

Instructor's Manual and Test Bank to accompany

***Ethics, Left and Right:
The Moral Issues That Divide Us***

First Edition

by Bob Fischer

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Dustin Crummett and Chad McIntosh, “Introduction to the Left and Right”	3
Chapter 2: Dan Bonevac and Gillian Brock, “America First”	8
Chapter 3: Nicole Hassoun and Jason Brennan, “Foreign Aid”	12
Chapter 4: Peter Jaworski and Hrishikesh Joshi, “Immigration”	17
Chapter 5: I. G. and Saba Fatima, “Religious Tests”	21
Chapter 6: Bruno Verbeek and Michael Huemer, “Taxation”	26
Chapter 7: Mark Reiff and John Gaski, “Minimum Wage”	31
Chapter 8: Seth Mayer and Dan Shahar, “Environmental Regulation”	36
Chapter 9: Sam Fleishacker & Sherry Glied and Chris Freiman, “Right to Healthcare”	41
Chapter 10: Christopher Tollefsen and Nathan Nobis, “Abortion”	46
Chapter 11: Tully Borland and Megan Hyska, “Political Correctness”	51
Chapter 12: John Corvino and Ryan Anderson & Sherif Girgis, “Religious Exceptions”	55
Chapter 13: Loren Cannon and Vaughn Baltzly, “Bathroom Bills”	60
Chapter 14: Dan Lowe and Spencer Case, “Privilege”	64
Chapter 15: Philippe Lemoine and Rebecca Tuvel, “Feminism”	67
Chapter 16: Travis Timmerman and Dan Demetriou, “Removing Historic Monuments”	72
Chapter 17: Stephen Kershnar and Kristina Meshelski, “Affirmative Action”	77
Chapter 18: Annabelle Lever and Allan Hillman, “Racial Profiling”	80
Chapter 19: Luke Maring and Tim Hsiao, “Guns”	86
Chapter 20: Mark Zelcer and Jen Kling, “Military Spending”	90
Chapter 21: Michael LaBossiere and Patrick Taylor Smith, “Voting Ethics”	94

Chapter 1:

Dustin Crummett and Chad McIntosh, “Introduction to the Left and Right”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Chad McIntosh claims that “The cold hard truth, one acknowledged by nearly every keen observer of humanity throughout history, is that the arc of man’s moral nature is long, and it bends not toward justice, but evil.” In your essay, explain what McIntosh describes as the problem of the “ineradicability of evil.” Do you think that the problem of evil really is ineradicable? Or, do you think that there are things that we can do to manage “human wickedness”? Defend your claim, providing an example that helps to illustrate your point.

A good essay will:

- Describe what McIntosh means by the “ineradicability of evil,” drawing from his essay
- Argue that it is not possible to overcome evil that humans perpetuate. Or,
- Argue that there are measures that societies can take to temper the problem of evil. Or,
- Argue that some combination of the above-mentioned stances is possible and defensible
- Provide an illustrative example that helps to illuminate this claim, expounding upon one of the cases brought up in this debate, or introducing a new example

2. In his essay, Dustin Crummett explains part of what is involved in the social egalitarian picture. He says:

When it comes to power relations, egalitarians generally support making them *reciprocal* where possible, so that no one has *unaccountable* power over another. ... Where this reciprocity isn’t feasible—as may be the case with, say, a sergeant and a private—egalitarians still insist that the authority possessed by the superior must be justified in terms of the general good, and must be *only* that which is necessary to promote that good. Clearly, Crummett believes that people in power should be held accountable and that power can be justified when it promotes the common good. In your essay, offer a description of what it would look like to make sure that people in power are held accountable. Then, explain what would be involved in checking to see if power does, in fact, uphold the general good. Finally,

consider whether the processes you've described are implementable in real-world cases. Briefly consider, does your description complicate or support Crummett's picture?

A good essay will:

- Offer a description, perhaps providing an example, of what would be involved in holding people in power accountable for their power
- Offer a description, perhaps providing an example, of what would be involved in ensuring that some exercise of power can be justified by reference to the common good
- Consider whether these measures could be implemented in real world cases
- Briefly link this discussion to the wider left vs. right debate

3. In their replies, Dustin Crummett and Chad McIntosh clash over their understandings of the relationship between freedom and equality. Crummett affirms that "Social equality is *necessary* for freedom worth having," while McIntosh says that "You can't have both a government powerful enough to enforce social equality *and* a free democracy devoid of the possibility of social inequalities." In your essay, defend a view about the relative worth of Crummett's "freedom worth having" and McIntosh's free democracies.

A good essay will:

- Explain the meanings of the terms at issue
- Provide a case for the relative importance or unimportance of "freedom worth having" and free democracies
- Draw on the arguments that Crummett and/or McIntosh give, as appropriate

Quiz Questions

1. Throughout his essay, Crummett explains and considers the implications of a key view for his position. What is it?

- a. Anti-oppression Activism
- b. Social Egalitarianism**
- c. Nationalist Isolationism
- d. Economic Redistributionism

2. *In his essay, which description of equality does Crummett support?
- a. People should be made equally well-off
 - b. People should be treated the same
 - c. People should all share the same amount of power
 - d. People should enjoy equal relationships with each other**
3. In his essay, Crummett describes four types of unequal relations between groups. Which of the following is NOT one of those relations?
- a. Domination
 - b. Degradation**
 - c. Disregard
 - d. Exploitation
4. *In his essay, McIntosh affirms that conservatism is all about _____:
- a. Conserving the tried and true**
 - b. Maintenance of the status quo
 - c. Allegiance to past institutional structures
 - d. The practice of compassion and fairness
5. In his essay, what does McIntosh claim is the most basic unit in society?
- a. The individual
 - b. Local governments
 - c. The family**
 - d. Grassroots movements
6. In his essay, McIntosh includes multiple pop-culture references in order to illustrate his points. Which of the following is NOT one of those references?
- a. Christopher Nolan's *The Dark Knight*
 - b. J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*
 - c. John Lennon's "Imagine"

d. C.S. Lewis' *The Chronicles of Narnia*

7. In his essay, McIntosh claims: "Diversity *per se*, far from being bad, is good. What's bad is *unity* in diversity."

- a. True
- b. False**

8. *In his reply, Crummett focuses on McIntosh's views on two particular issues. What are they?

- a. Equality and justice
- b. Liberty and labor
- c. Freedom and equality**
- d. Totalitarianism and anarchy

9. *In his reply, McIntosh offers five objections to McIntosh's position. Which of the following is NOT one of those objections?

- a. Social equality demands too much sacrifice from family units**
- b. The ideal of social equality fosters undue skepticism of all hierarchies
- c. Attempting to enforce social equality with the law is unjust and self-refuting
- d. The concern for social equality seems curiously selective

10. *Which author expresses the concern that Americans are currently living "under someone else's thumb" in his reply?

- a. Dustin Crummett**
- b. Chad McIntosh

Media Links

TED-Ed "The Moral Roots of Liberals and Conservatives"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8SOQduoLgRw>

Great Thinkers "Edmund Burke"

<https://thegreatthinkers.org/burke/>

Daily Nous “Analytic Philosophy’s Egalitarianism and Standpoint Epistemology’s Privileging”

<http://dailynous.com/2017/10/23/analytic-philosophy-egalitarianism-standpoint-epistemology-privileging/>

Chapter 2:

Dan Bonevac and Gillian Brock, “America First”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Daniel Bonevac covers four different philosophical theories—virtue ethics, consequentialism, Kantianism, and moral foundations theory—and shows how each supports his thesis. Which of these theory-driven arguments do you find *most* convincing? Why? Which do you find *least* convincing? Why? Do not simply say *that* you agree and disagree, or that Bonevac’s points match your opinions. Instead, be sure to argue for your positions.

A good essay will:

- Explain one of Bonevac’s theory-driven arguments, and provide an original argument for why it succeeds
- Explain one of Bonevac’s theory-driven arguments, and provide an original argument for why it fails

2. In her reply, Gillian Brock says:

Partiality clearly has some important role to play in our moral lives. However, just as partiality towards (say) family members or friends may be justified in some cases and not others, partiality towards co-nationals will be similarly circumscribed.

In your essay, give an example of a case where partiality would be morally justified in a person’s life. Why would it be justified? Does this justification of acceptable *interpersonal* partiality extend to *international* relationships? In other words, can you identify a case where the reason why it’s morally okay to be partial interpersonally is also a sufficient reason to be partial internationally? How does your case relate to the wider debate that Brock and Daniel Bonevac are having?

A good essay will:

- Offer an example of interpersonal partiality, and argue why it is morally justified
- Explore this example to argue whether some feature of it can be extended to international relationships. Or,
- Explore this example to argue that it cannot be extended to international relationships

- Link the essay's central example to the larger America first debate

3. Daniel Bonevac and Gillian Brock agree that there will be more than one nation even in an ideal world. But they believe for this different reasons. What are those reasons? Which are more plausible? Why?

A good essay will:

- Accurately explain the views of both authors
- Highlight the differences between these views
- Create and elaborate on an example, or otherwise provide an argument, that helps to show why we might find one or the other set of reasons more compelling

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Bonevac argues for what thesis?

- a. The Moral Foundations Thesis
- b. The Cosmopolitan Thesis
- c. The America First Thesis
- d. The Priority Thesis**

2. In his essay, Bonevac claims that Kantianism promotes cosmopolitanism:

- a. True
- b. False**

3. *In his essay, Bonevac argues that which three of Jonathan Haidt's foundations support Bonevac's thesis?

- a. Loyalty, authority, and sanctity**
- b. Care, fairness, and reciprocity
- c. Loyalty, fairness, and justice
- d. Peace, prosperity, and equality

4. In her essay, Brock argues that states should be eradicated in favor of a more cosmopolitan global community

a. True

b. False

5. *Which of the following is NOT one the central scaffolds to Brock's Moral Equality Imperative?

a. One should be enabled to meet one's basic needs

b. One must have adequate protection for one's basic liberties

c. Fair terms of cooperation should govern one's collective endeavors

d. One should have recourse to other nations' goods and properties

6. Brock is concerned with balancing which two types of justice?

a. Individual and communal

b. Distributive and restorative

c. Local and global

d. Social and political

7. *Which author makes the claim: "The current pressing issue is not, "Should we be nationalists or cosmopolitans?" Rather, there is much scope for showing creative ways to accommodate the plausible elements in both theories into one coherent, comprehensive, and compelling account."

a. Daniel Bonevac

b. Gillian Brock

8. Which of the authors expresses serious concern over the idea of "cosmic justice" in their reply?

a. Daniel Bonevac

b. Gillian Brock

9. *In her reply, Brock affirms that she does not want to challenge the idea that _____ should have a role to play in our lives:

- a. Cooperation
- b. Fairness
- c. Partiality**
- d. Care

10. *In his reply, Bonevac claims that these two things are problematic about cooperation:

- a. Cooperation is not always just and cooperation is not always fair
- b. Cooperation is not always possible and cooperation is not always good**
- c. Cooperation is not always possible and cooperation is not always fair
- d. Cooperation is not always friendly and cooperation is not always reciprocal

Media Links

The Daily “How the U.S. Military Interprets ‘America First’”

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/14/podcasts/the-daily/the-daily-how-the-us-military-interprets-america-first.html>

Aeon “When I help you, I also help myself: on being a cosmopolitan”

<https://aeon.co/ideas/when-i-help-you-i-also-help-myself-on-being-a-cosmopolitan>

The New York Times “Transcript: Donald Trump Expounds on His Foreign Policy Views,” see the section titled “America First”

<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/27/us/politics/donald-trump-transcript.html>

Chapter 3:

Nicole Hassoun and Jason Brennan, “Foreign Aid”

Essay Questions

1. Toward the end of her essay, Nicole Hassoun writes:

Billions lack access to clean water in their homes and access to essential health services. Millions lack access to adequate sanitation, food, and shelter. Foreign aid alone will not completely solve these problems, but it can help many people live minimally good lives. We should not neglect the water for the sea. Saving even one life is a good thing. A great thing.

In your essay, develop a possible challenge to what Hassoun says. Why might someone doubt that arguments like this—that focus on the goodness of saving “even one life”—should guide countries’ aid giving activity abroad?

A good essay will:

- Explain this claim of Hassoun’s
- Provide a reasonable criticism of Hassoun’s position

2. Throughout Jason Brennan’s essay, he raises a number of concerns with the way that philosophers tend to think about the foreign aid question. In your essay, explain one or more of these concerns. To what extent do Nicole Hassoun’s arguments have one or more of the problems that Brennan describes?

A good essay will:

- Identify and explain one or more of the passages where Brennan takes issue with philosophers’ arguments on aid in his essay (i.e— “This is a topic where normative reasoning and moral philosophy, in isolation, tend to lead us astray;” “Philosophy might uncover what our obligations are *in light of the facts*, but it does not help us discover what the facts are;” “But economics, surprisingly, tells us that philosophers are bad at philosophy. The problem is that these three thought experiments, and all the variations on them, are *irrelevant*;” “Philosophers tend to advocate the policies economists know don’t work, and tend to reject the institutions economists know work;” “Philosophers think the actual world is analogous to thought experiments like these. This makes foreign aid seem morally mandatory;” etc.)

