**What (allegedly) morally important considerations do the authors appeal to?**

Elizabeth Joh (undercover policing)

Saul Kassin (interrogations)

Robinson & Darley (deterrence)

Abbe Smith (criminal defense)

Rita Manning (incarcerating parents)

**How to argue that one moral reason or *prima facie* duty outweighs another**

1. Find a specific example in which the two reasons/duties conflict
	1. Generally, you want to find an example about a different context than the one you are arguing about (because you know people who disagree with you about that context aren’t going to agree with you about that example)
2. Show that, in this example, it is *uncontroversially* permissible to act as the first reason requires, and wrong to act as the second one requires
	1. What you say about this example has to be plausible to people who disagree with your thesis
3. Show that that context is relevantly similar to the context you ultimately want to talk about
	1. Otherwise you can’t draw conclusions about your thesis from this example

*Illustration:*

Some people think that lawyers have a duty to defend all of their clients in order to protect the lawyer-client relationship, and that this duty exists even when a particular choice of a particular lawyer has no effect on the lawyer-client relationship. Their idea, roughly, is that we have a duty to part of a group that, together, does something very good (like protect the lawyer-client relationship) even when we don’t make a noticeable difference to that good. Assume that’s true. How strong is that duty? Here is a (slightly edited) quote from a paper of mine where I talk about this:

Imagine that Carla lives in Los Angeles. Her choice to drive, rather than take the bus, would make no noticeable difference to traffic or pollution, but if a significant percentage of the driving population chose to take the bus, pollution and traffic would be greatly alleviated, saving thousands of lives. Assume, for the sake of argument, that this gives Carla a *prima facie* duty to take the bus rather than drive. If Carla can keep a minor promise (one with no significant consequences) only by driving her car, it is morally permissible for her to keep the promise, and wrong to break it. We can draw some generalizations from this example. The relevant goal in Carla’s case is hugely more significant than the lawyer client relationship, because it involves saving thousands of lives. Yet Carla’s duty to be part of the group which works towards that ends is overridden by a relatively minor duty – the duty to keep a fairly insignificant promise. So, if Carla’s reasons to be part of this group are easily overridden, reasons to be part of groups that work towards less important ends should be even easier to override. Which means that the lawyer’s duty to be part of the group that protects the lawyer-client relationship is very easily overridden.

*How to use examples* ***improperly***

A wants to argue that no one ever has a duty to donate to charity. A uses the following example:

It is morally permissible for me to not give money to a homeless person who needs it more than I do.

A wants to generalize from this example to the claim that *no one* has a duty to donate. Why is this a bad generalization?