

# PY4658

## Timely Topics in Political Philosophy

Semester 2, 2023-2024

30 Credits

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Key Module Information</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>General information</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Assessment</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Essay Titles</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Seminars</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Lecture Plan &amp; Essential Readings</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Additional Readings &amp; Resources</b>	<b>12</b>

### KEY MODULE INFORMATION

**Lectures:** Tuesdays 12-2pm, Younger Hall, Seminar Room 2

**Seminars:** *Starting in Week 2*

Wednesdays 9-10am, Edgecliffe, Room G03

Wednesdays 10-11am, Edgecliffe, Room G03

**Module Convener & Lecturer:**

Dr. Adam Etnison

- Email: [ae45@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:ae45@st-andrews.ac.uk)
- Office hour: Tuesdays, 2-3pm, or by appointment, Edgecliffe B18, (basement)

### Assessment:

- |                                      |                   |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| • Seminar Presentation (15%):        | <b>Varying</b>    |
| • Lecture & Seminar Questions (20%): | <b>Continuous</b> |
| • Timely Reflection (20%):           | <b>4 March</b>    |
| • Final Essay (45%):                 | <b>12 April</b>   |

## GENERAL INFORMATION

**Module Description:** This module explores several *timely* topics in political philosophy – that is, topics which seem especially relevant in light of current events. In its 2023-2024 iteration, the module examines questions about the morality of defensive war, terrorism, the right to unionize and strike, the future of work, institutional racism and the Black Lives Matter movement, populism, problems of democracy, polarization, “cancel culture,” gender and Trans rights, the political power of art, and climate change. Some of the assigned readings lie outside the confines of philosophy, narrowly conceived. They include works of sociology, political science, opinion pieces, and long-form journalism. Interdisciplinarity presents its challenges, but it also brings benefits: a chance to think about the world in all its baffling complexity.

### **Intended Learning Outcomes:**

By the end of the module, students will be able to:

- Discuss a range of important topics in political philosophy.
- Critically reflect on readings and come up with probing questions.
- Reflect analytically on complex philosophical texts.
- Produce a sophisticated philosophical argument on an essay topic connected to the syllabus reading material, referring to and critically analysing a range of relevant sources.

### **Graduate Attributes:**

- The module will contribute to **leadership skills** by asking students who give tutorial presentations to introduce a topic and take a leading role in facilitating discussion.
- The module will contribute to **diversity awareness** by including readings from diverse philosophical perspectives, including the perspectives of groups and/or identities underrepresented in Anglo-American philosophy.

**Module requirements:** Adequate reading, demonstrable engagement with the module content, regular attendance at tutorials and lectures, submission of all coursework, are all compulsory requirements of this module. Students with **four or more absences for whatever reason from lectures and/or seminars will fail the module** with a grade of oX, which does not permit re-assessment. Please note that at Honours level, accurate lecture attendance records are kept. **Students are required to submit all elements of the coursework in order to pass the module as a whole.** Reassessment will be permitted for those who fail the module with an overall grade of at least 4.o.

**Workload:** This module is worth 30 credits; hence it should typically occupy half of your working week, i.e., approximately **18 hours per week, of which three are spent**

*in class*. You will neither achieve the grade of which you are capable, nor gain much satisfaction from the course, unless you plan your study accordingly.

## **ASSESSMENT**

### **Weighting and components:**

**Marking and grading** is on the University 20-point scale. **For a full description of marking bands and grade classification**, see the Undergraduate Marking Criteria on p. 35 of the [Undergraduate Handbook](#). **Note that all marks are provisional until confirmed by the end-of-semester module boards.** For more information about the role of external examiners and module boards, please see the [University policy on assessment](#).

1. Seminar Presentations (~750 words, spoken)  
*Due Date: TBD*  
*Weighting: %15*

Students will present on their own or in teams for the ten seminars (students will be asked to sign up for presentations during Week 1).

Students will **not** be required to provide handouts or visual aids for their presentation, although they can provide a single page handout if they like. The exercise will be to imitate the lecture format (described below), by walking the class through **2-3 passages** selected from the reading as being of particular interest, explaining what is interesting/difficult in these passages, and inviting discussion from others.

