During the 2003 Winter semester, Chandran Kukathas, Associate Professor of Politics at the University of New South Wales, Australian Defence Force Academy was visiting professor at the Center for Ethics. He team-taught a graduate philosophy seminar with Jerry Gaus and on January 17 gave a Center-sponsored public lecture on “Anarcho-Multiculturalism: The Pure Theory of Liberalism.” At the end of his stay, we asked Professor Kukathas to reflect on the current state of the debate about multiculturalism and diversity in higher education.

Q: Over the course of the last 20 years, American universities have become among the most diverse institutions in America. How should the question of diversity figure in a university education?

CK: Personally, I’ve never thought of diversity as a virtue in itself, or as something that ought to be celebrated. It’s simply the way the world is. Certainly students should be made aware that they’ll be dealing with different kinds of people one way or another. But I don’t think an attitude of celebration is the right one.

The important thing is not so much encouraging students to confront diversity directly, as encouraging them to gather the intellectual resources they need to become thinking and critical persons who can deal with the world in whatever shape it comes.

Q: Why is diversity usually discussed in terms of the internal diversity of individual institutions rather than diversity among a broad range institutions? One of the distinctive features of American higher education, after all, is that it comes in a remarkable variety of shapes and sizes. We have single-sex female colleges, we have religious colleges, and we have the military academies. Where are the defenders of the notion of diversity among institutions, among different kinds of institutions?

CK: That’s an interesting question. Frankly, apart from the leaders of the institutions you mention, I’m not sure who in the United States is drawing attention to diversity of that second kind. I would certainly want to defend it, since I believe one of the marks of a diverse society is that it tolerates people and practices that reject diversity as an end in itself.

Q: Various projects have been defended in the name of multiculturalism. You have identified yourself as a proponent of “anarcho-multiculturalism.” How is “anarcho-multiculturalism” distinct from other more familiar kinds?

CK: My use of the term “anarcho-multiculturalism” is slightly tongue-in-cheek. It speaks to a kind of liberal multiculturalism that takes
IT IS MY PLEASURE to report on the activities of the Murphy Institute’s Center for Ethics and Public Affairs at the end of its first full year of activities, and the second of its existence.

Thanks to generous support from both the Tulane Murphy Foundation and the bequest Tulane University received from the Lallage Feazel Wall Fund, I believe we have established the foundations of a first-rate interdisciplinary center designed to promote scholarly research, teaching and discussion of ethics and the ethical dimensions of public and professional life. The success of the new Center was visible on several fronts:

• Some of the intellectual excitement of the year should be attributed to our first group of Graduate Fellows, who helped with selecting and hosting a distinguished group of visiting speakers for the Center’s 2002–2003 lecture series. (See “Profiles” p. 3 and “Lectures and Conferences” p. 6). We also are very pleased to announce that Graduate Fellow Elizabeth Umphress has accepted a position as assistant professor of business ethics at the May Business School, Texas A&M University.

• Another highlight of the year was the continuing development of our new academic journal Politics, Philosophy, and Economics. As this newsletter goes to press, three issues of Volume 1 and the first two issues of Volume 2 have been published. Contributors have included Brian Barry (Columbia), Allan Buchanan (Duke), David Miller (Oxford), Martha Nussbaum (University of Chicago), and John Roemer (Yale). The third annual PPE conference—on “Evolution and Economics”—was held on the Tulane campus on March 14–15, 2003.

• Finally, a distinguished group of scholars accepted invitations to serve on the Murphy Institute’s new External Advisory Board, established in part to provide expert counsel for the continuing development of the Center for Ethics within the Murphy Institute. Michael McPherson, President of the Spencer Foundation, and former President of Macalester College will serve as the Board’s first chair. Its other four new members are: John Ferejohn, Carolyn S.G. Munro Professor of Political Science, Stanford University; Geoffrey Galt Harpham, Director of the National Humanities Center; Bonnie Honig, Professor of Political Science and Director, Center for Law, Culture, and Social Thought, Northwestern University; Stephen Macedo, Director, University Center for Human Values, Princeton University.

