
John Rawls Justice As Fairness

John Rawls Justice As
Fairness

Downloaded from
template-dev.mobaptist.org
by Mccarty & Nathaniel

INTRODUCTION: UNDERSTANDING JOHN RAWLS AND JUSTICE AS FAIRNESS

Political philosophy in the twentieth century was profoundly reshaped by the work of John Rawls, an American moral and political philosopher whose 1971 magnum opus, *A Theory of Justice*, revitalized the social contract tradition. At the heart of his entire project lies a compelling and rigorously defended concept: **John Rawls Justice As Fairness**. This principle is not merely a suggestion for a better society; it is a sophisticated framework designed to determine the fundamental structure of a just society. Rawls sought to move beyond utilitarian thinking, which often permits the sacrifice of individual rights for the greater good, and beyond intuitionist approaches that offer no clear way to resolve conflicting moral claims. Instead, he proposed a set of principles that free and rational persons would accept in an initial position of equality. This article will explore the core components of this influential theory, examining its underlying logic, its key principles, its practical implications, and the enduring legacy it holds in contemporary political discourse.

THE CONTEXT OF RAWLS' WORK: A NEW DIRECTION FOR POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

To fully appreciate the significance of

John Rawls Justice As Fairness, it is essential to understand the philosophical landscape he entered. The dominant ethical theory in the mid-twentieth century, particularly in the English-speaking world, was utilitarianism. Championed by philosophers like Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, utilitarianism holds that the most just action or policy is the one that maximizes overall happiness or well-being. While appealing in its simplicity, utilitarianism faces a serious objection: it can theoretically justify the violation of individual rights if doing so produces enough net benefit for the majority. For example, enslaving a small minority could be deemed "just" if it brought immense pleasure to a much larger population. Rawls found this deeply problematic. He argued that a just society must protect the inviolability of each person, a protection that cannot be traded away even for the prosperity of society as a whole. **John Rawls Justice As Fairness** was designed as a direct and powerful alternative to utilitarianism, one that places the rights and dignity of the individual at the very center of the political order.

Reviving the Social Contract

To build his alternative, Rawls turned to the classical social contract tradition of John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Immanuel Kant. These thinkers imagined a "state of nature" where individuals,

free and equal, agree to form a political society. Rawls modernized this idea. He argued that the principles of justice should be the object of an original agreement among free and rational persons. However, he introduced a brilliant procedural device to ensure fairness in this hypothetical agreement: the **veil of ignorance**.

CORE CONCEPTS: THE ORIGINAL POSITION AND THE VEIL OF IGNORANCE

The framework for arriving at **John Rawls Justice As Fairness** relies on two central ideas: the original position and the veil of ignorance. The original position is a hypothetical scenario, a thought experiment, where representatives of every member of society come together to choose the basic principles that will govern their society. The crucial feature of this original position is the veil of ignorance. In this state, the representatives are deprived of all knowledge about their personal characteristics and their position in society.

They do not know their social class, gender, race, ethnicity, natural talents, intelligence, strength, or even their own conception of what makes a good life. They are ignorant of their age, their health, and their generation. This veil ensures that no one can tailor the principles of justice to benefit their particular circumstances. As Rawls famously put it, they do not know if they will be a "talented artist or a disabled laborer." This enforced ignorance forces the parties to be impartial. They must choose principles that are fair to everyone, regardless of their eventual position in society, because they could end up being anyone.

- **Impartiality:** The veil of ignorance guarantees that the chosen principles are not biased in favor of the powerful or privileged.
- **Rational Self-Interest:** Each representative is rational and self-interested, seeking the best possible outcome for themselves. Because they don't know who they will be, their self-interest paradoxically leads them to choose principles that are fair for everyone.
- **Agreement:** Under these conditions, Rawls argues, it would be rational to agree on a set of principles that protect the worst-off in society, as a form of insurance against ending up in a disadvantaged position.

The original position and the veil of ignorance are not meant to be realistic descriptions of any actual event. Instead, they are a "device of representation" that models the constraints of fairness on our reasoning about justice. By thinking from within this hypothetical situation, we can test our intuitions about what a truly fair society would look like. This is the starting point for all of **John Rawls Justice As Fairness**.

THE TWO PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE

Rawls argues that rational parties in the original position, behind the veil of ignorance, would unanimously agree on two fundamental principles of justice. These principles form the core of his theory and are presented in a specific order of priority. The first principle is absolute and cannot be traded away for the benefits of the second. This is known as the **lexical priority of liberty**.

The First Principle: Equal Basic Liberties

The first principle states: **Each person has an equal right to the most extensive scheme of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others.**

This principle guarantees a set of fundamental rights and freedoms to every citizen. These include political liberty (the right to vote and to hold public office), freedom of speech and assembly, liberty of conscience (freedom of thought and religion), freedom of the person (including freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention), and the right to hold personal property. This principle affirms the inviolability of the individual. A just society cannot infringe upon these basic liberties for the sake of economic efficiency or social stability. As Rawls powerfully states, "Each person possesses an inviolability founded on justice that even the welfare of society as a whole cannot override." This is the bedrock of **John Rawls Justice As Fairness**.

