics* (May 2013) (henceforth *Self Study*). The first challenge includes recruiting more students to the program. Currently, the small number of students makes it difficult to schedule courses required for degree completion and to establish a sense of community. The small number of applicants varies dramatically from year to year. The second challenge is fiscal. The program is able to offer only a very modest amount of financial aid in the form of a small stipend and accompanying tuition waiver for Graduate Teaching Assistants. The third is availability of 500-Level courses needed for completion of the degree. This challenge follows on the heels of the first and second. The fourth challenge has to do with limited opportunities for practicum experiences. This is an integral and pivotal aspect of the program. The program has found it challenging to locate and identify practicum opportunities. The last challenge is identified as “institutional recognition.” It is not clear that the program’s emphases on outreach and engagement on issues of practical ethics as a form of promoting social justice are sufficiently recognized in the public sphere.
Scope and Process of Review

The Team understood its charge to focus on challenges and goals (specifically those identified on page seven of the *Self Study*).

Prior to visiting the program, the Review Team (RT) reviewed the *Self-Study*. The RT met with Dean Brenda McComb the evening of May 16 to clarify the scope and nature of the review and to ask questions about the relationship of the program to the School, the College, and the university as a whole. The dinner meeting set the pace for the rest of the review.

On Friday, May 17th, the RT met with:

Jake Hamblin, the Director of Graduate Studies; and Ben Mutschler, Director, School of History, Philosophy and Religion
Mike Oriard, Associate Dean of College of Liberal Arts
Applied Ethics Committee
Graduate Students
Sharyn Clough for facilities tour
Philosophy faculty
SHPR staff (3).

During each of these meetings the RT encouraged free, frank, transparent, and open discussion of the program strengths and weaknesses.
Brief History of the Graduate Program in Applied Ethics

Founded in 2003, the graduate program has been in existence for a decade. During its formative years, it was steered primarily by one (now retired) faculty member who had a particular vision of the nature and scope of the program and of the metrics for its success. After her retirement, the program went into a kind of hiatus as new faculty were hired and a variety of organizational changes were underway in what is now the School of History, Philosophy, and Religion. The School houses only one other graduate program (in History of Science), though many of the 27 faculty are also involved in other graduate training efforts (for instance, in the MA in Interdisciplinary Studies). There are also plans afoot to develop a program in environmental humanities that will – we hope – complement without competing with the Applied Ethics program for faculty, resources, and students.

The program is currently structured under five pillars as follows:

1. Environmental Ethics;
2. Ethics and Religion;
3. Social Justice;
4. Biomedical Ethics; and
5. Global Justice, Peace and War

The program identifies its goals (*Self Study, page 4*) as follows:

1. To enable students to identify and analyze moral problems and to suggest responses supported by a knowledge base and analytical skills grounded in classical and contemporary ethical theory.
2. To empower students to address ethical problems that arise in their professional and civic lives through the study and analysis of case studies drawn from contemporary public life.
3. To elicit our students’ sense of moral responsibility to others and encourage them to exercise moral leadership within their communities.
4. To cultivate students’ skills for applying ethical theory to real-world problems through internship and community engagement, in which students experience the constraints, difficulties, and complexities of normative judgment for professional life in an increasingly complex and global world.
5. To support students bringing their graduate training in applied ethics to lifelong career work in fields in which their unique skills will be utilized and further developed, both inside and outside of the academy.
The MA in Applied Ethics located in the School of History, Philosophy, and Religion is an extraordinary program. The Program’s central position allows it to contribute to realizing the mission of the OSU as “a land grant institution committed to teaching, research, and outreach and engagement.” The program is also well positioned with regard to the vision of the University as an ethically engaged community. The mission of the program is specifically to promote OSU’s commitment to “economic, social, cultural and environmental progress for the people of Oregon, the nation and the world.” The Master of Arts Program in Applied Ethics is dedicated to teaching students the skills and knowledge they need for analyzing, navigating, and responding to the difficult issues they will confront as citizens and as professionals. Specifically, it is the mission of the program to provide students with an understanding of ethical values and dilemmas on topics that are of direct relevance to today’s world, including bioethics, environmental ethics, aesthetics, religion, and other contemporary issues. As such the program engages in critical work, both inside and outside of the academy, in the service of the University’s aim of contributing to social, economic, and environmental progress.

