**Master Syllabus for University Studies Course Proposal for Cluster 4A**

**PSC351: Modern Political Thought**

**For Cluster 4A: Human Questions and Contexts**

The goal of this course is to introduce students to some of the foundational texts in modern political theory – that is, the critical and systematic inquiry into how the practice of government can best contribute to human fulfillment – and to some of the basic methods and techniques that were developed to conduct this inquiry. This course provides an introduction to the leading European political thinkers of the 15th through 19th centuries who established the foundations of contemporary Anglo-American and Continental political theory. The class will focus in particular on the development of liberalism, particularly in the work of Locke, Kant and Mill, and on its most influential critics, including Rousseau, Marx and Nietzsche. It is intended not only to help students understand the roots of our contemporary political beliefs, but also to help them to understand the limits of these ideas and the potential alternatives. It is intended to help them to become critical and self-critical political thinkers.

**University Studies Course Rationale:**

The class explores major texts in Western philosophy devoted to illuminating the purpose of government and how it can be designed to enhance the quality of human life. The liberal tradition, which is developed in the thought of Hobbes, Locke, Kant and Mill, continues to dominate Western reflection on, and practice of, government today. Understanding their contributions establishes a foundation not only to understand why we organize government the way we do, particularly in regard to our constitutional arrangements, but also to conduct internal criticism where they fail to realize liberal ideals. The class also examines some of the most important critics of the liberal tradition – including Rousseau, Marx and Nietzsche - and the objections they raise to the liberal vision of how to enhance human life. This provides students with a range of bases for external criticism of Western constitutional arrangements. In this way the course (1) addresses questions of what it is to be human and particularly to participate in human relations and institutions, and promotes critical self-knowledge about these questions. It also (2) familiarizes students with central ethical discourses of a distinct but connected cultural context (i.e., early modern Western Europe), and how these evolved chronologically through the interactions of leading thinkers. In so doing, it draws (3) mainly on primary sources (i.e., great philosophical works), but also relies on some modern secondary sources (contemporary commentary on these great works) which, along with raising critical perspectives, help to show how the primary sources continue to influence and shape our thinking today. And finally and most importantly (4) it uses engagement with these texts to nurture critical and self-critical reflection on central questions like the purposes of human life and government, the nature of justice.

**Learning Outcomes:**

**Course Specific Learning Outcomes:**

After completing this course, students will

* be familiar with the most important and influential European political theorists of the 15th through 19th century.
* understand the main political traditions (such as liberalism, civic republicanism, conservatism and socialism) and their roots;
* appreciate, and be able to engage with the great historical debates over legitimacy, authority, rights, etc.; and
* be able to effectively form and defend political arguments and identify and critique underlying theoretical positions.

In short, this course is designed to familiarize students with the foundations of political thought and to equip them to begin thinking about politics on their own.

**University Studies Learning Outcomes:**

After completing this course, students will be able to:

**Cluster 4A:**

1. Explain different perspectives on:

a) what it means to be human and how the significance of human existence has been understood, *at least among philosophers addressing these questions from the 15th century to now in the West*;

b) the nature of human relationships and how these relationships are evidenced in regard to the broader world, *at least in terms of how humans can best live together in light of the kinds of creatures that they are and what kinds of things fulfills them*;

c) how knowledge is obtained, maintained and changed, as well as how individuals come to understand and think about the world around them, *at least within the discourses of Anglo-American and Continental philosophy from the 15th through 19th centuries*.

2. Recognize ethical issues in complex contexts and evaluate the ethical positions taken by themselves and others *by applying the analytical techniques and theoretical approaches prevalent among leading philosophers of the 15th through 19th centuries both to their own problems and, to a lesser extent, our own*.

3. Locate, analyze, summarize, paraphrase, and synthesize material from a variety of sources *by reading and evaluating both primary and secondary sources in contemporary philosophy as well as developing and testing their own positions in class debates*.

