The Ethics of Engagement

In 2007, Duke University launched DukeEngage, a $30-million initiative to support intensive civic engagement experiences for undergraduates. The program aims to help students develop valuable skills and self-knowledge as a result of an immersive service experience and to benefit the communities in which students are placed. In the summer of 2008, more than 350 students participated in service projects around the globe, from Durham to Dublin, St. Petersburg to Santiago. In preparation for these ventures, each DukeEngage student also took part in a series of pre-departure workshops, including one on The Ethics of Engagement offered by the Kenan Institute for Ethics.

The Institute's workshops pressed students to examine the ethical issues raised by the tensions of pursuing the twin goals of serving the students' needs and serving society; introduced them to ethical decision-making frameworks and principles of resolution; and explored case studies drawn from previous students’ experiences.

In focusing on those tensions and principles we had several goals for students. First, we wanted them to recognize that they will confront ethical challenges both as individuals and in terms of organizational life and broader issues of public policy. We then wanted them to practice seeking to resolve the challenges—to get in the habit of recognizing and wrestling with real dilemmas. Last, and perhaps most important, we wanted our students to understand the ethical significance of program design, personal reflection, and follow-up as preparation for a long-term commitment to civic engagement. We wanted students to understand that the very act of participating in a short-term immersive experience carries with it significant ethical considerations if they are to avoid falling into the trap of "moral tourism."

These goals were reflected in two of the case studies the students worked through:

Case Study I: Muhuru Bay, Kenya
A Duke student is faced with the choice of whether, against the express wishes of the community, to take an HIV-positive child on a dangerous overnight drive to a medical clinic. The next day, the student’s situation is further complicated by her group’s decision to call in a medical helicopter to evacuate a fellow student who has been bitten by a scorpion. This case press students to assess trade-offs between relieving suffering in the short-term and setting a precedent the program can’t sustain in the long run and between helping an individual and respecting the wishes of the local community. At the same time, the specific dilemmas raise the broader issue of what a more systemic approach to solving problems of health care delivery might
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look like and what kind of knowledge students will need to advance such an approach.

Case Study II: McDougald Terrace, Durham

A Duke student working in an academic and mentoring program in a Durham housing project must decide how to respond to a disruptive six-year-old student whose mother needs the child care the program provides to stay in her job. This case draws out the conflict between the boy’s need for individual attention and the class’s need for safety and for the teacher’s time, as well as the difficulty of coming to a fixed position. It is essential that we balance “making a difference” with analyzing and assessing what counts as making a difference.

This twin mission of action and analysis informs Project Change, our new immersive leadership experience for incoming freshmen at Duke. For eight days in August, the participating students worked to meet a core need of displaced and homeless youth in Durham. In doing so, they learned about the ethical challenges that community change entails as well as the causes of homelessness and displacement and the assumptions underlying the different options for responding to it.

The theme of action and analysis is also a feature of several stories in this issue of Ethics in Action. The lead article “The Ethics of Engagement” discusses the ethical challenges inherent in civic engagement and describes the training that the Institute provided to more than 350 students prior to their taking on intensive service projects. In these sessions, students navigated between their motivations of serving others while serving themselves, wrestled with the opportunities to do good and the risks of possibly doing harm, and confronted the ethical imperative to design appropriate, sustainable interventions.

These ideas are also central to the interview on p. 4 with Fiona Terry, the 2008 Kenan Distinguished Lecturer. Terry shares her analysis of the ethical tensions inherent in humanitarian relief operations, based on her more than 20 years in the field. Too often, she argues, well-intentioned efforts to relieve suffering end up supporting the very forces that have created the crisis. Neither dewy-eyed nor cynical, she offers morally sensitive guidance for taking action when all options are fraught with peril.

Less immediately fraught, but no less important or difficult to resolve, are the challenges of integrating migrants and refugees into a new society. On p. 3, you’ll hear from Duke students who, through our partnerships with University College Dublin and several Irish non-governmental organizations, sought to aid African child refugees in Dublin while simultaneously learning about the complex interplay of race, national identity, and human rights.

In this program, as in all our efforts, we seek to provide opportunities for students to make meaningful commitments to people, places, and principles. Equally important, we want to ensure that civic engagement projects intensify students’ desire for a solid liberal arts education, not serve as an alternative to it.

