

*Blackwell
Companions to
Philosophy*

A Companion to Applied Ethics

Edited by
R. G. Frey
and
Christopher Heath Wellman

 **Blackwell**
Publishing

A Companion to Applied Ethics

Blackwell Companions to Philosophy

This outstanding student reference series offers a comprehensive and authoritative survey of philosophy as a whole. Written by today's leading philosophers, each volume provides lucid and engaging coverage of the key figures, terms, topics, and problems of the field. Taken together, the volumes provide the ideal basis for course use, representing an unparalleled work of reference for students and specialists alike.

- Already published in the series:**
- 1 The Blackwell Companion to Philosophy, Second Edition
Edited by Nicholas Bunnin and Eric Tsui-James
 - 2 A Companion to Ethics
Edited by Peter Singer
 - 3 A Companion to Aesthetics
Edited by David Cooper
 - 4 A Companion to Epistemology
Edited by Jonathan Dancy and Ernest Sosa
 - 5 A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy
Edited by Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit
 - 6 A Companion to Philosophy of Mind
Edited by Samuel Guttenplan
 - 7 A Companion to Metaphysics
Edited by Jaegwon Kim and Ernest Sosa
 - 8 A Companion to Philosophy of Law and Legal Theory
Edited by Dennis Patterson
 - 9 A Companion to Philosophy of Religion
Edited by Philip L. Quinn and Charles Taliaferro
 - 10 A Companion to the Philosophy of Language
Edited by Bob Hale and Crispin Wright
 - 11 A Companion to World Philosophies
Edited by Eliot Deutsch and Ron Bontekoe
 - 12 A Companion to Continental Philosophy
Edited by Simon Critchley and William Schroeder
 - 13 A Companion to Feminist Philosophy
Edited by Alison M. Jaggar and Iris Marion Young
 - 14 A Companion to Cognitive Science
Edited by William Bechtel and George Graham
 - 15 A Companion to Bioethics
Edited by Helga Kuhse and Peter Singer
 - 16 A Companion to the Philosophers
Edited by Robert L. Arrington
 - 17 A Companion to Business Ethics
Edited by Robert E. Frederick
 - 18 A Companion to the Philosophy of Science
Edited by W. H. Newton-Smith
 - 19 A Companion to Environmental Philosophy
Edited by Dale Jamieson
 - 20 A Companion to Analytic Philosophy
Edited by A. P. Martinich and David Sosa
 - 21 A Companion to Genethics
Edited by Justine Burley and John Harris
 - 22 A Companion to Philosophical Logic
Edited by Dale Jacquette
 - 23 A Companion to Early Modern Philosophy
Edited by Steven Nadler
 - 24 A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages
Edited by Jorge J. E. Gracia and Timothy B. Noone
 - 25 A Companion to African-American Philosophy
Edited by Tommy L. Lott and John P. Pittman
 - 26 A Companion to Applied Ethics
Edited by R. G. Frey and Christopher Heath Wellman
 - 27 A Companion to the Philosophy of Education
Edited by Randall Curren

*Blackwell
Companions to
Philosophy*

A Companion to Applied Ethics

Edited by
R. G. Frey
and
Christopher Heath Wellman

 **Blackwell**
Publishing

© 2003 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5018, USA
108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton South, Melbourne, Victoria 3053, Australia
Kurfürstendamm 57, 10707 Berlin, Germany

The right of R. G. Frey and Christopher Heath Wellman to be identified as the Authors of the Editorial Material in this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

First published 2003 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to applied ethics / edited by R.G. Frey and Christopher Heath Wellman.

p. cm. — (Blackwell companions to philosophy)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-55786-594-9 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Applied ethics. I. Frey, R. G. (Raymond Gillespie) II. Wellman, Christopher Heath. III. Series.

BJ1031.C585 2003

170—dc21

2002004860

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 10/12½ Photina

by Kolam Information Services Pvt Ltd, Pondicherry, India

Printed and bound in the United Kingdom

by TJ International, Padstow, Cornwall

For further information on

Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:

<http://www.blackwellpublishing.com>

Contents

<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xvii
1 The Nature of Applied Ethics <i>Tom L. Beauchamp</i>	1
2 Theories of Ethics <i>Stephen L. Darwall</i>	17
3 Property Rights and Welfare Redistribution <i>Jeremy Waldron</i>	38
4 Civil Disobedience and the Duty to Obey the Law <i>A. John Simmons</i>	50
5 Capitalism and Marxism <i>Richard W. Miller</i>	62
6 State Punishment and the Death Penalty <i>David Dolinko</i>	75
7 Racism <i>Michele Moody-Adams</i>	89
8 Sexism <i>Ann E. Cudd and Leslie E. Jones</i>	102
9 Affirmative Action <i>Bernard Boxill and Jan Boxill</i>	118
10 The Legal Enforcement of Morality <i>Larry Alexander</i>	128
11 Hate Crimes, Literature, and Speech <i>L. W. Sumner</i>	142

CONTENTS

12	Pornography and Censorship <i>Lori Gruen</i>	154
13	Dirty Hands <i>Gerald F. Gaus</i>	167
14	Sexual Ethics <i>Alan H. Goldman</i>	180
15	Gun Control <i>Lance Stell</i>	192
16	Citizenship <i>Wayne Norman and Will Kymlicka</i>	210
17	Immigration <i>Michael Blake</i>	224
18	World Hunger <i>Hugh LaFollette</i>	238
19	War and Terrorism <i>C. A. J. Coady</i>	254
20	Nationalism and Secession <i>Christopher Heath Wellman</i>	267
21	Intergenerational Justice <i>Clark Wolf</i>	279
22	Bioethics <i>Margaret P. Battin</i>	295
23	Abortion <i>Margaret Olivia Little</i>	313
24	Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide <i>Michael Tooley</i>	326
25	Reproductive Technology <i>John D. Arras</i>	342
26	Genetic Engineering <i>Dan W. Brock</i>	356
27	Surrogate Motherhood <i>Rosemarie Tong</i>	369
28	Cloning <i>John Harris</i>	382
29	Allocation of Medical Resources <i>H. Tristram Engelhardt, Jr and Ana Smith Iltis</i>	396