4. Evaluate arguments made in support of different perspectives on human questions and contexts *not only by judging leading authors’ competing positions on both theoretical and practical questions, but also by adjudicating debates among their classmates on such issues*.

**Examples of Possible Texts and/or Assigned Readings:**

**Required Texts**

David Wooton (ed.), *Modern Political Thought: Readings from Machiavelli to Nietzsche*, *Second Edition*, Hackett Publishing: Indianapolis, IN, 2008.

**Other Required Readings:**

Pope Gregory VII, *Dictatus Papae* (The Dictates of the Pope), translated by Ernest F. Henderson

Isaiah Berlin, “On the Originality of Machiavelli”

*James VI & I, A Speech to the Lords and Commons of the Parliament at White-Hall, on Wednesday of the XXI. Of March. Anno 1609*

Lucien Jaume, “Hobbes and the Philosophical Sources of Liberalism,” p. 199- 216.

J.P. Sommerville, “Divine Rights Basics”

Benjamin Constant, “On Ancient and Modern Liberty”

Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha* (1680)

Richard Ashcraft, “Locke’s Political Philosophy,”

Joseph Lane and Rebecca Clark, “The Solitary Walker in the Political World: Rousseau and Deep Ecology”

William James Booth, “The Limits of Autonomy: Karl Marx’s Kant Critique,”

M.J. Mulnix, “Harm, Rights, and Liberty: Towards a Non-Normative Reading of Mill’s Liberty Principle”

**Example Learning Activities and Assignments:**

**Learning activities and Assignments include:**

**(1) First Take-Home Assignment**

**(2) Mid-Term Examination**

**(3) Second Take-Home Assignment**

**(4) Final Exam**

**(5) Weekly Quizzes**

**(I) Take-Home Assignment #1**

The first take-home assignment is designed (i.) to assure that students are doing the readings and understanding them, particularly with reference to how they interpret human beings, values and purposes especially with regard to the organization of political communities (i.e, US learning outcomes 1a-b); and (ii.) to compel them to engage critically with the theories advanced by the authors (i.e., US outcomes 2 & 4). Each question compels students to draw on at least two distinct perspectives and to engage critically with central claims within them (i.e., US outcome 3). Each of the questions is designed to illustrate how critical scrutiny of clearly formulated arguments contributes to the development and refining of knowledge (US outcome 1c).

**Instructions:**

Choose one of the following three topics and compose a two (2) to four (4) page *analytical* essay on it (double-spaced, 12 point font, 1 inch margins). When you quote from, or refer to ideas from, the Wooton Collection (which you should), then put the relevant page number in parentheses at the end of the sentence just before the period – for example, Hobbes claims that “all politics is about power” (121).\* If you cite other works on the syllabus, you can just use the author’s name and page number – for example, Strauss viewed Hobbes as the father of liberalism (Jaume 121). The essay will be marked on the criteria of preparation, argument, and presentation (see syllabus for details). This assignment accounts for 150 points in the course total of 1000 (or 15% of your grade). The essay will be due in 7 days on Thursday, March 15th at the beginning of class. Any essay handed in after class will be late. *Late assignments will be penalized 25 points per day (or 16.7% of the value of the assignment/day).*

Questions:

1. Isaiah Berlin argues that Machiavelli is a hedgehog (monist) who teaches us to be foxes (pluralists). Is Berlin right? Describe and assess Berlin’s reading of Machiavelli, explain some of the important implications of Berlin’s reading, and consider and answer one important rebuttal to Berlin’s account of Machiavelli.
2. Lucien Jaume argues that Leo Strauss is (mostly) wrong to characterize Thomas Hobbes as the Founding Father of Liberalism. Indicate what rides on this question, how Jaume argues it, and whether Jaume’s case is ultimately convincing or not. Consider and rebut at least one major criticism of your view.
3. John Locke’s lost *First Treatise of Government* offered a rebuttal of Sir Robert Filmer’s *Patriarcha* (which you read in the first week of class). Based on your reading of the *Second Treatise of Government*, which Locke tells us recaps many of the key points of his prior work, write your own short version of the *First Treatise*, developing the critique of “Sir Robert” offered in the *Second Treatise*, and applying its principles and ideas to form a more comprehensive rebuttal.

