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Trust and trustworthiness in modern society: an introduction from a Western Perspective

“You enter a food shop and buy some food.
You apply for a driver’slicense at the government.
You go to the bank for a cash withdrawal.
You switch on your computer and connect to the internet”
These are just four examples of activities from daily live that are hardly possible without some form of trust. Because of the complexity of our modern society, we cannot fully control or have full knowledge of the complete background of many activities.Consequently, we have to rely on many others, both individuals and institutions. The question is whether this is a problem.From philosophy and social sciences this question has been discussed and analyzed (e.g., Baier, Hardin, O’Neill). Some argue trust is an essential element for each society and an increased need of trust in modern society is no problem. Others argue that trust makes a society or individuals vulnerable and therefore should be addressed with suspicion. They argue that organized distrust is the best way to keep a society or institution running. This course aims to introduce the debate on trust and trustworthiness in four steps. First, the concept of trust is analyzed in order to have clarity on the central theme of the course. Second, the problem of trust is analyzed. Is there a real increase of the need to trust, is there a lack of trust and if so, is that to be considered as a problem? Third, a number of accounts to address the problems of trust are discussed, such as risk assessment, improved communication and transparency. Fourth, it will be argued that a promising way to deal with the question of trust is to start the analysis in the concept of trustworthiness. Finally, the course will apply the theoretical analyses to three field in which (problems of) trust play an important role: food production, (bio)technology and science.



Part I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION: trust in modern society
Session 1: Introduction to the problem of trust in modern society
Session 2: Conceptual analysis of trust
Session 3a: Trust as a philosophical notion: the position of trust in the history of philosophy
Session 3b: Trust as a philosophical notion: the recognition of the individual agent
Part II. THREE WAYS TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM OF TRUST
These four sessions aim to answer the question how problems of trust can be addressed. Two general approaches are analyzed (risk and information). Next a third proposal is presented and discussed.
Session 4: Trust and risk management
Session 5: Why providing more information is not enough for building trust
Session 6: From trust to trustworthiness: a matter of competence and motivation
Session 7: Problems of trustworthiness on an institutional level
Part III. BUILDING TRUST AND MORAL PLURALITY
Session 8: Introduction to moral and ethical pluralism in the context of trust
Session 9: Accommodation, compromises and dealing with plurality
Session 10: Trust, trustworthiness and the importance of integrity
Part IV. TRUST AND TRUSTWORTHINESS IN PRACTICE
In these four sessions, the theoretical analyses will be explicitly discussed in the context of three practices in which (problems of) trust play an important role: food production, (bio)technology and science.
Session 11: Food production
Session 12: Biotechnology
Session 13: Science
Session 14: Closing session
All sessions will require active input from students. This input can have different forms (a) presentation of the literature or additional literature, (b) presentation of case studies that link theory to practice and (c) formulating statements for class discussion.



Central Books are:
• Hardin, R., 2006, Trust, Cambridge: Polity Press
• Meijboom, F.L.B., 2008, Problems of trust: A question of trustworthiness. An ethical inquiry of trust  and trustworthiness in the context of the agricultural and food sector. Utrecht University. (as pfd. available)
• O’Neill, O., 2002, A Question of Trust, BBC Reith lectures, Cambridge: Cambridge  University Press



In the course we aim to work with a reader with texts that will be made available electronically in advance. The reader will include texts such as:

• Baier, A.C., 1994a [1986], ‘Trust and antitrust’, in: A.C. Baier, Moral Prejudices, essays on  ethics, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 95-129
• Hardin, R., 2006, Trust, Cambridge: Polity Press
• Hollis, M. 1998. Trust Within Reason. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
• Holton, R., 1994, ‘Deciding to trust, coming to believe’, Australian Journal of Philosophy, 72, pp. 63-76
• Hume, D. 1737.A Treatise of Human Nature. Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975 [1737].
• Lahno, B., 2001, ‘On the emotional character of trust’, Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, 4, pp. 171-189
• Lagerspetz, O. (1998). Trust: The Tacit Demand, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
• Luhmann, N. (1988). ‘Familiarity, confidence, trust: problems and alternatives’, in: Gambetta, D. (ed.), Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 94-107.
• O’Neill, O., 2002, A Question of Trust, BBC Reith lectures, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
• Ruscio, K.P., 1999, ‘Jay’s Pirouette, Or Why Political Trust Is Not The Same As Personal  Trust’, Administration & Society, 31/5, 639-657

窗体底端