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LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR

Twenty-five years ago, with the encouragement of then President Harold T. Shapiro, a small group of faculty members set out to plan a center for the study of human values at Princeton. Led by Amy Gutmann, then a professor of politics, they sketched a vision that must have seemed impossibly ambitious—it called for a series of faculty positions shared with academic departments, a visiting faculty fellows program, a program of graduate fellowships, seminar and lecture series, a book series, and more.

It has become a matter of legend that when Gutmann and Shapiro explained the vision to Laurance S. Rockefeller ’32, whose interest in human values dated to his senior thesis in philosophy (“The Concept of Value and its Relation to Ethics”), he offered to make the vision a reality by means of a spectacularly generous endowment gift that supported every dimension imagined by the faculty planners. Implausibly but wonderfully, the Center sprang to life in 1990 with the confident expectation that it could become all that was hoped for.

This year we celebrated the UCHV’s 25th anniversary with an international conference that brought together many of the people who have been associated with the Center from its beginnings. It was a memorable event for all and made it unmistakably clear that Mr. Rockefeller’s investment has established Princeton as a global presence in scholarship and teaching about human values in public and private life. The celebration is described elsewhere in this Review.

Even without the anniversary celebration, the 2014–15 academic year may qualify as the liveliest in the Center’s history. This Review documents the range of activities that took place within the Center and the many more that took place elsewhere on campus to which we contributed people, ideas, and support. It’s more difficult to document on the printed page, but I hope the text and photographs also convey the warmth and energy that exists within the community of faculty colleagues, graduate students, and undergraduates whose academic lives intersect in the Center.

Let me take this chance to thank the members of the Center’s Executive Committee, who commit a lot of time to guiding the Center’s affairs without any compensation other than the reward of being part of this extraordinary community. And let me also thank our remarkable staff who managed the unusual demands of a hugely complex 25th anniversary celebration without any compromise in the performance of their already demanding ongoing responsibilities. All of us associated with the Center are in their debt.

Charles R. Beitz
Director, University Center for Human Values
Edwards S. Sanford Professor of Politics
2014–15 FACULTY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

MARC FLEURBAEY

Received the *Revue Économique* prize in January 2015

MELISSA LANE

Appeared on BBC Radio 4’s *In Our Time* with Melvyn Bragg on two shows: “Utilitarianism” and “Solitude”

Received the Phi Beta Kappa annual award for excellence in undergraduate teaching

STEPHEN MACEDO

Published *Just Marriage: Same-Sex Couples, Monogamy, and the Future of Marriage*

Elected Vice President of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy

VICTORIA MCGEER

Visiting Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, University of London, June 2015

JAN-WERNER MÜLLER

Delivered a lecture on the meaning of democracy today at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg

PHILIP PETTIT

Awarded the 2014 David and Elaine Spitz Prize for *On the People’s Terms*

Awarded the Ph.D. *honoris causa* from the Department of Philosophy, University of Athens, Greece

Published *The Robust Demands of the Good: Ethics with Attachment, Virtue, and Reason*

Delivered the following named lectures:
- The Alan Saunders Memorial Lecture (Canberra);
- The Martha Nussbaum Symposium Lecture, Human Development and Capability Association (Athens);
- Plenary Speaker, Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Philosophie, triannual meeting (Muenster);
- European Forum for Philosophy Lecture (London);
- Annual Center for Political Philosophy Lecture (Leiden);
- The Tanner Lectures on Human Values (University of California-Berkeley); and
- The Taylor-Lewis Lecture, Philosophy (University of Melbourne)

ST Lee Visiting Professorial Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, University of London, June 2015

KIM LANE SCHEPPELE

Spoke at the Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference in Monterey, California

Delivered the inaugural Violet Magyar Lecture in Hungarian Studies at Case Western Reserve University

PETER SINGER

Published *The Most Good You Can Do*

Awarded the Ph.D. *honoris causa* from the University of Bucharest, Romania

Awarded the Ph.D. *honoris causa* from the Department of Philosophy, University of Athens, Greece

Received the 2015 Arts Alumni Lifetime Achievement Award, University of Melbourne

Received the Peter Singer Prize for Strategies to Reduce the Suffering of Animals, Berlin (Singer is the first recipient of the award named in his honor.)

Delivered the following named lectures:
- Second Century Lecture (University of Hong Kong);
- “Animal Liberation, Forty Years On,” keynote address at a conference in Rennes, France, to mark the 40th Anniversary of the publication of *Animal Liberation*;
- The Tanner Lectures on Human Values (University of Oxford)
DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING
Most American workers are subject to expansive and unaccountable power in the workplace. Ruled by unelected and arbitrary governors, workers are subject to surveillance, suspicionless searches, limits on speech and political activity, and innumerable other encroachments on their private sphere of autonomy. If this were a description of a political regime, many of us would not hesitate to label it a dictatorship and to insist that those subject to its power were unfree.

Elizabeth Anderson, of the University of Michigan, one of our foremost contemporary moral and political philosophers, took up this problem of “private government” in her timely and provocative Tanner Lectures on “Liberty, Equality, and Private Government” in March. Anderson’s first lecture approached the problem historically. We can recover a critique of private government in the egalitarian thought of the 17th and 18th centuries. This critique, suggested Anderson, was at the heart of egalitarian assessments of both political and economic arrangements.

Groups like the English Levellers and later thinkers like Adam Smith and Thomas Paine thought that arbitrary state power reinforced hierarchies of authority, esteem, and standing. However, the emergent market society promised to dismantle these hierarchies. The developments of the Industrial Revolution ultimately destroyed this hope by creating and reinforcing hierarchical relationships between employers and employees, leading to a dramatic deterioration of working conditions and the rise of private government in the workplace.

In their challenging replies, commentators Ann Hughes, of the University of Keele, emerita, and David Bromwich, of Yale University, both pressed on the details of Anderson’s historical narrative. To what degree was the market seen as an arena of
egalitarianism in the 17th and 18th centuries? Were preindustrial radicals like the Levellers really committed to “market society” in the sense we understand the term today? And, more broadly, how should we think about the place of historical explanations in philosophical argument?

Anderson’s second lecture addressed the problem of private government from a conceptual and normative perspective. Why does public discourse fail to acknowledge the reality of private government? First, suggested Anderson, we are vulnerable to various kinds of conceptual confusion. For instance, we tend to think that the agent of government is the state and that government only exists in those domains in which the state exercises authority. Anderson proposed instead that we are subject to private government in any domain in which we are subject to arbitrary and unaccountable power, as many employees are in the modern American workplace.

Second, we cling to a pre-Industrial Revolution worldview that sees workers as independent contractors with substantial power to negotiate terms of employment. Yet the contemporary realities of workplace hierarchy and the decline of labor unions belie this nostalgic picture.

What is to be done? Anderson concluded by suggesting that we draw inspiration from the long and ongoing fight against arbitrary state power. This would mean strengthening workers’ exit rights, affirming some version of the rule of law and a worker’s bill of rights, and providing more robust options for worker participation in firm governance.

Commenting on Anderson’s second lecture, Tyler Cowen, of George Mason University, urged Anderson to attend more closely to the trade-offs involved in her proposed remedies and gestured toward empirical findings that suggest these trade-offs are far from trivial. Niko Kolodny, of the University of California–Berkeley, tried to pin down what is really objectionable about private government in the workplace and how it differs from the government of the state. Would we want to insist on workplace democracy to the same degree as we insist on political democracy? How troubled should we really be that our rights as employees do not look more like our rights as citizens?
Our need for legitimate coercion is quickly outstripping our capacity for it, Professor Jane Mansbridge of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard argued at a Moffett Lecture last fall. How do we introduce both more coercion and more legitimate coercion? Coercion that is “good enough” may have to do, Mansbridge said.

A vast number of goods that are of greatest importance to human beings and communities are “free access goods,” or depend on the existence of such goods. A free access good is one that, once it has been created, anyone can freely use. Common examples of free access goods include systems of national defense, legal systems, non-tolled roads, and other public works. In truth, free access goods support and enable a wide array of human needs and wants, from the Chilean blueberries that I can buy in the Northern Hemisphere’s winter, thanks to trade enabled by coercive international regulation, to the habitable atmosphere, which only coercion on an international scale will be able to save from runaway greenhouse gas emissions. And increasingly, Mansbridge stressed, existing actors and institutions lack the legitimacy to introduce the additional coercion that is necessary to produce and safeguard the most important free access goods.

How can we legitimate the coercion that is already necessary or will soon become necessary? Usually the thought is that if a law or regulation is legitimate, then I have an obligation to obey; and if I refuse, I can then be legitimately coerced. According to
Mansbridge, we should explore a different approach. Legitimacy is partly a matter of consent, but various other factors matter as well. The “complex legitimacy” of a coercive institution depends, in addition, on the fairness of the procedures involved, the justice of the outcomes that it tends to reach, whether it shows due respect for persons as a matter of course, whether it gives voice to the affected in some way, and perhaps on other normative factors as well. On Mansbridge’s conception, legitimacy as a moral property is a composite notion and always a matter of degree. What we should aim for is coercion that is “good enough” on each of the component factors or parts.

This approach may put pressure on some long established views. Owing to the U.S. Constitution’s veto points and a Congress that has become increasingly polarized over the years, the legislative branch of the federal government is becoming less and less effective over time. Since the need for government continues to grow, however, we may need to reconsider what we take to be the conditions necessary for legitimate regulation and law. In particular, Mansbridge advised, we may need to put up with increased use of executive power and increased judicial lawmaking in a variety of domains.

At the same time, we may need to make negotiations easier in Congress through the use of mechanisms that have previously been thought to be illegitimate, or less legitimate. For example, long incumbencies allow for repeated interactions and can help to build empathy, trust, and willingness to compromise. Privacy, particularly concerning negotiations behind closed doors, can increase candor, and accurate listening. Side payments allow trades on items that are of high value to one lawmaker and of low value to another. Under what conditions are these processes compatible with democratic ideals? If we want adequate provision of the free access goods that only coercive governance can provide, Mansbridge urged, we should look for new ways of legitimating such processes while giving due respect to fairness, justice, and voice.

Lucas Stanczyk, Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Faculty Fellow

Politics graduate students Lucia Rafanelli, Isabella Litke, and Amy Hondo
The special feelings of concern and responsibility that parents have for their children or that other relatives have for each other are well known. Very often, these emotions and the obligations that follow may—and should, many believe—exceed those we have for even close friends, let alone for people we do not know. Common as they may be, are such distinctions with respect to our feelings for family, nonfamily, and strangers universal? Are they defensible? What can we learn from the story of a couple who felt the same duty to help children they had never met as they did their own, rejecting the distinction between “family” and “stranger” altogether?

These questions were among those explored in the spring 2015 James A. Moffett ’29 Lecture in Ethics, “What Is Family? What Are Strangers?” by Larissa MacFarquhar, a staff writer at The New Yorker whose work frequently examines issues of ethics and values. The lecture told the story of Hector and Sue Badeau, a couple who adopted and raised 20 children in addition to their two biological children. The Badeaus are featured in MacFarquhar’s forthcoming book, Strangers Drowning: Grappling with Impossible Idealism, Drastic Choices, and the Overpowering Urge to Help (Penguin Press).

For Hector and Sue, a child in distress—often struggling in group homes or unstable foster care arrangements—was not quite family, but not quite a stranger, either, prior to his or her adoption, even in cases when they had not yet met. The needs of that child weighed equally to the needs of their own children, both biological and previously adopted. Despite their limited and increasingly strained financial resources, they knew that they could provide a better life to each child they adopted than whatever alternative that child would face without them. Once adopted, Hector and Sue saw to it that their household was a
family, not an orphanage. What others may view as charity, they viewed as a duty to rescue. But rather than a comprehensive moral theory driving their decisions, Hector and Sue saw the will of God at work in their lives, MacFarquhar explained.

Like any family, the Badeaus and their children experienced both joys and tragedies over the years, all amplified, of course, by the size of the group and the unique challenges that came with introducing new members, many of whom had had extraordinarily difficult childhoods prior to their adoption. But through it all, as MacFarquhar concluded with an account of a large gathering of the children (many now grown) to celebrate Hector and Sue’s 25th wedding anniversary, they were and remain a family.

Following the lecture, comments were offered by Peter Singer, the Ira W. DeCamp Professor of Bioethics, who considered the similarities and differences between the Badeaus and the groups he has explored as part of his recent work on effective altruism. While their reasons for acting as they do differ considerably, Hector and Sue—as well as effective altruists who, for example, donate a kidney to a stranger or give away a large portion of their income—are all making choices that others may consider to be extreme sacrifices, but they see as simply doing the most good they can.