- Develop an argument, drawing from specific elements in Hassoun's essay, to show how her essay either is or is not an instance of the problems that Brennan describes
- An excellent essay *will not* make the part to whole fallacy, suggesting that just because Hassoun's essay does/does not fit the pattern Brennan points to, her work proves/disproves Brennan's point

3. In their replies, Jason Brennan and Nicole Hassoun dig into the issue of whether or not aid is effective in building "good institutions" in the countries where aid is received. This is an area where Brennan and Hassoun disagree. In your essay, explain their disagreement, drawing from both of their works. Then, briefly describe the extent to which you take this issue to be a central one in the aid debate. In other words, how much rides on whether aid builds good institutions? Could it usually be justified even if aid doesn't accomplish this?

A good essay will:

- Provide textual support for each author's claim(s) on aid's efficacy in the construction of "good institutions"

Then, the essay will either:

- Provide a plausible argument for the centrality of institution building in the foreign aid project; or
- Provide a plausible argument against the centrality of institution building

Quiz Questions

1. Hassoun's essay affirms that a "minimally good life" is one where _____.
 - a. One is better off than (s)he would be not having existed at all
 - b. One can secure what (s)he needs without aid
 - c. One lives well enough**
 - d. One is reasonable, caring, and free
2. In her essay, Hassoun outlines two moral arguments for aid. Identify one of those arguments:
 - a. Redistributive justice demands aid

- b. **Reasonable, caring, and free persons have strong reason to aid**
- c. We have an obligation to help everyone live a minimally good life
- d. Aid is always effective and productive, so we have a strong reason to aid

3. *In her conclusion, Hassoun affirms that foreign aid should stem from _____:

- a. A recognition of the injustices that created inequalities in the first place
- b. A desire to increase pleasure and reduce pain
- c. An organized effort to end corruption and ineffective global institutions
- d. **A desire to help others live minimally good lives**

4. Throughout his essay, Brennan relies on tools from which discipline to build his case?

- a. **Economics**
- b. Sociology
- c. Psychology
- d. Geography

5. *In his essay, Brennan affirms that there are two *wrong* answers when it comes to answering the question of why some countries are richer than others. What are they?

- a. Institutions and imperialism
- b. **Natural resources and imperialism**
- c. Isolation and under-development
- d. Institutions and open borders

6. In his essay, Brennan argues that if we could get wealthy adults to donate 15 cents a day, we could end world poverty, but people don't have an obligation to aid.

- a. True
- b. **False**

7. *Which of the authors affirms the following in their conclusion: "An obligation to help the poor is an obligation to actually help them. Good intentions don't matter"?

- a. Nicole Hassoun

b. Jason Brennan

8. *In his reply, Brennan suggests that there is a basic problem that philosophers ignore. What is it?

- a. No forms of aid do good
- b. Providing help for others, while admirable, is never obligatory
- c. Aid doesn't cause development**
- d. There's no such thing as a right to a decent life

9. In her reply, Hassoun suggests that she and Brennan agree about many things. Which of the following is one of those things?

- a. Aid can do some good**
- b. It is possible for foreigners to build good institutions
- c. Developed countries harmed people in developing countries
- d. Causes of poverty are complex

10. *In her reply, Hassoun disagrees with which of Brennan's guiding ideas?

- a. Access to natural resources inhibits a country's growth
- b. Aid should do good for individuals
- c. Poor countries stay poor because of their institutions
- d. Aid should increase economic growth**

Media Links

The Washington Times "GOP appropriators urge Trump to reconsider cuts to foreign aid"

<https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2019/aug/16/gop-appropriators-urge-trump-reconsider-cuts-forei/>

Aeon "After the Storm"

<https://aeon.co/essays/disaster-relief-as-a-threat-to-state-sovereignty>

TED “Friendly Fire: How Foreign Aid Hurts Development”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H-Q3zWv0Evw>

Chapter 4:
Peter Jaworski and Hrishikesh Joshi, “Immigration”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Jaworski claims that “The difference between Arlingtonians and Tangipahoans is about the same as the difference between Arlingtonians and Tamaulipasians.” In your essay, first explain what Jaworski means by this. Then, present a potential criticism of Jaworski’s view.

How might someone argue that these differences aren’t the same?

A good essay will:

- Explain this claim of Jaworski’s
- Provide a thoughtful reply to Jaworski’s point.

2. In his essay, Joshi states that “A major theme in the recent literature making such a case is that we should think of non-coercion as the moral default.” Then, he goes on to consider a variety of purposes for which it’s plausible that state coercion is justified. In your essay, examine the relevance of these purposes to the issue of immigration. Why might someone think that even if some state coercion is justified, those reasons don’t cover the kind of immigration restrictions that Joshi supports?

A good essay will:

- Provide an explanation for Joshi’s claim on coercion’s justifiability
- Explain some potential disanalogies between the cases that Joshi discusses and immigration

3. As Jaworski and Joshi’s replies show, a lot of the immigration debate hinges around the question of how much there is to be gained from freedom of movement. In your essay, explain both Jaworski’s and Joshi’s take on the freedom of movement question, drawing from both of their works. Then, defend your own view and explain what you take your view to imply for the immigration debate.

A good essay will:

- Present both Jaworski's and Joshi's explanations of the importance of freedom of movement. The author may draw from either the replies, or perhaps especially in Jaworski's case, the essay
- Provide a plausible argument for the importance or irrelevance of freedom of movement when confronting the wider question of immigration policy

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Jaworski compares restrictions on labor mobility to what act?
 - a. Not claiming a winning lottery ticket
 - b. Keeping Louisianians out of Virginia
 - c. Leaving a trillion dollars on the ground**
 - d. Refusing to accept a generous birthday gift

2. *In his essay, Jaworski argues that if you want borders to protect culture, then you should do what?
 - a. Erase all borders
 - b. Use cultural information to carefully monitor interstate activity
 - c. Use current borders to sort countries by culture
 - d. Use cultural information to draw borders within countries**

3. In his essay, Jaworski suggests that if you are worried about keeping outsider criminals out, you also have reason to do what?
 - a. Ship some insiders out**
 - b. Import some outsider law enforcement
 - c. Tax insider criminals more
 - d. Not allow any outsiders in

4. In his essay, Joshi uses two different moral frameworks to argue for his thesis. What are they?
 - a. Deontological and consequentialist**
 - b. Deontological and virtue ethical

- c. Contractarian and consequentialist
- d. Care ethical and virtue ethical

5. *In his essay, Joshi argues that there are three cases where states can legitimately use coercion. Which of the following is NOT one of those cases?

- a. To prevent negative externalities
- b. To protect the existence of valuable things
- c. To preserve liberal norms and values**
- d. To promote the interests of their low socioeconomic status residents

6. The arguments in Joshi's essay point to what kind of an immigration policy?

- a. Open borders
- b. Filtered restriction**
- c. Zero admittance
- d. Point-based

7. *Which author(s) make(s) the argument that weighing the effect of open borders on countries' GDP should play a role in answering the immigration question?

- a. Peter Jaworski
- b. Hrishikesh Joshi
- c. Both authors**
- d. Neither author

8. *In his reply, Jaworski affirms that we mustn't ever change our constitution in order to protect wealth-creating and rights-protecting institutions.

- a. True
- b. False**

9. What is one of the examples that Joshi points to when he lists the core values that might be threatened by open borders?

- a. Spoken language

- b. Women's role in society**
- c. Culinary tradition
- d. National pride

10. *Which author finishes his reply by affirming, "When thinking about immigration policy, we must look at our *non-ideal* world and its dynamics."

- a. Peter Jaworski
- b. Hrishikesh Joshi**

Media Links

Pew Research Center "Facts on U.S. Immigrants, 2017"

<https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2019/06/03/facts-on-u-s-immigrants/?fbclid=IwAR2x48Ub3tJe3U9oyHDIpLwCzbJRF1-OIj1wRY1lSKhqJRZf3ig107li6YY>

The Daily "Waiting for the Immigration Raids"

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/15/podcasts/the-daily/immigration-raids-ice.html?>

Aeon "For a radical new perspective on immigration, picture the US as an ancient tree"

<https://aeon.co/videos/for-a-radical-new-perspective-on-immigration-picture-the-us-as-an-ancient-tree>

Chapter 5:

I. G. and Saba Fatima, “Religious Tests”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, I. G. raises an ethical problem—the banality of evil. I. G. affirms that the banality of evil poses a problem within the Muslim community. In your essay, explain what I. G. means by “the banality of evil.” Then, offer an example of your own that illustrates the problem of the banality of evil. Finally, defend or object to this claim: religious tests are an adequate response to the problem that the banality of evil poses.

A good essay will:

- Explain I. G.’s understanding of the banality of evil, particularly within Muslim communities, drawing from the essay itself
- Offer an original example that is itself an example of the banality of evil
- Develop an argument either defending or objecting to the claim “religious tests are an adequate response to the problem that the banality of evil poses.”
- A strong, original argument will appeal to examples, either imagined or historical, perhaps including the particular example of Muslim immigration bans

2. Saba Fatima is worried about government-instituted thought policing. In her section on that topic, she claims:

A government-backed inquiry into ideological beliefs is a dangerous precedent to follow, especially when it comes to communities that are already stigmatized and vulnerable ... Once a tool for surveilling people’s ideologies is put in place, its parameters can evolve to suit the needs of the state and what it deems as threatening. The primary purpose of a state apparatus then becomes to preserve itself rather than to serve the people.

Do you think that it’s a problem for the primary purpose of some state apparatus to be state self-preservation rather than service of state citizens? Or, do you think that there are cases where it’s justified for a tool’s purpose to be state self-preservation? Defend your answer, linking it to the wider question of instituting religious tests.

A good essay will:

- Explain the choice between state self-preservation and citizen protection, as it pertains to implementing new apparatuses
- Argue that it is justified for a tool's purpose to be state self-preservation. Or,
- Argue that it is not justified for a tool's purpose to be state self-preservation
- Defend the answer to this justification question, exploring its relevance to the religious test question

3. In her reply, Saba Fatima is clearly worried about punishing an individual for the sins of her group. On the other hand, I. G.'s reply shows that the author is worried about not letting in potential terrorizers, even if it means keeping out individuals who are "hardworking, cultured, and law-abiding." What do you think is more important: protecting some group from potential harm, even if it means punishing some innocent people; or, engaging in potentially risky behavior, if it means protecting innocent people?

A good essay will:

- Provide some context for this debate, drawing from Fatima's reply to illustrate her concern over allowing religious tests to punish individuals "for the sins of 'their' people," and from I. G.'s' reply, particularly from the author's discussion on quotas
- Develop an argument that offers some guidance on how to balance precautionary measures against individual liberties
- Link up, at least to some degree, with the larger religious tests debate

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, I. G. claims that what happens as Islam spreads in society?

- a. **A culture of fear flourishes**
- b. Muslims become poorer
- c. Countries go to war
- d. Fewer people uphold Christian values

2. In his essay, I. G. raises a number of concerns with ideological violence, in particular. Which of the following is NOT one of those concerns?

- a. Violence begets violence
- b. It's difficult to react calmly to ideological violence
- c. The perpetrators effectively terrorize dissenters
- d. Ideological violence is hard to identify in practice**

3. *In his essay, I. G. suggests that problem with the banality of evil is that in communities where atrocities are committed, *most* people _____:

- a. Are violent
- b. Follow evil orders
- c. Don't care enough to change
- d. Look the other way**

4. In her essay, Fatima argues that religious based immigration tests will lead to a number of outcomes. Which of the following is NOT one of those outcomes?

- a. Anti-Muslim racism
- b. Ideological policing
- c. A comprehensive immigration system**
- d. Minorities will be deemed outsiders

5. In her essay, Fatima likens barring entry to Muslims to what act in American history?

- a. Turning ships of Holocaust survivors away**
- b. Incarcerating communists in the 1950s
- c. Racist messaging during the Vietnam War
- d. The bombing of Hiroshima

6. *In her essay, Fatima affirms that we do what in the name of protecting religious liberty in America?

- a. Whatever it takes
- b. Tolerate many abhorrent beliefs**

- c. Criminalize people who threaten it
- d. Promote open-mindedness and civility

7. Both authors agree with which the following claim: only a small minority of Muslims are perpetrators of violence

- a. **True**
- b. False

8. *In his reply, I. G. argues that what form of action in the religious tests decision is the best overall?

- a. Strict quotas
- b. The lottery system
- c. **A complete ban**
- d. A rigorous interview process

9. *In her reply, Fatima suggests that the main perpetrators of a culture of fear are not single religious groups, but rather _____:

- a. Corrupt religious leaders
- b. Misogynist cultures
- c. Illiberal societies
- d. **Authoritarian regimes**

10. *Which author begins their reply by affirming: “we can’t determine which aspect or version of Islam is to blame for the acts we call ‘Islamic terrorism.’ Moreover, even if we could, it would be impossible to find out who subscribes to it.”?

- a. **I. G.**
- b. Saba Fatima

Media Links

The Daily “Is China Really Freeing Uighurs?”

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/15/podcasts/the-daily/china-xinjiang-ughur-detention.html>

TED “What Islam really says about women?”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FETryXMpDl8>

The Washington Post “Will we be forced into a religious test? The dangerous questions Muslims are facing.”

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2017/01/28/will-we-be-forced-into-a-religious-test-the-dangerous-questions-muslims-are-facing/>

Chapter 6:
Bruno Verbeek and Michael Huemer, “Taxation”

Essay Questions

1. Michael Huemer believes that the current taxation exploits the wealthy. He affirms:

Many people assume as a matter of course that “the rich” or “the super-rich” as a class are immoral, that they are taking advantage of the rest of us, that they are failing to do “their fair share” for society. The truth is the exact opposite: It is the rest of us who refuse to do our fair share. It is we who are exploiting the rich. Through our representatives, we impose tax laws that force the wealthy to carry the entire burden of paying for government *and then some*.

