

IMPLICATIONS OF RAWLS THEORY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE ON INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL WELL BEING IN HYPERMODERN SOCIETIES

BY

*JUMBAM Gideon (Ph.D.)

Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts, the University of Bamenda-Cameroon

Abstract

Reflections on individual rights and social wellbeing constituted one of the major preoccupations of thinkers in the history of ideas. However, this paper seeks to examine the implications of John Rawls's theory of social justice on individual and social wellbeing within the actual hypermodern context. Hypermodernity, characterized by rapid technological advancements and diverse societal disorders, challenges the classical ideas of justice and equality thus, drumming the sophistic idea of justice as interest of the stronger party. The analysis of this research focuses on how Rawls's principles of justice as fairness, particularly the concepts of the original position and the difference principle can be applied to address contemporary issues such as social inequality and individual rights. By adopting a hermeneutico-comprehensive approach in unveiling the need to reconcile individual freedoms and social responsibilities, emphasis are laid on the relevance of Rawls's theory in promoting a just society amidst the challenges of hypermodern ideologies. The paper thus argued and recommend that, Rawls sociopolitical theory, if adopted and implemented, can paved the way for the emergence of impartial institutions that will protect the fundamental and civic rights of individuals and subsequently, guarantee social wellbeing. To this effect, the application of Rawls reflections on social justice is exceptional in overcoming the dynamics of hyper modernism characterized by excess individual preferences and the sidelines of the common good.

Keywords: Hypermodern Societies, Individual, Rawls, Social Wellbeing, theory of Social Justice

Introduction

The zeal to examine the impacts of John Rawls's theory of social justice on individual and social wellbeing is one of the fundamental and the most disputed issues in in contemporary social and political thoughts. This paper seeks to suggest the necessity of application of his social justice theory as an alternative solid base of reconciling individual and social wellbeing within the actual neoliberal and hypermodern societies. The context of this reflection on the individual and collective stemmed from the individualistic perspectives. The individualist is he who by virtue of his temperament is pre-disposed to feel in a particular acute way distinct from his social

milieu.”¹This perspective of individualism is beentackled from diversified plans. Alaine Laurent contends that: « *l'affirmation de l'individualité Sur le plan idéologico-politique rivalisent des versions anarchistes (Stirner), démocratiques (Durkheim), libérales (Locke), aristocratiques (Nietzsche) et conservatrices (Hayek) du primat de la liberté de l'individu.* »²Reflections on individual and society are an important and fundamental aspect of Rawls political liberalism. He conceives an individual as an ultimate unit but not a distinct entity from the group. At the beginning of *A Theory of Justice*, he opines “Each

¹Palante, G., *Anarchism and Individualism, La Sensibilité Individualiste*, Paris, Avan, 1909, p.2.

²Laurent, A., *Histoire de L'individualisme*, Ville de Paris, Bibliothèque Baudoyep, PUF, 1993, p.9.

person possesses an inviolability founded on justice that even the welfare of society as a whole cannot override. For this reason justice denies that the loss of freedom for some is made right by a greater good shared by others. It does not allow that the sacrifices imposed on a few are outweighed by the larger sum of advantages enjoyed by many. Therefore in a just society the liberties of equal citizenship are taken as settle.”³ Social justice in this regard is the first fundamental virtue of social institutions which he termed the society. This work seeks to examine the relevance of Rawls social justice theory from double lenses: from the individualistic perspective through his preservation of individual fundamental and civic rights and from the social perspective through the preservation and guarantee of social welfare and the common good. John Rawls was so much interested in this Hegelian approach to reality. It was due to this reason that he concluded as follows: the third rule of political philosophy could be trace back in Hegel philosophy of right which is that of reconciliation.⁴ Through this rule of reconciliation, political philosophy helps us to come out of the various frustrations of humanity. It draws us closer to our society. Through this approach, individuals are strongly aware of the fact that we cannot have individuals without a political society. This is the reason why “political society is always regarded as the scheme of social cooperation over time indefinitely.”⁵ The question that guides our reflection is: how can Rawls theory of social justice be apply to address the dynamic challenges of hypermodern societies characterized by rapid technological advancements and diverse societal shifts? Of what significance is Rawls’s theory of social justice a solution to combat excess individualism and promote the common good of every individual?

Philosophical Underpinning of Rawls Theory of Social Justice

Thomas Pogge in the preface to one of his major work entitle *John Rawls: His life and Theory of Justice*, thinks that for one to clearly understand an

³ Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, Revised Edition, London, Harvard University Press, 1999, p.3.

⁴ Rawls, J., *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*, ed. Erin Kelly, London, Harvard University Press, 2001, p.3.

⁵ Rawls, J., *The Law of The Peoples*, London, Harvard University Press, 2000, p.157.

author, before sorting out it lapses, one must first of all appreciate the thought of the author. It is with such appreciation that any critics levied will be fruitful.⁶ In order for us to show clearly how John Rawls uses *A Theory of Justice* in order to reconcile the opposing views that exist between the individuals and the society, we are first of all obliged to carry out a comprehensive analysis of the theory of justice. This is in view of bringing out it bases as well as it specificities. This will permit us to better understand the reason why Rawls believes that the theory of justice serves as a solution to the individual/society dichotomy. This shall be done through the analysis of the principle of justice as developed by the author.

It should first of all be noted that the question of social justice was one of the fundamental preoccupation that runs from the ancient period with thinkers like Plato, Aristotle to the contemporary with thinkers like John Rawls. He first of all considers justice as “the first virtue of social institutions.”⁷ This implies that justice serves as the base for social institutions and organizations which helps to promote peace and stability. This is in line with what Saint Thomas Aquinas noted erelong that justice is the mother of all virtues. The question of social justice pre occupies the mind of John Rawls for many years. Thomas Pogge, his major commentator, faced with this, highlighted on the importance of Rawls philosophical theories. For instance the theory of social justice, in which he maintains in the preface of the above mention book, as follows:

Trying to introduce an important philosopher, within a small volume, one most keep to the essentials. The adventures in Rawls life, largely concerns the developments in his thinking. And thus, I focus on... especially his theory of social justice, which occupied him for fifty years. Uniquely, ambitious and illuminating this theory is a brilliant achievement in political philosophy, the best there is. No one concerned for social justice in the real world can afford not to study it closely...must of Rawls ideas are presented in his 1971, *A Theory of Justice*, “TJ” we use to

⁶ Pogge, T., *John Rawls: His Life and Theory of Justice*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2007, p.vii.

