OVERVIEW

DPI-202 takes a cross-cultural approach to professional ethics. A close analysis of cases from around the world is the foundation upon which we will build an account of the competencies needed to be a virtuous public servant. Insights from the ever-growing field of moral psychology will be put into conversation with classic and contemporary ethical theory from both Western and non-Western traditions. Special emphasis will be placed on how to think and act strategically when balancing professional obligations with personal morality in the pursuit of creating public value. Unique to DPI-202 will be an opportunity for students to workshop their own cases with their peers in an effort to scrutinize, evaluate, and learn from the ethical issues that have already arisen in their professional lives.
REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

Individual Work

Participation

You are expected to attend every lecture, prepared to discuss the case and theoretical readings of the day and ready to make thoughtful contributions to the learning of your classmates.

Absences will be excused only for medical or family emergencies and for religious holidays. Students are expected to schedule interviews, ordinary medical appointments, other academic events and all other business around the lectures. Students are also expected to attend the entirety of each lecture, and so are advised to schedule other courses in a way that allows them to be at each lecture for its duration. Late arrivals and early exits will count as absences.

Phones and other devices should be silenced. Designated e-readers are allowed so long as they are used exclusively to refer to the course material for the day. Notes should be taken by hand. There’s a general prohibition on using phones, laptops, netbooks, iPads, etc. during lecture. Please do not eat during class. Beverages are fine.

Case Reflections

Each lecture focuses on a case of some sort. Many are drawn from the experiences of former MC/MPA students who took the course. Others are more standard HKS cases and a handful are films.

After reading (or watching) the case with care, please submit on the course page a two paragraph reflection on it. Reflections are due by 9am of the day the case will be discussed, to allow me time to read them prior to lecture.

Your reflections should answer the following two questions. 1) What features of the case stand out to you as morally significant? 2) What are some moral values in play in the case and what moral principles can guide our thinking about it?

These case reflections will be the foundation for our discussions, and as such are very important. Submissions will be graded as complete or incomplete. Students who receive more than two incompletes on these responses will fail to meet the minimum requirements to receive a grade for the course. Please be sure to do them and to do them on time.

Theoretical Readings

Each class, in addition to a case, has a couple of theoretical readings assigned. Please do these readings with care and work at putting them into conversation with your thinking about the case.
Weekly Tutorials

Attendance of the weekly tutorial is optional. At the same time, it provides an important chance to discuss the theoretical material at greater length in a smaller classroom setting, which is crucial to learning it. As such, regular attendance is strongly encouraged, and doing so will count toward your participation grade in the course.

Written Assignments

In addition to your case reflections, you will submit three individual pieces of writing. The first will be a short three page description of a case from your own professional experience that you would like to develop into your final paper and workshop in your small group. (See below for more details of the group work component of the course.) It will not be graded, but will be assigned a complete or incomplete. The second will be a four page case analysis of a case that I provide. This will count as a midterm and will be a good way to gauge your progress in the course. The third will be an eight page case analysis of your own ethics case; it is the final paper. By the time you write it, you will have benefitted from having work-shopped it in your small group and, potentially, in the entire class as well. (See below for more on this.)

Details on these three assignments will be provided in lecture. Due dates are:

- Friday, September 30th at 5pm: Three page personal case description
- Friday, October 14th at 5pm: Five page case analysis (midterm)
- Friday, December 9th at 5pm: Personal case analysis (final exam)

Summary

80% of your overall grade is determined by your individual work. That is broken down as follows. Participation in lectures (and attendance of tutorials, should you choose) counts for 20% of your overall grade, your second paper counts for 20%, and your final paper counts for 40%. The daily reflections, and the case description of your own professional experience, are graded as complete or incomplete, and completion of them is required to pass the course.

Group Work

Starting the third week of the course, you will be randomly placed into a group of four or five fellow students in the class. This will be your working group throughout the semester. Your group will be required to meet each week, for an hour, for a total of nine weeks. Groups will be tasked with arriving at a regular time to meet each week, and will be required to report that time to David Gray, the TF for the course. If groups cannot reach an agreed upon time to meet each week we will assign one.
The first three weeks of group work will involve groups doing activities that are required to be completed but not graded, like analyzing cases from former students that I provide. After that, the centerpiece of the group work will involve each student during one session presenting her or his ethics case, with the rest of the group helping him or her analyze it. The session will be led by another member of the group, who will be tasked with writing up a three-page summary of the group analysis of the case and submitting it on behalf of the group. There will be one group session at the end devoted to debriefing the group’s efforts throughout the semester.

