

Concepts to make sure you understand

- *prima facie* rights and duties, overriding, conflicts; how to show there is no *prima facie* duty to x
 - Give a case where it is permissible to not x , and there is no duty requiring you to not x
- fairness vs demandingness (know the difference between these)
- Don't confuse the right to not participate, or to not engage in direct action, with the permissibility of not participating or engaging in direct action

Moral collective action puzzles

- Remember: the individual's participation almost never makes a (noticeable) difference to the goal, and harms someone (often the participant)
- Intuitively, we should participate in some of these [probably a *prima facie* obligation].
 - E.g. most people thought Pat was obligated to restrict his water usage during the drought, we are obligated to pay taxes even if we can get away with it.
 - It seems that most of the class think that people in the U.S. are usually obligated to cut down on their greenhouse gas emissions, or recycle.
 - We are sometimes obligated to not do harmful things even when someone else would do it anyway.
- However, it's intuitive that some people are not obligated to participate some times.
 - E.g. your classmates thought one isn't obligated to go on strike, vote, or join the military.
- Are we obligated to do more than our "fair share" of participation?
 - Is there a difference between freeriding and being complicit? Maybe one is more unfair than the other?
- How do we explain the obligation to participate? (address the following *in addition to* the worries Sinnott-Armstrong raises)
 - Principles having to do with harm: What's the harm that is done? Participation almost never makes a noticeable difference, or makes a difference to any one person's life (other than the participant's).
 - Might connect this to the discussion of harm and welfare we had when talking about the experience machine (unnoticeable harms).
 - A requirement to avoid doing even unnoticeable harm might be extremely demanding (most things we do cause very minor harms).
 - Connect to direct action: direct action typically does harm, but most of you think that it is sometimes permissible.
 - Group principles (these say it is wrong to be part of a group that does harm)
 - This seems demanding in similar ways to harm principles.
 - What makes one part of the group? E.g. if one knows they probably don't make a difference, why should they count as part of the group that does harm?
 - Connect to direct action: Does committing direct action make one part of a harmful group (e.g. criminals)? Does this make direct action always impermissible? If not, how is direct action different from non-participation in MCAPs?

- Principles having to do with rules:
 - Even the best law is going to have exceptions – cases where following the rule doesn't really give the correct result; if good laws had no exceptions, they would be so complicated that no one would know how to properly follow or enforce them.
 - Why would one be obligated to follow a good rule when one is an exception to the rule?
 - So, even if a good rule required participation in collective action, why wouldn't MCAPs be an exception, since participation is overall bad?
 - Connect this to direct action: most of you seem to think that direct action is permissible, even though it violates rules that we generally should have. Why wouldn't non-participation in MCAPs be permissible for the same reasons?

Direct action

- Most of the class seems to think that direct action is sometimes permissible.
 - Problem: it violates the *prima facie* property rights of others.
 - Problem: it violates the *prima facie* duty to follow good rules / good laws.
 - Is there such a duty? Consider examples we discussed where it seems permissible to violate good laws (e.g. parking laws, speeding laws).
 - Does it matter if the laws do not respect the rights of animals, plants, or species?
- What would justify direct action?
 - Perhaps direct action is overall good?
 - Is it only when it turns out to be overall good? Then how can we tell before we engage in direct action? (Turner)
 - Is it only when we expect it to be overall good? If so, how much information do we need before we can act? Do we need so much information that it is almost never permissible to engage in direct action?
 - If direct action violates *prima facie* duties, then maybe there is an overriding *prima facie* duty to engage in direct action.
 - Isn't this too demanding? After all, it requires you to risk prison.
 - Is it unfair that one person is required to engage in direct action because other people are harming the environment?
 - Does your justification for direct action also say that we are obligated to participate in *all* MCAP? This would be a surprising claim.
- Connect direct action to state interactions:
 - Would one state be justified in forcing other states to do their fare share? Or in using violence to “encourage” being environmentally friendly?
 - If so, this is surprising and you need to defend this claim.
 - If not, how is this different from the sort of direct action you endorse?

States and the fair shares

- Common sense:
 - States are sometimes obligated to do more than their fair share, when other states are not doing so.
 - Individuals are sometimes obligated to do more than their fair share (e.g. drowning baby cases, lifeboat case).
 - Individuals are sometimes not obligated to do more than their fair share (e.g. neighbor case, group project case).
- How can we explain common sense?
 - One way is to say that fairness is more important than some moral considerations, such as exploitation, but less important than others, such as life.
 - How plausible is this? It's a pretty serious wrong to exploit other people who need jobs...
 - Or we might argue against common sense.
- How does demandingness factor in? Is one obligated to even do one's fair share when this is very costly?
- Do states have special obligations to their citizens?
 - When do these override the obligations to help non-citizens?
 - Does it matter if it is the lives of non-citizens vs the comfort of citizens?
- Stakes:
 - It was suggested in class that one is obligated to do more than one's fair share when the stakes of the situation are high:
 - Is this when the overall problem faced by the group is very important? This would suggest that we are always obligated to do more than our fair share of participation in MCAP (surprising).
 - Is it only when the stakes of one's contribution are high (i.e. when one can do a lot of good)?
 - Does this make participating in MCAPs when others do not participate an unfair burden and non-obligatory?
- Connect to MCAPs and direct action:
 - Does your view imply that we are obligated to do more than our fair share of participation in MCAPs? This is surprising.
 - Does your view imply that we are obligated to participate in direct action (not just that it is permissible)? This is surprising.