

The Ethical Principles of John Rawls as a Tool for Social Justice and Peace in Contemporary Society

Chidi Paul ORJI

Department of Philosophy, University of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences,
Umuagwo, Imo State NIGERIA

[0149] Abstract

A Theory of Justice, published in 1971, is one of the foundational works of political philosophy that offers a new perspective on the nature and ideals of social order. Rawls attempts to address the question of how an adequate notion of political fairness may be rooted in contemporary democratic society in his 1993 book Political Liberalism. Rawls contends that multiple religious, philosophical, and moral theories will unavoidably be adopted by individuals or groups in modern democratic societies where people are viewed as equal and free. Rawls also argues that most moral, philosophical, and religious opinions are legitimate and that society agrees that disputes may arise.

Key Words: Injustice, Democratic Societies Rawls, Social Cooperation,

Introduction

The major focus of this article is the idea of justice, and our primary source is Rawls' A Theory of Justice. According to Rawls, the highest ideal is justice, which necessitates viewing people as ends in and of themselves rather than as means. Despite acknowledging the importance of ideas like stability, production, and efficiency to a society, Rawls emphasizes the far greater importance of concentrating on justice and the relationship between institutions and just causes. According to Rawls, determining the values selected by certain social structures and allocating basic goods among society's constituents in accordance with these values constitute justice.

Justice, in Rawls' view, is a tradition that addresses the equitable allocation of needs among members of a community. According to Rawls, a society is made up of people who work together to create it. Every member of a well-ordered society essentially abides by the same moral and ethical principles and is aware that the main social organizations typically uphold these ideals. According to Rawls, the most important factor in establishing justice is the basic structure of society- the way important institutions like the family, political system, and economic system interact to affect people's opportunities in life. Therefore, justice principles are meant to govern the basis of society; social justice imposes ancillary obligations on individuals: if there are just institutions, they must abide by their rules; if not, they must endeavor to establish just institutions, to the extent that such endeavors are likely to succeed and do not impose an excessive burden on the striving individual; as a result, Rawls believed that justice was fairness because any set of principles that are accepted by everyone must also be fair to everyone else, since no one would accept them otherwise.

Rawls' Justice Ethical Principle

Justice is the primary virtue of social institutions and the foundation of social structure, according to Rawls. According to Rawls, all legislative and political decisions must stay within the bounds established by the rules of justice. The distribution of the commodity is the major area where justice operates, according to Rawls. A person's rational possession is the commodity, in Rawls' view. It encompasses everything of one's aspirations, such as wealth, social standing, opportunity, talent, independence, and self-respect. Rawls, the most influential spokesperson for contemporary contractual ethics, "investigated how the political order and institutions can be formed according to the principles of justice, which he first considers as an ethical value" (Cevizci, 2007:354). Additionally, Rawls chose the altruist side between the egoism and altruism poles because, according to Hofer, Hunt, and Okholm (2003), "there is a principle of not taking sides on the side of altruism (every person's goodness will be considered equal)," which Rawls developed in his work *A Theory of Justice* in which he defends justice as truth.

Two categories exist within the contemporary notion of contractual ethics. Although both of these versions have embraced the classical contract view that all people are created equal, they both express the idea that, if these principles are accepted by everyone, no one's interests can be sacrificed for another's. This idea starts with the idea that the principles of justice should be based on a hypothetical contract. He does, however, express different views about the nature of men's innate equality. Based on Hobbes, the first of these interprets the natural equality in question as the inequality of physical power and claims that it results in the realization that it is advantageous for both parties to embrace the norms that acknowledge and defend the rights of others. This interpretation, which has been embraced by philosophers like David Gauthier and Russell, is in opposition to the traditional contract concept of equality, which holds that persons are morally equal by nature and that people's goals are matters of impartial or common interest. John Rawls is a proponent of a contractual theory of ethics who bases his arguments on a Kantian, not a Hobbesian, conception of moral equality (Cevizci, 2007: 346).

The first step in comprehending Rawls' definition of "good" is to understand Aristotle's functional meaning of the term, which maintains that an object's unique activity or function is its fundamental essence and that it becomes the most ideal and genuine item when it fulfills that role properly. According to Aristotle, everything is excellent if it works well for its own species and makes a good connection between its role and reality. The reason we care about what is excellent is also explained by this functional definition of the good. However, when we say that freedom, pleasure, or beauty are beneficial, we hardly ever take into account the achievement of this or that function. He tries to extend his functional understanding of the "good" to include items that don't seem to have a clear function. Rawls asserts that "to say something is good means to say that it has the characteristics that can be rightly expected or demanded from it" (Cevizci, 2007:291). For example, Rawls asserted that the reason for their goodness is the role that pleasure, beauty, or freedom play in a happy existence.

