

Philosophy Religion and Ethics- Summer work

Philosophy

You must complete 1 of the tasks below and bring this in for the first lesson back in September.

Option 1

Read 11-14 of 'Philosophy the basics' by Nigel Warburton (note you do not need to read the subsection 'The Fine Tuning Argument').

Complete the essay question: **Does the Design argument effectively prove God exists?**

Suggested structure:

Outline the key argument- Paragraph 1

Outline Paley's Divine Watchmaker argument- Paragraph 2

Pick a criticism to explore. Your options are: Evolution/ limits on conclusions (could it be a group of Gods/ an all-powerful God, which undermines Paley's claims)/ Weakness of analogy - Paragraph 3

Paragraph 4- Same as above

Paragraph 5- Your conclusion which contains your view and key argument.

Option 2 Read 20-25 of 'Philosophy the basics' by Nigel Warburton

Complete the essay question: **To what extent does the Problem of evil challenge a belief in God.**

Suggested Structure

1. Outline the Problem of Evil- Paragraphs 1 and 2. You can make a distinction here between natural and moral evil.
2. Outline a response to the problem of evil and a defence of God. Your options are: Saintliness/ Artistic analogy/ Free will defence. Paragraph 3.
3. Paragraph 4- Same as above
4. Paragraph 5- Your conclusion which contains your view and key argument.

Ethics

You must complete 1 of the following tasks and bring this in for the first lesson in September.

Option 1

Blatant Benevolence – This article explores the ethics of public acts of charity, donated by the world's wealthiest people!

Read the article and answer the following questions.

- 1) What do you think Singer means by Blatant Benevolence?
- 2) What do evolutionary psychologists believe about 'displays of blatant benevolence'?
- 3) Could there be a positive consequence of those that give and make it known they do?
- 4) What are Chirs and Anne Ellinger hoping to achieve?
- 5) What does Singer state most donors gain from donating?
- 6) Why is Singer critical of Hong's 10 over 100 website?
- 7) What do you think about Blatant Benevolence? Explain your answer.

Option 2

Is it ok to cheat at football?

Read the article and answer the following questions.

- 1) Outline the events in the world cup elimination match between England and Germany on June 27th.
- 2) Explain what happened in the 1986 world cup match between Argentina and England.
- 3) What has Maradona admitted since?
- 4) What does Singer say should happen in cricket if a player knows they are out?
- 5) Can you liken to this to Robbie Fowlers actions in 1996?
- 6) Why does Singer think football players today won't admit to cheating?
- 7) What does Singer say Neuer should have done and why?
- 8) Is it ever ok to cheat in football? What is your opinion? Explain your answer.

But does this God described by Theists actually exist? Can we prove that he or she does? Should a reasonable person believe that no such God exists, a position known as atheism? Or is agnosticism, the suspension of belief (or sitting on the fence, as some people would describe it), the appropriate reaction? There are many different arguments intended to prove God's existence. I shall consider the most important of these in this chapter.

THE DESIGN ARGUMENT

One of the most frequently used arguments for God's existence is the Design Argument, sometimes also known as the Teleological Argument (from the Greek word *telos*, which means 'purpose'). This states that if we look around us at the natural world we can't help noticing how everything in it is suited to the function it performs: everything bears evidence of having been designed. This is supposed to demonstrate the existence of a Creator. If, for example, we examine the human eye, we see how its minute parts all fit together, each part cleverly suited to what it was apparently made for: seeing.

Supporters of the Design Argument, such as William Paley (1743–1805), claim that the complexity and efficiency of natural objects such as the eye are evidence that they must have been designed by God. How else could they have come to be as they are? Just as by looking at a watch we can tell that it was designed by a watchmaker, so, they argue, we can tell by looking at the eye that it was designed by some sort of Divine Watchmaker. It is as if God has deliberately left evidence of his or her existence all around us in the world.