Students will be assessed on how well their session serves to deepen understanding of the reading by the group, and on how constructive the discussion they facilitate is.

2. Discussion Questions (21 questions, up to 50 words each)  
*Due Date: Every Monday 7pm*  
*Weighting: %20*

Each student will be asked to submit **two discussion questions** each week: one on a lecture reading, and the other on the seminar reading (The sole exception to this is in Week 1, when there is no seminar at all) The questions must demonstrate that you've read the relevant text carefully and thought about how to interpret or criticize it, or how to connect some aspect of it to a relevant issue. These questions are meant to generate class **discussion**, and may well be raised and attributed to you in both lectures and seminars, so it is important that the question is posed as a productive **contribution** to discussion. This means crafting the question in a way that includes some idea(s) about how it might be answered.

So, for example, if you have an interpretive question, don't simply ask "What does *X* mean by *P*?" That would foist all the interpretive work onto your classmates! Instead, perhaps try to explain the *reason(s)* you're so unsure what *X* means by *P* as well as what you think *X might* mean by *P*, and *why*. That kind of thoughtful question, which invites others into your line of reasoning, will work much better as a trigger for, and contribution to, discussion in class. The same goes for a critical question. If you object to *X*'s claim that *P*, don't just say this: explain *why*, by making some effort to consider how *X*'s arguments fail to address your concerns, and consider a possible reply on *X*'s behalf. 50 words is not a lot, of course, so you can only go into so much detail. But make the most of it!

The questions will be marked on a 2-point scale—2 points for a question that shows you have clearly read and thought about the text, 1 point for a question that doesn't quite show this, and 0 points for non-submission, or a completely trivial/irrelevant question.

Students will receive an overall mark out of 20 for their combined lecture/seminar questions (a mark out of 22, for the 11 lecture questions, will be multiplied by 0.909 to get a mark out of 20, which will be averaged with a mark out of 20 for the 10 seminar questions).

If there are two or more readings for a lecture or seminar in one week, the submitted question need only address *one* of the readings (though it can also address all or both!)

Lecture and seminar questions must both be submitted by **Monday, 7pm**, in each week of term, **including Week 1**. There will be a submission portal available for this on MMS.

**Note:** Questions submitted **late** will be capped at a mark of 1. Penalties will only be waived in extreme circumstances.

3. Timely Reflection (up to 1000 words)  
*Due Date: Monday, 4 March, 23:59*  
*Weighting: %20*

The goal of this assignment is to use one (or a maximum of two) readings from anywhere on the course syllabus to cast light on some real-world event, trend, or piece of news of the day, or vice versa: the assignment may also use something in the news or real-world to cast critical or illuminating light on some syllabus reading(s).

In writing the short reflection, make sure you (i) explain the basic argument or thesis put forward in the reading(s) in question; (ii) show how this argument helps us understand, or bears on, some important real-world issue or news of the day, or vice versa; and (iii) outline further questions or concerns raised by the reading(s) and/or the real-world news you discuss.

This is an experimental task, so there is no single formula to follow here. But as a template, think of the genre of the “op-ed” – in which an author brings some piece of research or argument to bear on some problem of the day. There are plenty of op-eds listed in the syllabus to use as inspiration. We will read two for the lecture in Week 1.

4. Essay (up to 2250 words)  
*Due Date: Friday, 12 April, 23:59*  
*Weighting: %45*

The purpose of the final essay is for students to critically reflect on a key issue discussed in the course materials, or closely related thereto.

