

Week One

I. Types of knowing what is out there....

What is truth and what can be truth.

A. **Objectively True** - Reality is independent of the **knowing** observer.

1. Measurable through observation
2. No bias – personal views of the observation are irrelevant.
3. The reality of the thing being viewed is independent of the knowing (rational) observer.

B. **Conventionally Truth** - Reality exists by virtue of our agreement about it. It's true only because the knowing observers agree it's true.

1. Requires more than one person – it's a group phenomenon.
2. Explicit Agreements – laws, treaties
3. Implicit Agreements – language, justifications at law

C. **Inherently Contestable** – No single correct meaning at all. Non-rational experience. Feelings and sensations go directly to the part of the brain that registers it. There is no conceptual part of the feeling that must be decoded by our rational minds in order to be sensed. Things that are contestable in this way are not subject to argument because there is nothing to argue about. This is because all sensations are personal. There is nothing to share but rational descriptions of a personal event. These rational descriptions can only describe the feeling but no one else can experience in the same manner as the person who feels it.

Week 2

II. Modernism – Hobbes

- A. We're different from other animals in that we have **reason to develop the idea of society** and it doesn't just spring up from nature.
- B. We create the social world.
- C. We get knowledge to create our world through our senses. The only knowledge of the world is what we get from our senses.
- D. Empiricism - all the knowledge we get of the world comes through our senses. This data that comes in turns into knowledge through a process of comparison, association and construction.
 - 1. We take the raw data of experience and file it in our memories.
 - 2. We compare and contrast different experiences with our memories and form ideas about the world.
 - 2. **Imagination** – ability to think about different memories and what the consequences of different experiences were.
 - a) You can construct ideas from the combination of different memories of different observations.
 - b) You can make choices about what you need.
 - 3. Through speech we create categories that form concepts and exchange observations of what we have seen and what it means.
 - 4. Through reason we determine the relationship of these ideas and cause and effect. We sometimes call this process science.

E. **Essential Nature- Things that drive human behavior.** So the question is how does this way in which we develop our knowledge create a sense of self and why does that sense of self yearn after inherently scarce resources that lead us into conflict.

1. **Who is the self?** In order to understand why we are in conflict, we have to understand how our sense of self emerges from the totality of experiences, memories, imagination and subsequent ideas that we develop.
 - a) The idea of the self we have comes from the ideas and experiences we have embodied in ourselves.
 - b) As a consequence our idea of the self is unique to us because our experiences of the things out in the world are different.
 - c) But of course we have a natural desire that our sense of self be validated because we think that our preferences and taste are good given that they exist inside of us and we have no reason to think that they are bad preferences.
 - d) But remember that while our knowledge is rational and may be similar to other people who recognize the same patterns we do, our preferences about that knowledge comes from our own taste and is irrational. If something is irrational it isn't open to discussion. Indeed, there is nothing to discuss. Our tastes just are what they are.
 - e) Think of the fashion industry as an example of us having irrational preferences but wanting others to validate our preferences. In principle, clothing fashion is a matter of personal taste and so it shouldn't matter what other people think about your choice in clothing, if it pleases you. If you think that something tastes good or is looks good, who cares what other people think. But in fact we do want our taste in fashion to be validated and thought by others to be in good taste.
 - f) This puts us in a difficult situation, because while our preferences in tastes are irrational we are looking to be seen as having good taste. Yet we really can't give any reasons to show that our tastes are good because we don't have any. So resolving these differences in taste is not resolvable by reasoned discussion. More importantly, we are necessarily going to be in conflict because there will be a

multiplicity of tastes but each of us wants ours to be thought to be good and we have no mechanism to make other people see our position. So the differences can only be resolved through irrational means, and this usually means **force**.

g) Notice also that the sort of recognition we want is inherently scarce because not all of us can have our tastes validated by others. Some people just won't have our taste and so the more people who validate your taste means someone else will go without validation of their taste.

h) This lack of validation will be hurtful to a person's sense of self so people will go to great lengths not to have our sense of self damaged and to bolster our sense of self.

2. **Passions – appetites, hunger for what we need to thrive;** While our knowledge comes from a rational process, it is not the essence of our nature. We are not essential rational creatures even though our knowledge comes from the rational process. We are essentially egoistic self-serving creatures. That is our nature and it drives all our activity.

3. **Felicity -- Are the things that are driven by irrational egoistic passions.**

This is the thing that drives all human action. We only use our rationality instrumentally to satisfy our passions and achieve felicity.

a) *Biological – food, shelter, clothing... to survive....*

b) *Social – what you need to thrive begins to relate to other people... for example holding on to property in order to survive....*

(1) Power, Honor and Dignity – purely social passions they only exist inside of society. And they concern only your relationship to other people.

c) We strive for these social passions because they satisfy our egoistic desire for felicity.

d) But these social passions are **inherently scarce**. The more honor and dignity I have, someone has to have less in order to make that possible.

Questions for Next week.

- What is the relationship between our passions and rationality?
- What consequences for social order are there for our social passions for the relationship of people with each other.

1. Why are social goods inherently scarce? By definition, these socially constructed goods can only go to a small sliver of society or even just one person.
2. Humans can uniquely apply rationality to their passions. So our rational capacities are directly tied to what we want.
3. Moreover, our rationality gives us the capacity to compare ourselves to others and realize where we stand in relation to others.
4. Rationality is only instrumental to pursuing our passions.
This leads to a world that is competitive, violent, nasty brutish, and short. When people are driven by their passions... (passions are irrational appetites) there is inherent conflict...

5. We use our rationality to develop a social contract to contain the violence of our natural passions. But this contract is one where ALL the power goes to the ruler.
6. No room for dissent in this social order... because if your goals are driven by irrational appetites then there is NOTHING TO DISCUSS. You can't reason about irrational motives.
7. So all differences will lead to conflict...
8. Therefore only one person can have power.... Everyone else has to obey.

Questions for next week.

- How does Locke's idea about knowledge affect his conception of human identity?
- How does his idea of identity differ from Hobbes?
- Compare Bentham's idea of the person with that of Hobbes and Locke? What do they have in common and how do they differ?

1. Locke- Knowledge and Human Nature

- a. Locke begins by repudiating the Platonic notion of innate ideas. He rejects the idea that we are somehow hardwired with knowledge about morality or indeed anything else. Locke points out that if this were true, people would hold the same religious and moral views everywhere but that isn't true.
- b. Locke claims we are born as blank slates- ***tabula rasa***.... In that stage, we have no fully formed identity. What we need to get an identity is to have some notion of who we are. We get this from ideas about the world.
- c. While we're born as blank slates we are born with certain capacities that enable us to absorb data and turn that into ideas and knowledge. These two traits are:
 - i. **Sentience:** This is the ability to think and reflect on the sensory data that we take in.
 - ii. **Sapience:** This is the ability to think about the thoughts that we have and to realize that it is us who think these thoughts. We recognize that we are one entity having these observations and thoughts through time.

- d. Knowledge comes from us observing different phenomena and making comparisons of similarities and differences. These come in 4 types:
 - i. Identity/diversity
 - ii. relation
 - iii. coexistence or necessary connection
 - iv. real existence (related to but not the same as real essence)
- e. The ideas about the world start with observations of the qualities of objects. There are two sorts of qualities things can have:
 - i. primary qualities: These are qualities of the object itself and have nothing to do with the knowing observer. For example the shape or density of a cherry pit.
 - ii. Secondary qualities suggest features derived from the observer that doesn't come from the object being observed. So, for example, the sweetness of a cherry includes feelings/sensations in the observer, but importantly, these sensations are not themselves the product of thoughts or judgments. Rather they are just the sense feeling itself.
- f. We retain memories of the observations we have and make comparisons of some memories by which we can associate and assemble connections and synthesize them to come up with ideas.

Through a series of increasingly complex ideas that come from increasing numbers of observations, our memories of those observations, and more and more abstract associations of those observations we develop increasingly more complex ideas.

- i. Different levels of knowledge
 - 1. Pure sensory experience -- **intuition** non-rational experience
 -
 - 2. Memory and comparison of sensory experiences
 - a. How much one sensory experience should dominate over other types of experiences.
 -
 - 3. More complex ideas come from more and more abstract associations as well as more precise observations. **We are constantly creating categories based on these associations and these abstract categories are ideas that**

we come to think of as information or knowledge.

4. Along with this more abstract level of knowledge is the expansive level that comes from associating with others who have their associations and ideas.
- g. All the different associations of experiences you develop require REASON/RATIONALITY!!!!
Reason is at the root of all rational knowledge
- h. Our identity itself is based on reason. This is very important. Our identity is based on the fact that we know it is ourselves observing, remembering, synthesizing ideas all the time. Having memories of observations requires sapience. We know it is us who observed something and the thoughts we had are retained.
- i. All the different observations we develop over time serve as the source of ideas but also our preferences. We develop ideas of ourselves as social, religious, or shy based on our own experiences and the ideas we form from them. We are aware that our ideas come from these experiences and that our preferences come from the memories and ideas we get from them.
- j. Our awareness of this process of developing preferences based on our own reasoning and experiences means that we recognize that other people also develop preferences for things based on their observations and associations, etc.
- k. This recognition is key to the motives we have in relation to others. Unlike Hobbes who thought we were primarily driven by our passions, Locke feels that at root, our identities and therefore our preferences are rooted in reason (or at least the reasoning process).
- l. So while we might disagree with one another, we don't see other people as driven by irreconcilable passions which threaten my own pursuit of my own passions.
- m. Remember passions are not things we can rationally develop so we can't really reason with ourselves to change them. We just have them. But if we think that our own and everyone else's identity and preferences are rooted in reason, then there is something to discuss when disagreements arise. Hence, there is the possibility for accommodation and compromise.
- n. How does this affect the type of government that we have? How does government develop given these aspects of identity formation?

- i. We recognize that our pursuit of the good life is rooted in the identities we have and we also realize that other people's pursuit of the good life is premised on their own identities and experiences.
 - 1. So we can mostly get along.
 - 2. But we do have difficulty resolving disputes because we tend to take our own side in our arguments with others. Hence, Icelandic blood feuds and the Hatfields and McCoys.
 - 3. We protect property because that is the creation of willful intentional behavior based on someone's exercise of their free will and the implementation of their identities and idea of the good life.
 - 4. We agree to government to be a neutral third party arbiter between disputes
 - 5. But we also need the government to be neutral with respect to our pursuit of the good life. We develop an idea of the good life based on our identities and what we think is valuable to do and think. But we can't do this unless we can exercise our reason. That is what the living the good life means. We cannot live a good life morally speaking if we just act out of obedience to others or blindly follow without reasoning whether it is really a good life.
 - 6. Living a good life is intentional using our reasons and it requires the state to give us the personal space to develop and pursue our own ideas of the good life.
 - 7. So the purpose of govt is to protect individual autonomy of each person to make sure that no one interferes with anyone else's ability to pursue their own idea of the good life.

Week 3

- 2. **Bentham** – Humans are inherently motivated to avoid pain and seek pleasure.... That is the essential nature of humankind.... This premise leads him to present the first theory of social order that promotes democracy. Note that I said promotes. Does Bentham even care about justifying democracy?
 - a. All knowledge is empirical. It comes from observations of the world around us. He is using the scientific method to study human behavior.
 - i. Does science address questions of morality? Can it?
 - ii. Does Bentham purport to provide a moral basis of legislation at all or only a scientific foundation for guiding human behavior.
 - b. Bentham says that all humans are slaves to the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain.

- i. If this is true then what room is there for moral judgments? What are we doing when we invoke a moral judgment about someone else's behavior?
- c. What is pain and pleasure... They are feelings that are completely subjective...and therefore not subject to rational discourse or argument.
 - i. The experience of pleasure inside us is a purely biochemical reaction of neuro transmitters
 - ii. It isn't anything that we can share with anyone else.
- d. Because we experience pain and pleasure internally and only as a feeling there is no rational external method to rank them.
 - i. Even though Bentham talks about ways to evaluate pain and pleasure
 1. eg intensity, frequency, number of people experiencing etc.
 2. These are still all feelings experienced internally and not sharable with anyone else.
 3. There is no way to say how the pleasure I experience from eating a delicious cake is any better or worse than the pleasure you experience from deep frying little babies.
 - ii. No way to rank them. Pain and pleasure are non comparable, and in fact, they're incommensurate.
- e. Each person is a holder of pain and pleasure... no way to compare one person's pain

Questions for next class

How does Bentham's idea of human nature lead him to believe that everyone counts for one and no one counts for more than one?

How does Bentham's idea of human nature differ from Mill's?

How does Bentham's idea of utility differ from Mill's?

- f. Everyone counts for one and no one counts for more than one. If it's part of our essential nature to seek pleasure...how to get the most pleasure in society...
- g. Social justice is simply the aggregation of the most pleasure and the least pain.
- h. **Imperative** – take that **action** that maximizes pain and minimizes pleasure... But note this is not a moral imperative because there can be no such imperative in Bentham's model of human nature. He is just talking about maximizing pleasure and we are each just bundles of this pain and pleasure. So he's just talking about ways to maximize it. But he can't provide any justification for this other than to say this is what it is to have the most pleasure.
- i. **ACT Utilitarian**... **take that action which maximizes utility**... .the only view of the world in carrying this mandate is egoistic... that's all the view we have of pain and pleasure because those are inherently subjective notions.
- j. This formula laid the basis for modern democracy but not one in which there would be any guarantee of minority rights. Whatever maximizes the pleasure of the most people would be the **just** moral choice.

3. **John Stuart Mill** -- Rejects Bentham's idea of human nature... says we pursue happiness not pleasure. What is happiness....

- a. Happiness consists in *Well Being* ..
- b. Well-being consists in the ability to determine what will maximize your happiness over the course of your life..
- c. Happiness is connected with rational ideas about well-being – both in a general sense and in what YOUR well-being will be.
- d. Well-being is directly linked with rational ideas...
- e. The more connected with rational thought the higher level of well-being you're pursuing.