As part of the review process, the Review Panel focused on the history of the graduate program in applied ethics; program leadership, faculty interest in the program; the position and fit of the program at OSU; faculty capacity for research, teaching and advising students; staff capacity for administering the program; students’ needs, interests, and career prospects (current students as well as imagined prospective students to be targeted); space requirements; and the financial feasibility of the program given the economic realities of GTA funding and revenue sources at OSU.

The program has splendid leadership: The Director of the School of History, Philosophy and Religion, Ben Mutschler, and the Director of the Graduate Studies, Jake Hamblin, both demonstrate great energy, enthusiasm, creativity, and openness. The directors are approachable and trustworthy. Of special mention is Professor Sharyn Clough whose wonderful leadership of the Center for Phronesis and commitment to the program complements those of Hamblin and Mutschler. The staff and faculty have a sense of ownership of the program, thanks to that extraordinary leadership.

The program’s faculty and staff members are committed to and enthusiastic about promoting and realizing the mission of the program as stated on page three of the Self-Study Report of Graduate Program in Applied Ethics (May 2013). The support of the School is demonstrated by the recent addition of new faculty members (two of whom recently earned their tenures).

The faculty members are very productive in terms of publications, invited presentations, and engagement. They have expertise in philosophy, religion, social justice, and ethics across a wide range of areas. The one area in which a cohort appears to be coalescing is environmental ethics. Recent faculty hires include Allan Thompson, Associate professor, focused on environment ethics; Stephanie Jenkins, who is new to the faculty this year and brings considerable enthusiasm for the graduate program; and a new assistant professor starting this fall in environmental ethics.

Courtney Campbell runs the Hundere Center, holds the Hundere Endowed chair in Religion and Culture, and is Director of the program in Medical Humanities. Kathleen Dean Moore, who retires this year, began the Spring Creek Project, focused on nature, philosophy, and the environment, and that will continue under new leadership.

The faculty appears to be sufficient to support the mentoring of many more students. The current faculty load in terms of graduate student mentoring when considering MAIS majors needs to be enumerated.
The department is currently undergoing a major renovation of space in Milam on the third floor to combine offices for all members of the School into “pods” of four to five faculty members surrounding a central area. New space will also include new gathering spaces for students, small eating areas, and conference rooms. Space in Hovland will also be maintained for the time being with two classrooms, some office space for instructors, and more graduate student space. The space appears adequate to accommodate an expansion of the graduate student population, at least to 10 to 15 students, if not 22.

The new space is very impressive and represents a symbolic commitment to philosophy and by extension to the program. It is created in such a way as to reduce the gap between professors and their graduate students by way of forcing interaction and an intellectual epistemic community among students and professors. The facility expresses what the school stands for, and it communicates to students and the community the value that the university put on philosophy and by extension the graduate program in applied ethics. We salute the effort of the school, because the new facility make a point about the importance of the program more than can come out of the best orators or marketing brochures.

The faculty hosted a wonderful dinner for the external reviewers. The hosts, Sharyn and Jon, made Corvallis a second home to these reviewers by way of the stomach. They saw the dinner as an extension of the program.

With new hires and various elements of the reorganization into the School of History, Philosophy, and Religion, the graduate program in applied ethics is at an important turning point: (a) there is apparent widespread faculty interest in developing the program; (b) students have expressed both needs and preferences that could be relatively easily accommodated; and (c) faculty have organized new initiatives and collaborations to help build the applied ethics community at OSU. There are opportunities and resources to develop a marketing and recruitment strategy to improve the size and scope of the applicant pool (and so of the student body), and the faculty and staff are well-equipped to manage these changes. We believe that if significantly restructured, the program could grow over the next several years from “good” to “great.”

Our recommendations cluster around eight themes:

**A. Structure (related to thesis):** The program requirements should be revisited so as to allow for greater flexibility for students. The culminating experience/product should not be limited to a philosophy thesis, but rather allowances should be made for the practicum to be structured so as to count as the culminating experience/project. This change will also enable a broader recruitment strategy, and will allow the program to leverage other opportunities on campus and beyond for mentoring and placing students. Furthermore, for both the theses and the practicum projects there need to be some rubric developed to assess these works.

Additionally, we recommend the creation of a user-friendly Student Handbook detailing the learning objectives, the process for choosing a practicum site, the process for applying for and awarding GTAs, the varieties of ways in which students could fulfill the requirements of the degree, and the administering of a program questionnaire to beginning students so as to help them plot an educational plan and a career trajectory (see Appendix 2 for an example from Arizona State University).

