

## **Interview with Lulu Fleming-Benite, Rosina Kling and Jack Trowbridge, May 20, 2021**

Zander Lu 0:00

So, how are you guys? I'm doing very well. I'm doing very well. I think I know where you're going, Jack. But Rosina, where are you going to college?

Rosina Kling 0:16

Pitzer Pitzer College. Valid? Yeah. Yeah, I think George is going there to decide. How did I decide? Um, well, the school is part of a consortium of five other schools. My school started in the 60s. So it's really big on like, social justice and stuff. So that's like, kind of a big premises of the school. And it's also very, it's like, very environmentally, like, proactive. So, that was attractive to me. And also, it's a smaller school, and it's not super like, it's no Ivy League. So I was like, cool. I don't know. And I like the location a lot. And the teachers are really cool, too. So...

Jack Trowbridge 1:05

What part of California is, it's like 40 minutes outside of LA. So it's like, it's pretty cool. It's Yeah.

Yeah, that's, that's cool. Because I like lived around there for most of my childhood. I lived in Irvine. Is that where it is?

Rosina Kling 1:23

It's, it's in Clermont. It's like, if you go from downtown, and then go, like 40 minutes east, you could—you're there.

Jack Trowbridge 1:34

Oh, yeah. Yeah, it's like the opposite direction. But yeah, it's cool that you move in there. You're going to college out there.

Rosina Kling 1:41

Yeah. I'm excited. Should be much nicer weather than here, for sure. Oh, yeah.

Zander Lu 1:48

What about you, Jack?

Jack Trowbridge 1:51

Well, I'm going to Wesleyan University in Connecticut; Middletown, Connecticut. I really loved the open curriculum. It gives students like options to basically choose whatever path they want,

right from the get go. There's no distribution requirements to fulfill other than either doing, like a writing or a language class or something. So, and that's really meaningful for me, because all of the classes that I've loved in high school like Con Law, Existentialism and stuff, were only possible because of the elective program. So now I get to do that, but like the entire school,

Rosina Kling 2:33

I have a really good friend from LA, who's also an artist going to Wesleyan. So

Jack Trowbridge 2:39

Yeah, it seems like a really artist friendly school. Which is like partly why I chose it because of the music curriculum is really strong. But I also have options to do stuff outside of music.

Rosina Kling 2:53

It's a great choice. I almost applied there.

Jack Trowbridge 2:57

Wait did you say you applied there you almost you almost—

Rosina Kling 3:00

Well, I applied by ED to my school. So I didn't end up applying. Yeah.

Jack Trowbridge 3:07

That's right. And Zander, you want to talk about where you are going, why you decided,

Zander Lu 3:12

I'm going to Kenyon (College). I liked the environment. And I liked some of the academic focuses specifically on writing and incorporating writing into any discipline. And then additionally, there was a farming intensive that I was curious about. So I'll probably be doing that. I just got an email from them saying that they have too many incoming freshmen. Probably because a bunch of people last year deferred to this year because of COVID. And so they're offering a freshmen study abroad program in Copenhagen. That I'm considering.

Rosina Kling 4:04

Copenhagen sounds fun.

Jack Trowbridge 4:06

That's cool, though. What is it just like study anything in particular? Or is it just to be in a different place?

Zander Lu 4:13

It's to study there. I mean, it's Kenyon academics. But in Copenhagen.

Jack Trowbridge 4:22

Yeah, it's just the same program but different that's that's awesome. Also where in Ohio is it?

Zander Lu 4:33

It's in Gambier.

Jack Trowbridge 4:35

Is it is is that Mennonite country?

Zander Lu 4:42

No. It's farmland.

Rosina Kling 4:47

Ohio is like half farms and then maybe like 20% like Amish people. And then like a lot of cheese.

Jack Trowbridge 4:56

See, I was close. I was close. I got the farm, but

Rosina Kling 5:00

Ohio does have Cedar Point though, which is arguably one of the best amusement parks. I love Cedar Point.

Jack Trowbridge 5:11

Nice. I've never been to Ohio. But that sounds like a great school, Zander.

Zander Lu 5:16

Yeah, the reason I asked about it was because a lot of that decision making is reflective of values and value systems. Rosina mentioned social justice. You mentioned, Jack, open curriculum, which is reflective of moral libertarianism, and the ability to choose for oneself. And so I'm curious how you think the college reflects your personality?

Jack Trowbridge 6:05

That's a great question. Well, I'm, I'm someone who doesn't like to be tied down just by one thing. I'm passionate about multiple things. The two big ones being like government and music, and being able to choose freely between them, but also explore all different kinds of other stuff that will hopefully inform my current interests. It's really important to me. Yeah, that's a great

question. I got to think about that a little more. So how do you define libertarianism? Is it just like the like individual choice?

Zander Lu 6:58

Libertarianism is the belief that one should do—should be able to do whatever they want to, as long as it doesn't infringe on someone else's right to do whatever they want to. And so a lot of it is based upon individual freedoms, rather than liberty. It—an example that was used in my research was taxation. And that being a violation of property rights in the libertarian view, and an upon one's own wealth.

Jack Trowbridge 7:48

Gotcha. And so ensues the breakdown of society and government. Yeah, I guess I don't know. Rosina, did you want to respond to Zander's question because I don't want to go down the libertarian rabbit hole real quick. Right now.

Rosina Kling 8:04

Yeah, I mean, answer to like the college question. I think, um, you know, like the college process is part like colleges trying to like advertise themselves to you and then there's like, what you're really looking for? And I think LREI (Elisabeth Irwin High School) I taught me a lot about what I'm looking for, I think very similar to Jack, definitely government stuff. And now I'm looking into kind of like world studies, because America makes my heart hurt. So um, I'm definitely thinking about—the school I'm going to also has open curriculum very much. So I can take classes at any of the five schools, including Pomona, which is like arguably the best school. So I have a lot of options for studying both like abroad and there. And there's, like so many classes, so I'm thinking of going into partially like psychology, and then also integrating that until into, like, possibly anthropology, thing because I've always been the person who cares about other people, which, you know, this project has taught me a lot about because we study justice and such and like, part of it is like, what do you value about your own human life? So I'm thinking, you know, I value other people as well. So why not, you know, put that out into the world? That's kind of why I chose because I figured, I like helping people. So

Jack Trowbridge 9:35

Yeah, I mean, that's a whole other layer to like using what you learn as like, in service of other people. And, Zander, you're like, one of the philosophy experts here. How does that—is that reflective of a particular discipline or ideology.

Zander Lu 9:54

It's not specific to one ideology or another. There are different schools of thought that all value others. One being the Kantian view of motivation by morality. One thing is moral, if the

motivation is moral in and of itself. And so the motivation has to be at least in part removed from selfish values. And so it does care about other people.

Rosina Kling 10:49

I think oftentimes with philosophy when you have these like big concepts, first of all, like the vocabulary, and the language gets totally lost, and it's really hard to remember everything. But they really just offer you kind of guides for how to navigate your own lifestyle and what you choose. Like, when I was doing justice, there's like we talked about retributive justice, or I don't even know how to pronounce it, which is kind of what we do now in America. And then there's like rehabilitation, then there's like welfare maximization, which is like kind of more utilitarian. Which is cool, but that comes with like, a lot of other sh\*t. And then there's like restorative justice. So like, this is just under like the philosophical, philosophical portions, like justice. And then there's like a bunch of different ideas that you can kind of look into and then choose which one fits with your like, moral compass. I guess. That's what I've read, so far, about it.