*Criteria: See Undergraduate Handbook. Generally, research papers will be assessed on the basis of (i) lucidity, (ii) effort, (iii) relevance to the chosen question, (iv) independence of thought, (v) argumentative charity; and (vi) comprehension of the relevant readings.*

**Please note the following requirements for the essays:**

- Essays must be submitted via MMS.
- Essays must be word-processed and double-spaced. **Please use the essay template provided on the Moodle page for the module. No other format will be accepted.** In particular, you **must** submit any coursework **in Word format** only (the exception is logic assignments that may require LaTeX typesetting).
- Essays will be marked anonymously so **do not include your name** anywhere in the document.
- On the first page of your essay, write your matriculation number, the module name and number, your tutor’s name, the essay title, and the word count.
- Essays must not exceed 2250 words; The word count must include everything **except bibliography and title page**; that is to say, the word count must include all footnotes, quotations, etc.
- Please note that we implement the word count policy very strictly. Where the word limit is exceeded, **even by one word**, the following penalties will be applied:
- **1 mark for work that is over-length to any extent, then a further 1 mark per additional 5% over.**
- Your **bibliography** must give full details of all sources consulted. If you quote from or paraphrase any of those sources in your essay, you must give clear references that allow the sources to be identified in the bibliography. Further information about academic integrity and plagiarism can be found in the University’s *Good Academic Practice* policy and our *Undergraduate Handbook*.

## **ESSAY TITLES**

Students are responsible for coming up with their own essay questions and titles, though they are strongly encouraged to work within the content of the syllabus. In a sense, the summary description for each week, below, can be used as a guide for

constructing an essay question on that week's topic. But the blurb can also be modified or entirely ignored! The end of the module outline lists supplementary readings which are designed to be of use for essay writing on the module topics.

Feel free to contact the module convener about your essay question by email, or in office hours, for feedback.

## **SEMINARS**

Each seminar will be based on one or two readings (usually one). The seminar presenter(s) will lead the group through passages they have selected from the readings, providing commentary and inviting discussion. When there are multiple presenters, they will have to agree beforehand on how to divide up the reading, though different presenters can cover the same passages from different angles if they like.

Students will also be encouraged to raise their seminar questions for discussion with the class, and will sometimes be directly asked to do so by the lecturer.

### Seminar Groups:

*Group 1:* Wednesdays, 9 – 10am, Edgecliffe G03

*Group 2:* Wednesdays, 10 – 11am, Edgecliffe G03

## **STUDENT FEEDBACK**

You will have opportunities to give feedback on this module throughout the semester, including via your class reps at the SSCC meeting in week 5, and the end-of-semester Module Evaluation Questionnaires. Your comments are extremely valuable to your lecturers. In response to your feedback in previous years, I have made an effort to increase the diversity and gender-balance of the reading list.

## **LECTURE PLAN & ESSENTIAL READINGS**

***Format:*** Lectures for this module will be run more like seminars, in that they will focus on the collective “close reading” of assigned texts. The lecturer will present key passages from the assigned text(s), and invite students to comment on, critique, interpret, and analyze these passages, as part of the class discussion. The lecturer will also draw on and quote submitted lecture questions to facilitate the discussion.

### Lectures:

Tuesdays 12-2pm, Younger Hall, Seminar Room 2

JAN 16 & 17

## 1. DEFENSIVE WAR

*If there is any legitimate reason to engage in war, self-defense would seem to be it. But are there qualifications or limits to this just cause? Is it ever better to pursue a strategy of appeasement, rather than military defense – and if so, why and when? And what about third party states, i.e., allies? What ethical and practical considerations must they face when supporting a state in its pursuit of national self-defense?*

### Lecture Reading

- (1) Michael Walzer, “Law and Order in International Society” in *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), Ch. 4, pp. 51-73.
- (2) Stephen M. Walt, “The Morality of Ukraine’s War is Very Murky” in *Foreign Policy* (September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2023): <http://bit.ly/3RU8gTI>
- (3) Mariana Budjeryn, “The ‘Murky’ Morality of Opposition to US Support for Ukraine: A response: in *Just Security* (October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023): <https://bit.ly/3tCZgls>

NO SEMINARS IN FIRST WEEK!

JAN 23 & 24

## 2. TERRORISM

*Terrorism might seem like an odd topic for philosophical discussion. What else is there to do but condemn it? In fact, there is much to think about here, particularly in light of recent world events. What sort of violence is “terrorism,” exactly? And might it ever be justifiable, or at least excusable?*

### Lecture Reading

- (1) Virginia Held, “Terrorism, Rights, and Political Goals” in *How Terrorism is Wrong: Morality and Political Violence* (Oxford: OUP, 2008), Ch. 4, 71-90.

