COURSE OVERVIEW

Believing that individual business leaders and organizations should aspire beyond the mere avoidance of wrongdoing to Ask More of Business™ and of themselves in terms of individual integrity, effective organizations, and the greater good, we will engage in the following tripartite series of readings, discussions and exercises:

- **Part I** – We will reflect on our respective purposes, principles or goals with respect to the personal level of moral action, and on the foundations that must be in place for us to accomplish our purposes or goals consistently with our principles.

- **Part II** - We will reflect on our respective purposes, principles or goals with respect to the organizational level of moral action, and on the foundations that must be in place for us to accomplish our purposes or goals consistently with our principles at that level.

- **Part III** – We will assume that business and society share the goal of long-term prosperity and complete readings and a case relevant to the foundations necessary for the realization of that ideal (in particular sustainability) in the operations of a business.

COURSE FORMAT

Our primary method of learning will be discussions enriched by prior reading and reflection. We will have a number of small group discussions. Mini-lectures will round out consideration of certain topics in our discussions as needed.

Business leaders are often called upon to take a position on difficult ethical issues that arise unexpectedly. Skill in that area will be enhanced by a certain amount of cold-calling (in addition to voluntary participation), which will challenge individual students or student teams to take a reasoned public position on an ethical issue on the spot and subject to follow-up questioning by the facilitator and/or classmates. **In our classroom as generally in business, to be present is to communicate that you are prepared to be cold called.**
A portion of certain class meetings will be set aside for a “debate of the day” during which particular perennial or contemporary moral issues at the personal, organizational or societal issue will be discussed and debated. Some debates will be scheduled while others will be unannounced. A mix of voluntary participation and cold calling will be used in our debates of the day.

With respect to the place and importance of the assigned readings themselves, we will try to strike an ideal balance between the contrasting positions of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Mark Twain on the subject:

“Books are the best of things, well used; abused, among the worst. What is the right use? What is the one end, which all means go to effect? They are for nothing but to inspire. I had better never see a book, than to be warped by its attraction clean out of my own orbit, and made a satellite instead of a system. The one thing in the world, of value, is the active soul.”

Ralph Waldo Emerson

“The [person] who does not read good books, has no advantage over the [person] who can’t read them.”

Mark Twain

Consistently with the wisdom of Twain, we will avail ourselves of the opportunity to benefit from the insights of thought leaders on the intersection of ethics and business. Consistently with the wisdom of Emerson, we will regard those writings as a stimulus to rather than a substitute for our own thinking on the topics we consider.

CONTACTING THE FACILITATOR

My contact information is provided above. When using it keep in mind that for the duration of our course, I will be in South Bend from midday Monday through the end of business Thursday evening; I will typically be in Chicago or on the road at all other times. Barring emergencies, I do not work on Sundays as a matter of religious practice and so you should not expect an email or voicemail reply from me on that day of the week.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Our learning objectives include the following:

1. **Ethical Awareness and Recognition:**
   Exploring the ethical dimension, which is implied, though often not revealed, in both the practice and the study of business. If this dimension is not perceived and understood, ethics cannot become a proactive factor for business.

2. **Ethical Knowledge:**
   Identifying key ethical concepts and understanding different ethical approaches and theories. In our "age of moral confusion," clarifying complex ethical problems-- and understanding different, and often opposing viewpoints-- is essential. Otherwise, ethical dialogue is restricted.

3. **Ethical Judgment:**
Improving the skills of moral reasoning and ethical decision-making. Business ethics should not be content with "understanding worldwide complexities," but should concern itself with decision making and action, which is the basic purpose of ethics. Therefore, in addition to ethical awareness and ethical knowledge, ethical reasoning and ethical judgment are indispensable for "good" decision making.

4. Ethical Implementation:
Effective action and implementation require both moral courage and tactical savvy. It is not enough just to demonstrate ethical knowledge and judgment; it is also essential to have the courage to carry out an ethical action even at personal risk. Furthermore, the individual must understand the political and organizational contexts in which a given ethical challenge arises so that she or he can effectively respond to that challenge. Finally, consistently effective ethical action requires an understanding of the fundamental drivers of moral and immoral behavior.

5. Ethical Reflection and Idealism
Critical reflection is an important component of living an ethical life. Ethics at its best involves not just the episodic exercise of deliberative reason with respect to particular dilemmas that emerge, but also ongoing reflection on what most matters in life and how to live accordingly. Success can be defined in many ways. At Notre Dame a strong effort is made to educate the whole person. That means fostering integrity and an ethical idealism that should pervade both the personal and organizational spheres of one’s life. A sense of commitment to a larger purpose rooted in one’s core values and beliefs, whatever they may be, is fostered within this course, the ethics curriculum and the ND MBA program.