Looking forward, there is good reason to feel confident we will build on the past year’s success. The Center has selected an impressive first group of visiting Faculty Fellows for the 2003–2004 academic year. (See list of Faculty Fellows, p. 5). During Summer, 2003, the first floor of Tilton Hall will be remodeled to create the Center’s new administrative office, as well as offices for our visiting faculty fellows. We’ve also received welcome news that the Board of Tulane Murphy Foundation has put the Center on firm footing by approving funding for all program activity through 2006–2007. We are very grateful to the Tulane Murphy Foundation for its continuing generous support.
As world financial markets trembled with each revelation of corrupt corporate accounting practices this past year, Elizabeth Umphress’ doctoral dissertation became all the more timely. Umphress was in the final year of work on “In the Name of the Company: Unethical Behaviors Perpetrated by Employees in Response to Fair Treatment,” a dissertation she completed this spring under the direction of Professor Arthur Brief at Tulane’s A. B. Freeman School of Business.

“I want to explain why people behave unethically to benefit their organization,” the Sherman, Texas native explains. “Why do they shred documents, lie to clients and customers to benefit the corporation?”

Umphress predicted that two factors could determine an employee’s willingness to behave unethically: “Accountability is one—whether there is pressure to justify one’s decisions to one’s boss, and the second involves organizational justice—conduct and policies that bear on the question of how one is treated within the organization.”

And this is where Umphress’ findings are most intriguing. “I found some evidence to support the curious hypothesis that if employers treat employees fairly, their employees are more likely to act for the benefit of the employer,” even if the actions are unethical.

Umphress is quick to insist she needs to do more research to explain why. “This is a puzzling conclusion. There’s something else going on here that needs to be explained.” Umphress suggests one answer may lie in the exchange process. “Tit for tat?” she asks. “If employees are treated fairly, do they have reciprocate by engaging in unethical behavior for the benefit of the corporation?”

Umphress completed her undergraduate work at the University of Texas in Austin and will join the faculty at Texas A&M in the fall as an assistant professor of management. One of the highlights of her year as a Graduate Fellow was the opportunity to invite Ann Tenbrunsel (Business Administration, University of Notre Dame) to Tulane for a public lecture. Tenbrunsel’s research has shown that in some circumstances attempts to discourage forbidden behavior through external means do not in fact promote ethical behavior. Umphress gives the example of a company slapped with environmental sanctions. “When a company is ordered to take a corrective measure, such as installing a monitoring device, the sanction removes the behavior from a conscious moral framework. For this company, adherence to environmental standards ceases to be a conscious ethical issue, becoming instead a business decision that might lead to more unethical behavior.”

Umphress looks forward to a career of teaching and continued research into ways to eradicate unethical behavior in the workplace and hopes that one day her research will help organizations avoid unintentionally promoting unethical behaviors.

“What employers need to do is create a strong ethical climate in the workplace, to send a message that no unethical behavior will be tolerated. If I can show that treating employees fairly leads to unethical behavior, then one of the ways to stop it may be to be firm and tell employees, ‘you cannot act unethically in my organization’.”
Censorship can have a stunning influence on history, says Michael Redman. When censorship is rampant, as it was in England during the reign of Charles I in the 1630s, questions arise as to whether any contemporary historical account can accurately reflect the times.

Redman’s doctoral dissertation, “Censorship and Political Culture: Lying and Telling the Truth in Early Modern England,” explores a complicated array of ethical issues—including lying, sincerity, and trust—in an effort to develop a better understanding of the origins of the English Civil War.

“There are big questions that have been debated for a long time about events leading up to the English Civil War,” Redman explains, “radical political ideas suddenly emerged in the 1640s and many historians have wondered where they came from. Were they always there and simply censored, or did they arise out of a special moment in English history? And why were events reported as they were?”

Therein lies the historiographical problem. During the 1640s, censors of the 1630s were put on trial, most notably William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. Central to the deliberations about their fate was the right of unfettered authorship. Transcripts of the trials of the 1640s were not censored. In fact, the decade marks the first time verbatim trial transcripts were (not only) preserved (but also distributed by parliamentary order). Redman’s dissertation examines how both sides in the trials represented each other as either truth-tellers or liars. “I’m using these transcripts to look at how major historical figures reacted to each other, effectively putting in place through conflict the historical images of one another that we use today” he says.

The transcripts were among the developments that suddenly revealed fissures in a society opened up after having been heavily censored by Charles I, a monarch who sought to impose his own religious beliefs on the Scots, and thereby triggered a civil war that led to his execution.

“The trial’s managers thought that the trial records would help advance their agenda, but people in fact read them their own way. This opened up a new means for ordinary individuals to get involved in politics.” Redman’s research focuses both on how trial transcripts provided a new means for assessing the sincerity and truthfulness of public figures and how they shaped public memory in later decades.