CONTENTS

30	Experimentation on Human Subjects <i>Patrick Boleyn-Fitzgerald</i>	410
31	Disability <i>Leslie Pickering Francis</i>	424
32	Moral Status <i>Mary Anne Warren</i>	439
33	Killing and Letting Die <i>Alastair Norcross</i>	451
34	The Doctrine of Double Effect <i>R. G. Frey</i>	464
35	Bad Samaritans, Acts, and Omissions <i>Patricia Smith</i>	475
36	Moral Dilemmas <i>N. Ann Davis</i>	487
37	Education <i>Amy Gutmann</i>	498
38	Personal Relationships <i>Lawrence A. Blum</i>	512
39	Animals <i>Jeff McMahan</i>	525
40	Business Ethics <i>Patricia H. Werhane and R. Edward Freeman</i>	537
41	Corporate Responsibility <i>R. Edward Freeman and Patricia H. Werhane</i>	552
42	Whistle-blowing <i>Terrance McConnell</i>	570
43	Professional Ethics <i>David Luban</i>	583
44	Media Ethics <i>Judith Lichtenberg</i>	597
45	Computer Ethics <i>Deborah G. Johnson</i>	608
46	Engineering Ethics <i>Michael S. Pritchard</i>	620
47	Environmental Ethics <i>Andrew Light</i>	633

CONTENTS

48	Values in Nature <i>Dale Jamieson</i>	650
49	The Tragedy of the Commons <i>David Schmitz and Elizabeth Willott</i>	662
50	Global Warming <i>Robert Hood</i>	674
	<i>Index</i>	685

Notes on Contributors

Larry Alexander is Warren Distinguished Professor of Law at the University of San Diego. He specializes in the areas of constitutional law (especially First Amendment), criminal law, and jurisprudence. The author of numerous scholarly articles that have appeared in leading law reviews and philosophy journals, Professor Alexander is also co-author (with Paul Horton) of *Whom Does the Constitution Command?*, and editor of *Constitutionalism: Philosophical Foundations, An Anthology*. He serves on the editorial boards of the journals *Ethics* and *Law and Philosophy* and is co-editor of the international quarterly, *Legal Theory*.

John D. Arras is Porterfield Professor of Biomedical Ethics and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Virginia, where he directs the Undergraduate Bioethics Program and participates in the MA degree program in bioethics. He is a fellow of the Hastings Center and a former member of Governor Cuomo's New York State Task Force on Life and Law. Professor Arras is the editor of *Bringing the Hospital Home: Ethical and Social Implications of High Technology Home Care*, and the author of many articles on bioethics. His primary areas of research interest include the ethics of physician-assisted suicide, AIDS treatment and research, global justice and international research, reproductive ethics, and the methodologies of practical ethics.

Margaret P. Battin is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and Adjunct Professor of Internal Medicine, Division of Medical Ethics, at the University of Utah. She has authored, edited, or co-edited twelve books, including *Puzzles about Art*; *Ethics in the Sanctuary*; *The Least Worst Death*; *Ethical Issues in Suicide*; *Drug Use in Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide*; and *Physician-assisted Suicide: Expanding the Debate*. In 2000, Professor Battin was a co-recipient of the Rozenblatt Prize, the University of Utah's most prestigious award.

Tom L. Beauchamp is Professor of Philosophy and Senior Research Scholar at the Kennedy Institute, Georgetown University. He is series editor of *The Foundations of Philosophy Series*, and general editor, with David Fate Norton and M. A. Stewart, of *The Critical Edition of the Works of David Hume*.

Michael Blake is an Assistant Professor at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. His work centers on the implications of group member-

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

ship for liberal equality. He is currently writing a book about the normative importance of cultural survival.

Lawrence A. Blum is Professor of Philosophy and Distinguished Professor of Liberal Arts and Education at the University of Massachusetts. He is the author of *Friendship, Altruism, and Morality* and *Moral Perception and Particularity*.

Patrick Boleyn-Fitzgerald is Director of Lawrence University's Program in Biomedical Ethics and an Assistant Professor of Philosophy. He has served as a staff member for President Clinton's Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments and published on topics in ethics, bioethics, and political philosophy.

Bernard Boxill is Professor of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He specializes in social and political philosophy, and African-American political thought.

Jan Boxill is Lecturer and Associate Chair of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She specializes in social and political philosophy, feminist ethics, and the philosophy of sport.

Dan W. Brock is Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr. University Professor, Professor of Philosophy and Biomedical Ethics, and Director of the Center for Biomedical Ethics at Brown University. He has written widely in bioethics, including (with Allen Buchanan) *Deciding for Others: The Ethics of Surrogate Decision Making* and *Life and Death: Philosophical Essays in Biomedical Ethics*.

C. A. J. Coady is Senior Research Fellow and Deputy Director of the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics at the University of Melbourne, Australia. He has written on epistemology, the philosophy of language, the philosophy of mind, ethics, and political philosophy, including *Testimony: A Philosophical Study*.

Ann E. Cudd is Professor of Philosophy and Director of Women's Studies at the University of Kansas. Her main areas of interest are social and political philosophy, the philosophy of social science, and feminist theory. She is currently writing a book on oppression.

Stephen L. Darwall is John Dewey Collegiate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Michigan. He has written widely on the history and foundations of ethics and is the author of *Impartial Reason; The British Moralists and the Internal "Ought": 1640–1740; Philosophical Ethics; and Welfare and Rational Care*.

N. Ann Davis (formerly Nancy Davis) is currently Professor of Philosophy and McConnell Professor of Human Relations at Pomona College in Claremont, California. Prior to that, she taught for many years at the University of Colorado at Boulder. She has published papers that focus broadly on the connections between theory and practice; more specifically on the abortion debate, notions of moral responsibility, integrity, moral development, sentience, and other issues in moral theory, social philosophy, moral psychology, and biomedical ethics. She is an associate editor of *Ethics*.

David Dolinko is Professor of Law at the University of California, Los Angeles. His research interests focus on the philosophical underpinnings of criminal law. He has published articles on retributivism, capital punishment, and the privilege against self-incrimination.

H. Tristram Engelhardt, Jr is Professor of Philosophy at Rice University. He is the author of numerous articles and books, including *The Foundations of Bioethics*. He is also the editor of *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* and of *Christian Bioethics*.

Leslie Pickering Francis is Alfred C. Emery Professor of Law and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Utah. With Anita Silvers, she is the editor of *Americans with Disabilities: Implications of the Law for Individuals and Institutions*. She has also recently published *Sexual Harassment as an Ethical Issue in Academic Life*. She is currently at work on a book tentatively titled *Legitimate Expectations in a World of Imperfect Justice*.