This is an argument from an effect to its cause: we look at the effect (the watch or the eye), and from examination of it we try to tell what caused it (a watchmaker or a Divine Watchmaker). It relies on the idea that a designed object like a watch is in some ways very similar to a natural object such as the eye. This sort of argument, based on a similarity between two things, is known as an argument from analogy. Arguments from analogy rely on the principle that if two things are similar in some respects they will very likely be similar in others.

Those who accept the Design Argument tell us that everywhere we look, particularly in the natural world – whether at trees, cliffs,

Does God exist? This is a fundamental question, one which most of us ask ourselves at some time in our lives. The answer which each of us gives affects not only the way we behave, but also how we understand and interpret the world, and what we expect for the future. If God exists, then human existence may have a purpose, and we may even hope for eternal life. If not, then we must create any meaning in our lives for ourselves: no meaning will be given to them from outside, and death is probably final.

When philosophers turn their attention to religion they typically examine the various arguments that have been given for and against God's existence. They weigh up the evidence and look closely at the structure and implications of the arguments. They also examine concepts such as faith and religious belief to see if they can make sense of the way people talk about God.

The starting point for most philosophy of religion is a very general doctrine about the nature of God, known as Theism. This is the view that one God exists, that he or she is omnipotent (capable of doing anything), omniscient (knows everything), and supremely benevolent (all-good). Such a view is held by most Christians, Jews, and Muslims alike. Here I will focus on the Christian view of God, though most of the arguments will apply equally to the other Theistic religions, and some will be relevant to any religion.

animals, the stars, or whatever – we can find further confirmation of God's existence. Because these things are far more ingeniously constructed than a watch, the Divine Watchmaker must have been correspondingly more intelligent than the human watchmaker. Indeed, the Divine Watchmaker must have been so powerful, and so clever, that it makes sense to assume that it was God as traditionally understood by Theists.

However, there are strong arguments against the Design Argument, several of which were raised by the philosopher David Hume (1711–76) in his posthumously published *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, and in section XI of his *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.

CRITICISMS OF THE DESIGN ARGUMENT

WEAKNESS OF ANALOGY

One objection to the argument just set forth is that it relies on a weak analogy: it takes for granted that there is a significant resemblance between natural objects and objects which we know to have been designed. But it is not obvious that, to use the same example again, the human eye really is like a watch in any important respect. Arguments from analogy rely on there being a strong similarity between the two things being compared. If the similarity is weak, then the conclusions that can be drawn on the basis of the comparison are correspondingly weak. So, for example, a wrist watch and a pocket watch are sufficiently similar for us to be able to assume that they were both designed by watchmakers. But although there is some similarity between a watch and an eye – they are both intricate and fulfil their particular functions – it is only a vague similarity, and any conclusions based on the analogy will as a result be correspondingly vague.

Against this criticism a Theist might still maintain that it is more likely that the eye was designed by a supreme being than that it came about merely by chance.

EVOLUTION

The existence of a Divine Watchmaker is not, however, the only possible explanation of how it is that animals and plants are so well adapted to their functions. In particular, Charles Darwin's (1809–82)

theory of evolution by natural selection, explained in his book *The Origin of Species* (1859), gives a widely accepted alternative explanation of this phenomenon. Darwin showed how, by a process of the survival of the fittest, those animals and plants best suited to their environments lived to pass on their characteristics to their offspring. Later scientists have been able to account for the mechanism of evolution in terms of inherited genes. This process explains how such marvellous adaptations to environment as are found in the animal and plant kingdoms could have occurred, without needing to introduce the notion of God.

Of course Darwin's theory of evolution in no way *disproves* God's existence – indeed, many Christians accept it as the best explanation of how plants, animals, and human beings came to be as they are: they believe that God created the mechanism of evolution itself. However, Darwin's theory does weaken the power of the Design Argument since it explains the same effects without any mention of God as their cause. The existence of such a theory about the mechanism of biological adaptation prevents the Design Argument from being a conclusive proof of God's existence.

