Description
This course considers the question, "How can we fix injustice?" It begins by exploring the nature of injustice through the lens of poverty. It examines a range of descriptive metaphors (for example, poverty as a "trap") and the consequences of each metaphor for social action. It then considers the word "fix," and in doing so introduces several basic understandings of ethics (deontology, utilitarianism, contextual ethics, virtue, etc.) Finally, it considers the word "we" and offers three models for responding to injustice: working for, working with, and being with. Each model explores several examples of practice through readings, followed by critical reflection in class. The course also includes visits to local service organizations, as well as in-class interviews with individuals pursuing lives of service.

Aim
To train the imaginations of undergraduate students to ground such professional and activist enterprises, on which they may later embark, in genuine identification with and understanding of those people generally seen only as objects of mercy, scorn, or redemption.

Objectives
1. To offer an overview of various philosophical, political, and social approaches to ethics.
2. To offer a model for discerning and identifying motivations and assumptions in work addressing injustice.
3. To develop skills in understanding and critiquing the assumptions of various approaches to service work.
4. To expose students to concrete practices of engaging injustice in Durham and beyond.
5. To enable students to locate their own commitments, callings, and aptitudes within the models presented.

Format
There are three kinds of interaction:
- lectures and in-class discussion
- in-class interviews with Duke alumni
- off-campus visits to local organizations

Required Course Materials
All course readings are available online on Sakai.

Teaching Staff
Adam Hollowell, adam.hollowell@duke.edu
Senior Research Associate, Samuel DuBois Cook Center on Social Equity
Adjunct Professor, Sanford School of Public Policy

Raffi Wineburg, raphael.wineburg@duke.edu
Master of Public Policy Candidate, Sanford School of Public Policy

Susana Figueroa, susana.figueroa@duke.edu
Master of Public Policy Candidate, Duke University

Classes and Readings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>(1) Tuesday</th>
<th>(2) Thursday</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>How can we fix injustice?</td>
<td>(2) Carmen Giménez Smith, “Origins”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/14 + 1/16</td>
<td>What is poverty?</td>
<td>Poverty metaphors</td>
<td>(1) <em>Class Matters</em>, 27-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Matthew Desmond, <em>Evicted</em>, excerpts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) “How Cities Make Money by Fining the Poor”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, excerpts from <em>Why Nations Fail</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) WUNC, The State of Things 1/9/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Kraus, Rucker, &amp; Richeson, “Americans Misperceive Racial Economic Equality”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Jennine Capó Crucet, <em>My Time among the Whites</em>, 3-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Reginald Dwayne Betts, blackout poems in <em>Felon</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Baylis, Kenny, &amp; Sherwin, “A Relational Account of Public Health Ethics”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Charles Mathewes, “God and Morality,” 21-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Frans de Waal, <em>The Bonobo and the Atheist</em>, 149-167, 170-177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/28 + 1/30</td>
<td>Contextual Ethics: Gender and Race</td>
<td>Contextual Ethics: Race and Gender</td>
<td>(1) Katrine Marcal, <em>Who Cooked Adam Smith’s Dinner?</em>, 7-17, 29-41, 148-156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Melissa Harris-Perry, <em>Sister Citizen</em>, 24-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Imani Perry, <em>Vexy Thing</em>, 98-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Layli Long Soldier, “38”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) “The Groundwater Approach”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Jennine Capó Crucet, <em>My Time among the Whites</em>, 154-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Jeff Chang, “The In-Betweens,” 138-157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Danez Smith, “not an elegy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/4 + 2/6</td>
<td>Climate Change Ethics</td>
<td>Capabilities Approach &amp; Virtue Ethics</td>
<td>(1) Stephen Gardiner, <em>A Perfect Moral Storm</em>, excerpts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Giovanna Di Chi ro, “Environmental Justice from the Grassroots”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Martha Nussbaum, <em>Creating Capabilities</em>, 1-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Akeel Bilgrami, “Gandhi, the Philosopher”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Teju Cole, “White Savior Industrial Complex”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 71-86  
(2) Nikole Hannah-Jones, “Choosing a School”  
(2) Nikole Hannah-Jones, “Resegregation of Jefferson County”  
(2) Nikole Hannah-Jones with Lester Hold, “On Assignment” podcast  
(2) Anna Faith Jones, “Doors and Mirrors” |
| 9    | 3/3 + 3/5 | Working for Art | Public Servants | (1) adrienne maree brown, *Emergent Strategy*, 83-121  
(2) National Bail Toolkit, 1-26, 69-70  
(2) Karen Houppert, *Chasing Gideon*, 103-177 |
|      | 3/10 + 3/12 | Spring Break | Spring Break |  |
| 11   | 3/17 + 3/19 | Working With Community Organizing | Interview with Mark Hecker, Exec. Dir. of REACH, Inc.  
*Reflection Paper due Friday 8am* | (1) David France, *How to Survive a Plague*, excerpts  
(1) Mark Warren & Karen Mapp, “How Community Organizing Works”  
(2) Eula Biss, *Notes from No Man's Land*, 45-56  
(2) Building Teens into Strong Leaders by Letting Them Teach  
(2) Jaskiran Dhillon, “Indigenous Youth are Building Climate Justice Movement”  
(2) Saul Elbein, “The Youth Group that Launched a Movement at Standing Rock,” *New York Times*  
(2) Kevin Kumashiro, “Toward a Theory of Anti-Oppressive Education”  
(2) WUNC, “Meet Alexandra Zagbayou” |
(1) Atul Gawande, *Being Mortal*, 149-190  
(2) Ai-Jen Poo, *Age of Dignity*, excerpts  
(2) Christina Crosby, *A Body, Undone*, excerpts |
| 14   | 4/7 + 4/9 | Disability | Interview with Kristen Lakis, Chaplain, UNC Hospital | (1) John Swinton, *Becoming Friends of Time*, 35-53  
(1) Eli Clare, “Ideology of Cure”  
(1) Alison Kafer, “Time for Disability Studies and a Future for Crips”  
(2) Watch 4x videos from Courageous Parents Network website |
15
4/14 + 4/16
Proximity
*Debrief Urban Ministries Visits
Solidarity
(1) Eli Clare, *Exile and Pride*, 119-141
(2) Alexis Shotwell, “Aspirational Solidarity as a Bioethical Norm: The Case of Reproductive Justice”
(2) Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández, “Decolonization and the pedagogy of solidarity”