4. How does this transformation take place in humans that we begin seeking pleasure but then "graduate" to happiness?

Mill uses his theory of **associationism** (how the mind connects ideas) to argue that while we start as animals seeking simple pleasure (Bentham's view), the process of identity formation transforms us into beings who pursue a complex state of "happiness" or "well-being" that is distinct from mere sensation.

Mill argues that the way in which we gain knowledge of the world, and hence, our preferences, isn't just a matter of random experiences that we register and categorize, but that it includes an understanding of cause and effect.

Here is the detailed breakdown of how he uses identity formation to correct Bentham.

1. The Starting Point: Bentham's "Psychological Hedonism"

Jeremy Bentham was a strict psychological hedonist. He argued that nature has placed mankind under two sovereign masters: **pain** and **pleasure**.

- **Bentham's View:** We are biologically hardwired to pursue pleasure. When we say we pursue "virtue" or "honesty," we are really just pursuing the *pleasure* that those things bring (or avoiding the *pain* of punishment).
- **The Implication:** Identity is static. You are a pleasure-seeking container; you just get better at calculating which actions fill the container best.

2. Mill's Correction: The "Chemical" Transformation of Identity

Mill accepts that we start by seeking pleasure. However, in *A System of Logic* and later in *Utilitarianism*, he argues that through the **Laws of Association**, our identity changes *qualitatively*.

He uses the analogy of **chemistry**. Just as Hydrogen and Oxygen mix to create Water (which has totally different properties than H or O), our primitive desires mix with our experiences to create a new, complex identity.

The Mechanism: Means become Ends

Mill argues that we begin pursuing things like **Virtue**, **Money**, or **Power** only as *means* to pleasure.

- *Stage 1 (Childhood/Benthamite):* "I will be honest because if I am not, I will be punished (pain)."
- *Stage 2 (Association):* Over time, the act of being honest is repeatedly paired with the feeling of safety or praise.
- *Stage 3 (Identity Formation):* Eventually, the *means* (Honesty) becomes a part of the *end* (Happiness).

Mill writes that virtue is not naturally part of the end, but it is capable of **becoming** part of the end. Once this happens, the person no longer pursues "pleasure" derived from honesty; they pursue honesty *as part of their happiness*.

3. Pleasure vs. Happiness (Well-Being)

This is where Mill splits from Bentham explicitly regarding identity.

- **Bentham:** Happiness = A pile of pleasures.
- **Mill:** Happiness = A complex state of character where "higher" faculties are active.

Mill argues that a person with a developed identity (one who has undergone this associative process) pursues **Dignity** and **Self-Development**. He famously asserts in *Utilitarianism* that a being of higher faculties can never truly wish to sink into a lower grade of existence, even if that lower grade offers more "pleasure."

- **The "Sense of Dignity":** Mill argues that this sense of dignity is so essential to the identity of a cultivated person that "nothing which conflicts with it could be, otherwise than momentarily, an object of desire to them."

4. Conclusion

Mill connects identity to the pursuit of well-being by showing that **what we desire depends on who we are**.

- **Bentham** thought the object of desire (pleasure) was fixed, and we just changed our methods.
- **Mill** thought the object of desire *evolves* as our identity evolves.

Therefore, a developed human does not pursue "pleasure" in the Benthamite sense (sensation); they pursue a **realization of their identity**—a state of "well-being" where their higher faculties (intellect, sympathy, moral agency) are exercised. This effectively saves Utilitarianism from being a "philosophy for swine" by grounding it in the developmental psychology of the human character.

❖ Mill thinks that happiness is connected to rational ideas. Indeed, the greater the connection with rational thought, the greater the happiness. Does this mean that we should give greater weight, or perhaps more votes, to those policies that are based on more rational thought? Should we devote more public resources to subsidizing poetry than baseball stadiums?

- ❖ If Mill believes that we are basically self-interested, how is it that his version of utilitarianism is able to go beyond Bentham's hedonistic version.
 - a. What is happiness? Includes an ability to have an overall picture of your identity and what things will promote that idea of yourself.
 - b. Happiness requires the ability to sacrifice immediate pleasure for future benefits.
 - c. How do we justify rights?
 - i. It's in our interest to have sympathy for others and to look out for the whole community...
 - ii. Most of the social Darwinists misapplied Darwin. He was talking about the species, not the individual behavior. Social cooperation helped the species.
 - d. How to get self-interested people to look out for the well-being of the community?
- e. **Rule Utilitarian** enact legislation and follow laws that maximize utility (happiness/well being)
Means that people will have to take into account how the rule will affect them personally in a way they needn't do when just considering any immediate action.
- f. **Rights**- people will pass rights protecting people against coercion not out of altruism but out of their own self-interested desire not to be coerced.
- g. **Harm Principle** - People care most about two things
 - i. **Safety**
 - ii. **Freedom**
 - 1. This will lead them to a view that the government will not make any rule limiting liberty except to the extent it involves other-regarding **behavior**. This means behavior that harms other people.
 - 2. But this only begs the question, what is a harm?
- h. **Harm** = a setback to your legitimate interests. But what are your legitimate interests?
 - i. Physical safety
 - ii. Property
 - iii. Character

- i. **Offense** - goes towards people's feelings not their sense of harm or safety. This includes feelings from senses as well as our attitudes about the things other people are saying. If we had to conform behavior to anything inoffensive. People have strong feelings about the way other people live their lives but even though it might trigger us to know what others think about us, it does not constitute any of the cognizable harms in Mill's view.
- j. Is it a harm to know that someone else doesn't like you or wishes you ill?

5. To understand the difference between harm and offense we have to consider how we know anything to be true. How do we gain knowledge in the world and how is **knowledge** different from **belief**?

- a. Knowledge is related to those things we can know because of some way of getting data that we trust as an accurate description of the world.
 - i. Empiricism
 - ii. Tautologies-- These are things that are made up, like language. They are true because we defined it that way. eg Mathematics $1+1=2$ is true by the definition of the rules of math.

- b. Beliefs are things that are not generated by any of our sensing organs. They are things we believe are true without really knowing why they are true or being able to verify through a method we ourselves trust as accurate descriptors of the world.

Mill regards our identities as the product of rational ideas. So the things that we want to protect about humans are their capacity to be rational independent creatures deciding their own ideas of the good life.

- c. Offenses are assaults on our feelings, not our rational identity or our ability to live our own version of the good life, well lived.
- d. There is no way to debate what is offensive or not. Different people are offended by different things and there is no rational way to tell someone that they should or should not be offended by something.
- e. If we let offenses limit different forms of expression or different ways of living one's life then we will be limited to the ways of living of the least tolerant person in society.

1. Bentham vs Mill on Rights

- a. Bentham...the only things protected are irrational pleasures.
- b. Kelo vs. City of New London:
 - The beneficiaries weren't private...it was for a public benefit. Doesn't have to be a body purchasing so long as there are other public benefits...
 - Things like tax revenue, erasing urban blight, more jobs equals a public purpose.
 - If a piece of property can bring more pleasure if used for a different purpose, then it should go to that entity that can maximize this pleasure.
 - Would Mill's idea of utilitarianism lead to this result?
 1. Rule U... pass the rule or follow the rule that maximizes utility. Forces you to align your self-interest with the community by requiring you to be subject to the rules, and hence the actions of others.
 2. Mill thinks rights would be protected because of Rule U... they would not want to lose their own freedoms so they wouldn't pass a rule that would take away someone else's rights.

2. Fienberg's Ride On The Bus

This thought experiment is meant to illustrate the distinction between **harm** and **offense**, while at the same time calling into question how we come to label some things as harmful or offensive.

- a. Why is an affront to one's religious sensibilities not considered harmful under the law?
- b. Should people's idea of themselves be protected not only by what they choose but in how other people think of them? In other words, do we have a right that others think of us as we wish to think of ourselves?

3. The Role of Reason in protecting freedom and hence tolerance of other people's rights...

- a. Hobbes, Bentham..we're driven primarily by our passions, irrational pleasures
- b. Mill and Locke our identities are the product of reason itself.
 - Reason is something that we can share. it is above our purely subjective appetites.
 - We can put ourselves in other people's shoes with reason in a way that passions don't permit.
 - The purpose of entering into civil society for Locke is not fear of imminent death as it is for Hobbes but to protect the reasoned ideas of property and

contract rights that can't be protected in the state of nature.

- For Locke, we view others as rights holders like ourselves so there is a commonality with others that doesn't exist for Hobbes who thinks we're all driven by our passions.

4.

Part II Interpretive Foundations of Rationality and Human Nature

- a. Rousseau: The social basis of violence and injustice.

There is no rationality prior to society and indeed there's no personal identity prior to society.

- No language in the state of nature because no interaction can cause it. Without language there are no ideas and without ideas there are no concepts. There are no definitions of things.
- Language develops to communicate ideas...so you need other people to communicate to in order to have ideas.
- Ideas about the world are the product of social interactions
- People are amoral in the state of nature.
- People in nature have no sense of past, present or future... no sense of place in community. People don't have rational impulses for recognition, wealth, power... because those are all rational pursuits and the concepts for them don't exist.

1. That's why people in nature are amoral...they don't have the ideas that morality requires either for good or evil.
2. Nature is not violent... self love tempered by pity... Not because they're "good" but because they have no concept of separation from others. Like children when they see sickness or blood they think it is or will be happening to them.

3. **We enter into communities gradually and they get more complex and hence our concepts become more complex... As a result our identities become more complex.**
 - a. **Personal identity.... Is a product of my relationship to others....**
 - b. **Process of rationality and identity are created by social relationships and importantly by social practices...**
4. **Most important social practice is language.**

5. **Questions for Thursday**

- a. Why does Rousseau think that private property is the source of all the problems and barriers to freedom in opposition to Locke's view that it is the source of all freedom?
- b. What does Rousseau think that freedom consists in? What do we have a right to in his view?

b. **Equality and Self Mastery as the Foundation of Social Order**

Language is the building block of ideas or concepts. The ideas require social interaction.

1. Identity comes from the different concepts that we create together as a community.
2. Identity consists in social practices. You don't observe the world so much as you interpret it.
3. What is our human nature like...
 - a. People in nature are rather simple..without a firm identity. People aren't acquisitive for scarce resources in nature because that requires concepts of things that are naturally scarce. We don't compare ourselves to other people because our identities are not formed to differentiate from others.
 - i. Humans are neither good nor bad... they're amoral.
 - ii. Non acquisitive
 - iii. Self love tempered by pity.... Without identities you can't distinguish yourself from others so you don't hurt them... that might be you.
 - b. If our identity is only a product of society and social meanings.... You must get the social practices of society correct... otherwise you're going to install bad social practices and hence bad ideas of rationality based on bad identities.
 - i. Your identity is a product of social relationships. So is your rationality.

4. Why does property lead to inequality? Through social concepts like money there is an incentive to accumulate and therefore exclude others from accumulation.
5. Why is inequality so bad in Rousseau's view? If our identities are based on relationships then when we're unequal we'll have different identities and so we can't relate to each other as being the same.... Or even being human.
6. If you regard other people as not human then you treat them that way.
 - a. We create conditions of scarcity and competition and this creates a state of violence or war.
7. For Rousseau the good comes before the right... in order for you to be the person you want to be.... To be the best version of yourself.... To realize your potential..... you need to have the right social meanings.
 - a. For R freedom consists not in autonomy but in SELF REALIZATION....
 - i. Freedom consists in having a community that has the right social meanings where you can realize your human potential... you can master yourself and not be mastered by the community.
 - ii. Positive Freedom/ Positive Rights These are claims on the community to have the correct social practices that enable each person to realize the best version of themselves.

- iii. There's a potential here for "other realization" i.e. violation of negative freedom.
- iv. In order for self realization to be possible, there has to be some set of correct ideas that people should have in order for the social practices to empower everyone to master their own resources.
- v. So the positive freedom to the correct social practices implies that we live in a morally ***monistic*** world.
- vi. **Monism** is the idea that all the good values in the world are compatible and fit together without conflict. This is the opposite of moral pluralism that argues that we live in a world where different ideas of the good life can conflict. To the monist, all truly good ideas must be compatible.
- vii. **Communitarianism:** The political idea that is embodied by Rousseau's idea of interpretive identity formation and positive rights is called communitarianism. This idea can be ***either*** radical or conservative. Some communitarians believe that the social practices of the community are just fine and need to be maintained. They are conservatives. Others, like Rousseau, believe that the existing social practices prevent self realization and so need to be altered.

Rousseau's *Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men* (1755) is structured in two parts, preceded by a crucial methodological preface and a dedication to Geneva.

The Preface and Method. Rousseau begins by announcing that the question of inequality's origins requires a kind of philosophical archaeology — stripping away everything society has layered onto human nature to recover what he calls "natural man." He's explicit that this is not a historical project. He says the state of nature "no longer exists, perhaps never did exist, and probably never will exist," yet we need it as a conceptual baseline. This is already epistemologically significant: he's telling us that the foundation of his political theory is a rational reconstruction, not an empirical observation.

Part One: Natural Man. Rousseau describes humans in the pure state of nature as solitary, physically robust, and essentially unreflective. Natural man is governed by two pre-rational sentiments: *amour de soi* (self-preservation, a healthy self-concern) and *pitié* (a natural compassion or repugnance at the suffering of other sentient beings). Crucially, natural man lacks language, sustained social relationships, and comparative reasoning. He has sensations but not what we would call knowledge. He experiences the world immediately, without the mediating frameworks of language, abstraction, or social comparison.

Rousseau draws a sharp distinction here from both Hobbes and Locke. Hobbes projected civilized vices (vanity, competition) back onto natural man. Locke projected civilized rationality (the capacity to reason about natural law and property rights) back onto natural man. Rousseau argues both committed the same error: they observed civilized humans and mistook socially produced characteristics for natural ones.