⁷ Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, p.3.

call this best sellers, compose in twenty years of labor...⁸

From the above view, one can see clearly that the question of social justice was one of the fundamental questions in the liberal philosophy of Rawls. One of the social stakes or bases of justice was to ensure harmonious association or the possibility of living together. The goal of justice is to ensure an association among individuals with desperate aims and purposes...the conception of justice establishes bonds of civic friendship within a well ordered human association.⁹ Justice is seen if applied strictly and correctly as a pre-requirement for a harmonious human community. It is in fact a fundamental and reliable solution to multitude of social problems or crises that characterize our societies. Justice helps individuals to ensure fairness within the context of their social activities in terms of coordinating and ensuring stability. In order to define clearly the specificities of the theory of justice, Rawls proposes two fundamental principles of justice that must be abided to. These two principles are the principle of equal liberty and the principle of equal opportunity. In line with this, Rawls maintains:

I shall now state in a provisional form the two principles of justice that I believe will be argued to in the original position... the first statement of the two principles reads as follow: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive scheme of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others. Second: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that there are both (a) reasonably expected to be everyone's advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all.¹⁰

These above mentioned principles are to be applied at the level of the entire basic structures of the society in view of guiding and ensuring mutuality and stability. However, the subject of justice has a polysemy conception. This is why Rawls posits "for us the primary subject of justice is the basic structure of society, or more exactly, the way in which the major

social institution distribute fundamental rights and duties and determine the division of advantages in social cooperation."¹¹ Following the precision in regards to the subject of justice, one can draw out a remark that fundamental problems that are found within the basic structure of the society are to be tackled through justice. These crisis or social ills might erupt from individual's hostilities, exploitations, marginalization as well as social domination. This might lead to the violation of individual's rights, duties, which are contrarily to the natural law theory that admits the fact that each and every human being has certain basic rights and liberty that needs not to be violated. Individual's hostility could equally lead to the destruction of the society at the level where it can lead to the emergence of individualistic norms that are antithetical to the societal norms. That is the reason why Rawls will propose justice principle that will help to regulate social crisis. He thinks in this regard that the society should not override the prescribed individual rights and liberties. Amartya Sen maintains that Rawls constructed the notion of justice in terms of maximization of liberty, equality and opportunity as the central theme seeing justice in the light of fairness.¹² One can see an interconnection proposed here between justice and fairness. This justifies the reason why he justifies the concept of justice as fairness with the aim of rectifying the weaknesses found in *A theory of Justice*. To this effect, he contends "according to justice as fairness, the most reasonable principle of justice is those that will be the object of mutual agreements by persons under fair conditions."¹³

Through the principle of justice as fairness, one can admit certain fundamental rules of political philosophy for instance like the practical rule where political philosophy should abandon theory and embrace practice and the rule of reconciliation. This will help to solve the problems among individuals within the liberal democratic societies. It will equally help to overcome the dichotomies between opposing theories since our societies are being characterized by

⁸Pogge, T., *John Rawls: His Life and Theory of Justice*, p.vii.

⁹ Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, p.5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 52-3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p.6.

¹² Dhayal Shankar Srivastav, *Rawls Theory of Justice Through Amartya Sen's Ideas*, *ILI Law Review, LL.M (Fourth Semester)*, Indian Law Institute, New Delhi, Winter Issue, 2016, pp.151-160.

¹³ Rawls, J., *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*, p. xi.

pluralistic belief systems. In this light, one can see clearly the manifestation of the political conception of justice which opposes to comprehensive doctrines mostly presented in *A Theory of Justice*. The effective and global application of the principle of justice will in effect help to calm down the diverse frustrations of humanity. Political philosophy in this dimension should equally be appreciated for its humanitarian projects which are greater step towards the realization of an authentic humanism.

Conforming to the idea of justice, develop within the social and liberal philosophy of John Rawls, it might let us to a fundamental sense of reciprocity. This implies that by adopting the sense of justice and its fundamental principle, it will help us as argued by Andrew Lister to fight against personal interest with the aim of laying more emphasis to the idea of reciprocity.¹⁴ The ideas of justice are to be applicable to the entire society as a whole without excludability. Its principles are to be acknowledged by free persons who have no authority over one another.¹⁵ Justice as fairness implies that, the recognition of an individual's interest should equally imply the others within the society. In this perspective, it could be argued that such a circumstance will lead to a respect of the principle of reciprocity, which will effectively ensure a balance between individuals. A society that abides to the prescribed principles of justice could be referred to what Eric Brown considers as healthy community. That is, the principle of justice ensures the health of the political community. Such a conception draws us closer to the classical vision of the healthy political community seen in the context of thinkers like Plato and Aristotle.¹⁶

The conception of justice illustrated by Rawls in *A Theory of Justice* and *Justice as Fairness*, recalls us of the ancient conceptions of justice according to which justice was been viewed as the respect of class there by qualifying it as a fundamental element of an ideal society. The principle of justice creates us consciousness of having a good sense of recognition

for others in this light, John Rawls write thus, justice as fairness starts from within a certain political tradition and takes as its fundamental idea that of society as a fair system of cooperation over time, from one generation to the next. This central organizing idea is developed together with two companion fundamental ideas: one is the idea of citizen as free and equal persons; the other is the idea of a well-ordered society as a society effectively regulated by a political conception of justice... that will lead us to the realization of an overlapping consensus of reasonable pluralistic doctrines.¹⁷

Veronique Munoz-Darde argued in favor of Rawls conception of social justice mentioned above. In this light, she thinks clearly in the same perspective that justice in effect, plays a vital role in human societies thereby drawing away people from their individualistic human relations. Justice as she equally proposes in another perspective will help to tend individuals towards others in view of realizing an ideal human relation.¹⁸ Human relation like the society (fair system of cooperation), are to be founded on the principles of justice that will help to guide and regulate the activities within the social context. Recalling the earlier mentioned notion of reciprocity, Rawls thinks that the principle of justice plays an important role in ensuring the political criterion of reciprocity which is been strongly favored within the liberalist system. In this light, the idea of justice equally implies the idea of reciprocity that permits the possibilities of mutual advantage this makes Sam Purna Dutte to perceive Rawls theory of justice as a convergence of libertarianism, egalitarianism and communitarianism.¹⁹ That is, his theory is moving towards uniting the three above mentioned doctrines. Thomas Pogge, a student and commentator of the life and works of John Rawls, offered an interpretation of Rawls' theory of justice which to him seems to provide order within the basic structure of the society as well as an international

¹⁷Rawls, J., *Political Liberalism*, pp.14-15.

¹⁸Veronique Munoz-Darde, *La Justice Sociale; Le Liberalisme Egalitaire De John Rawls, Ouvrage Publie Surs La Direction de Francois de Singly, Nathan, Arman Colin, 2000, p.7.*

¹⁹Sam Purnadutte, *Rawls Theory of Justice; an Analysis, Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, vol.24, Issue.4, Ver.1, April.2017, Shillong, North Eastern Hill University, pp.40-43.*

¹⁴Lister, A., *Justice as Fairness and Reciprocity*, Analyse and Kritik, 01, 2011, (Lucius, and Stuttgart), S, pp.93-112.

