Overview and Objectives

This course starts from two main premises:

1. Value judgments are pervasive in policy decision-making.
2. Value conflicts are irreducible and ineliminable.

Value judgments\(^1\) are pervasive in policy decision-making. Morality is not just a set of constraining rules you make sure you aren't violating before you make a decision on other grounds, and it isn't just one more factor to consider along with, say, financial costs. We make moral judgments whenever we decide whose interests to count in our analyses, what should be considered part of our organization's mission, which costs are acceptable, and what our funding priorities should be. We often make moral judgments without even realizing that we are doing it - when everyone around assumes that X is a good thing to pursue, it is easy for a smart policy analyst to jump straight ahead to figuring out how to get the most X for the least $ and not even pausing to realize that X's value was something decided on. It might even count as shocking naïveté to question whether X is really good. This class is pro-shocking-naïveté. One goal of the course will be to try to make implicit moral judgments explicit, and examine them in the light of day. Maybe we will decide they are in good order. Maybe we will not.

Value conflicts are irreducible and ineliminable. Many policy analysts, like many philosophers, see the diversity of moral viewpoints people actually hold as something of an embarrassment. Not an embarrassment for us, of course, we're right, but an embarrassment for them. Why can't they just stop seeing things that stupid way and agree with my clearly correct way? Some people who worry about this kind of thing swing all the way the other direction and say that the answer must be that no one is right, and that's why we can't all agree. I hate to say it, but both of these views are luxuries that philosophers can afford but policy analysts and policy makers cannot.

\(^1\) In this course, we will not make much of any differences of meaning between "morality," "ethics," and "value." When we speak of rules we follow, we will use "morality" and "ethics" more or less interchangeably. When we talk about what we would like to create or see happen, we will talk about things we "value."
Even if there were One True Morality out there, waiting to be discovered - by you! - it would do you little good. Arguments between utilitarians and deontologists have been ongoing for hundreds of years and your RFP language is due next Tuesday. On the other hand, you can't rest content with easy relativism. It is hard to agree to disagree when in the final analysis you are either going to get to inspect this nuclear facility or you aren't.

The second principle means we need tools for constructively engaging, across value divides, with the issues we will (hopefully) be unearthing as a result of attending to the first. To that end, by the completion of this class, you should be able to:

- engage respectfully and constructively in disagreements about morality and values,
- identify and clarify the moral issues that surround difficult (and, heck, easy) policy decisions,
- write clearly and concisely about moral issues and policy analysis,
- integrate your moral analysis of a situation with the relevant non-moral facts,
- understand some of the major moral issues that arise in connection with the practice of democratic politics, the relationship between the individual and the state, and the use of state violence, and
- if all else fails, have a sense of some of the major debates in academic political philosophy.

The rest of this syllabus describes the tools we will use to try to achieve these objectives.

**Structure of the Class**

There are many issues to explore in a class like this, and sitting for two hours while I describe them to you is likely to be one of the least effective and most boring ways to explore them. Therefore, this class uses a very decentralized structure, where you are expected to more of the relatively passive absorption of material outside of the class period, but we will do more relatively active work in the classroom itself.

**Outside the Classroom: Reading and Audio Lectures**

As with any class, one of your primary jobs as a student is to read interesting things. *This is a fantastic job to have.* There's not much more to say than this. For each session, I have

---

2 Please take this seriously. Doing applied ethics well is hard, precisely because you must understand the non-moral facts quite well before you can responsibly pronounce on the difficult question of what is to be done. I will be merciless on writing that tries to play fast and loose with the empirical facts because this is philosophy class.

3 As you read through this syllabus, you may start to think, "Hey, if I play my cards right, I can probably get away with blowing off at least some of the reading!" Yes, that's true, by design, actually. You are all adults, and I feel silly giving pop quizzes. Either the reading is valuable to you, or it isn't. If it is, you're only hurting
collected a number of readings that address a core theme, and if you read them you will be much better equipped to participate in discussions and other activities than if you do not.

The other part of the class that happens outside class time is listening to lectures. Many people find brief lectures where the instructor walks through the core ideas and main themes of the readings and topic helpful. But there is relatively little advantage to you doing this sort of passive work in class. So, for each class I will make available a short (I will try to keep them to 30 minutes or less) audio lecture where I do just that. Listen to it on your own time; I will do very little lecturing in class.

I will also be trying out a social media experiment this semester (because blogs are so 2007). I can be found on Twitter under the exciting handle of daniel_h_levine. If I have ideas that I am hubristic enough to think are interesting while I am putting class prep together, I will tweet them with the hashtag #puaf650. If you have questions or thoughts as you do the readings and prepare for class, please feel free to tweet them at me, either by mentioning me or (this is probably better, so that folks can follow along more easily) tagging them #puaf650 as well. Always keep in mind that if you have a question, someone else probably does as well.

In the Classroom: Centers

Not every class needs to revolve around a large group listening to and firing questions at the instructor. This is especially true in a philosophically-minded course where it's not as simple as asking the instructor what the answer is (except perhaps on narrow textual issues). So, we won't be doing it that way. Each class, for at least part of the class, you will instead be able to take your choice of participating in one of several activities with me and your colleagues.

- Question and answer
- Application
- Writing/feedback
- Simulation prep/design

For some general principles on class discussion, please see Appendix C.

**Question and Answer**

You may still have questions about the basic ideas in the readings, or just want/need to discuss yourself if you don't read it. If it isn't, it would be bizarre and cruel for me to force you to read it. So, make your own decisions. You know, I can't stop you from treating your entire time here at the MSPP as a nothing more than a way to get a relevant sheet of paper, either. But if we're adding nothing to your life but a credential, you should skip my class to go demand better from the faculty and administration (you'll have to wait to come demand better from me, ex hypothesi I'm teaching the class that you're skipping). Otherwise you're being complicit in a massive waste of your own time and money. Bottom line: either the texts are valuable enough for your own sake to read them, or you really should spend the time you save not reading them yelling at me until I make the class better!
the readings themselves, directly, in more depth. If that is the case, you'll come to the (possibly inaptly named) question and answer center. In this group, I will primarily try to answer direct questions about the texts and the ideas, help you understand confusing things, and guide discussion aimed at working out issues that arise with the texts. Do not think of this as anything like the "remedial" group! Some of the texts we'll read are difficult, and sometimes the interesting thing for you may be talking about them and how they relate to each other, rather than going outside of that scope. Doing this as a smaller group will both let me give your questions more individualized attention and let students who are more interested in taking the issues off on a tangent space to do so without frustrating students who are less interested in that. As many people as are interested can come to this center.

