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It’s my pleasure to introduce the center’s Annual Review for 2014. I call your attention especially to the research reports of our Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Faculty Fellows (LSRs) and Graduate Prize Fellows (GPFs). Both groups share work-in-progress in seminars that meet regularly throughout the year. I chaired the LSR seminar all year and the GPF meetings in the spring, and was regularly reminded of the quality and diversity of the research the center supports. I was also reminded that our investment is a two-way street: the excellent work of our visiting and graduate fellows enriches the intellectual lives of all of us who have a stake in their subjects.

We were sorry to say goodbye to K. Anthony Appiah, a member of the faculty since 2002. Anthony departed for New York University at midyear. Simultaneously we welcomed Johann Frick, who arrived from Harvard to take up a new position held jointly with philosophy. Johann has broad interests in normative ethics and will contribute particularly to the center’s commitment to bioethics.

The undergraduate certificate program in Values and Public Life (VPL), now four years old, continues to prosper. In response to student demand we have enlarged the program by more than 50 percent this year. The program’s success reflects the energy and imagination devoted to it by Melissa Lane, professor of politics, who has directed it since its inception. (See her report on p. 30.) Melissa stepped down this summer and we are hugely lucky that Anna Stilz, associate professor of politics, has agreed to succeed her.

Susan Winters, whose title as administrative assistant hardly registers her many roles in the center, was honored this year with the University’s Donald Griffin ’23 Award. It recognizes the potential for leadership and continuing contribution to the University. Congratulations to Sue! Welcome to Femke de Ruyter, who joined our staff as program coordinator last September and, among many other responsibilities, has overseen the production of this Review. And thanks to all of the center’s superb staff for maintaining an exceptional standard of service for our faculty and visitors.

Finally, an alert: this year is the center’s 25th anniversary. We’ll celebrate with a conference on April 17–18, 2015, devoted to leading-edge problems of justice and injustice in our time. It will be an occasion for the center’s faculty, graduate students, and alumni/ae to join and continue conversations that have gone on here from the beginning.
2013–14 FACULTY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Peter Brooks
Published two edited volumes: *The Humanities and Public Life* and *Honoré de Balzac, The Human Comedy: Selected Stories*, edited and with an introduction by Peter Brooks

John Cooper
Delivered the Distinguished Harris Lecture at the Alice Kaplan Institute for the Humanities at Northwestern University and the Scholl Lecture at Purdue University

Jan-Werner Müller
Delivered the annual IWM Lectures in Human Sciences at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna
Delivered the inaugural Ernst Kogon Lecture at the Technical University of Darmstadt

Alan Patten
Published *Equal Recognition: The Moral Foundations of Minority Rights*

Philip Pettit
Published *Just Freedom: A Moral Compass for a Complex World*
Elected a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy
Served on leave in the spring term as Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the Australian National University

Reappointed to Honorary Professorships in Philosophy at Queen’s University, Belfast, and the University of Sydney
Delivered six named lectures: Alvin Plantinga Lecture for Human Values (Peking University); David Norton Memorial Lecture (University of Delaware); Kendrick Lecture (Arizona Workshop in Normative Ethics); Dan and Gwen Taylor Lecture in Philosophy (Otago University); Garret Fitzgerald School Lecture (Dublin); and the Mark Sacks Lecture, European Journal of Philosophy (University of Konstanz)

Kim Lane Scheppele
Awarded fellowship as a joint member of the School of Historical Studies and the School of Social Sciences at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton
Awarded the Harry J. Kalven Prize for 2014, the Law and Society Association’s highest honor

Peter Singer
 Ranked No. 3 among “Global Thought Leaders” in 2013 study by the Gottlieb Duttweiler Institute
Taught “Practical Ethics” as a free online course during the spring semester, through Coursera
Published *The Point of View of the Universe: Sidgwick and Contemporary Ethics* with Katarzyna de Lazari-Radek
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HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT PROJECT
DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING
One possible answer to this question is that there is a moral difference between “killing” and “letting die,” and we have a stronger moral obligation not to kill than to save. But this answer was soon challenged by another set of Trolley Problems: Why does it also seem morally permissible for a bystander to pull a switch to turn an out-of-control trolley from a track where it will kill five to a track where it will kill only one, but not morally permissible for him to push a large man off a bridge onto the track where the trolley will crash into and kill him, thereby saving five? Unlike the original driver case, in this case the bystander is not faced with the option of “killing five or killing one,” but with the option of “killing one or letting five die.” So we cannot account for our intuitions merely by appealing to the distinction of killing versus letting die. But if it is permissible for the bystander to turn the trolley, why may he not also push the large man?

Kamm’s aim in “Who Turned the Trolley?” is to examine this rich literature and to explain why simple answers that appeal either to the killing/letting die distinction or to facts about who would be doing the killing cannot provide an ultimate solution to the Trolley Problem. What really matters, in her view, is how certain killings are brought about: “[T]he Trolley Problem,” she argues, “is about why it is sometimes permissible to kill, even rather than let die, when we come to kill in some ways but not others.”

Kamm’s paper prompted a spirited discussion that focused primarily on the methodology employed in the setup and analysis of Trolley Problems and on whether we should give this methodology credence, particularly in light of recent empirical research involving the use of trolley cases. Several participants worried, for example, about the artificially constructed nature of Trolley Problems, and about whether such cases leave out morally relevant information. Others suggested that recent fMRI studies show that our “intuitions” about Trolley Problems are driven largely by the emotional rather than the cognitive centers of our brains, and that this should lead us to doubt the moral validity of these intuitions.

Frances Kamm, the Littauer Professor of Philosophy and Public Policy at Harvard University, gave a dazzling demonstration of the art and science of “trolley-ology” at a packed Program in Ethics and Public Affairs seminar in December. Kamm’s paper, “Who Turned the Trolley?,” was the basis for a lively discussion about the history, nature, and significance of the famous “Trolley Problem(s)” in ethics.

The Trolley Problem presents a challenge to philosophers who think there are certain constraints on what we are morally permitted to do to bring about good consequences. As originally presented, the “problem” was to explain why it seems morally permissible for the driver of an out-of-control trolley that is about to kill five people on one track to redirect his trolley onto another track where it will kill only one person, while it does not seem morally permissible for a doctor to kill a single healthy person to use his organs to save five fatally ill patients. In both cases, the result is one person dead and five alive, so why is one action permissible and the other not?
In response to these and other challenges, Kamm gave a sparkling (and unapologetic) defense of the philosophical methodology she employs, explaining how these carefully constructed examples allow us to isolate and critically evaluate the various considerations that may be playing a role in generating our considered moral intuitions. This method also allows us to evaluate various “debunking” hypotheses that have been given for these intuitions, such as those put forward by neuroscientists. “It’s an analytic question,” she insisted. “I don’t answer these questions by figuring out what portion of the brain these responses come from.”

“[T]HE TROLLEY PROBLEM IS ABOUT WHY IT IS SOMETIMES PERMISSIBLE TO KILL, EVEN RATHER THAN LET DIE, WHEN WE COME TO KILL IN SOME WAYS BUT NOT OTHERS.”

— Frances Kamm, Harvard University

PROGRAM IN ETHICS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The Program in Ethics and Public Affairs (PEPA) advances the study of the moral purposes and foundations of institutions and practices, both domestic and international. PEPA seminars seek to bring the perspectives of moral and political philosophy to bear on significant issues in public affairs.

SEPTEMBER 19, 2013
“The Great Escape from Sickness and Deprivation and How to Help Those Left Behind”
Angus Deaton, Princeton University

OCTOBER 10, 2013
“The Twilight of International Human Rights Law”
Eric Posner, University of Chicago

NOVEMBER 14, 2013
“A General Framework for the Ethics of Public Administration”
Joseph Heath, University of Toronto

DECEMBER 5, 2013
“Who Turned the Trolley?”
Frances Kamm, Harvard University

MARCH 13, 2014
“What Is Freedom For?”
Leslie Green, University of Oxford
The United States has drifted in recent years into a disturbing pattern of mass incarceration. Many factors sustain this pattern, one of which is a tendency for the public to blame criminals for their crimes and to blame them so intensely that people lose their sense of the criminal as a fellow human being.

T. M. Scanlon of Harvard University, one of the most influential moral philosophers today, took up this subject in his James A. Moffett ’29 Lecture in Ethics this April. Reflecting on the carceral frenzy in the United States, Scanlon suggested that moral philosophy could help by offering people a better way of understanding how the criminal’s offense makes him blameworthy and changes the nature of our relationship with him. Scanlon developed his more general ideas about moral blame into a temperate and humane account of the condemnatory aspect of legal punishment.

When a criminal commits a crime, Scanlon believes that the criminal’s action makes it appropriate for other people to change their attitudes toward him. For example, it would be appropriate for the victim of an assault to be angry and resentful toward her attacker; it might show a lack of self-respect if she did not feel this way. Other people should also withdraw some form of goodwill toward the attacker in recognition of the moral standing of the victim. And when the state punishes the attacker, one of the things that it does is to act as the defender of individual rights in the community and condemn authoritatively the perpetrator’s actions.

But Scanlon draws a line when it comes to “hard treatment.” When the state imposes prison sentences, fines, and other forms of suffering on the criminal, this cannot be justified by appeal to the standards of appropriate blame and condemnation. If prison sentences are justified, they are justified as part of a social institution that deters certain actions and thereby secures important goods (e.g., public safety), while also giving people a fair opportunity to avoid prison by making the right choices.

Scanlon’s view avoids the bloodlust inherent in the retributivist perspective. When the community metes out punishment, in his view, the
WHEN A CRIMINAL COMMITS A CRIME, SCANLON BELIEVES THAT THE CRIMINAL’S ACTION MAKES IT APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PEOPLE TO CHANGE THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD HIM. ... BUT SCANLON DRAWS A LINE WHEN IT COMES TO “HARD TREATMENT.”

suffering of the criminal is not something that we hope for, but something that we merely acquiesce to as part of a justified institution that secures important goods in a fair way.

A lively discussion followed the lecture and continued over dinner. Princeton’s Anna Stilz wondered about the role of the state in condemning the criminal’s act. Did the state act on behalf of the victims, on behalf of other citizens, or as a third party in its own right? Others wondered whether Scanlon had given an adequate account of the limits of the condemnatory aspect of punishment. A community imposes hardship on a criminal when its members withdraw friendly feelings toward him, effectively shunning him, and if this hardship can be justified by appeal to the standards of appropriate public condemnation, we might wonder what other hardships could be justified in this way? At what point does punishment cross the line and become subject to the standards of hard treatment rather than the standards of public condemnation?

All in all, it was a fascinating discussion, in the best tradition of moral philosophy engaged with the world.
DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING

DECEMBER 2003

Choiosing Life or Death in the Neonatal ICU

By Peter Singer, Ira W. DeCamp Professor of Bioethics in the UCHV

April Dworetz, an assistant professor of pediatrics at Emory University with 25 years' experience as a neonatologist, spoke at a DeCamp Bioethics Seminar in October on the life and death decisions presented in neonatal intensive care units. Under the title “Overwhelming Options or Best Interests,” Dworetz discussed how she works with parents facing such choices for their infants.

Dworetz explained that it is now possible to save infants born as early as 22 weeks of gestation. Very few such infants survive, however, and if they do, there is a high risk of serious disabilities. Her unit's policy is to not treat infants born earlier than 23 weeks. Of those born between 23 and 24 weeks, a discussion is initiated with the parents as to whether to attempt treatment.

