

'In individuals,
insanity is rare;
but in groups,
parties, nations,
and epochs it is
the rule'.

Friedrich Nietzsche
(1844-1900)

Ethics Journal

Kim Lee

Topics covered

- Tasmania's pulp mill
- Supply chain ethics and corporate social responsibility
- Biofuels and global warming
- Justification
- Death penalty
- Human trafficking
- What I learnt from keeping a journal

August to October 2007

Student ID: #####

The student, whose real name is not Kim Lee, has agreed to this journal being made available for others to see.

Some changes have been made so that the student's place of employment is not revealed.

Some comments by the marker and course coordinator are at the end of the journal.

There are many different ways of keeping a journal. The format used here of adding comments over time to entries on various topics is one method, but it is not the only acceptable one.

Tasmania's Pulp Mill

Saturday, 4 August – Four Corners - Grist to the Mill

Watched a story on Four Corners titled 'Grist to the Mill' (aired 30/7/07) on a \$1.7 billion pulp mill that Gunns Ltd want to build in conjunction with the Tasmanian Government in the Tamar Valley.

The main issue for me is that the team originally put together to investigate the environmental impact of such a pulp mill was thrown out by the Tassy government because, in my opinion, it didn't give them the answers they wanted to hear. Instead they've employed a team of overseas experts.

When I think of Tasmania, I think of an untouched wilderness. The thought of having a potential environmental hazard built there sends me into a spin. But are my thoughts based purely on emotion? I know we have an insatiable need for paper products so a mill is required but does it have to be built in Tasmania? If I were a member of the Tasmanian parliament would I support it? Assuming it is results-based driven project the positives are more jobs and more income for their economy. The negative is the potential environmental impact. For me, I wouldn't back it unless the original team of scientists reviewed the new report and were satisfied it answered all their questions. I'd also have a commitment to my constituents and would be listening to their opinions before I made a decision. If it was a 50/50 split between voters, as the program indicates it is, I'd probably have to go with my gut instinct and be true to my own values - that I wouldn't support it because of the status Tassy has a wilderness sanctuary. Bit like I hate the fact there is uranium mining in Kakadu.

Monday, 8th October – Malcolm Turnbull gives the mill the go-ahead

Heard on the radio that the federal government gave the go-ahead on the pulp mill today. Peatling (2007) stated 'Mr Turnbull repeated his assertion that his decision had been based on science'. I'm still questioning how he could have accepted the report from the 'new' group of scientists without publically acknowledging why the others had been thrown out. I guess we have to hope that the Code of Ethics that parliamentarians are bound by would ensure Mr Turnbull's acting in the best interests of all stakeholders.

Senator Bob Brown (2007) raised an issue that I hadn't thought about when he said 'the question is which company is going to lower its ... own ethics enough to put money behind Gunns' polluting pulp mill'. Further to this Peatling (2007) wrote that ANZ were 'considering whether it will fund the Gunns pulp mill, saying it must first assess whether the Tasmanian project meets its own environmental standards'. If I

were on ANZ's loan approval board I'd be very uncomfortable about the decision to fund the mill. From the results-based approach, on one hand, it's likely to make money and be a very valuable borrower but on the other hand, if the pulp mill does cause environmental destruction, ANZ is going to get canned by its other customers for backing them. I'd want to be 100% sure those environmental reports were accurate before I gave the go ahead.

Sunday, 14th October – bloggers page on GetUp

Read the feedback page on Australian site GetUp at lunch. Few interesting entries.

Blogger Valda Cross (2007) wrote

Gunns wants to build a new pulp mill because the world wants MORE PAPER!! That being a fact (PAPER), why can't the Greens admit that if a pulp mill is not built in Tasmania, then it will be built elsewhere in the world (say, India, or another "developing country" who are exempt, at the moment, under the Kyoto Agreement).

Another thing to ponder. If it's built in Australia we know the products that come from the mill are going to be environmentally sustainable (or at least that's what the scientists want us to believe). But if its not built, we'll have to source our paper from elsewhere in the world and then it gets harder to guarantee. Is having this 'control' another positive in the results-based way of thinking? I'm beginning to think so, especially after reading the article I found on Woolies during my daily internet trawl (see below).