LIMITATIONS ON CONCLUSION

Even if, despite the objections mentioned so far, you still find the Design Argument convincing, you should notice that it doesn't prove the existence of a unique, all-powerful, all-knowing, and all-good God. Close examination of the argument shows it to be limited in a number of ways.

First, the argument completely fails to support monotheism – the view that there is just one God. Even if you accept that the world and everything in it clearly shows evidence of having been designed, there is no reason to believe that it was all designed by one God. Why couldn't it have been designed by a team of lesser gods working together? After all, most large-scale, complex human constructions such as skyscrapers, pyramids, space rockets, and so on, were made by teams of individuals, so surely if we carry the analogy to its logical conclusion it will lead us to believe that the world was designed by a group of gods working together.

Second, the argument doesn't necessarily support the view that the Designer (or designers) was all-powerful. It could plausibly be

argued that the universe has a number of 'design faults': for instance, the human eye has a tendency to short-sightedness, and to cataracts in old age — hardly the work of an all-powerful Creator wanting to create the best world possible. Such observations might lead some people to think that the Designer of the universe, far from being all-powerful, was a comparatively weak god or gods, or possibly a young god experimenting with his or her powers. Maybe the Designer died soon after creating the universe, allowing it to run down of its own accord. The Design Argument provides at least as much evidence for these conclusions as it does for the existence of the God described by the Theists. So the Design Argument alone cannot prove that the Theists' God rather than some other type of God or gods exists.

Finally, on the question of whether the Designer is all-knowing and all-good, many people find the amount of evil in the world counts against this conclusion. This evil ranges from human cruelty, murder, and torture, to the suffering caused by natural disasters and disease. If, as the Design Argument suggests, we are to look around us to see the evidence of God's work, many people will find it hard to accept that what they see is the result of a benevolent Creator. An all-knowing God would know that evil exists; an all-powerful God would be able to prevent it occurring; and an all-good God would not want it to exist. But evil continues to occur. This serious challenge to belief in the Theists' God has been much discussed by philosophers. It is known as the Problem of Evil. In a later section we will examine it in some detail, together with several attempted solutions to it. Here it should at least make us wary about claims that the Design Argument provides conclusive evidence for the existence of a supremely good God.

As can be seen from this discussion, the Design Argument can only give us, at best, the very limited conclusion that the world and everything in it was designed by something or someone. To go beyond this would be to overstep what can logically be concluded from the argument.

THE FINE TUNING ARGUMENT

Despite the powerful arguments against the Design Argument, some recent thinkers have tried to defend a variant of it known as the Anthropic Principle. This is the view that the chance of the world

turning out to be conducive to human survival and development was so tiny that we can conclude that the world is the work of a divine architect. On this view, the fact that human beings have evolved and survived provides us with a proof of God's existence. God must have controlled the physical conditions in our universe, and fine-tuned them to allow just this kind of life form to evolve. This view is bolstered by scientific research indicating the limited range of suitable starting conditions for a universe in which life could develop at all.

CRITICISM OF THE FINE TUNING ARGUMENT

THE LOTTERY OBJECTION

There is a major objection to the argument from Fine Tuning. Imagine that you have bought a ticket for a national lottery. There are, perhaps, many millions of tickets, but only one will win. It is statistically highly unlikely that you will win. But you might. If you do, however, this doesn't demonstrate more than your good luck: it doesn't follow from the fact that, from amongst all those millions of losing tickets, your winning ticket was chosen that this must have been the result of something more than a random selection. You might, if you are superstitious, read all kinds of significance into the fact that you won the lottery. But anything which is statistically unlikely still can happen. The mistake that defenders of the Fine Tuning argument make is to assume that when something happens which is unlikely, there must be a more plausible explanation of it than that it arose naturally. Our presence in this part of the universe can be adequately explained without recourse to supernatural causes. It is not surprising that we are in a universe where the conditions were just right for beings of our kind to emerge, since there would be no chance whatsoever of us emerging elsewhere. So the fact that we are here cannot be taken as proof of God's design. Furthermore, the Fine Tuning argument is also vulnerable to the range of criticisms of traditional versions of the Design Argument outlined above.