**B. Structure (related to course delivery).** Moreover, we encourage the faculty to develop several online courses, for graduate students in the program, graduate students in other programs across
C. Program Direction: Currently, the program is structured as a master's program only. The faculty needs to decide if this is a terminal degree or a stepping stone, or both. As the program expands, stock should be taken on how many prospective students will obtain the MA as a "terminal degree" and how many will use it to apply to a doctoral program elsewhere. The program should then use this information to tailor the offerings. The possibility of a doctoral program should be considered after the MA is put on solid ground. The faculty needs to revisit the original proposal for the program and to examine the mission and vision of the program. We recommend that there be a faculty retreat next year to focus on these decisions and on the needed actions to re-invigorate the program.

As part of this re-examination, the faculty should consider the relationship between Applied Ethics and the new proposal for an interdisciplinary major in Environmental Humanities. It would be unfortunate if students interested in environmental ethics were divided between two competing programs. This is an especially acute concern given the low number of applications currently to the applied ethics program and the increasing focus in philosophy on environmental ethics.

D. Administration: The development of a practically relevant, engaged ethics program is too important to be left to philosophers alone. While philosophical methods are critical to engaged ethics, opportunities for engagement must be sought more systematically and more strategically by means of campus and community outreach. We recommend the establishment of a Community Advisory Board comprising a diversity of community leaders, business leaders, and some OSU representatives (for instance, from the Center for Civic Engagement) to help develop practicum opportunities (and potentially create jobs) for students, to support the expansion of Phronesis as a social laboratory, and to champion the program locally and more broadly so as to aid with fundraising and recruitment. Either as part of this Advisory Board or as a separate group, we recommend that an ad hoc advisory council of OSU faculty from the relevant colleges/units (public health, forestry, nursing, education, etc.) help inform the development of the program. Such a group could help advise as to their own needs, as well as identify potential collaborators or advisors across campus. The faculty, with no exception (see CVs), has created a culture of high quality scholarship, teaching, service, and community engagement in alignment with the mission of the university. The most difficult of all to fulfill in the academy is scholarship, and in this area, the faculty sets the standard of how productive a department can be. In keeping with this established tradition of scholarship, we recommend one semester of pre-tenure teaching relief for Stephanie Jenkins, so as to help ensure the development of her career given substantial responsibility for the program as well as to make a statement about the significant of the tradition of scholarship.

E. Size: The program must grow in order to be sustainable. Specifically, it has graduated only eight students during the past decade. The program is currently below OSU minimum graduates for a master's program. There is considerable capacity in terms of faculty to build the program to at least 22 students, if not more. Too few students – no matter how good – have the effect of undermining any kind of community of scholar-citizens toward which the program has always aimed. While it is desirable for the program to realize a genealogical or temporal community (including undergraduates as well as alumni of the program as part of the community), it is also desirable and mandatory for the program itself to grow. Unless the program graduates more students each year, it will be considered for suspension. Faculty members are not stretched too thin in terms of advising responsibilities, and the careful, strategic restructuring of the culminating experience within the MA should not increase faculty burden. Moreover, a larger body of students will enable more regular
graduate-student-only (500-level) offerings. The graduate students that we interviewed were vocal that the “slash” courses in which a majority of students were undergraduates did not provide a stimulating, graduate level learning experience. Reaching out to undergrads and integrating them as part of the applied ethics community may improve the quality of undergraduate participation in 400-500 offerings and provide new mentoring and teaching opportunities for the graduate students.

The program should carefully cultivate a relationship with the local business community members with the possibility of charging them with raising funds for the program as well as creating opportunities in their local businesses and organizations for practicum and employment. That means that a special committee of faculty should be charged with combing through the local community for those capable business men and women who may be interested in becoming members of the advisory committee. Further, the program should reach out to farmers, foresters, and local corporations in the service of engagement in the program, but also as avenues for resources for practicums, opportunities for employment, and for raising funds. What this means is that the program itself must make itself known in the university and local community. One way to do this is to invest in a theme called **ethics and the arts** whose aim is ethics in addition to raising visibility for the program at the university and the community. This could take a variety of forms including bringing leading, highly visible musicians and avant-garde artists to town. The program director would then approach the citizen board in search of someone or organization to sponsor the musician and so on. Another awareness-raising point should take the form of connecting the program to local **Non-Governmental Organizations**. In fact, a special committee should be appointed to take stock of all the local NGOs. This has at least two advantages: raising awareness of the program and providing opportunities for practicum. A related point to this is creating connections along the same line with local **faith communities**. The program should reach out to local faith communities and work with them with some of the ethical challenges that they may be facing.

