

Four rival theories of distributive justice:

- 1. Feudal or Caste System (fixed hierarchy based on birth).**
- 2. Libertarian: free market with formal equality of opportunity.**
- 3. Meritocratic: free market with fair equality of opportunity.**
- 4. Egalitarian: Rawl's Difference principle.**

-Problem with 1 - birth is morally arbitrary – not something you had control over.

-Problem with 2 - formal equality of opportunity allows people to run the race without impediments, but people start the race at different places. So it is not fair. Economic, social circumstances of people give them disparate advantages.

-Problem with 3 - fair equality of opportunity allows all to start at the same place (equalize educational opportunities, etc. - Head Start, all schools have equal funding), some people have natural talents, skills, ability to exert more effort, etc, that gives them advantages. That is unfair since they really don't deserve these advantages, and therefore they don't deserve to fully own their economic fruits.

Rawl's Egalitarian principle says the winners of the race should not slow down, but that they should be forced to share the award money so to speak with the losers.

Analysis of Rawls' Moral Arbitrariness Argument in the step from, Meritocracy to the Difference Principle.

In your groups, go through each premise of Rawls' argument and determine whether it is true or not. Please don't be wimpy and just roll over and agree with his premises. Put some effort in coming up with criticisms.

1. If your talents, skills and efforts (TSE) are a result of external circumstances (EC) like birth order, genetics and upbringing, then you are not responsible for them.
2. If you are not responsible for your talents, skills and efforts, then you do not deserve the fruits of these things.
3. If you do not deserve the fruits of your labor, then it is morally acceptable to take some of it away and give it to others who do not have as much.
4. Your talents, skills and efforts are a result of external circumstances.

5. Therefore (from 1 and 4) it necessarily follows that it is morally acceptable to take some of the fruits of your labor and give it to others who do not have as much.