# Spravedlnost

## Michael J. Sandel: Justice: What is the right thing to do?

* Three approaches to justice
  + **Welfare** – justice means maximizing the utility of welfare = the greatest happiness for the greatest amount of people
  + **Freedom** – justice means respecting freedom of choice (either the actual choices of people make in a free market or the hypothetical choices people would make in an original position of equality)
  + **Virtue** – justice involves cultivating virtue and reasoning about the common good

**Utilitarianism**

* **Jeremy Bentham**: the highest principle of morality is to maximize happiness = the overall balance of pleasure over pain
  + The right thing to do is whatever will maximize utility
  + By utility he means whatever produces pleasure or happiness, and whatever prevents pain or suffering
* X utilitarianism fails to respect individual rights – by caring only about the sum of satisfactions, it can run roughshod over individual people
  + For utilitarianism individual matters only in the sense that each person’s preferences should be counted along with everyone else’s
  + E.g. is torture ever justified? – even if it prevents the terrorist attack? Would you torture terrorist’s daughter in order to force him to tell you where he plans the attack?
* X utilitarianism weights preferences without judging them – everyone’s preferences count equally
  + But is it possible to translate all moral goods into a single currency of value without losing something in the translation?
  + E.g. can we do cost-benefit analysis in which we place a dollar value on human life?
* **John Stuart Mill**: he attempted to reconcile individual rights with the utilitarianism
  + Central principle: people should be free to do whatever they want, provided they do no harm to others
  + Government may not interfere with individual liberty in order to protect a person from himself, or to impose the majority’s beliefs about how to live – the only actions for which person is accountable to society are those that affect others
  + “As long as I am not harming anyone else, my independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.”
  + We should maximize utility in the long run (not case by case)
  + All over time, respecting individual liberty will lead to the greatest happiness

**Libertarianism**

* Economic inequality – utilitarian logic might support radical redistribution of wealth (to transfer money form rich to the poor until the last dollar we take form the rich hurt him as much as it helps the recipient)
* X high taxes might reduce the incentives to work and invest, leading to the decline of productivity
* X taxing the rich to help the poor can be considered unjust because it violates a fundamental right – it violates the liberty to do with your money whatever you want
* = \* libertarianism
* Libertarianism favours unfettered markets and oppose government regulation (not in the name of economic efficiency, but in the name of human freedom)
* Each of us has a fundamental right to liberty – the right to do whatever we want with the things we own
* It rejects three types of policies and laws that modern states commonly enact:
  + No paternalism (opposition to laws that protects people form harming themselves – e.g. seatbelts)
  + No morals legislations (e.g. prostitution)
  + No redistribution of income or wealth
* Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, Friedrich A. Hayek (*The Constitution of Liberty*), Milton Friedman, Robert Nozick (*Anarchy, State and Utopia*)
* **Robert Nozick**: there is nothing wrong with the economic inequality as such (simply knowing that the Forbes 400 have billions while others are penniless does not enable us to conclude anything about the justice or injustice of the arrangements)
  + What matters is how the distribution came about
  + Distributive justice depends on two requirements:
    - justice in initial holdings (whether the wealth is legitimately yours)
    - justice in transfer (if you made your money through free market exchanges or from gifts voluntarily bestowed upon you by others)
    - E.g. Michael Jordan’s money – he had very high salary because he was talented and indeed very good player and because people were willing to pay for the tickets and watch matches
* If I own myself, I must own my labour. If I own my labour, I must be entitled to the fruits of my labour. = Moral continuity from taxation (taking my earnings) to forced labour (taking my labour) to slavery (denying that I own myself)
* X taxation is not as bad as forced labour
* X the poor need money more
* X Jordan did not play alone. He therefore owed a dept to those who contribute to his success
* X does the self-ownership mean that I can sell myself into the slavery if the conditions (no money) force me to do so?

**Markets and Morals**

* Debates about whether is the free market fair? Are there some good that money cannot buy?
* The case for free market rests on two claims
  + Freedom – libertarian case for markets
  + Welfare – utilitarian case for markets
* X market sceptics – market choices are not always as free as they may seem, certain goods and social practices are corrupted or degraded if bought and sold for money
* E.g. What is just – drafting soldiers or hiring them?
  + Drafting soldiers violates individual liberties (libertarians)
  + Drafting soldiers limits people’s choices, and thus reduce overall happiness (utilitarianism)
  + x fairness and freedom – hiring people = I can choose whether I want to be soldier or not x not all people can really choose (maybe there is a need for money and being soldier is well paid = it is sort of coercion)
  + x civic virtue and common good – military service is not just another job, it is a civic obligation (and when we see it form a market point of view we violate the principles of patriotism – e.g. private firms operating in Iraq)

**What matters is the motive: Imanuel Kant**

* we are rational being, worthy of dignity and respect
* morality is not about maximizing happiness but about respecting people
* he connects justice and morality to freedom

What is freedom?

