

LEADERSHIP ETHICS

LDST 450 / Fall 2021

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

*Primary Email:*¹ coetsee.jepson@gmail.com

Office Hours: Thursday 12-1pm 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 consider 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 are most morally relevant for a leader to 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 meaningful, 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.

After covering normative ethics, we will pivot to discuss questions pertaining to *moral psychology and moral responsibility*. As we will see, even leaders who are consciously committed to acting on the right moral principles can still fail to successfully execute on their commitments. We will consider how leaders' *implicit attitudes* can undermine their ability to successfully navigate ethical challenges even when they do not consciously *intend* to act unethically, and consider whether and how leaders are morally responsible for the harmful effects of their actions in those 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 sorts of considerations justify leaders in enforcing some rules, but not others, within the context of a collective group. For instance, we will ask: to what extent are leaders justified in imposing rules that re-distribute resources among followers, and why? How should the rules that leaders enforce accommodate for differences in followers' religious and cultural values? To what extent should leaders' policies work to achieve the goals their followers prefer, as opposed to being aimed towards independently valuable moral ends? We will consider what *social contract, communitarian, and perfectionist* political theories have to say about these questions.

¹ This is my preferred email for communication about the class, but I also answer emails sent to mcoetsee@richmond.edu.

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. 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 critical role that implicit attitudes can play in leaders' ability to effectively execute their moral obligations, and be able to critically analyze whether and how leaders are morally responsible for actions that flow from these attitudes.

Students should understand and be able to apply the core principles of political ethics specified by social contract theory, perfectionism, and communitarian. They should be able to use these principles to assess whether leaders are justified in trying to compel followers to obey particular rules.

Students should appreciate the moral difficulties that attend collective decision-making in contexts where members of the group disagree about what should be done, and acquire tools for facilitating such decision-making in an ethically responsible way.

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 REQUIREMENTS

- 5% Attendance
- 5% Weekly Reading Checks
- 15% Hiroshima Guided Reflection*
- 15% DEI Reflection & Poster
- 15% Participation (In Class and in Discussion Forums)
- 20% Midterm Exam*
- 25% Final Exam

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

5%: Attendance

As a default, students 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%-1% from your final grade and—in extreme cases—could go beyond the 5% officially allotted for attendance. Please come talk to me as soon as possible if you anticipate or are having problems concerning attendance.

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 ½ of 1% of your grade), open note quizzes, and they are meant to keep you on track and help you prepare for the midterm and final exams.

- *Schedule:* The quiz for the next week will be available on Blackboard by Wednesday at midnight. It is *due by the start of class on the following Wednesday*. Your score as well as the correct answers to the quiz will be available by 5pm Wednesday after class.
- *Open-Note:* You may use *your* readings and notes, *but no other human beings*. I encourage you to have the quiz open as you do the reading and to fill it out as you go. There will not be a time limit on quizzes.
- *Missed Quizzes:* If you miss a quiz on a day for which you have an excused absence, you may make up the quiz later for full credit. If you miss a quiz on a day for which you do *not* have an excused absence, you may still make up the quiz, but one point (out of a typical of three points) will be deducted.

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 and do a really good job, then—because it is extra work—you are eligible to get an A+.

We will have an in-class debate to help you prepare for this reflection on September 15. In lieu of having reading assigned for that day, you will be required to submit some writing in preparation for the debate.

Due Date: September 25

20%: DEI Discussion & Poster

As we will talk about on the first day of class and as I note in the insert on DEI issues at the end of this syllabus, academic institutions in the US and Europe have developed in the context of broader racist, sexist, and colonialist social systems. As a result, a disproportionate amount of the training that I got in graduate school concerns ideas that were historically articulated by European and North American, wealthy, cis-gendered, straight, white males. Importantly, many of the relevant ideas are very abstract and have also been developed in different ways in other, non-Eurocentric traditions—for instance, the basic idea of utilitarianism (that we should promote the common good) is an idea that you find in many non-Eurocentric religious and cultural traditions. The fact that the ideas we talk about are so abstract, and in many cases shared by different traditions, means that the ideas are *not* necessarily intrinsically predicated on racism, sexism, and colonialism. Nevertheless, the people who articulate these ideas were limited in their perspective, and academic philosophy in the US has a *lot* of work to do in making its scholarship more diverse and inclusive. Many of you may have just as much, if not *much more*, background in issues of diversity, equity, an inclusion than I do, and so we are going to try to start correcting the structural problems in academia by giving you added space and time to explore those issues in this class.

