In A Theory of Justice - 1971

- 1. The basis for the theory
 - A revised version of the social contract theory
 - hypothetical -- a mental experiment

under the "veil of ignorance" the purpose of the veil: to assure fairness & to compensate for the natural lottery

- 2. Rejection of utilitarianism
 - Background
 - Jeremy Bentham (English, 1748-1832)
 - John Stuart Mill (English, 1806-1873)
 - 7 Utilitarianism
 - an ethical theory
 - consequentialist

John Rawls' theory of justice ~ slide 3

- must take into account all affected by the action
- what determines whether an action is good or bad?
- the pleasure-pain calculus

Rawls' reason for rejecting a utilitarian theory of justice:
Utilitarianism requires "lesser life prospects for some . . . for the sake of a greater sum of advantages enjoyed by others" (456)

- 3. Moving from the "original position . . . under the veil of ignorance" to principles of justice
 - Maximin reasoning (465) trying to make the minimal life maximally good

- 4. The two principles of justice
 - (1) "Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others." (460)
 - Concerned with basic rights or liberties
 - Calls for strict equality in this area

- (2) "All social values--liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases for self-respect--are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any, or all, of these values is to everyone's advantage."
 - Concerned with wealth & social status

- Justifies departures from strict equality in this area
- Note that the burden is on departures from equality

#Critique of Rawls' theory

- Is the use of a hypothetical situation a good basis for an ethical theory?
- Is Rawls justified in assuming that the members of the original position under the veil of ignorance are risk-aversive?
- Assumes that reason transcends culture? Is this a justifiable assumption?