

# PH212: Applied Ethics

[View Online](#)

---

1.

Lantz, G. Applied Ethics: What Kind of Ethics and What Kind of Ethicist? *Journal of applied philosophy* **17**, 21–28 (2000).

2.

Norman, R. Applied Ethics: What is Applied to What? *Utilitas* **12**, 119–136 (2000).

3.

Ethics in practice: an anthology. vol. Blackwell philosophy anthologies (Wiley Blackwell, 2014).

4.

Wiley InterScience (Online service). A companion to applied ethics. (Blackwell, 2005).

5.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <http://plato.stanford.edu/>.

6.

The Oxford handbook of ethical theory. vol. Oxford handbooks in philosophy (Oxford University Press, 2007).

7.

The Oxford handbook of ethical theory. vol. Oxford handbooks in philosophy (Oxford University Press, 2007).

8.

Thomson, J. J. A Defense of Abortion. Philosophy & Public Affairs **1**, 47–66 (1971).

9.

Marquis, D. Why Abortion is Immoral. The Journal of Philosophy **86**, 183–202 (1989).

10.

Cudd, A. E. Sensationalized Philosophy: A Reply to Marquis's 'Why Abortion is Immoral'. The Journal of Philosophy **87**, 262–264 (1990).

11.

Tooley, M. Abortion and Infanticide. Philosophy & public affairs (Online) Philosophy & public affairs [electronic resource]. Philos. public aff. (Online) Philosophy and public affairs (Online) Philosophy and public affairs **2**, 37–65 (1972).

12.

Cohen, A. I. & Wellman, C. H. Contemporary debates in applied ethics. vol. Contemporary debates in philosophy (Blackwell Pub, 2005).

13.

Davis, N. Abortion and Self-Defense. Philosophy & public affairs (Online) Philosophy & public affairs [electronic resource]. Philos. public aff. (Online) Philosophy and public affairs (Online) Philosophy and public affairs **13**, 175–207 (1984).

14.

Boonin-Vail, D. A Defense of 'A Defense of Abortion': On the Responsibility Objection to

Thomson's Argument. *Ethics* **107**, 286–313 (1997).

15.

McDaniel, I. The Responsibility Objection to Abortion: Rejecting the Notion that the Responsibility Objection Successfully Refutes a Woman's Right to Choose. *Bioethics* **29**, 291–299 (2015).

16.

Gibson, R. F. On an Inconsistency in Thomson's Abortion Argument. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition* **46**, 131–139 (1984).

17.

Finnis, J. The Rights and Wrongs of Abortion: A Reply to Judith Thomson. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **2**, 117–145 (1973).

18.

Brody, B. Thomson on Abortion. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **1**, 335–340 (1972).

19.

Sparrow, R. 'A Not-So-New Eugenics'. Hastings Center report (Online) The Hastings Center report [electronic resource]. Hastings cent. rep. (Online) The Hastings Center report (Online) **41**, 32–44 (2011).

20.

*Public Affairs Quarterly*.

21.

Kuhse, H. & Singer, P. *Bioethics: an anthology*. vol. Blackwell philosophy anthologies (Blackwell Pub, 2006).

22.

Buchanan, A. E. From chance to choice: genetics and justice. (Cambridge University Press, 2000).

23.

Bostrom, N. & Ord, T. The Reversal Test: Eliminating Status Quo Bias in Applied Ethics. *Ethics* (Chicago, Ill. : Online) *Ethics* [electronic resource]. *Ethics* (Online) *Ethics* (Online) **116**, 656-679 (2006).

24.

Savulescu, J. & Bostrom, N. Human enhancement. (Oxford University Press, 2011).

25.

Savulescu, J., Meulen, R. H. J. ter & Kahane, G. Enhancing human capacities. (Wiley-Blackwell, 2011).

26.

Life Sciences, Society and Policy | Full text | Procreative Beneficence, Obligation, and Eugenics. doi:10.1186/1746-5354-3-3-43.

27.

Singer, P. Animal liberation: towards an end to man's inhumanity to animals. (Paladin, 1977).

28.

LaFollette, H. Ethics in practice: an anthology. vol. Blackwell philosophy anthologies (Wiley Blackwell, 2014).

29.

Davis, S. L. The Least Harm Principle May Require that Humans Consume a Diet Containing

Large Herbivores, Not a Vegan Diet. *Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Ethics* **16**, 387–394 (2003).

30.