16
4/21
Closing Course Lecture
*Final Paper due Friday 8am
(1) Toni Morrison, “Moral Inhabitants”

---

**Note on Transportation**

*Personal transportation is not a requirement for enrollment in the course.* Students with concerns about transportation should read the additional notes on the course outings below. Additional questions should be directed to Raffi Wineburg, raphael.wineburg@duke.edu.

**Office Hours**

*Office hours will be Tuesdays 1:00-3:00pm in 128 Rubenstein Hall or by appointment at calendly.com/adam-hollowell*

Students are encouraged to contact the instructor or teaching staff by email for additional appointment hours. Concerns about the course, participation, unforeseen crises that might delay work, anticipated absences, and wider issues raised by the course should be directed to the instructor as soon as possible.

**Disability Statement**

Students with disabilities who may need accommodations are encouraged to contact, *if you have not done so already*, the Disability Management System—Student Access Office at 668-1267 as soon as possible to better ensure that such accommodations can be implemented in a timely fashion.

**Assessment**

Attendance, site visits, and participation in class 10%
Quizzes and Reflection Papers 10%
In-Class Exam 20%
Reflection Paper (1400 – 1600 words) 20%
Final Paper (2800 – 3000 words) 40%

**Criteria for Assessment**

Grades will be letter grades only, and will be determined on a 100-point scale, as follows:
- 94-100 = A / 90-93 = A-: these grades indicate that exceptional work has consistently been done, showing an unusual degree of effort and grasp of the material, as well as good judgment and some originality.
- 87-89 = B+ / 84-86 = B / 80-83 = B-: these grades indicate that good work has been done, but some problems persist (e.g., lack of clarity or concision, incomplete or inadequate citations, or unfocused discussion).
- 77-79 = C+ / 74-76 = C / 70-73 = C-: these grades indicate that the basic requirements of the class have been met, but no more than minimal competence has been demonstrated. Students who receive this grade will have received careful comments indicating where more work needs to be done.
- 67-69 = D+ / 64-66 = D / 61-64 = D-: these grades indicate that the work submitted does not meet the expectations of graduate level work, nor has competence and commitment sufficient for pastoral ministry been demonstrated. Comments will explain this judgment.
- 60 and below is an F. F indicates that the student has failed either to follow instructions for an assignment or to complete work by the due dates, and no satisfactory excuse has been given. Plagiarism results in an F.