Part Two: The Development of Inequality. This is the genealogical core. Rousseau traces a speculative history through several stages: the development of rudimentary tools and shelter, the formation of families and small communities, the emergence of language and comparative thinking, the invention of metallurgy and agriculture (which create the division of labor), and finally the establishment of private property — the famous passage where "the first person who, having enclosed a piece of ground, bethought himself of saying *This is mine*, and found people simple enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society."

Each stage involves a transformation not just in social organization but in *how humans know*. Language doesn't just express pre-existing thoughts; it restructures cognition. Social life doesn't just satisfy pre-existing needs; it generates new ones. The pivotal psychological transformation is the emergence of *amour-propre* — self-love mediated by comparison with others, the need to be esteemed, recognized, and ranked. This is the engine of inequality because it makes relative position constitutive of identity.

The Discourse ends darkly. The wealthy, having accumulated property through a system that generates conflict, propose a social contract that is really a confidence trick — it institutionalizes existing inequalities under the guise of protecting everyone. This is Rousseau's anti-Lockean social contract: not the rational securing of natural rights but the legitimization of usurpation.

The Epistemological Argument: Knowledge as Interpretive, Not Observational

This is where Rousseau is genuinely radical and where the contrast with Locke is sharpest. The argument runs through several layers.

The critique of empiricist observation. Locke's epistemology holds that the mind begins as a blank slate, receives simple ideas through sensation and reflection, and builds complex ideas through mental operations on that raw material. The process is fundamentally receptive — the world impresses itself on us, and knowledge is a faithful registration of what's there. From this, Locke derives natural rights: reason, operating on the data of experience, can discern the law of nature, which includes rights to life, liberty, and property.

Rousseau's counter-move is to argue that what Locke calls "observation" is always already interpretation shaped by social conditions. The key passage in the Second Discourse is his discussion of how we cannot access the state of nature through empirical investigation precisely because our cognitive apparatus has been transformed by civilization. We don't see "natural man" when we look at humans; we see beings whose perceptions, categories, desires, and reasoning have all been socially constituted. The observer is as much a product of social development as the observed.

Language and the constitution of knowledge. Rousseau's discussion of the origin of language in the Second Discourse (and expanded in his *Essay on the Origin of Languages*) is central here. He poses what is essentially a chicken-and-egg problem: abstract thought seems to require language, but language seems to require abstract thought. His resolution is that both develop together through social interaction. General ideas — the categories through which we organize experience — are not discovered in nature but produced through the social practice of communication. This means that what counts as an "observation" is always framed by a linguistically and socially constituted interpretive scheme.

This is why Rousseau says that philosophers who claim to describe natural man always end up describing civilized man. They can't step outside their own conceptual framework to achieve a view from nowhere. Their "observations" of human nature are interpretations produced by their particular social and historical position.

Needs, desires, and the social construction of interest. Rousseau extends this from cognition to motivation. Locke treats certain interests — in self-preservation, property, comfort — as natural and observable. Rousseau argues that most of what we call our "interests" and "needs" are socially produced. Natural man needs food, shelter, and rest. Everything beyond that — the desire for esteem, for accumulation, for luxury, for intellectual distinction — is generated by social life. So when Locke observes that humans naturally desire property and derives a natural right from that observation, he's actually observing a socially produced desire and misidentifying it as a natural fact.

The methodological upshot. If knowledge of human nature is always interpretive rather than observational, then we cannot ground political principles in supposedly observed natural facts. We cannot say "I observe that humans naturally have X quality, therefore they naturally have Y right." The entire Lockean method is undermined. What we need instead is a different foundation for rights — one that acknowledges their constructed character.

From Interpretive Knowledge to Positive Rights

This is the bridge to the *Social Contract* (1762), and it's where Rousseau's epistemology does its most consequential political work.

The impossibility of natural rights in the Lockean sense. If we cannot reliably observe a pre-social human nature, then we cannot derive rights from that nature. Lockean natural rights depend on a specific epistemological claim: that reason can discern the law of nature through experience. Rousseau has argued that reason itself is a social product, that experience is always interpreted through social categories, and that the "natural" interests from which Locke derives rights are actually social constructs. Natural rights in the Lockean sense are therefore a philosophical fiction — not in the sense that they're unimportant, but in the sense that they lack the epistemological foundation Locke claimed for them.

Rights as products of the social contract. Rousseau's alternative is that genuine rights are created, not discovered. In the *Social Contract*, legitimate political authority arises when individuals collectively agree to submit to the general will — the will of the community directed at the common good. Through this act, they exchange their natural liberty (which was precarious and unsecured) for civil liberty and moral freedom. Rights are constituted by the political community and have no prior existence.

This is "positive" in the jurisprudential sense: rights exist because they are posited (established, enacted) by a legitimate political authority, not because they inhere in nature waiting to be recognized. The general will doesn't discover pre-existing rights; it creates them.

The content of positive rights. Because rights are created by the community for the common good, they include not just protections from interference (negative liberty) but substantive entitlements. The social contract obligates the community to each of its members. Rousseau argues that extreme inequality is incompatible with legitimate political community because it undermines the conditions for genuine participation in the general will. This implies that the political community must ensure that each citizen has sufficient material security, education, and standing to participate as a genuine equal. These are positive rights in the modern sense — rights *to* something, not merely rights *from* interference.

Freedom as self-legislation. Rousseau's most profound move is redefining freedom itself. For Locke, freedom is essentially non-interference within the bounds of natural law. For Rousseau, freedom is obedience to a law one prescribes to oneself. This is "moral freedom" — the capacity to act according to principles one has rationally endorsed as a member of the political community. This kind of freedom can only exist within a well-constituted polity. It requires positive institutional conditions: education, civic participation, rough material equality. It cannot be secured merely by leaving people alone.

Emile and the Confessions: The Developmental and Autobiographical Dimensions

Emile, or On Education (1762). This is where Rousseau's epistemology becomes a pedagogical program, and it's essential reading alongside the political works. Emile is organized around the education of a fictional child from birth to adulthood, and each stage corresponds to a theory of cognitive and moral development.

The central pedagogical principle is that a child should learn through direct experience with things, not through verbal instruction or books, in the early years. This might seem to contradict the "knowledge is interpretive" thesis, but it actually deepens it. Rousseau's point is that the child must develop a relationship with the natural world *before* social influences distort perception. The tutor's job is largely negative — keeping away the corrupting influences of social opinion, vanity, and premature abstraction. The child learns that fire burns by approaching the fire, not by being told. This isn't naive empiricism; it's a carefully controlled environment designed to let natural development proceed without the overlay of social interpretation.

As Emile matures, Rousseau introduces social knowledge gradually and critically. The teenager learns history not as a set of facts but as a study of human passions and their consequences. He learns to read other people's perspectives, to understand that knowledge is situated and shaped by interest. The goal is to produce a citizen who can participate in the general will with clear-eyed understanding rather than being manipulated by the social fictions that pass for natural truths.

The famous "Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar" embedded in Book IV of *Emile* is Rousseau's most sustained epistemological statement. The Vicar argues that inner conscience and sentiment, not abstract reason or empirical observation, are the truest guides to moral and metaphysical truth. This is Rousseau pushing back against both rationalist and empiricist epistemology — knowledge of what matters most (goodness, justice, God) comes through a kind of moral intuition that is neither deductive nor inductive but something closer to what we might call interpretive judgment shaped by properly cultivated sentiment.

The *Confessions* (written 1765–70, published posthumously). The *Confessions* perform the epistemological argument autobiographically. Rousseau's project of radical self-disclosure is premised on the idea that self-knowledge is not transparent introspection but an interpretive act. He repeatedly shows how his own self-understanding was distorted by social pressures, by amour-propre, by the need to appear a certain way. The famous early episodes — stealing the ribbon and blaming the servant Marion, abandoning his own children to the foundling hospital — are presented not as simple confessions of wrongdoing but as case studies in how social conditions deform moral perception and self-knowledge.

The connection to the political theory is direct. If even self-knowledge requires the kind of interpretive reconstruction Rousseau undertakes in the *Confessions*, then the Lockean assumption that individuals can straightforwardly know their own natural interests and rights through introspection is naive. We need social and political institutions that cultivate genuine self-knowledge rather than assuming it's naturally given.

Other relevant works. The *Essay on the Origin of Languages* extends the argument about language constituting rather than merely expressing thought. The *Letter to d'Alembert on the Theatre* argues that cultural institutions shape moral perception — we don't just observe a play, we're formed by it. And the *Reveries of the Solitary Walker* returns to the epistemological theme in a contemplative key, exploring how solitude might offer a path to less distorted self-knowledge, though Rousseau remains honest about the impossibility of fully escaping social mediation.

Locke assumes that properly functioning individuals can observe human nature and derive rights from what they find. Rousseau argues that what we "find" when we observe human nature is always a reflection of the social conditions under which we're observing. Rights therefore cannot be discovered — they must be made, collectively and deliberately, through legitimate political institutions. That's the move from observational to interpretive epistemology, and from negative natural rights to positive constructed ones.

8. Michael Walzer From Simple To Complex Equality: The Social meaning of the resources we distribute.

Chapters 1-3 is

I. Introduction:

- Setting the stage: defining **distributive justice** as the fair allocation of scarce goods within a society.
- Introducing the central tension: balancing two seemingly contradictory principles: **equality** and **difference**.

II. The Problem of Distribution:

- Different societies face diverse questions about what to distribute and how:
 - Goods and services (wealth, income, healthcare)
 - Power and authority (political participation, decision-making)
 - Social recognition and esteem (honor, prestige, status)
- various **approaches to distribution**:
 - **Utilitarianism**: Maximizing aggregate welfare, regardless of individual shares.
 - **Libertarianism**: Minimal state intervention, individuals keep what they earn.
 - **Egalitarianism**: Equal shares for all, regardless of differences.

III. Critique of Existing Theories:

- **utilitarianism**: Ignores individual rights and overlooks different types of goods.
- **libertarianism**: Can lead to vast inequalities and neglects social obligations.
- **egalitarianism**: Ignores differences in talent, effort, and contribution.

IV. Introducing Spheres of Justice:

- Walzer proposes an alternative framework: **distribution occurs within distinct spheres of social life**.
- Each sphere has its own principles for allocating goods and distributing social burdens:
 - **Politics**: Equal political rights and participation.
 - **Economy**: Distribution based on fair wages and market exchange, with social intervention for basic needs.

- **Education:** Access to quality education, but variations in outcomes based on talent and effort.
- **Social recognition:** Respect and dignity for all, but different levels of honor for achievements.

V. Balancing Equality and Difference:

- Within each sphere, **different principles of equality and difference apply:**
 - **Equality of access:** Everyone has equal opportunity to compete within the sphere.
 - **Equality of outcome:** Some inequalities in outcome may be justified based on contribution or effort.
 - **Respect for difference:** Recognizing and valuing different talents, achievements, and needs.

VI. Negotiating Justice:

- Walzer emphasizes the need for **ongoing negotiation and compromise** between principles of equality and difference.
- Different societies will develop their own specific understandings of justice within each sphere.
- The book aims to explore and evaluate these differing understandings and compromises.

VII. Conclusion:

At first glance, Walzer seems like a modern version of Rousseau, **But he rejects all** formulaic ideas of justice that are rooted in some abstract ordering principle. Hence, just as he rejects Locke and Mill's abstract ideas of autonomy and utility, he also rejects Rousseau's call for equality in which all resources must be distributed equally. Walzer calls this "simple equality" and regards it as inconsistent both with the meaning of the resources we are distributing and with the ideas of justice that we use.

Walzer says that every resource society produces has a meaning that is based on the history and social practices of that community for that particular resource. Not every resources is meant to be distributed equally? For example, must our love be distributed equally to everyone, or can we limit the distribution of this resource to those we designate for the reasons we decide? Walzer says the fact that people properly think their love can be withheld from others in ways

that say, civil rights cannot, means that we conceive of these resources differently. So the distribution mechanism we use must be related to the the nature of the resource being distributed.

Tyranny is when resources are distributed according to principles outside their proper sphere. So for example, in our society, mosty people are comfortable distributing iphones according to free market principles, there is more disagreement about whether health care should be distributed based on those principles rather than need. There is still more agreement that political power should not be allocated according to market principles but the practice appears to belie this belief.

So what to do when resources are distributed according to principles outside their realm.

Simple Equality: People like Rousseau believe that when a **monopoly** of one resource, like property, leads to a monopoly in all other resources, then the solution is to redistribute the dominant resource, (property) so that all other resources will be equally accessible.

Complex Equality: Walzer argues that the problem is one of **dominance, not monopoly**. The problem is the dominance of one distribution method outside the appropriate boundaries of the resource it was designed to distribute.

1. The solution for Walzer is not to engage in a wholesale redistribution distribution of dominant goods.
2. Rather the solution is to ensure that all resources are uncoupled from the dominant distribution method and permitted to be distributed according the the meaning of that resource in a particular community.
3. So some people for example, argue that government ought to be run like a business. But Walzer would say that governments distribute things like political power, and indivudal rights which must go to everyone even when the principles of business efficiency might suggest that not everyone ought to have those rights.

I. The Idea of a Bounded Community:

- Distributive justice requires a defined group: the **political community**.
- This community excludes outsiders and limits who shares and distributes goods.
- Sharing and exchange within the community raises questions of fairness and entitlement.

II. Membership and Distribution:

- Membership grants access to various goods: power, honor, wealth, etc.
- Different spheres (politics, economy, etc.) have different principles for distribution.
- Each sphere defines its own **worthy pursuits** justifying unequal shares.

