

Analysis #2: Case Study

Demonstrate your understanding of principles of **DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE** by:

- Reading case study 3.1 *Eminent Domain* (pp.107-110)
- Identifying **one distribution basis that supports** the use of eminent domain to promote economic growth in this case
- Explaining **why** that basis supports the use of eminent domain. Do this by...
 - Identifying features of the case that, together with the utilitarian theory of distributive justice, the libertarian theory of distributive justice, **OR** the Rawlsian theory of distributive justice would indicate that use of eminent domain is fair in this case.
 - Explaining why, if these features were missing from the case, the chosen theory of distributive justice would no longer support that basis of distribution.
- Identifying **one distribution basis that would prohibit** the use of eminent domain to promote economic growth in this case
- Explaining **why** that basis would prohibit the use of eminent domain. Do this by...
 - Identifying features of the case that, together with the utilitarian theory of distributive justice, the libertarian theory of distributive justice, **OR** the Rawlsian theory of distributive justice would indicate that use of eminent domain is unfair in this case.
 - Explaining why, if these features were missing from the case, the chosen theory of distributive justice might support that basis of distribution.

Further Instructions:

- Your analysis should be printed in double-spaced 12 point times new roman (or similar).
- Your analysis should be two paragraphs long and between 200 and 300 words.
- Staple this assignment sheet at the end of your analysis (I use it for grading).
- Turn this assignment in at the beginning of class the day it is due.

Understanding the Rubric (on the back): The numbers next to the areas, e.g. (x.4), indicate the weight of each area. Thus, an area with a weight of (x.4) is twice as important as one with a weight of (x.2). For example:

Area	Unweighted Score	Weighted Score
Accuracy (x.4)	4	1.6
Completeness (x.4)	3	1.2
Clarity (x.2)	2	.4
Total	12/16	$3.2 / 4 = 80\% = 4.8 / 6$

	0	1	2	3	4
Accuracy (x.4)	- Use and explanation do not demonstrate that any of the bases of distribution and theories of distributive justice used are roughly understood.	- Use and explanation demonstrate that some of the bases of distribution and theories of distributive justice used are roughly understood.	- Use and explanation demonstrate that all of the bases of distribution and theories of distributive justice used are roughly understood.	- Use and explanation demonstrate that some of the bases of distribution and theories of distributive justice used are well understood, and all are roughly understood.	- Use and explanation demonstrate that all of the bases of distribution and theories of distributive justice used are well understood.
Completeness (x.4)	None or only one of the following are present: (1) a distribution basis that supports the use of eminent domain, (2) a feature of the case and (3) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, (4) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would not longer support the use of eminent domain, (5) a distribution basis that prohibits the use of eminent domain, (6) a feature of the case and (7) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, and (8) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would no longer prohibit the use of eminent domain.	- Two or three of the following are present: (1) a distribution basis that supports the use of eminent domain, (2) a feature of the case and (3) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, (4) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would not longer support the use of eminent domain, (5) a distribution basis that prohibits the use of eminent domain, (6) a feature of the case and (7) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, and (8) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would no longer prohibit the use of eminent domain.	- Four or five of the following are present: (1) a distribution basis that supports the use of eminent domain, (2) a feature of the case and (3) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, (4) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would not longer support the use of eminent domain, (5) a distribution basis that prohibits the use of eminent domain, (6) a feature of the case and (7) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, and (8) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would no longer prohibit the use of eminent domain.	- Six or seven of the following are present: (1) a distribution basis that supports the use of eminent domain, (2) a feature of the case and (3) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, (4) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would not longer support the use of eminent domain, (5) a distribution basis that prohibits the use of eminent domain, (6) a feature of the case and (7) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, and (8) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would no longer prohibit the use of eminent domain.	- All of the following are present: (1) a distribution basis that supports the use of eminent domain, (2) a feature of the case and (3) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, (4) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would not longer support the use of eminent domain, (5) a distribution basis that prohibits the use of eminent domain, (6) a feature of the case and (7) a theory of distributive justice that together explain why that basis of distribution might be fair, and (8) an explanation of why, if that feature were missing, that theory of distributive justice would no longer prohibit the use of eminent domain.
Clarity (x.2)	- Components of analysis cannot be identified, OR - Why the features of the case along with the theory of distributive justice are thought to support a given basis of distribution are not evidence	- Components of analysis are identified with difficulty, AND - Why the features of the case along with the theory of distributive justice are thought to support a given basis of distribution is evident but not clearly explained AND - Confusing or incomplete claims in key areas.	- Components of analysis are identified with difficulty, AND - Why the features of the case along with the theory of distributive justice are thought to support a given basis of distribution is evident but not clearly explained, AND - No confusing or incomplete claims in key areas.	- Components of analysis are easily identified, AND - Why the features of the case along with the theory of distributive justice are thought to support a given basis of distribution is clearly explained, AND - No confusing or incomplete claims in key areas.	- Components of analysis are easily identified, AND - Why the features of the case along with the theory of distributive justice are thought to support a given basis of distribution is clearly explained, AND - No confusing or incomplete claims, AND - Unnecessary information is not included.

Total: / 4 = % = / 10