SMC 362Y1S – INTERCORDIA

MEETING TIMES: Tuesdays, 5-7 pm, 6 January – 24 February, Alumni Hall 105
Plus a final meeting in August or September 2015

Instructor: Reid B. Locklin **Office:** Odette Hall 130
Phone: 416.926.1300, x3317 **Email:** reid.locklin@utoronto.ca
Office Hours: ***T 10:10-12 noon*** and by chance or appointment

Email Policy: I will attempt to respond to legitimate email enquiries from students within 3-4 days. If you do not receive a reply within this period, please re-submit your question(s) and/or leave a message by telephone. Where a question cannot be easily or briefly answered by email, I will indicate that the student should see me during my posted office hours.

Course Description

This course, offered in conjunction with an international or other service experience arranged by each student between May and August 2015, will raise critical questions of social justice and international development from diverse religious and disciplinary perspectives. The course will consist of eight academic seminars, seven of which will be held before the international placement and one thereafter.

Course Objectives

1. To demonstrate critical understanding of and engagement with diverse religious and disciplinary perspectives on social justice and international development;
2. To develop strong connections between theoretical understanding and practical application before, during and after the service learning experience;
3. To strengthen academic skills in careful reading, critical analysis, and clear written expression.

Required Texts

- The following required textbooks are available at **Crux Books** (5 Hoskin Avenue, at Wycliffe College; 416.599.2749):
    - John Borrows, *Canada's Indigenous Constitution* (U Toronto P, 2010)
    - Dorothy Day, *Loaves and Fishes* (Orbis, 1963, 1997)
    - Paulo Freire, et al, *Pedagogy of Solidarity* (Left Coast P, 2014)
    - bell hooks, *Belonging* (Routledge, 2009)
    - Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* (Anchor, 1999).
    - Jean Vanier, *Becoming Human* (Anansi, 1998; Paulist, 1999)
- Short pre-readings will be assigned for each week's readings, as well as for the first introductory session. These are available through the Portal (Blackboard).

Assignments and Evaluation

25% – *Class Participation*, including attendance, one classroom presentation, discussion, participation in a summer placement and three email reflections during this placement (in mid-May, mid-June and mid-July).

20% – *Six Short Reflection Papers* (2 pages, 4% each, lowest mark dropped), completed prior to each seminar meeting—excluding the first organizational session and the last seminar. Each paper should offer a brief *description* of the argument of the book, *interpretation* of the source in light of prior knowledge, pre-reading and/or our shared study, and a preliminary *evaluation* of its strength and weaknesses as a way of approaching international development and/or questions of social justice.

25% – *Research Paper* (15-20 pages), due **27 March 2015.** A preliminary bibliography is due on **13 February 2015.**

30% – *Integration Paper* (15-20 pages), due at the final seminar in **September 2015**.

Marking protocols for written work will follow the Grading Regulations described in the *University of Toronto Faculty of Arts and Science (St. George Campus) 2014-2015 Calendar*. **NOTE: *Failure to attempt every one of these written assignments (specifically, the term papers) will ordinarily result in failure of the course.***

Academic Expectations

Students are expected to attend seminar meetings regularly, to submit assignments on time, and to participate actively in class discussions. It is also expected that reading assignments will be completed by the assigned date and time. Excessive absences and/or obvious lack of preparation will weigh against the participation portion of the student's final grade. *Please turn off pagers and cell phones during class.*

All students in this class are bound by the Code of Behavior on Academic Matters available at <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppjun011995.pdf>. Each individual student is responsible for completing her or his own work and for appropriately acknowledging outside sources used in the preparation of papers and other written work.

Reading Schedule

6 January 2015:	Introduction to the Course – Organizational Meeting
13 January 2015:	The Idea of Development – Sen, *Development as Freedom*
20 January 2015:	The Idea of Law – Borrows, *Canada's Indigenous Constitution*
27 January 2015:	Catholic Social Teaching – Day, *Loaves and Fishes*
3 February 2015:	Critical Theory & Praxis – Freire, et al, *Pedagogy of Solidarity*
10 February 2015:	Racism and Reconciliation – hooks, *Belonging*
24 February 2015:	Jean Vanier's Vision – Vanier, *Becoming Human*
Eighth Meeting TBA:	Presentation and Discussion of Integration Papers

Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom*
Reading Guide
SMC362Y1S (2014-15)

Pre-Reading: Read Martha C. Nussbaum, "What Makes Life Good?", *The Nation,* 2 May 2011, available on the web: <http://www.thenation.com/article/159928/what-makes-life-good>, also available on the Portal. This is an excerpt from Nussbaum's previously published *Creating Capabilities* (Harvard UP, 2011).