Redman’s dissertation is being completed under the direction of Professor Linda Pollock in Tulane’s Department of History. As part of his Graduate Fellowship, he helped to host a public lecture by Annabel Patterson, Sterling Chair of English Literature at Yale University, and a leading expert on the literary and cultural history of early modern England. “Professor Patterson helped me reshape ideas,” says Redman, “Her visit was a great opportunity afforded me by the Center for Ethics and Public Affairs, because it gave me access to such an important person in my field.”
virtue can be taught. Socrates says no; Protagoras argues that it can. Oberrieder points out that, as in Plato’s other dialogues, Socrates never asserts his views directly. They must be gleaned by close examination of his exchange with Protagoras, and of the tools each figure uses to make his argument, such as the creation myth in Protagoras’ case and quotations of Homer in Socrates’.

Oberrieder explains that while the dialogue doesn’t explicitly answer the basic question of whether or not virtue can be taught, it does so implicitly. Plato seems to suggest that while virtue isn’t teachable, it can be gained through reflection and self-examination. And it is precisely this ability to engage in a philosophical examination of one’s own being, Plato tells us, that establishes our humanity.

Oberrieder’s Graduate Fellowship at the Murphy Institute’s Center for Ethics and Public Affairs has helped him to complete work on his dissertation “Shame, Self-Knowledge, and the Human in Plato’s Protagoras,” under the direction of Professor Ronna Burger in the Department of Philosophy. Oberrieder’s fellowship also allowed him to invite Thomas Pangle (University of Toronto) to speak at Tulane during the winter semester of 2003. While Pangle spoke on a contemporary topic—“Should Convicts Have the Right to Vote?”—he is a leading expert in ancient moral and political philosophy, and Oberrieder was delighted to have the chance to discuss his own work and exchange ideas with Pangle.

And does the study of ancient philosophy inform the ethical considerations of the modern world? Oberrieder says it does. “I tend to agree with Plato—and Pangle—that human excellence and virtue lie in the investigation of philosophical questions—and most relevant of these is ‘what does it mean to be a human being?’ ‘There couldn’t be anything more important,’ he adds, “or more relevant to flourishing as a human being, than to reflect on what it means to live your life. It’s not theoretical, but practical.”
SEPTEMBER 19, 2002
Can Ethics Be Taught?
GARY PAVELA, Director, Judicial and Student Ethical Development Programs, University of Maryland–College Park
Co-sponsored with Office of Student Affairs

NOVEMBER 1, 2002
Attending to Reasons
CHARLES LARMORE, Tripp Professor of Humanities & Professor of Philosophy and Political Science, University of Chicago
Co-sponsored with the Department of Philosophy

NOVEMBER 2, 2002
Architecture’s Paradox of Value: Buildings, Ethics, and the Ecology of Wealth
THOMAS FISHER, Dean, College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, University of Minnesota
Co-sponsored with the School of Architecture

NOVEMBER 20, 2002
The Organization Made Me Do It: Situational Influences on Unethical Behavior
ANN E. TENBRUNSEL, Associate Professor, College of Business Administration, University of Notre Dame

DECEMBER 6, 2002
Rent, Profit, and Work
JAN NARVESON, Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Waterloo
Co-sponsored with the Department of Philosophy

JANUARY 17, 2003
Anarcho-Multiculturalism: The Pure Theory of Liberalism
CHANDRAN KUKATHAS, Associate Professor of Politics, University of New South Wales, Australian Defence Force Academy
Co-sponsored with the Department of Philosophy

FEBRUARY 6, 2003
On Thin Ice: John Donne and the Dangers of Compromise
ANNABEL PATTERSON, Sterling Professor of English, Yale University
Co-sponsored with the Department of History

FEBRUARY 7, 2003
Kant on Punishment
THOMAS HILL, Kenan Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Co-sponsored with the Department of Philosophy

FEBRUARY 19, 2003
Friendship and Justice in Aristotle
LORRAINE SMITH PANGLE, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto
Co-sponsored with the Department of Philosophy

FEBRUARY 20, 2003
Should Convicts Have the Right to Vote?
THOMAS L. PANGLE, University Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto
MARY C. PARKER YATES LECTURE
The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in the Age of Terror
MICHAEL IGNATIEFF, Carr Professor & Director, Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

MARCH 14-15, 2003
POLITICS, PHILOSOPHY & ECONOMICS CONFERENCE
“Philosophy, Economics, and Evolution”

Ken Binmore (University College, London): “Natural Justice”
Geoffrey Hodgson (University of Hertfordshire): “Social Darwinism in Anglophone Academia”
Dennis Mueller (University of Vienna): “Models of Man: Neoclassical, Behavioral, Evolutionary”
Michael Ruse (Florida State University): “Is Darwinian Metaethics Possible (and if it is, is it well taken?)”

