



Readings and Assignments: Weeks One-Five

If you miss a class, check these *Readings and Assignments* handouts for assignments or handouts.

If you have questions about an assignment after class has adjourned, I prefer that you ask them through the *Course Website* Bulletin Board so that all can benefit.

If I make a special arrangement with you for due dates, etc., explain it in a note or e-mail message and ask me to sign or confirm it; show it to me to remind me of our arrangement.

 indicates a handout in class.  indicates material from *Philosophy 310 Course Pack*.
[Titles with a dotted underline](#) are also available at the *Course Website*.

Contents

In deference to our leaf-bearing friends, *Readings and Assignments* is handed out in instalments in case there are revisions as we go along.

However, *Readings and Assignments* for the whole course is at the *Course Website*, but treat it as open to revision. Major due dates are listed below.

Introduction

[1. Friday, January 9](#)

Public Policy Framework: Defining Issues

[2. Friday, January 16](#)

[3. Friday, January 23](#)

Public Policy Framework: Finding Solutions

[3. Friday, January 30](#)

[4. Friday, February 6](#)

[5. Friday, February 13](#)

Theories of Justice/Negotiating Policy

[5. Friday, February 13](#): *Policy Project* groups assigned.

February 16-21: Mid-term Break

[6. Friday, February 27](#) *Seminars* assigned.

[7. Friday, March 6](#)

[8. Friday, March 13](#): Seminar on Liberal Theory of Justice
Policy Meeting & Prep: Liberalism

[9. Friday, March 20](#)

[10. Friday, March 27](#): Seminar on Libertarian Theory of Justice
Policy Meeting & Prep: Libertarianism

[11. Friday, April 3](#) Seminar on Democratic Cultural Pluralism

Policy Meeting & Prep: Democratic Cultural Pluralism

Friday, April 10: Good Friday

[DUE April 20: *Policy Project: Final Report*](#)

1. Friday, January 9**Introduction to the course**

 [Course Description](#)

 [Readings & Assignments: Weeks One-Two](#) (this handout)

 [Introductory Questions](#)

Public Policy: Introduction

 [2.1 Public Policy: Introduction](#)



 [1.2. Public Policy Framework](#)

 [1.3. Public Policy Framework: Examples](#)

Assignment

QUESTIONS about  [Course Description](#),  [Policy Project](#),  [1.4. Methods of Inquiry](#), and the course?


READ:  [2.2 Gordon Campbell: Core Services Review](#)

Leslie Pal,  [2.2 Public Policy Analysis](#) and  [2.3 Beyond Policy Analysis](#).

(Yes, I mistakenly used “2.2” twice.)


Pay attention especially to sections about defining problems.

LOOK OVER  [1.2 Public Policy Framework: Steps 1 & 2;](#)

 [1.3. Public Policy Framework: Examples: Steps 1 & 2 of “Selecting a Vacation Book” and “Public Funding for Independent Schools.”](#)

READ  [2.4 Michael Walzer: “Political Action: the Problem of Dirty Hands,”](#) and

 [2.5 Dirty Hands: Pinochet.](#)

 [2.6 Barbara Amiel: “It’s madness to prosecute for socio-political crimes”](#)

DUE NEXT SESSION: Dirty Hands: Individual Prep Questions

Answer the following questions in no more than about 200 words each.

Walzer sees Dirty Hands as a genuine problem. He considers and argues against several utilitarian arguments that Dirty Hands is not a genuine problem (169-173).

1. Using Pinochet as an example, explain the supposed problem of Dirty Hands.
2. Using this example, explain why you agree with Walzer that Dirty Hands is a genuine problem, or why you are convinced by the utilitarian arguments (in which case you must be a utilitarian?) that it is not.

Be prepared to explain your example and reasoning to others during co-op work.

Assignment continued on next page...

READ FOR SESSION 3: 📖 3.3 Selections from Jonathan Baron, *Thinking and Deciding*;
📖 3.4 Selections from Samuel S. Komorita & Craig D. Parks, *Social Dilemmas*.

DUE SESSION 3: If you have time, see if you can get a start on what is DUE SESSION 3.