In your essay, explain what Huemer means when he talks about exploitation in this context.

Then, think of a reasonable criticism of Huemer’s understanding of exploitation. How might someone respond to him, arguing that the behavior he describes is *not* an unjust, exploitative act? What kind of understanding of exploitation would you have to adopt in order to disagree with Huemer on this point?

A good essay will:

- Explain Michael Huemer’s worry that progressive taxation is exploitative, illustrating the link that he makes between exploitation and unfairness
- Offer an original argument as to why this understanding of exploitation is either incomplete, irrelevant to the taxation debate, or fundamentally mistaken
- Effectively describe the understanding of exploitation that one would have to adopt in order to forward the essay’s counter-argument

2. In his essay, Bruno Verbeek introduces and defends the ability-to-pay principle. In your essay, explain this principle. Do you think it is fair for “the strongest shoulders” to carry most of the weight? Or, do you think that there are situations where placing greater burdens on stronger persons or groups is unfair? Defend your answer. Then, explain your answer’s implications for the taxation debate.

A good essay will:

- Explain the ability-to-pay principle, drawing from Verbeek’s essay or reply

- Evaluate this principle in order to argue that it is either a fair principle. Or,
- Evaluate this principle in order to argue that it is an unfair principle
- Link the essay's evaluation of the ability-to-pay concept to the taxation debate

3. In his section "What Is a Fair Tax?," Michael Huemer argues that certain progressive principles are incompatible with common sense moral judgments. In your essay, answer this question: how important is it that our policies are justified based on common sense moral judgments? In other words, are there situations where common sense isn't particularly relevant, in which it's OK if the right course of action seems unfair or otherwise wrong? If so, why might that be?

A good essay will:

- Exhibit an understanding of what common sense moral judgments are
- Argue that ethical decisions should be—or should often be—influenced by our common sense. Or,
- Argue that ethical decisions should not be—or should rarely be—influenced by our common sense
- Offer an illustrative example of common sense moral judgments put into practice
- Link this discussion to the taxation debate, illuminating its relevance to the tax policy question

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Verbeek suggests that a society with a just economic distribution is one where _____:

- a. Everyone enjoys equal opportunities
- b. Economic inequalities benefit the least well off in society
- c. Everyone gets out exactly what they put in
- d. No one is below a certain level such that a decent life is possible**

2. *In his essay, Verbeek responds to what objection against his argument on taxation?

- a. **Taxation violates people's property rights**
 - b. Taxation is an unfair way of achieving distributive justice
 - c. Taxation negatively affects people's wellbeing
 - d. Taxation harms the economy by limiting the rich
3. In his essay, Verbeek proposes combining two principles in order to determine the extent to which progressive taxation is permissible. What are these two principles?
- a. Instrumentalist principle and distributivist principle
 - b. Principle of fairness and principle of justice
 - c. **Principle of fairness and ability-to-pay principle**
 - d. Principle of obligation and principle of duty
4. In his essay, Huemer considers three theories of fair tax distribution. Which of the following is NOT one of those theories?
- a. Benefits received
 - b. Ability to pay
 - c. **Degree of productivity**
 - d. Costs Incurred
5. *Throughout his essay, Huemer uses an example to help illustrate his argument for fair taxation. What is it?
- a. A band playing a rock concert
 - b. **Friends dining at a restaurant**
 - c. Retirees playing on a golf course
 - d. Warren Buffett paying his secretary
6. Huemer concludes his essay by saying, "It is time for the poor and the middle class to start paying their fair share of taxes."
- a. **True**
 - b. False

7. *Both Verbeek and Huemer agree with which of the following statements?
- a. **Income below a certain amount should be exempt from taxation**
 - b. The wealthy should give a higher percentage of their income to charity than the poor
 - c. People have property rights to their pre-tax income
 - d. The poor are undertaxed relative to the wealthy
8. *In his reply, Verbeek affirms that Huemer fails to recognize that taxation is a legal instrument that does what?
- a. Holds the rich accountable
 - b. Ensures legal fairness
 - c. Fixes interpersonal inequality
 - d. **Imposes legal duties**
9. *In his reply, Huemer argues that even if the wealthy should pay a higher absolute tax, it does not follow that the wealthy should pay ____:
- a. For benefits that only the poor receive
 - b. A higher property tax
 - c. **A higher percentage of their income**
 - d. For public goods and services
10. Which author begins his essay by saying, “Let’s assume for the sake of argument that government is necessary for any livable society. Let us assume also that taxation is the only feasible means of financing a government. The question is: how should the tax burden be distributed?”
- a. **Michael Huemer**
 - b. Bruno Verbeek

Media Links

Pew Research Center “A closer look at who does (and doesn’t) pay U.S. income tax”

[https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/10/06/a-closer-look-at-who-does-and-doesnt-pay-u-s-income-tax/?](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/10/06/a-closer-look-at-who-does-and-doesnt-pay-u-s-income-tax/?fbclid=IwAR0E7D9Qbc_8PIYqzsnTJaPu57Oyo13UhpRKlW4ZQw0VoIJ8Kd7kqsRH3rQ)

[fbclid=IwAR0E7D9Qbc_8PIYqzsnTJaPu57Oyo13UhpRKlW4ZQw0VoIJ8Kd7kqsRH3rQ](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/10/06/a-closer-look-at-who-does-and-doesnt-pay-u-s-income-tax/?fbclid=IwAR0E7D9Qbc_8PIYqzsnTJaPu57Oyo13UhpRKlW4ZQw0VoIJ8Kd7kqsRH3rQ)

The Daily “The Tax Bill and Trickle-Down Economics”

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/13/podcasts/the-daily/tax-bill-trickle-down-economics.html>

Aeon “Is Taxation Theft?”

<https://aeon.co/essays/if-your-pay-is-not-yours-to-keep-then-neither-is-the-tax>

Chapter 7:

Mark Reiff and John Gaski, “Minimum Wage”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Mark Reiff says that,

In a just society, the solution to the problem of under and unemployment is not employing people for less than a just wage, it is growing the economy to a sufficient extent by moral means, whatever these may be, so that all those who are willing and able to work for a just wage can find the employment they desire.

In your essay, consider and explain: what understanding about the importance of work must Reiff have in order to make a claim like this one? Then, think about one challenge that could arise from thinking about work this way, especially in the context of the minimum wage debate. In other words, what is a problem that we might face if we took Reiff’s beliefs about work, and used them to help us decide what to do about minimum wage? You may think that this problem has a solution, but use your essay to explore this problem.

A good essay will:

- Describe the understanding of labor that underpins Reiff’s claim, perhaps drawing from his earlier claim that “employment is an important component of self-respect”
- Present a challenge that can arise from upholding this understanding of labor, illustrating this point by making reference to the minimum wage policy question

2. In his essay, John Gaski expresses a deep cynicism about certain groups of people who support minimum wage. In your essay, describe one of Gaski’s concerns. Then, consider: If we are worried that our opponents have evil aims, how important should this be in shaping our ethical response? Be sure to link your answer up with the wider minimum wage debate.

A good essay will:

- Capture one of the areas of cynicism that Gaski expresses about his ideological opponents (i.e— “politicians know how they benefit from the superficial attraction of a minimum wage to voters who do not comprehend the detrimental economics of the policy,” “[Democratic politicians] actually wish to create a larger underclass because that is their most reliable source of votes,” etc.)

- Thoughtfully examine the idea that a concern over an opponent's intentions should form part of our ethical response to their position
- Argue that a cynical concern like this one has an important role to play in shaping our ethical response. Or,
- Argue that a cynical concern like this one does not have an important role to play in shaping our ethical response
- The essay's original argument should be put into conversation with the minimum wage debate, even if it is only briefly

3. In his reply to Mark Reiff's Rawlsian argument, John Gaski asserts:

Of course all humans are not perfectly equal in talent, information, or effort. A liberal government endeavors to enact equality before the law, but countless sources of natural inequality are present in any society. As a result, this Rawls/Reiff hypothetical does not apply to the real world.

What do you make of this claim? Is it true that "this Rawls/Reiff hypothetical" doesn't apply to the real world? How important is actual equality to the point Reiff is making? And more generally, what should we do when there's tension between our ideals and empirical realities?

A good essay will:

- Demonstrate understanding of the dispute between Gaski and Reiff
- Reflect on the problem of balancing abstract, ideological commitments with the messy realities of real world problems

Quiz Questions

1. *In his essay, Reiff makes three main arguments. Which of the following is NOT one of his arguments?

- a. A living wage is a just wage
- b. A living wage is required by our moral duty to alleviate poverty**
- c. There are no counter-veiling negative effects of paying a living wage
- d. The value of labor performed should be determined by reference to the labor's cost of production

2. In his essay, Reiff suggests that a workers' wages should cover the cost of what?
 - a. The price of keeping a family alive
 - b. Their absolute most basic needs
 - c. The cost of living and modest luxuries
 - d. **Their contextual basic needs**

3. In his essay, Reiff grounds his argument on the requirement(s) of ____:
 - a. **Reciprocity**
 - b. Poverty alleviation
 - c. Distributive justice
 - d. Equality

4. In his essay, Gaski affirms that an enforced minimum wage is essentially what?
 - a. **A price control**
 - b. A government scam
 - c. A tool to help the poor
 - d. An income buffer

5. *In his essay, Gaski points to a group that overwhelmingly agrees that minimum wage causes unemployment in order to defend his position. What group is it?
 - a. Politicians
 - b. **Economists**
 - c. Philosophers
 - d. Middle-class citizens

6. In his essay, Gaski suggests a number of reasons why well-educated people might support minimum wage policies. Which of the following is NOT one of those reasons?
 - a. Politicians get votes from people who think bad policy is good policy
 - b. Some Democrat economists' inner struggle prompts them to change their understanding of minimum wage

- c. **Some Democrats spread misinformation about supply and demand that misinforms economists**
 - d. Politicians wish to create a larger underclass because that is their most reliable source of votes
7. Which author affirms, with John Rawls, that “people will often agree to terms that are in fact unjust” in his essay?
- a. **Mark Reiff**
 - b. John Gaski
8. *In his reply, Reiff takes issue with Gaski’s agreement with an idea in economics. What is it?
- a. The principle of exchange
 - b. **Wages fund theory**
 - c. Market failure theory
 - d. Trickle-down economics
9. *In his reply, Gaski affirms: “The actual level of economic distress in America is much higher than advertised.”
- a. True
 - b. **False**
10. *Both Reiff and Gaski are proponents of what?
- a. **The free market**
 - b. A living wage
 - c. The principle of exchange
 - d. Contractarianism

Media Links

Pew Research Center “Two-Thirds of Americans Favor Raising Federal Minimum Wage to \$15 an Hour”

https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/30/two-thirds-of-americans-favor-raising-federal-minimum-wage-to-15-an-hour/?fbclid=IwAR1iBhuD7TdsVSkKHDmWkNg6-A_zsgR5CgZYwAeBbkRSZGjCXliCz0Ps2r8

CNN “A tale of two minimum wages

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hFTpr4e5tKs>

Pew Research Center “5 facts about minimum wage”

<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/01/04/5-facts-about-the-minimum-wage/>

Chapter 8:

Seth Mayer and Dan Shahar, “Environmental Regulation”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Seth Mayer discusses the relationship between the law and citizens of a democracy. He believes that this forms part of a solution to the climate change problem. Mayer affirms:

Even when rules are somewhat economically inefficient, they can manifest public attitudes and commitments about which actions and interactions are acceptable. Law, particularly democratically legitimate law, can represent the perspective of the public at large—deeming some actions morally acceptable and others out of bounds. It is an attempt to coordinate social action to further public purposes.

Begin your essay by describing the relationship between law and public attitudes, as Mayer understands it. Then, give a non-environmental example that further helps to illustrate Mayer’s point. Finally, consider: what are the *liabilities* of using the law to accomplish Mayer’s environmental goals? Are they significant enough to show that the law *shouldn’t* be used for those ends? Why or why not?

A good essay will:

- Explain Mayer’s understanding that the law has the potential to represent and coordinate public attitudes
- Offer an example, real or imagined, from outside of the climate change debate that illustrates this kind of relationship between the law and citizens
- Thoughtfully consider the costs of Mayer’s approach
- Defend a position on whether those costs are too great

2. According to Dan Shahar, the negative effects of climate change:

...have significance beyond their ramifications for human interests: our obligation not to ransack the planet goes beyond our duties to ourselves. Yet, even if we look solely at our own desires, I think we will see that we do not want to let nature’s treasures fall by the wayside when we still have the opportunity to preserve them.

The second point here is about human desires. But the first isn’t. If our “obligation not to ransack the planet goes beyond our duties to ourselves,” then to whom—or to what—might we have that

obligation? Does it make sense to say that we have obligations to (some or all of the many) nonhuman parts of the world? Why or why not?

A good essay will:

- Demonstrate understanding of the point that Shahar is making about obligations to nonhuman entities
- Propose some candidates for the entity/entities to which we might have an obligation
- Explain why it is or isn't plausible that we have such an obligation

3. Seth Mayer begins his reply by saying, "Our agreements show that the left and the right have an opportunity to work together on this issue, rather than taking a complacent, business-as-usual approach." In your essay, discuss some of the similarities between Mayer's and Dan Shahar's approaches to the environmental regulation question. Then, discuss at least one major difference. Based on this analysis, what do you think will pose the greatest challenge to Shahar's affirmation that "the left and the right have an opportunity to work together on this issue?"