>>> 2002–2003
ANNABEL PATTERSON
GARY PAVELA
Dr. Robert Martensen is an observer, constantly extrapolating and evaluating. The “art of observation,” he insists, is critical in the practice of medicine. “What is said and what is not said is very helpful when assessing patients,” says Martensen, whose goal is to inspire students to form their own interpretive framework as they enter the increasingly complex world of medicine and healthcare. “Students will hear opinions for the rest of their lives—how things ought to be,” says Martensen. “The dynamic is changing so quickly that doctors now feel blind sided—there are a lot of demons and finger pointing. Ethics helps solve these dilemmas.”

Martensen, the recently appointed James A. Knight Chair of Humanities and Ethics in Medicine, hopes to convey to students the importance of observation as a means to promote professionalism, ethics and communication. Martensen, also a member of the Faculty Executive Committee at the Center for Ethics and Public Affairs, plans to integrate these doctrines into curricula at both the uptown and downtown campuses.

Martensen draws upon philosophy, history, and anthropology for guidance. The Center for Ethics and Public Affairs is a catalyst for these discussions, and he envisions an opportunity for joint programs for undergraduate students and medical students. “Bringing moral and historical insights to doctors-in-training at the graduate and undergraduate level will help them understand what is at stake in the debate so they can better navigate the waters and help decode the complicated social milieu in which modern diagnoses, health and medicine work.”

One of the country’s foremost medical historians, Martensen won a prestigious Guggenheim fellowship last year. He is formerly Chair of the Department of History and Philosophy of Medicine at the University of Kansas School of Medicine, as well as Director of the Clendening Library of the History of Medicine. He completed his undergraduate studies at Harvard, graduated from Dartmouth Medical School and holds a PhD in History of Health Sciences from the University of California, San Francisco.

Martensen estimates that he has seen close to 100,000 patients as an emergency room physician and a doctor’s ability to properly observe a patient results in more accurate diagnoses. “Bad observers can spend thousands of dollars on unneeded tests because they haven’t paid attention to something that’s relatively obvious.”

The quest for better insight has taken Martensen and some of his fourth year medical students to the New Orleans Museum of Art for a seminar entitled, “The Art of Observation.” Through the examination of portraits and photographs, students look for clues about the health status of the subjects—visual indicators of health status. “It’s not art history,” insists Martensen. “The course challenges students by asking: ‘by focusing physical cues, what can we tell when somebody comes before us, particularly in the context of doctor and patient?’” His method is multi-disciplinary, borrowed from college campuses. “The good work in these fields is happening on liberal arts campuses,” explains Martensen. “Ethics can identify all the voices in the room and evaluate the moral valence of the claims. Anthropology is good at attuning people to cultural blind spots that other cultures don’t take for granted. Historians are skeptics—very good at
“Bringing historical insights to doctors-in-training at the graduate and undergraduate level will help them understand what is at stake in the debate so they can better navigate the waters and help decode the complicated social milieu in which modern diagnoses, health and medicine work.”

assessing competing claims of the truth to interpret evidence. All of these fields are outside the traditional routines of medical education. You have to participate in this intellectual trading zone to avoid living in an intellectual ghetto.”

Martensen cites escalating research figures as evidence of the rapid rate of change. In 1948, the research budget at the National Institute of Health was approximately $6 million. In 2003, the NIH budget is $22 billion. This phenomenal explosion triggered complex issues affecting patients, research subjects, physicians, and investigators. The changing landscape includes issues related to stem cell research and information transparency—the fact that medical knowledge is no longer controlled by doctors. Improved technology is able to perform fast and accurate diagnoses previously reserved for specialists. The competition for public and private dollars has commercialized much of the research sector, even at the academic level. According to Martensen, these changes are challenging traditions, including the most basic—the way in which physicians care for patients.

Martensen views his role as one of teacher, scholar, and community servant. Within months of his arrival at Tulane, he was consulted by colleagues and members of the community on ethical predicaments. He hopes to share his insights with others and envisions community programs for ethics and professionalism. A vision he hopes will teach others how to observe so they are better prepared to see the many challenges ahead.