* To act freely = to act *autonomously*
* when we act heteronomously we act in the sake of something – for the sake of ends given outside
* x acting autonomously = according to a law we give to ourselves, we do something for its own sake, as an end in itself = this is what gives human beings something special and that is dignity
* respecting human dignity = treating persons as ends in itself

What is moral?

* Moral worth of an action consists not in the consequences that flow from it, but in the intention from which the act is done
* What matters is the motive, and the motive must be of a certain kind
* It is not enough if the action conforms to the moral law – it must also be done for the sake of the moral law
* Motive of duty = moral motive
* X motive of inclination = self-interest, motive to satisfy our desires, appetites, wants
* To know what duty is, one needs to understand the supreme principle of morality
* If we are capable of freedom, we must be capable of acting according to some other kind of law (than law of nature)
  + Freedom = act according to law we give to ourselves
* Where could such laws come from?
  + From reason
* We are not only sentient being, we are also rational being
* Reason is not just the slave of passion – it is pure practical reason, which legislates *a priori*, regardless of all empirical ends
* Two ways that reason can command the will (two different kinds of imperative)
  + *Hypothetical imperative* (instrumental reason) – it is always conditional
    - If you want X, then do Y.
  + *Categorical imperative* – it is unconditional
    - If the action is represented as good in itself, and therefore as necessary for a will which of itself accords with reason
    - This imperative can be qualified as an imperative of morality
    - universalize the maxim = we should act only on principles that we could universalize without contradiction (e.g. promise to pay back the loan even if I know I will not be able to do it – is it right? = try to universalize – if everyone does that, nobody would believe such promises)
    - treat person as ends = behave to all people as to humans (without exceptions) – for Kant murder is the same as suicide because it violates humanity
* = to be free in the sense of *autonomous* requires that I act out of a *categorical imperative*
* = acting morally means acting out of duty – for the sake of the moral law
* = moral laws consist of a categorical imperative, a principle that requires us to treat persons with respects, as ends in themselves
* = only when I act in accordance with the categorical imperative am I acting freely
* We have to treat even ourselves with respect
  + = prostitution is bad because it does not treat us with respect (x libertarianism – we can do what we want with our bodies because we own it – x Kant – we cannot, because we have to behave in accordance with the categorical imperative)
* He rejects utilitarianism in favour of a theory of justice based on a social contract
* And he derives justice and rights from social contract

