

Chapter 1 : Political views of Christopher Hitchens - Wikipedia

Principles of Liberalism; trade-offs are inevitable in our world of limitations and some individuals are bound to lose against others in these trade-offs, the.

But for equality their passion is ardent, insatiable, incessant, invincible; they call for equality in freedom, and if they cannot obtain that, they still call for equality in slavery. Thus the rule of law, the absence of arbitrary legal privileges or distinctions of status, appears to the liberal as the legal embodiment of freedom and equality alike, and as his greatest and proudest achievement. Since a free society will not produce the kind of uniform, coherent moral scheme that would be necessary to justify systematic redistribution, the ideal of justice that would govern it cannot be that of a society as a whole, but only that of someone within it. Merit and Value Closely related to the demand for a less unequal distribution of the good things of the world, and perhaps underpinning much of the sense of injustice driving it, is a feeling that market outcomes do not adequately reflect our intuitions of moral merit. A ready source of discontent may be found, for example, in the fact that a free society of any complexity will witness a marked discrepancy between the rewards of individuals within the same profession and even between those possessing the same technical skills or special abilities. Insofar as the burden of discovering how to make optimal use of our abilities is concerned, the free society makes an entrepreneur of every one of us, with all the attendant frustrations, disappointments, and resentments. Hard as one may find the discipline thus imposed, and bitter as it may be to fail in making oneself as useful to others as one might have been hence failing as well to reap the rewards of that usefulness, the discipline we may deplore is inseparable from the freedom we cherish. There is a sense, of course, in which we would be relieved of a burden if we were simply told what to do: If we were to be guided by the moral character of an action, however, rather than by the value it has for us as consumers, the allocative dimension of the problem would surely lead us to just the opposite conclusion. What seems a lot less certain, however, is whether those falling short would be any happier in a more strictly meritorious world, in which their lack of success could be directly and reliably attributed to their own shortcomings. Surely we should at least pause to consider that such a world might be far crueler than even the capriciousness we may deplore and lament. The farce of confiscatory marginal income tax rates approaching a hundred percent on paper, combined with myriad special provisions and loopholes that render them ineffective, has been playing itself out at great length over the past half-century and seems to have run its course at last. Behind many a seemingly unwarranted discrepancy in income are a host of equalizing factors that need to be considered, and that would be all but impossible to calculate, except in a few cases, without reliance on the information gathering power of the market. A snap-shot of income distributions at any one point in time will fail to distinguish, for one, between merely temporary, short-run differences and long-run differences in income, even though the former is the very mark of a dynamic, socially mobile society as opposed to one dominated by status. Anyone who would presume to combine, weigh, and reconcile all these considerations without recourse to market forces would somehow have to overcome the most daunting obstacles. The more freely market forces are allowed to operate, on the other hand, the more reliably can they fulfill their function of signaling, to those who need to decide what to do with themselves, just what skills or services are in particular demand or especially scarce at the moment. The level of remuneration offered thus transmits some of the vitally important information necessary for an individual to decide where to invest his energies, and creates an incentive to direct them where others value them most. No such determination can ever be fail-proof, of course, and many actual options may be unappealing; yet such risk, uncertainty, and frustration is but the converse of that unrestricted freedom and opportunity which can only thrive in a society where none but the individual himself bears the responsibility for finding his way. There is, for one, the straightforward fact that even billions concentrated in the hands of a relatively few will have only a modest impact when distributed among millions. For, implausible as it may seem at first, we all stand to benefit from the existence of a class of the rich, even if their ways may strike us as often idle and vain, frivolous and wasteful. Two considerations stand out particularly. First, there is the important role of the wealthy as independent foci of support to foster experimentation and

cultural diversity, especially in the arts never yet adequately supported where the majority has displaced the wealthy patron, but generally wherever else new ideas have fought for recognition. It is too frequently overlooked, as Hayek rightly points out, that action by collective agreement must be limited, by its very nature, to instances where previous efforts have already produced consensus. Then there is a second, more strictly economic, respect in which even the most egalitarian society would have to mimic the dynamics of a free society or else face stagnation. For in effect, though also inadvertently, the expenditures of the rich will serve to defray the initial cost of experimentation and development that must precede the introduction of any consumer good on a large scale. At any given moment, it is true, we might be able to improve the position of the poorest by taking from the wealthiest: Vintage, , p. Pocock Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett, , p. University of Chicago Press,], p. For a discussion of the issues raised by these terms under contemporary North American conditions, compare Friedrich A. University of Chicago Press, , pp. But notice the difference: Quoted in Friedrich A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, , p. Thus also Hayek, RS xxxvi: Norton,], part I, esp. Of course the possibility of passing on material goods is an important factor in perpetuating family traditions and standards, but that does not mean that such transmission is primarily material, let alone pecuniary. Cultural values and customs, moral habits, the intelligence and kindness of parents, and everything else that goes into a good and loving home are surely at least as important, and probably far more so, than the material circumstances in which they are embedded. Perhaps one should give some credit to those who shrink from the colossal presumption of assessing these complex qualitative differences by focusing instead on what can be gauged more readily; by the same token, however, the reduction of inheritance to a matter of money is a crude materialism curiously at odds with the higher motives egalitarians commonly claim for themselves. It might also be noted that rich and powerful parents will always find ways to pass on their wealth and influence, and that the bequest of money is likely to be far cheaper from a social point of view than the alternatives Hayek, RS , CL ; Friedman Basic Books, , pp. And the essential element of security that the competitive system offers, the great variety of opportunities, is more and more reduced. Thus Hayek, CL It can hardly be denied that as we grow richer, that minimum of sustenance which the community has always provided for those not able to look after themselves, and which can be provided outside the market, will gradually rise, or that government may, usefully and without doing any harm, assist or even lead in such endeavors. Compare Hayek, CL Thus also Hayek, CL The college professor whose colleague wins a sweepstake will envy him but is unlikely to bear him any malice or feel unjustly treated. After all, the goddess of chance, as of justice, is blind. The salary raise was a deliberate judgment of relative merit. Envy will become more severe as competitors are pitted more directly against each other on the same dimension, creating frustrations among the losers that are much more difficult to reason away Nozick *The Modern Library*, , p. For some related considerations, compare Friedman , ; Hayek, CL Money has been the object of particular opprobrium, of course, inasmuch as it makes the limitations on our choices painfully obvious. Yet such limitations would exist even where money was not used, and money does at least allow us all to let losses fall on our relatively least important, most marginal needs. It is ironic how much the development of socialist doctrine, and especially of Marxism, owed to precisely this kind of patronage, which it everywhere suppressed once ensconced in power. Compare also Friedman , Queen Elizabeth owned silk stockings. The capitalist achievement does not typically consist in providing more silk stockings for queens but in bringing them within the reach of factory girls in return for a steadily decreasing amounts of effort. To take more recent examples from the world of consumer electronics, one might marvel at the pace at which the cell phone or the laptop computer has moved from a plaything of the very rich and ostentatious to an everyday item within reach of virtually everyone. This essay was awarded first prize in the Olive W. Garvey Essay Contest and the author would like to express his thanks and appreciation to The Independent Institute. He also is a winner of The Sir John M. Templeton Fellowships Essay Contest. The author would like to express his thanks and appreciation to The Independent Institute.

