Review Questions:

1. What was Dworkin mean by right in the strong sense? What rights in this sense are protected by the U.S Constitution?

Dworkin means that we should practice our rights in a serious way. That we should fight for what we believed in. The American constitution provides a set of individual legal rights in the first amendment, due process, equal protection and similar clauses.

1. Distinguish between legal and moral rights. Give some examples of legal rights that are not moral rights, and moral rights that are not legal rights.

Basically a legal right is something that is already stated in the law (constitutional) while moral rights are laws or ethical practices. For example; (legal bot not moral); the right to carry a weapon. Or to kill someone. (Moral but not legal) The right to choose whether to believe God or not.

1. What are the two models of how a government might define the rights of its citizen? Which does Dworkin find more attractive?

The first model states that there should be a balance between the individual right and the rights of the government. While the second model states that each and every one should respect the rights of others.

Dworkin finds the second model more attractive because according to him, if right make sense at all, then the invasion of a relatively important right must be a serious matter.

1. According to Dworkin, what two important ideas are behind the institution of rights?

According to Dworkin the two important ideas behind the institution of rights is faith and respect.

Discussion Questions:

1. Does a person have a right to break the law? Why or why not?

Yes. Because we have the right to break the law. The thing is, it is up to us to decide whether to break it or not. After all, the consequences of our actions will be faced by us in the end.

1. Are the rights in the strong sense compatible with Mill’s utilitarianism? (See the footnote about institutional utilitarianism)

Well, we can say that these two notions are compatible after all, Mill’s stand of happiness is somehow related to practicing our rights.

1. Do you think that Kant would accept rights in the strong sense or not?

I think Kant would accept rights in the strong sense after all, the notion about rights still talks about the freedom of a person.