Application

The point of this class is not to simply reflect on the big issues of moral theory, but to think about how they do and should influence policy-making. So, each class, one of the things you can do is apply the materials from the class to some question relevant to current policy. I will come prepared with at least one that you can choose to spend your time grappling with, that I will put up at the beginning of class. If your group has a burning question that you want to address instead, just clear it with me - I am much more likely to ask you to refine/clarify it than to simply say "no." If you choose to participate in the application center, your job is to discuss the question with your classmates and try to come up with an answer to it. At the end of the time set aside for centers, each of the application groups will be asked to make a brief presentation to the whole class about how they answered the question, or why they could not come to consensus on an answer. Application groups will be capped at four people. If more than four people want to discuss applications, the applications center will just have multiple groups (selected at random).

Writing

Writing is a social activity - this is true in both philosophy and policy. Over the course of the semester, you will be asked to write three short, focused pieces (more on these below). As usual, most of that work will take place on your own time, but there is also space for you to engage in that work in the classroom.

What you will do in class is not just go off to a quiet corner to write. Rather, class time presents an opportunity for you to interact with your colleagues (and with me) over your writing. In the writing center, you will break down into groups of not more than three students. Then,

- go around the group and have each person describe what they are working on, and one thing that is going pretty well in their writing;
- go around again, and have each person talk about an aspect of their writing with which they are having trouble (this can be anything from "I don't know how to resolve this substantive issue," to "I'm not sure if I'm making use of this reading properly," to "I like the idea here, but it's too long."
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Once you have done that, you can have a more open discussion about your writing and solicit feedback and help from your colleagues. *Writing groups are capped at three people each.* As with application groups, *if there are more than three people who want to spend center time working on writing, you will be broken up into groups at random.*

**Simulation Design and Prep**

As discussed in more detail below, one of the running projects that we will be doing over the course of the semester is designing and running a policy simulation. During class, one of your options will be getting together with classmates to work on the simulation. *As many people as are interested can participate each class in the simulation design center, but you will often find yourselves breaking up into sub-groups to work on different aspects. How you do that is for you to decide amongst yourselves.*

**Selecting a Center**

This is very low-tech. I will give you each an index card with your name on it. You will give it to me when I ask people to select centers, and I'll give it back to you when we're done. Having the index cards in hand will let me track who is going to which center and also give me a ready way to randomize groups if need be.

**What I Will Do During Center Time**

Especially if it is large, I will often spend most of my time with the question and answer center, since that is the one that most directly involves consulting with an instructor. I will also make a point of circulating to other groups, and if you need something of course just send someone over to fetch me.

For the most part, this means I will be trusting you to do actual work when you are off in your center. This is not much different from any class. If I taught as a large lecture, there is no way I could keep you from sitting quietly and thinking about your fantasy football league instead of what I was saying (Yet. Who knows what the NSA is working on?). For more detail, please see fn 3 above.

**How Many Centers?**

Nearly every class will include at least one hour (about half of class, minus time to deal with housekeeping issues and short break) where you will pick a center to go to and work on. In many classes, the second half of class will be devoted to some other activity, either an *ad hoc* one or one of the recurring ones I will talk about below. In others, we will have two sessions of centers; pick a different one before and after the break.
In the Classroom: Mosaic Groups

This is a relatively high-level survey course, as the saying goes: "a mile wide and an inch deep." But sometimes it is difficult even to appreciate the issues involved in some policy/moral area without exploring several different aspects of it. As a result, in some classes we will break up into "mosaic" groups to cover more ground.

The point of these groups is to make sure that each of you are exposed to and aware of a number of aspects of the topic we're discussing, without crushing anyone with work. They are also an exercise to get you to think about the main points of a paper in a way that can be conveyed to others clearly and concisely, without presuming too much on their background knowledge.

At least a week in advance of any class that will involve mosaic groups, I will post a sign-up sheet. Everyone should sign up to cover one sub-set of the readings (you will find lists as part of the reading schedule below, where applicable). Outside of class, you are responsible for reading all the general readings and the readings assigned for your sub-topic, but not the readings assigned for other sub-topics. Sign ups are first come, first served. When you sign up for a sub-topic, you should not double up on a topic unless every topic has one person covering it, you should not be the third person on a topic unless every topic already has two people, etc.

In class, we will break down into groups twice during the time we devote the mosaic.

First, you will meet with everyone else who chose the same sub-topic. This will give you a chance to compare notes, and just generally discuss the issue that you have flagged yourself as particularly interested in. This is intended as a pretty unstructured, free-wheeling discussion.

Second, we will meet in groups of people who covered different topics. In these groups, you will be expected to go around and present the main ideas that you took away from your reading on your sub-topic. Then there will be time to generally discuss how the sub-topics fit together and whatever else you may find interesting.

In the Classroom: Student Group Presentations

We will cover a number of specific topics in the class: war, drugs, civil disobedience, etc. But there is no way that we could cover everything of interest to all of you. And many of our readings will still be at a fairly "theoretical" level.

To mitigate these effects, we will also have student presentations on a topic from time to time. These are discussed in more detail under "assignments," below.

---

4 Of course, you may read them. Some of them are interesting.
In the Classroom: Breaks

That's a lot to do in a class. About halfway through, we'll take a short break. Try not to stretch it past ten minutes.

Assignments and Grading

Your grade in the class will be based on five factors, which will be explained in more detail in this section of the syllabus.

- Class Participation (15%)
- Short Writing Assignments (40%) and Peer Feedback (15%)
- Group Presentations (20%)
- Simulation Design (10%)

Class Participation

This is fairly straightforward. You can learn a lot about policy and philosophy on your own, but the point of this class is to have you hash it out with your colleagues. The baseline for class participation is that you show up, prepared to take part in activities and discussions with your classmates. If you are an active user of out-of-class ways of participating - contacting me via email, coming to office hours, using the #puaf650 hashtag, that will count in your favor, but the main focus is on how much you contribute to the intellectual atmosphere of the classroom.

Note the first: Of course, sometimes you need to miss class. If you are out once or twice over the course of the semester, it will not really hurt you. If you need to miss more classes, please talk to me about it.

Note the second: I know, some people are shy. Unfortunately, there is no way around the value of open discussion for improving your understanding of things. I have tried to provide ample opportunity for small group discussions and other venues for participation that may be less dominated by the most extroverted students in the design of this class.