**F. Funding:** One way to grow the program is to insist on additional GTA funding from the Dean or Associate Dean; we believe that this is an inappropriate strategy at OSU, as elsewhere. Instead, we encourage the faculty to develop bottom-up initiatives to generate new teaching and research opportunities for students, as well as to take advantage of Ecampus and INTO Pathway as revenue sources for the program, which could then be reinvested into students. We also encourage more strategic investment of existing resources in students, as GTA allocation appears uneven across students and somewhat *ad hoc* and opaque. Current and planned facilities are entirely appropriate, and the current staff members are capable and skilled (and very happy). We further recommend that a group of applied ethics faculty apply jointly to eCampus to fund a GTA to help develop a cluster of online courses. Foreign students should be recruited for the diversity as well as revenue source. That means that the program should invest faculty time in both of these endeavors. Moreover, the program should reach out to local corporations and businesses to canvass for funding for particular endeavors. One could be to fund a student or a faculty focusing on corporate ethics or something like that. After all, most successful sustainable graduate programs at OSU are entrepreneurial in spirit.

**G. Recruitment:** Recruitment to date has been *ad hoc*, at best, and the program has relied primarily on chance to attract applicants, most of whom were Philosophy majors as OSU undergrads. Staff support is now in place to enable an actual recruitment strategy, one that should target a diversity of prospective students locally, nationally, and globally (e.g., via INTO Pathway or by creating a collaborative arrangement with Pacific Rim institutions or through Ecampus marketing). Additionally, we recommend that the program develop a new revenue stream via the recruitment of mid-career professionals – from industry, healthcare, government, forestry, agriculture (both farmers and ranchers), business, education, NGOs, etc. – who will pay their own way through the program
(or whose employers will subsidize their education). One prospect would be to create a non-degree certificate program to attract students who might eventually elect to pursue the graduate degree (and this certificate program might also be made available to students in other units as another source of revenue). Another consideration would be to reconfigure the program to accommodate these students. This may take the form of intensive courses on weekend or once a month or it may also take for form of developing and issuing online courses. Finally, faculty consider seeking cost-sharing for recruitment through the Graduate School.

H. Integration: Philosophers can be an insular bunch. While the philosophers at OSU are not predisposed toward insularity, we would like to see broader outreach and inclusivity across campus so as to better integrate the applied ethics program into the many parts of campus and the many educational initiatives to which it is directly relevant. That is, we recommend that the same effort be put into forestry and education and public health as has recently been put into disability studies. Indeed, it may be appropriate to include Michael Nelson, a philosopher/ethicist in Forestry, as a member of the core faculty. We recommend that the School revive the popular and successful Ideas Matter program, as well as institute new activities to help integrate the program on campus and beyond. These might include student-led ethics forums at high schools or in libraries or cafes, a student-and-faculty-led undergraduate journal and/or a regional conference on applied ethics, and faculty-led professional development workshops for those teaching or hoping to teach applied ethics material in their OSU (or community college or high school) courses. Additional ideas for creating visibility of the program and integration with the campus include activities such as bringing in popular musicians or public art exhibits for the school and local community. Some other ideas appear in Appendix 3.

I. Diversity: The program as it stands is not diverse. The program does not reflect our variegated world or the diverse society that is the United States. We recommend that effort be put into diversity for its expressive content as well as for the benefit of diversity in its own right. This diversity can be achieved through some of the above recommendations, such as the establishment of the Community Advisory Board, the connection with the Center for Civic Engagement, the involvement with eCampus, local churches, and the connection with INTO.
Appendix 1: Schedule

Applied Ethics Program Review
May 16th-17th, 2013
Site Visit Agenda

Thursday, May 16th, 2013
6:00pm – 8:30pm  Pre-review dinner with Graduate Dean and Review Panel
  Dean McComb will pick up Dr. Wingo and Dr. Robert from the Harrison House
  and drive them to Luc Restaurant

