

WRTG 3020-101: Writing in Global Justice

2017 summer A-term

Instructor: Dr. Lev Szentkirályi (pronounced sěnt-kě-rő-yě or “sent-key-rah-ye”)

Email: szentkiralyi@colorado.edu

Phone: 720-636-5041

Office hours: Wednesdays 12-2pm or by appointment

Office: in transition—office hours will be held at Innisfree coffee shop at Broadway/Pennsylvania

Course Overview and Objectives

This interdisciplinary hybrid course teaches principles of academic writing by examining contemporary issues of international politics, which challenge students to engage difficult texts in normative political theory. Students will explore the rights of migrants and refugees, global poverty and theories of distributive justice, moral culpability for environmental injustices, and humanitarian intervention and the ethical duty to prevent genocidal violence. Through course readings, independent research, and various writing assignments, students will critically evaluate diverse moral arguments in these different issue-areas, and will critique proposed solutions to these prevailing injustices. In having students apply lessons of rhetorical analysis learned in the classroom to real world states of affairs and complex ethical problems, this course strives to motivate students to think beyond themselves and their own interests, to appreciate the hardships others endure, and to develop a sense of civic responsibility toward victims of injustice.

The first three weeks of this hybrid course will consist in traditional in-class lectures, discussions, and assignments; whereas the last two weeks will consist in independent and collaborative online work.

Writing Requirements

This writing course meets two sets of requirements here on the CU-Boulder campus.

The first set consists in the requirements established by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education for all third-level “Communication General Education ‘Guaranteed Transfer’” (CO-3) courses in the state. These CO-3 courses are designed to ensure that students understand “how to summarize, analyze, and synthesize the ideas of others” and “learn more sophisticated ways of communicating knowledge...in the context of a specific discipline” (par. 3). This is achieved by extending “rhetorical knowledge,” “writing processes [and] conventions,” and “comprehension of content knowledge at the advanced level” (par. 6).

The second set consists in the requirements established by the Program for Writing and Rhetoric (PWR), which is the home program for this course. These include your capacities to:

- *develop rhetorical knowledge*—analyzing and making informed choices about purposes, audiences, and context as you read and compose texts.
- *analyze texts in a variety of genres*—understanding how content, style, structure and format vary across a range of reading and writing situations.
- *refine and reflect on your writing process*—using multiple strategies to generate ideas, draft, revise, and edit your writing across a variety of genres.
- *develop information literacy*—making critical choices as you identify a specific research need, locate and evaluate information and sources, and draw connections among your own and others' ideas in your writing.
- *construct effective arguments*—using appropriate reasons and evidence to support your positions while responding to multiple points of view.
- *understand and apply language conventions rhetorically*—including grammar, spelling, punctuation and format. (PWR First Year Committee)

In light of these requirements, our writing course this semester will ask you to:

1. develop rhetorical knowledge by reading and writing a range of academic arguments—which will attend to a variety of rhetorical considerations, including context, audience, purpose, rhetorical

appeals, genre- and discipline-specific conventions of writing and research, and so forth—while using effective evidence and providing appropriate analysis.

2. develop an intimate understanding of writing processes and information literacy by drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading your own work; by reading and critiquing the work of others; and by engaging in a number of formative writing assignments using primary and secondary source materials.
3. understand and employ general and discipline-specific conventions and principles of academic writing and clear prose style in your writing, while exploring the potential social benefits and costs of doing so, as well as our obligations to our communities as educated students and writers.
4. reflect on your educational goals and values, and those of others.

To accomplish these goals, you will spend extensive time this semester working alone and in groups. You are also encouraged to meet with me one-on-one to discuss your paper assignments.

Required Textbooks

There is only one required text for this course:

- Anthony Weston. *A Rulebook for Arguments*, 4th ed. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2009).

All other required readings will be made available on our course webpage:

- http://levszentkiralyi/teaching/3020-101_2017/

University and Course Policies

Class Behavior: be respectful of and considerate toward your classmates. I am committed to establishing an atmosphere that fosters open, civil, and constructive lines of communication, and inappropriate or offensive conduct will not be tolerated. *If you feel uncomfortable at any time with any aspect of the class environment, I strongly encourage you to come discuss your concerns with me.*

Attendance Policy: Since this is an abbreviated summer class, since it is a hybrid class that only meets the first three weeks of the summer term, and since we will have several writing and peer-review workshops and in-class activities, there is a formal attendance policy for this class.

