Course Description
Look at the following situation, called the “Heinz dilemma,” proposed in order to study the moral development of children and adolescents:

In Europe, a woman was near death from cancer. One drug might save her, a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The druggist was charging $2,000, ten times what the drug cost him to make. The sick woman’s husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, “No.” The husband got desperate and broke into the man’s store to steal the drug for his wife.²

In our course, we will have the opportunity to learn a good deal about normative moral theories—that is, moral theories that tell us what we ought or ought not do. We will focus in particular on our moral obligations to refugees.

Learning Outcomes:
By the end of the term, students will be able to:

1. Argue persuasively why each of us is responsible for having ethical concerns about and commitments to the good of others.
2. Resolve moral problems consistently drawing on resources (e.g. conceptions of human nature and the human community) of one of the ethical theories or traditions studied.
3. Respectfully advocate for their critically assessed moral commitments and perspective within a diverse community.

Course Texts

¹ Note that “by appointment” includes nights and weekends via Google+.
Additional readings will be made available on Blackboard.

Course Work
1. Reflection days
Throughout the term, we will have reflection days in which I will give you a set of questions and you will reflect on them with your group. You will submit a 1.5-2 page response to the questions posed.

Purpose: The purpose of the reflection days is to give you space to think carefully about difficult moral issues. And you’ll work in groups because it’s often helpful to reflect with others on conceptually difficult issues.

2. Florence/Italy walkabout
Throughout the term, you will walk throughout Florence (and other parts of Italy if you’re traveling in your off days) to look for signs of the ongoing refugee crisis. You’ll keep a journal of your travels and submit this to me at the end of the term. When you submit your journals, I’d like you to reflect on two issues:

(i) what have you seen in your travels? What is safe to infer about the presence of refugees in Florence? (Keep in mind that seeing very little doesn’t necessarily mean that there aren’t refugees living in and around Florence.)
(ii) do Italians bear a greater obligation to help refugees than Americans because they are closer?

Purpose: The Syrian Civil War began in 2011; it’s been six years since the carnage began. Southern Italy, according to the UN Human Rights Council, has been a major landing spot for refugees. One way for them to get to anywhere else in Europe is to travel north through Italy. Between January 2016 and mid-June 2016, 35,000 refugees landed in Southern Italy. It seems reasonable that there should be some sign of this impact. The goal is for you to reflect on the presence or absence of signs of impact and what (if anything) physical proximity has to do with moral obligations.

3. Refugee Ethics Project:

Description: This project has a few parts to it:
Part I: Go online to find narratives from Syrian refugees. Also, find recent data on the refugee crisis. Submit 2-3 pages describing what you find.
Part II: Find arguments in popular media in favor of and against admitting large numbers of refugees. Identify the reasons offered and describe what kinds of reasons they are (e.g. are they utilitarian-friendly reasons? Kantian-friendly reasons?). Reflect on whether the arguments engage the facts of the matter or people’s experiences (i.e. what you found in part I): do they? Don’t they? What bite do the arguments have relative to their engaging the empirical details? This should be 3-4 pages.
Part III: Explain why you do or do not find the reasons from part II convincing. Give reasons for your own position on refugee admissions. Identify the kinds of reasons you offer. Again: 2-3 pages.

Purpose: This class focuses on the issue of refugees. There’s a lot of talk and not a lot of consensus about what is to be done: not only politically but morally. This project offers you the opportunity to
reflect on what others have had to say about our moral and political obligations to refugees as well as develop some reasons you find compelling. Note that you do not need to settle on a position (e.g. unrestricted admission of refugees). But you do need to articulate reasons that you find compelling. (E.g. refugees are humans with dignity that demands respect; but also we need to preserve national identity.)

4. Participation
Students can participate in a number of ways. In addition to discussion in class, students may email questions and come to see me during office hours to discuss class material (for those who are not yet comfortable with talking in class). Here’s how participation fits into the grade. If student S participates very little or not at all, then there is no grade bonus to S’s final grade. If S participates occasionally, there is a 3 point bonus. If S participates in almost every class, there is a 6 point bonus.

Here is how each of the above will contribute to your final grade:

Walkabout: 20%
Refugee Project: 60%
Reflection day questions: 20%
Participation: * (see above)

Grading Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Value</th>
<th>Letter/GPA point value</th>
<th>Rough idea of what the grade means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94-100</td>
<td>A/4.0</td>
<td>Outstanding. Student goes above and beyond what is required. (E.g. offers an insight/analysis that appears elsewhere in the philosophical literature; does extensive research for papers/presentations.) Concepts elucidated clearly and with novel examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-93</td>
<td>A-/3.7</td>
<td>Very good. Student does more high-quality research than is required for the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-89</td>
<td>B+/3.3</td>
<td>Average. Doing what is assigned. Note that following the instructions will put you in the orbit of this grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-85</td>
<td>B/3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-81</td>
<td>B-/2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-77</td>
<td>C+/2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-73</td>
<td>C/2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>C- / 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>D / 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>F / 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attendance**
Students are permitted four absences. If you exceed the number of absences permitted, your grade will go down one letter for each additional day missed. Exceptions include: documented illness, religious holidays, travelling for sports events (or comparable extracurricular activity, e.g. debate team.)