\* If you used sources other than Heywood (which you may but are not required to do) give the name of the author and the page number in brackets at the end of the sentence – for example (Rawls 3792). Then add a separate page listing your references at the end of your text – for example,

References

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1971.

(II) Mid-Term Guideline

The mid-term is designed (i.) to assure that students are doing the readings and understanding them, particularly with reference to how they interpret human beings, values and purposes especially with regard to the organization of political communities (i.e, US learning outcomes 1a-b); and (ii.) to compel them to engage critically with the theories advanced by the authors (i.e., US outcomes 2 & 4). Each question compels students to draw on at least two distinct perspectives and to engage critically with central claims within them (i.e., US outcome 3). Each essay question also asks students to apply the claims they examine to contemporary circumstances. Each of the questions is designed to illustrate how critical scrutiny of clearly formulated arguments contributes to the development and refining of knowledge (US outcome 1c).

**PSC351: Modern Political Theory**

**Spring 2012**

**Mid-Term Guideline**

***Overview:*** The Mid-Term will be given in class on Thursday, April 5th, 2012, and will therefore be seventy-five minutes in duration. It will be divided into two sections. The first section will be worth 50% of the test’s value. In it, you will be asked to choose two of four essay topics and to write short essays on them. The second section will also be worth 50%. In it you will be asked to identify five pertinent concepts or expressions that have been employed in class and/or in the readings.

**Section I (50%=2\*25%): Short Essays**

I will select four (4) of the following five (5) topics to appear on the Mid-Term. **You will select** **two** **(2)** of those four (4) topics and write short essays on them.

1. In contrast with Locke, Rousseau argues against the recognition of individual rights prior to formation of a social contract. On what grounds and is his case compelling? Describe Rousseau’s arguments, raise a telling objection and assess whether his argument can be effectively defended against it. Try if possible to relate the discussion to contemporary circumstances.
2. Richard Ashcraft contends that Locke’s desire to justify the overthrow of James II leads him to re-interpret the political role of parliament and its jurisdiction in the UK. How does he do this and is his argument convincing? Outline Locke’s argument, raise at least one telling objection and assess whether Locke’s argument can be defended against it. Try if possible to relate the discussion to contemporary circumstances and issues.
3. Rousseau’s *On Social Contract* suggests an argument for why the United States should abandon democracy on two grounds. What are they and are they convincing? Describe Rousseau’s arguments and what he prescribes as an alternative, raise one telling objection to his argument and assess how well it can answer that challenge.
4. As we noted in class, Locke’s account of how we initially acquire private property is perhaps the most influential even formulated. Describe his account, raise two telling objections, and assess whether it can be defended against them. Is there a better way of explaining the origins of private property, and what contemporary implications does your answer have?
5. Is Rousseau’s version of civic republicanism more or less attractive than Machiavelli’s. Drawing on both the lectures identify two important differences between the two writers and assess in each case which offers the more compelling idea. What implications does your contention have for contemporary politics.

**Section II: Identifies**

I will select seven (7) of the following ten (10) terms. **You will choose and identify five (5)** of those seven (7) terms. You will give a definition and an example of each of those five (5) terms, and relate each to themes in the course (for example, the chapter and topic in relation to which they were raised, the role they played in class discussion, etc.).

(1) General Will (2) Social Contract

(3) Primogeniture (4) Noble Savage

(5) Noble Savage (6) Absolute Monarchy

(7) Civil Liberty (8) Public-Private Distinction

(9) Divine Right (10) Value Pluralism

(III) Second Take-Home

**Take-Home Assignment #2**

The second take-home assignment is designed (i.) to assure that students are doing the readings and understanding them, particularly with reference to how they interpret human beings, values and purposes especially with regard to the organization of political communities (i.e, US learning outcomes 1a-b); and (ii.) to compel them to engage critically with the theories advanced by the authors (i.e., US outcomes 2 & 4). Each question compels students to draw on at least two distinct perspectives and to engage critically with central claims within them (i.e., US outcome 3). Each of the questions is designed to illustrate how critical scrutiny of clearly formulated arguments contributes to the development and refining of knowledge (US outcome 1c).