Students are only permitted one unexcused absence without penalty—each subsequent unexcused absence will result in a 5% deduction in their attendance grade. Since attendance accounts for 10% of your final course grade, this means that three unexcused absences will result in a full letter-grade deduction of your final course grade.

Punctuality Policy: Persistent tardiness is unacceptable. Please make an effort to arrive on time.

Use of electronics: Students are expected to turn **OFF** all electronic devices when entering the classroom, with the exception of personal computers—which are to be used only for course-related purposes.

- You should regularly check your CU email account for class announcements and information. You should also regularly check our course webpage to confirm regular reading and homework assignments, to view paper assignments, and to view syllabus updates.
- You must bring either paper or electronic copies of each course reading with you to each class—you will not be permitted to use cell phones to access course readings. Computer problems, broken printers, empty toner cartridges, or other technology problems will not excuse you from completing your assigned work on time or from bringing required materials with you to class.

Written Work and Due Dates: Students must type all writing assignments using 12-point font, 1-inch margins, and a consistent citation style (MLA, APA, or Chicago), and they must submit all assignments to turnitin.com by the assigned dates and times.

- To upload your work, log into <http://turnitin.com>, enroll in our class (#15449913) using our class password (3020-101), click on the appropriate assignment link, and upload your paper.
- Note that late work will be penalized one full letter grade (10%) for each day that it is late.

Disability accommodations: If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit a letter to me from Disability Support Services (DSS) in a timely manner so that your needs may be accommodated. DSS requires that disabilities be documented, and can be contacted at 303.492.8671 or at dsinfo@colorado.edu.

If you have a temporary medical condition or injury, see Temporary Injuries under Quick Links at Disability Services website (<http://disabilityservices.colorado.edu/>) and discuss your needs with me.

Religious observances: Campus policy requires that faculty make every effort to reasonably and fairly accommodate students who have scheduling conflicts because of religious observances. Students who need to reschedule exams or assignments should inform me as soon as possible.

Addressing discrimination: No discrimination or harassment will be tolerated in this class. If you believe you have been discriminated against, you are strongly encouraged to contact the Office of Discrimination and Harassment at 303.492.2127, or the Office of Student Conduct at 303.492.5550. Information about University policies and resources can be found at <http://hr.colorado.edu/dh/>.

Honor code: Students are responsible for knowing and adhering to the academic integrity policy of this institution. Violations may include cheating, plagiarism, aiding others in academic dishonesty, deception, fabrication, and etc. All incidents of academic misconduct will be reported to the Honor Code Council (honor@colorado.edu; 303.735.2273). Students found to be in violation of the academic integrity policy will be subject to both academic sanctions from the faculty member and non-academic sanctions (including, but not limited to, university probation, suspension, or expulsion). Further details can be found at <http://colorado.edu/policies/honor.html>, and at <http://honorcode.colorado.edu>.

Plagiarism: If students have *any* doubt about what constitutes plagiarism, it is their responsibility to ask *before* submitting work as their own.

Plagiarism is the act of using others' words and/or ideas without proper attribution, either intentionally or unintentionally. The *MLA Style Manual* (2nd edition) requires that

[s]cholarly authors generously acknowledge their debts to predecessors by carefully giving credit to each source. Whenever you draw on another's work, you must specify what you borrowed—whether facts, opinions, or quotations—and where you borrowed it from. Using another person's ideas without acknowledging the source constitutes plagiarism (Gibaldi 151).

Intentional plagiarism will be strictly punished: a proven first offense will result in an automatic F for the final assignment grade, while a proven second offense will result in an automatic F for the course. Moreover, depending on the nature of the offense, engaging in plagiarism may result in further disciplinary action by the University. Consult the PWR or Campus Honor Code websites for more info.

Further resources are available at https://levszentkiralyi.com/teaching/student_resources/, including

- Purdue Online Writing Lab: <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/section/2/9/>
- <http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/how/citationstyle.htm>
- <http://honorcode.colorado.edu/student-information>
- <http://colorado.edu/policies/honor.html>
- See also Joseph Gibaldi, *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing*, 2nd ed. (New York: Modern Language Association, 1999).

