The book, *Justice: What’s The Right Thing To Do,* written by Michael J. Sandel, explores the strengths and weaknesses of three different ways of thinking about justice. The first one is utilitarianism, whose supporters state that the right thing to do is to maximize welfare. Next comes libertarianism, divided into two rival camps —the laissez-faire camp and the fairness camp. The last one is virtue theories, which is often identified with cultural conservatives and the religious rights.

To enable readers to cultivate their own views about justice, the writer analyzes several thought-provoking cases. Take the story *The Afghan Goatherds* for example. An American special forces team met two unarmed Afghan Goatherds accidentally during a secret mission in Afghanistan in search of a Taliban leader. The group chose to let them free instead of killing them. However, it turned out that the soldiers had made the wrong decision. The Taliban fighters were then informed, leading to the failure of the mission and the death of several American soldiers. Readers can’t help falling into deep thought: How can we justify whether a person is innocent? If we can’t, is killing someone who may be innocent right? Otherwise, is it worthwhile to set suspected enemies free at the risk of losing our comrades? What should we do in such moral dilemmas? What is the right thing to do? What on earth is justice? Thus, with the cases given, readers are likely to feel confused and conflicted while reading the book.

However, the writer offers no definite answer. He just lists the strengths and weaknesses of the three approaches to justice. Just as he writes in his book: *Its goal is not to show who influenced whom in the history of political thought, but to invite readers to subject their own views about justice to critical examination*. All he wants is to inspire readers to think on their own and reflect on different judgments critically.

To sum up, what makes the book worth reading is that it enables us to revise our judgment about the right thing to do and rethink the principle we initially espoused. It does provide much food for thought for readers.