THE FIRST CAUSE ARGUMENT

The Design Argument and its variant the Fine Tuning Argument are based on direct observation of the world. As such they are what

Knowledge in this context can be defined as a kind of true, justified belief. If we were to have knowledge that God exists it would have to be true that God actually does exist. But our belief that God exists would also have to be justified: it would have to be based on the right sort of evidence. It is possible to have beliefs that are true but unjustified: for example, I may believe that it is Tuesday because I have looked at what is written on what I believe is today's newspaper. But in fact I was looking at an old paper which just happened to have come out on a Tuesday. Although I believe that it is Tuesday (which it is), I did not acquire my belief in a reliable way, since I could just as easily have picked up an old newspaper which would have convinced me it was Thursday. So I did not really have knowledge, though I may mistakenly have thought that I did.

All the arguments for the existence of God that we have examined so far have been open to a number of objections. Whether these objections are sound or not is for you to decide. Certainly the objections should raise doubts about whether or not these arguments can be considered *proofs* of God's existence. But could we perhaps have knowledge – this type of true, justified belief – that God does *not* exist? In other words, are there any arguments which could conclusively disprove the existence of the God described by the Theists?

There is indeed at least one very strong argument against the existence of a benevolent God, one which I have already mentioned as a criticism of the Design, First Cause, and Ontological Arguments. This is the so-called Problem of Evil.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

There is evil in the world: this cannot seriously be denied. Think only of the Holocaust, of Pol Pot's massacres in Cambodia, or of the widespread practice of torture. These are all examples of moral evil or cruelty: human beings inflicting suffering on other human beings, for whatever reason. Cruelty is also often inflicted upon animals. There is also a different kind of evil, known as natural or metaphysical evil: earthquakes, disease, and famine are examples of this sort of evil.

Natural evil has natural causes, though it may be worsened by human incompetence or lack of care. 'Evil' may not be the most

appropriate word to describe such natural phenomena, which give rise to human suffering, because the word is usually used to refer to deliberate cruelty. However, whether we label them 'natural evil' or choose another name for them, the existence of such things as disease and natural disaster certainly has to be accounted for if we are to maintain a belief in a benevolent God. Why would a god who cares about human beings create childhood leukemia or malaria? Why would such a god allow earthquakes and tsunamis to take place?

In view of the existence of so much evil, how can anyone seriously believe in the existence of an all-good God? An all-knowing God would know that evil exists; an all-powerful God would be able to prevent it occurring; and an all-good God would not want it to exist. But evil continues to occur. This is the Problem of Evil: the problem of explaining how the alleged attributes of God can be compatible with this undeniable fact of evil. This is the most serious challenge to belief in the Theists' God. The Problem of Evil has led many people to reject belief in God altogether, or at least to revise their opinion about God's supposed benevolence, omnipotence, or omniscience.

Theists have suggested a number of solutions to the Problem of Evil, three of which we will consider here. Such attempted explanations of how evil is compatible with the existence of God are usually known as theodicies.

ATTEMPTED SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

SAINTLINESS

Some people have argued that, though the presence of evil in the world is clearly not a good thing in itself, it is justified because it can lead to greater moral goodness. Without poverty and disease, for instance, Mother Teresa's great moral goodness in helping the needy would not have been possible. Without war, torture, and cruelty, no saints or heroes could exist. Evil allows the supposedly greater good of this kind of triumph over human suffering. However, such a solution is open to at least two objections. First, the degree and extent of suffering are far greater than would be necessary to allow saints and heroes to perform their acts of great moral goodness. It is extremely difficult to justify the horrific deaths of millions

the explosion and the blood. For many people this analogy between a work of art and the world would be more successful as an argument *against* God's benevolence than for it.