1. DEI Discussion (5%):

You and partner will select a day of class where you will connect the material to one of the following:

- an event based in an international context outside of the US or Western Europe
- a domestic event that relates to communities that have historically been underrepresented in the US or Western Europe
- a campus event or conversation that relates to communities have historically been underrepresented
- 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 lens or concept that comes from a tradition that is not represented in this class.

(This may draw on a religious or cultural tradition you are familiar with. For instance, I grew up with a heavy emphasis on the ethical/religious concept of ‘grace’, which could be connected to discussions we will have about the distinction between personally blaming someone for something and holding them accountable.)

- a critique of how a theory (or the way a theory is articulated) may reflect the privileged social standing of the author(s), and what insights that privilege may have lead them to be ignorant of.

(For instance, when Peter Singer talks about our obligations to people who are in extreme poverty, he assumes that “they” are “far away”. While it is true that the kind of extremely extreme poverty he is most concerned about—e.g. in situations where there is a widespread famine—is not common in the US, he does seem to presume that his readers do not have close personal relationships to people in those situations or in other, perhaps similar, situations.)

You will be asked to post about this on Packback as well as to give a short, informal overview presentation in class.

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

2. DEI Final Project (10%):

You will create a poster ‘exhibit’ to display in an end-of-the-semester ‘(More) Inclusive Ethics Museum’. For this, you may develop the ideas that you began discussing in item #1, applying that discussion to a specific instance of leadership, or you may choose to switch gears and focus on a new example. You may do this project with a partner or individually. Specific instructions will be distributed separately, but if you choose to do this with a partner you will be required to do further research into outside sources beyond what you are required to do if you do this individually. If you do this individually and there is a topic that you are interested in that relates more broadly to concerns about justice, fairness, and ethical decision-making—but does not specifically pertain to issues that have typically come under the umbrella of ‘DEI’—that is ok. Just consult me first to talk about your interests!

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

***Note: Outside Event or Reading**

Monday, September 6 we will not have class. I am ‘trading in’ this class time to you to have you attend one talk that relates to an under-represented community or moral tradition. You may do this at any time in the semester, but whatever week you do it, your discussion post for that week should be on the event (see below). You are free to find your own talk or event, but may also choose to consult the online Excel document below, which has some relevant options. Not everything on this Excel document will ‘count’ (e.g. the ‘Launch Party’ for the Student Center on Equity and Inclusion won’t count), so please CHECK WITH ME BEFORE YOU CHOOSE AND ATTEND AN EVENT. Additionally, if there is an outside talk (not at UR) that you are interested in, a museum exhibit, or even an outside reading (not covered in class) that you are interested in exploring in more depth let me know. We can probably work something out! If feasible, I recommend going with someone in the class so that you have someone to talk about with your experience. In particular, it might benefit you to go with the people you are doing your DEI discussion with.

[DEI Talks and Events on Campus](#)

15%: Participation (In Class & Discussion Forums)

In class:

Sometimes, people who feel comfortable in a classroom dominate discussion over those who don’t. I was a more quiet student in college, and I want to make sure that everyone feels included—including, particularly, students who like to think through what they want to say more before

speaking and so tend to be more quiet in the fray of a quick moving conversation. As a result—while some of the guidelines below are familiar from participation guidelines in other classes—there are also some that are more experimental. I will check in with you at least mid-way through the semester, if not before, to see how things are going on this front.

* **Listen carefully and thoughtfully to others’ comments and questions, as well as the lecture**

* **Try to offer at least *one* quality contribution *most* days you are in class.** I encourage *everyone* to *write down* comments and questions *before class* and to draw on these in in-class discussion.

- **Quality over quantity:** Though both the quality and quantity of your in-class contributions matter, the quality of your contributions will matter more than the quantity. Typically, quality contributions are ones that show that you *have done the reading* and that *offer reasons for the point(s) you try to make*. Here are some examples of quality contributions: you give a thoughtful attempt at answering a question that I pose to the class, you respond to a point a classmate makes in a way that shows that you have understood and carefully considered their perspective, you ask a question with a non-obvious answer, or you offer a concern that is backed up by some kind of reason (for example, “The author says X, but that seems problematic to me because...”.)
- **I will often call on students to share their questions or comments from Packback posts. I will also sometimes randomly call on students by drawing their name out of jar.** When I do this, it is not to stress you out but rather to make clear that every voice in the classroom is important.