Short Writing Assignments

Over the course of the class, you will be asked to write three short pieces. Do not take "short" to mean "easy" - part of the point of the structure of these assignments is to help you improve your ability to pare down your ideas into a concise, clear, focused piece that nonetheless doesn't
The format of the memo should be familiar from your other memo-writing classes, though the content may be different.

Please also see Appendix D for the University Honor Code and a note on what constitutes plagiarism. I have had students, in the past, tell me that they were unaware of the rules regarding plagiarism - I find this difficult to believe, but to avoid any confusion, here are the basic rules:

- If you use someone's exact words, they must be in quotes (or otherwise indicated as a direct quote, such as by being set off in a block quote), attributed, and sourced.6
- If you paraphrase someone's words, it must be sourced.
- If you make a factual claim that is not common knowledge, it must be sourced.

**Memo Format**

Every memo you write in this class should follow roughly the same basic format, and will be graded in part on style. Here is how to get maximum style points:

- At the top of your memo, include a header that indicates your name, the intended recipient's name, the topic of the memo, and the date.7
- Memos should be **no longer than three pages, single-spaced**.
- Text should be single-spaced, but a wall of text is not what you are going for. Use white space, headings, and bullets judiciously to break up the text and help your reader find what she is looking for. Your design goal should be that a reader looking for a particular point you make should be able to find it without having to read the memo linearly again from the first page.
- **Include a "bottom line up front" paragraph at the start.** This is a paragraph, typically no more than three sentences long, which lays out the basic point of the memo. Someone who reads only this paragraph should be able to tell me what your memo is about and what your perspective is. Importantly, **this paragraph should give away the ending.** Don't say something like, "this memo will explore the question of whether the ICC should issue an arrest warrant for Bashar al-Assad." Do say something like, "failing to issue an arrest warrant for Bashar al-Assad would be unconscionable and undermine the fundamental point of the ICC." You are not making your whole argument here, but your reader should know what you are aiming at.
- You do not need to include in-text citations, but you **do need to append a list of**

---

5 In other words, the exact opposite of this syllabus.

6 This also applies to other uses of the exact form in which something appeared, such as using someone else's photograph or chart in your memo, or using a slide from someone else's presentation as part of your own presentation. The general principle is, if it's not yours, you must make that clear and make clear whose it is. Also be aware of copyright issues and the like on things like photographs (non-commercial use does not immediately release you from all restrictions).

7 You do not need to write "Memo" or "MEMORANDUM" across the top or anything like that.
references you have used to construct your memo. This list does not count toward your three page limit.

Memo Content

Each of your three memos will have a different focus and content.

Moral Analysis Memo

This memo should be directed to me.
In this memo, you should pick some live policy question that you care about - it can otherwise be whatever you like. In this memo, you will be explaining what you take to be the major moral/ethical issues that impact on the policy. Your job is not to say what should be done about it.

The memo should cover at least four areas:

First, it should explain the relevant background of the policy issue in a way that a non-specialist can understand just from reading what you have written. This is a judgment call, intentionally - include what you think your reader needs to know to understand your analysis, but not more than that.

Second, it should explain who the morally relevant stakeholders in the situation are, and why. When the decision is made, whose interests should "count?" This may also include explaining why some people whose interests might seem morally relevant should in fact not be considered in making the decision. For example, if we are talking about whether or not the US should further clamp down on illegal immigration, you will need to explain why the interests and desires of foreign nationals who want to come to the United States should or should not matter to the decision.

Third, it should explore the moral issues surrounding the way that "success" for the policy is defined. To stick with the US immigration example, for some people "success" means that the number of undocumented immigrants in the US is minimized, while for others it means maximizing the economic efficiency of the global market as a whole, and for still others it means expressing the American ideal of being open to the world. These definitions of "success" encode moral judgments, that you should unpack.

Fourth, it should explain the moral implications of the major policy proposals for addressing the issue that are currently out there. For instance, do they represent fundamental clashes of

---

6 Read "policy issue" broadly. Whether the US should invade Iran is a policy issue, but so is whether Greenpeace should change its stance on nuclear power, or even perhaps whether Apple should change its oversight rules for factories in China. And I should not have to say this, but I get the question almost every semester: yes, nations other than the US have policy and, yes, of course, you can write about them.
values? Or disagreements about what policy will actually bring about an end that people agree is valuable? What are the moral "pros" and "cons" of various options?

Lastly, if there are any important moral aspects of the issue that aren't neatly included in one of those areas, discuss them as well. The above list is a guide to what you need to think about, not a conceptual or formatting straitjacket.

Reaction Memo

This memo should be directed to an author you disagree with.

The overall point of this memo is to explain why you disagree with the author on some point that she makes. As you write it, keep in mind that that you disagree is just human nature, why you disagree is the important part.

First, simply explain the point you disagree with. This need not be very long, but you should at the very least explain what the point is, how you think the author ends up there, and what the importance is for her piece. Select one point or argument you disagree with. If you try to cover everything in a piece that you disagree with, you are not going to be able to focus in on the details of any one.

- This should be an important disagreement. If you do not think that the fact that you disagree means much to any interesting issues, pick something else.
- This should be a philosophical disagreement. Disagreement about facts are important! But they are not what I would like you to go after in this assignment. Focus on disagreements that go either to the question of what rules people ought to be following, what they ought to be striving for, how they ought to relate to each other, and the like. Of course, sometimes philosophical differences are tied up in disagreements about the facts, just avoid purely factual disputes. If you are unsure whether you are over this admittedly fuzzy borderline, just ask me.
  - So, for instance, you probably do not want to focus on something like, "Fnord, et al, argue that women receive only 71% of a man's pay, on average, for comparable work. In reality, the number is closer to 78%, but it is still unfair."
  - It would be more interesting to say, "Fnord, et al, argue that it is unfair for women to be paid only 71% of what men are paid. I say that whatever you are paid in a free market is, by definition, fair."
  - A mixed fact-value case but still an interesting and worthwhile one would be something like, "Fnord, et al, argue that women are paid only 71% of what men are paid. But this statistic is misleading - when you break the numbers down by field you find that when women do not have children the gap narrows dramatically. Therefore they are wrong to focus on reducing misogyny in society; our real target should be the relationship between work and family."
Second, explain why you disagree. This is crucial but often overlooked: do not simply emphatically state your disagreement. If the author is arguing that, e.g., citizens have an obligation to be actively engaged with their government, it is not enough to simply say, "I do not think citizens need to do that." Explain why. Maybe you think that no one can be coerced to do anything except avoid harming others, say. Then dig. The author you are reading has probably heard that one before. Why doesn't she accept your very limited scope of legitimate coercion? What can you say in response? Do not throw your hands up and say something to the effect that you simply feel differently or have different basic intuitions until you have pushed as far as you can.