The Writing Center: Students should consider utilizing the Writing Center—a campus service offering free one-on-one feedback about academic writing—as a supplement to their learning in this course. (See <http://www.colorado.edu/pwr/writingcenter.html> for more information about the Center or to schedule an appointment.) Be warned, however, that the Center books up quickly, often up to one week in advance during peak times. Be sure to plan accordingly.

Course Requirements

The individual graded assignments are as follows. Specific information about each assignment will be provided as we move through the semester.

- **Attendance** (10% of final course grade):
 - This is a discussion-based course in which students are expected to be actively involved in class discussions, workshops, and in-class assignments—making attendance a prerequisite.
 - Moreover, since this is an abbreviated summer course and a hybrid course that only meets for the first three weeks of the summer term, attendance is essential.
 - Therefore, you are permitted 1 unexcused absence without penalty. Each further unexcused absences will result in a 5% deduction to your attendance grade. And since your attendance grade is 10% of your final course grade, this means that 3 unexcused absences will result in a full letter-grade deduction to your final course grade.
 - NOTE: a generic slip provided by Wardenburg that notes that a student had an appointment on the day the student missed class will not be accepted as excusing the absence. Students missing class due to illness must provide a note signed by or an email sent from their doctor explaining that the absence from class should be excused.

- **Course Participation** (10% of final course grade):
 - This is a discussion-based course in which students are expected to be actively involved in class discussions and workshops, to thoroughly complete all readings and to come prepared to class to engage in critical discussion of the readings, and to complete all class assignments.
 - Arriving to class late, arriving unprepared to discuss the readings, neglecting to contribute substantively to our class discussions, demonstrating a lack of engagement, and failing to complete in-class assignments will all result in deductions in your course participation grade.
 - **Examples of behavior that indicates to me your lack of engagement:** not taking notes; using cell phones during class; being generally disengaged (staring off into space, chatting with others, falling asleep, etc.); failing to make an effort to answer questions asked of you.
 - **Examples of behavior that indicates to me you are actively engagement:** taking detailed notes (not just writing down what's provided on the slides); being generally engaged (active listening, making eye contact, responding to comments other students may make, etc.); making an effort to answer questions directly asked of you.

- **Reading Comprehension Quizzes** (20% of final course grade):
 - Each week there will be a comprehensive take-home quiz, which will consist in a series of short-answer questions that will test students on specifics from the course readings assigned for the week and/or will ask students to apply course material learned during the week.
 - There will be a total of five quizzes. The lowest quiz grade will be dropped, so each quiz will be worth 5% of the final course grade.

- **Position Papers** (60% of final course grade):
 - Students will be expected to write three researched, thesis-drive, and evidence-based papers.
 - Each paper will be 5-6 pages in length, and each will constitute 20% of the final course grade.
 - Students must submit a rough draft and a substantively revised final draft for each assignment.
 - Each rough draft will be peer-reviewed.

Final class grades will be based on the following scale:

93 – 100% = A	87 – 89% = B+	77 – 79% = C+	67 – 69% = D+	< 60% = F
90 – 92% = A-	83 – 86% = B	73 – 76% = C	63 – 66% = D	
	80 – 82% = B-	70 – 72% = C-	60 – 62% = D-	

General Grading Guidelines for Major Writing Assignments:

The following represent my general grading criteria for the researched position papers you will be writing this semester. Specific rubrics will be provided for each assignment.

An essay in the “A” Range will feature

- a strong thesis with a clear claim, reasons and evidence, and underlying warrant
- relevant and specific examples drawn from appropriate sources
- consistently clear analysis of reasons and evidence
- consistently appropriate and correct use of citation
- consistently clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- careful attention to issues of grammar and style (especially sentence boundaries, clarity, coherence, and punctuation)
- meeting the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “B” Range will feature

- a generally good thesis with a clear claim, reasons and evidence, and underlying warrant
- relevant and specific examples drawn from appropriate sources
- generally clear analysis of reasons and evidence
- generally appropriate and correct use of citation
- generally clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- generally strong attention to issues of grammar and style
- meeting the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “C” Range will feature

