**Your classmates’ (tentative) views**

*Here are some of the theses your classmates proposed. I have slightly edited some of them. These are here to show you how much disagreement there is, so you know what you cannot take for granted in your paper (that is, you can’t assume people are going to agree with you about certain things). They also give you a sense of what you have to argue with in your paper. It may also give you ideas on how to revise your thesis.*

*I’m clustering views roughly together by the general ideas or themes that seem to unite them.*

*I put notes in brackets where the thesis needs to be fixed to be suitable for the actual paper.*

**The state has a very strong obligation to protect children**

*These theses seemed to say that the obligation to protect children overrides most other obligations.*

*Note: you should think about how* your *thesis has implications for children, even if you aren’t explicitly writing on this topic. For example, you might think that interrogation of parents, or investigation of crimes involving children, should be treated differently than other interrogations or investigations.*

It is morally wrong for punishment of criminals with children to be legally allowed when the punishment fails to prioritize the reduction of harm to children [*This needs some clarification on what this is supposed to look like*]. Otherwise it is morally permissible to allow it.

Incarceration of parents is morally permissible when it is both immediate and the parents are dangerous in some way. Otherwise it is wrong.

**The state has a very strong obligation to treat people fairly/equally**

*These theses seem to think that fair or equal treatment is more important than most or all other considerations. Both of these thought that we should factor in how what we are doing affects children, but only in relatively minor cases; when the stakes are high, fairness is more important. It is possible, though, that both these theses are more about protecting society than fairness; maybe they thought we should harshly punish criminals with children because that’s best for society.*

It is legally permissible to charge and treat criminals with young children (under the age of 16) differently if the crime that they are accused of is victimless or a rather minor crime such as tax evasion, petty larceny, etc. In all other cases of criminal activity, it is legally and morally wrong to treat parents of young children differently in the justice system.

Punishment of criminals with children is morally wrong when the crime is victimless. Otherwise it is morally permissible.

**Emphasize public safety; the ends justify the means**

*These theses thought that it was permissible for people to engage in “bad” behavior if that did enough good.*

It is morally permissible for the law to allow physically violent or threatening interrogation techniques when criminal activity includes acts of terrorism. Otherwise it is morally wrong to allow. [*Note: this was not approved as is, because it is incomplete- it doesn’t talk about the wrongness or permissibility of non violent interrogation techniques*]

It is morally permissible for the law to allow the use of criminal informants when the crime involves national security. Otherwise, it is morally wrong for the law to allow the use of criminal informants.

It is morally wrong for zealous criminal defense by public defenders who have their clients appointed to them to be legally allowed when (a) the criminal has confessed their guilt explicitly to their public defender and (b) the defense tactics cause psychological and/or traumatic harm to the victim and (c) the defendant has committed a crime of a physically violent or sexual nature. Otherwise it is morally permissible to allow it.

Zealous criminal defense by public defenders who have their clients appointed to them is morally wrong when an innocent verdict would harm society, or a lesser sentence would be unfair compared to others, or a guilty verdict would benefit society. Otherwise, it is morally permissible.

It is morally wrong for a defense attorney to zealously defend (if the defendant is guilty of heinous crimes and is not at risk of being overly punished, or getting the criminal out of punishment or a lesser punishment or sentence would put society at risk of further victimization or crime) or ( if the tactics and mechanisms necessary to defend zealously would not be within the scope of the law or would retraumatize or harm the victim.) It is morally permissible for a defense attorney to zealously defend in all other instances.

**Special obligations: the ends do not justify the means**

*These theses seem to say that people (e.g. police officers, lawyers) are obligated to do our job “well,” regardless of the costs and benefits. Unlike the previous theses, these don’t say that the ends justify the means. Rather, they say (roughly) that we should follow the rules even when breaking them would be overall better.*

It is morally wrong for undercover police participation in illegal activities to be legally allowed when the officers in an undercover investigation are using or distributing hard drugs, using or distributing illegal weapons, or assaulting, raping, or killing with or without legal weapons, unless the officer feels threatened and uses force or kills to save his or her life. Otherwise, police participation in illegal activities is morally permissible.

Entrapment is always morally wrong. [*Three different people proposed this*]

Illegal activity by undercover police is morally wrong when it causes physical harm to other people. All other undercover illegal activity is morally permissible.

It is morally wrong for undercover police officers to break the law in the course of their investigation when a) they are not motivated by intentions to promote the general welfare and public happiness, protect the innocent and/or vulnerable, or eliminate maleficent forces or entities, or b) they commit any act of cruelty, malice, and ill intent that has the potential to traumatize an innocent or cause some other great harm to the ecosystem, society, or particular individuals. Otherwise it is morally permissible.

Interrogation is morally wrong when tactics that are harmful to the suspect physically, mentally, or emotionally are being used. Otherwise, it is morally permissible.

**Consent**

*These theses seemed to see consent, or autonomy, as one of the most important moral considerations: they think that our strongest obligations are to protect/respect autonomy; these may override other obligations, or perhaps they are the* only *real obligation.*

Interrogation of suspects by police officers is morally wrong when it is done for a consecutive five hours or longer, or done to a minor without their guardian, or to the mentally ill who are incapable of making informed decisions and cannot consent, or to someone who is temporarily impaired by drugs or alcohol. Otherwise it is morally permissible.

It is morally wrong for the interrogation of suspects by police officers to be legally allowed when the suspect is under the influence of drugs or alcohol, or they are being presented fake incriminating evidence by police. Otherwise it is morally permissible.

It is morally wrong to interrogate suspects when they are mentally incapacitated, coerced, or an unaccompanied minor. Otherwise it is permissible.

Punishment of a crime is morally wrong when the criminal did not understand that what they did was morally or legally wrong and the punishment does more harm than it does good by teaching the criminal. Otherwise punishment is morally permissible.

It is morally wrong for the law to allow police or special interrogators to use falsified scientific evidence or to give false future promises or to deny basic human needs (ie: water, food, sleep, bathroom) as interrogation tactics. Everything else is permissible in interrogations.

Legal interrogations tactics are permissible only if the person being interrogated isn’t deceived with false evidence and is not denied basic necessities, such as sleep, food, or water. Otherwise, all interrogation tactics are morally permissible.

Falsifying real/scientific evidential data or explicitly lying to the interrogated is morally wrong. Otherwise, all other tactics of interrogation are morally permissible to use.

**Miscellaneous**

*Here are some theses I had a hard time categorizing, just to give you some additional ideas.*

It is morally permissible to punish individuals by incarceration as long as the government had previously made a genuine attempt to reform the individual. Otherwise, punishing individuals via incarceration is wrong.

Illegal activity committed by undercover police is wrong when it is not authorized by a superior board, or the undercover officer doesn’t use full and accurate information to get approval, or when it puts innocent actors in harm’s way is wrong. Otherwise, it is morally permissible.

Government surveillance is morally wrong when they are accessing information that has absolutely nothing to do with national security and are storing that information, or when tech companies hand over our information to the government without our consent or knowledge. Otherwise, government surveillance is permissible.