Following a question-and-answer period, the conversation continued over dinner at Prospect House. With a number of former UCHV visitors in attendance for both the lecture and dinner, the afternoon served as a lively, thought-provoking, and powerful prelude to the 25th anniversary conference that began the following afternoon.

September 18, 2014
“Global History as Political Thought: Irony in the Wealth of Nations”
Jennifer Pitts, University of Chicago

October 23, 2014
“In Dubious Battle: Uncertainty and the Ethics of Killing”
Seth Lazar, Australian National University

December 4, 2014
“A Form of Unfreedom”
A.J. Julius, University of California-Los Angeles

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.

Speakers discuss the motivation of their precirculated paper and draw attention to what they see as essential points. An extensive question-and-answer period with seminar participants—a mixture of faculty and graduate students from politics, philosophy, and the Woodrow Wilson School, and elsewhere—follows, which typically extends throughout the ensuing dinner.
Professor Jeff McMahan spoke at a DeCamp Bioethics Seminar on “Individualist and Collectivist Moralties of War” on October 8. Since his appointment at Rutgers University in 2003, McMahan has been a prominent participant at the DeCamp seminars, often as a speaker, a respondent, or taking part in discussions. This event was a kind of farewell, as he was about to take up his appointment to the White’s Chair of Moral Philosophy at the University of Oxford.

Philip Pettit, the Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Politics and Human Values, was the respondent.

McMahan began by pointing out that killing other human beings is generally seen as something that is in need of justification. One familiar form of justification for killing is self-defense. This familiar claim is then often extrapolated to killing in war: states are seen as individual persons, and when they are attacked, they have the right to defend themselves.

The “Just War” tradition still dominates discussions both on the morality of going to war and on morality in war. In keeping with this tradition, Michael Walzer sees states as entities that possess rights more or less as individuals do. In this view, the soldier is the instrument of the state, so if the state is wrongfully waging a war of aggression, the wrong is done by the state, not by the soldier. In war one state may be the unjust aggressor, while the other state is acting in justified self-defense. But as far as the soldiers are concerned, those on both sides are justified in seeking to kill soldiers on the other side.

In opposition to this widely accepted view, McMahan argues that states are nothing like individuals and should not be regarded as if they were. Individuals are conscious beings and can be harmed. A state can only be harmed insofar as harm falls on some individual members of it. A state may act wrongly, without all its members acting wrongly, and it is a mistake to think that the wrong acts of a state justify us in harming all the individual members of the state. Terrorists commonly make this mistake when they think that every member of a state that (in their view) is involved in wrongdoing is liable for what the state does.

According to the traditional view of the morality of war, it is important to know whether a conflict is or is not a war. If it is
a war, then I am not doing wrong if I fight, even if I am on the unjust side. But if it is not a war, and I am on the unjust side, I am engaged in wrongdoing. So the traditional view suggests that the moral question that should be considered is not “am I on the unjust side?” but “is this a war?” That, McMahan urges, is the wrong question to ask.

One response to this objection is to claim that whether an act of conflict is a war is established by political leaders speaking on behalf of their nation: “We declare war on X.” But again, it seems odd that the mere saying of these words makes it permissible for soldiers to kill and to be killed by the other side.

McMahan offers the example of the gradual escalation of the conflict in Syria, from repressive actions against peaceful protest to the present state of war. How can one set of moral principles (those that apply in situations other than war, when it is important for each individual to know whether his or her act of killing is justified) apply at one time and then suddenly cease to apply, when the conflict has escalated to a state of war, so that it now becomes permissible for the soldiers to kill, where previously it was not?

A better view, McMahan concludes, is that justifications for killing in war are exactly the same as justifications for killing outside the context of war. In other words, the familiar asymmetrical stance according to which one side is acting justly and the other side is acting unjustly will apply to individuals as well as to states.

In response, Pettit suggests that states can count as agents—not conscious agents, but agents who are representable—and that states can also act as agents, with a purpose. Nevertheless, Pettit said he is a normative individualist. When the state or other corporate entity does something wrong, individuals within or outside the corporate entities are the ones to be held responsible. The corporation and the individuals can be held responsible for the same act, so there is a dual system of corporate responsibility.

If we assume that there are going to be wars between states, then the interests of individuals require that there be some rules or codes of war limiting what can be done to individuals. That doesn’t mean that soldiers are always right to follow the code, but it is better to have one than to leave it up to the individual judgments of soldiers.

We wish McMahan well in his new position, and look forward to seeing him on future visits to the United States.

IRA W. DECOMP BIOETHICS SEMINARS

The Ira W. DeCamp Bioethics Seminars are open to all students, faculty, and interested members of the public. Seminars range across a wide variety of topics at the intersections of philosophy, ecology, biology, medicine, and public policy. The seminar series is made possible by a gift from the Ira W. DeCamp Foundation.

OCTOBER 1, 2014
“Killing and Saving Lives”
Derek Parfit, All Souls College, University of Oxford, emeritus

OCTOBER 8, 2014
“Individualist and Collectivist Moralities of War”
Jeff McMahan, University of Oxford

NOVEMBER 12, 2014
“Health Equity”
Dan Hausman, University of Wisconsin-Madison

NOVEMBER 19, 2014
“Ethics of Obesity Prevention Policy”
Anne Barnhill, University of Pennsylvania

FEBRUARY 25, 2015
“Developing a Deaf Feminist Bioethics: The Case of Cochlear Implants”
Teresa Blankmeyer Burke, Gallaudet University

MARCH 11, 2015
“Conditional Obligations: Understanding Surfaxin-style Cases”
Tina Rulli, University of California-Davis

APRIL 1, 2015
“The Ethics and Politics of E-Cigarettes”
Ronald Bayer, Columbia University
Abraham Lincoln explained his own political thought through a metaphor, drawn from Proverbs, about an “apple of gold” and a “picture of silver.” The apple was “Liberty for all,” as was enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. The silver picture was the Union and the Constitution, created to “adorn and preserve” the ideal. In January 1861, after secession had begun, Lincoln wrote of protecting the rights guaranteed by American institutions, as if preparing for the coming of the war: “So let us act, that neither picture, or apple, shall ever be blurred, bruised or broken.”

Ironically, his epic triumph—saving the Union while destroying slavery—occurred because he won the presidency by denying he was an abolitionist. For Lincoln, the Constitution granted the national government no power to interfere with the South’s peculiar institution, but only to prohibit its westward spread. And though prophesying that America could not endure as a “house divided,” Lincoln conceived of himself as an “unintentional emancipator,” impelled by wartime circumstances, not by the inhumanity of slavery.

Moreover, as an emancipator, Lincoln violated the Constitution that he so revered, abridging fundamental liberties by invoking presidential war powers to suspend the writ of habeus corpus. The Civil War was an evil done to prevent evil, noted Kateb, meditating on the problem of means and ends. Not only did it leave 750,000 dead, producing a harvest of death greater than in any other American war, it also established a fateful precedent—that basic rights may legitimately be revoked in times of war.

From such paradoxes, Kateb drew broader conclusions about the dilemmas of political practice and the principles of democracy. He advanced four main arguments. That truth indeed lies in the tenet of political theory that it is hard “to do the right thing for the right reasons.” That no government is legitimate when it violates rights, even for reasons of national security. That
rights cease to be rights if not universal, as when they are racially selective. And that democratic self-government entails the formal equality of all persons.

It was Lincoln’s Second Inaugural that drew Kateb to study his thought. The 700 words spoken on March 4, 1865—about a month before the president’s death—follow what Kateb called a “wayward course” in infusing “metaphysical ideas” into a ceremonial public utterance, shifting meaning with each phrase, turning from divine providence to human will, but finally holding the entire American people accountable for the sins of slavery. The most remarkable sentence, Kateb explained, begins by alluding to unending war in a conditional mode but ends by quoting from the Bible to declare the absolute justice of deadly retribution—“if God wills that it continue...until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword...it must be said ‘the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.’ ” Kateb argued that such words are more evocative of Kierkegaardian fear and trembling than of American transcendentalism.

Questions led to further reflection on topics both political and philosophical. What was the imperative of saving the Union, asked Harry Frankfurt, emeritus philosophy professor at Princeton? What implications for political action—for political ethics—lie in the idea of the impossibility of doing the right thing for the right reasons, asked both Melissa Lane and Anna Stilz, political theorists at Princeton? Could it be that the Second Inaugural’s astonishing language confounded even the reverential metaphors of the golden apple and silver frame, asked David Bromwich, a literature professor at Yale? Kateb responded, in far greater depth than can be done justice here, that the Union, for Lincoln, required saving as the world’s beacon of democratic freedom. That the carnage of the Civil War surely illustrates the ethical necessity of weighing the worst of means against the best of ends as well as the perplexity of unintended consequences. And that the Second Inaugural compels study not least because the clarity of Lincoln’s words is belied by the deep opacity of his thought.
Today, films are more accessible than ever and might come close to having a truly global audience. But has this development also made film a privileged carrier of universal norms? Is film because of its accessibility automatically more “democratic,” as is sometimes claimed? Do human rights documentaries make their audiences politically more sensitive human beings, as some assert? What do we make of the relationship between film and moral and political philosophy, a topic of increasing interest to academics?

The very animated colloquium “Film, Democracy, and Liberal Education,” organized by Erika Kiss, founding director of the UCHV Film Forum, and Jan-Werner Müller addressed such questions in Marx Hall on May 1–2. Political philosophers mingled with historians, practicing lawyers, educators, and filmmakers to see where a truly interdisciplinary conversation might lead—and what they could learn from each other.

In her opening remarks, Kiss emphasized that film could be integrated into teaching various disciplines and, in fact, had the potential to reinvigorate liberal arts education more broadly. Many students are already familiar with editing techniques and could be taught what Kiss called “cinematic philology” rather easily; cinematic philology might then in turn lead students back to texts. Paul Kahn, Yale Law School, argued that the relationship between film and moral universalism was much more complicated than usually assumed and that movies did not present one with a universalist “view from nowhere”. Martin Seel, Frankfurt, objected that film’s strength consisted precisely in the experimentation with different perspectives and argued that film’s pathos could ultimately encourage a particular ethos. Davide Panagia, University of California–Los Angeles, stressed that film’s formal qualities, discontinuity in particular,
could open up interesting questions about political experience and agency, a thought shared by his colleague Joshua Foa Dienstag, who focused on the British Up series to argue that the incomplete nature of representation in film should make us rethink the limits of political representation.

One of the highlights of the gathering was a conversation with directors Gyula Gazdag and Joshua Oppenheimer. Conference participants attended a sneak preview of Oppenheimer’s new documentary The Look of Silence (about the aftermath of the ostensibly anti-communist massacres in Indonesia in 1965–66). In the discussion, Oppenheimer emphasized the capacity of documentaries to generate a “the emperor is naked” moment. Gazdag, a legendary Hungarian director, virtually all of whose films were banned at one point or another, stressed that documentary filmmakers constantly make choices, including ethical ones, a point supported by Purcell Carson, who teaches documentary filmmaking at Princeton. Every documentary is also a work of fiction, but every fiction film is also a documentary—an insight on which many of the participants could converge. Renáta Uitz, a Budapest-based constitutional lawyer, emphasized that students in law and politics should become more sophisticated in their understanding of visual techniques—rather than thinking that Law and Order-type shows can tell us much about legal systems, they should study documentary film to learn how visual evidence can be manipulated.

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 constitutional law, and area studies.

APRIL 25, 2015
“New Histories of Human Rights Workshop”
Jan-Werner Müller and Dan Edelstein, Princeton University

MAY 1-2, 2015
“Film, Democracy, and Liberal Education”
Jan Werner Müller and Erika Kiss, Princeton University

Erika Kiss, founding director of the UCHV Film Forum

Renáta Uitz, Professor of Comparative Constitutional Law and Chair of the Comparative Constitutional Law Program, Central European University
The Center celebrated its 25th anniversary April 17-18 with an international conference on the theme of “Justice and Injustice in Our Time.” More than 200 people attended, including nearly 100 former Laurance S. Rockefeller visiting faculty fellows, graduate prize fellows, and postdocs who returned to Princeton for the event.

The conference panels were held in Jadwin Hall. Each panel was composed of former fellows who spoke to issues of concern in their current work, ranging from problems of global justice to the ethics of climate change, the impact of psychological research on criminal justice, and immigration policy and the refugee crisis.