The Second Principle: Fair Equality of Opportunity and

the Difference Principle

The second principle of **John Rawls Justice As Fairness** governs social and economic inequalities. It has two parts:

1. **Fair Equality of Opportunity:** Offices and positions must be open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity. This goes beyond the formal "careers open to talents" idea. It requires that people with similar abilities and motivations have roughly the same chances of attaining these positions, regardless of their social class, race, or other arbitrary factors. This means society must actively work to overcome the effects of social disadvantage, for example, through publicly funded education and healthcare.
2. **The Difference Principle:** Social and economic inequalities must be arranged so that they are to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society. This is arguably the most distinctive and controversial element of **John Rawls Justice As Fairness**. It does not demand perfect equality. It allows for inequalities—for example, higher pay for doctors or entrepreneurs—only if those inequalities improve the situation of those who are worst off.

The justification for the difference principle is powerful. From behind the veil of ignorance, a rational person would worry about ending up among the least advantaged. So, they would agree

to a system that makes the least advantaged as well off as possible. This principle transforms the justification for inequality: it is not enough to say that someone "deserves" their wealth because they are talented. For Rawls, natural talents are a "common asset" and we do not morally deserve the advantages of being born with a high IQ or a specific talent. Instead, inequalities are justified only if they incentivize the talented to use their abilities in ways that ultimately benefit everyone, especially the least fortunate.

APPLICATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF JUSTICE AS FAIRNESS

The principles of **John Rawls Justice As Fairness** have profound implications for the structure of a society. They paint a picture of a "property-owning democracy" rather than a welfare state. A welfare state typically redistributes income after the fact, allowing large inequalities to persist. In contrast, a property-owning democracy aims to prevent such inequalities from arising in the first place by widely dispersing the ownership of capital and wealth. This could include policies like progressive inheritance taxes, publicly funded education, and policies to ensure a fair distribution of productive assets. The goal is to ensure that all citizens have the necessary resources and social bases of self-respect to participate as equals in the political and social life of their society.

In this view, justice demands more than just a social safety net. It requires a fundamental commitment to ensuring that the basic structure of society—its major institutions, including the constitution, the economy, and the legal

system—is organized in a way that respects the equal liberty of all and works to the advantage of the least well off.

CRITICISMS AND RESPONSES

The immense influence of **John Rawls Justice As Fairness** has naturally attracted a great deal of criticism from various philosophical perspectives.

Libertarian Critiques

The most famous libertarian critique comes from Robert Nozick in his book *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Nozick argues that the difference principle is fundamentally unjust because it violates individual liberty. If a person legitimately acquires property through their own talents and efforts, it is a violation of their freedom for the state to take that property away and redistribute it. Nozick champions a "minimal state" that only protects against force, fraud, and theft, and enforces contracts. Rawls' response is that the distribution of talents is a matter of brute luck, not moral desert, and that the individual's "entitlement" to their talents is shaped by a social system that is itself a matter of justice.

Communitarian Critiques

Communitarian thinkers like Michael Sandel and Michael Walzer argue that Rawls' theory is built on an overly individualistic and abstract view of the self. Sandel, in particular, argues that the "unencumbered self" behind the veil of ignorance is a fiction. We are not free,

rational agents who can choose our values independently of our communities and traditions. Our identities are partly constituted by the communities we belong to. For communitarians, **John Rawls Justice As Fairness** ignores the importance of shared values, community bonds, and the common good. Rawls and his defenders have responded by arguing that his theory is political, not metaphysical; it is designed for a pluralistic society where people have different comprehensive moral and religious views, and it does not require them to abandon their particular identities.

Feminist Critiques

Feminist philosophers like Susan Moller Okin have both praised and criticized Rawls. Okin argued that Rawls' framework, with its focus on the "basic structure of society," could be extended to address gender injustice within the family. However, she also criticized him for not initially applying his own

principles of justice to the family, which is a primary site of social reproduction and inequality. A truly just society, she argued, must ensure fair equality of opportunity within the household as well as in the public sphere. Rawls later acknowledged this critique and applied his principles to the family as part of the basic structure.

LEGACY AND CONTINUING RELEVANCE OF JUSTICE AS FAIRNESS

More than five decades after its publication, **John Rawls Justice As Fairness** remains a central and unavoidable reference point in political philosophy. It is the theory that all other theories of justice must define themselves against. Its concepts—the original position, the veil of ignorance, the difference principle—have become part of the common vocabulary of political discourse. The theory has been applied to a wide range of issues, including global justice, climate change, health care, and educational policy. Rawls himself extended his theory to international relations in his later work, *The Law of*