

Q2: Mill

Monday, July 13, 2020 10:13 AM



Question  
Two (MIL)

- Read On Liberty Extract
- Read Principles of political economy
- Read introduction and notes on Mill
- Read Brink + summ
- Read Cave
- Read Heywood
- Read Magid
- Read Perry
- Read Riley
- Read Skorupski
- Read Stafford
- Read Warburton
- Write Thesis Statement - check with
- Write Plan - check with Cave
- Write 1st Draft
- Write final draft

DEFINE TOO MUCH FREEDOM!!!

TOO MUCH FREEDOM

In this essay, I shall argue that the harm principle does give individuals too much freedom because despite its various exemptions and detailed examples of what is and is not harm, the harm principle does not take into consideration overall cultural harm that individual actions can have that may not be in the best interest of the people. This argument is further strengthened by example

- Mill is optimistic

THERE IS NO SINGLE CLEAR ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION

- We cannot clearly answer this question because
  1. There are different answers for different groups of people within a society
    - Gerians, rational people
    - Barbarians, children, irrational people
  2. Harm is not clearly defined
  3. There is no clear expectation of what too much freedom is
  4. Not clear about whether or not psychological harm is considered to be harm
    - Psychological harm can be just as harmful as physical harm
    - Racist speech/hate speech
  6. Lazy people vs Societal people
  7. People being intrusive
- All of this\* leads to a very vague picture of freedom that he gives
- So there is no one answer and any answer we give is very vague
- Therefore, there is no single clear answer to this question

- Government encouragement for education may be paternalistic or intrusive? <Not clearly defined by Mill but may be evidence of contradiction to the Liberty Principle>

- The Harm Principle is giving people too much freedom and even Mill uses that it is a chart why he gives so many scenarios, examples, exceptions and further limitations - to try to make it seem like it is not too much freedom - but the core of the principle is too simple and does give too much freedom for everyone

- Compare modern and historical context - focus more on Mill's time

- No one is a truly isolated being
- People should be able to do anything you want to yourself

- Mill put a lot of value on social progress
  - But not putting limitations on certain actions will hinder social progress
    - Eg. if racism is allowed - it will ruin social progress
    - If suicide is allowed - it will ruin humanity lol - everyone kills themselves without

NOT TOO MUCH FREEDOM

In this essay, I shall argue that the harm principle does not give individuals too much freedom, especially in a democratic society, because within a democratic society, the people are the ones with sovereign power; thus, they should be able to exercise robust freedom of speech, including the freedom to strongly criticize government officials, government policies and the people themselves who may agree or disagree with the government. This argument is further strengthened by exemplary disadvantages that the tyranny of majority can have on individual and communal liberty in both historical and modern settings.

- not too much freedom in modern settings
  - argument specifically about the right to offend and how it may or may not allow for
    - racism
  - silencing these topics with censorship or other limits (law) would prevent these issues from surfacing to everyone's awareness
  - It is impossible to say anything, especially of importance, without offending at least one out of the 7.6 billion people on Earth - offence cannot be quantified

Bentham's utilitarianism - happiness to the most amount of people  
Mill's utilitarianism - quality of happiness

2 TYPES OF FREEDOM

1. Freedom to
2. Freedom from

Example: someone's freedom to say anything they want might come at the cost of another person's freedom from psychological harm

IS THE HARM PRINCIPLE JUST THAT ONE LINE THAT SAYS:  
OR DOES IT INCLUDE EVERYTHING THAT MILL IS SAYING - the exceptions, examples and scenarios

Does Mill's harm principle give individuals too much freedom in a democratic society?	
<b>PRIMARY SOURCES</b>	
<u>On Liberty Extract</u>	
<b>In-text:</b> (Mill, 2020a, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Mill, J. S. (2020a). On liberty extract. Melbourne: Trinity College Foundation Studies.	
<u>Principles of political economy Extract</u>	
<b>In-text:</b> (Mill, 2020b, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Mill, J. S. (2020b). Principles of political economy extract. Melbourne: Trinity College Foundation Studies.	
<b>SECONDARY SOURCES</b>	
<u>Introduction</u>	
<b>In-text:</b> (Andrews & Nield, 2020, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Andrews, F. & Nield, J. (2020). Introduction and notes to Mill essay, Trinity College Foundation Studies, Melbourne.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Brink, 2009, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Brink, D. G. (2009). Mill's liberal principles and freedom of expression. In C. L. ten (Ed.), Mill's On Liberty: A critical guide (pp. 40-61). Leiden: Cambridge University Press.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Cave, 2019, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Cave, P. (2019). The myths we live by: Adventures in democracy, free speech and other liberal inventions. London: Atlantic Books.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Heilbroner, 2000, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Heilbroner, P. (2000). The worldly philosophers: The lives, times and ideas of the great economic thinkers. London: Penguin Books.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Heywood, 2007, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Heywood, A. (2007). Political ideologies: An introduction. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Magid, 1987, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Magid, H. M. (1987). John Stuart Mill. In L. Strauss & J. Cropsey (Eds.), History of political philosophy (pp. 784-801). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Perry, 2016, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Perry, M., Chase, M., Jacob, J., Jacob, M., & Von Lau, T. (2016). Western civilization: Ideas, politics & society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Riley, 1998, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Riley, J. (1998). Mill on liberty. New York: Routledge.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Skorupski, 2006, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Skorupski, J. (2006). Why read Mill today? London: Routledge.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Stafford, 1998, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Stafford, W. (1998). John Stuart Mill. Houndmills: Macmillan.	
<b>In-text:</b> (Warburton, 2009, p.XX)	
<b>Post-text:</b> Warburton, N. (2009). Free Speech: A very short introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.	

INTRODUCTION	
	SOURCES
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• explain who Mill is</li><li>• Explain a bit about Liberalism</li><li>• Talk about the 2 books</li><li>• Thesis Statement</li></ul>
THESIS STATEMENT	
OUTLINE/MAP	
BODY 1	
	SOURCES
BODY 2	
	SOURCES
BODY 3	
	SOURCES
CONCLUSION	
	SOURCES
FEEDBACK FROM ESSAY 1	
CUE COLUMN Questions/Cues Evidence	NOTE TAKING COLUMN Key Ideas/Important facts/Repeated (stressed) information <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• short quotes of primary sources</li><li>• secondary sources</li><li>• someone had 52 in-text references :D</li><li>• <a href="#">feedback</a></li></ul>