The standards of care set by the American Association of Pediatrics recommend that nontreatment decisions should be guided by “the best interests of the infant,” but Dworetz described the difficulties of deciding what is in the best interest of the infant. At one extreme, Dworetz cited the case of a child with epidermolysis bullosa, an inherited skin condition that affects about one in 50,000 children. It varies in degree, but in severe cases the infant's skin breaks and blisters, both externally and on internal organs. Attempts to dress the child's blisters cause more skin breakages whenever the dressings are changed, and the baby appears to be in considerable pain. Here, the combination of pain and—in the most severe cases—short life expectancy, even with treatment, suggests that it is not in the best interest of the infant to keep it alive.

In other cases, an infant may have severe brain damage that indicates a likelihood of profound intellectual disability. The precise degree of disability, however, is difficult to predict: Will the child be able to feed itself? To walk? To use language? In such cases, it is less clear what is in the best interest of the child and Dworetz prefers to allow parents, in accordance with their own values, to decide whether to withdraw life support. The case histories she presented showed that this is not always easy. One teenage mother, for example, initially said that she could not kill her baby, and missed many consultation appointments. In time, and after several
discussions with Dworetz, this young woman realized the kind of life her baby was likely to have, and was able to determine for herself that she did not want her child to have such a life.

In response, Jeff McMahan, a professor of philosophy at Rutgers University, argued that life and death decisions for infants ought to be governed solely by the best interests of the infant only if those interests are very strong. He further argued, however, that just as a fetus’s interest in continuing to live is weak in comparison with an adult’s interest in continuing to live, so an infant’s interest in continuing to live is also relatively weak. The explanation in both cases has to do with the tenuousness of the psychological relations that bind a fetus or infant to its future adult self. McMahan then argued that if the comparative weakness of an infant’s interest in continuing to live means that its death is a significantly lesser misfortune for it than death normally is for an older child or adult, considerations other than the best interest of the infant should have a role in decisions about whether to allow certain infants to die. He concluded by arguing that not only are the interests of the parents relevant, but that in some cases the death of a badly impaired infant is necessary for its parents to be able to have another child whose life could be expected to be much better.
Organ transplantation is inarguably among the most transformative developments in modern medicine. Patients whose conditions were tantamount to death sentences a few generations ago now routinely live full, healthy lives upon receiving donor kidneys, livers, hearts, or lungs to replace their own diseased organs. But as longer life spans and the consequences of choices regarding diet and smoking (among other factors) have led to increased numbers of patients in need of transplants, the supply of organs—through deceased donors and altruistic living donors—is consistently inadequate to meet this growing demand. This gap continues to widen, with tragic consequences for patients. In the United States alone, 18 people die each day waiting for transplants.

To address this shortfall, attention has turned to numerous policy proposals, including the legalization of organ sales, a practice currently prohibited in every country except Iran. The ethical and policy considerations related to organ-procurement strategies were the subject of a daylong symposium hosted by the University Center for Human Values in October. Organized by Peter Singer, the Ira W. DeCamp Professor of Bioethics in the University Center for Human Values, and Frances Kissling, an instructor at the University of Pennsylvania Department of Medical Ethics and Health Policy, the event brought together an interdisciplinary group of more than 30 physicians, scholars, policy makers, and patient advocates to explore the complex challenges raised by organ procurement and the role of legalized organ sales as a potential solution.

The focus for the October 3 symposium was the work of Janet Radcliffe Richards, a professor of practical ethics at the University of Oxford and the author of *The Ethics of Transplants: Why Careless Thought Costs Lives*. In
her book, Radcliffe Richards argues that if people die whose lives could be saved were more organs available (as is undisputed), there is a presumption in favor of policies that create additional potential sources of organs and, conversely, against policies that restrict such sources. Since existing donation practices have not satisfied the need for organs, she argues that the ethical arguments for banning organ sales are inadequate, failing to justify the preventable deaths to which such policies contribute.

The day began with a screening of Tales from the Organ Trade, a documentary examining the world of organ sales in the international communities where an illegal market exists, followed by a discussion with the film’s director. Among other sessions was a presentation by a senior official at the World Health Organization reviewing the global need for organs and data regarding organ trafficking worldwide. A highlight of the day was a public lecture by Radcliffe Richards followed by comments from a distinguished interdisciplinary panel.

A lively discussion among all attendees occurred throughout the day and continued at dinner, with participants agreeing on the moral imperative of increasing the supply of organs available for transplantation, but holding a range of views regarding the legalization of organ sales as a solution. This ethical and policy debate will continue, but this timely and informative symposium left little doubt about the need for innovative approaches to an ongoing issue with profound consequences for the wellbeing of patients and the future of medicine.

The conference was funded, in part, by a gift from Ms. Virginia H. Klein K*50.

IN HER BOOK, RADCLIFFE RICHARDS ARGUES THAT IF PEOPLE DIE WHOSE LIVES COULD BE SAVED WERE MORE ORGANS AVAILABLE (AS IS UNDISPUTED), THERE IS A PRESUMPTION IN FAVOR OF POLICIES THAT CREATE ADDITIONAL POTENTIAL SOURCES OF ORGANS AND, CONVERSELY, AGAINST POLICIES THAT RESTRICT SUCH SOURCES.
Can architects and political theorists really talk to each other? Perhaps even find a shared normative language about the built environment and urban planning in particular? Such questions stood at the beginning of a two-day colloquium on “Architecture, Urban Space, and Democracy,” held at the University Center for Human Values on February 21 and 22. It was an unusual experiment involving local and international architects, historians, and philosophers, as well as a sitting member of the European Parliament. Participants found it intellectually satisfying and highly stimulating.

Since Aristotle’s remarks on Hippodamus in *Politics*, political thinkers have reflected on how political values and the built environment relate to each other. While there have been many explorations of the architecture of authoritarianism, this colloquium focused on the generally less-well-known traditions of reflecting on architecture and specifically democratic values. Jessica Paga explained how the meeting place of the Council in ancient Athens encouraged both deliberation and transparency; her fellow classicist, Josiah Ober, focused on the relationship between massive walls and democracy (having the former, he explained, helped preserve the latter). Others focused on more recent government architecture, especially in Brasilia and Berlin; in the process, they questioned some of the simplistic equations present in many debates on architecture and democracy: that certain materials unambiguously reflect democratic values, glass equating to democratic transparency, for instance. Judith Resnik and Dennis Curtis from Yale Law School explored the changing architecture of courts in the United States, while others revisited some of the famous critiques of modernism, notably Jane Jacobs’s, that led to basic questions about urban planning and distributive justice; in her presentation on New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, Christine Boyer demonstrated the many failures to address the latter, in particular.

Richard Sennett emphasized that the planning challenges of the 21st century—especially with the huge movement of people to cities—would require a shift toward “open systems” that allow citizens to improvise. Stan Allen, former dean of Princeton’s School of Architecture, suggested that building a lot of redundant infrastructure—or infrastructure that can be repurposed—might create such openness. Some participants took issue with what they saw as romantic Western enthusiasm for “favela kitsch,” or the praise for the Torre David in Caracas, as an experiment in self-determination by the poor—when the latter, in the eyes of critics, is in fact highly authoritarian and crime-ridden.

Princeton’s Kim Lane Scheppele and the Hungarian architect, film-set designer, and former dissident László Rajk posed questions about the moral and political responsibilities of architects more directly. Rajk proposed a set of criteria for determining which commissions an architect ought to reject—an especially urgent issue in light of the role “starchitects” now often play in the legitimation of new urban environments under authoritarian regimes such as China and Azerbaijan.
The colloquium enabled many people to meet who otherwise might not have; it sparked a conversation among scholars of different disciplines, nationalities, and generations; and as Germany’s largest daily paper, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, stated in a long piece about the gathering, the two-day conversation provided enough food for thought for a whole series of specialized seminars and further colloquia.

**WHILE THERE HAVE BEEN MANY EXPLORATIONS OF THE ARCHITECTURE OF AUTHORITARIANISM, THIS COLLOQUIUM FOCUSED ON THE GENERALLY LESS-WELL-KNOWN TRADITIONS OF REFLECTING ON ARCHITECTURE AND SPECIFICALLY DEMOCRATIC VALUES.**

**HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT PROJECT**

*The History of Political Thought Project provides a venue for Princeton students and faculty from different disciplines to discuss both substantive and methodological issues in the history of political thought and seeks to build bridges to comparative politics, comparative institutional law, and area studies.*

**NOVEMBER 15, 2013**
“Democracy and Education: A Conversation with Axel Honneth”

**FEBRUARY 21, 2014**
“Architecture, Urban Space, and Democracy”

**APRIL 30, 2014**
“Workshop on Epistemic Democracy”

Left bottom: left, Richard Sennett, University Professor of the Humanities at New York University; Centennial Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics and Political Science
Top right: Jan-Werner Müller, Professor of Politics
POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY COLLOQUIUM

CO-SPONSORED LECTURES/WORKSHOPS

PROGRAM IN LAW AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
FOSTERING COLLABORATION
In his classic essay, “Freedom and Resentment” (1962), P. F. Strawson argues that we should understand moral responsibility in terms of what he calls “the reactive attitudes.” Reactive attitudes, he suggests, are the natural sentimental responses to perceived expressions of goodwill, ill will, and indifference. They include personal attitudes, such as resentment; vicarious or impersonal analogues of these attitudes, such as indignation; and self-reflective attitudes, such as guilt and remorse. Strawson argues influentially that understanding moral responsibility in terms of the reactive attitudes provides an attractive way of resolving the apparent incompatibility between free will and determinism.

At the February 25 convening of the Political Philosophy Colloquium, Berkeley philosopher R. Jay Wallace offered a revision of Strawson’s account. Strawson claims that the reactive attitudes have to do with participation in human relationships. But his essay leaves ambiguous the precise connection between the reactive attitudes and these relationships. In a paper tentatively titled “Emotions and Relationships: On a Strawsonian Theme,” Wallace contends that the reactive attitudes are best understood as resting on relational demands or requirements.

Strawson claims that “being involved in inter-personal relationships as we normally understand them precisely is being exposed to the range of reactive attitudes and feelings that is in question.” Wallace finds ambiguous this idea that participation in interpersonal relationships “precisely is” a matter of exposure to the reactive attitudes. First, we can likely feel impersonal or vicarious attitudes, such as indignation, toward others with whom we share no interpersonal relationship. If this is true, interpersonal relationships are not necessary for evoking reactive attitudes. Second, it seems that friends and family members frequently suspend typical reactive attitudes when they choose to accept one another simply for who they are. Thus participating in an interpersonal relationship would not be sufficient for triggering these attitudes. If interpersonal relationships are neither necessary nor sufficient for calling forth the reactive attitudes, we face a dilemma. We either need to dispense with the idea that relationships matter, or we need to refine our understanding of the connection between relationships and reactivity. Wallace opts for the latter strategy.

Wallace argues that the reactive attitudes have an “implicitly” relational structure. That is, even in cases where we might think relationships play no role in generating reactive attitudes, our reactions are still predicated on the notion of a relationship. Specifically, Wallace develops the idea that the reactive attitudes rest on relational demands, understood as what we expect of someone when we assume the stance of holding her to a moral requirement. This stance involves expecting others not merely to comply with moral standards, but also to endorse those standards and to govern their behavior in light of them. Wallace also believes that the moral
standards of relationships are themselves relational in nature. They are not based, as he says, on “monadic standards of individual rationality or attainment,” but on the claims of the individual parties to the relationship. The positional character of the reactive attitudes cannot be adequately explained by nonrelational theories of moral requirement, such as consequentialism. If nonrelational theories ignore a central aspect of moral experience, we might reconsider whether these theories are plausible guides for moral conduct.