In UCHV fashion, the conversations that began during the first day continued throughout the reception and the festive dinner at Prospect House that evening. Guests heard remarks from Center Director Charles Beitz, Princeton’s 20th President (and member of the Center’s faculty) Christopher L. Eisgruber, and special guest Amy Gutmann, the Center’s founding director, former provost of the University, and now president of the University of Pennsylvania.

Introducing President Gutmann before the dinner, President Eisgruber noted that she is responsible for almost every feature of the Center’s identity, from her partnership with Princeton’s 18th president, Harold T. Shapiro, in securing the initial gift from Laurance S. Rockefeller ’32 that made the Center possible; framing its constitution; recruiting many of its faculty and a generation of its fellows; to defining its institutions and social norms, including the tradition of continuing seminar discussions over dinner.
In her remarks, Gutmann recalled that she came to Princeton as a junior faculty member partly for the graduate Program in Political Philosophy, which dates from the 1960s. It served to underscore the University’s commitment to moral and political philosophy and political theory together with cognate areas of history, religion, and classics. The next generation of colleagues from that program wanted to create something broader and better, she said—an ethics center that spanned the entire University at all levels, beginning with freshman seminars, extending to public lectures, and a book series, and bringing the best minds from all across the world to Princeton as graduate students and visiting faculty fellows. President Shapiro’s commitment, in his inaugural address, to the centrality of ethics in the University galvanized the faculty and motivated planning for a center. That commitment led to Mr. Rockefeller’s far-sighted initial gift that launched the Center.

The Center’s 10th anniversary celebration included the publication of a book, *What Do We Value? A Decade of Questions*, in which essays written by either Center faculty or UCHV-invited speakers discuss some of the ethical questions of our time. In the 15 years since the Center celebrated its 10th anniversary, Gutmann said, “the University Center has provoked not one or two, but thousands more students... to tackle important ethical questions, central to living a more examined life and creating a better society. This, with the addition of an undergraduate certificate program in Values and Public Life (VPL) and the most high-powered and collegial group of faculty and fellows gathered anywhere, is a reason to celebrate.”

One fellow remarked, “It was absolutely fantastic both intellectually and socially—the kind of occasion that people will talk about for a long, long time.”

**PROGRAM OF EVENTS**

**OPENING REMARKS**
Charles Beitz

**SOCIAL JUSTICE VS. GLOBALIZATION?**
*Chair*: Stephen Macedo  
*Panelists*:  
Michael Blake  
Debra Satz  
Leif Wenar  
Melissa Williams

**RESPONSIBILITY IN LAW AND PSYCHOLOGY: NEW CHALLENGES FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE?**
*Chair*: Victoria McGeer  
*Panelists*:  
Agnieszka Jaworska  
Heidi Maibom  
Walter Sinnott-Armstrong

**MORAL VALUES AND ECONOMIC VALUING IN CLIMATE CHANGE**
*Chair*: Melissa Lane  
*Panelists*:  
Julia Driver  
Dale Jamieson  
Timothy Mulgan

**BORDERS, REFUGEES, HARM, AND INJUSTICE**
*Chair*: Charles Beitz  
*Panelists*:  
Arash Abizadeh  
Mathias Risse  
Joan Tronto
FOSTERING COLLABORATION
Princeton hosted the first “Networking and Mentoring Workshop for Graduate Student Women in Philosophy,” which was sponsored by the University Center for Human Values, the Council of the Humanities, the Department of Philosophy, and the Office of the Provost. Other sponsors were Rutgers University, Cornell University, and the Marc Sanders Foundation. The workshop was co-directed by Rutgers’ Elisabeth Camp, Princeton’s Elizabeth Harman, and Cornell’s Jill North.

With 325 applicants for 37 spots—joining five Princeton graduate students—there was tremendous interest in the inaugural event, proposed by the co-directors of the program to address a serious inequity in the profession of philosophy. In their proposal, Camp, Harman, and North cite a New York Times opinion piece by Sally Haslanger, in which Haslanger says that less than 30 percent of 2009 philosophy doctorates in the United States went to women and that philosophy has the lowest percentage of women Ph.D.s among all humanities fields, and lower than many fields of science, leading to a loss of these women—or their best work—which is “a serious loss for the profession.”

Addressing this issue facing women in philosophy, the August workshop brought together women graduate students from a range of schools, interests, and stages of their Ph.D. programs with 11 women faculty mentors for three days of substantive philosophical discussion and professional advice. The three days included seven paper sessions, with two student commentators each, followed by a lengthy open discussion forum. Paper topics included: epistemology and philosophy of mind, political philosophy, ancient philosophy and philosophy of science, moral philosophy, philosophy of mathematics, metaphysics, and philosophy of language.

Here is what some of the graduate participants had to say:

“I felt like I was part of something really special. And I gained confidence in my own abilities.”

“It was so wonderful to be in a room full of women philosophers, not just sharing our experiences about what it’s like to be a woman in philosophy, but actually doing philosophy. The workshop gave me the confidence to feel like I could make it in this profession.”

“I completely lost my fear of public speaking after the workshop. I can’t overstate the effects it has had on me.”

“Simply the best time I’ve had doing philosophy, ever. And the mentoring sessions were not only useful, but offered comfort in that they provided both concrete suggestions and a variety of approaches. Most of all, it was just thrilling to be around such an amazing community of women philosophers.”

From left, Workshop directors Jill North, Elisabeth Camp, and Elizabeth Harman
In addition to the three directors, the eight faculty mentors at the workshop were Karen Bennett (Cornell), Ruth Chang (Rutgers), Jennifer Lackey (Northwestern), Sarah-Jane Leslie (Princeton), Ishani Maitra (Michigan), Jennifer Uleman (State University of New York–Purchase), Katja Vogt (Columbia), and Susan Wolf (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill).

The workshop’s advice sessions included getting the most out of graduate school, writing a dissertation, publishing, presenting and participating at conferences, preparing for and going on the job market, teaching, starting a tenure-track job, and balancing work with the rest of life. Faculty mentors shared personal anecdotes and held a general question-and-answer period.

At the final lunch, many students volunteered that the workshop had changed their outlook on the profession and secured their belief that they could belong and thrive in this work. Several emailed us to say their papers were accepted at conferences or into journals, or that they had taken concrete steps to help cultivate a more inclusive culture at their home departments. Moreover, although this was not one of our anticipated aims, several of the mentors reported that they were also energized and motivated by the workshop.

The sponsors have committed to funding two future workshops at Princeton, in 2016 and 2018. Information about the next workshop will be available in fall 2015. These workshops will accommodate 35 graduate student participants and 10 faculty mentors and follow a comparable structure. All told, the three workshops will reach more than 100 graduate student women in philosophy across five years.
In a conversation peppered with humor and warmth, Elena Kagan, an associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and a member of Princeton’s Class of 1981, offered insights into her time at the University, the workings of the court, and her legal philosophy on Thursday, November 20, in Richardson Auditorium.

Kagan, who said she was returning to campus for the first time since her 25th reunion, engaged in a discussion with President Christopher L. Eisgruber, a noted constitutional scholar, before answering questions from students and other members of the audience. The event, with around 750 people in attendance, was the highlight of a day of activities for Kagan on campus, and was sponsored by the University Center for Human Values and the Public Lecture Series.

Asked by Eisgruber to recall her time at Princeton, Kagan emphasized the generosity of the faculty with their time, the importance of extracurricular activities to her experience, and the lifelong friendships she formed.

“I just thought this was the greatest place,” said Kagan, who majored in history. “I feel very, very warmly about it and warmly about all it did for me.”

“Did it ever occur to you while you were here that you might want to be a Supreme Court justice?” Eisgruber asked.

“No, I didn’t really have that thought,” Kagan said, drawing laughter from the audience.
Following her time at Princeton, Kagan received an M.Phil. from the University of Oxford in 1983 and a J.D. from Harvard Law School in 1986. Between 2003 and 2009, she served as the dean of Harvard Law School. In 2009, President Barack Obama nominated her as the solicitor general of the United States. After serving in that role for a year, the president nominated her as an associate justice of the Supreme Court on May 10, 2010. She took her seat on August 7, 2010.

In response to a question from Eisgruber about her judicial philosophy, Kagan said she doesn’t think of herself as “a grand philosopher.” “I think of myself as having views about how the law is done best, about constitutional interpretation, about statutory interpretation,” Kagan said. “You bring those views to the table every time you engage with a case with a particular set of issues and a particular set of facts.”

Eisgruber asked how Kagan approaches the Constitution’s equal protection and due process clauses.

While some parts of the Constitution are perfectly clear, the equal protection and due process clauses “speak in such abstract, even vague terms,” Kagan said. “When the Constitution says you’re entitled to the due process of law and you’re entitled to the equal protection of the law, trying to get that content and meaning — it can’t be done by just staring at the words.”

One approach is to try to figure out what the drafters of the Constitution thought the language meant, Kagan said. But, she said, that leads to untenable results. “I myself am a big precedent person. I’m kind of what some people call a common-law constitutionalist. I think really hard about how the way of interpreting the due process or equal protection clause has developed over time in case after case after case and try to think about the principles that have emerged in all those cases.”

With the conversation lasting approximately one hour, Kagan and Eisgruber covered topics from skeet shooting to a behind-the-scenes description of how the court works and the justices interact with each other to Kagan’s moral struggles with certain cases, citing one that had to do with violent video games. The conversation concluded with a question-and-answer session with the audience, where Kagan addressed matters ranging from the influence of international legal decisions on the court, the frustration of being on the losing side of a case, to whether justices pay attention to what academics write about the court. →
Graduates, undergraduates, and faculty members from across disciplines gathered March 28 for the “Workshop on Feminist Theory and Practice in Academia,” organized under the auspices of the University Center for Human Values and the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies. The workshop convened 10 panelists from different disciplines and stages of their academic careers to discuss—over the course of one keynote speech and three panels—recent developments in feminist theory, practicing feminism(s) within academic settings, and the relationship of feminism to intersectional methodologies.

The energy and intensity of engagement from panelists and audience members demonstrated that there is tremendous interest in feminist theory. Participants found it to be a “provocative and energizing” experience that generated an “abundance of productive discussion” in the following days and weeks, particularly about practices and resources to use within the classroom, applications of feminist theory to other dimensions of identity-based marginalization, and extensions of feminist theory beyond academia.

Nancy Hirschmann (political science, University of Pennsylvania) delivered the keynote address and focused on the continued sexual division of labor within academia. She showed, for example, how university child-care policies, student evaluations, and the gendered distribution of university service positions all impede women’s academic careers.

Members of the first panel considered resources available to scholars who endeavor to practice feminism as colleagues, academics, teachers, and students—and the challenges that these scholars face. Linda Martín Alcoff (philosophy, CUNY Graduate Center/Hunter College) argued that feminist
philosophers must retain their “diagnostic impulses” as their work enters mainstream philosophy, by continuing to demonstrate philosophy’s “constitutive dialectic with its social context.” Elizabeth Harman (philosophy, Princeton) and Sukaina Hirji (philosophy, Princeton graduate student) offered concrete practices for supporting women within the discipline, including mentoring, networking events, reading groups, doing philosophy about philosophy, and refusing to police the boundaries of “real philosophy.”

Members of the second panel considered feminist theory within and without institutions. Imani Perry (Center for African American Studies, Princeton) described the challenges that neoliberalism—particularly the tendency to imagine self-creation in terms of market logics—poses for feminist thought. Diane Rizzo (McGraw Center, Princeton) highlighted how same-sex marriage cases before courts have drawn their impetus from feminist jurisprudence, but have culminated in judicial decisions devoid of feminist insights. Shatema Threadcraft (political science, Rutgers) suggested two ways of thinking about the policing of black bodies, and in particular black female bodies, in the United States: racialized state failure (the lack of security available to black Americans) and “necropolitics” (strategies that actively entrench black bodies in conditions of life that resemble “death-worlds”).

