

Rawls_and_Nozick.edited.edited.docx

by

Submission date: 24-Sep-2021 05:48AM (UTC-0600)

Submission ID: 1656394042

File name: Rawls_and_Nozick.edited.edited.docx (16.24K)

Word count: 1402

Character count: 7519

Rawls and Nozick

Name:

Institution:

Course:

Instructor:

Date:

Rawls and Nozick

Part 1

Question 1

Nozick disagrees with Rawls' interpretation of fair treatment in terms of economic disparities. Rawls argued that economic injustices must be allowed if only they benefit the community and mainly profit the socially disadvantaged people in society. It is referred to as the "difference principle." Rawls and Nozick sought divergent routes to the same goal: a community in which disparities benefit everyone. Nozick distinguishes with both "end-result" but also "historical" precepts. A historical theory of equality is one for that, if we evaluate a wealth inequality, we cannot ascertain if it is just or unfair except if we recognize several of the historical aspects on how this dispersion originated.

Nevertheless, per the end-result concept, we only have to look at the allocation alone to establish inequitably. We do not need to recognize any of the background aspects of how this distribution emerged. In the entitlement perspective, Nozick (1938) talks about the historical principle that is not linked with the end-state and how it emerges, provided that the method used to arrive at the end-state is done voluntarily, devoid of the loss of liberty. He means that the road to the final result adheres to the entitlement aspect, meaning that it is acceptable if all riches are derived from voluntary arrangements. Rawls is fixated on outcomes. If there are wide disparities and economic hardship, the path that prompted the outcome must have been unfair. The profound insight of Rawls was that income disparities can benefit the public and the impoverished and that favorable disparities do just that.

Question 2

In chapter seven, Nozick talks about individuals having rights, and there is nothing a person or group can do to deny them those rights. Among these rights is property rights. These entitlements are so solid and far-reaching that they pose something the government and its representatives can do. These entitlements are so solid and far-reaching that they beg the question of what the government and its representatives can do about these rights. Nozick (1938) set out to prove the property rights assertion by demonstrating that only liberal economies treat people equally. To accomplish this, he devised his entitlement conception of justice. To understand this, one must first consider what is known as self-ownership reasoning. Nozick's self-ownership argument amounts to individuals owning themselves. It is premised upon the belief provided by Nozick earlier in this section. Second, the universe and its items are ownerless at first. Third, if one does not deteriorate the material properties of others, they can obtain an inherent right to an inordinate portion of the world. Because Nozick (1938) believes that each individual owns oneself, each person will also hold her abilities. He theorized that this entails possession of the results of those skills and abilities. The object that owns and is owned by the same entity, the entire individual, is just the same institution. Nozick understood people to have ultimate property rights over themselves and utter property rights over assets they obtain, with this prerequisite. Property rights in this scenario are essential to Nozick's theory of justice because people own the means of achieving justice since they own their property rights.

Question 3

According to Nozick's theory on entitlement and justice, the allocation of wealth in the society is only just if everyone in that community is eligible for what they own. Ownership is retained if people obtain it in a just manner. For instance, there are numerous Americans who

made wealth through legitimate means. At the same time, numerous individuals cannot afford a single meal in a day, are homeless, and cannot acquire a decent place to call home. In simple terms, society is divided between the rich and the poor, and the gap is growing daily. In my view, there ought to be a way that we can strike a balance. Those who have can contribute towards those who are struggling, either through introducing laws requiring them to do so or via their own volition. Regardless, both methods would benefit the impoverished members of the society because we will share resources between the rich and the poor. The approach, in my view, is just and the best way to address some of the economic challenges impoverished people experience though Nozick would never agree to it. According to Nozick, the distribution of wealth in societal structure is only fair if everyone is entitled to everything they own. Possession is preserved if it was acquired fairly. As per Nozick's (1938) argument, in this scenario, the wealthy have the right to refuse to share part of their wealth if they earned it legitimately. It is theirs, and they cannot be coerced into dividing it among the impoverished members of society. In addition, the poor will not be acquiring this wealth unjustly because they will forcefully take it from the wealthy, who have acquired their possessions through legitimate methods.

Part 2

In the United States Democratic presidential nominations, Senator Bernie Sanders's triumph in New Hampshire and Iowa showed that his policy suggestion on wealth redistribution resonated well with the masses. Senator Sanders suggested that should he become president, he would increase the taxes levied to the wealthy Americans, guarantee universal health coverage for all, among other policy changes (Harper, 2019). This move was meant to reverse the growing economic gap between wealthy and impoverished Americans. To deal with the rising income inequality, the senator promised to directly tax the wealthy Americans to half the fortune of

American multi-billionaires in the subsequent 15 years. According to the senator's campaign team, the strategy was projected to generate \$4.35 trillion over the next decade (Harper, 2019). Most of Sanders' practical policy ideas, including his affordable homes plan, unifying childcare, and assistance in funding Health care for all, would be funded with taxes collected from the wealthy Americans. If ratified, the policy would be phased initially with families with a total value of \$32 million, with tariffs ranging from 1% to 8%. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) would be expected to enforce the policy, including verifying all multimillionaires and 30% of taxation from the top 1% of capital income brackets (Harper, 2019). It would also impose a 40% "exit tax" on the super-rich and a 60% tax on tycoons who wish to relocate to other countries.

In this supposition, Rawls (2001) proposed two precepts he believed most people could agree on. To begin, the Liberty Concept asserts that everyone has the entitlement to the most equitable liberty conceivable. Second, the Difference Principle stating that economic and social discrepancies in civilization can only be warranted if they profit the most vulnerable people in society. When society evolves, it must ensure that things progress for the ones at the bottom. As a result, the rich can get wealthier if the impoverished are not abandoned behind. Senator Sander's policy recommendation resonates with Rawls' concept because it will benefit the impoverished members of American society. Wealth redistribution means that the needs of the less fortunate will be addressed.

On the contrary, as per Nozick's theory on entitlement and justice, he argues that the allocation of wealth in the society is only just if everyone in that community is eligible for what they own. Ownership is retained if it was obtained in a just manner. America is commonly referred to as the land of opportunity where hard work is rewarded with wealth. Some of the senator's wealthy individuals targeted in his tax policies are hardworking Americans who have

made their fortune via hard work. Nozick asserts that any authority that burdens the rich with taxes and redistributes their riches to help the needy infringes on the rich's rights. Governments, he claims, have no right to infringe on people's rights by taking their wealth and giving it to others. Authorities should not act as vigilantes, taking hardworking people's hard-earned wealth and redistributing it to the poor. It is certainly relevant if a person's riches were earned via expertise or industriousness. Nozick firmly believes in personal liberty and advocates for a minimal state that maintains the rule of law and does nothing to redistribute income, contrary to Rawls' (2001) idea.

References

Harper, A. (2019, September 24). *Sen. Bernie Sanders unveils the 'Tax on extreme wealth' plan.*

ABC News. <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/sen-bernie-sanders-unveils-tax-extreme-wealth-plan/story?id=65822393>

Nozick, R. (1938). Justice and entitlement. *Ethics*, 87(2), 653-660.

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness: A restatement*. Harvard University Press.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off