Rawls's view of ethics is fundamentally based on a specific notion of the individual as he stresses human agency- not the self-interested form of human agency, but the person who is the decision unit as a person with identity. In Rawls' view, an individual is a decently and fairly behaving being rather than a completely rational creature who seeks his own benefit, as the utilitarians would anticipate. According to the definition of rationality, each person has a tendency to pursue their own interests and the idea of good;

the rational person exhibits the efficient methods for achieving objectives, the hierarchy of values, and priorities. Stated differently, people are sensible and right comes before benefit. This idea is associated with building relationships, revealing equitable social collaboration and facilitating the realization of the concept of justice.

Utilitarian critiques of John Rawls' Ethical Principles of Justice

The 19th-century utilitarian philosophy of Jeremy Bentham, which can be summed up as "to make as many people as possible as happy as possible," holds that pleasures and pains are natural phenomena that influence our behavior; pleasures are good, pains are bad, and anything that promotes mental and physical comfort is advantageous to people. It is essential to enhance joys and achieve higher degrees of pleasure since pleasure is the basis of existence. According to Bentham's utilitarianism, man is a rational entity who must choose between pleasures; unlike animals, he never jumps on every item of pleasure that comes his way but instead always thinks about the consequences of his acts. Bentham defines this will to be decisive as "moral arithmetic," which maintains that the existence of a pleasure level brings an arithmetic tact or calculation in the face of pleasures. Bentham argues that it is necessary to understand and evaluate social life within this framework because politics serves to protect private interests, and in the process, the happiness of the people should be given the utmost consideration (Timuçin, 1992:594-595).

Bentham thought that there was no distinction of quality between pleasures, and that any action that could bring us the greatest happiness was good. In reality, Bentham considers that the happiness and benefits that laws may provide to the entire community should be quantified or computed before they are passed. Given that an attack or illegal behavior clearly detracts from the community's enjoyment, Bentham recognized that the legislator's job was to encourage individuals to do certain things while discouraging others. "Measuring the damage caused by the action," which Bentham described as the suffering or evil that follows an activity, is the basis of his life method. When people do anything that leads to evil, they should be discouraged.

According to Bentham, the goal of the law was to improve the general well-being of the populace, and this might be achieved by outlawing behaviors that would have detrimental effects. Bentham generally held that the government should punish criminals by undertaking actions that violate the principle of utility in order to increase the pleasure of society. Bentham believed that these behaviors needed to be reclassified in order to regulate which behaviors are appropriate and which are not, and that the government should make laws for the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people rather than for their own personal interests or at random (Çelik, 2011b:159-160). The "utility principle" can only be supported by the fact that people are inherently motivated to pursue happiness, either directly or through indirect ways.

Our activities are genuine to the degree that they regard and bring about happiness, and not true to the extent that they bring about the reverse of happiness, according to Mill, who shares Bentham's philosophy. Bentham and Mill differ on two important points: First, whereas Mill argues that there is no method to quantify the number of joys; Bentham argued that the quantity of pleasures could be quantified in a concrete and scientific way. We will only make a reasonable choice when we are faced with two pleasures, according to Mill, and we are unable to determine which of the two painful sensations is more intense or which of the two pleasant emotions is stronger.

Additionally, Bentham was chastised by Mill for his view that merely quantifying pleasures is inadequate. For according to Mill, joys can be physiologically satisfying and also intellectual, artistic, and rational. Besides, these joys are qualitatively different from bodily pleasures. Mill contends that assessing pleasure and satisfaction just on a body-animal level undervalues the human state. In his discussion of pleasures, Mill makes a distinction between higher and lower pleasures, the former being the physical sensations that Bentham suggests quantifying and the latter being the human-specific intellectual and artistic pleasures. Some pleasures are more desirable and valuable than others, according to Mill. He argues that virtues like self-sacrifice, renunciation, and sacrifice are examples of pleasures that are more valuable in terms of their social usefulness, whereas utilitarianism views each person's happiness as beneficial for that individual and, consequently, for the happiness of all people.