Fake green certification backfires - Woolworths

Woolworths supposedly have a Corporate Social Responsibility policy yet the article stated the company

was using a "Sustainable Forest Fibre" logo on its premium home brand "Select" range of tissue and paper products, with claims they were from a certified environmentally managed company that is environmentally, socially and economically responsible. (Australian Associated Press 2007)



However, it turns out timber industry and environment organisations had never heard of "Sustainable Forest Fibre" and that there isn't any such certification. Whist this in itself raised questions about Woolworths corporate ethics, at least if we had a pulp mill in Australia, perhaps we could generate such certification with stringent guidelines attached?

Supply Chain Ethics & Corporate Social Responsibility

Saturday, 18th August - Gardening with Pa

Today, whilst pruning roses with my Pa (granddad), he presented me with his "bargain" pair of \$2.96 secateurs that he'd bought from Bunnings. I am in the middle of research on Supply Chain Ethics for the first assignment and so the following question went through my mind.

How on earth can you make a pair of metal secateurs so cheaply? When you consider Bunnings probably make a 20% margin, then there's shipping costs, material costs and tax it's not hard to imagine the people who made them probably got a few cents per piece. Were they made in a sweatshop? If we keep buying cheap imports from countries like China and India how can we ever expect to reduce carbon emissions when these countries are the biggest emitters?

The question I asked myself is whether I would buy a pair considering what I've learnt about big companies using low paid workers to produce goods? If I consider virtue based decisions and I consider my Pa a person of virtue does this mean if he's bought a pair it is also ok for me to buy a pair? In this situation, no. Pa is virtuous but not when it comes to buying products from Asia. I think as a consumer I need to be more responsible for where my products come from but acknowledge that this isn't always going to be possible or convenient. The next time I buy something that seems too cheap to be true, I will try to take the time to question the shop owner about where the product came from. I encouraged my Pa to do the same but he laughed at me. He has no qualms about his bargain purchase. Unfortunately I know he'd not be alone in his thinking. Ah Westerners. Always thinking of ourselves and our back pocket.

Tuesday, 25th September 2007 – Nokia: A Decent Factory – A film by Thomas Balmès

On Sunday (9/9/07) SBS aired a program titled 'Nokia - A Decent Factory'. It was a 2005 doco on Supply Chain Ethics and followed visits by two international ethics consultants employed by Nokia (as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility) to factories in China that make and assemble the mobile phone components on behalf of Nokia.

The factory appeared clean and very orderly. The living conditions of the workers (90% women) were small but according to one of the consultants were ok by world standards. It was by no means a 'sweat shop'. So why do I feel complete anger at the end of watching it? Probably because I feel guilty that these workers don't

receive the same cushy office environment that I get every day and I feel somehow responsible knowing I'm one of the capitalist consumers that can't wait to upgrade my phone when the contract expires even though it works perfectly fine. It's this type of capitalism that keeps the demand up for low wage workers to produce the goods.

Having said this, I can recall listening to Triple J's Hack program last year and hearing a new migrant from China speak on her experience in a Chinese sweatshop. She said Westerners should not be so concerned about their treatment because for them, simply having a job, regardless of what it pays, gives them a sense of purpose. She said with over a billion people, there is no such thing as welfare in China so if you don't work your family starves. Whilst I still don't agree with the sweatshop mentality, and never will, it did give me a perspective I hadn't thought about.

I did a bit of research on supply chain ethics and corporate social responsibility (CSR). Sencer (2007) in relation to an article in The Economist

For most companies. . . CSR is little more than a cosmetic treatment. The human face that CSR applies to capitalism goes on each morning, gets increasingly smeared by day, and washes off at night."

Is this the unfortunate truth? It's one thing to have a nice spiel in your glossy annual report to shareholders on how you take great pride in being socially responsible, it's another to actually do it without altering the all important bottom line.