III. Different Conceptions of Membership:

- **Universalism:** Membership based on shared humanity, leading to equal shares.
- **Nationalism:** Membership based on shared history and culture, excluding outsiders.
- **Ethnosymbolilic:** Membership based on shared descent, language, or religion.
- **Market:** Membership based on economic participation, leading to unequal shares.

IV. Critique of Universalism:

- Ignores the importance of social bonds and shared history.
- Creates unrealistic expectations of complete equality in all spheres.
- Risks ignoring important differences and specific needs within communities.

V. Critique of Nationalism:

- Excludes individuals based on arbitrary factors like birth or ancestry.
- Can be used to justify oppression and discrimination against minorities.
- Doesn't adequately address global challenges and responsibilities.

VI. Critique of Ethnosymbolilic Membership:

- Can lead to closed communities and intolerance towards outsiders.
- May be based on arbitrary and historically contingent factors.
- Risks prioritizing homogeneity over social justice and individual rights.

VII. Critique of Market Membership:

- Ignores the importance of non-economic goods like political participation and social recognition.
- Can exacerbate inequalities and lead to social atomization.
- Neglects the need for collective provision of essential goods and services.

VIII. Conclusion:

- No single principle of membership perfectly balances claims of equality and difference.
- A just society involves complex negotiations and compromises within each sphere.
- Membership should be based on respect for individual dignity and collective responsibility.

I. Introduction:

- Walzer identifies **equality** as a core principle of distributive justice, alongside difference.
- He examines different interpretations of equality, particularly focusing on **equality of need**.

II. Equality of Need vs. Other Principles:

- He contrasts** equality of need** with:
 - **Equality of endowment:** Everyone gets the same, regardless of need.
 - **Equality of outcome:** Everyone ends up with the same level of well-being.
 - **Equality of access:** Everyone has equal access to resources, not necessarily equal outcomes.
- He argues for **equality of need** as a core principle, but not the only one.

III. Defining Needs:

- Walzer differentiates between **basic needs** (necessary for survival and dignity) and **wants** (desires).
- He acknowledges the difficulty of defining basic needs across diverse communities and individuals.
- He suggests a flexible approach based on social consensus and negotiation.

IV. Social Provision and Need:

- He argues that society has a responsibility to ensure basic needs are met for all members.
- He supports social welfare programs as key tools for fulfilling this responsibility.

- He warns against creating dependency traps and undermining individual agency.

V. Needs and Different Spheres:

- He applies the principle of need to different spheres of distribution:
 - **Politics:** Equal political rights and opportunities are essential needs.
 - **Economy:** Basic economic needs must be met, but inequalities arising from talent and effort may be justifiable.
 - **Education:** Access to quality education is a basic need, but differences in talent and effort may lead to variations in outcome.
 - **Social recognition:** Equal respect and dignity are essential needs, even with different levels of public honor.

VI. Critique of Needs-Based Distribution:

- He addresses critiques of needs-based distribution, such as:
 - Difficulty in defining and measuring needs.
 - Disincentives to work and effort.
 - Potential for paternalism and undermining individual responsibility.
- He argues for balancing individual liberty with collective responsibility.

VII. Conclusion:

- **Equality of need** remains a powerful principle for ensuring basic well-being for all.
- It needs to be applied judiciously, considering other principles and respecting individual agency.
- A just society requires ongoing negotiation and compromise between equality and difference within each sphere.

Rights Claims Compared

1. **What is a Rights Claim?** Every rights claim involves a reciprocal obligation...

- a. **Negative rights (liberalism)** X claims right to y obligates Z not to interfere with x's pursuit of y. These are the sort of rights envisioned by Locke and Mill.
- b. **Positive right (communitarianism)** X claims a right to y, obligates Z to help x achieve y. These rights claims are the sort envisioned by Rousseau and Taylor.

5. Locke's idea of Tolerance

- a. The purpose of the state is to protect our rights (primarily although not exclusively to property and contract).
- b. It's possible for the state to play a role as a neutral arbiter of disputes.
- c. How does this lead to religious tolerance?
 - What is the nature of your relationship to God?
 - How do you get religious salvation?
- d. Locke says that religious salvation is outside the jurisdiction of the state. It cannot accomplish this goal even if it wants to.
- e. In order to achieve religious salvation one must understand and freely choose the right path. Free choice is at the core of salvation and so no one can force anyone to be free.

6. What is a Rights Claim?

- a. Every rights claim involves a reciprocal obligation....

- Negative rights (liberalism) X claims right to y obligates Z not to interfere with x's pursuit of y. These are the sort of rights envisioned by Locke and Mill.

■ **Positive rights (communitarianism)** X claims a right to y, obligates Z to help x achieve y. These rights claims are the sort envisioned by Rousseau and Taylor.

b. Competing Ideas of Community and Membership.

Why does Locke think that religious salvation is outside the jurisdiction of the state? Does he mean this in a normative sense that the state *shouldn't* involve itself in people's religious salvation or that the state *can't* help people achieve religious salvation.

1. Locke says that religious salvation isn't within the state to save souls. They don't have authority over that issue.
 - a. Lack of subject matter jurisdiction
 - i. Only God can save souls, not kings.
 - ii. Capability of converting
 - iii. Faith itself is a personal experience that can't be coerced... It's not real unless you actually hold it.
 - iv. Protestant idea that each person has an individual relationship with God and so no one can intervene between a person and god to determine or alter that relationship. So Locke's idea of toleration comes from the protestant ideal.

2. Walzer: Five Regimes of Tolerance

- a. **International Society:** This is governed by the principle of Westphalian Sovereignty. Each state is like a person in the state of nature. You're not supposed to penetrate their person but in fact people do. To the extent they do it is on the supposed recognition of their personal sovereignty. But that's honored in the breach.
 - i. Westphalian/Hobbesian Tolerance
 1. You hate the other person/group but you agree to abide by each other...
 - ii. This is more like a truce than the modern idea of tolerance. You would squash them if you could but to preserve a truce you don't..
- b. **Multinational Empires:** The Roman and Ottoman empires are examples of states that took over lots of other states and let those states retain their own identities. The internal structures were left intact, permitting people of all different religions to live together in their own communities.
 - i. The different communities (ie religions) were all tolerated so long as none of them threatened the rule of the empire itself.

- ii. But only the group was tolerated and each group was left to govern its own people. In practice this meant no autonomy or tolerance for *individual* differences. You had to belong to some religion and obey all the dictates of that religion. You could not live in the Ottoman empire as an atheist and apostasy could be punished by the religion if you attempted to deviate from it.
- c. **Nation States:** Here there is primacy of individual citizenship. Individuals are free to form groups, including religion but it is the individual who retains the primary rights. The religion is not allowed to do anything to derogate those rights. This type of control can take a liberal form but it can also be decidedly illiberal to people who are outside the designated national markers of identity
 - i. Nationalism In its illiberal form the nation state is bound together by features that are exclusive, like religion, ethnicity or race. Those features which are considered prize elements of national identity are included and all people with this identity are protected against derogation of national rights. But anyone falling outside those categories are shunned or worse.
 - ii. Liberalism People are born owning themselves. They are born sovereign over themselves. So society needs to protect each person's autonomy to choose his or her own idea of the good life.

1. One needn't respect the ideas of anyone else. People don't see tolerance as an endorsement of any particular views.
2. They see tolerance as respect for the autonomy of others that is part of being sovereign.

d. **Consociative States:** These are states like Switzerland, Belgium and Canada which is a nation state consisting of several recognized subnations. In these cases the group are recognized but the state can still take measures that might diminish some of the groups practices to the extent that they trample on some set individual rights guaranteed to everyone. Regards difference as a good thing in itself. So we respect most differences.

- i. So no single dogma is permitted but that doesn't mean that all differences must be tolerated.
- ii. We're committed here only to the idea of respecting differences but not all are tolerated equally when they trample on some valued individual rights
- iii. This society commits to differences but not necessarily to liking the differences that exist.

e. **Immigrant Societies:** These societies house many different groups who come from different backgrounds with no group able to claim primacy over another.

- i. These societies do not distribute claims to legal rights or dignity according to any immigrant groups identity.
- ii. Immigrants assume a new identity of their new society.

- iii. This does not mean that there is no history or set of social practices that have affected the trajectory of resource distribution. So there might be other issues to address.
- iv. But then there's a tension between treating each person individually according to citizenship and dealing with resource inequalities that have emerged over time.

Question for next class:

What conception of the person is contemplated by the courts in the Dartmouth College case and the Hobby Lobby Case. Do they envision this cooperative person to be envisioned by Locke or Rousseau?

Dartmouth College Case Lockean idea of the person.

Corporation is a fictional person created to provide a legal entity to engage in relationships with others.

It is really just extending the property and contract rights of the persons who created it. Not thought to be a person in any other sense.

Hobby Lobby v Burwell – Here the idea of the corporation is much more complex. It's like the corporation, like Rousseau's person, has an identity that is the product of social meanings. It's more than just a mechanism to carry out a contract.

October 12, 2020

Questions for next class

Why does Taylor believe that we have an obligation to organize society so that some people have their social forms protected?

Rousseau – imagines self realization to be self mastery... finding your true self and living that best life.

Mastery of the self is implied by liberalism – whatever people believe is the authentic way

New Regimes of Tolerance ??

Multiculturalism there's a commitment to differences for their own sake. Every difference demands respect. So it doesn't mean that you have to generate differences. Rather it means that every difference that exists in a society must be respected..

- v. it's there because of a process that's central to human identity and so the order must protect each process (social form) that produces different ways of living.

9. Charles Taylor – Multiculturalism

- a. Recognition was hierarchical in its original sense and
- b. Dignity was not something that was universal... it only belonged to certain classes
- c. Democratization of this idea of dignity

- d. Authenticity – the original idea of dignity is democratized so that we recognize each person's special character and their manifestation of it.
- e. Monological idea of human nature .. we each listen to our inner voice and live the life that reflects it.
- f. But how do we develop our ideas of best life?
- g. Monistic conception of society there is a correct authenticity.
- h. pluralistic conception of the world there is more than one idea of authenticity
- i. Identities are not monological... they're not developed autonomously. We don't get up in the morning and decide we want to be a civil rights lawyer.
- j. Identities are formed by our many relationships with other people that are themselves defined by social forms... social practices that define what is the correct way to engage in that relationship.
 - i. Language is a primary constituent of our identities. An essential social practice through which we develop all the practices that constitute our identity.
 - 1. Language is inter subjective—by which we mean it isn't objectively true. It belongs to the community of users.
- k. What are our responsibilities towards different social practices? For Taylor, if these practices define our authenticity then we need to make space for them in a society...
 - i. Hence we have to protect multicultural practices...we have to protect the different practices that permit identity to form in the first place.
 - ii. Problem... how do we know which are the practices that are good and which are bad... are we forced to permit things like FGM just because a community practices it?

10. Anthony Appiah -- Argues that we should respect cultures and teach about them but not give any particular overt support to any culture.
 - a. Culture vs Society
 - i. Society covers our universal commitments to each other in a larger community.
 1. Legal relationships
 2. Political relationships
 - ii. Cultural commitments are deeper but more local and even more than local they are personal. It's not up to society to decide which aspects of a person's culture to emphasize and give support
 1. Appiah is

- a. Male
- b. African
- c. Immigrant
- d. Gay
- e. Christian

2. He doesn't want anyone else deciding which part of himself is most important to emphasize.
3. He argues that all different cultures should be taught about in schools and respected but that no culture should be state supported to the degree that its practice is mandated by law as in Quebec.

- b. **Harris** - agrees that that culture is not the state or society but argues that the sort of respect for cultures and critical thinking can't take place in the context of power relationships that don't recognize the importance of following Appiah's advice. If there are power imbalances that cause discrimination then how do you get schools to teach about other cultures.
- c. **Klor de Alva** – people often have their cultures assigned to them and they can't get the state to recognize any different conception of them than the one socially accepted. So they need a way to redefine themselves that involves state de-recognition of stereotypes. This will often require state action of some sort in order to achieve that end.

Ideas/Questions for next class

So far we have considered social orders as constituted by individual (liberal) and social (communitarian) identities. Kant argues that we should not be defined by our identities but rather by our capacity to choose rationally how we ought to live our lives.

- Why does the fact that we can choose how we want to act affect how we ought to construct our relations with others? What is it about making rational choices about right and wrong that requires us to treat others in a particular way?
- When we criticize someone for acting immorally, what specifically are we judging about what they have done.
- Kant claims to have come up with a logical basis for morality that is derived from pure reason and the logic of the universe. What is that logical process and do you agree that he is successful?

Kant: Reason And Its Requirements

11. Kant Says if morality exists it really exists as its own thing, not derived from something else...

- a. It's not a conditional imperative based on certain facts being true
- b. It's not based on a hypothetical contract that might have happened
- c. If morality exists it really exists on its own independent of
 - i. facts from the empirical natural world
 - ii. and conventions or social understandings of people.

12. Why can we make moral judgments... Is because humans have free will

- a. Humans are rule-following... in the sense that when we take an action it's based on our idea of what that action means.
 - i. So actions are rule-governed activities that are taken for reasons based on our understanding of what that activity means.
 - ii. What makes morality real is that people act for reasons.... No one takes any action unless they think they have a good reason to do it.
 - iii. Every action we take is based on our **judgment** that we have a good reason to do it.
 - iv. People's actions are a function of their free will and judgment applied to their reasons for acting.
 - v. We're rational actors who use our reason to judge what are good reasons to act.
 - vi. Morality, therefore, is universally true based on whatever are the correct judgments on how we ought to act.

b. \$64K Question – How do we find the one right reason to act?

- i. It's derived from the fact that we are all reasoning creatures trying to find the right reasons for our actions.
- ii. We all have a moral duty to act for the right reasons.
- iii. What does this do for our own reasons for acting?

c. Morality consists almost completely in acting for the right reason.