Our larger goal, which will be significantly enhanced as we add faculty positions in civic and global ethics, is to become a leading force in reinvigorating civic engagement and purpose among undergraduates, analyzing the ethical dimensions of civil society, and advancing solutions to global ethical problems.

We look forward in this and future newsletters to demonstrating our commitment to “doing good,” both in the work that we do and in the questions that we ask along the way.

— Noah Pickus
Notes from the Field

In partnership with DukeEngage and the Geary Institute at University College Dublin, the Kenan Institute for Ethics placed eight Duke students with six different non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Ireland this past summer. For two months these students were immersed in the Irish experience of immigration and migration as well as the real experience of immigrants and refugees who’ve recently found themselves very far from home.

What follows are two students’ reflections at the midway point of their experience. Their thoughts speak to the ethical challenges that the students encountered in their daily work. They also reveal the broader ethical dilemmas that Irish NGOs and Irish society increasingly face in the wake of a historically unprecedented decade of immigration.

Yifan Wang ’10
Mosney is the largest direct provision center in Ireland, housing up to 800 asylum seekers at one time. Individuals seeking asylum are randomly placed in one of approximately 66 direct provision centers throughout the country, with 800 out of 7,000 individuals “lucky” enough to be placed in Mosney.

I visited the center on a Thursday when around 100 residents were preparing to go to the Dublin Zoo. What I saw there both pleasantly surprised me and complicated my views on Ireland’s handling of asylum seekers.

Despite Mosney’s reputation as the best direct provision center in Ireland, I was still expecting the bare minimum in accommodations: bunk beds, low-nutrient foods, cramped facilities. Instead I found that while unrelated individuals often share apartments, no adult individual is forced to share a bedroom with another. The food is nutritious and in high abundance, and while some facilities such as the daycare center are oversubscribed, several buildings and rooms sit without purpose.

On the surface, Mosney is perfect because individuals have all their needs provided for while having all day every day to lounge around. In reality, however, residents often suffer from depression and a sense of hopelessness and lack of purpose. True, they have far superior creature comforts than the average Irish beggar, but they do not have the freedom of choice.

They cannot work, and without work it is often difficult to find meaning in life. They cannot leave the center except on brief day excursions, and above all, they lack security. Most have been waiting for years for the government to make a decision to either allow them to remain in Ireland or send them back to their country of origin. They have no idea how long that decision will take or whether it will be positive or negative. I struggle now with reconciling basic human rights and needs with the responsibilities of government. It pains me to see 800 people walk through life in limbo, but at the same time it is unfair to demand that the Irish government do more. Social welfare in Ireland entitles an individual to approximately €185 per week. Each resident at Mosney also receives this amount, only it is paid directly to the center that supports them.

So the question becomes to what extent can we ask the government to provide more for foreign nationals than it does to its own citizens? There are ethical issues on the individual level that must be considered, but there are also issues that arise at the broader, state level. At Mosney, these two sides collide.

To complicate matters further, most direct provision centers in Ireland are not nearly as good as Mosney. Those run privately often skimp on as much as they can in order to shave costs and increase profit. Does the government have a responsibility to crack down on these centers? After all, life in these centers must be better than life where the residents came from. These are questions that I do not have the answers to, nor will I find the answers anytime soon.

Sara Huff ’09
I am spending part of my time in Dublin working for a newspaper called Metro Eireann, Ireland’s first and only multicultural weekly paper. The week I started my placement, the paper had just broken a story about a Muslim community worker who was denied an award because he refused to shake hands with the female presenter at the ceremony.

The man claimed it was against his Islamic faith to touch a woman who was not his wife. Apparently he had contacted the organizers of the awards days before to see if they could accommodate his request to have a male presenter, and the organizers agreed to do so. But the night of the awards, as the man scribbled notes for his acceptance speech from the audience, a different winner was called in his category. He was outraged that the award was revoked as a result of his religious beliefs.