Howley (2005) asks the question 'from a P.R. perspective, what flies? When you're marketing human decency, which inequities matter?' As far as I'm concerned all inequities matter. You can't say you're socially responsible but turn a blind eye to the fact the workers you don't employ, but that make products for you, are paid under the minimum wage in their country. From this point I definitely don't take the relativist 'when in Rome' stance. As Einstein once quoted 'relativity applies to physics, not ethics'. However, I recognise the fact that labour is cheap in countries like China and India, the people need the work, so how do you solve such problems ethically if you're an international company like Nokia?

Looked up section 8 (International & Global Aspects) in the study guide (pg 81). Describes the 'Caux principles' and the actual influence of multinationals. The documentary did show Nokia was making some effort to do the right thing and audit their supply chains. It was obvious by the 'jump-to-it' reactions of the managers when they picked something up that they do have power to make change. If the supply

chains loose a contract like Nokia that's big biccies they are going to miss out on. I think companies like Nokia need to do these types of audits on a regular basis and have contracts in place with conditions like it being mandatory to pay the minimum (if not more) wage to the workers or the deal gets cancelled. All very nice in theory but until the consumer kicks up more of a stink, will it actually happen? Most people probably never stop to think where their phone came from. So long as it's got a camera, MP3 and ability to store millions of numbers of people you hardly know, it keeps the consumer happy.

Wednesday, 10th October – Carbon Emission Offset for Falls Festival

I bought tickets for the Falls Music Festival in Lorne Victoria this year. When purchasing tickets you could opt to voluntarily pay \$2 extra per ticket in order to help offset carbon emissions. Organisers stated the money would go towards making the event carbon neutral by purchasing green energy, planting trees, putting in recycle stations etc. I chose to do this because I feel strongly about global warming and what an individual can do to reduce their own carbon footprint. I was surprised to learn in an email from the organisers this morning that only 25% of people opted to pay the extra. The organisers claim to be thrilled with this response. I think it's really poor. The organisers put themselves forward as being environmentally conscious as part of their social responsibility framework. In my opinion, people attending the concert have just as much responsibility to ensure their results-based 'happiness' isn't causing harm. Personally, I wouldn't have given people the voluntary option and would have included the cost for carbon offsetting in the price of the ticket. But would this be ethical?

Fisher and Lovell (2006, p143) suggest a number of principles you can go through to help in decision making. I think the one that applies best to this scenario would be the Means-ends ethic – 'if the end justifies the means, then you should act'. The 'end' would be that each person attending the event would be made responsible for his/her own carbon footprint whilst at the event. Be it unintentionally or intentionally, I don't think it matters. When we pay tax, we get little choice in what the government do with it but know in rough terms it pays for health, education, roads etc – all necessary 'good' things. I don't see adding a carbon offset any different from a tax.

I guess if you don't believe that global warming is a farce then you might object to paying it. My answer would be that if you feel that strongly, you could always opt not to go to the event.

Biofuels & Global Warming

Sunday, 19th August - Landline - Food or Fuel - Reporter: Tim Lee

Watched a Landline story today on whether we should be growing food crops i.e. barley, corn, wheat etc for food or fuel. 'With dwindling oil supplies and international campaigns to cut carbon emissions, the biofuel industry is growing. But this new industry is not without controversy, with some analysts questioning whether it makes economic and environmental sense to convert food crops into fuel'. (Food or Fuel, 2007)

There's no doubting this is a massive issue. We are a society consumed with a way of life that needs fuel to function. How do you decide what is more important? For me (even as I sit on my electricity powered laptop typing this) it's a simple one. Food is the most important. Without it the laptops, cars and all the modern pleasures are useless because we'll all be dead. And without food, the second most precious commodity is water. Without that we'd be dead too. Water's needed to grow food for us to survive.

Hazelton (2007) in talking about our driving pleasure at the prospect of stabilised fuel prices from biofuels in the US comments potential results on poorer countries saying their 'inhabitants may know only the pain of higher food costs, or, worse, food shortages from a diminishing surplus of US corn available to export'. This is a very real problem.

In my opinion it would be ethically wrong to grow a wheat crop in Australia to turn into fuel for me to run my TV at night when it could go towards providing food for hundreds in a developing nation. But I know that's what's happening and it sickens me. It is a complete violation of the Golden Rule. I think the government needs to get serious about other forms of energy i.e. wind and sun.