Chapter 2 : Intolerant Liberalism – Global Issues

For liberalism to survive as an ideology, reality must be made to fit the concept, people need to "get with the program," and the doctrine must be preserved against all evidence to the contrary.

Many have abandoned liberal principles, and even those I would call friends of liberalism have begun to think that liberalism has failed. Liberalism comes in many forms, and any tradition this old and studied will frustrate those who attempt to define even a common, agreed upon core. My hope is that many people who may be disillusioned with liberalism will look upon these principles with fresh eyes. Liberalism is often defined in terms of the primacy of individual liberty. This is already two concepts: These apply to all human persons, which is to say the principles are universal. Individualism and universalism are supported by the idea that persons have in some sense an innate moral equality merely by virtue of their humanity. Finally, pluralism, or a commitment to toleration of diversity of belief and culture, directly obtains from the moral equality of individuals and their free use of reason. Individualism takes the individual human being to be the fundamental unit of ethics and politics. Individualism does not mean atomism. The liberal may adhere to individualism and acknowledge the profound importance of human connection and relationships. Each individual of course has a mother, and enters the world bearing the genetic imprints of both their mother and their father. A liberal may place immense value on their membership in different groups, whether family, ethnic group, nation or state, community, faith, and so on. Nevertheless, there is a deep internality to human life. The individual experiences a narrative and store of memories they alone are privy to. They alone perceive their thoughts and internal debates; they dream only their own dreams. While thoughts and emotions may be held simultaneously for the same reasons across persons, they are still felt distinctly by each individual. Our bodies are separate. An individual digests only their own food and feels only their own thirst and hunger; they feel fatigue only from their own muscles, pleasure and pain from only their own nervous system. The individual breathes with only their lungs and pumps blood with only their heart. And of course the individual is fated to die alone. The liberal takes this separateness as a fundamental truth. Any ideology that ignores or denies this separateness of individuals, or that asserts the individual is of less moral importance than some group, is to that extent illiberal. Thus, utilitarianism, an ethical approach that aggregates pain and pleasure across individuals, must be at least in tension with liberalism, though there are forms of utilitarianism that seek to resolve this tension. While trade-offs are inevitable in our world of limitations and some individuals are bound to lose against others in these trade-offs, the liberal maintains that no individuals may simply be subsumed into a collective or otherwise ignored in ethical considerations. Liberty The liberal begins by assuming the intrinsic value of individual liberty. The individual may do or be what they please and no one should interfere with their actions or projects unless they have powerful justifying reasons to interfere. This applies to everyday actions like choosing where to go, what to eat or drink, what to buy or sell, what to wear, whether to pray or sing or exercise and how. And where these actions involve others, the assumption of liberty extends to whom the individual chooses to interact with. It applies to our long term projects. The individual is free to choose a course of study or not to study , a career or job, whether to have a family and whom to create that family with, a sport or craft to master, and so on. An individual is free to choose and pursue their own understanding of God s , the heavens, and the good life. They choose a religious faith, or not to believe at all. They determine for themselves the importance of civic engagement, work-family balance, and education. And they are free to develop their own political beliefs, and which political factions to join, if any. To the liberal, none of this requires permission or approval. This presumption can be contrasted with an illiberal understanding that an individual is not assumed to be free to act without explicit permission. A totalitarian society may operate with this general understanding. Avoiding this extreme, we can consider areas of social life as illiberal to the extent they require that individuals seek permission from some authority before they commit some action, before they plan and execute projects, and before they fashion their own fundamental beliefs about life and living. Thus we speak of the illiberalism of a command-and-control economy because individuals are not free to pursue their own agendas in the market. Conversely we speak of liberalizing

reforms when unnecessary or poorly justified regulations are removed. We speak of censorship and other curtailments of free expression as illiberal. State support of a specific faith and repression of disfavored religions are likewise illiberal. But the presumption of liberty can be overridden. If there are strong reasons to forbid a person from doing something, then the liberal has no problem with forbidding that thing. Such overriding considerations can take many forms, such as the need to protect the liberty of others, facilitating social order for collective benefit, or preventing gross moral horror. Mileage will vary on when individual freedom can be justifiably overridden, and here is not the place to resolve ideological disputes, but the idea of the presumption of liberty should be clear enough. And liberty must be understood in context. The basic liberties mentioned above are intuitive enough to understand outside any political context, but the imperatives of freedom in property, contracts, finance, intellectual property, common law, restitution for historical injustices, and other complicated domains are much harder to discern. Bodies of statute and precedent stack, interpenetrate, and co-evolve so that we can only make trade-offs among competing but legitimate values. What, for example, does the presumption of liberty advise in the case of separatist religious groups seeking to remove their children from compulsory schooling? The implications of freedom are even murkier where jurisdictions overlap, or where international conflicts and obligations are concerned. Some problems are hard.

Universalism and moral equality The blessings of liberty belong to each individual, regardless of their sex, race, place of birth, religion, sexuality, wealth, class, disability, or any other contingent characteristic. Each individual deserves freedom just in virtue of their humanity and their abilities to reason and participate in society in moral ways. A person has a certain inalienable dignity as an individual just by being capable of enjoying free thought and action. Those societies and belief systems are illiberal to the extent they fail to respect the dignity and liberty of individuals on account of these factors. Racist and ethnonationalist regimes; societies that place individuals in certain castes because of the identities of their parents that they cannot escape; societies that condone religious persecution; patriarchal societies that limit the freedom of women or transgender persons; all these societies are illiberal. And otherwise liberal societies are illiberal to the extent they condone or allow these sorts of hierarchies. The liberal understands that different societies have developed along different trajectories. A society in which certain religious or ethnic groups suffered a long period of violence and strife may have a significantly different constitution from a society in which there was a dominant majority group for a long time. The liberal recognizes that no single liberal constitution can be simply copied and pasted to another society without paying careful attention to the social and historical context. Furthermore, no currently existing society is perfectly liberal. Liberalism is a work in progress around the world, and while some countries are certainly more liberal than others, those we would consider basically liberal have different strengths and weaknesses say, a freer labor market in one versus stronger protection for religious liberty or free speech in another. And all have adapted liberal principles to their institutions in slightly different ways say, in the procedural details of legislative bodies. No one and no society is in a position to dictate to those from other cultures exactly how liberal principles must be applied. But this is no comfort to illiberal governments and other authorities around the world. No one and no society is free from liberal criticism. Indeed, liberalism encourages intercultural dialogue and exchange, both on grounds of freedom as well as learning and improving from exchange. Perfection is not a prerequisite for liberal criticism. First, some level of dignity is simply inalienable. Even if a person must be confined to protect the rest of society, their humanity affords them some basic level of decent treatment. The very basis for individual dignity—the ability to reflect and choose—makes diversity inevitable. Individuals will come to different conclusions about matters of high and low importance and everything in between. To the extent possible, the liberal must respect the good faith beliefs of their fellows. A liberal may disapprove of the religious doctrines of others but they must still respect the rights of those others to practice their faiths. The liberal recognizes that in order to live together in peace, we must accommodate the sincerely held beliefs of others who understand the world very differently but who also desire peaceful and productive coexistence. Exceptions arise when some party takes their deeply held beliefs to be inconsistent with the pluralistic peace and acts on those beliefs through violence or threats of violence. The liberal begins with the assumption that another individual has chosen their deeply held beliefs and lifestyle with a good faith use of their rational powers. The liberal society