A good essay will:

- Highlight some of the similarities between Mayer and Shahar's takes on environmental regulation
- Discuss at least one major difference between their positions
- Offer an argument that posits which aspect of their debate will pose the greatest challenge to cooperation

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Mayer discusses two market-based policies that respond to climate change in detail. What are they?

- a. Permit trading and technology transfers
- b. Cap-and-trade policies and taxes**
- c. Command-and-control schemes and taxes
- d. Free trade and direct trade

2. *In his essay, Mayer suggests that environmental regulation leads to a number of effects.

Which of the following is NOT one of those effects?

- a. Increased effectiveness
- b. Human rights protection
- c. Greater justice
- d. Economic abundance**

3. In his essay, Mayer offers an argument that evades moral and political questions.

- a. True
- b. False**

4. In his essay, Shahar argues that reforms should be pursued with what goal in mind?

- a. The continued expansion of material prosperity worldwide**
- b. The moral betterment of a well-informed citizenry
- c. The protection of nature, which is of intrinsic value
- d. The maximization of communal happiness across border lines

5. *In his essay, Shahar affirms that industrial growth has had a number of effects on the human community. Which of the following is NOT one of those effects?

- a. Lower child mortality rates
- b. Reduction in extreme poverty
- c. Increased charitable giving**
- d. Greater respect for human rights

6. In his essay, Shahar discusses a key work in the climate change literature. What is it?

- a. The *Stern Review of the Economics of Climate Change***
- b. The United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals
- c. The EPA's "Climate Change Indicators"
- d. The UNEP's "Emissions Gap Report"

7. *Mayer and Shahar agree with each other on a number of things. Which of the following is NOT an area of agreement?

- a. The poor are disproportionately impacted by climate change
- b. Future generations will do better if we begin to act on climate change now
- c. Economic growth directly translates into broad-based human flourishing**
- d. Climate change creates severe and irreversible setbacks

8. *In his reply, Mayer states: “The core question is whether growth is desirable, not when and how we should use law to shape economic activities in light of climate change.”

- a. True
- b. False**

9. In his reply, Shahar offers what as an example of something that is good when done in moderation, but bad when done too often?

- a. Mountain biking
- b. Withdrawing case
- c. Beachgoing**
- d. Restaurant dining

10. *In his reply, Shahar defends a particular approach for responding to climate change. What is it?

- a. Cap-and-trade**
- b. Legal regulation
- c. Technological innovation
- d. Redistributive justice

Media Links

Aeon “Opportunity costs: can carbon taxing become a positive-sum game?”

<https://aeon.co/ideas/opportunity-costs-can-carbon-taxing-become-a-positive-sum-game>

Canada's Ecofiscal Commission "Carbon pricing: how does a cap-and-trade system work?"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bxs6ZrxLvHg>

The Washington Post "Five legal principles for the Green New Deal"

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2019/05/22/five-legal-principles-green-new-deal>

Chapter 9:

Sam Fleishacker & Sherry Glied and Chris Freiman, “Right to Healthcare”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Chris Freiman affirms, “what makes for a good life for you depends in part on the particulars of who you are.” In your essay, explain what Freiman means by this. Then, consider: what does it look like to apply this point when it comes to the way that we protect people’s rights? In other words, how can we balance each individual’s wellbeing against our government’s duty to protect all people’s rights? Be sure to consider the way that this affects the healthcare debate.

A good essay will:

- Explain Freiman’s understanding of the “good life” as being particular for individual persons
- Illustrate what a balance of universal rights protection and respect of individual goods looks like, and
- Offer a defense of this illustration
- Link this descriptive illustration to the wider healthcare debate, perhaps drawing from either essay

2. In their essay, Sam Fleishacker and Sherry Glied argue that the right to healthcare is based in freedom, saying, “If health care is a condition for the ability to make free choices, then there is a case for a right to health care that even libertarians should respect.” This claim helps to illustrate their commitment to making an argument that both traditional rightists and leftists can get behind. In your essay, identify one of the arguments that that the authors make to defend their claim that healthcare is a right based in freedom. Then, develop one objection to the argument you’ve selected. What should the authors say in response?

A good essay will:

- Identify one of the authors' arguments for the claim that healthcare is a right based in freedom (arguments found in the sections "The Significance of Freedom," "From Welfare Rights to a Healthcare Right," and "A Right Too Much?")
- Develop an objection to the identified argument
- Explore at least one potential response to the objection

3. In their reply, Sam Fleishacker and Sherry Glied offer an analogy about a corrupt town's new mayor. At the end of their analogy, they state:

We can leave the provision of headphones entirely up to the free choices of individuals, but we can't do that with health care. Since health is a condition for choice, rather than simply a result of it, leaving it up to the market alone imposes costs that can in the long run deprive many people of their ability to choose freely at all.

In your essay, explain the authors' analogy and this concluding statement. What point are they making? Then, develop one objection to their concluding statement. Why might someone deny that such long run risks are sufficient to establish a right to healthcare specifically?

A good essay will:

- Explicate both the authors' analogy between a corrupt town's new mayor and giving up health care in favor of other, less necessary goods and their concluding statement
- Develop an objection to the authors' concluding statement
- A strong objection will address the authors' perception that cash provision is in tension with individuals' freedom. Perhaps, this objection will draw from Freiman's defense of healthcare provision

Quiz Questions

1. In their essay, Fleishacker and Glied affirm that on liberal theories of government, the prime reason for governments to act is the protection or enhancement of individual _____:

- a. **Freedom**
- b. Autonomy
- c. Wellbeing
- d. Security

2. *In their essay, Fleishacker and Glied object to what claim?

- a. **Welfare as a right is impracticable**
- b. Health care is a condition for freedom
- c. It is possible to define a right to healthcare
- d. The state itself shouldn't distribute healthcare

3. In their essay, Fleishacker and Glied list three features of healthcare that make it different from other goods or services. Which of the following is NOT one of those features?

- a. The need for care is often urgent
- b. **It protects citizens' right to life**
- c. It can be very costly relative to family budget
- d. It is often unpredictable

4. In his essay, Freiman states "I believe that people *do* have a right to healthcare."

- a. **True**
- b. False

5. *In his essay, Freiman claims that his argument for cash appeals to the diversity of people's opinions about what two things?

- a. The proper flexibility and versatility of the healthcare system
- b. The incorrectness of coercion and manipulation
- c. The effectiveness and importance of naturopathy
- d. **The right kind and amount of healthcare to consume**

6. In his essay, Freiman affirms the that a state sponsored healthcare package of in-kind provision is not as _____ as providing citizens with cash:

- a. Practical
- b. Responsible
- c. Efficient
- d. **Flexible**

7. *In their reply, Fleishacker and Glied close with an analogy. What is their analogy about?

- a. Headphones
- b. A bank teller
- c. A town mayor**
- d. Lifesavers

8. *In his reply, Freiman affirms that Fleishacker and Glied's position on the right to healthcare is compatible with what?

- a. The provision of in kind healthcare
- b. The restriction of freedom
- c. The provision of a basic income**
- d. The downfall of the healthcare system

9. Through the authors' responses, it becomes clear that they agree on multiple things. Which of the following is NOT a statement that the Fleishacker, Glied, and Freiman agree on?

- a. It is possible to justify a right to healthcare by an appeal to freedom**
- b. All citizens have a right to healthcare
- c. States have an obligation to establish institutions that give access to healthcare
- d. People should receive life-saving care when they need it

10. *Which of the author(s)' reply includes the statement that: "A collective decision to provide life-saving care must constrain individual decisions about what coverage to purchase."

- a. Fleischacker and Glied**
- b. Freiman

Media Links

The Daily "How 'Medicare for All' Would Work (or Not Work)"

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/13/podcasts/the-daily/medicare-for-all.html?showTranscript=1>

TED “Poverty isn’t a lack of character; it’s a lack of cash”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ydKcaIE6O1k>

The New Yorker “Is Health Care A Right?”

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/10/02/is-health-care-a-right>

Chapter 10: Christopher Tollefsen and Nathan Nobis, “Abortion”

Essay Questions

1. In footnote three of Nathan Nobis’s essay, Nobis responds to the concern that men should not offer arguments on the abortion debate. He says:

Someone’s sex (or gender) doesn’t influence their ability to give good arguments on issues that, in many ways, mostly affect people who are importantly different from them. Women can have insights and good arguments about issues that uniquely affect men, and vice-versa. ... Women are not infallible on these topics, and neither are men. The goal for everyone is to carefully and critically evaluate any claims and arguments, whatever and whoever their source.

In your essay, consider the question, “What influences a person’s ability to give good arguments on a certain issue?” To do this, try to come up with an example from beyond the abortion debate that responds to the line of reasoning that Nobis presents here. In other words, can you think of a case where people might think that only those uniquely affected by an issue are able to craft good arguments about it? Why should others agree? Does this example complicate Nobis’ position on men’s ability to give arguments in the abortion debate, or are the cases dissimilar enough that his point stands?

A good essay will:

- Offer an explanation of the influences that determine whether or not one is able to give good arguments on an ethical issue, focusing on whether or not that person’s personal connection to that issue is of relevance
- Offer an example of a case where people might think that only those uniquely affected by the issue are able to craft good arguments on the subject
- Relate the example to Nobis’ position on men’s ability to offer good arguments on the abortion debate

2. In his reply, Christopher Tollefsen discusses what he takes to be the similarity between human fetuses and us. He affirms:

...there is a way in which human fetuses are *vastly* more like us than *any* other creature of whose existence we are directly aware. Human fetuses — if they do not die, or are not

otherwise impaired — will grow and develop naturally to the point of being able to exercise exactly the characteristics that impress Nobis (and me) so much. No other being of whose existence we are directly aware will *ever* do that

In your essay, consider, “What traits make something like us?” What do you think is morally relevant in determining whether or not something is like a human person? Does your account challenge Tollefsen’s defense of human fetuses being similar to us?

A good essay will:

- Offer a description or a list of those traits that make some creature similar to a human person in morally relevant ways
- Consider whether this list presents challenges for affirming Tollefsen’s assertion that human fetuses “are *vastly* more like us than *any* other creature of whose existence we are directly aware”

3. In their replies, Nathan Nobis and Christopher Tollefsen both offer competing accounts of what grounds human rights. In your essay, explain the authors’ disagreement, drawing from both of their accounts. Then, briefly describe the extent to which you take the human rights issue to be an important one in the abortion debate. In other words, how much rides on whether human fetuses have rights? Can abortion be justified even if they do?

A good essay will:

- Provide textual support for each author’s claim on what constitutes the foundation of human rights

Then, the essay will either:

- Provide a plausible argument for the importance of protecting human fetuses rights if they have them; or
- Provide a plausible argument against the importance of protecting human fetuses rights if they have them

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Tollefsen presents a moral argument that proceeds in three steps. Which of the following is NOT one of those steps?

- a. Abortion, understood either as direct killing or unjust detaching, is always wrong
 - b. You and I are human beings, and thus we began as one-celled human organisms
 - c. We are animal organisms, and mother and child share a real and personal relationship**
 - d. All human beings possess fundamental rights against being attacked, damaged, or destroyed intentionally
2. *In his essay, Tollefsen claims that dualism is misguided because it fails to recognize what?
- a. Humans are capable of both good and evil acts
 - b. Humans are both minded beings and physical organisms**
 - c. People are human organisms from the time that they are embryos
 - d. Humans possess both natural rights and fundamental dignity
3. In his essay, Tollefsen makes a number of claims. Which of the following is NOT one of his claims?
- a. Unchosen biological relations do not matter morally**
 - b. It is wrong to intend the death of any human being
 - c. Abortion isn't merely a private matter
 - d. Human organisms begin at fertilization
4. In his essay, Nobis defends a number of claims. Which of the following is NOT one of those claims?
- a. Late-term abortions are morally wrong**
 - b. Early abortions are not wrong
 - c. Probably all abortions should be legal
 - d. Early fetuses aren't made worse off by death
5. *In his essay, Nobis gives examples of a number of question-begging arguments on abortion. Identify an example of a question-begging argument.
- a. Abortion is not wrong because abortion is a personal choice**
 - b. Fetuses have valuable futures; they lose those valuable futures when aborted

- c. The Bible says that abortion is wrong
- d. Fetuses do not have the right to their mother's bodies, even if they have the right to life

6. In his essay, Nobis outlines positive defenses of abortion founded on three areas of concern.

Which of the following is NOT one of those areas?

- a. Personhood
- b. Consciousness
- c. Harm
- d. Human rights**

7. *In his reply, Tollefsen affirms that what is the appropriate grounding property for basic rights?

- a. Having a rational nature**
- b. Exhibiting personal characteristics
- c. Being made of human DNA
- d. Being capable of being harmed

8. *In his reply, Nobis affirms that what is the appropriate grounding property for basic rights?

- a. Having a rational nature
- b. Exhibiting personal characteristics
- c. Being made of human DNA
- d. Being capable of being harmed**

9. Both authors agree that the claim "fetuses are biologically human" is of little moral relevance when determining the ethical status of abortion.

- a. True**
- b. False

10. *Which author adopts the following definition of abortion: "An abortion is the intentional killing of an embryo or fetus to end a pregnancy?"

- a. Chris Tollefsen
- b. Nathan Nobis**

Media Links

The Washington Times “Oppression in its barest form”

<https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2019/mar/12/abortion-is-the-social-justice-issue-of-the-millen/>

Aeon “Bun or Bump?”

