POSCI 240: Environmental Policy
Spring 2012

Professor Frank Kuserk (kuserk@moravian.edu)
Office: HOSCI 305; Phone: x1429; Office hours: MWF 9:00 am-10:00 am; other times by appointment

Professor John Reynolds (reynoldsj@moravian.edu)
Office: Comenius 113; Phone: x1408; Office hours: MTWR 1:00 pm-2:00 pm; other times by appointment

Class: MWF 3a (10:20-11:10 am) in PPHAC 330

Course Description

This course focuses primarily on the factors, from both the social sciences and the sciences that shape contemporary American politics and policy regarding environmental issues. It explores current controversies in legislative, regulatory, scientific, and activist forums concerning environmental issues, both domestically and internationally. Comparative, historical, philosophical, and scientific approaches are used to examine and better understand the relationship between environmental issues and the political process. This course satisfies the Social Impact of Science (U1) guideline in the LinC curriculum.

Goals and Objectives

After completing the course, students will be able to:

- Recognize fundamental connections between science, technology, politics, and environmental problems;
- Explain the importance, urgency, and contemporariness of environmental issues as matters of public policy;
- Evaluate how public problems are defined, the ways in which public policy is made, and how possible solutions are formulated
- Analyze the global dimension of these issues and how they are addressed in a comparative context;
- Recognize and understand the application to scientific and technological concepts to real world environmental problems.
- Identify tradeoffs in the choice of environmental policies

Course Guidelines

1. Students are expected to attend all classes. Absences due to participation in legitimate Moravian College extracurricular activities, a doctor's excuse or notification by the Dean of Student's Office will allow a student to be excused from class. All other excuses are subject to the instructors' judgment.

2. All assignments are expected to be handed in according to the due date on the syllabus. Late work will be penalized; the instructors will assess the penalty for any late work.

3. All students are expected to follow the principles of academic honesty as set out in the policies of Moravian College. See the Student Handbook for details. Any and all written work must be done in your own words (with the exception of direct quotations which are clearly indicated as such), and written work must include proper citations indicating the sources for any ideas, concepts, facts, or other information derived from others, whether or not you have restated it in your own words. Any cases of suspected

cheating or plagiarism will be referred to the Academic Affairs Office. Academic dishonesty may result in a failing grade in the course.

4. In case of any crisis or emergency, or an extended absence from class, you must inform your professor through Learning Services or the Academic Dean's Office.

5. Learning disability accommodations: students who wish to request accommodations in this class for support of learning disabilities should contact Learning Services (x1510). Accommodations cannot be provided until authorization is received from the appropriate disability support provider on campus.

6. These guidelines are intended for the benefit of the students as far as clarification of the instructor's expectations for the course; however, in exceptional circumstances the instructors reserve the right to exercise discretion in the application of these guidelines to individual cases or to refer a particular case to the Academic Dean if necessary.

Classroom Expectations

1) Respect for others' answers and views.
2) Disruptive behavior during class will result in your dismissal from the class the first time, after that, disciplinary action will be taken.
3) Non-alcoholic drinks are allowed in class, other food is not.
4) Attention to course related material only.
5) Necessary breaks at the discretion of the instructor.
6) If you arrive late, be respectful by not disrupting a class already in progress

Required Texts: Available at the college bookstore

- Walter Rosenbaum. *Environmental Politics and Policy*. 8th edition.
- Robert W. Taylor. *Taking Sides: Clashing Views in Sustainability*
- Reserve readings/Online readings/Readings on Blackboard

Course Requirements

A. Graded Requirements

1) Short essays (2 – each will be 15% of the final grade): Students will complete two short essays. The first will be due Monday, February 3 and the second will be due Friday, February 24. Students will have choice of the essays to be completed. The choices will entail a selection by the students of one of the essays due on Monday, February 3 and one of the essays due on Friday, February 24. The essay prompts are presented below.

In selecting the essays to be completed please note that in each case Dr. Kuserk will grade one of the two essays and Dr. Reynolds will grade the other. The student is required to select one essay that will be graded by each instructor. Thus, if the student chooses an essay from the first set that is to be graded by Dr. Kuserk, then the student must choose the essay from the second set that will be graded by Dr. Reynolds. The student cannot choose in such a way as to have the same instructor grade both of these essays.