can thus be expected to be and become diverse in terms of ethnicity, religion, and lifestyle. Liberal purposes These are the principles the liberal seeks to apply to society and its government. Given the importance of individual freedom and pluralism to liberalism, any social goal would need to be rather vague and capacious to avoid an illiberal prescriptivism. Individual freedom itself is one liberal goal. That is, a liberal society is one that aims toward securing and nourishing freedom to ever greater degrees. The liberal looks to a future where each person, regardless of their background, is able to develop their capacities so they can make decisions and plan projects that are truly their own. Peace has already been mentioned. One of the historical reasons liberal principles coalesced in the first place was to end ethnic and religious strife, and to find a way diverse people could live together in peace. Liberalism seeks to entrench this pluralistic peace, and to extend its reach as widely as possible. It prevents individuals from pursuing the kinds of lives they have good reason to wish to live because they are struggling merely to survive. Poverty can also exacerbate strife and conflict. While the liberal may choose to live their own life within frugal means, the liberal recognizes that a prosperous society empowers individuals to make more authentic choices about their lives, rather than choices circumscribed by desperation. The liberal thus advances the principles of individualism, freedom, universalism, equality, and pluralism in society, and in so doing ultimately directs that society toward the natural liberal ends of peace, freedom, and prosperity for all.

Chapter 3 : Trade-Offs - Conservative News

Trade-Offs (Steven Hayward) There is other news happening right now aside from the Kavanaugh matter and the upcoming elections. Like the last minute deal with Canada to restructure NAFTA.

Universities are a relatively recent invention in the , or so years in which humans, in forms we would recognize today, inhabit the planet. The oldest universities such as Bologna and Oxford date back ten centuries and along with other medieval universities were first established to transmit religious dogma and support a world order in which most people would endure a stagnant life of misery in hopes of eventual salvation in the afterlife. Those were indeed times in which societies were ruled by very small elites, nobles and religious leaders, whose legitimacy was predicated on claimed links to divinity or prophets. The Italian Renaissance, borne out of the extraordinary convergence of talent from multiple disciplines and areas of human creativity which the House of Medici sponsored in Florence in the fourteenth and fifteenth century, would begin a process of examination of the powerful ideology of the Middle Ages which condemned most humans to a life of servitude to nobles and preachers. Products of the Italian Renaissance were the Renaissance and Humanism which would, over the following two centuries, lay the foundation for an extraordinarily powerful alternative set of ideas. The ideas that ordinary people had rights, and the capacity to improve themselves and their communities. These ideas are central to liberalism the political philosophy founded by John Locke which gave preeminence to the ideas of liberty and equality, and which is the foundation of the freedoms on which democratic societies are founded: Three products of liberalism are democracy, public education and the modern university. All of them based on great hopes in human reason, assisted by science, to interpret and transform the world. All of them designed on the premise that the aspiration of salvation should be replaced by the aspiration to improve the world. At its core, the liberal project is cosmopolitan, a global project of humanity advancing together towards a world of greater freedom and justice. Each of these creations of the enlightenment is interdependent with the two others: Globally, access to public education expanded significantly with the consolidation of nation states and the expansion of liberalism in the s, and again after World War II as a result of the creation of a global architecture to promote the values of freedom and equality, liberal ideas, around the world, reflected in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the United Nations system and other global institutions to advance such rights. Under liberalism it was assumed that public education could serve democratic political and economic goals with limited trade offs between them. Additional goals such as advancing human rights and modernization were also seen as convergent with political and economic goals. For this reason, most governments advancing education as part of liberalism saw limited trade offs between the goals of education. The challenges to liberalism from communism and fascism brought alternative goals for public education, challenging the notion that individuals could be free to choose which education to pursue, and emphasizing political and economic goals, as well as downplaying human rights and modernization goals. The modern research university, chartered by Wilhelm Humboldt in Berlin in , was a product of the liberal project designed to advance truth, through scientific research, the development of rational and critical thought, through education, and the enlightenment of the larger public, through extension. Most universities built since have embraced, to varying degrees, these three goals. Since the fall of the Berlin wall, the main political challenge to these liberal views came from populism. Populism posits that ordinary people are exploited by elites and challenges the notion of representative democracy with direct participation by the masses. Since direct participation by large numbers in complex societies is impractical, too often populism results in autocratic rule by a leader, who claims to be communicating directly with the masses, unobstructed from intermediary institutions such as political parties, elected representatives to Congress, organizations of civil society, the judiciary or the Press. This notion of direct links between the autocrat and the people undermines the normal division of power and the checks and balances on which democratic government depends. Historically, some political scientists have argued that such autocratic rule of populist leaders can easily give rise to fascism. Modern populists exploit the following ideas. The first that globalization, and liberal policies, do not benefit all, and that there are important groups of the population who

are left behind, and without hope of seeing their conditions improve. They attribute this to elites that are not accountable to those groups, to a model of development that fails to envision a role for these groups which are left behind, and to a state that is captured by administrators and interest groups who advance their own interests at the expense of those of the people. Populists exploit also cultural divides among the population, deep differences in values and worldviews. In the recent presidential election in the United States, these divisions are between the political establishment, which since World War II followed the views of the Hamiltonians and Wilsonians with the older views of the Jeffersonians and Jacksonians. Hamiltonians embraced the cosmopolitan liberal project so that the United States would play a global leadership role in creating a global liberal order to contain the Soviet Union and advance US interests. Wilsonians also advanced a global liberal order in terms of values that would reduce global conflict and violence. They promoted human rights, democratic governance and the rule of law. Jeffersonians believe that minimizing the global role of the United States would reduce costs and risks to the country. Jacksonian populist nationalists, in contrast, believe that advancement in the conditions of American citizens would best pursued delinking from cosmopolitan enlightenment ideals and from the global liberal order. Populism is therefore a serious challenge to the idea of a universal project to advance freedom, equality and human rights. It is a challenge to the project of globalization and perhaps also a challenge to the idea of representative democracy, with checks and balances that limit the freedoms of rulers. They are also a challenge to the institutions which were invented to advance the liberal project, public schools and the modern university. What could the challenge from populism mean for public schools and universities? It would be congruent with populist ideas to seek more power for local groups to define the goals of education, and less role for government and for inter-governmental institutions. Replacing global and national politics with local politics of course does not mean more consensus, as competing ideas exist in local communities as well about the goals of education. Local control may in fact mean more conflict, perhaps with less rules of arbitration. Given that the divisions between cosmopolitans and populists exist in local communities, how will these differences will be resolved? Will the rule of law and expertise continue to play a role? We should expect less trust in and recognition of the authority of governments, experts and elites, including scientists and academics. It is also predictable that we will see a renewed emphasis on identity politics and culture wars in education. Universities, in so far as they exist to cultivate reason, advance truth and enlighten the public are at odds with the populist worldview. Science and expertise are a problem for populist autocracies that do not value reasoned deliberation or informed understanding of facts as essential to solving controversies. There are some risks we can expect to emerge from a world of emboldened populism. The first is a risk to the idea of human rights. If nationalism is the new organizing force, the notion of in group and outgroup is defined by citizenship, not by membership in humanity. Because one of the consequences of globalization has been migration, non citizens will be the first target for exclusion. A second risk concerns global challenges. The prospects for collective action diminish as the world moves towards national populism, and the goals of education move away from preparing students to understand global interconnectedness and globalization. A third risk is a breakdown of the institutions that were created to protect freedom, democracy, the rule of law, and basic freedoms, and a breakdown of public education itself. The risk to these institutions of democracy is the risk that populism might evolve into fascism. The risk of disorder. Lack of trust in institutions, elites and governments, will make the challenge of resolving conflict greater. Can the institutions created to advance a liberal world order, such as public education and universities, save it? Since modern universities were created because of the global liberal project to advance freedom and equality, as that project is challenged by populism Universities should renew their civic mission, embracing a new focus on education for democratic citizenship, including global citizenship. This means advancing human rights education, educating about shared global challenges, educating for engaged citizenship, contribute to build the civic sphere, renew their attention to the development of the dispositions and values of their students, as much as their skills and knowledge, boldly provide opportunities to access higher education to students from the most marginalized groups in society, double down on the extension mission to educate the public, and undertake unprecedented efforts to partner with K schools and help improve them. While these goals are within the reach of what Universities could do,