A spirited discussion followed Wallace’s presentation. Some questioners disputed the accuracy of Wallace’s accounting of the phenomenology of reactivity. If reactivity is a matter of relational moral requirements, how is it that we often feel indignant toward people with whom we share no relevant relationship? Others challenged Wallace’s claim that we often suspend reactive attitudes toward people with whom we share especially close relationships. If the claim is false, then an important link in the chain of Wallace’s reasoning needs repair. A third line of questioning pressed the speaker to clarify whether the paper claims that all facets of morality—not simply moral responsibility—are relational in nature.

### POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY COLLOQUIUM

The Program in Political Philosophy presents a colloquium for graduate students and faculty in which scholars from Princeton and elsewhere lead seminars on a broad range of topics of interest to the University’s political philosophy community. The University Center for Human Values and the Department of Politics co-sponsor the colloquium.

**SEPTEMBER 26, 2013**
“Plural Freedom”
Sharon Krause, Brown University

**NOVEMBER 21, 2013**
“Evaluating Risky Prospects: The Distribution View”
Luc Bovens, London School of Economics and Political Science

**FEBRUARY 27, 2014**
“Emotions and Relationships: On a Theme from Strawson”
R. Jay Wallace, University of California-Berkeley

**MARCH 27, 2014**
“The Right to Free Choice of Occupation”
Lucas Stanczyk, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

**APRIL 3, 2014**
“Political Realism and Moral Corruption”
Alison McQueen, Stanford University
Students, faculty, and Princeton community members crowded into Dodds Auditorium on March 25 to hear renowned investigative journalist and Pulitzer Prize winner Sheri Fink speak on the topic of her new book, *Five Days at Memorial: Life and Death in a Storm-Ravaged Hospital*. Fink’s lecture, co-sponsored with the Woodrow Wilson School, explored some of the harrowing ethical choices faced by staff and rescue workers at Memorial Medical Center in New Orleans in the days following Hurricane Katrina in 2005.

The events at Memorial Medical Center gained national notoriety through a criminal investigation conducted by the state of Louisiana in 2006, which probed the unusually high death toll at the hospital in the wake of Katrina. (Of the 244 patients at Memorial when Katrina hit, 45 did not make it out alive—far more than at any comparable-size hospital in New Orleans). At the center of the investigation stood Dr. Anna Pou, a respected physician at Memorial, and two nurses, Cheri Landry and Lori Budo. They were accused of having deliberately hastened the deaths of several patients, whom they deemed unlikely to survive the evacuation process, by administering lethal doses of morphine. The medical professionals maintained that their intention had not been to kill, but to provide palliative care to the patients, many of whom were in a terminal condition after days without access to adequate medical treatment. In July 2007, a New Orleans grand jury refused to indict them.

However, this tragic case, which Fink recounted with great vividness, was but the culmination of a series of wrenching ethical decisions that confronted medical workers as the situation at Memorial rapidly deteriorated in the wake of the storm. With floodwaters rising and the circuits for backup generators located in the basement, it was only a matter of time before the hospital would lose power. It was therefore imperative to begin evacuating patients. But whom to rescue first? Much of Fink’s talk was devoted to a freewheeling back-and-forth with the audience, exploring the ethics of triage and the moral rationales for prioritizing different groups of patients: Should help come first to those most in need of assistance, i.e., the old and very sick? Or ought we, by contrast, prioritize future quality of life, privileging those patients who face a better prognosis if rescued? Should
we aim to maximize the number of lives saved, therefore giving preference to ambulatory patients? Or ought we to maximize the number of life years saved, by focusing on rescuing the youngest patients? Should patient-preferences be taken into account in triage situations? And who is to set the general rules governing such circumstances—medical professionals or a deliberative body of citizens?

These questions are important and likely to become even more pressing in the future, given the rising risks from global climate change and pandemic disease. Moral philosophers and bioethicists will undoubtedly have an important role to play in providing answers. And yet, Fink emphasized, we must resist the temptation to conceive of disaster situations on the model of philosophical thought experiments—as stark choices between precisely defined alternatives. Amidst the darkness and moral chaos at Memorial Medical Center, there were also many stories of ingenuity and heroism. Perhaps the central lesson of this tragic episode is that, even when it appears that we must choose between two bad outcomes, we must never stop looking for a creative third solution.

MUCH OF FINK’S TALK WAS DEVOTED TO A FREEWHEELING BACK-AND-FORTH WITH THE AUDIENCE, EXPLORING THE ETHICS OF TRIAGE AND THE MORAL RATIONALES FOR PRIORITIZING DIFFERENT GROUPS OF PATIENTS.

WORKSHOP ON WELLBEING AND PUBLIC POLICY

Scholars from a range of fields gathered February 28–March 1 at the Workshop on Wellbeing and Public Policy to consider the question of the appropriate measure by which to evaluate the impact of government policy on individual welfare.

The scholars are the authors of the second half of the Oxford Handbook on Wellbeing and Public Policy, co-edited by Matthew Adler (Duke University, Law) and Marc Fleurbaey (Princeton, Woodrow Wilson School and UCHV). Authors of the first half of the handbook gathered in November 2013.

Among the highlights of this workshop was the dialogue among competing measures of wellbeing ranging from the most subjective (happiness, discussed by Andrew Clark) to the most objective (capabilities, defended by Sabina Alkire), with extended preferences (Matthew Adler) and equivalent income (Marc Fleurbaey) in between, all jointly illustrated with real data by two empirical economists (Koen Decancq, Dirk Neumann). Beside the objective/subjective divide, an important issue was whether inclusive measures of wellbeing are needed or can be avoided by the use of multidimensional measurement. The multidimensional poverty measures were featured in Thomas Pogge and Scott Wisor’s original feminist approach, and have been the target of thorough critical discussions by the philosopher Richard Arneson and the economist Jean-Yves Duclos.
In one of the final weeks of the spring semester, Jürgen Habermas, a world-renowned public intellectual, sociologist, and philosopher and professor emeritus at Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, visited Princeton’s campus. During his week in residence, Habermas contributed to graduate seminars, participated in a daylong workshop on “Epistemic Dimensions of Democracy” organized by Politics Professor Jan-Werner Müller, and delivered a public lecture, featured below.

Can a supra-national organization of states, such as the European Union, attain the standards of legitimacy that we expect to see in a nation-state? This is the question Habermas tackled in a lecture presented by the Program in Contemporary European Politics and Society and co-sponsored by the European Union Program; the Program in Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies; and the University Center for Human Values. Almost every chair in the 450-seat auditorium was taken as people gathered to hear Habermas reflect on the uncertain future of the European Union.

The Europeans, like most people in the world today, face a dilemma. On the one hand, they realize that their societies have become more interconnected with others abroad and they cherish the connections and the advantages these connections bring. On the other hand, they see that economic and political decisions made beyond national borders have deep impact in their everyday lives. They fear that the connections are fostering even stronger forms of supra-national governance that individual citizens cannot hope to influence or control. Which should they choose? Not surprisingly, many Europeans have sought refuge in their state institutions and national communities. Although they are parochial, nation-states are accountable and democratic. But is it possible to avoid this retrenchment? What would be required to create supra-national institutions that foster cooperation, and still remain democratic?

In Europe, this question became urgent in the aftermath of the 2008 economic crisis. In Habermas’s view, a political crisis followed the economic one, as the European Council imposed measures that treated independent countries “like minors.” This harsh treatment, moreover, did not even touch the underlying causes of the problem: the lack of institutions to coordinate a joint European fiscal and economic policy. For Habermas, the solution must come from more integration, but this integration must also include mechanisms of democratic control.

In his lecture, Habermas proposed an unusual and innovative constitution-making scheme for the European Union. In democratic nation-states, the ground of the constitution has traditionally been a people, a unified collection of individuals. Instead, Habermas proposes that two different
subjects make the constitution: first, a people composed of individual citizens, second, a body that represents different collectives—those already-formed peoples of European nation-states. To develop this model he turned to the history of the United States, where a process of deepening ties among independent political communities grounded a democratic constitution. There the already existing states played an important role in creating federal institutions. In Habermas’s view, a similar scheme could allow the European Union to achieve its democratic aspirations. However, the mutual trust among peoples that would be required for a similar project to succeed is still lacking in Europe. For this reason he proposes the dual standard—his would allow Europeans to have better institutions, but would stop short of the full integration at the federal level. Individuals can then preserve the historical civic conquests of each people while opening up the possibility of further integration in the future.

Left: Speaker Jürgen Habermas on May 1 at “Transnationalization of Democracy: A European Experiment”
Bottom: Attendees listen to Habermas’ lecture on the future of Europe
The UCHV is a principal sponsor of Princeton’s Program in Law and Public Affairs (LAPA), established to create at Princeton an interdisciplinary legal community for examining the role of law in politics, society, the economy, and culture in the United States, in countries around the world, and across national borders. Each year, LAPA brings to Princeton a select group of legal scholars for a year-long fellowship as well as American and international visitors from the academy, legal practice, and government, who participate in seminars, conferences, and conversations that consider how law contributes to the search for solutions to complex problems of the 21st century. LAPA sponsors a wide range of programming, teaching, and research for undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, and fellow academics from many disciplines, and the public.
2013–14 LAPA FELLOWS

Stéphanie Hennette-Vauchez
Visiting Research Scholar,
Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense

R. Daniel Kelemen
Visiting Research Scholar,
Rutgers University

Daniel LaChance
Visiting Associate Research Scholar; LAPA/Perkins Fellow,
Emory University

David Lieberman
Visiting Research Scholar,
University of California-Berkeley, School of Law

Georg Nolte
Visiting Research Scholar,
Humboldt University

Bertrall Ross
Visiting Associate Research Scholar,
University of California-Berkeley, School of Law

Top, left: from left, R. Daniel Kelemen, Stephen Macedo, David Lieberman
Bottom: from left to right, 2013–14 Fellows Bertrall Ross, Georg Nolte, David Lieberman,
Daniel LaChance, Stéphanie Hennette-Vauchez, R. Daniel Kelemen
CO-SPONSORED EVENTS

SEPTEMBER 20
Gilbert Harman: Celebrating 50 Years Teaching at Princeton
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy and the Council of the Humanities

OCTOBER 11–13
Young Ethicists Workshop
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy and the Council of the Humanities

OCTOBER 18–19
Conceptualizing the Human in Slavic and Eurasian Culture
Co-sponsored by the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies

OCTOBER 22
Public History Initiative: Guantanamo Memory Project
Co-sponsored by the Department of History

OCTOBER 25–27
Cornell-Princeton Plotinus Workshop
Co-sponsored by the Department of Classics, the Center for the Study of Religion, the Council of the Humanities, the David A. Gardner ’69 Magic Project, and the Seeger Center for Hellenic Studies (with the support of the Stanley J. Seeger Hellenic Fund)

NOVEMBER 1–2
Semaphores and Surfaces: Reading the New African Cinemas
Co-sponsored by the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies

DECEMBER 7–8
Classical Philosophy Colloquium
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy

FEBRUARY 12
Why Shylock Loses His Case: Judicial Rhetoric in The Merchant of Venice
Co-sponsored by the Department of English Renaissance Colloquium

FEBRUARY 15
The Passions in Historical Perspective
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy and the Council of the Humanities

FEBRUARY 20–21
Public Lecture: “Aquinas: A Life” and Seminar: “Dante: Theologus-Poeta”
Co-sponsored by the Department of Art and Archaeology, Program in Medieval Studies, Stewart Fund in the Council of the Humanities, Princeton Center for the Study of Religion, Department of French and Italian, and Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

