

## **Notes to Guide Reading**

---

### *Week 4, Section 3: Distributing the Costs of Climate Change*

#### **Caney, “Cosmopolitan Justice, Rights and Global Climate Change” (2006)**

- Understand what “common but differentiated responsibility” and the “polluter pays principle” mean.
- Recall the difference between causal and moral responsibility, and think about why it’s problematic that assigning moral responsibility for the effects of climate change requires that we first establish causal responsibility.
- Also, be able to explain one of the three reasons why the polluter pays principle fails to justify how the burdens of climate change should be distributed.
- Caney makes two starting assumptions: (1) anthropogenic global climate change is a fact, and (2) principles of justice extend beyond borders (cosmopolitanism is true).
  - In thinking about why Caney would make these assumptions and who his likely target audience is, be prepared to explain whether or not you think either of these assumptions are problematic.
- Be prepared to reconstruct Caney’s argument in defense of his central claim that burdens of climate change should be distributed according to the notion of “common but differentiated responsibility”—explaining three reasons or pieces of evidence Caney uses to support the truth of his claim and a plausible warrant for his argument.

---

#### **Thonney, “Teaching the Conventions of Academic Discourse” (2011)**

- This reading is intended to complement the earlier Bartholomae reading on satisfying the conventions and expectations of our academic audiences, and aims to have you think about the common conventions of research and writing in your *own* major.
  - For instance, what counts as evidence in your field and how much evidence is necessary?
    - ↳ Quantitative data from observational studies, surveys, experiments?
    - ↳ Qualitative data from case studies or historical examples?
    - ↳ Personal observations, anecdotes, or interviews?
    - ↳ Logical reasoning, normative principles, analogies and examples?
  - What research methods are used in your field—logical analysis, case studies, statistical analysis?
  - What are the presentation and organizational styles in your field—e.g., text-based v. multimedia?
  - How do scholars in your field adapt their writing to accommodate the different and context-dependent components of the rhetorical situations?
- In this vein, think through the common conventions of academic writing that Thonney explores in this paper. Some of these include the following, for instance:
  - writers respond to what others have said about their topic
  - writers state the purpose, value, and blueprint of their paper
  - writers acknowledge others may disagree (objections/qualifications)
  - writers adopt voice of authority—meaning what? (e.g., Bartholomae)
  - writers use academic and discipline-specific vocabulary
  - writers emphasize evidence (capacity to interpret quantitative data)
- Be prepared to explain what defines good writing for you, and with this aim, be able to explain the difference between *conventions* of academic writing versus *principles* of good academic writing, and be prepared to critique 2-3 common conventions of writing in your major and to explain why these conventions do or do not constitute principles of good academic writing.