Jack Trowbridge 11:46

Yeah, I haven't studied like, I haven't read any, like academic work on this. But retributive justice is an interesting idea to me. And I'm sorry, I don't want to derail the conversation center. But—I don't know, it is really interesting, because it's so emotionally charged. In a way, I mean, like, we can say, like, I think that there's too many people in prisons, and I think prisons aren't used to rehabilitate people like they should. But, if somebody like murders your whole family, gruesomely, I think it would be natural that you'd want to see them "rot in jail". I mean, that's, that's the phrase we use in society for people who, who are so horrible, they see them rot in jail, or whatever, like, it's very emotionally charged.

Rosina Kling 12:39

But then, I think like, if you take that example, like someone murdered my whole family, I think the first question I'd ask is why. Who, like what made that person do that? And then I think once you look into like the reasons for, then you take criminal out of like, the entire criminal context, and you look at people individually, and you're like, maybe there are discrepancies, or a lot of similarities with people, and then that works, I think, better towards rehabilitation. So I think that's my standpoint on it. I can't say that I quite agree with retributive justice, because it just feels mean. People don't use it right at all.

Zander Lu 13:23

Devil's advocate. These are people who have harmed other people, proven themselves to be a danger to society, and broken the mutual trust of societal laws.

Rosina Kling 13:39

Well, but societal laws are not necessarily created by society? I mean, if you think about how many people are in jail right now over minor drug accusations? And what, you know, you have to think about the power positions in the justice system, which we're all well aware of. And it's, you know, if we take, I think if we were to take a harder look at who was actually in our system, and like, what was really going on, I feel like there would be a lot more people that were like, "why are these people in jail, they should be in rehab, they should be in mental health places."

Zander Lu 14:15

So send the murderer to rehab. And then when they get out, they're free to kill people?

Rosina Kling 14:20

I'm not saying that's how it's gonna work. There's definitely people who are like, far off definitely need to be stay away. But I mean, jail? Jail? Put them in a room where I can sleep at least and like, I don't know.

Jack Trowbridge 14:36

I think there's varying levels to this. I mean, I think there's there's public support out there for, for not throwing someone in jail for a while for minor drug offenses. I think that's that can be reasonable, but I don't think it can be reasonably inferred that society is just going to accept murder as okay. I don't know We got here, but we're here.

Rosina Kling 15:03

I think I brought it up on accident, which is I do that a lot. So

Jack Trowbridge 15:09

Yeah, I was making the point before that, like retributive justice is such an emotionally charged idea that if somebody harms you or someone you love that they should be harmed equally in return. And it's obviously like, easy—easier to say that retributive justice harms people too much, until like, something bad happens to you. Like, if someone does harm to your family really badly, then you'd want to see the person responsible, rot in jail. I'm not I'm not saying for everybody. But that's like the kind of the terminology we have in this country. Like, "I want to see them rot in jail for what they've done."

Rosina Kling 15:54

I think that question was, especially as a woman saying this, when you hear about rape, and like allegations against women, then I take definitely, like a more emotional side. And I think, well, that's f\*cked. But at the same time, I feel like there's a story behind everyone that cannot be not included in the decision to put them in jail. I feel like jail has become like the normal answer for anyone who's done anything wrong. But I feel like everyone needs different things. You can't you

take murders, and that's very serious offense, and I think that it's really hard, like...Here's a perfect example. All the police, the police who are shooting people for like, they're pulling people over bla bla bla, black people think of that they're murderers on the situation. But why did they do it? Because they've been ingrained with whatever, racial stereotypes. That's something that you can fix, you know, to a certain extent, obviously, but there's work you can—can be done around that to make people realize certain things. So that's like a very specific case. And obviously, there are cases where this totally doesn't apply. And there's very dangerous people out there. And I don't just agree that those people need help. Or I guess some sort of punishment. I just think it's, I think it's (inaudible).

Jack Trowbridge 17:31

Yeah, I mean, I thought, because I thought a bit about this topic, when this Chauvin trial happened, because there's been all sorts of talk, especially in the last year about approaching justice in a different way of models of restorative justice and, and rehabilitating people instead of locking them away. But I've, I felt somewhat a level of relief, when he was sentenced to—well, he wasn't sentence, but even with the decision for him to go to prison, which seems to contradict the ideas of restorative justice. Obviously, that's just me how I felt but...

Lulu Fleming-Benite 18:14

Yeah, I think—oh, sorry.

Jack Trowbridge 18:18

No, no, no, I my volume way up. That's why.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 18:20

Um, I think that there's always, and I think Rosina touched on this, there's always an emotional aspect to the way that we react to these cases, especially in our initial reactions. And I think that it's normal. I think you've been if you are someone who is a proponent of restorative justice, that's what it's called, right? Okay. I want to make sure I wasn't talking about something I didn't know what I was talking about. You can be a proponent of that and still have that sort of emotional reaction that you had, Jack of relief. Especially because in in that case in specific, it it's not as much about that case in specific but about what it represents and what Derek Chauvin symbolizes and what the decision to put him in jail represents, and what it signifies. Of course, you can sort of try to unpack what prison signifies to us and how it's a bit, hypocritical isn't the right word, but it's certainly ironic, that the thing that provides us with relief is to throw someone in jail when really jail, it is that part of the same structure that the police is a part of.

Rosina Kling 20:01

I like that point, Lulu. Zander, I don't know if this is something you learned about in your ethics, I'm assuming because I was looking at like meta ethics. And you have the idea of like moral

realism, which is kind of the idea of like the belief that there are like moral absolutes or like moral kind of ground rules that people should follow. And then from that more contemporary philosophers have come up with, like, moral relativism, which is like, you can make moral choices relative to the decision. And then there's also like cultural relativism. So you can make those choices based on like, how people how cultures work, so you take like culture into account into your moral decisions, which I think is a conversation that nobody really has enough today because philosophy is...

Jack Trowbridge 20:57

Like, like, certain things are considered moral in one culture, but not in another.

Rosina Kling 21:03

Yeah, could be like that. Or it's also like taking culture into account. So in this situation, like the history of treatment of African-Americans in America taking that into account. Making decisions based on cultural relativism, there's like, there's options for everyone to kind of choose. So it's really just what you feel. I don't think any of us will, like agree or disagree.

Jack Trowbridge 21:40

Yeah, that just sorry, this is not entirely related. But that reminded me, Zander, did you in Con Law, remember that case? In Oregon, of that, uh that city official who I think like, smoked peyote or some sort of drug for as part of a religious ceremony and was fired and denied unemployment benefits, because it's considered drug use? I think that might be an example of what you're talking about, Rosina, because the Supreme Court ruled that like, it was, like it was okay, right, to for him to be fired and denied benefits? Because it was it was drug use. So, in effect, not taking in the culture aspect of it being for a religious purpose into account.

Rosina Kling 22:34

Yeah, that's a great example of, especially one that went to the Supreme Court (inaudible) these moral questions are answered...

Jack Trowbridge 22:50

I think that idea of it is because you brought it up Rosina expand on the idea of moral absolutism or realism, or whatever, that there's certain things that are inherently moral or not.

Rosina Kling 23:07

So moral realism is the belief they're like moral facts, that they're, like moral standards that people I mean, depending on if you're like a utilitarian, or whatever, you think maybe everyone should follow those rules or a specific field, whatever it is. But it's just the idea that like, in the same way that there are like scientific facts that we know, that there are moral facts. So that's like the biggest, and then there's like...So it goes from moral realism, and then it trickles down into



like the other categories that I mentioned. So that's like the basis, and then, like moral absolutism would be like, their absolute standards at which like morals can be kind of judged. And then that goes down to moral relativism, which is the idea that it's relative to the situation, and then cultural relativism, relative to the culture that's being talked about in the moral situation. So I think depending on how specifically you look into it, like, I think that cultural relativism is kind of a better idea than just saying that there are moral facts because everyone's—because I do think it's subjective. So like, depending on how far you go down it, there's a lot of different options you can choose. I don't really know if that answers your question.