they are not, at present, embraced as priorities by most universities. Whether universities step up in saving the liberal order which gave them life will depend on whether higher education leaders and faculty understand the grave risk facing the project of the Enlightenment itself.

Chapter 4 : Liberalism: A Joke, Literally | Front Porch Republic

*Like Thomas Powell said, "There are no solutions, only trade-offs." Which is a social expression of the idea that, Except by God, matter can neither be created, nor destroyed." *There are different meanings to the various terms used, such as Liberal, depending on your context.*

Trade deals, their thinking went, boosted GDP, brought consumers cheaper imported goods, and created only modest problems for American workers, who could find new jobs if their old firms failed in the face of low-wage foreign competition. David Autor is helping to change that thinking. Autor, Ford Professor of Economics and associate head of the economics department, has produced a series of studies over the last several years showing that trade produces clear winners and losers. The winners include U. The losers are the workers who have watched their livelihoods disappear as their regions have been devastated by the departure of manufacturing jobs. Moreover, Autor has found, the effects of trade have been concentrated in the last 15 years or so. In areas dominated by non-Hispanic white voters, conservative Republicans and Tea Party candidates have made huge gains, replacing moderate Republicans and some Democrats, while districts in which people of color constitute the majority have swung further to the left. And we were not set up institutionally to help them adjust to that. Trade with China, which has increased its manufacturing capacity enormously in a short time, has cost Americans as many as 2. They have closely scrutinized U. Through this approach, the scholars have established a new geography of trade effects. Imports from China have hit hard in former textile centers like Raleigh, North Carolina; furniture-manufacturing areas, including Tennessee; and many places that formerly manufactured shoes, leather goods, and rubber products, among other goods. As Autor is careful to point out, increased trade does increase aggregate wealth. And millions of Americans save a bit of money every year buying those phones, as well as cheap imported goods like T-shirts and assemble-it-yourself furniture. But the benefits and drawbacks of free trade are more unevenly distributed—and the magnitude of job losses more severe—than most economists and politicians previously realized. He finished his undergraduate degree at Tufts in , emerging with a major in psychology, an informal concentration in computer science, and a bit of ambivalence about his studies. So Autor ended the road trip in that city, where he volunteered at Glide Memorial and wound up as education director of that very program, teaching computer skills classes to disadvantaged adults and children. After a few years at Glide Memorial and similar work in South Africa, he attended graduate school in public policy at the Harvard Kennedy School, studying technology, the labor market, and inequality. I thought it was just about the study of money. But Autor was ready for the big leagues, publishing enough well-regarded papers to receive tenure by A conversation with Hanson launched the research partnership about the effects of trade with China, with Dorn soon getting on board as well. Examining the effects of trade meant the economists were venturing into terrain where the profession had fixed views. Indeed, Autor became an economist at a time when many in the field were concluding that technology, not trade, was principally responsible for costing workers jobs. But in the early s, China entered the World Trade Organization, ushering in a new period of trade-based job losses. For him, being a labor economist means studying the laborers, not just the labor. His ongoing research is likely to amplify this: Join us at EmTech Digital

Chapter 5 : The Trade-Offs of Free Trade - MIT Technology Review

But, as Milton Friedman likes to say, for all of that there are trade offs, just like there are trade offs for liberalism. The question that people often answer whether consciencely or not when deciding which side they are on are not the benefits that each provides but their willingness to live with the trade offs required.

Writer on politics, mysticism and fiction [http:](http://) GDP and profit maximization are destroying their communal ties. The gentrification of Harlem and the deindustrialization of the Midwest reflect the same phenomenon. These processes tend to dissolve the patterns and features of human organization that would previously supply these communities with meaning, all in the name of abstract international capital. The trade-offs—such as the local for the Goliath—are perhaps worth the material benefits for the whole of the country, but sacrifice the communal history of particular regions, coming with psychological ramifications that will define the rest of the century. Deserting your hometown in search of work, or walking outside to find that your neighbors have been replaced by chain brands such as Starbucks or Jamba Juice, reflect the spiritual homelessness of the 21st century. We live in a time when, after all, countless thinkers parade the loss of human agency to technological control as a great advancement. We are supposed to celebrate the loss of not only our hometowns, but also ourselves, to a machine that thinks better than we do. This techno optimism, this acquiescence to mechanization, reflects the anxieties of working people in the face of international capital. In many respects, the foreign calculus of a machine, the prioritization of GDP over communal and individual meaning, has already taken over the world. We are simply waiting for the last patches of human uniqueness to become commodified. These structures produced vast sums of wealth, mostly for those at the top, at the cost of a coherent world. The great chroniclers of bureaucracy, such as Franz Kafka, could be read as producing searing indictments of either the Soviet system or bloated corporate HR. Liberalism, as the open-ended political system of the 20th century, has borne much of the blame for selling away American community in the name of abstract gains. The most prominent enthusiasts for the liberal order today, such as Steven Pinker, make their case via statistical abstraction, i. We need a new way to understand our relationship to the physical world and digital. Statistics go down like a bad salve in the face of a life that appears to lack distinct meaning. Immigration is good, liberals argue, because it benefits the economy as a whole. Free trade is good because it benefits the economy as a whole. These compromises, continually made for an abstract polity, are no longer convincing to an American populace increasingly less attached to—indeed, less capable of—community and place. The loss of towns built around manufacturing, for example, is not solved by asking the community to dissolve itself for jobs elsewhere and insisting that cheap goods will continue to flow. Liberalism is fantastic at making abstract cases to convince people to let go of their actual, personal problems. The notion that statistical information about progress can persuade people out of their moods is itself reflective of a detached managerial ideology. As such, critics of liberalism seem to want one thing: When there is no longer a sense of unified polity, the mass benefits are no longer worth the particular costs. Other communities also feel their social fabric torn apart, not by immigration as a general policy, but by capitalists using illegal immigration and cheaper production to concentrate more gains for themselves at the expense of low-wage workers. Smith would be horrified to see the state of his argument today, where the self-interest of those who know no nation run universal digital marketplaces like Apple and Amazon, not only paying no taxes, but also employing foreign sweatshop labor. As such, both small town and inner city America rot, and the coasts accumulate with the degreed jewels mined from their communities. Elizabeth Bruenig, a Catholic like Deneen and Vermeule, yet a socialist, mounts a critique of America from the religious left. Bruenig quotes Aristotle to great effect: No common virtue, no common bonds, remain, save for the pursuit of self-interest. Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton both embodied a lack of virtue and a cynical promotion of their own interests, turning individualism on its head in the form of politics as corporate marketing. Absolute freedom becomes absolute tyranny. Liberation from responsibility becomes an invitation to do anything, and to serve any interests who will also serve you. The fact that critiques of global profit-seeking are overlapping with the ideas of Catholic thinkers reveals another key element of the critiques of liberalism—a yearning for the sacred.