### Seminar Reading

- (a) Emile Henry, “A Terrorist’s Defense” in *The Anarchist Reader* (Glasgow: Fontana Paperbacks, 1977), ed. G. Woodcock, pp. 189-196. [Emile Henry was a French anarchist who detonated a bomb in Paris’ popular, Café Terminus, in 1894. This “defense” is his address to the jury at his trial.]
- (b) Michael Walzer, “Even the Oppressed Have Obligations” in *The Atlantic* (November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023): <https://bit.ly/47sz4Py>

JAN 30 & 31

## 3. THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

*Workers in virtually every sector of society, it seems, are currently engaged in strikes. Given that employees are typically bound by a voluntary contract with their employers, it is in some ways odd to think they have a “right” to strike (unless it’s included in the*

contract). And yet, we normally regard such rights as basic, universal, and essential. What is the right to strike? How can we justify it? And what, if any, are its limits?

Lecture Reading - **Special Guest: Dr. Steven Klein (King's College London)**

- (1) Alex Gourevitch, "Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike" in *Perspectives on Politics* (2016), Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 307-323.
- (2) Steven Klein, "Towards a Democratic Theory of Labour Unions" in *Public Ethics* (September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2023): <https://bit.ly/3G5Du3l>

Seminar Reading

- (a) Elizabeth Anderson, *Private Government: How Employers Rule Our Lives (and Why We Don't Talk about It)* (Princeton University Press, 2017), Ch. 2, pp. 37-71.

**FEB 6 & 7**

**4. WORK?**

*There has been much debate in recent years about the idea of a universal basic income. Rather than make income conditional upon employment in the free market, which is difficult or impossible for some (and will mean grueling work for many), why not furnish citizens with an unconditional and universal income, if we can? Is there any inherent value to work anyways? Or might we be just as well off living a life of leisure?*

Lecture Reading

- (1) Philip Van Parijs, "Why Surfers Should be Fed: The Liberal Case for an Unconditional Basic Income" in *Philosophy & Public Affairs* (1991), Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 101-131.

Seminar Reading

- (a) Bertrand Russell, "In Praise of Idleness" in *Harper's Magazine* (October 1932): <https://bit.ly/3FjhHVa>

**FEB 13 & 14**

**5. POPULISM**

*We live in an age of "populism," we are often told. If populism is not just another word for democracy, though, what is populism? And if it is dangerous, what should we do about it?*

Lecture Reading

- (1) Jan-Werner Müller, *What is Populism?* (New York: Penguin, 2017), Introduction, Chs. 1 & 2, & Conclusion, pp. 1-74, 101-104.

Seminar Reading

- (a) Arlie R. Hochschild, "The Deep Story" in *Strangers in their Own Land: Anger and Mourning on the American Right* (The New Press, 2018), Ch. 9, pp. 135-153.



- (b) Katherine J. Cramer, “Making Sense of Politics Through Resentment” in *The Politics of Resentment: Rural Consciousness in Wisconsin and the Rise of Scott Walker* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016), Ch. 1, pp. 1-25, esp. 1-18.

**FEB 20 & 21**

## **6. DEMOCRACY**

*The United Kingdom, like most democratic states, is a representative democracy, where representatives are chosen through elections. But this is not the only kind of democracy. In ancient Athens, some important councils were run by random lottery, meaning that citizens would be randomly selected, rather than voted in, to rule. What promise might there be in such a “lottocratic” system? Might it help us avoid some of the increasingly evident ills of representative democracy?*

Lecture Reading - **Special Guest: Prof. Alexander A. Guerrero (Rutgers)**

- (1) Alexander A. Guerrero, “Against Elections: The Lottocratic Alternative” in *Philosophy & Public Affairs* (2014), Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 135-179.

Seminar Reading

- (a) Dimitri Landa & Ryan Pevnick, “Is Random Selection a Cure for the Ills of Electoral Representation? In *The Journal of Political Philosophy* (2021), Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 46-72.

