

# LEADERSHIP ETHICS

LDST 450 / Fall 2022

*Instructor:* Dr. Marilie Coetsee (she/hers or ze/zir)

*Primary Email:*<sup>1</sup> [coetsee.jepson@gmail.com](mailto:coetsee.jepson@gmail.com)

*Office Hours:* Tuesday 4:30-5:30pm and by appointment.

## COURSE DESCRIPTION

In this course, you will develop the skills you need to analyze leaders' ethical decisions by way of critical engagement with the Euro-American tradition of philosophical ethics. We will begin in the first half of the semester by examining three prominent theories of ***normative ethics: utilitarian ethics, Kantian ethics, and virtue ethics***. We will examine what these theories have to teach us about how leaders ought to negotiate conflicts between the interests of themselves, their groups, and the broader global society. As we will see, each of these theories offers a different understanding of the nature of the interests that a leader must consider: utilitarians urge leaders to focus on persons' interests in happiness, Kantians urge leaders to focus on persons' interests in having their rights and freedoms protected, and virtue ethicists urge leaders to focus on persons' interests in living virtuous, flourishing lives.

To see how our theoretical study of normative ethics applies to practical, real-world problems, we will use Kantian ethics, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics to analyze two historical case studies: first, President Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima in 1945 and, second, President Kennedy and NASA's decision to spend billions of dollars to send astronauts to the moon in 1969, even amidst pressing problems concerning poverty and civil rights at home.

Our discussion about the US's decision to send astronauts to the moon will lead us to reflect on questions about ***moral psychology and moral responsibility***. Even leaders who have a good cognitive grasp of the right moral rules can still fail to act ethically due to lack of self-awareness about, or control over, their attitudes, emotions, and selfish desires. Starting with a consideration of how fascination with going to the moon may potentially have distracted leaders from attending to pressing problems of poverty here on earth, we will specifically consider how leaders' ***implicit attitudes*** can undermine their ability to successfully navigate ethical challenges—even when they do not consciously *intend* to act unethically. We will also investigate different models for understanding whether and how leaders are morally responsible for the harmful effects of their actions in these kinds of cases.

In the final part of the course, we will examine major theories of ***political philosophy***. In this portion of the course, we will be less focused on leaders' decisions about how to address specific moral dilemmas, and more focused on what principles justify leaders in choosing some rules or goals over others as guides for their group. For instance, we will ask: to what extent should leaders' work to achieve the goals their followers prefer, as opposed to aiming towards independently valuable moral ends? How should leaders address disagreements between followers with different religious or cultural values? To what extent are leaders justified in imposing rules

---

<sup>1</sup> This is my preferred email for communication about the class, but I also answer emails sent to [mcoetsee@richmond.edu](mailto:mcoetsee@richmond.edu).

that redistribute resources among followers, and why? We will consider what three theories of political justification—*social contract theory*, *communitarianism*, and *political perfectionism*—have to say about these questions.

In the final section of the course, we will reflect in more detail on the concrete decision procedures that leaders should employ. Specifically, we'll consider what sorts of moral considerations speak in favor of leaders' choosing to make decisions by way of democratic vote, consultation with experts, or group deliberation. We will also discuss whether and when followers are justified in committing acts of civil disobedience in response to problematic rules imposed by a leader. In this portion of the course, we will apply what we learn to decisions about whether and when to remove confederate monuments at UNC Chapel Hill and on Richmond's Monument Avenue.

### **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

Students should be able to use moral and political theories we discuss to analyze the decisions of everyday leaders, as well as current social and political events and pressing matters of justice.

*More specifically:*

Students should be able to use the insights of utilitarianism, Kantianism, and virtue ethics to recognize and assess the importance of morally relevant details in the ethical dilemmas that leaders face.

Students should be cognizant of the important role that implicit attitudes (emotions, desires, etc.) can play in undermining leaders' ability to follow through on their moral obligations, be able to critically analyze whether and how leaders are responsible for resulting moral shortcomings, and appreciate the role that followers may have in addressing the cultural and structural problems that are associated with the wider presence of such implicit attitudes in a group.

Students should understand and be able to apply the core principles of political ethics specified by social contract theory, perfectionism, and communitarianism. They should be able to use these principles to assess whether leaders are justified in trying to compel those in their group to abide by some rules or pursue some goals over others.

Students should appreciate the moral difficulties that attend collective decision-making in contexts where members of the group disagree about what should be done. They should be able to thoughtfully analyze how leaders and followers should push for change when rules are unjust or otherwise unhelpful.

Students should be able to critically re-evaluate their views in light of the moral and political theories we discuss, as well as questions and concerns raised by others. After critical reflection, they should be able to clearly articulate the reasons for their views, as well as to be able to discern, understand, and engage the kinds of reasons and arguments that motivate others to hold alternative perspectives.