REQUIRED READINGS

Our primary source of readings will available electronically, on either Library Reserve or Sakai; those readings will be supplemented by our course packet available from our bookstore. We are relying on electronic readings to the extent possible both to reduce the cost to you of readings for the course and in the interest of the environment.

We will also read The Death of Ivan Ilyich (New York, N.Y.: Bantam Books, 1985), by Leo Tolstoy. Other readings will be provided as needed either in hard copy or posted electronically on our Sakai or Library Reserve web-pages. The link to our Library Reserve web page is https://reserves.library.nd.edu/courses/201410_12413_12414_12419_13833/reserves.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Class Participation 30%
Quiz(zes) 25%
Final Exam 45%

General Grading Criteria: As a more general matter, grading of all work will be determined in light of factors including responsiveness to the question(s)/issue(s) raised, organization, content, clarity, grammar, insightfulness, thoughtfulness, comprehensiveness, and logic/reasoning.
**Class Participation:** Class participation is a very important part of the learning process in this course. You will be evaluated based on both the quantity and the quality of your contributions and insights. High quality comments possess one or more of the following properties:

- offer a different or unique, but relevant, perspective
- contribute to moving the discussion and analysis forward
- build on or constructively challenge comments from other students
- apply concepts from the readings to the issue or topic the class is discussing

The participation grade, like many performance ratings you will receive in your careers, is partially subjective; but it is not random or arbitrary. By way of a rough guideline to the basis for determining class participation grades, I offer the following (with “plusses” such as B+ and minuses such as “B-“ given as deemed appropriate at the margins):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Regular and timely attendance; frequent, clear and consistent evidence of thorough class preparation; consistently thoughtful, insightful, relevant and constructive comments and/or questions that forward the discussion materially and so contribute substantially to individual and class learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Generally regular and timely attendance; frequent evidence of generally solid class preparation; generally thoughtful, insightful, relevant and constructive comments and/or questions that tend to forward the discussion and so contribute to individual and class learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Possibly some absences; some evidence of class preparation that is adequate but not thorough or solid; comments and/or questions that only occasionally contribute to individual and class learning in the manner described above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quizzes:** One or more unannounced quizzes will be given during the term of our course; the quiz(zes) will take 5 to 10 minutes to complete and be based on the readings assigned for the day of the quiz. Thank you in advance for not communicating to any student in any other section of this course, pursuant to the Honor Code, that there was a quiz in your section on a given day; that knowledge would of course give its recipient an unfair advantage. If there are 3 or more quizzes, then your lowest quiz score will be dropped.

**Final Exam:** We will have a two-hour written final exam in our regularly scheduled room. The final exam for both MW sections will take place in our regularly scheduled room from 1pm to 3pm on Thursday, October 9th (and Professor Crant will give all his exams from 3pm to 5pm that day). The final exam for the TR sections will take place in our regularly scheduled room and at our regularly scheduled times on Friday, October 10th. **Your scheduling of travel, other exams, interviews, etc. should be made with those dates and times in mind.** The exam will be closed book and closed notes. A final review topics sheet will be provided the week before the exam to facilitate preparation for it. The final exam will be comprised of a Part I involving a small number of objective questions (e.g. definitions, fill in the blanks, multiple choice), a Part II consisting of 2 short essay questions and a Part III involving resolution of a moral dilemma, provided by me, through application of your personal framework for moral decision-making (on that, see more below).

Students will have the option to take the final exam in verbal rather than written form. **Those who would prefer to take the exam verbally should express that preference to me by separate email (please do not include the oral exam request in an email conveying any other course deliverable)**
by the start of class on September 22nd (for M/W sections) or 23rd (for T/R sections) as the case may be. This is a hard notification deadline. Those who do not express a preference will be deemed to have chosen the written exam format as of that time and do not need to contact me to express that preference.

Non-graded Deliverables: There will be three short, non-graded deliverables:

- Before the start of our second class meeting the week of September 1st, each student should submit a “Front Line Ethics” form describing a challenging moral situation he or she encountered in the workplace. The front line ethics form should be submitted in both hard and electronic (Word only please) copies if you are giving permission to share your dilemma and electronically only if not. We will discuss select front line ethics cases during our final class meeting, and at other points of our course if and as our schedule allows. The front line ethics form itself will be uploaded to our Sakai web-page. For database purposes, it is important to follow the format provided in that document.