**FEB 27 & 28**

## **VACATION**

**MAR 5 & 6**

## **7. BLACK LIVES MATTER**

*Over the last decade, the Black Lives Matter movement has helped bring attention to the racism, discrimination, brutality, and inequality regularly faced by African Americans, particularly at the hands of police. Does being the victim of systematic social and institutional oppression affect one’s obligations to society as a whole? And are there any “blind spots,” as it were, in the BLM movement itself? How might it be improved?*

Lecture Reading

- (1) Tommie Shelby, “Justice, Deviance, and the Dark Ghetto” in *Philosophy & Public Affairs* (2007), Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 126-160. \*

Seminar Reading – **Special Guest: Prof. Tommy J. Curry (Edinburgh)**

- (a) Tommy J. Curry, “He Never Mattered: Poor Black Males and the Dark Logic of Intersectional Invisibility” in *The Movement for Black Lives: Philosophical Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), eds. B. Hogan, M. Cholbi, A. Madva, B.S. Yost, Ch. 3, pp. 59-89.

**MAR 12 & 13**

**8. ART & POLITICS**

*We know that art, film, and literature have a powerful capacity to evoke human emotions. But can aesthetic experiences, and art in particular, motivate political change – changing not just minds but also actions? If art can be political, and remake the world, should it? Can it help us navigate the current climate crisis?*

**Lecture Reading – Special Guest: Dr. Vid Simoniti (Liverpool)**

- (1) Vid Simoniti, “Creativity in the Face of Extinction: On Art and Climate Change” in *Artist’s Remake the World: A Contemporary Art Manifesto* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2023), Ch. 6, pp. 128-153.

**Seminar Reading**

- (a) Duncan C. Stewart & Taylor N. Johnson, “Complicating Aesthetic Environmentalism: Four Criticisms of Aesthetic Motivations for Environmental Action” in *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* (2018), Vol. 76, No. 4, pp. 441-451.

**MAR 19 & 20**

**9. TRANS RIGHTS**

*In 2004, the UK passed the Gender Recognition Act, which aims to safeguard the privacy of transgender people by making sure that information about a citizen’s gender cannot be made public without their consent. But what about our gendered notions of “woman” and “man” themselves? Might these be conceived, or re-conceived, in such a way as to make them more amenable to important political goals, such as the full social and legal inclusion of transgender persons? What ethical and political lessons might we learn from the firsthand experience of such persons?*

**Lecture Reading – Special Guest: Prof. Mary Leng (York)**

- (1) Mary Leng, “Amelioration, Inclusion, and Legal Recognition: on Sex, Gender, and the UK’s Gender Recognition Act” in *The Journal of Political Philosophy* (2023), Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 129-157.

**Seminar Reading – Special Guest: Prof. Sophie-Grace Chappell (Open U.)**

- (a) Sophie-Grace Chappell, *Trans Figured: On Being a Transgender Person in a Cisgender World* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2024), Secs. I.1-I.4, I.16-I.24, & VI, pp. 3-8, 41-66, 211-217.
- (b) J.K. Rowling, “My Reasons for Speaking out on Sex and Gender Issues” (10 June 2022): <https://bit.ly/4oeotm9>

**MAR 26 & 27**

**10. POLARIZATION**

*Western democracies are growing increasingly polarized, it seems. Citizens are finding it more and more difficult to find common ideological and political ground. Instead, we insulate ourselves in “epistemic bubbles” and “echo chambers” – or so it is often said.*

*What are these so-called chambers and bubbles? Or what might they be? And how might we talk across them? How can we engage productively across deepening social and ideological divides?*

Lecture Reading

- (1) C. Thi Nguyen, “Echo Chambers and Epistemic Bubbles” in *Episteme* (2020), Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 141-161.

Seminar Reading

- (a) Rachel Fraser, “How to Talk Back” in *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* (2023), Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 315-335.

**APR 2 & 3**

**11. NO PLATFORMING**

*In May 2023, the UK government recently passed the Freedom of Speech Act, designed to ensure and protect freedom of speech on campus. What sense can we make of the idea of “free speech” in the context of academic life? And what sensible limits might there be to it, if any? Surely it cannot mean that everyone has a right to a University platform. What does the Freedom of Speech Act prescribe, and does it make any sense?*

Lecture Reading

- (1) Victor Tadros, “The Rights and Wrongs of No-Platforming” in *Modern Law Review* (2022), Vol. 85, No. 4, pp. 968-996.