Jack Trowbridge 24:34

Yeah. I mean, what could some of those like moral facts possibly be? Because the one that comes to mind first is don't kill people. But even then, some people would take exception to that. There's some cases...

Rosina Kling 24:52

Well, Jack think about euthanasia.

Jack Trowbridge 24:54

That's what I was gonna say. Yeah. Or assisted suicide. Like some people would say that it's okay if someone's in a huge amount of suffering, to, to take their life with their consent.

Rosina Kling 25:15

And then there's the other side, which is like, someone shoots, like 13 people on the street. That's not okay. I think that that's more of like, I feel like a terrorist kind of situation.

Jack Trowbridge 25:27

Yeah. And like how like, how far do we go in that case of like examining the person's background? And sort of is it? Where does it become make making excuses?

Rosina Kling 25:39

Because I think, if you take like that, if you take that example, you have someone who's very emotionally charged against the people that are murdering these are, this is intentional, like harm, not only to the people, but it's make it makes a statement about the country, about whoever's involved. And that is, I think, a much bigger situation than just the murder of a bunch of people. And in that case, I feel like there's definitely some conversation to be had about, you know, justice or jail or whatever. I don't think I can make that decision really and be like, I can't choose. I don't I don't even know how to like, begin to understand that's like, yeah. I really have no answer for that. Because I don't know. But I think that in that situation, you have a much larger threat than just your average day like American.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 26:42

Yeah, I think it's tough. I was thinking about what Jack was saying, I think the way you introduced the idea of euthanasia was you said that you were trying to think of things that are objectively immoral, and then you cited, killing other people, but then you countered that with the example of euthanasia. And I think that this sort of problem leads us to the question, I think we can all agree that not everyone has the same morals, each person has a different conception of morality. You know, there are different ways of thinking or you can think in terms of intent, you can think in terms of consequence, you know, how many damages have been done and, or sort of what Jack was saying, the the desire of the person and concern. So like, the pers—the patient wants to be euthanized, and it's not immoral. I think we can agree that everyone has a moral compass, or moral law within themselves, it doesn't mean that they always follow it. I'm also some that, since we were talking about law, and I think it was kind of funny how you guys were talking about—it's, like, you know, the way that we decide what punishments to give people. And it's really interesting how that becomes involved in a conversation about morality because I think it's so hard to separate law from morals. laws don't establish what is moral and immoral. Laws are just there to establish order supposedly. I think if you wanted a law that was really moral than you will have no laws because how can an action be moral, if you are only doing it because the law requires it? How can—an action can only be moral if you are making your own decision to take that action? Right.

Jack Trowbridge 29:17

I sorry, I was getting caught up in what you said last. I lost my train of thought.

Rosina Kling 29:29

Yeah, well, I haven't—I think you bring up a really good point Lulu, and bringing like law and morals together because it introduces the idea that like the conversation of morality and what's moral has become, you know, a global topic in this contemporary age because literally anyone has access to it. You can, the internet gives you like, you know, people are, and often in in this day of so much like misinformation, specifically in like the political system right now, you have a gajillion conversations about the same thing going on everyone's thinking something different. So when you bring the law into that conversation, and then you think about who's actually making the laws, who's paying them to make the laws? I think then you kind of get into the—this idea of like cultural relativism, because everything now is determined by what the culture does; what the people are doing. I mean, we're only four people in a country of 300 million. And everyone's thinking similar thing. Not everyone, but people.

Jack Trowbridge 30:42

Well, I think some people aren't thinking,

Rosina Kling 30:44

Yeah, definitely.

Jack Trowbridge 30:46

But not us.

Rosina Kling 30:48

There's, there's something different in this age. I mean, when I was reading the philosophy from...I don't even know what time period because too long ago, but these people like they read something, and because especially everything was religious back then. It's like, if God thinks it, then it's cool. So when you there's so much more like stability, I guess, in the thought back then, and obviously that changed, like dramatically over time. But now, where we have conversations about these things, like in relation to like everything, it's a lot harder for us to like, come to answers, I think. So I don't like there's no easy way to have this conversation out because there's too many, too many things. Because everything has an impact on everything else. I didn't make that up.

Jack Trowbridge 31:43

I think Lulu, did you say that, that laws can't like really establish an objective morality? Is that did you mention that in your previous comment?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 31:56

Yeah. Well, I don't think that—it just doesn't work for laws to establish what is moral and immoral? Because an action can't be moral if you're just doing it because the law requires it? I'm not saying that's how I think the law should be. But if you're thinking in terms of what is moral and immoral, I don't think that—I mean, I think that thinking in terms of morality can only be practical to an extent, morality, what is moral and what is good does not always correspond with what is—

Jack Trowbridge 32:38

Legal

Lulu Fleming-Benite 32:40

Legal, but also what is in someone's best interest to do? Or what is the the thing that has the most positive outcome? It's not always what is moral to do?

Jack Trowbridge 32:55

What do you mean by that?

Rosina Kling 33:03

I think he means that it's like that the question of like, when you think about ethics, and morals, everyone has, like, someone gives you a situation, and you can usually determine that there's some moral facts about it, like killing the person. Most of us say that that's wrong. So you could argue that that's moral facts. But I think what Lulu saying like, when you integrate that with laws, there are moral facts that just don't work with everyone. There's history in our, in our country that makes the laws that might seem moral or immoral, like that, kind of skew that understand it. And then you have different narratives coming in, and different people trying to make what law and then I think the morals kind of like, get squeezed out of it. But I mean, it's a law that you can't kill people. Like, technically, maybe that's a moral law. Um...

Jack Trowbridge 33:59

Yeah, under most circumstances, and in most places, but for example, I think like Vermont and Washington, maybe it's Oregon, like, euthanasia is legal there. Those people in Vermont or Washington have a different set of values and ideas about in what cases are you allowed to kill people? in Texas? They said, "no, you can't." You can't euthanize people. Well, well, Texas is an even a more interesting example, because the death penalty is so prevalent there. I think inevitably, that was going to get brought up here.

Rosina Kling 34:40

And that's where I think the big question is kept here you have a state that says it's immoral to kill people, under their own circumstances; if they want it, then they are suffering. They don't even acknowledge that, but then they think that it's totally fine for them to kill people, because of, you know, whatever they decide they can kill people for now, and then I have a lot of discrepancies.

Jack Trowbridge 35:07

And it's a big difference of who's doing and who is deciding. Because obviously, in the case of the death penalty, that person doesn't have much saying either happens or it doesn't. And it's basically, in states like Texas, or in cases where there's the death penalty, the state has a monopoly on the use of force and on the use of violence. You can't kill people. But we the government, the justice system, we can in ways that we, that we've set.

Rosina Kling 35:42

Jack, did you do you know about the Supreme Court case with Bryan Stevenson, who worked on that? I forgot what the case was, specifically, it was a young boy who was put up I think, for the death penalty. And it was a pretty, it was a pretty big case, I don't really remember anything about it, which is

Jack Trowbridge 35:59

I've read a couple of death penalty cases in the past, but I remember that specific one.

Rosina Kling 36:03

He made a bunch of I mean, you probably know Bryan Stevenson from his book anyway. But...

Jack Trowbridge 36:08

I know of him

Rosina Kling 36:09

It's very interesting conversation in his statement for the problem. oral argument.