- i. It's not the results.
- ii. It's not external factors.
- d. To act morally is to act for the right reason. Intention is the basis of morality.. intentionality is the reason we have morality in the first place.
- e. The one thing we know is to never ever interfere with anyone's ability to act for the right reason.
- f. There's an element of fairness but not completely because morality is derived from acting for the right reason .. that triggers morality

13. Categorical Imperative...

- a. Whenever you're making a judgment about your reasons for action... you must will that it become universally legislated.
- b. Everyone is the sovereign of their own ends. so you can never treat anyone as an object of your ends.
- c. For Kant morality is rooted in the idea that we are all rational creatures who act for reasons that we judge for ourselves to be good reasons.
- d. So the one thing we can't do in acting morally is to interfere with anyone else's attempt to judge what are the right reasons for them to act.

14. So Kant deduces our moral duties from the meaning of morality itself. Morality is the judgment of other people's actions. It only makes sense to judge someone's actions if they had free will to come to their own judgments about the proper way to act. So morality consists in people coming up with the right reason for actions.

- a. Because I have a moral duty to come up with the right reason for my actions so does everyone else.
- b. The way to find the right reason for actions is by not taking any action that interferes with anyone else's ability to be a moral actor and come up with the right reasons for their own actions.
 - i. Don't lie or steal or break promises because they all overcome another person's ability to decide for him or her self what the proper way to behave is.

Questions for next class

How strong protections do you think this source of morality actually provides in real life. Some people regard this as impractical while others believe it is not a very strong protection for people.

Do you think any of the case studies reflect someone living an enlightened life as Kant imagines such a life?

October 26, 2020

15. What is Enlightenment - Who acts morally? Is morality possible in society when people have local institutional obligations that are different from one's moral duties?

- a. Cowards don't act morally... because they're afraid to take the consequences of acting morally.
- b. Most people are just lazy... they don't bother to think about their reasons for acting. They just do things out of habit which didn't even begin for their own reasoning but because of actors around them telling them to behave in a certain way.
 - i. Religion is based in faith and generally speaking prioritizes faith and obedience to dogma over individuals
 - ii. It doesn't want people to use their reason to arrive at dogma. it wants their faith to establish the truth.
- c. Many people have conflicting obligations that prevent them from acting morally.
 - i. Civil servants and lower level politicians
 - ii. Any institution run by a chain of command precludes it.
 - 1. eg military
 - 2. civil servants
 - iii. It doesn't make sense to give people independent judgment in light of what the institutions are set up to do. Is this distinction sensible or workable? Can people acting in different roles in society really use their independent judgment all the time?
 - 1. Judges must follow the law.
 - 2. Citizens must pay their taxes.
 - 3. Military officers must obey orders.
 - 4. Civil Servants must implement the will of their political leaders.
 - iv. What happens when they conflict? Kant says that everyone plays multiple roles in society.
 - v. Kant distinguishes between two roles that people must occupy in society.

1. Private role- as actors in organizations and professions. These people must act in their institutional roles and follow instructions dictated by the context of that institution. So if you're a judge you can't subvert the law even if you think it's wrong or unjust.
2. Public Role - as moral actors who can judge whether or not some policies are done for the right reasons and can speak out to inform people about their judgments. Scholars only reason for being is to speak truth to power. So they are always obligated to speak the truth. But even individuals must speak as scholars speaking the truth. So while they must follow their institutional roles or quit, they must also express publicly their considered judgments about the actions they are required to take and in their private institutional roles.

vi. Does this really work in reality -- Snowden and Reality Winner both wanted to speak out about actions that were illegal for the US govt to do yet they were punished for doing so. Kant would say that they still acted morally. Do you agree? What if the actions of the government explicitly violate the categorical imperative such as the torturers in Guantanamo Bay. Should they go ahead and torture people and then say publicly that the policy was wrong? Even if doing so means they will have to go to jail or flee the country?

Questions for next class.

Rousseau and Taylor contend that our identities are the product of social institutions which defines who we are, and hence, what living an authentic life will look like. They both argued that we need to interpret the social forms of society correctly so that we can master ourselves and live our lives to their full potential. If living an authentic life requires us to properly interpret the social forms of our own society and make sure to get them right, what happens if we make a mistake and interpret them incorrectly? What happens if we are wrong about the most fundamental aspects of our own identity and what is out there in the world?

How do we know if we are wrong or not?

Marx says that we are wrong about the way the world works. Society says that God made the world including the markets etc and that justice comes in heaven but life on earth is for suffering. Marx says it's the reverse: We made god because we were suffering on earth and were told there was no solution for that suffering. It was inevitable. How do we tell who is right?

October 29 2020

16. Critical Theory - Mistakes of interpretation and the implications for the social order

- a. Critical theory is a way of studying society that branched from communitarian theories of human nature and society.
 - i. Critical theory accepts the idea that our identities and our idea of rationality are formed by the social practices of the society we inhabit.
 - ii. In order to understand society we must accurately interpret these practices to ourselves.
 - iii. The premise of critical theory is that people can make mistakes interpreting their society's own social practices.
 - iv. These misinterpretations can be so profound that our entire conception of reality can be mistaken. Things that we believe really exist in the world are not in fact there or are only the product of our misinterpretations.
 1. So for example if we interpret these practices correctly we'll discover that we created God instead of God creating us. (Nietzsche, Marx)
 2. Or we might discover that the discontents of our civilization and even our own personal neuroses stem from our desire for freedom being repressed by society's attempt to control our behavior and in particular our sexual behavior (Freud).
- b. Union of Interpretive And Empirical Methodologies.

Questions for Next Class

What does Marx tell us is the essential feature of the human species?

What role does property play in our essential nature?

What role does technology play in the concentration of capital and in how we labor?

How has the changing way in which we labor changed our identities?

How has the changing way in which we labor affected our ability to realize our full human potential?

November 2, 2020

17. Karl Marx- Alienated Labor and Historical Materialism The basic element of our species' existence is that we are laboring creatures. But all other animals must also labor to survive. What makes it different for humans is that we do so **purposely** and **intentionally**.
18. Humans are essentially economic creatures. While everyone we have studied so far thought of our essential nature in political or legal terms, Marx says you must understand the economic basis of society, the way in which we trade, in order to understand both humans and society. There is a dialectic between those economic institutions and human nature. One affects the other. While there is a natural progression this progression can be changed if we understand our essential economic nature and how it interacts.
 - a. Only our species chooses what type of labor we pursue and so how we work and what we produce reflects who we are.
 - b. But the choices we make about how we will labor are affected by social factors that define what options are open to us.
 - i. If we live in a society without the rule of law, it would never occur to us to want to be a lawyer or a judge.
 - ii. If we lived in a society where you were a piece of property you would never grow up to think that one day you could be king or even that you could have a different job from that which your owner decided for you.
 - c. So our identity and sense of rationality is reflected in social factors. While we may think that we have no control over these phenomena, part of Marx's critical theory is that if we understand how those social factors took place we will see where they went wrong and how we can fix them. They are not

natural phenomena fixed in stone.

19. In the Beginning When our ancestors came out of the forests and switched from hunting and gathering to agriculture we were all more or less equal. Markets were almost non existent. Everyone made what they needed or went without what they couldn't make. People were mostly self sufficient.

- a. Given our rational processes we constantly developed technology to make our lives easier. This early technology did not interfere with our connection to our labor, it just made us more productive and reduced some of the backbreaking parts of labor.
- b. Gradually however technological advances did change our relationship to the products of our labor.
 - i. The enclosure movement, was a social phenomena that permitted technological advances in agriculture to be implemented. Agricultural technologies like crop rotation required private land ownership instead of shared access to common lands.
 - ii. This movement made many independent business owners (farmers) into laborers who worked for a wage and were separated from the means of production and the objects of production.
 - iii. Hence there is a connection between technology and social practices (land as private property instead of shared good) and the emergence of people who own nothing except their labor to sell.
- c. Gradually this created surplus in crops that permitted some people to cease farming to survive and become specialized suppliers of goods everyone used to make for themselves (e.g. coopers, blacksmiths, tanners, butchers etc).
- d. Notice how technological change (crop rotation) leads to social change (private land ownership) leads to new social change (emergence of a market for goods that used to be self produced).
- e. Notice that these crafts people have been positively affected by technology. They are in complete control of the means and product of their labor. So while

the people who remain farm laborers are made worse off by enclosure, craftsmen are better off with technology advances like enclosure.

Questions for Thursday.

So far the technological changes have generally made life easier for people by making labor easier and creating more surplus. How does technological advancements begin to evolve into something different as they progress?

- How does technology affect the type of work available and the ability to be connected with both the means and product of labor.
- What is the relationship between technological change and social structures of society
- What is the relationship between technological change and capital?
 - This includes the need for capital
 - Concentration for capital.

20. **Alienation:** As technology advances more and more people are transferred from independent actors with full agency to determine the direction of their labor and ability to identify or objectify themselves in the product of their labor. They turn into people who do not choose the means of producing goods, the methods of producing nor are they connected to the product of their labor in any spiritual way or indeed any economic way. They do not own the product. Their only connection is to the wages that they earn and that is not to the production process or its fruits but just a subordinate position to the owner of the means of production. Hence we lose our agency when we become wage laborers.

In general, at the most abstract level, alienation can be thought of as a surrender of control through separation from an essential attribute of the self, and, more specifically, separation of an actor or agent from the conditions of meaningful agency. In capitalist society the most important such separation, the one that ultimately underlies many, if not most other forms, is the separation of most of the producers from the means of production.

a. Four Types of Alienation

- i. alienation from the product of labour;
- ii. alienation from the activity of labour;
- iii. alienation from one's own specific humanity;
- iv. alienation from others, from society.

21. **Historical Materialism** - Marx's theory that there is a dialectic between technological improvements and the development of social institutions that emerge with certain characteristics. These include the creation of deeper inequality, creation of markets and concentration of capital. These create several phenomena in

- a. **Deterministic**- Marx thinks that the progression of civilization is deterministic in that it's the natural order of development between our rational urge to create technology and the social institutions that emerge from technological change. It's a natural process that produces more abundance and new social forms of relations.
- b. **BUT** remember that although natural, it is a product of **US** by that I mean all human kind. We made it happen **AND** importantly we as rational creatures can change the direction of history. It is in our control if we understand these processes and change them.
- c. **This is where Marx departs from Hegel in several ways.** Hegel thinks that there is a rational core in the development of history and that it is leading towards the single end of human freedom. Marx says no, it is not leading towards human freedom although it could be made to do so if we use our rational capacity to understand how it has gone wrong. This is where Marx is acting as a critical theorist to the hermeneutic theory of Hegel. Hegel is interpreting western history and Marx is saying that Hegel has misinterpreted it. He has gotten it wrong and so has mistaken the meaning of the institutions acting all around us. Marx is saying that Hegel has misunderstood the spirit that moves people.
- d. For Marx, technological change itself begins to change from replacing muscle to replacing brain power.
- e. The cost of technological change increases relative to each person's ability to afford it. So this increases the concentration of capital in fewer and fewer hands as fewer people can afford the larger amount of capital needed to make the next technological change.
- f. There was no such thing as a market when civilization started out and people were self sufficient. People made everything they needed or they went without. Technological change was initially focused on farming because everyone was a farmer to survive. Technology increased the surplus of food

but still no markets in land because landowners would never ever part with land. You could inherit it but you couldn't buy it because no one would ever sell it

- g. Humans as Economic Creatures: Gradually the technology created a surplus in food to enable some people to specialize and become craftsmen. This was sort of an ideal time. While people suffered in many ways but they controlled their labor, owned the means of producing their goods, and could identify themselves with the product of their labor.

22. Each technological change causes increased alienation by changing both the social structures of society and changing the level of our removal from the production process.

- a. **Change human agency to create.** As technology advances it goes from mere muscle saving devices to brain replacing devices. The cobbler uses his creativity and skill to design and produce a beautiful shoe. In a shoe factory, the machines are designed to do all this creative design and manufacture. The shoe factory worker, as opposed to a cobbler, just pushes levers to make sure the machine works.

 - i. As technology advances it goes higher and higher up the intellectual food chain. At first only farm hands are replaced, then craftsmen.
 - ii. Professionals were always safe from technological change. But now technology is replacing people at the top of the intellectual food chain. AI can read contracts as well as experienced lawyers and read images of the human body as well as a radiologist.

- b. **Change in ability to own the means of production.** Early technological changes are accessible to most people but each advance requires more and more capital to create and own. But there are fewer and fewer people who can afford it. The people who have been thrown into wage labor in previous technology advances obviously can't afford it and only the most successful remaining entrepreneurs can afford to keep on owning the means of production. This also keeps going up and up the food chain.

 - i. Doctors used to be independent entrepreneurs. They owned their own practice and the means to deliver it. Had x-ray equipment in their offices.

- ii. No doctor can afford to have his own MRI or CAT Scanner. So they are owned by companies or hospitals in which doctors are employees or purchasers of the product of these machines.

23. The economic superstructure of society causes us to be alienated from

- a. capital
- b. means of production.
- c. objects of production.
- d. Our own humanity because our ability to be economic creatures with agency over our lives becomes removed.

24. In our despair and lack of understanding we lack understanding of what is happening and give up on life. We create ways of salving our tortured selves by creating myths like the existence of God who will take the wretched of the earth into heaven. Marx says **NO** that's backwards. God didn't create this mess, we did and only we can get ourselves out of it.

25. **Super Abundance of Capitalism** Marx says this progression to capitalism is bad in many ways but one good thing it does is create a super abundance of goods. Commodities keep getting cheaper and cheaper.

- a. The problem is that even as goods become cheaper and cheaper, more and more people are turned into laborers with only their labor to sell and this labor is less and less valuable because machines can do more and more.
- b. If you look at the top five companies in the S&P 500 from 1920, 1970 and 2020 you will see that fewer and fewer employees are needed to produce the same value.
 - i. Standard Oil had a million employees in 1920,
 - ii. GM had 400,000 employees in 1970
 - iii. Facebook has 53,000 employees in 2020

Question for next class

What will happen when artificial intelligence is able to produce **everything** better and cheaper than any human. It will be able to design other computers better than we can, build rockets better, do brain surgery better, etc etc. How will people make their living? What will people do in this situation?

