

JEM180 Philosophy, Economics and Politics: Current Debates (Brexit Negotiations)

Instructors:

Jaromír Baxa, jaromir.baxa@fsv.cuni.cz
Vilém Semerák, vilem.semerak@fsv.cuni.cz

Place: Monday 12:30 – 13:50, room 206, Opletalova IES

MOODLE course name: JEM180 Philosophy, Economics and Politics II: Current Debates

MOODLE password: provided at the lectures

1) Course overview and aim of the course

Throughout the course, students participate in role-playing game in which they negotiate possible resolution of the Irish border, likely the most complicated issues in Brexit negotiations. While Ireland, the EU as well as the UK want to retain the border open, the proposed future relationships seem to exclude this option. The border between Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland might remain open if and only if the UK remains in the single market or in customs union, however the UK strongly prefers ambitious free trade agreement. Keeping the border open is, on the other hand, one of the key foundations of the Good Friday Agreement that ended the decades of violence in Northern Ireland. Consequently a failure to negotiate an agreement can endanger the peace process as a whole.

The purpose of the game is (i) to understand the obstacles of negotiations of political and economic agreements and (ii) to learn negotiation techniques (iii) to discuss international trade agreements and (iv) to evaluate costs and benefits of the EU membership. Additionally, students will get insight in forecasting of the effects of large events (like the Brexit).

The course is divided into three parts. Firstly we start with four lectures introducing the topic. That part is followed by the game itself. The course is concluded by a follow-up and short essay.

2) Course schedule

1 (19.2.)	Lecture 1 J. Baxa, V. Semerák	Game rules and general guidelines.
2 (26.2.)	Lecture 2 J. Baxa	The Road to Brexit
3 (5.3.)	Lecture 3 V. Semerák	Trade Agreements and the EU's Single Market
4 (12.3.)	Lecture 4 J. Baxa	Evaluating costs and benefits of Brexit I Predicting short-term effects of large shocks
5 (19.3.)	Lecture 5 V. Semerák	Evaluating costs and benefits of Brexit II Predicting long-term effects of large shocks
6 (26.3.)	Time for elaboration of the proposals and meeting with students	Teachers will meet with each group separately to ensure that all groups do understand their roles and tasks.
7 (9.4.)	Group presentations – analytical proposals	Groups are presenting their position papers
8 (16.4.)	Analytical proposals – review of the reports by other groups	Groups are reviewing the reports of the competing groups. Goal is to find weak and strong sides.
	1 st voting round	Groups must elect the binding analytical proposal / Groups must select alternatives for negotiations.
9 (23.4.)	Group presentations – policy maker perspective	Groups are presenting the policy proposals .
10 (30.4.)	Policy solution proposal – review of the reports by other groups	Groups are reviewing the reports of the competing groups. Goal is to find weak and strong sides.
	2 nd voting round	Groups must elect the final policy solution.
11 (7.5)	Follow up J. Baxa and V. Semerák	Critical review of the experience with all activities: negotiation within and between groups, voting negotiations, analysis of the winning proposals etc.
12 (14.5.)	Follow up J. Baxa and V. Semerák	Philosophical perspective – do we decide according to the facts and scientific arguments? Role of values, falsification criteria, etc. If time permits, discussion about the essays.

3) Game setting: Brexit and the problem of the Irish border

In the Brexit referendum, 51.9% of voters decided in favour of the U.K. leaving the European Union. Then, on 29 March 2017, the British Government invoked the Article 50 of the Treaty on the European Union. By this, the two-years long process of leaving the EU has been officially started and the U.K. is due to leave on 29 March 2019. Transitional agreements might be put in place afterwards for some, previously and legally unspecified, period.

However, negotiations about the conditions under which the U.K. leaves the EU are tricky. So far, the progress is rather limited and there are multiple issues upon which both parties are far from reaching an agreement. The list includes citizens' rights, financial settlements and future U.K.'s financial obligations, access to the Single Market. Generally, the U.K. wants to achieve as much independence as it gets while keeping access to the Single Market for some key sectors of the U.K.'s economy. On the other hand, the EU officials insist there is "no cherry-picking" in terms of the Single Market and excludes the sector-by-sector agreements from negotiations.