R. Edward Freeman is Elis and Signe Olsson Professor of Business Administration and Co-director of the Olsson Center for Applied Ethics at the Darden Graduate School of Business Administration, and Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Virginia. His books include *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*; *Business Ethics: The State of the Art*; *Corporate Strategy and the Search for Ethics* (with D. Gilbert, Jr); and *Environmentalism and the New Logic of Business* (with J. Pierce and R. Dodd).

R. G. Frey is Professor of Philosophy at Bowling Green State University. He is the author of numerous books and articles on applied ethics, normative theory, and the history of eighteenth-century British moral philosophy. His latest book (with Gerald Dworkin and Sissela Bok) is *Euthanasia and Physician-assisted Suicide*.

Gerald F. Gaus is Professor of Philosophy, and on the faculty of the Murphy Institute of Political Economy, at Tulane University. He is the author of *The Modern Liberal Theory of Man*; *Value and Justification*; *Justificatory Liberalism*; *Social Philosophy*; *Political Concepts and Political Theories*; and *Contemporary Liberalism: Theories of Public Reason*. With Stanley Benn, he edited *Public and Private in Social Life* and with F. B. D'Agostino is the editor of *Public Reason*. He and William Street are the editors of Bernard Bosanquet's *The Philosophical Theory of the State and Related Essays*. Professor Gaus has been an editor of the *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, is presently editor of *Politics, Philosophy and Economics*, and co-editor of *The Handbook of Political Theory*.

Alan H. Goldman is a member of the Philosophy Department at William and Mary College, Williamsburg. He is the author of several books, including *Justice and Reverse Discrimination*; *The Moral Foundations of Professional Ethics*; *Moral Knowledge*; and *Practical Rules: When We Need Them and When We Don't*.

Lori Gruen teaches ethics, politics, and practical philosophy at Wesleyan University. She is currently completing a book entitled, *Overcoming Moral Alienation*, in which she argues for an enhanced version of consequentialism that can more adequately address the practical moral problems real people face.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Amy Gutmann is Laurance S. Rockefeller University Professor of Politics and Director of the University Center for Human Values at Princeton University. She is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Education. Among her books are *Democratic Education; Liberal Equality; Democracy and Disagreement* (with Dennis Thompson); and *Color Conscious* (with Anthony Appiah), which received the Ralph J. Bunche Award. Her articles on moral and political philosophy appear in *Ethics, Philosophy and Public Affairs, Political Theory, Social Philosophy and Policy*, and other journals.

John Harris is a member of the United Kingdom Human Genetics Commission and the Ethics Committee of the British Medical Association. He is the author or editor of fourteen books and over one hundred and fifty papers, including *Clones, Genes, and Immortality; The Future of Human Reproduction; and Bioethics*. He is the series editor of "Social Ethics and Policy" published by Routledge, and the founder and a general editor of the "Issues in Biomedical Ethics" series published by Oxford University Press. He was elected a Fellow of the United Kingdom Academy of Medical Sciences in 2001, the first philosopher to have been elected to this select group of medical scientists.

Robert Hood is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Middle Tennessee State University. He works on environmental ethics and is currently writing a book on clinical approaches to environmental ethics.

Ana Smith Iltis is a PhD candidate at Rice University. Her areas of focus are ethics, bioethics, and political philosophy.

Dale Jamieson is Henry R. Luce Professor in the Human Dimensions of Global Change at Carleton College. He has written widely in environmental philosophy, moral and political philosophy, the philosophy of biology, behavior, and mind. Professor Jamieson has edited *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*.

Deborah G. Johnson is Anne Shirley Carter Olsson Professor of Applied Ethics at the University of Virginia. She is the author of *Computer Ethics* and other books and articles on ethics, science, and technology.

Leslie E. Jones is a doctoral student in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Kansas.

Will Kymlicka is Professor of Philosophy at Queen's University in Ontario, Canada. He has written many articles and several books in moral and political philosophy, including *Liberalism, Community and Culture; Contemporary Political Philosophy; Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights; Finding our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada; and Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*.

Hugh LaFollette is Professor of Philosophy at East Tennessee State University. He is a co-author of *Brute Science: The Dilemmas of Animal Experimentation*, the author of *Personal Relationships: Love, Identity, and Morality*, and editor or co-editor of seven volumes. He is currently writing *The Practice of Ethics*, which seeks to integrate discussions of practical ethical issues with ethical theory.

Judith Lichtenberg is Associate Professor of Philosophy, Research Scholar in the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy, and Director of the Committee on Politics, Philosophy, and Public Policy at the University of Maryland. She writes in the areas of ethics and political philosophy and has edited *Democracy and the Mass Media*.

Andrew Light is Assistant Professor of Environmental Philosophy and Director of the Graduate Program in Environmental Conservation Education at New York University, as well as Research Fellow at the Institute for Environment, Philosophy and Public Policy at Lancaster University (UK). In addition to founding and co-editing the journal *Philosophy and Geography*, Andrew Light is the author of over fifty articles on environmental ethics, the philosophy of technology, and the philosophy of film, and has edited or co-edited twelve books, including *Environmental Pragmatism*; *Social Ecology after Bookchin*; *Philosophies of Place*; *Beneath the Surface: Critical Essays on the Philosophy of Deep Ecology*; *Technology and the Good Life?*; and *The Aesthetics of Everyday Life*. He is currently completing a book on pragmatism and the relationship between environmental ethics and environmental policy-making.

Margaret Olivia Little is Associate Professor of Philosophy and Senior Research Scholar in the Kennedy Institute of Ethics at Georgetown University. She is co-editor (with Brad Hooker) of *Moral Particularism* and is currently finishing a book on abortion entitled *Abortion, Intimacy, and Responsibilities to Gestate*.

David Luban is Frederick Haas Professor of Law and Philosophy at Georgetown University Law Center. He has written or edited five books on legal ethics: *The Good Lawyer: Lawyers' Roles and Lawyers' Ethics*; *Lawyers and Justice: An Ethical Study*; *The Ethics of Lawyers*; *Legal Ethics* (co-authored with Deborah L. Rhode); and, most recently, a Japanese-language anthology of his writings. His other writings include *Legal Modernism* and many papers on legal and political philosophy.

Terrance McConnell is Professor of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. He is the author of *Gratitude*; *Moral Issues in Health Care*; and *Inalienable Rights*.

Jeff McMahan is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is the author of *The Ethics of Killing: Problems at the Margins of Life* and is currently working on a sequel that discusses killing in self-defense, in war, and as a mode of punishment.

