Review Questions:

1. Carefully explain Rawl’s conception of the original position.

According to Rawls, when talk about the fairness of justice, the original position of equality corresponds to the state of nature in the traditional theory of the social contract. The original position is not, of course, thought of as an actual historical state of affairs, much less as a primitive condition of culture. The original position is what we can say the initial status quo of a person.

1. State and explain Rawl’s first principle of justice

Rawl's stated in his principle that each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others. Based from the statement, the first principle wants us to know that each person has their own right. It is our responsibility and duty to respect them as much as we can.

1. State and explain the second principle. Which principle has priority such that it cannot be sacrificed?

The second principle states that social and economic equalities, for example inequalities of wealth and authority, are just only if they result in compensating benefits for everyone, and in particular for the least advantage member of the society.

The first principle has priority because it talks about the rights of everyone.

Discussion Questions:

1. On the first principle, each person has an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty as long as this does not interfere with a similar liberty for others. What does this allow people to do? Does it mean, for example, the people have the right to engage in homosexual activities as long as they don’t interfere with others? Can people produce and view pornography if it does not restrict anyone’s freedom? Are people allowed to take drugs in the privacy of their homes?

This principle allows people to do whatever they want. When talking about the issue behind homosexuality, I think we should give them a chance to do whatever they like, after all they still have to practice their own rights. We should respect them in any way that we can because the things that they are doing doesn’t harm us at all.

1. Is it possible for free and rational persons in the original positions to agree upon different principle than those given by Rawls? For example, why wouldn’t they agree to an equal distribution of wealth and income rather than the unequal distribution? That is, why wouldn’t they adopt socialism rather than capitalism? Isn’t socialism just as rational as capitalism?

Well, I think we all have different perspective of the principles given by Rawls. Choosing whatever we like depends on our personalities. I think choosing between the two principles doesn’t mean that they don’t adapt in capitalism it’s just that they want fairness when talking about wealth.