Justice, John Rawls, says, “is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought. A theory however elegant and economical must be rejected or revised if it is untrue; likewise laws and institutions no matter how efficient or well-arranged must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust.” In this course, we explore three fundamental questions about the ideal of a just society and the place of values of liberty and equality in such a society:


3. Can a society ensure **both** liberty and equality? Or are these warring political values?

We will approach these questions by examining answers to them provided by three contemporary theories of justice: utilitarianism, libertarianism, and egalitarian liberalism. To understand the theories, and to assess their strengths and weaknesses, we will discuss their implications for some topics of ongoing moral-political controversy—including the enforcement of sexual morality, protecting religious liberty, regulating labor markets, financing schools, extending group rights, and abortion—that exemplify our three fundamental questions about liberty and equality. We conclude with some issues of global justice.
BOOKS AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE

Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*
Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*
John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*

The books are in the bookstore. Other readings are available on Coursework.

REQUIREMENTS

1. You are required to submit two papers, and to rewrite the first on the basis of comments from your teaching assistant. The first paper should be no shorter than 1800 words and no longer than 2200. You need to submit the first version on October 13th. You will have comments by October 20th, and must submit a rewrite by October 27th. The second paper should be between 3000 and 3500 words: the readers will not read past 3500 words. The paper is due on December 8th. Policies on late papers will be set by your teaching assistant, and must be arranged with the teaching assistant in advance.

When you rewrite the first paper, you need to take into account the comments on the first version; the evaluation of the rewrite will depend in part on your success in addressing the comments. So if you get a B+ on the first draft, and are not very responsive to the comments, you may end up with a C on the revision.

The paper topics are on pages 12-13 of this syllabus, and some Rules of Thumb for writing papers on pages 14-16. Note that the paper topics often present a series of questions. Your paper needs to be responsive to these questions. **Be sure to review the Rules before writing the first paper.**

2. Discussion is an essential part of this course. You are expected to attend the recitations regularly, and participate constructively in discussion.

GRADING

The first paper will be 25% of the final grade (and the grade will be a weighted combination of the grades of the first version and rewrite, with the rewrite weighted twice as much as the first version). The second paper will be 50% of the grade. The other 25% of the grade will be based on your contributions in the discussion section. Your TA will give you a mid-semester, preliminary grade on your contribution to discussion.

The teaching assistants will grade your papers. Should you have any question about the fairness of a grade, bring the matter to my attention right away. It is
especially important in this course that students not be penalized—or even suspect that they might be penalized—for the content of their views.

INCOMPLETES

You can get an Incomplete only if you have completed the first paper, including the rewrite, and have regularly attended the discussion section. These conditions are necessary, not sufficient, for an incomplete. I will decide requests for Incompletes on their merits. You must request an incomplete, and requests are to come to me. Students who do not hand in all the work and do not request an Incomplete will receive an F.
READING ASSIGNMENTS

Readings marked with an asterisk (*) can be found on Coursework. Other readings are in the books in the bookstore. After each assignment, I list some Study Questions. Please think about the questions as (and after) you read.

When there are multiple reading assignments for a lecture, please read in the order in which the readings are listed on the syllabus.

LECTURE ONE: PROBLEMS OF JUSTICE IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

I. UTILITARIANISM

LECTURE 2: LIBERTY AND EQUALITY IN HEDONISTIC UTILITARIANISM

*Jeremy Bentham, Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, chaps. 1, 4, 13, 17 (sec. 1);
*Bentham, Anarchical Fallacies, selections;
*Bentham, Principles of the Civil Code, selections.

Study Questions: (1) What is Bentham’s “principle of utility” or “greatest happiness principle”? (2) Bentham says that pleasure is the only thing that is good in itself. Is he right? What about knowledge? Or beauty? Or achieving the aims (whatever they are) that you set for yourself? (3) Can you make a utilitarian case against slavery? Consider three cases, and work out the argument for each: (i) slaves are only 10% of the population; (ii) slaves are a quarter of the population, but are members of a socially outcast group; (iii) the slaves are a majority of the population, and do backbreaking work in mines, but are very productive; (4) Is the legal enforcement of a community’s moral code such a bad thing? Does Bentham make a persuasive case against it? (What does he mean when he says it is unprofitable?) Can you think of laws that regulate conduct because the conduct is immoral? What do you think of those laws? (5) Why does Bentham think that the idea of preserving natural rights is complete nonsense? (6) Why does Bentham think that equality of wealth increases the “mass of happiness”? What qualifies his commitment to equality?

