

John Rawls' Theory of Cosmopolitan Justice and the Right to Recognition of Peoples

Kamel DOUIBI ¹, Soumia KHOUDRI ²

¹Human Sciences Research Unit for Philosophical, Social, and Human Studies,
University of Oran 2, Algeria

douibi.kamel@gmail.com

²Laboratory for the Dialogue of Civilizations and Globalization, University of
Batna 1 Hadj Lakhder, Algeria

khoudri1983@gmail.com

Received: 15/07/2024,

Accepted: 27/11/2024,

Published: 25/12/2024

ABSTRACT: *This study is concerned with the theory of justice as a philosophical problem and a human requirement, researchers in the political and moral field have worked hard to research it, and we have highlighted the theory of justice presented by the American philosopher John Rawls as an alternative to the shortcomings of the classical theory of utilitarianism, as it caused intellectual and philosophical controversy and different points of view between supporters, opponents and critics, which prompted him to revise, modify and reformulate justice as fairness in order to apply a new realistic culture that addresses individuals and invites them to build a modern democratic society, aimed at achieving cohesion and consensus socialists to move it from localism to universalism to political liberalism.*

Keywords: *theory of justice, justice as fairness, John Rawls, utilitarianism, political liberalism.*

المخلص: تهتم هذه الدراسة بنظرية العدالة كإشكالية فلسفية ومطلب إنساني، اجتهد الباحثون في الحقل السياسي والأخلاقي بالبحث فيها، وقد سلطنا الضوء على نظرية العدالة التي تقدم بها الفيلسوف الأمريكي جون رولز كبديل لقصور النظرية الكلاسيكية لمذهب المنفعة، حيث أحدثت جدلا فكريا وفلسفيا ووجهات نظر مختلفة بين مؤيد ومعارض وناقد مما دفعه إلى تنقيحها وتعديلها وإعادة صياغتها للعدالة كإنصاف من أجل تطبيق ثقافة واقعية جديدة تخاطب الأفراد وتدعوهم إلى بناء مجتمع ديمقراطي حديث، هدفها تحقيق تماسك وتوافق اجتماعيين لينقلها من المحلية إلى الكونية إلى الليبرالية السياسية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: نظرية العدالة، العدالة كإنصاف، جون رولز، مذهب المنفعة، الليبرالية السياسية.

Introduction

If we delve into the narratives of what ought to be, we find that the issue of justice is one of the most significant issues raised by the human mind. It is considered both a moral virtue and a human value that has imposed itself on the philosophical and political debate and all fields of knowledge since its Platonic proposition in various Socratic dialogues up to our present time. Researchers have spilled much ink in books and journals to study this matter. Among the most prominent figures in contemporary Western philosophical, political, and liberal thought is the American thinker John Rawls, who introduced a new turn in political philosophy with his theory of justice, after years of dominance by the philosophy of science. Since 1971, following the publication of his book "A Theory of Justice," writers have expressed their opinions, both for and against, as this theory brought about a renewal in human thought as a whole.

Based on the above, a series of questions can be posed to identify the key points that this study will address, namely:

- What is the essence of justice according to Rawls?
- What is his stance on it?
- How did he employ it as a moral and political concept?
- What are the main intellectual references from which he drew his theory?
- How did the other side respond to it, with acceptance or rejection?

To answer these questions, we follow the analytical method by tracing the sources of his ideas and explaining the features and foundations of his theory.

As for the goals, Rawls aims to implement a new realistic culture that seeks to achieve social harmony and consensus.

John Rawls and his pioneering theory of justice as equity

A. John Rawls:

He is a well-deserved philosopher of ethics and politics. He was born (February 21, 1921 – died November 24, 2002) in Baltimore, Maryland. In 1939, he joined Princeton University to study philosophy

