

### Sample Answers

**There are many possible perfect answers. Here is one set.**

Question 1 (a, b, and c) and Question 2 in the “Notes and Questions” section at the end of the Nozick piece on page 1163.

1a) In both *Taxation 1* and *Taxation 2* we have an intrusion on liberty. A taxation scheme prevents people from making contracts that they might otherwise like to make. In both cases, Wilt Chamberlain is prevented from playing basketball in exchange for \$10 million dollars to go just to him. Whether he actually ends up playing or not and paying taxes or not is irrelevant.

1b) If money goes to the literacy program, this will benefit the liberty of the people who receive the training since the ability to read provides many opportunities that would otherwise not be available for these people. So taxation to support the literacy program can be thought of as a burden on some people in exchange for increased opportunities for others.

1c) The beginning of the question states that the status quo distribution fits a distributional pattern. In *No Taxation 1*, the pattern is the most upset since Wilt Chamberlain now has \$10 million dollars in addition to whatever he had before. The liberty of people to pay money to see Wilt Chamberlain play is directly responsible for this change in the pattern. In each of the four cases there is some exchange of money and so some change in pattern however small, though in *Taxation 1* the change is very minimal as some number of people paying to attending a basketball game really doesn't affect the economic distribution in any significant way.

2) There are a number of differences between the cases of being taxed to support a school and being forced to work in the school. For one thing, James would be working as a lawyer (a profession he chose) rather than as a teacher (which he didn't choose). Taxation involves taking money from someone whereas forced labor violates a certain kind of “bodily integrity” where your movements are restricted for example. Finally, in ordinary cases we think that people can choose to work or not and then paying taxes happens only if they work. In the normal case of forced labor, you do not have the choice to simply not work. But this is not clear from the example. I believe that Nozick is wrong and these differences are morally important. In particular, while taxation is an intrusion on liberty, it is relatively minor compared to the large intrusion of forced labor. While the benefits of taxation outweigh the comparatively small intrusion on liberty, forced labor cannot be justified in this way.

Question 2 in the “Notes and Questions” section at the end of the Locke piece on page 1086.

2) Locke’s argument is that even if coercion worked and caused religious conversion, the government should not do it. First, this would cause fewer people to go to heaven. If every country enacted this conversion scheme, then everyone would have the religion of his or her prince. But princes disagree and since there is only one truth of the matter, at most one prince would have it right and so now the citizens of at most one country would go to heaven. On the other hand, if people were allowed to think for themselves, more people would come to the truth. Additionally, whether or not you get to heaven would now simply be a matter of luck, as it would depend completely on where you were born. This is a bad thing.

I think that these are not good arguments for religious liberty. First, why think that fewer people will go to heaven? If people can figure out the religious truth on their own, then princes can too. If anything, you might think that the typical prince is more educated and wealthy and might stand a better chance of reaching the truth. As for the luck aspect of salvation, historically one’s religion is almost entirely determined by one’s place of birth anyway. There is some variation of course, but if luck itself is bad, there is quite a lot of luck involved.

**Also answer the following questions:**

1) The government is considering requiring adults to wear seat belts while driving a car.

The Harm Principle says that the government cannot force you to do anything against your will unless it is to prevent harm to others. Since not wearing your seat belt harms only yourself, the Harm Principle says that this law is not justified.

2) The government is considering requiring children under the age of four to be in a child safety seat while riding in a car.

Mill makes an exception for children when describing the harm principle. Since children are not in full possession of their faculties, it is appropriate for the state to keep them from harm so the Harm Principle does not rule out this law.

3) The government is considering requiring any new car produced in the United States to get at least 25 miles to the gallon.

Producing and buying cars that are not fuel-efficient reliably leads to people driving these cars, which uses up fossil fuels at an increased rate, pollutes the environment, and leads to various harms such as global climate change. So the Harm Principle would allow this relatively minor imposition on our liberty.

4) The government is considering banning the production, distribution, and use of cocaine.

In the typical case of the cocaine user, the user only directly harms themselves. While it is often true that they do bad things while high, those actions should be punished, not the use of cocaine in the first place. So the Harm Principle would rule out such a law.

5) The government is considering banning the production and sales of hardcore pornography.

In the typical case of producing hardcore pornography, all of the actors are consenting, as is the viewer. It is unclear if this leads to an increase in violence for example, but given its uncertainty, the indirect harm that might possibly come about to others cannot justify the banning of pornography. So the Harm Principle would rule this out.

6) The government is considering banning the production and sales of all handguns.

In many cases, the sale of a handgun will lead to harm to a non-consenting party. In many cases it will not. Since the harm is not really directly related to the purchasing of the gun, the Harm Principle cannot justify this law.