These essays are intended to provide students an opportunity to demonstrate mastery of materials covered in the course readings and in class. The essays should be 3 to 4 typewritten pages. Material from outside of the course is acceptable as long as it addresses the essay prompt but the principal evaluation of the

essay will be based on the quality of presentation of the course material. As with any other formal assignment, writing counts and the students are expected to observe the rules of appropriate citation.

Set I (Due Monday, February 3):

1. (Kuserk) Explain what is meant by the "demographic transition." Discuss how the demographic transition presents different challenges and influences public policy for underdeveloped, developing and developed countries.

2. (Reynolds) Explain what is meant by the "social construction of technology" and the implications of that concept for understanding questions of environmental policy. Select one of the three global "drivers" identified in class and explain how the concept might help one consider the nature of that "driver?"

Set II (Due Friday, February 24)

1. (Kuserk) Discuss how what is known as the "environmental movement" has evolved from the late-19th / early 20th century to the present. Explain the different views and agendas of the various groups that currently make up this movement and how they influence environmental policy.

2. (Reynolds) Explain the significance of four of the following concepts for the construction of environmental policy: market failures, federalism, incrementalism, "normal" politics and command and control regulation.

2) <u>Final essay</u> (20% of the final grade): Students will complete a final essay in lieu of an in class final exam. This essay will be due on **Wednesday, May 2**. The final essay is intended to have students reflect on material learned during the semester and how their views on environmental issues and policy has been enhanced, reinforced, confounded or otherwise affected. In pursuit of that assessment, students at the beginning of the semester will produce a 2 to 3 page typewritten statement (**Due Friday, January 20**) in response to the following prompt:

> What do you consider the most important environmental policy issues (please select at least three) facing the United States and why? What roles should be played by government and by science in addressing these issues?

The response to this prompt will not be graded and will not be read by the instructors until the final essays have been submitted.

At the end of the semester, students will be asked to revisit their initial reflection and revise it accordingly based on course materials. The revision must show evidence of knowledge of course materials in support of whatever position the student chooses to take. Again, material from outside of the course is acceptable as long as it addresses the essay prompt but the principal evaluation of the essay will be based on the quality of presentation of the course material. The final essay should be 5 to 6 typewritten pages.

3) <u>Debates</u> (20% of the final grade): Each student will participate in an in class debate on a course related question. The specific question to be addressed will be determined through consultation between the students and the instructors. To determine the issue to be assigned, students will be presented with a list of five debate propositions (presented below) each focusing on a specific area of concern for the course. The students will submit a rank order of their first three choices and the side of the question that they would prefer to argue. From this information, the instructors will construct teams of three to address the four questions that draw the most interest and assign students to each side of the question at hand. The

instructors will try as best they can to assign students to their first choice but such an outcome cannot be guaranteed. The format for the debate is presented at the end of the syllabus and the class will devote its February 17 class meeting to instruction on the format and advise on how to approach the question assigned to each team.

Scoring for the debate will be done by the instructors with two components for each score. A maximum of ten points can be assigned for the individual student's performance and a maximum of ten points can be assigned based on the performance of the team. In each of these areas, the criteria for evaluation in will include:

- Clarity and organization of arguments
- Quality of oral presentation including speaking voice, engagement of the audience and delivery of material
- Use of logical argument and clarity of the connection between the team's position and the team members' presentation.
- Use of evidenced based argument where appropriate.
- Evidence of team work and shared responsibility for the presentation

Debate Topics

1. Has the science of environmental policy been overly politicized?
2. Does the environmental movement represent the public interest?
3. Should the government concentrate its research and development spending on the development of "green" technologies such as wind, solar and biomass?
4. Should the government enact a carbon tax or some other way to "internalize" the costs of carbon emissions?
5. Is the current level of consumption of natural and environmental resources in the United States morally defensible?