Members of the third panel considered feminism in history and practice. Amy Dru Stanley (LSR fellow) argued that histories of capitalism overlook the ways in which women and relations of sex lay at the heart of the development of American finance. Claire Lyness (politics graduate student, University of California–Santa Cruz) and Brittney Edmonds (English, Princeton graduate student) discussed the opportunities and challenges that the resurgence of cultural feminism poses for academic feminist theory.
CO-SPONSORED EVENTS

AUGUST 21–24
Networking and Mentoring Workshop for Graduate Women in Philosophy
Co-sponsored by Princeton’s Council of the Humanities, Department of Philosophy, and the Office of the Provost; Rutgers University; Cornell University; and the Marc Sanders Foundation

SEPTEMBER 12–13
Globalization and the Social Sciences Symposium
Co-sponsored by the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies

SEPTEMBER 12–13
“Acts of Comparison: Meaning and Methodology in Comparative Thinking”
Co-sponsored by the Department of English, the Department of Comparative Literature, and the Program in European Cultural Studies

SEPTEMBER 19–20
“Garberfest”: An Early Modern Philosophy Conference in Honor of Daniel Garber
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy, the Council of the Humanities, the Program in History of Science, and the Office of the Dean of the Faculty

OCTOBER 24–26
Workshop on Plotinus
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy, the Department of Classics, the Center for the Study of Religion, the Council of the Humanities, and the Seeger Center for Hellenic Studies

NOVEMBER 14
French Materialist Feminism
Co-sponsored by the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies, the Department of French and Italian, and the Department of Sociology

NOVEMBER 15
Varieties of Normativity Workshop
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy

NOVEMBER 17
Political Dissent, Digital Media, and Futures of Academic Freedom: An Evening with Steven Salaita
Co-sponsored by the Princeton Committee on Palestine, Program in American Studies, and the Council of the Humanities

DECEMBER 6–7
Classical Philosophy Colloquium
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy

FEBRUARY 17
Gareth Williams: Human Rights and Democracy in Latin America
Co-sponsored by the Department of Spanish and Portuguese Languages and Cultures

FEBRUARY 27–28
“René Char, Poetry and War”: A Colloquium at Princeton University
Co-sponsored by the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, the Department of French and Italian, the Department of English, the Department of Comparative Literature, the Council of the Humanities, and the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies

FEBRUARY 28–MARCH 1
Problem Promises Workshop
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy

MARCH 11
Tinghir-Jerusalem Film Screening
Co-sponsored by the Department of Comparative Literature

MARCH 26
The Overnighters—Screening and discussion with the director
Co-sponsored by the Department of Sociology, the Center for the Study of Religion, the Council of the Humanities, the Lewis Center for the Arts, the Princeton Environmental Film Festival, and the Program in American Studies

MARCH 27
Digital Humanities and Teaching Workshop
Co-sponsored by the Center for Digital Humanities

MARCH 27–28
American Studies Conference
Co-sponsored by the Program in American Studies, Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies, Department of History, and the Department of English

MARCH 28
Workshop on Feminist Theory and Practice in Academia
Co-sponsored by the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies
APRIL 3–4
“The Long Aftermath of Slavery: Emancipation and Reparations Struggles in the United States and the Caribbean”
Co-sponsored by the Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Historical Studies

APRIL 9–10
Frames: Jewish Culture and the Comic Book
Co-sponsored by the Department of French and Italian

APRIL 10–11
Princeton Graduate Conference in Political Theory
Co-sponsored by the Department of Politics, Dean of the Graduate School

APRIL 10–11
The Pedagogy of Images: Depicting Communism for Children
Co-sponsored by the Firestone Library, the Council of the Humanities, the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, the Program in European Cultural Studies, and the Program in Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies

APRIL 11
Princeton Graduate Philosophy Conference
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy

APRIL 17–18
“The English Legal Imaginary, 1500–1700: A Princeton Conference on Early Modern Law, Politics, and Literature”
Co-sponsored by the Department of English, the Department of Comparative Literature, the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies, the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies, the Program in Law and Public Affairs, and the Council of the Humanities

APRIL 23–24
“Wars of Religion—Past and Present: An International and Interdisciplinary Conference”
Co-sponsored by the Council of the Humanities, the Program in European Cultural Studies, the Program in Contemporary European Politics and Society, the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies, and the Princeton Center for the Study of Religion

APRIL 28
“Sea Changes: A Conversation with Ruth Ozeki and Chang-rae Lee”
Co-sponsored by the Department of English, the Department of Comparative Literature, the Program in American Studies, Jaquelyne Hata Alexander ‘84 P14 Fund for Japanese American Studies, the Lewis Center for the Arts, Princeton Environmental Institute, the Council of the Humanities, and the Fund for Canadian Studies

MAY 2
Princeton-Penn-Columbia Graduate Conference in the History of Philosophy
Co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy

MAY 8–9
Princeton Workshop on Social Choice and Public Economics

MAY 18–19
Workshop on Plato’s Statesman
Co-sponsored by the Department of Classical Philosophy; the Seeger Center for Hellenic Studies, with the support of the Stanley J. Seeger Hellenic Fund; the Russell B. Newton Faculty Support Fund; and the Council of the Humanities

FALL 2014–SPRING 2015
The Center helped sponsor these ongoing activities:

- Digital Humanities Initiative
- Princeton Workshop on Normative Philosophy, co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy
- Interdisciplinary Ethnography Workshop, co-sponsored by the Departments of Sociology, Anthropology, and Religion; and the Princeton-Mellon Initiative in Architecture, Urbanism, and the Humanities; Program in American Studies; and the Center for the Study of Religion
- Minorities and Philosophy (MAP), co-sponsored by the Department of Philosophy
- Renaissance Studies Colloquium, co-sponsored by the Department of English
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.

Kim Lane Scheppele, Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Sociology and International Affairs in the Woodrow Wilson School and the University Center for Human Values, stepped down as director of LAPA, completing 10 years of service. Paul Frymer is the new director.
2014–15 LAPA FELLOWS

JONATHAN HAFETZ
Visiting Associate Research Scholar
Seton Hall Law School

TURKULER ISIKSEL
Visiting Associate Research Scholar
LAPA/Perkins Fellow
Columbia University

DAVID LAW
Visiting Research Scholar
Washington University in St. Louis

MICHELLE MCKINLEY
Visiting Research Scholar
University of Oregon Law School

JAMES WHITMAN
Visiting Research Scholar
Yale Law School
**Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Professors for Distinguished Teaching**

This visiting professorship was established as part of Princeton’s 250th anniversary commemoration to recognize faculty members at other institutions who have distinguished themselves as undergraduate instructors. The Center has hosted 15 outstanding scholar-teachers in this capacity.*

**2000–01**
Melissa S. Williams, University of Toronto

**2001–02**
J. Donald Moon, Wesleyan University

**2002–03**
J. B. Schneewind, Johns Hopkins University

**2003–04**
James Tatum, Dartmouth College

**2004–05**
Dale Jamieson, New York University

**2005–06**
Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, Dartmouth College

**2006–07**
Jonathan Haidt, University of Virginia

**2007–08**
Don Marquis, University of Kansas

**2008–09**
Lawrie Balfour, University of Virginia

**2009–10**
Fania Oz-Salzberger, Haifa University and Monash University

**2010–11**
John Seery, Pomona College

**2011–12**
Larry Temkin, Rutgers University

**2012–13**
Peter Brooks, Princeton University

**2013–14**
Quentin Skinner, Queen Mary, University of London

**2014–15**
Dan Edelstein, Stanford University

**Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Faculty Fellows**

LSR Fellows devote an academic year in residence at the Center to research and writing about topics involving human values in public and private life, while contributing to a weekly fellows’ seminar to discuss work in progress and participating in the Center’s lectures and colloquia. All of the following were LSR fellows, unless otherwise noted.*

**1991–92**
C. Daniel Batson, University of Kansas

Kristen Renwick Monroe, University of California–Irvine

Mary Lyndon Shanley, Vassar College (Ira W. DeCamp Visiting Fellow)

**1992–93**
Julia Driver, Brooklyn College–City University of New York

J. Peter Euben, University of California–Santa Cruz (Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

Samuel Freeman, University of Pennsylvania

Frances M. Kamm, New York University

**1993–94**
C.A.J. Coady, University of Melbourne (Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

Peter de Marneffe, Arizona State University

Alan C. Houston, University of California–San Diego

Thomas W. Pogge, Columbia University

Debra Satz, Stanford University

**1994–95**
Daniel Bell, Canada SSHRC Research Fellow

Chris Bobonich, University of Chicago

Hilary Bok, Pomona College

Samuel Fleischacker, Williams College

Kent Greenawalt, Columbia Law School

Stephen J. Macedo, Syracuse University (Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

Yael Tamir, Tel-Aviv University

**1995–96**
Arthur Appelbaum, Harvard University (Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

Christine Korsgaard, Harvard University

Avishai Margalit, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Arthur Ripstein, University of Toronto

Jeff Spinner-Halev, University of Nebraska–Lincoln

Michael Thompson, University of Pittsburgh

**1996–97**
Neera K. Badhwar, University of Oklahoma

Robert Gooding-Williams, Amherst College

Casey R. Haskins, Purchase College, State University of New York

David Heyd, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Donald Ray Morrison, Rice University

Iris Marion Young, University of Pittsburgh

**1997–98**
Sarah Barringer Gordon, University of Pennsylvania Law School

Jodi Halpern, University of California–Los Angeles (Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

John Kleinig, College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York

Bernard Regenster, Brown University

John Skrentny, University of Pennsylvania

Dana Villa, Amherst College

**1998–99**
André du Toit, University of Cape Town (Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

Claire O. Finkelstein, University of California–Berkeley

Ruth Gavison, Hebrew University in Jerusalem

Richard Moran, Harvard University

Connie S. Rosati, University of California–Davis

Barry S. Strauss, Cornell University

Daniel M. Weinstock, Université de Montréal (also Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

**1999–2000**
Rachel Barney, University of Chicago

Natalie Brender, Wesleyan University

Simone Chambers, University of Colorado

Ruth Chang, Rutgers University

John M. Doris, University of California–Santa Cruz (also Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

Simeon O. Ilesanmi, Wake Forest University

Alan J. Weisbard, University of Wisconsin Law Schools (also Fellow in Ethics and Public Affairs)

**2000–01**
G. Scott Davis, University of Richmond

Pablo De Greiff, State University of New York–Buffalo

Logi Gunnarsson, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin

Dale Jamieson, Carleton College

Glen Newey, University of Sussex

Jonathan Riley, Tulane University

Heda Šegvić, University of Pittsburgh

Joan C. Tronto, Hunter College and Graduate Center, City University of New York

Leif Wenar, University of Sheffield

* Please note: University affiliations are at the time of appointment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001–02</td>
<td>Colin Bird, University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Blake, Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judith Butler, University of California–Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Gubar, Indiana University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Patten, McGill University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Taylor, Tufts University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gonda Van Steen, University of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niza Yanay, Ben Gurion University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td>R. Bruce Hitchner, University of Dayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duncan Ivison, University of Sydney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Kelsay, Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael S. Kochin, Tel Aviv University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arlene W. Saxonhouse, University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William E. Scheuerman, University of Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tracy B. Strong, University of California–San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Wall, Kansas State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roslyn Weiss, Lehigh University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>Kate Abramson, University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriela Carone, University of Colorado–Boulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joy Connolly, Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice Crary, New School University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnieszka Jaworska, Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff McMahan, Rutgers University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Urban Walker, Arizona State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>Justin D'Arms, Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Gardiner, University of Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Jacobson, Bowling Green State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachana Kamtekar, University of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Lape, University of California–Irvine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanjay Reddy, Barnard College, Columbia University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Reich, Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Wright, journalist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–06</td>
<td>Anne Eaton, University of Illinois–Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Guyer, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angelika Krebs, University of Basel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Mallon, University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Oberdiek, Rutgers University School of Law–Camden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tommie Shelby, Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–07</td>
<td>Jill Frank, University of South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Glickman, University of South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Harman, New York University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nadeem Hussain, Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rahul Kumar, Queens University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heidi Maibom, Carleton University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie Mayerfeld, University of Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathias Risse, Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–08</td>
<td>Arash Abizadeh, McGill University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Evans, New York University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Kolber, University of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Norton, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aidan O’Neill, Queen’s Counsel, Edinburgh and London (also Program in Law and Public Affairs Fellow)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corey Robin, Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miranda Spieler, University of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nadia Urbinati, Columbia University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09</td>
<td>Leland de la Durantaye, Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ioannis D. Evriginis, Tufts University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Lefkowitz, University of North Carolina–Greensboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Lovett, Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>José Luis Martí, Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sigrún Svavarðsdóttir, Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey K. Tulis, University of Texas–Austin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–10</td>
<td>David Benatar, University of Cape Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selim Berker, Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyla Ebels-Duggan, Northwestern University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Hirschmann, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andreas Kalyvas, New School for Social Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian List, London School of Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–11</td>
<td>Corey Brettschneider, Brown University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Christiano, University of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerry Mackie, University of California–San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adrienne M. Martin, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Mulgan, University of St. Andrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleen Murphy, Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Quong, University of Manchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–12</td>
<td>Ben Bradley, Syracuse University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emily Brady, University of Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pablo Gilabert, Concordia University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinch Hoekstra, University of California–Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adina Roskies, Dartmouth College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Schafer, University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Sher, Rice University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laurie Shrage, Florida International University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–13</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ashford, University of St. Andrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonali Chakravarti, Wesleyan University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas G. Denery II, Bowdoin College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberly Ferzan, Rutgers School of Law–Camden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Heathwood, University of Colorado–Boulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennett Helm, Franklin &amp; Marshall College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Otsuka, University College London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry S. Richardson, Georgetown University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Voorhoeve, London School of Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–14</td>
<td>John Brunero, University of Missouri in St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Ciepley, University of Denver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paulina Ochoa Espejo, Yale University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaim Gans, Tel Aviv University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter A. Graham, University of Massachusetts–Amherst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waheed Hussain, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan James, Birkbeck College, University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Smith, Washington and Lee University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–15</td>
<td>Louis-Philippe Hodgson, York University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hallie Liberto, University of Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alison McQueen, Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoltan Miklosi, Central European University, Budapest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Plunkett, Dartmouth College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucas Stanczyk, Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Dru Stanley, University of Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Street, New York University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alec Walen, Rutgers University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1990
The University Center for Human Values is established through a gift from Laurance S. Rockefeller ’32. Amy Gutmann becomes inaugural director of the Center.