McPherson, T. A Case for Ethical Veganism Intuitive and Methodological Considerations. *Journal of Moral Philosophy* **11**, 677–703 (2014).

31.

Korsgaard, K. A Kantian Case for Animal Rights.

32.

Singer, P. Utilitarianism and Vegetarianism. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **9**, 325–337 (1980).

33.

Regan, T. The Moral Basis of Vegetarianism. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* **5**, 181–214 (1975).

34.

Fairlie, S. Meat: a benign extravagance. (Permanent Pub, 2010).

35.

Savoury, A. How to green the world's deserts and reverse climate change.

36.

Sinnott-Armstrong, W. & Howarth, R. B. Perspectives on climate change: science, economics, politics, ethics. vol. *Advances in the economics of environmental resources* (Elsevier JAI, 2005).

37.

KAGAN, S. Do I Make a Difference? *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **39**, 105–141 (2011).

38.

NEFSKY, J. Consequentialism and the Problem of Collective Harm: A Reply to Kagan. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **39**, 364–395 (2011).

39.

Andreou, C. Environmental Damage and the Puzzle of the Self-Torturer. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **34**, 95–108 (2006).

40.

Lawson, B. Individual Complicity in Collective Wrongdoing. In: *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* (2013).

41.

Parfit, D. *Reasons and persons*. (Clarendon, 1984).

42.

Jamieson, Dale. When Utilitarians Should Be Virtue Theorists. *Utilitas*; Jun2007, Vol **19**, 160–183 (2007).

43.

Wündisch, J. Green Votes not Green Virtues: Effective Utilitarian Responses to Climate Change. *Utilitas* **26**, 192–205 (2014).

44.

Spiekermann, K. Small impacts and imperceptible effects: Causing harm with others.

45.

Glover, J. & Scott-Taggart, M. J. It Makes no Difference Whether or Not I Do It. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes **49**, 171–209 (1975).

46.

Broad, C. D. On the Function of False Hypotheses in Ethics. International Journal of Ethics **26**, 377–397 (1916).

47.

Pinkert, F. What if i cannot make a difference (and know it). Ethics **125**, 971–998 (2015).

48.

Zwolinski, Matt. SWEATSHOPS, CHOICE, AND EXPLOITATION. Business Ethics Quarterly **17**, 689–727 (2007).

49.

Peter Singer. Famine, Affluence, and Morality. Philosophy & Public Affairs **1**, 229–243 (1972).

50.

Pogge, T. Real World Justice. The Journal of Ethics **9**, 29–53 (2005).

51.

Green, K. Distance, Divided Responsibility and Universalizability. The Monist **86**, 501–515 (2003).

52.

MacAskill, W. Replaceability, Career Choice, and Making a Difference. Ethical Theory and Moral Practice **17**, 269–283 (2014).

53.

Collins, S. Duties to Make Friends. *Ethical Theory & Moral Practice* **16**, 907–921 (2013).

54.

Deveaux, M. The Global Poor as Agents of Justice. *Journal of Moral Philosophy* **12**, 125–150 (2015).

55.

PABLO GILABERT. THE DUTY TO ERADICATE GLOBAL POVERTY: POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE? *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* **7**, 537–550 (2005).

56.

Brock, G. Global Poverty and Desert. *Politics* **26**, 168–175 (2006).

57.

Risse, M. Do We Owe the Global Poor Assistance or Rectification? *Ethics & International Affairs* **19**, 9–18 (2005).

58.

Wenar, L. Property Rights and the Resource Curse. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **36**, 2–32 (2008).

59.

Miller, R. W. Beneficence, Duty and Distance. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **32**, 357–383 (2004).

60.

Satz, D. What Do We Owe the Global Poor? *Ethics & International Affairs* **19**, 47–54 (2005).



61.

O'Neill, O. Global Poverty and the Limits of Academic Expertise. *Ethics & International Affairs* **26**, 183–189 (2012).

62.

Spoerl, J. S. Peter Singer on famine, affluence, and morality: a Christian response. *American Journal of Jurisprudence* **37**, 113–134 (1992).

63.

McElwee, B. Impartial Reasons, Moral Demands. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* **14**, 457–466 (2011).

64.

Pogge, T. *World poverty and human rights: cosmopolitan responsibilities and reforms.* (Polity, 2008).

65.

Liam B. Murphy. The Demands of Beneficence. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **22**, 267–292 (1993).

66.