Jack Trowbridge 36:19

Yeah. I mean, how long—

Rosina Kling 36:26

It's not an easy equation.

Jack Trowbridge 36:30

But I think this is an idea that's existed for a while, like a state monopoly on violence. And, but like what existed before that, before a government was allowed to be, was allowed to use violence.

Rosina Kling 36:49

Back, it's always been this way.

Jack Trowbridge 36:51

It's basically all chaos?'

Rosina Kling 36:51

I don't know if you remember learning about like, the Roman Empire, or the Persian Empire, but basically every, like, our history is riddled with violence against people who aren't in power. And I think that's like, that has been the situation since like, day one, which is why I feel like Earth is just like, kind of, kind of—

Jack Trowbridge 37:18

What I'm saying here is we so we have laws that prevent, in most cases—sorry there's a bird that's flying outside—prevent people from killing people, in most cases, for most reasons, not saying every case or every reason. But what happened, what was the world like, before we had those laws? I remember we learned in 9th grade history, basically, like the first like code of law

was the code of Hammurabi. Very, very retributive ideas in they're, like; very much an eye for an eye type of code. Right? Do you all remember that or have learned about it at some point? What happened before that code was in place?

Rosina Kling 38:09

Jack what I'm telling you the same thing.—

Jack Trowbridge 38:10

People were just killing people.

Rosina Kling 38:12

—without the laws I watched. So part of this project had me watching all of like, the Crash Course US history to kind of understand what—literally what I've learned that is always been this way. There are just laws now and we have a much more organized system for sure. It's always been this way. And that's when it kind of starts to hit you that like, yeah.

Jack Trowbridge 38:37

So Rosina, you mean to tell me you've watched like 100 episodes of John Green talking about his holy sh\*t,

Rosina Kling 38:43

and like full speed to and I did it for fun. Yeah.

Zander Lu 38:56

I have an idea to pose to you. I was reading an essay by Pradeep Gokhale. in which he compares different traditional Indian thoughts and he draws from them universal principles. And these are non-injury, truthfulness, non-stealing, purity and control over senses—

Jack Trowbridge 39:23

Hold on. Wait, I already forgot like the first three. Can you put them in the chat please? So that I can see them.

Rosina Kling 39:36

And Zander, what do you want us to like answer about these.

Jack Trowbridge 39:42

Sorry, I didn't even give him the opportunity to ask a question. I already forgot what he read.

Zander Lu 39:54

So the principles of non-injury truthfulness, non-stealing, purity and control—

Jack Trowbridge 0:04  
Is that all one purity and control?

Zander Lu 0:06  
—over senses.

Rosina Kling 0:10  
I think it's senses and then

Jack Trowbridge 0:14  
Oh, okay?

Rosina Kling 0:17  
Oh control over senses.

(inaudible)

Lulu Fleming-Benite 0:19  
We don't like indulgent whatever your body desires

Jack Trowbridge 0:27  
Don't f\*ck. Sorry Zander, Am I not allowed to swear on this? Are you uploading this whole thing to the senior project blog?

Zander Lu 0:39  
I'm gonna write a transcript so

Jack Trowbridge 0:41  
Oh my god (inaudible)

Zander Lu 0:46  
I can censor it if you want

Lulu Fleming-Benite 0:48  
Yeah, just —

Jack Trowbridge 0:52  
Yeah, I'm not trying to get yelled at

Lulu Fleming-Benite 0:56  
Live a little! Oh my gosh!

Jack Trowbridge 1:01  
Okay, so—

Zander Lu 1:03  
How do you feel about these; do you think it encompasses everything about morality? Do you think there's something missing? Do you think there are some things that are flat out wrong in these five?

Jack Trowbridge 1:15  
Okay, wait, is there a comma bit supposed to be comma between non-stealing impurity?

Zander Lu 1:20  
Yes.

Jack Trowbridge 1:20  
Or is that non-stealing, period? I can't steal someone's purity?

Zander Lu 1:24  
Non-stealing or pur—and purity.

Jack Trowbridge 1:28  
What does that even mean to be pure pure pure pure?

Rosina Kling 1:33  
Pure I think if you I mean is he a philosopher?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 1:37  
Honesty? What is that?

Rosina Kling 1:39  
—philosophical contracts?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 1:43  
Dirty like honesty? candor? integrity? What is that?

Jack Trowbridge 1:48



Is it like living up to religious values or being like, or valuing what's like being reverent or whatever?

Rosina Kling 1:58

You said he was in India, right? I think if you think about India's history with like the caste system, and then Hinduism and how that all came to be, I think this feels very, almost not religious at all, in that sense, but I mean, I can't disagree that I, that I, I can't say that I don't like agree with ideas of truthfulness, not stealing and purity. But at the same time, I still feel like, these things can be subjective and that I feel like placing rules like this without, without it like including perhaps a little side note, that—

Jack Trowbridge 2:41

a little asterisk on your moral values

Rosina Kling 2:44

—are subject to, you know, I feel like that is a bit. You know, that's what people do is they put their ideas out and then, you know, whoever follows them, follows them.

Jack Trowbridge 2:56

Okay, well, what would be an asterisk to something like non-stealing? What would be an instance in which stealing is actually not amoral.

Rosina Kling 3:06

Well, I mean, think about charity?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 3:10

Well, I mean, there are plenty of I know, this is stupid, but let's see, you know, appropriate this into an adolescent sort of framework here, you know, I, what I hear often from, you know, fellow teenagers is, what is it? "If it's a chain, it's free rein".

Jack Trowbridge 3:29

What, wait, what was that?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 3:32

There's this nice phrase that certain people like to say, that goes a little something like, "if it's a chain, it's free rein," which basically means stealing, it's okay, if it's from, you know, big store.

Rosina Kling 3:49

And here (inaudible) it's adding corporate America to those values. I think that the asterisk of like, Okay, well, do people really respect those corporations after everything?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 4:03

Stealing from an individual and stealing from a business? Those are two different things. Sort of...but only sort of.

Jack Trowbridge 4:17

But who suffers? If you steal from a chain store? Is it—is the business going to go "pbbt"? Or is it that the the individuals who work there, who are probably making?

Rosina Kling 4:31

That's the asterisk.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 4:33

That's the asterisk, the asterisk to non-stealing is, "if it's a chain, it's free rein". Kind of joking.

Rosina Kling 4:48

It's hard for us to have like an emotional connection to the corporation and be like, well, that's not really right. Whereas if we were like, oh, would you steal from a poor person? God no! I'd probably give them You know, and so hear you. That's the that's the issue? Well, it's not as easy as not stealing?

Jack Trowbridge 5:10

Well, I mean, I think a bigger example something that could be far more, both injurious and stealing. Like, there's certain, like cyber groups out there that target either corporations or governments, with the either with, like a political motive or, or just opposing the big institutions like that. I'm not really explaining this well, but...I don't know from what I hear, the—the—the gas pipeline and Texas that got hit with a cyber attack was was targeted by a group like that from Russia. But I think for people like that, who use technology to deal harm to corporations and governments on a big level, they believe that what they're doing is moral, at least in most cases. So that's, that's their asterisk.

Rosina Kling 6:14

They might have just pushed morals aside and been like, Okay, this is what we think this is what will profit us?

Jack Trowbridge 6:20

Yeah. Well, I mean, yeah, that that would be a different example. I'm talking about people who are like, like, like doing this out of, like, a sense of patriotism, like they want to attack the US or China, like, if driven by national identity or driven by, like, an opposition to like corporations.

Zander Lu 6:44

Would this be a case of what is moral being different from what is just?

Jack Trowbridge 6:54

Well, I mean, I don't know, it all depends on whether you think that it's right. What what they do.