## **COURSE MATERIALS**

All readings will be available on Blackboard. Although you are not required to pay for any books, you will need to pay \$29 to use the Packback platform we will be using for discussion forums.

## **COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

- 5% Weekly Quizzes
- 8% DEI Presentation, Activity, and Reflection
- 17% Packback Posts, Participation, and Attendance
- 15% Hiroshima Guided Reflection\*
- 20% Midterm Exam\*
- 10% Applied Analysis Project
- 25% Final Exam / Applied Analysis Paper

\* *You may choose to revise one of these.*

### **5%: Weekly Reading Checks**

The education literature suggests that quizzes are very effective at helping students to internalize and retain information. The quizzes are low stakes (each is only worth .5% of your final grade). You may use your notes and unlimited time to complete them, *but no other human beings*. Many of the questions from quizzes will show up in a related form on your midterm and final exam, and whether you get the question right on the midterm/final will often count for more than if you get it right initially when you take the quiz.

Quizzes will be available on Blackboard by Friday at around 5pm (the week prior to when the reading is due) and are *due by the start of class on Thursday*. Your score as well as the correct answers to the quiz will be available by 5pm Thursday after class. I will detract one point (out of a typical three points) for quizzes that are late without a legitimate excuse.

### **8%: DEI Presentation, Activity, and Reflection**

*Presentation (4.5%):* You and partner will select a day of class where you will connect or compare/contrast the reading to an underrepresented perspective or to events affecting an underrepresented community. For example, you may connect the reading to:

- an event based in an international context outside of the US or Western Europe
- an event in the US *or on campus* that relates to communities that have historically been underrepresented in the US
- a historical or contemporary instance in which the theory we are discussing was leveraged as a “justification” for injustice.

*(For instance, the theory of property that Nozick discusses was historically used as an excuse to delegitimize the land claims of indigenous peoples in the Americas.)*

- an ethical concept that comes from a tradition that is not represented in this class. This may include concepts, ideas, or stories from religious traditions.

*More details on this will be provided in a separate assignment sheet.*

*Activity & Reflection (3.5%):* There will not be class on Tuesday, October 25 in order to make space for you to do one of the following:

- (a) Attend a talk or lecture on (or off) campus in which you learn about a perspective that either has historically not been well-represented within Euro-American academia and/or is not well-represented in this class. (This may include religious perspectives! However, that religious perspective should either (a) be a minority religious perspective within the US (not mainstream Christianity) OR (b) if it is a mainstream Christian perspective, be a perspective that relates Christianity to some community that has historically been underserved or underrepresented.)
- (b) Participate in our prison correspondence program. You will write three letters to someone who is incarcerated in Virginia and they will write three letters back.
- (c) Participate in some other on or off campus organization that bears on the experience of a community that has historically been underserved or underrepresented, and in which you get to see the dynamics of leadership play out over time.

For one week, your reflection on Packback should be on your activity/event. You should summarize the main points of interest and relate that activity/event to leadership and our class material. If you choose option (b) your reflection should be after you have written and received at least two letters. Otherwise, you may choose which week you write your reflection. This should be about 300-400 words.

Some other week, you should reply to someone else's reflection. You should note what you learned from their reflection, connect it to any relevant ideas or experiences you may have, and further expand on how what they say relates to something in the reading. This should be 200-300 words. (Note that this reply does not substitute for one of your standard Packback's.)

***Please feel free to email me if there is a perspective you'd really like to explore but you are not sure if it counts as 'underrepresented.' I am very open to dialogue about this!***

### **17%: Packback Posts, Participation, and Attendance**

*Packback Posts (9%):*

Most weeks, you should submit at least one substantial, open-ended question or substantial response to someone else's question on our discussion forum, Packback. Some days I will ask you to post on a specific question or topic, but most days you will have free reign to bring up topics related to the reading you want to discuss. The one major constraint is this: your posts must always show critical engagement with one or more of the core readings that are due for that day.\*

—\**'Core readings'*: I will often have you read a short news article or a couple paragraphs from a philosophy paper to get you thinking about a case or an objection to the main readings. Your posts can certainly include reference to these, but they should generally not just be about these. I want to see evidence that you engaged with the core ideas for a particular day. Email me if you have any questions on this and I will get right back to you.

—Somewhere in your post, you should paraphrase some argument that is offered in one of the core readings, reference a page number, and—if needed—provide a direct quotation.

Note that an ‘argument’ in this context is not simply a claim or a conclusion reached in the reading; you should include reference to some of the *reasons* offered for that claim or conclusion. If there is an unsupported claim in the reading, you may make note of that and provide an argument against it.

—See the next page for ideas on how you can engage in critical philosophical dialogue about an argument.

—You will be assigned to an “A” Group or “B” Group, and most of the time you will alternate which days of the week you post. Posts will begin the second week of class. If you are in the 1:30pm class, you should post by 11:30am. If you are in the 3pm class, you should post by 12:30pm.