**Integrity**

In accordance with the Duke Community Standard, students are expected to do their own work for each assignment and exam. *Any violation of the Community Standard will result in a failing grade.*

**Requirements**
1. **Attendance, quality of participation in class: 10%**
   i. Attendance and participation are essential components of this course. Students should arrive to class on time having done the reading and ready to engage the material in a variety of ways. Students often think that participation is the same as talking, which is usually just thinking out loud or making declarative statements. Participation can be: asking a thoughtful question, helping others refine their thoughts, active listening, coming to office hours or staying after class, engaging with instructors and course guests outside of class, and beyond.
   ii. **Students are permitted to miss two class sessions without penalty, regardless of the reason for the absence.**
   iii. Experiential outings contribute significantly to the learning in this course. Students are required to attend **three outings** throughout the semester. Multiple options will be available for each outing; for instance, for the first required outing students may attend one of four sessions at Durham City Council or the Durham County School Board. Information for all outings will be provided in class. Additional questions should be directed to Raffi Wineburg, raphael.wineburg@duke.edu.

2. **Quizzes and Reflection Papers: 10%**
   Six times during the semester students will be presented with a quiz at the start of class. The quiz will contain five questions that should be easily answerable if the student has completed the assigned reading for that day. The student can choose to take the quiz, or, if preferred, submit one single-spaced page reflection paper within 24 hours of the start of the class. Quizzes and reflection papers will be graded 0, 4, or 5. At the end of the semester the highest five scores will be averaged for this portion of the final grade. Students who do not attend class on the day of a quiz or who elect not to submit a quiz can submit a reflection paper to a dropbox on Sakai within 24 hours of the start of class. If a student fails a quiz, they cannot submit a reflection paper for that same date. **No exceptions will be made for late reflection papers.**

3. **In-Class Exam: 20%**
   The exam asks students to respond to a given prompt with reference to the approaches to ethics covered in class: Kant’s deontology, utilitarianism, divine command, evolutionary ethics, contextual ethics: gender, contextual ethics: race, climate change ethics, capabilities approach, and virtue ethics. The response will include one- or two- sentence definitions of each approach, as well as 3-4 sentence elaboration of how each approach might inform a reaction to the prompt. No introduction or conclusion is necessary. Prior to the exam date the format and expectations will be discussed in class. **The exam will take place in class on Thursday February 13, 2020.**

4. **Reflection Essay: 20%**
   **Length: 1400-1600 words.** Upload papers to Sakai dropbox by 8:00am Friday March 19, 2020. Describe one experience you have had that attempted to answer the question, "How can we fix injustice? Describe that experience (mission trip, service project, internship, etc.) and analyze it using the categories of working for, working with, and being with. Draw some conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of the experience/program/trip. This paper is designed to show the instructors your level of thoughtful engagement with the three categories (working for, working with, being with) that constitute the core of the course. It should demonstrate your ability to make connections between your own experience and the three categories. Your writing should point toward course readings as appropriate. Papers should be structured as follows:
   i. Introduction. Introduces the general context of the experience/program/trip, why you were there, whether it was a regular or occasional involvement, whether it was regarded as a success by participants, recipients etc., and on what grounds. Describe the organization’s or program’s approach to injustice, stated and/or assumed.
   ii. Analysis under working for criteria.
   iii. Analysis under working with criteria.
   iv. Analysis under being with criteria.
   v. Conclusion. Reinforce which model best describes the experience/program/trip and what you derive from this conclusion.
5. **Final Essay: 40%**

Length: 2,800 to 3,000 words. Upload papers to Sakai dropbox by 8:00am Friday April 24, 2020.

