

# Syllabus for Political Science 110K: Liberty and Equality

**Spring 2021**

(Last updated on January 11, 2022)

<b>Instructor:</b>	Sean Ingham	<b>Time:</b>	Tu., Th., 11-12:20
<b>Email:</b>	singham@ucsd.edu	<b>Website:</b>	<a href="https://canvas.ucsd.edu">https://canvas.ucsd.edu</a>
<b>Office hours:</b>	Tu., Th., 1-2pm Meeting ID 524 605 6423		

## Course description

The course considers questions about the concepts of freedom and equality and their roles in political argument. What individual freedoms ought society to recognize as important and worthy of protection? What does it mean to be free or unfree anyway? What kind of equality is necessary in a just society? Equality of basic rights and freedoms only, or also equality of opportunities for attaining wealth, positions of power, and other goods? What of inequalities in wealth and income that arise under conditions of equal opportunity? Other topics include freedom of speech, markets and economic liberties, and racial injustice. The primary pedagogical goals are to expose students to influential ideas in political theory and to improve students' abilities to think and write clearly about them.

## Zoom meetings for Jan. 4-Jan. 13

Per university policy we will be meeting remotely during the first two weeks of the quarter. Use the following link to register for the Zoom meeting:



After registering you will receive an email with a link for joining the meeting.

## Expectations and grading

### Class discussion

Neither attendance nor participation are graded, although they are strongly encouraged. If you attend class, you are expected to participate and should be ready to discuss the assigned reading. Our goal for each meeting is to improve our understanding of the ideas covered in the readings, explore their implications, test them against objections, and work out our own opinions about them on the basis of reasons and arguments. This is a collaborative exercise that works best when everyone participates. You can participate by asking questions about the material, attempting to answer questions that others have posed, offering arguments or engaging with the arguments other

students have made. To encourage equal participation of all participants, I may occasionally call on you.

The expectation is that we will sometimes disagree with each other, and, when we do, we will try to learn from those disagreements through respectful but critical engagement with each other's ideas. In the presence of disagreement, everyone should try to remain open to the possibility that they are wrong, or that their views are poorly reasoned, and use the disagreement as an occasion to explore the reasons for and against different views.

## Graded assignments

Your final grade reflects your performance on the following assignments:

- **Short papers (30 points; 5 points each).** There are six extremely short “papers”—ranging from four to twelve sentences each—that you must submit during the quarter.
  - A four-sentence paper is due ~~January 13~~ January 18 (5 points)
  - An eight-sentence paper is due ~~January 15~~ January 25 (5 points)
  - During the remainder of the quarter, you should submit three additional eight-sentence papers (5 points each), on topics of your choosing.
  - A twelve-sentence paper is due February 15 (5 points); a second twelve-sentence paper is due February 24 (ungraded). The second of these should be the skeleton of your final paper. You will exchange it with a peer as part of the peer editing assignment.
- **Peer editing (10 points).** You will exchange twelve-sentence papers with one of the other students in the class. You will submit an edited copy of your partner's paper together with your “referee report” to your partner and to me. This submission is due March 1.
- **Final paper (30 points).** An essay of 1200-1600 words is due March 10. It should be an extension of the second twelve-sentence paper you submit on February 24.
- **Midterm exam (10 points).** The midterm exam is on Feb. 3. More information about its format will be shared later in the quarter.
- **Final exam (20 points).** The final exam will be scheduled according to the university's schedule of final examinations. It is cumulative. More information about its format will be shared later in the quarter.

## Late submissions

If a paper is submitted after the deadline, it receives a penalty of one third of a letter grade for each of the days that have passed since the due date: thus A instead of A+ (or B instead of a B+) if it is one day late, B+ instead of a A- (or B- instead of a B) if it is two days late, and so on.

If circumstances beyond your control will prevent you from submitting a paper by the due date, you must contact me as soon as you become aware of this fact. Do not wait until after completing an assignment to explain that your performance was compromised by circumstances outside your control; I will not make post hoc changes to assigned grades in such a case.

A student's fraction of the 100 points will be converted to a final letter grade according to the following (provisional) rule:

90–100% = A or A-,  
80–89% = B-, B, B+,  
70–79% = C-, C, C+,  
60–69% = D,  
≤ 59% = F.

This rule is provisional. The goal of the grading policy is that students will receive grades in the A-range if their work is *excellent*, grades in the B-range if their work is *good* but not excellent, grades in the C-range if it is *satisfactory* but not good, and grades of D or F if the work is unsatisfactory.