—You do not need to post on the week where you post your DEI reflection OR the week where you do your DEI presentation.

#### *Attendance and In-Class Participation (8%):*

*Attendance:* Attendance is important because this is a discussion-based class, and you cannot participate in or learn from discussion if you are not in class. As a default, you get two free excused absences. You may use these absences for whatever you wish, but I recommend that you save them to cover emergencies, minor illnesses, and/or job interviews you cannot reschedule. Because you get two free absences, the ‘bar’ for a third absence is normally quite high: a third absence will only be permitted in exceptional cases. An unexcused absence will typically detract .5% from your *final* grade. Please come talk to me as soon as possible if you anticipate or are having problems concerning attendance.

*In-Class Participation:* You may have out your compuDo not be staring at your computer for most of class. Listen thoughtfully to others’ comments and questions, as well as the lecture. Takes notes where possible and relevant.

I value quality over quantity. Try to offer at least *one* quality contribution *most* days you are in class. I encourage you to draw on your Packback posts, and I will often explicitly ask you to share about your post. I also encourage you to write down other comments and questions before coming to class. I will always try to prioritize those in class who have not yet spoken in a particular period and/or who do not tend to speak as much in general.

*Computer Policy:* You may have out your computer to actively take notes during lecture, but when lecture is over I strongly prefer that you take any further notes by hand. (I will tend to use GoogleDocs for class notes and will make these available to you afterward so that should help.) You may also open up your computer if you need to reference a specific reading in class discussion, but if you have your computer open during discussion I will take that as a sign that you are thinking of something you might want to say, and I may call on you randomly to hear what that is. You may pass if necessary but if that starts to happen a lot that will severely detract from your participation grade. If you have special circumstances and you think any of this might be a problem for you, please let me know.

### *Tips for Participation*

Here are some ideas about how you can participate in conversation. These ideas—and much of the language for articulating these ideas—come from Olivia Bailey’s ‘But How Do I Participate?’<sup>2</sup>

- **Reconstruct an argument:** When faced with a difficult or complex argument, try to reformulate it in your own words. This may be one of the most important ways for you to work on *understanding* what the argument actually is.
- **Apply the argument to a case:** To understand an argument, it can be useful to think about how the argument would apply to a particular case. (“You/the text says *p*, and I want to know what *p* would tell us about case *c*.”).
- **Offer a new reason to accept someone else’s claim:** Consider how their claim help inform our analysis of the reading and/or help make sense of another case or moral intuition you may have in mind. (“Utilitarians say that we should maximize happiness, and this makes sense of why we all think we should save a child drowning in a pond.”)
- **Offer an objection:** One way of offering an objection is to give a case for which the author’s/other participant’s claim seems to yield a problematic verdict. (“You say *p*, but here’s a case *c* where *p* seems not to be true.” Another is to find a logical error in the argument for a claim or to identify an assumption that is being made that you disagree with (“You seem to be taking *a* for granted in arguing that *b*, but I’m not convinced that *a* is true, so *b* looks shaky to me”). When lodging an objection, it is important to be charitable. Try to be sure the objection is to the actual claim at issue
- **Ask a clarificatory question:** Before you object to a claim made by the text or by someone in the class, it will often be helpful to ask for clarification about what that claim is. Sometimes, we run together two concepts that should actually be held apart and considered separately, and if you are uncertain as to whether someone else’s concept of something matches with the concept you have in mind, you should flag that.
- **Offer a case:** It can be useful to identify specific cases against which the adequacy of an author’s claims can be tested. Cases can be imagined or real, and they can be offered in (at least) three different spirits: (1) to challenge a claim (“you say *p*, but here’s a case *c* where *p* seems not to be true”) (2) to support a claim (“you say *p*, which does a really nice job of handling case *c*”) (3) to help learn more about a claim and/or the case (“you say *p*, I want to know what *p* would tell us about *c*”).
- **Ask about the big picture:** What’s the basic issue this text or this discussion is tackling? Why does this issue matter? These are critically important questions, and they point to an area where assumptions often lurk. Does everybody seem to assume that *q* is a really important question, but you don’t get why? Time to ask about the big picture! You may also ask how the success or failure of some particular part of the argument you’ve been considering bears on the bigger picture.
- **Put one text or claim into conversation with another:** It can be useful to link the claim(s) you are considering to other claim(s) you have encountered earlier, whether in different texts/discussions or in the very same text/conversation. Do they support each other? Do they

---

<sup>2</sup> Full text is available at <https://obailey.weebly.com/>.

contradict each other, or at least sit in some tension with each other? Are they perhaps the same claim, put in different terms?