**John Rawls**

* In fact people have not signed any contract
* X Kant appeals to *hypothetical consent* – a law is just if it could have been agreed to by the public as a whole
* X it is only puzzling alternative to an actual social contract
* **John Rawls** offers answer – the way we think about justice is to ask what principles we would agree to in an initial situation of equality
  + Suppose we gather just as we are to choose the principle to govern out collective life – to write a social contract
  + It would be difficult to agree because people are different (religion, nation, ethnicity, education)
    - So we would have to make an compromise = that means that we cannot speak of just agreement
  + X suppose we gather to write a social contract without knowing where we will wind up in society – we choose behind a “veil of ignorance” that prevents us from knowing anything about who in particular we are
  + = we would choose from an original position of equality and since nobody would have a superior bargaining position, the principle we would agree to would be just
* What principles would we choose in this situation?
  + We would not use utilitarianism – because no one knows whether he ends up being a member of an oppressed minority
  + We would not choose libertarianism – because no one knows whether he ends up being super rich or super poor
  + Rawls believes that two principles of justice would emerge from the hypothetical contract
    - 1. Provides equal basic liberties for all citizens, such as freedom of speech and religion
    - 2. Concerns social and economic equality (although it does not require an equal distribution of income and wealth)
      * *Difference principle*: only those social and economic inequality are permitted that work to the advantage of the least well-off members of society
      * His perception was not meant to assess the fairness of this or that person’s earnings – he was concerned with the basic structure of society and the way it allocates rights and duties (income and wealth, power and opportunities)
* The distribution of income and opportunity should not be based on factors that are arbitrary from a moral point of view
  + Feudal aristocracies and caste systems are unfair because they distribute income, wealth, opportunity and power according to the accident of birth
  + Market societies remedy this arbitrariness but are still unfair because e.g. those who have supportive families and a good education have obvious advantages = if everybody starts form different starting points, the race is hardly fair
  + Meritocracy – when we correct for social and economic disadvantages
    - Meritocracy removes obstacles to achievement by providing equal educational opportunities – so all can compete on an equal basis
    - Free markets are just only if everyone has the same opportunity to develop his talent
    - But it is still unfair because it does not solve the problem with the situation when some people are naturally more talented for something than others
  + Egalitarian principle - Some believes that the solution is a levelling equality that imposes handicaps on the talented
  + It seems that Rawls’s difference principle is the egalitarian x he claims it does not handicap the talented
    - Encourage gifted to develop and exercise their talents, but with the understanding that the rewards these talents reap in the market belong to the community as a whole = do not handicap the talented, let them do their best but acknowledge them in advance that the winnings do not belong to them alone, but should be shared with those who lack similar gifts
* = in thinking about justice we should abstract from, or set aside, contingent facts about persons and their social positions
* X incentives – what if the talented decide to work less?
  + Rawls: the difference principles permits income inequalities for the sake of incentives, provided the incentives are needed to improve the lot of the least advantages
* X effort – what if I am not talented but have an effort to achieve something?
  + Rawls: effort is influenced by contingencies for which we can claim no credit
  + X does that mean that those who work hard does not deserve reward?
  + Rawls: yes
* If Rawls’s argument about the moral arbitrariness of talents is right does that mean that distributive justice is not a matter of rewarding moral desert?
  + He distinguished: *moral desert* and “*entitlements to legitimate expectations*”
  + *Moral desert* = when we derive something because we are talented or because of the simple fact that we have something
  + *Entitlements to legitimate expectations* = it arises only once certain rules of the game are in place
* = distributive justice is not about rewarding virtue of moral desert but rather about meeting the legitimate expectation that arise once the rules of the game are in place
  + Once the principles of justice set the terms of social cooperation, people are entitled to the benefits they earn under the rules

**Arguing affirmative question**

* Is it unjust to consider race and ethnicity as factor in hiring or university admission?
* Proponent of affirmative questions consider three reasons for it
  + Correcting bias in standardized tests
  + Compensation for past wrongs
    - X can we ever have a moral responsibility to redress wrong committed by a previous generation?
  + Promoting diversity – an argument in the name of a common good
* X it does not solve the inequality problem and it does not reduce racial prejudice – it rather damage the self-esteem of minorities and increase racial consciousness
* The thing is that university can set different goals – and it wants to fulfil them = if one of its mission is to promote diversity it can use affirmative action
* It is not a moral desert – it is based upon decided rules
* X is it right that universities decide their mission and they use race as a base for selection?
* X can universities define their mission however they pleased?
* Universities should behave in the way that they serve the common good (civic good) through teaching and research