Seminar Reading

- (a) Amia Srinivasan, “Free Speech on Campus” in *London Review of Books* (29 June 2023), Vol. 45, No. 13, pp. 3-10.

*FINAL SEMINAR WILL INCLUDE AN (OPTIONAL) FINAL ESSAY DISCUSSION*

## ADDITIONAL READINGS & RESOURCES

### Week 1 - Defensive War

- Cecile Fabre & Seth Lazar, *The Morality of Defensive War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)
- C.A.J. Coady, *Morality and Political Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Seth Lazar, “War” in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2016): <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/war/>

### Week 2 – Terrorism

- Igor Primoratz, “Terrorism” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2022): <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/terrorism/>
- Alison Jaggar, “What is terrorism, Why is it Wrong, and Could it Ever be Morally Permissible?” in *Journal of Social Philosophy* (2005), Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 202-217.
- Gerald Cohen, “Casting the First Stone: Who Can, and Who Can’t, Condemn the Terrorists?” in *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplements* (2006), Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 113-136.

### Week 3 - The Right to Strike

- Alex Gourevitch, “The Right to Strike: A Radical View” in *American Political Science Review* (2018), Vol. 112, No. 4, pp. 905-917.
- Don Locke, “The Right to Strike” in *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplements* (1984), Vol. 18, pp. 173-202.

### Week 4 – Work?

- Juliana Uhuru Bidadanure, “The Political Theory of Universal Basic Income” in *Annual Review of Political Science* (2019), Vol. 22, pp. 481-501.
- Michael Cholbi, “Philosophical Approaches to Work and Labor” in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2022).
- Tommie Shelby, “Justice, Work, and the Ghetto Poor” *The Law and Ethics of Human Rights* (2012), Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 71-96.
- CHAPTER FROM POANDEMIC BOOK
- Jonathan Wolff, *Ethics and Public Policy: A Philosophical Inquiry* (Second Edition) (Routledge: Oxford, 2020), Ch. 10, pp. 194-214.
- Jeremy Waldron, *Liberal Rights: Collected Papers 1981-1991* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 4-17
- Marshall Sahlins, “The Original Affluent Society” in *Stone Age Economics* (New Brunswick: Aldine, 1972), Ch. 1, pp. 1-40.

### Week 5 – Populism

- Jan-Werner Muller, “Italy: The Bright Side of Populism” in *The New York Review of Books*, June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2018
- Steven Levitsky & Daniel Ziblatt, “The Unraveling” in *How Democracies Die* (New York: Penguin Press, 2018), Ch. 7, pp. 145-176.

- Yascha Mounk, *The People vs. Democracy: Why Our Freedom is in Danger and How to Save it* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018)
- Yascha Mounk & Jordan Kyle, “What Populists Do to Democracies” in *The Atlantic*, December 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018.
- William Galston, *Anti-Pluralism: The Populist Threat to Liberal Democracy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017)
- VIDEO: “The Dangers of Populism” (23 min video interview with Jan-Werner Muller, Council of Europe, on Vimeo)
- Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Penguin University Press, 1951/2017), Ch. 6, Sec. II; Ch. 10, Sec. I; Ch. 11, Sec. I, pp. 215-222, 413-427, 446-476.
- Alex Wagner, “The Church of Trump” in *The Atlantic*, August 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018.
- Eli Zaretsky, “The Mass Psychology of Trumpism” in *LRB Blog*, Sept 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018.
- Jason Frank, “Populism Isn’t the Problem” in *Boston Review*, August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