Rosina Kling 7:03

I, well, I feel like the topic of justice has a lot more to do with like, I feel like in that situation, the question of justice isn't really relevant, because like, what are they doing justice for? themselves? That doesn't really like, you know, justice, I feel like has to have like a thing. And like an ending, you have to have something to kind of balance the scales, like, why is it just? why is it not? And if you're talking about like another country organizing and then attacking another country? I feel like that's outside of the moral question. Because I mean, it depends on if you think like international interference is moral.

Jack Trowbridge 7:51

Well, this is actually a great, I'm really glad you brought that up, because I was about to bring that into the conversation. Because I, I don't think it's moral or justified. I don't know which word to use there. If one country were to just go around, and just just invade every single country, and just absorb them just for its personal, national or economic gain.

Rosina Kling 8:21

Colonialism, colonizing?

Jack Trowbridge 8:24

Yes. But there are instances.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 8:27

Is that just?

Jack Trowbridge 8:29

But, but what about a state that's headed by a dictator, that abuses human rights and doesn't follow international law? Is it—When is it justified for other countries to come in?

Rosina Kling 8:53

Because there is like a balance of power. See, I feel like in that situation, if it was my way, the way I wish the world worked was that we all had our individual countries, and that's great. And people work the way they want to and live their life the way they want to. And then we all come together at some point, and there's like, the One World and we all like, acknowledge that we're on the earth and we want to survive, and we want people to have good lives. You know, like, I

wish it could just work like that, and then you wouldn't really have dictators because I feel like the idea of a dictator is just morally unjust anyway. That's my that's my...

Jack Trowbridge 9:34

Yeah, dictator dictators are injurious, not truthful, usually steal, probably not pure and probably don't have very much control over their senses.

Rosina Kling 9:48

I would agree with you there. So then, is it okay for some for another country to interfere or a bunch of other countries?

Jack Trowbridge 9:59

Is it more justified when there's a group of other countries doing it, or just one? Like I think about, like the war in Iraq, the US is basically like yeehaw. We're doing this ourselves. Yeah. Britain, I guess Britain, invaded too.

Unknown Speaker 10:14

But can that be considered moral? Because why do we do that? We did that for on profit. Oil.

Jack Trowbridge 10:21

Yeah.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 10:22

As someone who is a little bit Iraqi on my dad side, half Iraqi, represent, who will never go to that country ever, because I will get killed various reasons, because I'm also a Jew.

Rosina Kling 10:45

—sad to hear that? But don't you think that you asked me?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 10:49

It is not awesome

Jack Trowbridge 10:50

Look, let me just say I am not justifying the war in Iraq? That's not I was not trying to do that I would not.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 10:56

I just feel like in every single case that other countries and it's always Western countries, Western...Oh, you know, first world, whatever you want to call it, it's always countries that have more power than others because of their economic—their economy and their resources. Like this

thought is going nowhere, but never have any international interventions gone right. Or gone well, it always ends up being that then, the army that settles there sort of takes control of the area, or they leave and then the country is left with no government at all. And usually the people, it's like Lord of the Flies, you know, the people who take power don't usually have the best interest in mind.

Jack Trowbridge 12:03

Yeah—

Rosina Kling 12:04

I feel like we should—

Jack Trowbridge 12:05

—this is just like what happens in Afghanistan when the after the invasion, the United States would withdraw. And whenever that happens, the Taliban increase or influence increases.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 12:18

And it's even sort of what's happened in Israel/Palestine. Afterwards, World War II, the all of these countries got together and we're like, what should we do with the Jews? Let's just make up another state, even though it's the 20th century and that really shouldn't be a thing anymore. Although I understand where it was coming from, you know, there was a lot of trauma there. But then it just ended up it didn't, it didn't work out. Because it doesn't work out that way. You can't just implant people into a place. And you can't try to reorganize a person's or a people's government or their country's way of functioning. You have a corrupt government in Israel, and basically a useless government in Palestine. And then that's why, you know, you have things like Hamas, who come to represent this country, even though they're sort of nothing to do with the people. I'm very anti interventionalist.

Rosina Kling 13:38

Snaps for you. Well, Lulu, I have I have perhaps, an experiment for us. So my aunt, she works in like international relations, and she was a law student. Now she works with establishing like rule of law in countries. I think she's currently working with Congo. And the situation in Africa is that, you know, you think about Africa, and when you think about Africa, colonialism was two completely different...no. And then turns into the question of like, is it actually justified to, like, interfere in that, that situation? So what she's doing is, the court system there is basically like, totally sh\*t. And sorry. You can edit that out.

Jack Trowbridge 14:28

You're giving more work to Zander...get the censor bar.

Rosina Kling 14:32

Sorry. It's—it's very corrupt, though. You have people who are just being arrested off the street, they don't have places to hold them. They don't have judges to actually hold the courts. So you have people just staying in jail until they can actually get a court date, which is, you know, we wouldn't even allow that here. So what they're doing is trying, and she had this whole conversation about this with me because I was like, okay, is it moral to like, interfere in their court system to try to make it better, of course, but also, because you're changing it. And the way that they do it; the way that her company or whatever organization she's working with is doing is that they're finding people there who have slightly aligned themselves with the American court system values, and then they're putting them in power there to help even out the situation. And you know, a lot of the things that you've done, there are actually pretty good, they are helping people because the court system is really, just like, f\*cked. And ours is a little bit better. But what what is that costing the people Africa? And is that really justified to like, take all of your American views of your perfect court system, and put them in a place that you consider third world just because you think it'll make it better? Like? I don't know.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 15:55

Um, well, I can, I think we can certainly say about things, whether they are useful or not, or whether they improve situations or not, it's hard to say whether they are moral or not. There's this saying, and it's about Kant, but I, but I think you can sort of talk, talk about a lot of conceptions about of morality in this way. They say, the Kantian, the Kantian has clean hands, but in a manner of speaking, they actually have no hands. So that means that basically, you know, by trying to be pure, they actually just by trying to keep their hands clean, they end up not using them at all. So they have, they have no hands. And I think that's what when, when I'm hearing you talk, I think that what your aunt is doing is useful and improving the situation. Can we call it moral or immoral? I'm not sure. I was going to go somewhere with that, but I don't know. But it's sort of like what I was saying with before you can't call intervention. I don't know if you can say that interventionism is moral or immoral, you can say that it's harmful or, or useful. My question is when when we say justified, what what do we mean by that?

Jack Trowbridge 17:49

I think it means like, there is some...there's something maybe a principle that makes it okay, and this that makes a particular action okay, or not objectionable in a particular instance, like, I think there's, at least I've heard some, someone draw the distinction before, between justified and justifiable, like justified is a particular singular action is justified under certain circumstances, versus justifiable, is more general and not specific to the circumstances. I would like someone who's more well read to answer though.

Rosina Kling 18:43

Listen, I think, first of all, Lulu, what you bring up about that, that content quote, where the hands are clean, but the hands are really not doing anything, brings up a really good point, because I feel that you know, today you get your hands dirty and trying to help other people it's always gonna come with philosophical consequences, which I think is kind of important to remember but I think in the term of, sorry, in the question of like, what justified really means you hear a lot, you know, the ends justify the means. Are—and I think when most people think about that, the ends justify the means has a lot of other negative connotations with it just because of it's like a historical phrase. But I think if something the matter of whether something is justified or not, has...maybe this isn't so easy to answer.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 19:42

Okay. Um, you guys probably already all know this, but I feel like we can sort of, I think this is always a fun thing to chat about: the trolley problem. And I think this is sort of the question that the trolley problem, as says, Is it good to intervene with other sub questions.