Discussion Forums:

Each week, you should submit at least *one open-ended question* and *one response* on our online discussions forums, which will be hosted via an online platform called Packback. The Packback platform only allows me to have one ‘official’ deadline posted for the week on their website. This deadline is the deadline for having both your comment and response in, and it is set for Tuesday/Wednesday (see below in **bold**). However, you should not leave both the question and response till Tuesday/Wednesday! You should post at least one question or response prior to our Monday class. (You can do both prior to our Monday class if you want. I just don’t want you to leave both for Wednesday, because that is when we have our weekly reading check due.)

9am class: One post 6pm Sunday; another by **6pm Tuesday**

12pm class: 10:15am Monday; another by **10:15am Wednesday**

3pm class: 1:15pm Monday; another by **1:15pm Wednesday**

Your post should address the upcoming readings due for the class. You are allowed to miss one week of posts this semester, no questions asked. An additional week of posts will be covered by your DEI Discussion post (see above). Some weeks, there will be specific prompts I ask you to write about. More information on how we will conduct discussion forums will be provided on Blackboard and in class.

25% 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 of the Final Exam will consist primarily of a written reflection on some element of the ‘(More) Inclusive Ethics Museum’ we have on the last day of class.

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 | |

COURSE MATERIALS

All readings will be available on Blackboard.

Although you are not required to pay for any books, you will need to pay \$25 to use the Packback platform we will be using for discussion forums.

CLASS SCHEDULE

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

| | |
|----|---|
| 1. | <i>Monday, 8/23:</i> |
| | Why Do Moral Theory? An Introduction to Utilitarianism and Kantianism Sandel, "Doing the Right Thing" |
| 2. | <i>Wednesday, 8/25:</i> |
| | Is It All Relative? Shafer-Landau, "Eleven Arguments against Moral Objectivity" Rachels, "The Challenge of Cultural Relativism" Singer, selections from <i>Practical Ethics</i> , Chapters 1 and 2 |
| 3. | <i>Monday, 8/30:</i> |
| | Do We Need a Revolution? Utilitarianism, (Im)Partiality, and Poverty Singer, selections from "Famine, Affluence, and Morality" Cullity, selections from "The Moral Demands of Affluence" Price, "The Utilitarian View of Everyday Leadership" from <i>Leadership Ethics</i> Friedman, selections from "The Practice of Partiality" Todd and Whittlestone, blog posts on "Should You Follow Your Passion?" |

| | |
|----|--|
| 4. | Wednesday, 9/1: |
| | <p>The Utilitarian Revolution Gone Wrong? Kantian Ethics and Human Rights</p> <p>Burnor & Raley, “Deontological Ethics” in <i>Ethical Choices</i> (8)</p> <p>Thomson, selections from “Turning the Trolley” (6)</p> <p>Shafer-Landau, “Is Moral Absolutism Irrational?” in <i>Fundamentals of Ethics</i> (4)</p> <p>O’Neill, “Kantian Approaches to Some Famine Problems (5)</p> <p><i>Watch short clip on Hiroshima & Nagasaki (see Blackboard).</i></p> <p>Holt, “Morality, Reduced to Arithmetic” (2)</p> |
| 5. | Monday, 9/6: |
| | <p>Class cancelled for DEI/Ethics Outside Event</p> <p>(Pick a talk or event related to DEI or Leadership Ethics to attend this semester. That week, you should write a Packback post on the event and your reflections on it.)</p> |
| 6. | Wednesday, 9/8: |
| | <p>Advanced Utilitarianism: Rights as (Very Reliable) Rules of Thumb</p> <p>Driver, selections on “Utilitarianism, Justice, and Rights” (6), “Integrity and Negative Responsibility” and “Criticisms and Responses” (5.5)</p> <p>Nagel, selections from “War and Massacres” (4.5)</p> <p>RM Hare, key passages from “Rights and Justice” (5) and “Rules of War and Moral Reasoning” (5)</p> <p>Wake, “Asian America’s Fear, Anger, and Isolation is Rooted in US History” (2)</p> <p><i>Watch assigned video on Truman and Hiroshima & Nagasaki (see Blackboard).</i></p> <p>(*DEI)</p> |
| 7. | Monday, 9/13: |
| | <p>Advanced Kantianism: Integrity, Intentions, and the Doctrine of Double Effect</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> |