26. Technological Change and Labor

- a. While it is hard to anticipate change scientists and engineers like Stephen Hawking, Elon Musk and Bill Joy all contend that at some point in the not too distant future, robots and computers with AI software will be able to do EVERYTHING better than humans.
- b. How will people earn money to live on if machines can do everything better than us?
- c. What will our lives be like? What will we do all day if this happens? While goods will be much cheaper our purchasing power will be mostly eliminated.
- d. Hawking says that there are two possibilities.
 - i. **Hunger Games world** where most of humanity lives in hand to mouth poverty while the .0001% live lives of abundance and leisure.
 - ii. **Mutual Ownership of the Means of Production** where everyone owns a robot (or shares in a robot company) so that they will be able to partake of the superabundance that the technology has created.

Questions For next class

Neitzsche is often criticised as a nihilist, someone who believes in the complete subjectivity of all morals and ethical beliefs. Is this label accurate? Why or why not?

How is Nietzsche's critical theory different from Marx's? What is their different idea about the essential feature of human nature and society?

What is Marx's idea of a good society and what is Nietzsche's? (sort of a trick question)

27. Nietzsche - The Will To Power

Like other critical theorists Nietzsche believes that humans have fundamentally misinterpreted the meaning of our own social practices and hence the

essence of our own identity. But unlike Marx, Freud and other critical theorists, he does not offer a single correct understanding about how our social institutions ought to be structured.

- a. **The Will To Power:** Is for Nietzsche the fundamental feature that drives human nature and our creation of the world. Indeed, he seems to be making an empirical claim when he calls the will to power the '*primordial fact of all history*' (BGE, 259).
- b. He believes that each human has the will to define his or her self and that it is appropriate to do so. That power to define the parameters of our actions and how to judge them is our essence. But we can't do so alone because we must create understandings of the world which approximate those meanings. So like all hermeneutic ideas of identity, our understanding of ourselves and the world are inextricably linked to our interpretations of our own social practices.
- c. **Nietzsche** believes that the development of morality, and more specifically, judeo-christian religion, in Western society has suppressed our ability to find meaning and fulfillment in the world by misinterpreting our nature and social institutions.
- d. While religion purports to offer freedom and fulfillment through learning to love one another, the meaning behind it leads to our own enslavement to the powers that it ostensibly is judging as wrong. The church offers nothing but support for the powerful while entreating us to practice weakness by loving one another and turning the other cheek.
- e. Hence, in trying to justify the misery of our wretched existence under the powerful we have doubled down and made things worse by actually glorifying our weakness as morality good.

28. Nietzsche is a [philologist](#). This is the historical and comparative study of languages to see how they developed over time based on how users of the language itself understood its meaning over time. He uses this method to understand the development of moral principles in modern society. His goal is to show that our Judeo Christian principles of limiting power through law and love did not come from God or any transcendent source. Rather it came from our attempt to deal with our own miserable existence.

29. The Origins of Morality

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Good} & \leftrightarrow & \text{Bad} \\ \text{Good} & \leftrightarrow & \text{Evil} \end{array}$$

a. **Good vs Bad:** Both of these terms are meant by Nietzsche to be merely descriptive terms coined by the strong or **Übermensch (supermen)**. They are not meant as moral judgements. Rather they are just descriptions of the world as they see it.

i. **Good** in the time of warrior class supermen was all about the self and the exercise of power. It was not a power to accumulate for its own sake but just an expression of their will to do and get what they wanted. Joy in being in control and living their lives as they wanted. Being in control and having all the power and wealth that you can have. This was the world of superman/ übermensch - the strong took what they wanted.

1. Good was defined by the powerful.... wealthy, powerful
2. Bad was also defined by the powerful
3. Focus on Qualities, Not Specific Classes: Nietzsche wasn't advocating for a return to feudalism or the Roman Empire. He used these historical examples to illustrate specific qualities he valued:

Good was:

4. **Strength and Vitality:** A life-affirming energy and rejection of weakness or resentment.
5. **Self-Mastery and Discipline:** The ability to overcome oneself and impose form on chaos.
6. **Value Creation:** The capacity to establish one's own hierarchy of values (master morality) rather than adopting pre-existing ones (slave morality).
7. **Affirmation of Life:** Embracing life in its totality, including its suffering and struggles.
8. **Spiritual Warfare:** The "warrior" for Nietzsche is often a metaphor for someone engaged in a struggle against nihilism, decadence, and herd mentality. It's about intellectual courage,

challenging norms, and self-overcoming.

b. **Bad** -- all the things that aren't them. all the poor suckers who were their meals or sources of labor or pleasure. To be bad was simply not to be good (i.e. powerful, noble, graceful etc.) It was to be poor and weak and stupid.

Bad" is Secondary and an Afterthought: "Bad" (*schlecht* in German, which originally had connotations closer to 'plain', 'simple', or 'common') arises later, almost dismissively. It simply refers to those who are *not* like the nobles. It's a contrast, not the central focus.

Qualities Attributed to the "Bad": From the perspective of the noble type, the "bad" (i.e., the common people, the dominated) are seen as:

- **Common / Plebeian / Vulgar:** Lacking distinction, refinement, and nobility.
- **Weak / Powerless:** Lacking the physical and spiritual strength of the masters.
- **Simple / Plain:** Lacking complexity or greatness of soul.
- **Contemptible / Despicable:** The nobles look down upon them with a degree of disdain or pity, but not necessarily hatred (hatred is more characteristic of the *ressentiment* found in slave morality).

i.

1. But the supermen spent very little time thinking about the poor suckers who they used for their own purposes. Just like we don't think of the poor butchered cow when his barbequed ribs are served to us for dinner. We just enjoy and go on living our lives.

c. **Good vs Evil (prescriptive)** are defined by the weak **Untermensch** who are tired of having their ribs served for dinner. They don't like being butchered and want it to stop. The problem is that they are weak and the world they inhabit demeans and abhors weakness. So they begin to think differently about their own existence and the society that defines their situation. The new meanings they derived are very much judgmental. They do mean to imply moral judgment on their enemies.

- i. **EVIL:** The weak all get together and said they didn't like being killed and robbed and that the strong people who did it didn't have to do so. If the powerful did hurt them when they didn't have to, they were evil. They used their free will to do something they shouldn't do. They have personal responsibility for deciding to hurt others.
- ii. **Good** People who don't hurt others are virtuous. The sheep don't hurt anyone and they are good for not doing so. You don't see them eating lions or even some poor cows barbecued ribs.
- iii. The Jews were the first to generate this slave mentality of judging your oppressors. They began to make laws restricting the way power could be used against others. They sought to limit the exploitation of the weak by the strong.
- iv. The Christians raised weakness to a whole new level by elevating suffering as a virtue. Weak people were going to go to heaven. The more they suffered the oppression of the powerful the more virtuous they were. Christians preached love not war and told their adherents to turn the other cheek. Glorifying a cult of weakness. What people need is love, not power.

d. Nietzsche thinks Christian morality took weak people and made them into slaves of their weakness. It produced the mentality of the *untermensch*, or slave.

- i. Power was still ruling society and the Church helped. Even as the church praised weakness it supported the rule of the powerful over the weak.
- ii. The Church was nihilistic in his view because it really didn't believe in poverty or weakness. It supported the strong and rich and sought to live like them.

e. **Resentment:** Deep down the weak understand that their weakness isn't getting them anywhere but they don't know why. They don't understand why the powerful and rich won't love their fellow human beings and share their wealth etc. So they resent the rich but get nowhere with it because they also cling to their weakness.

- f. Nietzsche says that people must realize they made all these ideas of God and morality up as a way to ease the misery they suffered at the hands of the warrior class.
- g. People need to throw off the shackles of weakness (religion) and develop a **will to power**.
- h. Note: Nietzsche is not suggesting that the weak develop into their own warrior class exploiting others, although they can do that if they want because moral judgments don't exist.
- i. But if the weak want to create a world of love they will have to assert their power and get control of the world and then they create heaven on earth or a democracy or whatever they choose.
- j. But don't just wallow in your resentment.

Questions For Next Class

If you became a Superman/woman what would you think about the ubermensch you left behind?

While Rousseau thought that self realization was only viable in small homogeneous communities, Durkheim thought that large diverse industrial cities would not only be capable, but better equipped to provide the conditions necessary for a social contract providing positive freedom. What is it about life in industrial society that led Durkheim to believe that people could identify with each other's ends?

What is mechanical solidarity and under what conditions does it develop?

What is organic solidarity and under what conditions does it develop?

November 16 2020

30. **Also Sprach Zarathustra: Clip from 2001 Space Odyssey.** We see here a stage in which our ancestors took a leap from one stage of life to another through the sheer recognition of their power. They didn't need to see it as power, they just thought of it as living.

- a. Nietzsche isn't asking us to think of being powerful, but to use the power inside of us to live our lives.

- b. When we use this power we will move to a different level and get control over our lives and those around us.
- c. The true superman does not dwell on the people he conquers any more than the Apes who learned how to kill the wart hogs thought about them. They just ate them. Similarly, when they learned how to get back their watering hole, the other tribe of apes probably died, but the powerful group didn't think about them anymore.

31. Durkheim: The Division of Labor and Social Cohesion

- a. The main question that concerns Durkheim is whether society can hold itself together in the age of industrialization. He is a critical theorist like Marx before him and like Weber and Freud. That means he is at heart a communitarian who believes that our identities emerge from social practices but that we have misinterpreted those social practices so that we are experiencing some sort of pathology. For Durkheim, that problem is called **Anomie**.
- b. Durkheim was writing in late 19th century France which was in the throes of the industrial revolution. People were coming from small rural communities where everyone was the same.
- c. **Morality as a social fact:** Durkheim is trying to find the social morality that will hold together society but he is not starting out with some a priori idea of human identity or human psychology.
- d. Durkheim is attempting to determine the roots of morality by studying society, and changes in society. These forms of morality are social facts, and data from society must be obtained, and these used to discover causes. The data used by Durkheim are observable, empirical forms of data in the form of laws, institutions (legal and other), norms and behaviour. In this book, Durkheim adopts a non-quantitative approach, but in *Suicide* his approach is more quantitative.
 - i. He's a critical theorist who is trying to combine interpretation and empiricism.
 - ii. Durkheim thinks that morality derives from social facts extant in the community.

- iii. Durkeim is not merely interpreting social practices but also observing data in the form of
 - 1. **systems of laws:** he thinks the types of laws a society has reflect the inner core of the social morality governing the community.
 - 2. **institutions:** political, legal, social, economic...
 - 3. norms of behavior
- iv. These different phenomena are data that can be observed and measured.

32. Mechanical Solidarity --*solidarity through likeness* Rural society consists in many small villages where everyone is more or less the same. This sameness is the glue of society and supplies its meaning. The ideology that holds society together is being the same. The norms align because all aspects of individual and social life are the same and are rigidly enforced. This can be seen in all aspects of life....

- a. **Legal** -- Law is mainly penal... Top down criminal law rules are the main concern of the state.
 - i. State doesn't do much else but enforce rules that push conformity.
 - ii. the only common characteristic of all crimes is that they consist ... in acts universally disapproved of by members of each society. (Division, p. 73).
- b. **Economic** -- Agricultural self sufficiency. Everyone works for themselves and lives off of what they can produce on their own. If they don't make it themselves they usually go without. The social institution of the market is tiny to non-existent. So there is little interdependence. People don't need each other to survive. This is a classless society. While some farmers may be more prosperous than others, no one is so rich to be able to sustain the difference over generations.
- c. **Ethnic/Cultural Basis - homogenous** -- everyone in the village is the same religion, the same ethnicity, same class, etc etc.

33. Mechanical solidarity is tribal. People must be the same in all ways in order for social order to be preserved. People from this social order look at diverse cities and the lack of sameness implies a lack of order. A call for law and order is a call for the sameness that reflects the cohesion of society.

- a. For Mechanical Solidarity, the diversity of people and viewpoints typical of a large city are themselves the **disorder, normlessness and lawlessness** that needs to be stamped out. Peaceful protests to them are criminal because they are challenging the social order of sameness that holds everything together for mechanical solidarity.

Questions for Next Class

What is **anomie**, and what conditions bring it about?

What is Organic Solidarity and how does it help address the problem of anomie?

34. Anomie: The process of development As society grows it becomes more diverse.

- a. Technology brings about social change -- as it develops peoples social and economic lives diverge. Large societies need large amounts of technology to exist. You couldn't have 20 million people live in the Los Angeles basin without large amounts of technology enabling everyone to live in such a dry environment.
- b. As technology develops the capital needed for technology increases and so the means of production become concentrated in fewer and fewer hands and in fewer and fewer places.... These fewer places are what we call cities

- i. This concentration of capital creates different classes that enable persistent differences.
- ii. Members of different classes will be able to stay in different classes for more than one generation based on the accumulation of capital.
- c. Cities are places of diversity. They attract all the displaced workers from different villages to a single place. These villagers each have different social practices that they bring with them. They come with different religions, ethnicities, races, etc.
- d. Social Structure. They are constituted, not by a repetition of similar, homogeneous segments, but by a system of different organs each of which has a special role, and which are themselves formed of differentiated parts.
- e. All these different people come to the city voluntarily to get a new life so penal laws are not as relevant as other laws.

35. Division of Labor permits people to live together without having to destroy each other to survive. They can pursue their own interests while co existing with others. Indeed, they need each other. The tailor doesn't need to destroy the baker or plumber. Indeed they all need each other.