### **Week 6 - Democracy**

- Jason Brennan, “The Right to a Competent Electorate” in *The Philosophical Quarterly* (2011), Vol. 61, No. 245, pp. 700-724. \*
- Jason Brennan & Helene Landemore, *Debating Democracy: Do We Need More or Less?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022)
- Insa Lee Koch, “Democracy as Punishment: Brexit and Austerity Politics” in *Personalizing the State: An Anthropology of Law, Politics, and Welfare in Austerity Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), Ch. 7.
- Jane J. Mansbridge, “The Argument” in *Beyond Adversary Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), Part I, pp. 3-38.
- Ilya Somin, “Do Voters Know Enough?” in *Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government is Smarter, Second Edition* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016), Ch. 2, pp. 47-74.
- Melissa Lane, “Democracy” in *The Birth of Politics: Eight Greek and Roman Political Ideas and Why They Matter* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), pp. 93-129. \*
- Josiah Ober, “Conditions of Athenian Democracy” in *The Making and Unmaking of Democracy: Lessons from History and World Politics* (New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 2-19.
- James Madison, “The Federalist No. 10” (1787) & “The Federalist No. 51” (1788) in *The Federalist, with Letters of “Brutus”* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), ed. Terence Ball, pp. 40-46, 251-255. \*
- Alexander Hamilton, “The Federalist No. 68” (1788) in *The Federalist, with Letters of “Brutus”* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), ed. Terence Ball, pp. 331-334.
- Jeffrey Rosen, “America is Living James Madison’s Nightmare” in *The Atlantic*, October 2018 issue. (Available online)

### **Week 7 – Black Lives Matter**

- Tommie Shelby, *Dark Ghettos: Injustice, Dissent, and Reform* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).

- Peggy McIntosh, “White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women’s Studies” in *Race, Ethnicity, and Gender: Selected Readings* (London: Pine Forge Press, 2007), eds. Joseph F. Healey & Eileen O’Brien, pp. 377-385.
- Reni Eddo-Lodge, *Why I’m No Longer Talking to White People About Race* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), Chs. 2 & 3, pp. 57-117.
- Cheshire Calhoun, “Responsibility and Reproach” in *Ethics* (1989) Vol. 99, No. 2, pp. 389-406.
- Elizabeth Anderson, *The Imperative of Integration* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).
- Joshua Rothman, “The Origins of ‘Privilege’” in *The New Yorker*, May 12<sup>th</sup> 2014.
- VIDEO: Tommie Shelby & Amilcar Shabazz, “Difficult Dialogues: Tommie Shelbie” (28 mins – Amherst Media, on YouTube).
- B. Hogan, M. Cholbi, A. Madva, B.S. Yost, (eds.) *The Movement for Black Lives: Philosophical Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).
- Iris Marion Young, “Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Idea of Universal Citizenship” in *Ethics* (1989), Vol. 99, No. 1, pp. 250-274.

### **Week 8 – Art & Politics (& Hope)**

- Vid Simoniti, “Art as Political Discourse” in *British Journal of Aesthetics* (2021), Vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 559-574.
- Vid Simoniti, *Artist’s Remake the World: A Contemporary Art Manifesto* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2023).
- Yuriko Saito, *Aesthetics of the Familiar: Everyday Life and World-Making* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)
- Dale Jamieson & Marcello Di Paola, “Climate Change, Liberalism, and the Public/Private Distinction” in *Philosophy and Climate Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), eds. M. Budolfson, T. McPherson, and D. Plunket, Ch. 16, pp. 370-395.
- Larry Alan Busk, “Liberal Democracies Can’t Solve Climate Change” in *IaI News* (19 April 2022): <https://bit.ly/46VFzu5>
- Elizabeth Cripps, *What Climate Justice Means and Why we Should Care* (London: Bloomsbury, 2022)
- Matthew Adams & Fay Niker, “Harnessing the Epistemic Value of Crises for Just Ends” in *Political Philosophy in a Pandemic* (London: Bloomsbury, 2021) eds., Fay Niker & Aweek Bhattacharya, Ch. 17, pp. 219-232.

### **Hope**

- Kwame Anthony Appiah, “Making Change” in *Conversations in Philosophy, Law, and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024), eds. Ruth Chang & Amia Srinivasan, Ch. 1.2.
- Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2010)
- Kimberley Brownlee, “On the Urgency of Kick-starting a Moral Revolution to Save Ourselves” in *Conversations in Philosophy, Law, and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024), eds. Ruth Chang & Amia Srinivasan, Ch. 1.1.

