

Jonathan Phouminh

PHIL 1200: Contemporary Social Problems

Fall 2017

Assignment 2

Instructions

Please submit a Microsoft Word file or a pdf. If neither of those options work, let me know.

Submit via the D2L dropbox.

Your submission should have only your answers. Your submission SHOULD NOT contain the instructions for the assignment, the quoted passage, the argument, or the questions themselves. Your answers must be numbered (obviously the number for each answer should match the number of the question it is answering). Failure to do this will hurt your grade.

Plagiarism detection will be turned on.

Do not work with each other, your answers must represent your own work.

Do not do any outside research. In my experience, students who try to research these questions either completely mess up their answer or end up plagiarizing.

Due date

Wednesday, Dec. 13, 11:59pm

Grading

Each question will be graded based on a) how clear your answer is b) how well you demonstrate understanding of the question and relevant course material and c) the thoughtfulness of your answer. “Thoughtful” does not mean long. A thoughtful answer is one that shows me that you have more than a superficial understanding of what’s going on. This means that you may receive, for example, 4 out of 5 points if your answer is good but didn’t show any sort of exceptional insight.

Irrelevant comments and over-stylized language (i.e. trying to use “big” words) will count against you. Keep your answers clear and focused.

Do not assume that you will do well on this assignment just because you did well on the first assignment. A similar amount of effort may not produce the same results.

All questions are based on the following passage from the reading “Huemer – Is There a Right to Immigrate”.

“When Americans today recall the unabashed racism of earlier generations, we may easily feel ashamed of our forebears. Most of us would cringe at the suggestion that our race is better than other races. We feel that we cannot understand what it would be like to be so prejudiced. How could one not see the injustice in slavery, or racial segregation? But most Americans, like most human beings around the world, in fact have easy access to what it was like to be an unabashed racist. It was to feel about one’s race the way most of us now feel about our country. Today’s Americans do not cringe when we hear the statement that America is the greatest country on Earth, any more than white people a century ago would have cringed to hear that whites were the best race. We do not cringe to hear that American businesses should hire native-born Americans rather than immigrants, any more than Americans three generations ago would have cringed to hear that white-owned businesses should hire white people in preference to blacks. Naturally, nationalists may attempt to devise explanations for why nationality is different from race, and why nationalism is really justified. This is not the place to attempt to argue that point. I would like simply to put forward for consideration the thought that perhaps we have no right to feel ashamed of our ancestors, and that our descendants may feel about us the way we feel about our ancestors.”

Huemer appears to be making the following argument:

Racism is morally wrong.

Nationalism is analogous to racism.

So, nationalism is morally wrong.

Questions

Based on this passage, how would Huemer define “racism”? Your answer must be exactly 1 sentence long. Don’t give me an example, don’t ramble, just write out the definition. (2 points)

Based on the passage I would define racism by stating that it is the idea to give more consideration of one races interests on another and to always put their race at a higher value than **all** other races.

Based on this passage and the argument that Huemer is making, how would Huemer define “nationalism”? Your answer must be exactly 1 sentence long. Don’t give me an example, don’t ramble, just write out the definition. (2 points)

According to this passage Huemer would define nationalism similarly to how he would define racism and that is by saying that nationalism is the idea to give more consideration towards one nation over another.

In what way(s) do YOU think racism is RELEVANTLY similar to nationalism? Just focus on the most important way, or ways, in which they are similar and justify your answer. 1-2 paragraphs. (5 points)

In my opinion, nationalism and racism are relevantly similar just based on the fact that they are both ideologies that give more consideration towards their nation or race over others. Or another way to describe the similarity between them is that they will always show more favor for those with similar interests before anybody else. For example, let's say there is a company that is hiring for only one position and the company is a white dominated and there is a black and a white candidate for the job. And in the end the company hired the white candidate because they wanted to help those of their same race FIRST before helping any other race which would obviously be considered racist. I think this analogy is very similar to how a nationalist system would work, but instead of hiring on the bases of race it would be hiring on the basis of who has citizenship and who doesn't.

What is one way that YOU think racism is different from nationalism? Is this difference relevant? Why or why not? If you choose a difference that seems obviously irrelevant and then tell me it is irrelevant, you will not do well on this question. For example, the following answer is worth 0 points: "one difference is that nations have flags but races don't, but this difference is irrelevant". 1-2 paragraphs. (5 points)

Racism and Nationalism to me are very similar in the way they are defined but there are two key ideas that differentiates the two. One is how both ideologies choose which group of people receive more consideration than others and the other is racism is an ideology that applies around the world and nationalism is dependant on only the individual nation. To further explain the first difference, racism differentiates who receives more consideration by those of the same skin color and / or ideology whereas nationality only differentiates those who receive more consideration by including only those who are citizens of the nation no matter what belief or skin color they have. The next difference that I see is that racism can apply worldwide whereas nationalism can only occur to one specific nation. For example, if blue people chose to be racist to everybody except blue people then they can carry that belief outside of the nation if there are other blue people around the world. Whereas if one nation believes it is impermissible to kill babies and a citizen of that nation goes to a different nation and tries to spread that idea then it wouldn't make sense because that belief wouldn't apply elsewhere.