### **15% Hiroshima Guided Reflection**

You will be asked to compare and contrast what Kantian and Utilitarian theories have to say about an ethical decision made by a leader. You may either choose your own problem (from politics, history, literature, etc.) *or* you may write on Truman's decision to drop the nuclear bomb on Hiroshima (which we will have discussed in detail in class). If you are new to philosophy, I recommend you write about the case we will discuss in class (Hiroshima) because it gives you more time to focus on understanding the theoretical parts of the arguments. However, if you have already feel very comfortable with Kantian and Utilitarian theories and/or wish to explore a new issue, you can pick your own topic. If you do so, I will give you a little bit of extra grace on your grade. (For instance, if you are at the edge of a B+ and A-, I would bump you up to the A-.)

### **10%: Applied Analysis Project**

As we complete our unit on ethics and move into discussions about moral psychology and political philosophy, you and a partner will pick an applied problem related to leadership ethics that you will explore from three different angles: (1) moral psychology and responsibility, (2) principles of political justification, and (3) theories of political decision-making. On the final day of class, you will pick one of your explorations to develop and present to the class as a whole. By default, I ask that you consider something related to diversity, equity, and inclusion. However, if there is another topic you are really interested in let me know and we will work something out.

One of the goals of this project is to teach you to engage constructively with those who disagree with you. As a result, for each exploration you and your partner do, you must offer *contrasting* perspectives. You do not have to genuinely be at odds on every detail you end up arguing for, but I do want you to start with at least the seeds of some real, different inclinations on the issue you decide to discuss. (For instance, you may be inclined in a different direction from your partner on an issue, and then do your best to explore what the strongest argument for that side of the issue is, even if you do not end up genuinely thinking every point you argue for.) To make this work, you will need to find a topic over which there could be reasonable disagreement. Details will be provided as we get to the end of the ethics unit, but here are some deadlines to get on your calendar:

Below you will find the schedule of assignments related to this project. Please note that:

- The current word counts are estimates to give you ballpark idea of how much work you will be needing to do; they may change slightly.
- The assignments that are starred will be submitted as part of your midterm/final, and so will count towards that grade.

Tuesday, October 4 *by midnight*: Pick your topic and each write a short paragraph on a contrasting perspective *related to virtue ethics OR moral psychology and responsibility*. This paragraph should give me a rough idea of what key claims and arguments you will make and refer to the relevant readings. This paragraph is pass/fail. I simply want you to get

thinking about the topic. However, if you want to get a head start on your writing, I encourage you to meet with me and/or put some real effort into this and ask for more substantial feedback. (*No Packback post required this Tuesday.*)

\* Thursday, October 27 *by noon before class*: By noon on the day of the midterm, you will need to submit ~550 words arguing for one side of the debate from the standpoint of virtue ethics or moral psychology and responsibility. I will print out your argument and give it to your partner during the exam. They will be required to write a response as part of the midterm. Both your ~550 words and your response will count towards the written portion of your Midterm Exam grade. (There will also be one other question for you to give a written answer to for the midterm. Possibilities for what this question may be will be distributed beforehand.)

Tuesday, November 22 *by midnight*: Each submit ~750 words on a contrasting perspective, drawing on the readings on political philosophy. You should both focus either on readings that address principles of political justification (from unit 3A) OR on readings that address political decision procedures (from unit 3B). (You may negotiate this deadline with your partner if you want, so long as you both meet the next deadline.)

Tuesday, November 29 *by class*: You should both submit both your ~750 words and a draft of a ~350 word response to your partner. During class, you should talk about your responses and work on your final poster. Your poster should highlight the main ideas on each side, and also offer a synthesis of both sides in which you and your partner either persuade one another of one view or (more likely) find a middle-ground which makes some reasonable concessions to each side.

Thursday, December 1 *by class*: Present your poster to class. Write down questions and objections about other students' presentation.

\* Tuesday, December 13 *by midnight*: Submit a paper that takes the form of a dialogue about your topic. In addition to polishing the ~750 word statement you've already written, you should also paraphrase your partner's objections in your own words, and write a response to their objection. Finally, you should answer one of the questions offered from another student on the last day of class that addresses whichever subunit you *didn't* focus on (whether that is 3A, on principles of political justification or 3B, on political decision procedures.)

### **20% Midterm Exam**

The midterm exam will cover material from the first half of the semester. There will be a multiple choice portion that draws largely (though not entirely) from related quiz questions, and a written portion that will be mostly (though not entirely) related to your applied analysis project.



## **20% Final Exam**

The final exam will cover material from the whole semester, with an emphasis on the material from the second half of the semester. The written portion will be mostly (though not entirely) related to your applied analysis project.

## **GRADING**

The numerical values for final letter grades are as follows:

A+ 100-97	B+ 89.99-87	C+ 79.99-77	D+ 69.99-67	F 59.99 >
A 96.99-94	B 86.99-84	C 76.99-74	D 66.99-64	
A- 93.99-90	B- 83.99-80	C- 73.99-70	D- 63.99-60	

## **Reading Schedule**

Readings are subject to change. All readings will be available on Blackboard, and you should always consult there to find your reading assignment.