LECTURE 3: THE LEGAL ENFORCEMENT OF SEXUAL MORALITY

*Bowers v. Hardwick (1986), selections
*Lawrence v. Texas (2003), selections
Study Questions: (1) Does the fact that sodomy violates common morality (assuming that it does) provide a legitimate reason for criminalizing it? (2) What is the distinction between the claim that sodomy violates the common morality in a society, and the claim that it is condemned by the moral views of the majority in society? Does that distinction make a difference? (3) Utilitarians have traditionally opposed the enforcement of morality. Do they have a convincing utilitarian case against it? (4) Are there reasons for opposing the enforcement of morality that strike you as more convincing than the utilitarian argument? (5) If anti-sodomy laws are unacceptable, then what about bans on gay and lesbian marriage? Are they permissible? Is there a case for preserving a ban on gay and lesbian marriage that does not depend on judgments about sexual morality?

LECTURES 4, 5: UTILITARIANISM AND SELF-GOVERNMENT

*John Stuart Mill, Utilitarianism, chaps. 1, 2;  
*John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, chaps. 1-3;  
*Subjection of Women, chap. 4

Study Questions: (1) What is Mill’s distinction between higher and lower quality pleasures? What does it mean to say that the quality of a pleasure is higher, not just that the quantity is greater? (2) Does Mill’s higher/lower distinction reflect an objectionable elitism, and an undue emphasis on intellectual pleasures? (3) Is it better, as Mill says, to be Socrates dissatisfied than the fool satisfied? Why? Is that because Socrates has better pleasures, or for some other reason? (4) Mill says that On Liberty defends “one very simple principle.” What is that principle? How would Mill use that principle to respond to restrictions on racist hate speech, or pornography, or slander? (6) How does Mill argue for his “simple principle” on utilitarian grounds? How is the general welfare improved by tolerating religious, philosophical, and moral dissent? What are the costs of such toleration? Why do the benefits outweigh the costs? (7) Do you agree that conduct ought only to be regulated if it is harmful to others? Can you think of cases in which conduct ought to be regulated in the name of the person’s own welfare (drugs, seat belts), or because it is repulsive (bestiality), or because it is offensive to others (public sex), or because it is judged to be wrong (suicide, physician-assisted suicide)?

Lecture 6: Religious Freedom and Religious Accommodations

*Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Considerations Regarding Proposals To Give Legal Recognition to Unions Between Homosexual Persons”
*Sherbert v. Verner (1963)
*Employment Division v. Smith (1990)

Study Questions: (1) In Sherbert v. Verner, Justice Brennan says that the denial of unemployment benefits to the Seventh Day Adventist who cannot work on Saturday is a burden akin to a fine for Saturday worship. Do you think that fines for Saturday worship are acceptable? Is the denial of benefits akin to such a fine? Is there any distinction? Does the distinction make a difference? (2) Is it unfair to exempt people, because of their religious convictions, from criminal laws that arguably serve good purposes and that others are required to comply with? (3) Why are religious convictions important? Are they more important than cultural commitments? (4) Suppose there are religious exemptions from generally applicable criminal laws. Do such exemptions promise anarchy? (5) If not anarchy, do exemptions amount to unjustifiable favoritism, or a kind of religious Establishment? (6) Do you think there ought to be exemptions of the kind explored in Sherbert v. Verner or Employment Division v. Smith? Should there be cultural exemptions as well? (7) Is there a compelling utilitarian case in favor of religious exemptions? Does utilitarianism have a good way to capture the nature of the burden on religious liberty when there are no exemptions? If it does not, should utilitarians be troubled?

II. LIBERTARIANISM AND CLASSICAL LIBERALISM

LECTURES 7, 8: LIBERTARIANISM, THE MINIMAL STATE, AND LABOR MARKET REGULATION

Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State, and Utopia, pp. xi-xiv, 3-6, 10-17, 22-35, 48-56, 101-19, 149-64, 167-182, 232-238
*Lochner v. New York (1905)
*Coppage v. Kansas (1915)
*West Coast Hotel v. Parrish (1937)