Faculty Fellowships 2004-05

The Murphy Institute’s Center for Ethics and Public Affairs at Tulane University is pleased to announce residential Faculty Fellowships for the 2004-2005 academic year. These fellowships, made possible by grants from the Tulane Murphy Foundation and from the bequest the University received from the estate of Lallage Feazel Wall, are available to support outstanding faculty whose teaching and research focus on questions of ethics and moral choice in such areas as architecture, business, government, law, medicine, urban design and planning, and engineering. While fellows will participate in conferences and seminars organized by the Center, they will be expected to devote most of their time to conducting their own research. Stipends will vary in accordance with individual circumstance, but will not exceed US$35,000. Center Faculty Fellowships are open to all, regardless of citizenship.

Further information about the Fellowships and applications may be obtained from the Center page on the Murphy Institute web site at www.tulane.edu/~murphy or may be requested by contacting:
The Center for Ethics and Public Affairs
The Murphy Institute
Tulane University
New Orleans, LA 70118
504.862.3236 tel
504.862.8360 fax
cena@tulane.edu
RICHARD CULBERTSON, Associate Professor, School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, was named “Professor of the Year 2002” by the Tulane chapter of the American College of Healthcare Executives.

KAY C. DEE, Associate Professor, School of Engineering, was named 2002 “Professor of the Year” for the State of Louisiana by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

STEPHEN GRIFFIN, Rutledge C. Clement Jr. Professor in Constitutional Law and Vice of Academic Affairs, Tulane University Law School, received the 2002 Felix Frankfurter Distinguished Teaching Award.

CATHY LAZARUS, Associate Professor, received the 2003 Presidential Medal of Excellence for Graduate and Professional Teaching, Tulane University School of Medicine.

ROBERT MARTENSEN, Knight Chair of Humanities and Ethics, School of Medicine, was a Guggenheim Fellow during 2002–2003.

JONATHAN RILEY, Professor of Philosophy, received a residential 2002–2003 Fellowship from the National Humanities Center.

MICHAEL ZIMMERMAN, Professor of Philosophy, received the Interdisciplinary Teacher of the Year Award, Tulane University, 2002–2003.

GERALD GAUS
toleration very seriously, that insists we tolerate everyone, even those who might reject multiculturalism itself. Or put another way, embracing “anarcho-multiculturalism” would have us tolerate ideas which in the end might be completely intolerant of toleration itself.

Q: Why have Americans come to think of diversity primarily in cultural terms, as a matter to be understood in terms of race, ethnicity, and gender?

CK: The answer may have something to do with the absence of controversy about other equally important forms of diversity. In the United States, I don’t think there is, for example, heated debate about religious diversity, because by and large this is a Christian country. And to the extent that there are other non-Christian religions present, there’s not much debate about religious freedom and religious toleration either, since they are enshrined in the Constitution.

Linguistic diversity has never really been much of an issue either, though at times there have been debates about what should be the national language. English has been dominant for a very long time, and even with the rise of the Hispanic population, it doesn’t look like that’s going to change. So I don’t see a debate in terms of linguistic diversity either. In other countries, things of course are rather different.

Q: A final question about diversity and sameness in America. There are still observers who stress the cultural homogeneity of America more than its now much vaunted variety. After spending a semester living and teaching in New Orleans, where do you stand on this issue?

CK: This may sound like I’m dodging the question, but I’ve always been struck by both things in the United States. And I don’t think it’s implausible that a country could be both strikingly diverse and strikingly united.

In the United States, what’s striking is how much there really is an ethos of “being American.” It’s something that certainly strikes me because there isn’t the equivalent in Australia, Britain, or Malaysia, which are societies that I know quite well. In the United States, one quickly gets a very strong sense in watching television and reading newspapers, as well as in talking to ordinary people and observing public figures, that says: “We’ve built ourselves into a nation, and this is something that we’re especially proud of.”

By contrast, in Australia, it is impossible to imagine people standing up with their hands over their hearts when the national anthem is played. Not that Australians wouldn’t stand for the national anthem at a football game. But there simply isn’t the same kind of passion associated with national sentiment.

All that said, I’m also struck by how dramatically different the different regions of America are. In Australia, if you go to Perth or Brisbane or to Melbourne, you will not notice significant regional variation. Maybe one or two words used differently, maybe some minor differences in accent. Whereas in the United States, New Orleans is very different from Utah, which in turn is very different from California. The Northeast is very different from the Southwest. The United States is a different country in different parts of the country in a way that simply isn’t the case in Australia. It’s also striking just how diverse some places are in themselves. Utah may not be a diverse place by American standards. But New Orleans clearly is, and New York is just an extraordinary place in this respect. Viewed in its entirety, it’s hard not to be struck by both the sameness and the diversity of the United States.
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