## Academic integrity

Please familiarize yourself with the university's policies regarding academic integrity. For general information about what constitutes academic dishonesty and the potential repercussions, see the information at the following link:

<https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu/>

I will provide specific information about the expectations for the writing assignments and the exams, and what would constitute violations of academic integrity in the context of those assignments, via email and course documents later in the quarter. You are responsible for knowing university policy and for reading all course-related email and documents that explain the expectations for assignments and exams. Ignorance of this information or of general university policy does not absolve students of culpability for violations of academic integrity.

## Resources

Resources to help you improve your writing:

- UCSD's Writing Hub: [www.writinghub.ucsd.edu](http://www.writinghub.ucsd.edu)
- Bryan Garner, *Garner's Modern American Usage*, 3rd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

## Schedule

- [1] Jan. 4. Justice as fairness
  - John Rawls. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. §§1–3
- [2] Jan. 6. Justice as fairness.
  - Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, §§4–6
- [3] Jan. 11. Justice as fairness, continued.
  - Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, §§8–10, 20

- [4] Jan. 13. Justice as fairness, continued
- Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, §§11–17, 32, 39
  - ~~(First) four-sentence paper due.~~
- [5] Jan. 18. Property rights and the critique of distributive justice
- Robert Nozick. 1974. “Distributive Justice.” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 3(1): 45–126.
  - ~~(First) eight-sentence paper due.~~ **(First) four-sentence paper due.**
- [6] Jan. 20. Markets in everything? The case of contractual slavery
- Debra Satz. 2010. *Why Some Things Should Not Be for Sale: The Moral Limits of Markets*. Oxford University Press. Ch. 8.
- [7] Jan. 25. Market democracy, liberal socialism, and property-owning democracy
- John Tomasi. 2012. *Free Market Fairness*. Princeton University Press. Ch. 8, pp. 226–237.
  - Samuel Arnold. 2013. “Right-wing Rawlsianism: A Critique.” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 21(4): 382–404.
  - **(First) eight-sentence paper due.**
- [8] Jan. 27. Freedom and money
- G. A. Cohen. 2011. “Freedom and Money.” In *On the Currency of Egalitarian Justice, and Other Essays in Political Philosophy*. Ed. Michael Otsuka.
- [9] Feb. 1. Freedom of speech
- J.S. Mill, *On Liberty*, excerpts from chs. 1 and 2.
- [10] Feb. 3. Midterm exam.
- [11] Feb. 8. Harmful speech
- Marie Matsuda. 1989. “Public Response to Racist Speech: Considering the Victim’s Story.” *Michigan Law Review* 87(8): 2320–2381.
  - Andrew Altman. 1993. “Liberalism and Campus Hate Speech.” *Ethics* 103(2): 302–317.
- [12] Feb. 10. Harmful speech, continued
- Jeffrey Howard. 2019. “Dangerous Speech.” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 47(2): 208–254.
- [13] Feb. 15. Republicanism and freedom from domination
- Philip Pettit. 1997. *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford University Press. Ch. 1 (§§1, 2, 4, 5), ch. 2 (§§1, 2), ch. 3.
  - **(First) twelve-sentence paper due.**
- [14] Feb. 17. Republicanism, continued

- Pettit, *Republicanism*, ch. 4.
- [15] Feb. 22. Social equality
- Anderson, “Freedom and Equality”
  - Marie Garrau & Cécile Laborde, “Relational Equality, Non-Domination, and Vulnerability” in *Social Equality: Essays on What It Means to be Equals*, eds. Carina Fourie, Fabian Schuppert and Ivo Wallimann-Helmer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming.
  - Emily McTernan. 2018. “Microaggressions, equality, and social practices.” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 26(3): 261–281.
- [16] Feb. 24. Racial segregation and social inequality
- Elizabeth Anderson. 2013. *The Imperative of Integration*. Princeton University Press, chs. 1, 2.
  - **(Second) twelve-sentence paper due.**
- [17] Mar. 1. Racial inequality in non-ideal theory
- Tommie Shelby. 2007. “Justice, Deviance, and the Dark Ghetto.” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 35(2): 126–160.
  - **Peer review assignment due.**
- [18] Mar. 3. Reparations for slavery
- Bernard R. Boxill. 2003. “A Lockean Argument for Black Reparations.” *Journal of Ethics* 7: 63–91.
- [19] Mar. 8. Racial segregation and social inequality, continued
- Anderson, *Imperative of Integration*, ch. 4, 6
- [20] Mar. 10. Racial segregation and social inequality, continued
- Anderson, *Imperative of Integration*, chs. 7, 9