

# Economic inequality

[Sociology](#), [Social Issues](#)



Economic Inequality is a foreign concept to nature. Justice and morality do not apply when it comes to the genetic lottery. Is it still survival of the fittest if your luck limits your ability to succeed? We lack control over most the factors that pre-determine our fate and govern our lives. I will argue that economic inequality is perfectly just by defending the entitlement theory and distributive justice from the works of Robert Nozick and analyzing the works of John Rawls and Michael Sandel. John Rawls was a philosopher of the twentieth century.

Rawls believes that the thing that makes us unique to ourselves is in our control. Not only in terms of genetics and demographic but also in terms of work ethic and natural talent. He believes nature and nurture define all characteristics about us. Therefore, we are not entitled to the circumstances of our lives. We do not have a clear perception of justice because of these things that one, we do not have genuine ownership and can not take credit for. And, two, because we are self-interested beings we only define justice based off of what will benefit us and our situation.

We cannot decide what is just until we all come from common, equal ground. John Rawls proposes the "veil of ignorance" to neutralize factors that would bias our opinions. When under the veil of ignorance, you are not aware of your demographic, education status, income, class, family circumstance, ethnicity, race, religion, or gender. After wiping these characteristics away, you only know you are a good, moral being. Making just decisions with the veil of ignorance on allows us to see life from a neutral standpoint and accurately judge what is just and what is unjust.

Not knowing whether you will luck out by chance or not will change the way you want the overspent to be run. You will be more inclined to better the worst case scenario just in case that is your fate. The only way inequality can be just is if the inequality favors the least off members of society. " The aim is to use the notion of pure procedural Justice as a basis theory. Somehow we must nullify the effects of specific contingencies which put natural circumstances to their own advantage. " (Rawls 704). Robert Nozick, like Rawls was a well known philosopher from the twentieth century, as well.

Nozick points out there is no pattern to Justice. Economic Justice is eased off the decisions people choose to make in a free market. First off, there is justice in what you start out with economically speaking in nature, what you are born with is what you get and fair game. Second, the economic decisions you make in your lifetime express free will and do not express any code of injustice, therefore, are just. The entitlement theory outlines principles that justify holdings called the original acquisition of holdings. The distributive Justice is applied in these circumstances.

Possessions can only be acquired and transferred. The Government would need to intervene on every economic interaction to ensure Justice and equality between parties. " The complete principle of distributive Justice would say simply that a distribution is just if everyone is entitled to the holdings they possess under the distribution. " (Nozick 714). Furthermore, it would be a violation to your liberty if government forces you to give a portion of your profit to charity. If the government has right to claim a portion of your earnings, it is essentially claiming a portion of your time, as well.

This is in a sense forced labor aka a very moderate form of slavery. On one hand, John Rails defends the injustice of economic inequality. He would be in favor of welfare programs and raising taxes on the rich. Though I admire the sympathy Rails shows to the victims of economic inequality, I disagree with his approach. I side more with Robert Nonionic. He is Libertarian and would favor the least amount of government involvement. He would be completely against taxing one demographic more than another and favor private charities over government intervention. I identify with Nonionic more than Rails when it comes to defining justice.

Assume that "you" existed before you were consciously existing. Imagine the moment before you were conceived, before you were conscious and before you were born, you would find that all potential beings are on equal, unexplored ground. No one is anyone. There are no defining characteristics or separating factors that make you different from anyone else. There are no judgments and no attachments to anyone or anything. In fact, there are even no words or language, concepts or principles that have been introduced to you. You are saturating in ultimate nothingness. I do not believe economic inequality to be unjust.

In fact, I would go as far to say that correcting economic inequality would be unjust. Economic inequality is as inherent as human nature itself. As I stated above, I believe we come from the same common background before our hearts begin to beat. Once you enter the world, the game of life begins and most of what will define you is pre-determined by genetics and luck, call it fate. Whether it be as subjective as the energy of life force coursing through

your veins or as objective as a physical being governing humanity, " God" is present in this process. It is not the governments place to correct " Gods" work.

The overspent should protect citizens rights and provide security. Economic inequality is just because the government should not be used as a crutch for those who are impaired by nature. Although, justice has no routine or pattern, inequalities naturally occur in nature. Simply put, government velvet in economic inequality is unnecessary. The government should keep its paws off the matter in my opinion. It is not their place to play god. I believe in the good in people's hearts to care for each other more than the force of the government. To have complete freedom would be superior to all else.