Murphy, L. B. *Moral demands in nonideal theory.* vol. Oxford ethics series (Oxford University Press, 2000).

67.

Pogge, T. Priorities of global justice. *Metaphilosophy* **32**, 6–24 (2001).

68.

Unger, P. K. Living high and letting die: our illusion of innocence. (Oxford University Press, 1996).

69.

Thomson, Judith Jarvis. The Right to Privacy. Philosophy & Public Affairs, 7/1/1975, Vol **4**, (1975).

70.

Rachels, James. Why Privacy is Important. Philosophy & Public Affairs, 7/1/1975, Vol **4**, (1975).

71.

Benn, S. I. A Theory of Freedom. (Cambridge University Press, 1988).

72.

Allen, A. L. Unpopular privacy: what must we hide? vol. Studies in feminist philosophy (Oxford University Press, 2011).

73.

Scanlon, Thomas. Thomson on Privacy. Philosophy & Public Affairs, 7/1/1975, Vol **4**, (1975).

74.

Benn, S. I. A Theory of Freedom. (Cambridge University Press, 1988).

75.

Hughes, R. L. D. Two concepts of privacy. Computer Law & Security Review **31**, 527-537 (2015).

76.

Blaauw, M. THE EPISTEMIC ACCOUNT OF PRIVACY. EPISTEME-A JOURNAL OF INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL EPISTEMOLOGY; JUN, 2013, 10 2, p167-p177, 11p (2013).

77.

van den Hoven, M. J. Privacy and the varieties of moral wrong-doing in an information age. Computers & Society; Sep1997, Vol **27**, 33-37 (1997).

78.

Mill, J. S. & Gray, J. On liberty, and other essays. vol. Oxford world's classics (Oxford University Press, 1998).

79.

Parent, W. A. Privacy, Morality, and the Law. Philosophy & public affairs (Online) Philosophy & public affairs [electronic resource]. Philos. public aff. (Online) Philosophy and public affairs (Online) Philosophy and public affairs **12**, 269-288 (1983).

80.

Gerstein, R. S. Intimacy and Privacy. Ethics (Chicago, Ill. : Online) Ethics [electronic resource]. Ethics (Online) Ethics (Online) **89**, 76-81 (1978).

81.

Etzioni, A. The limits of privacy. (Basic Books, 1999).

82.

van den Hoven van Genderen, Rob. Trading Privacy for Security [article]. Amsterdam Law Forum, Vol **1**, (2009).

83.

Lusk, Rachel E. Facebook's Newest Friend - Employers: Use of Social Networking in Hiring Challenges U.S. Privacy Constructs [comments]. *Capital University Law Review*, Vol **42**, (2014).

84.

Wiley InterScience (Online service). *A companion to applied ethics*. (Blackwell, 2005).

85.

Lenman, J. On Becoming Redundant or What Computers Shouldn't Do. *Journal of Applied Philosophy* **18**, 1-11 (2001).

86.

Mitcham, C. Convivial software: an end-user perspective on free and open source software. *Ethics and Information Technology* **11**, 299-310 (2009).

87.

Bonnefon, J.-F., Shariff, A. & Rahwan, I. Autonomous Vehicles Need Experimental Ethics: Are We Ready for Utilitarian Cars? *Science* **352**, 1573-1576.

88.

Nozick, R. *Anarchy, state, and utopia*. (Basic Books, a member of the Perseus Books Group, 2013).

89.

Parks, J. A. Lifting the Burden of Women's Care Work: Should Robots Replace the 'Human Touch'? *Hypatia* **25**, 100-120 (2010).

90.

Collins, M. Will Robots Replace Humans? *Industrial Maintenance & Plant Operation* **75**, 46-46 (2014).

91.

Wolbring, GYumakulov, S. Social Robots: Views of Staff of a Disability Service Organization. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ROBOTICS*; AUG, 2014, 6 3, p457-p468, 12p (2014).

92.

Information Technology Wants to Be Free. *Academe*, v98 n5 p18-23 Sep-Oct 2012 18-23 (2012).

93.

Nihlén Fahlquist, J. Saving lives in road traffic—ethical aspects. *Journal of Public Health* **17**, 385–394 (2009).

94.

Hevelke, A. & Nida-Rümelin, J. Responsibility for Crashes of Autonomous Vehicles: An Ethical Analysis. *Science and Engineering Ethics* **21**, 619–630 (2015).

95.