**Instructions:**

Choose one of the following three topics and compose a two (2) to four (4) page *analytical* essay on it (double-spaced, 12 point font, 1 inch margins). When you quote from, or refer to ideas from, the Wooton Collection (which you should), then put the relevant page number in parentheses at the end of the sentence just before the period – for example, Hobbes claims that “all politics is about power” (121). If you cite other works on the syllabus, you can just use the author’s name and page number – for example, Strauss viewed Hobbes as the father of liberalism (Jaume 121). If you use sources beyond the course readings, which you are encouraged but not required to do, then reference them in the same way, but add a separate page listing your references at the end of your text.\* The essay will be marked on the criteria of preparation, argument, and presentation (see syllabus for details). This assignment accounts for 150 points in the course total of 1000 (or 15% of your grade). The essay will be due in 7 days on Thursday, April 26th at the beginning of class. Any essay handed in after class will be late. *Late assignments will be penalized 25 points per day (or 16.7% of the value of the assignment/day).*

Questions:

1. In “The Solitary Walker” Joseph Lane and Rebecca Clark argue that Rousseau’s thought reflects and reveals a paradox at the heart of the deep ecology movement. Are they right, why, and is there a means of resolving this paradox? Describe the paradox they identify in Rousseau’s thought on nature, how it is reflected in contemporary deep ecological thought, and explain whether there is or is not a means of resolving this paradox and why?
2. William James Booth’s “The Limits of Autonomy” argues that Karl Marx has a telling critique of Kant’s account of freedom (as autonomy). Does he? Describe Kant’s account of freedom, Marx’s critique of it and his alternative, and offer a justified assessment of it.
3. In Benjamin Constant’s famous essay, “On Ancient and Modern Liberty,” he argues that we must give priority to modern liberty but we must not rely on it exclusively. Is his case compelling? Describe Constant’s famous distinction between two types of liberty, his reasons for insisting that we must give priority to modern liberty, and his arguments for why we should not do so exclusively. Raise at least one telling objection to Constant’s case and assess the force of his article in that light.

\*for example:

References

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1971.

(IV) Final Exam

The Final Exam is designed (i.) to assure that students are doing the readings and understanding them, particularly with reference to how they interpret human beings, values and purposes especially with regard to the organization of political communities (i.e, US learning outcomes 1a-b); and (ii.) to compel them to engage critically with the theories advanced by the authors (i.e., US outcomes 2 & 4). Each question encourages students to apply the ideas they discuss to modern contexts. Each of the questions is designed to illustrate how critical scrutiny of clearly formulated arguments contributes to the development and refining of knowledge (US outcome 1c).

**Final Exam Guidelines**

**Section I: Short Essay Questions (2x25%=50%)**

**I will choose 4 of the following 5 questions for the Assignment. You will answer 2 of those 4 questions. Your short essays will be worth 50% of the value of the Assignment. They will be marked on the basis of demonstrated knowledge of the texts, clarity of analysis and quality of argument.**

**Questions:**

(1) Does Marx claim that workers in a capitalist economy are alienated from their labor carry conviction? Why or why not? Describe Marx’s main lines of argument, analyze their force, raise and assess at least one telling objection, and draw a reasoned judgment about the force of Marx’s case. You’ll receive bonus points if you can relate Marx’s 19th century idea of typical labor to the contemporary context.

(2) Is Professor Michael Mulnix correct that Mill’s liberty principle can be rendered neutral and still act as a central principle in guiding our collective political decisions? Describe Mulnix’s argument, raise and assess at least one telling criticism and draw a reasoned conclusion. Try to use some contemporary illustrations.