Richard W. Miller is Professor of Philosophy at Cornell University. His writings, in social and political philosophy, ethics, epistemology, the philosophy of science and aesthetics, include *Analyzing Marx: Morality, Power and History*; *Fact and Method: Explanation, Confirmation and Reality in the Natural and the Social Sciences*; and *Moral Differences: Truth, Justice and Conscience in a World of Conflict*.

Michele Moody-Adams is Hutchinson Professor of Ethics and Public Life, as well as Professor of Philosophy, at Cornell University. She teaches and does research in contemporary moral theory, moral psychology, and applied ethics, as well as in the history of moral and political philosophy and the philosophy of law.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Alastair Norcross is Associate Professor of Philosophy at Rice University. He works both in ethical theory and in several areas of applied ethics, such as euthanasia, abortion, and animal rights. He has edited (with Bonnie Steinbock) *Killing and Letting Die*. He is currently writing a book arguing that consequentialist ethical theories should not be interpreted as theories of either the rightness or goodness of actions, but instead as scalar theories that evaluate actions as better or worse than possible alternatives.

Wayne Norman is Chair of Business Ethics with a cross appointment in the Centre for Applied Ethics and the Faculty of Commerce at the University of British Columbia. He has written on a wide range of topics in moral philosophy, specializing recently in political philosophy as well as business ethics and corporate citizenship. He is the author of *Taking Freedom Too Seriously?*, and has edited *Canadian Political Philosophy* (with R. Beiner), as well as *Citizenship in Diverse Societies* (with Will Kymlicka).

Michael S. Pritchard is Willard A. Brown Professor of Philosophy, Director for the Center of Ethics in Society, and Associate Dean of the Graduate College of Western Michigan University. His publications include *Engineering Ethics: Concepts and Cases* (with C. E. Harris and Michael Rabins); *Reasonable Children*; and *On Becoming Responsible*.

David Schmidt is Professor of Philosophy and Professor of Economics at the University of Arizona. He works principally in moral and social philosophy and has authored *The Limits of Government: An Essay on the Public Goods Argument*; *Rational Choice and Moral Agency*; and (with Robert E. Goodin) *Social Welfare and Individual Responsibility*. He has edited *Robert Nozick* and (with Elizabeth Willott) *Environmental Ethics: What Really Matters, What Really Works*.

A. John Simmons is Commonwealth Professor of Philosophy at the University of Virginia, specializing in political, legal, and moral philosophy. He is an editor of the journal *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, and the author of *Moral Principles and Political Obligations*; *The Lockean Theory of Rights*; *On the Edge of Anarchy*; and *Justification and Legitimacy*.

Patricia Smith is Professor of Philosophy at Baruch College and Graduate Center, City University of New York, where she specializes in legal, political and social philosophy, feminist jurisprudence, and action theory. She is the author of *Liberalism and Affirmative Obligation and Omission, Law and Responsibility*, as well as editor or co-editor of five volumes, including *Feminist Jurisprudence* and *Philosophy of Law: Theoretical Issues and Practical Applications* (with P. Commanducci). She is currently working on a book on the evolution of values during cultural revolution.

Lance Stell is Charles A. Dana Professor of Philosophy at Davidson College, where he directs the Medical Humanities Program. He also holds an appointment as a medical ethicist in the Department of Internal Medicine at Carolinas Medical Center (Charlotte, NC). He publishes in the areas of ethics, medical ethics, political philosophy, and the philosophy of law.

L. W. Sumner is Professor of Philosophy and Law at the University of Toronto. He is the author of *Abortion and Moral Theory; The Moral Foundation of Rights; and Welfare, Happiness, and Ethics*, as well as numerous articles on ethics, applied ethics, and the philosophy of law. He is currently working on a book on *The Hateful and the Obscene: Studies in the Limits of Free Expression*.

Rosemarie Tong is Distinguished Professor of Health Care Ethics in the Department of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. An award-winning teacher and prolific writer and lecturer, she is the author of *Women, Sex, and the Law; Feminine and Feminist Ethics; Feminist Approaches to Bioethics: Theoretical Reflections and Practical Applications; Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction; and Globalizing Feminist Bioethics: Crosscultural Perspectives*. Professor Tong currently serves as Co-coordinator of the International Network on Feminist Approaches to Bioethics.

Michael Tooley is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Colorado. He is co-editor (with Ernest Sosa) of *Causation*, the editor of the first five volumes of *Analytical Metaphysics*, and the author of *Abortion and Infanticide; Causation: A Realist Approach; and Time, Tense and Causation*.

Jeremy Waldron is Maurice and Hilda Friedman Professor of Law and the Director of the Center for Law and Philosophy at Columbia University. He has written widely in political and legal philosophy, including *The Right to Private Property; Nonsense upon Stilts: Bentham, Burke and Marx on the Rights of Man; Liberal Rights: Collected Papers 1981–91; The Dignity of Legislation; and Law and Disagreement*. Professor Waldron was elected a fellow of the American Academy of the Arts and Sciences in 1998.

Mary Anne Warren teaches in the Department of Philosophy at San Francisco State University. Her publications include *Moral Status: Obligations to Persons and Other Living Things; The Nature of Woman: An Encyclopedia and Guide to the Literature; and Gendercide: The Implications of Sex Selection*.

Christopher Heath Wellman directs the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics and teaches in the Department of Philosophy at Georgia State University. He works broadly in ethics, specializing in political and legal philosophy.

Patricia H. Werhane is the Ruffin Professor of Business Ethics and Co-director of the Olsson Center for Applied Ethics at the Darden Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Virginia. Her works include *Ethical Issues in Business* (edited with Tom Donaldson and Margaret Cording); *Adam Smith and his Legacy for Modern Capitalism; and Moral Imagination and Management Decision-making*. She is the founding editor-in-chief of *Business Ethics Quarterly* and on the editorial board of the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Elizabeth Willott is Assistant Professor in Entomology at the University of Arizona. She has co-edited (with David Schmidtz) *Environmental Ethics: What Really Matters, What Really Works* and has presented papers on environmental ethics in Italy, Australia, the US, and to the Convocation of World Leaders. She has published on

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

human population trends and on the management of insect resistance to transgenic cotton. With David Schmitz, she has done fieldwork in sub-Saharan Africa on wildlife management. In addition, she works on the immune response and biochemistry of insects.

Clark Wolf is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Georgia. He specializes in ethical theory, political philosophy, and the philosophy of law.