FEBRUARY 28–MARCH 1
Oxford Handbook on Wellbeing and Public Policy Workshop
Co-sponsored by the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies and the Center for Health and Wellbeing

MARCH 3
Cherokee Plantation Slavery
Co-sponsored by the Princeton American Indian Studies Working Group

MARCH 6
Tiya Miles in Conversation with Martha Sandweiss
Co-sponsored by the Program in American Studies, the Center for African American Studies, and the Department of English

MARCH 6–7
The Politics of Spirit: Augustine and Hegel in Dialogue
Co-sponsored by the Department of Religion, the Council of the Humanities, and the Center for the Study of Religion

MARCH 7–8
Race and Religion in American History Conference
Co-sponsored by the Center for the Study of Religion, the Program in American Studies, the Center for African American Studies, the Department of Religion, and the Council of the Humanities
MARCH 13–14
A Conference in Honor of Margaret Lock: New Directions in Social Studies of Medicine, Science, and Ethics
Co-sponsored by East Asian Studies Program, Orita-McCosh Leadership, and Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies

MARCH 24
Genes, Risk, Race, and Policy
Co-sponsored by the Department of Anthropology, the Center for African American Studies, Department of History, Department of Molecular Biology, and the Department of Sociology

MARCH 25
Five Days at Memorial: Life and Death in a Storm-Ravaged Hospital with author Sheri Fink
Co-sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

MARCH 27–MARCH 28
Myth and Transformation: The Phaedra Project
Co-sponsored by the Department in Slavic Languages and Comparative Literature

APRIL 1
Kruetzer Sonata Evening
Co-sponsored by Slavic Department and Program in Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies

APRIL 5–6
Princeton-Rutgers Graduate Conference
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy

APRIL 11–12
Princeton Graduate Conference in Political Theory
Co-sponsored by the Department of Politics

APRIL 11–12
South Asian Studies Workshop: Cultures—Past and Present
Co-sponsored by Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies

APRIL 18
RACA Conference: Photography and Race in the Americas: Beyond Fixity
Co-sponsored by the Department of Spanish and Portuguese Languages and Cultures, the Department of Anthropology, Program in Latin American Studies, Lewis Center for the Arts, the Center for African American Studies, Department of Art and Archaeology

APRIL 25
There and Back Again: Travel, Itinerancy, and Adventure in the Middle Ages
Co-sponsored by the Program in Medieval Studies

APRIL 25
The Theory Reading Group: Translating the Universe
Co-sponsored by the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program in the Humanities

APRIL 26
Princeton-Penn-Columbia Graduate Conference
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy and the Council of the Humanities

MAY 16–17
Making and Justifying Territorial Claims Workshop
Co-sponsored by the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies

MAY 22–24
Patriots or Invaders? Immigrants in the Military in Modern America
Co-sponsored by the Center for Migration and Development

FALL 2013–SPRING 2014
The center sponsored these ongoing series:
• The Princeton Workshop on Normative Philosophy, co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy
• The Ethics and Politics of Ethnography, co-sponsored by the Department of Religion
• The Gender and Philosophy Working Group, co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy
This has been a busy and fulfilling year as I conclude my term as director of the Values and Public Life (VPL) certificate program. Integrating a values perspective in their studies—ranging from mathematics to comparative literature to civil and environmental engineering—10 seniors graduated with the certificate in Values and Public Life in June.

The program requires students to take a course in both moral philosophy and political theory, helping guide their studies as they pursue their own areas of interest in values and public life, which might be human rights or public health or democratic theory or prison reform, for example. Some will have interests in government and are majoring in the Wilson School; others may be planning to be doctors or engineers or academics.

Additionally, I taught one of the five junior-senior seminars offered this year, of which VPL students are required to complete one. “Science and Democracy” is a political theory and normative reasoning course that integrates perspectives from the philosophy of science, science and technology studies, and case studies. “Explaining Values” and “Architecture and Democracy” were among the other seminars offered.

Besides the strict academic component, the program offers a range of extracurricular talks and opportunities, especially focused on how to integrate values into career choices. A particular highlight is the annual VPL field trip, which has been supported by the center’s 250th Anniversary Fund award for curricular innovation. The trip exposes students to the possibility of doing so in various sectors of public life, including work in government, think tanks, and the nonprofit sector. Historically the field trip has alternated between visits to New York City or Washington, DC.

We spent the last day of the fall semester in Washington visiting the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; the New America Foundation; and Oxfam America’s Policy and Campaigns office. Representatives at each stop described their respective career paths, the challenges and rewards of their career, and highlighted ethical issues that arise either directly in their roles or more broadly. Before leaving Washington, the VPL group bonded over dinner at Union Station.
Another exciting VPL opportunity this year was the ability to participate in an op-ed workshop in New York City through The OpEd Project. Founded by Catherine Orenstein, this is a social venture hoping to increase the range of voices and quality of ideas heard in the world, by training under-represented “experts” to take thought leadership positions through op-eds and more. Even more valuable than the intensive daylong workshop, is the attendees’ yearlong access to a network of mentors, who help edit and guide op-ed submissions. The workshop provides a clear and concrete framework in which to voice an opinion that has the potential of creating a public discussion or impacting policy. As such, it equips our VPL students with a tool to bring informed discussion of values (or issues and ethical questions) into the public sphere.

At home, the center hosted Career Conversations with center visitors, including Eric Posner (law professor at University of Chicago), Omar Wasow (assistant professor of politics at Princeton and co-founder of BlackPlanet.com), and Debra Satz. Sharing her outlook as the founding director of the Stanford University Center for Ethics in Society, Satz reflected on how students can best integrate values and ethics into their independent work. She stressed the importance of formulating a core normative question—what is it that I want to understand?—though also observed that questions may change in the course of research and only be fully clarified toward the end. She also stressed the importance of exploring what values might be at stake in a particular issue, something that can often be clarified through empirical as well as theoretical work.

Other extracurricular opportunities included senior thesis workshops in the spring, where seniors had the opportunity to talk through their thesis projects and receive feedback from the group; coffee conversations with me to informally discuss anything of interest within small groups at the campus center’s café; and finally the VPL Student Conference, which features a keynote speaker, showcases students’ work in one of several categories, and concludes with a group dinner. The year culminates with Class Day, providing an opportunity for celebration with seniors and their families.

We spent the last day of the fall semester in Washington visiting the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee of Oversight and Government Reform; The New America Foundation; and Oxfam America’s Policy and Campaigns Office.
During the summer of 2013, I was an intern at a criminal-justice and low-income housing nonprofit that provides free legal representation for low-income individuals in Washington, DC. Some of the clients’ experiences reminded me of my peers’ experiences at my DC public high school, which had a large population of students from crime-ridden neighborhoods, a noticeable police presence, and a significant number of arrests. Some classmates were victims of gang violence and others were perpetrators of it. I was frustrated that the criminal justice system seemed ruthless, unproductive, and insensitive to the effects of poverty and formative circumstances on an individual. Moreover, the arrest of students for cafeteria fights seemed simply unfair.

Although I hoped to develop my interest and knowledge of criminal justice at Princeton, I did not expect that it would be through my major. I am a junior concentrating in philosophy and pursuing the Values and Public Life certificate. In the fall of 2013, I took Victoria McGeer’s course, “Explaining Values,” which was composed of McGeer, a research scholar at UCHV, and 15 students representing a variety of backgrounds, academic concentrations, and extracurricular activities. We were united by our interest in the major themes of the course: free will, moral responsibility, blame, and punishment.

To set the stage for the semester, we watched the film Dead Man Walking, which is an account of a nun’s quest to reform and “redeem” a man on death row. What followed was a discussion of moral responsibility and its relationship to metaphysical issues of free will and determinism. After we evaluated compatibilist and incompatibilist approaches to those issues, we explored the conditions of moral responsibility and debated whether it requires, for example, free will (in some deep metaphysical sense); the ability to do otherwise; or the ability to have an accurate
conception of right and wrong. We focused primarily on philosophy papers throughout the first half of the course.

Once we laid a philosophical foundation, we incorporated other disciplines into our thinking about these issues. We tackled the question of what it means for our conceptions of free will, determinism, and moral responsibility that contemporary findings in neuroscience suggest that our brain consists in complex, but seemingly deterministic processes. Is there a free agent apart from these processes? Is neuroscience even relevant to the philosophical debate? As most people in the class were not hard determinists, we proceeded under the assumption that we can consider most people responsible agents, at least to some extent. However, we debated various cases in which it may not be clear whether one is a responsible agent. For example, we discussed victims of deprived childhoods, coercion, psychological impairment, and finally, psychopaths. To inform our views and supplement our philosophy readings, we read neuroscience papers and psychology studies.

We finished the semester with a discussion of punishment, in which we evaluated the aims and justifications for the retributive, consequentialist, and restorative justice punishment systems. During the last two classes, students summarized their final papers and received feedback from McGeer and the class. These presentations indicated that many students were interested in finding a way to blend the three punishment systems to make for a philosophically appropriate response to crime and those convicted. In my final paper, I advocate for a greater allocation of resources to hard punishment alternatives and argue that if the offender is deemed a responsible agent, society owes it to him [or her] to attempt to stimulate his [or her] moral capacities in a more humane environment.

Through the completion of three response papers to the readings; a stimulating atmosphere guided by McGeer; and encouragement of active participation, “Explaining Values” improved our philosophical writing skills and helped form our views.
COURSES AND SEMINARS

VPL SEMINARS

The VPL junior/senior seminars aim to cultivate students’ abilities to analyze, criticize, and construct systematic arguments about values in public life. While the seminars vary considerably in their thematic content, they are linked by a common pedagogical purpose and an approach that emphasizes intensive small group discussion and advanced writing exercises. The seminars provide an explicit link between the core coursework of the certificate and the independent work requirement.