**Who deserves what? Aristotle**

* Central political ideas of Aristotle
  + Justice is *teleological* = defining right requires us to figure out the *telos* (the purpose, end, or essential nature) of the social practice in question
  + Justice is *honorific* = to reason about the telos of a practice – or to argue about it – is, at least in part, to reason or argue about what virtues it should honour and reward
* Unlike other thinkers about justice, Aristotle believes that debates about justice are debate about honour, virtue, and the nature of good life (x modern theories try to separate question of fairness and rights form arguments about honour, virtue and moral desert – they seek principles that are neutral among ends)
* Justice = giving people what they deserve = giving each person his or her due
* X what is a person due?
* That depend on what is being distributed and on the virtues relevant to those things
* X suppose we are distributing flutes – who should get the best one?
* A: the best players
* = justice discriminates according to merit
  + His way of reasoning forms the purpose of a good to the proper allocation of the good is an instance of teleological reasoning
  + = in order to determine the just distribution of a good, we have to inquire into the *telos*, or purpose, of the good being distributed
* What is purpose of politics?
  + For Aristotle the purpose of politics is not to set up a framework of rights that is neutral among ends. It is to form good citizens and to cultivate good character.
  + (he opposes both oligarchy and democracy)
* = when it comes to the distribution of political power, only those who are greatest in civic virtue and best at identifying the common good should govern
* X Is politics really important?
* A: it is because the polis exists by nature and that it is *prior* to the individual
  + By *prior* he means prior in function or purpose – only in the polis we are able to realize our nature
  + We are not self-sufficient when we are isolated, because we cannot develop our capacity for language and moral deliberation (*The man who is isolated and is not part of the polis is either the beast or God.)*
* Moral life aims at happiness
  + Happiness is not a state of mind but a way of being = an activity of the soul in accordance with virtue
  + We become virtues only by first exercising them
* If moral virtue is something we learn by doing, we have somehow to develop right habits in the first place
  + And this is the primary purpose of law – to cultivate habits that lead to good characters
* Habit is not the whole moral virtue – new situations arise, and we have to know which habit we should use
  + Moral virtue therefore requires judgement = a kind of knowledge Aristotle calls “practical wisdom” – which is about how to act
  + *Practical wisdom* = a reasoned and true state of capacity to act with regard to the human good
* Aristoteles defended slavery – why?
  + Liberal theories of justice (Rawls and Kant) – would disagree with Aristotle’s *teleological conception* because it violates the freedom – for them the justice is not about fit but about the freedom of choosing
  + For Aristotle the slavery to be just, two conditions must be met
    - It must be necessary
      * Slavery is necessary because someone has to take care of household
    - It must be natural
      * Some people are born to be slaves – *A man is by nature a slave is he is capable of becoming the property of another, and if he participates in reason to the extent of apprehending it in another, though destitute of it himself.*
      * X man who has become slave by an accident (war) is unjustly slave

**What do we owe one another? / Dilemmas of loyalty**

* Should we apologize for the past injustice our predecessors have done?
* X no – we were not directly involved so why should we?
  + We are responsible only for those things we directly did not for the actions that are beyond our control
  + – it rests on the idea of “moral individualism” = to be free is to be subject only to obligations I voluntarily incur
  + It assumes that we are moral agents free and independent selves, unbound by prior moral ties
* = the notion that we are freely choosing supports the idea that the principles of justice that define our right should try to be neutral among competing visions of the good life
* X Aristotle: arguments about justice are arguments about the good life – it is necessary to firstly determine the nature of the most desirable way of life
* X Kant, Rawls: this is at odds with freedom – by imposing on some the values of others, such theories fail to respect person as free and independent selves, capable of choosing their own purposes and ends
  + Because we are free choosing, we need a framework of rights that is neutral among ends
* X no theory of justice can be morally neutral
* X Kant, Rawls: it rests upon the refusal to affirm the preferred way of life or conception of the good
  + The right is *prior* to good
  + The principles that specify our duties and right should not be based on any particular conception of the good life
  + They both conceive moral agent as independent of his or her particular aims and attachments
* X Aristotle: the purpose of politics is not only to ease economic exchange and provide for the common defence, it is also to cultivate good character and form good citizen
* X Kant, Rawls: Aristotle’s *teleology* does not seem to leave us room to choose our goods ourselves
  + Because Aristotle sees justice as a matter of fit between persons and the ends or good appropriate to their nature
* we are nowadays inclined to see justice as matter of choice, not fit
* but how about sense of a range of moral and political obligation we commonly recognize – moral claims that arise from the communities and traditions that shape our identity
  + **Alsdair MacIntyre** (*After Virtue*, 1981): *“narrative conception”*
    - Human beings are storytelling beings, we live our lives as narrative quest
    - All lived narratives have a certain teleological character
    - This does not mean they have fixed purpose – teleology and unpredictability coexist
    - To live a life is to enact a narrative quest that aspires to a certain unity or coherence – when I am confronted with competing path, I try to figure out which path will best make sense of my life as a whole
    - His conception offers a clear contrast with the voluntarist conception of person freely choosing
* Are we really bound to some moral ties we have not chosen and that cannot be traced to a social contract?
  + Liberal conception: No (Rawls, Kant)
    - Obligations arise only in two ways – as natural duties we owe to human beings as such and as a voluntary obligation we incur by consent
      * *Natural duties* – universal, we owe them to persons as persons (to treat person with respect, to avoid cruelty…)
        + They arise form an autonomous will (Kant) or form a hypothetical social contract (Rawls) they do not need an act of consent
      * *Voluntary obligations* – they are particular and arise form consent
  + X narrative conception: yes
    - Liberal conception fails to account for the special responsibilities we have to one another as fellow citizens, to capture those loyalties and responsibilities whose moral force consists partly in the fact that living by them is inseparable form understanding ourselves as the particular persons we are – as member of family, nation, people
    - = there is a third obligation – *obligation of solidarity* (particular, do not require consent)