Discussion: Amartya Sen is most well-known as the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize in Economics in 1998. Born in 1933 to a Hindu family in what is now Bangladesh, he completed studies in Calcutta and Cambridge, subsequently taught in several American and Indian universities, including Oxford University and Cambridge. He is currently the Thomas W. Lamont University Professor and Professor of Economics and Philosophy at Harvard University, while also maintaining a "special relationship" with the University of Delhi and many contacts in Bangladesh and India. His career started with a reconsideration of the "social choice" theory of Kenneth Arrow in the 1970s and 1980s and gradually expanded to include issues of famine and famine prevention, equality and justice in the political theory of John Rawls, and development policy. In the early 1990s he collaborated with Mahbub ul Haq at the United Nations to formulate a series of *Human Development Reports* and especially the "Human Freedom Index."

With ul Haq and his frequent collaborator Martha Nussbaum, Sen argued for a broader approach to human development than permitted by standard approaches that focus almost exclusively on GDP. As a careful reading of the fifth chapter of *Development and Freedom* well reveals, Sen like Dambisa Moyo (but unlike some voices we will encounter later in the course) is very insistent about the value of free market capitalism. But he sharply challenges its sufficiency as an indicator or tools of human development. *Development and Freedom*, published shortly after Sen received the Nobel Prize, is his attempt to make the case for an alternative approach that focuses not merely on GDP, but on what he will refer to in many places as "lives we have reason to value" (14)—what Nussbaum will call the "Capabilities Approach."

What to Look For: Nussbaum's short essay nicely illustrates the leading concerns of the Capabilities Approach by focusing on a particular case: Vasanti, a poor woman in Ahmedabad, India. As you read Sen, you will encounter a substantively similar argument, albeit one articulated primarily in terms of global systems and economic statistics. Keep in mind that some of the examples Sen provides are a bit dated now: one student objected to his very positive assessment of Zimbabwe, for example, which has now departed significantly from the path it seemed to be on in the 1980s. Focus on the broad framework of his claims:

1. What *evidence* and *arguments* does Sen offer to argue that a purely economic approach, focused on GDP, fails as a measure of "development"? At what points do they cohere and at what points do they diverge from the analysis of Dambisa Moyo and other participants in the Munk debate, which you viewed last week? How might Sen's approach change the approach to development policy?
2. How does Sen propose to *measure* or *assess* the success of any development policy? Stated differently, how do we know whether people have become more or less free?

You should feel free to address these or other questions in the interpretation and evaluation portions of your reflection paper you prepare for class on 13 January.

John Borrows, *Canada's Indigenous Constitution*
Reading Guide
SMC362Y1S (2014-2015)

Pre-Reading: Watch at least the first 15 minutes of Val Napoleon's lecture entitled, "Recovering Indigenous Legal Systems & Governance" from 27 April 2013 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gd2NYIfDXo0>. You might also take a look at the more detailed application of legal pluralism in Sarah Morales' 17 May 2012 lecture on "Cooperation or Conquest: Coast Salish Legal Traditions & the Canadian State"< http://www.lrwc.org/sarah-morales-cooperation-or-conquest-coast-salish-legal-traditions-the-canadian-state-video/>. If you have leisure, you might also listen to John Borrows' recent lecture in the series "Fragile Freedoms" at the new Canadian Museum for Human Rights, in Winnipeg <http://www.cbc.ca/ideas/episodes/2014/07/25/fragile-freedoms---first-nations-and-human-rights-1/index.html>

Discussion: John Borrows is a member of the Chippewas of Nawash First Nation and Anishinabe in Ontario, growing up on the Bruce Peninsula. He is also one of the leading scholars and activists in the area of Indigenous legal and political rights, currently holding professorships at both the University of Victoria and the University of Minnesota faculties of law. He has published a number of books in addition to the one that we are reading, including *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law* (2002) and *Drawing Out Law: A Spirit's Guide* (2010), both published by the University of Toronto Press.