¹⁵Rawls, J., *Justice as Fairness*, The Philosophical Review, vol.67, No. 2 (April 1958), pp.164-194.

¹⁶ Brown, E., *Rawls and The Duty of Civility*, in Locations of the Political, ed .S. Gorman, Vienna, IWN Junior Visiting Fellows Conferences ,Vol.15, 2003, pp. 1-18.

order. This justifies the reason why within the theories of justice of John Rawls one can remark the account of domestic justice found in *A Theory of Justice*, and an account of international justice found in *The Law of Peoples*.²⁰

As earlier noted by Thomas Pogge in his elaboration and analysis of *John Rawls' life and A Theory of Justice*, to better understand an author it is necessary for one to begin by appreciating the force of argument used by the author in the process of defending his thought. In this case, one is therefore obliged to appreciate Rawls' conception of justice in relation to its principles, stakes and specificities. The central thing left is to show with precisions and in details, how John Rawls uses a theory of justice in order to reconcile the notion of the individual and the society which before him has been a topic of great debate among classical scholars.

Rawls Reflections on Individual and the Society

The question of the relation between the individual and the society that preoccupies thinkers in the history of ideas, constitute one of the fundamental questions in the liberal philosophy of John Rawls. He proposes to reconcile or integrate the individual and the society in order to overcome the long classical dichotomy established between them. His conceptions opposes to the classical methodological individualism or the individualistic conception and methodological holism or collectivist conception. It could equally be illustrated that Rawls was not in favor of the valorization of the individual at the detriment of the society as well as the valorization of the society at the detriment of the individual. This is why his thoughts could serve as basis to combat the hypermodern ideologies. Michel Seymour in his comprehension of the philosophy of Rawls and in its conformity to his major works entitled *The Law of the Peoples* originally published in 1993 as an article and expanded in 1999 as a joint book with other essays (*the idea of public reason revisited*), conclude:

Rawls does not engage in an individualist point of view nor in the collectivist point of view but rather from the reasonable

perspective, we can attribute at the same time an anti-individualistic and an anti-collectivist point of view to Rawls. That is, a point of view that rejects at the same time the absolute primacy attributed to individual rights and the absolute primacy attributed to the collective rights. But rather Rawls wants to ensure an equilibrium position between the individual and the society. Rawls in this light neither engages in political individualism nor in political collectivism.²¹

Following the above assertion, it is clear evidence that John Rawls' quest to reconcile the individual and the society in view of ensuring its inter-dependence was one of the essential aspects of his later philosophy that could be seen through most of his works like *A Brief Inquiry, Justice as Fairness: A restatement*. The later Rawls (Rawls after Rawls) embraces the views of sociologist like Norbert Elias his contemporary as well as the views of modern thinkers like Hegel in regard to the notion of reconciliation. In *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*, that was explicated from his early article of 1958 *Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical*, the author argues in line with Hegel that the role of reconciliation is one of the fundamental roles of political philosophy.²² The concept of justice as fairness is one of the models put in place by John Rawls in order to ensure the relation between the individual and the society. This conception of justice as fairness helps to correct the weakness of *A Theory of Justice* so as to overcome the tension that exists between the individual and the society in favor of social unity between the two concepts. It was due to this conception that Jonathan Edward Mansfield conclude as follows:

In justice as fairness, Rawls has reconsidered the balance between individual concerns and community values in a new way. As a bearer of the liberal standard he has attempt to posit a self that individual, equal, moral being. Sensitive to societal consideration and communal values from these individualist

²⁰Pogge, T., *Do Rawls Two Theories of Justice Fit Together ?*, *Research Gate in Health Impact Fund View Project*, Feb.2008, Uploaded by ThomassPogge, on 10th January, 2018, Yale University, Pp. 1-31.

²¹ Seymour, M., *Rawls et Le Droit Des Peuple*, (A Paraitre Dans Philosophiques), Departement de Philosophie, Universite de Montreal, an article of *Journal Philosophiques*, vol. 26, Issue 1, Printemps 1999, pp.109-137.

²² Rawls, J., *Justice As Fairness: A Restatement*, p.3.

premises... this proposed balanced between the individual and the society is a laudable aim...²³

Taking in to consideration the above assertion, one can derive or sort out the thesis of John Rawls in relation to the question of the individual and the society. The author's conception of the individual and the society are highlighted in the above affirmation of Mansfield is indeed an action that deserves praise. The fundamental principles of justice help to ensure the harmonious union between the conception of the society and the conception of individuals or persons. To further expatiate on this view, one can argue in line with the original position or the hypothetical state that present the existence of incomplete individuals that takes decisions that are not qualified as individualistic but decisions that help the political community or society. In this perspective decisions taken by selected individuals are incompatible with the societal values. In this case, one can abide with John Rawls that justice or just principles will help to reconcile the individuals and the collectivity.

Note should be taken that as earlier mentioned by John Rawls himself "there is a need for a democratic society to secure the possibility of an overlapping consensus on its fundamental political values."²⁴ Based on this assertion, it could equally be argue that there is a need to ensure an over-lapping consensus between the individual and the society since both the individual and the society are fundamental political values. One of the fundamental political objectives is to defend the individual right and equally the societal right. The overlapping consensus in this case is the fruit of the constructivist political conception that ensures the connection of diversities or diverse ideologies taking into account the political conception of justice chosen by rational agents at the initial stage. In this case, John Rawls informs us that in political constructivism there is a need for more complex conceptions of persons and society; such conceptions are required to provide the form and structure of its constructivist procedure this is in opposition to rational intuitionism that promotes

²³ Mansfield, J. E., *John Rawls, The Conception of a Liberal Self and the communitarian critic*, p. 109.

²⁴ Rawls, J., *Political Liberalism*, Expanded edition, New York, Columbian University Press, 2005, p.90.

nothing more than the idea of the self as a knower independent of the object.²⁵ Constructivism in its context is based on the political conception of the society and the individual. Its finality is to ensure a coalition between the two. Rawls says precisely:

The third feature of political constructivism is that it uses a rather complex conception of person and society to give form and structure to its construction. As we have seen, political constructivism view the person as belonging to political society understood as a fair system for social cooperation from one generation to the next persons are said to possess the two moral powers paid with this idea of social cooperation a capacity for a sense of justice and for a conception of the good.²⁶

Rawls thus believes and defended the reconciliation between the individual and social justice in order to avoid falling in the trap of modern individualism. Individualism is inseparable from the modern conception of liberty and autonomy of individual declared by thinkers like Benjamin Constant.²⁷ This conception even though having impact on young Rawls, was been opposed by the matured Rawls. Principles of justice will therefore permit us to fight against individual self-interest so as to emphasize on the notion of reciprocity as recommended by justice as fairness. In this dimension of illustrating the importance of social justice we equally have to pay attention to one of the articles of John Rawls: *Social Unity and Primary Good* originally published in 1982 where the author himself declares that the conception of justice will help to promote inter- personal connection that will open a way for social unity.²⁸

The question of the individual and the society is been tackled well in one of the works of the Rawls: *A Brief Inquiry in to the Meaning of Sin and Faith* edited by thinkers like Thomas Nagel and Joshua Cohen. The ideas proposed in the works of matured

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

²⁷ Audard, C And Boudon R..., *Individu et Justice Sociale: Author de John Rawls*, Preface de Francois Terre, Paris, editions du Seuil, April 1988, p.80.

