Introduction

Ethical models provide frameworks for evaluating right and wrong in human action. In the context of data ethics, where fairness, accountability, and responsibility are pressing concerns, selecting an appropriate model is crucial. This essay compares justice ethics, grounded in John Rawls' theory of fairness, with virtue ethics, based on Aristotle's concept of character and moral virtues. The two models share an interest in human well-being but differ in focus: justice ethics emphasizes fairness in structures and outcomes, while virtue ethics prioritizes the moral character of decision-makers.

Justice Ethics

Justice ethics, particularly Rawls' *Theory of Justice* (1971), argues that fairness arises when principles of justice are chosen behind a "veil of ignorance," where individuals do not know their position in society. Two principles emerge: equal basic liberties for all, and social and economic inequalities arranged to benefit the least advantaged. Applied to data ethics, justice ethics highlights issues such as equitable access to technology, protection of individual rights, and reducing algorithmic bias that disproportionately harm marginalized groups. It is outcome-oriented and focuses on ensuring systems are designed and governed fairly.

Virtue Ethics

Virtue ethics, rooted in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, emphasizes cultivating virtuous character traits such as honesty, fairness, courage, and temperance. Ethical action stems not from strict rules or distributive fairness but from the moral excellence of individuals and organizations. In data ethics, virtue ethics calls for data scientists, engineers, and organizations to embody virtues like transparency, humility, and responsibility. Instead of asking "What rules should guide data use?" or "Is this outcome fair?" virtue ethics asks "What would a virtuous professional do in this context?" This makes it deeply relational and focuses on moral growth.

Similarities

Both models aim to promote human flourishing and prevent harm. Each also resists purely self-interested approaches: Rawls by enforcing fairness regardless of social position, Aristotle by cultivating virtues that align personal excellence with the common good. In data ethics, both models recognize the need to counteract power imbalances, whether through structural fairness or virtuous conduct.

Differences

The main difference lies in their orientation:

- Justice ethics is structural, systemic and it evaluates fairness at the societal or institutional level.

- Virtue ethics is personal, character based, and it evaluates the integrity and intentions of individuals.

Another distinction is methodology: Rawls uses a hypothetical social contract to derive principles of justice, while Aristotle relies on lived practice and habituation to cultivate moral excellence. In practice, justice ethics might call for regulatory frameworks to enforce fairness in algorithms, while virtue ethics would stress the moral responsibility of data professionals to act honestly and prudently.

Preference and Evaluation

I personally prefer justice ethics in the field of data ethics. Data-driven systems affect millions of people simultaneously, and structural safeguards are essential. For example, without systemic fairness checks, even the most virtuous data scientist could inadvertently deploy a biased algorithm that disadvantages vulnerable populations. Justice ethics provides the necessary principles to guide governance at scale.

However, virtue ethics still plays an important complementary role. Regulations alone cannot ensure ethical practice; organizations and professionals must also cultivate virtues such as integrity and empathy. A hybrid approach may be ideal, but if one must be prioritized, justice ethics is more suited to addressing widespread issues of fairness, rights, and equity in data ethics.

Conclusion

Justice ethics and virtue ethics both offer valuable insights, but they operate at various levels: systemic fairness versus individual virtue. While virtue ethics strengthens personal responsibility, justice ethics offers a more robust framework for ensuring fairness in data governance. Given the collective impact of data systems, justice ethics is better suited for guiding ethical practice in this domain, though ideally it should be complimented by virtue-based professional conduct.

References

- Aristotle. (2009). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 B.C.E.)
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Floridi, L., & Taddeo, M. (2016). What is data ethics? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 374*(2083), 20160360. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0360