Study Questions: (1) What basic, natural rights does Nozick attribute to individuals, and why does he suppose that we have those rights? (2) What is a minimal state, and how is it different from a dominant protective association and an ultraminimal state; does Nozick have a plausible story of how such a could emerge in a morally permissible way (without violating anyone's rights)? (3) How does the idea of equality before the law fit into Nozick's minimal state? Does a minimal state provide any assurance of a rule of law? (4) Nozick says that people own themselves (pp. 171-72)? What does that mean? Do you agree? (5) What does Nozick mean when he says that "liberty upsets patterns?" (6) Why does the Lochner Court think it is illegitimate for the state to
regulate labor markets in order to redress inequalities of bargaining power between employers and employees? Are there such inequalities? What are the implications of those inequalities for wages and working conditions? (7) Are legislative efforts to correct for inequalities of bargaining power paternalistic? Do such regulations make workers “wards of the state?” (Is it paternalistic to protect a person from physical assault? Are minimum wage laws or workplace health and safety regulations objectionably paternalistic?) (8) Does Nozick’s libertarian philosophy echo the reasoning in Lochner and Cопpage?

**LECTURE 9: THE RULE OF LAW**

*John Locke, Second Treatise of Government, chap. 11
*Friedrich Hayek, The Constitution of Liberty, chap. 10

Study Questions: (1) What is the rule of law? Is that idea well-captured by Locke’s requirement that there be “settled standing laws,” or is something more needed? (Suppose the settled, standing laws impose racial apartheid?) (2) Hayek argues that there is a very intimate connection between the rule of law and liberty. What precisely is the nature of that connection. Does he think that the rule of law is necessary for the assurance of liberty? Does he think it sufficient? Do you find his claim plausible? (3) Locke says that there is to be “one rule for rich and poor, for favorite at court and countryman at plough.” Does Nozick’s minimal state have such uniform rules for all? Suppose people agreed to a minimal state with different rules for rich and poor, for favorite at court and countryman at plough. Would Locke accept such a state as legitimate? Would Nozick? (4) Locke says that laws are to be designed for “the good of the people.” What does “the good of the people” mean? Is Nozick’s minimal state required to meet that condition? Is it morally required to work for the “good of the people”?

**LECTURES 10-11: LIBERTY, GENERAL WELFARE, AND EQUALITY IN CLASSICAL LIBERALISM**

Milton Friedman, Capitalism and Freedom, Introduction, chaps. 1, 2, 10, 12, Conclusion

Study Questions: (1) What does Friedman mean by “liberty?” (2) What is a “right to liberty,” and why is there such a right? Are all kinds of liberty of equal importance? Or are some liberties more important than others? (3) It is sometimes said (as in the Preamble to the US Constitution) that government ought to make laws that promote the general welfare. What does that mean? Does Friedman agree? Do laws made for the general
welfare (“the good of the people,” as Locke put it) violate the basic right to liberty? (4) Friedman accepts certain kinds of anti-poverty programs and public spending on education as legitimate uses of tax dollars. How does Friedman make the case that an anti-poverty program might promote the general welfare (how does it promote the welfare of people who are not poor)? (5) Why is it wrong for the government to promote what Friedman calls “equality of treatment?” (6) What does Hayek mean when he says that inequality is the “necessary result and part of the justification of individual liberty”? (7) How does Hayek respond to the claim that “all inequalities that rest on birth and inherited property ought to be abolished and none remain unless it is an effect of superior talent and industry”? How do his discussions of family, inheritance, and education respond to this claim? (8) Should people be rewarded according to their merit? How does Hayek respond to this idea?

**LECTURE 12: EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND EDUCATION**

*San Antonio v. Rodriguez (1973), selections
Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*, pp. 85-98

Study Questions: (1) Justice Marshall says that there is a right to an equal start in life. What is an “equal start in life”? Do you agree that there is such a right? Is it fair for some people to have better chances from the outset? If everyone has a decent chance to do something worthwhile—make something good of their lives—does it matter if they have equal starts? (2) Hayek (in the reading for Lectures 10-11) contrasts the “conception that all should be allowed to try” with the “altogether different conception that all must be assured an equal start and the same prospects.” Do his criticisms of the “equal start” view raise troubles for Justice Marshall’s ideal of an equal start? Is the idea that everyone should be “allowed to try” an attractive conception of equality of opportunity? (3) Could education help to ensure that everyone has an equal start—or at least an acceptable start—in life? (4) Does a system of school financing based on local property taxes violate the right to an equal start? Suppose each district gets the same resources from the state, but districts can supplement their resources with voluntary contributions from families? (5) Does a system of equal educational opportunity, financed exclusively out of taxes, violate the rights of parents to decide how much they want to spend on education? (6) Does a program of state-financed, universal education promote the general welfare? How does Friedman make the case that it does? Do you find his argument convincing?