<https://aeon.co/essays/is-the-mother-a-container-for-the-foetus-or-is-it-part-of-her>

The Daily Nous “Philosophers On the Ethics and Politics of Abortion”

<http://dailynous.com/2019/06/10/philosophers-on-ethics-politics-abortion/>

Chapter 11:

Tully Borland and Megan Hyska, “Political Correctness”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Tully Borland discusses what he takes to be the importance of language. He says:

Let us recall that language is a precious gift ... Though sometimes used for evil, it is also a source of good. Thus, as with other goods, we should want as few restrictions upon it as possible.

Borland is trying to set the default here. He’s trying to say that the burden of proof is on the person who wants to restrict language, rather than on the person who wants unrestricted speech. Would Hyska disagree? Why or why not? And if not, then what would she want to add to Borland’s point?

A good essay will:

- Demonstrate understanding of the views of both authors
- Offer a reasonable interpretation of Borland’s point such that it’s plausible that Hyska would disagree, explaining why, or offer a reasonable interpretation of Borland’s point such that it’s plausible that Hyska would not disagree, again explaining why

2. In her essay, Megan Hyska responds to the worry that changing language to reflect collective ideals makes it impossible to articulate disagreement. She writes:

Some will suggest that changing language to reflect our collective ideals is fine, but that we should wait until after some widespread agreement about these ideals is reached before we do so. Otherwise, goes the worry, aren’t we depriving dissidents of the raw linguistic materials needed to articulate their position...? The answer is no, we aren’t. It just isn’t the case that PC linguistic changes make it impossible to articulate a position in disagreement with the egalitarian norms that they serve. A person can still express general racial animosity without the use of a slur ... and can still dispute the proper treatment of trans people while using the phrase “transgender” rather than the aforementioned non-synonymous alternatives.

In your essay, evaluate Hyska’s claim. Then, try to come up with an example that would count as evidence against her view, using it as the basis for an objection to the position that she outlines here. Then, consider how Hyska might respond.

A good essay will:

- Explain and evaluate Hyska's claim about the possibility of expressing disagreement even when language reflects collective ideals
- Offer an original example that presents a challenge to the argument that Hysa develops
- Explain how Hyska might respond to this objection

3. In his reply, Tully Borland suggests that "PC-speech codes are like book burnings." Explain what he means by that. Then, describe the extent to which you believe that we as a society should be worried about the kind of problem that Borland has in mind. Finally, defend or object to this claim: politically correct speech is like book burning, and we ought to object to it.

A good essay will:

- Explain Borland's understanding of PC-speech codes being like book burnings, drawing from the reply itself
- Explain the extent to which the author is concerned with the kind of restriction on freedom that Borland is concerned about
- Develop an argument either defending or objecting to the claim "politically correct speech is like book burning, and we ought to object to it"

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Borland affirms that political correctness originated in what political context?

- a. Napoleon Bonaparte's empire
- b. Mao Tse-Tung's communist party**
- c. Nazi Germany
- d. The American Civil War

2. *In his essay, Borland introduces the concept of "Orwellian Speech." Which of the following is NOT a characteristic of Orwellian Speech?

- a. The purpose is thought-manipulation
- b. The rules stay the same for an extended period**
- c. It distorts the truth by saying the opposite

- d. It introduces a new euphemism into the language
3. In his essay, Borland argues that, in a liberal democracy, one should be against _____:
- a. Microaggressions
 - b. Thrasymachus's view of justice
 - c. *De facto* discrimination
 - d. Hate speech codes**
4. In her essay, Hyska suggests that those things that get called "politically correct" are attempts at what?
- a. A reformation of norms**
 - b. Radical Islamic terror
 - c. Conscientious democracy building
 - d. Orwellian speech
5. *In her essay, Hyska responds to a number of objections against her view. Which of the following is NOT one of those objections?
- 1. Egalitarianism as mind control**
 - 2. Egalitarianism as unnecessary
 - 3. Political correctness as mind control
 - 4. Political correctness as petty tyranny
6. In her essay, Hyska affirms that the phrase "forced busing" is an example of what?
- a. Politically correct speech
 - b. Fear-mongering
 - c. Animosity toward the left
 - d. A political dogwhistle**
7. *In his reply, Borland suggests that political correctness speech codes are like what act?
- a. Tweeting against safe-spaces
 - b. Picketing

c. Democratic election

d. Book burning

8. *In her reply, Hyska argues that a commitment to freedom of speech requires _____:

a. Rejecting inorganic speech innovations

b. Openness to language change

c. Enforcing “bottom-up” linguistic change

d. A full-fledged endorsement of speech-policing

9. In her essay, Hyska says, “although the term often known as political correctness is a positive one, the *phenomenon* “political correctness” has come to be used in a way that does our democracy a profound disservice.”

a. True

b. False

10. *Which author concludes their essay by saying, “While the expression ‘politically correct’ feels like a convenient shorthand for a kind of norm change that is a disorienting aspect of contemporary life, its use is now an investment in an apparatus that mainly functions to obscure and polarize the political landscape.”

a. Tully Borland

b. Megan Hyska

Media Links

Aeon “Age of Sincerity”

<https://aeon.co/essays/beyond-right-or-wrong-beyond-fact-or-fake-lies-sincerity>

TED-ed “What ‘Orwellian’ really means”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oe64p-QzhNE>

TED “Political Correctness on the College Campus”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FefaREhBo3A>

Chapter 12:
John Corvino and Ryan Anderson & Sherif Girgis, “Religious Exceptions”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, John Corvino responds to an objection that refusing to sell a wedding cake to a same-sex couple is discrimination based on identity. He explains:

Some deny that refusing to sell a cake for a same-sex wedding constitutes sexual orientation discrimination: After all, the baker would equally refuse to provide a wedding cake for two heterosexual women or two heterosexual men. This objection overlooks the way in which some actions are constitutive of identity.

What does Corvino mean when he says that “some actions are constitutive of identity?” Offer an example of your own that illustrates this point. Then, consider: what might be a good way of dividing up which actions are constitutive of identity and which are not?

A good essay will:

- Explain Corvino’s claim on the role of some actions as being constitutive of one’s identity
- Offer an original example of an action that is constitutive of identity
- Provide an account on how one might distinguish those actions which are constitutive of identity from those which are not

2. In their essay, Ryan Anderson and Sherif Girgis say, “The law isn’t about siphoning evil out of every heart. It’s about setting up and keeping up the conditions under which everyone can adequately pursue the basic goods of human life.” To what degree do you think that the law should form our moral character? To what degree do you think that the law should simply allow citizens to pursue basic goods? How does your answer relate to the debate that these authors and Corvino are having?

A good essay will:

- Develop an argument that offers guidance on how to balance the law’s role in character formation against the law’s role in providing conditions that grant individuals freedom to pursue perceived goods
- Link this argument to the wider religious exceptions debate

3. Through their replies, it is clear that John Corvino disagrees with Ryan Anderson and Sherif Girgis on what must be involved in a discriminatory act for it to be harmful. In your essay, explain the nature of these authors' disagreement, drawing from both of their works. Then, offer an explanation of what type of discriminatory act is involved in a case like Bowman-Cryer's (that Corvino discusses in his essay). Do you think Corvino's or Anderson and Girgis' description of harm best fits this case? Why?

A good essay will:

- Provide textual support for the authors' claims on what must be involved for a discriminatory act to be harmful, drawing from the replies
- Argue that a case like Bowman-Cryer's is best described by Corvino's description of harm. Or,
- Argue that a case like Bowman-Cryer's is best described by Anderson and Girgis' description of discriminatory acts that ought not be the target of antidiscrimination laws

Quiz Questions

1. *In his essay, Corvino outlines two ways in which discrimination harms people. What are they?

- a. Normative harm and social harm
- b. Systematic harm and cumulative harm
- c. Design-based harm and use-based harm
- d. Material harm and dignitary harm**

2. In his essay, Corvino offers a number of examples of *unjust* discriminatory practices. Which of the following is NOT one of Corvino's examples?

- a. A vegan restaurant's refusal to serve a cattle farmer**
- b. Bob Jones University's policy on interracial dating
- c. A Florida gun retailer's declaration of his shop as a "Muslim-Free Zone"
- d. Aaron Klein's refusal to sell a wedding cake to a lesbian couple

3. In his essay, Corvino affirms that while business owners generally have discretion over what they sell, they do not have discretion over _____:

- a. The religious beliefs of their customers
- b. When they will sell their products
- c. How their products are later used**
- d. Who will desire to purchase their products

4. In their essay, Anderson and Girgis claim that businesses, charities, and other civic associations ought to run by their own values. On what do they found this claim?

- a. Freedoms of association and contract**
- b. Equality under the law
- c. *De jure* and *de facto* discrimination
- d. The *Obergefell* and *Roe* decisions

5. *In their essay, Anderson and Girgis affirm that in determining the social meaning of some action, we must ask about what aspect of this action?

- a. The intention(s) of the person performing the action
- b. The historical context in which this action is performed
- c. How this action would be seen by a reasonable observer**
- d. What moral roots or convictions give rise to the action in question

6. In their essay, Anderson and Girgis suggest that the refusal to create a custom wedding cake for a same-sex marriage celebration is similar to a Jim Crow-era policy on race.

- a. True
- b. False**

7. *In his reply, Corvino argues that what is the ultimate objective of antidiscrimination law?

- a. To challenge traditional social norms
- b. The ensure equal access in the public square**
- c. To punish hateful, discriminatory persons

- d. To console and comfort victims of discrimination

8. In their essay and reply, Anderson and Girgis argue that one's conduct should be the target of antidiscrimination law when it promotes unfair, socially debilitating attitudes and ideas about minorities. These punishable attitudes towards and ideas about minorities target four things.

Which of the following is NOT one of those things?

- a. Minorities' worth
- b. Minorities' place in society
- c. Minorities' abilities
- d. Minorities' history**

9. *In their reply, Anderson and Girgis urge for our policy toward traditional marriage supporters after the *Obergefell* decision to mirror our policy toward which group?

- a. Opponents of interracial marriage
- b. Anti-Catholics
- c. Pro-lifers**
- d. LGBT people

10. *Which author(s) conclude his/their reply by saying, "Not every disagreement is discrimination. Our law shouldn't suppose otherwise."

- a. John Corvino
- b. Ryan Anderson and Sherif Girgis**

Media Links

The Advocate "The Women Who Challenged Sweet Cakes on the Cost of Their Battle"

<https://www.advocate.com/commentary/2016/9/06/women-who-challenged-sweet-cakes-cost-their-battle>

The New York Times "Supreme Court Won't Rule on Clash Between Another Bakery and a Gay Couple"

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/17/us/politics/supreme-court-gay-marriage-bakery.html>

CNN “Gun Store: We’re a Muslim-Free Zone”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kOJ3E-3b4tI>

Chapter 13: Loren Cannon and Vaughn Baltzly, “Bathroom Bills”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Loren Cannon discusses the issue of whether or not there are biological conditions for being a man or a woman. He says,

Defining an individual by their genitalia (or perceived genitalia at birth), their chromosomes, their hormones, or some official designation made before they could barely open their eyes and experience this grand world is to unnecessarily reduce our human experience. Furthermore, doing so disrespects the epistemic authority of trans persons to characterize our experiences ... Humans quite simply defy neat categorizations and not recognizing this fact nearly always leads to moral harm.

In your essay, explain what Cannon means by this. Then consider: are there *any* “neat categorizations” that we may use to define individuals? If not, why not? And if so, why might someone think that those “neat categorizations” are different from the ones that Cannon has in mind?

A good essay will:

- Accurately explain Cannon’s view
- Make the case that all “neat categorizations” are objectionable, or explain why they aren’t, but someone might take them to be dissimilar from the ones that Cannon discusses

2. In his essay, Vaughn Baltzly discusses the social practices of admissions policies to colleges and universities in the United States. In your essay, explain what he means when he says, “the institution of American higher education is complicit in ... the systematic oppression of the socioeconomically disadvantaged, and the ongoing maintenance of privilege and enforcement of class distinctions. Or so one might argue.” What do you make of this rhetorical parallel between admissions policies and the social practices surrounding bathroom usage? In your essay, offer an argument that resists Baltzly’s implication, suggesting a way that one might support practices like this education, but object to them in the context of other social customs?

A good essay will:

- Explain Baltzly's rhetorical parallel between admissions policies and the social practices surrounding bathroom usage
- Offer an argument that suggests a way of supporting arguably oppressive practices in education, but that does not support such practices in the bathroom case

3. In his reply, Vaughn Baltzly offers "a recipe for how you might have a productive dialogue about ... sometimes-conflicting, sometimes-overlapping considerations and positions." In your essay, explain the steps in this recipe. What do you take to be the most complicated step in this process? Offer an example in defense of your answer.

A good essay will:

- Outline each of the steps that Baltzly presents in his recipe for productive dialogue
- Offer an argument for which of these steps is the most complex
- Defend this argument by appealing to an example

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Cannon argues that bathroom bills will negatively affect a wide variety of people. One reason for this is because *enforcement* of these bills will occur on what basis?

- a. Birth certificates
- b. Physical appearance**
- c. Inspection of genitalia
- d. An unwritten promise

2. *In his essay, Cannon affirms that denying people the ability to tend to their physical needs infringes upon their opportunity to _____:

- a. Participate in society**
- b. Form meaningful relationships
- c. Experience lasting happiness
- d. Have their gender expression validated

3. In his essay, Cannon argues that bathroom bills will negatively affect trans persons in a number of ways. Which of the following is NOT one of those negative effects?