Somewhat interestingly, the most cumbersome negotiations are related to the border between the Republic of Ireland and the Northern Ireland. While Ireland, the EU as well as the UK want to retain the border open, the proposed future relationships seem to exclude this option. The border between Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland might remain open if and only if the UK remains in the single market or in customs union, however the UK strongly prefers ambitious free trade agreement. Keeping the border open is, on the other hand, one of the key foundations of the Good Friday Agreement that ended the decades of violence in Northern Ireland. Consequently a failure to negotiate an agreement can endanger the peace process as a whole.

The purpose of the game is to simulate the ongoing negotiations. The policy makers need to seek decisions in following areas:

- i) Whether the U.K. shall remain in the Single Market.
- ii) Whether the EU shall insist on its "no cherry-picking" principle.
- iii) If the U.K. decides to withdraw from the Single Market as well, whether it shall opt for the customs union or free trade area.
- iv) Whether there is a possibility how to keep the Irish government open while leaving the Single Market or customs union with the EU.
- v) Whether Ireland shall veto the agreement if a the resulting solution wouldn't permit the Irish border open.

If negotiations do not result in a ratified agreement, the U.K. leaves without an agreement, and the EU Treaties shall cease to apply without any substitute or transitional arrangements being put in place. As regards trade, the parties would likely follow World Trade Organisation rules on tariffs. These WTO tariffs range from 32 per cent on wine, to 4.1 per cent on liquefied natural gas, with items like cars (9.8 per cent) and wheat products (12.8 per cent) somewhere in between.

Regarding the Irish border, it would be closed and customs and passport controls will appear there.

Facts - Article 50 of the Treaty

Once triggered, there is a two-year period to complete negotiations. If negotiations do not result in a ratified agreement, the seceding country leaves without an agreement, and the EU Treaties shall cease to apply to the seceding country, without any substitute or transitional arrangements being put in place. As regards trade, the parties would likely follow World Trade Organisation rules on tariffs.

- The two-year period can be extended: unanimous vote by the Council.
- The UK shall not participate in discussions and decisions of the Council.
- The UK is supposed to be allowed to revise its intention to leave by the Treaty: "deal, no deal or no Brexit". But there is a consensus the Article 50 cannot be used to renegotiate better terms of membership.

The final agreement has to be ratified by the Parliament in the U.K. In the EU, the agreement needs to be ratified by the Council of the European Union (qualified majority, i.e. 55% of governments, 65% of EU citizens; blocking minority 4 governments and 35% of the EU population), after obtaining the consent of the European Parliament (simple majority).

UK trading partners: EU around 50%, U.S. 13%, China 3%.

Facts - Alternative options for the EU

The Swiss model: Under the Swiss model, the UK would have single market access for goods and services while retaining most aspects of national sovereignty. Switzerland, unlike other members of the European Free Trade Area (EFTA), did not join the European Economic Area (EEA) and was not automatically obliged to adopt freedom of movement, but it did so as a part of its relations with the EU. The EU is also not keen to accept any other Swiss-like model. Moreover, the Swiss model implies loss of access of the U.K. financial services on the EU market. See

https://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/politics/eu-negotiations_would-the-swiss-model-suit-a-post-brex-it-britain/42128110 and <https://www.politico.eu/article/brexiters-fear-swiss-trap-deal-for-britain/>.

The Norway way: As part of the European Economic Area, Norway has accepted freedom of movement – something that no Brexit-supporting UK government would be likely to do. Norway still has to obey many EU rules and is obliged to make a financial contribution to the bloc while having no voting rights. Some see this as the worst of both worlds. Note that Norway is strongly against special conditions for the U.K.

Turkey-style customs union: Turkey is the only major country to have a customs union with the EU, as part of a bilateral agreement. Under such an arrangement, the UK would not be allowed to negotiate trade deals outside the EU, instead having the bloc negotiate on its behalf. Many Brexiteers would be unwilling to accept this. It would, however, help minimize disruption at ports and, crucially, at the Irish border.

Definitions:

Free trade area (no tariffs, taxes or quotas but own external trade deals allowed, often a lot of exceptions; closed NI/Ireland border, hard form of Brexit in fact)

Customs union (same import duties, no own trade deals, free trade among members; no free trade for services, they face non tariff barriers; it would require acceptance of European Court of Justice judgement related to trade; likely not covering agriculture and fish; but it would allow open border between Ireland and Northern Ireland)

Single market (+ free movement of people, money and services).