Paul Green, a US Trade Consultant said 'if biofuels are justified by their energy output and their economic driver, because of high oil prices, that's one thing. If it's because governments make the decision it's picking winners and losers and the loser might be the food supply and cost of food to consumers'. (Landline 2007)

How does the government decide on picking winners and losers? Obviously they do what their voters tell them. With an election to be held this year I'll be sure to find out what our parties stances are on biofuels. Greens may well get my vote this year.

Monday, 20th August - Landline website feedback page

Read some of the feedback after the Food or Fuel story. Feedback blogger 'Ignatius_Writalot®' wrote on 19 August 2007

Instead of using food based vegetation, could our scientists consider the possibility of using prickly pear for this purpose? While we have spent millions to eradicate this pest, I believe that it will grow anywhere in any rainfall profile. A quarantined licenced site could be reserved for growth and harvesting. Our considerations should also include all and any pest plants, perhaps putting value on controlling waste areas for native or crop use.

What a great concept. I'd back a controlled weed growing program even though I spend every weekend pulling the bloody things out of my garden! Especially if it meant we could continue to grow food crops to feed people and not our fuel tanks.

Thursday, 13th September – another side to the debate

Whilst trawling through the net looking for the pros of biofuel (one of which is that it is a cleaner fuel and so helps with global warming) I came across an article by Bagaric (2007) in talking about environmental ethics. He takes a different view to that of millions of people concerned with global warming. He raises the issue that

Tim Flannery [current Australian of the Year] says that climate change is the most pressing issue confronting humanity. That might be so for affluent misguided Australians but the reaches of moral concern don't stop at the territorial seas of the Australian coastline.

The fact that present day preventable suffering grossly exceeds the most dire predictions of climatologists stemming from global warming, exposes the intractable ethical shortcomings of the environmental movement.

I hadn't thought of this before. Whilst I am still concerned about global warming, Bargaric (2007) does put things into perspective when he powerfully states 'in the 90 seconds that it took you to read this article 30 of them [people in developing nations] have just died. In the same time, the sea-levels haven't risen a milli-fraction'. Further supports my thoughts that food is far more important than fuel and perhaps even the global warming debate if we hold a human life as the most sacred. Good debate for next year's ethics students I reckon!

Justification

Friday, 3rd August

I work as a Business Manager in [deleted] primary school. After school today one of the upper primary teachers was telling me about the results of an experiment she had performed on the senior students (aged 11-13).

At recess time, she placed several plates of typical junk food in the Year 6/7 classrooms. The children were not told about the experiment beforehand and she made sure she was out of the classroom when they came back from recess and left them unattended for 10 minutes. She wanted to know whether they would eat the treats or know it was wrong to touch them without permission. She expected they wouldn't be able to resist but when she returned (to salivating students!) nothing had been touched. When she asked them why they all agreed to wait for her return instead of giving in to temptation she said there were two answers. Some said it was because they viewed it as stealing and acknowledged it was wrong to take something that wasn't theirs and the rest weren't prepared to go out on a limb against the others.

I thought about how this changes when you get older and how you learn to justify decisions (moral reasoning) even when you know they are wrong. I've often had parts of my lunch go astray in the staffroom refrigerator yet once when I left \$10 on the staffroom table it stayed there for nearly a week until I remembered to collect it. Are decisions based on our personal values or simply whether or not we think we can justify them? Do we get better at justifying as we mature or do our values strengthen? Justifying a wrong doesn't make it right yet adults seem to do it more than children. I'm very good at justification of my decisions and admit that sometimes it's fair and other times it's blatant manipulation.

