



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Just to be sure? An analysis of security in relation to the values of well-being, freedom, and equality

Daemen, J.A.M.

Citation

Daemen, J. A. M. (2024, May 2). *Just to be sure?: An analysis of security in relation to the values of well-being, freedom, and equality*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3750298>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3750298>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Propositions
accompanying the dissertation
Just to Be Sure? An Analysis of Security
in Relation to the Values of Well-being, Freedom, and Equality

1. Security is best understood as a mode in which individuals may enjoy goods, whereby this mode has a factual, a cognitive, and an emotional aspect. [this dissertation]
2. There are a number of ways in which security contributes to a person's well-being, but true human flourishing also requires that she does not always have full security in each and every aspect of her life. [this dissertation]
3. Although security and freedom can indeed conflict with one another, there is no necessary trade-off between the two, and there are also important ways in which security and freedom actually work to each other's benefit. [this dissertation]
4. Equality demands that all members of society be granted a particular set of moral, economic, and political securities, but realising the egalitarian ideal also puts a certain set of moral, economic, and political securities out of reach. [this dissertation]
5. Security is not an intrinsic value, but it can be valuable for the sake of other key values, including well-being, freedom, and equality. [this dissertation]
6. Instead of trying to build an all-encompassing normative theory around one supreme value, political philosophers would be wise to acknowledge that there are multiple different values, that these can simultaneously pull into multiple different directions, and that conflicts between these values may be resolved in multiple different ways. [field of inquiry]
7. Following the advice of G.A. Cohen (2011), political philosophers must be careful not to confuse the following three questions: (i) What is justice? (ii) What should the state do? (iii) Which social states of affairs ought to be brought about? [field of inquiry]
8. Political philosophers would do well to concern themselves not just with the accuracy of their arguments, but also with their impact. [field of inquiry]
9. Political philosophers are morally permitted, and indeed under some circumstances required, to make their voices heard in the public debate. [field of inquiry]
10. At least as bad as so-called 'fact-free politics' is the idea that political decisions can or should be based on facts or science alone. [own choice]
11. If you attach a lot of value to security, then you should probably not pursue a career in academia. [own choice]