- a. **Division does not occur by design.** This metamorphosis is not designed but rather is the result of different people trying to survive and produce.
- b. **Forced Division** where people are forced into slavery, castes or classes creates divided labor where people cannot see their connection with each other.
- c. **Division is not always smooth or functional:** e.g. conflict between wage labor and capital can come from immature markets. The depression also illustrates immaturity of newly specialized institutions.

36. Identity metamorphosizes in industrial society to become more divergent and more individualistic. People are told that they must be committed to their community. That is a necessity for social cohesion. But in industrial society people have more control over their lives and they are becoming different.

- a. Specialization leads to individualization of people doing different things and making decisions about what to do and make. But this individualization is at odds with the need to be part of the community. People are having to make decisions for themselves about what to produce and also what to be and this sort of self definition is alien to agricultural societies held together by mechanical identities where you are defined by the norms of the community.
- b. So people develop individual personalities: Note that this is something which Rousseau said started with society but Durkheim is pointing out that it happens only gradually in rural society.
- c. It is only with the individuation of personality that the idea of individual rights can emerge as a meaningful idea.

37. Anomie defined: all of these differences create a sense of rootlessness. People coming to the big city don't see the familiar signs of order. This leads them to a sense of disorder. There is a feeling of no rules existing.

- a. This results in pathologies. Remember, pathologies means something that is abnormal. But in the cities everything different will appear abnormal.
- b. Differences that were once not accepted (eg homosexuality) were labeled as pathologies. Now they are just considered a different way of living one's life.

38. Organic Solidarity -- With the increasing division of labor people perform different functions.

- a. **Legal:** With society becoming more complex there is a need for more than just criminal restrictions. So pure penal law advances to all other parts of life including property law, contract, health regulation, work regulation.
- b. People come to big cities voluntarily for the most part and so the basis of association is completely different. Here a social contract idea of law is more appropriate because it reflects the voluntary nature of the union that is occurring.
 - i. Punishment is less important. Instead, society is concerned with restoration of the original situation, rather than exacting revenge on the offender. "But today, it is said, *punishment has changed it*

character; it is no longer to avenge itself that society punishes, it is to defend itself.” (Division, p. 86).

- ii. **Restitutive or restorative law.** Modern systems of law tend to be restitutive or restorative, according to Durkheim. While there are elements of penal or repressive law, such as the death penalty for murder, that continue to exist in modern societies, modern systems of law are primarily characterized by judgments that require the offending party to restore the situation to the original state – eg. paying restitution for theft or to victims. Modern business and contract law governs the conditions of contracts but says little or nothing about what type of contract parties can enter into.
- c. **Economic:** With the growth of technology and surplus there emerge complicated markets and also stratification of labor. No longer is everyone more or less in the same class. Different classes emerge depending upon how much demand there is for one's specialized form of labor or how much capital is required for the technology of your particular type of production.
- d. **Ethnic/Cultural** People coming from all sorts of backgrounds to seek the opportunities of the big city so they are multi cultural.
- e. This division of labor into different classes and function makes everyone dependent upon one another to survive even if the people one is dependent on are different than you.
 - i. Recognition of the dependence of everyone on each other for survival stimulates a tolerance for those different forms and functions. Like a human body, the brain cannot survive without the heart or kidneys, so each shares the body's resources and over time even appreciates what the other parts of the body are doing to help everyone else.
 - ii. Organic Solidarity looks for rules and norms that can accommodate these differences. So it is at a higher level of abstraction and generality than just being the same. The norms and rules that guide us are based on a respect for people's entire humanity rather than just our race, religion etc, because that is what we share.

- iii. But organic solidarity creates norms and rules that bind everyone together not based on our sameness but on our mutual efforts to hold society together and make it work. We are committed to an ideal of accommodating complex differences because these differences are necessary for us to survive as a society.
- iv. This type of solidarity is more adaptable to changes in society that inevitably occur. Hence, it is more robust.

39. **Role of The State:** The state is simply supplying the “scientifically” arrived at answers to what the functional needs of the community are.

- a. It’s the state’s job to ensure that the rules are moral and just
- b. This means that it has rules that permit each person to thrive as individuals but also to see how they fit together in the overall divided functions of the social body politic.

40. **Structural Functionalism:** Durkheim’s model of Organic solidarity is based on an idea of knowledge rooted in ***structural functionalism***. This concept of knowledge suggests that the most important thing to know about a social institution is the way it functions and the purpose of that function for the overall social entity of which it is a part. This is similar to biology where scientists try to understand the way organs work and what role they play in keeping the body alive. This type of knowledge can be contrasted with empiricism in physics which seeks to understand the nature of objects by observing their behavior on their own and in relation to other objects. Function is not the primary concern for Physics. Rather it tries to understand composition, behavior and effects. We don’t think of planets having a function. They just exist and we try to understand their nature.

Questions for next week.

Weber rejects Marx’s idea that we are essentially economic creatures and that pathologies in our economic structure manifest themselves in all other social institutions. What does Weber think is part of our essential nature if it isn’t our economic selves?

Why do people need to find legitimacy in the political order of things in Weber's view?

What causes the tension between our search for meaning and the institutions we create to act in the world?

Where should we look to find meaning in our lives and legitimacy in our institutions?

41. Weber - Protestantism And the Spirit of Capitalism

- a. He's a critical theorist who says that we misunderstand our own consciousness and so misunderstand the basis of our own suffering.
- b. The basic element of human nature is that we need to have answers to why we are here and what our purposes are in life.
- c. If we fail to answer this question then we are separated from the meaning in our lives and this separation is called **disenchantment**.
- d. We also need a routine to implement the meaning which is itself very abstract.
- e. But the problem is that the technical part of the routine becomes our focus and becomes the end in itself. Then the meaning is crowded out and we lose connection with the meaning in our lives. = disenchantment.

42. Three ideal types of legitimization.

- a. Charismatic -- this imbues the leader with super human power. And this leader provides meaning directly to each person.
- b. Traditional or Customary legitimization. -- the reason why something is legitimate is because it has always been done that way. eg divine right of kings.

- c. Bureaucratic Legal Order-- Here the goal is to get rid of arbitrary power that just gives power to people because they already had it. The legal order gives rules to make sure that everything is clear and non arbitrary. It implements the meaning of the social order.

43. Weber is saying if you understand the meanings people have (ie religions) you'll understand the economic organizations that people develop and how they might have gone wrong.

- a. He looks at religion in Europe and notices that the belief system (ie religions) are related to economic development and he wants to know why.
 - i. Catholicism dominates in southern europe. It's belief in good works enabling people to enter heaven means that people devote their capital to those goals. Rather than plowing their money back into their businesses, they give it to the church. The Church uses it to purchases stain glassed windows and other beautiful art but that doesn't really spur development.
 - ii. Protestantism reigns in northern europe. Their belief in predestination means that good works won't get you into heaven. That decision is made when you're born. So they don't bother giving their money to the church in order to buy their way into heaven.
 - 1. However, being rich is good according to the meanings of protestantism because it is a sign of being part of God's elect.
 - 2. So note that Protestantism provides a reason to be rich not for wealth itself but because it is a sign that you are a moral person.
 - 3. It's also part of the religion not to spend money ostentatiously. Conspicuous signs of wealth are considered immodest and therefore irreligious.
- b. The cycle of routinization and disenchantment. People need meaning in their lives but the meaning is often abstract and does not provide enough guidance. For example, loving one another as oneself is somewhat general. How should I love myself let alone others?
 - i. So people need institutions and rules that help put the flesh on the abstract guidance. We need to fit the abstract goals within concrete rules and practices that help us implement them.

- ii. The problem is that when these institutions come into existence to help us make the meaning practical, there become rules on how the institutions ought to function. Soon the practical rules about how the institutions that create the practical rules take on an importance of their own. The institution must be protected for its own sake with the view that it is needed to protect the greater meaning in our lives. Gradually we become wedded to the rules of the institutions and forget about the larger meaning they were meant to serve.
- c. This is what happened with protestantism and wealth accumulation. Pretty soon the wealth accumulation was perceived as a good in itself.
- d. You could see this in the aphorisms of Benjamin Franklin. Weber shows that all Franklin's moral attitudes are colored with utilitarianism. Honesty is useful, because it assures credit; so are punctuality, industry, frugality, and implies that is the reason they are virtues. According to Weber, Franklin is implying that those virtues, like all others, are only in so far virtues as they are actually useful to the individual, and the surrogate of mere appearance is always sufficient when it accomplishes the end in view.
 - i. eg. Early to bed early to rise, makes a man healthy, wealthy and wise. Rather than working hard to be moral one works hard to be wealthy.
 - ii. He that is known to pay punctually and exactly to the time he promises, may at any time, and on any occasion, raise all the money his friends can spare. This is sometimes of great use.
- e. You can see in Franklin's quotes that being virtuous is important because it will lead to wealth.
- f. Soon people are working for money rather than a sign of salvation. Or rather, the money is the salvation.
- g. The trouble is that money has no meaning in and of itself. So people become separated from the meaning in their lives.
- h. They become enslaved by their own misunderstanding of the purpose of their lives. They work 24/7 to make more money but money has no meaning in and

of themselves. So people's lives are dedicated to meaningless activity.

- i. This is **disenchantment** when people become separated from the practices that give meaning to life but they don't realize it. They are committed to making more and more money without even thinking why. There is no answer to why because making money was always just a means to a larger end. So there is disenchantment in people's lives when the larger end disappears into the ether and no one knows why they keep working so hard.
- j. This is a type of enslavement but it is enslavement that we help create ourselves by letting the meaning become over routinized until it disappears. We are caught in a golden cage of our own making.
- k. The solution to this problem for Weber is to make sure to keep connected to the meanings that give purpose to your life and don't let them become subsumed under the routines of life that are just a means to the larger end.

44. Freud - Civilization And Its Discontent- Victorian England was a time of repression generally and sexual repression in particular. FOLLOW the RULES!!

- a. Parts of the mind
 - i. **Id** -- Unconscious and Preconscious.
 - 1. Unconscious thoughts are those that we're displeased with (we feel shame) so we repress them and put them out of our mind.
 - 2. Preconscious mind -- things that are sort of pre wired.
 - ii. **Ego** -- It is our conscious idea of ourselves. The executive control over the decisions that we make about what to do or be or think.
 - 1. The ego is what represses our unpleasant thoughts into the unconscious.
 - 2. In the ego our conscious idea of ourselves and it incorporates the external world as it is
 - 3. Although our ego is supposed to be in control its relation to the id is sort of like a rider on a horse. Sometimes the rider can

control the horse but sometimes it has a mind of its own and takes control. Then we sort of go along for the ride.

- iii. Super Ego -- It is our idea of who we **should** be. It's our moral ideal of the way things ought to be. While it reflects the external world it is internal to us.
 - 1. It is **OUR internal** idea of how the world is, and hence, how WE should be.
 - 2. Although this is a conscious product of our mind, it is infected by the repressed unconscious and preconscious thoughts of our id.
- b. So there are conflicts between
 - i. **The id and the ego.** We're not so aware of this conflict because it is either unconscious or preconscious but it is going on. We are ashamed or repulsed by our unconscious desires and this causes discomfort that we try to tamp down.
 - ii. **The ego and super ego** are also in conflict. We are conscious of the external world and this affects our idea of who we are (remember that critical theorists are communitarians so our identities are formed by meanings that come from the world.)
 - 1. But internally we think we are bad (but we don't know why because of our repressed feelings.)
 - 2. Hence we internally set up these idealized moral principles that are perfect and which we try to make real in our society.
- c. We **internally** set up this perfect world of how we should be and then try to make our actions and the external world reflect our idealized moral view of the world. In our attempt to make up a perfect external world that will guide us we set up this idea of God the Father who will be the symbol of perfection.
- d. But note that we created **this religious perfection** and it is unrealistic.
- e. Our idea of how we should be is based on the infected subconscious.

45. What are we trying to repress?

- a. Our preconscious/unconscious is wired for us to pursue(our avoid) two goals.
 - i. **Eros or happiness** -- we want to be happy and this is normal and good. The problem is when we suppress normal desires to be happy as bad or shameful (like loving one of our parents) and so our normal pursuit of happiness becomes screwed up.
 - 1. We deny ourselves the pursuit of happiness because we associate this with the things we're ashamed of. **Victorianism** was the classic social structure embodying this pathology. Everything that made us happy was shameful.
 - 2. Note that the things that made us happy are hard wired into us. Sex, the classic source of shame is literally part of our evolutionary solution to survive and yet we have created a social consciousness that it is evil. The source of our survival is evil.
 - ii. **Thanatos or death.** We have a fear of death and this is so upsetting that of course we repress it. Unfortunately this is so huge that it won't stay repressed and so can rear its head in many different pathologies including sadism.

46. Effects of Repression -- The unsuccessful struggle to repress these two impulses leads to all sorts of pathologies.

- a. Internally it can lead to living in a fantasy world where one doesn't live one's real-life but just stews in fantasies.
- b. Externally it can manifest itself in a desire to repress all the bad things one sees and this turns into a repressive society where all sorts of happy behavior must be outlawed and violent behavior is used towards others to forestall a perceived threat of death.
- c. This leads civilization to tyranny.

47. The solution to all this repression is to become aware of it and so let oneself be happy and live with the reality of death someday. We will get rid of neurotic behavior both internally

and in society by realizing these impulses of eros and Thanatos are necessary parts of life.

- a. Just be happy and don't try to control others.
- b. We can do this once we integrate the natural impulses of our pre-conscious into the conscious world. Then there won't be shame about these impulses and we can create an external world that is not laden with conflicts and which needn't be repressive.

48. **From Neuroticism and Hysteria To A Healthy Society:** How do we expel the neuroticism which plagues society and causes personal and social distress?