- a thesis lacking a clear claim, reasons, evidence, and/or underlying warrant
- poorly chosen and poorly explained examples
- little specific analysis of reasons and evidence (often as a result of a poor thesis)
- minimally appropriate and correct use of appropriate citation styles
- minimally clear and correct use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- minimal attention to issues of grammar and style
- failure to meet the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “D” Range will feature

- no real thesis
- weak or no examples
- little or no analysis of reasons and evidence
- generally inappropriate or incorrect use of citation (but without lapsing into plagiarism)
- generally unclear or incorrect use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- significant problems with grammar and style
- failure to meet the minimum page requirements

An essay in the “F” Range will feature

- no real thesis
- weak or no examples
- little or no analysis of reasons and evidence
- generally unclear and incorrect use of citation styles (often in ways that lapse into plagiarism)
- generally inappropriate or incorrect use of quotation, summary, and paraphrase
- significant problems with grammar and style
- failure to meet the minimum page requirements

Reading and Assignment Schedule

Note: the assigned readings that follow are subject to revision.

Details about how course readings and assignments satisfy CCHE guidelines are provided below.

Note the shorthand for CCHE goals:

1: Rhetorical Knowledge, 2: Writing Processes, 3: Writing Conventions, 4: Content Knowledge

THE WRITING PROCESS AND PROBLEMS OF GLOBAL JUSTICE

Guiding Questions: What is writing and rhetoric? What is global justice? What can we learn about principles of good writing from the study of issues of global justice?

Objectives: Understand what the writing process consists in, what the aims of writing are, how to structure academic papers, what the study of global justice consists in, and how exploring normative issues of justice can improve student writing.

Monday, 5 June: Course Introduction and Calculated Skimming

- “Truck of Corpses, New Shipwreck Intensify Europe’s Migrant Crisis,” *Reuters* (2015)¹
- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Introduction and Chapter 1²
- “National Responsibility and Global Justice,” David Miller (2008)³

¹ Purpose: preview course and outline expectations

² Purpose: review components of academic arguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

³ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

ACADEMIC AND NORMATIVE ARGUMENTS

Guiding Questions: What makes an argument strong? What are ‘academic’ and ‘normative’ arguments? Are normative arguments simply expressions of our opinions (subjective value judgments)?

Objectives: Recognize that there are various types of arguments, that strong academic arguments have certain key features, and that arguments of global justice are grounded in value-laden claims of normative truth or value judgments. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary philosophical debates over universal moral principles.

Tuesday, 6 June: Arguments that Generalize ▪ Global Justice as Normative Ethics

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapter 2¹
- *Justice Beyond Borders*, Chapter 2 on universalism, Simon Caney (2005)²

¹ Purpose: review types of arguments and their purposes; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

TYPES OF ARGUMENTS AND IMMIGRATION

Guiding Questions: What are causal arguments and how do they relate to normative arguments? What are some foundational arguments for and against restricting immigration? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these normative arguments?

Objectives: Recognize that there are various types of arguments, and that strong normative arguments depend on descriptive and causal assumptions. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary philosophical debates over immigration policies.

Wednesday, 7 June: Arguments about Causes ▪ Cases Against Open Borders

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapter 5¹
- *Spheres of Justice*, Chapter 2: Membership, Michael Walzer (1983)²
- “Immigration and Freedom of Association,” Christopher Wellman (2008)²

¹ Purpose: review types of arguments and their purposes; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

TYPES OF ARGUMENTS, RHETORICAL ANALYSIS, AND IMMIGRATION

Guiding Questions: What are deductive arguments and how do they relate to normative arguments? How does context in writing matter? What are some foundational arguments in support of the rights of migrants? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these normative arguments?

Objectives: Recognize there are various types of arguments, understand the strengths and weaknesses of deductive reasoning. Recognize writing is context-dependent: authors have specific objectives, types of arguments have specific purposes, target audiences have specific expectations, and understanding any given 'rhetorical situation' is necessary for successful writing. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary debates over the rights of migrants.