Friday, May 17th, 2013 - Milam 319A
8:00am – 9:00am  Pick up at hotel, transport
  Discussions with Jake Hamblin Director of Graduate Studies and Ben Mutschler,
  Director, School of History Philosophy and Religion

9:00am – 9:45am  Meet with Mike Oriard, Associate Dean of College of Liberal Arts

9:45am – 10:00am  Break

10:00am – 11:15am  Applied Ethics Committee, David Bishop, Academic Advisor and Courtney
  Campbell, Hundere Professor

11:15am – 12:00pm  Graduate Students

1200pm – 1:00pm  Working Lunch for Review Panel

1:00pm – 2:00pm  Facilities tour led by Sharyn Clough

2:00pm – 3:00pm  Meet with Philosophy faculty

3:00pm – 3:15pm  Break

3:15pm – 3:45pm  Meet with SHPR staff
  Dwanee Howard, Robert Peckyno, and David Bishop

3:45pm – 4:15pm  Final discussions with DGS (Hamblin) and SHPR Director (Mutschler)

4:15pm – 5:15pm  Executive session

6:00pm  Dinner for out of town guests (at private residence, details to be provided)
Applied Project Planning Questionnaire

All students in the MA AEP program must complete six (6) credits of AEP 593: Applied Project and Capstone. The purpose of the applied project is to give all students a hands-on learning experience to apply their skills and abilities with identifying, analyzing, and resolving ethical issues within a professional context. This project will be a summative experience where students will bring their knowledge of ethics and reasoning about ethical issues to bear in a real life context. Each track’s Lincoln Professor and committee sets the requirements for, reviews, and approves student projects, along with examining the portfolio that the student creates as evidence demonstrating satisfactory completion of the project.

In order to orchestrate an excellent applied project experience, we need to know more about your specific learning objectives and your likely career plans. Please complete the information on this worksheet prior to meeting with the MA AEP BHE Applied Project Liaison to begin developing your personalized project.

Learning Objectives

During my applied project experience, I would most like to spend time doing:

At the end of my applied project experience, I want to have developed the following skills:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Career Planning.

Please write a statement, up to one (1) page in length, describing your current career path. Include brief details about your undergraduate background, any specific strengths or gaps in education or training, and your immediate plans upon completion of this degree.
Appendix 3: Dream Proposals

The list below is series of ideas that could form the basis for student or faculty projects in Applied Ethics. These are meant to stimulate thought amongst the faculty about means to advance outreach into the community and beyond. They are not meant to be prescriptive for the program.

**Cyber Ethics:** Internet and computer technology, like it or not, has become an essential ingredient of our modern life. The ways the Western world does business, conducts public affairs, fights wars, carries out research, and produces and delivers goods and services are all dependent on computer and internet technology. Computer technology has further revolutionized everyday life by making the distances separating governments from their citizens, businesses from their clients and customers, and even individuals from one another, increasingly irrelevant. Thanks to internet and computer technology, students from all over the world can get access to libraries, museum collections, and other scholars they will never meet in person; but they can also get access to the most egregious pornography that can be said to be degrading to women who tend to be overrepresented in it, making it difficult to fight sexism and the oppression and repression of women the world over.

These questions about this strange new cyberworld have no obvious answers, but it seems increasingly clear that if there are answers, they will not be simple ones. No government – not even that of the United States, which was so instrumental in creating this frontier – appears to have the ability to exercise meaningful authority there. For instance, the “Protecting Cyberspace as a National Asset Act of 2010” introduced in the U.S. Congress provides for a National Center for Cyber-security and Communications charged with overseeing the federal government’s information security strategy. But the most widely-touted method of protecting vital U.S. internet resources is the so-called “kill switch” – a means by which the President could shut down critical IT structures in case of an emergency – is a means of reacting to a serious cyberattack, rather than preventing such an attack in the first place.

Neither does it appear plausible to hope that some kind of “spontaneous order” will emerge from the free interactions among cybercitizens. Lest this sound abstract, consider the recent WikiLeaks affair, in which a single man, Julian Assange, created a means for other individuals, apparently operating on their own initiative to make public classified government documents available for public gaze. Setting aside real questions about how much harm was caused, it appears clear at the very least that the government charged with protecting those documents was apparently powerless to do anything about keeping those documents confidential. This raises questions of value regarding the public/private distinction well known in the lives of citizens in liberal democratic states.