The event sparked a debate in the immigrant community about the extent to which one should sacrifice his or her own religious or cultural beliefs in order to integrate into a new country. Some prominent Muslim leaders wrote to Metro Eireann in defense of the community worker, quoting passages from Islamic scripture that supported this view of women. Yet other Muslim leaders wrote saying that the man’s actions had no basis in the Islamic faith as practiced today and thus were inappropriate.

The editor of Metro Eireann, a Nigerian immigrant, wrote a response to the event in the following week’s issue saying that if immigrants want to be accepted into Irish society they have to respect the ideal of equality. In his opinion, the Irish people would never be welcoming to immigrants who had such radically different beliefs about gender.

As a woman, I found myself offended by the man’s request for a male presenter. I was unfazed that his award had been revoked but felt he should have been informed about it beforehand. As an American, I couldn’t help but wonder how such a debate would have been settled in our country, where there are strict laws enforcing both religious freedom and gender equality.

Ireland is just beginning to grapple with the hard questions that a multicultural society poses, but unfortunately, it may not be just a matter of time before they master handling such conflicts. Even the United States, which has been lauded as being a land of immigrants, could not offer clear advice in such a difficult situation.
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refugee policy raises for host communities, for countries, and for asylum seekers. Students continued these studies in Ireland with weekly seminars hosted by University College Dublin.

To link personal change and community impact, students took on difficult tasks that were of real value to their organizations and the communities they served. Students were given huge responsibilities—from organizing a path-breaking national conference on the health of women and child refugees to setting up programming for several hundred children, from conducting a survey they designed themselves to developing life-skills classes for refugees. The non-governmental organizations (NGOs) the students were placed with consistently described them as a phenomenal asset. Many were simply stunned by the students’ initiative. All are very eager to have students again next summer and several are making provisions for students to continue their projects through the upcoming year.

The result of being so centrally involved with real tasks ensured that being in Ireland—an English-speaking country with full modern amenities—in fact intensified students’ own emotional challenges. Students worked in NGOs headed by charismatic refugees whose organizational mission was intimately connected to their often horrific personal experience. They then had to help these individuals and their organizations achieve tangible goals in the context of a country that was not their own. This challenge required daily vigilance on their part and was often a deeply humbling experience. Our students had to grapple with the realization that, in the most profound of ways, they cannot be fully successful merely by operating on their own. A good idea and a smart person are only part of any equation.

We’ve found that the intensity of the students’ time in Ireland led them naturally to translate their experience back into their lives in Durham and at Duke. Two students are further pursuing themes developed over the summer by enrolling in the Institute’s Ethics Certificate Program and another is following up on her interest in the asylum process with an independent study course. The Institute facilitated one student’s returning to Ireland in October to present her research at a national conference on women’s health. Another is developing a series of community forums in Ireland where the police and refugees can develop a better working relationship. And yet another student is creating a post-graduation project to work elsewhere in Europe on similar kinds of problems.

The Institute’s workshops for all DukeEngage students and our own Dublin program were both pilot projects. While we’re well on our way to better preparing students for their engagement experiences and to refining our own program, we still have much to do. Both programs need to be informed by continued assessments of the ethical issues that are at the heart of civic engagement. In the meantime, our Dublin students’ own reflections, captured midway through their experience, told their stories of the ethical dilemmas they confronted. ‘They are offered on p. 3 of this newsletter and on our website, dukeethics.org.

— Noah Pickus

WEB EXTRA: Read Institute Faculty Council member Sam Wells’ reflections on three modes of service as well as the full Muhuru Bay, Kenya, and McDougald Terrace, Durham, case studies used in the Ethics of Engagement workshops at dukeethics.org.

Doing Ethics: Fiona Terry

Fiona Terry, the 2008 Kenan Distinguished Lecturer, has spent most of the past 15 years involved in humanitarian relief operations in different parts of the world, including northern Iraq, Somalia, the Great Lakes region of Africa, Liberia, and along the Sino-Korean border. From 2000 to 2003 she worked as a research director with Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors Without Borders) in Paris, before spending three years in Myanmar (Burma) with the International Committee of the Red Cross. Ethics in Action Editor Aimee Rodriguez spoke with Terry while she was on a brief holiday, having just come from the Sudan.

How did you become interested in doing humanitarian work?