In Komorita, I have left out or bracketed (⌈⌋) most of the math (and math-fear inducing symbols), and most of the empirical research in psychology and sociology, which I nonetheless commend to you.

READ FOR SESSION 4:

📖 4.3 John Locke: “Of Property” from *Two Treatises of Government*

📖 4.4 John Stuart Mill: “On the Connection between Justice and Utility,” from *Utilitarianism*

2. Friday, January 16

QUESTIONS about 📖 *Course Description*, 📖 1.1 *Policy Project*, 📖 1.4 *Methods of Inquiry*, and the course?

Public Policy Framework: Steps 1 & 2

Dirty Hands

DUE: Dirty Hands: Individual Prep Questions

Decision Making: Introduction

Social Dilemmas: Introduction

📖 *Social Dilemmas: Matrix*

Assignment

DUE NEXT SESSION: Public Policy Framework Practice

You should have already worked through the first example, “Selecting a Vacation Book,” in [Public Policy Framework: Examples](#).

Follow the [Public Policy Framework](#) steps below for choosing a car to buy. Invent your situation, desires, and vehicles as you please.

This exercise simply requires you to go through the decision-making procedure at a basic level to ensure that you understand its fundamentals.

1. Define the problem.

1.1 Describe how things are.

Describe the situation you find yourself in such that you need to buy a motor vehicle, *e.g.*, what you need the vehicle for, how much you can afford to pay for it, etc. Include the interests of the major parties involved, *e.g.*, your family, friends, co-workers.

Assignment continued on next page...

3. Explain and justify criteria for a good resolution of the problem.

1.2 As a result, ask a question to answer in order to solve the problem.

It is doubtful that your question at this step **requires** you to buy a motor vehicle. For example, it might leave open the possibility of renting a car occasionally while otherwise relying on public transport. However, for this exercise, restrict the question to deciding what motor vehicle to buy.

So, your **goal** is to find a good answer to this question.

2. State your recommended resolution for the best motor vehicle to buy.

Do not complete this step until you have completed steps 3-5.

3.1 Identify and justify values as criteria that must be satisfied by a good answer to the Question.

3.2 Identify and justify other criteria that a good answer to the Question must meet.

While most of your criteria probably fall under 3.1 above, do consider feasibility criteria that you may have neglected there, *e.g.*, can you easily maintain a Ferrari in Chilliwack?

3.3 Prioritise criteria by ranking them.

Distinguish non-compensatory and compensatory criteria.

Rank your criteria.

Obviously, non-compensatory criteria must be met.

Rank your compensatory criteria.

4. Identify at least three alternative motor vehicles for achieving your goals.

The selection is limited to vehicles for sale. So, there may not be a lot of room for creativity here unless you create imaginary cars. But do avoid unnecessary constraints on your choices, *e.g.*, failing to consider buying a truck, or an American car, or a used car.

5. Use criteria to decide on and justify your recommended resolution.

Use simplified rules:

Satisfice: Eliminate any alternative that does not meet your non-compensatory criteria.

(Presumably, you would eliminate such possibilities even before seriously considering them as alternatives, *e.g.*, if you **need** a car that uses little gas, you would not seriously consider most SUVs.)

Rank each alternative for how well it meets each of the compensatory criteria.

Add up the rankings: low score wins.

Assignment continued on next page...

DUE NEXT SESSION: Social Dilemmas: Individual Prep Questions

LOOK OVER 📖 1.2 *Public Policy Framework: Steps 3 & 4;*

📖 1.3 *Public Policy Framework: Examples: Steps 3 & 4 of “Selecting a Vacation Book” and “Public Funding for Independent Schools.”*

READ 📖 3.3. *Selections from Jonathan Baron, Thinking and Deciding.*

📖 3.4 *Selections from Samuel S. Komorita & Craig D. Parks, Social Dilemmas.*

In Komorita, I have left out or bracketed (⌈ ⌋) most of the math (and math-fear inducing symbols), and most of the empirical research in psychology and sociology, which I nonetheless commend to you.

Situations:

Divorce: Two people are contesting a divorce to divide about \$100,000 of property. Each insists on settling for nothing less than \$65,000. Rather than divide the property equally, each threatens to a protracted legal battle that would see all the value of the contested property spent on lawyer’s fees. Even if they agree on a settlement, each can expect to spend about \$5,000 for legal fees.