In *Canada's Indigenous Constitution*, Borrows argues for a fuller recognition of "legal pluralism"—the existence of multiple legal frameworks in a single social order—as a central principle of Canadian jurisprudence and, with such a recognition, a more robust incorporation of Indigenous legal traditions within Canadian society at large. Chapter 1-6 lay out the case for legal pluralism and the coherence of Indigenous traditions of law in the abstract; chapters 7-10 apply these principles to particular legal institutions, including the Canadian government, courts, law schools and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms.*

What to Look For: We are reading John Borrows work for two major reasons: first, to get a sense of the rationale, status and function of law as a principle of securing justice and, second, to become acquainted with Indigenous legal traditions as a living alternative to the dominant legal regimes in Canada and elsewhere in North and South America. Val Napoleon's lecture addresses both of these issues in a way that is broadly coherent with Borrow's approach. As you read Borrows' more detailed argument, I would encourage you to consider these questions:

1. What is a *legal tradition*? What are the sources of Indigenous law, or *any* law? How does law function to secure justice, and how does it concretely develop and change? Borrows primarily addresses these questions with reference to Indigenous law, but the principles and examples that he provides could also be applied to many other legal regimes.
2. What *evidence* and *arguments* does Borrows provide to argue that Canadian society would benefit from a fuller recognition of Indigenous legal traditions? What are some common concerns about bi-judicialism and legal pluralism, and how does Borrows address these concerns in the course of his discussion?

You should feel free to address these or other questions in the interpretation and evaluation portions of your reflection paper you prepare for class on 20 January.

Dorothy Day, *Loaves and Fishes*
Reading Guide
SMC362Y1S (2014-2015)

Pre-Reading: For a brief introduction to major themes of Catholic Social Teaching, read Pope Francis, "Visit to the Community of Varginha (Manguinhos)," *The Holy See*, 25 July 2013, <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/francesco/speeches/2013/july/documents/papa-francesco_20130725_gmg-comunita-varginha_en.html> and Pope Francis, "Address to Participants in a Conference Sponsored by the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace Celebrating the 50th Anniversary of 'Pacem in Terris,'" *The Holy See*, 3 October 2013 <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/francesco/speeches/2013/october/documents/papa-francesco_20131003_50-pacem-in-terris_en.html>, available on the Portal. If you have leisure, the film *Entertaining Angels* (Paulist Media, 1996) is a worthy, if somewhat romanticised portrait of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker movement.

Discussion: Dorothy Day (1897-1980) was an American activist and, with Peter Maurin (1877-1949), founder of the Catholic Worker movement during the era of the Great Depression. As a young journalist in New York City, she was already sympathetic to radical politics, but her life took an unexpected turn when she converted to Catholicism in 1927—a conversion inspired, in part, by the birth of her daughter Tamara. Some five years later, she met Peter Maurin and made a commitment to a newspaper, *The Catholic Worker*, and a radical grass-roots programme of hospitality, poverty reduction, pacifism and self-reliance. She and Maurin are generally classified as Christian personalists, equally critical of capitalist and socialist ideologies. Day's most important works are her autobiography, *The Long Loneliness*, and her narrative history of the Catholic Worker movement, *Loaves and Fishes*.

We are reading Day both as an original thinker in her own right and as a representative of **Catholic Social Teaching (CST)**. The origins of CST—sometimes called the Catholic Church's "Best Kept Secret"—are usually traced to Pope Leo XIII's 1891 encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, "On the Condition of Labour." Key themes of CST include: the intrinsic dignity of the human person, the significance of meaningful labour, the centrality of community and the common good, the interconnection of human rights and social responsibilities, the "preferential option" of the poor, the virtue of solidarity, and, especially recently, the integrity of the natural world (see DeBerri, et al, *Catholic Social Teaching* [Orbis, 2003]). Day makes few explicit references to this teaching, beyond passing mention of "the teachings of recent popes," and she sometimes clashed with Church authorities. Nevertheless, her movement is usually interpreted as a particularly compelling, if also particularly radical, application of the core principles of CST.