The community and self-cultivation once offered by religious institutions are utterly vacant in a secular, demystified, disenchanted age. Though churches have always been flawed — and news of the Catholic Church from this week confirms just how flawed they can be — they at least proposed a center for human bondship that was not run by capital or self-interest. Of which of our institutions today could the same be said? The notion of the sacred proposed an immunization against becoming a creature of thrift and hedonism. The critics of liberalism, more than ever, wish for values outside of market forces. They wish for a society that is still personalized, communal, and human, in a non-quantifiable way. A society that has lost touch with the sacred, lost touch with the self that is deeper than utility and market value, answering only to political abstractions, is ripe for spiritual and mental decay. Exploring the tensions inherent to our liberal framework is digital. They seek the touch of others, not more products that stimulate them. They seek a meaningful community, not access to more efficient technology. These concerns must be addressed on their own terms, and not with more comforting abstractions.

From A Conflict of Visions: Ideological Origins of Political Struggles, by Thomas Sowell, page TRADE-OFFS VERSUS SOLUTIONS. Prudence "the careful weighing of trade-offs" is seen in very different terms within the constrained and the unconstrained visions.

Take Andrew Sullivan, for example, a shrewd and reasonable thinker. No response from fellow commentators. Is the assault on democratic norms populist idiocy, or are dreary elites missing something of note? What is it we must wake up to? The mind is all about Science, the material and rational. What goes on in the human realm of things, data, ideology, rules, debates over the function of government and justified use of power. Trade-offs are considered, compromises made. Our spiritual needs, on the other hand, are absolute and indivisible, knowable only in a heart-felt or emotional manner. Art is instinctive, its visceral understandings of what truly matters too immediate to be explained or validated, in a fully rational sense. Myth and narrative, poetry and music, are our best approximations of an answer. Reconciling heart and mind, in both public and private life, is a challenge. Science is utterly necessary. Abandon empirical or rational reality, and things fall apart. This is, of necessity, beyond reason and language. Detecting and responding to a common source of value is distinctly personal and localized, contingent on being open and attentive to what shines forth before us, from moment to moment. The solution is to eschew pre-emptive solutions from the top-down. Crucially, this is itself dependent on society acknowledging the irony: Science and politics will only be effective if we first accept their limitations. Alas, to address this fear, one must have already conquered it, a rare achievement indeed amongst those indebted to institutional power. And the electoral response to the failed exceptionalism? Elect an anti-intellectual demagogue, prone to go with gut feel. Our polite authoritarian state is no triumph. Freedom does not lurk at one end of a continuum of compromise " its dignity transcends the relativities of Science. Fascism could never take hold in Britain, he believed, because people would giggle if they saw soldiers goose-stepping down the street. Shame, then, he and other intellectuals, overly serious in their analysis of our plight, are unable to frame the joke and its punchline. Kanye, one more time:

Chapter 7 : Sowell: Trade-Offs Versus Solutions | The Independent Whig

Some may therefore despise liberalism as promising little more than the freedom to make a mess of our lives; still the liberal condition is a distinctive one, with its own great rewards and a vision of true dignity such as no more paternalistic arrangement could offer.

For Hitchens, the Cromwellian revolt represents not just the foundational struggle for parliamentary rule, but the great rejection of divine right. But he is no optimistic Enlightenment rationalist. He is incurious about what religious belief feels like, or what meaning it has for millions of people – even though, unlike his co-anti-religionist Richard Dawkins, Hitchens concedes that religious feeling is ineradicable. The Mourning After accused the British media of playing an essential role in creating a national, unchallengeable, and at times hysterical cult of personality surrounding the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, whereas previously they had been extremely critical of her and the monarchy after she had separated and divorced from Charles, Prince of Wales, and was having an affair with Egyptian billionaire son Dodi Fayed. Hitchens claimed the public were behaving irrationally, and that many appeared to not even know why they were mourning. He also scrutinised the level of censorship against criticism of Diana and the monarchy but was accused, in a review by The Independent, of exaggerating on this point. Since then he stated he had "re-enlisted a few times" back into the Labour Party. He also stated that by not voting for the Labour Party he was effectively voting for Margaret Thatcher to win, which he said he had "secretly hoped would happen. And one of the things that attracted me to socialism in the beginning was the idea of withering away of the state. In , he was demonstrating in Trafalgar Square against the Vietnam War. Under the influence of Peter Sedgwick, who translated the writings of Russian revolutionary and Soviet dissident Victor Serge, Hitchens forged an ideological interest in Trotskyist and anti-Stalinist socialism. Shortly after he joined "a small but growing post-Trotskyist Luxemburgist sect". Socialists, he claimed, had ceased to offer a positive alternative to the capitalist system. I think the materialist conception of history is valid. I consider myself a very conservative Marxist". Bush and Al Gore. Bush in the US presidential election. Hitchens shifted his opinion to "neutral", saying: I think that the nature of the jihadist enemy will decide things in the end". Hitchens went on to call McCain "senile", and his choice of running mate Sarah Palin "absurd", calling Palin a "pathological liar" and a "national disgrace". Hitchens also wrote that "Obama is greatly overrated" and that the Obama-Biden ticket "show[s] some signs of being able and willing to profit from experience". Constitution to his political philosophy. Bill of Rights contrasts with a dim opinion of constitutional politics on the other side of the Atlantic. Hitchens notes, "the utter failure [of the EU] to compose a viable constitution" and the "brevity of the British constitution, perhaps because the motherland of the English-speaking peoples has absent-mindedly failed to evolve one in written form". In an interview with Johann Hari he said: That war in the early s changed a lot for me. I never thought I would see, in Europe, a full-dress reprise of internment camps, the mass murder of civilians, the reinstiution [sic] of torture and rape as acts of policy. And I thought – destabilisation of fascist regimes is a good thing. Why should the left care about the stability of undemocratic regimes? It was a time when the left was mostly taking the conservative, status quo position – leave the Balkans alone, leave Milosevic alone, do nothing. And that kind of conservatism can easily mutate into actual support for the aggressors. Weimar-style conservatism can easily mutate into National Socialism. That seemed interesting to me. These people were saying that we had to act. Before, I had avoided them like the plague, especially because of what they said about General Sharon and about Nicaragua. But nobody could say they were interested in oil in the Balkans, or in strategic needs, and the people who tried to say that – like Chomsky – looked ridiculous. So now I was interested. In effect, the extremist Catholic and Orthodox forces were colluding in a bloody partition and cleansing of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The same blunder is made in a different way in coverage of Iraq, with the "Sunni - Shia - Kurd" trilateral. He contended that President George H. In the continuation of a national policy dating back to Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon in , the latest "cause was yet another move in the policy of keeping a region divided and embittered, and therefore accessible to the franchisers of weaponry and the owners of black gold". It said that a war was more or less