Third, and this may be tied up with your second task, explain what your positive, alternative theory/principle/idea is. If you are arguing against someone who thinks that only states can legitimately declare war, explain who you think can legitimately declare war. If you are arguing against someone who thinks that the social contract is irredeemably racist, explain how you would put together a non-racist social contract (or what principle you would judge contracts on to which racism is irrelevant).

Dilemma Memo

Often, the way that policy "debates" happen is that individuals and organizations with fixed, sometimes institutionally mandated positions will duke it out in public. This can make it seem as if there is no room for constructive engagement - it is rare for groups like the Chamber of Commerce and Unite Here to sit down together and say, "OK, we've managed to see where the other is coming from, and we've both agreed on something we can live with." Whether that's a feature or a bug of our public climate is something we will discuss, but it is not a good environment to look to to find how to address the nuances of moral positions.

But organizations and policy actors are not always internally univocal. Many organizations have multiple value commitments and can face interesting and difficult decisions about how to reconcile them. Is NARAL a pro-choice organization or a feminist organization (and how far are those two the same)? Is the Republican Party the party of small government or the party of traditional values (and ditto)?

In this memo, you should choose some actual - current or recent historical - issue facing some particular organization that seems to have an ambiguous relationship to that organization’s core values. You need not have evidence that there was internal debate about that matter - that information is often not available. It is enough to find an issue where it seems morally plausible that the organization could have faced a tough choice. Here are some quick (real) examples, but pick your own:

- Should NARAL have supported or opposed a bill that would make it harder for individuals fined for harassing abortion clinics to declare bankruptcy (and avoid paying the fines), but also harder for women facing debts from medical crises or divorce (which
disproportionately affect women) to declare bankruptcy?
- Should the National Alliance on Mental Illness have lobbied for a law that permits people who are not a clear danger to themselves or others to be coerced into outpatient treatment to ensure that more people can get help, or is this a violation of the rights of the mentally ill?
- Should an environmental group concerned about carbon emissions support or oppose the expansion of nuclear power?
- Should the US impose restrictions on NGO recipients of aid that prevent them from working with sex workers, so as to avoid complicity in prostitution and trafficking, or should there be no such restrictions so that sex workers can more easily obtain medical care?
- When General Shinseki testified before Congress that the Iraq war would require many more troops than the Pentagon's civilian leadership was predicting, was he rightfully upholding his duty to give his best military advice to civilian leaders or wrongfully undermining civilian control of the military?
- How should Doctors Without Borders have balanced its obligation to protect its own personnel (who have, after all, knowingly signed up for work that they know to be dangerous) with its mission to save lives in conflict areas in making its decision to withdraw from Somalia?
- Should Human Rights Campaign back a hate-crimes bill that includes protection for gay men and lesbians but not for transgendered people because at least it is something?

Once you have selected an organization and a dilemma that confronts or confronted it this memo should be directed to a member of the organization with the power to take action on the issue you are concerned with. You should write the memo as if you are a staff member of the relevant organization asked to provide advice to your principal.

First, you should, as always, lay out the issue at hand. Here, you can assume that your principal has some specialist knowledge, but you still need to describe what you take to be the important aspects of the issue in play.9

Second, you should explain why the issue poses a moral dilemma within the value-structure of your organization. If you are writing to the Pope, you don't need to explain what atheists think about the issue. But you do need to explain which value commitments or concerns of the organization are in tension or conflict here.

Third, explain what you think the best option to take is, within the context of those values. Keep in mind a few points here.
- Re-read the bits above under "reaction memo" on how you need to explain why you agree with one position and not another. "I feel like free speech is more important than

---

9 In your list of sources, please do include some that would allow me to get a broader background on the issue, since I am not likely to have specialized knowledge of the topic.
preventing harm" or the like is not going to be enough.

- Your explanation may very well require that you put the various concerns of the organization in a priority order (again, explaining why) or re-interpreting them in some way that avoids the apparent dilemma (e.g., "Shinseki's obligation is not to submit to the civilian leadership of the Pentagon, but to civilians in the body of the whole US voting population").

- The option you suggest taking must be within the power of your principal. Barack Obama can't pass laws (he can use his bully pulpit to support them). Greenpeace neither builds nor refrains from building nuclear reactors (but it can put out PR campaigns for or against them). Ban Ki-Moon can't send peacekeepers to Syria without a Security Council mandate (but he can lobby for such a mandate). Etc.

- This discussion should probably include at least some discussion of what the other plausible (or superficially plausible) options are, and why yours is superior in terms of satisfying the values (properly understood) of the organization.

**Peer Feedback**

While you can get some peer feedback in class by selecting the writing center, there is no substitute for the discipline of having someone go through your writing in detail (and doing the same for them). So, each memo will include a phase where you give and solicit peer feedback. Here is how that works:

Each memo will have three due dates associated with it (see the master course calendar in Appendix A). On the first date, you will email me a first draft of your memo. *This draft will be graded*, solely as a hedge against people not bothering with first drafts, or turning in radically incomplete ones (for more on grading, see the end of the Assignments section). I will post a copy of your memo to Google Docs, shared with the rest of the class, and create a master document you can all visit with links to every draft. I will email this link, and it will also be available on the course's Canvas site.

You will then have one week to choose two of your classmates' memos and give feedback on them (just make comments or edits on the Google Doc). Feedback will be due by the second due date, one week after the first one. **If you do not receive two sets of feedback by the due date, please contact me ASAP and I will make some comments on your draft.**

Once feedback is complete, you will have a week to incorporate it. A final draft is due to me on the third due date, two weeks after you turned in your draft.

**Please note that because this structure incorporates feedback already, I do not have any provision for re-writes of short papers in this class. If you ask, I will politely but firmly say**

---

10 You will have access to memos written by students in both your section and the other section I am teaching this semester. You may comment on either.
Endeavor to give the most helpful and informed feedback that you can on your colleagues' papers. Not only does this express your respect for them and their work, it is part of your grade.

**Memo Timing**

The memo due dates are spaced out across the semester, as noted below. But you can write the memos in whatever order you like. That is, you can first turn in an analysis memo, then a reaction memo, and then a dilemma memo; or, you could go dilemma-analysis-reaction; or, however you like. The due dates are necessary to coordinate peer feedback and prevent my receiving everyone's memos on the last day of class\(^{11}\), but the order is unimportant.