Rosina Kling 20:11

Well, is the trolley problem, because I've heard so many there's versions where it's like your family is on one side, and then like, it's a bunch of other random people on the other. And there I feel like you, when you, when you introduce your own, like personal emotions into it, I feel like there's no way you're going to get any type of like moral answer out of it.

Unknown Speaker 20:29

Yeah. You might get something that's useful or something that an outcome that you personally would prefer, in that instance,

Lulu Fleming-Benite 20:36

The trolley problem that I know, I think it goes something like you are, you have a trolley going downhill. There's a fork in the road. On one side, there's a bunch of people on the track, that's where you're headed. So if you keep going, um, yeah, I think it's that like, if you're, you're in the trolley with two people. And there's, you know, five people on the track, and you're headed towards the track. And if you keep going in that direction, you're going to kill five people, but save the three people that are in, I need to look this up. But basically, it's like, let's look it up.

Zander Lu 21:23

The trolley problem I'm most familiar with is: you are heading down a track towards five workers. And you can divert the trolley down to another path where there's only one person on the track.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 21:42

Yeah.

Rosina Kling 21:44

Well, in that case, then it's easy five lives over one.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 21:48

But...

Rosina Kling 21:50

—personal. Wait, what? So wait, what's the catch?

Jack Trowbridge 21:53

Well, that—what, what's the question that we're using to frame this?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 21:59

Well, the question is, what is what is the moral thing to do? So Rosina, if you're saying that it's better to move the track, onto the side where there's only one person because that way, you're only killing one person rather than five, that makes you a consequentialist because the consequence—

Rosina Kling 22:18

Because the consequence justifies the, yeah...

Lulu Fleming-Benite 22:20

that one person. If you were a Kantian, for example, you might say, well, I can't divert the track, because that would be, that would make me like, if I'm not doing anything, then nothing is my fault. And by changing the situation, then I might be affecting it in a way that I don't even know like, another Kantian thing is, you have a friend at home. And you open the door, and there's a serial killer, and it's like, "hey, is your friend home? I'm trying to kill them." Do you lie. And say the friend is not home? Or do you tell the truth? A Kantian would tell the truth, because they would argue that it's always better to tell the truth. And you never know, your friend might have run away while the serial killer came in. And then you know, then the, then, then you wouldn't even have had to lie. Or if you did lie, and then your friend was actually running away. Okay, and then, you know, goes outside and sees your buddy and kills them. Sorry, I don't know if that totally helps.

Rosina Kling 22:43

No, Lulu, you explained it very well.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 23:11

So, you know, that's why the Kantian has no hands.



Rosina Kling 23:43

I think when you say anything about, Kant like he's very...

Lulu Fleming-Benite 23:47

he's pretty idiosyncratic.

Rosina Kling 23:48

Yeah. Like, I wouldn't say that lying would be unjustified in that situation. You know, obviously, this, the friend could run away and blah, blah, blah. But that's also a graph. There's no real way to know you can't tell the future. You know, you don't know if that's going to happen or not. And I feel like in the interest of saving a life a lie to someone who is morally unjust, a criminal might be okay.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 24:19

But you're lying!

Rosina Kling 24:20

Your friend's there.

Jack Trowbridge 24:21

I mean, I don't think it's like, I agreed with you up until you made the judgment that they're necessary that it's because they're morally unjust.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 24:30

Very bold thing to say—

Rosina Kling 24:33

But if you know that they're a serial killer, you said they were a serial killer.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 24:40

But does that make them moral—

Jack Trowbridge 24:42

Hold on. Wait, unless this is a public figure serial killer, then you don't necessarily know.

Rosina Kling 24:49

Okay, so, are we taking it as like, someone you don't know comes up or

Jack Trowbridge 24:53

Someone walks up and says, I'm gonna kill your friend. That's all you know.

Rosina Kling 24:58

But then in that case, you can say but's morally unjust because killing is wrong.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 25:04

But we established that killing is not always wrong. Did we not?

Jack Trowbridge 25:08

I guess you just need to make a call in that situation.

Rosina Kling 25:13

Let's say that your friend is in good condition and is not suffering.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 25:17

And here's what Kant says. And this is the problem with saying that killing is wrong or with any of the things that Zander put in the chat. The problem is you what is—you can only—the way to determine whether something is moral or not is whether you can universalize it.

Rosina Kling 25:39

Oh, no. Yeah, I I see that too.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 25:42

Universalize killing is wrong. Can you? I'm not sure.

Rosina Kling 25:47

I mean, I feel like I wouldn't have an issue. Because I mean, let's

Lulu Fleming-Benite 25:52

Didn't you say that euthanasia, should...

Rosina Kling 25:57

is euthanasia killing? I feel like—

Jack Trowbridge 26:01

Yes, yes.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 26:02

Yes.

Rosina Kling 26:04

Maybe I think murder is wrong, but I don't think okay,

Jack Trowbridge 26:08

well, murder is a different type of killing than euthanasia. Murder is specifically a premeditated. Well, that's first,

Lulu Fleming-Benite 26:17

When we say killing, we mean giving deaths. It doesn't.

Rosina Kling 26:22

I don't think killing

(inaudible)

Rosina Kling 26:23

There can be accidents with killing, I think if you're talking about because in my voice in my head, like, maybe you introduced like animals into this situation. I am not vegetarian, but I really try to like not eat meat that much. Because I feel like morally responsible for, you know, killing animals. So in that way, yeah, killing, you know, but I think if someone comes up to you and says they're gonna kill your friend, that feels like premeditated murder. And I feel like I would feel okay, like that person to save my friend's life.

Jack Trowbridge 27:03

I also think you have to consider is this a calculation that you would make in the moment? I mean, you'd go with what probably your instinct is, instead of trying to figure out this person's intentions, and whether or not they would be justified in doing what they're planning on doing. I think also a problem with like, a with trying to universalize "murder is wrong" is that people will define murder in different ways. Like, I don't mean to, like, bring this big subject in there. But people would—certain people in this nation would define abortion as murder, and say, well, all killing is wrong. Abortion is killing, therefore abortion is wrong, but I'm sure plenty would disagree. I would disagree. Okay.

Rosina Kling 28:00

I feel that that is a very common issue. Let me see, I have some notes on like the whole universal principle. So let me try to and find that.

Jack Trowbridge 28:26

What would define that, that that universal principle, if that was the case? Depends on who you are.

Rosina Kling 28:36

Well, 'cause Kant had categorical, categorical. imperatives, right. So he, I feel like it when you're talking about Kant, like he had very specific ideas about what he wants. And I feel like I can't operate under that same like, I feel like I have to include the whole story for like, each sub each like, thing. It's the same as in Con Law. Both sides of the story are important in Con Law, you know. And that's like the whole issue,

Jack Trowbridge 29:08

Most of the time.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 29:12

You guys should read the book that I just translated, "Do you really think what you think you think" and it will help you understand your morals. (inaudible)

Rosina Kling 29:27

Okay, I found it. So, this was formulation, one of cons thing is the universe stability principle, is formulation to was the formulation of humanity, formula of humanity, which says, act so that you treat humanity whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a mere means so you never use other people to your own benefit type of situation. There's another one. Like is it? So I feel like his his formula is can be kind of really, really difficult to navigate in contemporary times, because this is.

Jack Trowbridge 30:10

So I'm sorry, because I don't really have a big background. I can't I haven't read any of his work. I don't know much about him. What? Essentially, what was this like a central philosophy? Like, what did he believe that there can be universal morality or without religion?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 30:29

I mean, I don't know how you would explain it Rosina, I think, Kant was the kind of guy where it was like, I think it's, so I'm right. Now, I'm joking, but not really. Like, if you read this, his philosophy on like aesthetics and stuff, it's basically what is beautiful is what, what Kant thinks is beautiful.