Thursday, 8 June: Deductive Arguments ▪ Cases For Migrant Rights

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapter 6¹
- "The Rights of Irregular Immigrants," Joseph Carens (2008)²
- *Plyer v. Doe* Majority Opinion, Justice Brennan (1981)²
- **Students receive directions for Paper 1**³

¹ Purpose: review types of arguments and their purposes; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading, understand notion of counterarguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

³ Purpose: understand requirements of first major writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

Friday, 9 June: Rhetorical Analysis ▪ Future of Immigration Policy?

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Appendices I and II—just skim¹
- "Birthright Citizenship and the Alien Citizen," Mae Ngai (2007)²
- "Citizenship Without Consent," Peter Schuck and Rogers Smith (1996)²
- "For Sale: U.S. Citizenship, \$500,000 to \$1 million," *Los Angeles Times* (2015)²
- **Students receive Quiz 1—due tonight**

¹ Purpose: review rhetorical situations, rhetorical appeals, logical fallacies; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

ENGAGING THE ESSAY AND RESEARCH PROCESSES

Guiding Questions: What are the components of the traditional academic paper? What resources are available to us for our research, how do we effectively navigate these databases, how do we evaluate scholarly sources, and how do we make the best use of our sources?

Objectives: Review the components of the argumentative essay and how to structure your writing. Learn how to effectively utilize research databases, and recognize that the strength of an argument depends on finding and effectively utilizing external sources, and that sources can serve various purposes in the academic arguments we write.

Monday, 12 June: Argumentative Essays ▪ Information Literacy

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapters 4¹, and 7-8²
- Class activity: writing workshop³

¹ Purpose: understand how to effectively locate and use sources; CCHE Goals: 1, 2

² Purpose: review the different sections of the academic argumentative essay; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

³ Purpose: make progress on Paper 1; CCHE Goals: 1, 3

RULES OF CITATION, THE REVISION PROCESS, AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Guiding Questions: Why and how do we properly cite our sources? What does the revision process consist in? What is the significance of revising on the writing process, and how can we make the most of the peer-review process to improve our writing? What are some foundational arguments for and against the legitimacy of status quo global distributions of wealth and resources? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments?

Objectives: Understand some fundamental rules of citation. Understand that writing is a cyclical process that entails consistent and substantive revision of earlier drafts, and that successful revision requires critical reflection on the content and purpose of one's writing and on the rhetorical situation. Refine our ability to identify and correct problem areas in our writing. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing arguments in contemporary debates over distributive justice.

Tuesday, 13 June: Avoiding Plagiarism ▪ Revision Process ▪ Global Resource Redistribution

- Handout on Rules of Citation¹
- *Justice Beyond Borders*, Chapter 4 excerpt on distributive justice, Simon Caney (2005)²

¹ Purpose: review summary, paraphrase, quotation, citation, and source information; CCHE Goals: 1, 3

² Purpose: critically analyze readings; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Wednesday, 14 June: Revision Process ▪ Peer-Review Workshop

- *The Practical Tutor*, Chapter 2: Engaging in Dialogue, Emily Meyer and Louise Smith (1987)¹
- "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers," Nancy Sommers (1980)²
- Paper 1 rough draft must be uploaded to course dropbox before class, two hard copies due in class
- Class activity: peer-review workshop of Paper 1 rough draft³

¹ Purpose: understand that writing is a cyclical and critically self-reflective process; CCHE Goals: 2, 4

² Purpose: discuss writing as a process and common difficulties novice writers have; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

³ Purpose: engage in peer review; CCHE Goal: 2

GRAMMAR AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Guiding Questions: What are some basic rules of grammar? What are some foundational arguments for and against the legitimacy of status quo global distributions of wealth and resources? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments?

Objectives: Understand some fundamental rules of citation and grammar. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary philosophical debates over distributive justice.