Death penalty

Tuesday, 4th September – Andrew Denton interview with Sister Helen Prejean on 'Enough Rope'

Sister Helen Prejean, a nun and spiritual advisor to death row inmates talked about the death principle and how our Prime Minister John Howard is not willing to interfere with other countries justice systems and she states he said something like "well it's OK for them to do the death penalty" in relation to Indonesia. The Bali bombers and Bali-9 came to mind. Made me think about the relativist approach, the 'when in Rome' principle. If I'm honest, if someone killed a member of my family I'd be vengeful and I can't say for certain I'd rule out wanting them to get the death penalty. But then I think about what that would do for my well being. Imagine the guilt you'd feel in being responsible for another human being's life being terminated. I don't think I could live with myself. I wonder whether John Howard considers his inaction to help prevent the death penalty in other countries as taking a role in the killings? If we hold human life with the utmost regard, it should be the case for every human being regardless of what crime they've committed.

Friday 28th September – Australian's urged to spare Bali bombers' lives

An article appeared on 'Adelaide Now' today about Amnesty International's plea to the Australia public to write to the Indonesian government to help spare the lives of the Bali bombers. Tim Goodwin, Amnesty International Australia's anti-death penalty coordinator said 'this is about upholding the value of human rights, not picking and choosing which people deserve to die'. Michelmore and Rondonuwu (2007). He's hit the nail on the head with this. How could you ethically choose who has the right to live and who has the right to die? What do you base it on? If someone traffics drugs? If someone commits murder? Where do you draw the line? Any killing is murder.

Human Trafficking

Sunday, 16th September – The Jammed

Saw 'The Jammed' with friends today. It was a movie about the human traffic trade within Australia and is supposedly based on court documents. Women are flown in from overseas countries, particularly Asian countries and are told they have to pay off their family's debt. Some are tricked into situations they can't get out of and end up being controlled by brothel operators using their passports as a manipulation tool. These women speak little English, are too afraid to go to the police and live in fear. It's been a while since I've seen a movie when at the end the whole cinema is almost silent because of the impact it's just had on you. Wasn't a light hearted feel-good movie for a Sunday arvo but it opened my eyes to a subject I knew nothing about. Will do some more research on it tomorrow.

Monday, 17th September

Googled 'Human Trafficking'. Found a website for a group called 'Project Respect'. They state in relation to whether women know what they are getting into and what impact it has on their lives

Taking the biggest group of women trafficked into Australia, Thai women, as an example, we know the group includes both those who are totally deceived about the fact that they will do prostitution in Australia (the minority) and those who know they will do prostitution but are deceived about the conditions of that prostitution (the majority). The former group think that they will be employed in a sector outside the sex industry, for example, a restaurant, in the travel industry etc. The latter group of women may be given the impression that they will be working in a karaoke bar, will be able to pick and chose who they have sex with and will only have a small number of prostitution clients. This group includes both women who have done prostitution previously in Thailand and/or abroad, and women who have never done prostitution before. Both groups of women are likely to be told that they will have a debt to the traffickers, but will be deceived about the size of the debt and/or how quickly they will be able to pay it off.

Trafficking for prostitution exposes women to a range of negative impacts, including psychological and physical ill health due to violence while in the sex trafficking situation, including rape; beatings; forced abortions; threats and actual violence against family, including children in home countries; having

their passport taken by traffickers; verbal abuse; and imprisonment. US research on domestic and international trafficking documented serious injuries sustained by trafficked women, ranging from head injuries to vaginal bleeding, as a result of violence including stabbing and sexual assault. The slave-like conditions that trafficked women in Australia are held in have been documented in the 2000 court case against trafficker Gary Glazner in Victoria.

Project Respect (2007)

Found a review in which the reviewer, Palathingal (2007) likened 'sexual trafficking' to 'modern slavery' and I tend to agree with him. Apparently Australian police are aware it goes on but the movie shows them to treat the women as illegal immigrants instead of victims and when they catch them they are usually deported. Not sure if this was a real life depiction but it wouldn't be hard to imagine this does happen, particularly because our society doesn't hold much respect for prostitution. Further to this I found a story by Peter Gregory (2007) that stated the first person in Australia to be found guilty of possessing sex slaves had won an appeal against her convictions. The judge (Justice Eames) based this on the fact that her involvement with the women was that of an employer and that they were not her 'property'. In other words he believed the conditions by which these women worked for her did not fit the definition of slavery. Um sorry, but isn't forcing women into an already illegal trade and not allowing them to leave until they pay off their debts a crime in itself regardless of whether you wish to call it something other than slavery? I was appalled to read this. How did the judge who threw out the case live with himself? Judges in Australia base most of their decisions on prior precedent. What does this say to the next judge? I think I should have gone into law instead of business. I'd be the most hated feminist judge on the bar!!! I'd be basing my decision on basic human rights. The Golden Rule. Unfortunately law in this country seems to all too often forget this.