Architecture and Democracy
POL 403/CHV 403/ARC 405/GER 403
Jan-Werner Müller, Politics

The Diverse Society
POL 419/CHV 420
Alan Patten, Politics

Ethics and Public Health
CHV 331/WWS 372
Jason Schwartz, Harold T. Shapiro Postdoctoral Research Associate in Bioethics

Explaining Values
PHI 380/CHV 380
Victoria McGeer, University Center for Human Values

Science and Democracy
POL 404/CHV 404
Melissa Lane, Politics

FRESHMAN SEMINARS

Capitalism, Utopia, and Social Justice
Marc Fleurbaey
Kurt and Beatrice Gutmann Freshman Seminar in Human Values

History and Cinema
Gaetana Marrone
University Center for Human Values Freshman Seminar

Human Dignity as a Legal Principle
Stéphanie Hennette Vauchez
Paul L. Miller ’41 Freshman Seminar in Human Values

The Politics of Seeing: The Films of the French New Wave
Natasha Lee
Class of 1976 Freshman Seminar in Human Values

Religion and Politics: Conflicts of Public and Private Values
Stephen Macedo
Professor Amy Gutmann Freshman Seminar in Human Values

The Road Not Taken
Alan Ryan
Dean Eva Gossman Freshman Seminar in Human Values

Science and Buddhism
Robert Wright
University Center for Human Values Freshman Seminar

What Makes for a Meaningful Life?
Ellen Chances
Peter T. Joseph ’72 Freshman Seminar in Human Values
CROSS-LISTED COURSES

Christian Ethics and Modern Society
REL 261/CHV 261
Eric Gregory, Religion

Clues, Evidence, Detection: Law Stories
CHV 375/COM 392/ENG 379
Peter Brooks, Comparative Literature and University Center for Human Values

Criminal Law and Criminal Literature
CHV 579/COM 579/ENG 579
Peter Brooks, Comparative Literature and University Center for Human Values

Ethics and Economics
ECO 385/CHV 345
Thomas Leonard, Economics

Foundations of the Modern State
CHV 466/POL 466/HIS 466
Quentin Skinner, Laurence S. Rockefeller Visiting Professor for Distinguished Teaching, University Center for Human Values

Global Justice
POL 313/CHV 313
Charles Beitz, Politics

Greek Ethical Theory
PHI 335/CHV 335/HLS 338
Sari Kisilevsky, Philosophy (Visiting)

Introduction to Moral Philosophy
PHI 202/CHV 202
Michael Smith, Philosophy

The Just Society
POL 307/CHV 307
Alan Patten, Politics

The Life of Honor
PHI 365/CHV 365
K. Anthony Appiah, Philosophy and University Center for Human Values

Morals and Markets
WWS 374/CHV 372
Simon Cotton, Values and Public Policy Postdoctoral Research Associate

The Other Side of Rome
CLA 214/CHV 214
Andrew Riggsby, Visiting Professor for Distinguished Teaching, Classics

Philosophy of Randomness and Risk
PHI 374/CHV 374
Daniel Cloud, Philosophy and Council of the Humanities, and Professor Adam Elga, Philosophy

Practical Ethics
CHV 310/PHI 385
Peter Singer, University Center for Human Values

Recent Feminist Philosophical Work
PHI 513/CHV 513
Cheshire Calhoun, Philosophy and University Center for Human Values (Visiting)

Seminar in Normative Ethics
PHI 419/CHV 419
K. Anthony Appiah, Philosophy and University Center for Human Values

Stolen Years: Youth under the Nazis
COM 362/CHV 362/JDS 362/ECS 362
Froma Zeitlin, Emeritus, Classics and Comparative Literature

Systematic Ethics
PHI 307/CHV 311
Gilbert Harman, Philosophy

Topics in Population Ethics
PHI 523/CHV 524
Johann Frick, Philosophy and University Center for Human Values

Welfare, Economics, and Climate Change Mitigation Policy
WWS 373/CHV 373
Francis Dennig, Values and Public Policy Postdoctoral Research Associate
Teaming up with Whitman and Butler residential colleges, the center initiated a new series of campus events that seeks to highlight the role that ethical commitments can play in people’s professional lives. In February, Bill Hirsch, producer of The Waiting Room, hosted a film screening in Whitman College, and in early April, Dr. Anne Hallward, founder and host of SafeSpace Radio, joined us for a talk and conversation in Butler College.

Students interested in the intersection of ethics and values with social policy, politics, and film/journalism, heard from Hirsch about his circuitous path from studying political theory at Princeton to achieving distinction as a class-action attorney before focusing on documentary film. In 2006, he co-founded Peer Review Films to produce documentaries that explore critical social, political, and cultural issues. His first film, The Waiting Room, which was shortlisted for an Academy Award, features the struggles of an American public hospital to offer health care to a diverse and needy population. Following the screening, Hirsch discussed how he views documentaries as a form of politics. Continuing the conversation over dinner, he answered questions on topics ranging from health-care policy to the use of journalism as a tool.

Through stories, Hirsch said, we can sometimes break through the ideological walls that divide us, and transform the way we understand the challenges we face as a society and the way we organize our collective power to address those challenges.

Hallward, a board certified psychiatrist in Portland, Maine, also uses journalism to stimulate cultural change. “Dr. Anne,” who founded SafeSpace Radio in 2008, spoke about her innovative career combining psychiatry and radio in the service of public health.

Hallward traced her career to her undergraduate days at Harvard University when she, and classmate professor Melissa Lane, contemplated how a career can reflect one’s personal values. A path that began with an external political focus and turned into an internal focus—as personal childhood experiences, volunteering for various social justice projects, and then ultimately specializing in psychiatry in medical school—led to Hallward’s idea of “public interest psychiatry” that enabled her to reclaim her original concern for social justice.

She argued that the core value of sharing stories is the ability to use one’s personal traumatic experience and offer it as a gift to others who may be undergoing something similar, while redeeming the wound and passing the healing forward.

The “Values and Vocations” series is a cooperative effort with the residential colleges to encourage undergraduates to examine the many ways that a person’s moral commitments can shape the choice and conduct of their careers.
The “Values and Vocations” series is a cooperative effort with the residential colleges to encourage undergraduates to examine the many ways that a person’s moral commitments can shape the choice and conduct of their careers.

“Public psychiatry” was the topic at the April Values and Vocations event with Dr. Anne Hallward, founder and host of SafeSpace Radio.

Values and Vocations

Film screening -- The Waiting Room

-- with Producer BILL HIRSCH

Can film change lives?

Wednesday, February 19th
5:00 p.m. to 7:45 p.m.

5:00-6:45 pm: film screening & discussion
Whitman College Class of 1970 Theater

6:45-7:45 pm: dinner with Bill Hirsch
by RSVP to Femke de Ruyter at
258-1460 or femked@princeton.edu

http://uchv.princeton.edu/vocations.php
A YEAR IN REVIEW WITH QUENTIN SKINNER

The Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Professorship for Distinguished Teaching was established as part of Princeton’s 250th anniversary teaching initiatives, enabling the center each year to bring to campus one excellent undergraduate teacher and scholar whose teaching and research explicitly examine values in public and private life. Quentin Skinner, the Barber Beaumont Professor of the Humanities at Queen Mary, University of London, engaged undergraduate students in a highly subscribed course on the foundations of the modern state and led graduate student workshops and colloquia for students in various disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. The following is a sampling of Skinner’s year in residence.

“FOUNDATIONS OF THE MODERN STATE”
By Cameron Langford ’15, Politics, VPL

Like his scholarship, Professor Skinner’s undergraduate seminar “Foundations of the Modern State” straddled the line between history and politics. Billed as an examination of “the evolution of Western thinking about the concept of the state,” the seminar combined historical and theoretical approaches to famous political works from the early modern period, examining texts both in their own contexts and as part of a continuing conversation about the nature of the state and of sovereign power. We began by looking at Renaissance theorists Machiavelli and More before moving onto Hobbes, Harrington, Locke, and finally the American Federalists. Through seminars that paired breadth of reading with depth of discussion and analysis, Skinner pushed us to call on our diverse departmental expertise (students spanned philosophy, history, and politics) and to pay attention to how each subsequent text both drew on and pushed against the last. Two longer papers allowed students to investigate more deeply topics of their own choosing. By the end of the semester, we had covered nearly 300 years (and many more pages!) of political history, and gained a sense of how answers to big questions—How are states created? What does it mean for a citizen to be free?—have changed over time.

“GIVING A TALK AT A CONFERENCE: A WORKSHOP”
By Joan Ricart-Hugué, Graduate Student, Politics

Last fall Professor Skinner scheduled a talk on campus, which I was motivated to attend due to his renown as a political theorist. His lecture, however, was on how to deliver a lecture or an academic talk. Many students have known the brilliant scholar who cannot speak clearly or ably teach the public. Professor Skinner presented the audience with a masterpiece of oratory: perfect pace, changing tone on the right occasions, and offering very useful advice throughout. One must surely have interesting arguments or findings to show and be enthusiastic about his or her topic, he argued. Limited use of PowerPoint often aids a presentation, but communication should mostly emanate from the speaker, not the screen. Professor Skinner further suggested to always start by asking oneself: What is it “about your new findings that matters” and how does it modify conventional wisdom in your area? Transitioning to practical advice, Professor Skinner instructed: Do not say what you argue is interesting, show it; get the timing right by practicing ahead of time; and record and listen to yourself. It is surprising how easy it is to forget the basics.
“WHY SHYLOCK LOSES HIS CASE: JUDICIAL RHETORIC IN THE MERCHANT OF VENICE”
By Daniel Blank and Andrew Miller, Graduate Students, English

Professor Skinner’s talk for the English Department Renaissance Colloquium, “Why Shylock Loses His Case: Judicial Rhetoric in The Merchant of Venice,” brought the audience to a new understanding of a much-discussed scene, the climactic confrontation regarding the “pound of flesh” in Act 4 Scene 1 of Shakespeare’s play. Critics have often read this scene with reference to legal materials, particularly focusing on equity and the strict letter of the law. As Professor Skinner showed, however, Shakespeare is instead dramatizing this legal wrangling through the rules and methods of judicial rhetoric. In the first part of his talk, Professor Skinner outlined ancient rhetorical materials on the presentation of cases, paying particular attention to those precepts and terms that would have been most familiar to Shakespeare and his audience. In the second part, Professor Skinner demonstrated the necessity of these frequently neglected materials to our understanding of The Merchant of Venice, revealing how its most famous scene is incontestably suffused with the language and principles of judicial rhetoric. As Professor Skinner showed, the drama of Shylock’s demands and eventual defeat can only be understood—and would have been understood by Shakespeare’s contemporaries—in light of this body of learning.

According to the rhetorical manuals Professor Skinner outlined, the strange (admirabilis) nature of Shylock’s case would require him to act in an ingratiating manner and to make use of insinuation. Believing his cause to be absolute, however, Shylock conforms to none of these instructions, leading toward his inevitable undoing. As a corrective reading of this play’s pivotal moment, therefore, Professor Skinner’s talk illuminated just what is at stake in each dramatic twist for Shylock’s case. It also gestured more broadly towards Professor Skinner’s new book and its contribution to Shakespeare studies: this reading showed the importance of recovering this intellectual context and of reading Shakespeare’s plays with a keener appreciation of the structuring role of judicial rhetoric.

“How (Not) to Teach Intellectual History”
By Amy Hondo, Graduate Student, Politics

On February 20, Quentin Skinner, Visiting Professor for Distinguished Teaching at the University Center for Human Values, gave a lecture on teaching that welcomed an audience from across the University. In his characteristically dynamic style, Professor Skinner presented to students, professors from the politics, philosophy, and history departments, and community members on “How (not) to Teach Intellectual History”. Discussing a range of approaches from the “Cambridge School” to “New Historicism,” Skinner argued that it was not the task of the intellectual historian to identify and explain past beliefs. Furthermore, he argued that the intellectual historian ought not ask whether past beliefs are true or false because something that was perfectly reasonable in the past could seem irrational today. The appropriate test for irrationality, then, is whether it violates the constellation of ideas and concepts of its own time; consequently, Skinner concludes, a close reading of a text must include a close reading of the historical context as well.
STUDENT PRIZES

SENIOR THESIS PRIZE

Each year, the center awards prizes to the senior theses that make an outstanding contribution to the study of human values. Nominations for the prize are made by departments across the University.

Seongcheol Kim
German
“Theory, Organization, and Milieu in the West German Extra-Parliamentary Left, 1966-78”

Mary Schulman
East Asian Studies
“The King’s Speech: Language and Ritual in the ‘Great Proclamation’ of the Classic of Documents”

Naomi Zucker
Anthropology
“Visions of Health and Care in São Paulo, Brazil”

Robert Stone III
Politics
“Socrates Satisfied: John Stuart Mill, Plato, and the Athenian Political Ideal”

GRADUATE STUDENT TOP-UP PRIZES, 2014–15

The UCHV offers prizes to help attract Princeton graduate students whose work explicitly focuses on ethics, political theory, and human values. The following students, who will begin their graduate studies in September 2014, were awarded grants this spring.