- Each student will be asked to submit a personal statement of guiding principles, values and/or goals. The due date for the assignment is September 8th (for M/W sections) or September 9th (for T/R sections). The assignment should be submitted in hard copy only by the start of class on the date just given. Background reflections and guidelines for this assignment will be uploaded to our Sakai webpage.

- Each student will be asked to develop and submit a personal moral decision-making framework. This is meant to serve as a bridge between each student’s core values/beliefs and the particular moral judgments he or she will be responsible for making during our course and more importantly upon graduation from the MBA program at Notre Dame. The due date for the assignment is September 15th (for M/W sections) or September 16th (for T/R sections). The framework should be submitted in hard copy only. Further guidelines for this assignment will also be uploaded to our Sakai webpage.

CLASS VALUES & PRINCIPLES OF DIALOGUE

The profitability of our time together will depend above all on the values and attitudes that guide our interactions with one another. Discussions about controversial moral dilemmas can be mutually beneficial rather than fruitless if approached on the basis of certain values and principles of dialogue. The values listed on Appendix A, and the discussion guidelines on Appendix B, are intended as the bases of our mutually beneficial interactions; it is important that we understand and commit ourselves to each one.
**MENU OF TOPICS AND READINGS** (Readings are available on our Library Reserve web page, on Sakai, or online via the links below; remaining readings are in our case discussion course pack.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK OF AUGUST 25th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>INTRODUCTORY CONCEPTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initial case discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Reading:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PART I – GOALS AND FOUNDATIONS AT THE PERSONAL LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overview of Ethical Theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Debate of the Day:</strong> Do people have “the right to be forgotten”? (The EU vs. the US, who has it right?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Readings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “A Summary of the Four Cardinal Virtues,” by Joseph Holt (Focus: know the meaning of each of the 4 cardinal virtues and their significance for effective business leadership) (Library Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Debate background reading:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “EU Court Tells Google That People Have 'The Right To Be Forgotten'” NPR March 13, 2014, story available online, to listen to or read, via a Google search or at <a href="http://www.npr.org/2014/05/13/312197640/eu-court-tells-google-that-people-have-the-right-to-be-forgotten?utm_source=npr_email_a_friend&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_content=20140514&amp;utm_campaign=storyshare&amp;utm_term=">http://www.npr.org/2014/05/13/312197640/eu-court-tells-google-that-people-have-the-right-to-be-forgotten?utm_source=npr_email_a_friend&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_content=20140514&amp;utm_campaign=storyshare&amp;utm_term=</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WEEK OF September 1st

#### First Meeting
- Foundational issue discussion (2): Why be moral?
- Foundational issue (3): Is following one’s conscience or gut sufficient to know you’re doing the right thing?
- Foundational issue discussion (4): What matters most in life and how should we shape our lives accordingly?

#### Required Readings:
- The Ring of Gyges, Plato (Foci: What is Glaucon’s view of why seemingly good people are moral? To what extent do you agree or disagree with that view? What is your own view?) (Library Reserve)
- “Sleep-Test Ethics,” Chapter 4 of *Defining Moments: When Managers Must Choose Between Right and Right*, by Joseph Badaracco (Foci: the characteristics of the unreliable and reliable versions of the sleep test and degree to which the sleep test alone is a reliable foundation for moral decision-making) (Sakai)
- *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*, by Leo Tolstoy (Foci: What matters most in life? How should we live accordingly? What mattered most in life to Ivan Ilyich and what can we learn from how he lived based on his values?)
- “Background Reflections” (on *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*), by Joseph Holt (Library Reserve)

#### Second Meeting
- The meaning and importance of living in moral alignment
- Moral alignment and career choice
- The nature of “defining moments”
- The nature and importance of moral courage

#### Required Readings:
- “Your Moral Compass,” Chapter 3 of *Moral Intelligence*, by Lennick & Kiel (Course Pack)
- “The Discipline of Building Character,” by Joseph Badaracco, HBR, March-April 1998, 115-124 (Foci: what is a “defining moment” and what is your takeaway from the defining moment of Peter Adario?) (Library Reserve)
- “Chapter 4” (Derrick & Erica), from *Young Money*, by Kevin Roose (Foci: What competing values of Derrick are revealed in the reading? What seems to be the relative strength of his commitment to those values? How will the decision involved shape him, for better or worse, going forward?) (Sakai)
- “Going Deeper (And Higher) Into Values and Ethics,” Chapter 3 of *Courage: The Backbone of Leadership*, by Gus Lee (Foci: What is the
difference between being morally good and morally courageous and how important is moral courage for effective business leadership?) (Sakai)

**WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 8th**

### First Meeting
- Foundational issue discussion (5): What does positive moral action require beyond knowing the right thing to do?
- What are the drivers of moral behavior?
- Foundational issue discussion (6): What leads people to act against their better judgment? Under what circumstances will people typically follow or act against the dictates of conscience?