²⁸ Rawls, J., *Social Unity and Primary Good*, edited by Amartyasen, Bernard Williams, in (Utilitarianism and Beyond) Cambridge Books Online, Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp.159-86.

Rawls faced with the question of the individual and the society within the liberal democratic context rhymes with the ideas proposed in the post publication like *A Brief Inquiry* (2009). This book equally dwells much on how Rawls has established a balance between the individual and the society. In the same line with what he equally proposes in *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*(2001). What he refers to in these two books mentioned above in regards to the individual and the society recalls us of what he termed in one of his works *Political Liberalism*, in an expanded edition (2005) the relation between persons and the society. We shall equally take note of the fact that Rawls was strongly against individualism while in favor of liberalism. As argued in an inquiry “the word individualism is used a number of times...always as something that Rawls is against. It is explicitly connected with sin and contrasted with communal thinking.”²⁹ The question of the relation between the individual and the society is not recent in the liberal philosophy of John Rawls. The question is as old as the philosophy of Rawls itself.

The philosophical thoughts of Rawls began with the question of the individual and the society and equally ended with it. This therefore implies that this question appears in one way or the other in his most publications that run from the young Rawls precisely in his senior thesis that were been submitted in the department of philosophy at the university of Princeton (1942) till his mature publications. As argued and illustrated by the two disciples of Rawls, Thomas Nagel and Joshua Cohen:

It seems fair to say, on the whole, that in his senior thesis Rawls values both individuality and community very highly, and the same is true of his matured writings, as is argued in the introduction to the present volume. In the thesis, and especially in the later theory of justice, themes of individuality and community are inter-woven in complex and subtle ways. If we are going to speak of Rawls as an “individualist” or a “communitarian” at all, I think it will be most accurate to use those terms in a sense in which he is both an individualist and a communitarian. That applies in similar thought not identical, ways

to both his senior thesis and his later theories of justice and political liberalism.³⁰

Following the above affirmation of the editors of *A Brief Inquiry* (Thomas Nagel and Joshua Cohen), one can observe the progressive evolution of the question of the individual and the society within the thought pattern or within the general evolution of the thoughts of John Rawls. Indeed the major preoccupation could nearly be traced from the genesis or the beginning of the philosophy of the American liberal philosophers (John Rawls). In addition from the enlightenment of the above assertion, one could draw out a remark that follows: the first remark is the fact that the question of the individual and the society is not recent and hidden within the thought system of the author. The second remark is the fact that the author is neither an individualist nor a collectivist while, the third remark lies on the fact that the author wants to ensure a balance or a concomitant relation between the individual and the society. This was in view of overcoming the long controversies that surrounds the main question at stake. However, it will not be wrong for one to argue concerning the fact that the beginning point of the philosophy of Rawls (young Rawls) and the end (matured Rawls) are alike when it comes to his position concerning the question of establishing a correlation between persons or the individual and the society or the whole.

Following the preface of his senior thesis, Rawls declares: “I believe myself that the flavor of the times seems to point to a revival of “communal thinking” after centuries of individualism.”³¹ But following the author’s thought, we should not only rely in promoting communal thinking but what is necessary is to see how we can inter-connect the concept of the individual (personality) and the society (communality). In this perspective he concluded as follows:

If our culture is to solve the problem of the individual and the society, the answer suggested above seems to be the right one. We must realize that an individual is not merely an individual, but a person and that a society is not a group of individuals but a community. Once we realize this fact any solution which advocates a balance between independence

²⁹ Rawls, J., *A Brief Inquiry*, p.68.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.71.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p.108.

and absorption is seen to be false. It is false because there is no such thing as independent personality free of community, and further, community as such does not absorb personality but create and sustain it...our solution to this problem is not a matter of finding the means between two extremes we should always be suspicious of such facile answer. Our solution is to examine and fine out what community and personality really are...therefore the reconciliation between the person and community, between the individual and society, can be understood by analyzing the concepts themselves they are mutually inter dependent. One cannot exist without the other. The dichotomy between the individual and the society which recent western thoughts have puzzled over is really no dichotomy at all. Where the difficulty arises is how personality and community can be achieved in face of the pervasive sin which exist in the world. Therefore, the chief problem of politics is to work out some scheme of social arrangement which can so harness human sin as to make the natural correlate of community and personality possible.³²

This assertion above concerning the quest for ensuring a balance between the individual and the society is the major task of political philosophy. This explains why the author himself admitted that one of the fundamental roles of political philosophy is that of reconciliation. The author himself borrows this conception from Hegel in this light; it is the task of politics to ensure the balance between the individual and the society taking into account the principle of justice as fairness. As argued by Rawls, this seems pertinent because “political philosophy may contribute to how people think of their political and social institution as a whole, and their basic aims and purposes as a society with a history- a nation- as opposed to their aims and purposes as individuals or as members of families and associations.”³³ The author is proposing a need here to integrate the individual and the society or the individual interest and the social interest or furthermore, the individual right and the

societal right.

Political philosophy then plays a role of orientating and overcoming the conflict between the individual and the society. This is the reason why John Rawls thinks that political philosophy manifest in diverse ways in solving diverse and profound problems that arise in our liberal society.³⁴ Principles of political justice have great impact in solving major problems like that of the individual or person and the society. It plays a vital role in ensuring a union that should exist between the two concepts as well as the complementarity that equally exist between the political conception of justice and the conception of person (individual) and the society. Realizing such a conception will lead us to the stage of satisfaction which the author of *A Theory of Justice* thinks it could only be possible when the complementarity between the good of the individual and the society or community is been realized.³⁵ The author in this aspect is requesting for a kind of “mutual recognition”³⁶ of the individual and the society by conforming to the principles of justice.

As earlier noted by Wayne Proudfoot and later on prolonged by F. M. AnayetHossain and Md. Korban Ali^{37,38}, the idea of social union is one of the models put in place by John Rawls in order to discuss the question of the individual and the society. He handles this problem of establishing the relationship that exists between the individual and the society in reference to three main models:

At least three models for conceiving the relation between individual and society are considered and discussed by Rawls. The first is identified with classical utilitarianism and is rejected, but serves as the primary foil over

³²*Ibid.*, pp.127-8.

³³Rawls, J.,*Justice As Fairness: A Restatement*, p.2.

³⁴Rawls, J.,*Justice Et Critique*, p. 88.

³⁵Rawls, J.,*A Theory of Justice*, p.461.

³⁶*Ibid.*, p.50.

³⁷Wayne Proudfoot, *Rawls on The Individual and the Social*, Blackwell publishing Ltd on Behalf of Journal of Religious Ethics, Inc, the Journal of Religious Ethics, vol. 2, No. 2 (Fall, 1974), pp. 107-128, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40017752>, this Content Downloaded From 154.72.169.175 On Tue, 01 Sep 2020 11:08:57 UTC.

³⁸AnayetHussen,F.M. and Korban Ali,M D.,*The Relations Between Individualand Society*, Department of Philosophy, University of Chittagong, Bangladesh, Open Journal of Social Sciences, 2014, 2, pp.130-137.

against which he establishes his own position. The second is the model represented by justice as fairness, and is imaginatively portrayed in the description of the original position and in the constraints on ethical choice which are imposed by that description. The third is the idea of a social union which is developed in the third part of the book as an initial step toward the construction of a theory of the good, with particular emphasis on the values of community and on shared social ends. Three models of the relation between individual and society have been described. The first is explicitly rejected by Rawls, the second is fundamental to his theory of justice as fairness, and the third is employed in his outline of a corresponding theory of the good. Rawls is clearly aware of the issues involved in providing an adequate paradigm for conceiving the relation between individuals and society. It is important, however, to lift these paradigms out of the volume and to examine the ways in which they are interrelated.³⁹

We are concerned here with the third model which is the idea of the social union developed at the last part of his work: *A Theory of Justice*. He discusses this idea in relation to the good of the community taking into account the view of justice as fairness. It should be noted that Rawls wanted to provide a reliable solution that will permit us to reconcile and perceive the interdependent between the individual and the society. In this case we shall equally adopt a sense of mutual recognition as requested by Axel Honneth in perceiving the inter relation between the individual and the society. He argues that there is a need to realize what he termed a unique domain of the social that which recognizes both the individual and the collective.⁴⁰ The relation that can be perceived between the individual and the society taking into consideration Rawls idea of union of social unions is not a vertical relationship but rather a horizontal

relationship based on horizontal or equal recognition. This implies that both the individual and the society are to be perceived in line with the principles of justice. Justice principles combined with the idea of social union; help to define equilibrium by ensuring equality and fairness that aim at promoting stability between free persons and well-ordered society.⁴¹ This is because the principles of justice can help to regulate our conducts towards one another thereby creating a spirit of awareness of the interrelation between the private interest of individuals and the collective interest as whole within the social union.

The Idea of Social Justice as Path to Social Cooperation and Integration

John Rawls emphasized on the notion of social integration and cooperation in relation to the notion of justice. This could be realized through his idea of social justice. It could be noted here that the view of justice he is proposing has in fact what could be termed as relational value. He argued in this perspective that the principle of political justice that are being decided at the initial stage(original position) under the veil, helps to ensure and specify fair terms of cooperation between equal and free persons within a justly democratic system.⁴² This is the reason why the decisions that are been taken under the veil of ignorance is to avoid aspects that might bring disintegration due to egoism or self-interest of some individuals. In this light, “justice as fairness regards citizens as engaged in social cooperation...”⁴³ This aim of social cooperation between individuals is to pursue certain shade values and ends.⁴⁴ These values can only be realized through collective life. This then follows that; cooperation can lead to a better and reliable outcome for both the individual and the group than would have been achieved privately. It should be noted clearly here that the notion of cooperation is been perceived in different dimension or senses. This could first of all be seen through Jiewuh Song who maintains that:

The concept of cooperation plays an important role in political philosophy, and in particular in Rawls theory of justice...first, I argue that

³⁹Wayne Proudfoot, *Rawls on the Individual and the Social*, *Opcit*.

⁴⁰Honneth, A., *The Critique of Power: Reflective Stages in a Critical Social Theory*, translated by Kenneth Baynes, London, MIT Press, 1993, p.viii.

⁴¹Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, p.450.

⁴² Rawls, J., *Justice As Fairness: A Restatement*, p.17.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, P.18.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, P.20.

we found at least three distinct senses of cooperation at work in the relevant discussions: cooperation as mutual advantage, or interaction through which each participant is better off than she would be without the interaction; cooperation as reciprocity or interaction in which all participants receive their fair share; and cooperation as productive interaction that is interaction that produces a different pattern or sum of benefits and burdens than would be obtained without the interaction.⁴⁵

From the enlightenment of the above citation, it is clearly stated that the notion of cooperation has three fundamentals which are all in conformity to the idea of justice highlighted in A Theory of Justice of John Rawls. These diverse senses of cooperation could be analyzed as follows;

The idea of cooperation as mutual advantage: Rawls noted clearly that “in justice as fairness society is interpreted as a cooperative venture for mutual advantage”⁴⁶ or better still, a society could still be considered as a system of social cooperation that guarantees equality between free and equal persons.⁴⁷ This therefore implies that the society with its social norms helps to put in place some rules that guide and direct individuals on the sense of belonging, that is on the sense of togetherness so as to attain certain benefits that will be at the service of all. Rawls admits that there is an interconnection or interlink between the conception of the individual and the conception of the social cooperation. This equally implies that individuals cannot flourish well without involving in social cooperation. For this reason he concludes as follows:

The connection between the notion of social cooperation and the conception of the person which I shall introduce can be explained as follows. The notion of social cooperation is not simply that of coordinated social activity efficiently organized and guided by publicly

recognized rules to achieve so overall end. Social cooperation is always for mutual benefits and this implies that it involve two elements: the first is a shared notion of fair terms of cooperation which each participant may reasonably be expected to accept, provided that everyone else likewise accept them. Fair terms of cooperation articulate an idea of reciprocity and mutuality: all who cooperate must benefit or share in common burdens, in some appropriate fashion.⁴⁸

Each and every individual receives certain advantages which are been guided by fair term of cooperation in regard to the principle of social justice. This is the reason why the society could generally be considered as cooperation between individuals. This notion of social cooperation for mutual benefit is not optional but an obligation for entire life. It equally signifies that the view of social cooperation is not voluntary neither has an alternative this is the reason why it is been considered so fundamental insofar as human life is concerned. It is equally considered so vital and fundamental because it appears to be the first subject of social justice. In this regard one can make reference to the view of the author according to which individuals have possess two fundamental powers that defines their personalities. That is, The capacity for the sense of right and justice(the capacity to honors fair terms of cooperation... and the capacity for the conception of the good). In greater details, the capacity for a sense of justice is the capacity to understand, to apply and normally to be moved by an effective desire to act from the principle of justice as the fair term of social cooperation. The capacity for a conception of the good is the capacity to form, to revise and rationally to pursue such a conception that is a conception of what we regard for us as a world wild human life.⁴⁹ Individual relation to the world is the most essential. Each and every individual in the world following the bases of mutual respect are to be recognized as one despite their diverse world views. The author in this perspective added that “ I shall use the term ‘society of peoples’ to mean all those people who follow the ideals and principle of the law of

⁴⁵Jiewuh Song, *Justice and Cooperation*, Rywichi Yamaoka and Anonymous Reviewers Journal, The National Foundation of Korea, (2017), pp.263-290.