What I learnt from keeping a journal

What I've learnt in this course and doing the journal is that even though I have strong values that guide my choices i.e. truth, honesty, responsibility, fairness and integrity, I have realised that there are always two sides to every ethical issue and that I should consider all sides not just the one I feel most strongly about.

I've learnt not to make 'on-the-spot' decisions if you don't have to. Do further research and ask the opinion of others. Try to look at both sides – the potential positive your decision will bring and the potential negative. For instance, I commented in the debate that I sent a text message to sign up to Bono's tour petition to help alleviate debt in Africa whilst I was in attendance at the U2 concert in 2006. I had the choice of keeping the number in my phone and coming home and finding out a bit more about it and if I still felt strongly about it send a text message then. I didn't. I acted impulsively and I won't make that mistake again. Fisher and Lovell's ethical evaluation framework on pages 137 and the section on prioritising ethical principles on page 143 will be helpful with personal and business ethical decisions.

Leading on from this, before I agreed to purchase a \$2 voluntary carbon offset with my Falls Festival ticket I made sure I read the fine print and knew before I signed up exactly what the organisers planned to do with the money before I ticked the yes box.

The research I did on supply chain ethics has made me become more aware as a consumer of what products I purchase and whether I'm happy they've been manufactured in an ethical manner. As an example, I'm currently in the process of purchasing educational furniture for the school I work at and have asked the company to provide me with a list of their suppliers. I will make every effort to ensure the parts come from non-sweatshop factories using sustainable products.

I learn better from audio visual i.e. watching a TV documentary and from human interaction i.e. discussion boards and emails rather than simply reading books and articles. I would have liked a dialogue journal with my tutor i.e. 'provides a means for the student and instructor to maintain a private dialogue with one another around any number of issues.' (Hubbs and Brand 2005) as the emails I've sent/received with [tutor's name] have really got me thinking in a completely different mindset. No amount of text book reading can ever give you that.

References

Australian Associated Press 2007, *Woolworths blows away dodgy tissues*, Sydney Morning Herald, viewed 14 October 2007, <<http://www.smh.com.au/news/environment/woolworths-blows-away-dodgy-tissues/2007/08/27/1188067008764.html>>.

Bagaric, M 2007, *Environmental ethics - a world record for misplaced concern*, Online Opinion, Viewed 13 September 2007, <<http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=5495>>.

Fisher, C & Lovell, A 2006, *Business ethics and values: Individual, corporate and international perspectives*, 2nd Edition, FT Prentice Hall, Harlow UK.

Food or Fuel 2007, Australian Broadcasting Commission – Landline, viewed 19/20 August 2007, <<http://www.abc.net.au/landline/content/2006/s2009826.htm>>.

Food or Fuel 2007, television program, ABC television, Sydney, 19 August.

GetUp! 2007, *Politicians blog for GetUp after pulp mill decision*, Viewed 14 October 2007, <<http://www.getup.org.au/blogs/view.php?id=516&start=1550>>.

Grist to the mill 2007, television program, Four Corners for ABC television, Sydney, 30 July.

Grist to the mill 2007, Australian Broadcasting Commission – 4 Corners, viewed 3 August 2007, <<http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2007/s1990239.htm>>.

Gregory, P 2007, *Sex slave owner wins conviction appeal*, The Age, Viewed 17 September 2007, <<http://www.theage.com.au/news/national/sex-slave-owner-wins-conviction-appeal/2007/06/27/1182623975426.html>>.

Hazelton, K 2007, *The ethics of ethanol*, American Chronicle, Viewed 19 August 2007, <<http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/viewArticle.asp?articleID=25990>>

Howley, K 2005, *Market failure or marketing failure? A Decent Factory slams corporate social responsibility*, Reason Online, Viewed 25 September 2007, <<http://www.reason.com/news/show/34058.html>>.