Center administration with first group of visitors, left to right, Daniel C. Batson (LSR), Helen Nissenbaum (Associate Director), Kristen Monroe (LSR), Amy Gutmann (Director), and Molly Shanley (DeCamp).

1991
Whitehall Foundation gift establishes the James A. Moffett ’29 Lectures in Ethics.

1992
Dennis Thompson presents the inaugural Moffett Lecture, “Mediated Corruption: Reflections on the Keating Five.”

1993
Marx Hall, the Center’s home, opens.

1995
George Kateb (right) becomes Center director.
Justice Antonin Scalia delivers Tanner Lectures.

The Center has sponsored the Tanner Lectures on Human Values since 1991 and has produced publications based on the lectures.

Charles Taylor, professor of philosophy and political science at McGill University, gives the Center’s inaugural lecture, titled “The Politics of Recognition.”
1997
The Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Professorship for Distinguished Teaching is established as part of the University’s 250th anniversary teaching initiative.

Amy Gutmann assumes Center directorship again.

1998
Peter Singer joins the faculty as the Ira W. DeCamp Professor of Bioethics.

1999
An estimated 800 people attend the Moffett Roundtable Discussion on “Mind, Faith, and Spirit,” in Richardson Auditorium, moderated by Bill Moyers.

Support from Bert Kerstetter ’66 helps establish the Human Values Forum.

Stephen Macedo is appointed Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Politics and the University Center for Human Values.

2000
UCHV celebrates its 10th anniversary.

2001
Stephen Macedo (right) becomes Center director.
Christopher L. Eisgruber is appointed Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Public Affairs in the Woodrow Wilson School and the University Center for Human Values.

2002
Gift establishes the Harold T. Shapiro Postdoctoral Fellowship in Bioethics.
2004
Philip Pettit is appointed Laurance S. Rockefeller University Professor of Politics and the University Center for Human Values.

2005
Support from Bert Kerstetter ’66 (right) helps establish the UCHV Film Forum, directed by Erika Kiss (left).

2006
Kim Lane Schepple is appointed Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Sociology and International Affairs and the University Center for Human Values.

2007
Elizabeth Harman is appointed associate professor of philosophy and the University Center for Human Values.

2009
Charles Beitz becomes Center director.

2014 Princeton Pre-read

Susan Wolf delivers Tanner Lectures, “Meaning in Life and Why It Matters.”
2009
Charles Beitz becomes Center director.

2010
The History of Political Thought Project, directed by Jan-Werner Müller (below left) is established.
Juergen Habermas (below right) delivers keynote lecture, “The Utopian Surplus of Human Rights,” as part of the Democracy and Human Values workshop organized by Philip Pettit.

“Open Hearts, Open Minds” conference brings more than 350 people to campus to discuss the ethical dimensions of the abortion debate.
Marc Fleurbaey is appointed Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Public Affairs and the University Center for Human Values.

2011
The Center establishes the Program in Values and Public Life; Melissa Lane is appointed inaugural director.

2012
The first cohort of Values and Public Policy postdocs, who are jointly appointed with the Woodrow Wilson School, arrives on campus.

2014
UCHV hosts a conversation with Justice Elena Kagan and Princeton President Christopher L. Eisgruber.

Johann Frick is appointed assistant professor of philosophy and the University Center for Human Values.
Anna Stilz takes over as director of the VPL program.

2015
The Center celebrates its 25th anniversary with a conference on “Justice and Injustice in Our Time.”
## VALUES COUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tanner Lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Other talks sponsored by the Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Directors of the Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Faculty Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Graduate Prize Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Research Associates in Values and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Harold T. Shapiro Postdoctoral Fellows in Bioethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Participants in the Program in Values and Public Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Visiting Professors for Distinguished Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR
PROGRAM IN VALUES AND PUBLIC LIFE

ANNA STILZ
Associate Professor of Politics

My first year as director of the Values and Public Life (VPL) certificate program has been an exciting and gratifying one. Eighteen seniors—six more than last year—graduated with the certificate in Values and Public Life in June.

The VPL program was launched in 2010-11 by my predecessor, Melissa Lane, as a way of sharing the remarkable resources of the University Center for Human Values with the undergraduate community here at Princeton. Our students come from a wide range of disciplines, including the Woodrow Wilson School and the departments of politics and philosophy, as well as many students from the natural sciences. Program requirements include two core courses, one in moral philosophy and a choice of one of four options in political theory; a junior/senior VPL seminar in normative issues; and two thematic courses in students’ own particular area of interest, such as political justice, climate change, or religion and ethics.

Two new VPL seminars were offered this year, in addition to “Explaining Values,” “Ethics and Public Health,” and “Architecture and Democracy,” which were offered again. I taught “The Ethics of Borders and Migration,” which focused on current debates about boundaries and immigration through the lens of current issues like guest workers, irregular migrants, refugees, and brain drain. Johann Frick taught the other new seminar, “Bioethics: Clinical and Population-Level,” which adds to our bioethics-related offerings.

Academic requirements aside, the program offers extracurricular events that encourage students to integrate a values perspective into areas outside of their studies, both through their career choices and other opportunities for engagement. Every year the program sponsors a field trip on the last day of the fall semester, and this year’s field trip was to New York City. The purpose of the annual VPL field trip is for students to hear from people who work in normatively significant areas of public life talk about their work and its importance. We try to give them a sense of a career trajectory that combines public service and a commitment to important moral issues. This year’s visits included Grand Street Settlement, the Council on Foreign Relations, and Bloomberg.

In the early part of the spring semester, VPL students had an opportunity to participate in a special trip to McCarter Theatre for a performance of Sizwe Banzi Is Dead, a play dramatizing the everyday challenges of life in apartheid South Africa. Prior to the show, students were joined by Kevin Place, McCarter’s directing assistant to the co-creator of the play, for a talk that covered
such issues as the original 1972 production of the play and its historical significance, how collaborators brought the play to life, and the sociopolitical context of the play, including information on life under apartheid.

The program also hosted both academic and career conversations with visitors, including Joe Stephens (investigative reporter for *The Washington Post* and lecturer in the Council of the Humanities and Ferris Professor of Journalism at Princeton), Alexander Guerrero (University of Pennsylvania), and Seth Lazar (Australian National University). Several of our students were able to attend a special dinner following Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan’s November conversation at Princeton, allowing them an opportunity to meet and talk with the justice, which they found to be a true highlight of the VPL experience.

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; informal coffee conversations at the student center’s café and finally the VPL Student Conference, which this year featured a panel discussion on “Race, Justice, and Criminal Punishment” with Glenn Martin (founder of JustLeadershipUSA and criminal justice reform advocate, who spent six years in New York state prisons), Omar Wasow (Princeton and co-founder of BlackPlanet.com) and Alec Walen (LSR visiting fellow). VPL seniors also presented their theses at the conference and several juniors gave short “elevator pitches” based on their junior independent work. Class Day celebrated the achievements of this year’s 18 VPL seniors, together with Center faculty, advisers, and students’ families.
I have relished the opportunity to consider questions of the ideal political regime and to examine the merits and pitfalls of democracy in particular. As a political theory concentrator, such questions have dominated many of the courses I have taken. My seminar within the Program in Values and Public Life, however, incorporated an element with which I was less familiar. “Architecture and Democracy,” led by Jan-Werner Müller, explored how democratic ideals can inform architecture, how architecture can positively or negatively influence the democratic process, and the standards that the built environment must fulfill to adequately facilitate a democratic process. The architecture question lent a concrete nature to my exploration of democratic political systems, in addition to an artistic element; because architecture is subject to constraints of feasibility, security, affordability, and aestheticism, it becomes a paradigmatic case of attempting to reconcile political ideals with realistic parameters.

We began the semester considering broader, more theoretical questions about the nature
of democratic architecture; for a building or urban space to be “democratic,” for example, must it contain certain architectural motifs that have a historical association with democratic practice, such as columns reminiscent of ancient Greece and Rome? Or can a building be democratic based on feelings it evokes of inclusiveness and openness? If the democratic nature of a building is determined by the reactions it produces in visitors, then its success at promoting democratic ideals could vary based on each subjective experience. Whether a democratic space can be accurately deemed so because democratic practice has occurred there, or conversely, whether the ability for democratic practice to ensue depends on the surrounding structural environment that facilitates it, remained key questions throughout spirited debates.

In order to ensure a common understanding amidst a diverse classroom, in which students’ specialties ranged from political theory to architecture to English, we spent a week acquainting ourselves with what are seen to be lynchpins of a democratic political system, and surveying different variations on the ideal, as well as versing ourselves in the history of democratic institutions.

The latter half of the course dealt more centrally with questions of architecture and urban planning, wherein political process plays a larger role than one might initially imagine. Efforts to gentrify and develop cities often come at the expense of current inhabitants, bringing into play questions of rights and the government’s role in protecting them. The design of common spaces, and efforts to memorialize events that affect entire communities, such as 9/11, introduce the trade-off of inclusiveness, expedience, and quality of result, in a realm where technical design expertise is indispensable and yet common use makes popular opinion appropriate, if its consideration is not a normative requirement.

Ultimately, the course raised questions with which I continue to wrestle, weeks after the semester concluded. How do we adjudicate between our desire to constantly beautify and improve our urban spaces while adequately attending to the rights of those who might be displaced by such noble efforts? How can we use a commonly recognizable visual language to express theoretical values that do not have an inherent aesthetic form? How can we understand the ways that the built environment shapes the activity that takes place therein? The importance of these questions became apparent when we consider the possibility of harnessing architectural prowess to make our political practice increasingly just and as we become able to more wholeheartedly embrace urban development when it is conducted within the scope of our values.

“... efforts to memorialize events that affect entire communities, such as 9/11, introduce the trade-off of inclusiveness, expedience, and quality of result, in a realm where technical design expertise is indispensable and yet common use makes popular opinion appropriate ...”

Students contemplated what institutions are essential to a democracy, considered architectural features sufficient to make a structure democratic, and then examined several cases of capital cities in light of standards for democratic urban planning, including Washington, Berlin, and Brasilia. Capital cities also bring to light issues that are not relevant for every city in which inhabitants seek to employ democracy as a means of governing themselves; a capital city’s unique duty to symbolize the ideals of a country elevates the standards it must meet to successfully convey democratic or other political values.

Jan-Werner Müller, Professor of Politics
Once dismissed as a fad, the new research methodologies grouped under the umbrella term “digital humanities” are capturing the interests of an increasingly large number of researchers. The broad and hopefully lasting appeal of this emergent field can be seen in the establishment this year of a Center for Digital Humanities (CDH) at Princeton. In collaboration with the CDH’s director, Meredith Martin, and associate director, Jean Bauer, I organized a one-day workshop in March on teaching and research in digital humanities. We brought four digital humanities pioneers to campus: Nicole Coleman (CESTA, Stanford University), Jo Guldi (history, Brown University), Matthew Jones (history of science, Columbia University), and Sean Takats (history/Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media, George Mason University).

In the morning session, each presenter shared examples of successful teaching modules that incorporate digital humanities. For instance, Guldi discussed how using the Google Ngram Viewer (https://books.google.com/ngrams) can lead students to discover research questions, based on the rise and fall of word frequencies; Jones described a course he co-teaches in which students learn how to code in Python with one instructor, while he asks them to think about what might be going in the “black boxes” of certain applications, and how this might affect their data.