Alexander Ades
Politics

Ian Campbell
Philosophy

Daniela Gandorfer
German

Christopher-Marcus Gibson
Philosophy

Dongxian Jiang
Politics

Rebecca Johnson
Sociology

Sarah-Jane Koulen
Anthropology

Erin Miller
Politics

Kyle Oskvig
Classics

Yaritza Perez
Psychology

Raissa von Doetinchem de Rande
Religion

Cameron VanSant
English

Ian Walling
Politics

Ma Ziyao
East Asian Studies
**VPL SUMMER RESEARCH GRANTS**

The Program in Values and Public Life offers competitive summer grants for students enrolled in the undergraduate certificate program to pursue values-related internships or research projects. These grants may be used for travel, housing, or other purposes in support of students’ work.

**Melissa Bales ’15**  
History

**Lakshmi Davey ’15**  
Woodrow Wilson School

**Cameron Langford ’15**  
Politics

**Brian Reed ’15**  
Politics

**Adam Tcharni ’15**  
Operations Research and Financial Engineering

**Han Tran ’15**  
Woodrow Wilson School

**Oren Fliegelman ’16**  
Woodrow Wilson School

**VPL GRANT IN SUPPORT OF VALUES-RELATED STUDENT INITIATIVES**

**Jen Kim ’14**  
Civil and Environmental Engineering

**SHORT MOVIE PRIZE**

The theme of the 2014 competition was equality.

**Winner**  
**Jeanette Beebe ’14, Beyond the Boys’ Club**

**Honorable Mention**  
**Cameron Johanning ’16, Equality**

**Honorable Mention**  
**Jane Pritchard ’15, Hats**
UCHV FILM FORUM

SERIES EXAMINES THEMES OF ‘LOVE STORY’ AND ‘TERROIR’
By Erika Kiss, Director, UCHV Film Forum

Founded in the fall of 2005, the UCHV Film Forum has become a Princeton tradition, filling Rocky Theater every Monday evening of the teaching term. Film screenings are followed by discussions, which are informed by the vast canon of films we have examined together over the years. Each season revolves around a theme, which in the fall was “Love Story.”

The fall series began with George Cukor’s Philadelphia Story (1940) and Stanley Cavell’s thought-provoking interpretation of the film as an allegory of the social contract made by the American founding fathers, sparking heated conversation. We went on to examine classic cinematic love stories by Bergman, Truffaut, Fellini, Sautet, Buñuel, etc., as emblems of civic relations within the specific social contracts reflected in the films.

Our theme for the spring, “Terroir: A Sense of Place,” developed from an analogy between wine tasting and film criticism. Introducing this concept, the spring semester opened with the documentary Mondovino (2004); this film discusses the endangering effect of globalization on the historically developed art of terroir wines. We combined this discussion with a wine tasting designed by a local wine merchant, who included two sophisticated terroir wines in his selection for the evening.

The next film, Wreckers (2011), was partially grown from our own terroir: its original music score was penned by Princeton’s Andrew Lovett, a Film Forum regular, and provided for an opportunity to discuss the film with one of its contributors. We had another such opportunity with the screening of Bela Tarr’s The Man from London (2007), for which the film’s artistic director, László Rajk, was present. In addition to the usual conversation after the screening, Film Forum guests benefited from the famous Hungarian artist and dissident’s master class on film architecture in a separate event and a special Film Forum dinner for students and faculty only.

The following film, Final Cut, Ladies and Gentlemen (2012), was made by the young, but already critically acclaimed, Hungarian director György Palfi with no budget due to the cultural politics of the present Hungarian government. Despite his lack of financial resources, Palfi managed to create an original film that the Cannes Film Festival, the journal Senses of Cinema, among other forums, recognized as a film historical event. The enormous critical attention and enthusiasm notwithstanding, Palfi’s film cannot be legally distributed due to copyright issues, yet the Film Forum was able to screen it as an educational event. Final Cut is a love story assembled from 1,395 short cuts taken out of 449 different classic films. This is done with such mastery that viewers are carried away by the story of a woman and a man who morph from one cinematic icon to another, without ever questioning the integrity of the characters, their emotions, or the plot.

Our “Sense of Place” series concluded with a focus on the Danish cinematic terroir. Despite the strong trend of globalization in film culture, Danish film managed to preserve, cultivate, and market a characteristically local style of filmmaking. Film Forum attendees had the opportunity to discuss the success of Scandinavian cinema and television culture with the prominent Danish film scholar, Ib Bondebjerg. For our last official event, we screened the Oscar-winning Danish film, Babette’s Feast (1987), and celebrated with another wine tasting. What better way to appreciate a film that celebrates the integration of refined tastes with refined morals?
Fall 2013

‘LOVE STORY’

September 16
Philadelphia Story (1940)
George Cukor

September 23
Smiles of a Summer Night (1955)
Ingmar Bergman

September 30
Brokeback Mountain (2005)
Ang Lee

October 7
Hiroshima, mon amour (1959)
Alain Resnais

October 14
Amour (2012)
Michael Haneke

October 21
Claire’s Knee (1970)
Eric Rohmer

November 4
That Obscure Object of Desire (1977)
Luis Buñuel

November 11
Like Someone in Love (2012)
Abbas Kiarostami

November 18
Jules and Jim (1962)
François Truffaut

November 25
A Heart in Winter (1992)
Claude Sautet

December 2
Casanova (1976)
Federico Fellini

December 9
Strictly Ballroom (1992)
Baz Luhrmann

Spring 2014

‘TERROIR’

February 3
Mondovino (2004)
Jonathan Nossiter

February 10
Wreckers (2011)
Dictynna Hood

February 17
The Man from London (2007)
Béla Tarr, Ágnes Hranitzky

February 17
Master Class on Film Architecture
László Rajk, artistic director of Béla Tarr’s The Man from London (2007)

February 19
The Converging Arts of Video Games and Cinema
László Rajk, artistic director of Béla Tarr’s The Man from London (2007)

February 24
Final Cut (2012)
György Pálfi

March 3
The Great Beauty (2013)
Paolo Sorrentino

March 10
Reality (2012)
Matteo Garrone

March 24
Life Is Beautiful (1997)
Roberto Benigni

March 31
The Act of Killing (2012)
Anonymous, Christine Cynn, and Joshua Oppenheimer

April 7
The Celebration (1998)
Thomas Vinterberg

April 14
The Idiots (1998)
Lars von Trier

April 21
Submarino (2010)
Thomas Vinterberg

April 28
Babette’s Feast (1987)
Gabriel Axel
The Human Values Forum (HVF) is an undergraduate enrichment program of the University Center for Human Values. Its fellows meet for dinner discussions with scholars of human values every Monday night of the academic year and participate in teas with guest speakers on special occasions. The informal nature of HVF events allows students to build closer relationships with faculty members than they are able to in formal classroom settings. Presenters at the forum have included Princeton faculty in the humanities and sciences, as well as visitors from New York University and Rutgers University. The forum frequently co-sponsors events with the Program in Values and Public Life, as well as with other student groups.

University President Christopher L. Eisgruber spoke to the Human Values Forum on February 24 about “Challenges to Liberal Arts Education: the Ideal of Engagement and the Puzzle of Presence.” He discussed the importance of the personal, residential character of liberal arts education to future leaders, emphasizing the role that shared values and mutual respect play in the classroom. Students asked Eisgruber about numerous topics, including MOOCs, continuing education, and access to education. The free-flowing discussion between students and a prominent figure in higher education is emblematic of the experience students have each week at HVF.

**HUMAN VALUES FORUM**

*With support from Bert Kerstetter ’66, the Human Values Forum provides an opportunity for approximately 50 students and 15 faculty members to meet in an informal setting to discuss current and enduring questions concerning ethics and human values. They meet over dinner at 5 Ivy Lane most weeks during the academic year.*

**OFFICERS**

Max Siegel ’14, President  
Adam Tcharni ’15, Vice President, Programming  
Alex Brock ’14, Vice President, Membership

**EVENTS**

**SEPTEMBER 23**  
“Effective Altruism”  
Peter Singer, University Center for Human Values

**SEPTEMBER 30**  
“Is the Universe Finite or Infinite?”  
David Spergel, Astrophysical Sciences

**OCTOBER 7**  
“Aristotle on Justifying Democracy”  
Melissa Lane, Politics

**OCTOBER 14**  
“The Concept of Liberty”  
Quentin Skinner, University Center for Human Values

**OCTOBER 21**  
“Implementing Values”  
Frank Jackson, Philosophy

**NOVEMBER 4**  
“Internet Privacy and Security”  
Brian Kernighan, Computer Science
NOVEMBER 11

“Truths We Must Tell Ourselves to Manage Climate Change”
Robert Socolow, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

NOVEMBER 18

“The Rights of Minority Language Speakers”
Joshua Katz, Classics

NOVEMBER 25

“Acting on Principle”
Michael Smith, Philosophy

DECEMBER 2

“The Moral Responsibility of Volunteer Services”
Jefferson McMahan, Rutgers University, Philosophy

DECEMBER 9

“Dark Tongues”
Daniel Heller-Roazen, Comparative Literature

JANUARY 6

“The Future of Nuclear Weapons”
Frank von Hippel, Woodrow Wilson School

FEBRUARY 17

“Is Living Longer Living Better?”
Larry Temkin, Rutgers University, Philosophy

FEBRUARY 24

“Challenges to Liberal Arts Education; the Ideal of Engagement and the Puzzle of Presence”
Christopher L. Eisgruber, Princeton University President

MARCH 3

“An Argument for Same-Sex Marriage”
Gideon Rosen, Philosophy

MARCH 10

“Is Biological Parenting a Human Right?”
S. Matthew Liao, New York University, Bioethics

MARCH 31

“Who Owns the Corporation?”
David Ciepley, University Center for Human Values

APRIL 7

“The Future of Marriage”
Stephen Macedo, Politics

APRIL 14

“Did You Hurt Someone When You Bought Your iPhone?”
Charles Beitz, Politics

APRIL 28

“Hard Choices”
Ruth Chang, Rutgers University, Philosophy

MAY 5

“Why We Fight and Can We Stop?”
Robert Wright, Religion and University Center for Human Values
RESEARCH REPORTS:

LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER VISITING PROFESSOR FOR DISTINGUISHED TEACHING
LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER VISITING FACULTY FELLOWS
POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
GRADUATE PRIZE FELLOWS
The University Center seeks to advance original scholarship relating to human values by sponsoring visiting faculty fellowships, a visiting professorship of distinguished teaching, postdoctoral research appointments, and dissertation-stage fellowships for outstanding Princeton graduate students. The research reports presented in this section suggest the reach and quality of the work carried out under the center’s auspices last year.

A main feature of the visiting fellows program is a regular lunch seminar at which our visitors, together with the center’s faculty members, present their work to an audience of peers. The graduate fellows meet regularly for their own research seminar, typically followed by a working dinner. As the research reports attest, the systematic criticism and discussion of work in progress is among the principal benefits of affiliation with the center.
LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER VISITING PROFESSOR FOR DISTINGUISHED TEACHING

This professorship is part of the 250th Anniversary Visiting Professorships for Distinguished Teaching program. Each faculty visitor teaches an undergraduate course and engages in other activities aimed at improving teaching at Princeton.