This idea is challenged, because, if total happiness is just the sum of all individual pleasure- that is, if total happiness somehow equals total happiness- then everyone can seek their own happiness without trying to achieve overall happiness. It is clear, however, that this is not the path to pleasure for many. Because occasionally, individual pleasure-seeking does not align with overall contentment—on the contrary, it does. Mill tries to overcome this challenge by highlighting the social component of the person. He claims that utilitarianism's solid basis comes from human social impulses. These emotions, which change over time, reflect a yearning to be in unity with entities that are similar to us in origin. In contrast to Bentham's utilitarianism, Mill contends that social sentiments evolve as a result of education and the advancement of civilization, and that the more these sentiments grow the more desirable the common good or pleasure becomes as a goal worth pursuing. After that, Mill moves toward an ethical interpretation grounded on a more suitable understanding of human nature, which aims to bring usefulness closer to one another (Çelik, 2011b:164-650).

Despite Mill's attempts, the most important criticism of utilitarianism is that it is unclear what the utilitarian principle- "the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people"—means. Cevizci (1996:545) asserts that "the principle in question may have very bad consequences for the minority, even though it may provide the greatest benefit for the majority" (p.). This is when Rawls' main criticism of creative ethics is revealed. The primary inquiry is whether the problem of privileged people in society not receiving an equitable share of the benefit can be resolved by alterations to the liberal system. In pursuit of an explanation, Rawls considers the utilitarian principle- "the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people"- to be irrational and unjust in terms of evaluations of equality and fairness because he argues that such acceptance creates an environment that is harmful to the poor and marginalized. Rawls claims that utilitarianism does not provide us with a basis for our sense of fairness because "the principle of the greatest happiness for the greatest number may require that some individuals' freedoms or opportunities be sacrificed in order to achieve greater overall satisfaction." Rawls believes that this goes against our conviction that justice is right (Honer, Hunt & Okholm, 2003:430).

John Rawls' Perspective on Justice

One of the most significant modern political philosophers, Rawls, attempts to address the issue of how an effective conception of political justice may be based in modern democracies where individuals are seen as equal and free. Political liberalism, released in 1993, presents a fresh perspective on what and how social organization ought to be.

Rawls's *A Theory of Justice*, published in 1971, is considered one of the founding books of political philosophy. Individuals or groups will inevitably choose alternative theological, philosophical, and moral views in modern democratic societies where everyone are seen as equal and free, according to Rawls. According to Rawls, "political liberalism is a system that can enable different reasonable views to coexist in a constitutional and democratic system. It aims to present the understanding of 'political justice'" (Borovali, 2006: x). Because most moral, philosophical, and religious opinions are reasonable, Rawls argues that reasonable among society's members accepts the possibility of conflicts.

The *Law of the Peoples* addresses the issues of what constitutes a just order in international relations and what form of just foreign policy should be determined by a (liberal democratic) society that has embraced the principles of justice in domestic affairs" (Borovali, 2006: xi). In *Law of Peoples and Reconsideration of Public Reason Thought*, published in 1999, Rawls outlines his views on how a society that embraces his suggested conception of justice ought to interact fairly with other communities. Justice is the highest of all values, according to Rawls, and it requires that people be viewed as ends in and of themselves rather than as means.

Although Rawls recognizes the value of concepts like stability, production, and efficiency in a society, he gives justice and the relationship between institutions and righteousness much greater weight. Due to the fact that "justice includes the determination of the principles chosen by some social arrangements and the distribution of primary goods among the members of the society in line with these principles" (Lenning, 2011:38). Based on Rawls, justice is a tradition that deals with the fair distribution of necessities among the people in a community.

Rawls declares that justice primarily functions in the distribution of the commodity, which he defines as one's rational possession and encompasses everything one values, including as wealth, social status, opportunity, skill, freedom, and self-respect. Rawls contends that all political and legislative choices must be made within the parameters set by the principles of justice, which are the first virtue of social institutions and the cornerstone of social structure (Gorowitz, 1994:271).