The last two weeks of the course will be devoted to work-shopping as an entire class a few of the cases that have been work-shopped in the smaller groups.

20% of your final grade will be based on the analyses of the cases; it will be an average of the four-or-five submissions received throughout the semester from different members of the group. Details on this aspect of the course will be provided in lecture throughout the semester.

**TEXTS**

The readings for this course will be available through the Canvas course webpage.

You will also be required to watch five films:

- *Wall Street*
- *Dead Man Walking*
- *The Whistleblower*
- *Selma*
- *All the Way*

All can be streamed on Amazon for a few dollars each. Copies are available in libraries as well.

**ADDENDUM I: CONFIDENTIALITY**

It is a non-negotiable norm of this course that all personal case discussions that occur in class, in groups, on paper, online, etc. are *strictly confidential*. This means that you are expected not to discuss the details of these cases to anyone who is not taking the course. To make any progress on our own cases, we must together establish a community of trust. As such (and similar to courses like Adaptive Leadership), I take consent to this norm to be constituted by taking this class for credit or auditing it, and thus will hold students accountable accordingly.

**ADDENDUM II: COURSE CONTENT**
It is impossible to teach a course on ethics of any worth, particularly one that aims to engage the world on its terms and not to retreat wholly into the realm of the abstract, that does not regularly touch upon issues that will likely prove challenging for some students. Part of our task as a class will be to learn how to discuss these topics in a productive way. A non-negotiable norm of the course will be that we create a safe space to tackle these matters. Safe, however, does not mean that we will avoid difficult, troubling, upsetting, unsettling and sometimes emotionally charged topics. All care will be taken to confront these issues responsibly. Confront them though we must.

**ADDENDUM III: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

Students are encouraged to re-familiarize themselves with all material relating to academic integrity found here:

http://www.hks.harvard.edu/degrees/registrar/procedures/integrity

This course operates under the expectation that all students understand and will comply with the code of behavior discussed at length under the topics found at the page linked to above.

**ADDENDUM IV: SOCIAL NETWORK POLICY**

I have an online presence through various social networks and am delighted if you’re interested in connecting with me via these sites. I’m also perfectly content if you are not. The views I express on these sites are entirely my own and are not to be confused in any way with me speaking in the capacity of my role at HKS. In light of that, while I’ll happily accept FB friend requests, Twitter followers, etc., I will not initiate such contact. The idea is to do whatever you’re comfortable with.
COURSE SCHEDULE

Part One
Frameworks

1. Doing the Most Good (The Good)
Thursday, September 1

- HKS MC/MPA Case: The Woman in the Corridor
- Paul Bloom et al., “Forum: Against Empathy” Boston Review http://www.boston-review.net/forum/paul-bloom-against-empathy (Please read all contributions.)
- Peter Singer et al., “Forum: The Logic of Effective Altruism” Boston Review http://bostonreview.net/forum/peter-singer-logic-effective-altruism (Please read all contributions)
- Ken Winston, “Introduction”—selections—in Ethics in Public Life

2. Making Hard Decisions (The Right/Just)
Tuesday, September 6

- Joshua Greene, “Trollyology,” Chapter 4 in Moral Tribes.

3. Turning a State Around (The Legitimate)
Thursday, September 8

- Case: Seizing the Moment: Soaring Hopes & Tough Constraints in Myanmar’s Unfolding Democracy
- Ken Winston, “Introduction”—selections—in Ethics in Public Life

4. Saving a City (Moral Responsibility)
Tuesday, September 13

- Naomi Zack, “The Disadvantaged and Disaster” in Ethics for Disaster.
• Joel Feinberg, “Collective Responsibility”