### Required Readings:
- “The Four Component Model,” by James Rest (Foci: What are each of the components and which is deficient in notable ethics scandals?) (Sakai)
- Case Discussion: “GM Recalls: How General Motors Silenced a Whistle-Blower,” By Tim Higgins and Nick Summers, June 18, 2014, available online at [http://www.businessweek.com/printer/articles/208647-gm-recalls-how-general-motors-silenced-a-whistle-blower](http://www.businessweek.com/printer/articles/208647-gm-recalls-how-general-motors-silenced-a-whistle-blower) (Focus: Which of the four components were weak or deficient under the facts described?)
- “Just Following Orders,” Chapter 6 of *Willful Blindness: Why We Ignore the Obvious At Our Peril*, by Margaret Heffernan (Focus: To what extent and under what circumstances will people violate their own conscience when following orders?) (Sakai)
- Class viewing of “Obedience” experiment video by Stanley Milgram (Focus: Based on the readings and videotaped experiment, under what circumstances will people follow or deviate from their respective voices of conscience in response to a command from someone in authority?)

### Second Meeting
- Foundational issue discussion (7): What is the difference between having a job, career or calling, and what difference does that make?
- Does the God you believe in care about your work?

### Required Readings:
- “Ethics or Excellence? Conscience as a Check on the Unbalanced Pursuit of Organizational Goals,” by Kenneth Goodpaster, Ivey Business Journal (Foci: What is the meaning of telepathy and what are its three symptoms? How common or rare is telepathy in business today?) (Library Reserve)
  (Focus: What are the differences between having a job, a career or a calling, and what difference does it make if you or those you lead or manage see your work one way or the other? What are the components of a “good job”? If you are a believer, in what ways, if any, does the God you believe in care about your work?)
- **Debate of the Day:** Does the free market corrode moral character?
**First Meeting**

**PART II – GOALS AND FOUNDATIONS AT THE ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL**

- Foundational issue discussion (7): What is the overriding purpose of a business?

**Required Readings:**
- “The Profit-Seeking Paradox: How the Most Profitable Companies Are Not the Most Profit-Oriented,” from *Obliquity: Why Our Goals Are Best Achieved Indirectly*, by John Kay (Sakai)
- “Shareholder Return is the Wrong Measure of Performance,” from *What Were They Thinking? Unconventional Wisdom About Management*, by Jeffrey Pfeffer (Sakai)
- “Introduction: The New Realities of Corporate Purpose,” from *Leading With Purpose*, by Richard Ellsworth (Sakai)
- “Managing for Stakeholders,” Chapter 1 of *Managing for Stakeholders: Survival, Reputation, and Success*, by R. Edward Freeman, Jeffrey Harrison, and Andrew Wicks (Sakai)
- (Focus for each reading: What view does this reading offer of the overriding purpose of a business, what are the strengths and weaknesses of each view, and which do you find most compelling and why?)

**Second Meeting**

- Foundational issue discussion (8): What are the dominant approaches to ethics management and which is better and why?

**Required Reading:**
- “Managing for Organizational Integrity,” by Lynn Sharp Paine (course pack) (Foci: Is business ethics a personal or organizational issue? What are the differences between the compliance-based and integrity- or values-based approaches to ethics management? What are the hallmarks of an effective integrity-based approach?) (Library Reserve)
- **Debate of the day:** Should Astrigo, the company at the heart of today’s case, resort to layoffs and, if so, how should they be conducted?
“Half-a-Million Job Cuts: Is There a Strategy Behind the Layoffs?” (http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=2154)

WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 22nd

First Meeting
- Foundational issue (9): What are the organizational foundations of an effective values-based approach to ethics management?

Required Readings:
- (Foci: What organizational foundations were not sufficiently in place at BP such that the Deepwater Horizon disaster occurred? What changes would senior leadership at BP need to make to avoid a recurrence?)

Second Meeting
- Foundational issue discussion (10): What causes companies to fall from greatness and even to collapse?