What to Look For: From the two addresses by Pope Francis, you will gain a good orientation to major principles of CST on the question of poverty, development and the global economic system. Read Day as an earlier response to many of the same issues, as raised by the Great Depression of the 1920s and 1930s. Consider the following questions:

1. Day's personal piety is very evident in *Loaves and Fishes*, and she describes the entire project as an application of the "works of mercy." Yet, one can ask: to what extent is this a religious vision? How does it cohere with or diverge from the vision of Pope Francis?
2. Though her narratives, Day describes a fairly coherent programme of development, focused on issues of poverty and unemployment. What are the major principles and practices of this approach? How does the Catholic Worker define "development"?

You should feel free to address these or other questions in the interpretation and evaluation portions of your reflection paper you prepare for class on 27 January.

Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of Solidarity*
Reading Guide
SMC362Y1S (2014-2015)

Pre-Reading: Read Gerald McCarthy, "A World Waiting for Paulo Freire," *The Month* 33.9/10 (Sept/Oct 2000): 393-98, available electronically through the UTLibraries system. If you have leisure, it would also be worthwhile to watch the last interview Paulo Freire gave before his death in 1997: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aFWjnkFypFA>.

Discussion: Born in Brazil to middle-class parents, Paulo Freire (1921-1997) grew up in relative poverty in the 1930s, due to the Great Depression. He studied law and philosophy in the 1940s, and went on to design literacy programmes for the urban and rural poor, founded on principles of dialogue and cultural transformation. After a military coup in 1964, Freire was briefly imprisoned and then sent into exile until 1979. While in exile, working in agrarian reform in Chile, he published his signature work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968, ET 1970). In this work, he sharply criticized what he called the "banking model" of education, calling instead for a programme of dialogue and concientization that drew deeply—though not uncritically—on Marxist models of *praxis* and revolutionary action. His work has been influential in the fields of education, critical theory and Christian liberation theology. *Pedagogy of Solidarity* was published in 2014, based on a lecture and dialogue with Freire at the University of Iowa in 1996.

Gerald McCarthy offers a useful summary of many of Freire's major ideas, and places them into dialogue with landmarks of Catholic Social Teaching, including the Vatican II document on the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et Spes* (1965), the statement of the Latin American bishops at Medellin (1968) and Pope John Paul II's *Ecclesia in America* (1999). Paulo Freire's mother was a devout Catholic, as was Freire himself, and much of his early work was inspired by the Catholic Action movement in the 1940s – a social justice movement that resonated strongly with Dorothy Day's Catholic Worker movement. His anthropology, or vision of the human person, tends to the transcendental in its emphasis on the unfinished, ever striving nature of the human person. His work, however, rarely if ever refers explicitly to Catholic traditions, and most commentators would agree that it stands as a significant contribution to the philosophy of education and critical theory in its own right.

What to Look For: *Pedagogy of Solidarity* is a co-authored work, including the lecture and dialogue with Paulo Freire along with commentary by Walter Ferreira de Oliveira, Ana Maria Araújo Freire, Norman K. Denzin and Donald Macedo. Please read all of these as extensions of Freire's own thought, as you consider the following questions:

1. What are the major principles of Paulo Freire's educational theory? What does he mean by the statement, "there is no education without ethics" (25), and why does he so strongly critique any pretense to political neutrality on the part of would-be educators?
2. To what extent doe *Pedagogy of Solidarity* advance a theory or implicit vision of human development? Stated differently, what is the vision (or visions) of the human person advanced by Freire and the co-authors of this volume, and how does his theory of educator aim towards such persons' full development? How does this compare with other theories we have encountered earlier in this course?

You should feel free to address these or other questions in the interpretation and evaluation portions of your reflection paper you prepare for class on 3 February.

bell hooks, *Belonging*
Reading Guide
SMC362Y1S (2014-2015)

Pre-Reading: Read Mary Jo Leddy, "The God of Small Neighborhoods," in *The Other Face of God: When the Stranger Calls Us Home* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2011), 73-94. If you have leisure, please consider watching the recent, extended interview with bell hooks, "Are You Still a Slave? Liberating the Black Female Body" <http://new.livestream.com/thenewschool/slave>.