THE FREE WILL DEFENCE

By far the most important attempt at a solution to the Problem of Evil is the Free Will Defence. This is the claim that God has given human beings free will: the ability to choose for ourselves what to do. If we did not have free will we would be like robots, or automata, with no choices of our own. Those who accept the Free Will Defence argue that it is a necessary consequence of having free will that we should have the possibility of doing evil; otherwise it would not genuinely be free will. They tell us that a world in which human beings have free will which sometimes leads to evil is preferable to one in which human action is predetermined, one in which we would be like robots, programmed only to perform good actions. Indeed, if we were pre-programmed in this way, we could not even call our actions morally good since moral goodness depends on having a choice about what we do. Again, there are a number of objections to this proposed solution.

CRITICISMS OF THE FREE WILL DEFENCE

IT MAKES TWO BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The main assumption that the Free Will Defence makes is that a world with free will and the possibility of evil is preferable to a world of robot-like people who never perform evil actions. But is this obviously so? Suffering can be so terrible that no doubt many people, given the choice, would prefer everyone to have been pre-programmed only to do good, rather than have to undergo such pain. These pre-programmed beings could even have been designed so that they believed they had free will even though they didn't: they could have had the illusion of free will with all the benefits that follow from thinking that they are free, but with none of the drawbacks.

This hints at a second assumption that the Free Will Defence makes, namely that we do actually have free will and not just an

of people in Nazi concentration camps using this argument. Besides, much of this suffering goes unnoticed and unrecorded, and so cannot be explained in this way: in some cases the suffering individual is the only person capable of moral improvement in such a situation, and this improvement would be highly unlikely to occur in cases of extreme pain.

Second, it is not obvious that a world in which great evil exists would be preferable to one in which there was less evil and as a result fewer saints and heroes. Indeed, there is something offensive, for example, about trying to justify the agony of a young child dying of an incurable disease by arguing that this allows those witnessing this to become morally better people. Would an all-good God really use such methods to aid our moral development?

ARTISTIC ANALOGY

Some people have claimed that there is an analogy between the world and a work of art. Overall harmony in a piece of music usually involves discords which are subsequently resolved; a painting typically has large areas of darker as well as of lighter pigment. In a similar way, so the argument goes, evil contributes to the overall harmony or beauty of the world. This view is also open to at least two objections.

First, it is just difficult to believe. For instance, it is hard to understand how somebody dying in agony on a barbed-wire fence in no-man's-land in the Battle of the Somme could be said to have been contributing to the overall harmony of the world. If the analogy with a work of art is really the explanation of why God permits so much evil, then this is almost an admission that evil cannot satisfactorily be explained since it puts the understanding of evil beyond a merely human comprehension. It is only from God's viewpoint that the harmony could be observed and appreciated. If this is what it means when Theists say that God is all-good, then it is a very different use of the word 'good' from our usual one.

Second, a God who allows such suffering for merely aesthetic purposes – in order to appreciate it in the way one appreciates a work of art – sounds more like a sadist than the all-good deity described by Theists. If this is the role suffering plays, then it makes God uncomfortably close to the psychopath who throws a bomb into a crowd in order to admire the beautiful patterns created by

illusion of it. Some psychologists believe that we can explain every decision or choice that an individual makes by referring to some earlier conditioning that the individual has undergone, so that, although the individual might feel free, his or her action is in fact entirely determined by what has happened in the past, and by genetically transmitted predispositions. We cannot know for certain that this isn't actually the case.

However, it should be pointed out in the Free Will Defence's favour that most philosophers believe that human beings do have free will in some sense, and that free will is generally considered essential to being human.

