COURSE SUMMARY

How should one live? This question, central to the study of moral philosophy, is obviously one that much economic analysis attempts, in part, to answer in terms of evaluating resource allocations and other outcomes. When economists pronounce in favour of particular actions on ‘welfare’ grounds, they are, in effect, declaring that greater ‘goodness’ results relative to possible alternatives. As such, economics reflects its origins in ethical thought, broadly conceived despite the assertion, made by many economists, that the subject is ‘value-free’.

The aim of this course is to explore the interface between economic theorising and ethical thought. At issue will be the extent to which economic theory and argument reflects, often implicitly, characteristic concerns of the major approaches to moral philosophy, and why an informed and critical appreciation of these effects is important for understanding the sources of success and failure of economic analysis.

Furthermore, the relationship between economics and moral and political philosophy will be examined. Historically, the development of economic thought and that of political thought have been closely related, and modern analyses of distributive justice, especially in the liberal tradition, draw explicitly on the theoretical apparatus of economics in the formulation of their arguments. It is important to see how both political philosophy and economic analysis can shed light on each other; the implicit value premises of economic theory can be pernicious to the aims of political arguments based on it, and the insights of political philosophers can highlight the conceptual shortcomings of economic analyses of justice, fairness, equality, etc.
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SEMINARS

Philosophy is based on discussion, analysis and argument. As this course is being offered as a reading unit, the set reading material for each week will form the basis of group discussions based on the key themes and their applications to economic theory and policy.

It is expected that all participants in the course will be just that: participants. You are expected to have thoroughly covered the readings set, and to be prepared to offer opinions and take positions. Participation *per se* is not assessable. However, it is hard to imagine how you will succeed if you do not invest the due time and effort in absorbing the content of the readings. And remember: there are no “right” answers in philosophical discourse, only better or worse arguments. Success in the course is *in no way* dependent on the stances you take on particular issues. All that matters is how well you structure arguments in support of any position you take.

ASSESSMENT

The course is assessed through written work, as the material is not readily suited to an examination format. There are three types of writing exercise you will undertake in the course – a short argument example, a seminar paper (max 1500 words) and a final essay (max 6000 words). The argument example is worth **10%** of the overall assessment, the seminar paper is worth **30%**. The remaining **60%** of your mark will come from the final research essay.
SEMINAR PAPERS

We have 10 weeks of discussing journal articles in class. By week 8, you will hand in a paper which involves a critical analysis of the Commonwealth Treasury’s Wellbeing Framework (available via the course website), which attempts to embrace a wider perspective on the issue of wellbeing and the aims of policy.

By a critical analysis I don’t mean criticism per se, but a reasoned identification (in light of what we have covered in the course) of what you see as the principal strengths and weaknesses of the document qua an argument about the appropriate relationships between traditional economics and wider philosophical themes.

The seminar paper should be no more than 1500 words in length. Submission of seminar papers will be by the same procedure as the essay (see below).

RESEARCH ESSAY

The topic of your main research essay will be determined early in the semester. The essay should be no more than 4000 words in length.

The essay is due on Monday 7 June. Word limits will be enforced. Late essays will attract a penalty of 5 marks per day.

Essays are to be submitted by two methods:

(1) Electronic copy submitted via the ‘Assignment’ tool on the Blackboard site;

AND

(2) Electronic version via Turnitin. Go to www.turnitin.com and click on ‘create a user profile’. Then select ‘student’ from the drop down menu and follow the steps. The class ID number is 3140190 and the password is philosophy. You use these to establish an account for ECON883. Note that passwords are case sensitive, so type it exactly as it appears here. You will then get your own user ID and password.

The final meeting(s) will be devoted to a presentation of your research essay arguments (20-30 min) with the opportunity for Q&A (which, hopefully, will be constructive!).

Two citation databases that will be useful to you are EconLit and The Philosophers Index. Both are available through the library website: (http://www.lib.mq.edu.au/resources/database/)
COURSE READINGS (NB: RIGHT TO SUBSTITUTE AT ANY TIME RESERVED BY LIC!)

All readings will be available for download from the course website.

N.B: You might find it interesting and/or worthwhile to read items marked with (+) last in each set.

Packet 1 – Moral Theory


Packet 2 – Preferences and Welfare


Packet 3 – Norms


Packet 4 – Choice and Consent


Packet 5 – Distributive Justice I: Philosophical Perspectives

Packet 6 – Distributive Justice II: Contributions from Economists


Packet 7 - State Action and Outcomes I: Income, Wealth and Employment


Packet 8 - State Action and Outcomes II: Work Organisation and the Labour Process


Packet 9 - Intergenerational Justice I: General Concepts


Packet 10 – Intergenerational Justice II: Environment and Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26 February</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Packet 1</td>
<td>Moral Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>Packet 2</td>
<td>Preferences &amp; Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19 March</td>
<td>Packet 3</td>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26 March</td>
<td>Packet 4</td>
<td>Choice and consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 April</td>
<td>Packet 5</td>
<td>Distributive Justice I – Philosophical Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-semester break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23 April</td>
<td>Packet 6</td>
<td>Distributive Justice II – Contributions from Economists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>Packet 7</td>
<td>State Action and Outcomes I – Income, Wealth and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7 May</td>
<td>Packet 8</td>
<td>State Action and Outcomes II – Work Organisation and the Labour Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14 May</td>
<td>Packet 9</td>
<td>Intergenerational Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21 May</td>
<td>Packet 10</td>
<td>Environment and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28 May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Essay Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 June</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Essay Presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>