Required Reading:
- Overview of the Seven Deadly Sins, by Joe Holt (Focus: What is the essence of each sin, where might it show up in the workplace, what effects might it have there?) (Library Reserve)
- “How the Mighty Fall: A Primer on the Warning Signs,” Jim Collins, Businessweek.com, May 14, 2009, available online at (Focus: What are the 5 stages of collapse?) (Library Reserve)
- “Case Study: The Collapse of Lehman Brothers,” also available online at http://www.investopedia.com/articles/economics/09/lehman-brothers-collapse.asp
in the downfall of Lehman Brothers?)

**WEEK OF September 29th**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Meeting</th>
<th>PART III – GOALS AND FOUNDATIONS AT THE SOCIETAL LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Foundational issue discussion (11): What are the basic principles of Catholic Social Thought, and what is their concrete relevance for business?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Required Readings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ “Basic Principles of Catholic Social Teaching,” from the <em>Summary Report of the Task Force on Catholic Social Teaching and Catholic Education, U.S. Catholic Conference</em> (Focus: What are the main principles of CST?) (Sakai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ “Discussion Case: Sweatshops,” from <em>An Introduction to Business Ethics</em>, 2nd edition, by Joseph DesJardins (Focus: In what ways did the pre-reform sweatshop practices of Nike and others violate any of the principles of CST?) (Sakai)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Meeting</th>
<th><strong>Required Readings:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Foundational issue discussion (12): What is the meaning and importance of sustainability in business today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Are tax inversions ethical?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Required Readings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ “For Companies, It’s Not Easy Being Green,” by Matt Palmquist, Business+Strategy, January 9, 2014 (Library Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ “The Coming Age of Sustainable Business,” from <em>Business, Ethics, and the Environment: Imagining a Sustainable Future</em>, by Joseph DesJardins (Focus: What is the meaning of sustainability? What is the difference between economic development and economic growth?) (Sakai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Case: “Cradle-to-Cradle Design at Herman Miller: Moving Toward Environmental Sustainability,” Harvard Business Case 9-607-003 (Focus: Which way should Drew Schramm lean on the Mirra armchair pad decision and why?) (course pack)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ <strong>Debate of the Day:</strong> Are tax inversions ethical? (Test case: Who got it morally right, Medtronic or Walgreens? Are inversions a matter of ethical tax saving or unethical tax dodging?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ <strong>Background Reading:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competing Views:**


**WEEK OF OCTOBER 6th**

**Sole Meeting**

- Shared Lessons from the Front Lines – A discussion of select front line ethics dilemmas presented by select members of your section
- Foundational issue discussion (13): What is the importance of solitude and self-reflection to effective business leadership?

**Required Reading:**

- “Solitude and Leadership,” by William Deresiewicz, The American Scholar, Spring 2010 (Foci: What is the meaning of solitude? How do most ascend to positions of leadership? In what ways is solitude important for effective business leadership?) (Library Reserve)
- “Self-Reflection,” chapter 1 of *From Values to Action*, by Harry M. Jansen Kraemer Jr. (Foci: In what ways would Deresiewicz likely applaud or challenge this former Baxter CEO’s understanding and practice of self-reflection? What do you find most important or helpful in what he has to say?) (Sakai)
APPENDIX A

CLASS VALUES

Intellectual Curiosity. We grow in insight and understanding in a given subject area only if we take an active and intrinsic interest in it. Intellectual curiosity motivates us beyond mere memorization and recitation of facts presented by others to active reflection of our own. Intellectual curiosity is fueled by recognition of both the importance and value of a given subject and our need for growth in knowledge and understanding. It presupposes restless and yet hopeful dissatisfaction stemming from the beneficial recognition of a gap between where we are and where we would like to be in our understanding of an important subject.

Civility. John Courtney Murray described the essence of democracy as “conflicting opinions locked in civil conversation.” Some of our opinions differ but we will nevertheless in the spirit of effective democracy remain “locked in civil conversation.” The emphasis in this description is on the terms “locked” and “civil.” To be locked in conversation with someone whose opinions differ from our own is to be committed to staying with the conversation until it bears fruit in mutual insight and understanding. We will remain fruitfully engaged in such conversations only to the extent they remain civil. Civility is a quality necessary to persons living harmoniously in community. At a minimum, it requires avoidance of rudeness; in the ideal it extends to courteousness, which implies a more active consideration for others consistently with due of respect for them. Consistently with the value of civility we should focus our disagreements on the positions advanced by other class participants rather than on the participants themselves in a manner that becomes needlessly personal and sadly counter-productive. Commitment to mutually enlightening conversation requires both that we not abandon our conversations prematurely and that we remained locked in them in a courteous and yet lively desire to reach insight rather than in a combative desire to prevail at all costs.