Thursday, 15 June: Rules of Grammar ▪ Complicating Distributive Theories

- "Justice and International Relations" excerpt, Charles Beitz (1975)¹
- *Justice and Politics of Difference*, Chapter 1: Displacing the Distributive Paradigm, Iris Young (1991)¹
- Class activity: grammar and style workshop 1²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze readings; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: rhetorical grammar, review punctuation and sentence components; CCHE Goal: 3

Friday, 16 June: Analogies ▪ A Case For Resource Redistribution

- *Rulebook for Arguments*, Chapters 3¹
- "Famine, Affluence, and Morality," Peter Singer (1972)²
- Students receive Quiz 2—due tonight
- Paper 1 final draft must be uploaded to course dropbox by Sunday night (18th)³

¹ Purpose: review types of arguments and their purposes; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze readings, emphasis on counterarguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

³ Purpose: complete first major writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

COUNTERARGUMENTS AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Guiding Questions: What is a counterargument and why does the academic argument require that we take possible objections seriously? How can examples and analogies work to support our claims? What are some foundational arguments for and against the legitimacy of status quo global distributions of wealth and resources? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments?

Objectives: Understand that the strength of an argument depends on considering plausible alternative accounts and thoughtfully explaining why they are wrong, and that examples can help to bolster our arguments. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary philosophical debates over distributive justice.

Monday, 19 June: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Cases Against Redistribution

- “Lifeboat Ethics: The Case Against Helping the Poor,” Garrett Hardin (1974)¹
- “Sustainable Growth: An Impossibility Theorem,” Herman Daly (1993)²
- **Students receive directions for Paper 2**³

¹ Purpose: critically analyze readings, emphasis on the role of counterarguments; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 4

² Purpose: critically analyze readings; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

³ Purpose: understand requirements of second major writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

Tuesday, 20 June: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Future of Foreign Aid?

- “Development Challenge,” Jeffrey Sachs (2005)¹
- *Law of Peoples* excerpt, John Rawls (1993)¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

RESPONSIBILITY FOR GLOBAL INEQUALITIES

Guiding Questions: What are some foundational arguments for our moral obligations to redress existing social and economic injustices? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments? How can political theory and writing help us to exact social reform, that is to achieve greater justice? What are our obligations as educated writers?

Objectives: Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary philosophical debates over assigning moral responsibility for benefiting from and helping to perpetuate social and economic injustices. Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing arguments about the civic responsibilities writers and theorists have to improve the welfare of underprivileged and vulnerable groups.

Wednesday, 21 June: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Collective Responsibility for Economic Inequalities

- “Factory Audits and Safety Don’t Always Go Hand In Hand” Podcast, NPR (2013)
- “Responsibility and Global Labor Justice,” Iris Young (2004)¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Thursday, 22 June: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Obligations as Educated Students and Writers?

- *The Republic*, Book VII excerpt on the “Allegory of the Cave,” Plato (1987 [380 BCE])¹
- “White Guys Who Send my Uncle to Prison,” Ben Keubrich (2015)¹
- Class activity: writing workshop²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: make progress on paper 1; CCHE Goals: 1, 3

GRAMMAR AND THE REVISION PROCESS REVISITED

Guiding Questions: What defines helpful v. unhelpful comments on working drafts? How can we improve the comments we give to and receive from others? How can we make the most of the peer-review process to improve our writing?

Objectives: Reiterate that successful revision requires critical reflection on the content and purpose of one's writing and on the rhetorical situation. Refine our ability to identify and correct problem areas in our writing—by giving and receiving substantive and constructive critiques of our works in progress.

Friday, 23 June: Offering Helpful Feedback ▪ Peer-Review Workshop

- “Responding to Student Writing,” Nancy Sommers (1982)¹
- Paper 2 rough draft must be uploaded to course dropbox before class, two hard copies due in class
- Students receive Quiz 3—due tonight
- Class activity: grammar and style workshop 2²
- Class activity: peer-review workshop of Paper 2 rough draft³

¹ Purpose: understand how to provide helpful and constructive peer-review feedback; CCHE Goal: 4

² Purpose: understand notions of concision, parallelism, and precision; CCHE Goal: 3

³ Purpose: engage in peer review; CCHE Goal: 2

AS THIS IS A HYBRID COURSE, ALL REMAINING COURSEWORK WILL BE COMPLETED ONLINE

That is, we will not meet in class the rest of the summer semester.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND CONVENTIONS OF ACADEMIC WRITING

Guiding Questions: What are some foundational arguments for our moral obligations to redress existing environmental injustices? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments? Why does audience matter? How can we as writers successfully appeal to an academic target audience?

Objectives: Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary philosophical debates over assigning moral responsibility for benefiting from or tolerating environmental injustices. Refine our abilities identify and apply the conventions of academic writing.