| | |
|--|---|
| 8. | Wednesday, 9/15: |
| | <p>Debate: Was it wrong to drop the atomic bomb?</p> <p>Prepare for Debate: Required Reflection</p> <p>(This reflection will help you prepare for the debate & your upcoming paper. Detailed instructions to be distributed.)</p> |
| 9. | Monday, 9/20: |
| | <p>When Good People Do Bad Things: Pluralism and the Problem of Dirty Hands</p> <p>Nussbaum, selections from “Aeschylus and Practical Conflict” in <i>The Fragility of Goodness</i> (10)</p> <p>Walzer, short selection from “The Problem of Dirty Hands” (4.5)</p> <p>Nussbaum, “Emotions as Evaluative Judgments” (13)</p> <p>(*DEI)</p> |
| 10. | Wednesday, 9/22: |
| | <p>Living it Up: Virtue, Happiness, and Human Flourishing</p> <p>Swift, selections from “Virtue Ethics: Aristotle” (9) in <i>An Introduction to Philosophy</i></p> <p>Shafer-Landau, selections on “Ethical Pluralism” and “Virtue Ethics” in <i>Fundamentals of Ethics</i> (6.5)</p> <p>Aristotle, selections on “Human Happiness and Excellence” from <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> (6)</p> <p>Ludwig and Longenecker, “The Bathsheba Syndrome” (10)</p> <p>(*DEI)</p> |
| HIROSHIMA GUIDED REFLECTION DUE – Friday 9/25 | |
| 11. | Monday, 9/27: |
| | <p>The Experience Machine or Moral Meaning?</p> <p>Watch assigned selections from <i>The Right Stuff</i> (movie)</p> <p>Selected short articles on the Space Program and “Whitey’s on the Moon”</p> <p>Nozick, key passage from “The Experience Machine”</p> |
| 12. | Wednesday, 9/29: |
| | <p>Implicit Bias and Moral Responsibility</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> <p>(*DEI)</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| 13. Monday, 10/4: | |
| | <p>Structural Injustice and Moral Responsibility</p> <p>Haslanger, “Social Structure, Narrative and Explanation” (10)</p> <p>McHugh and Davidson, “Epistemic Responsibility and Implicit Bias”</p> <p>Holroyd, short excerpt from “Implicit Bias, Awareness and Imperfect Cognition” (2) (*DEI)</p> |
| 14. Wednesday, 10/6: | |
| | <p>Cultural Ignorance and Moral Responsibility</p> <p>Wieland, selections “Willful Ignorance” (10)</p> <p>Hayward, “Responsibility and Ignorance: On Dismantling Structural Injustice” (*DEI)</p> |
| 15. Monday, 10/11: Fall Study Break! | |
| 16. Wednesday, 10/13: | |
| | <p>Introduction to Political Philosophy & Nozick’s Social Contract Theory</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> |
| 17. Monday, 10/18: | |
| | Midterm Exam |
| 18. Wednesday, 10/20: | |
| | <p>Applying Nozick: Sweatshops, Coercion, and the Free Market</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> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 19. | Monday, 10/25: |
| | <p>Introduction to Rawlsian Social Contract Theory</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> <p>(*DEI)</p> |
| 20. | Wednesday, 10/27: |
| | <p>Guest Speaker: Chong Choe-Smith, “Should Undocumented Immigrants Have Access to Public Benefits?”</p> <p>NOTE: ALL CLASSES WILL MEET AT NOON OVER ZOOM</p> <p><i>If you are not in the 12pm class and not able to make it, please let me know.</i></p> |
| 21. | Monday, 11/1: |
| | <p>Rawlsian Social Contract Theory, Pt. 2: Religious Neutrality & the Demands of Community</p> <p>Marneffe, “Rawlsian Neutrality”</p> <p>Kymlicka, selections from “Communitarianism” in <i>Contemporary Political Philosophy</i></p> <p>Kymlicka, selections from <i>Multicultural Citizenship</i></p> <p>Wechter, “Trump Supporters Not Welcome,” short editorial from <i>New Times</i></p> <p>(*DEI)</p> |
| 22. | Wednesday, 11/3: |
| | <p>Rawlsian Neutrality and Tolerating the Intolerant</p> <p>Rawls, selections on “Toleration and the Common Interest,” and “Toleration of the Intolerant,” <i>Theory of Justice</i></p> <p>Okin, selections from <i>Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?</i> and <i>Justice, Gender, and the Family</i></p> <p>Nussbaum, selections from “Reply to Okin” in <i>Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?</i></p> <p>Al-Hibri, selections from “<i>Is Western Patriarchal Feminism Good for Third World/Minority Women?</i>”</p> |
| 23. | Monday, 11/8: |
| | <p>Liberal Feminist Perfectionism</p> <p>George, “The Central Tradition” from <i>Making Men Moral: Civil Liberties and Public Morality</i></p> <p>Yuracko, “Towards Feminist Perfectionism: A Radical Critique of Rawlsian Liberalism,” <i>UCLA Women’s Law Journal</i></p> <p>(*DEI)</p> |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 24. | Wednesday, 11/10 |
| | <p>Epistocracy</p> <p>Cristiano, “Democracy” from the International Encyclopedia of Ethics</p> <p>Brennan, selections from <i>Against Democracy</i></p> <p>(*DEI)</p> |
| 25. | Monday, 11/15 |
| | <p>Deliberative Democracy</p> <p>Gutmann and Thompson, selections from <i>Why Deliberative Democracy?</i></p> <p>(*DEI)</p> |
| 26. | Wednesday, 11/17: |
| | <p>Guest Speaker: Dr. Lee (Monument Avenue Commission)</p> <p>Reading: Selections from Monument Avenue Commission Report</p> |
| 27. | Monday, 11/22: |
| | <p>Echo Chambers and Effective Deliberation</p> <p>Nguyen, “Escape the Echo Chamber,” <i>Aeon Magazine</i></p> <p>Weston, selections from “Dialogue,” from <i>The Ethical Toolbox</i></p> <p>Coates, “A Muscular Empathy”</p> <p>(*DEI)</p> |
| | Wednesday, 11/24— No Class—Happy Thanksgiving! |
| | |
| 28. | Monday, 11/29 |
| | <p>Civil Disobedience</p> <p>The Observer Editorial Board, “Silent Sam: UNC Protestors Decide Not to Wait for Change”</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> <p>Watch short video clips on removal of Silent Sam</p> |
| 29. | Wednesday, 12/1 |
| | (More) Inclusive Ethics Day |