<i>Unit 1: Ethics</i>	
1.	<b><i>Tuesday, August 23</i></b>
	<b>Why Do Moral Theory? An Introduction to Utilitarianism and Kantianism</b>
2.	<b><i>Thursday, August 25</i></b>
	<b>Do We Need a Revolution? Utilitarianism, Poverty, and (Im)Partiality</b> Singer, selections from “Famine, Affluence, and Morality” Price, “The Utilitarian View of Everyday Leadership” from <i>Leadership Ethics</i> Friedman, selections from “The Practice of Partiality”
3.	<b><i>Tuesday, August 30</i></b>
	<b>Advanced Utilitarianism: Rights as (Very Reliable) Rules of Thumb</b> Driver, selections on Utilitarianism, Rights, and Rules of Thumb RM Hare, key passages from “Rights and Justice” Selections from exchange between Nagel and RM Hare: Nagel, “War and Massacre” and Hare, “Rules of War and Moral Reasoning” Gunter, “Why Japan? The Racism of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki Bombings” <i>Watch assigned video clips on Hiroshima &amp; Nagasaki (see Blackboard).comm</i>

<b>4.</b>	<b><i>Thursday, September 1</i></b>
	<p><b>Another Basis for Rights: Kantian Ethics and Consent</b></p> <p>Sandel, “What Matters is the Motive: Immanuel Kant”</p> <p>Selections from O’Neill, “Kantian Approaches to Some Famine Problems” and Thomson, “Turning the Trolley”</p> <p>Driver, selections on ‘Integrity and Negative Responsibility’ and ‘Criticisms and Responses’</p> <p>Ciulla, passage on Kant and Moral Luck</p>
<b>5.</b>	<b><i>Tuesday, September 6</i></b>
	<p><b>Advanced Kantianism: Integrity, Intentions, and the Doctrine of Double Effect</b></p> <p>Driver, “Constraints”, “The Doctrine of Doing and Allowing,” “The Doctrine of Double Effect”</p> <p>Quinn, “Actions, Intentions, and Consequences: The Doctrine of Double Effect”</p>
<b>6.</b>	<b><i>Thursday, September 8</i></b>
	<p><b>Debate: Was it wrong to drop the atomic bomb?</b></p> <p><i>Prepare for Debate: Required Reflection</i></p> <p>This reflection will help you prepare for the debate <i>and</i> your upcoming paper.</p> <p>Detailed instructions to be distributed.</p>
<b>7.</b>	<b><i>Tuesday, September 13</i></b>
	<p><b>When Good People Do Bad Things: Pluralism and the Problem of Dirty Hands</b></p> <p>Walzer, selection from “The Problem of Dirty Hands”</p> <p>Nussbaum, “Aeschylus and Practical Conflict” in <i>The Fragility of Goodness</i></p> <p>Nussbaum, “Emotions as Evaluative Judgments”</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b><i>Thursday, September 15</i></b>
	<p><b>Virtue Ethics, Practical Wisdom, and the Emotions</b></p> <p>Watch Schwartz, “Our Loss of Wisdom” and “The Harvard Happiness Study”</p> <p>3 Key Ideas from Virtue Ethics: selections from Driver’s <i>Ethics: The Fundamentals</i> and Shafer-Landau’s <i>Fundamentals of Ethics</i></p> <p>Schwartz, “Practical Wisdom: Aristotle Meets Positive Psychology”</p> <p>Aristotle, selections on “Human Happiness and Excellence” from <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i></p>

<b>9.</b>	<b><i>Tuesday, September 20</i></b>
	<p><b>Living it Up: Virtue, Happiness, and Human Flourishing</b></p> <p>Watch assigned portions of <i>The Right Stuff</i></p> <p>Nozick, “The Experience Machine”</p> <p>Selections on the Space Program (“The Right Stuff: 50 Years Later’, ‘Drink, Debauchery, and Despair’, ‘Whitey’s on the Moon’</p>
<b><i>Unit 2: Moral Psychology and Responsibility</i></b>	
<b>10.</b>	<b><i>Thursday, September 22</i></b>
	<p><b>Willful Ignorance and Echo Chambers</b></p> <p>Wolf, ‘Sanity and the Metaphysics of Responsibility’</p> <p>Selections from Nguyen, ‘Escape the Echo Chamber’ and Wieland, ‘Willful Ignorance’</p>
<p><b>Friday, September 23*: HIROSHIMA GUIDED REFLECTION DUE</b></p> <p><i>*Flexible deadline. You may ask for a short extension, no questions asked.</i></p>	
<b>11.</b>	<b><i>Tuesday, September 27</i></b>
	<p><b>Implicit Bias and Moral Responsibility</b></p> <p>Payne, “Implicit Bias: The Psychology of Ordinary Prejudice in Everyday Lives” (Video)</p> <p>Zheng, selections from “Attributability, Accountability, and Implicit Bias”</p>
<b>12.</b>	<b><i>Thursday, September 29</i></b>
	<p><b>Structural Injustice and Moral Responsibility</b></p> <p>Haslanger, “Social Structure, Narrative and Explanation”</p> <p>Selections from McHugh and Davidson on “Epistemic Responsibility and Implicit Bias” and Hayward on “Epistemologies of Ignorance”</p>