Fairness. Fruitful conversation requires that we treat ideas and persons fairly. This requires endeavoring to understand ideas and persons before taking a clear position on them. One test of this is to consider whether the author or spokesperson of a given view would accept our description of his or her view as accurate. We should not too readily place the view of another into this or that pre-existing category of thought but should rather listen to the particular argument being made and the particular reasons being advanced in support of that argument. Fruitful conversation further requires an inclination to see the strengths and not only the limitations of views that differ from our own, and to recognize the limitations and not only the strengths of our own views. Consistently with the Golden Rule, we should strive to put the best possible construction on differing views rather than examining them with the principal aim of finding and exploiting their most vulnerable points; we all hope that our own views will be treated likewise. Fairness requires not that our own views prevail but rather that they are given a fair hearing.

Constructive criticism. Constructive criticism seeks to understand and build on the views of others rather than to tear them down. Success in this activity requires actively listening to others’ views rather than waiting more or less patiently until it is our turn to speak. None of us will grow in knowledge and understanding unless we strive to become at least as ready to listen as we are to speak. Constructive criticism is compatible with appropriate humor but requires that we refrain from firing off one-liners that are unkind or otherwise lack positive purpose. More generally the
disposition to be constructively critical requires that we are for something rather than merely against the view of another.

**Humility.** The original meaning of humility pertains to accurate self-knowledge. The humble person knows both his or her strengths and his or her limitations. Recognizing the strengths of our insights and experience will leave us more inclined to contribute to our discussions. Recognizing the limitations of our insights and experience will leave us more inclined to benefit from the insights and experience of others. Humility requires at a minimum recognizing that no one of us has a monopoly on the truth on any given subject such that the bare assertion by us of a given position is sufficient to establish that position in the mind of any fair and intelligent person. We should rather regard each statement we make as a hypothesis or an assertion in need of a justification. In cultivating humility it is helpful to recall some time in the past—and we have all had them-- when we were certain that something was true but ultimately wrong in that assumption.

**Appreciation.** Consistently with the values of civility, fairness and humility, we must at a minimum tolerate or patiently endure the differing views of others. In the ideal, however, we will move from mere tolerance to positive appreciation of those who lead us to insights and understanding we would not otherwise have achieved at that time on our own. The person who challenges my pre-existing views without changing them has done me the favor of confirming my views by allowing me to test them against a worthy counter-argument. The person who challenges my view and leads me to modify those views on the basis of new insight has done me the considerable favor of deepening my knowledge and understanding. For such a benefit, we should be inclined to give thanks rather than to brood over having “lost” the argument.
APPENDIX B

PRINCIPLES OF CONSTRUCTIVE DIALOGUE

The following principles,¹ which are consistent with our class values, provide guidelines intended to foster constructive dialogue among individuals and groups who have conflicting views on issues they care about deeply.

1. **We should recognize that no single individual or collective view within our class has a complete monopoly on the truth.** Lasting solutions to the most pressing problems we discuss will almost always come from a variety of sources.

2. **None of us should see ourselves, or any group we belong to, as “the solution” to pressing problems while regarding those who hold different views as “the problem.”** No individual or group should view itself as enlightened and those who disagree as “in the dark” or otherwise “out of it.”

3. **We should test all courses of action proposed by any individual or group not only for their persuasiveness but also for their practicability and likely concrete impact on all who will be affected by them.** Effectiveness is responsibility of leadership.

4. **We should presume that those with whom we differ are acting in good faith.** We should demonstrate civility, charity, and a sincere effort to understand their concerns; we should not substitute labels or blanketing terms (“liberal,” “socialist,” “hawk,” “dove”) for living, complicated persons.

5. **We should put the best possible construction on differing positions.** We should acknowledge the strongest points of opposing points of view and the weakest points of our preferred points of view instead of only the strongest aspects of our view and the most vulnerable aspects of opposing views. We should be inclined to recognize whatever valid insights and worries may be found in opposing points of view.

6. **We should hesitate to ascribe motives.** We should not assume that someone who disagrees with a particular position also disagrees with the underlying principle (that someone who favors a more balanced workplace disagrees with the principle of hard work, etc.).

7. **We should engage the cultures we discuss not by simple acquiescence or defiance but recognizing both their strengths and their weaknesses.**

---