- a. **Change The Social Conditions:** The answer is to change the social practices which cause this disunion between **Id** and **Ego**. Stop shaming things which we are hardwired to do. But how to accomplish this?
- b. **Change The Laws and Institutions** Supporting repression. This is one step but it is difficult because the super ego we have created is still in our heads and we have difficulty letting go of the things we are ashamed of. People will rebel against these changes because we don't realize that the morals we have created don't come from a transcendent god, but rather are a reaction to the shaming we got in the first place. Our mind, which controls us, has developed an idea of morality that it believes is imposed from the outside.
- c. **Psychotherapy** Individuals can seek medical interventions to confront the things in our self conscious brain that are bothering us and realize that those things are not shameful at all. So we can incorporate those thoughts and actions into our ego and stop acting unconsciously to protect ourselves by defeating the goals of our conscious selves.

The problem with this solution is that it is just retail. Fixing this will be difficult if it requires every person to go through the treatment process. There aren't enough psychotherapists on earth to complete this process, nor could there ever be.

- d. **Proper Child Rearing** Society should not only stop repressing and shaming natural acts but the neuroticism should be prevented from ever occurring by ensuring that as children age they are not shamed for thoughts and deeds that are perfectly natural. This approach is still a retail as opposed to wholesale solution but at least it can be integrated into what parents are already doing

with their children.

- e. **Question:** Can all the problems leading to neurotic behavior be traced to the parents? Are there other sorts of shaming and control that exist outside of the parent's control?

49. The Subconscious and Evolution One might wonder why such a self destructive mechanism such as the subconscious develops. There are several possibilities outstanding.

- a. **Evolution I:** Certainly our preconscious is simply the product of evolution itself. Homo Sapiens development stretches all the way back to the amoeba. Every stage of brain development is built on top of the existing structures. So the reptilian brain structure still exists in humans and still functions for some purposes. Not all human activity requires higher level thinking from the prefrontal cortex so these other parts of the brain are there to still do the rudimentary stuff. But does the complexity of multiple brain functions create opportunities for malfunctions?
- b. **Self Protection:** Here we see how the mind protects us against unpleasant thoughts or reptilian thinking that our human minds feel uncomfortable about.
- c. **Evolution II Self Deception:** In order to convince other humans to mate with us we have to show them that we are reliable and will stay around to gather food and take care of the children. We will lie about this, of course, but others will become adept at detecting our lies. We can always lie more effectively when we believe our own lies. Hence, developed the idea of love which is an irrational phenomena in which we believe we want to be with the other person forever. We convince ourselves of this and when we believe it then it becomes easier to convince the other person that we will stick around to share the burdens of child care etc.

50. Skinner: The Sciences of Human Behavior.

Skinner is the polar opposite of Freud. For Freud, the key to understanding human behavior is in the mind. If we understand the dynamics of the different sorts of thoughts people have and why they have those thoughts and the nature of those thoughts, we can understand human behavior and with it social relationships.

Skinner says that all that focus on the thoughts of human actors is misplaced. He believes that humans are like every other natural phenomena in the universe in that they can all be, and indeed, only be, studied through observation. This leads him to 3 major claims about the study of human behavior.

1. There's no real human nature. Rather, people are infinitely malleable. Everything you know, everything you are, is the result of experience. Specifically, the experience of external forces acting on you. Skinner believed that any person could be molded into any type of character if you started early and were persistent.

If there's no human nature, then there's no sense in which one group of humans by dint of their race or their sex could be better than another group. None of those facts about people will ever make any difference. What matters to what you are is what you learn and how you're treated

2. Anti-mentalism. The behaviorists were obsessed with scientific methodology and so were suspicious of claims about internal mental states like desires, wishes, goals, and emotions because they couldn't be observed. These invisible, vague things can never form the basis of a serious science. And so, the behaviorist developed a method of social relationships that excluded anything that's unobservable. Instead it uses notions like stimulus and response and reinforcement and punishment and environment that refer to real world and tangible events.
3. All objects of observation are the same. If studying a human is the same as studying planets or electrons then certainly there are no interesting differences across species. A behaviorist might admit that a human can do things that a rat or pigeon couldn't but a behaviorist might just say, "Look. Those are just general associative powers that differ" or they may even deny it. They might say, "Humans and rats aren't different at all. It's just that humans tend to live in a richer environment than rats." From that theoretical standpoint, comes a methodological approach which is, if they're all the same then you could study human learning by studying nonhuman animals. And that's a lot of what they did.
4. If people are what they learn through their experiences then we can shape human behavior, and the institutions humans create, by controlling what humans experience, or what they learn. There are different levels of experience that humans can undergo with varying effects on how much and how precisely this affects behavior.

- a. **Habituation** This is the simplest form of learning and not very precise. If we hear fire trucks and ambulance sirens outside our window every day we learn to tune them out so that we can concentrate on other things.
- b. **Classical Conditioning** This form of learning teaches us to associate one sort of stimulus with another stimulus where stimulus is a term that means events out in the environment. Examples of this are Pavlov's famous dog experiment. First put food on the dog's lips to get the saliva, then just have the person who gives the food come into the room and you get the saliva, then just ring a bell when the person comes in and the dog ends up making saliva when hearing the bell. In this sort of conditioning the subject (the dog) doesn't need to know anything about the connections between different stimuli. It just happens.
- c. **Operant Conditioning:** Unlike classical conditioning in which the subject is passive, here the person learns the connection between the stimuli. The subject learns the relationships between what you do and how successful or unsuccessful people are in getting something else. People are learning what works and what doesn't to get other stimuli they want or avoiding stimuli they dislike.
 - i. Thinking of this from the personal level, if people want to be successful at a task, like studying for example, then you teach the person to associate positive stimuli with good study techniques and bad stimuli with no or poor studying.
 - ii. At a societal level, if you want to get certain types of behavior then the gov't will provide certain types of stimulus in order to get people to act in a certain way.
- d. **Behaviorism as a social theory** Part of the problem with behaviorism as a social theory is how we decide what are good or bad behaviors. Remember, if there is absolutely no such thing as human nature, if we are just like electrons, there is no such thing as good or bad behavior. There is only behavior. So how does society decide what behavior to encourage and which to avoid? We can't ask people because people are only conditioned to like what they have learned. So what they want has no value whatsoever. We can just teach them to like something else. In this we can teach people to like literally anything and it has as much value as anything else. This is because no behavior of any sort has any value good or bad. It is just behavior. So we need to get beyond judgments of freedom and dignity because those reflect the old idea that humans had a natural and there was some

behavior that was in compliance with it and others not.

- e. Skinner thought that those ideas of good and bad were based on non-scientific ideas of human nature and dignity. But this means that any type of behavior the state encourages, including living in pods feeding electricity to the grid, is as good as inventing cures for diseases. They're all just behaviors in response to stimulus.

i. [Clockwork Orange Operant Conditioning Scene I](#)

ii. [Clockwork Orange Operant Conditioning Scene II](#)

- 5. **Chomsky** Notes that the way Skinner has framed his theory it isn't falsifiable. All scientific theories purport to be statements about the world. This means that they are observable and other observations could show them to be wrong. If a factual statement is not subject to falsification, then it is a tautology (ie made up) and so isn't a statement about something real in the world but is just a made-up definition.

	Source of Knowledge	Human Identity	Human Nature	Human Thriving	Social Pathology	Remedy	Relation Amongst People	
Hobbes	Observation of the world remembered , assembled and ordered into ideas in our head.	Based on our own experiences and observations as we pass through time. Note that core identity is fixed as the passion for "felicity" ie for pleasure.	We're driven by irrational passions to satisfy our desire for social goods. We use rationality only to achieve those irrationally sourced desires. So we are rational maximizers but our fundamental impulse is irrational and we use rationality to achieve those irrationally authored preferences.	Personal safety and order.	War of Each against all due to lack of power to contain peoples insatiable hunger for scarce social goods. Because there is inherently a shortage of social goods and we are irrationally motivated, we the world in zero sum circumstances. The more you have, that means the less I have.	Leviathan who imposes strong control over everyone to prevent violence People agree to a supreme authoritarian power to impose peace and stability. Differences in thought	Differences cause strife so everyone must conform to a single way of living and thinking imposed from above.	

	Source of Knowledge	Human Identity	Human Nature	Human Thriving	Social Pathology	Remedy	Relation Amongst People	
Locke		We are born blank slates. We have no knowledge or identities until we have knowledge to form them. Because our identity is itself the product of rationally formed ideas, we are able to understand that others have the same desire for autonomy for themselves.	Because our identity is itself the product of rational thought, reason is the basic source of our ideas, and hence, our desires. We realize that everyone's desires are the product of their ideas and understand that if we want to be given our own freedom we must give it to others.	A tolerant society where each person is able to exercise their own personal freedom to pursue their own idea of the good life.	1) <u>Coercion</u> 2) intolerance When people are left to resolve their own disputes they favor themselves. Similarly, people favor their own idea of the good life and sometimes become intolerant of other people's choices. Not everyone can think rationally about the benefit to their freedom of allotting freedom to others.	A social contract in which everyone gives the govt the right to be a neutral arbiter between them when they have disputes with each other and across society to ensure that every idea of the good life is treated the same and not favored by factions within society.	People living in a society protecting their rights do not see other people as threats. Everyone agrees to leave space for other people and the state is clearly willing and able to enforce that.	

	Source of Knowledge	Human Identity	Human Nature	Human Thriving	Social Pathology	Remedy	Relation Amongst People	
Bentham		Rational maximizer driven by irrational desires. The desires we have are hardwired and not the result of thoughts or judgments	We see ourselves as autonomous need satisfiers. We see others as competitors.	Maximizing pleasure and avoiding pain. We may be hedonistic but that's just the way we are.	A coercive or unequal society where one person or group's pleasure is valued more highly than another. This is so bad because it doesn't maximize utility.	Some sort of democratic system to measure utility correctly. Everyone counts for one and no one for more than one.	Potential for exploitation and coercion.	

	Source of Knowledge	Human Identity	Human Nature	Human Thriving	Social Pathology	Remedy	Relation Amongst People	
Mill		Your identity is itself the construction of ideas.	Utility is the pursuit of happiness which is really our well being.	A free society that has access to all ideas to pursue the truth of well being is.	One where access to truth is suppressed. One which is coercive and prevents people from pursuing their idea of the good life.	Rule Utilitarianism. Forces you to take the perspective of society when you're pursuing your well being.	You recognize other people as pursuing an idea of well being. So you are connected to them in the enterprise of pursuing well being.	One which is open, and free for people to debate ideas of well being and pursue it through legislation to maximize happiness.

	Source of Knowledge	Human Identity	Human Nature	Human Thriving	Social Pathology	Remedy	Relation Amongst People	
Walzer								
Taylor								
Appiah								
Rousseau	Knowledge is the product of our social interaction. Practice first, then its conceptualization.	In nature, it is just amoral and focused on survival. Not violent but only because of our lack of identity. Identity only comes in society where we develop practices that create concepts of everything.	Only as good as the social practices that define our identity. WE are the people and do the things that the social practices of our society dictate.	A place where every human has the opportunity to master the capacities inside of them to be what they are possible of being.	Unequal society where people don't have respect for each other because they're too different to identify with each other's ends. People are indifferent to each other's ends. So no empathy. Now common ideas that people share with each other.	Positive Right to the correct social practices. This is achieved through discourse where people with empathy try to construct a society where everyone can achieve self realization.	People can identify with each other's ends and their ideas of others having been shaped by social practices sees them as people who want	Where the general will prevails in that social practices permit everyone to achieve self mastery.

	Source of Knowledge	Human Identity	Human Nature	Human Thriving	Social Pathology	Remedy	Relation Amongst People	
						The result is a consensus, not a compromise.	to live an authentic life.	
Kant	Knowledge comes both from observation (natural world) and logical deduction (social world)	Someone who has the capacity to make judgements and therefore be a moral person. IE we can reason.	Someone who has the capacity to reason through life but not always the incentive or desire to act that way.	Living according to the rules of reason....this means according to the categorical imperative. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Univers alisation of any action 2) Cannot use anyone else as a means to an end. 3) We live in a society 	People are either too timid or selfish to act according to the imperative. Immoral society. Even acting out of concern for the general welfare is not acting morally.	Structure society so that people can more easily pursue the kingdom of ends. Result: An extremely liberal society where everyone is free to pursue their own ends.	You see everyone as a reasoning and therefore potentially moral person. So you grant them space to pursue their own kingdom.	IS one that is not structured around coercion or even pursuing happiness for most people. People are free to do what they want so long as they leave the space for others too.

	Source of Knowledge	Human Identity	Human Nature	Human Thriving	Social Pathology	Remedy	Relation Amongst People	
				of sovereigns and citizens.				
Nietzsche								
Marx								
Durkheim	Knowledge is interpreted BUT we sometimes don't do it correctly or even realize that it's a social practice.	It's the product of our understanding of the social practices which BTW might be incorrect. So bad interpretation equals a pathological identity. Collective consciousness is from the fact that each of our	We have a need for norms and a sense of order. There need to be rules we understand about how the world works.	Feeling like we belong in a community with norms which we take to be the correct ones.	Anomie - when we don't feel like there are any norms to structure society and we don't feel part of it. Division of labor creates interdependence not found in rural society where everyone is more self-sufficient.	Reinterpret group consciousness to recognize the different social practices inherent in a large urban diverse community. So your idea of yourself is based on organic solidarity which sees you	Depends on our community and social conscience. <u>Mechanical solidarity</u> : we see each other as the same but not interdependent. We're similar	Recognition that we are all part of this organic organism and that we need each other.

	Source of Knowledge	Human Identity	Human Nature	Human Thriving	Social Pathology	Remedy	Relation Amongst People	
		identities are socially derived.				as part of a large diverse function entity like the human body.	people operating on separate islands. <u>Organic solidarity</u> where people are diverse economically and in every way. So they think of each as <u>part of the same organism</u> where we all need each other. So we treat each other with	

