

Evaluation of Rawls' Theory of Justice:

Political philosophy constitutes a systematic inquiry into the foundational principles of governance, justice, liberty, and the legitimate exercise of authority. Among the most influential contributions to contemporary political thought is John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* (1971), which seeks to reconcile liberty and equality through a contractualist framework. Rawls' theory often termed "justice as fairness" proposes two lexically ordered principles designed to structure a just society: (1) the equal liberty principle, guaranteeing maximal basic freedoms for all, and (2) the difference principle, permitting socio-economic inequalities only insofar as they benefit the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971).

Despite its prominence, Rawls' theory has faced sustained critique from rival traditions, particularly communitarianism and Marxism. Communitarians challenge Rawls' abstract individualism, arguing that justice cannot be theorized in isolation from communal values and historical contingencies (Sandel, 1982; Walzer, 1983). Marxists, conversely, critique Rawls' accommodation of capitalism, contending that his distributive paradigm fails to address the structural exploitation inherent in class society (Buchanan, 1982; Cohen, 1995). This paper evaluates Rawls' theory through these critical lenses, assessing whether his framework withstands their objections.

Rawls' Theory of Justice: An Overview

Rawls' theory emerges from a hypothetical "original position," where rational agents behind a "veil of ignorance" ignorant of their social status, talents, or conceptions of the good select principles of justice. This thought experiment yields two key principles:

- 1. The Liberty Principle:** Each person has an equal right to the most extensive set of basic liberties compatible with a similar liberty for others.
- 2. The Difference Principle:** Social and economic inequalities must (a) be attached to positions open to all under fair equality of opportunity, and (b) benefit the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971).

Rawls justifies these principles as the most rational choice for ensuring a stable, well-ordered society. His framework prioritizes liberty but permits regulated inequalities if they enhance the position of the worst-off, thus balancing egalitarian and liberal commitments.

Communitarian Critique: The Neglect of Embedded Selves

Communitarians argue that Rawls' theory presupposes an implausibly abstract conception of the self. Michael Sandel (1982) contends that the "unencumbered self" in the original position is a fiction, as individuals are always already shaped by communal attachments, traditions, and shared understandings of the good. For Sandel, Rawls' prioritization of the "right over the good" disregards the constitutive role of community in shaping moral agency.

Similarly, Alasdair MacIntyre (1981) asserts that justice cannot be derived from ahistorical, universal principles but must emerge from particular moral traditions. Charles Taylor (1985) further critiques Rawls' individualism, arguing that human flourishing depends on participation in a common good that transcends contractual agreements.

Michael Walzer (1983) advances a pluralist critique, contending that justice is not singular but "spheres-specific." Different social goods (e.g., education, healthcare, political office) require distinct distributive logics rooted in their cultural meanings. Rawls' universalist approach, Walzer argues, fails to account for this complexity.

Assessment

While communitarians rightly highlight the social constitution of identity, Rawls (1993) later addresses some concerns in *Political Liberalism*, distinguishing between comprehensive moral doctrines and a freestanding political conception of justice. Nevertheless, the charge that his theory underplays communal bonds retains force, particularly in non-liberal societies where justice is deeply tied to collective traditions.

Marxist Critique: Justice Under Capitalism

Marxist critics challenge Rawls' theory for legitimizing capitalist inequalities rather than abolishing them. G.A. Cohen (1995) argues that the difference principle permits unjust disparities if they marginally improve the worst-off's position, failing to interrogate why such inequalities exist in the first place. For Marxists, true justice requires abolishing private ownership of production, not merely mitigating its effects.

Allen Buchanan (1982) contends that Rawls' framework ignores the structural exploitation of labor under capitalism. Even if the worst-off benefit slightly from inequality, this does not negate the alienation and class domination inherent in capitalist relations. Moreover, Rawls' assumption of moderate scarcity as a "circumstance of justice" precludes the Marxist vision of a post-scarcity communist society where distribution follows the principle: "From each according to ability, to each according to need" (Marx, 1875).

Assessment

Rawls (2001) concedes that his theory operates within a "property-owning democracy" rather than laissez-faire capitalism, yet Marxists rightly question whether his principles can meaningfully constrain capitalist accumulation. His framework lacks a robust critique of class power, rendering it susceptible to co-optation by neoliberal discourses that justify inequality under the guise of "trickle-down" economics.

Conclusion: The Limits and Legacies of Rawlsian Justice

Rawls' theory remains a monumental effort to reconcile liberty and equality within a liberal-democratic framework. However, both communitarian and Marxist critiques expose its limitations:

- Abstract Individualism: Rawls' original position neglects the embedded nature of moral agents in communal traditions.
- Capitalist Accommodation: His difference principle fails to dismantle structural class domination, instead legitimizing constrained inequality.

While Rawlsian justice offers a compelling normative model for liberal societies, its applicability in contexts where communal solidarity or class struggle dominates remains contested. A more robust theory might integrate Rawls' egalitarian impulses with communitarian insights on collective identity and Marxist critiques of political economy—though whether such a synthesis is possible remains an open question.

References

- Buchanan, A. E. (1982) *Marx and justice: The radical critique of liberalism* (pp. 92-97). London: Methuen.
- Corlett, J. A. (Ed.) (2016) *Equality and liberty: analyzing Rawls and Nozick*. Hampshire: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd.
- Faiz, P. (2007) *John Rawls's Theory of Justice*. [Online] PAN MOHAMAD FAIZ. Available from: <https://panmohamadfaiz.com/2007/01/31/john-rawlss-theory-of-justice/> [Accessed on: 08/01/17]
- Garner, R., Ferdinand, P., and Lawson, S. (2016) *Introduction to politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gray, J. (2014) *Post-liberalism: Studies in political thought*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Grcic, J. (2011) *Free and Equal: Rawls' Theory of Justice and Political Reform*. New York: Algora Publishing.
- Kanatli, M. (2015) *Rawlsian Theory of Justice as Fairness: A Marxist Critique*. *Hitit University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 8(1), pp. 301-318.
- Mandle, J. (2009) *Rawls's 'A Theory of Justice': An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pojman, L. P. (Ed.) (2016) *Justice: An anthology*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Rawls, J. (2009) *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Sandel, M.J. (1982) *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sen, A. (2011) *The idea of justice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Thomas, A. (2016) *Republic of Equals: Predistribution and Property-Owning Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walzer, M. (2008) *Spheres Of Justice: A Defense Of Pluralism And Equality*. New York: Basic Books.

JUNE 3 2025

Email:
analyca@analycainstitute.com