- Jonathan Lear, *Radical Hope: Ethics in the Face of Cultural Devastation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Adrienne M. Martin, *How We Hope: A Moral Psychology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), Chs. 1 & 4, pp. 11-35, 98-118.
- Martha Nussbaum, "Hope, Love, Vision" in *The Monarchy of Fear: A Philosopher Looks at Our Political Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), Ch. 7, pp. 197-247.

### **Week 9 – Trans Rights**

- Katherine Jenkins, "Toward an Account of Gender Identity" in *Ergo* (2018), Vol. 5, No. 27, pp. 713-744.
- Judith Butler, "We Need to Rethink the Category of Woman" in *The Guardian* (7 September 2021).
- Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble* (New York: Routledge, 1999).
- Judith Butler, *Whose Afraid of Gender* (New York: Penguin, 2024)
- Germaine Greer, *The Whole Woman* (London: Transworld, 1999)
- Talia Bettcher, "Feminist Perspectives on Trans Issues" in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2014)

### **Week 10 - Polarization**

- C. Thi Nguyen, "Hostile Epistemology" in *Social Philosophy Today* (2023), Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 9-32.
- Bianca Cepollaro, Maxime Lepoutre, Robert Mark Simpson, "Counterspeech" in *Philosophy Compass* (2022), Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 11-11.
- Etienne Brown, "Free Speech and the Legal prohibition of fake News" in *Social Theory and Practice* (2023), Vol. 49, No. 1, pp. 29-55.
- Elizabeth Anderson, "Epistemic Bubbles and Authoritarian Politics" in *Political Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), eds. Elizabeth Edenberg & Michael Hannon, pp. 11-30.
- Harry Frankfurt, *On Bullshit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
- Cass R. Sunstein, "Conspiracy Theories" in *Conspiracy Theories & Other Dangerous Ideas* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2016), Ch. 1, pp. 1-33. \*
- Steve Clark, "Conspiracy Theories and Conspiracy Theorizing" in *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* (2002), Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 131-150.
- John Bargh, "At Yale, we conducted an experiment to turn conservatives into liberals. The results say a lot about our political divisions" in *The Washington Post*, November 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 (Available online).
- Cheshire Calhoun, "The Virtue of Civility" in *Philosophy & Public Affairs* (2000), Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 251-275.
- Tadeq Quillien, "Is Virtue Signaling a Vice?" in *Aeon*: <https://bit.ly/3Qi4PFf>
- Scott F. Aikin & Robert B. Talisse, *Why We Argue (And How We Should): A Guide to Political Disagreement in an Age of Unreason, Second Edition* (New York: Routledge, 2019).
- James E. Campbell, *Polarized: Making Sense of a Divided America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), Ch. 2 & Afterword, pp. 39-59, 247-257.
- David Bornstein, "Recovering the (Lost) Art of Civility" in *The New York Times*, October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

- VIDEO: Cass R. Sunstein, “Why Conspiracy Theories are Rational to Believe” (13.5 min video – Vox – YouTube).
- VIDEO: Contrapoints, “The Apocalypse” YouTube (24 mins).

### **Week 11 - No Platforming**

- Jason Brennan, “Friendship and Blackballing for Bad Beliefs” in *Philosophy* (2023), Vol. 98, No. 1, pp. 191-214.
- Jonathan Haidt & Greg Lukianoff, “The Coddling of the American Mind” in *The Atlantic*, September 2015 issue.
- Mark Fisher, “Exiting the Vampire Castle” *Open Democracy UK*, Nov 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013.
- Mark Lilla, *The Once and Future Liberal: After Identity Politics* (London: Hurst & Company, 2018)
- Tom Slater, ed., *Unsafe Space: The Crisis of Free Speech on Campus* (London: Palgrave, 2016)
- Uwe Peters & Nikolaj Nottelmann, “Weighing the Costs: The Epistemic Dilemma of No-Platforming” in *Synthese* (2021), Vol. 199, No. 1, pp. 7231-7253.
- Robert Mark Simpson & Amia Srinivasa, “No Platforming” in *Academic Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 186-209.
- Neil Levy, “No-Platforming and Higher-Order Evidence, or Anti-Anti-No-Platforming” in *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* (2019), Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 487-502.