(3) Is J. S. Mill correct that an expansive freedom of speech limited only by the harm principle can be justified on the criteria of utility? Describe and analyze Mill’s arguments, raise at least one telling objection, and draw a reasoned conclusion. You’ll receive bonus points if you can relate your discussion to recent political debates over the limits of free speech.

(4) Is social contract, utility or autonomy the best basis for evaluating political principles and why? Describe and distinguish these three approaches, their strengths and weaknesses, and make an argument for which, if any, is preferable overall. You’ll receive bonus points if you can relate your analysis to problems in contemporary U.S. or global politics.

(5) What role does Marx think religion should play in modern politics, why, and is he right? Summarize Marx’s view, analyze his main argument for it, offer at least two telling critiques and draw a reasoned conclusion. You’ll receive bonus points if you can relate your discussion to contemporary political debates over religion in public life.

**Section II: Identifications (5x10=50%)**

**I will select 8 of the following 14 concepts for inclusion on the mid-term. You will choose 5 of those 8 on the test. You will define the concept, give an example of how it is used, and explain why it is important in terms of the subject matter of the course.**

1. **Deontology 2. Historical Materialism**
2. **Felicific Calculus 4. Original Position**
3. **Enlightenment 6. Tyranny according to Locke**

**7. Civic Republicanism 8. The Reformation**

**9. Romanticism 10. Dialectics**

**11. Exploitation 12. Reactionary Socialism**

**13. Categorical Imperative 14. Idealism**

**(5) Weekly Quizzes,**

Weekly quizzes are intended to assure that students are engaging seriously with the texts and are internalizing the fundamental arguments, particularly connected with what it means to be humans, and how humans can best be fulfilled (US outcome 1a).

Examples:

* Week 2: Does Machiavelli think it is better to be loved or feared? Why (in a sentence)?
* Week 5: How does Locke think that you can legitimately acquire private property? Name three criteria he thinks must be met for acquisition to be legitimate.
* Week 9: What, for Kant, is Enlightenment? Are you convinced? Why?
* Week 12: In one sentence each: (1) does Mulnix believe that Mill’s harm priniciple can be rendered morally neutral? (2) Why or why not? (3) Is he right?

**Outcome Map:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| University Studies Learning Outcome | Teaching & Learning Activities | Student Work Product |
| (1) Students should be able to explain different perspectives on:  (a) what is means to be human and how the significance of human existence has been understood | * Learning the foundations of liberal thought and the most prominent lines of criticism and proposed alternatives (Machiavelli, Rousseau, Marx, Nietzsche, etc.) * Developing their own critical perspective | * Mid-Term Tests * Take-Homes 1 & 2 * Final Exam * Weekly Quizzes |
| (b) the nature of human relationships and how these relationships are evidenced in regard to the broader world | * Lecture and discussion exploring the understandings of human nature and relationships exhibited in the thought of Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Marx, Kant, Mill, Nietzsche, etc. * Lecture and discussion exploring how their accounts of human nature and relationships stand up to both history and contemporary evidence. | * Take-Homes 1 & 2 * Mid-Term Tests * Final Exams |
| c) how knowledge is obtained, maintained and changed, as well as how individuals come to understand and think about the world around them | * Lecture and discussion moving chronologically through major political theories from the 15th through the 19th century, focusing not only on changing claims about governments, but also the way that assumptions and forms of argument have evolved. Essentially the theories and theorists are presented as in an ongoing conversation with one another about what we know human purpose and government. * Of necessity, the class examines the different epistemic frameworks of the theories offered by Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Marx, Kant, Mill, Nietzsche, etc. It does not abstract and thematize these issues, but encounters them in the course of evaluating their arguments and theories. * The course also seeks to hone students’ own ability to gather and evaluate knowledge through careful analysis of arguments. | * Take-Homes 1 & 2 \*\*\* * Mid-Term Tests * Final Exams |
| 2. Recognize ethical issues in complex contexts and evaluate the ethical positions taken by themselves and others | * Lecture and discussion exploring the ethical frameworks exhibited in the thought of Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Marx, Kant, Mill, Nietzsche, etc., and the conclusions about politics and social life they drew on the basis of these ethical positions. * Through discussion and debate about these theories, the course helps students to become more self-aware and self-critical about their ethical assumptions and more consistent in applying them to political and social questions. | * Take-Homes 1 & 2 * Mid-Term Tests * Final Exams |
| 3. Locate, analyze, summarize, paraphrase, and synthesize material from a variety of sources | * Through lectures and discussions drawing on such a wide range of writings and thinkers across four centuries and a variety of European cultures, the class requires students to be able to synthesize distinct theory, locate and compare them in relation to one another, and to be able to analyze each on its own and in comparison with the others. | * Weekly Quiz Answers * Take-Homes 1 & 2 * Mid-Term Tests * Final Exams |
| 4. Evaluate arguments made in support of different perspectives on human questions and contexts | * The entire class is devoted to the identification and evaluation of a range of arguments and theories about the purposes of government (in light of the human condition) and how best to realize them. The central purpose is to make students aware of the range of foundational approaches to these questions, and thus to help them to become more self-aware and self-critical, while enhancing the analytical skills that permit them to do this well. | * Take-Homes 1 & 2 * Mid-Term Tests * Final Exams |