Because of the need to coordinate peer feedback fairly, please do your best to get your draft memos and peer feedback in on time. This is not, in this case, an arbitrary rule, but a way to ensure that you are not disadvantaging any of your classmates. If, for some reason, you have a legitimate need to delay an assignment, please contact me before the due date, unless it is an emergency that prevents that.

Note that if you do not turn in a draft, you should also not submit peer comments. If you do, you are mucking up the math and preventing someone else from turning in their required two comments. I know that this means you will be dinged both for the missing draft and for the missing comments. Please turn in assignments on time (barring emergencies, legitimate problems, etc., of course)!

**Group Presentations**

Some of the theory in the class can be abstract, and it is often best understood if applied to concrete cases. But, if I choose the cases you will only learn about things I am interested in - this is your chance to bore me, rather than the other way around!

By the third week of class, you will have chosen (or had chosen for you) a small group of your peers to work with on preparing a case study for discussion one week during the semester. Assuming the course is full at 20, we'll have five groups of four. Then...

First, choose a date on which to present. There will be a Google Doc to sign up for dates; first come, first served. You will be expected to relate your case study to the theme of that class, so choose with that in mind.

---

\(^{11}\) I tried "hand memos in whenever you like as long as I get three by the end of class" and that is exactly what happened. I also received several end-of-semester comments to the effect that people were frustrated that they received no grades throughout the semester to gauge their progress.
Second, choose an actual policy decision (historical or in-progress) that has two critical aspects. A) it should interest the members of your group. B) it should plausibly relate to the theme of the class on the day you'll be presenting.

Third, write up the case. You will be expected to prepare a one-page document/handout for the rest of the class to read that briefly explains the case and why it is interesting and important. Your write-up should accomplish the following:

- Explain the case in enough detail that a reader with no familiarity with the particular case (you can assume general background understanding of the basics of national and international politics - no need to explain what the UN is, or how many justices there are on the US Supreme Court) will understand what happened/is happening, and why (more or less). Pay special attention to explaining who the major stakeholders are/were and how their perspectives differ.
- Explain why the case is important and/or interesting, with special reference to the moral issues involved and the theme of the class. For instance, if you were talking about Israel's decision to bomb Iraq's Osirak reactor, on the War day (good choice!), you should probably discuss whether the decision met just cause criteria, etc.
- Provide at least three open-ended discussion questions for the class. Ideally, these should be more specific than, "did the relevant actors do the right thing?" Your questions should guide the class into illuminating the major issues at stake.

Fourth, send the write-up to me **no later than Monday** of the week you will present. Then I can circulate it to the rest of the class.

Fifth, take a breather! Hey, rest of the class: read the case write-up. Think about if you have any questions. Consider your answers to the questions posed by the presenters.

Sixth, on the day of the presentation, I will set aside the final hour of the class for you. You should give a brief presentation of the issues - remember that everyone in class should have read your write-up. Then it will be your main responsibility to field questions about the case and guide discussion.

Please keep in mind that **it is not your responsibility to provide a general presentation on the themes of the class**. You should not be trying to put together a presentation on "identity politics" (e.g.) as a whole. Rather, you should be presenting on some particular policy issue that relates to that general question.

Also, I know that dynamics in group work can sometimes be problematic. If you can, try to work it out amongst yourselves. But if there is a real issue that you cannot resolve internally, please come talk to me about it ASAP.
Simulation

Since the class is heavily focused on the theme of how to constructively engage across policy divides, part of what we will do is try to model that. Conflict resolution and negotiation simulations are widely used for professional training, but the evidence is that students who participate in the creation of simulations get even more out of the experience than if they just participated in the simulation itself.

So, over the course of this class, we will create a simulation. Early on in the class, we will spend some in-class time discussing the topic we would like to address, and the kind of policy context we would like to simulate (e.g., town hall meeting, floor vote in Congress, NGO general meeting, confrontation among protesters and counter-protesters, etc.). The decision will be put to a vote of the class - it can be any situation where people are likely to come into conflict (in part) because of their value-commitments.

Throughout the class you will be able to select the option of spending in-class time fleshing out the simulation itself, creating materials and scripts, determining roles, etc. I will also create space on the Canvas site for asynchronous work on the simulation.

It will largely be up to you to decide amongst yourselves what kind of materials you need and want for the simulation. But you should be aiming at a scenario that can be "run" in about an hour and a half, so that we can then take a break and have a debriefing period where we talk about things. I am happy to discuss this with you, but it is ultimately your decision as a class.

One thing that you need (though this is subject to revision, if you decide to, though I would consider carefully first) is a role for each person to play in the simulation, and a one-pager that gives the player information on the role. Given the focus of the class, discussions of that role's values and interests are crucial to the document. Each person will be expected to create the one-pager for one role in the simulation (part of what you should do collectively is come up with a list of roles, which you can then assign for writing amongst yourselves, or I can assign randomly). The due date for the one-pager is listed on the master calendar. After I have received all the roles, I will randomly distribute them to classmates to play on the simulation day. I will not have a role, but will serve as timekeeper and moderator, and I may recruit additional faculty observers/moderators if the scenario seems to require them (or if you tell me that it does).

My plan is to make all materials from the simulation available for free on the internet under a Creative Commons Non-Commercial Share-Alike license (the same license this syllabus is distributed under). See the Appendix for details. You will be asked to consent to this distribution for any materials you authored, so if you don't like it, you will get a chance to say so.

---

12 Of course, we will also model it in different ways through discussions in class and through the memo assignments.
Grading

Triage Grading

In this class, I use a variant of a system called "triage grading." The dirty secret of most professors is that it is very difficult to articulate the difference between, say, a B+ and an A-. The gradations are just too fine and subjective (at least outside quant classes). It is much easier - and fairer, because it gives less play to any unconscious prejudices I have - to tell the difference between solid but unexceptional work versus exceptionally nice work or very sub-par work. So the core of my grading system is a simple 0-3 scale.

0: Wholly inadequate. You didn't turn in the assignment at all or it does not even begin to address the requirements, you've missed more that half the classes without a good explanation, etc. Please don't make me hand out this grade.

1: Needs improvement. You've clearly put some effort into this, but it has one or more significant issues. You've seriously misunderstood some concept, you've recommended an impossible action, you've overlooked key and well-known data, you're in class most of the time but you sit silently in centers, etc.