It was a political awakening at university that really tweaked my interest. I felt anger and also a sense of injustice—I wondered why I was fortunate to be born where I was born and to whom I was born, why I was given opportunities and others weren’t. It was a sense of that question that drew me to the humanitarian field, particularly as I came to realize that all is not as black and white as perhaps we see it in our undergraduate years.

Had you done much traveling before? How did that motivation become international in scope?

I was very fortunate that while I was at university my stepfather was posted to Papua New Guinea, so every year when everybody else went off on their summer holidays, I went there. My stepfather worked in the Australian High Commission, and I was able to test all of my radical university theories on pretty jaded diplomats who gave my idealism a big blow of realism. It was the best possible training I could have had—there I was, puffed up on all these wonderful ideas of development and justice and what we should be doing, and then I’d see the reality of how difficult it is in places like Papua New Guinea. I was schooled very much in that way.

After that dose of reality you were still interested and motivated enough to continue?!

That’s what drove me actually, that look at how hard it would be. My first post was in Vietnam doing development work—the kind of action that focuses on infrastructure development over a long period of time. It was the most amazing country, and I was very much looking forward to a future in development when I was whisked out of Vietnam and into northern Iraq to help with a big food distribution project. That’s where I got my first taste of humanitarian action and emergency response and the kinds of ethical questions that arise when you’re trying to save lives. I never went back to development again.

There are many college students out there now who are getting their first taste of that same sense of anger and injustice that you felt, and many of them are also engaging in humanitarian work for the first time as well. What advice would you give them?
I would encourage them to keep their passion but not to let it blind them to the stark realities of humanitarian action and the realization that they can do harm as well as good. An awareness of that will already be an amazing achievement. There seems to be very little transmission of lessons learned in the humanitarian field, and this extremely important lesson doesn’t always get passed down. So first being aware that they can do harm is key.

Second, they need to choose an organization to work with that is open to discussion and debate about the potential negative consequences of assistance and other ethical issues. You’d imagine that all humanitarian organizations would be, but that’s not at all the case. It’s astounding to see that there still is this idea that we as humanitarian workers are the salvation of the people we seek to help—that’s just not true. I’d also suggest that they be wary of organizations doing too much self-interested promotional work—those that are more concerned with getting their name and logo on TV than with actually providing aid.

I imagine it’s possible to become so paralyzed by the fear of doing harm that it seems better not to take any action at all. How do we avoid falling into that trap? It’s the gravity of the problems that you have to consider. If you’re facing a situation where there are people dying, then you have to put some of these considerations about what harm you might do down the road in second rank. In an emergency situation, your first priority and obligation is to save lives. Then when the things calm down a bit and you’ve got time to breathe and think, it’s at that point that you do the hard calculations about who is really benefiting from your aid and who is being harmed.

It seems like evaluation and assessment are important when doing humanitarian work, that there’s a need to constantly make sure the work you’re doing is the best for the people you’re trying to help. Would you agree?

Absolutely. You have to evaluate and also make sure you’re very clear-headed about being independent in your assessments and not allowing other parties or authorities to bias those judgments. This is more easily said than done depending on the conflict and the country. Common sense, funnily enough, plays a very big part—keeping your eyes open and being aware of the things that you have to look out for, such as not being pulled to evaluate one population’s needs at the expense of another population hidden around the corner.

So the assessment of whether you’re doing more harm than good is all about asking the right questions?

That and having a good political sense—you really need to know politically what’s going on. Who stands to benefit from this aid coming in? Who stands to lose? As a humanitarian worker, you are part of the political process and whatever you do will have an impact on the political situation, whether you intend it to or not. By your intervention itself you’re going to create winners and losers. You have to be aware of who they’re going to be and to be comfortable with that. And you have to measure that against how many lives will be saved by your intervention. Your assessment can’t be overwhelmed by your motivation.

Let’s talk about that idea of creating winners and losers. By intervening you are automatically taking away one group’s rights in order to protect the rights of another. On the one hand it seems like that should be avoided, but on the other hand, don’t we as countries, organizations, or individuals have a duty to intervene in a humanitarian crisis?

This for me has got to be the ethical question of this year if not the last few. I would actually take it one step further: you have a duty to intervene and you do so—can you actually accomplish what you’ve set out to achieve by fulfilling that duty?

