

Alex Jacob

Professor Mathers

PHIL 102

April 5, 2020

Fairness

1)

The veil of ignorance is a method that is used to determine the morality of issues. It says that any person can have a veil covering them, and while behind this veil, you know nothing about yourself. Behind this veil, everyone is classified as a rational and morally equal being; hence giving them the most impartial view on any subject given to them. Rawls introduces this concept because everyone has a different moral standpoint; some people can believe that an action is moral while others can say that it is not.

2)

Behind the veil of ignorance, a person does not know anything about themselves, therefore they do not know of their social standing nor of their contribution to society. Because of this, the highest ranking form of justice is Strict Egalitarianism since it says that everyone gets equal shares of “society’s benefits and burdens”. After that, the Marxist and Capitalist principles are nearly tied under the veil since they both require one’s knowledge of themselves. The Capitalist principle has an ever so slight edge over the Marxist principle due to the fact that others will know of their contribution.

3)

Rawls proposes the principle that economic inequalities must be arranged so that they are for the advantage of all. The general example of this is to show a very well off status, yet make it a difficult path to travel. More specifically, when doctors are paid well, it motivates people to strive through med-school and later providing the population with great medical care. A more down-to-earth example is a game studio making a competition for their fanbase of 1 million players. In order to benefit from this competition, you have to rank in the top 100,000. This entirely promotes competition, introduces more players into the fanbase, retains dedicated players, benefits those who play the game most, and most importantly makes the fanbase enjoy the time they spend on the game. This situation is to the advantage of all.

4)

Nozick's Chamberlain example states a hypothetical situation in which Chamberlain would only play under certain conditions: games he played in would cost more to attend and would get \$100,000 more than the other players. Yet people would still buy tickets because of his skills in basketball. This example would hinder Rawls's difference principle because this situation does not favor the least well-off, but only makes Chamberlain more wealthy. This tilts the "playing field of society" even more.