Discussion: bell hooks is the pen-name for Gloria Jean Watkins, a prominent African-American feminist and postmodern cultural critic. Born in Hopkinsville, Kentucky, bell hooks began her academic career in English literature and Ethnic Studies and held teaching posts at the University of Southern California, University of California, Yale University, Oberlin College, City College of New York and, beginning in 2004, Berea College in her home state of Kentucky. Her first major work, *Ain't I a Woman? Black Women and Feminism*, was published in 1981. Among the many works she published since that time, she is perhaps best known for her trilogy of works in engaged pedagogy: *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), *Teaching Community* (2003) and *Teaching Critical Thinking* (2010).

As an educational theorist, bell hooks stands in the tradition of Paulo Freire, and her work advances many similar critiques of the "banking model" of education, the importance of dialogue, and the explicitly political, partisan character of teaching and theorizing experience. She does so, however, from a distinctive interpretive perspective, as a Black feminist committed to addressing the mutual connections among racism, sexism and class divisions – what she will sometimes call "the system of imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" (e.g. *belonging*, 8). Whereas Freire's vision is grounded in a transcendentalist philosophy and a commitment to a particular form of Marxist practice, hooks offers a more communitarian vision of mutual relations and the formation of a "Beloved Community." In *belonging*, hooks explicitly extends her communitarian vision to include ecology, sustainability and a theory of place.

What to Look For: Like many of her works, *belonging* is a collection of essays, connected by theme. Leddy's pre-reading will help introduce the notion of place and community as primary loci of ethical reflections. After this, I recommend beginning with chapters 7-8 to get a sense of the critical theory that hooks brings to her study of rural Kentucky. From there, you can return to the introduction and other chapters to discern how this study of "place" fits within hooks' larger, post-colonialist critique. You might consider the following questions:

1. How does bell's notion of "place" and a regionalism relate to her social analysis of "imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy"? In what ways, and to what extent, is commitment to the earth a feminist and anti-racist concern?
2. As usual, I would also encourage you to read this book as advancing a theory of development, just like Amartya Sen or Dorothy Day. Particularly as she articulates notions of community and communion, you might ask: what is hooks' implicit vision of human persons, and how can a rootedness in place contribute to their full development?

You should feel free to address these or other questions in the interpretation and evaluation portions of your reflection paper you prepare for class on 10 February.

Jean Vanier, *Becoming Human*
Reading Guide
SMC362Y1S (2014-2015)

Pre-Reading: Read Stanley Hauerwas, "Finding God in Strange Places: Why L'Arche Needs the Church," in *Living Gently in a Violent World*, by Stanley Hauerwas and Jean Vanier (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2008), available on the Portal. Also useful as an introduction to the philosophy of Jean Vanier is the video *Belonging: the Search for Acceptance*, by Karen Pascal and Jean Vanier (Markham, Ont.: Windborne Productions, 2002), as well as a recent two-part CBC radio series entitled, "How to Do Ordinary Things": <http://www.cbc.ca/ideas/episodes/2014/09/02/how-to-do-ordinary-things-part-1/index.html>.

Discussion: Jean Vanier provides a good deal of autobiographical detail in *Becoming Human*, much of which may already be familiar to you. The son of the former Governor-General of Canada, Georges Vanier (1888-1967), Vanier served in the Royal Navy and Royal Canadian Navy during World War II, completed a philosophy degree focused on the ethics of Aristotle at l'Institut Catholique de Paris in 1962, and taught philosophy briefly at St. Michael's College. In 1964, at the suggestion of Fr. Thomas Philipe, Vanier started an intentional community with two men with disabilities in Trosly-Breuil, France, which he called L'Arche, after Noah's Ark. Since then, L'Arche has grown into an international movement. Vanier himself became something of a public intellectual in Canada and France, speaking and publishing on the L'Arche movement, on philosophy and theology, and on peace and reconciliation. *Becoming Human* began as the 1998 Massey Lectures, originally broadcast on the CBC *Ideas* radio programme.