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, more privileged 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 privileged authors can be used to critique the injustices that privilege reflects and perpetuates. Students are encouraged not to treat any author as a final authority on the issues they discuss. Students' unique and diverse backgrounds give them the basis for developing new insights that privileged 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, however, you or I may say or do something that inadvertently causes harm to another student. If or when this happens, we must 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 also the note on '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.

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

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/

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

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

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.¹ Recent research has found that, when professors do not address microaggressions in class, microaggressions foster alienation of marginalized groups.² 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).³ 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.⁴

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.⁵ 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.

¹Sue, 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>

²Bergom, 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>

³Nadal, 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>

⁴Rolón-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>

⁵ <https://inclusion.richmond.edu/>

ACADEMIC AND PERSONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

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): 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 Mancastropa](mailto:Rmancast@richmond.edu) (Rmancast@richmond.edu) and [Hope Walton](mailto:Hwalton@richmond.edu) (Hwalton@richmond.edu) for coaching appointments in academic and life skills.

Boatwright Library Research Librarians: (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), text (804-277-9ASK), or [chat](http://library.richmond.edu/chat.html) (library.richmond.edu/chat.html).

Career Services: (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 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 and psychotherapy, skills-building classes, crisis intervention, psychiatric consultation, and related services.

Disability Services (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 or 287-6409): Assists with preparation and practice in the pursuit of excellence in public expression. Recording, playback, coaching and critique sessions offered by teams of student consultants trained to assist in developing ideas, arranging key points for more effective organization, improving style and delivery, and handling multimedia aids for individual and group presentations. Remote practice sessions can be arranged; we look forward to meeting your public speaking needs.

Writing Center (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.