due to his passion and passion for it and its issues, but he was interrupted for a good period due to the outbreak of World War II, and in 1946 he returned to the field of study to work on his doctoral thesis that he discussed in 1950 on the subject of moral justifications. However, his political orientation and the control of the idea of justice on his mind made him change his course towards it as a student, analyst and discussant of this issue from its various aspects economically, socially and politically, and that began with his residence at the universities of Oxford, then Cornell and Harvard, where he ended his university career and retired in 1995, in 1971 Rawls put his valuable ideas in the most important book known to mankind, entitled *The Theory of Justice*, and it was very popular, especially in United States in particular. And that this theory will change the course of human thinking and modify his view of the other individually and collectively in the framework of injustice and racial discrimination that was prevalent, and therefore Frolz presented his theory in a distinct framework for the development of moral and political thinking in the Anglo-Saxon world by trying to revive the idea of the social contract and the intellectual heritage of John Locke, Rousseau and Kant, as he linked two opposing traditions in understanding and construction that they are Kant and John Stuart Mill, his theory of justice has reached between them and made them meet . (Jacqueline Ross, 2001, p. 103) and his books also include the law of peoples, political liberalism, justice as fairness.

B. Justice as equity:

Get up John Rawls Reviving the theory of the social contract after he noticed and realized the danger of utilitarian thought and its impact on increasing and deepening inequality and the spread of injustice among people He declared: "My aim is to present the conception of justice by imposing the generalization and elevation of abstraction of the famous social contract theory as found in the works of Jean-Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Kant..." (John Rawls, 2017, p. 38)•However, the Rolzi social contract It was imaginary. default it is It is a socio-philosophical, moral hypothesis, which is What he calls Also in fairness, which means the situation of people In a circle of the elementary equality that A sentence of Common principles and agreed without reservation, because Fairness in the end leads to the

simple condition in which rational beings are treated equally by returning to their human nature by themselves, that is, they are completely devoid of all differences, interests and circumstantial and acquired contradictions, this situation is what allows rational beings to agree on the principles of justice that they choose unanimously. (Abdelkader Pleman, also takes many forms, but the main point requires taking into account the interests and concerns of others. (John Rawls, p. 250)

Therefore, the theory of justice in essence, it is built. On equity as an idea of central importance where the relationships of individuals with each other or with the group are formed by this relationship which Human society cannot abandon it, as it is one of the most important virtues and moral values. (Ahmed Jamal Al-Zahir, 1988, p. 172) Thus, its lofty goal seeks to achieve a just society that guarantees its members freedom and equality, so that the fair limits of cooperation are agreed upon by the citizens themselves.

The concept of justice as equity differs from the many diverse concepts of justice, especially the moral concept and the utilitarian concept, because from his perspective: "It is a political concept of the basic structure of a modern democratic society" and this means that it is linked to the basic structure of a democratic society, making it linked to politics and not to philosophy or ethics in the transcendent sense. (John Rawls, p. 105)

The reference of justice and the criticism of the doctrine of utility in the thought of John Rawls

A. On what justice is according to Rawls:

The problem of justice when Rawls is based on social institutions posed by the social situation, it is not a hypothesis but a stand-alone problem linked to the conditions of life of individuals and institutions where he says: "Justice is the basic virtue for social institutions, such as the truth for intellectual systems", and therefore Rowls tends to search for practical effective application procedures in order to reach organizational formulas for individuals in light of an organized and urgent society that here moves from The first is based on the fact that individuals are free and equal and the second is based on the obstacles and risks required by a life of coexistence, that is, distributive justice is the focus of the theory of Rowleian justice, which can only be achieved by institutions, taking into account that the base

structure is fair, so he proceeded to present his theory by proposing the hypothesis of the original situation and the veil of ignorance as (John Rawls, 1987et1997, p. 29)basis To build his theory.

B.Criticism of utilitarianism:

To understand Rawls's theory of justice, it requires an understanding of utilitarian philosophy, especially since he wanted to offer an alternative to it to justify the principles of liberalism, so he opposed all the perceptions of this philosophy during the crystallization of his conception of social justice, saying: "I wanted to reach a conception of justice that offers a reasonable systemic alternative to doctrine. The utilitarian who Prevailed in a way Or another For a long time in the Anglo-Saxon tradition of thinking The politician and the reason The main one that pushes me to find such an alternative is weakness As I think In utilitarian doctrine as the basis of constitutional democratic institutions, in particular, I do not believe that utilitarianism can provide a satisfactory explanation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens as free and equal individuals." (John Rawls, p. 12)