In the afternoon session, presenters discussed their ongoing research projects.
Coleman presented an overview of the Stanford project “Mapping the Republic of Letters” (of which I am a co-principal investigator), and demonstrated the new visualization suite, Palladio (http://palladio.design-humanities.org/); Guldi gave an introduction to “Paper machines” (http://papermachines.org/), a topic modeling application that runs on Zotero; Takats described the work being done to maintain Zotero (https://www.zotero.org/), an open-source reference management system, as well as Omeka (http://chnm.gmu.edu/omeka/), a web publishing platform; and Bauer presented Project Quincy (http://projectquincy.org/), the network visualization and analysis software she developed.

While the presenters who attended the workshop have all managed large projects supported by grant money (a major funder of many projects is the Office of Digital Humanities in the National Endowment for the Humanities), the discussion also focused on the widespread availability of digital tools that can offer interesting results straight out of the box. Five to 10 years ago, if a researcher needed a piece of software to analyze her data, she usually had to build it; that is no longer the case. To be sure, there will always be a need for grant-funded tool-development, but researchers who are “digi-curious” can get involved in digital humanities without necessarily applying for grants or putting together a large team.

Digital Humanities (DH) are becoming increasingly visible and valued, both in the classroom and for research. This workshop brings together leading DH’ers to share their success stories, their failed experiments, and their vision of what a more digitized future might look like for the humanities.

**Session One:**
Teaching with DH
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
301 Marx Hall, Kerstetter Room

**Session Two:**
Doing Research in DH
3:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.
101 McCormick Hall

**Chair:**
Dan Edelstein,
Laurence S. Rockefeller Visiting Professor for Distinguished Teaching,
University Center for Human Values, Princeton University

**Speakers:**
Jean Bauer (Princeton University)
Nicole Coleman (Stanford University)
Jo Guldi (Brown University)
Matthew Jones (Columbia University)
Meredith Martin (Princeton University)
Sean Takats (George Mason University)

Friday, March 27, 2015

Sponsored by the University Center for Human Values and the Center for Digital Humanities
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.

EXPLAINING VALUES

PHI 380/CHV 380
Victoria McGeer

ARCHITECTURE AND DEMOCRACY

POL 403/CHV 403/ARC 405/GER 403/SOC 403/URB 403
Jan-Werner Müller

THE ETHICS OF BORDERS AND MIGRATION

POL 405/CHV 406
Anna Stilz

BIOETHICS: CLINICAL AND POPULATION-LEVEL

CHV 333/PHI 344
Johann Frick

ETHICS AND PUBLIC HEALTH

CHV 331/WWS 372
Jason Schwartz

FRESHMAN SEMINARS

MORAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL LIFE
John Cooper
Class of 1976 Freshman Seminar in Human Values

FAMILY, FRIENDS, AND GROUPS: THE ETHICS OF ASSOCIATION
Chiara Cordelli
Paul L. Miller ’41 Freshman Seminar in Human Values

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND INTERNATIONAL LAW
David Law
Kurt and Beatrice Gutmann Freshman Seminar in Human Values

CITIZENSHIP: LAW, CULTURE, AND SOCIETY
Michelle McKinley
Dean Eva Gossman Freshman Seminar in Human Values

VACCINATION AND SOCIETY: ETHICS, POLITICS, AND PUBLIC HEALTH
Jason Schwartz
University Center for Human Values Freshman Seminar

CAPITALISM, UTOPIA, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE
Marc Fleurbaey
Professor Amy Gutmann Freshman Seminar in Human Values

DESIGNING LIFE: THE ETHICS OF CREATION AND ITS CONTROL
Elizabeth Harman
University Center for Human Values Freshman Seminar (Anonymous)

THE POLITICS OF SEEING: THE FILMS OF THE FRENCH NEW WAVE
Natasha Lee
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

DEMOCRATIC THEORY
POL 306/PHI 360/CHV 306
Philip Pettit, Politics and University Center for Human Values

ETHICAL AND SCIENTIFIC ISSUES IN ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY
CHV 321/ENV 321/WWS 371
Peter Singer, University Center for Human Values
David S. Wilcove, Woodrow Wilson School

ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN A GLOBAL SOCIETY
CHV 472/POL 472
Chiara Cordelli, University Center for Human Values

ETHICS AND PUBLIC POLICY
WWS 370/POL 308/CHV 301
Keith Shaw, Princeton Writing Program

GREEK POLITICS IN PRACTICE AND THEORY
CLA 244/CHV 244/POL 337
Nino Luraghi, Classics

INTRODUCTION TO MORAL PHILOSOPHY
PHI 202/CHV 202
Michael Smith, Philosophy
Sebastian Köhler, Philosophy

NON-COGNITIVISM IN ETHICS
PHI 362/CHV 363
Sebastian Köhler, Philosophy

NORMATIVE ETHICS: ETHICS AND THE FUTURE
PHI 519/CHV 519
Johann Frick, Philosophy and University Center for Human Values

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
PHI 309/CHV 309/HUM 309
Jonathan Thakkar, Council of the Humanities and Philosophy

STOLEN YEARS: YOUTH UNDER THE NAZIS IN WORLD WAR II
COM 362/CHV 362/ECS 362/GSS 366
Froma Zeitlin, Classics

SYSTEMATIC ETHICS
PHI 524/CHV 522
Jonathan Dancy, Council of the Humanities and Philosophy

SYSTEMATIC ETHICS
PHI 307/CHV 311
Gilbert Harman, Philosophy

THE AGE OF RIGHTS: NATURE, ENLIGHTENMENT, AND REVOLUTION
CHV 350/HIS 357/POL 469
Dan Edelstein, University Center for Human Values

THE JUST SOCIETY
POL 307/CHV 307
Alan Patten, Politics

THE SOCIOLOGY OF LAW
SOC 405/CHV 405
Kim Lane Schepppele, Sociology, Woodrow Wilson School, and University Center for Human Values
The Film Forum convenes under the direction of Erika Kiss at the Rockefeller College Theater for a film screening followed by comments from Princeton faculty and lively discussion. The series is supported by a gift from Bert Kerstetter ’66 and is co-sponsored by the University Center for Human Values and Rockefeller College.

Fall 2014

NEW WAVES

SEPTEMBER 15
Morris Engel, Raymond Abrashkin, Ruth Orkin
*Intimate Lighting* (1965)

SEPTEMBER 22
Jean-Luc Godard
*Breathless* (1960)

SEPTEMBER 29
Ivan Passer
*Intimate Lighting* (1965)

OCTOBER 6
Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos
*The Shop on Main Street* (1965)

OCTOBER 13
Dusan Makavejev
*WR: Mysteries of the Organism* (1971)

OCTOBER 20
Gyula Gazdag
*A Hungarian Fairy Tale* (1987)

NOVEMBER 3
Lindsay Anderson
*If…* (1968)

NOVEMBER 10
Gyula Gazdag
*Stand Off* (1989)

NOVEMBER 17
Cristian Mungiu
*4 Months, 3 Weeks and 2 Days* (2007)

NOVEMBER 24
Nuri Bilge Ceylan
*Once Upon a Time* (2011)

DECEMBER 1
Juan José Campanella
*The Secret in Their Eyes* (2009)

DECEMBER 8
Asghar Farhadi
*A Separation* (2011)

Spring 2015

LIBERAL-FILM-EDUCATION

FEBRUARY 2
Wim Wenders
*Buena Vista Social Club* (1999)

FEBRUARY 9
Joel and Ethan Coen
*Inside Llewyn Davis* (2013)

FEBRUARY 16
Jean Renoir
*The Rules of the Game* (1939)

FEBRUARY 23
Roberto Rossellini
*Europe’51* (1952)

MARCH 2
Stanley Kubrick
*A Clockwork Orange* (1971)

MARCH 9
Werner Herzog
*The Enigma of Kaspar Hauser* (1974)

MARCH 23
Robert Mulligan
*To Kill a Mockingbird* (1962)

MARCH 30
Alfred Hitchcock
*The Birds* (1963)

APRIL 13
Benedek Fliegauf
*Just the Wind* (2012)

APRIL 20
Charles Chaplin
*The Great Dictator* (1940)

APRIL 27
György Pálfi
*Final Cut: Ladies and Gentlemen* (2012)
STUDENT PRIZES AND GRANTS

SENIOR THESIS PRIZE

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

CAMERON LANGFORD
Politics
“Epistemic Ecosystems: A Theory of Science Communications”

ELENA DI ROSA
Philosophy
“A Contemporary Theory of Responsibility: What Aristotle Can Teach Us”

ANALIESE IONSON
Anthropology
“Competing Discourses: Diabetes and the Narrative of First Nations Identity”

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.

WARDAH BARI ’16
RACHEL BRONHEIM ’15
ARIEL FUTTER ’16
JIEMIN WEI ’16
SAVANNAH MARQUARDT ’16

GRADUATE STUDENT TOP-UP PRIZES, 2015-16

The UCHV offers prizes to help attract graduate students to Princeton whose work explicitly focuses on ethics, political theory, and human values. In spring 2015, the following students were awarded these grants.

OLAOLUWATONI ALIMI
Religion

JOHN COLIN BRADLEY
Philosophy

GRACE CAREY
Anthropology

SHUK YING CHAN
Politics

ADAM KERN
Politics

JOSEPH MOORE
Philosophy

OWEN PHILLIPS
Classics

DAVID ROMNEY
East Asian Studies

MARGARITA ROSARIO
Comparative Literature

KATHARINA SCHMIDT
History

RAMINA SOTOUDEH
Sociology

JOHANN TROVIK
Politics

TAYLOR WINFIELD
Sociology

ARDEVAN YAGHOUBI
Politics

YUAN ZHANG
Philosophy

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY RESEARCH AND TRAVEL GRANTS

The University Center for Human Values, along with the Program in Political Philosophy, offers Political Philosophy Research and Travel grants, supported by a fund established by Amy Gutmann, former provost of the University and founding director of the University Center for Human Values. The following students received grants.

BENJAMIN BERNARD
History

ROBIN DEMBROFF
Philosophy

ERIN ISLO
Philosophy

JASON IULIANO
Politics

MADISON KILBRIDE
Philosophy

TREVOR LATIMER
Politics

TED LECHTERMAN
Politics

YENA LEE
Philosophy

MICHAELA MCSWEENEY
Philosophy

LUCIA RAFANELLI
Politics

DANIEL WODAK
Philosophy

SHORT MOVIE PRIZE

Sponsored by the Center, this award is given to the undergraduate who produces the best short film that addresses a given theme; the theme for 2014-15 was “Attachment.”

BEN GOODMAN ’17,
CAPTURE BONDING
(made in collaboration with his friend, Simon Gulergun)
The Human Values Forum 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.

Professor Johann Frick spoke to the Human Values Forum on April 6 about “Treatment vs. Prevention for AIDS and the Problem of Identified vs. Statistical Lives.” As a philosopher, Professor Frick provided a unique lens through which to consider real-life epidemics in situations of limited medical resources. His discussion touched upon both theoretical and practical considerations, and as such, the topic proved engaging to philosophy majors and pre-med students alike. Small table discussions with an expert in the field—on a topic that appeals to students of all academic backgrounds and interests—is characteristic of the HVF experience. This informal environment also gives students the opportunity to learn about the incredible research that Princeton professors are doing, as well as related courses that they teach. Many HVF members have expressed interest in taking Professor Frick’s bioethics seminar (CHV 333) that was offered for the first time this spring.
HUMAN VALUES FORUM

With support from Bert Kerstetter ’66, the Human Values Forum provides an opportunity for approximately 50 undergraduates, faculty members, graduate students, and faculty visitors 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

President: Adam Tcharni ’15
Vice President: Elena Di Rosa ’15
Vice President: Jenna Spitzer ’16

EVENTS

SEPTEMBER 29
Should We Legalize Physician-Assisted Suicide?
Peter Singer

OCTOBER 6
Perfecting Distributive Justice
John Oberdiek

OCTOBER 13
What Role Is There for Platonic Justice Today?
Johnny Thakkar

NOVEMBER 3
Equality
Sherif Girgis

NOVEMBER 10
Documentary: Cowspiracy: The Sustainability Secret
Kip Anderson and Keegan Kuhn

NOVEMBER 17
Why Do We Punish? Confronting the Myth of Folk Retributivism
Victoria McGeer

DECEMBER 1
The History of Statelessness, Human Rights, and Political Agency
Mira Siegelberg

DECEMBER 8
The Ethics of Singling Out
Melissa Lane

FEBRUARY 9
Aristotle and Intuitions About Moral Character
Brennan McDavid

FEBRUARY 16
Territorial Expulsion and Return
Anna Stilz

FEBRUARY 23
Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt: A Balanced Retributive Account
Alec Walen

MARCH 9
When Did Rights Become Rights? Examining Their Enlightenment Roots
Dan Edelstein

MARCH 23
Ethics and Social Psychology
Simon Cullen

MARCH 30
Conscientious Politics and Israel’s Moral Dilemmas
Uriel Abulof

APRIL 6
Treatment vs. Prevention for AIDS and the Problem of Identified vs. Statistical Lives
Johann Frick

APRIL 14
Causal Inference and Happiness
Howard Wainer

APRIL 20
Inequality in Education
Daniel Wodak and Sukaina Hirji

APRIL 27
Misinformation and Sexual Consent
Hallie Liberto

MAY 4
International Distributive Justice and the Moral Arbitrariness of Birthplace
Louis-Philippe Hodgson
SUPPORTING RESEARCH
The UCHV 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 illustrate 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.
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.

