Reflection

Max Carlson

Professor Engelman

SOC-250-001

Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do? By Michael J. Sandel

Michael J. Sandel's Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do? is one of those rare books that invites you to slow down and really wrestle with what you believe about right, wrong, freedom, and fairness. Sandel doesn't just lay out theories of justice—he asks you to live with them, test them, and see how they hold up when applied to real-world dilemmas. His examples—from trolley problems to debates over price gouging, same-sex marriage, and affirmative action—force readers to go beyond surface-level opinions and think carefully about why they believe what they believe. As someone who leans libertarian, I naturally gravitate toward arguments that prioritize individual freedom, property rights, and personal responsibility, because I see those as the foundation of a just society. But what I appreciate about Sandel is that he doesn't let anyone, libertarians included, off the hook. He challenges every perspective fairly, highlighting not just its strengths but also its weaknesses and blind spots. By bringing in multiple philosophical frameworks—utilitarianism, virtue ethics, Rawlsian egalitarianism—Sandel shows how each one has something meaningful to contribute to our understanding of justice, even if we don't fully agree with them. This book didn't just confirm my beliefs; it pushed me to clarify why I hold them, to see where my framework might fall short, and to stay open to refining my views in light of new arguments and moral considerations.

Reading Sandel's exploration of libertarianism felt both familiar and validating. He explains the libertarian position as one that seeks to keep the state neutral about competing conceptions of the good life, focusing instead on protecting individual rights and voluntary exchange. That resonated with me because I believe people should have as much freedom as possible to live as they choose, so long as they aren't harming others. The idea that government should not impose one group's vision of morality on everyone else is central to how I see a just society functioning. At the same time, Sandel doesn't let libertarians stop at the abstract principle of freedom—he challenges us to think through situations where pure freedom might produce outcomes that seem intuitively unjust or even harmful. For example, he raises questions about price gouging and whether it is truly just to let markets run wild in the aftermath of natural disasters, when people are desperate for basic goods like water or shelter. His discussion made me pause and consider whether unfettered markets always serve justice, or whether there are times when temporary restrictions might be justified to protect the most vulnerable. I still believe that market freedom is a cornerstone of prosperity and human flourishing, but Sandel's examples helped me see that some reasonable limits could actually support human dignity and prevent exploitation rather than threaten freedom.

The key topics Sandel explores—distribution of wealth, the morality of markets, affirmative action, military service, and the meaning of marriage—are all issues that force you to slow down and confront what you value most. These are not abstract debates; they are questions that cut to the heart of how we want to live together in society. When he discusses equality and Rawls's difference principle, for example, I found myself thinking deeply about the tension between fairness and freedom. Rawls argues that inequalities are acceptable only if they benefit the least advantaged members of society, which is a compelling way of reframing justice around shared responsibility. As a libertarian, my instinct is to protect property rights and voluntary exchange above all else, but Sandel's discussion made me consider how extreme inequality might not just be an economic problem but a moral one—one that can erode opportunity, foster resentment, and weaken the social bonds that hold a community together. Justice, then, might not be only about what we have a right to do or to own, but also about what we owe one another as members of a shared society, especially when our choices impact others in ways we cannot ignore.

One of the most personally meaningful sections of the book for me was Sandel's discussion of same-sex marriage. He frames the debate as a conflict between two different views of the purpose of marriage—one that understands marriage primarily as a social institution for procreation and childrearing, and another that sees marriage as a bond of love, devotion, and companionship between two consenting adults. What I appreciate about Sandel's approach is that he doesn't simply tell readers which view is "correct"; instead, he asks us to wrestle with the underlying moral assumptions that shape each perspective. For me, as someone who supports same-sex marriage, this section was an opportunity to articulate why I believe what I do. I see marriage not just as a private contract but as a public recognition of a shared commitment and a life built together. Denying that recognition to same-sex couples feels inconsistent with the principles of equality and individual liberty that I hold so strongly. Sandel's discussion helped me realize that supporting same-sex marriage is not merely a matter of being "tolerant" or accepting diverse lifestyles. It is fundamentally a question of justice—of giving people what they are due as equal members of a democratic society. In that way, my libertarian commitment to personal freedom actually deepens my support for marriage equality, because it affirms the right of individuals to define and live out their most meaningful relationships without unnecessary state interference.

What struck me most about Sandel's work is how he refuses to keep morality locked away in the private sphere. As someone with libertarian leanings, I often find myself agreeing with the idea that the state should stay neutral on moral questions, letting individuals decide what constitutes the "good life" for themselves. But Sandel reminds us that this neutrality is, in many ways, impossible. Laws and policies always carry moral weight because they shape whose rights are recognized, whose claims are prioritized, and what we collectively encourage or discourage as a society. He writes, "Some of our debates reflect disagreement about what it means to maximize welfare or respect freedom or cultivate virtue. Others involve disagreement about what to do when these ideals conflict. Political philosophy cannot resolve these disagreements once and for all. But it can shape the arguments we have, and bring moral clarity to the

alternatives we confront as democratic citizens" (p. 9). That line really stayed with me because it reframed the way I think about civic life. It reminded me that democracy isn't just about voting every few years and then retreating into private life; it's about engaging in ongoing, sometimes uncomfortable conversations about what justice requires and what we owe to one another. Sandel seems to be saying that avoiding these debates isn't neutrality—it's neglect. Even if we can't resolve every disagreement, we still have a responsibility to engage with them honestly, to listen to opposing views, and to sharpen our own moral reasoning in the process. For me, this was a powerful challenge to not simply retreat into my ideological corner but to see moral and political debate as an essential part of living in a pluralistic society.

Sandel's approach has made me more confident in my own views while also making me humbler about them. I am still very committed to libertarian principles like free speech, bodily autonomy, and equality before the law, but I now see more clearly where those principles intersect with questions of community and virtue. For example, I still think markets should generally be free, but I can admit there are situations where unfettered markets might corrode important social values. I still think people should be able to live as they choose, but I now understand why communities sometimes want to publicly honor certain ways of life—they see them as tied to human flourishing.

In the end, Justice did exactly what Sandel hopes it will do: it pushed me to reason more carefully, to listen more deeply, and to engage in debate with a genuine openness to being persuaded. I agree wholeheartedly with Sandel's main goal of encouraging critical thinking and public reasoning. It's not about forcing consensus, but about clarifying where we stand and why. I now find myself more willing to discuss difficult issues with friends or classmates, not just to defend my beliefs but to understand theirs. Justice, as Sandel frames it, is not a static answer but a living conversation.

Ultimately, I would say this book has made me a better thinker and a more engaged citizen. I still see myself as a libertarian, but I am more aware of the limits of my framework and the ways other philosophies can enrich my thinking. I support same-sex marriage, equality before the law, and minimal state interference, but I also see the value of reflecting on what kind of society we want to create together, not just what rights we want to protect. Sandel has made me more willing to wrestle with the hard questions, and that, to me, feels like the right thing to do.