(Last name: A-D)

Pricing: You have just purchased your own gas station and need to decide on your prices. Suppliers charge gas stations 60¢/litre. The gas station on the same intersection as your gas station charges its customers 90¢/litre. You figure that if you charge 90¢/litre, you will sell about 10,000 litres per month, but that if you lower your price to 85¢/litre, you will sell 15,000 litres per month if your competitor keeps the price at 90¢/litre.

(Last name: E-J)

Boycott: You have just discovered that most chicken eggs for sale in grocery stores are produced by chickens living in wire cages where each chicken has less than the area of a piece of notebook paper, chickens cannibalize cage mates, often rub their breasts against the wire mesh until it is completely bald and bleeding, and 10% die.

You vow to buy only free range eggs from now on. But then you discover that they cost about twice as much as regular eggs. Since your family eats at least a couple of dozen eggs a week and they are living on a poor student’s budget, you may have to cut down on other groceries. And how much effect will your buying habits have on the welfare of chickens, anyway?

(Last name: J-Z)

1. For the situation assigned to you according to your last name, assign weights to the various utility factors in a pay-off matrix (📖 *Social Dilemmas: Matrix*) so that the situation is a social dilemma, *i.e.*, it produces conflict between individual rationality (choose the dominant solution) and collective rationality (choose a Pareto optimal solution).

Then, explain whether the situation:

involves public goods, *i.e.*, with jointness of supply, impossibility of excluding users, and discrete or continuous goods;

is a Prisoners’ Dilemmas ($T > R > P > S$; $2R > (T+S)$);

is a game of Chicken ($T > R > S > P$).

Assignment continued on next page...

2. Does it make sense to you logically, *i.e.*, do the characteristics of social dilemmas help you understand how this situation is structured?

Does it make sense to you realistically, *i.e.*, do the characteristics of social dilemmas help you understand what people actually do in this situation?

3. What approach would you be inclined to adopt towards it: Co-operator? Competitor? Individualist? Why?
Does it pose moral difficulties for you when deciding what to do in this situation?

DUE SESSION 4: Choose your issue for the *Policy Project*.

See the guidelines on page 1 of *Policy Project*.

You should decide your issue as soon as possible.

I must approve it: no more than four or five students can write on the same issue.

Obviously, your life will be easier if you already have some expertise about your issue.

Give your issue in the form of a question: Who should do what about this issue...? For example, How should the provincial government fund independent schools?

3. Friday, January 23

DUE: *Policy Project, Public Policy Framework Practice*

Public Policy Framework: Steps 3 & 4

Social Dilemmas

DUE: *Social Dilemmas: Individual Prep Questions*

DUE: Choose your issue for the *Policy Project*.

Assignment

DUE SESSION 5: In no more than about 500 words, write a rough draft of *Public Policy Framework* steps 1 and 2 for your *Policy Project* issue.

Early in the next week, I will confirm by e-mail your policy issue.

Do not proceed with this assignment until I have approved your policy issue.

This *Project* is **not** a research paper built on an exhaustive, comprehensive survey of the literature on empirical aspects of your issue. You are expected to be an expert on empirical aspects of your issue only in comparison to other members of this class.

Do only as much research as necessary to provide yourself with the relevant background and the central arguments advanced by various plausible positions on the issue.

In particular, document any major agreements and disagreements about important empirical matters concerning this issue, and note major positions (including the reasons for them) about what should be done about this issue. Interviews with relevant experts or practitioners can be an excellent source of information.

Use **footnotes** to document your information.

Take particular care in formulating your issue as a **question**.

For **step 2**, simply state and briefly explain your *hypothesis* about the best solution to this issue.

(See "Example Essay" in *Public Policy Framework: Examples*.)

LOOK OVER 📖 1.2 *Public Policy Framework: Step 5*;
📖 1.3. *Public Policy Framework: Examples: Step 5 of “Selecting a Vacation Book” and “Public Funding for Independent Schools.”*

READ FOR SESSION 5: 📖 4.3 John Locke: “Of Property”
📖 4.4 John Stuart Mill: “On the Connection between Justice and Utility”

4. Friday, January 30

Social Dilemmas: Finish

Public Policy Framework, step 5.