FREE WILL BUT NO EVIL

If God is omnipotent, then presumably it is within his or her powers to have created a world in which there was both free will and yet no evil. In fact such a world is not particularly difficult to imagine. Although having free will always gives us the possibility of performing evil, there is no reason why this should ever become an actuality. It is logically possible that everyone could have had free will but decided always to shun the evil course of behaviour.

Those who accept the Free Will Defence would probably reply to this that such a state of affairs would not be genuine free will. This is open to debate.

GOD COULD INTERVENE

Theists typically believe that God can and does intervene in the world, primarily by performing miracles. If God intervenes sometimes, why does he or she choose to perform what can seem to a non-believer relatively minor 'tricks' such as producing stigmata (marks on people's hands, like the nail holes in Christ's hands) or changing water into wine? Why didn't God intervene to prevent the Holocaust or the whole Second World War or the AIDS epidemic?

Again, Theists might reply that if God ever intervened then we would not have genuine free will. But this would be to abandon an aspect of most Theists' belief in God, namely that divine intervention sometimes occurs.

DOESN'T EXPLAIN NATURAL EVIL

A major criticism of the Free Will Defence is that it can at best only justify the existence of moral evil, evil brought about directly by human beings. There is no conceivable connection between having free will and the existence of such natural evil as earthquakes, disease, volcanic eruptions, and so on, unless one accepts some kind of doctrine of the Fall whereby Adam and Eve's betrayal of God's trust is supposed to have brought all the different sorts of evil on the world. The doctrine of the Fall makes human beings responsible for every form of evil in the world. However, such a doctrine would only be acceptable to someone who already believed in the existence of the Judaeo-Christian God.

There are other more plausible explanations of natural evil, one of which is that the regularity in the laws of nature has a great overall benefit which outweighs the occasional disasters that it gives rise to.

BENEFICIAL LAWS OF NATURE

Without regularity in nature our world would be mere chaos, and we would have no way of predicting the results of any of our actions. If, for instance, footballs only sometimes left our feet when we kicked them, sometimes simply sticking to them, then we would have great difficulty predicting what was going to happen on any particular occasion when we went to kick a ball. Lack of regularity in other aspects of the world might make life itself impossible. Science, as well as everyday life, relies upon there being a great deal of regularity in nature, similar causes tending to produce similar effects.

Some Theists argue that because this regularity is usually beneficial to us, natural evil is justified since it is just an unfortunate side-effect of the laws of nature continuing to operate in a regular way. The overall beneficial effects of this regularity are supposed to outweigh the detrimental ones. But this argument is vulnerable in at least two ways.

First, it does not explain why an omnipotent God couldn't have created laws of nature which would never actually lead to any natural evil. A possible response to this is that even God is bound by the laws of nature; but this suggests that God is not really omnipotent.

This is why the potential of GiveWell is revolutionary. In the United States, individual donors give about \$200 billion to charities each year. No one knows how effective that vast sum is in achieving the goals that donors intend to support. By giving charities an incentive to become more transparent and more focused on being demonstrably effective, GiveWell could make our charitable donations do much more good than ever before.

from Project Syndicate, February 14, 2008

Postscript: In the years since this column was written, GiveWell has thrived, increasing its staff to enable it to do more research. In 2015, GiveWell tracked approximately \$100 million dollars in donations going to its recommended charities as a result of its research. The current list of its top-ranked charities is available at www.givewell.org.

BLATANT BENEVOLENCE

JESUS SAID THAT WE SHOULD GIVE ALMS in private rather than when others are watching. That fits with the commonsense idea that if people only do good in public, they may be motivated by a desire to gain a reputation for generosity. Perhaps when no one is looking, they are not generous at all.

That thought may lead us to disdain the kind of philanthropic graffiti that leads to donors' names being prominently displayed on concert halls, art museums, and college buildings. Often, names are stuck not only over the entire building, but also on as many constituent parts of it as fundraisers and architects can manage.