Students may choose from one of two options for the final paper:

**Traditional Approach:** Respond to the question “How can we fix injustice?” with respect to a specific organization or program of engagement *outside your personal experience* and with respect to each of the three key words (we, fix, injustice). Chose an organization or program that is relatively new to you or one you would like to learn more about. Papers should be structured as follows:

i. **Introduction.** Introduces the specific organization or program, including who is “we,” what is the “injustice,” and how is it being “fixed.” Does this program operate broadly, impacting many people in small ways, or more narrowly, affecting a few people in significant ways? How long has it existed and has it changed over that time for ideological or political reasons? How does the organization or program understand its identity, mission, and core community?

ii. **Analyze the definitions of injustice at work in this program or organization.** Are any of the poverty metaphors from the beginning of the semester relevant to this work? If so, which ones, and why? Cite lecture, powerpoints, or assigned readings to justify your claims in this section.

iii. **Identify the customary ethical arguments from the categories examined earlier in the semester that are present, either explicitly or implicitly, in the program’s identity and mission.** Are any ethical argument embraced or, alternatively, neglected or shunned? Make an initial judgment about whether the ethics approach of the organization is appropriate to the kind of community or work they engage? For example, if an end-of-life care organization is highly utilitarian, make a judgment about whether this is an appropriate ethical argument for the work being undertaken. Cite lecture, powerpoints, or assigned readings to justify your claims in this section.

iv. **Identify to what extent the approach of the organization follows a working for, working with, or being with model, respectively.** Make a reasoned assessment of whether you think the approach is the most appropriate one, and highlight strengths, shortcomings, and suggestions for improvement. Use “The Nazareth Manifesto” from Sam Wells and Marcia Owen to justify your claims in this section.

v. **Conclusion.** No more than 200 words. Reinforce what you’ve concluded in the three previous sections and the significance of these conclusions. Make any general comments about the relative usefulness of the ethical categories threefold model of engagement.

**Creative Approach:** Design and describe a new program, service, or organization that responds to injustice. Think carefully about the specific context of engagement for the program and the needs or community to which it responds. Explain how the program would reflect the three key words (we, fix, injustice). Papers may include creative or non-traditional structure or material, but will likely address the following questions:

i. **Introduction.** What is the specific community or work that this program or organization engages? Does the proposed program operate broadly, impacting many people in small ways, or more narrowly, affecting a few people in significant ways? How does the organization or program understand its identity, mission, and core community? What are its ideological or political foundations?

ii. **What are the definitions of injustice at work in this program or organization?** How does this program utilize or employ the metaphors of poverty identified earlier in the semester or similar language? Which one(s), and why? Cite lecture, powerpoints, or assigned readings to justify your claims in this section.

iii. **What customary ethical arguments, from those identified earlier in the semester, are employed, either explicitly or implicitly, in the organization, and what arguments are neglected or shunned?** Why did you choose the forms of moral argument that you did, and
why are they the most appropriate for this program, service, or organization? Cite lecture, powerpoints, or assigned readings to justify your claims in this section.

iv. To what extent does the proposed organization follow a working for, working with, or being with model? Explain why this approach is the most appropriate one, and highlight strengths, shortcomings, and suggestions for improvement. Use “The Nazareth Manifesto” from Sam Wells and Marcia Owen to justify your claims in this section.

v. Conclusion. No more than 200 words. Reinforce what you’ve concluded in the three previous sections and the significance of these conclusions. Make any general comments about the proposed organization and why it matters to you.

All essays should be organized as follows:

a. Cover Sheet. The paper title, name of course, word count, and your name should be on a cover sheet.
b. Introduction. The introduction should identify the argument that follows, the specific ways in which you are narrowing your subject down to a manageable size for a paper, and the specific terms you are using that need some definition.
c. Main body of the paper. A sequence of subheadings that divide the paper into logical, clearly defined sections reassures the instructor that the argument has been planned and reasoned carefully.
d. Conclusion. Should be very short and summarize main findings.

Late Penalties:

a. Students will be penalized 2 points for handing a late paper in up to 12 hours after the deadline, and will lose 2 points for each subsequent 12 hour window. For example, a paper submitted 20 hours late would lose four points; a paper 45 hours late would lose 8 points; a paper five days late would lose 20 points.
b. The reflection essay will be accepted up to 10 days after the deadline (up to a final penalty of 40 points). After 10 days the student will receive a zero for the assignment.
c. Because the final essay must be graded in time for final grade submission deadlines, students are encouraged to turn the papers promptly to avoid receiving an incomplete mark for the course.
d. Requests for extensions are generally discouraged, as this provides an unfair advantage over other students. Students should prepare for computer troubles and should always back up their work in multiple secure places. Students should follow university policy for requests due to severe illness, religious holidays, family emergencies, or athletic or extra-curricular conflicts.
# Ethics in an Unjust World

Essay feedback and mark sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Engagement with prompt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Knowledge of categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Quality use of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Citation of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Structure, prose, (grammar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: