Joel Feinberg: The Nature and Value of Rights

Review Questions:

1. Describe Nowheresville. How this world different from our world?

Nowheresville is a place similar to our world except that we have no rights to defend ourselves or moral claims are limited.

2. Explain the doctrine of the logical correlativity of rights and duties. What is Feinberg's position on this doctrine?

The rights and duties are connected in the sense that we uphold our rights. This doctrine has two claims. First, All rights entail other people's duties and second, that all duties entail other people's rights.

3. How does Feinberg explain the concept of personal desert? How would personal desert work in Nowheresville?

According to Feinberg, personal desert means when a person deserves something good from mankind what is meant in parts is that there would be a certain claim that an individual cannot avail because human rights are only limited. The good thing is that rewards are given by higher authority to the weaker one. Someone cannot claim rewards even a person deserve it. A man is only entitled to be given not to claim.

4. Explain the notion of a sovereign right monopoly. How would this work in Nowheresville according to Feinberg?

The sovereign has a certain has a duty to treat his students well, but this duty was owed not to the subjects directly but to God, just as man might have duty to a person to treat his property well, but of course no duty to the property itself but only to the owner and was rather competent of harming his subjects. Furthermore, he could commit no wrong against them that they could criticize about, since they had no prior claims against his behaviour. As the Genuine sovereign monopoly they will do all those things too, and thus sustain genuine obligations will not be owed directly to pledge creditors, parents, and the like but rather to god alone, or to the members of some elite or to a single sovereign under god.

5. What are claim rights? Why does Feinberg think they are morally important?

A claim right is a right which involves responsibilities, duties, or obligations for other parties. This is to petition or seek by virtue of supposed right. It simply means the legal power to claim one's right. This is done by acknowledged right holder when he serves notice that he now wants turned over to him that which has already been acknowledged to be his, something borrowed, say, or improperly taken from him. It also serves as man's shield of protection to secure individual rights.

Discussion Questions:

1. Does Feinberg make a convincing case for the importance of rights? Why or why not?

Yes, Feinberg successfully make a convincing case for the importance of rights. He makes a clear illustration on how a man can claim his rights for his own good. Also, the mutuality and relativism of it is really confused to anyone in the society today. Then, right is one the essential things that a man possesses especially in any society today because it guides anyone to perfect acceptance and freedom.

2. Can you give a noncircular definition of claim-right?

I don't have any idea of noncircular definition of claim; right because I believe it's the same with the definition given. As well as on the basis of claim; right is always circular and it applies in different scenarios in the society.