⁴⁶Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, pp.73-4.

⁴⁷Rawls, J., *Justice et Democratie*, trad. Française par Catherine Audard, Paris, Seuil, 2009, p.237.

⁴⁸Rawls, J., *Political Liberalism*, p.300.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p.302.

peoples in their mutual relations.”⁵⁰ Mutual assistance is one of the natural duties which is positive. It consists in doing something good to one another in view of bringing or rescuing him or her out of certain pains that might arise. Individuals are obliged to possess a sense of mutuality towards each other in the society. This sense of mutuality happens to be an obligation and not a will. Wickedness towards others here has to be rejected. There shall be no discrimination in relation to mutual assistance or help. For it is the first and famous duty. The duty of mutual aid is a positive duty in that, it is a duty to do something good for another.⁵¹

The idea of cooperation as reciprocity: This is another sense of cooperation which is different from that of advantage. This type of cooperation implies that each and every individual that involves in it have to receive equal fair shares. Individuals according to the principle of reciprocity are both considered free and equal in terms of shared ends or values as well as before the law. Reciprocity in this light is to serve the purpose of the higher good of each and every individual. There is a need in this case to admit the political value of reciprocity in relation to the political systems of governance, reason why John Rawls thinks that the criterion of reciprocity which is an aspect of constitutional democracy should not be rejected, for rejecting it implies the rejection of the idea of public reason.⁵²

The idea of justice as productive interaction: This conception of cooperation outlines certain benefits which are fruits of individual interactions. It equally outlines the fact that certain profits as well as certain burdens are fruits or products of individual interrelation. Those benefits and burdens cannot be tackled individually or privately.

From a general observation, John Rawls dwelled much on the other two senses of cooperation which are; cooperation as mutual advantage and cooperation as reciprocity. Following his views, fair terms of social cooperation can really be defined based on the idea of reciprocity and mutuality according to which every individual that involves in social cooperation must enjoy certain benefits and consider

every burden as one.⁵³ What ensures the possibility and the necessity of social cooperation is the cooperation of justice.⁵⁴ Cooperation is human life as seen where it promotes the progress of each and every individual in the society. The application of the natural duty of mutual help goes to individuals in general and not only to those who cooperate among themselves. Through mutual cooperation individuals are been seen as equal moral persons. However, the obligatory lesson that goes to the entire humanity is to adopt a sense of recognition of certain positive natural duties like mutual aid.

The notion of cooperation is been admitted here in order to solve the tension that might exist between the individuals due to isolated ways of living. This is what sparks the authors consciousness in which he requested to solve this problem as follows “To fill this gap I shall introduce a certain conception of the person together with a companion conception of social cooperation.”⁵⁵ Social cooperation entails that every individual should both enjoy everyone’s effort. So as to avoid a case where there is no application of fairness. The benefits of social cooperation are identical to each and every one or member, following the equality principle. Justice is been considered as the only major condition that defines the possibility and the necessity through which human cooperation is foreseen. This therefore implies that justice is the foundation of human cooperation in the liberal context.

A worthy and healthy life is that which solely depends on social cooperation regulated through the principle of social justice. In order to further enlighten this notion of cooperation Shaun Moss, asserts that “my teacher showed me that the human race is like a natural network. Our planet have almost seven billion people working around, communicating with each other, we are each connected to thousands of other humans by relationships through which we are constantly exchanging information... the human race is like an interconnected system structure.”⁵⁶ This shows that we cannot live in isolation but preferably in connection with others. Social cooperation equally

⁵⁰Rawls, J., *The Law of The Peoples*, p.3.

⁵¹ Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, p.98.

⁵²Rawls, J., *The Law of The Peoples*, p.132.

⁵³Rawls, J., *Political Liberealism*, p.300.

⁵⁴Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, p.109.

⁵⁵Rawls, J., *Political Liberealism*, pp.299-300.

⁵⁶ Shaun Moss, *Practical Metaphysics*, Australia, Melbourne, 2009, p.3.

justifies the fact that there exist an interdependent between the individual and the society not in a contextual sense, but rather in a global sense.⁵⁷ The author admits the positive powers of cooperation between the individuals as compared to the powerlessness of individualism. Cooperate powers are stronger as seen where they make us to be conscious about the affairs of the whole society and not one's individual affairs. Individuals should in this perspective be identified as members of society and not as atoms or isolated individuals.

Due to this, there is a need to insist in the construction of cooperate societies in which cooperate powers will grow at the expense of individual powers. In fact with cooperation, individualism represents a death end after all; cooperation is our friend and aimed to satisfy our every need.⁵⁸ Rawls principle of justice helps to regulate the activities of individuals thereby promoting individual associations with others which will subsequently lead to a development of a strong sense of recognizes others or awareness of other persons. It encourages the fulfillment of one's duties and obligation in the association. Reason why he termed this as the 'the morality of association' dwelling much on the notion of mutuality and reciprocity, Rawls argues that there should be a balance between altruism and self-interest. This is why Rawls considers justice as fairness as a social union of social unions. In which individuals cooperate to realize their aims as well as those of others. We need to act here in accordance to the principle of justice. Social cooperation generally is fair when all its members benefit according to agreement that is been made in between them, despite their diverse believes. This view of cooperation intensifies the relation or ties between the individuals and social reality or society. One of the instruments of social cooperation is language. This implies that there is an interrelation between language, the individual and the society.

The Notion of Social Structure and the Common Good

Haven opposed the notion of individual

⁵⁷Bentz, S and Ines Gomez Chalon, M.,*European Identity. Individual, Group and Society*, Bilbas, University of Deusto,2003, p.13.