In *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls challenges us to imagine a permanent gathering of individuals to talk about the fundamentals of justice. This is the initial state, according to Rawls, in which parties "come together to establish a social contract in which they define the political environment in which they will be governed and specify its scope and limits" (Gorowitz, 1994:272). Each party represents the interests of free and equal citizens who are fairly positioned and agree on terms that limit what they can offer as good cause. Despite being free individuals when they begin the negotiating process, these individuals must formally embrace and endorse the principles that will emerge from the process and live by them. As Rawls contends, he proposed the original scenario because there was no way to improve our concept of justice for the fundamental framework of society, which is a continuous and equitable system of collaboration between equal and free individuals (Rawls, 2007:68-70). To put it another way, the original scenario is a model that is current; that is, it reflects the conditions (conditions) established by the representatives of equal and free people with respect to the fundamental framework established by the social cooperation norms.

In addition, it is clear that Rawls' initial state is similar to the state of nature (natural) in theories of the social contract; Rawls claims that there is no historical basis for this group of people to meet to discuss the principles of justice, so this description is a tool and

premise that facilitates the understanding of the theory of justice; Rawls also assumes that this group of people is logical, knowledgeable in disciplines such as psychology, economics, and sociology, and has a variety of advantageous and detrimental goals in furthering their own interests. Besides Rawls assumes that "each of this group of people is concerned only with promoting their own interests, determined only to achieve their own ends, and disinterested in the interests of everyone but themselves" (Gorowitz, 1994:272). Known as the veil of ignorance, Rawls restricts the group of persons who get together to decide on the principles of justice in the first stage. In this case, the group of persons who get together to decide on the principles of justice cannot be seen as representatives of equal and free citizens who will come to a right conclusion. To put it another way, this group of people feels unsure about their place in the future of society. (Rawls, 2007: 71).

Their social, economic, and social positions, as well as their religious beliefs, color and ethnicity, gender, age, IQ, and skill set, are all unknown the parties. While parties beneath the veil of ignorance have goals they would want to achieve, they are completely unable of differentiating themselves from others through any criteria or characteristics. Interviewees do not try to protect their own interests at the expense of others' when the veil of ignorance is lifted. Rational interviewers who are blinded by ignorance have no affection for one another since they are unable to predict what will happen if any of the interviewees raise the veil and understand where they fit in the actual world and whether the prejudiced viewpoint is beneficial or detrimental.

"Interviewers are ignorant in particular and wise in general," to put it briefly. Despite their want to advance their own interests, they are unable to differentiate them from those of others (Gorowitz, 1994: 273). According to Rawls, the parties operating under the veil of ignorance will be inspired to select the principles of justice by "attributes to individual's two moral abilities, the capacity for sense of justice and the capacity for understanding good" (Rawls, 2007:64). Indeed, according to Rawls, "people have the capacity for sense of justice and understanding of the good to establish the idea that principles of justice emerge through an appropriate construction process" (Rawls, 2007:135). According to Rawls (2007:118–119), a sense of justice is a strong desire to cultivate and employ the ability to comprehend, apply, and act upon all reasonable justice principles that the parties have agreed upon. This ensures that the principles will be upheld once each party has fulfilled their obligation. This capability is the ability to understand, apply, and behave in a way that is consistent with the fair circumstances of social cooperation.

Rawls's Principles of Justice

In order to protect their own interests, the rational people who have come together to decide on the principles of justice will understand, as far as they can see through the veil of ignorance, that they are equally likely to gain or lose from the application of principles that will advance the interests of some people more than others. As a result, they will arrange their lives as they see fit. According to Rawls, the negotiators are forced to choose the principles that will best serve the interests of the party that the principles least favor. This way of thinking creates a new necessity: "the principles that will regulate the formation of the social order must be the principles that the person rationally accepts that he can live, taking into account that he can be the least privileged individual in that society" (Gorowitz, 1994: 273). Whoever he is, he will stand up for the values that provide everyone the best chance, including himself. Five distinct conceptions of justice are presented to the parties in the first scenario: the first is the interpretation that justice is truth; the second is

the utilitarian interpretation; the third is the intuitive interpretation; the fourth is the mixed justice (intuitive-utilitarian) interpretation; and the fifth is the egoistic interpretation.

The intuitive understanding of justice is also unacceptable because it lays out the fundamental principles and arranges them according to the overall benefit; the utilitarian understanding of justice sacrifices the interests of minorities or single people for the benefit of the majority; and the egoist understanding of justice, on the other hand, questions the power of one individual and the person is pursuing his own interests, which is unacceptable (Macit, 2009:38-39). Rawls observes that interviewers would reject all of these preconceived notions of justice since each of these viewpoints consistently rejects the rights of one or more groups of people. Eventually, this group will conclude that "even though there are various alternatives to justice, the most reasonable one among them, namely, the concept of justice, which Rawls calls fairness" (Gorowitz, 1994:273).