What do you do with a case like Myanmar, where people are dying but the government won’t allow aid in—what do you do then? It’s all well and good to say you have a duty to intervene, but physically, practically, what can you do? Do you invade the country? Do you fly over and drop sacks of rice from the air? How is that rice going to get to the people who need it?

I mix a lot of my ethical questions with a sharp slap of practicality—what do they mean on the ground, what is the practical application of that duty to intervene. It’s really tough. I haven’t got an answer for it, but I’m working on it.

What about individual commitment? Is there an all or nothing in terms of time commitment? Is there a minimum level of experience or education that one must achieve in order to be a good humanitarian worker?

It’s not the degree or the time that makes a better humanitarian worker, it’s the commitment, the feeling, the empathy with those who are suffering. Long-term work does not necessarily imply greater commitment but might instead reflect career and salary considerations, particularly when an organization like the United Nations offers you financial incentives to work in more dangerous posts.

Of course, it’s also important to have skills which will assist the population you are there to aid. There are a lot of implications when people say, “I want to help.” You really need to think about—think about the people you are going to serve, think about why you’re going, and think about whether or not it’s really justified in terms of what it’s costing to get you there versus what you’re actually going to be able to achieve for the people you’re supposedly going there to help.

So let’s say I decide I want to help, and I figure out the best and right way to do that. How do I know if my actions, my aid, have actually made a difference?

That’s tough, because it depends so much on the context. If you’re in Darfur bringing essential elements of survival to people who don’t have those things, you know you’re making a difference. If you’re saving lives, feeding children, if you’re vaccinating, you’re making an impact. You have to look at the small things, because if you put your head up and look globally at a war that’s been going on for so many years, such as in Sudan, then it’s hard to see any kind of long-term improvements. Humanitarian workers are not there to make peace—that’s for the politicians. We’re there to try to improve the dignity of the people suffering, to make sure that they have the minimum of what they’re entitled to as a member of humanity.

What about when I return home? Is there an obligation to make that shorter-term work a longer-term commitment?

I wouldn’t say it’s an obligation, but one would hope that if aid workers come back so moved by what they had seen and by the strength of the people they were trying to help, that they would transmit these ideas and talk about them upon their return. Often the media images we see are not at all the real situation. When people come back, I believe it’s important that they try to rectify the stereotypes and false images that are in place. They could also connect with local refugee communities. I would imagine that it might be fantastic for refugees to talk to someone who’s just come back from their area or their country—that could be really a wonderful gesture.

In collaboration with the Office of the Provost and the Duke Global Health Institute, Fiona Terry will return to Duke in 2009 as a practitioner-in-residence.

Irrational Morality

Ethical decisions often rest on irrational modes of thinking, claims Duke professor Dan Ariely. In fact, Ariely contends, these modes of thinking, and especially the ways in which we make decisions on moral issues, are significantly and consistently shaped by immediate environmental cues and contexts.

Ariely is the James B. Duke Professor of Behavioral Economics at the Fuqua School of Business and a senior fellow in the Kenan Institute for Ethics. He discusses our irrational behaviors and the surprisingly predictable decisions that lead us to such behaviors in his new book, Predictably Irrational: The Hidden Forces That Shape Our Decisions.

The Science of Cheating

Ariely began thinking about moral decision-making, character, and dishonesty after the Enron scandal in 2001. He wondered if there were two different kinds of dishonesty: the premeditated kind and "the kind committed by people who generally consider themselves honest—the men and women who have 'borrowed' a pen from a conference site, taken an extra splash of soda from the soft drink dispenser, exaggerated the cost of their television on their property loss report, or falsely reported a meal with Aunt Enid as a business expense."

Ariely set up a series of experiments designed to measure the circumstances in which people cheat. Testing groups of Harvard undergraduates and MBA students, Ariely created scenarios with various levels of both risk of getting caught and potential reward.

The results were quite revealing. All of the groups presented with an opportunity to cheat did so. Yet they remained consistent in terms of how much they cheated—all of them cheated just a little bit—despite the variance in risk of getting caught.