2: Fine. The work is not perfect, but it represents a competent take on the assignment. You have done more or less as expected, and your work may even have some nice points. You're in class most of the time, and when you speak up, it's clear you're basically on top of things, etc. Solid.

3: Great. You still need not be perfect, but on the relevant aspect, something stands out about your work. Your memo is a stylistic pleasure to read, or you've made a particularly insightful point. You almost always come to class prepared and you make frequent and high-value additions to the discussion, etc. Kudos.

Each assignment will get graded in a small number of categories, representing the important aspects of it (this will also guide the written feedback I give you). Some simple assignments may just get a straight 0-3 grade; others may have multiple categories. Your letter grade will be based on your overall score, but you should assume that if you get a "2" in all categories on an assignment you will end up receiving a B+ letter grade (in theory, the MSPP benchmark grade) on the assignment.

Grading Rubrics for Assignments

Class participation: One overall grade. I will take note of attendance (when people select centers) and make notes on who is particularly active in conversations around the room.

---

13 As far as I know, the idea originates with Prof. William Rapaport of SUNY-Buffalo. See http://www.cse.buffalo.edu/~rapaport/howigrade.html
All memos:
- Rough draft
- Style
- Quality of sources

In addition, on the analysis memo (21 points total):
- Background
- Stakeholders
- Definition of success
- Moral analysis of options

Reaction memo (18 points total):
- Description of point
- Explanation of/argument for disagreement
- Alternative proposal

Dilemma memo (18 points total):
- Description of organization's values
- Description of dilemma
- Argument for resolution

Note that the memos together count for 40% of your grade, but there is not an individual weighting. In no case will you receive a grade on the memos that is less than the arithmetic mean of your grade on all three. But leaving the grade loose among them allows me to reward improvement - there is no shame in not starting knowing everything - and discount clear outliers, etc.

Peer feedback: One overall grade on each piece of feedback. Your grade for feedback as a whole will simply be the mean of these grades.

Group presentation:
- One-pager
- Presentation

Simulation Design:
- Participation in planning\(^\text{14}\)
- Role one-pager

Readings

\(^{14}\) In class or outside of class. If you participate in planning outside of class, but not online some place that I can see it, please let me know what you have done so that I can give you credit!
Where to Get the Readings

There is no book for this class. Readings are available to you in one of three ways, noted below.

- Online: readings that are natively online, or with a decent-quality public online version will have their URLs below.
- PDF: A scanned version of this reading will be available via Canvas.
- ResearchPort: The article is available via the UMD ResearchPort system. I will put links to these articles up on Canvas, but if you are not accessing the system from on campus, you may need to find it in the system yourself to engage the security properly.

Note that PDF scanned readings are organized by book, not in separate files by section if we are reading multiple sections of the book on different days. So, e.g., if you download the scanned excerpts from Amartya Sen's *The Idea of Justice*, you will have all the chapters we will read throughout the course, not just the chapters for one particular day. If you have trouble obtaining any of the readings, please let me know ASAP.

All of these readings are required; a list of optional readings that you may find interesting, organized by topic, can be found in the appendix to this syllabus.

Some of this reading is difficult, but it will usually yield to study, and that is why we will have a question and answer center in class. The readings will not always agree with each other, and you need not agree with them (I intentionally have readings on here I believe to be wrongheaded). When in doubt, work in groups and compare notes. When in doubt that that cannot resolve, or when in the throes of an interesting idea, email/call/tweet/visit-during-office-hours me.

The readings in this class will not always be perfectly ideologically balanced. Some of this is pure time constraint. But part of it is that moral and political philosophy is not an already-complete conversation that it is your job to merely observe and note. You are necessary to complete the conversation. If you feel that your perspective on an issue is not adequately represented in or addressed by the readings, well, I guess we are very lucky to have you in the class to represent, then!

Some of the reading deals with difficult material. This is somewhat unavoidable - policy decisions are made in a world filled with atrocities, violence, poverty, misery, misogyny, racism, domination, and other nasty things. But while we cannot in good conscience avoid difficult topics entirely in the class, if something is making you uncomfortable, please let me know, and we will find a way to move the conversation onto safer ground (or take other appropriate action). The course is intended to perhaps discomfit you sometimes, but not traumatize you.

Part I: Politics Under Conditions of Value Pluralism
In the first part of the course, we will engage with some of the fundamental questions of political philosophy and public policy. As analysts and policy makers, in a world where value pluralism is a fact of life, how should you make decisions? What do you do about moral and factual disagreement? What do you do if you disagree with policies you are asked to implement? The sessions in this section will address those ideas, among others. We will focus on how to address these issues within a democracy, but even non-democratic systems must think about similar issues.

Session 1 (9/5/2013) - Introduction
- This syllabus.

Session 2 (9/12/2013) - Democracy in a World of Plural Values
- Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, "Democracy or Consensus?" (http://them.polylog.org/2/fee-en.htm)
- Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism*, ch. 4 "Moral Disagreement" (pdf)
- C.L.R. James, "Every Cook Can Govern" (pdf)

Session 3 (9/19/2013) - The Policy-Makers: Obligations of Policy Actors
- Rosemarie Tong, *Ethics in Policy Analysis* (pdf)
- Kwame Gyeke, *Tradition and Modernity*, ch. 7 "Corruption: A Moral Pollution" (pdf)

Session 4 (9/26/2013) - The Policy-Targets: Obligations to Stakeholders
- Andrew L. Friedman and Samantha Miles, *Stakeholders: Theory and Practice*, ch. 1 "Introduction," ch. 3 "Normative Stakeholder Analysis" (pdf)

Part II: The Person in Society

One of the perennial questions of political philosophy is the correct relationship between the individual human being and her society. Does society serve the interests of the individual, or should the individual subordinate herself to the group? Is there anything outside the bounds of legitimate social control - your body, your mind? Should states relate to individuals only as individuals, blind to the other groups like gender and race that we find ourselves part of? Should society seek harmony with the natural world (and what would that *mean*) or should the environment be subject to our needs? These are not just philosopher's questions - policy makers face them when they decide which programs to create, which cultural practices to subsidize, how to define protected classes, and how to set the limits of taxation, among other things.
Session 5 (10/3/2013) - Liberalism, Contract, and Rights
● Judith Shklar, "The Liberalism of Fear" (pdf)
● Wendy McElroy, Liberty for Women, ch 1 "Introduction" (pdf)
● Amartya Sen, The Idea of Justice, ch. 17 "Human Rights and Global Imperatives" (pdf)
● Carole Pateman and Charles Mills, Contract and Domination, ch. 3 "The Domination Contract" (pdf)