Preface

Applied ethics is the largest area of growth in philosophy, and we here feature a variety of original pieces designed to capture the breadth and depth of the writing in the general field today. Our aim has been to select the best philosophers we could on some of the topics we thought likely to be of interest to a broad public of specialists and non-specialists alike, and we were mindful to include excellent young people as well as established and noteworthy figures in the group of contributors. The result is a volume that we think is representative of the best writing in applied ethics today, one that not only attempts to cover selected topics of great contemporary import but also tries to do so in a way consistent with the high standards found in other areas of analytic philosophy.

While we have not given complete coverage to everything that today goes under the title of “applied ethics,” we have aimed to include most of the main issues that are usually taken to fall under that heading. Where we were unsure of the lasting import of a particular issue, we excluded it; where we were unsure whether an issue warranted extended treatment, we excluded it; most especially, where we felt ourselves unable to find an excellent philosopher to undertake a topic, even when we thought that topic worthy of inclusion, we excluded it. We have striven for quality even at the cost of a more complete coverage that, while not unusual in collections on applied ethics, has done little to enhance the reputation of the subject in general.

For the fact is that a suspicion still exists among philosophers, particularly analytic ones, that, despite the popularity of courses in applied ethics which, to increase enrollment, departments have to offer, standards in applied ethics are low. The result has been a tension between the feeling that one has to defer to fashion and offer applied courses and the sense that what goes on in those courses does not mirror in rigor or subtlety of argument what goes on in courses on epistemology or the philosophy of mind. We have tried here to address this concern over quality with a collection of original offerings that stress argument, clarity of thought, and carefulness of exposition by philosophers and others at home in the analytic tradition. Substantive concerns and argument do not have to be alien to each other.

The chapters may be read in any order. In this regard, the book can be used in a variety of ways: as a reference work on what today typically counts as applied

PREFACE

ethics, as a reader on topics in a particular area or on interrelated topics bridging several areas, and as a collection of individual essays on topics of great moral, social, and political interest.

We would like to thank Stephan Chambers, Steve Smith, Jeff Dean, and Nirit Simon of Blackwell for their enduring support for and help with this project. We would also like to thank Sue Ashton, Brad Champion, Elisa Marchetta, Karen Mazner, Eric Rovie, and Sara Zenlea for their very extensive help in preparing the manuscript for publication.

RGF and CHW

The Nature of Applied Ethics

TOM L. BEAUCHAMP

The term “applied ethics” and its synonym “practical ethics” came into use in the 1970s when philosophers and other academics began to address pressing moral problems in society and in professional ethics (especially medical ethics and business ethics). Prominent examples, then and now, are abortion, euthanasia, the protection of human and animal subjects in research, racism, sexism, affirmative action, acceptable risk in the workplace, the legal enforcement of morality, civil disobedience, unjust war, and the privacy of information.

Historical Background

Despite the recent origins of the term “applied ethics,” various topics that form its subject matter can be traced to ancient times. For example, liberties to publish controversial opinions, engage in civil disobedience, commit suicide, and choose one’s religious viewpoint are matters of perennial interest, as are questions of unjust wars and the moral status of animals. Although moral philosophers have long discussed these problems, it is arguably the case that no major philosopher throughout the history of moral philosophy has developed a program or method of applied ethics. Moral philosophers have traditionally formulated theories of the right, the good, and the virtuous that are set out in the most general terms. A practical price is paid for this theoretical generality: it is usually hazy whether and, if so, how theory is to be applied to generate public policy, settle moral problems, and reduce controversy in controversial cases.

It is not obvious that applied ethics is the offspring of, or even dependent upon, general moral philosophy. Its early successes in the 1970s owed more to arguments directed at pressing and emerging moral problems in society than to traditional theories of ethics. Many individuals in law, philosophical and theological ethics, political theory, and the professions, including medicine, business, engineering, and scientific research, addressed these issues. These individuals were profoundly affected by concerns in the wider society regarding individual liberties, social equality, and various forms of abuse and injustice directed at vulnerable groups. The issues raised by civil rights, women’s rights, animal rights, the consumer movement, the environmental

movement, and the rights of prisoners and the mentally ill often included ethical issues that stimulated the imagination of philosophers and non-philosophers alike. (A volume that nicely illustrates the state of one area of interdisciplinary ethical inquiry around 1970 is the massive compendium on research involving human subjects entitled *Experimentation with Human Beings* [Katz, 1972].)

In the late 1960s and early 1970s philosophers increasingly came into contact with people from other disciplines who were interested in moral problems, including those of the health professions, law, business, engineering, and the social and behavioral sciences. Perhaps the most influential fields in the development of a scholarly literature in applied ethics were law and moral philosophy. Many problems of applied ethics have since been framed in the vocabularies of these two disciplines. This is not surprising since moral philosophy and law have common concerns over matters of basic social importance and share various principles, requirements, and criteria of evidence. Law is, in many respects, the public's agency for translating morality into explicit social guidelines and practices and for stipulating punishments for offenses. Case law, in particular, has provided precedents and basic material that are influential in all areas of applied ethics.

During the 1970s and early 1980s a number of philosophers began to fashion their careers around interests in applied ethics – an almost unprecedented development in a profession generally skeptical that “applied ethics” was either a scholarly enterprise or had a future in the university. The late 1970s and early 1980s saw the publication of several books devoted to philosophical treatments of subjects in applied ethics. Virtually every book published in applied ethics prior to the late 1970s had been organized topically, rather than in terms of moral principles or philosophical theories. This orientation changed rapidly in the late 1970s and 1980s.

Problems of Definition

Many philosophers have viewed applied ethics as the attempt to implement either general moral norms or general moral theories with the goal of resolving practical problems. They see theory, argument, and analysis as tools that can be used to examine these moral problems. However, it is today generally accepted that no straightforward movement to practical judgments is possible by appeal either to moral theories or to general moral principles (such as “One ought not to treat people as mere means to the ends of others;” “One ought to keep promises;” “One ought not to inflict harm or risk of harm;” “One ought to treat people fairly and with equal respect;” and “One ought to respect the autonomy of others”). This is the so-called gap between theory and practice. Theory and principles must, it seems, be supplemented in some way by paradigm cases of right action, empirical data, organizational experience, and the like. But in precisely which way(s)? This question helps us see why “applied ethics” is a very difficult notion to understand and define.