**Sample Class Schedule:**

I. Introduction & Historical Background: Papal Supremacy, Diving Right, Patriarchy

II. Machiavelli and the Renaissance Prince

III. Classical Politics v. Christian Politics

IV. Hobbes’ Leviathan

V. Debating Absolute Sovereignty and the Birth of Liberalism

VI. John Locke and the Glorious Revolution

VII. Debating the Lockean Roots of the American Revolution

VIII. Rousseau and the Roots of the Romantic Revolution

IX. Debating the Rousseauean Roots of Deep Ecology

X. Kant and the Deontic Turn

XI. Three Critiques of Kantian Politics: Marx, Montesquieu and Constant

XII. J.S. Mill and the Idea of Negative Liberty

XIII. Mulnix and the Modern Answers to Mill’s Critics

XIV. Marx’s Scientific Philosophy of Revolution

XV. Nietzsche, the End of Philosophy and the Unraveling of the Modern World

**A Sample Syllabus Follows:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Modern Political Theory** |
| **PSC 351-01** |
| Section 10773 |
| Spring 2012 |
| Tuesday and Thursday 11:00am-12:15pm |
| Liberal Arts (Group 1), Room #214 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dr. Avery Plaw** |  |
| Office: | Liberal Arts 399J |
| Office Hours: | Tuesday and Thursday 3:15-4:30pm, Wednesday 3:10-4:40pm |
| Phone: | (508) 910-6887 |
| E-mail: | [aplaw@umassd.edu](mailto:sjenkins@umassd.edu) |
| Course website: | <http://dartmouth.umassonline.net> |

**Overview**

This course provides an introduction to the leading European political thinkers of the 15th through 19th centuries who established the foundations of contemporary Anglo-American and Continental political theory. The class will focus in particular on the development of liberalism, particularly in the work of Locke, Kant and Mill, and on its most influential critics, including Rousseau, Marx and Nietzsche. It is intended not only to help students understand the roots of our contemporary political beliefs, but also to help them to understand the limits of these ideas and the potential alternatives. It is intended to help them to become critical and self-critical political thinkers.

**Course Objectives**

After completing this course, students will

* be familiar with the most important and influential European political theorists of the 15th through 19th century.
* understand the main political traditions (such as liberalism, civic republicanism, conservatism and socialism);
* appreciate, and be able to engage with the great historical debates over legitimacy, authority, rights, etc.; and
* be able to effectively form and defend political arguments and identify and critique underlying theoretical positions.

In short, this course is designed to familiarize students with the foundations of political thought and to equip them to begin thinking about politics on their own.