The utilitarian thought in Rawls's view is not suitable to be a criterion for social justice because this theory takes into account the losses of individuals, it sacrifices the rights of minorities, in order to achieve the so-called general welfare, and does not take into account fundamental freedoms and rights and does not provide sufficient guarantee of freedom, which contradicts the basic principles of the Rolls theory based on the need for all individuals to enjoy their fundamental freedoms on an equal footing as well as inequality (difference) that serves the less fortunate groups within human society, and what Negroes lived. Africa in a United States of injustice, arbitrariness and racial discrimination by whites is the greatest proof of the selfishness and corruption of utilitarian thought: "Throughout his career and mature experience, John Rawls has been aware of the profound injustice that Americans have inflicted on Africans and their descendants over successive generations." (Johnston 2012, p. 236)

Rawls focused on the most important shortcomings and negative perceptions that utilitarian thought has established in societies, as mentioned above, so he worked on his criticism from the most prominent

aspects in order to provide an alternative, saying: "My goal is to find a theory of justice that represents an alternative to utilitarian thought in general, and therefore to all the different derivations of it. So the mistake that utilitarianism fell into in Rawls's view is that it applies it to society the same logic that it applied to the individual and therefore it is not individualistic in this respect, and he emphasized this in saying: "But utilitarianism is not individual, at least when we reach the natural course of thinking that by integrating all systems of desires, it applies to society the principle of one-choice and because utilitarianism sees the individual as merely a means to a larger end, which is society as a whole. This is what Rawls rejects and considers a breach of social justice, in which he presented several theories that are well explained and clarified to show the political perception of them, which is more acceptable to determine equitable formulas for cooperation between citizens who are considered free and equal. Here we find the Kantian view of Rawls, which leads him to highlight the gaps of the utilitarian doctrine more in his principle that he dealt with every person in society in terms of an end and not just (John Rawls, p. 51) (John Rawls, p. 59) A means and therefore The proponents of utilitarianism, whose methodological principle is more harmful than useful, especially since the idea of maximum satisfaction may contain other formulations and concepts such as the dimensions of freedom and culture... In fact, utilitarianism is an optional doctrine that proceeds from facts, while Rawls looks at something tribal, "Justice can only be applied in a particular group of people because its primary material is the basic structure of society, the way in which the main social institutions distribute basic rights and duties and determine the division of benefits resulting from social partnership. (Jacqueline Ross, 2001, p. 98)

In contrast to John Rawls' criticisms of utilitarians, he was also not spared their criticisms, which had a positive role in modifying and developing his way of thinking, especially in his recent writings: "We will be pleased if the followers of utilitarianism were able to find in their own view a way to acknowledge the ideas and principles of justice as fairness, because by doing so they can participate in the intertwined consensus on that principle. If the above remarks do not mean a critique of utilitarianism as a universal doctrine, and justice as equity in terms of a political concept of justice avoids such criticism where possible, yet we

must insist that justice as equity is not in itself utilitarian." (Rawls, 2009, pp. 249-250)

John Rawls' important ideas on justice theory

Introducing the concept of "original status" and "curtain of ignorance" as an intellectual experiment to define the principles of justice, Rawls proposed that in order to create a just society, individuals must choose themselves in an original position of equality, behind the "curtain of ignorance" that obscures their personal traits (such as wealth, talents, or social status). This ensures that the principles of justice are established without prejudice.

-Native modelIt is a fictional hypothesis in which the parties concerned do not know their selves and personal interests, where free people come together to choose the rules and principles that should guide the structure of society, especially the distribution of basic goods (rights, freedoms, wealth... "We must envision those who are involved in a social partnership, chose, in one common act, principles that will allocate fundamental rights and duties and determine the division of social benefits," he declares. (John Rawls, 1993, p. 39)

This hypothesis imagined by Rawls corresponds to the state of nature developed by the philosophers of the social contract, but he disagrees with them in that he cares about justice while the owners of the social contract are concerned with security, which serves to determine the laws that serve to give rise to principles of justice. This idea represents A hypothetical case carried out by a group of rational, free and equal persons, some of whom are not allowed to enjoy privileges at the expense of others in addition to having the ability to rationally calculate the instrument for their benefit and their common good among themselves reasonably and fairly, the latter according to Rawls does not mean that it is equal to justice, but its meaning is deeper than its appearance because it seeks to place people within a framework of primary equality that must be shared principles agreed upon without reservation, that is, "fairness devolves Ultimately to the simple condition in which rational beings are treated equally, returning to their human nature..... This is a situation that allows rational beings to agree on the principles of justice of their overall choice. on (Belaman, 2017, p. 250).