According to evolutionary psychologists, such displays of blatant benevolence are the human equivalent of the male peacock's tail. Just as the peacock signals his strength and fitness by displaying his enormous tail—a sheer waste of resources from a practical point of view—so costly public acts of benevolence signal to potential mates that one possesses enough resources to give so much away.

From an ethical perspective, however, should we care so much about the purity of the motive with which the gift was made? Surely, what matters is that something was given to a good cause. We may well look askance at a lavish new concert hall, but not because the donor's name is chiseled into the marble façade. Rather, we should question whether, in a world in which 25,000 impoverished children die unnecessarily every day, another concert hall is what the world needs.

A substantial body of current psychological research points against Jesus's advice. One of the most significant factors determining whether people give to charity is their beliefs about what others are doing. Those who make it known that they give to charity increase the likelihood that others will do the same. Perhaps we will eventually reach a tipping point at which giving a significant amount to help the world's poorest becomes sufficiently widespread to eliminate the majority of those 25,000 needless daily deaths.

That is what Chris and Anne Ellinger hope their website, www.boldergiving.org, will achieve. The website tells the story of more than 50 members of the 50 Percent League—people who have given away either 50 percent of their assets or 50 percent of their income in each of the last three years. Members of the league want to change expectations about what is a “normal” or “reasonable” amount to give.

They are a diverse group of people. Tom White ran a big construction company, and started giving millions to Paul Farmer's efforts to bring health services to Haiti's rural poor. Tom Hsieh and his wife, Bree, made a commitment to live on less than the national median income, currently \$46,000 a year. As Hsieh, who is 36, earned more, they gave away more, mostly to organizations helping the poor in developing countries. Hal Taussig and his wife have given away about \$3 million, amounting to 90 percent of their assets, and now live happily on their social security checks.

Most donors see giving as personally rewarding. Hsieh says that whether or not his giving has saved the lives of others, it has saved his own: “I could easily have lived a life that was boring and inconsequential. Now I am graced with a life of service and meaning.” When people praise Hal Taussig for his generosity, he tells them, “Frankly, it's my way of getting kicks out of life.”

The 50 Percent League sets the bar high—perhaps too high for most people. James Hong started www.hotornot.com, a website that allows people to rate how “hot” other people are. It made him rich. He has pledged to give away 10 percent of everything he earns over \$100,000. Hong's website, www.10over100.org, invites others to do likewise. So far, more than 3,500 people have.

Hong sets the bar low. If you earn less than \$100,000, you don't have to give away anything at all, and if you earn, say, \$110,000, you would be required to give away only \$1,000—less than 1 percent of your income. That is not generous at all. Many of those earning less than \$100,000 can also afford to give something. Still, Hong's formula is simple, and it starts to bite when earnings get really big. If you earn a million dollars a year, you have pledged to give \$90,000, or 9 percent of what you earn, which is more than most rich people give.

We need to get over our reluctance to speak openly about the good we do. Silent giving will not change a culture that deems it sensible to spend all your money on yourself and your family, rather than to help those in greater need—even though helping others is likely to bring more fulfillment in the long run.

from Project Syndicate, June 13, 2008

Postscript: Bolder Giving is still flourishing, and its 50 percent pledge helped to inspire Bill and Melinda Gates to set up the Giving Pledge (www.givingpledge.org) asking the world's wealthiest people to pledge to give half of their wealth to charity before they die. (My own book, *The Life You Can Save*, was also an influence on the Gates's thinking.) As of January 2016, more than 130 billionaires have pledged to

IS IT OK TO CHEAT AT FOOTBALL?

SHORTLY BEFORE HALF-TIME in the World Cup elimination match between England and Germany on June 27, the English midfielder Frank Lampard had a shot at goal that struck the crossbar and bounced down onto the ground, clearly over the goal line. The goalkeeper, Manuel Neuer, grabbed the ball and put it back into play. Neither the referee nor the linesman, both of whom were still coming down the field—and thus were poorly positioned to judge—signaled a goal, and play continued.