**Justice and a Common Good**

* Rawls argue that we should set apart our loyalties and attachments (personal moral and religious convictions) in debating justice
  + In order to respect “the fact of reasonable pluralism” about the good life that prevails in the modern world
  + = the case for liberal neutrality arises form the need for tolerance in the face of moral and religious disagreements
* Controversial issues
  + Same-sex marriage
    - Everyone should be free to choose = state should be neutral in this case and allow people to choose
    - X we should look at the initial purpose of the marriage and the goods it honours
    - = the decision rest upon the certain conception of telos marriage
    - In fact state can decide in three ways
      * Recognize same-sex marriage and opposite-sex marriage
      * Recognize only marriage between man and woman
      * Do not recognize marriage of any kind, but leave this role to private associations (= ideal libertarian solution)
    - if state approves same-sex marriage on the free-choice base, why does not approve polygamy?
      * Because of the perception about the institution of marriage = the debate is about the virtues it honours
  + Abortion
* Sandel favours the approach of justice of Aristotle’s = the one which involves cultivating virtue
  + Utilitarian approach has two defects
    - It makes justice and right a matter of calculations, not principle
    - By trying to transform all human goods into a single, uniform measure of value, it flattens them
  + Freedom-based theories solve the first problem but not the second one
    - The do not require us to question or challenge the preferences and desires we bring to public life
    - The moral worth of the ends we pursue and the quality and character of the common life we share all lie beyond the domain of justice
  + X a just society cannot be achieved simply by maximizing utility or by securing freedom of choice
    - To achieve a just society, we have to reason together about the meaning of the good life and create a public culture hospitable to the disagreements that will inevitably arise
    - Justice is inescapably judgemental
    - Justice is not only about the right ways to distribute things, it is also about the right way to value things
* Sandel offers some possible themes of what a new politics of common good look like might
  + Citizenship, sacrifice, and service
    - If a just society requires a strong sense of community, it must find a way to cultivate in citizens a concern for the whole, a dedication to the common good
  + The moral limits of markets
    - Today the free-market-oriented reasoning has been expanding into the spheres traditionally governed by non-market norms
    - We should protect some schemes that used to be governed by non-market norms
  + Inequality, solidarity and civic virtue
    - Rising inequality = bad fiscal but also civic effects
  + A politics of moral engagement
    - Politics should be built on the basis of mutual respect (not on neutrality)

## Nerovnost v rámci vyspělých společností

* 20 % nejbohatší populace spotřebuje 86 % světové produkce
* 40 % světového bohatství je vlastněno 1 % nejbohatších
* Nerovnost se měří *giniho koeficientem*: číslo, které se pohybuje mezi 0 a 1
  + Čím blíže k 0, tím více rovnostářský stát
  + Čím blíže k 1, tím větší nerovnost
  + X koeficient nezohledňuje rozdíly mezi typy příjmů, kapitálů
  + Vychází z toho, jak je národní příjem rozprostřen mezi skupiny obyvatel
* *Giniho koeficient* se zvyšuje jakoby tím, jak se v současné neoliberální politice tlačí na snižování daní
  + V USA se od 30. let snižoval v důsledku sociální politiky
* **Kuznets** – kapitalismus ve své podstatě není předurčen k tomu, aby byl nespravedlivý → platí totiž *Kuznetsova křivka* = budoucnost kapitalismu je optimistická
* **Piketty** – říká, že měl **Marx** v akumulaci kapitálu pravdu
  + Vývoj od 70. let totiž *Kuznetsovu křivku* nepotvrzuje
* **Sandel** – tržní ekonomika dala vzniknout tržní společnosti
  + *Tržní společnost*: ta, kde je vše na prodej
    - Trh ovládl chápání o všem
    - Roste nerovnost – čím více věcí se dá koupit, tím na tom vydělávají bohatí → což má následně společenské i politické důsledky
    - Vstup tržních prvků do tradičních zvyklostí → změna hodnot a postojů (například

peníze pro děti, kteří mají samé jedničky)

