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Sanded Michael Sanded starts off “ The Procedural Republic and the Unencumbered Se by stating that philosophy is unavoidable and has existed from the beginning of humanity. He states, “ To engage in a political practice is already to stand in reel action to theory. For all our uncertainties about ultimate questions Of political philosophy why of justice and value and the nature of the good life the one thing we know is that we live some answer all the time” (Sanded 81).

He then states his thesis for his work w here he will explore philosophy in contemporary America and explore the theory that affirms the Luray of answers in philosophy in contrast to the theory of one single awns In Sandal’s first section “ The Right and the Good”, he describes a liberal vision that gives “ pride Of place to justice, fairness, and individual rights” (Sanded 82).

He then explains that this liberal society’s core thesis is “ not to promote any particular ends, but enables it’s citizens to pursue their own end, consistent with a similar liberty f or all; it therefore must govern by principles that do not presuppose any particular co inception of the good” (Sanded 82). Sanded then explains that constitution and laws of a jus society “ provides a framework within which it’s citizens can pursue their own values a ND ends, consistent with a similar liberty for others” (Sanded 82).

Sandal summarizes, “ t he right is prior to the good and independent, and in two senses: The priority of the right t means first, that individual rights cannot be sacrificed for the sake of the general go d, and second, that the principles of justice that specify these rights cannot be premier seed on any particular vision of the good life” (Sanded 82). This “ Framework” means that when the government interprets laws and right s, It ant say that our idea of the good is infant good or bad, but only says that we have a right to pursue and have our own ideas and values and the ability to pursue o our ends.

As a human we have the right to define our “ Idea of the Good”. This freedom must be preserved and not dictated by the government. However, Sanded says that “ De spite philosophical force, the claim for the priority of the right over the good ultimate tell fails”. This liberal vision is the one in which we, as Americans in the late twentieth CE entry, live. Sandal’s next section, Kantian Foundations, addresses the flaw of this liberal dead.

Sanded States “ The liberal ethic asserts the priority Of right, and seeks PRI incises of justice that do not presuppose any particular conception of the good” (Sanded Sanded uses Cant’s example of supremacy of the moral law, and Rail’s states “ Justice is the first virtue of social institutions” (Rail 83). Sanded explains that j justice is the framework that regulates competing values and ends and therefore must have an independent sanction. Different people have differing desires and ends, and s 0 any principle derived from them must be contingent.

People also differ in their id as of what happiness is so to have a preset conception to regulate with would dent the FRR demo to choose one’s own conception. Sanded explains that ‘ the moral law needs a cat gorilla foundation, not a contingent one” (Sanded 83) as he states “ Only when I am go versed by principles that do not presuppose any particular ends am I free to pursue my own ends consistent with a similar freedom for all” (Sanded 84). Sanded brings up K ant’s thinking Of how laws aren’t objective because man wrote them and they are s abject to what is important to man.

Happiness should not be dependent on anything b cause people’s view of happiness differ. Any other arrangement would “ fail to Reese CT persons as being capable of choice; it would treat them as objects rather than subjects ” (Sanded 85). Sanded analyzes Rails’ “ Original Position” and it’s role, to preserve Cant’s moral and political teaching by replacing Germanic obscurities with a domestic meta physic more congenial to the Noncommercial temper.

Sanded also explains how Kant’ s notion of the subject is bound up with the claim for the priority of right. In the next section “ From Transcendental Subject to Unencumbered Self” San explains how Rail’s original position tries to provide what Cant’s transcended tall argument cannot, which is a foundation for the right that is prior to the good but still situated in the world. Rails explains the true image of unencumbered self who ICC is a self understood as prior to and independent of purposes and ends.

He then s dates that the most important thing about the unencumbered self is that “ essential to o Persephone, are not the ends we choose but our capacity to choose them” (S ended 86). Sanded quotes Aras’s, “ It is not our aims that primarily reveal our nature but RA there the reminisces that we would acknowledge to govern the background conditions u ender which these aims are to be formed. We should therefore reverse the relation Bette en the right and the good… Sanded explains how no individual can be transcended above the law.

He also discusses the fact that in the liberal vision we are free to make laws the at gives us freedoms that are unconstrained by an order of value antecedently given, but then we must follow these laws. What is most important in the liberal vision is not thinking of how laws aren’t bobs what is important to man. Haft peoples view of happiness dif s being capable of choice: it bob Sanded analyzes Rails’ “ Or and political teaching by replace more congenial to the Anglo s notion or the subject is bound In the next section “ From Trans! explains how Rail’s original PC argument cannot, which sis of hut still situated in the world. Rails ex self understood as prior to NC rates that the most important thing ball- Persephone, are not the ends Sanded quotes Rails, “ 11 is not principles that we would acne these aims are to be formed. V and the good, \_, Sanded explain He also discusses the fact that us freedoms that are encounter we must follow these laws. Who what we choose, but that we have the capacity to Coho tat Eng that he does not think that we can make sense of e light of the Selfridges it requires.

In the next section, Justice and Community, SE arguing within the liberal project and then be meant that utilitarianism forgets to take the distinction of animism goes wrong by failing to acknowledge the arbitrator against the difference principle because it starts with the are only accidental theirs and ends by assuming that TTL assets and that society has a prior claim, hi arrant”. The difference principle is a “ formula for using and verbalism is committed to reject it. Sanded SST Nicole requires but cannot provide is some way of id e assets one bears are properly thought common, son dually indebted and morally engaged to begin with. Attachments that would save and set up the difference pair If and their obligations would undercut the priority Of the to view ourselves independent because no matter are attached to a community, family, nation, I agree with Sanded in that in liberalism and UT get would not properly work.