Rawls (1971:52) identified two basic concepts of justice: 1. Every individual has an equal right to the most extensive fundamental freedoms that are consistent with those of others; 2. The following measures should be taken to limit social and economic inequality: a) adhere to the equitable protection concept in a way that serves the least advantaged the most; b) make positions, offices, and jobs available to everyone under the fair equal opportunity principle. The principles of freedom, difference, and fair equality of opportunity are the names given to the first, second, and third, respectively. Given that the second principle will take absolute precedence over the first and that option b of the second principle comes before option a, which means that the principle of fair equality of opportunity comes before the principle of difference, Rawls contends that the interviewers followed the first principle. In order to develop social structures and acts, the first principle is absolutely required, and without it, the second principle cannot be used. It is also difficult to sustain the second principle at the expense of the fundamental rights and liberties that are safeguarded by this principle. As long as they assist the most disadvantaged, the second premise allows them to be used to control social and economic problems.

In the words of Gorowitz (1994:276), "this condition, called 'chain-relatedness,' is not inevitable, since it is not that all will benefit from permitted inequalities, but that the least privileged benefit from them." It is evident that the goal of Rawls' theories of justice is to give the most disadvantaged members of society the best opportunity for success. Therefore, the values of justice, which are fundamental to a fair social order, are chosen by the representatives who first stand behind the curtain of ignorance. According to Rawls (2007:322), "the two principles of justice provide a better basis for understanding claims to freedom and equality in a democratic society than traditional creative doctrine." Rawls claims that the theory of justice applies rational choice theory, which he describes as a part of it. The categorical imperative, according to Kant, is to be a free and rational being. Since it is in line with human nature, it is a principle that applies to everyone equally. "Rawls also determines the principles of justice in a distinctly Kantian manner" (Gorowitz, 1994:277).

After deciding on the principles of justice, the interviewees establish the social order. A political understanding that functions within the parameters of justice ideals is developed at this point. When the interviewees make their judgments for a feeling of fairness, the interviewers' understanding of the society's general conditions, political and economic culture, and natural resources further removes the mask of ignorance. They are

now required to design a constitution that lays out the fundamental rights of the populace as well as the power of the executive branch.

In this way, a carefully thought-out constitution that follows the principles of justice will be chosen, leading to the creation of legislation that is both efficient and just. Gorowitz (1994: 277) states that this constitution will "protect the freedom of conscience and thought, freedom over the person, and equal political rights." Further, it is limited to the concept of justice, and the concept of freedom is the most important justice principle at the constitutional level. After a just constitution is established, the negotiators move on to the next stage, becoming lawmakers.

At this level of government, laws are created based on the ideals of justice (legislation). With the curtain of ignorance partially lifted, the interviewer gains control over all general and economic social concerns. Identity and personal traits are still undisclosed to prevent bias. This is where the concept of difference becomes important. According to Gorowitz (1994), "Rawls, like the utilitarians, are ready to allow privileges, not for the sake of maximizing the good, but only because it will bring the least privileged out of their predicament." In the context of equal opportunity, this principle of difference requires that social and political policies be focused on increasing the long-term aspirations of the least fortunate. The final step is the judgment stage. Currently, the laws' relevance to certain circumstances and individuals' (non-compliance) with them are being examined. The curtain of ignorance has now been completely removed, and the interviewees are not subject to any further informational restrictions. The judgment step shows how justice ideas that were ideally formulated at the theoretical level are used in practice. Rawls argued that the state's conception of justice is the fundamental requirement for citizens to obey it and its laws. Obeying the just state is a natural obligation of citizens.

Rawls' theory of justice seems to be a theory of social justice because it highlights a redistributive production-distribution distinction: the state is a democratic state that does not endorse any religion, thought, or belief system that will guarantee the existence of such an area and support the living of various ideas, beliefs, or religions. If there are just institutions, citizens are expected to follow them; if not, they are expected to encourage the creation of right arrangements. This is the obligation of natural justice. In contrast, Rawls advocates qualities that will uphold and reinforce just social cooperation circumstances, whereas the state enforces a certain comprehensive ideology as a way of life. Civility, tolerance, rationality, and fairness- qualities that cannot be objective and may be advised- are examples of just social cooperation (Macit, 2009:61-62). For Rawls, "the state not only saves individuals from the obstacles related to their economic activities, but also contributes to the development of a better life for its citizens" (Cevizci, 2007:387). Because he thinks that the state should work to accomplish distributive justice- which recognizes the highest social good as providing for the most vulnerable- rather than merely upholding social order, Rawls is a redistributionist.