Facts - Stages of negotiations

Phase 1 - Withdrawal arrangements.

Three negotiating groups: citizens' rights, financial settlement, "other separation issues" + separate dialogue on Ireland and Northern Ireland led by Barnier and Davis (principal negotiators of the EU and the UK).

Disagreement in following areas: the role of the European Court of Justice in enforcing citizens' rights, and the extent of the UK's financial obligations.

Draft of an agreement prepared in December 4 2017, agreement closed on December 8. However, many areas still open.

On the Irish border question there was a "breakthrough", with the British side guaranteeing free movement of EU citizens within the Common travel area constituting Ireland and the United Kingdom.

The deal: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/joint_report.pdf

<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-42280487>

Phase 2. Transitional arrangements + Future relationship

Necessary to translate the merits of the agreement to legal terms, UK proposed transition period for two years. The UK was hoping to settle the transition deal by March 2018 which seems not realistic right now. The council is to adopt negotiating directives on 29 February.

The EU's stance: Until everything settled, nothing negotiated.

4) The rules of the game

Students are divided into five groups (described below). Each group follows its own specific interests and has always one main goal (all other mentioned interests are regarded as secondary goals).

The game is composed of two main rounds. Each main round has its own two sub-rounds.

a) Goal of the game

Main goal of the game is to negotiate the solution of the Irish border. Each group has its own specific goals and one main goal. A group does not have to follow all goals except of the main one. Some secondary goals may be contradictory so the group must decide whether to balance both goals or follow primarily just one of them.

There are several potential outcomes of the crisis that can be voted:

- i) The U.K. remains in the EU or in the Single Market, or in the customs union. Irish border remains open.
- ii) The EU redefines conditions of its Single Market as a friendly gesture, the U.K. remains in the Single Market. Irish border remains open.
- iii) The U.K. and the EU reach an agreement to keep the Irish border open while the U.K. is allowed to leave the customs union.
- iv) Hard Brexit

Note that any other potential outcomes can emerge as a result of the game.

Each group has naturally different preferences towards the outcomes. The groups are expected to come up with their “distribution of preferences” towards each of the outcomes. We will discuss the chosen preferences with each group separately in the 6th week of the semester. However, we will not reveal the preferences to other group to avoid any improper intervention in the game.

b) Groups and their main interests

i) European Commission (EC) and European Parliament (EP)

Political position and national interests.

EU-wide bodies representing the EU policy stance, to some extent unifying positions of individual countries. The European Parliament is supposed to provide or not to provide consent with the negotiated agreement. The European Commission leads negotiation on behalf of the European Council which has the power to ratify the final agreement. The main interest of the group is the coherent and unified EU. The group has just one vote and one voice but representatives of both policymakers may be “publicly” active. All disagreements must be solved just within the group and should not be discussed openly in front of the other groups while that would significantly harm the reputation of both bodies.

Main interests

Unified EU able to reach consensus (main goal).

Irish border being open

Sticking with the EU rules / not willing to provide exceptions from the rules of the Single market

ii) United Kingdom

Political position and national interests.

Brexit seems to be a clear priority for the UK's government but the details are not known, yet. It seems the U.K. does not want to stay within the Single market since it requires free movement of people. The government of the U.K. needs to consider rising opposition towards the no-deal scenario sometimes proclaimed as a viable option by some policy makers.

Main interests

Brexit

Limited immigration and inference to the UK's law

Trade deal with the EU

Maintaining the Common Travel Area with Ireland

iii) Ireland

Political position and national interests.

To secure close ties with the U.K. and maintain the Irish border open. At the same time Ireland wish to remain in the EU thus it cannot resort to solutions beyond the existing EU wide regulation. On the other hand, Ireland is willing to veto any agreement without open Irish border.

Main interests

Irish border open

Remain in the EU

iv) Germany

Political position and national interests.

Germany is one of the key players in the EU Council. It is likely to accentuate trade deal and close relations with the U.K., but likely unwilling to accept modifications of the EU-wide rules and large exceptions. Aware of negative effects of Brexit on its industry.

Main interests

Trade deal

Few exceptions in the EU rules

v) France

Political position and national interests.

France is the other key player in the EU council but with own incentives. The French will unlikely accept an agreement that would allow the U.K. to secure better condition than within the EU.