Accordingly, it seems doubtful that applied ethics is best defined as the application of general ethical theories to particular moral problems (roughly the definition

offered by Gert, 1982: 51–2). This definition is so narrow that many will not recognize it as reflecting either the appropriate method or content of applied ethics. A weaker and more defensible view is that “applied ethics” refers to any use of philosophical methods to treat moral problems, practices, and policies in the professions, technology, government, and the like. This broader usage makes no commitment to the place of general theories or principles and does not insist on problem-solving as the goal. It may be the most common understanding of the term within the profession of philosophy, but it would be viewed outside philosophy as reflecting a significant disciplinary bias.

A different bias is found in the idea that “applied ethics” is synonymous with “professional ethics.” Problems such as the allocation of scarce medical resources, unjust wars, abortion, conflicts of interest in surrogate decision-making, hate crimes, pornography, war and terrorism, whistle-blowing, the entrapment of public officials, intergenerational justice, research on animals, and the confidentiality of tax information extend beyond professional conduct, yet all are topics in the domain of applied ethics. These conceptual questions about the nature of “applied ethics” lead to a consideration of both the content and the methods of applied ethics.

Problems of Moral Content

Three influential types of answer have appeared in the literature on the appropriate sources of content in applied ethics: an internal account, an external account, and a mixed internal–external account. These categories were first fashioned for the analysis of professional ethics, but they can be generalized to other areas, such as institutional and group ethics of all types. The first defends an ethic derived from professional – or institutional or group – practice standards. The second maintains that precepts in settings of applied ethics rely upon and require justification by external standards such as those of public opinion, law, the common morality, religious ethics, and philosophical ethics. The third claims that distinct forms of practical ethics *internal* to professions, groups, and institutions are themselves deeply influenced by broader (external) cultural frameworks.

Internalism

Some philosophers have maintained that established practices provide the primary source of practical ethics. Influential in this literature is Alasdair MacIntyre’s use of “practice” to designate a cooperative arrangement in pursuit of goods that are internal to a structured communal life. He holds that “goods internal to a practice” such as those found in the professions are achievable only by engaging in the practice and conforming to its standards of excellence. Standards internal to these professions therefore determine what it means to be a good practitioner. Each profession has a history and specific character that sustains a tradition requiring professionals to cultivate its virtues (MacIntyre, 1984: 17, 175, 187, 190–203).

Howard Brody and Frank Miller offer one form of internalism to explain the foundations of medical ethics:

Physicians, by virtue of becoming socialized into the medical profession, accept allegiance to a set of moral values which define the core nature of medical practice. These values give rise to at least some of the moral duties incumbent upon physicians in their professional role and indicate the virtues proper to physicians. . . . The *professional integrity* of physicians is constituted by allegiance to this internal morality. (Brody and Miller, 1998: 386)

These writers, and others like them, maintain that moral frameworks in the professions derive from role-specific duties and professional virtues.

No one can reasonably dispute that professional roles incorporate moral obligations and ideals. However, an internal morality notoriously may not be adequately comprehensive, coherent, or even morally acceptable. Tradition and professional standards are no guarantee of moral adequacy; and, unfortunately, professional codes in medicine, business, journalism, engineering, and other fields often oversimplify moral requirements, make them indefensibly rigid, or claim more completeness and authority than they are entitled to claim.

Brody and Miller address this problem by distinguishing between the core moral norms appropriate to a profession and the dogmatic and unsystematic provisions found in many codes of professional ethics. As they see it, an internal morality can and should evolve in the face of social change: “*Even the core of medical morality must be thoughtfully reevaluated and reconstructed at intervals, and the reconstruction will be carried out by those who live in modern society who are inevitably influenced by societal values as they interpret the history*” (Brody and Miller, 1998: 393–4, 397; emphasis added).

Though correct, this view is fatal to internalism. It shows that internal standards may be shallow and expendable, whereas some external standards are deep and essential. Even current practice standards might be weak and insupportable. We also know from recent history that a meaningful reconstruction of traditional professional and institutional moralities to accommodate cultural change is unlikely to occur by appeal to the internal standards of professional morality.

Consider this historical example. In the late 1960s the book *A Time to Speak: On Human Values and Social Research* by social psychologist Herbert Kelman was published just as a number of controversial cases surfaced of abuses of human subjects by social scientists (Kelman, 1968). Kelman’s book and these cases functioned as wake-up calls alerting social scientists to the fact that they had serious deficiencies in standards of research ethics. Careful attention was subsequently paid to the moral judgments that psychologists should make in carrying out their research and to the many defects of standards in the then prevailing practices. Problems were found in practices such as the experimental deception of subjects, the collection of data on persons in an individually identifiable form, and the use of financial incentives to obtain subjects. It became clear that there were no prevailing practice standards adequate to address these questions.

Externalism

Are there external, by contrast to internal, standards for professional and institutional morality? An external morality is one that incorporates norms and values

that sustain, supplement, or correct those of an internal morality. Public opinion, law, religious institutions, and philosophical ethics have all served (whether justifiably or not) as sources of external morality.

One influential answer in philosophy to the question of which external source is most appropriate is that ethical theory provides the appropriate basis for applied ethics. An example is found in the work of Bernard Gert and Danner Clouser. They maintain that to make sound judgments in applied ethics there must be “a single unified ethical theory.” The goal of their theory is to provide “a common framework on which all of the disputing parties can agree” and to give “guidance in circumstances that are not intuitively morally clear.” They believe that their theory will alert attentive persons to issues of applied ethics, identify the morally relevant features of circumstances, determine the difference between morally acceptable and unacceptable solutions to problems, and show which conditions are necessary and sufficient to justify the violation of a moral rule (Clouser and Gert, 1990: esp. 231–2; cf. Gert et al., 1997: esp. 3–6, 15–19).

Gert and Clouser do not hold that theory in general supplies appropriate external standards for professional ethics. Only their theory can do so; all other theories are fatally flawed and incapable of sound advice. Proponents of other theories generally assume a similar partisan stance. Independent of this confusion over whether one particular theory is morally authoritative, it is often unclear whether and, if so, how a philosophical theory is to be used to criticize internal standards or address a difficult moral problem. If we could be confident that an ethical theory supplied the best basis, we could work constructively on practical and policy questions by progressively making the norms in that theory more specific. However, at present, we have no such theory, and a general consensus exists that no theory of this description is likely to emerge. Both within and without philosophy the theories that vie for supremacy are more contested than the commitments of the very social morality from which they spring. Even if an individual is convinced that some particular theory is correct (authoritative), he or she needs to deal responsibly with the fact that other morally serious and informed individuals reject this conviction.