DUE: draft of *Policy Project* steps 1 & 2

Assignment

LOOK OVER: 📖 3.2 *Negotiating*.

DUE NEXT SESSION: In no more than about 500 words write a very rough draft of step 3 of *Public Policy Framework*, building on your work on step 1.

Early in the next week, I will e-mail to you comments on your draft of *Policy Project* steps 1 & 2. Then you can proceed with this assignment.

You are recording your **initial** thoughts about these criteria before we venture deeply into theories of justice.

- 3.1 Based on the parties and interests identified in step 1, briefly justify which **parties** you believe should have what **interests** satisfied by a good resolution of your issue, *i.e.*, what interests are **legitimate**.
- 3.2 Explain the most important feasibility criteria that must be satisfied by a good resolution of your issue.
- 3.3 Decide which criteria from 3.1 and 3.2 are non-compensatory.

(See “Example Essay” in *Public Policy Framework: Examples*.)

You will probably revise these criteria many times as we look at different theories of justice.

You may find *Decision*+ helpful with this and subsequent assignments where you must reassess and calculate criteria.

Assignment continued on next page...

DUE NEXT SESSION: Prepare notes (to be turned in) of no more than about 250 words on step 4 below for your First Policy Project Meeting.

You will be assigned to a group with members considering a variety of policy issues.

1. Decide who will serve as Chair and as Recorder for your Policy Project meetings.

After each meeting, there should be no doubt who will serve as Chair and as Recorder for the next meeting. You do not want to waste time at a meeting because no one was prepared to serve in these roles.

The easiest way to remove doubt is to select a continuing Chair and Vice-Chair (to act in the Chair's absence), First Recorder and Second Recorder (to act in the First Recorder's absence). However, that risks having a Chair or Recorder who is not doing well but whom no one will be so impolite as to suggest replacing.

So, make your choice of having permanent or rotating Chairs and Recorders, so long as there is no doubt who will serve in these capacities at each next meeting.

The Chair convenes each meeting, reviews the agenda, chairs the meeting, ensures the agenda is set for next meeting and clarifies what preparatory work is required from each member.

The Chair does not have a license to impose its ideas on the group. If anything, the Chair should have **less** opportunity to express its views as it performs its duties.

The Recorder records and posts to the *Course Website* the minutes of each meeting, including:

- where, when, and for how long you met, and who attended;
- topics discussed, agreements reached, obstacles to agreement dealt with, obstacles to agreement that remain and steps taken to deal with them;
- significant arguments made about various issues;
- agenda for next meeting and responsibilities of members.

The fuller and better organized are these minutes, the more work will already have been done towards your *Final Report*. **So, select, care for and feed your Recorder well!**

Given the work involved for the position, a permanent Recorder should also have less responsibility than other members for preparing the *Group Report*.

2. Decide how your group will make decisions: Lottery? Simple majority? Stronger majority (e.g., two-thirds)? Consensus?

Parties first have to negotiate a framework agreement about how they will negotiate an agreement. You have no recourse to outside arbitration: you must decide for yourselves how you will decide. And how do you decide how to decide about how you will decide?

In part, your decision should be based on what you see as the point of negotiations:

- To ensure a fair process?
- To reach an agreement?
- To produce the best consequences?

You must also be prepared to mediate disagreements within your group, essentially, to help each other follow procedures for successful negotiations.

Assignment continued on next page...

3. Each member briefly explain your policy issue.**4. Produce your group's working definition of justice and the goals of your group for a just society.**

In order to apply the method of reflective equilibrium to theories of justice, we need some initial intuitions about justice. This initial statement also provides a working hypothesis for your *Group Report* that will almost certainly be revised many times throughout the term. Your *Minutes* should record these changes so that in your *Group Report* you can explain and justify your final definition and goals: why are they better than the alternatives?

Prep notes: Explain your definition of justice and your notion of a just society.

Do not do any research: simply explain your concept of justice in general using specific examples to help explain your concept.