- a. **Inability to connect with likeminded persons**
- b. Risk of verbal harassment
- c. Disrespect of bodily authority
- d. Denial of full moral status

4. In his essay, Baltzly distinguishes between what two notions?

- a. Segregation and discrimination
- b. Conservatism and conserve-atism
- c. Gender identity and gender expression
- d. **Legalization and Legal-ization**

5. *In his essay, Baltzly argues that the consistent Progressive must embrace a commitment to what ideal?

- a. Generalization
- b. **Integrationism**
- c. Absurdism
- d. Burkeanism

6. In his essay, Baltzly argues in defense of his position by supporting what approach to convention and custom?

- a. A Progressive approach
- b. A legalistic approach
- c. A liberalizing approach
- d. **Edumund Burke's approach**

7. *In his reply, Cannon concludes with what he calls his “most important criticism” of Baltzly’s argument. What is this criticism?

- a. No one has moral reasons defend Burkean tendencies
- b. Transgender persons should not be barred from meaningful social participation

- c. The only effective change is rapid social change
- d. These proposals' negative impact on marginalized persons isn't discussed**

8. *In his reply, Baltzly takes issue with Cannon's appeal to what?

- a. The rights of trans persons
- b. A regime of fully-fledged integration
- c. The non-inheritability argument**
- d. A recipe for productive dialogue

9. *Identify the author who affirms the following in his essay: "At the most basic level, respecting another means to, at the very least, respect that they have authority over their physical bodies"

- a. Loren Cannon**
- b. Vaughn Baltzly

10. In his essay, Baltzly argues in defense of the position that "the very notion of being transgender is suspect."

- a. True
- b. False**

Media Links

National Conference of State Legislatures "'Bathroom Bill' Legislative Tracking"

<http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/-bathroom-bill-legislative-tracking635951130.aspx>

CNN "Transgender law advocate: Bathroom bill about culture"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xv5Rs2KV-ek>

PBS "Transgender bathroom battle goes national with Obama school directive"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vHO1c5EdfkE>

Chapter 14: Dan Lowe and Spencer Case, “Privilege”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Dan Lowe explains Arlie Russell Hochschild’s underlying metaphor behind “the deep story.” In your essay, briefly explain this metaphor, focusing on the relationship between the “people in line” and “the top of the hill.” What do you make of this metaphor? How do you think we ought to respond to framing privilege in his way?

A good essay will:

- Explicate Hoschild’s metaphor that serves as a foundation for the idea of “the deep story”
- Respond to this metaphor, discussing some of its merits or drawbacks
- Offer an account of how one ought to reply to Hoschild’s approach in discussing privilege

2. In his essay, Spencer Case discusses the importance of his critique in the discussion of white privilege. In this context, he writes,

Slogans like “love trumps hate” perpetuate the idea that the difference between good and bad political ideas is amounts to the difference between good and bad motives. What this overlooks is that crusades against genuine evils, fired by moral zeal, often produce terrible consequences.

In your essay, capture the concern that Case is expressing here. Then, reflect: What role, if any, does moral zeal have to play in political or social movements? Do you share Case’s concern that movements “fired by moral zeal” routinely yield “terrible consequences?” Be sure to include a real example, perhaps tying your answer to the wider privilege debate.

A good essay will:

- Explain Case’s concern that certain zeal-fueled movements confuse bad politics with bad moral motive, and his subsequent concern that this zeal will produce terrible consequences
- Offer an account for what role moral zeal should play in political or social movements, drawing from a real-to-life example

3. Through Dan Lowe's essay and Spencer Case's reply, it becomes clear that the authors have very different understandings of the moral value of the assertion "check your privilege." In your essay, explain their disagreement, drawing from both of their works. Then, explain the extent to which you worry about this particular disagreement. In other words, is Lowe's point worth making even if Case's concern is well-founded? Or is Case's concern strong enough to override the reasons that Lowe gives for the importance of privilege checking?

A good essay will:

- Draw from both Lowe's and Case's work to capture the authors' perspectives on the idea of checking one's privilege
- Explain the nature of these authors' disagreement
- Develop an argument that offers some guidance on the moral importance of privilege checking

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Lowe offers a series of descriptions that help to explain privilege. Which of the following is NOT an aspect of having privilege, as he describes it?

- a. Someone who has privilege has an advantage compared to others
- b. Someone who has privilege has an easy life**
- c. Having a right can be a privilege
- d. Having a privilege is never justified

2. *In his essay, Lowe identifies a number of patterns that help us to understand how privilege works. Which of the following is NOT one of those patterns?

- a. Privilege is intersectional
- b. Privilege is contextual
- c. Privilege is an unchanging aspect of one's life**
- d. Privilege tends to be invisible to the person who has it

3. In his essay, Lowe offers a number of suggestions on how people should respond to privilege if they have it. Which of the following is one of his suggestions?

- a. Criticize members of privileged social groups for their unjust advantages
- b. Use privilege to reinforce the social norms which create and sustain privilege
- c. Ensure that privilege remains invisible for the privileged
- d. Do not feel ashamed for having privilege, as one does not have control over it**

4. In his essay, Case argues that the biggest issue with the academic literature that builds on Peggy McIntosh's ideas is that what is ambiguous?

- a. The role of the oppressor and of the victim
- b. Honest and dishonest claims to privilege
- c. Permissible and impermissible social norms
- d. The weak and strong senses of privilege**

5. *In his essay, Case suggests a couple of alternative hypotheses that aim to explain the existence of many important racial disparities. Which of the following is one of those alternatives to the view that racial disparities are primarily the products of racism?

- a. The conservative thesis
- b. The cultural hypothesis**
- c. Good policies post-1986
- d. The mismatch view

6. In his essay, Case argues that we are unlikely to "find compelling evidence for the widespread existence of white privilege, in the strong sense," in what source?

- a. The testimony of people who are, or consider themselves, oppressed**
- b. The experiences of the supposed oppressors or sustainers of privilege
- c. The sociological documents written by senator Patrick Moynihan
- d. The police reports on underprivileged communities

7. *In his reply, Lowe argues that Case's argument is based on what?

- a. A slippery slope

- b. A misunderstanding of oppression
- c. An appeal to emotion
- d. A false dilemma**

8. *In his reply, Case levels two main challenges against Lowe’s account of privilege. Which of the following is one of those challenges?

- a. This account underestimates how rigid and immovable privilege categories really are
- b. It isn’t clear why, given Lowe’s definition, privilege matters so much**
- c. Lowe’s definition does not go far enough in vilifying oppressors
- d. Lowe grossly underestimates the benefits of framing social issues in terms of privilege

9. In his essay, Lowe affirms, “We can simply choose *not* to have privilege; it is an individual’s choice to have privilege, so one can just choose to jettison it.”

- a. True
- b. False**

10. *Identify the author who concludes his reply with the following cautionary message:

“Beware of tunnel vision about evil. Future tyranny may not resemble any tyranny of the past.”

- a. Dan Lowe
- b. Spencer Case**

Media Links

TED-Ed “How to Understand Power”

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c_Eutci7ack

The Atlantic “The Moynihan Report: An Annotated Edition”

<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/09/the-moynihan-report-an-annotated-edition/404632/>

TED “Your Privilege is Showing”

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R4b_ojKx6UI

Chapter 15:

Philippe Lemoine and Rebecca Tuvel, “Feminism”

Essay Questions

1. When discussing challenges to intersectional feminism in her essay, Rebecca Tuvel brings up the risk that identity framed as injury takes center stage in one’s self understanding. She explains the problem, namely that “preoccupation with a wounded notion of identity can also preclude more positive ways of understanding it.” In your essay, consider the following question: What does it mean to balance an understanding of one’s identity that includes both injury and more positive realities? Then, explain how your answer fits into the feminism debate, focusing on whether your account complicates or support an intersectional view.

A good essay will:

- Develop an argument that offers guidance on how one ought to balance both the reality of injury and positive notions in one’s self-understanding
- Link this answer to the wider feminism debate, explaining whether it complicates or supports Tuvel’s intersectional view

2. In his essay, Philippe Lemoine expresses concern with oppression both as a word and a phenomenon. In your essay, explain Lemoine’s objection to standard feminist uses of this word. Do you think that he is right to say that people typically understand oppression to be about problems like racism, slavery, and the holocaust? Are there alternate views of oppression that are typically held? Be sure to include an example in your answer.

A good essay will:

- Explain Lemoine’s objection to the word “oppression,” as feminists use it
- Either defend or object to Lemoine’s claim that oppression is widely understood as pertaining exclusively to the most severe matters

- Offer an example in support of the author's argument

3. In their essays and replies, Philippe Lemoine and Rebecca Tuvel explain their understandings of the phenomenon of oppression. In your essay, highlight the differences between their views. Then, briefly describe the extent to which you take this issue to be a central one in the feminism debate. In other words, is feminism over if women aren't oppressed? Or is there more work for feminism to do quite independently of whether women are oppressed?

A good essay will:

- Provide textual support for each author's claim(s) on the nature of oppression
- Develop a plausible argument that suggests the extent to which oppression is central to the feminism debate

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Lemoine affirms that it's consistent to think both that women should enjoy the same rights as men *and* that _____:

- a. They should be treated differently
- b. They always have
- c. Men don't need to respect them
- d. They already do**

2. *In his essay, Lemoine argues that one shouldn't use what word to describe how women are treated in contemporary Western societies?

- a. Sexism
- b. Oppression**
- c. Disempowerment
- d. Harm

3. In his essay, Lemoine agrees with which of the following claims?

- a. Female politicians face significant gender bias
- b. Men are systematically disadvantaged in a variety of ways**

- c. Overall, women have it worse off than men in society
 - d. Both women and men are oppressed
4. *In her essay, Tuvel argues that modern feminists have learned from early black feminists' insights when it comes to acknowledging the need for ____:
- a. Diversity
 - b. Access to abortion
 - c. **Intersectionality**
 - d. Inclusivity
5. In her essay, Tuvel describes the gender binary as being a number of things. Which of the following is NOT a way that she categorizes the gender binary?
- a. **Exploitative**
 - b. Heteronormative
 - c. Enforcing of standards of feminine appearance
 - d. Punitive
6. In her essay, Tuvel argues that we can know that a wrong took place without knowing what?
- a. Whether anyone was harmed
 - b. The intent of the wrongdoer
 - c. The moment when it took place
 - d. **The precise cause of the wrong**
7. *In his reply, Lemoine argues that what is remarkable about Tuvel's conception of feminism?
- a. **It doesn't have anything to do essentially with women**
 - b. It recognizes the ways in which men are disadvantaged
 - c. It fails to acknowledge the existence of racism, homophobia, etc.
 - d. It ignores the oppression that women face outside of the West
8. *In her reply, Tuvel offers an explanation for why feminists resist what idea?
- a. Some forms of masculinity are toxic

- b. Gender norms harm men and women equally**
- c. Men suffer various forms of male disadvantage
- d. Women are more damaged by the dominant gender script

9. Which author affirmed the following in their reply: “blanket statements about what *all* women or *all* men or *all* members of any category suffer must go out the window.”

a. Philippe Lemoine

b. Rebecca Tuvel

10. *In his essay, Lemoine states, “I agree that women should have the same rights as men. I just don’t think that’s what “feminism” means anymore.”

a. True

b. False

Media Links

Aeon “I’m not a feminist but...”

<https://aeon.co/essays/how-feminism-fell-into-disrepair-among-american-teenagers>

“What is Privilege?” Example of line activity

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hD5f8GuNuGQ>

TED “The Urgency of Intersectionality”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=akOe5-UsQ2o>

Chapter 16:

Travis Timmerman and Dan Demetriou, “Removing Historic Monuments”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Travis Timmerman affirms that much of the harm “which preservationists would suffer if Confederate monuments were removed crucially depends on them holding certain irrational beliefs or contemptible attitudes.” On this basis, he argues that such beliefs and attitudes serves as the basis of their suffering, and as such, their suffering “matters less than the suffering endured by people whose suffering is predicated upon rational beliefs and fitting attitudes.” In your essay, explain the argument that Timmerman gives to arrive at this claim. How do you think we might determine which beliefs qualify as “irrational” and which attitudes count as “contemptible?” Does your standard support or challenge Timmerman’s view about Confederate monuments?

A good essay will:

- Clearly and effectively recreate the argument that Timmerman gives in defense of the claim that preservationists’ suffering matters less than the suffering of those people whose beliefs and attitudes are rational
- Offer a plausible description of the criteria we might employ in order to determine which attitudes and beliefs qualify as irrational and contemptible
- Relate these criteria to Timmerman’s argument, showing how they support or challenge his view as it relates to the Confederate monument debate

2. In his essay, Dan Demetriou says “tribal rightists, not liberals, leftists, or (least of all) cosmopolitans, are likely to have the best instincts on matters of building social cohesion in ethnically divided polities.” In your essay, explain what Demetriou means by this. Then, offer objection to his position. Why might we think that tribal rightists are not the most likely “to have the best instincts on matters of building social cohesion in ethnically divided polities?”

A good essay will:

- Explain Demetriou’s claim that tribal rightists are likely to have the best instincts when it comes to cohesive society building

- Develop and defend an objection to Demetriou's view

3. In his reply, Dan Demetriou denies Travis Timmerman's premise that "If x unavoidably harms morally considerable beings who don't deserve to be harmed, then there's strong moral reason to prevent x ." In doing so, he offers the example of NBA player Stephen Curry. In your essay, explain Demetriou's example. In your explanation, offer another example that illustrates Demetriou's point. Finally, defend or object to this claim: Demetriou's example is similar in morally relevant ways to the situations that Timmerman has in mind when he defends this premise.