LOUIS-PHILIPPE HODGSON
My year at the Center was exceptionally stimulating and fruitful in all respects. I was able to complete two self-standing papers: one asking what liberals should make of the kind of social ideal defended by G. A. Cohen in his later work, and another arguing that some of the most prominent theories of international justice are inadequate because they ignore the relevance of reproductive choices to questions of distributive justice. I made substantial progress on a new project concerning the place that questions of legitimacy should occupy in political theorizing. A first installment, concerning the respective merits of Lockean and Kantian views of legitimacy, was the subject of my LSR seminar presentation in April. I also presented works in progress at Columbia University and at Loyola Law School. And, of course, I attended more lectures, seminars, and workshops than I would have antecedently thought possible. I am deeply grateful to the Center’s wonderfully helpful staff, to its stellar faculty, and to the splendid group of fellows for the extraordinarily congenial and inspiring atmosphere they created, a testimony to which is that I leave Princeton with ideas for new projects that I expect will fuel my research for years to come.

HALLIE LIBERTO
During my time at the UCHV, I wrote a series of three papers on the topic of problematic promises. I investigated immoral promises, incompatible promises, promises made to future people (or to existing people, but to be received in the future), and the special moral concerns related to sexual promises. The last two of these inquiries culminated in the papers, “Promises and the Backward Reach of Uptake” and “The Moral Problem with Monogamy Promises.” As a result of examining so many problematic cases of promising, I concluded that no single type of obligation, or theory of promissory obligation, can explain the moral features at the heart of every successful and binding promise. I argue for this conclusion in “Promissory Obligation: Against a Unified Account”—a paper I wrote while at the Center, presented in the fellows’ seminar, and am contributing to Oxford Studies in Normative Ethics. This paper, and all of the others, benefited immeasurably from the comments and criticisms of Center faculty and the other LSR Fellows. Due to the generous support of the UCHV and the philosophy department, and the tremendous help of the Center’s staff, I held a workshop on my research topic in February and discussed problematic promises with many of the authors whose work has shaped the contemporary debate about promissory obligation. I am eager to maintain the friendships, work ethic, and the collaborative attitude that blossomed so naturally at the Center this year.
ALISON MCQUEEN

My UCHV fellowship has been very rewarding. In the fall, I revised a book manuscript provisionally titled *Political Realism in Apocalyptic Times* (under review), which explores how Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, and Hans Morgenthau responded to hopes and fears about the end of the world. I also completed a new paper, “Political Realism and the ‘Realist Tradition’,” that I presented at a workshop at Yale-NUS in Singapore. In the spring, I began work on a book project on the role of scriptural argument in Thomas Hobbes’ political works. I wrote and presented a paper that draws from this larger project at the fellows’ seminar. The feedback I have received on the paper and the larger project have sharpened both and pushed the book in a more ambitious direction, for which I’m very grateful. I also completed major revisions to a paper, “Hans Morgenthau and Nuclear Catastrophe: Lessons for the Climate Change Debates,” which I presented at Princeton’s Climate Futures Initiative and Cornell’s Reppy Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies. Throughout the year, I continued work on two projects that bring computer-assisted textual analysis to bear on the analysis of large corpora of historical texts from the medieval through early modern periods. Finally, I presented new and ongoing work on Hobbes at workshops at Columbia, Harvard, and New York University’s Remarque Institute (Kandersteg Seminar), and at a conference on “Wars of Religion: Past and Present,” organized by the Princeton Society of Fellows.

ZOLTAN MIKLOSI

Throughout the year, I have worked on papers loosely connected to various aspects of egalitarianism. I finished two on the problem of global distributive justice that dissect various statist coercion-based arguments in favor of restrictions on the scope of distributive obligations. These papers argue that none of these attempts succeed in justifying scope restrictions. I produced a draft of a paper on different versions of relational egalitarianism developed in recent years. The paper attempts to show that not all of these versions can be seen as genuine rivals of the distributive conception, and that versions that pose a fundamental challenge to the distributive view are the least plausible ones. I presented a paper tentatively titled “Basic Equality” at the fellows’ lunchtime seminar. In addition, I have written a short piece on the application of the hypothetical insurance approach under non-ideal circumstances, and I did extensive research and (very) early drafts for a project that explores the possibility of grounding equal political rights in our natural duty to comply with and contribute to the operation of just social and political institutions. I also greatly benefited from participating in the Political Philosophy Colloquium and other UCHV lectures. I have been greatly helped by the friendly and welcoming environment of the UCHV and its outstanding director and staff.

DAVID PLUNKETT

During my year at the UCHV, I wrote a long paper called “The Role of Metalinguistic Negotiation in Philosophical Disputes and How It Matters for Thinking About the Methodology of Philosophy,” which was the focus of my research in the fall. In the spring, I wrote a closely connected paper called “The Metalinguistic Dimension of the Dispute Over Legal Positivism.” I also did substantial work on five other papers throughout the academic year: “Justice, Non-Human Animals, and the Methodology of Political Philosophy” (which I presented at the UCHV seminar in the fall), “Law, Morality, and Everything Else” (co-authored with Scott Shapiro), “Quasi-Expressivism about Statements of Law: A Hartian Theory” (co-authored with Stephen Finlay), “Conceptual History, Conceptual Ethics, and The Aims of Inquiry: A Framework for Thinking About The Relevance of Conceptual History/Genealogy to Normative Inquiry,” and “Dispositional Theories of Normative Facts and the Nature of Idealization: A Humean Approach.” I co-organized a one-day workshop in the fall, “The Varieties of Normativity,” that brought together philosophers from America, Australia, and Britain; it was co-sponsored by the UCHV, the philosophy department, and the Collaborative Research Network in Analytic Philosophy. This year has been one of the most intellectually rewarding years of my life. I have particularly enjoyed the opportunity to talk with the other LSR fellows and faculty members in both the philosophy and politics departments. I would like to thank everyone involved with the UCHV for making this a great year.
LUCAS STANCZYK
Having an opportunity to spend a year at the Center has been an extraordinary privilege. Thanks to my time here, I was able to work out important remaining pieces of my book manuscript on justice in production. In addition, I wrote drafts of four new papers on various aspects of equality. One essay ventures into new territory and defends a technical thesis about inequality and development. A second essay develops a new conception of the significance of the basic structure of society for liberal political philosophy. A third essay develops a critique of ideas of fair equality of opportunity. In a fourth essay, I was able to bring together a series of claims about equality that will form the core of my second book project. I presented this essay in the fellows’ seminar and received a wealth of useful feedback. The conversations have continued long after the seminar, not only with fellows, but with Princeton faculty, graduate students, and visiting speakers. My thinking on each of these matters has improved greatly as a result. I would like to thank the Center and all of the wonderful people here for an immensely stimulating and rewarding year.

AMY DRU STANLEY
My time at the Center has been enormously provocative and enlightening. Interdisciplinary dialogue with theorists of human rights, ethics, and the history of political thought has deepened my understanding of my own project. My research project is a book provisionally titled From Slave Emancipation to the Commerce Power: An American History of Human Rights (Harvard University Press, forthcoming.) At the Center, I presented parts of this project in the LSR seminar and its human rights conference in April. In addition, I finished a forthcoming article on commerce power and human rights for a collection on The New History of Capitalism. I gave a paper on history and feminism at a UCHV co-sponsored conference on feminist theory in academics, and I presented my work to the history department’s modern history workshop. I organized an interdisciplinary workshop on legal history and regularly attended LAPA and Davis seminars. My experience at the UCHV also offered a foundation for presenting my work both internationally and nationally, including a conference on the Crisis of Capitalism at the Free University of Berlin, a keynote address on Consent in Early America at the Oxford University Rothermere Center for American History (UK), and a presentation at University of Virginia law school. In March, I wrote The New York Times op-ed titled “The Forgotten Emancipation.” All in all, it has been a splendid experience to belong to the UCHV for the year and the Princeton community more broadly. I count myself lucky to have worked with such wonderful members of the faculty and staff.

SHARON STREET
I am deeply grateful for my year at the University Center for Human Values. My research goal was to get substantially underway with a book project on the epistemology of ethics, and the UCHV provided the ideal setting in which to do this. Thanks to the time dedicated to writing, I was able to finish two book chapters and make significant progress on three others. I presented a version of one chapter, “Meditation and Metaethics: Reasons to Pay Attention,” as a keynote address for a graduate student conference at the University of Connecticut. I gave versions of another chapter, “Constructivism in Ethics and the Problem of Attachment and Loss,” at several talks, including departmental colloquia at Berkeley, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, and UCLA. I also presented the latter chapter as work-in-progress at the LSR seminar, where I received invaluable feedback. These seminars were a highlight throughout the year, and I want to thank Chuck Beitz for creating an environment with a perfect combination of warm collegiality and searching criticism. I benefited greatly from the intellectual stimulation and companionship of the other LSR fellows, as well as the many Princeton faculty members, visitors, and postdoctoral fellows I got to know over the course of the year. Finally, I am grateful to the UCHV administrative staff for their expert support, friendliness, and for making the entire fellowship year run so smoothly.
ALEC WALEN
The Center is as intellectually vibrant a place to be as any I’ve known. I got to know, or know better, a number of Princeton scholars whose work engages with mine. Many of my co-fellows have taught me important things about moral and political philosophy. I have also managed to be reasonably productive in my core scholarly work. Specifically, I started the year by presenting, at the Monday lunch seminar, a paper called “The Restricting Claims Principle Revisited.” I received very helpful comments on it, and then sent it off for publication. I also finished two long law articles and a related article/book chapter. They were: “Constitutional Rights for Nonresident Aliens; A Doctrinal and Normative Argument” (forthcoming in the Drexel Law Review); “Fourth Amendment Rights for Nonresident Aliens” (submitted to the German Law Journal, and in shorter form as a chapter in a book under review at Oxford University Press); and “Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt; A Balanced Retributive Account” (forthcoming in the Louisiana Law Review). Most importantly, I started to write the book I have under contract at Oxford University Press (the project I proposed to work on this year when I applied for this fellowship): Detention in a Liberal State. My only real regret is that the year has to come to an end.

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 third and final year of my fellowship, I continued my research and writing on public health regulation and policy, looking at how evidence regarding the safety, effectiveness, and value of medical interventions is discussed and evaluated by policymakers and their expert advisers. While continuing work on a few large projects, I completed several short manuscripts, including a paper on U.S. vaccination policy that appeared in the New England Journal of Medicine in the fall and another on national bioethics commissions that will be published in the Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal later this year. In addition to my research, I taught a freshman seminar on vaccination in the fall and an upperclass seminar on public health policy in the spring, advised two senior theses in the Woodrow Wilson School, and co-organized the spring DeCamp Bioethics Seminars, among other activities. Outbreaks of Ebola in West Africa and measles in the United States this year also provided many opportunities for me to comment in print and broadcast media. As I leave Princeton to join the faculty at Yale in health policy and the history of medicine, I am extremely grateful for these three remarkable years at the UCHV among inspiring colleagues and in a deeply supportive environment.

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.