Vanier describes *Becoming Human* as, above all, a work of "anthropology," about what it means to be a human being. He also describes it, however, as a work about the "life of faith." Perhaps, therefore, it is best described as a work of spiritual anthropology. At the centre of Vanier's vision is the conviction that we become fully human only through experiences of weakness, vulnerability and, eventually, inclusive community. The goal and scope of the work is thus very close to that of bell hooks' *belonging*; the method and mode of reflection is, on the other hand, very different, as is the context in which these reflections take place.

What to Look For: Stanley Hauerwas offers an interpretation of the L'Arche movement from the point of view of a Christian ethicist, drawing particular attention to the movement's attentiveness to patience, emplacement and peace-building. Few of these themes are explicit in *Becoming Human*, but it would be worthwhile reading the work with them in mind. You might also consider the following questions:

1. How does Jean Vanier's vision of human anthropology compare with others we have encountered in this class, particularly those of Freire and hooks? How does his focus on human vulnerability, insecurity and hunger for interpersonal healing shape the way that he approaches questions of development? Is this view coherent with critical theory?
2. Hauerwas contends that L'Arche offers something rather modest, "not a solution but a sign" (52) of reconciliation and human transformation. Is this sufficient as a response to inequity? What is the specific contribution that Vanier and L'Arche make to the questions of development, justice and ethics that we have been exploring in this course?

You should feel free to address these or other questions in the interpretation and evaluation portions of your reflection paper you prepare for class on 24 February.

“I don’t have time to do the reading!”

Obviously, in order to do well in a course, you will eventually have to complete the readings very carefully—typically this will require *between 3 and 4 hours* of preparation for each and every class. However, particularly as we come to the end of the term, you may not always be able to commit this time before each class.

So what do you do if you cannot complete the reading?

BRING THE READINGS TO CLASS

First and foremost, please **bring the readings with you to class**. If you have not read, and you do not have the readings with you, you make yourself a completely passive learner . . . which, for most students, means that you are unlikely to do much learning at all. There are exceptions to this rule, but they are few. Most people learn most effectively through engagement.

If you do not have time to complete the readings, however, you can still engage with them. Here are some suggestions:

- If you have only **5 minutes** for preparation: take a quick look at *handouts* and/or *secondary source* assignments to get a sense of the reading. A secondary source may summarize a primary source very succinctly.
- If you have only **15-20 minutes** to prepare: Do the above, plus read all of the *chapter headings* in the reading, if they exist. Often, this will allow you to hone in on a short statement of the most essential points: for example, a section labelled "The Main Point of My Argument" is very likely to be of central importance to whatever we will discuss in class. This doesn't help with every source but it is a good tool to keep in your academic kit.
- If you have an **hour**: read the *first and last paragraph of each chapter* of a selection, and the *first and last sentence of every paragraph*, and slow down here and there to read passages that are obviously central. For most authors, this will give you a very good idea of the main argument.
- What if you have **no time at all**? *Bring the reading with you to class*.

(Adapted from an email rant by Prof. Reid Locklin; used with permission)

SMC 362 Research Paper
Due: 27 March 2014
Weight: 25% of Course Mark
Length: 15-20 pages (double-spaced, 12 point font)

Grassroots Development

This assignment is designed to prepare you intellectually and historically for the locale in which you will be placed in the spring/summer, as well as for your critical reflection on that placement experience. You may attempt this assignment under one of three of the following headings: ***person, event, or organization***. Regardless of which category you choose, you will be *1) researching and writing on a development issue germane to your planned placement*, and *2) evaluating or reflecting upon that issue in light of one or more of the theories we have studied in this class.* Each assignment will require that you submit a preliminary bibliography of sources, including at least one primary source on the subject of your paper. A draft of this bibliography must be submitted to the course instructor by 13 February.

A. **Person**: choose a person from your region, or who was influential in your region, who has dedicated themselves to development issues. This is not a biography, pure and simple, but an exploration of their involvement in development issues. Make an assessment of their success or failures to better the lives of people within your prospective country. **Example**: El Salvador—Archbishop Oscar Romero; his struggle for the poor of his country that led to his untimely death. Primary source: Romero, "A Bishop's Diary."