alright with it as long as it could be guaranteed in advance that American casualties could be kept low I thought that was a dishonourably narrow way of approaching the question. When large numbers of Iraqis were turned into soap Hitchens described Zionism as "an ethno-nationalist quasi-religious ideology" but argued that Zionism " Hitchens contended that the "solution of withdrawal would not satisfy the jihadists" and wondered "What did they imagine would be the response of the followers of the Prophet [Muhammad]? Edward Said asked many times, in public and private, where the Mandela of Palestine could be. In rather bold contrast to this decent imagination, Arafat managed to be both a killer and a compromiser Mandela was neither , both a Swiss bank account artist and a populist ranter Mandela was neither , both an Islamic "martyrdom" blow-hard and a servile opportunist, and a man who managed to establish a dictatorship over his own people before they even had a state here one simply refuses to mention Mandela in the same breath. Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question. The first 6 million live in what the Zionist movement used to call Palestine. The second 6 million live in the United States. The third 6 million are distributed mainly among Russia, France, Britain, and Argentina. Only the first group lives daily in range of missiles that can be and are launched by people who hate Jews. During the many years I spent on the Left, the cause of self-determination for Kurdistan was high on the list of principles and priorities â€” there are many more Kurds than there are Palestinians and they have been staunch fighters for democracy in the region. At the same time, he was attracted to the foreign policy ideas of some on the Republican -right that promoted pro-liberalism intervention, especially the neoconservative group that included Paul Wolfowitz. In , Hitchens criticised the abuse of prisoners in Abu Ghraib but argued that overall "prison conditions at Abu Ghraib have improved markedly and dramatically since the arrival of Coalition troops in Baghdad", [36] arguing that "before March , Abu Ghraib was an abattoir , a torture chamber , and a concentration camp. Marines in Haditha , Hitchens argued that whether or not a massacre had taken place, comparisons with the My Lai massacre in Vietnam were "so much propaganda and hot air" that ignored substantial changes in the rules of engagement and US Army procedures and training designed to prevent and discourage such an event. He argued that lesson had been learned such that "as a consequence, a training film about My Lai â€” "if anything like this happens, you have really, truly screwed up" â€” has been in use for U. Security Council Resolutions and , the cease-fire agreements ending the Iraq-Kuwait conflict. On 19 March , Hitchens asked himself whether Western intelligence sources should have known that Iraq had "no stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction. The entire record of UNSCOM until that date had shown a determination on the part of the Iraqi dictatorship to build dummy facilities to deceive inspectors, to refuse to allow scientists to be interviewed without coercion, to conceal chemical and biological deposits, and to search the black market for material that would breach the sanctions. We still do not know what happened to this weaponry. This is partly why all Western intelligence agencies, including French and German ones quite uninfluenced by Ahmad Chalabi, believed that Iraq had actual or latent programs for the production of WMD. Iraq, which has this dynamic combination and much else besides, has not until recently been very much regarded as a power. But with the new discussions in OPEC , the ending of the Kurdistan war and the new round of fighting in Lebanon , its political voice is being heard more and more. The Baghdad regime is the first oil-producing government to opt for per-cent nationalisation , a process completed with the acquisition of foreign assets in Basrah last December. It was the first to call for the use of oil as a political weapon against Israel and her backers. He argued that the means through which the Baathist regime rose to power were similar to that of Iran: He claimed that Iraq defended this by claiming "that the country is surrounded by enemies and attacked by imperialist intrigue" but that this had led to the repression of Kurdish nationalists. Waterboarding[edit] Hitchens was asked by Vanity Fair to experience waterboarding for himself at a U. In May , Hitchens voluntarily underwent the procedure. Hitchens stopped the procedure after 11 seconds and subsequently endorsed the view that it was " torture. It took Hercules to work out his vulnerability as a wrestler. Hezbollah loves death, thrives on defeat and disaster, and is rapidly moving from being a state within a state to becoming the master of what was once the most cosmopolitan and democratic country in the Middle East. Only a few years from now, this, too, will seem hard to believe, as well as shameful and unpardonable.

Chapter 8 : Sexy Conservatives Will Out-Breed Barren Liberals

States first define preferencesâ€”a stage uniquely explained by liberal theoriesâ€”and only then do they debate, bargain, or fight to particular agreementsâ€”a second stage explained by realist and/or institutionalist (as well as liberal) theories of strategic interaction.

It is featured in the current edition of *Modern Age*. To many, liberalism seems the best, in fact the only, platform that enables political leaders and social groups to cooperate and to introduce social changes and political reforms. At any rate this is the situation in Eastern Europe, but I believe that to a considerable degree it is also the case in other countries of what we call the West. Liberalism is regarded not only as synonymous with a free society, but also as the destiny of the modern world, the basic binding force of civilization, and the only basis for a political language through which we can all communicate. When the East Europeans freed themselves from the Soviet hegemony, the first thing they were told, and many of them told themselves, was that they must follow the liberal pattern. Liberalism is obviously a loose and rather obscure concept covering several ideas, not always compatible with one another in different historical contexts. It extends from radical free market capitalism to certain forms of the welfare state, from Ludwig von Mises to John Rawls, from Reaganomics to the European Union. Shifting from a narrow understanding of liberalism to a large one and then back to a narrow one is, especially in polemics, a common practice among politicians, political commentators, and the public at large. This should not, however, be sufficient reason to abandon the search for a more or less unifying definition. Coherent and exhaustive renderings of socialism or conservatism are no less difficult, yet this has never prevented critics from formulating objections against socialism as such or against conservatism as such. Let me offer my own formula by way of definition. A liberal is someone who takes a rather thin view of man, society, morality, religion, history, and philosophy, believing this to be the safest approach to organizing human cooperation. He does not deny that thicker, non-procedural principles and norms are possible, but believes these to be particular preferences which possess validity only within particular groups and communities. For this reason he refuses to attribute to such principles and norms any universal value, and he protests whenever someone attempts to impose his profound beliefs, however true they may seem to him, on the entire social body. Liberals might have divergent opinions on economic freedoms and the role of government, but they are united in their conviction that thinness of anthropological, moral, and metaphysical assumptions is the prerequisite for freedom and peace. Whoever would thicken such assumptions generates ideological conflicts and is believed to undermine the basis of peaceful cooperation and open the door to unjust discrimination. Can one have non-liberal or even anti-liberal views today without becoming, at best, a laughing stock, or at worst, a dangerous supporter of authoritarianism? Is the thinness of basic assumptions indeed the only way to secure liberal ends? I, for one, think that the identification of liberalism and liberty, so characteristic of modern times, is largely unfounded. Liberalism is one of several systems whose aim is to establish a certain ordering of the world. Whether this ordering is good, or preferable to other orderings, or to what extent this ordering increases our freedom, are open questions, and no definite answer seems compelling. In what will follow I will present five arguments against liberalism, of which some will be against the theory as such while others will be against some of its claims. **First Argument** The first and most immediate reason for my lukewarm attitude toward liberalism is its modest position in the entirety of human experience. To put it simply: Plato, Aristotle, Dante, Shakespeare, and Dostoyevsky were not liberals. One cannot think of any outstanding writer who could be qualified simply and solely as a liberal. What is most fascinating in the picture of man and the world, in the understanding of our relation to God, to nature, to one another, was all formulated outside the realm of liberal thought. The most intriguing thinkers whom we regard as belonging to the liberal tradition in the largest sense of the wordâ€”Kant, Ortega y Gasset, or Tocqueville are all interesting to the degree to which they transcend liberal orthodoxy. A thought experiment will make this clear. Let us imagine a man educated exclusively in Aristotelianism, or Hegelianism, or phenomenology, or Thomism. Such a man could be accused of one-sidedness, but he certainly could, other conditions being fulfilled, achieve wisdom in the most basic meaning of the word. Then let us imagine someone who is