It should help to think in terms of the categories used in *Public Policy Framework* and in *Negotiating*:

Parties: Whose interests must be considered?

(E.g., All adults? All humans—children, people with disabilities? All animals? Groups—gendered, ethnic, sexual, species? Others?)

Interests: What kinds of interests must be considered?

(E.g., All? Only needs for survival? Only those necessary for living a good life? Others?)

Legitimacy: What standard of justice should we use?

(E.g., Equality? Merit? Social utility? Other?)

Commitment: How is the just distribution to be put into effect?

(E.g.,: Should it be imposed by the state? Should compliance be voluntary? Other?)

5. Reflect on this meeting and set the agenda for the next meeting.

How did today's meeting go well? What could be done to help the next meeting go better?

Is the agenda and preparatory work for the next meeting clear?

READ FOR NEXT SESSION:

📖 4.3 John Locke: "Of Property" from *Two Treatises of Government*

📖 4.4 John Stuart Mill: "On the Connection between Justice and Utility," from *Utilitarianism*

READ FOR SESSION 6: Farrelly, Preface, Chapter 1;

John Rawls, *Justice as Fairness*, Parts I, II, III.

LOOK OVER 📖 5.1 *Liberal Theory of Justice* that places Rawls's theory in the framework of Fisher's theory of negotiation (📖 3.2 *Negotiating* pp. 2-4).

5. Friday, February 6

Negotiating: 📖 3.2 *Negotiating*

Justice: Introduction: 📖 4.1 **Justice: Introduction**

Policy Project groups assigned

DUE: draft of step 3 of *Public Policy Framework*

DUE: First *Policy Project* Meeting prep notes

Assignment

DUE Monday, February 9: IF YOU CARE, send me an e-mail ranking the theories of justice in the order of your preference for your group seminar.

READ FOR SESSION 6: Farrelly, Preface, Chapter 1;
John Rawls, *Justice as Fairness*, Parts I, II, III.

LOOK OVER 📖 5.1 *Liberal Theory of Justice* that places Rawls's theory in the framework of Fisher's theory of negotiation (📖 3.2 *Negotiating* pp. 2-4).

Farrelly, Chapter 4, examines another variety of liberalism.

6. Friday, February 13

Seminars on Justice assigned.

First Policy Project meeting: continued?

Liberal Theory of Justice: John Rawls

📖 5.1 *Liberal Theory of Justice*

Readings and Assignments: The Rest

6. Friday, February 13

Seminars on Justice assigned.

First Policy Project meeting: continued?

Liberal Theory of Justice: John Rawls

Assignment

NEXT SESSION: Prepare for Seminar groups meeting to organise and divide the labour.

READ FOR SESSION 8: Farrelly, Chapter 2;

📖 6.3: Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*.

LOOK OVER 📖 6.1 *Libertarian Theory of Justice* that places Nozick's theory in the framework of Fisher's theory of negotiation (📖 3.2 *Negotiating* pp. 2-4).

Farrelly, Chapter 3, examines another variety of Libertarianism.

Previous students also found <http://www.libertarian.org/> helpful. There are also left-libertarians, but I have not found a good left-libertarian website. If you do, please let me know.

If you are doing a policy issue about criminal justice, please remind me to supply you with some additional reading from Nozick.

DUE SESSION 9: Seminar on Liberal Theory of Justice;

Policy Project, "Policy Meeting Assignment: Liberalism."

Seminar leaders should also read Parts IV and V of *Justice as Fairness*. Of course, you are also welcome to use additional resources.

Farrelly, Chapter 4, examines another variety of liberalism.

DUE SESSION 10: Seminar on Libertarian Theory of Justice

Policy Project, "Policy Meeting Assignment: Libertarianism"

Seminar leaders should also read 📖 6.5: Robert Nozick: "Equality," "Equality of Opportunity," "A Framework for Utopia."

Of course, you are also welcome to use additional resources.

February 16-21: Midterm Break

7. Friday, February 27**Liberal Theory of Justice: John Rawls**📖 **5.1 *Liberal Theory of Justice***

Seminar groups meet.