**Required Texts**

David Wooton (ed.), *Modern Political Thought: Readings from Machiavelli to Nietzsche*, *Second Edition*, Hackett Publishing: Indianapolis, IN, 2008.

\*additional required readings will be available on the course website.

**Course Requirements**

The final course grade will be based on 1000 points, allocated as follows:

**Mid-Term Exam (200 points)**

The Mid-Term Exam will be given in class (on April 5, 2012). You will be given the full class period of 75 minutes to complete the exam. It will be composed of two sections. In the first section you will be given a choice of questions and asked to write two short essays on them. The essay will be weighted at half the value of the test and 100 points out of your term total of 1000. It will be graded on the basis of three criteria: (1.) *preparation* - demonstrated familiarity with, and comprehension of, the texts; (2.) *argument* - the pertinence, logic and force of your answer; and (3) *presentation* – the organization, clarity and conciseness of your case. The second section of the exam will comprise a list of eight concepts, five of which you will be asked identify. Identifications will include a brief definition of the concept and an example of how it has been used in the course readings or lectures. Answers will be assessed in terms of *accuracy*, *clarity* and *effective illustration*. The second section will also be worth half the value of the test and 100 points of the term total of 1000.

**Take-Home Assignments (2 assignments at 150 points each = 300 points)**

Twice during the term you will be given a choice of two questions and asked to write a two to four page essay answering one of them. The questions will address issues drawn from the texts and discussed in the lectures. Your answers will be marked on the basis of the same criteria used on the essay section of the mid-term exam. The assignments are open book and you will have seven days to complete them. However, these are timed assignments and must be handed in at the beginning of the class at which they are due. *Late assignments will be docked 25 points per day***.**

**Final Exam (300 points)**

The final exam will be based on the entirety of the material presented throughout the course, but with an emphasis on the readings and lectures following the mid-term exam. The exam will be three hours in length and will be structured as the mid-term exam was, except that there will be two essays worth 100 points each. The five identifies will also count for 100 points. The final will be assessed according to the same criteria as the mid-term.

**Participation (200 points)**

Finally, a portion of your grades will be based on participation. There are a number of factors that will be considered in calculating this element of your final marks, including class attendance, the number and quality of your contributions in the classroom, as well as your deportment towards one another. *Disruptive behavior in class will not be tolerated.* I will also be giving **brief quizzes** on the weeks’ readings at the beginnings of Tuesday classes which may or may not be factored into participation grades depending on the outcome of a weekly coin toss. Finally, I will assign some **short in-class and take-home work** and will factor performance on these into the participation grades.

**Final Grades**

Final grades will be assigned on the basis of the following scale:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Letter Grade | Final Point Total | Percent | Letter Grade | Final Point Total | Percent |
| **A** | 925-1000 | 93-100 | **C** | 725-764 | 73-76 |
| **A-** | 895-924 | 90-92 | **C-** | 695-724 | 70-72 |
| **B+** | 865-894 | 87-89 | **D+** | 665-694 | 67-69 |
| **B** | 825-864 | 83-86 | **D** | 625-664 | 63-66 |
| **B-** | 795-824 | 80-82 | **D-** | 595-624 | 60-62 |
| **C+** | 765-794 | 77-79 | **E** | <595 | <60 |

**Missing Classes/Exams/Assignments**

Make-up exams will only be given in the event of a serious emergency. *Documentation will be required* in order to make arrangements for a make-up. You must contact me in advance of the missed exam. You do not need to contact me if you are missing a regular class period (i.e., no exam or homework submission is scheduled); it will be your responsibility to determine what was covered during the missed class period from other students in the class. *Incompletes will only be given in exceptional circumstances*; any student not completing all of the required coursework who has not discussed an incomplete with me prior to the final examination period *will not receive credit for missed assignments*.