educated only in the works of liberalism. Such a man could never attain wisdom because the works he studies leave out the most important problems that have preoccupied human beings from time immemorial. The liberal ignores those questions because he considers them either irrelevant, or "for reasons I will explain later" dangerous. My experience with liberals is that whenever I raise those questions in their company I encounter two kinds of reaction: The lack of weight which one feels whenever one reads liberal works is an obvious consequence of the thinness of liberal assumptions, from which one cannot derive any profound insights. It is not that the tree of literary art is always greener than the tree of political theory, and that no poet or writer of significance was a propounder of a particular theory. The root of the problem lies in the program of consistent reductionism which closes the liberal mind to the issues that men have always thought constitutive of the human condition. The dilemma is inescapable: Second Argument What has been said so far can immediately be countered with the following reply. Liberalism does not address the fundamental metaphysical and anthropological "which is to say, human" problems because it has a far more modest objective. Liberals want to construct a model of public order spacious enough to secure maximum freedom for everyone, including the Aristotelians, the Hegelians, the Thomists, as well as their opponents "in short, to anyone, regardless of the priority or the profundity of his problems. This reply is well known, but I do not think much of it. What we find in the reply reveals another level of liberal problems and explains why liberals are so difficult to communicate with. This leads me to my second argument. Liberals always place themselves in a higher position than their interlocutors, and from that position they have an irresistible urge to dominate. What they usually say is something like this: We are not interested in deciding any particular issue; all we want to do is to create a system within which you will make your own decisions. By saying this they do two things which I find rather dubious. First, they always usurp for themselves "without asking anyone for permission and without any permission being granted" the role of the architectonic organizer of society; thus they always want to dominate by performing the roles of the guardians of the whole of the social system and the judges of the procedural rules within the system. At least since John Locke, the liberals "declaring that all they are interested in is freedom of individuals and not the content of their choices" have made categorical judgments about what government should look like, how it should govern, how social life should be arranged, how families should be constructed, how our minds should work, and how we should relate to God. They had definitive answers "believed to follow from the principles underlying their framework" about which institutions are inferior and which superior, how children should be educated and what objectives schools and universities should have, what is the best structure of churches and families, what are acceptable relations between spouses, between parents and children, between teachers and pupils. In the system of liberty which they have constructed, everything is predictably known and accordingly regulated. There are no non-substantive procedures. And once a radical change is made, whether in a school system, family life, the university, or the church, it does not make the slightest difference if the nature of the change was procedural or substantive. The liberals have legalized abortion, are in the process of legalizing homosexual marriages, are inclined to legalize euthanasia; they have changed or supported changes in family life, in religious discipline, in school curricula, in sexual conduct. But the practical effects in social and moral life were profound. Not only is liberalism not modest, its ambition to have a decisive voice is unquenchable: The socialists, the conservatives, the monarchists are ambitious too, but they all know very well how far they want to penetrate the social fabric, and at least some of them are well aware that reality often resists and that giving in to reality is sometimes a sound decision. But such a promise, even if sincere, is incongruent with the nature of liberalism. Once it is assumed "as all the liberals do assume" that individuals are the basic agents, then communities, particularly non-liberal communities, lose any privileges that may stem from experience, custom, tradition, or human nature. There is no compelling argument that would make a liberal uncompromising with respect to the principles of the whole while tolerant with respect to the principles of particular groups or communities. All communities are understood as aggregates of individuals, and it is individuals, not communities, that are said to need liberal protections. But as everyone seriously interested in religion knows, the key to understanding the church lies not in organizational questions but in substantive propositions about human nature, metaphysics, etc. To acquiesce in the existence of the Catholic

Churchâ€™ regardless of its non-liberal organizational structureâ€™ as an irreducible expression of human experience, an experience from which one can learn or profit, is impossible for liberals. This would be for them a betrayal of liberal principles. Learning from others is something liberals never do. Third Argument One can hardly deny the moral impulse behind liberal thinking: But what would the world look like when men are in this blessed state? To this question, the liberals reply that it is precisely a world which corresponds to the liberal order. In other words, liberalsâ€™ and this is my third argumentâ€™ confuse two kinds of aspiration to freedom, or better, and to put it differently, two claims about freedom. The first claim is that people are mature beings and their free actions should not be impeded by arbitrary will. The second claim is that what free people in fact want is a liberal order which best satisfies their need for freedom. These two claims are not necessarily identical, but liberals have no doubt about their equivalence. In the second case, we have the belief that there is a single system which secures the maximum of freedom for everyone and that for all those who value freedom such a system must be the object of their aspiration. By identifying these two beliefs liberals assume that whoever wants freedom must necessarily want liberalism, and whoever wants liberalism must necessarily want freedom. Armed with this assumption liberals assess the progress of freedom by the yardstick of acceptance of their own system. Liberals thus reconcileâ€™ in their minds as well as in their consciencesâ€™ two tendencies which are essentially irreconcilable: Since those two things are not differentiated in their minds, the liberals believe that not only does the future of freedom depend on whether people accept the system they consider optimal, but also that the implementation of this system is in fact indistinguishable from the satisfaction of the deepest desires of sovereign individuals. This, I think, explains an otherwise inexplicable paradox: Modernity, we are told, makes it imperative to embrace the liberal system and to reject whatever is not liberal. Whoever thinks otherwise should be placed in the dustbin of history. In no place is this imperative more palpable than in Eastern Europe. Almost immediately after the fall of the old communist regimeâ€™ whose ideologues also believed in the inexorable laws of historyâ€™ the peoples of Eastern Europe were told that in order to become free societies they would have to conform to one political model. In order to be free, they had to submit to liberal tutelage. Schools, universities, the media, familiesâ€™ all had to become liberal. Fourth Argument Many liberals, particularly in recent decades, while never ceasing to preach the superiority of pluralism, have in fact been propagating a dualistic vision of the world: This dichotomy is believed to describe not only the modern world but the entirety of human history, past and future. For liberals, the claim that in the human drama there have always been two antagonistsâ€™ pluralists and monistsâ€™ has acquired the status of a dogma, more self-evident than the Ten Commandments. The pluralists are, of course, the liberals. The monists are ayatollahs, Adolf Hitlers, Christian fundamentalists, Catholic integrist, Islamists, conservatives, and many more. Whoever does not belong to the camp of the pluralists, the camp of the liberals, will inevitably find himself sooner or later in the camp of their enemies. If, for instance, someone maintains that the human soul consists of two partsâ€™ i. As it is easy to see, Berlin employs here a slippery slope argument, perhaps the most often used argument in this context, which says that monistic philosophies all lead, sooner or later, to disastrous political consequences by sanctioning discrimination, domination, and other equally reprehensible practices. This tendency derives from the simple criterion which they so often apply, and which is essentially political. The liberals do not analyze whether this or that theory is true or false, whether this or that moral position is good or bad, but whether those positions are politically safeâ€™ that is, whether they are not too monistic and therefore too authoritarian. And because in the light of the slippery slope argument nothing other than liberalism is safe, and because all non-trivial propositions may be placed on the slippery slope, the liberals are moral busybodies, never ceasing to warn, reprimand, condemn, praise, or lament. Fifth Argument Obsessed with the specter of discrimination and enslavement looming within every social practice, philosophy, or moral norm, liberals fall prey to the rhetoric of emancipation and are helpless when faced with modern ideological mystifications, which are often created in bad faith and from evidently erroneous assumptions. During the last century there have appeared many ideologies that proclaim their noble aim of opposing unjust discrimination.