**Cell Phones, Tablets, Laptops, etc.**
Please do not use your phones during class except in the case of an emergency. If you have to call or text someone, please step out of the room to do so. Texting during class is disruptive for me, you and other students. For me, I’m distracted by the fact that you’re disengaged from the class. For you, you’re disengaged from the class. For other students, there are at least two participants in the class (me and you) who are disengaged, which undermines our class as a place of focused attention and critical examination.

In the past, I’ve had trouble with students bringing laptops and tablets to class: they have very good intentions of using them only for classwork but the temptation to browse the Interweb during class won out. So please do not bring a tablet or laptop to class. I will allow exceptions on a case by case basis if a student needs to use a laptop during class for taking notes, etc.

**Late Work**
Papers are penalized by one letter grade for each class it is late. If students know ahead of time that they will have some difficulty meeting a deadline, please contact me. I’ll be more than happy to take other commitments you might have into consideration when assigning due dates.

**Plagiarism and Cheating**
Plagiarism, or taking someone else’s work without giving credit to the original author, can and must be avoided at all costs. It violates the integrity of scholarship and academic honesty. It is certainly fine to build on or explain the work of others, and in fact, such communal work is necessary to expand our knowledge. But, to claim the other’s work as your own is dishonest, and honesty is essential to the life of a student.

Plagiarism and cheating are not tolerated. The first instance of plagiarism results in a 0 for the assignment. The second instance results in a failing grade for the course. All cases of plagiarism are reported to the Dean’s office. Please see the University’s "Code of Academic Honesty" in the student handbook, available online through the University website. If you have any questions about
what does or does not count as plagiarism or cheating, please feel free to ask me.

**Statement Concerning Sexual Misconduct**

Gonzaga University recognizes the inherent dignity of all individuals and promotes respect for all people. Sexual misconduct is not tolerated at Gonzaga. This includes unwanted physical/sexual contact, sexual assault, and unwanted and harassing sexual comments. (Clearly, this list isn’t exhaustive.) If you have been the victim of sexual misconduct, I want you to know that I am a first point of contact for getting you in touch with mental health services, campus police, and (if you should choose to pursue legal action) city police. As a faculty member, I am interested in promoting a safe and healthy environment. But you should also know that if you tell me anything that incriminates a student, I am legally bound to report that information. The technical terminology here is that I (and all other faculty and administrators) am a mandatory reporter. This rule might seem a little draconian, but it prevents faculty and administrators from being passive bystanders: if you tell me something, I’m in serious trouble (= breaking the law) if I don’t tell the relevant people, e.g. Gonzaga University’s title IX coordinator. But I understand that you might not want to begin going down the road of an investigation. Perhaps you just want to talk with someone about what happened. That’s ok. If you would feel more comfortable talking with someone other than me or any other mandatory reporter, here are some phone numbers that will connect you with people to whom you can talk.

**Course Schedule**

*Note:* This is a projected reading schedule. We may get a little behind if some concepts require further fleshing out or generate discussion. That’s ok. We’ll compensate accordingly. For each class, you can divide the reading up into thirds. I’ll expect you to have covered the relevant third for each class meeting. For quizzes, this means that I’ll ask you a question on the third covered for that class. I divide up the readings by weeks rather than by days because the texts we’re working with don’t divide up that neatly. Of course, we have our limits on what we can cover in a given class meeting, but I’d prefer to let the flow of the class determine how long we spend on concepts presented in the reading.

Week 1: Intro: refresher on critical thinking and human nature.
Day 1: Critical thinking refresher. Some tools that will be helpful
Day 3: Shacknove, “Who is a refugee?”
Day 4: Lister, “Who are refugees?”

Week 2: Refugee ethics
Day 1: Lister, cont.
Day 2: Reflection
Day 3: Philosophers on the Syrian Refugees Refugee Project Part I due
Day 4: Hardin, “Lifeboat Ethics,” “Cultural Carrying Capacity”

Week 3: Refugee ethics
Day 1: Singer, “Insiders and Outsiders”
Day 2: Carens, “Aliens and citizens: the case for open borders”
Day 3: Reflection
Day 4: No Class

Week 4: Utilitarianism
Day 1: chapters 1, 2 (skip from the top of p. 20 to the bottom of p. 25 and then stop midway down p. 28
Day 2: chapters 3 & 4 from Utilitarianism Refugee Project Part II due
Day 3: Bernard Williams, from Utilitarianism: For and Against
Day 4: reflection

Week 5: Kant
Day 1: Onora O’neill, “A Simplified Account of Kant’s Ethics,” Immanuel Kant, Groundwork, part 1 (end on p. 14 at “...the aforementioned principle.”
Day 2: Immanuel Kant, Groundwork, part 2 (pp. 39 [beginning with where you left off last week] - p. 45 [top]
Day 3: Rae Langton, “Duty and Desolation”
Day 4: Reflection

Week 6: Virtue ethics
Day 1: Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book I
Day 2: Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book II Refugee Project Part III due
Day 3: Susan Wolf, “Moral Saints”
Day 4: Final reflection and Walkabout project due