Main interests

Brexit worse than membership

Reuters agency (Teachers)

Teachers do not take part in any official group. They have a role of supervisors and the Reuters news agency that in case of emergency or according to the situation may change anything in the game simply by informing players about news and unexpected development. Reuters teacher group therefore plays a role of Deus ex machina whenever they consider it as desirable.

c) Group composition and roles within group

The maximum number of members of the group is 6. Each member of the group has specific role. The roles within the group are following:

- ⌞ **Analysts** (prepare the analytical report and provide decision makers with necessary facts and background knowledge)
- ⌞ **Decision makers** (responsible for voting and negotiations between groups)
- ⌞ **Chair of the session** (role associated only to European Commission group – responsible for chairing the sessions)

Because the whole negotiation is lead by the European Commission, each session (sub-round) is chaired by one member from the EU commission group.

d) Main rounds

All rounds are organized and chaired by the EC group. The group is responsible for organizing the debates, voting and reaching the consensus.

i) First main round

In the **first main round** the students are playing a role of economic analysts of the five groups. The role of the analysts is to prepare a position paper explaining the situation from the perspective of each group. The aim is to deliver comprehensive and "true" interpretation of the reality and to select several proposals that can be considered as a feasible solution of the problem and to identify possible incompatibility with the EU legislation or existing trade deals.

As a "true" interpretation of reality we regard that one which is based on facts, logical reasoning and free of lies or manipulation with facts. However analysts of each group are expected to deliver different interpretation because of their different origin, interests or opinions.

In the **first sub-round** the position papers are presented by the analysts and the groups are free to discuss the proposed interpretations.

In the **second sub-round** there are two activities. At first the groups present critical review of the position paper of their opponents (according to the specific scheme) while the authors of the criticized analyses have the right to respond.

Alternative (last year)

Secondly, at the end of the sub-round the decision makers must meet after the session (organized by the EC-EP group) and vote for the position paper that would be since then regarded as the "true interpretation of reality" and binding for the final decision about the solution of the crisis. Every group has just one voice while the groups openly discuss and vote. The EC-EP group must prepare short report summarizing the reasons behind the final vote (half page is enough) and presenting the elected proposal. Any group can present more than one proposal that are allowed to be considered during the voting (e.g. group may present its solution proposal from the first-sub-round and also some more compromise variant). The voting follows the ranking and second-round rule (explained below in a separate section).

Alternative (proposed):

Secondly, at the end of the sub-round the decision makers must meet after the session (organized by the EC-ECB group) and vote for alternative proposals that will be considered for negotiations in the next round. If the selected proposals are in potential conflict with existing legislation or trade deals, the ways how to resolve these conflicts need to be negotiated in the next stage.

Every group has just one voice while the groups openly discuss and vote. The EC-EP group must prepare short report summarizing the reasons behind the final vote (half page is enough) and present the chosen alternatives. Any group can present more than one proposal that are allowed to be considered during the voting (e.g. group may present its solution proposal from the first-sub-round and also some more compromise variant) and more groups can present their joint proposals as well.

The voting rule (tentative): Each alternative proposal is accepted if not vetoed by any other group. Note that at this stage the group does not have to accept the alternative as such but it can express conditions upon which any alternative could be accepted. The veto shall be used if and only if the proposal is clearly unacceptable for the group. Each group must vote for “yes” or “no”. There is no neutral position possible.

Note that other voting rules are possible as well if they gain unanimous support.

Stage of the game		Activity	Goal of the activity
1 st main round	1 st sub-round	Position paper	Identifies/interprets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⌞ Sources of the crisis ⌞ Current situation ⌞ “Whom to blame”
	2 nd sub-round	Reviews of the position papers	Groups are reviewing the papers of the other groups (each group has been assigned as an opponent to another group). Each reviewed group has an opportunity to react and defend its position.
	2 nd sub-round	Voting the most appropriate analysis	Decision makers from each group are voting to select proposals available for the next round of negotiations. The EC-EP group as the organizer must prepare short report summarizing the reasons behind the final vote and presenting the elected proposal.
2 nd main round	1 st sub-round	Policy proposals	Presents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⌞ Solution of the crisis ⌞ Responsibilities of each group implied by the proposal
	2 nd sub-round	Reviews of the proposals	Groups are reviewing the other groups' proposals (each group has been assigned as an opponent to another group). Each reviewed group has an opportunity to react and defend its position.
	2 nd sub-round	Voting the solution	Decision makers from each group are negotiating and voting for the final agreement.

ii) Second main round

The goal of the **second main round** is to negotiate the final deal.