Skepticism about the practical relevance of theory is not surprising in light of the fact that philosophers have traditionally tried to explain and justify morality, to clarify moral concepts, to examine how moral judgments and arguments are made, and to array basic principles of morals, not to use normative theories to solve practical moral problems or delineate codes of professional ethics. General theories are ill suited, really unsuited, for practical work because they address philosophical problems that are, in themselves, disengaged from practice. Although about morality, philosophical theories are primarily attempts to understand or unify morality, not attempts to specify its practical commitments.

Mixed internalism and externalism

A third type of approach to the content of applied ethics incorporates elements of both internalism and externalism. It starts with the conviction that moral commitments are implemented in different ways in diverse cultures and groups. Members of the professions and other trusted institutions are bound by moral standards that

are fixed not merely by their membership (an internal morality), but also by the moral standards of the broader culture or community (an external morality). The authority to practice is itself granted by society on the condition that its professions and institutions will in a responsible manner be educated in and adhere to the high moral standards expected by that society. If necessary, professions and institutions are expected to reform their practices so that the prevailing moral rules of the larger society will be honored in practice. These social standards, according to the present conception, will vary from society to society. Internal moralities in the professions will vary accordingly because they are in significant measure dependent upon the external moralities.

A theory of this description has been advanced by H. Tristram Engelhardt. He holds that profound disagreement exists about the nature and requirements of professional practice across larger communities such as Orthodox Judaism, Roman Catholicism, Hinduism, and secular humanism:

There is no way to discover either a canonical content-full secular morality or the correct morally content-full solutions to strangers when they are not bound by the communality of a shared moral vision that binds moral friends. Moral strangers do not see the world in the same way . . . Moral strangers [cannot] resolve content-full moral controversies by sound rational argument. Moral friends, on the other hand, are individuals who do share such premises in common. (Engelhardt and Wildes, 1994: 136; see also 135–47)

According to Engelhardt, no content-full morality spans different societies or groups. The outlook of Orthodox Judaism, for example, determines what is acceptable or unacceptable only for that portion of the Jewish nation which accepts its distinctive norms. From this perspective, moral standards of what is obligatory and permissible for professionals in medicine, politics, law, and business derive from the more general moral commitments of a larger community beyond the narrower community of professionals.

The deep moral thesis at work in this account is skeptical: there are no substantive foundations of a secular applied ethics, and, lacking such foundations, there are no foundations of any sort of applied ethics other than historical roots in communities. No internal morality ever escapes its roots in the external morality of particular cultures (Engelhardt and Wildes, 1994: 137–8; Engelhardt, 1996: 105–24).

This account shows insight into the relations between external and internal moralities, but it has many weaknesses. By emphasizing diversity, it is easy to overlook basic similarities; that is, to neglect the core of near identical moral goals, interests, and commitments that exist among well-trained professionals from different cultural backgrounds. For example, physicians all over the world share goals and techniques of healing, palliation, rehabilitation, removing discomfort, diagnostic testing, and the like. There is a shared moral viewpoint (however limited) and shared norms of professional practice across these communities.

Paradoxically, this theory also overstates the degree of shared agreement within “the communities of moral friends” that form the primary resource of the account. The theory envisions a cohesive, pervasively shared uniformity in each community

of friends, which enables a stable and reliable agreement regarding the goal of the professions and professional ethics. However, in communities of almost any size, there exists a pluralism of viewpoint. These communities are not lacking in sub-groups with different moral points of view and hopes to revise prevailing conditions, practices, and codes. Changing circumstances of urbanization, education, industrialization, the evolution of civil rights, and the like make for fluid circumstances in these communities, with a consequent need to reassess moral positions.

Another weakness is that this mixed internalist–externalist account effectively precludes cross-cultural, that is, cross-community, judgments. The validity of moral norms and judgments depends in this account on their endorsement by a community; no transcendent principle warrants cross-cultural appraisal. It follows that there are no universal human rights that protect individuals. Human rights are by definition valid claims that are justified by reference to morally relevant features of human beings, not by reference to communal standards.

It is also difficult to see how, in this theory, morally warranted public policy is to be fashioned in a pluralistic society. It is easy to see how this theory can account for private policies in private institutions, but its inability to explain, justify, and criticize public policy makes it seem out of touch with the modern world and unable to apply ethics to our deepest social problems.

Problems of Method and Justification

Several models of method – sometimes called methods or models of justification – have been discussed in applied ethics. Three of the most influential models are treated in this section. The first model approaches justification and method from a top-down perspective that emphasizes general norms and ethical theory. The second approaches justification and method from a bottom-up perspective that emphasizes moral tradition, experience, and particular circumstances. The third refuses to assign priority to either a top-down or a bottom-up strategy.

Top-down models

In the first model pre-existing general norms are applied to new particular situations. This model conforms to the way in which virtually all persons learn to think morally: its method involves applying a general rule (principle, ideal, right, etc.) to a case that falls under the rule. The following is the deductive form involved in “applying” a rule:

- 1 Every act of description *A* is obligatory.
- 2 Act *b* is of description *A*. Therefore,
- 3 Act *b* is obligatory.

This model seems plausible in the simple case of a judgment brought directly and unambiguously under a rule or a principle, but it also suggests, less plausibly, an ordering in which theories and general principles enjoy priority in ethics over

traditional practices, institutional rules, and case judgments. While much in the moral life conforms roughly to this conception of moral priority, much does not.

There are several problems with this moral-priority thesis. First, moral judgments in hard cases almost always require that we make the norms themselves more specific (see the section on “Problems of Specification” below) before we can bring a particular instance under a covering rule or principle. In the process of specifying norms and in making particular judgments we often must take into account factual beliefs about the world, cultural expectations, judgments of likely outcome, and previous precedents to help fill out and give weight to rules, principles, and theories. There is no clear moral priority in these cases. Second, the facts of a situation can also be such that no general norm (principle or rule) clearly applies, and the different moral norms that can be brought to bear on a set of facts may yield inconclusive results. For example, destroying a non-viable human embryo or fetus does not clearly violate rules against killing or murder, nor does the rule that a person has a right to protect bodily integrity and property clearly apply to this moral issue. Even if we have our facts straight, the choice of facts and the choice of rules that one person deems relevant will generate a judgment that is incompatible with another person’s choice of facts and rules. Selecting the right set of facts and bringing the right set of rules to bear on these facts are not reducible either to a deductive form of judgment or to the resources of a general ethical theory.