MARK BUDOLFSON
In association with the Program in Science, Technology and Environmental Policy
Much of my research focuses on issues at the interface of ethics and public policy, especially in connection with collective action problems such as climate change and other dilemmas that arise when discussing common resources and public goods. For example, together with UCHV, Woodrow Wilson School and Princeton Environmental Institute colleagues, I have been working on several papers that critically examine leading economic models of what we should do about climate change. These models have been particularly influential because they purport to quantify the costs and benefits to society of greenhouse gas reductions, and thus can be seen as giving clear recommendations to policymakers who are deciding what magnitude of emissions reductions we should make. An important part of our project is to clarify the value judgments that are implicit in these models, and how policy recommendations would change under alternative ethical frameworks. One of our findings is that more adequately accounting for the distribution of both wealth and damages from climate change could substantially change how quickly we should be making emissions reductions from both a utilitarian and deontological point of view. I’ve been very lucky to benefit from the UCHV’s wonderfully collegial and generous environment that has supported this interdisciplinary work in every way, as well as my other more traditional philosophical projects.
MINH LY

In association with the Niehaus Center for Globalization and Governance

In my first year as a postdoctoral research associate, I have continued my research and writing on democratic theory, global justice, ethics and public policy, and the justice of international finance. I have focused on revising a book manuscript based on my dissertation, *Global Deliberation: A Human Right to Deliberative Democracy*. It examines how states and international organizations can be held democratically accountable for respecting human rights. It develops a participatory theory of accountability called deliberative justification that would more strongly protect human rights than the current system of accountability through states, while being more feasible than global democracy. I had the opportunity to present a chapter at the American Political Science Association’s annual meeting. I also presented a revised version of chapter one to the LSR seminar, and submitted it to a journal for review. The paper, “What Justification Are People Owed,” argues that justification is owed as a human right not only to citizens, but also to affected noncitizens. It proposes a moral standard for when justification is required, the human rights duty principle, in place of the widely used coercion and all-affected interests principles.

ANDREAS SCHMIDT

In association with the Center for Health and Wellbeing

The interdisciplinary, stimulating, and friendly nature of the UCHV has provided me with ideal working conditions. During the first year of my fellowship, I finished a number of papers on socio-political freedom, animal ethics, consequentialism, and public health ethics. In my paper “Abilities and Sources of Unfreedom,” I argue for a new approach to freedom that combines elements of both positive and negative views. I finished a paper on whether nonhuman animals have an interest in socio-political freedom and, if so, what this implies for our obligations toward animals (commissioned to be published this year) and a related paper more specifically about the legal status of animals. I had the opportunity to present my work on consequentialism and the ethics of blame at the LSR fellows seminar, where I received very valuable feedback. At the Center for Health and Wellbeing, I presented a paper in which I discuss how far the status quo and path-dependence should restrict which health promotion policies we can implement. Besides these and related projects, I have also started work on nudging in health policy, attended various conferences in public health ethics, and worked together with Marc Fleurbaey on the International Panel of Social Progress.
**BENJAMIN EWING**

As a Graduate Prize Fellow this academic year, I made great progress on my dissertation, tentatively titled “Punishing Disadvantage: Culpability, Opportunity, and Responsibility.” During my time as a fellow, I worked on drafts of multiple dissertation chapters, honing the core theoretical argument of the dissertation, contextualizing that argument within academic philosophical debates and actual legal practice, and working through some of its implications for reform. In brief, I argue that individuals from unjustly disadvantaged backgrounds may be deprived of “fair moral opportunity” to avoid criminal wrongdoing. Moreover, even when being deprived of fair moral opportunity does not appropriately relieve a person of blame for his wrongful actions, it may still give him a strong claim of fairness to be treated less harshly by the criminal law. Discussing my work in progress with the other GPFs was a terrific opportunity to help me develop both my substantive ideas and my presentation skills. I also enjoyed stimulating interactions with several of the Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Faculty Fellows, who contributed to a collegial and engaging environment at the UCHV this year and at the various talks it hosted, such as those that fall under the Program in Ethics and Public Affairs.

**SHIRA BILLET**

I feel a profound sense of gratitude to the UCHV for giving me the opportunity to be part of the Graduate Prize Fellowship community. This has been a very productive year of research and writing. I drafted three chapters of my dissertation on Hermann Cohen (a 19th-century Jewish philosopher) and the social turn in philosophy, religion, and ethics. I presented the raw material of a fourth chapter at the interdisciplinary seminar and received immensely helpful feedback from my colleagues. I also presented dissertation-related papers at three of the most important academic conferences in my field, and I’m in the process of revising one of those papers for publication. Over the course of the year, I also developed a clearer sense of my dissertation as a whole and its broader significance. The interdisciplinary seminar was much more than a place to discuss my own and my colleagues’ work. It was a model community of intellectual discourse among people who care deeply about ideas and how those ideas should impact the world. I will take this community with me as I complete my dissertation, and will continue to hold my own thinking and writing to the standards set by this group.

**FRIEDERIKE FUNK**

My fifth and final year of graduate studies at Princeton began with an interesting workshop on “Republican Theories of Criminal Law” at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, where Victoria McGeer and I presented some of our work on the psychology of punishment. For most of the fall, I focused on finishing up data collection for my dissertation project, which thoroughly examines punishers’ transformative justice motives. Thanks to the UCHV Graduate Prize Fellowship I could then devote most of my time in the spring semester to the final writing phase. Throughout the year, I found meetings with the other fellows to be extremely thought-provoking and interesting. I especially valued the interdisciplinary composition of our group, as it encouraged me to present my research in different ways and make me approach it from various perspectives. I am tremendously grateful to have been a Graduate Prize Fellow this year, and I hope that I can be part of similar programs in the future. I have connected with numerous interesting people, while simultaneously supporting my research interest in punishment, combining aspects of psychology, philosophy, and law.

**GRADUATE PRIZE FELLOWS**

These fellowships, made possible by a gift from Laurance S. Rockefeller ’32, are awarded to Princeton graduate students with distinguished academic records who show great promise of contributing to scholarship and teaching about ethics and human values. Fellows participate in an interdisciplinary research seminar throughout the year. In 2014–15 the seminar was convened by Johann Frick (Philosophy and UCHV).
TED LECHTERMAN

My main focus during my time as a Graduate Prize Fellow has been on developing two chapters of my dissertation on the political theory of philanthropy. The political theory of philanthropy proposes frameworks for justifying and appraising practices of donation. The first of these two chapters argues for an institutional division of labor that sorts public institutions and private organizations into distinct roles. In a well-ordered society, private donors do well to supplement and challenge public institutions, but securing conditions of justice is a collective duty that citizens can only discharge through these institutions. The second chapter considers whether there are good reasons to care about the distribution of donative resources, apart from general concerns about the distribution of wealth. I argue that there are such reasons. Namely, I propose that insofar as philanthropy constitutes a form of social power, it triggers principles of democratic legitimacy. Beyond the Prize Fellows’ research seminar, I also presented these ideas in the politics department’s political theory graduate research seminar and at the Western Political Science Association conference. My work has been significantly enriched by opportunities to interact with the wider UCHV community, especially the visiting faculty fellows. I have also taken much from my experiences mentoring undergraduates participating in the Values and Public Life certificate program.

JANE MANNERS

Being a UCHV Graduate Prize Fellow this year has given me two invaluable gifts: time and perspective. Having the time to dig deep into my dissertation on the legal and political aftermath of the Great New York Fire of 1835 enabled me to revise one chapter and produce a draft of another, prepare a review essay for publication, and present my project to multiple audiences in and outside the University. Perhaps more importantly, the regular GPF seminars provided illuminating perspectives on my own work. Despite our different disciplinary backgrounds and methodological approaches, our GPF cohort discovered over the course of the year that our work explores related ethical dilemmas, tackling such topics as the role of philanthropy, the assessment of guilt, and the meting out of punishment. Viewing these issues through the disciplinary lenses of the other fellows, both by learning about their projects and by hearing their thoughts on mine, revealed new implications of my own work and the ways in which it overlaps with work being done in other fields. I’m extremely grateful for the opportunity UCHV has given me both to deepen my own thinking on questions of moral significance and to broaden my knowledge of the range of disciplinary approaches to such questions.

BRENNAN MCDAVID

The seminar meetings for the Graduate Prize Fellows have been an anchor for me in a wild academic year. I have now completed my dissertation, *Aristotle on Ethical Epistemology*, thanks in large part to the wonderful support of the fellowship and the engaging, inspiring community of colleagues I found in my cohort of prize fellows. My project explores the relationship between Aristotle’s theory of scientific knowledge and his theory of ethical knowledge, comparing them and determining the borders between them in order to recover a precise account of what a practically wise person knows. I argue that practical wisdom is similar to scientific knowledge, on Aristotle’s account, because both consist in grasping explanations for truths in their respective domains. But they are separate and distinct, and having knowledge in one domain does not require having knowledge in the other—i.e., being practically wise does not involve having scientific knowledge. I have presented this work in several professional forums this year, and it aided me in securing a job at Ormond College of the University of Melbourne. I am so grateful to the UCHV for welcoming me into the fold and giving me the gift of a truly spectacular year.
DAVID MCNAMEE
The Graduate Prize Fellowship has afforded me the opportunity to concentrate on my dissertation project and to make substantial inroads toward completing it.

I argue for citizens’ direct participation in interpreting the American Constitution as they carry out certain role responsibilities. Like officials, citizens are also responsible for independently assessing how the supreme law of the Constitution bears on their role-specific duties, as voters, jurors, and more. The Constitution’s most fundamental principles and provisions invite citizens to reason together about what they mean—liberty, equality, the purposes of the Preamble—and claim the Constitution for themselves through interpretive argument. I also offer institutional reforms to better realize the values of this interpretive participation. This year I have completed drafts of three chapters and made progress toward revising them. I presented portions at a graduate conference at the University of Texas. I am grateful for the encouragement and penetrating comments I received in presenting to the GPF seminar, as well as for the opportunity to zoom out and see the sweep of the argument in full view. This generous fellowship is just one example of how the UCHV has built an interdisciplinary community that enriches intellectual life at Princeton.

ANNA SCHRIMPF
My time as a Graduate Prize Fellow at the UCHV was extremely valuable. Not only did I learn a lot from the other fellows both inside and outside of the classroom, I also benefited from the challenge of communicating my ideas to an audience other than the political science one I have grown used to. My work this year focused on the examination of international advocacy efforts toward global health issues and natural disasters—two of the substantive issue areas my dissertation on the determinants of International Non-Governmental Organization (INGO) activism for global causes seeks to illuminate. I have also been working on a project that examines the effects of INGOs’ public “naming and shaming” of human rights abusers on these countries’ human rights practices. I presented my research at a University of Chicago Law School conference that evaluated the effectiveness of international human rights law, in addition to the annual meetings of the MPSA, EPSA, and APSA. Finally, I have collaborated on a number of projects studying the effects of INGO activism on domestic and international human rights trials (with Geoffrey Dancy, Tulane University), examining dynamics of NGO coalition building (with Wendy Wong, University of Toronto) and investigating the effect of violent U.S. deaths abroad on international aid allocations (with Nancy Qian, Yale University).

ELISE WANG
I had a wonderful and productive year as a Graduate Prize Fellow. The support of the UCHV allowed me to make significant progress on my dissertation, most notably by giving me the opportunity to publicly tackle the sections with the most moving parts. My dissertation examines literary and philosophical approaches to the ethics of measurement in late medieval England, and the community of the seminar helped me to reframe my project to speak more directly to the interdisciplinary conversations on punishment and ethical quantification. In the seminar, I presented a section that links academic theories of measurement to labor practices, and the feedback I received from the other fellows and from Johann [Frick] helped me to restart the chapter as a standalone article. The seminar and the UCHV also introduced me to an intellectually vibrant community within the University, for which I am very grateful. The progress the UCHV allowed me to make this year helped me to secure a Charlotte Newcombe Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship to fund my final year of reading and writing.
I mostly focused on finishing my dissertation, which systematically explores the distinction between two kinds of normative standards: “substantive” standards like morality, which must matter, and “merely formal” standards like etiquette, which need not matter. In particular, I developed my first chapter, which provides a positive view of the metaphysics of mere formalities, from a somewhat scattered draft into something more polished; and I wrote my second chapter, which explores whether a widely accepted anti-metaphysical view about normativity called “expressivism” can provide a unified semantics for terms like “ought” when they are used in claims about substantive and merely formal standards. I also completed drafts of two other chapters, and of two papers that are unrelated to my dissertation. There were two other academic highlights of the year; the first was participating in the UCHV Graduate Prize Fellows seminars. It was a great privilege to interact with such impressive students, engaging with similar issues from a wide variety of disciplinary backgrounds. And second, teaching a course on the philosophy of inequality at Albert C. Wagner Youth Correctional Facility. I learned a great deal from the talented, insightful students.
FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS
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