B. **Event:** choose an event in the modern history of your prospective country that had a significant impact on the development (or lack thereof) in your country of placement. What were the causes of this event? How did the event unfold? What was its effect on the development of the country in question? **Example**: Ghana—in 1957 Ghana became the first in a wave of African nations to declare their independence from former colonial powers (in this case Britain). How did the transfer of power to local hands affect the human development of this new country? What social and political elements proved to be helpful/harmful to Ghana's early development? Primary source: newspapers on line.

C. **Organization**: choose a Non Governmental Organization that is currently working in your prospective country (not Intercordia) and write a paper detailing the origins of this group's involvement in the country's human development. **Example**: Chiapas, Mexico: Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace and the Fair Trade Coffee Program. What are the origins of CCODP? What are the essential characteristics of "fair trade" over standard trade practices? What role has CCODP played in the coffee trade? Does fair traded coffee contribute to human development in Chiapas?

Appendix: Each paper is required to have a 1 page appendix (single-spaced) outlining the principal characteristics of your prospective country [land area, population, language, religion, currency, literacy, economy, trade, form of government, any important recent historical developments etc.] This will allow you a saving of space in the essay since the reader can refer to the appendix for any details. **Example**: The Principality of Liechtenstein is one of Europe's smallest countries, with a land mass of only 160 square kilometres. In 2005, it had a population of 33, 717, of which 5,300 live in its capital city of Vaduz. …

THE REFLECTION PROCESS FOR SMC362Y1Y

What are Reflection Partners?

Before leaving for placement, each student will be assigned to one reflection partner for the duration of their placement – ordinarily, this will be the instructor, Reid Locklin. Some time between the last seminar in March and the research paper due date in April, please inform Reid if you would like to have a different reflection partner. The reflections that you submit to your partner will not receive separate marks, but they are course requirements. Unless the reflection partner has serious concerns about a student's physical or emotional health, these reflections will be confidential.

When Do I Submit Reflections?

You will hopefully be keeping a journal throughout your summer placement. In addition to this ongoing reflection, we are also asking each student to submit three reflections to their reflection partners (preferably by email), one at the end of each month of your stay—that is, for most students, one at the end of May, another at the end of June, and a final reflection at the end of July. These reflections are intended to build upon the reflection you are already doing in your journal. ***For these reflections, you should feel free to draw directly on material from your journal, blog or any other platform you are using for personal reflections – you can even cut and paste other reflections into this one.***

What Should Be Included in These Reflections?

The specific purpose of these reflections is *to integrate the academic and experiential dimensions of your learning*. In each reflection, therefore, I ask you to do two things:

1) **Describe, interpret and evaluate 2-3 specific experiences** from your placement that month. Any experiences are fine, from the most mundane (meals, sleeping) to the most jarring or profound (experiences of racism, breakthrough moments in your work, etc.). You should, however, make an effort to interpret and evaluate these experiences critically, either all together or one at a time, asking what assumptions you brought to these experiences, how these assumptions might have been challenged, how they have changed the way you think about issues such as development, or justice, or the culture of your community placement, etc. As mentioned above, for this part of the assignment you should feel free to draw on reflections you have written in your journals or blogs.
2) Try, even briefly, to **apply concepts** from your research and reading for this or other courses to the experiences you describe, either in addition to your subsequent interpretation and evaluation or as part of them. Do this from memory—do *not* try to cite readings – and don't worry if the application seems superficial or includes elements of pure contrast. Economic theory, Catholic

Social Teaching and the personal narratives of bell hooks and Dorothy Day may seem quite distant from your experience, and you will not be able to relate every experience to course texts. Nevertheless, even the most passing application in the midst of your placement may plant seeds that can develop more fully in your final integration papers.

What Kind of Response Will I Receive?

The role of the reflection partner is to give you a **substantive response** to your reflection – to respond directly to your experiences, to clarify or to challenge your reflections, and perhaps most importantly to raise further questions. We will, as a rule, endeavour to reply within 10 days of receiving your reflection.