In the **first sub-round** each group (decision makers) must present its policy proposal of solution of the crisis which is then discussed. Each groups shall focus on conditions under which proposed alternatives can be accepted or to argue why some alternatives shall be rejected.

The **second sub-round** again consists of critical review of the policy reports by decision makers from each group. We will again assign a reviewer to each group. The reviewer shall focus on possible shortcomings of the proposals. At the end of the second sub-round the final negotiations take a place and policy makers need to finalize the agreement.

Again, any group can present more than one proposals that are considered during the voting.

The voting meeting must be again organized by the EC-ECB group. The voting follows the ranking and second-round rule (explained below in a separate section).

The voting rule (tentative): Each alternative proposal is accepted if not vetoed by any other group, hence the solution has to be accepted unanimously. If no solution agreed, hard Brexit without any deals will happen and the Irish border will get closed in March 2019.

Note that the EC-EP group as a chairman of the negotiations may propose its own voting mechanism (how to vote while obeying the ranking rule). However, that mechanism must be agreed unanimously by all groups.

5) Grading

The grading is composed of several graded activities:

Graded activities	Points	Notes
Position paper	0-20	
Voting on the position paper	10/15	10 - losing the vote; 15 - proposal of a group elected
Policy solution proposal	0-20	
Voting on the policy solution proposal	10/20	10 - losing the vote; 15 - proposal of a group elected
Written personal assessment - short essay	0-15	
Compliance of the final deal with group's main goals and preferences	0-10	
Bonus points for extraordinary performance	0-10	Excellent presentations or policy proposal etc.

Students have to participate in all activities to obtain the grade.

The grade is simply based on the total points the group achieves:

Grade	Points
1	100-90
2	89-80
3	79-70
4	69-60
5	59-60
6	49-0

a) Position paper and policy proposals

The presented position paper and policy proposals are graded according to several criteria:

- the quality of the content of the proposal and the logical structure of the argument, **(10p)**
- the language of the proposal **(5p)** and
- complying with the citation standards and the quality of the used sources. **(5p)**

Requirements

Position papers

The papers should have between 1000 – 1500 words.

The goal of the position paper is to identify:

- The nature of the problem from the point of view of each group. The point is to provide an interpretation of the reality that can, however, implicitly suggest potential negotiating power of each group as well.
- Desired outcome of negotiations and evaluation of alternatives (what the country wants to achieve)
- Identification of key issues in each alternatives subject to negotiations

The sources used for the arguments in the proposal should be of high quality. Groups are encouraged to use academic papers, official reports of various bodies (governments, international organizations, NGOs), respected newspaper articles (Economists, Financial Times, etc.), data or any other reliable sources. Blog discussions, Wikipedia or other commentaries are regarded as low-quality sources and will not guarantee high number of points during the assessment.

Policy proposal

The proposal should be large between 1000 – 1500 words

The goal of the proposal is to identify:

- solution of the problems related to Irish border preferred by the respective group based on the set of alternatives and issues negotiated in the first round
- solutions to possible issues that limit some of the negotiating parties to accept the proposed solution.
- proposals shall be realistic (feasible to implement)

The sources used for the arguments in the proposal should be of high quality. Groups are encouraged to use academic papers, official reports of various bodies (governments, international organizations, NGOs), respected newspaper articles (Economists, Financial Times, etc.), data or any other reliable sources. Blog discussions, Wikipedia or other commentaries are regarded as low-quality sources and will not guarantee high number of points during the assessment.

b) Voting on the proposals

A group that managed to negotiate that its proposal has been elected gets 15 points in the first round and 20 points in the second round. All other groups then get just 10 points. A group can therefore get at least 20 points (unsuccessful in both votes) or maximally 35 points (successful in both votes). Important feature of voting is that groups are allowed to present proposal jointly if there is consensus between them. Then all proposers receive 15 points in the first round or 20 points in the second one.

c) Written assessment – essay

Every participant must then write a short essay that will reflect the game and the activities from the perspective of philosophy of science. First, you are supposed to summarize your own personal reflection of the game in a short personal assessment. Focus on what has been the most interesting issue of the game for your own and whether your strategy would differ if you would negotiate again. Second, think about the game and its outcome from a broader perspective. Pick-up one of the following question and try to evaluate the outcome from that point of view.