⁵⁸Perelman, M.,*Manufacturing Discontent*, London, Pluto Press, 2005, pp.4 - 6.

egoism, John Rawls proceeded in reflecting on how we can attain the common good of each and every one, which equally at the same time justifies the wellbeing of an individual and the society. A fight for the realization of the common good equally implies the possibility of possessing a good sense of justice. Individuals within the social structure and not only purchases their proper interest but rather those interest that can lead to the wellbeing of each and every one the author admits a co-relation between the theory of justice and the common good of the community. His second principle of justice for instance admits the fact that there should be a case where offices are being opened to each and everyone without exception. That is what could equally be referred to as the notion of equal opportunity. In addition he was equally conscious of the fact that inequalities should be ensured in order to ensure justice and equally at the profit of the under privileged. Basing our mine on this conception, one can clearly perceive a link between justice and a common good. Rawls noted that "last of all I explain how the theory of justice connects up with the social value and the good of the community."⁵⁹ The common good is been realized through individual fair relation, moving beyond the liberalism of autonomy insisted on by Kant and the liberalism of individuality by John Stuart Mill. This could only be realized through political liberalism (of John Rawls), which takes into consideration the political conception of justice as well as the conception of the individual and the society. The social good needs the cooperation of many individuals to achieve or it is mutually dependent⁶⁰. The unity of social cooperation tilted us gradually to the realization of the good of it members.

What justifies the unity of social interdependency is the fact that individuals who are involve must abide to the fair terms of those who determine social principles that guide and regulate the activities of each and every individuals within the social structure. John Rawls declared in one of his works "in this essay, I have two aims: first, to elaborate the notion of primary good, a notion which is part of the conception of justice as fairness presented in my book *A Theory of Justice* and second to explain the connection between the notion of primary good

⁵⁹Rawls,J., *A Theory of Justice*, p.347.

⁶⁰RawlsJ., *Political Liberalism*, p.204.

and a certain conception of the person which leads in tend to a certain conception of social unity.”⁶¹The notion of the common good is one of the focuses and attributes of social institutions. With this notion of the common good each and every individual has to be placed under the same index. For instance needs to be granted equal liberty of conscience, equal liberty in terms of their freedom of thoughts as well as freedom of expression. This is why Rawls thinks that at the initial stage, the common good index is already part and parcel of the principle of justice that will in return define and characterize the good of each and every one. What is been termed as the common good in reality and precisely is what each and every individual in the society agreed on. Each and every individual agreed on what Rawls termed as “one rational good”⁶²the rational good in which they agreed and abided to is being deemed necessary to be advanced.

Individuality of individuals is been commensurable to the notion of the common good. The common good is not the food of individuality but rather it is “*the supposed benefit of unionism*”⁶³. This then implies that individualistic consideration are not supposed to be acknowledged insofar as the notion of the common good within the social structure is concerned. What we need to take into consideration is the collective position that is, the position and the value of each and every individuals. For this to be realistic, we need to take into account justice principles that helps to provide models that will intend unite every individual within a given social structure. Members of the social structure have to be taken together as one. In this case one can argue that the value of Rawls in terms of the individuals and the society and in accordance to the social structure and the wellbeing of every individuals opposes to the view of the post-modernist. Postmodern thinkers mostly emphasis on the individual good as well as individual position. They do not believe on collective good neither do they believe on the social structure that englobes individuals for collective purpose. In this

⁶¹Rawls,J, *Social Unity and Primary Good, cited in Utilitarianism and Beyond* edited by AmartyaSen, Benard William, Cambridge Books online, Cambridge University Press, pp.159-186.

⁶²*Idem.*

⁶³ Rawls,J., *Justice As Fairness*, the Political Review, vol 67, No .2 (April 1958), pp. 164-194.

regard, Catherine Audard, one of the commentators of John Rawls affirms “let us conclude that Rawls’ position is consistently anti individualist”⁶⁴. The common good under normal and just circumstances has to put aside individual aspiration reason being that the real notion of the common good has to be guided by socially recognized public principles. In this case, it is evident that Rawls tries to eliminate subjective goal in view of encouraging inter subjective aspiration. What is been defined as the common good most socially be recognized in such a way that the notion of alterity must be approved. Worth-living consist in admitting other persons endeavors. John Rawls develops a holistic conception of the common good that is, his conception of the common good concerns the whole and not part unlike his conception of justice. In other words, the notion of the common good mentioned here is equally known as the notion of the universal good which at the same time is the integration of the good of every individual, that is, the relation of parts to the whole as well as to each other⁶⁵ conforming to the notion of the common good, guided by just principles is an aspect of realizing “a vision of a good society”⁶⁶a society that takes into consideration checks and balances, equilibrium between its individuals so as to avoid or exclude aspects of inequality. The principle of equality occupies an important place insofar as the notion of the primary good for all is concerned. This follows that all the social values and profit has to be shaded to each and every individual equally without any discrimination. When it comes to the benefit of the social good, there are no justifiable motives insofar as cases of social inequality are been detected. In this case, we need to practice the notion of social cohesion that will aim at mutual advantage or advantage among cooperative members.

The Veil of Ignorance and the Rejection of Individual Preferences

The veil of ignorance proposed by Rawls at the initial stage helps to fight against individualistic positions. Individuals or parties present at the initial stage and under this veil could not detect certain social

⁶⁴ Audard, C., *John Rawls: Philosophy Now*, p.106.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p.114.

⁶⁶ Rawls,J., *Collected Papers*, edited by Samuel Freeman, London, Harvard University Press, 1999, p.73.

positions. This incapability to detect certain position in the society favors the determination of just and collective principles since they are ignorant of where they themselves might fall. Decisions taken in this case are not egoistic or individualistic ones but rather those that at to serve the purpose of the society as a whole. Reason why Rawls clearly points out that “no one knows his place in society, his class, position or social status...the persons in the original position have no information as to which generation they belong”⁶⁷. It is thanks to the veil of ignorance that the model of justice as fairness is been established. The value of justice in this case helps to ensure reconciliation between interests. In this case, the tension that arises between the individual and the society is being overcome. One can argue in this light that the Rawlsian veil of ignorance serves as an anti-individualistic tool. Anti-individualistic because individuals who are supposed to take decisions that will govern each and every one including themselves are been veiled from having the knowledge of certain existing positions that might interfere in their decision making. Decisions that are been taken insofar as social principles are concerned is to serve the purpose for social cooperation. However, “there is no way for him to win special advantages for himself”⁶⁸ individuals who are participants could equally be considered as being mutually disinterested. Their advantage is neither to the disadvantage of others nor their disadvantage to the advantage of others. Thom Brooks and Fabian Freyenhagen overs:

In the original position, people will be represented by parties who are rational mutually disinterested while behind the veil of ignorance meaning that they only have access to the uncontroversial findings of sciences and common sense but not to knowledge about the social positions, sex or conception of the good of those they are representing...a society that will be govern by this principles is called by Rawls “a well ordered society”⁶⁹