Debate Format

The debate will employ the advocate debate style. This format entails two teams of three students. Each team will have a lead advocate and two "witnesses" who present information through a process of direct and cross examination focused on the resolution of the issue under consideration. The roles and responsibilities of team members include:

- Each team will decide who will serve as lead advocate and which students will assume the role of witnesses.
- Team members will prepare an inventory of arguments in support of the team position and allocate elements of the arguments to individual witnesses.
- The lead advocate will introduce the basic arguments, present questions to student "witnesses" designed to introduce information in support of the position taken by the team, cross examine witnesses for the opposing team to challenge their arguments and offer concluding statements in support of the position taken by his or her team.
- Witnesses will help in the preparation of questions, respond to questions from the "lead advocate" as a means of introducing information that will support the position of the team and will respond to questions from the opposing lead advocate to defend the positions being taken.
- All team members will work to anticipate the questions that might be posed by the opposing lead advocate and will consult during the debate to offer lead advocates questions to ask and arguments to make during the debate.

Format and process:

Lead advocate affirmative introduction (2 minutes)
Lead advocate negative introduction (2 minutes)

First witness affirmative direct examination (5 minutes)
First witness affirmative cross examination (3 minutes)

Second witness affirmative direct examination (5 minutes)
Second witness affirmative cross examination (3 minutes)

Lead advocate affirmative summary (1 minute)
Lead advocate negative summary and reintroduction (1 minute)

First witness negative direct examination (5 minutes)
First witness negative cross examination (3 minutes)

Second witness negative direct examination (5 minutes)
Second witness negative cross examination (3 minutes)

Lead advocate negative summary (1 minute)
Lead advocate affirmative summary (1 minute)

Notes:

1. To avoid speechmaking and filibusters, the lead advocate should ask each witnesses for his or her own team at least four (4) questions. Each lead advocate should ask the witnesses for the opposing team at least three (3) questions. Witnesses who filibuster will be penalized.

2. The class will hold a workshop on **February 17** to help students understand their responsibilities and begin preparation for the debates that will be held during the last month of the term.

3. Student not participating in the debate will be asked to complete an evaluation sheet for each speaker in the debate. The evaluation sheets will **NOT** be factored into the grade for the oral presentation but will be shared with the speaker.

4. Instructors will complete the same evaluation sheets and those evaluations **will be used** in assigning a grade for the presentation. Grades for the oral presentations will be determined prior to instructor review of the student evaluations.

5. The time allotted for the debate presentation is 40 minutes. The remaining 10 minutes of class will be available for the class or the instructors to ask questions to the debate performers.

6. ***Each student will write a report on the arguments made during the debate. Discussions of the positions taken by the each team are welcome. The paper should be 5 to 7 type written pages and be appropriately formatted with appropriate citations.***

4) <u>Debate paper</u> (20% of the final grade): In conjunction with the in class debates, student will write a standard research paper focusing on the debate questions on which they worked. The paper should review the question and discuss the issues raised by it. In preparing the essay, it is generally expected that the essays will review the arguments presented by one's team and rebut the opposing arguments. A student can reverse positions in the essay if they choose to do so, however. In either case the evaluation of the paper, will follow the guidelines (rubric) presented below.

5) <u>Instructor evaluation</u> (10% of the final grade): The instructors will evaluate each student for his or her participation, involvement in and contributions to the course. This portion of the grade will reflect all activities in the course that are not otherwise specified in the syllabus including attendance, participation in class discussions ***and activities, and other evidence of engagement in class including out of class communications.***

Note: Among the required activities that will be incorporated into the Instructor Evaluation grade will be attendance at two presentations in the Environmental Film Series:

- **"The Economics of Happiness," Thursday, February 16 at 7:00 PM in the UBC Room**
- **"Blue Gold: World Water Wars," Tuesday, April 17 at 7:00 PM in the UBC Room**

If a student has a legitimate excuse for not being able to attend the showing of these films, the student should communicate that to the instructors as soon as possible. The instructors reserve the right to determine the legitimacy of the excuse. For those who are excused, the videos will be available for viewing on the POSC 240 Blackboard site.

B. Grade Components: all assignments under graded requirements must be completed in order to pass this class.
Your final grade in this course will be determined as follows:

Short essays (2)	30% (15 % each)
In class debates	20%
Debate topic paper	20%
Final essay	20%
Instructor evaluation	10%

<u>Guidelines (Rubric) for Written Assignments</u> (Written by Ben Slote and modified slightly by Ann Bomberger)

1) Written work in the A range is based on an original, logical and coherently organized set of ideas; it makes a clear and persuasive argument (even if the reader disagrees with its argument); it brings in specific, relevant examples to back up its assertions; its points, at each turn, are clearly articulated: the words carry precise meaning, they don't obscure it; its sentences use only the words their ideas require, not anymore; its paragraphs have distinct though related roles in the essay's cohesion as a whole, each holding one thoroughly asserted idea (not two competing ideas, not one idea half-asserted); if appropriate it accurately and thoughtfully uses other sources; and its sentences are without the grammatical, spelling, or typographical mistakes that exacting proof-reading would catch. (All of this takes a lot of work. If it is all very nearly accomplished, the essay usually earns an A-.)