After the match, Neuer gave this account of his actions: "I tried not to react to the referee and just concentrate on what was happening. I realized it was over the line and I think the way I carried on so quickly fooled the referee into thinking it was not over."

To put it bluntly: Neuer cheated, and then boasted about it. By any normal ethical standards, what Neuer did was wrong. But does the fact that Neuer was playing football mean that the only ethical rule is "Win at all costs"?

In soccer, that does seem to be the prevailing ethic. The most famous of these incidents was Diego Maradona's goal in Argentina's 1986 World Cup match against England, which he later described as having been scored "a little with the head of Maradona and a little with the hand of God." Replays left no doubt that it was the hand of Maradona that scored the goal. Twenty years later, he admitted in a BBC

interview that he had intentionally acted as if it were a goal, in order to deceive the referee.

Something similar happened last November, in a game between France and Ireland that decided which of the two nations went to the World Cup. The French striker Thierry Henry used his hand to control the ball and pass to a teammate, who scored the decisive goal. Asked about the incident after the match, Henry said: "I will be honest, it was a handball. But I'm not the ref. I played it, the ref allowed it. That's a question you should ask him."

But is it? Why should the fact that you can get away with cheating mean that you are not culpable? Players should not be exempt from ethical criticism for what they do on the field, any more than they are exempt from ethical criticism for cheating off the field—for example, by taking performance-enhancing drugs.

Sports today are highly competitive, with huge amounts of money at stake, but that does not mean it is impossible to be honest. In cricket, if a batsman hits the ball and one of the fielders catches it, the batsman is out. Sometimes when the ball is caught the umpire cannot be sure if the ball has touched the edge of the bat. The batsman usually knows and traditionally should "walk"—leave the ground—if he knows that he is out.

Some still do. The Australian batsman Adam Gilchrist "walked" in the 2003 World Cup semi-final against Sri Lanka, although the umpire had already declared him not out. His decision surprised some of his teammates but won applause from many cricket fans.

An Internet search brought me just one clear-cut case of a footballer doing something equivalent to a batsman walking. In 1996, Liverpool striker Robbie Fowler was awarded a

penalty for being fouled by the Arsenal goalkeeper. He told the referee that he had not been fouled, but the referee insisted that he take the penalty kick. Fowler did so, but in a manner that enabled the goalkeeper to save it.

Why are there so few examples of such behavior from professional footballers? Perhaps a culture of excessive partisanship has trumped ethical values. Fans don't seem to mind if members of their own team cheat successfully; they only object when the other side cheats. That is not an ethical attitude. (Though, to their credit, many French football followers, from President Nicolas Sarkozy down, expressed their sympathy for Ireland after Henry's handball.)

Yes, we can deal with the problem to some extent by using modern technology or video replays to review controversial refereeing decisions. But, while that will reduce the opportunity for cheating, it won't eliminate it, and it isn't really the point. We should not make excuses for intentional cheating in sports. In one important way, it is much worse than cheating in one's private life. When what you do will be seen by millions, revisited on endless video replays, and dissected on television sports programs, it is especially important to do what is right.

How would football fans have reacted if Neuer had stopped play and told the referee that the ball was a goal? Given the rarity of such behavior in football, the initial reaction would no doubt have been surprise. Some German fans might have been disappointed. But the world as a whole—and every fair-minded German fan too—would have had to admit that he had done the right thing.

Neuer missed a rare opportunity to do something noble in front of millions of people. He could have set a positive ethical example to people watching all over the world, including the many millions who are young and impressionable.

Who knows what difference that example might have made to the lives of many of those watching? Neuer could have been a hero, standing up for what is right. Instead, he is just another footballer who is very skillful at cheating.

from Project Syndicate, June 28, 2010