

Lim, Marylyn Grace C.
OOB

Chapter 10: Taking Rights Seriously

Amazon Reference: <http://www.amazon.com/Contemporary-Moral-Problems-James-White/dp/0534584306/>

Quote: “if a people have a right to do something, then it is wrong to interfere with them.”

What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn what a right is.

Review:

First, we define what a right and legal rights are. *Rights are entitlements (not) to perform certain actions or be in certain states, or entitlements that others (not) perform certain actions or be in certain states. Legal rights are, clearly, rights which exist under the rules of legal systems.* According to Ronald Dworkin, “if a people have a right to do something, then it is wrong to interfere with them.” He also set an example of it which is regarding the freedom of speech of the people. He is trying to say that if people have the freedom of speech then the government has no right to stop the people in exercising their rights. I also agree with this but if we think of about it more deeply, isn't the government the one who said that people have the right of free speech? So they also have the right to state when this right can be exercise and when this right can't be exercise. They are the ruler of the country so they could interfere with people who are exercising their rights IF it is necessary to protect other rights. We, government and citizens, should all take rights seriously because this makes the country organize. If there are no rights, there will be inequalities in our country and there will be instances that people could take advantage over other people.

What I learned:

- rights
- legal rights

Integrative Question:

1. What is a legal right?
2. What is a right?
3. What is Dworkin's view of rights?
4. What is Dworkin's example of rights?
5. Do we need to take rights seriously?

Reference:

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rights/>
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/legal-rights/>

Chapter 11: A Theory of Justice

Amazon Reference: <http://www.amazon.com/Contemporary-Moral-Problems-James-White/dp/0534584306/>

Quote: “These are the principles that free and rational persons would accept in a hypothetical original position where there is a veil of ignorance hiding from the contractors all the particular facts about themselves.”

What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn what justice is.

Review:

First of all what is justice? According to Wikipedia, justice is the concept of moral rightness based on ethics, rationality, law, natural law, religion, fairness, or equity. According to John Rawls, there are 2 principles of justice and the first principle concerns with equal basic liberties and the second principle involves the arrangement of social and economic inequalities. For him, “These are the principles that free and rational persons would accept in a hypothetical original position where there is a veil of ignorance hiding from the contractors all the particular facts about themselves.” He stated that the original agreement is the basic structure of the theory of justice. “The original agreement is the principles that free and rational persons concerned to further their own interest would accept in an initial position of equality as defining the fundamental terms of their association.” According to a website, original agreement or position “*is designed to be a fair and impartial point of view that is to be adopted in our reasoning about fundamental principles of justice. In taking up this point of view, we are to imagine ourselves in the position of free and equal persons who jointly agree upon and commit themselves to principles of social and political justice.*” For short, John Rawls calls justice as fairness. Lastly, according to Rawls, justice as fairness has 2 parts. First is an interpretation of the initial situation and the second is a set of principles which would be agreed to.

What I learned:

- justice
- original agreement

Integrative Question:

1. What is justice?
2. What is original agreement?
3. What are the 2 principles of justice?
4. What are the 2 parts of justice as fairness?
5. What is injustice?

Reference:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Justice>

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/original-position/>

Chapter 12: The Need for More than Justice

Amazon Reference: <http://www.amazon.com/Contemporary-Moral-Problems-James-White/dp/0534584306/>

Quote: "The best moral theory is one that harmonizes justice and care."

What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn what does the need for more than justice means.

Review:

According to Annette Baier, there are 2 perspectives on moral and social issues. First is the justice perspective and the second one is the care perspective. I research on the meaning of justice perspective and this is what I found out. Justice perspective concentrates on how fairly or unfairly our actions bring benefits and burdens among people. *The principle states: "Treat people the same unless there are morally relevant differences between them."* For Annette Baier, care perspective is related to women because women are the primary caretakers of young children. For her, the natural care perspective comes for the parental and maternal role of the mother. She also stated 2 evils that any child may become aware of. First, the evil of detachment or isolation from others whose love one needs which aims to gain satisfying community with others and the second one is the evil of relative powerlessness and weakness which aims for equality of power. She also discussed the 3 reasons why women have not to be content to pursue their own values w/n the framework of liberal morality. The reasons are: liberal morality's dubious record, inattention to relations of inequality or its pretense equality and lastly, exaggeration of the scope of choice or its inattention to unchosen relations. On the latter part, she mention the fourth feature which is typical rationalism or intellectualism and its assumption that we need not worry what passions person have as long as their rational wills can control them.

What I learned:

- Care perspective
- Justice perspective

Integrative Question:

1. What is care perspective?
2. What is justice perspective?
3. What are the 3 reasons of Annette Baier why women have not to be content to pursue their own values w/n the framework of liberal morality?
4. What is the fourth feature?
5. How is women related to care perspective?

Reference:

<http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/decision/fairness.html>