2) Written work in the B range: a very good paper, the writing of which is clearly, thoughtfully, and effectively executed. What sometimes prevents an "A" is a lack of originality, thorough thinking or careful proofreading. If two of these virtues are absent and the other areas of the paper are strong, the essay will usually earn a B-.

3) Written work in the C range: some conspicuous flaw usually earns an essay a C; its argument is really underdeveloped, it contains only minimal textual support, it has problems with organization and/or sentence clarity, it is in dire need of proofreading.

4) Written D work either contains more than one of the large problems cited in the "C" description or finds another way to convince its reader that the author has not spent nearly enough time on the thinking or writing in the essay.

5) Written work that earns an F misses on all criteria (originality, articulateness, persuasiveness, organization, the absence of mechanical mistakes).

Final Grade Scale

93-100	A
90-92.9	A-
87-89.9	B+
83-86.9	B
80-82.9	B-
77-79.9	C+
73-76.9	C
70-72.9	C-
67-69.9	D+
63-66.9	D
60-62.9	D-
less than 60	F

Note: It is within the instructor's purview to apply qualitative judgment in determining grades for any assignment and for the course final grade.

Class Assignments

M 1/16 Introduction

W 1/18 Culture, Technology and Choice I
Read: David Nye, "Introduction" in **Consuming Power**, pp. 1-12.

F 1/20 Discussion: Culture, Technology and Choice
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 36-61
Issue 3: Are Western Values, Ethics, and Dominant Paradigms Compatible with Sustainability?
YES: Jo Kwong, from "Globalization's Effects on the Environment—Boon or Bane?," *Lindenwood Economic Policy Lecture Series* (July 2004)
NO: Erik Assadourian, from "The Rise and Fall of Consumer Cultures," *2010 State of the World—Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability* (The Worldwatch Institute, 2010)

M 1/23 Global Drivers I: Population
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 162-186.
Issue 7. Is Limiting Consumption Rather Than Limiting Population the Key to Sustainability?
YES: Robert W. Kates, from "Population and Consumption: What We Know, What We Need to Know," *Environment* (April 2000).

NO: J. Anthony Cassils, from "Overpopulation, Sustainable Development, and Security: Developing an Integrated Strategy," *Population and Environment* (January 2004).

W 1/25 Global Drivers II: Technology
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 189-217.
Issue 8. Is Technological Innovation the Main Driver for Achieving Sustainability?
YES: Joanna I. Lewis, from "Technology Acquisition and Innovation in the Developing World: Wind Turbine Development in China and India," *Studies in Comparative International Development* (November/December 2007).
NO: Alan Colin Brent and David E. Rogers, from "Renewable Rural Electrification: Sustainability Assessment of Mini-hybrid Off-grid Technological Systems in the African Context," *Renewable Energy* (2010).

F 1/27 Global Drivers III: Consumption and Affluence
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 134-158.
Issue 6. Is Global Environmental Degradation an Issue of Poverty Rather Than Environmental Policy?
YES: J.B. (Hans) Opschoor, from "Environment and Poverty: Perspectives, Propositions, Policies," in Institute of Social Studies, Working Paper 437, Netherlands, 2007.
NO: John Ambler, from "Attacking Poverty While Improving the Environment: Towards Win-Win Policy Options," *Poverty & Environment Initiative,* (United Nations Development Program, 2004).

M 1/30 Class discussion on drivers

W 2/1 Public Policy I: Market Failures and Public Policy
Read: Goodwin, Neva, "The Limitations of Markets: Background Essay," Global Development and Environment Institute. Tufts University, December 2005. http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/te/GoodwinMarketFailureFinal2005.pdf
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 224-238.
Issue 9. Is Monetizing Ecosystem Services Essential for Sustainability?
YES: Stephen Polasky, from "What's Nature Done for You Lately: Measuring the Value of Ecosystem Services," *Choices* (2nd Quarter, 2008).
NO: Clive L. Spash, from "How Much Is That Ecosystem in the Window? The One with the Bio-Diverse Trail," *Environmental Values* (May 2008).