Monday, 26 June: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Environmental Inequalities and Discrimination

- “Unequal Environmental Protection” excerpt, Robert Bullard (1994)¹
- *Environmental Justice*, Chapter 8: “Developing Nations, Equal Protection, and Limits of Moral Heroism,” Kristin Shrader-Frechette (2002)¹
- Paper 2 final draft must be uploaded to course dropbox by tonight³

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: complete second major writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4

Tuesday, 27 June: Academic Audiences ▪ Collective Responsibility for Environmental Inequalities

- “Human Rights and Duties to Alleviate Environmental Injustice,” Kristin Schrader-Frechette (2007)¹
- “Inventing the University,” David Bartholomae (2003)²
- Students receive directions for Paper 3³

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: discuss how writing requires engaging particular discourse communities; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

³ Purpose: understand requirements of third major writing assignment; CCHE Goal: 2

CLIMATE ETHICS AND CONVENTIONS OF ACADEMIC WRITING

Guiding Questions: What are some foundational arguments for fairly distributing the costs of global climate change, and what are some foundational arguments for our moral obligations to redress existing environmental injustices? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these normative arguments? Why does audience matter? How can we as writers successfully appeal to an academic target audience?

Objectives: Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary philosophical debates over climate justice, and assigning responsibility for benefiting from or tolerating environmental injustices. Refine our abilities identify and apply the conventions of academic writing.

Wednesday, 28 June: Conventions of Academic Writing ▪ Distributing the Costs of Climate Change

- “Cosmopolitan Justice, Rights and Global Climate Change,” Simon Caney (2006)¹
- “Teaching the Conventions of Academic Discourse,” Teresa Thonney (2011)²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: understand general and discipline-specific standards of good writing; CCHE Goals: 1, 3, 4

Thursday, 29 June: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Distributing the Costs of Climate Change

- “Global Climate Justice, Historic Emissions, and Excusable Ignorance,” Derek Bell (2011)²

² Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goal: 1, 4

Friday, 30 June: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Rejection of Individual Moral Responsibility

- “Individualization: Plant a Tree, Ride a Bike, Save the World?” excerpt, Michael Maniates (2001)¹
- “It’s Not My Fault” excerpt, Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (2005)¹
- Students receive Quiz 4—due tonight
- Paper 3 rough draft must be uploaded to course dropbox and emailed to classmate by tonight
- Peer-review of Paper 3 draft must be completed by Sunday night (2nd)²

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

³ Purpose: engage in peer review; CCHE Goal: 2

Morally Just Wars, Humanitarian Intervention, and Terrorist Violence

Guiding Questions: What are some foundational arguments for requiring that wars be morally justifiable and fought justly, and for permitting external intervention to prevent violence against innocent civilians? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these normative arguments?

Objectives: Apply principles of good argumentation in critically analyzing normative arguments in contemporary philosophical debates over the significance of justly fighting just wars, and over the necessary conditions for morally justified external military intervention.

Monday, 3 July: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Just and Unjust Wars

- *Just and Unjust Wars*, Chapters 8-9, Michael Walzer (1977)¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Tuesday, 4 July: No coursework assigned

Wednesday, 5 July: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Justified Humanitarian Intervention

- *Justice Beyond Borders*, Chapter 7 excerpt on humanitarian intervention, Simon Caney (2005)¹
- “Implementing the R2P,” U.N. General Assembly (2009): pp. 4-10—just skim¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Thursday, 6 July: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Principle of Non-Intervention

- *Just and Unjust Wars*, Chapter 6 excerpt on intervention, Michael Walzer (1977): pp.86-95 and 101-8¹
- “Genocide and Humanitarian Intervention,” Jack Donnelly (2002)¹

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

Friday, 7 July: Analyzing Arguments ▪ Future of the Responsibility to Protect?

- “Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention,” Alan Kuperman (2008)¹
- “A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO’s Libya Campaign,” Alan Kuperman (2013)¹
- **Students receive Quiz 5—due tonight**
- **Paper 3 final draft must be uploaded to course dropbox by tonight³**

¹ Purpose: critically analyze reading; CCHE Goals: 1, 4

² Purpose: complete final major writing assignment; CCHE Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4