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**QUESTION 1**

1. **John Rawl’s Frist Principle.**

John Rawl’s first principle is the principle of equal basic liberties. In his principle, he believes that every citizen has two core fundamental capabilities, interest and are willing to realize those capabilities thereby making one person dependent on the other person. These capabilities being able to formulate and live according to some particular conception of the good and interest in exercising ones sense of justice and to be motivated by it and also driving others to do so as well as citing examples that others can follow.

He went further explaining that the citizen should have the idea that in a democratic society, citizens are both equal and free; meaning that each person is conceived to be of good character, to be a reputable member of the society that everyone knows and be sufficient to be able to fully contribute to the other persons adult life which he believes that all the citizens are equal.

Rawl’s offers liberty of conscience and freedom of personal association as examples of liberties justified under the first interest. He argues that people will not be able to live according to what they believe is good and whatever leads to good. He also argues that it is simply that people could not live cooperatively with fellow citizens on terms of equality and mutual respect in a unified scheme of democratic political institutions without having a practice of free political speech in place.

He believes that basic liberties such as civil rights e.g European convention on human rights would fall under one or the other two fundamental cases or on both cases.

For Rawl, all liberties should be counted among the basic constitutional rights. He said that the foundation lies in the conception of the person and social cooperation.

**QUESTION 2**

**The second principle: Distributive Economic Justice.**

Rawl’s second principle is quite different from the first principle because it centers on justice. Rawl’s believes with the fact that people have different natural endowment and are born into different circumstances and that no one is responsible for the situation he/she finds himself in.

He explains that the leading idea here is to try to make people somewhat less unequal at the point where they actually enter into adult life as workers. John said that an absolute equality where fundamental equality in starting points is not fully and strictly achieved. He introduced a further idea to equality of opportunity to complete the line of argument and added two remedial steps of which one is the principle of everyone continual benefits.

His principle first assumption is that we are starting from a hypothetical point of strict equality between people and the second assumption is that we must assume that so long as the benefit of the least well off group could possibly be higher meaning to identify a zone or contact in which the procedure can operate to achieve its intended end.

**QUESTION 3**

Write short explanatory note on the original position. Rawl’s explains in the original position that they are men and women with ordinary tastes, talents, ambitions and convictions but each is temporarily ignorant of these features of his own personality and must agree upon a contract before his self-awareness returns. He explains that if these men and women are national and act only in their own self-interest, they will choose his two principles of justice.

Rawl does not suppose that any group ever entered into a social contract of the sort he describes. He argues only that if a group of national men did find themselves in the predicament of the original position, they would contract for the two principles. His contract is hypothetical and hypothetical contracts do not supply on independent argument for the fairness of enforcing their terms.

The Original Position argument suggests or seeks to justify the contemporary use of the two principles on the supposition that under conditions very different from present conditions, it would be in the antecedent interest of everyone to agree to them. For example if I have bought a ticket on a longshot it might be in my antecedent interest, before the race to sell the ticket to you for twice what I paid therefore it does not follow that it is fair for you to take it from me for that sum when the longshot is about to win.

Rawl’s actual argument is quite different, however the ignorance in which his men must choose affects their calculations of self interest and cannot be described merely as setting boundaries within which these calculations must be applied.

A description is taken from Raw’ls first statement of the original position. it is plainly of capital importance and it suggest that the original position far from being the foundation of his argument of an expository device for the technique of equilibrium is one of the major substantive products of the theory as a whole.

**QUESTION 4**

**Summarize John Rawl’s idea of Justice.**

John Rawl’s in his theory of justice emphasized on two fundamental principles which will in turn guarantee a just and morally acceptable society. By the first principle, he guarantees the right of each person to have the most extensive basic liberty compliable with their liberty of others.

By the second principle, he stated that social and economic positions are to be everyone’s advantage and also open to all. Psychology of distributive justice have in it three main allocation principles of which they are equity, equality and need and also to propose that each operates within a specific sphere of influencer.

Rawl’s proposes that the most reasonable principles of justice for a society are those that individuals would themselves agree to blind the veil of ignorance in circumstances in which each is represented as a moral person, endowed with the basic moral powers. This position supports is that while each person has different ends and goals different backgrounds and talents each ought to have a fair chance to develop his or her talents and to pursue those goals with fair equality for opportunity. He went further by saying that this justice should be a complete cooperation among all so that there may be reasonable life for all and not just to one person alone. It may seem to be in a form of competition that is what is so desired must be achieved.

It major problem Rawl empathized on is to show how such principles would be universally adopted and here the work borders on general ethical issues.

The veil of ignorance mentioned above is when all the players in the social game would be placed in a situation which is called the original position, having only a general knowledge of the facts of life and society each player is to abide based on their moral obligation. By denying the players any specific information about themselves, it forces them to adopt a generalized point of view that bears a strong resemblance to the moral point of view.