Session 6 (10/10/2013) - Communities and Communitarianism
● Kwame Gyeke, Tradition and Modernity, ch. 2 "A Defense of Moderate Communitarianism" (pdf)
● Selya Benhabib, Another Cosmopolitanism (excerpt) (pdf)
● Kwame Anthony Appiah, Cosmopolitanism, ch. 8 "Whose Culture is it Anyway?" (pdf)

Session 7 (10/17/2013) - Race, Gender, and Other Political Identities
● Catherine MacKinnon, Feminism Unmodified, ch. 2 "Difference and Dominance" (pdf)
● Wendy McElroy, "What Does Affirmative Action Affirm?" (in Liberty for Women)
● MOSAIC ON IDENTITY POLITICS
  ○ Option 1: Race
  ○ Option 2: Gender
    ■ Virginia Held, The Ethics of Care, ch. 1 "The Ethics of Care as Moral Theory" (pdf)
  ○ Option 3: Sexual Identity


Michel Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth* (pdf)

Henriette Gunkel, "I Myself Had a Sweetie... Re-Thinking Female Same-sex Intimacy Beyond the Institution of Marriage and Identity Politics" *Social Dynamics* 36:3 (2010) (ResearchPort)

Option 4: Intersections

bell hooks, *Where We Stand*, ch. 8 "Class and Race," ch. 9 "Feminism and Class Power," ch. 10, "White Poverty" (pdf)

bell hooks, *Talking Back*, ch. 17 "Homophobia in Black Communities" (pdf)

Samantha Allen, "CounterPunch and the War on Transgender People," *Jacobin* 10 July 2013 (http://jacobinmag.com/2013/07/counterpunch-and-the-war-on-the-transgendered/) - also click through to read the Brennan and Hungerford letter to the United Nations

Iris Marion Young, "Difference as a Resource for Democratic Communication," in Bohman and Rehg (eds.), *Deliberative Democracy* (pdf)

---

**Session 8 (10/24/2013) - Citizenship**


**Session 9 (10/31/2013) - The Body in the State**

- MOSAIC READINGS
  - Option 1: Reproduction
    - Sara Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking*, ch. 2 "Thinking About 'Mothers'" (pdf)
- Laura Purdy, "Exporting the Culture of Life," in Michael Boylan (ed.) International Public Health Policy and Ethics (pdf)
  - Option 2: Drugs
    - Carl Hart, High Price (excerpt; pdf)
    - Moises Naim, Illicit, ch. 4 "No Business Like Drug Business," ch. 12 "What to Do" (pdf)
  - Option 3: Disability
    - Martha Nussbaum, Frontiers of Justice, ch. 2 "Disabilities and the Social Contract," ch. 3 "Capabilities and Disabilities" (pdf)
  - Option 4: Food
    - Tina Beuchelt and Detlef Virchow, "Food Sovereignty or the Right to Adequate Food?" Agriculture and Human Values 29:2 (2012) (ResearchPort)
  - Option 5: Medicine


Michel Foucault, "The Birth of Social Medicine," in James D. Faubion (ed.), *Power* (pdf)

**Session 10 (11/7/2013) - The Environment**

- Christopher Foreman, *The Promise and Peril of Environmental Justice*, ch. 1 "Challenges," ch. 2 "Foundations," ch. 4 "Health," ch. 6 "Prospects" (pdf)

**Part III: Violence**

One of the key attributes of the state in traditional political theory is its monopoly on (legitimate) violence - and it is from this feature of states that many of the moral questions about policy ultimately flow. If states could only ask us nicely to do things, instead of enforcing their laws with weapons and devastating neighbors with war, they would be relatively innocuous. And in subtler ways, through their laws and social programs, security arrangements and economic systems, states determine who in society is exposed to which risks. Mainstream political theory assumes that we *need* states, despite their dangers. But those dangers require moral analysis, especially from people like policy analysts who will indirectly control state violence and coercion.

**Session 11 (11/14/2013) - Law and Punishment**

- Judith Shklar, *Legalism*, part I "Law and Morals" (pdf)
- MOSAIC READINGS
  - Option 1: Interpreting the Law
    - Linda Martin Alcoff, "Sotomayor's Reasoning," *Southern Journal of*
Session 12 (11/21/2013) - Poverty

• Martin Luther King, Jr., *Speech to the AFSCME Mass Meeting 18 March 1968* (pdf)
• Dambisa Moyo, *Dead Aid*, ch. 3 "Aid is Not Working," ch. 8 "Let's Trade" (pdf)

**Thanksgiving Break - 11/28/2013 - No Class**

**Session 13 (12/5/2013) - War and Terror**
- Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Just War Against Terror*, ch. 3 "What is a Just War?" ch. 4 "Is the War Against Terror Just?" (pdf)
- Virginia Held, *How Terrorism is Wrong*, ch. 1 "Terrorism and War," ch. 7 "The Moral Assessment of Violence and Terrorism" (pdf)
- Judith Butler, *Precarious Life*, ch. 2 "Violence, Mourning, Politics" (pdf)
- Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, ch. 1 "On Violence" (pdf)

**Session 14 (12/12/2013) - Simulation, Debrief, and Popcorn**

**Appendix A: Master Course Calendar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2013</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2013</td>
<td>Democracy and Value Pluralism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2013</td>
<td>Obligations of Policy-Makers</td>
<td>Create presentation groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2013</td>
<td>Obligations to Policy-Targets</td>
<td>First draft of memo #1 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td>Liberalism/Contract/Rights</td>
<td>Peer comments on memo #1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2013</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Final draft of memo #1 due; sign up for identities mosaic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2013</td>
<td>Political Identities</td>
<td>Mosaic discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2013</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>First draft of memo #2 due; sign up for body mosaic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2013</td>
<td>The Body</td>
<td>Mosaic discussion; peer comments on memo #2 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/2013</td>
<td>The Environment</td>
<td>Final draft of memo #2 due; sign up for law mosaic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2013</td>
<td>Law and Punishment</td>
<td>Mosaic discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/2013</td>
<td>Poverty and Exploitation</td>
<td>Simulation role one-pager due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2013</td>
<td>NO CLASS</td>
<td>THANKSGIVING BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2013</td>
<td>War and Terror</td>
<td>First draft of memo #3 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/2013</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Peer comments on memo #3 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/2013</td>
<td>NO CLASS</td>
<td>Final draft of memo #3 due.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please note:** All written assignments are due by *email* by 11:59PM on the date listed. Late assignments without prior arrangement will be docked a half-letter-grade after one day, a full grade after two, and not accepted after one week (emergencies excepted, of course). Please send assignments in *.doc, *.pdf, *.tex, *.txt, *.odt, or *.rtf format if possible. *.docx files (Word 2010) are acceptable, but a pain in my butt.