A good essay will:

- Explain Demetriou's Stephen Curry example, highlighting the way in which it is meant to undermine Timmerman's premise on harm
- Offer an original example that illustrates Demetriou's point
- Develop an argument that defends or objects to the claim: Demetriou's example is similar in morally relevant ways to the situations that Timmerman has in mind when he defends his premise on harm

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Timmerman affirms that the majority of Confederate monuments were erected in which two periods?

- The Civil War and Reconciliation
- The Civil War and the Civil Rights movement
- The Jim Crow era and the Civil Rights movement**
- World War I and World War II

2. In his essay, Timmerman offers a historic example to illustrate the nature of the harm that Confederate monuments cause. Which example does he offer?

- Punk musicians wearing swastikas**
- The government putting slaveowners on currency

- c. KKK members wearing white hoods
- d. Slaveowners punishing enslaved persons

3. *In his essay, Timmerman considers a number of objections his position. Which of the following is NOT one of the objections that he considers?

- a. Removing statues erases history
- b. Removing statues causes harm to preservationists
- c. These statues are works of art with aesthetic value
- d. Preserving statues is a natural human right**

4. In his essay, Demetriou expresses concern that destroying old tribal identities and encouraging a new multiethnic tribal identity is unacceptably _____:

- a. Authoritarian**
- b. Racist
- c. Elitist
- d. Idealistic

5. *In his essay, Demetriou argues that tribal continuity is not possible without what?

- a. Oral histories
- b. Family photos
- c. Reenacting
- d. Memorializing**

6. In his essay, Demetriou offers an analogy that helps to illustrate his stance on multicultural states. What is his analogy?

- a. An interracial couple decorating their home**
- b. A pair of immigrant friends on a road trip
- c. A brother and sister starting a business
- d. An international fair at a public school

7. *In his reply, Timmerman outlines a number of areas where he and Demetriou agree. Which of the following is NOT a point where these authors' positions overlap?

- a. **Removing Confederate monuments need result in the loss of tribal identity and social cohesion**
- b. We should create additional monuments for people in historically underrepresented groups
- c. Political structures should, in some ways, accommodate humans' tribal nature
- d. It can be permissible to selectively honor people who have performed grossly wrong moral acts

8. In his reply, Demetriou affirms that there are at least two reasons to maintain monuments that precipitate racist offense. What are they?

- a. Achievement of cosmopolitan ideals and representation of the underrepresented
- b. Cultural continuity and strengthened economic structures
- c. **Cultural continuity and preserving people's interest in a multiracial future**
- d. Honor for the dead and rightful celebration of heroism

9. *In his reply, Demetriou denies Timmerman's premise that "If the existence of a monument M unavoidably harms an undeserving group, then there's strong moral reason to end the existence of M."

- a. **True**
- b. False

10. *Identify the author who affirms the following in his essay, "gradually, as historical research into ignored or preliterate cultures improves, and as new outstanding citizens arise, the formerly underrepresented peoples should be suitably showcased in the national household"

- a. Travis Timmerman
- b. **Dan Demetriou**

Media Links

The Daily “A Turning Point in Charlottesville”

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/15/podcasts/the-daily/charlottesville-trump.html>

“Goodbye, Old Glory” Short documentary

<https://vimeo.com/221655873>

The Atlantic “The Stubborn Persistence of Confederate Monuments”

<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/04/the-stubborn-persistence-of-confederate-monuments/479751/>

Chapter 17:
Stephen Kershnar and Kristina Meshelski, “Affirmative Action”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Stephen Kershnar defends the “mismatch thesis.” In your essay, explain what Kershnar thinks this thesis implies about affirmative action. Then, consider why someone might be skeptical about either the mismatch thesis or the implication that Kershnar says it has for affirmative action.

A good essay will:

- Explain Kershnar’s understanding that the mismatch thesis counts as a strike against affirmative action
- Develop an argument against either the mismatch thesis, or against the way that Kershnar employs it when it comes to affirmative action cases

2. In her essay, Kristina Meshelski takes issue with a pure meritocracy. Explain her reasons for this view, ultimately explaining why she holds that “being admitted to college or given a job is not a prize that distinguishes the person who is best at something.” Do you agree that we function in a society that is not a pure meritocracy? Be sure to defend your view. Then, object to or defend the following claim: We ought to live in a purely meritocratic society.

A good essay will:

- Explain Meshelski’s qualms with purely meritocratic societies
- Defend the claim that we function in a society that is not a pure meritocracy. Or,
- Defend the claim that we function in a society that is a pure meritocracy
- Develop an argument in support of or in opposition to the claim: We ought to live in a purely meritocratic society

3. Through Kristina Meshelski’s essay and Stephen Kershnar’s reply, it becomes clear that the two do not agree on how to categorize affirmative action as a form of procedural justice. In your essay, explain the nature of this disagreement, drawing from both authors’ works. Then, offer an

original example that helps to illustrate the central concept of procedural justice. Does this concept help to clarify what is at issue in the affirmative action debate?

A good essay will:

- Provide textual support for each author's claim(s) on whether affirmative action is a form of procedural justice
- Offer an original example that helps to explain the concept of procedural justice
- Explain whether the concept of procedural justice is a helpful one in the affirmative action debate

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Kershnar argues that which compensatory principle is hard to apply in the context of affirmative action?

- a. From the rich to the poor
- b. Distributive justice
- c. In-kind compensation
- d. Make the person whole**

2. *In his essay, Kershnar suggests that there is a more just and efficient form of compensation than affirmative action. What is it?

- a. Money**
- b. Property
- c. Inheritance
- d. Food vouchers

3. In his essay, Kershnar objects to the forward-looking argument on what basis?

- a. Affirmative action is prima facie morally impermissible
- b. It's difficult to tell whether there's been a failure to mitigate
- c. The cost likely outweighs the benefit**
- d. The future should not weigh into ethical considerations

4. In her essay, Meshelski says that College admissions or job search processes cannot be considered fair unless _____:

- a. Anyone can get in
- b. The applicants believe them to be fair
- c. Their outcomes are also fair**
- d. The people in power are free of bad intent

5. *In her essay, Meshelski distinguishes between three types of procedural justice. Which of the following is NOT a type of procedural justice?

- a. Pure
- b. Impure**
- c. Perfect
- d. Imperfect

6. In her essay, Meshelski affirms that being admitted to college or given a job is not a prize, but rather _____:

- a. A free pass
- b. An obvious harm
- c. A privilege
- d. A valuable resource**

7. *In his reply, Kershner forwards a number of statements related to affirmative action. Which of the following statements is one that he agrees with?

- a. Affirmative action succeeds in benefitting the groups it is trying to help
- b. Differences in education, income, and wealth are certainly unfair
- c. The risk of admitting or hiring less meritorious candidates is fairly low
- d. Some procedures that distribute resources are unfair independent of their outcome**

8. *In her reply, Meshelski argues that there are serious reasons to doubt which of the theses that Kershner endorses?

- a. **The mismatch thesis**
- b. The procedural thesis
- c. The meritocracy thesis
- d. The forward-looking thesis

9. In her essay, Meshelski states that “we must note that accepting a non-white applicant to a college only because of their race, the most talked-about and controversial kind of affirmative action, has a long history of being frequently and widely practiced.”

- a. True
- b. False**

10. *Through their works, it becomes clear that Meshelski and Kershner agree that there are more effective ways to compensate for past wrongs than affirmative action.

- a. True**
- b. False

Media Links

The School of Life “Meritocracy”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bTDGdKaMDhQ>

CNN “Harvard admissions case could end Affirmative Action”

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=19i_MfsIDg0

The Daily “The Asian-Americans Suing Harvard, and the Man Behind the Case”

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/04/podcasts/the-daily/asian-americans-suing-harvard-affirmative-action.html>

The New Yorker “The Rise and Fall of Affirmative Action”

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/10/15/the-rise-and-fall-of-affirmative-action>

Chapter 18:
Annabelle Lever and Allan Hillman, “Racial Profiling”

Essay Questions

1. Summarize Annabelle Lever’s understanding of how racial profiling affects police officers’ prejudices. Do a little research on the formation of prejudices. Explain what you found. Then consider: does this research support or fail to support Lever’s claims?

A good essay will:

- Explain Lever’s understanding of the relationship between police officers’ prejudices and the act of racial profiling
- Detail research on prejudice formation
- Explain whether this research supports or undermines Lever’s claims

2. In his essay, Allan Hillman compares the act of racial profiling to the types of considerations that other medical professionals make: “Like the physician, the police officer is simply taking into consideration the prior probabilities of group behavior in order to better do her job.” In your essay, evaluate the aptness of this parallel. In other words, does Hillman’s move work? Can you think of a morally relevant factor that distinguishes the doctor’s case from the police officer’s? Defend your answer.

A good essay will:

- Explain and evaluate Hillman’s parallel between police engaged in racial profiling and doctors taking race into consideration in their medical practices
- Consider whether there is a morally relevant factor that distinguishes these two cases, and thus serves to undermine Hillman’s comparison
- Argue in defense of either the existence or nonexistence of a morally relevant distinguishing factor

3. In her reply, Annabelle Lever discusses the relationship between certain policies and increased crime rates. She says that

...policies that may appear on their face to have nothing to do with the racial characteristics of crime – such as urban renewal or government support for home ownership — turn out to explain why some social groups, rather than others, face crime and violence as an everyday part of their lives, and may find themselves tempted to engage in it as a rational strategy for improving their lot in life, or drawn into it through friendship, loneliness, anger, depression, despair.

In your essay, explain what Lever means here. Why might someone think that all this is irrelevant to the ethics of criminal profiling? What argument could they give to this effect? And how might Lever respond?

A good essay will:

- Explain Lever's claim that social policies, which may seem unrelated to crime rates, are actually powerful and relevant factors in understanding those crime rates
- Offer an original argument that presents a challenge to the claim that Lever develops
- Explain how Lever might respond to this objection

Quiz Questions

1. In her essay, Lever discusses three objections to racial profiling. Which of the following is NOT one of those objections?

- a. Racial profiling harms the police officers who practice it
- b. Racial profiling is unlikely to be effective
- c. Racial profiling punishes people for things outside of their control**
- d. Racial profiling is likely to exacerbate racial injustices

2. *In her essay, Lever argues that who will be the main beneficiaries of the racial profiling of black people?

- a. White people**
- b. Young black men
- c. Criminals
- d. The police

3. In her essay, Lever offers two examples of crime preventing tactics that serve as viable alternatives to racial profiling. What are they?

- a. Neighborhood watches and “see something, say something” campaigns
- b. “Stop and search” and “stop and frisk”
- c. Traffic stops and road blocks
- d. Random searches and universal searches**

4. In his essay, Hillman identifies the controversial type of profiling. What is it?

- a. Instrumental profiling
- b. Retroactive profiling
- c. Comprehensive profiling
- d. Predictive profiling**

5. *In his essay, Hillman explains that institutional entities may use the type of rationality that an agent uses who wishes to achieve the most efficient or cost-effective means in order to achieve some end. What is this type of rationality called?

- a. Deontological rationality
- b. Instrumental rationality**
- c. Efficient rationality
- d. Incremental rationality

6. In his essay, Hillman affirms that if racial profiling can be reasonably suggested to result in harms, those harms will be in some way _____ in nature?

- a. Physical
- b. Material
- c. Psychological**
- d. Dignitary

7. *In her reply, Lever argues that once one recognizes the extent of _____ in our societies, it seems clear that combining racial profiling with affirmative action is wholly inadequate?

- a. Class division
- b. Unchecked privilege
- c. Racial injustice**

- d. Criminal activity
8. *In his reply, Hillman affirms that one of Lever's objections assumes what without argument?
- a. That police officers can't make reasonable decisions
 - b. That white people are worse criminals than black people
 - c. That all persons have a shared interest in life, liberty, and property
 - d. That police officers are prejudicial in an offensive sense**
9. Identify the author who states the following in their reply: "the police, like racialised minorities, have collective as well as individual interests in protection from arbitrary and prejudiced judgements about their sentiments, beliefs and behaviour."
- a. Annabelle Lever**
 - b. Allan Hillman
10. *Through Lever's essay and Hillman's reply, it becomes clear that the authors agree that "racial profiling is little more than a self-fulfilling prophecy."
- a. True
 - b. False**

Media Links

TED "How racial profiling hurts everyone, including the police"

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LCX_Th-IjjE

The Atlantic "How Much Racial Profiling Happens in Ferguson?"

<https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/08/how-much-racial-profiling-happens-in-ferguson/378606/>

The Washington Post "There's overwhelming evidence that the criminal-justice system is racist. Here's the proof."

<https://beta.washingtonpost.com/news/opinions/wp/2018/09/18/theres-overwhelming-evidence-that-the-criminal-justice-system-is-racist-heres-the-proof/>

Chapter 19: Luke Maring and Tim Hsiao, “Guns”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Luke Maring offers an example of a parent taking money from her child’s piggybank to illustrate a point about gun ownership. In your essay, explain Maring’s piggybank example. Then, explain why someone might resist interpreting the state’s role in citizens’ lives in this way. Finally, consider how Maring might respond to the argument you propose.