"People think that cheating is driven by three factors: the reward to be gained, the probability of being caught, and the size of the punishment," Ariely says. "But our studies show that people who cheat have two goals: they want to see themselves as honest and they also want to benefit from cheating," he says.

"Ultimately we find that a given person's dishonesty point is influenced by what they're thinking at the moment, by what they're cheating with, and by what is the local social norm," Ariely says.

Learning Morality

Rather than imagining that good people cheat less and bad people cheat more, Ariely suggests that there is actually no such thing as a good or bad person. He contends that not only do we make ethical decisions based on factors other
than traditional moral values, but that those values are less influenced by our parents than we might think.

"I think that learning right from wrong from your parents is much less in the big picture and much more in the details," Ariely says. "If your parents teach you to 'save your money,' that doesn't mean you will do so. But if your parents teach you to 'put 20 percent of your income into a savings account every month,' you're much more likely to do that."

Ariely argues that parents can't teach you to be a good person, but they can teach you to behave in specific ways. He acknowledges that his is not the sunniest perspective on human nature, in that he believes it's that very nature that makes us all susceptible to ethical transgressions.

"Imagine I'm a physician and you are a patient needing Treatment A or Treatment B," Ariely offers. "I'm not sure which is better, but maybe A looks more appealing. But I own the equipment needed for Treatment B. The question is, can I truly see reality in an objective way? And the answer is no. What this says is that to be biased, you don't need to be a bad physician, you just need to be a person."

**Promoting Ethical Behavior**

Ariely contends that it's our avoidance of temptation that keeps us ethical. "From my perspective, there are no 'good' people; there are people who don't let themselves get tempted." He offers infidelity as an example.

"You have someone who says 'I don't go to office parties, because if I do I know I'll cheat on my spouse,'" he says. "Is he a moral person? If he was at the party, he'd do the same as the immoral person. He just doesn't put himself in that situation.

"People have strict rules where they don't allow themselves to be tempted, or if they're in a tempting situation, they have strict rules about how they behave. It's wherever we have flexibility that we have a place to fail," he says.

Ariely proposes that the solution lies in control. "You have to control the environment by creating the right forms, dictating the culture of the organization, and reducing temptation," he says.

He suggests that in a university setting, for instance, controlling the environment would involve the following practices: creating the right forms by having students sign an honor code at the beginning of each year and at the beginning of every test; dictating the culture by making sure that when someone is caught cheating, there is a social outcry in an exclusion from the university culture; and removing temptation by having a zero tolerance for any gray areas.

**Where to Go From Here**

Ariely suggests that to learn more about promoting ethical behavior, and the impediments to doing so, conversations across disciplines are imperative.

As a senior fellow at the Institute, Ariely has convened the “Almost Honest Colloquium.” The colloquium is intended as a faculty forum for an ongoing dialogue about ethics, moral decision-making, and institutions that will promote research and understanding across disciplines.

"I plan to continue to get a better sense of all kinds and types of dishonesty, to understand the more complex drivers and inhibitors, and to think together with philosophers, economists, psychologists, sociologists, and others about what we can do," Ariely says.

— Aimee Rodriguez

WEB EXTRA: Read Dan Ariely’s blog, as well as the blogs of other Institute fellows, at dukeethics.org.
The Institute began a new series, “What Is Ethics? And Who Cares?” this past fall. Below are comments from the first gathering. Read the full commentary from each contributor on our website at dukeethics.org.

“I define ethics as ‘informed prayer.’ Prayer is openness towards, recognition of, appeal to, explicit desire for, and dependence on the presence of God… For me, ethics is more about bringing people to [a] state of relaxed awareness than it is prescribing how they should behave in its absence.”

— Sam Wells, Dean of Duke Chapel

“Ethics is the arena in which the claims of otherness—the moral law, the human other, cultural norms, the Good-in-itself, etc.—are articulated and negotiated…. Ethics is the ultimate trump card.”

— Geoffrey Harpham, President and Director of the National Humanities Center

“At one extreme, ethics is an alibi to pursue one’s self-interest with a clear conscience and without being an egotistical monster; at the other extreme, it can swamp the self with the impossible debt of unrequitable obligation to society and the world.”

— Srinivas Aravamudan, Director of the Franklin Humanities Institute at Duke University
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