Rawls argued that "the first obligation of the social order is to provide justice, and the legislative implications of such a view are entirely separate from the utilitarian understanding of the state as intermediary for the maximization of general happiness" (Gorowitz, 1994:279). Even though Rawls was a philosopher, his theory of justice has had a big impact on economics, which has long been focused on individual motivation. Additionally, moral and political ideologies were confined to a very small area due to the positivist point of view's long-term ascendancy.

Only the significance and application of ideas related to political and moral philosophy should be judged by a philosopher. Thus, hardly much research had been done in these areas, and the ideologies in question seemed dry and uninteresting.

An Examination of John Rawls Ethical Principles and its Implications

The idea of justice as truth, according to Rawls, offers two benefits over utilitarianism. In the first place, its two principles better reflect our understanding of justice than utilitarianism does. This suggests that Rawls' view is morally better. Secondly, Rawls argues that the social contract theory of justice, which sees justice as the equalization of free and equal rational designers, resolves many of the main problems utilitarian's face when trying to apply their theory to contemporary situations. According to Rawls' theory, "it is not necessary to compare the tastes of two people quantitatively." It is simple to identify the least privileged individual and decide what would benefit him (Gorowitz, 1994: 279). Gorowitz asserts that Rawls' theory of justice provides a fresh and effective means of illuminating social issues (1994:281). Rawls, a philosopher of politics and morals, reoriented his vision with a fundamental work that is abstract yet has highly concrete repercussions. Furthermore, in a context when people were forced to choose between equality and freedom due to the Cold War, Rawls' theory of justice offered a cogent and comprehensive view of justice. "Rawls' theory of justice is of vital importance in terms of understanding today's political philosophy" (Ecer, 2010:2) and hence crucial.

Despite all these positive aspects, Rawls' theory of justice has been criticized from a number of perspectives. The first critique of Rawls' theory of justice focuses on his conception of the individual. A theory of justice is not a theory that chooses between regimes or is intended to prove any regime. It is directly concerned with the idea of justice itself, not with a particular political regime. This aspect of the theory in question and the sound reasoning in its content have caused many ethical theorists, political scientists, or economists who have very different political understandings to reevaluate their ideas. Many philosophers and writers contend that Rawls' theory of justice is predicated on a completely abstract and asocial individual thinking that distances people from their goals and values. The abstract human fiction serves as the foundation for Rawls' initial scenario for explaining the pre-contract. This impersonal guy is disconnected from his social circle and personal goals. This perception of the individual encourages alienation and isolation. Therefore, Rawls is criticized for putting out a human interpretation that is incompatible with social design, likened to disparate islands living together in the same ocean. Furthermore, because people's identities and preferences are greatly influenced by social reality, it is extremely challenging for those who are constructed independently of social reality to make rational decisions about the principles of justice. Dworkin argues that a hypothetical compromise cannot be a draft version of an actual contract because the liberal tradition maintains that there is no such pre-contractual period in nature. He also contends that the concept of the social contract cannot be based on historical reality if it is not founded on de facto consensus.

The starting state and the veil of ignorance, two fundamental ideas in Rawls' theory of justice, have also come under fire. Furthermore, criteria of fairness cannot be established because of the parties' rationality in the initial situation and their motivation to maximize their own interests. Again, impartiality in the choice of justice-related principles cannot be ensured by the veil of ignorance alone. Furthermore, without reciprocal dialogue and negotiation, a solution based on people's free choice is unattainable. Economic liberals also

oppose the aforementioned hypothesis. As a strong egalitarian theory, Rawls' theory of justice is seen by certain economic liberals who argue that its goal-statement- the welfare of the least advantaged- prefers a just distribution that maximizes. Furthermore, the same people disagree with Rawls' premise that a common pool of inherent abilities should be allocated in accordance with social fairness principles. Robert Nozick, a libertarian, for example, argues that Rawls' difference principle will be unjust to people who behave responsibly, make sensible choices, and work hard. According to Nozick (1974), products must be provided to individuals for free from outside sources in order for Rawls's principle to be implemented. However, in reality, this is not the case:

People naturally make more money by working harder than others who compete on equal conditions because they have a right to commodities and welfare in proportion to their effort. Nozick feels that redistribution of legally acquired property is unlawful and detrimental to freedom, and that any transfer of resources from these persons to others is unjust in accordance with the difference principle. Nozick argues that the freedom principle and the difference principle are thus irreconcilable. Finally, in his book "The Idea of Justice," Amartya Sen (2009) challenged Rawls' theory of justice by claiming that a lack of capacity can have quite different outcomes even in cases where primary goods are distributed equally. Sen contends that one cannot determine an individual's degree of welfare solely by looking at the fundamental liberties and rights that Rawls identifies as primary goods: wealth, income, opportunities, self-respect, and basic freedoms. The elimination of glaring disparities in capacities should be the main objective to ensure justice, according to Sen, who recognizes that neither utility nor primary goods are suitable for the analysis of the inequality problem because, when taking into account the actual possibilities that an individual has to achieve his goals, the primary goods that he has are insufficient; personal characteristics (e.g., disability, old age, illness) as well as the ability to achieve different lifestyle capacities must also be taken into consideration.

Conclusion

In his theory of justice, which emphasizes the distribution of primary goods and sees justice as equality, American philosopher John Rawls asserts that the concept of justice appears as a convention regarding the determination of the principles chosen by certain social arrangements within the society and the distribution of primary goods among the members of the society in accordance with these principles. For Rawls, the concept of social state and social justice gained their true meaning. The question of how to attain social justice that guarantees the peace and well-being of everyone in this global era is the focus of Amartya Sen, one of the most influential intellectuals of our day. Sen, challenges Rawls' egalitarian justice theory based on primary goods at this point, contending that although primary goods are given equally, and people's incapacity might have quite different effects. Justice, according to Amartya Sen, is eliminating obvious inequalities in ability. Sen also contends that fair access to essential facilities, such as basic healthcare and education, is necessary for justice.

References

- Borovali, M. (2006). *John Rawls and his Political Philosophy*. Borovali M. and Özbank M. (Eds.), *Peoples of the law and the Idea of Public Mind the Idea* (pp. X-xxiii). (Trans. G. Bilgi University Press. 2nd edition.
- Celik, S. (2011a). *Modern Philosophy*. Anadolu University Press.

- _____. (2011b). *Modern Philosophy-II*. Anadolu University Press.
- Cevizci, A. (2007). *Philosophy*. Sentez Publishing.
- Dworkin R. (2000). *Sovereign Virtue. The Theory and Practice of Equality*. Harvard University Press.
- Ecer, A. (2010). *A Restoration in Political Philosophy: John Rawls and A Theory of Justice*. New Yükseksektepe E-Magazine, 68, 1-10. <http://www.magazine.yeniyuksektepe.org>.
- Gorowitz, S. (1994). *John Rawls: A Theory of Justice*. De Crespigny A. and Minogue K.R. (Edt.). Contemporary Political Philosophers. (Trans. S. Can) Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- Honer, S. M., Hunt, T. C., and Okholm, D. L. (2003). *A call to Philosophy: Problems and Options*. (Trans. Hasan u.) . Imge Bookstore.
- Kant, I. (2000). *Foundation of Moral Metaphysics*. (Trans. I. Kuçuradi) Turkish Philosophy Institution.
- Lenning, M. (2011). *The Concept of Justice in the History of Economic Thought*. <http://toulouse-Justice-2011.fr/fullpapers/e5lenning.pdf>
- Macit, M. H. (2009). *John in Rawls' Political Liberalism re- build*. Ataturk University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Philosophy. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Sen, A. (2007). *Political liberalism*. (Trans. Mehmet Fevzi Bilgin) Istanbul: Bilgi University Press.
- _____. (2009). *The Idea of Justice*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Timuçin, A. (1992). *Thought History*. BDS Publication.

Biographical Note

Chidi Paul ORJI *Ph.D.*, is a Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy, University of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, Umuagwo, Imo State NIGERIA E-mail: hipaulco@gmail.com, paul.orji@uaes.edu.ng+234(0)8149412995, ORCID iD:<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2941-5398>