F 2/3 Public Policy II: Institutional Policy Making
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, **Environmental Politics and Policy**, Ch. 2 and 3.

M 2/6 Public Policy III: Decision Making
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 17-35.
Issue 2. Is Sustainability More About Politics Than Science?
YES: Bill McKibben, from "Hot Mess: Why Are Conservatives So Radical About the Climate?," *The New Republic* (October 2010).
NO: Huub Spiertz, from "Food Production, Crops, and Sustainability: Restoring Confidence in Science and Technology," *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* (December 2010).

W 2/8 Public Policy III: Decision Making
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, **Environmental Politics and Policy**, Ch. 4 and 5.

F 2/10 Public policy IV: Policy Options and implementation
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 242-275.
Issue 10. Does the Market Work Better Than Government at Achieving Sustainability?
YES: Paul Krugman, from "Green Economics: How We Can Afford to Tackle Climate Change," *The New York Times Magazine* (April 11, 2010).
NO: Leigh K. Fletcher, from "Green Construction Costs and Benefits: Is National Regulation Warranted?" *Natural Resources & Environment* (Summer, 2009).

M 2/13 History of Environmentalism I: The Conservation Movement of the Early 20th Century
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, **Environmental Politics and Policy**, Ch. 1.
Kuzmiak, D.T. 1991. The American Environmental Movement. *The Geographical Journal* 157 (3): 265-278.
http://hudson2.skidmore.edu/~rscarce/Environmental_Sociology/Kuzmiak--AmEnvMvtto1990.pdf

W 2/15 History of Environmentalism II: The Modern Environmental Movement
Read: Dunlap, Riley E. and Angela G. Mertig. 1992. The Evolution of the U.S. Environmental Movement from 1970 to 1990: An Overview, *American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement, 1970-1990*, Taylor & Francis, New York.
http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=nIl9Y5gmg1cC&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=modern+environmental+movement&ots=GEK6a0brmu&sig=llolZ8eVm8oXTl_9Zp1Gyvs4mlU#v=onepage&q=modern%20environmental%20movement&f=false

Attend the Environmental Film Series: "The Economics of Happiness," Thursday, February 16 at 7:00 PM in the UBC Room (This video may also be viewed online from the POSC 240 Blackboard site).

F 2/17 Debate Workshop

M 2/20 Energy Demand Issues
Read: A. Bartlett, "Forgotten Fundamentals of the Energy Crisis," *American Journal of Physics*, September 1978.
http://www.npg.org/specialreports/bartlett_index.htm

W 2/22 Energy Supply Issues
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, pp. 278-289.

F 2/24 Air Pollution & Air Quality: The Problems
Read: Samet, J.M., F. Dominici, F.C. Curriero, I. Coursac and S.L. Zeger. 2000. Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Mortality in 20 U.S. Cities, 1987-1994. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 343(24): 1742-1949.
http://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu:8080/bitstream/handle/1774.2/32832/2000-Fine%20particulates.pdf

M 2/27 Air Pollution & Air Quality: The policy response
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, pp. 197-218.

W 2/29 Global Climate Change Defined
Visit http://climate.nasa.gov/ and read the information under these subheadings: 1) Key

Indicators; 2) Evidence; 3) Causes; 4) Effects; 5) Uncertainties; 6) NASA's Role; 7) Missions. Explore other links that are of interest to you.

F 3/2 Global Climate Change: The Policy response
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, Chapter 10.

M 3/5 No Class-Spring Break

W 3/7 No Class-Spring Break

F 3/9 No Class-Spring Break

M 3/12 COP 17: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Durban, South Africa

W 3/14 Energy Sources: The Challenges of Coal
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, pp. 308-316.
James Fallows, "Why the Future of Clean Energy is Dirty Coal," *The Atlantic*, December 2010.