**III. EGALITARIAN LIBERALISM**
LECTURES 13-14: RECONCILING LIBERTY AND EQUALITY

John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, sections 1-5, 11-14, 17, 20-26, 29, 32-33, 36-37, 67

Study Questions: (1) Rawls presents the ideal of a fair society in which life chances are not settled by differences in social background or native endowments. How attractive is that ideal? (2) What is the “priority of liberty?” Is this the same as the idea of a basic right to liberty? (3) What is “fair equality of opportunity,” and why is it a more compelling idea than the more formal equality of opportunity associated with what Rawls calls the “system of natural liberty?” (4) Are native endowments (natural talents) morally on a par with the contingencies of social background? What does it mean to say that your social background and your native talents are “arbitrary from a moral point of view?” (5) What principles would people chose in a hypothetical original position, behind a veil of ignorance? (6) Why should we care about what would be chosen in the original position? Are the considerations that Rawls locates behind the veil of ignorance really irrelevant to deciding what justice requires? (7) Is Rawls’s difference principle fair to people who would be better off under a less egalitarian principle? (8) What does Rawls mean by “self-respect”? Why is self-respect so important? What does its importance have to do with the choice of principles of justice for a society?

LECTURE 15: EVEN MORE Egalitarian?

*Susan Okin, *Is Multiculturalism Bad For Women?, pp. 3-24, 31-34

Study Questions: (1) GA Cohen has said that his criticisms of incentive inequalities reflect the feminist thesis that “the personal is political.” How so? How does the idea that the personal is political play a role in Cohen’s view? In Okin’s? (2) How important is it for people to have continuing access to the culture in which they have been raised, as opposed to assimilating into the dominant culture of the society? (3) How could it be fair to provide one group with rights that other groups lack—say, to exempt its members from laws (for example, regulating headgear) that others are required to obey? Does it matter if the exemptions have a religious basis? (4) Is Okin right that most cultures are patriarchal, and have “as one of their principal aims the control of women by men?” (Are her examples convincing?) (5) Suppose a person with unusual talents is unwilling to make a socially valuable contribution without receiving special incentives for that contribution. Is that unwillingness objectionably selfish, and is the distribution of rewards that results from paying the incentives unjust? (6) What would a society be like if its ethos (and not only its laws) required members to make
contributions without expecting special rewards? (7) Suppose that some racists in a society will make productive contributions that benefit racial minorities only if they (the racists) receive very large incentives. Does justice permit the payment of such incentives?

LECTURES 16-17: EQUALITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

*Sayyid Qutb, Social Justice in Islam, chap. 3.

Study Questions: (1) How compelling are Dworkin’s two principles of human dignity: the principle of intrinsic value and the principle of personal responsibility? Do you think that government must treat each person’s life as being of equal importance? (2) What kind of responsibility do individuals have for their lives? How does Qutb interpret the idea of responsibility? How is Qutb’s account of responsibility different from Dworkin’s? Qutb says that “every individual will be held responsible for every evildoing in the community, even if he has had no part in it.” Is that a compelling view of responsibility? (3) How close are the views of intrinsic equality in Dworkin and Qutb? (4) How does Dworkin’s insurance model draw on his two principles? Where does the idea of special responsibility fit into the insurance scheme? Does Rawls have an adequate way of accommodating personal responsibility? (5) What kind of tax system would, do you think, emerge from Dworkin’s hypothetical insurance scheme? (6) Dworkin distinguishes justice from legitimacy, and expresses concern not only about the injustice of current inequalities, but about the “legitimacy of our political society.” What explains the concern about legitimacy? Is he right to be concerned?

LECTURE 18: JUSTICE AT LIFE’S INCEPTION

*Roe v. Wade (1973), selections  
*Planned Parenthood v. Casey (1992), selections  
*Judith Thomson, “Abortion,” Boston Review

Study Questions: (1) The Court majority in Roe v. Wade says that “the right of privacy ... is broad enough to encompass a woman’s decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy.” What reasons are given in support of this conclusion? (2) Does the state have a compelling interest in protecting human life from conception? (3) Can men and woman be social equals in a society with restrictive regulations on terminating pregnancies? (4) The majority opinion refers to a “wide divergence of thinking” on the question of when life begins. What sort of divergence do they have in mind? What is the relevance of this observation about divergence to the permissibility of regulation? (5) According to Thomson,
“there is nothing contrary to reason in refusing to lend any credence at all to the idea that fertilized eggs have a right to life.” Is this claim right? What bearing does it have on the issue about the permissibility of restrictive abortion regulations? (6) How does Thomson respond to the claim that there is a “standoff” in the debate on abortion? How does her response connect to the point in Casey about the conventional doctrine that when “reasonable people disagree,” government may decide whether or not to regulate?

