

Mateo, Alberto Nel R.  
OOB

## Chapter 10: Taking Rights Seriously

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

Quote:

"If the Government does not take rights seriously, then it does not take law seriously either."

What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn about the essence rights to people's lives.

Review:

This chapter focuses on some key points as to how human act according to their rights. It may also point out as to how rights should be used and when is the right time that we should claim for it. These key points may somehow tell us where the rights of the people seem to be in the right place.

At first, we would argue that there are times as to which we wonder if the Government is violating our rights. This makes us also ask if we have the rights to go against the Government itself. In doing so, we are most likely fall on the confusion of our rights. One point of determining the correctness of using our rights is to weigh it against the rights of the common. By doing this, we can somehow have knowledge if exercising that certain right of ours is appropriate at that specific situation. The second point is that all people especially the minorities must also have the same concern and respect earn from the Government. This makes things clearer that if some have the right to speech, then all must have. We should only consider that every thing that is done has its consequences. Thus, even exercising of our rights may also have. It may not be to us but most likely to others. That is why we should be mindful and aware that what we do will not causes harm to others.

So as for the question of do we really need to take rights seriously, the very answer is yes. It is because we should be all aware of our acts to which we don't deprive other's rights. As for the Government, they must also take it seriously because if they don't, then they also take law seriously in order to serve their constituents properly.

What I have learned:

- Connection of Law and Rights
- Rights is a serious matter to the society
- Two forms of categorical imperative

Integrative Questions:

- Where do people fall when have rights in violating the Government?
- What is the connection of rights and law?
- Why do we need to take rights seriously?
- What should people be always remindful in themselves?

- Why should Government always have to consider rights?

## Chapter 11: A Theory of Justice

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

Quote:

"The principles must be specified so that they yield a determinate conclusion."

What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn some perspectives about justice.

Review:

In this chapter, the author wants to tell us that there are two main principles of justice that he has define. The first one is about the basic freedom that everyone should have while the second states that there are some arrangements which concerns the social and economic inequalities.

The first principle is basically about the equalities that people must have. But even how hard we try; equality is a broad term that would only be an ideology in this world. It is for the reason that there are too many factors to consider in order to say that one is equal to another especially is what we are pointing is a human being. But if we are to think the other way around, we could say that there is equality on one basis, it is the equality on opportunities. It is the one thing that is possible for all. The opportunity to do or acquire something is what can all people could be entitled of. That would now make sense to have equalities in a little way. The second one is the principle concerning inequalities on social and economic aspects. These two factors are connected in some ways. An example is riches, wherein if one is rich, he/she has a high social status. It can be because of authority or by other means. Thus it really creates inequality. But we should consider that there is already no equality at the first place in these aspects. The only equality we have is the one mentioned in the earlier principle. Therefore, in this principle, these inequalities should be an advantage for all and is attached to positions and offices for it to become justifiable. Its counterpart is what makes it injustice. Thus, we can say that justice is giving that is due. That thing which is due is earn not assigned. That is why we all have equal opportunity even to the attached positions and offices that creates inequality. It's because we must earn what is due for us. In order to do so, we should consider the principles specifically to gain definite conclusions that are beneficial for all.

What I have learned:

- Principles of Justice
- How those principles must be used

Integrative Questions:

- What is Justice?
- What is the First Principle of Justice?
- What is the only thing equal for everyone?
- What is the Second Principle of Justice?

- How should the principles be used in order to have valid conclusions?

## Chapter 12: The Need for More than Justice

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

Quote:

"Importance of independence over mutual interdependence"

What I expect to learn:

I expect to learn about the thing we need that is greater than justice.

Review:

This chapter explains how the theory of justice in the point of view of Immanuel Kant and John Rawls is insufficient for it to be a moral theory by itself. The author of the reading, Annentte Baier argues that it should be accompanied by the perspective of care by Carol Gilligan for this theory of justice to become a valid moral theory.

Baier tells us that the theory of justice may have some deficiency that makes it invalid as a moral theory. First, it fails to see the inequalities between people. These are in the form of relationships with them. An example is a parent and children relationship. Unlike what the principle of justice identifies, this kind of inequality doesn't fall on the economic and social aspects. Thus, it is not consider being a source of inequality among people. It's because the inequality identified by the principle of justice is in terms of people's capability and status. Another is the unrealistic view of justice. The author may say this because she wants to convey that reality is composed of many elements including emotional reality that which justice fails to include. That is why; it has lack of other morality components especially those that are related. What Baier wants to put in it to make it complete is the perspective of care. This perspective deals with one's concern for others. With this it is likely that giving what is due to the person is not only because he earned it but he deserves it and can be given from the kindness of others. Thus, justice and care should be joined together in order to create a moral theory that is fitted for all realities that this world could offer.

What I have learned:

- Deficiencies of the perspective of justice
- Perspective of care
- The way how can justice be completed as a moral theory

Integrative Questions:

- What is the argument of the author to the theory of justice?
- What is lacking in the theory of justice?
- What is the theory of care?
- What is considered in the theory of care that doesn't in justice?
- How the theory of justice does become a complete moral theory?