Relevant questions for discussion:

- Was the negotiated proposal rational?
- Was the choice of the winning proposal motivated by the facts? Do facts matter in decisions or there are other, possibly more important factors?
- What was the role of arguments and what of rhetoric in the persuasion process?
- How did the choices the group took (on what is true or the final decision) reflect the practical aspect of the problem and the state of scientific knowledge of economics?
- Was there a clear divide between what is the problem and which theory is to be used for its solution?
- What is the Fact-Value distinction and is there one?
- Was the decision proposed ethically good?
- Is there a difference between the ethically good decision and the rational decision? Wherein lies the difference?
- Was there something suboptimal about the decision procedure?

Some links

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/decision-theory/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rationality-instrumental/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/value-theory/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/truth/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/methodological-individualism/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/holism-social/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/collective-intentionality/>

You might also discuss another question, but in that case, write us in advance to settle the topic.

Requirements on the essay:

The length of the essay (including personal statement) should be 1000 words. Not much more please. If the length is exceeded by more than 10%, we reserve our right to decrease the points by some penalty.

We demand any essay to have a certain level in the following areas: content, logical consistency, proper literature review, academic citation style, proper English. All these areas are part of the resulting grade. Do not underestimate appropriate citation styles. Inconsistency or evident citation style mistakes belong to the most common causes of lower grades, even though it is expected that on the master level any student is skilled in this area. We recommend using standard citation style like MLA¹ or APA².

¹<https://www.library.cornell.edu/research/citation/mla#mla>

²<http://www.apastyle.org/index.aspx>

We have to warn you against any **plagiarism** attempt. We check every essay using a very precise anti-plagiarism software. The consequences of any revealed cases of plagiarism are serious. A student can be called to the faculty disciplinary commission and his or her studies can even be terminated.

Tips on essay writing:

For some tips on essay writing either consult:

1) *Strategies for essay writing* by Harvard College Writing Center

<http://writingcenter.fas.harvard.edu/pages/strategies-essay-writing>

This is a great resource. It is online and it has very nice examples of how you should go about writing the essay. It goes through the whole process of writing essay, from choosing the topic, to editing of the essay. If you read and understand this text, then you will know how to write a good essay.

2) *The Basics of Essay Writing* by Nigel Warburton

This is a basic text, which you can read quickly and get your grip on the essay fast.

3) *How to write a Thesis* by Umberto Eco

This is for more serious students. Some points are a bit outdated, but there are many important lessons, which are not in the basic texts. It is more suited for longer pieces, like dissertation. Nonetheless, it applies to shorter texts very well.

4) Bird Nick *The Grading Key* <https://www.byrdnick.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/grading-shorthand-nick-byrd-public-domain.pdf>

This is quite a short key to how the essay will approximately be graded. If you will look at it, it can be a good guide to see what is expected of you.

Of course, these texts are supplementary – that means, it is far more preferable to start writing the essay and only consult the books on essays, than to read the books and deliberate on what the author did mean by some specific points. One learns most by doing and the same applies for essay writing. Writing an essay is mainly a technique, the knowledge of explicit rules is not needed to write a good essay, but they can be a good guide. First of all, do not be afraid to write and send something you have written. In the worst case scenario you will get to rework it with more notes on how to do it.

In the case of further problems write an e-mail to Andrej Virdzek - andrej.virdzek@gmail.com. Please understand, that if you are to write an essay you should start some time before the deadline. It is quite useless to start two days before deadline and then, when you get stuck, to complain about the rules of the essay not being made clear enough. If there is not something clear, write an e-mail and we will solve the problem.

For anybody who would just like to enjoy good essay writing (even though not academic) read: Montaigne, Michel; *Essays of Michel de Montaigne* Hume, David; *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary*

Some useful tools:

<http://www.voyant-tools.org/> - This application analyses your text so that you see how long your text is, how long your sentences are and which words are used repeatedly. When you stumble upon such a word, then use Thesaurus.

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/english-thesaurus> - Thesaurus gives you an option with many synonymous expressions.