5. Finding Common Ground (Moral Psychology)
Thursday September 15

• Case: The 2016 American Presidential Election
• More readings TBA

Corruption, Complicity and Compromise

6. Avoiding Corruption of Character
Tuesday, September 20

• Case: Wall Street (film)
• David DeSteno and Piercarlo Valdesolo, “Saints and Sinners,” Chapter One of Out of Character.
• Dan Ariely, “Testing the Simple Model of Rational Crime” and “Cheating as an Infection” in The (Honest) Truth About Dishonesty

7. Maintaining Personal Integrity
Thursday, September 22

• MC/MPA HKS Case: The Prison Master’s Dilemma
• Kwon-loi Shun, “Ethical Self Commitment and Ethical Self-Indulgence” in The Philosophical Challenge from China,,” edited by Brian Bruya

8. Standing on Principle
Tuesday, September 27

• Case: Bart Stupak and the Passage of the Affordable Care Act
• Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, “The Value of Compromise,” Chapter One of *The Spirit of Compromise*
• Avishai Margalit, “Two Pictures of Compromise” and “The Morality of Rotten Compromises,” Chapters 1 and 5 of *On Compromise and Rotten Compromises*
• Richard Weisberg, “The Politics of Compromise,” Chapter 2 of *In Praise of Intransigence*

9. **Complicity and Corporate Responsibility**
Thursday, September 29

• HKS MC/MPA Case: Discovery in the Amazon
• Chiara Lepora and Robert Goodin, “Assessing Acts of Complicity” in *On Complicity and Compromise*

**Professional Duties and Personal Morality**

10. **Pushing Your Cause**
Tuesday October 4

• Case: Divided We Stand: Gay Marriage Rulings and Official Disobedience.
• Martha Nussbaum “The Costs of Tragedy: Moral Limits of Cost-Benefit Analysis”
• Kent Greenawalt “Same Sex Marriage and Sexual Relations” in *Exemptions*

11. **Conflicting Loyalties**
Thursday October 6

• HKS MC/MPA Case: Divided Loyalties
• Iris Marion Young, “Affirmative Action and the Myth of Merit,” Chapter 7 in *Justice and the Politics of Difference*
• Kathleen Higgins, “Loyalty from a Confucian Perspective” in *Loyalty: NOMOS LIV*, edited by Sanford Levinson and Paul Woodruff

12. **Revealing Wrongdoing**
Tuesday October 11

• Case: Edward Snowden Hero or Traitor?
13. Taking Extreme Measures  
Thursday October 13

- Frantz Fanon, selections from *The Wretched of the Earth* (1963), 2-4, 5-7, 23-24, 42-44, 50-52

14. Realizing Social Justice  
Tuesday October 18

- Case: *Selma* and *All the Way* (films)
- Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, “The New Racism” in *Racism Without Racists*

15. Advancing Gender Justice  
Thursday October 20

- Case: *The Whistleblower* (film)
- Readings TBA

16. Addressing Criminal Justice  
Tuesday October 25

- Case: *Dead Man Walking* (film)

17. Promoting Human Rights Across Cultures  
Thursday October 27

- HKS MC/MPA Case: Making the List
• Chad Hansen, “The Normative Aspect of Comparative Ethics: Human Rights” in *Confucian Ethics*, edited by Kwong-Loi Shun and David B. Wong

**Ethics and Politics**

**18. Governing with an Agenda**
Tuesday November 1

- Machiavelli, *The Prince*. (selections)

**19. Attacking Political Opponents**
Thursday November 3


**20. Voting in an Election**
Tuesday November 8

- Case and Readings TBA

**21. Challenging Democracy**
Thursday November 10

- Case: Brexit and the EU
- Ilya Somin, *Democracy and Political Ignorance*, selections
- Jason Brennan, *Against Democracy*, selections
- Plato, *The Republic*, Book VIII

Case Workshop
22. Case: Christopher Robichaud and the Satanic Mass at Harvard
Tuesday November 15

- Christopher Robichaud, transcript of MSNBC appearance, http://www.nbcnews.com/id/55237286/ns/msnbc-all_in_with_chris_hayes/t/all-chris-hayes-wednesday-may-th/#.VdIlVWRViko

23. Student Case TBA
Thursday November 17

24. Student Case TBA
Tuesday November 22

25. Student Case TBA
Tuesday November 29

26. Student Case TBA
Thursday December 1