The veil of ignorance is an aspect of denial of individualistic circumstances that seems common

within hypermodern societies. These individuals might still be self- interested but what can definitely obstruct them is the lack of information on collective values. It serves as an appropriate restriction for individual secondary aims that might arise contrarily to the postulated collective decisions that will serve the common good for each and every individual. Although parties concerned have the conception of the good but unfortunately they do not know really their conception of the good due to the fact that there are veils from knowing it so as to resolve the problems of social inequalities. The veil offers certain restriction concerning the taking of decision of justice. If we might accept with the views of Plato according to which justice is the fundamental element of an ideal society, Rawls according to which it is the first virtue of social institutions and Aquinas as the mother of all virtues, then it is obvious that its decisions should be taken within a lot of carefulness and strictness. Following the views in regard to the veil of ignorance it is certain that through it we can avoid individualistic premises or preferences which are antithetical to the collective good. Hence, Rawls proposal of social justice principles is fundamentally remarkable and if apply can restore the present generation from hypermodern beliefs systems. The veil of ignorance permits us to realize decisions that can serve the purpose of the common good. Through the veil of ignorance one can argue on the fact that individual preferences are been negated. Their preferences that can service their proper individuality at the detriment of the collectivity are been alienated since the veil of ignorance acts as a shelter or barrier or an obstacle for them to perceive where their various individual preferences can be situated within their social context in short we can note the fact that participative individual are ignorant of what they might have preferred for their own proper individual interest.

Conclusion

The main problem of this research was to examine the relevance of Rawls theory of social justice in reconciling the individual and the society within the hypermodern context. Specifically Rawls proposed a theory of social justice as a means of integrating the individuals and the society within the liberal system. This is in view of overcoming a long debate that surrounds the concept of the individuals and the society. In the course of resolving this, we can see

⁶⁷ Rawls J., *A Theory of Justice*, p.108.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p.130.

⁶⁹ Brooks, T and Freyenhagen, F., *The Legacy of John Rawls*, p.3.

clearly what Rawls theory of justice is all about first of all and finally the role it play in the conception of ensuring an interdependence between the individuals or the society. John Rawls reflections on the sociopolitical pressing issues of his epoch was been sparked by major challenges that dominated most western societies for instance like the crisis of individualism, subjectivism, relativism and the most renounce American notion of private life. This conception of John Rawls greatly inspired later philosophers who later share the same view. The individual and the society are not mutually exclusive thus an inseparable fact. They are sides of the same coin which justify the recent interaction between the individual and the social environment. Following the author's perspective, adopting the spirit of solidarity and social justice principles, will play an important role in reshaping western hypermodern mentalities in particular and the world at large. Solidarity does not entail racial discrimination but rather it encourages the harmonious living together of individuals with different world views or individuals of different races, culture and identity. This refers to as what Charles Robert Dimi terms as "l'universalisation de la Solidarite. Justice serves therefore as a path towards fair governance which takes into account the freedom and the equality of the members of the society. It helps to lay a foundation for an egalitarian society. The political conception of justice will help to combat individual's proper self- interest, egoism and exploitation of others through it principle of equality and equal opportunity. This will be essential in promoting a kind of egalitarian society that will be interested and focus in ensuring the common good of each and every individual.

References

Audard, C And Boudon R..., *Individu et Justice Sociale: Author de John Rawls*, Preface de Francois Terre, Paris, editions du Seuil, April 1988

AnayetHussen, F.M. and Korban Ali, M D., *The Relations Between Individual and Society*, Department of Philosophy, University of Chittagong, Bangladesh, Open Journal of Social Sciences, 2014, 2, pp.130-137.

Bentz, S and Ines Gomez Chalon, M., *European Identity. Individual, Group and Society*,

Bilbas, University of Deusto,2003

Brown, E., *Rawls and The Duty of Civility*, in Locations of the Political, ed .S. Gorman, Vienna, IWN Junior Visiting Fellows Conferences ,Vol.15, 2003, pp. 1-18.

Rawls, J., *Collected Papers*, edited by Samuel Freeman, London, Harvard University Press, 1999

Justice et Democratie, trad. par Catherine Audard, Paris, Seuil, 2009

Social Unity and Primary Good, edited by Amartyasen, Cambridge Books Online, Cambridge University Press, 2014

Political Liberalism, Expanded edition, New York, Columbian University Press, 2005

The Law of The Peoples, London, Harvard University Press, 2000

A Theory of Justice, Revised Edition, London, Harvard University Press, 1999

Justice as Fairness: A Restatement, London, Harvard University Press, 2001

Justice as Fairness, The Philosophical Review, vol.67, No. 2 (April 1958), pp.164-194.

Sen, Benard William, Cambridge Books online, Cambridge University Press, pp.159-186.

Shaun Moss, *Practical Metaphysics*, Australia, Melbourne, 2009

Perelman, M., *Manufacturing Discontent*, London, Pluto Press, 2005

Jiewuh Song, *Justice and Cooperation*, Rywichi Yamaoka and Anonymous Reviewers Journal, The National Foundation of Korea, (2017), pp.263-290.

Honneth, A., *The Critique of Power: Reflective Stages in a Critical Social Theory*, translated by Kenneth Baynes, London, MIT Press, 1993

Wayne Proudfoot, *Rawls on The Individual and the Social*, Blackwell publishing Ltd on Behalf of Journal of Religious Ethics, Inc, the Journal of Religious Ethics, vol. 2, No. 2 (Fall, 1974), pp. 107-128,
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40017752>, this Content Downloaded From 154.72.169.175 On Tue, 01 Sep 2020 11:08:57 UTC.

Seymour, M., *Rawls et Le Driot Des Peuple*, (A Paraitre Dans Philosophiques), Departement de Philosophie, Universite de Montreal, an

- article of Journal Philosophiques, vol. 26, Issue 1, Printemps 1999, pp.109-137.
- Pogge, T., *Do Rawls Two Theories of Justice Fit Together ?*, Resarch Gate in Health Impact Fund View Project, Feb.2008, Uploaded by ThomassPogge, 2018, Yale University
- Veronique Munoz-Darde, *La Justice Sociale; Le Liberalisme Egalitaire De John Rawls, Ouvrage Publie Surs La Direction de Francois de Singly, Nathan, Arman Colin, 2000*
- Sam Purnadutte, *Rawls Theory of Justice; an Analysis, Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, vol.24, Issue.4, Ver.1, April.2017, Shillong, North Eastern Hill University, pp.40-43.*
- ris, Bibliothèque Baudoyep, PUF, 1993
- Dhayal Shankar Srivastav, *Rawls Theory of Justice Through Amartyasen's Ideas, ILI Law Review, LL.M (Forth Semester), Indian Law Institute, New Delhi, Winter Issue, 201*
- Lister, A., *Justice as Fairness and Reciprocity, Analyse and Kritik, 01, 2011, (Lucius, and Stuttgart), S, pp.93-112*
- Pogge, T., *John Rawls: His Life and Theory of Justice, New York, Oxford University Press, 2007*
- Palante, G., *Anarchism and Individualism, La Sensibilite Individualiste, Paris, Avan , 1909*
- Laurent, A., *Histoire de L'individualisme, Ville de Pa*