Justice. No doubt they are expressed too strongly. In any event I wish to remind you that the purpose of this essay is to present an outline of the principles of justice in Friedman and Rawls. Rawls provides a description of the social situation of establishing the ground rules of a society. What are these assumptions? Friedman emphasizes the importance of social institutions, as well as the inherent value of social equality and economic justice. It is unique to Friedman's work and institutions matter how effective and well thought. A theory however elegant and economically just be affected or revised if it is not in line with the principles of justice.

4. The Role of Justice

4. Compare and contrast the purposes of justice in Friedman and Rawls. Rawls makes a number of assumptions about society and the nature of individuals in a society. What are these assumptions?

Questions for Discussion

1. Rawls was one of the most important political philosophers in the area of political economy. Friedman also was one of the most important political philosophers in the area of political economy. How do their views differ? What are the implications of these differences for society?

2. Friedman provides a description of the social situation of establishing the ground rules of a society. What are these assumptions? What is the role of the individual in society? Friedman emphasizes the importance of social institutions, as well as the inherent value of social equality and economic justice. It is unique to Friedman's work and institutions matter how effective and well thought. A theory however elegant and economically just be affected or revised if it is not in line with the principles of justice.

John Rawls (1921-2002)

AN EQUITARIAN THEORY OF JUSTICE

The intellectual dilemma between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome.

The liberal will advocate diminishing disparity between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome. The liberal will advocate diminishing disparity between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome. This means that the liberal will advocate diminishing disparity between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome. This means that the liberal will advocate diminishing disparity between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome. This means that the liberal will advocate diminishing disparity between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome. This means that the liberal will advocate diminishing disparity between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome.
TWO PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE

An Explanation Theory of Justice

Unit III: Private Interests and Public Welfare
The basic structure of these institutions incorporates the principles of equality and social justice in promoting opportunities and reducing discrimination. The unequal distribution of income and wealth, as well as the unequal access to education and health care, are major issues that need to be addressed in our current society. To reduce these inequalities, we must focus on policies that promote equality and social justice.

The unequal distribution of income and wealth is not only a matter of justice, but also affects the overall economic growth and stability of a society. To address this issue, we need to implement policies that promote equality and social justice. These policies should include investments in education and health care, as well as measures to promote economic growth and reduce poverty.

In conclusion, the unequal distribution of income and wealth is a major challenge that needs to be addressed. By implementing policies that promote equality and social justice, we can work towards a more just and equitable society.
in nature. But there is no necessity for men to resign themselves to these contingencies. The social system is not an unchangeable order beyond human control but a pattern of human action. In justice as fairness men agree to share one another's fate. In designing institutions they undertake to avail themselves of the accidents of nature and social circumstance only when doing so is for the common benefit. The two principles are a fair way of meeting the arbitrariness of fortune; and while no doubt imperfect in other ways, the institutions which satisfy these principles are just . . .

There is a natural inclination to object that those better situated deserve their greater advantages whether or not they are to the benefit of others. At this point it is necessary to be clear about the notion of desert. It is perfectly true that given a just system of cooperation as a scheme of public rules and the expectations set up by it, those who, with the prospect of improving their condition, have done what the system announces that it will reward are entitled to their advantages. In this sense the more fortunate have a claim to their better situation; their claims are legitimate expectations established by social institutions, and the community is obligated to meet them. But this sense of desert presupposes the existence of the cooperative scheme; it is irrelevant to the question whether in the first place the scheme is to be designed in accordance with the difference principle or some other criterion.

Perhaps some will think that the person with greater natural endowments deserves those assets and the superior character that made their development possible. Because he is more worthy in this sense, he deserves the greater advantages that he could achieve with them. This view, however, is surely incorrect. It seems to be one of the fixed points of our considered judgments that no one deserves his place in the distribution of native endowments, any more than one deserves one's initial starting place in society. The assertion that a man deserves the superior character that enables him to make the effort to cultivate his abilities is equally problematic; for his character depends in large part upon fortunate family and social circumstances for which he can claim no credit. The notion of desert seems not to apply to these cases. Thus the more advantaged representative man cannot say that he deserves and therefore has a right to a scheme of cooperation in which he is permitted to acquire benefits in ways that do not contribute to the welfare of others. There is no basis for his making this claim. From the standpoint of common sense, then, the difference principle appears to be acceptable both to the more advantaged and to the less advantaged individual.

---

Robert Reich was the Secretary of Labor in the Clinton administration. He is a Rhodes scholar and a lecturer on political economy at Harvard University. Reich explores how economic issues increasingly have global causes and effects. For Reich, this means that economic problems do not respect national boundaries and that the United States is linked to the globe through trade and commerce. Our lives and the choices that we make have profound implications on the lives of people in other countries and vice versa.

Questions for Discussion

1. Identify and describe the three groups of workers in the global economy. What challenges does each face?

2. In your opinion, what would constitute a fair wage structure in a global economy for these different groups of workers? Should a worker's wages and their power differ based on where they live?

3. Reich argues that the American middle class is shrinking. How would the United States change if this trend continues?

4. Does our educational system prepare students well enough for 21st-century economic realities? Explain your answer.

[The division of labour is limited by the extent of the market.]

—Adam Smith,

An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations (1776)

Regardless of how your job is officially classified (manufacturing, service, managerial, technical, secretarial, and so on), or the industry in which you work (automotive, steel, computer, advertising, finance, food processing), your real competitive position in the world economy is coming to depend on the function you perform in it. Herein lies the basic reason why incomes are diverging. The fortunes of routine producers are declining. In-person servers are also becoming poorer, although their fates are less clear-cut. But symbolic analysts—who solve, identify, and broker new problems—are, by and large, succeeding in the world economy.