Chapter 9 : Liberalism and Equality: Winning Essay

The trade-offs "such as the local for the Goliath" are perhaps worth the material benefits for the whole of the country, but sacrifice the communal history of particular regions, coming with psychological ramifications that will define the rest of the century.

Examples[edit] The concept of a trade-off is often used to describe situations in everyday life. Similarly, trash cans that are used inside and then taken out to the street and emptied into a Dumpster can be small or large. A large trash can does not need to be taken out to the Dumpster so often, but it may become so heavy when full that the user risks strain or back injury when moving it. The choice of waste receptacle is a trade-off between the frequency of needing to take the trash out for the Dumpster versus the ease and safety of use. In the case of food waste, a second trade-off presents itself as large trash cans are more likely to sit for a long time in the kitchen, leading to higher levels of decomposing food indoors and a potential pest attraction. With a small trash can, the can will be taken out to the Dumpster more often, thus eliminating the persist rot that attracts pests. Of course, a user of a large trashcan could carry the can outside frequently anyway, but the heavier can would weigh more and the user would have to think more about when to take the can out, or confine themselves to a schedule, compared to a smaller can which is evidently full when it takes taking out. In cold climates, mittens in which all the fingers are in the same compartment serve well to keep the hands warm, but this arrangement also confines finger movement and prevents the full range of hand function; gloves, with their separate fingers, do not have this drawback, but they do not keep the fingers as warm as mittens do. As such, with mittens and gloves, warmth versus dexterity is the trade-off. In a like fashion, warm coats are often bulky and hence they impede freedom of movement for the wearer. Thin coats, such as those worn by winter sports athletes, give the wearer more freedom of movement, but they are not as warm. When copying music from compact discs to a computer, lossy compression formats, such as MP3 , are used routinely to save hard disk space, but information is "thrown away" to the detriment of sound quality. Lossless compression schemes, such as FLAC or ALAC take much more disc space, but do not affect the sound quality as much, thus providing better sound. Large cars can carry many people five or more , and since they have larger crumple zones, they may be safer in an accident. However they also tend to be heavy and often not very aerodynamic and hence have relatively poor fuel economy. Small cars like the Smart Car can only carry two people, and their light weight means they are very fuel efficient. At the same time, the smaller size and weight of small cars means that they have smaller crumple zones, which means occupants are less protected in case of an accident. In addition, if a small car has an accident with a larger, heavier car, the occupants of the smaller car will fare more poorly. Thus car size large versus small involves multiple tradeoffs regarding passenger capacity, accident safety and fuel economy. In athletics, sprint running demands different physical attributes from running a marathon. As such, the two contests have distinct events in competitions such as the Olympics , and each pursuit features distinct teams of athletes. The meaning of trade off quite similar to that of Opportunity cost In economics[edit] In economics a trade-off is expressed in terms of the opportunity cost of a particular choice, which is the loss of the most preferred alternative given up. A tradeoff, then, involves a sacrifice that must be made to obtain a certain product, service or experience, rather than others that could be made or obtained using the same required resources. For example, for a person going to a basketball game, their opportunity cost is the loss of the alternative of watching a particular television program at home. Many factors affect the tradeoff environment within a particular country, including availability of raw materials, a skilled labor force, machinery for producing a product, technology and capital, market rate to produce that product on reasonable time scale, and so forth. A trade-off in economics is often illustrated graphically by a Pareto frontier named after the economist Vilfredo Pareto , which shows the greatest or least amount of one thing that can be attained for each of various given amounts of the other. As an example, in production theory the trade-off between output of one good and output of another is illustrated graphically by the production possibilities frontier. The Pareto frontier is also used in multi-objective optimization. In finance , the capital asset pricing model includes an efficient frontier that shows the highest level of expected return that any

portfolio could have given any particular level of risk, as measured by the variance of portfolio return. In other specific fields[edit] In biology and microbiology , tradeoffs occur when a beneficial change in one trait is linked to a detrimental change in another trait. For example, the higher the fecundity number of offspring , the lower the parental care that each offspring will receive. Parental care as a function of fecundity would show a negative sloped linear graph. A related phenomenon, known as demographic compensation, arises when the different components of species life cycles survival, growth, fecundity, etc show negative correlations across the distribution ranges [7] [8]. For example, survival may be higher towards the northern edge of the distribution, while fecundity or growth increases towards the south, leading to a compensation that allows the species to persist along an environmental gradient. Contrasting trends in life cycle components may arise through tradeoffs in resource allocation , but also through independent but opposite responses to environmental conditions. Tradeoffs are important in engineering. Similarly, tradeoffs are used to maximise power efficiency in medical devices whilst guaranteeing the required measurement quality [9]. In computer science , tradeoffs are viewed as a tool of the trade. A program can often run faster if it uses more memory a spaceâ€”time tradeoff. Consider the following examples: Depending on the compression method, this may also involve the tradeoff of a loss in image quality. By using a lookup table , you may be able to reduce CPU time at the expense of space to hold the table, e. For some situations e. Strategy board games often involve tradeoffs: In a worst-case scenario, a chess player might even tradeoff the loss of a valuable piece even the Queen to protect the King. In Go , you might trade thickness for influence. Ethics often involves competing interests that must be traded off against each other, such as the interests of different people, or different principles e. In medicine , patients and physicians are often faced with difficult decisions involving tradeoffs. One example is localized prostate cancer where patients need to weigh the possibility of a prolonged life expectancy against possible stressful or unpleasant treatment side-effects patient trade-off. Governmental tradeoffs are among the most controversial political and social difficulties of any time. All of politics can be viewed as a series of tradeoffs based upon which core values are most core to the most people or politicians. Political campaigns also involve tradeoffs, as when attack ads may energize the political base but alienate undecided voters.