

John Rawls's philosophy of liberalism essay



John Rawl's ideas about liberalism are influenced by the concept of social rules. These rules are formulated by different people or groups to come up with agreements. Rawl argues that these parties regard wealth and income creation as opportunities which encourage progressive social collaboration.

The participants involved help one another meet their mutual interests and goals. Rawl's arguments are correct because social rules apply differently to different societies depending on their ways of lives.

Rawl argues that liberalism brings about social justice. He further stresses that people follow rules they form for their own benefit.

Rules of justice guide people on how ownership and distribution of social goods happen within a society. These rules are not meant to protect natural rights or rights given to humanity by God. The rules only look at how resources that exist in the society are to be shared based on people's agreements.

The rules of justice as propounded by Rawl present a true picture of complex attitudes that influence people's views. His argument is correct because most rules are formed by humans.

Only humans can decide how fair or unfair the rules are depending on their experiences. Rawl's ideas advance the ideals of democracy which help societies progress.

Rawl's philosophy on social and economic equalities is credible. The philosophy talks about formal equality before the law without discrimination. However, the theory does not adequately address the issue of historical

discrimination that denies people equal access to social and economic opportunities.

Rawls proposes good ideas but does not offer solutions that can eliminate economic and social inequalities. Rawls also fails to show the method that can effectively distribute economic and social resources equitably.

Rawls's philosophy is idealistic and cannot be a solution for all issues that relate to social and economic inequality. Most societies in the world do not have economic or social equality because of different reasons.

There is a small section of people within a given society who influence how rules are made. Rawls assumes that rules of ownership and distribution of resources are made by people living within a particular society.

This assumption is incorrect because the people that have power within a society have a big influence on how social and economic rules are enforced. Rawls further assumes that making people acquire skills and knowledge through education eliminates inequality.

Some societies have high literacy rates in their adult populations yet they still experience social and economic inequalities. The increase in the number of skilled and educated people does not always eliminate economic and social inequalities.

In conclusion, Rawls's philosophy has weight. The contribution that members of a given society have in forming rules that decide how social and economic resources are distributed improves living standards for all. Rawls however

does not fully address modern problems that arise out of unequal distribution of wealth and resources.

Discrimination in the modern world has reduced substantially yet social and economic inequalities still persist. Liberalism does not offer practical solutions that can eliminate problems caused by economic and social inequalities in many societies.

Some societies have their economies controlled by a few people who are not always willing to allow the majority to get access to resources. Modern societies have not yet found solutions to the problems of inequality that many people face.