* + → to podkopává demokracii (demokracie ale nepotřebuje nutně rovnost; důležité je, aby občané sdíleli společný život)
* Dopady nerovnosti
  + Ekonomické
    - S vyšší nerovností je pokles HDP (v tomto ohledu ale není úplná akademická shoda – každopádně platí, že nějaký vztah existuje: vzroste-li o 1 % příjmy kapitálové u nejbohatších → ekonomický růst vzroste o 0,8 %; když ale nárůst kapitálového příjmu o nejchudších → ekonomický růst jen o 0,3 %)
    - Lidský kapitál a specializace – vzdělání je stále častěji přesouváno do soukromého sektoru (jelikož zadlužení státu) → omezení lidského kapitálu, neboť pouze ti bohatí si mohou dovolit zaplatit ty nejlepší školy → chudým se sníží lidský kapitál a i sociální mobilita
    - Finanční nestabilita **–** část HDP je vázána na privátní kapitál → nestabilita (zranitelnost při otřesech)
    - Produktivita – existuje totiž vztah rozvírání nůžek příjmu a produktivita
      * Produktivita roste x zisky tak rychle nerostou
      * zisky se čím dál více točí ve finančních kruzích (a nejdou do lidí)
    - Fiskální politika – více lidí je v nesnázích → tlak na veřejný rozpočet
  + Sociální patologie
    - čím je větší nerovnost, tím roste nejistota obyvatel → lidé přijímají různé strategie pro přežití
      * *existenciální třesy* – lidé nevědí, kam patří = tendence minimalizovat rizika (přehnaná starost o děti, zdraví…)
    - když část lidí pod hranicí chudoby → nedostatečná zdravotní péče → nemocní lidé = nízká produktivita práce → výdaje na fiskální politiku
    - chudí lidé si nemohou dovolit dobré vzdělání → nízká produktivita práce
  + Demokracie
    - když se oddělí sociální rovnost od politické, tak si pod sebou vlastně řežeme větev → reálná rovnost klesá → může vést k nepotismu, korupci a lobbingu
    - pokles vzájemné solidarity – žijeme totiž v bublinách standardu a neumíme se vcítit do situace někoho mimo bublinu = neschopnost nazírat na druhé a vcítit se do nich (v USA se na chudé lidi divá jako na „loosery“, zatímco v Evropě spíše jako na lidi, kteří neměli štěstí)
* nerovnost ve společnosti může být ale i pozitivní
  + předpoklad liberalismu, že nerovnost pobízí díky konkurenci k pokroku
  + x asi by to nemělo přesáhnout určité meze
    - nesmí být diskriminace
    - pokud existuje něco, co brání sociální mobilitě, vzniká problém
* *Gatsbyho křivka* – ukazuje sociální mobilitu obyvatel
  + Pojí *giniho koeficient* a míru, jakou se dědí majetek od rodičů