Hubbs, DL & Brand, CF 2005, 'The paper mirror: Understanding reflective journaling', *Journal of Experiential Education*, Vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 60-71.

Michelmores, K and Rondonuwu O 2007, *Australian's urged to spare Bali bombers' lives*, Adelaide Now, Viewed 28 September 2007, <<http://www.news.com.au/adelaidenow/story/0,22606,22497543-5006301,00.html>>.

News.com.au 2007, *PM pressured Turnbull on pulp mill – Greens*, viewed 8 October 2007 <<http://www.news.com.au/story/0,23599,22548414-2,00.html>>.

Nokia: A Decent Factory 2005, television program, SBS television for Making Movies/Margot Films/Artline Films/MMIV, Sydney, 9 September 2007.

Palathingal, G 2007, *The Jammed*, Sydney Morning Herald, viewed 17 September 2007, <<http://www.smh.com.au/news/film-reviews/the-jammed/2007/08/30/1188067231253.html>>.

Peatling, S 2007, *ANZ runs the rule over pulp mill project*, Sydney Morning Herald, Viewed 8 October 2007, <<http://www.smh.com.au/news/environment/anz-runs-the-rule-over-pulp-mill-project/2007/10/05/1191091364623.html>>.

Project Respect 2007, *About Trafficking*, viewed 17 September 2007, <<http://www.projectrespect.org.au/>>.

Senser, R 2007, 'Corporate social responsibility', *A.. Dissent*, Vol. 54 , no. 1, p77-82.

Thinkexist.com 2007, Ethics quotes, Thinkexist.com, Viewed 13 October 2007, <<http://thinkexist.com/quotations/ethics/4.html>>.

Comments by the course coordinator

This journal was graded HD.

The journal is long, over 5,000 words. That is acceptable. 2,000 words is a minimum. The marker will read sufficient to form an opinion of the level of reflection and engagement shown.

The format, of going back to earlier topics and adding dated comments, can be an effective way of reflection, and of developing reflective capability. It is not the only way, and many journals are written chronologically. Do not feel that the format of this journal is the preferred one. If you plan to use an unusual format it would be helpful to check with the tutor during the early feedback period.

Comments on the Journal by the tutor who marked it

This journal contains several excellent aspects. It is written in her own voice. Each item that aroused the student's interest was not restricted to just one article or news item upon which she pontificated and spouted forth her own unquestioned opinion and then moved on. She reflected on it and researched for differing views on the original item that had caught her eye. She then reconsidered her own original view on each item by applying further ethical aspects or taking on board other later developments as she progressed through the course, building up a greater understanding of not only the complexities of the problems - and the topics she includes here are highly complex - but also questioning and probing her own values in relation to them, reflecting upon how her values could and should be applied to those problems and where the weaknesses in her own values resided.

In this regard note the range and quality rather than the length of the reference list at the end – the course required merely two academic sources plus the sources of news articles used in the journal. Although she has gone much further than normally expected, it does show how she became highly involved in not just the course material but also in applying the material to real world problems and her own values via a wide range of quality sources and other peoples' arguments.

In emails she often complained that her head was spinning because she too often was left in greater doubt about which way the problem should be resolved ethically and whether her own values and beliefs were up to the job as she originally thought. But to her credit she resisted the temptation to give up and fall back on the easy option of walking away from many of the issues. Much of this internal questioning and wrestling can be seen in this journal. Karl Popper once said "True ignorance is not the lack of knowledge but the refusal to acquire it". This is not the journal of a truly ignorant person but the journal of a person who recognises their own ignorance and is doing quite a lot about rectifying that weakness. No wonder her head was spinning at times, given the complex issues she picked and especially as an external isolated for the most part from other course members whilst in full-time employment plus all the other aspects of a daily life.

It is thus surprising that her final section upon the usefulness of keeping a reflective journal is probably the weakest part here. But it does show that at course end the issues remained unresolved for the most part although the intimation is that she will continue to resist taking the easy option. To a large degree she has moved on much further than her initial concluding remark of there being always two sides to any ethical issue – the previous journal sections show that she is recognising and dealing with more than two sides in relation to them. Popper's comment revisited.