<b>Unit 3: Political Philosophy</b>	
<b>Unit 3.A: Theories of Political Justification</b>	
<b>13.</b>	<b>Tuesday, October 4</b>
	<p><b>Introduction to Political Philosophy &amp; Nozick’s Social Contract Theory</b></p> <p>Instructor’s Supplement: Political Philosophy and Leadership Ethics</p> <p>Shafer-Landau, selections from “The Social Contract Tradition”</p> <p>Sandel, “Do We Own Ourselves? Libertarianism,” <i>Justice: What’s the Right Thing to Do?</i></p>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Thursday, October 6</b>
	<p><b>Applying Nozick: Reparations &amp; Land Claims</b></p> <p>Nozick, passage on ‘The Principle of Rectification’</p> <p>Boxill, selections from ‘A Lockean Argument for Black Reparations’</p> <p>Wilkins, ‘Preface’ and ‘The Cobell Trust Fund Settlement—An Accounting’ from <i>Hollow Justice</i></p> <p><i>All classes meet at 3pm. Please let me know if you can’t make it.</i></p>
<b>Tuesday, October 11: Fall Study Break!</b>	
<b>15.</b>	<b>Thursday, October 13</b>
	<p><b>Applying Nozick: Sweatshops, Coercion, and the Free Market</b></p> <p>Zwolinski, “Sweatshops, Choice, and Exploitation”</p> <p>Frankfurt, short excerpt on “Coercion and Moral Responsibility”</p> <p>Meyers, selections from “Wrongful Beneficence: Exploitation and Third World Sweatshops,” <i>Journal of Social Philosophy</i></p>
<b>16.</b>	<b>Tuesday, October 18</b>
	<p><b>Introduction to Rawlsian Social Contract Theory</b></p> <p>Sandel, selections from “The Case for Equality: John Rawls,” <i>Justice: What’s the Right Thing to Do?</i></p> <p>Freeman, “The Original Position and the Difference Principle”</p>

17.	<b>Thursday, October 20</b>
	<p><b>Guest Speaker:</b>  <b>Chong Choe-Smith, “Should Undocumented Immigrants Have Access to Public Benefits?”</b>  <i>All classes meet at 1:30pm on Zoom.</i></p>
19.	<b>Tuesday, October 25</b>
	<b>No class. DEI event/activity substituted for class.</b>
20.	<b>Thursday, October 27</b>
	<b>MIDTERM EXAM</b>
21.	<b>Tuesday, November 1</b>
8	<p><b>Rawlsian Social Contract Theory, Pt. 2: Religious Neutrality &amp; the Demands of Community</b>  Marneffe, “Rawlsian Neutrality”  Kymlicka, selections from “Communitarianism” in <i>Contemporary Political Philosophy</i>  Kymlicka, selections from <i>Multicultural Citizenship</i>  Wechter, “Trump Supporters Not Welcome,” short editorial from <i>New Times</i></p>
22.	<b>Thursday, November 3</b>
9	<p><b>Rawlsian Neutrality and Tolerating the Intolerant</b>  Rawls, selections on “Toleration and the Common Interest,” and “Toleration of the Intolerant,” <i>Theory of Justice</i>  Okin, selections from <i>Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?</i> and <i>Justice, Gender, and the Family</i>  Nussbaum, selections from “Reply to Okin” in <i>Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?</i>  Al-Hibri, selections from “Is Western Patriarchal Feminism Good for Third World/Minority Women?”</p>
23.	<b>Tuesday, November 8</b>
10	<p><b>Liberal Feminist Perfectionism</b>  George, “The Central Tradition” from <i>Making Men Moral: Civil Liberties and Public Morality</i>  Yuracko, “Towards Feminist Perfectionism: A Radical Critique of Rawlsian Liberalism,” <i>UCLA Women’s Law Journal</i></p>

