

Feminist ethics (carol gilligan)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Analysis of “ Moral Orientation and Moral Development” by Carol Gilligan The points raised by Carol Gilligan in her work “ Moral Orientation and Moral Development” remind me of the essence of understanding perspectives and creating sound judgments after thoughts which I believe must be carefully devoted to thorough learning of orientations unique to distinct individuals. On this ground, there exists sufficient basis to acknowledge that every human being is truly entitled to a personal statement or claim which necessarily differs from that of another in terms of origin and application. So it is normal to encounter people with strangely different views considering the diversity in socio-cultural factors acquired from the environment which correspondingly reflect through their mental attitude and social behavior. Apparently, ‘ perceptual organization’ in this regard serves as a crucial tool in determining a person’s moral orientation.

In matters concerning law and order, a rigid set of standards is set and employed to call for a mandatory obedience yet proper legal execution as we see it, still relies heavily upon weighing of perspectives or possibilities. Since the exact image of truth is not available for the sight of everyone due to limitations in the scope of our senses and intellectual reach, we bear the capacity of depending on someone else’s trusted paradigm. At times, other people see what we don’t or cannot see and equivalently, we possess the ability to know something which others struggle to gain knowledge of. This is one concrete evidence of reality by which we may agree with Gilligan at depth as she delivers the premise that “ there are at least two perspectives possible in analyzing any moral problem, and that these perspectives, far from being mutually exclusive or oppositional, are in fact applied or adopted according to varying circumstances.” Hence, I suppose herein that

psychological components as such play a significant role in court proceedings or even in plain settings that exhibit sharp argumentations between people who take ample pride in individual reasoning due to rich past experiences in life. This is especially true on areas they have been well engaged so it would often seem pointless to bring to discussion subjects that are perceived otherwise in their context.

When exactly can one be justified as ethically right or having a better perception and approach of evaluating objects of interest? Gilligan accounts for the 'search for clarity' and the 'search for justification' in a perceptual task of examining things whose meanings come with ambiguity and eventually, her theory indicates lack of inclination in concluding that one perspective ought to be held in higher recognition over its counterpart.

Typically, in view of current political situations, people tend to look for a single perspective that would stand above the rest as entirely right and characteristic of moral justice in all aspects. Because of this, we also tend to decline from the maturity of comprehending the uniqueness of each empirical witness just so we may attain to the objective of arriving at the conceived single standard measure of truth or righteousness in mind. We may be right indeed on several points, however, as

Gilligan attempts to propose "even when we spontaneously prefer one, we are capable of recognizing the value of the other" in making moral choices. Thus, it is fair to claim that our concept or discernment of matters is better yet only within our very own empirical context for this is something that would fall short when assessed via the universal principle of paying respect to the moral orientation and moral development of others.