Rosina Kling 30:56

Well, I've read his stuff, it wasn't, it wasn't as bad as that it was actually pretty—I think a lot of his work is, has to do with like, including the the stuff of like other people and kind of this. I don't think it is as subjective as that. But I think that when people talk about Kant, like, the big thing is that he separated religion and morality, which is a huge thing, because philosophers didn't do that back then. So I don't know what his like, basic kind of philosophical thing is,

because I haven't read like all of Kant's work. But in his separation of religion and morality, there's a lot that comes with that, because philosophical thought was like, governed by the divine before and that the moral, like God could lead you to the moral answer something and he said that, that those things are separated, because religion is a choice. You know, it's, maybe it's not a choice. I don't know how to explain it. But I don't think I really know what his like standard philosophical ideas are. But I don't know what I'm saying anymore. Forget, I'm talking.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 32:14

I think he's sort of, again, enumerating it, his main like moral things, the categorical imperative. And they're, I think they're like three parts, criteria that something an action has to meet, in order to, for it to be moral. So it's like three sort of tests. The first one is, can it be universalized? Let me look it up. And I think you mentioned the one about instrumentalizing, yourself or another?

Rosina Kling 32:49

I don't think it's that. So okay, what he argued, he said, unlike other things in the world, we're self governed, which we are, we're able to set our own ends, make our own free decision, and based on like rational thought, and wills, which obviously not everyone does. So that's another reason why it's like really hard to make those decisions today. But it's categorical, Categorical Imperative thing said that you're, your moral obligations are defined by Pure Reason. So reason is really important here. And the reason part gets a little complicated, because not everyone reasons the same, which is why I don't think you can kind of like apply one thing to like, how people interpret his like thought stuff. But I mean, I appreciate that it's like based on reason and not religion, because that was really getting on my nerves. No offense, but yeah.

Zander Lu 33:54

So one thing about Kant is, he emphasizes motive in his teachings. So I'm wondering—one problem that I have with Kant is the possibility and probability of one thing having multiple motivations. Is that something that you agree with? Or

Jack Trowbridge 34:26

What do you have an example in mind? One thing having multiple motivations?

Zander Lu 34:33

Well, an example I can think of just off the top of my head was play testing, Caleb (Kohn-Blank)'s game. There's the altruistic helping a friend motivation. And then there's also the use for Senior Project hours where we use it, secondarily, to talk about our own projects. And to further understand our projects.

Jack Trowbridge 35:09

That might be a bad example. I wasn't using it to understand my project. I, okay, here's it. I see what you're saying, I see what you're trying to introduce the example that came to mind have enemies seen the show Breaking Bad. Well, at least you'll probably know the premise, a guy gets diagnosed with cancer and starts cooking meth to pay off his payments, supposedly. And there's basically two motivations that you can see for this. One is to support his family financially. Because he makes very little money, it's got two kids, wife doesn't work and get all these medical bills. And the other which becomes more apparent is it fuels his his ego and personal lust for power. Is this the type of thing you're talking about? What is sort of like these two different motivations for the same thing that are kind of in conflict?

Rosina Kling 36:19

Yeah, but here, there's more than just two motivations. Because there's other motivation that he's the chemistry teacher. So he's very good at making? Yeah, well, that's

Lulu Fleming-Benite 36:29

Is that a motivation? or is that just—

Jack Trowbridge 36:31

that goes into, yeah, it's not a motivation necessarily. It's connected to his his personal desire for recognition, because he never got recognized for how talented he was as a chemist.

Rosina Kling 36:46

So I think here's where you can kind of implement, like, the moral thing, because you can be like, well, he's just doing his job. Drugs, no. But cuz I've just heard things about it. But I think, I don't know.

Jack Trowbridge 37:05

He's not a chemistry teacher for very long in the show.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 37:09

Drugs are moral or immoral.

Jack Trowbridge 37:13

Who? Are you asking?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 37:18

I don't really think it can be said that. Drugs are more alert, more or less? It depends on your...

Rosina Kling 37:25

What, what? Give us a motivation for the drug, and then we can

Lulu Fleming-Benite 37:32

It depends on your conception of morality. Yeah, you can argue that if they, if they are making that choice, by their own will do that drug and they're not directly affecting anyone. And by that, I mean, you're not, you know, like, stealing from somebody in order to pay for your drugs, or you're not, you know, that sort of thing. I'm not talking about like, your mom is sad, because you're doing drugs, or your kids or, I mean...

Rosina Kling 38:04

Well think about like—Think about constant universe ability principle.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 38:08

Or you can say that—

Rosina Kling 38:09

Can you universalize it?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 38:11

—because the consequence is that you ruined your life.

Zander Lu 38:22

So studies are being done to isolate the non-addictive properties of ecstasy in order to treat depression. Is that immoral?

Rosina Kling 38:35

I mean, as someone with depression, the idea that like, was, like I can, I can kind of speak from personal experience, because I have had substance issues, and I have depression. So for someone living like this, I'm already on medications that really changed a lot of things for me and the ways that I can describe can sometimes almost be worse than drugs. So I think when you when you take kind of like, the situation of what medication and pharmaceuticals are today, you've like a totally different issue. But I think, you know, a big part of like the moral and philosophical conversations are, you know, your, your personal? Like, what do you want? personally? First of all, you have to determine like, how much of your personal like, how much do you want that to like value? How much do you want to value like your own personal beliefs or like wishes, you know? Because if you think about it with the universal thing, like No, I don't want to universalize drug usage, but at the same time when it might help someone specific, like how do you how do you make that moral moral decision when it like contradicts a lot of things? I feel like we don't really have the exact framework for how to think about those things yet, because part of it is a lot of science. Because I wouldn't want to take some drug not knowing what it like does to me. And yet, I'm on birth control, and it's like ruining me. So, you know, it depends.

Jack Trowbridge 1:05

Yeah, I think when it comes to drug consumption and distribution, you, you have to, alright, at least I have tried to think about it in two different ways. At least with like, serious drugs that are considered illegal, like heroin or methamphetamine, I think it's, I think it can be considered morally objectionable to produce and distribute those drugs, because of their highly addictive and highly injurious qualities. Because it's not the case that people who use them can always just like, stop using it. It's hard to consider it a rational choice for someone to take a drug, exactly the overdose. But so I think people who, sorry, I was just contradicting myself in my head, I think, in many instances, people who are part of that supply chain of distributing this highly addictive, highly destructive drugs can be held accountable. But also, like, you can say that for the people way at the top who were running such an operation, but what about like, dealers on the street? Who there might be, like Rosina, you said, there's a story to every case. There's a reason why people got into drug dealing, and, it's probably not the desire to harm other people. In the case of someone just on the street doing drugs.

Rosina Kling 2:50

Jack, can I ask you, like, in your opinion, because you mentioned that there's people, you know, very high up if you were to universalize, like a certain judgment, or, let's say, a strange drug usage, or in like this situation of like heroin, or meth, or whatever it is? Do you think you could universalize it and be okay, with that decision, like a certain way?

Jack Trowbridge 3:18

Say that all drug dealing is bad all the time? Or? Or is that? Is that what you're saying?

Rosina Kling 3:24

No. Let's think about like, like, arguments be for like the usage, universal, like usage of it. Can you like, apply moral like restrictions around that? Like, what would your argument be for that?

Jack Trowbridge 3:42

About people using drugs?