<b>Unit 3.B: Political Decision Procedures</b>	
<b>24.</b>	<b>Thursday, November 10</b>
12	<p><b>Epistocracy</b></p> <p>Cristiano, “Democracy” from the International Encyclopedia of Ethics</p> <p>Brennan, selections from <i>Against Democracy</i></p>
<b>25.</b>	<b>Tuesday, November 15</b>
	<p><b>Deliberative Democracy</b></p> <p>Gutmann and Thompson, selections from <i>Why Deliberative Democracy?</i></p> <p>Young, selections from ‘Inclusion and Democracy’</p> <p>Brick and van der Linden, “How Identity, Not Issues, Explains the Partisan Divide”</p>
<b>26.</b>	<b>Thursday, November 17</b>
	<p><b>Civil Disobedience</b></p> <p>The Observer Editorial Board, “Silent Sam: UNC Protestors Decide Not to Wait for Change”. Watch short video clips on removal of Silent Sam</p> <p>Lebron, “Time for a New Black Radicalism,” <i>The New York Times</i></p> <p>King, selections from “Letter from a Birmingham Jail”</p> <p>Beinart, selections from “Left-Wing Protests Are Crossing the Line,” <i>The Atlantic</i></p> <p>Nagel, selections from “War and Massacres” (pt 2)</p>
<b>27.</b>	<b>Tuesday, November 22</b>
	<p><b>Tentative Guest Speaker: Dr. Lee (Monument Avenue Commission)</b></p> <p>Reading: Selections from Monument Avenue Commission Report</p> <p><i>All classes meet via Zoom.</i></p>
	<b>Thursday, November 24— No Class—Happy Thanksgiving!</b>
<b>28.</b>	<b>Tuesday, November 29</b>
	Review, Moral Relativism, and Work on Final Poster
<b>29.</b>	<b>Thursday, December 1</b>
	<b>Ethics Museum and Presentations</b>

## Equity and Inclusion Statement

**Course Content:** The authors you find on this syllabus reflect structural injustices of the past. Powers of colonialism, racism, and sexism have worked to the advantage of wealthy, straight, cis-gendered, males of European descent. They have been provided with opportunities for formal education that others were deprived of and—even when others have also been able to get a formal education—the voices of the former, generally more powerful group that have received disproportional amplification in the academy.

Different texts reflect the privileged positions of their authors to different extents, and we will examine some of the biased assumptions of the authors we read. We will also see that even texts written by authors from a powerful group can be used to critique the injustices that power sometimes reflects and perpetuates. Students are encouraged not to treat any author as a final authority on the issues they discuss. Your unique and diverse backgrounds give you a basis for developing new insights that our authors may have missed, and so you are encouraged to actively participate in the continuing development of our collective body of knowledge.

**Course Discussion:** As participants in this course, we must all work conscientiously to be aware of the variety of ways in which our statements can negatively impact others, including in particular those whose identify with historically marginalized groups. Even despite good intentions, you or I may say or do something that inadvertently causes harm to another student. If or when this happens, we must all be receptive to criticism. If other students *or I* say something in class that causes hurt or concern and you don't feel comfortable raising it in class at the time, please come talk to me. I hope that I am able to earn your trust enough so that you feel comfortable talking to me. However, if you do not feel comfortable talking to me in person, please feel free to leave an anonymous comment at <https://forms.gle/fwdFC7Mk7hSqddVK8>.

Please also note that no one is expected to serve as a representative for a community that they identify with during class discussions.

Finally, please see the 'Addressing Microaggressions on Campus' on the next page.

**Coursework:** If you feel like your performance in the class is being impacted by your experiences outside of class, please don't hesitate to come and talk with me.

If you wish to discuss any other issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, I would love to talk to you. I'm almost always available after class. You can also easily set up an appointment with me by emailing me at [coetsee.jepson@gmail.com](mailto:coetsee.jepson@gmail.com).

## Jepson School of Leadership Studies—Common Syllabus Insert

### *Awarding of Credit*

To be successful in this course, a student should expect to devote 10-14 hours each week, including class time and time spent on course-related activities.

[registrar.richmond.edu/services/policies/academic-credit.html](https://registrar.richmond.edu/services/policies/academic-credit.html)

### *Disability Accommodations*

Students with a Disability Accommodation Notice should contact their instructors as early in the semester as possible to discuss arrangements for completing course assignments and exams.

[disability.richmond.edu/](https://disability.richmond.edu/)

### *Honor System*

The Jepson School supports the provisions of the Honor System. The shortened version of the honor pledge is: “I pledge that I have neither received nor given unauthorized assistance during the completion of this work.”

[studentdevelopment.richmond.edu/student-handbook/honor/the-honor-code.html](https://studentdevelopment.richmond.edu/student-handbook/honor/the-honor-code.html)

### *Religious Observance*

Students should notify their instructors within the first two weeks of classes if they will need accommodations for religious observance.

[registrar.richmond.edu/planning/religiousobs.html](https://registrar.richmond.edu/planning/religiousobs.html)

### *Addressing Microaggressions on Campus*

Microaggressions are the everyday verbal, nonverbal, and environmental slights, snubs, or insults, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative messages to target persons based solely upon their marginalized group membership.<sup>1</sup> Recent research has found that, when professors do not address microaggressions in class, microaggressions foster alienation of marginalized groups.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, both students and faculty that are exposed to microaggressions more often are more likely to have depressive symptoms and negative affect (a negative view of the world).<sup>3</sup> A comfortable and productive environment where meaningful learning happens can be collectively created through actions, words, or environmental cues that promote the inclusion and success of marginalized members, recognizing their embodied identity, validating their realities, resisting sexism, ableism, and racism.<sup>4</sup>

The University of Richmond is committed to building an inclusive community. To this end, the Student Center for Equity and Inclusion (SCEI) was created in 2021 and offers ongoing support and assistance for a diverse student body.<sup>5</sup> With this in mind, as a community member at the University of Richmond, I pledge to address microaggressions in the classroom by holding myself, other students, and faculty accountable for what is said and being receptive to criticism when perpetuating these slights, snubs, or insults.