Quentin Skinner
Barber Beaumont Professor of the Humanities at Queen Mary, University of London

One project I aimed to finish while at the center was the editing of a volume on popular sovereignty, and I succeeded. The other was a book on the idea of state personality, but here I failed. This was because, shortly before arriving, I completed what I had hoped was the final draft of a book (on drama and rhetoric), which I sent to a number of readers. Their comments convinced me that the work needed to be entirely rewritten, and this task occupied most of my stay. Besides working on these projects, I gave two lectures under the aegis of the Department of English connected with my research on classical rhetoric, and taught an undergraduate seminar entitled “Foundations of the Modern State.” By way of discharging my obligation as Rockefeller Visiting Professor to offer instruction in teaching I offered two talks, one recklessly entitled “Giving a Talk,” the other “How (Not) to Teach Intellectual History.” During my stay I also delivered the annual Lectio Magistralis of the Balzan Foundation in Milan, the annual George S. Parthemos Lecture at the University of Georgia, the AMIAS Lecture at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and the Spinoza Lectures at the University of Amsterdam. In addition I lectured on different aspects of my research at Berkeley, Columbia, CUNY, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, NYU, Yale, and the University of Pennsylvania. I immensely enjoyed everything about my year at the center (except the weather).

LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER VISITING FACULTY FELLOWS

These fellowships are awarded annually to outstanding scholars and teachers interested in devoting a year in residence at Princeton writing about ethics and human values, discussing their work in a fellows seminar, and participating in seminar activities.

John Brunero
Associate professor of philosophy at the University of Missouri-St. Louis

My time at the center has been intellectually invigorating and productive. I developed a renewed interest in political theory, due largely to conversations with other fellows, and to the engaging papers presented in the Political Philosophy and Law and Public Affairs colloquia. I also began work on my book, Intentions, Reasons, and Instrumental Rationality. Important conversations with faculty in both the philosophy department and the center helped shape the overall direction of the project. I completed two chapters of the book: one on the normative significance of intentions and another on the relationship between practical and theoretical rationality. One of these chapters benefited greatly from a presentation at the regular fellows lunch seminar. I also finished another paper, “Reasons, Evidence, and Explanations,” which was much improved after a presentation at the Princeton Normative Philosophy Workshop, and will appear in the Oxford Handbook of Reasons and Normativity. Lastly, generous funding from the center supported several conference and colloquia presentations. I’d like to express my gratitude to the center’s director, and its faculty and staff, for providing us with such a delightful and stimulating environment in which to work, and to the other fellows and visiting faculty for so many engaging and memorable philosophical conversations.
RESEARCH REPORTS

David Cieply
Assistant professor of political science at the University of Denver

At Princeton, I have been working on my book about corporations in political theory, which challenges the reclassification of corporations over the past two centuries from “bodies politic” to “private concerns”—a legal status that exempts them from any duty, accountability, or even publicity, to the public, and that endows them with legal protections and rights of political participation that they ought not have. I discuss the corporation as an institution of delegated government, what I call a “franchise government.” I’ve worked primarily on one of the early chapters, “The Corporate Roots of the Liberal Democratic State,” which is based on material much richer than expected and is shaping up to be two chapters. I am also completing an intensive Latin course, which will prove of great use as my project proceeds. I’ve taken full advantage of Princeton’s intellectual life, having attended lectures on campus and at the Institute for Advanced Study, served as a discussant in two workshops, participated in the graduate student theory workshop, spoken at the Human Values Forum (a student-run dinner discussion group), and audited various classes, including one by Quentin Skinner on the theory of the state. It has also been helpful professionally to be on the East Coast, as I’ve spoken at Yale, Columbia, Brown, and Cornell.

Paulina Ochoa Espejo
Assistant professor of political science at Yale University

The center is a wonderful place to work. I have benefited from the conversations and advice of affiliated faculty and other fellows, and I have learned from the lectures and speakers’ series. In my time at Princeton, I completed a first draft of my second book, *Borders: People, Territory, and Legitimacy in the Democratic State*, and presented new chapters as independent papers in several venues. In the first semester, I completed “Taking Place Seriously: Place-Specific Duties and the Rights of Immigrants,” which I presented at the center’s fellows lunch seminar and also at the Political Theory Workshops at the University of California-San Diego and the University of Sheffield in the U.K. In the second semester, I wrote a paper on “Topian and Utopian Thinking,” which I presented at the Department of Political Science at the University of Copenhagen. I also wrote a paper on “Territorial Rights, Border Control, and Border Fences,” which I presented to the Political Theory Workshop at CIDE in Mexico City, as well as at Princeton’s politics conference “Making and Justifying Territorial Claims.” In addition, I spoke at the New School for Social Research in New York and El Colegio de la Frontera Norte in Tijuana, Mexico, on a previously written paper, “What’s wrong with Border Fences?” Besides my book, I worked on two parallel projects: I participated in the center’s colloquium on Architecture, Urban Space, and Democracy, for which I wrote a new piece entitled “Border Walls: Three models of the relation between Politics and Architecture,” and I also wrote a piece for the European Union Observatory for Democracy’s Citizenship paper series called “What Money Can’t Buy: Face-to-Face Cooperation and Local Democratic Life.”

Chaim Gans
Professor of law at Tel Aviv University

The abundance of scholarly virtues, intelligence, friendliness, and generosity at the center and its Princeton University surroundings made my year here one of the best during my long academic career. My book, *A Political Theory for the Jewish People: Three Zionist Narratives*, was published in Hebrew just before my arrival in Princeton. I spent the first semester working on the English version of this book and presenting several talks, which were based on excerpts from it. My new research project is on cosmopolitanism and cultural rights. Fortunately for this project, Alan Patten has given me the manuscript of his new book on minority rights, forthcoming at Princeton University Press. It adds a
major important example to the one provided by Kymlicka of an attempt to construct and justify cultural rights as an issue for intra-statist justice. I spent part of the spring semester writing a paper analyzing the differences between these two examples of an intra-statist construction of cultural rights on the one hand, and the possibility of their construction from a globalist perspective on the other. I was also working on a conference presentation of a review of my Israeli colleague Yoav Peled's new book on the notion of “ethnic democracy” and its workings in Israel, in Poland between the two world wars, and in Northern Ireland. In addition I prepared a presentation based partly on the work mentioned above for the a workshop organized by Anna Stilz and David Carter on territorial claims, which took place at Princeton on May 16 and 17.

Peter Graham
Associate professor of philosophy at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst

While at the UCHV, I have continued to investigate the various relations between what we ought to do and what we can do. During my time here, I completed two substantial papers and made significant progress on a third. The first, “Actualism and Possibilism,” concerns whether what we ought to do now crucially depends on what we will do in the future or, rather, on what we will be able to do. I presented drafts of it at the LSR lunchtime seminar, the Princeton Workshop in Normative Philosophy, a meeting of the Ethicists Network Workshop at Princeton, and at the UNLV colloquium series. In the second paper, “Thomson’s Trolley Problem,” I address a long-standing, controversial problem in nonconsequentialist moral theory, both critiquing the many different takes on this problem posed by Judith Thomson, and offering my solution to it. The third paper, “Secondary Permissibility and the Dynamics of Permissible Harming,” investigates and explores the interesting moral phenomenon whereby the mere presence of an option—in some cases permissible, in others not—renders an otherwise morally impermissible option permissible. Being at the center has been an unalloyed pleasure; interacting with the other fellows and members of the Princeton community, as well as participating in the myriad events sponsored by, and held at, the center has been intellectually stimulating and enriching and at the same time, just plain fun.

Waheed Hussain
Assistant professor in the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania

During my fellowship year, I wrote a long paper called “Solidarity and Rivalry in a Market Society,” which I presented at the lunchtime seminar in the spring. I finished a shorter paper about the cultural tensions of liberal market democracy entitled “Consumer Culture, Self-Respect, and Participation in Public Life.” I completed a draft of a new chapter of my book manuscript, Embracing the Invisible Hand: Market Governance and Human Freedom. Along the way, I developed several ideas about the moral agency of business corporations, their relationship with shareholders, and their normative role in a liberal market democracy, ideas that I presented at business schools in the United States, the U.K., and France. My time at the center also allowed me to attend Philip Pettit’s graduate seminar in political philosophy, and my conversations with Philip sparked several ideas for future projects. I would like to thank Chuck Beitz, the staff at the UCHV, and my fellow fellows for making this an enjoyable and productive year.
Susan James
Professor of philosophy at Birkbeck College, University of London

My project this year has been to work on a book of essays about Spinoza that is under contract to Oxford University Press. I’ve written a piece on Spinoza’s conception of natural rights and another on his theory of freedom, and by the time I leave will have completed a further essay on imagination. Bar one more piece, the book will then be complete.

In addition, I’ve written a separate paper (due to appear in a symposium in *Philosophical Topics*) together with a number of talks, and have begun to plan a project on the philosophy of hope and fear. At Princeton I’ve had the great privilege of presenting work to the center’s Monday seminar, and to a workshop about early modern interpretations of the passions where my book, *Passion and Action*, was one of three discussed. I’ve also benefited from the opportunity to give talks elsewhere. I’ve spoken to the philosophy departments of the universities of Washington and Chicago and the politics departments at Northwestern and Columbia, to interdisciplinary audiences at Johns Hopkins and Berkeley, to conferences at the University of Pittsburgh and Boston University, and have contributed to a panel at the annual meeting of the Renaissance Society of America. I’m immensely grateful to the center for giving me so much writing time, and to the University as a whole for so many interesting seminars and conversations. It’s hard to see how LSR Fellows could be better looked after, or to imagine a more fruitful environment for research.

Angela M. Smith
Professor of philosophy at Washington and Lee University and director of the Roger Mudd Center for Ethics

My time at the UCHV has been extremely stimulating and productive. I have been working on a book on the importance of attitudes in our moral lives. I was able to complete three self-standing papers and a book review, and I made substantial progress on a fourth paper, each of which will form a core chapter of the book. The first paper, which is committed for publication, defends an account of moral responsibility that I call “responsibility as answerability.” The second paper, which I presented at the Princeton Workshop in Normative Philosophy in November, critiques “voluntarist” accounts of responsibility for attitudes. The third paper, which was the subject of my UCHV lunchtime seminar in March, defends the view that we are morally responsible for implicit biases. And the fourth paper argues that we have attitudinal obligations to others. I presented a version of the third paper at three universities this winter, including as a keynote address at two graduate student philosophy conferences at the University of Washington and the University of Michigan. I attended numerous talks, workshops, and seminars at the UCHV this year, participated in a philosophy department reading group on moral responsibility, and had many helpful informal discussions with other LSR fellows and Princeton faculty and graduate students. I am deeply grateful to the center’s staff, faculty, and fellows for creating such a congenial environment for research and discussion.
HAROLD T. SHAPIRO POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATE IN BIOETHICS

The Harold T. Shapiro Postdoctoral Fellowship in Bioethics supports outstanding scholars studying ethical issues arising from developments in medicine or the biological sciences. The Shapiro Fellow spends from one to three years at Princeton conducting research and teaching one course each year.

Jason L. Schwartz

During this second year of my fellowship, I continued my research and writing on decision-making in public health regulation and policy, particularly issues related to evidence and perceptions of the risks and benefits of medical interventions. In the fall, I presented papers at the annual meetings of the bioethics, science and technology studies, and public health professional associations. I also published several short papers in pediatrics, bioethics, and immunology journals on topics in vaccination ethics and policy, another of my primary research interests. In addition to continuing work on these areas in the spring, I taught my undergraduate seminar, “Ethics and Public Health,” directed the DeCamp Bioethics Seminars, and presented at the LSR fellows seminar, among other activities. Throughout the year, I again enjoyed the many opportunities to interact with and learn from our remarkable community at the UCHV and across the University. I am greatly looking forward to my third and final year at Princeton beginning in the fall, prior to joining the faculty at Yale University in 2015 as assistant professor of health policy in the School of Public Health and School of Medicine.