**B: War Ethics:** While war has changed and is changing on a daily basis, thanks to technology, the proverbial Just War Theory remains stagnant. Originally formulated by Saint Augustine of Hippo and further reformulated by Saint Thomas Aquinas, it has remained unchanged though the world has moved on. The Just War Ethics was formulated for its own time when the weapons of war were as simple as using knives, swords, human bodies, spears and propaganda. The fundamental basis of the Just War Theory was in the centrality of religion to the lives of leaders who believe in earnest that they were God’s aegis on earth and the veracity of their beliefs was proven by their participation in wars.
The fact that Western liberal states are divorced from theocracies mean that in cases of war, they are cut off from the fundamental basis of the Just War Theory. Invoking the Just War Theory in the absence of strong belief in God sounds hollow. Technology has transformed wars. Apart from nuclear weapons, chemical weapons and the difficulties of separating combatants from noncombatants, wars are no longer geographical circumscribed. There are no battle fields anymore. The biggest development in warfare is the use of drones controlled from remote areas that allow Westerners to kill people in distant lands like Afghanistan by the click of the mouse, free of any kind of physical danger.

It is apparent that combatants who lack this technology would find ways to fight as the 9/11 terrorists did. The ethical question is whether we should stick to the Just War Ethics despite the fact that it is patently anachronistic. The questions here are not limited to the treatment of prisoners of war or what to do about collateral damage as it is about war itself and the way we should be justifying it.

**Global Ethics:** Thomas Pogge has done some good work on global justice. The question of past and current injustices perpetrated on those at the global south cannot be ignored. There are issues of environmental degradation in the northern hemisphere that affects the entire world including those from the southern hemisphere who reap little or no benefit from it. The further question is what the north owes the south as a matter of justice in reparation for past injustices such as colonialism, and so on. These are value questions that the ethics program ought to be in line with.

**Business Ethic:** Corporations are a funny moral kind. They function well under laissez faire capitalism. But it is clear that laissez faire capitalism is not the only system that there is. Corporate citizenship is a matter of choices that liberal democratic societies make. Though their citizens are rooted in particular places in time, these citizens are cosmopolitan. They are able to enjoy the benefit of protection of their government while outsourcing their operations to other parts of the world where they can make the most in profit. Yes, there has been emphasis placed on corporate social responsibility, but is this enough of a responsibility? Further, these corporations have a lot of resources that enable them to pollute the polity, as in Super Pac unlimited spending. What is the status of this fictitious personality and what responsibilities and limits to freedom should be imposed on these entities?

**NGO Ethics:** A whole pillar should be devoted to NGOs. They seems to be playing a powerful ethical role in changing governments around the world and even domestically. What are their responsibilities to the people supporting them and to the people that they are serving? Whose interests should be paramount?

**Zombie and Pop Culture Ethics:** Life can be about grave matters. The pop and Zombie culture has something to tell us: that life can also be about light matters. There is a surge in these cultures all over the Western world. There are questions of values to be had about these cultures.

**The Ethics of Privacy in a Public World:** The question of privacy is pertinent to our conception of freedom at the heart of politics. In the rapidly changing world of technology and the American love for the publicity in the press, is the idea of privacy a kind of fetish? The right to be let alone seems like a fetish in the world in which people are at the same time chronicling their lives on Facebook and Twitter and inviting the press to their lives, while at the same time demanding the best form of privacy. What is the relationship between privacy and publicity in our age? There once
was the mystery of states by which the king was crowned by an invisible power of God in the Western world. With the ascendancy of democracy, rulers are elected and the mystery of states is now public or has evaporated. Of course, the divine right of Kings was tied to this mystery. In the age of publicity is there still a value to privacy and secrecy or is it a kind of nostalgia? Think about the increasing technology of unmanned aerial systems (UAS) the best known of which is the drone. Drones have the capability of collecting all sorts of information, leaving people with nothing to protect or with no privacy of any kind. This is notwithstanding cyber technology and all that it implies. In the wake of Edward Snowden, a former National Security Contractor who reveals the classified secret that shows that the government of the United States has been eavesdropping on its citizens without their consent, what should we make of the relationship between publicity and privacy?

The way to go about these dream proposals is to look for resources throughout the university and beyond. Students who would want to work on one of these topics should not be turned down but should be allowed to form an interdisciplinary patchwork, taking from here and from there. A student may work with an anthropologist, a historian, a religious studies professor and so on and so forth with a core in ethics offered by philosophers, of course.