LECTURE 19: THE PROBLEM OF GLOBAL JUSTICE

*Thomas Nagel, “The Problem of Global Justice”
*Joshua Cohen and Charles Sabel, “Extra Rempublicam, Nulla Justitia?”

Study Questions: (1) What is the difference between considerations of humanitarianism and considerations of justice? How extensive are the demands imposed by a “minimal humanitarian morality”? (2) How, according to Nagel, does the existence of a state—of political relations between persons—change the moral terrain that we operate on? Why is sovereignty so essential to justice? (3) What is the difference between what Nagel calls “cosmopolitanism” and what he calls “the political conception”? Should we follow Nagel in endorsing the political conception? Or is a cosmopolitan view more compelling? How does the idea of “involvement of will” support the case for a political conception? (4) What is the distinction between a “discontinuous” and a “continuous” political conception? Are there good reasons for endorsing a discontinuous view?

Lecture 20: Human Rights

*Joshua Cohen, “Minimalism About Human Rights: The Most We Can Hope For?”

Study Questions: (1) What is a human right? (2) Is the idea of human rights a parochial, Western-liberal idea? Is it a problem if it is parochial? (3) What are the universal human rights? Are those rights confined to basic protections of bodily security? (4) What is the difference between what Cohen calls “substantive” and “justificatory” minimalism? Can we, as he argues, embrace justificatory minimalism while rejecting substantive minimalism? (5) What is “inclusion,” and how does the idea of inclusion connect to human rights?
**Paper Topics**

Here are the topics for the papers. If you want to write on another topic, write out the topic in a few sentences, and check it with me or your TA. The first paper should be 1800-2200 words

**Topics for Paper 1**

The first version is due on October 13; the rewrite is due on October 27.

1. Critically assess Mill’s utilitarian defense of freedom of speech (in On Liberty, esp. chap. 2). Be sure to address at least the following three issues: (i) what reasons does Mill give for protecting freedom of speech? (ii) how (if at all) do those reasons connect to his utilitarianism, with its distinction between high and lower quality pleasures; (iii) do you find his arguments for freedom of speech compelling?

2. Using the principle of utility, not the Constitution, evaluate laws that regulate sexual conduct on grounds of its immorality or regulations that lack religious exemptions. (You should use laws and regulations of the kind discussed by the Court in Bowers, Lawrence, Sherbert, Employment Division to focus your discussion.) Does the principle of utility permit such laws and regulations? Or would it condemn the laws? In answering these questions, you should discuss either Bentham’s and Mill’s formulation of utilitarianism. You may focus principally on religious liberty or sexual liberty, but you must say something about both.

**Topics for Paper 2**

Due on December 8th. The paper must be 3000-3500 words. Readers will stop after 3500.

1. Sketch Rawls’s distinction between the natural liberty, liberal equality, and democratic equality views of distributive justice. Which of these views is the most compelling? In answering this question, you should discuss the arguments in at least two of the following: Nozick, Hayek, Friedman, Rawls, Dworkin, GA Cohen.

2. Discuss either abortion rights or Okin’s critical account of group rights in light of Dworkin’s two principles of equal importance and special responsibility. Be sure to state the principles and address at least the following issues: (i) Are Dworkin’s principles plausible? (ii) Is there a way to address the issue of
abortion or group rights for cultural minorities that accommodates both principles?

3. What is equality of opportunity? Why, if at all, is it an important element in a just society? In addressing these questions, be sure to: (i) explain different interpretations of the idea of equality of opportunity; (ii) discuss the notion of an “equal start,” and whether it is a sensible and attractive idea; (iii) explain why equality of opportunity is important, on the interpretation you find most reasonable; and (iv) discuss whether a society that protects liberty also ensures all the equality of opportunity that justice demands. In addressing these issues, you should discuss at least two of the following: Nozick, Hayek, Friedman, Rawls, Dworkin.
SOME RULES OF THUMB FOR WRITING PAPERS

Here are some suggestions about writing papers. Please read through them before you write the first paper.

1. **State the main thesis** of your paper at (or near) the beginning: preferably in the opening paragraph. It is not bad to say something like: "I will argue that ...." If you do not have a thesis, get one.