Definitions

Please, if necessary to define non-technical terms, use Oxford English Dictionary (apart from the technical terms which are directly concerned with the subject matter, or the terms which you want, for good reasons, to define on your own):

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/>

For philosophical terms use either a philosophical dictionary or find a definition on the Stanford Encyclopedia for Philosophy. It is also good to look how the philosophical term stands in comparison to the term in ordinary language (so you can compare the OED definition with the philosophical use of the term).

a) Compliance of the final deal with group's main goals and preferences

Teachers will subjectively evaluate whether the groups were able to reach their main goals and preferences. This grading category therefore aims to evaluate a group's ability to play the game and defend its interests. We recognize that a group may be successful in the game even though that the final deal is not the "first best" for the group.

d) Bonus points

There are two ways how bonus points can be obtained: (1) Extraordinary performance in negotiations and (2) Detection of invalid arguments.

(1) There are many ways how to negotiate. Usually, a pro-active approach leads to desired outcomes likely than passive awaiting. Teachers can give bonus point for extraordinary good performance in negotiations.

(2) Any group may identify "invalid" arguments or other „deceptions“ of other groups that are based on lies, manipulation or loose thinking. The group will get **bonus point** for each successfully identified invalid argument or "deception". The bonus points are then added up at the end of the course.

Definition of the terms

It is important to note that these definitions are auxiliary and it will be up to the teachers to decide what counts and what doesn't count as their instantiation – what counts as invalid argument, what counts as a deception. We post them here mainly for information so that the members of the groups know what to expect in evaluation. In the end, the decision about which information regarding deception merits a point will be up to the teachers.

Deception is an act which has as its goal misinformation in a matter, which is important to judge the true nature of some state of affairs. It can be 1) a straightforward lie, or 2) intentional omission of a crucial fact, or 3) redefinition of terms in accordance with your goals against the normally

recognized and used definitions in the context or 4) use of some fact where it is uncalled for to switch attention.

Most importantly, every invalid argument regarding important matters to the conclusion of the game will be counted as a “deception”. If the other group identifies some deception from other groups, it can get a bonus point. But the identifying group needs to explain why this should count as a deception. A group must deliver very convincing and precise explanation why some argument is a deception.

Fact is a true proposition, that is a proposition which corresponds to the state of affairs in the world.

Proposition is a sentence generally used to state some fact.

How to properly identify an “invalid” argument

As mentioned above, the group must not only identify an “invalid” argument, but more importantly explain the reason for that accusation. Let’s suppose we have an argument A1 with premises:

P1. John is English and P2. Mary is a dancer therefore R1. John is English.

This is a formally valid argument, even though it is trivial. It is of form „P and Q therefore P“ which is a valid argument form, because you can use any true propositions as P and as Q and you will necessarily get true result. If you use false propositions you have a guarantee of a false result. But if I have an argument A2:

P1. Brad Pitt is from USA and

P2. John Smith owns a mobile phone therefore

R2. Donald Trump is the President of USA

Then the argument is invalid even though the result is true (the reason here is the non-sequitur, which means that the result doesn’t follow from the premises). There are many fallacies when presenting arguments, but also there are many ways in which argument can be valid (logical, causal etc.) Don’t feel intimidated, one has a very good intuition about what is and what is not valid in most cases. Also there is no loss for the group which sends some argument and the teachers account that it was a proper argument.

For a list of possible fallacies one can start here (there is no need to learn those, this is rather for your information): https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_fallacies

To identify the argument a group must send teachers an email where the argument of the other group is presented together with explanation why the argument should be regarded as a deception. Only then a group may receive bonus points. The email must be sent even though that the arguments were identified during the class. Only identification via email is considered by the teachers.

6) Free-rider problem

It may happen that a free rider problem appears during your group work (non-cooperative group members doing “nothing” and receiving grade for the work of others). If this happens please follow our recommended procedure that we can handle the issue effectively.

- 1) Inform the free-rider via email (there must be evidence of the conversation) that you demand his active cooperation. Describe the amount of work necessary for the assignment, division of labor within your group and therefore his duties.

- 2) If he still does not increase his activity to sufficient level, please inform us and forward us your mutual communication proving his unfulfilled duties. There must be of course evidence about the division of labor, therefore we recommend you always to inform each other about your mutual duties via email.
- 3) If the evidence is conclusive then we take adequate action (=no points for free-rider).