---

<sup>1</sup>Sue, S., Zane, N., Nagayama Hall, G. C., & Berger, L. K. (2009). The Case for Cultural Competency in Psychotherapeutic Interventions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(1), 525–548.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163651>

<sup>2</sup>Bergom, I., Wright, M.C., Brown, M.K. and Brooks, M. (2011), Promoting college student development through collaborative learning: A case study of *hevruta*. *About Campus*, 15: 19-25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.20044>

<sup>3</sup>Nadal, K. L., Griffin, K. E., Wong, Y., Hamit, S., & Rasmus, M. (2014). The Impact of Racial Microaggressions on Mental Health: Counseling Implications for Clients of Color. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 92(1), 57–66.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00130.x>

<sup>4</sup>Rolón-Dow, R. (2019). Stories of Microaggressions and Microaffirmation: A Framework for Understanding Campus Racial Climate. *NCID Currents*, 1(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/currents.17387731.0001.106>

<sup>5</sup> <https://inclusion.richmond.edu/>



## SYLLABUS INSERT REGARDING ACADEMIC AND PERSONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

### Hope N. Walton, Director Academic Skills

If you experience difficulties in this course, do not hesitate to consult with me. There are also other resources that can support you in your efforts to meet course requirements.

**Academic Skills Center** ([asc.richmond.edu](http://asc.richmond.edu)): Academic coaches assist students in assessing and developing their academic and life-skills (e.g., critical reading and thinking, information conceptualization, concentration, test preparation, time management, stress management, etc.). Peer tutors offer assistance in specific subject areas (e.g., calculus, chemistry, accounting, etc.) and will be available for appointments in-person and virtually. Peer tutors are listed on the ASC website. Email [Roger Mancastroppa \(rmancast@richmond.edu\)](mailto:Rmancast@richmond.edu) and [Hope Walton \(hwalton@richmond.edu\)](mailto:hwalton@richmond.edu) for coaching appointments in academic and life skills.

**Boatwright Library Research Librarians:** ([library.richmond.edu/help/ask/](http://library.richmond.edu/help/ask/) or 289-8876): Research librarians help students with all steps of their research, from identifying or narrowing a topic, to locating, accessing, evaluating, and citing information resources. Librarians support students in their classes across the curriculum and provide individual appointments, class library instruction, tutorials, and [research guides](http://libguides.richmond.edu) (libguides.richmond.edu). Students can [contact an individual librarian](http://library.richmond.edu/help/liaison-librarians.html) (library.richmond.edu/help/liaison-librarians.html) or ASK a librarian for help via email ([library@richmond.edu](mailto:library@richmond.edu)), text (804-277-9ASK), or [chat](http://library.richmond.edu/chat.html) (library.richmond.edu/chat.html).

**Career Services:** ([careerservices.richmond.edu](http://careerservices.richmond.edu) or 289-8547): Can assist you in exploring your interests and abilities, choosing a major or course of study, connecting with internships and jobs, and investigating graduate and professional school options. We encourage you to schedule an appointment with a career advisor early in your time at UR.

**Counseling and Psychological Services:** ([caps.richmond.edu](http://caps.richmond.edu) or 289-8119): Assists currently enrolled, full-time, degree-seeking students in improving their mental health and well-being, and in handling challenges that may impede their growth and development. Services include brief consultations, short-term counseling, skills-building classes, therapy groups, crisis intervention, psychiatric consultation, and related services.

**Disability Services:** ([disability.richmond.edu](http://disability.richmond.edu)): The Office of Disability Services works to ensure that qualified students with a disability (whether incoming or current) are provided with reasonable accommodations that enable students to participate fully in activities, programs, services and benefits provided to all students. Please let your professors know as soon as possible if you have an accommodation that requires academic coordination and planning.

**Speech Center:** ([speech.richmond.edu](http://speech.richmond.edu) or 287-6409): Assists with preparation and practice in the pursuit of excellence in public expression. Recording, playback, coaching and critique sessions are offered by teams of trained student consultants. During scheduled [appointments](#), consultants assist in developing ideas, arranging key points for more effective organization, improving style and delivery, and handling multimedia aids for individual and group presentations. We look forward to meeting your public speaking needs.

**Writing Center** ([writing.richmond.edu](http://writing.richmond.edu) or 289-8263): Assists writers at all levels of experience, across all majors. Students can schedule appointments with trained writing consultants who offer friendly critiques of written work.