Rosina Kling 3:45

No, just like, just like, what do you think the consequences of applying like, some sort of like moral framework for drug usage? universally?

Jack Trowbridge 3:55

Okay, consequences of that? Well, I don't think that you can treat all drugs equally. You can't equate marijuana, or even alcohol with to heroin or meth. I think those things have to be treated



as as separate things. Partially because of the end, there's a scientific element that Zander was talking about, because of the addictive and destructive qualities are different between the two. And if you punished every drug user, as if they were using heroin, then I think you'd be punishing some people unfairly.

Rosina Kling 4:39

Which is literally what they do. And that's why I feel like talking about this is like, it doesn't seem right. Right. And like, why I feel like—

Jack Trowbridge 4:51

but what's, what's the alternative to that? I mean, do you decriminalize all drugs?

Rosina Kling 4:57

No. I mean, I was I was thinking specifically of like, hard drug usage like heroin, or let's say cocaine, because it's really, really popular. And, you know, so many people who are like running everything in this country, probably around the world also probably used drugs at some point in time, probably some hard drugs too. So like, would you be justified in? And I don't know, if you would think that they deserve punishment or rehabilitation, whatever you think would be right. But do you think you could universalize an idea that there's some sort of like, moral framework for hard drug usage? I just want to know what you think?

Jack Trowbridge 5:48

Um, I don't know. It's hard to say, because part of me wants to say that like, that drug, that people who are addicted to drugs, it's it's a disease. And I think there's some scientific evidence to support that. And that they're victims of a situation that is not entirely their own. And at one point, at some point in their usage, it becomes not a rational decision. But I'm not sure what I'm trying to say.

Rosina Kling 6:30

It's okay, you don't need to go in depth, I think you make some very good points. And I think it's important to probably to actually answer that question.

Jack Trowbridge 6:36

Yeah.

Zander Lu 6:38

On the other hand, with the universal principle, universalization principle, you have divided the world into black and white. And a lot of moral thought, is along similar lines, and then you have moral relativism, which says, There is no hard line. You can't say, either, all drugs are bad, or all drugs are good. You have to take into, you have to take the context with it. And then even

utilitarianism, for example, or libertarianism. It's ultimately, the choice of whomever takes the drug. Or if you take the drug, and it makes you more productive, even though it harms yourself, the greater societal good outweighs that.

Rosina Kling 7:55

That's a really good point.

Jack Trowbridge 7:56

But then again, like aren't there multiple ways of looking at what is the greater societal good, because one could say that the greater societal good is to lock them the hell up and keep them away from our children. But you could also say that if we expend police and justice resources to locking up every single person who uses drugs in this country, then we will have no money.

Rosina Kling 8:22

Well, I think that so the first point you brought up talk about like locking them up and keeping them away from children. There's so much—there's so many stereotypes around drug users. I don't think any serious drug user is going to be I mean, there are definitely some exceptions, always context important. But I drug users who are struggling with addiction, or with whatever they're on the drug for even you know, it could be pharmaceutical to those people usually aren't looking for violence against your children. So how can you justify the court's decision to like, lawfully, execute those or imprison those who are using drugs? Because they are fearful that they're going to hurt people? I mean, how much scientific evidence can you actually hold to, like, prove that that's true? No, are—obviously they're violent people, and they're violent people who use drugs. And then I think you have like a whole nother category of people because, you know, drugs don't implicate violence, you know. And then I think you have to hold, you know, hold that with, like, our cultural values today. And then I think you have a lot of discrepancies.

Jack Trowbridge 9:39

Yeah. I think an even more interesting question is how do we treat people who, who deal drugs? And should the state be like, to what extent should the state be able to use force to stop that from happening? Like, I think most people connect knowledge that, that dealing—or not dealing—that, I don't know see every, every, every time I try and make a statement like this, I end up like contradicting myself in the head. But I think most people accept that, that the drug trade of like things like heroin, meth, cocaine is bad. Right? I think most people believe that. So then what is the government doing?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 10:39

Can you specify what you mean by bad? Sorry, I missed a whole chapter.

Jack Trowbridge 10:41

No, no, no, it's fine.

Rosina Kling 10:47

Well, yeah. Jack, just the thing like drug distribu—distribution doesn't happen for drug usage. So I think in this case, you have to consider drug usage before because there are always going to be people who are using drugs. And you can't say that everyone thinks that drug dealing is bad, because a lot of people are using those drugs. So and that's for I think it's, you know, like, like, the government's not going to deal with something like that. Because that's, you know, there's a lot of things that our government just can't do, because people would have too many issues with it. And, you know, the way the way our government works, I mean, think about Congress try to pass a law about anything, and you get, you know, it's almost impossible to do anything. So I agree with your statement. But I also think that there's a lot that comes with it.

Zander Lu 11:47

I'd like to rephrase what I said earlier about utilitarian drug use. So the utilitarian—

Jack Trowbridge 11:56

Oh, I thought you were talking about libertarianism. I didn't know you're talking about that. Okay.

Zander Lu 11:59

Yeah, the utilitarian view is that you want to maximize pleasure over pain. And so if you deem the pleasure from the high of the drug, to be worth more than the pain that it causes, both to yourself and to your family, any potential drawback like the crash, or potential violence, you commit while on the drug? If that pleasure outweighs that, then it is the moral thing to do to do drugs, under a utilitarian view.

Rosina Kling 12:46

I wouldn't go as far to say that that's like the moral decision of it, because utilitarianism, like there's a ton of people who've died because of drug usage too. So you can easily just as argue that no drugs for anyone because of that.

Jack Trowbridge 13:02

Yeah. And you could also like, how rational of a choice is it to say, for instance, if you're addicted to a certain drug that the pleasure outweighs the pain? Like, is that a calculation that that that people would make all the time? I don't know.

Rosina Kling 13:27

Jack, that's a conscious choice that almost—a lot of people make, like every day.

Jack Trowbridge 13:37

Yeah, I think like a fallback for—a drawback of libertarianism in this instance is like some people who would—

Zander Lu 13:48

Utilitarianism or libertarianism?

Jack Trowbridge 13:50

Libertarianism, which, and let's make sure we're on like the same premise here is like that. The moral was, as you describe it, because you have read things.

Zander Lu 14:05

What's moral is letting everyone decide for themselves what they want to do. And as Rosina put in the chat, the political application is minimizing the state and state powers. And in moral application, it is a bit different. But essentially similar in that I don't intervene in your matters. You don't intervene in mine. If I want to do drugs, I do drugs. As long as it doesn't hurt you. It's perfectly fine.

Jack Trowbridge 14:46

Yeah. But then again, what about on the manufacturing end? I mean, one of the things that we talked about like a principle of like not, not a exploiting others for your own gains, right? Because you could, you could still argue that, like, pharmaceutical companies are just people who manufacture drugs that like that harm. People are relying on the idea of, well, somebody is going to do it. Somebody needs this. So I'm going to make it regardless of whether it harms people I can't give. Yeah.

Lulu Fleming-Benite 15:31

Yeah. I mean, I'm not sure where you're driving this point, but just—

Jack Trowbridge 15:34

I don't know, either, so...

Lulu Fleming-Benite 15:37

You know, manufacturing of opioids and stuff, the thing that Oxycontin (inaudible) here that it's not only that they were making, it might help some people, they kept making it, and they, they distributed it in a way that they were purposefully getting people addicted, so that they would buy more of it, and then the Sackler family, or you know, what's the name of the company that makes us Oxycontin?

Jack Trowbridge 16:08  
Purdue?

Lulu Fleming-Benite 16:11  
Purdue pharma. So they could just make more money.

**This is the end of the recording. The conversation continued.**