F 3/16 **Debate 1**

M 3/19 Energy Sources: The Challenges of Nuclear
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, pp. 289-308 .
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 414-439.
Issue 16. Can Nuclear Energy Be a Sustainable Resource?
YES: A. Adamantiades and I. Kessides, from "Nuclear Power for Sustainable Development: Current Status and Future Prospects," *Energy Policy* (December 2009).
NO: Milton H. Saier and Jack T. Trevors, from "Is Nuclear Energy the Solution?" *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution* (May 2010).

W 3/21 Energy Sources: The Challenges of the "Soft Path"
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 389-408.
Issue 15. Should Sustainability in Energy Resources Be Based on Conservation?
YES: Eric A. Woodroof, Wayne C. Turner, and Steven D. Heinz, from "The 'Secret Benefits' from Energy Conservation," *Strategic Planning for Energy and the Environment* (April 2008).
NO: Hermann Scheer, from "The Cost of Renewable Energy: Time to Disprove the Myths," in J. Nethersole, ed., *Climate Action* (pp. 128–131, Sustainable Development International, 2009).

F 3/23 Energy Sources-Natural Gas and Fracking

M 3/26 **Debate 2**

W 3/28 Homage to Santa Rosalia, or Why are there so many kinds of animals?
Read: Brown, James H. 1981. Two Decades of Homage to Santa Rosalia: Toward a General Theory of Diversity. *American Zoologist* 21:877-888.
http://biology.unm.edu/jHBrown/Documents/Publications/1980s/Brown1981AZ.pdf

F 3/30 Conserving Biodiversity
Read: Myers, N., R.A. Mittermeler, C.G. Mittermeler, G.A.B. da Fonseca, and J. Kent.

2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403:853-858. http://se-server.ethz.ch/staff/af/Fi159/M/My042.pdf

M 4/2 Access to Natural Resources on Public Lands
Read: Rosenbaum Ch. 9.

W 4/4 Land Use Planning and Urban Development
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 276-293; 493-512.
Issue 11. Does Sustainable Urban Development Require More Policy Innovation and Planning?
YES: Bruce Katz, *Smart Growth: The Future of the American Metropolis,* (Center for Analysis of Social Exclusion and Brookings Institution, 2002).
NO: David B. Resnik, from "Urban Sprawl, Smart Growth, and Deliberative Democracy," *American Journal of Public Health* (October 2010).

Issue 19. Are Cities Sustainable?
YES: Stephen M. Wheeler, from "Planning for Sustainability," in *Local Planning: Contemporary Principles and Practice,* by Gary Hack *et al.*, eds., (International City-County Management Association, 2009).
NO: Giok Ling Ooi, "Challenges of Sustainability for Asian Urbanisation," *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* (December 2009).

F 4/6 No Class-Easter Break

M 4/9 No Class-Easter Break

W 4/11 Water as a Scarce Global Resource
Read: Oki, T. and S. Kanae. 2006. Global Hydrological Cycles and World Water Resources. *Science* 33:1068-1072.
http://www.conserv.missouri.edu/forms/science-2006-oki-1068-72.pdf

F 4/13 **Debate 3**

M 4/16 Water as a Source of Political Conflict

Attend the Environmental Film Series: "Blue Gold: World Water Wars," Tuesday, April 17 at 7:00 PM in the UBC Room (This video may also be viewed online from the POSC 240 Blackboard site).

W 4/18 Water Pollution and Quality
Read: Walter Rosenbaum, pp. 218-237.

F 4/20 TBD

M 4/23 **Debate 4**

W 4/25 Class Discussion: Sustainability as a Policy Goal
Read: Robert Taylor, pp. 2-13; 64-94.
Issue 1: Is Sustainability a Realistic Objective for Society?
YES: Sharon Boyd-Peshkin, from "Built to Trash: Is 'Heirloom Design' the Cure for Consumption?" In These Times (November 2009) .

NO: Sharon Begley, from "Green and Clueless," Newsweek (August 2010).
Issue 4. Does Sustainability Mean a Lower Standard of Living?
YES: Will Wilkerson, from "In Pursuit of Happiness Research: Is It Reliable? What Does It Imply for Policy? *Policy Analysis* (April 11, 2007).
NO: Saamah Abdallah, Sam Thompson, Juliet Michaelson, Nic Marks, and Nicole Steuer, from "Unhappy Planet Index 2.0: Why Good Lives Don't Have to Cost the Earth," http://happyplanetindex.org (2009).

F 4/27 Closing and Evaluation