Assignment**READ FOR SESSION 8: Farrelly, Chapter 2;**📖 **6.4: Robert Nozick: “Distributive Justice.”****LOOK OVER** 📖 **6.1 *Libertarian Theory of Justice*** that places Nozick’s theory in the framework of Fisher’s theory of negotiation (📖 **3.2 *Negotiating*** pp. 2-4).**Farrelly, Chapter 3, examines another variety of Libertarianism.**Some students have found <http://www.libertarian.org/> helpful. There are also left-libertarians, but I have not found a good left-libertarian website. If you do, please let me know.**8. Friday, March 6****Libertarian Theory of Justice: Robert Nozick**📖 **6.1 *Libertarian Theory of Justice***

Seminar groups meet.

Assignment**DUE NEXT SESSION: Seminar on Liberal Theory of Justice.****Assignment: Policy Meetings****DUE NEXT SESSION: Policy Meeting: Liberalism (see *Policy Project*)**Your Policy Meeting could be more productive if you exchange your liberal criteria and policy proposals ahead of time (*e.g.*, through your group’s forum at the *Course Website*) for each member to review others’ proposals before your meeting.**9. Friday, March 13****Seminar on Liberal Theory of Justice****Policy Meeting: Liberalism****DUE: Policy Meeting: Liberalism (see *Policy Project*)*****Assignment on next page...***

Assignment

POST the minutes from your Policy Meeting on Liberalism to your policy group's forum at the course website.

DUE NEXT SESSION: Seminar on Libertarian Theory of Justice.

DUE NEXT SESSION: Policy Meeting: Libertarianism (see *Policy Project*)

Your Policy Meeting could be more productive if you exchange your liberal criteria and policy proposals ahead of time (*e.g.*, through your group's forum at the *Course Website*) for each member to review others' proposals before your meeting.

READ FOR SESSION 11: Farrelly, Chapters 6, 7, 8;

Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, chapters 1, 2, 6, pp. 248-56.

All should try to and **seminar leaders should definitely** read chapters 3 and 4. Of course, you are also welcome to use additional resources.

LOOK OVER 📖 **7.1 *Democratic Cultural Pluralism*** that places Young's theory in the framework of Fisher's theory of negotiation (📖 **3.2 *Negotiating*** pp. 2-4).

10. Friday, March 20

Seminar on Libertarian Theory of Justice

Policy Meeting: Libertarianism

DUE: Policy Meeting: Libertarianism (see *Policy Project*)

Assignment

POST the minutes from your Policy Meeting on Libertarianism to your policy group's forum at the course website.

READ FOR NEXT SESSION:

Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, chapters 1, 2, 6, pp. 248-56

Farrelly, Chapters 6, 7, 8.

All should try to and **seminar leaders should definitely** read chapters 3 and 4. Seminar leaders should also read Farrelly, Chapter 6, 7, 8; Of course, you are also welcome to use additional resources.

LOOK OVER 📖 **7.1 *Democratic Cultural Pluralism*** that places Young's theory in the framework of Fisher's theory of negotiation (📖 **3.2 *Negotiating*** pp. 2-4).

11. Friday, March 27

Democratic Cultural Pluralism: Iris Marion Young

 **7.1 Democratic Cultural Pluralism**

Assignment

DUE NEXT SESSION: Seminar on Democratic Cultural Pluralism

DUE NEXT SESSION: Policy Meeting: Democratic Cultural Pluralism (see *Policy Project*)

Your Policy Meeting could be more productive if you exchange your liberal criteria and policy proposals ahead of time (*e.g.*, through your group's forum at the *Course Website*) for each member to review others' proposals before your meeting.

12. Friday, April 3

Seminar on Democratic Cultural Pluralism

Policy Meeting: Democratic Cultural Pluralism

DUE: Policy Meeting: Libertarianism (see *Policy Project*)

Assignment

POST the minutes from your Policy Meeting on Democratic Cultural Pluralism to your policy group's forum at the course website.

Friday, April 10: Good Friday

Unfortunately, we lose the last session of the course when you could meet to work on your *Policy Project*. We could try to arrange to meet all at another time. Or I could try to meet with each group if that is desired.

DUE April 20: *Policy Project: Final Report*