## Thomas Piketty: Kapitál ve 21. století

* Otázka distribuce bohatství poutala pozornost v minulosti celé řady odborníků
  + **Thomas Malthus**: *Eseje o principu obyvatelstva* (1798)
    - Varuje před hrozbou přelidnění
    - Demografický růst → stagnace výše platů + nárůst pozemkové renty
    - Vychází z dat anglického agronoma Arthura Younga, který putoval po Francii (vypozoroval přelidnění)
    - Aby se VB vyhnula tomu, co se děje ve Francii, je třeba zrušit systém pomoci chudým a kontrolovat jejich porodnost – jinak dojde k přelidnění, chaosu a bídě
  + **David Ricardo**: *Principy politické ekonomie* (1817)
    - Zabýval se problémem dlouhodobého vývoje cen pozemků a výše pozemkové renty
    - Zájem o logický paradox: v momentě, kdy začne trvale růst výroba, začíná být půda v porovnáním s dalšími statky vzácnější (to se ve skutečnosti nepotvrdí, jelikož dojde k poklesu podílu zemědělství na tvorbě národního důchodu)
      * Zákon nabídky a poptávky vede ke zvýšení cen pozemků a zvýšení rent pro majitele půdy → majitel získává stále větší část národního důchodu x zbytek obyvatel stále menší část = není sociální rovnováha
    - → návrh zvýšení sazby daně z pozemkové renty
    - *Princip vzácnosti*: některé komodity mohou narůstat na hodnotě
  + **Karl Marx**: *Kapitál* (1867)
    - Dílo vydává v době, kdy mzdy nerostou, ale dochází k velkému ekonomickému růstu
    - Zabývá se analýzou vnitřních logických rozporů kapitalismu (jakoby vychází z **Ricardova** modelu ceny kapitálu a principu vzácnosti)
    - Existence *principu nekonečné akumulace*: tendence shromažďovat kapitál bez jakéhokoliv omezení – díky tomu může dojít k
      * Poklesu míry kapitálové výnosnosti = konec motoru akumulace
      * Nekonečnému růstu podílu kapitálu na národním důchodu → povede k povstání pracujících
    - X **Piketty:** později ale ve skutečnosti dojde k růstu mezd – Marx opomenul možnost trvalého technického pokroku a stálého růstu produktivity
  + **Simon Kuznets:** *Population, Capital and Growth* (1973)
    - Rozdíly v příjmech ve vyspělých fázích kapitalistického rozvoje samy snižují a stabilizují na přijatelné úrovni
      * Stačí být trpělivý a růst dosáhne na všechny
    - Ve své analýze pracuje se statistickými daty – národní důchod, daňová přiznání…
    - Zjistí, že nerovnost klesá
    - V roce 1955 představí *Kuznetsovu křivku*: nerovnost bude v průběhu industrializace opisovat křivku ve tvaru obráceného U → nejprve poroste a poté bude klesat
    - X **Piketty**: snížení nerovnosti v období 1914-1945 je mimo jiných také důsledkem dvou světových válek
* Po roce 1970 postupně dochází k opětovnému nárůstu nerovnosti – důsledkem politických zvratů
* Mechanismy, které teoreticky směřují ke konvergenci (tj. k omezení a snížení nerovnosti)
  + Investice do vzdělání a jeho šíření (vzdělání → inovace → technologická vyspělost)
  + Nárůst hodnoty *lidského kapitálu* – záleží na zásluhách (demokratická racionalita)
  + Změna „třídního boje“ v „boj generační“ – úspory na stáří
* Mechanismy, které směřují k divergenci
  + Nedostatečné vzdělání
    - To může nastat i tam, kde do něj investují a kde jsou splněny všechny podmínky pro funkční ekonomiku
  + Tam, kde vyplácení různě vysokých mezd (odpoutání se vedoucích pracovníků od zbytku zaměstnanců – z důvodu třeba rychlejší kvalifikace než zbytek lidí)
  + Tam, kde akumulace majetku – nízký ekonomický růst, ale vysoký kapitálový výnos
* Platí tedy základní nerovnost g < r (g = míra růstu; r = míra kapitálových výnosů)
  + Pokud r výrazně převyšuje g = majetek nahromaděný v minulosti se rekapitalizuje rychleji než tempo, jímž roste výroba a příjmy (velkou roli tedy hraje zděděný majetek)
* Platová nerovnost – v tom měl **Kuznets** pravdu
  + X reálné příjmy ale stagnují oproti výnosům z kapitálu (kapitál pro **Pikettyho** = nejen produkční vstup, ale vše se vsím můžeme obchodovat – v záměně se slovem bohatství)
* Srovnání platového nárůstu (závisí na píli, našich vlastnostech…) a výnosu z kapitálu
  + Výnosy z kapitálu rostou rychleji → jsme čím dál více dynastická společnost – už nezáleží ani tolik na schopnostech jako na tom, kde se narodím
* S klesajícím HDP roste nerovnost
  + Nyní malý ekonomický růst → to nenastartuje platový růst takový, aby dobíhal výnos z kapitálu
  + Čím více závisí na dědictví, tím více roste nerovnost
* **Piketty** navrhuje, aby společnost dbala na progresivní zdanění až do hodnoty 80 % z kapitálu = aby postihl ty nejbohatší
* osm základních principů spravedlnosti:

1. Národy jsou svobodné a nezávislé, a jejich svoboda a nezávislost mají být ostatními národy respektovány.
2. Národy mají dodržovat smlouvy a závazky.
3. Národy jsou rovnocenné a jsou součástí dohod, které je zavazují.
4. Národy mají dodržovat povinnost neintervence (s výjimkou reakce na závažné porušování lidských práv).
5. Národy mají právo na sebeobranu, ale nemají právo vyvolat válku z jiných důvodů než ze sebeobrany.
6. Národy mají dodržovat lidská práva.
7. Národy mají dodržovat určitá omezení ve vedení války.
8. Národy mají povinnost pomoci ostatním národům žijícím v nepříznivých podmínkách, které jim znemožňují spravedlivý nebo přijatelný politický a sociální systém.