A good essay will:

- Explicate Maring’s piggybank example, explaining how it serves to illustrate the role that the state takes in citizens’ lives
- Offer an original argument that presents a challenge to the example that Maring develops
- Explain how Maring might respond to this objection

2. In his essay, Tim Hsiao makes an argument from liberty. One of the benefits of this argument, in his view, is that “the defender of the argument from liberty does not have to show that guns are beneficial per se.” In your essay, explain what Hsiao means by this. Then, offer an objection to his argument from liberty, and consider how Hsiao might reply.

A good essay will:

- Explain Hsiao’s claim that an “argument from liberty does not have to show that guns are beneficial per se
- Offer an original argument that presents a challenge to the argument that Hsiao develops
- Explain how Hsiao might respond to this objection

3. In his reply, Luke Maring affirms that “Hsiao and I share important common ground: wariness of armed state forces.” While they agree on this general point, they come to different conclusions as to how citizens ought to respond. In your essay, explain the nature of this disagreement,

drawing from both of their works. Then try to convince your reader that one position, the other, or some alternative is most plausible.

A good essay will:

- Provide textual support for the authors' responses to their concern over armed state forces
- Provide a plausible argument in defense of Maring's response, Hsiao's response, or an alternative response

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Maring affirms that guns advocates have developed two rights-based arguments that cited different entitlements. What do these advocates claim that they are entitled to use guns for?

- a. Self-defense and strategic attack
- b. Domestic tranquility and neighborhood security
- c. Combat training and foreign invasion
- d. Recreation and self-defense**

2. In his essay, Maring forwards what argument?

- a. We should disarm citizens and allow police to keep their guns
- b. We should disarm both citizens and police**
- c. We should arm citizens and disarm police
- d. We should allow citizens and police to keep their guns

3. *In his essay, Maring offers a series of alternative options to modifying the Second Amendment in order to secure mutual disarmament. Which of the following is one of the options he considers?

- a. Lobby on Capitol Hill for rapid, business-based reform
- b. Invite celebrities to advocate for mutual disarmament
- c. Require bullets sold in the U.S. to have a non-standard diameter**
- d. Withhold hunting permits on the basis of animals' rights

4. In his essay, Hsiao considers various potential social harms of gun ownership. Which of the following is NOT a harm that he considers?

- a. Suicide rates
- b. Mass shootings**
- c. Crime rates
- d. Fatal accidents

5. *In his essay, Hsiao presents an argument from *what* in favor of his position?

- a. Liberty**
- b. Equality
- c. Justice
- d. Fairness

6. In his essay, Hsiao affirms that we should think of an armed citizenry as _____ against government abuse.

- a. Stirring up a revolution
- b. Being wholly ineffective
- c. Erecting an impermeable barrier
- d. Providing a deterrent**

7. *In his reply, Maring outlines three questions we need to ask about the sources we encounter.

Which of the following is NOT one of those questions?

- a. Is there a consensus opinion among experts; if so, does the source contradict it?
- b. Does the source come from a researcher with a narrow and extreme ideological bent?
- c. Is the source peer-reviewed?
- d. Is this source come from a researcher who upholds moral values?**

8. *In his reply, Hsiao argues that defensive gun use does not require what?

- a. The actual discharge of a firearm**
- b. For the police to be armed

- c. That the victim know how to use a firearm
- d. The erasure of no concealed weapon zones

9. Identify the author who affirms the following in his essay: “Political conservatives sometimes criticize liberals for trusting the state—... conservatives are on this score exactly correct. The great insight of conservatism is that governments are not grand impartial arbiters dispassionately pursuing the common good.”

- a. **Luke Maring**
- b. Tim Hsiao

10. *Both Hsiao and Maring are wary of armed state forces.

- a. **True**
- b. False

Media Links

Quartz “The case for disarming America’s police force”

<https://qz.com/602682/the-case-for-disarming-americas-police-force/>

NPR “How Often Do People Use Guns In Self-Defense?”

<https://www.npr.org/2018/04/13/602143823/how-often-do-people-use-guns-in-self-defense>

NPR “Some Gun Control Opponents Cite Fear Of Government Tyranny”

<https://www.npr.org/sections/itsallpolitics/2013/04/08/176350364/fears-of-government-tyranny-push-some-to-reject-gun-control>

Chapter 20:
Mark Zelcer and Jen Kling, “Military Spending”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Mark Zelcer says that most governments’ behavior is “Thrasymachian.” In your essay, explain what he means by this. Should we behave as though this is true? Or is there another way that military spending ought to be responsive to governmental behavior?

A good essay will:

- Explain what “Thrasymachian” means, and why Zelcer believes that most government’s behavior is like this
- Develop an argument either in defense of or in objection to the claim that military spending should be set with the assumption that governments will behave like Thrasymachus

2. In the section of her essay titled, “Safety and Security,” Jen Kling considers three scenarios which she presents in order to help her reader to think about global stability. In your essay, explain these scenarios, as well as her reasons for favoring the one that she does. Then, consider what would have to be true in order to make one of the other two scenarios preferable to the one that Kling chooses. Do your considerations complicate Kling’s argument? Why or why not?

A good essay will:

- Explain Kling’s three scenarios, as well as her reasons for arguing that Scenario C is the most stable of the three
- Describe which conditions would have to be in place in order to make either Scenario A or Scenario B the most stable of the three
- Explain whether or not these enumerated conditions serve to complicate Kling’s argument in favor of Scenario C being the most stable

3. In his reply, Zelcer discusses the merits of liberal democracies with strong militaries. He says,

It could even be argued that liberal democracies like the US with strong militaries make war *less* common, not more. A nation can use a powerful military to threaten and coerce, but threats neither kill people nor topple governments. War does.

This reply shows that Zelcer sees threats and coercion as being importantly different from war.

In your essay, consider why might someone push back against this assertion. In other words, what might be a reason to worry about Zelcer's suggestion that stronger militaries—who have the powers of threat and coercion—make war less common? How might Zelcer respond to this objection?

A good essay will:

- Develop an argument that complicates the relationship between threats, coercion, and war, as Zelcer presents it
- Explain how Zelcer might respond to this objection

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, Zelcer affirms that what is the basic reason that militaries exist?
 - a. Aggression
 - b. Protection**
 - c. Distraction
 - d. Diplomatic relations

2. *In his essay, Zelcer argues that the more nations that are militarily self-reliant, _____.
 - a. The safer all nations are
 - b. More opportunities for peace talks arise
 - c. The less safe all nations are**
 - d. The less soldier training is needed

3. In his essay, Zelcer offers a number of arguments in favor of his position. Which of the following is NOT one of those arguments?
 - a. Military spending is a way for a government to stimulate an economy
 - b. Decreased military spending does not free up money for spending elsewhere
 - c. Military spending helps to promote a healthy and well-trained police force**

- d. The more we spend on the military, the fewer people die
4. In her essay, Kling affirms that the goal of increased U.S. military spending is to accomplish what?
- a. Make militaries unnecessary in the future
 - b. Enforce American values worldwide
 - c. Instill fear in our adversaries
 - d. **Shift the balance of power towards the U.S.**
5. *In her essay, Kling argues that current military operations adversely affect what group?
- a. Black Americans
 - b. **Military veterans and their families**
 - c. Diplomats and peace negotiators
 - d. The U.S.' European allies
6. In her essay, Kling argues that the U.S. military has the economic problems that _____ typically have.
- a. Communist countries
 - b. Massive corporations
 - c. Banks
 - d. **Monopolies**
7. *In his reply, Zelcer suggests that it is possible for liberal democracies with strong militaries to make war less common.
- a. **True**
 - b. False
8. *Zelcer and Kling agree that having a strong, prepared, robust U.S. military is essential.
- a. **True**
 - b. False

9. Identify the author who affirms: “Countries are indeed going to resort to violence when it suits their purposes, and so our goal should be to set conditions for as much cooperation and pacifist interaction as possible, between as many peoples as feasible, given the liberties we value.”

a. **Mark Zelcer**

b. Jen Kling

10. *In her reply, Kling affirms that what is changeable in the military spending domain?

a. **Public sentiment on military spending**

b. The biases of politicians who set the budget

c. The quantity invested in veteran affairs

d. The form of communicating spending decisions to civilians

Media Links

NPR “Global Military Expenditures Are Up, Driven By Top 2 Spenders — U.S. And China”

<https://www.npr.org/2019/04/29/718144787/global-military-expenditures-up-driven-by-top-two-spenders-u-s-and-china>

The Washington Post “2020 Democrats must address our addiction to military spending”

<https://beta.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2019/06/25/democrats-must-address-our-addiction-military-spending/>

The Atlantic “Democrats Are Wrong About Defense Spending”

<https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/01/democrats-would-be-wrong-cut-us-military-spending/579457/>

Chapter 21:
Michael LaBossiere and Patrick Taylor Smith, “Voting Ethics”

Essay Questions

1. In his essay, Michael LaBossiere considers the view that

a voter has no obligation to intervene when the odds of making a difference are miniscule—especially when doing so would make them a party to evil. Going back to the villain example, it would be as if the villain told the hero that if they killed the person, the villain would offer a one in a million chance of sparing the many.

In your essay, explain this dilemma, as well as the deontological reasoning that LaBossiere uses to solve it. While he is worried that “this view would entail that people should not even bother to try when the odds are terrible,” it may seem odd to imply that the hero should kill the person. Is this what LaBossiere is suggesting? Finally, answer the question, “How do you think that that the hero should respond in the one in a million situation?,” relating your answer to the voting ethics debate.

A good essay will:

- Explicate LaBossiere’s “one in a million” chance dilemma and his deontological solution
- Explain whether or not LaBossiere implies that the hero should kill one person in an attempt to save the many at risk
- Offer an argument that offers moral guidance in the one in a million chance dilemma
- Link this argument to the wider, voting ethics debate

2. In his essay, Patrick Taylor Smith argues that “well-ordered institutions not only filter out bad information, they can actually put irrational or uninformed actors to good use in order to help the process generate even better outputs.” In your essay, explain the steps that he takes to defend this claim, including his reliance on this claim's parallel in the sciences. On this view, what relationship to voters have to well-ordered institutions? Would there ever be a case where one might have a moral reason to act irrationally or badly?

A good essay will:

- Explain the steps that Smith takes in order to defend the claim that bad actors can be put to good use in a well-ordered democracy, highlighting Smith's reliance on his claim's parallel in the sciences
- Consider how one would have to understand the relationship between voters and well-ordered states if she took Smith's claim seriously
- Argue that, on this view, one *may* have moral reason to act irrationally or badly. Or,
- Argue that, on this view, one *would never* have moral reason to act irrationally or badly

3. In his reply, Patrick Taylor Smith distinguishes between what one *should* do and what one *owes other people*. He appeals to John Stuart Mill's distinction between types of duties. In your essay, explain this distinction. Then, defend or object to this claim: the duty to vote well is a perfect duty, owed to fellow citizens.

A good essay will:

- Explain Smith's distinction between what one should do and what one owes other people, including his appeal to Mill's distinction between types of duties
- Develop an argument either in support of or in objection to the claim that the duty to vote well is a perfect duty, owed to fellow citizens

Quiz Questions

1. In his essay, LaBossiere uses the insights from two moral theories in order to defend his position. What are they?

- e. Contractarianism and contractualism
- f. Consequentialist ethics and deontological ethics**
- g. Egoism and altruism
- h. Consequentialist ethics and virtue ethics

2. *In his essay, LaBossiere suggests that the ideal utilitarian citizen would respond to the question of how to vote in what way?

- a. By not voting at all
- b. By voting for the lesser of two evils**
- c. By not voting, and engaging in other positive activities instead
- d. By voting for a non-evil, third party candidate

3. In his essay, LaBossiere makes an analogy between not voting for any evil candidate and what?

- a. Choosing whether to save a drowning murderer
- b. Being forced to ride a runaway trolley
- c. Comparing two torture devices to each other
- d. Deciding whether to aid a villain**

4. In his essay, Smith rejects a claim related to the question of voters' responsibilities. What is it?

- a. You can vote for whomever you want, however you want
- b. Non-voting does not fulfill your obligations
- c. You have a duty to vote well or to not vote at all**
- d. You should vote well if everyone will vote like you

5. *In his essay, Smith outlines three conditions for calling voting bad. Which of the following is NOT one of those conditions?

- a. It is irrational
- b. It can clearly be shown to be motivated by deeply immoral beliefs
- c. It is based in ignorance
- d. It is for a morally corrupt candidate**

6. In his essay, Smith argues that in a well-ordered democracy, bad voters are _____:

- a. Harmless or even beneficial**
- b. Especially harmful and corrupt
- c. A necessary evil
- d. Better assets than decent or excellent voters

7. *At the close of his reply, LaBossiere makes three statements. Which of the following is NOT one of those statements?

- a. Bad voters should not vote in okay states
- b. Bad voters can vote in very good states
- c. Good voters should vote in very bad states**
- d. Good voters should not vote in very bad states

8. *In his reply, Smith discusses the difference between what two things?

- a. Voting and advocacy**
- b. Advocacy and running for office
- c. Voting and being a moral person
- d. Democracies and dictatorships

9. In his essay, Smith affirms that it is his view that "bad voting *does* violate our obligations of *justice*."

- a. True
- b. False**

10. *Both LaBossiere and Smith are interested in the question "How should you vote?"

- a. True
- b. False**

Media Links

Aeon "The right to vote should be restricted to those with knowledge"

<https://aeon.co/ideas/the-right-to-vote-should-be-restricted-to-those-with-knowledge>

TED "There's no such thing as not voting"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NqOjj1FCcVY>

TED-Ed "Does your vote count? The Electoral College explained"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W9H3gynN468>