2. **Stay focused.** Your papers should critically assess some important aspect of one of the theories we have been discussing: the thesis of your paper, stated near the beginning (see point 1 above), will say what that aspect is. Before getting to the evaluation you will need to describe the relevant aspect(s) of the theory you are assessing. But do not try to provide a comprehensive overview of the theory. Instead, guide your presentation by the particular problems that animate your paper. For example, if you are writing in criticism of Mill’s account free speech, you should not try to engage his arguments about Socrates and the fool. Confine yourself to the aspects of Mill’s view that are of immediate relevance. Anything else will be a distraction, and, in the short space available, is not likely to be done well.

3. **Do not lead with (or conclude with, or otherwise include) sweeping such generalities as:** "Rawls’s theory of justice is the most important recent contribution to the perennial human search for the ideal society," or "Since Plato, philosophers have sought out the meaning of justice," or "For millennia, human beings have searched for truth," or “Philosophy is based on reason, not rhetoric." (What about: “Man is born free, but is everywhere in chains.” If you are Jean-Jacques Rousseau, you are allowed to break any rule that I have stated here.) Such remarks add nothing of substance; indeed, they subtract by distracting from the issues at hand. Moreover, they suggest that the writer, unsure what to say, and is looking for a way to fill some space. Not a suspicion you want to create. So just get right to the point.

4. **Write clearly.** That's easier said than done, and hard to make operational. But you can make a first step by writing short sentences, avoiding page-long paragraphs, and being careful to signal transitions. Operationally: If a sentence occupies more than (say) 5 lines, find a way to divide it up; if a paragraph goes on for more than 20 lines, find a way to divide it up; if your paper falls into sections, make sure to include a sentence or two of connective tissue between the sections. Moreover, put things as simply as you can. Writing philosophy does not require elaborate formulations, esoteric words, neologisms, or polysyllabophilia. The rules for poetry are different, but in this prosaic course, your writing should focus readers’ attention on the ideas you wish to express, not on the words you have chosen to express those ideas. (Think of the words
as a window on your thought, and of bad writing as smudge on the window. See Orwell.)

5. **Do not make the writing boring and clumsy.** Introduce some stylistic variety. For example, do not start every sentence with the subject. Moreover, stay away from passive constructions: instead of "The wheel was invented by Joe," why not: "Joe invented the wheel." Do not have too many sentences that begin "It is..." or "There is...." Though such constructions are sometimes appropriate, overusing them slows things down. Avoid long strings of prepositional clauses. And try not to repeat the same words (except if you are Homer).

6. **Support assertions.** When you attribute views to the person whose ideas you are addressing, indicate the evidence for the attribution by noting relevant passages. But you need not include quotations. As a general rule, you should only quote a passage if the passage plays an important role in the paper (say, it is a passage that you will want to be able to refer back to at various points in the argument), or if you think that there is some controversy about whether the philosopher actually held the view you are attributing to him or her. Do not submit a paper that strings together lots of quotations.

7. **Take the views you are discussing seriously.** The political philosophers we are reading are not fools. If, as you describe the relevant parts of their views, you find yourself attributing foolish views to them, assume you have misinterpreted. (Perhaps you have not. But treat “misinterpretation” as the default setting.) One strategy for taking a view seriously is to “argue against yourself” when you make a criticism: ask yourself how the philosopher you are criticizing would respond to your criticism. Try to get “inside” the conception you are discussing; develop a sense of its internal integrity, and see if you are able to understand how someone (who may have strange ideas, but is neither moron nor sociopath) might have come to hold the views in question. The books and articles we are reading are the product of sustained reflection, over a long period. The authors often distributed drafts of their manuscripts to other people, and then tried to incorporate responses to the objections they received. The result is not that their views are right, or genuinely coherent, or nice. But you can safely assume that they have greater depth and coherence than you may suspect on first reading.

8. When you finish writing, **read your paper out loud.** Writing that does not sound right will not read right.

9. In high school, you were probably told not to **use the first person singular.** Forget that piece of bad advice. (“In this paper, I will argue that....” is fine. “The author of this paper will argue that...” is not fine. “In this paper, it will be argued that...” is also not fine.)
10. **Do not plagiarize.** Plagiarism comes in two forms, both unacceptable. First, you plagiarize when you use the words of a source without quotation marks. If you take words from a source, you must use quotation marks, not just a footnote. Moreover, you *should not present a close paraphrase from a source:* either use the exact words with quotation marks, or restate the point in your own words. Second, you plagiarize if you take ideas from a source without footnoting the source.