VALUES AND PUBLIC POLICY POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

The Values and Public Policy Postdoctoral Fellowship is a joint endeavor of the University Center for Human Values and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and supports highly promising scholars trained in moral and political philosophy, political theory, normative economics, and related areas to develop a research agenda in the ethical dimensions of public policy.

Simon Cotton

My second year as a postdoctoral research associate proved itself enjoyable, productive, and stimulating. I was able to continue work on a number of papers, including one arguing that exploitation is neither reducible to pre-existing injustice nor dependent on the existence of market power, and another arguing that Rawls’s theory of justice ought to be supplemented with a principle of non-domination. I had the opportunity to present the former at the Midwest Political Science Association’s annual meeting and the latter at the Northeastern and Western conferences. I was also able to deepen my engagement with work that informs my book project on fair trade; I published a review article on practice-dependent accounts of global justice in the Australian Journal of Political Science and a review of Aaron James’s book that defends a social contract for the global economy in Ethics & International Affairs. Perhaps most valuable, though, was the chance to present a new paper on market boundaries to the LSR seminar in February. The considered and insightful feedback of UCHV faculty and fellows proved invaluable in strengthening my treatment of the topic. Finally, I was lucky to have the opportunity to teach a seminar on markets and morals in the Woodrow Wilson School. I couldn’t have asked for a more enthusiastic and motivated group!
**Francis Dennig**

My research focuses on the intergenerational aspects of climate change. From such a perspective, climate change is an externality of the activities of the current generation on a number of future generations. A straightforward application of economic theory yields that there are mutual benefits to be had from mitigation; this was the main insight from my doctoral thesis. How these benefits ought to be distributed amongst the generations in question is a normative question beyond the scope of economic theory. During my stay at the center I have been working on merging my economic analysis with the appropriate value judgments to answer this question. The center, through its lively community and seminar series focused on ethical questions, provides the ideal environment for this kind of work. As an economist venturing outside the domain in which I was trained, I felt comfortable discussing these matters with my colleagues. My enthusiasm to embark on a cross-disciplinary project has been affirmed and encouraged. I look forward to completing my current project during the year to come at the center.

**Gavin Arnall**

As a University Center for Human Values Graduate Prize Fellow, I researched and began to draft the first two chapters of my dissertation, *Translating Universality: Marxism in Latin America and the Caribbean*. I explore how Latin American and Caribbean writers, filmmakers, and intellectuals conceptually translate European and Soviet Marxism in accordance with the historical, material, and cultural diversity of their environments. I argue that this practice of translation neither fetishizes difference (particularism) nor erases it (abstract universalism), but rather transforms Marxism’s categories so that they become at once universal and concrete. The manuscript also interrogates when this practice of conceptual translation breaks down, when Marxism resists translation. I consider how this short circuit of translation occasions the articulation of alternative universal notions that seek to overcome the limits of the Marxist tradition. Along with my dissertation writing and research, I organized a theory reading group colloquium, “Theory, Translation, Universality,” which brought internationally renowned scholars from the United States and England to Princeton. I also completed a long essay on the Belgian situationist Raoul Vaneigem’s subversive détournement of Friedrich Nietzsche’s philosophy for the anthology *Global Anarchisms: No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries* (PM Press, forthcoming 2014).
Emilee Chapman

Holding the UCHV fellowship this year has allowed me to focus on making significant progress on my dissertation research and writing. I completed drafts of the first three chapters of my dissertation on the role of voting in contemporary democracy. I have revised one of these chapters to serve as a writing sample, and I planned to present another of these chapters at a conference in mid-April. I also developed an independent paper offering normative grounds for the duty to vote, which I submitted to a peer-reviewed journal. I presented the theoretical core of my first three dissertation chapters to the UCHV Graduate Prize Fellows Seminar. This audience offered me a valuable new perspective on my work, challenging me to clarify my ideas in order to communicate them to scholars from a variety of disciplines and to respond to objections that I have not encountered when I have presented my work to scholars in my own field. The GPF seminars and dinners have been both illuminating and enjoyable. I have appreciated hearing about and engaging with the other fellows’ exciting projects and seeing how scholars in various fields approach similar questions with different methods and perspectives.

Frederic Clark

I had a wonderful year as a prize fellow and I am extremely grateful to the center for its generous support of my research. This year I worked on the final chapters of my dissertation, titled Dividing Time: The Making of Historical Periodization in Early Modern Europe, c.1500-1750. My study seeks to reconstruct the origins of our threefold scheme for dividing historical time into ancient, medieval, and modern phases, and its neglected importance to debates over the definition of modernity—debates that continue to affect so many aspects of contemporary humanistic and social scientific scholarship. I benefited enormously from the interdisciplinary environment fostered by the regular fellows seminars, and my presentation to the seminar aided me tremendously in framing my project for a wide interdisciplinary audience. In addition to my dissertation work, I also published an article in the Princeton University Library Chronicle based on my research in Firestone Library, and completed a chapter for a volume on early modern forgeries to be published by Johns Hopkins University Press. I will defend my dissertation in September 2014 and will then take up a position as a postdoctoral fellow in the Mellon Fellowship of Scholars in the Humanities at Stanford.

Clifton Granby

I am grateful to the UCHV for what has been an exciting and productive year. Each workshop afforded a fresh encounter with the interesting work of my peers, as well as the space to see my own project in a new light. These exchanges were invaluable, both as an aid to my own scholarship and for their generosity of spirit. During an early seminar, I presented a draft on Ralph Waldo Emerson’s critique of religion and society. In the months that followed, I was able to write more than half of my dissertation on the ways in which Howard Thurman offered a tenable reply to Emerson’s concerns. During that time, I also revised a couple of essays for publication and participated in a number of invited lectures and presentations. That burst of writing and productivity had everything to do with the Graduate Prize Fellowship providing not only a place of intellectual exchange, but also an encouraging community of writers. I expect to defend my dissertation in the spring of 2015, as a graduate fellow at the Center for the Study of Religion.
Janet Hine
I have greatly enjoyed and benefited from being a Graduate Prize Fellow at the University Center for Human Values this past year. The seminars have been an invaluable interdisciplinary learning experience, having introduced me to new ideas, approaches, and literatures and made clearer to me what anthropology has to offer to questions substantive and methodological. Upon my return from two years of fieldwork on the regulation of human stem-cell research in Canadian public institutions, I particularly appreciated the collegial environment and the stimulating seminar discussions. My project looks at the way in which the knowledge bureaucracy surrounding research at universities and hospitals mediates various regulatory mechanisms and weaves technical, ethical, and commercial considerations into stem-cell science. Presenting my work to the other fellows helped me to clarify my overall research question while informal discussions broadened my perspective on the theoretical issues the topic raises. As a result, my dissertation outline is more focused and, at the same time, I am thinking about larger questions in a way that is more historically informed. In the spring, I moderated a panel at a UCHV co-sponsored conference, which honored Canadian medical anthropologist Margaret Lock. My project engages with Lock’s important contributions to the study of the body and biomedicine making the conference both timely and rewarding.

Amy Hondo
The Graduate Prize Fellowship provided for a productive year of research and writing. I made progress in three sections of my dissertation. I significantly revised the first section, where I examine current work on how historical injustice misdiagnoses the wrong and the subsequent harm at the root of claims for redress. In the second section on political responsibility and historical injustice, I show that a coherent group is not adequately accounted for in the literature on collective responsibility. Then, drawing from the framework of my first two sections, I focus my writing on the subject of integration, arguing that the wrong of segregation is not necessarily undone through a policy of integration. In addition to presenting work at the UCHV fellows seminar, I also presented work at a political theory research seminar at the Midwest Political Science Association’s annual conference and at the Oxford Graduate Student Conference in Political Theory. The fellowship provided me the opportunity to share work with other fellows; the ability to attend professional conferences; and the ability to take full advantage of the intellectual resources offered by the University, through the lectures and seminars offered in the politics, history, philosophy, and religion departments, as well as the creative space to research and write without distraction.

Trevor Latimer
I have spent this academic year developing an analytical framework to identify and understand a phenomenon I call localism in the history of American political thought. This phenomenon is frequently identified but poorly understood. I have applied that framework (which draws on work in critical political geography) to two cases: Anti-Federalist political thought in the 1780s and the debate over popular sovereignty and the extension of slavery into new territories in the 1850s. I also planned to apply the framework to two further cases: the American Revolution and 19th-century utopian communities. Through attending the Graduate Prize Fellowship seminars, I benefited from enriching conversations with my fellow students in history, religion, sociology, anthropology, and comparative literature. I regularly attend the Program in Ethics and Public Affairs seminar as well as the Political Philosophy Colloquium. I have enjoyed the many lectures given by the Rockefeller Visiting Professor for Distinguished Teaching, Quentin Skinner. I especially enjoyed his lecture on “How (NOT) to Teach Intellectual History.” I look forward to another year of activities sponsored by the University Center for Human Values.
Karen Levy
My experience as a UCHV Graduate Prize Fellow has been incredibly valuable. I spent the year completing my dissertation, *The Automation of Compliance: Techno-Legal Regulation in the United States Trucking Industry*. My research considers relationships among law, technology, and social life, focusing on the rollout of an electronic monitoring regime meant to enforce federal timekeeping regulations among U.S. truck drivers. The interdisciplinary group of fellows helped me sharpen my theoretical frame and to think through important values that digital surveillance brings into play, such as freedom, autonomy, and discretion; I also enjoyed and learned a great deal from the fascinating work of the other fellows. With the center’s support, I published two academic papers and a book review; I have had another paper conditionally accepted for publication; and have presented my research six times at conferences, universities, and other forums. I’m truly grateful for the opportunities UCHV has afforded me and have really enjoyed being part of this vibrant intellectual community.

Sarah Seo
I am indebted to the UCHV for supporting what has been my most productive year at Princeton. By the end of the year, I will have completed drafts of four chapters of my dissertation on the history of car searches and the Fourth Amendment and presented papers at four different conferences. This does not include my presentation before the Graduate Prize Fellows, who asked some of the most challenging and helpful questions that will no doubt refine my research project. Based on this year’s progress, I received the William Nelson Cromwell Foundation Fellowship, which will fund an archival trip this summer, as well as the Samuel I. Golieb Fellowship at NYU Law School for the following academic year. Perhaps what has been most enjoyable about being a fellow was the opportunity to learn about subjects that I would not have come across otherwise as a 20th-century legal historian. I thank UCHV and my associated fellows for enriching my intellectual journey at Princeton.

Iwa Nawrocki
My experience as a UCHV Graduate Prize Fellow has been immensely rewarding for a number of reasons. I am particularly grateful for having been given the opportunity to be part of an interdisciplinary intellectual community. The formal and informal discussions I engaged in not only exposed me to new methodologies, theories, and questions, but also helped me reframe my own project. In it, I take up two parallel democratic struggles that drew in Brazilian Catholic intellectuals beginning in the late 1970s: the political campaign for the democratization of Brazil’s military dictatorship (1964–1985), and the push for greater freedom and horizontality within the Roman Catholic Church in reaction to Pope John Paul II’s increasingly centralizing rule. I examine how these two struggles intersect, and how transnational exchanges between Brazilian, Nicaraguan, and Polish Catholic intellectuals shaped their trajectory and outcome. The comments I received on the presentation I gave in the fall enabled me to specify my dissertation’s scope and central argument, and so greatly facilitated my writing process. Holding a UCHV fellowship has also allowed me to focus on writing. Considering that I was coming out of 14 months of archival research, being at leisure to dive into my materials proved invaluable. I drafted two chapters this year, one of which I will be presenting at an international conference in Berlin next September.
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