The design for social justice framework offered by Leyden’s et al. wholly supports ethical ways of resolving the three crises, limited only by the subjective nature of ethics (the design framework supports predominantly liberal ethical values). This is because the design framework has specific criteria whose purpose is to ensure an ethical design process and ethical designs. As stated in the article, engaging these criteria “ensure that attention to social justice is incorporated into design solutions”. A few of these criteria are discussed later in this response.

Design ethics consists of micro and macro-ethics. While micro-ethics is already frequently considered in most engineering and design practices, macro-ethics is far from being deeply incorporated into these practices. Due to the nature of macro-ethics and how it is defined, nearly all macro-ethical issues are (or are at least related to) social justice issues. The reason why the design for social justice framework wholly supports ethical design practices can be seen from the name of the framework itself – the consideration of social justice issues are at the core of this design framework. Its entire purpose is to introduce macro-ethics into engineering and design practices. The framework ensures this by specifying criteria that define the framework.

One of the criteria specified is “increasing human rights”. For this criterion, the article emphasizes that designers must be aware of how their designs affect the human rights of which people; that their designs and products have the ability to enforce laws, and therefore *can* be designed with purpose of enforcing laws which protect human rights. The design for social justice framework changes the “can” in the previous sentence to “should”, making the consideration of human rights an integral part of the design process. This criterion strongly supports the individualizing foundations of fairness/reciprocity and harm/care discussed in the article by Graham et al. on liberal and conservative moral foundations.

“Increasing opportunities and resources” and “reducing imposed risks and harms” are two other criteria defining the design for social justice framework. The framework employs a “contextual listening framework”, making it easier for designers to unearth these “social justice dimensions” embedded in designs that would otherwise be difficult to uncover. These two criteria push designers to consciously look for ways to increase equity and social justice. We can judge the ethics of the design for social justice framework with Reflexive Principlism discussed in Brightman and Beever article. In this case, increasing opportunities and resources pushes towards the justice axis, while reducing risks and harms covers the non-maleficence axis.

Another criterion for the framework is “enhancing human capabilities”, where “human capabilities” is defined as “what people are effectively able to do and be or the positive freedoms that people have to enjoy valuable ‘beings and doings’”. Essentially, the idea of “human capabilities” addresses the welfare and well-being of individuals. Similar to the criterion on “increasing human rights”, this criterion is heavily rooted in individualizing moral foundations. Among ten established “human capabilities” which the article refers to, one of them is “other species” which focuses on our respect for the environment, therefore incorporating sustainability into the definition of ethical design as well. Ultimately, the article attributes the enhancement of “human capabilities” as one of the main goals of social justice (the others being the equitable distribution of opportunities and resources while reducing risks and harms, discussed in the paragraph above).

Lastly, the article made it important to note that design for social justice doesn’t hinder other design processes. Instead, it simply “renders visible” social justice dimensions that *should* be inherent constraints already but are often overlooked due to our lack of regard for macro-ethics in engineering design. Therefore, the entire purpose the design for social justice framework is to support ethical forms of design processes. This is essentially the fullest extent possible to which it can support ethical ways of resolving the three crises. The only limitation/flaw in the offered framework is that the framework itself is biased towards liberal ethical values, and therefore people with differing ethical values may not completely agree with the values held by the framework.