**Appendix B: Further Readings**

Whenever I construct a syllabus, I come across many more interesting pieces than I can reasonably ask you to read. Yes, indeed, the reading list above represents me *paring down* what I would ask you to read. None of these are required reading, but if you are interested in digging deeper into the issues we discuss in class, they may be worthwhile reads. There is no rhyme or reason to them or attempt to balance between different topics; this is a serendipitous list. I will put up scans of and link to things here from Canvas when I have a chance, but my priority in building our online library is the required readings; if you want something here that you can't find on your own and I haven't put up, please contact me.
Democracy and Value Pluralism

- Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism*, ch. 4 "Moral Disagreement," ch. 5 "The Primacy of Practice" (pdf)
- Xavier De Sousa Briggs, *Democracy as Problem-Solving*
- Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, *Why Deliberative Democracy?*
- Christine Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, ch. 7 "Creating the Kingdom of Ends," ch. 10 "The Reasons We Can Share"
- Alain Locke, "Values and Imperatives" in Charles Molesworth and Henry Louis Gates, Jr. (eds), *The Works of Alain Locke*
- Amartya Sen, *The Idea of Justice*, chs. 3-6, 8-9

Oligations of Policy Actors

- Rosemary O'Leary, *The Ethics of Dissent: Managing Guerrilla Government*

Liberalism, Contract, and Rights

- Wendy Brown, "The Most We Can Hope For...", *South Atlantic Quarterly* 103:2-3 (2004)
- Charles Mills, *The Racial Contract*
- Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract*
- Carole Pateman and Charles Mills, *Contract and Domination*

Political Identities, Race, Gender, Etc.

- C.L.R. James, *The Black Jacobins*, "Appendix: From Toussaint L'Ouverture to Fidel Castro"
- Carole Pateman and Charles Mills, *Contract and Domination*, ch. 6 "Intersecting Contracts" (pdf)
- Dean Spade, "The Only Way to End Racialized Gender Violence in Prisons is to End Prisons," *California Law Review* 18 December 2012 (http://www.californialawreview.org/articles/the-only-way-to-end-racialized-gender-violenc}
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Citizenship

- Hannah Arendt, *Between Past and Future*, ch. 4 "What is Freedom?"

The Body

- Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic*
- Chaone Mallory, "Locating Ecofeminism in Encounters with Food and Place," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 26:1 (2013)

The Environment

Law and Punishment

- Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*

Poverty

- bell hooks, *Where We Stand*, ch. 11 "Solidarity with the Poor"
- Olivia Rutazibwa, "What if We Took Autonomous Recovery Seriously?", *Ethical Perspectives* 20:1 (2013) (pdf)
- Walter E. Williams, *The State Against Blacks*

War and Terror

- Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, Book Twenty-Two
- Judith Butler, *Frames of War*
- Martin Luther King, Jr. "Why I am Opposed to the War in Vietnam" (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b80Bsw0UG-U)
- Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain*, ch. 1 "The Structure of Torture," ch. 2 "The Structure of
Appendix C: Some Principles for Class Discussion

Mostly, class discussions, whether as large or small groups, will be run under the assumption that you are all adults and can interact with each other civilly and professionally. But here are some things to keep in mind:

- Disagreement is healthy and encouraged! All of the readings we are tackling have their own perspective. Nothing said by any of the authors we will read, let alone anything said by me, is sacrosanct and beyond criticism. Look for opportunities to engage with other students who hold views with which you disagree (so long as they are on topic for the class, of course).
- Agreement is healthy and encouraged! Not all disagreements need to end with a winner (or even an “agreement to disagree”). Many times, policy disagreements coexist with deeper agreements (or partial agreements) on matters of principle. In discussing things with your classmates, you should actively seek out and explore common ground, and how you can use it to find principled compromises on policy issues and deeper understanding of your interlocutors. This is not just a hippie philosopher love-in principle: in the policy world, you will often find yourself working with people with whom you do not agree, and finding common ground will often be valuable.
- Be respectful of others. Remember that you are attacking arguments not people, when you disagree with someone.
- Be wary of speech that may be offensive to others, especially including speech that invokes race, gender, class, disability, or sexual orientation in a derogatory manner.
- Conversely, if you are inclined to be offended by someone’s comment, first try to read it charitably. Everyone should be given the benefit of the doubt that they meant their comments as a sincere contribution to discussion, and not to cause offense – you should be able to understand and engage with views that you find morally mistaken without taking them as personal attacks.

Appendix D: Honor Code

Let me add my own, specific, extra warning to this: plagiarism will not be tolerated. If you are using someone else’s words, they need to be in quotation marks (or otherwise clearly marked) and attributed. If you are paraphrasing someone, at the very least the source needs to be listed in your reference list. Factual claims must be sourced unless they are common knowledge (the Earth is round, the US Civil War was 1860-5, etc.). I have in the past had some students say that...
they were not aware that these were the rules; this is general good scholarly practice, but now you have been explicitly told as well.

Without further ado, here’s the University’s code:

*The University of Maryland, College Park has a nationally recognized Code of Academic Integrity, administered by the Student Honor Council. This Code sets standards for academic integrity at Maryland for all undergraduate and graduate students. As a student you are responsible for upholding these standards for this course. It is very important for you to be aware of the consequences of cheating, fabrication, facilitation, and plagiarism. For more information on the Code of Academic Integrity or the Student Honor Council, please visit http://www.shc.umd.edu.*

*To further exhibit your commitment to academic integrity, remember to sign the Honor Pledge on all examinations and assignments: "I pledge on my honor that I have not given or received any unauthorized assistance on this examination (assignment)."

**Appendix E: Creative Commons License**

This syllabus is copyright 2013 by Daniel H. Levine and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 license.

In a nutshell, this means that you can freely use the syllabus, including tweaking it and using part of it in your own work, as long as you are not making any money off of it, you credit me, and you share any derivative works under the same terms.

For more information, please see the human-readable "license deed:" http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/

Or, the full license in legalese: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/legalcode