The top-down model also creates a potentially infinite regress of justification, a never-ending demand for final justification, because each level of appeal to a covering precept requires a higher level to justify it. If standards are unjustified until brought under a justified covering precept, it would appear, on the assumptions of this approach, that there are no justified principles or judgments. In theory, we could handle this problem by presenting a norm that is self-justifying or one that it is irrational not to hold, but proof that some norms occupy this status and that they justify all other principles and rules is not a demand that current ethical theory is well equipped to meet.

Bottom-up models

Some writers in applied ethics center their attention squarely on how practical decisions are made, rather than on general principles and theories. They believe that moral reasoning and justification proceed bottom-up, not top-down. They point to our use of existing social agreements and practices, insight-producing novel cases, and comparative case analysis as the starting-points from which we commonly make moral decisions. They also depict an evolving structure of moral beliefs based on exemplary lives and narratives, experience with hard cases, and analogy from prior practice.

Bottom-up models potentially include several distinct methodologies. Casuistry has been the most widely discussed in applied ethics, but various forms of pragmatism, particularism, and other methods may also qualify. Proponents of these approaches see moral principles as derivative in the order of knowledge, not primary. That is, the meaning, function, and weight of a principle derive from previous moral struggles in particular circumstances (Jonsen and Toulmin, 1988). For example, physicians once

regarded withdrawing various life-saving technologies from patients as acts of impermissible killing. But progressively, after dealing with many agonizing cases, they and society came to frame many of these acts as forms of permissible allowing to die or even as morally required acts of acknowledging refusals of treatment. All practical moral rules about killing and letting die arise and are refined over time; they never become more than provisionally secure points in a cultural matrix of guidelines. A society's moral views find their warrant through an embedded moral tradition and a set of procedures that permit and even foster new insights and judgments.

An analogy to the authority operative in case law is sometimes said to be at the heart of this method: when the decision of a majority of judges becomes authoritative in a case, the judgments in their decision are positioned to become authoritative for other courts hearing cases with similar facts. Defenders of bottom-up reasoning see moral authority as analogous: social ethics develops from a social consensus formed around cases, which can then be extended to new cases without loss of the accumulated moral wisdom. As a history of similar cases and similar judgments mounts, a society becomes increasingly confident in its moral conclusions and acknowledges secure generalizations (rules, principles) in its evolving tradition of ethical reflection.

Case analysis, which is central to casuistry, has long been used in law schools and business schools. Training in the case method is widely believed to sharpen skills of legal and business reasoning as well as moral reasoning. One can tear a case apart and then construct a better way of treating similar situations. In the thrust-and-parry classroom setting, teacher and student alike reach conclusions about rights, wrongs, and best outcomes in cases. The objective is to develop a capacity to grasp problems and to find novel solutions that work in the context: knowing how to reason and act is more prized than knowing that something is the case on the basis of a foundational rule.

The case method in law has come to be understood as a way of learning to assemble facts and judge the weight of evidence, enabling the transfer of that weight to new cases. This task is accomplished by generalizing and mastering the principles that control the transfer, usually principles at work in the reasoning of judges. Use of the case method in business schools springs from an ideal of education that puts the student in the decision-making role after an initial immersion into the facts of a complex situation. Here the essence of the case method is to present a situation replete with the facts, opinions, and prejudices that one might encounter and to find a way of making appropriate decisions in such an environment.

As with top-down theories, serious problems lie in wait for a defender of bottom-up theories. First, defenders sometimes write as if paradigm cases or particular circumstances speak for themselves or inform moral judgment by their facts alone. Clearly they do not. To move constructively from case to case or to attend to the relevant features of a particular situation, some recognized rule of moral relevance must connect the cases or situations. The rule is not part of the case or situation, but rather a way of interpreting and linking cases or situations. All analogical reasoning requires a connecting norm to indicate that one object or event is like or unlike another in relevant respects. The creation or discovery of these circumstance-linking norms cannot be achieved by analogy itself. Bottom-up accounts

therefore seem to presuppose principles, rules, or maxims as essential moral elements in the case or set of facts at hand.

“Paradigm cases” and “morally relevant features of circumstances” seem to combine facts that can be generalized to other situations (for example, “The employee blew the whistle on some other employees”) and settled values (for example, “Knowledgeable employees have a right to disclose the wrongdoing of other employees.”) The settled values are analytically distinct from the facts of particular cases. The more general the central values or connecting norms, the closer they come to the status of general principles or rules.

Bottom-up accounts also encounter problems where there exist conflicting analogies, judgments, and case interpretations. Defenders stress that cases and particular circumstances point beyond themselves and evolve into generalizations, but they also may evolve in the wrong way if they were improperly grounded from the outset. Bottom-up accounts have no clear methodological resource to prevent a biased development of cases or a neglect of relevant features of cases.

These problems lead to questions about the justificatory power of these accounts. How does justification occur? Is it merely by social convention and analogy? Might not different analogies and novel cases generate competing “right” answers? Without some stable framework of norms, there seems to be a lack of control over judgment and no way to prevent prejudiced or poorly formulated social conventions. This criticism is a variant of the much-discussed problem that bottom-up accounts lack critical distance from cultural blindness, rash analogy, and mere popular opinion. Identification of the morally relevant features of a case depends on those who make judgments about cases, and these individuals could operate from a partiality, predisposing bias, or prejudicial use of analogy that is unchecked by a stable system of impartial principles and human rights.

The heart of the problem may be that these accounts present a method without content; that is, a tool of thought that displays the fundamental importance of case-comparison and analogy in moral thinking, but that lacks initial moral premises. It is certain that we reason morally by analogy almost daily, and we are often confident in our conclusions. However, such analogies also often fail, and analogies never warrant a claim of truth or certainty. This method, then, leaves us with the problem that no matter how many properties two circumstances initially share, an inference from the first circumstance to yet another property in the second circumstance may mislead or produce false statements.

Coherentism

“The top” (principles, theories) and “the bottom” (cases, particular judgments) are both now widely regarded as insufficient resources for applied ethics. Neither general principles nor particular circumstances have sufficient power to generate conclusions with the needed reliability. Principles need to be made specific for cases, and case analysis needs illumination from general principles. Instead of a top-down or bottom-up model, many now support a version of another model, variously referred to as “reflective equilibrium” and “coherence theory.”