SMC362 Final Integration Paper
Due: Final Academic Seminar (August/September 2015)
Weight: 30% of Course Mark
Length: 15-20 pages (double-spaced, 12 point font)

This assignment is designed to help you reflect critically on your summer experience and make connections to and from your academic work for the course. More specifically, for this paper assignment, you will be asked to develop a synthetic argument about social justice and/or human development from your experiences and from academic sources, revealing how selected development theories and visions we have encountered in class help inform your reflection on the summer experience, and vice-versa.

The resources on which you can draw in writing your paper include; the core readings of SMC362Y1S (Amartya Sen, John Borrows, Dorothy Day, Paulo Freire, bell hooks, Jean Vanier), as well as your reflection papers on these core readings; the sources you used for your research paper, prior to departure; and your journal entries and formal reflections, which you generated throughout your three-month summer experience.

There is no single source that is required and, as this paper represents a culmination of your academic and personal reflections, we hope that you will use it as an opportunity to develop your own distinctive ideas about social justice and/or human development. As it is also an *integration* paper, however, it must also integrate disparate elements and reveal your ability to bring academic theory and personal experience together in a critical and original way.

With these goals in mind, we think that the satisfactory integration paper will meet the following minimum requirements, in any order:

1. Substantive, accurate and sustained discussion of ***at least two significant academic sources***, including at least one of the core readings for the course;
2. Substantive, sustained and reflective discussion of ***at least two specific experiences*** from your summer placement;
3. Some critical account of ***how reflection on your summer placement experience helps you understand or explain a key concept*** from one or more of your academic sources;
4. Some critical account of ***how a key concept from one or more of your academic sources offers insight*** for reflecting on your summer placement experience;
5. Some attempt to ***draw together these disparate experiences, theories and your own critical reflection*** into a single, cohesive argument.

Though the paper involves critical, personal reflection as an integral component, it is still an academic paper. Hence, you should again remember to include a clear statement of your main point in your introduction and to support your arguments with evidence and documented sources (endnotes or footnotes in standard/University of Chicago style are preferred, though you can also ask to use MLA Style). A bibliography or works cited page is required at the end of the paper.

The Chameleon Complex, and the Final Academic Seminar

SMC362Y1S – Locklin

> Eight years after participating in the international service-learning program in Nicaragua, Karen provides a compelling metaphor that captures the ongoing struggle inherent in the chameleon complex, 'I am like a fish out of water . . . I don't fit in anymore . . . I am a fish with legs . . . so what do I do? I go back into the water with legs on . . .'[1]

Educational theorist Richard Kiely has coined the term "Chameleon Complex" to describe the dilemma faced by many students who return to their First-World lives after profound and often emotionally intense experiences in the Two-Thirds World. Beyond the ordinary difficulties of re-integration, shared by many students in travel abroad programmes, those who engage in direct service and immersion with persons in situations of extreme poverty and injustice often find the return particularly jarring. Indeed, the experience of "dissonance" between the placement experience and one's ordinary life can sometimes become more, rather than less intense with the passage of time. In such cases, as revealed in the above quotation, persons can come to feel like "chameleons," immersed in a world that they no longer completely understand and that, at least in some important respects, they no longer accept.

The struggles that may follow your return to Canada will be a source of continued reflection, well beyond the confines of this course. The major purpose of the final academic seminar is to give you the opportunity to share insights gained in the process of writing your final integration papers—which will be due at the beginning of the class session. Nevertheless, most of the folks associated with this course consider ourselves "chameleons" to one degree or another, based on our own transformative experiences of service and/or immersion in the Two-Thirds World. Though our experiences differ specifically from yours, most of us would largely trace our commitment to Intercordia to these early experiences. So we think that the "chameleon complex" might help all of us focus our shared conversation and suggest ways of reflecting on the possible long-term impact of your participation in the Intercordia programme.

With these preliminary reflections in mind, we recommend that you prepare for the academic seminar by considering three key questions:

1. What is one leading insight you formulated for the first time in reflecting on your placement experience and/or writing the Integration Paper?
2. Since your return, have you experienced anything like a "chameleon complex"? What do such experiences teach you, and how might they be sustained in the years to come?
3. How does your answer to #1 relate to your answer to #2?

---

[1] Richard Kiely, "Transformative International Service-Learning," *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 22 March 2005; <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Transformative+international+service-learning-a0132867360>, accessed 13 February 2008.