Malcolm Keyte

A couple of further points can be noted as to how this journal can be improved.

During this course one emphasis is on finding creative solutions to ethical issues and one of its topics looks specifically at how to construct sound arguments. In this journal there is a glaring example of both uncreative thinking and an unsound and fallacious argument that she fails to recognise and consequentially is misled by. This is the blogger's argument in the Tasmania Pulp Mill section. The argument is that the world needs more paper so it's better to have the pulp mill in Australia than somewhere else. The initial premise is false – there are very good reasons why the world does not need more paper. The argument is also fallacious because it is based upon the fallacy known as a false dilemma – arguing that there are only two alternatives when there are more alternatives in existence. The blogger argues that there are only two alternatives to the solution (a mill here or a mill somewhere else) when there are other alternatives also available, for example no mill anywhere. Research and studies show that a vast amount of currently produced paper is wasted just in the office context and therefore a better course of action is less paper usage to cut out the waste that currently goes on and thus reduce demand not increase unnecessary supply still further. Research by computer printer manufacturers for example show that about 45% of printouts in offices last less than one day before they are binned – that's more than a trillion pages each year. *'Some people use what they've printed only for a minute. A cover page on a network printer job only survives maybe 30 seconds'* (Paul Smith, Xerox laboratory manager, Toronto). As any elementary understanding of economics shows, scarcity not overabundance leads to improved efficiencies and effectiveness in this context – necessity is the mother of all invention, as the old adage goes (and no, Frank Zappa did not create it, merely used it).

This highlights some fundamental ethics based aspects of capitalism generally: first, the amount of waste and excess production it creates – ie capitalism's inability to deal with its self-created externalities which is a common aspect of many business ethical problems; and second, whether market imperative capitalism is really the most efficient and effective use of limited and finite resources that it's cracked up to be. But note that the whole of this waste argument is just another angle to the results based approach discussed in this section of the journal and clearly shows the limitations of many government and management initiatives, and bloggers spouting forth, not being critically analysed or creatively formulated. It shows just how limited Turnbull's science-based impact on the local environment position really is. It also clearly shows the role managers and business have to play in all this in creating more ethical solutions to their own externality problems. And note that Turnbull's credentials for becoming a politician and minister are as a successful businessman – he's an Aussie icon in that respect – so his government line here is somewhat puzzling. Far more stakeholders' interests are met by such creative thinking, critical analysis and ethical application and reflection – reducing paper usage in offices appears no longer a luxury but an essential if locals are to maintain the value of their scenic property and the world is to maintain its old growth forests and natural diversity rather than vast factory style monoculture plantations; furthermore the money to be invested in the pulp mill can be used to create less destructive long term employment in that locality.

Another comment relates to the death penalty section which also may appear weak in certain respects. However, this student became involved, amongst other things, in a somewhat long and detailed argument on the course discussion board on this topic and was advised not to repeat all those points in her journal to help her reduce the word count. She therefore kept in only her reflections centred upon revenge versus justice and her own personal conflict between wanting to strangle for herself one of the murderers discussed on the board and her own values of not killing. As a result that section does appear to ignore many of the considerations relating to that topic which one would normally expect to see.

The Justification section is crying out for an assessment of Kant's arguments on rules (are the children not taking the junk food because they fear punishment, because they understand the value of not stealing and respecting property rights or because they are merely indoctrinated into not stealing?) and of course an application of Kohlberg (does this classroom experiment appear to affirm or refute his theory?). Again some of these issues were dealt with by this student elsewhere but a quick later reflection on these aspects would have improved this section. Word limit, word limit, oh that awful word limit...

And yes, in relation to human trafficking, she is correct - she would be deeply reviled if her professional judgements as a judge were purely restricted to a feminist position rather than a broader more general and thorough human rights and justice basis!

Supply Chain section – my favourite Einstein quote is "Two things are infinite, the universe and human stupidity, and I'm not sure about the universe". Nice one, Bertie.

Malcolm Keyte