Purves, D., Jenkins, R. & Strawser, B. J. Autonomous Machines, Moral Judgment, and Acting for the Right Reasons. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* **18**, 851–872 (2015).

96.

Ravid, O. Don't Sue Me, I Was Just Lawfully Texting & Drunk When My Autonomous Car Crashed into You. *Southwestern Law Review* **44**, 175–207 (2014).

97.

Waytz, A., Heafner, J. & Epley, N. The mind in the machine: Anthropomorphism increases trust in an autonomous vehicle. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* **52**, 113–117 (2014).

98.

Gurney, J. K. Sue My Car Not Me: Products Liability and Accidents Involving Autonomous Vehicles. *Journal of Law, Technology & Policy* 247–277 (2013).

99.

Swift, A. The morality of school choice. *Theory and Research in Education* **2**, 7–21 (2004).

100.

Swift, A. The morality of school choice reconsidered: a response. *Theory & Research in Education* **2**, 323–342 (2004).

101.

Anderson, E. Rethinking Equality of Opportunity: Comment on Adam Swift's 'How Not to Be a Hypocrite'. *Theory and Research in Education*, **2**, 99–110 (2004).

102.

Macleod, C. M. The Puzzle of Parental Partiality: Reflections on 'How Not to Be a Hypocrite--School Choice for the Morally Perplexed Parent'. *Theory and Research in Education* **2**, 309–321 (2004).

103.

Swift, A. A short guide to hypocrisy. *New Statesman* **132**, 16–16 (2003).

104.

Clayton, M. & Stevens, D. School Choice and the Burdens of Justice. *Theory and Research in Education* **2**, 111–126 (2004).

105.

Macleod, C. M. The Puzzle of Parental Partiality: Reflections on How Not to Be a Hypocrite:

School Choice for the Morally Perplexed Parent. *Theory and Research in Education* **2**, 309–321 (2004).

106.

Swift, A. *How not to be a hypocrite: school choice for the morally perplexed parent*. (Routledge, 2003).

107.

Power, S. Comments on 'How Not to Be a Hypocrite': School Choice for the Morally Perplexed. *Theory and Research in Education* **2**, 23–29 (2004).

108.

Anderson, K. How not to be a Hypocrite: School Choice and the Morally Perplexed Parent. *Journal of Educational Thought* **40**, 97–100 (2006).

109.

Leathwood, C. A Critique of Institutional Inequalities in Higher Education (or an Alternative to Hypocrisy for Higher Educational Policy). *Theory and Research in Education* **2**, 31–48 (2004).

110.

Brighouse, H. & Swift, A. Legitimate Parental Partiality. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* **37**, 43–80 (2009).

111.

Leibowitz, Uri D. Moral Deliberation and Ad Hominem Fallacies. *Journal of Moral Philosophy*; 2015, p1-23, 23p 1–23 (2015).

112.

Singer, Peter. Moral Experts. *Analysis*, 3/1/1972, Vol **32**, (1972).

113.

Cross, B. Moral Philosophy, Moral Expertise, and the Argument from Disagreement. *Bioethics* **30**, 188–194 (2016).

114.

Gesang, B. ARE MORAL PHILOSOPHERS MORAL EXPERTS? *BIOETHICS*; MAY, 2010, 24 4, p153-p159, 7p (2010).

115.

Archard, D. WHY MORAL PHILOSOPHERS ARE NOT AND SHOULD NOT BE MORAL EXPERTS. *BIOETHICS*; MAR, 2011, 25 3, p119-p127, 9p (2011).

116.

Hoffmann, M. How to identify moral experts? An application of Goldman's criteria for expert identification to the domain of morality. In: *Analyse und Kritik* (2012).

117.

Burch, Robert W. ARE THERE MORAL EXPERTS? *The Monist*, 10/1/1974, Vol **58**, (1974).

118.

Miller, Peter. Who are the Moral Experts? *Journal of Moral Education*; Oct1975, Vol **5**, 3–12 (1975).

119.

Nielsen, K. On the need for 'moral experts': a test case for practical ethics. In: *The International journal of applied philosophy* (1984).

120.



Hills, A. Moral Testimony and Moral Epistemology\*. *Ethics* **120**, 94–127 (2009).

121.

Driver, Julia. Autonomy and the Asymmetry Problem for Moral Expertise. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, 4/1/2006, Vol **128**, (2006).

122.

Goldman, Alvin I. Experts: Which Ones Should You Trust? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 7/1/2001, Vol **63**, (2001).