**Plagiarism Policy**

All UMass Dartmouth students are expected to maintain high standards of academic integrity and scholarly practice. The University does not tolerate cheating of any variety, whether as a result of dishonesty or ignorance of academic rules or scholarly procedures (see <http://www.umassd.edu/studenthandbook/academicregs/ethicalstandards.cfm>). A student found guilty of cheating is subject to severe disciplinary action, which may include *expulsion from the University*. Please refer to the **Student Handbook** (<http://www.umassd.edu/studenthandbook/>) for due process. Any student caught cheating in this course will *fail the course for the semester* and will be referred to the Political Science department chair and the Student Judicial Affairs Coordinator. Please see me in advance of any assignment if you have specific questions.

**Students with Disabilities**

In accordance with University policy, if you have a documented disability and require accommodations to obtain equal access in this course, please meet with me at the beginning of the semester and provide the appropriate paperwork from the Disabled Students Services Office (DSS).  The necessary paperwork is obtained from the DSS, which is located in Group I, Room 016, phone: 508-999-8711.

**Course Schedule**

The assigned readings should be completed ***prior to*** the date indicated. Students should be prepared to discuss the readings on that date.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Date** | **Reading** | **Assignment** |
| Week 1 | January 31, 2012 | Class Overview |  |
|  | February 2 | \*On-Line Reading 1: Package on Traditional Ideas: Papal Supremacy, Divine Right, Patriarchy |  |
| Week 2 | February 7 | Wooton, p. 1-52: Niccolo Machiavelli |  |
|  | February 9 |  |  |
| Week 3 | February 14 | \*On-Line Reading 2: Isaiah Berlin, “The Originality of Machiavelli” |  |
|  | February 16 |  |  |
| Week 4 | February 21 | NO CLASS – MONDAY SCHEDULE |  |
|  | February 23 | Wooton, p. 117-9 (Introduction into chap. 2), p. 131-6 (chap. 6), p. 158-171 (chap. 13-15), p.173-84 (chap.17-9), p.188-93 (chap. 21) |  |
| Week 5 | February 28 | On-Line Reading 3: Lucien Jaume, “Hobbes and the Philosophical Sources of Liberalism,” p. 199- 216. |  |
|  | March 1 |  |  |
| Week 6 | March 6 | Wooton, p. 285-330: Locke |  |
|  | March 8 |  | First Take-Home Assignment |
| Week 7 | March 13 | On-Line Reading 4: Richard Ashcraft, “Locke’s Political Philosophy,” p. 226-251 |  |
|  | March 15 |  | First Take-Home Due |
|  | March 20 | NO CLASS - SPRING BREAK |  |
|  | March 22 | NO CLASS - SPRING BREAK |  |
| Week 8 | March 27 | Wooton, p. 427-471: Rousseau (shorten) |  |
|  | March 29 |  |  |
| Week 9 | April 3 | On-Line Reading 5: Joseph Lane and Rebecca Clark, “The Solitary Walker in the Political World: Rousseau and Deep Ecology,” p. 62- 94. |  |
|  | April 5 |  | Mid-Term |
| Week 10 | April 10 | Wooton, p. 522-5, 535-542, 558-569: Kant, Montesquieu, Constant (drop Montesquieu?) |  |
|  | April 12 |  |  |
| Week 11 | April 17 | On-Line Reading 6: William James Booth, “The Limits of Autonomy: Karl Marx’s Kant Critique,” p. 245-275. |  |
|  | April 19 |  | Second Take-Home Assignment |
| Week 12 | April 24 | Wooton, p. 592-651: J. S. Mill (shorten, just opening and on free speech) |  |
|  | April 26 |  | Second Take-Home due |
| Week 13 | May 1 | On-Line Reading 7: M.J. Mulnix, “Harm, Rights, and Liberty: Towards a Non-Normative Reading of Mill’s Liberty Princple, p. 1-22. |  |
|  | May 3 |  |  |
| Week 14 | May 8 | Wooton, p. 798-804, 773-4, 766-72, 742-5: Marx |  |
|  | May 10 |  |  |
| Week 15 | May 15 | Wooton, p. 865-903: Nietzsche |  |
| Exam Schedule | May 23, 11:30pm-2:30pm | Final Exam | Final Exam |