The veil of ignorance: The hypothesis of the original situation depicted by Rawls does not differ with the veil of ignorance, but rather coincides with it, as in the case of this veil everyone is ignorant of his own status in society and also ignorant of his natural qualifications so that there is no bias for their own interests, the totality of what they know about themselves is that they are human regardless of the rest of the other information such as name, gender, creed or color... They are also ignorant of the number of benefits that they will take and that will eventually benefit them without their knowledge, and they do not know their intelligence abilities nor their strength nor their own circumstances. The latter, which means Rawls' social, economic and political conditions, and therefore this veil rids individuals of their concerns that keep them away from the development of laws and principles that achieve them social justice, they are equal.

It was the total neutrality to which the negotiators committed itself was the goal that made Rawls put on the veil of ignorance and so they would put forward the principles of justice that is equal for all and Individuals in this hypothetical situation are tasked with determining the rules of the society that should be created without prior knowledge of their social status, and the veil of ignorance, according to Rawls, makes a unified choice of a distinctive conception of justice possible. (Dougherty, pp. 207-208)

The principles of fairness of the basic structure of a society are the object or object of the original agreement, the principles that will be accepted by free and rational people, who are concerned with their self-interest, are to establish principles of equality as defining the basic conditions that bind them and these principles must regulate all other conventions," Rawls says. (John Rawls, 1993, pp. 38-39)

So, John Rawls considers the veil of ignorance a necessary and essential condition in the process of cooperation between people who have come together to arrive at the principles of justice. He put forward the hypothesis that Partners are behind the veil of ignorance. They do not know anything about their private lives, so as not to appeal to emotional tendencies or biases and do not know how different possibilities affect their own situation, to be forced accordingly to imagine the principles of

work on a general basis, no one knows what befalls him from the distribution of natural fortunes and psychological abilities of strength, intelligence and genius... And everyone is ignorant of the meaning that he gives to the good and ignorant of the content of his own rational project in life, and ignorant of the special features of his psychology, motives and hopes, and therefore the veil of ignorance will remove all the differences between the negotiators, and perhaps this is what made Rawls Confirm To negotiate in an atmosphere of neutrality between people so that principles of justice are designed to suit their situation, but these negotiators, in Rawls' view, "can put the doctrine of utility on the table, but soon they will reject it, needing that this doctrine allows the oppression of some for the welfare of the majority." John Rawls' view of society as a fair system of cooperation between free and equal citizens prompted him to establish principles of justice through which these citizens seek to achieve their interests by agreement and consensus, and in this regard proceeds from the following question "What are the principles of justice most appropriate for the designation of fundamental rights and for the regulation of phenomena except social and economic equality in the public views of citizens for a full lifetime", the Rawls theory has combined mental and moral rules, as it relied on reason as a feature are fundamental, especially since its principles are reasonable and not rational (Anthony DeCrespinne and Kenneth Menogriya, 1996, p. 142).

Principles and Objectives of Rawls Justice

The theory of justice has always aimed to address the deviations reached by political liberalism, the distortions that have affected liberal democracy, and the set of dangers that surround and lurk political modernity in our contemporary world, and its repercussions may not be hidden, as they are visible to all, especially the dissolution and disintegration of social ties, the spread of selfishness, the tyranny of individualism and the inflation of freedom at the expense of equality... All of them made the path of political liberalism surrounded by many dangers, so he urged Rawls to achieve the social dimension, so he based his construction of the principles of justice on two main principles that he reformulated during his review of the theory of justice, but it must be

emphasized that his goal, whether in the first or second formulation, is to develop principles on which the legislative, economic, social and educational institutions are based, and not to determine good from evil, because the subject of justice when Rawls is more political than moral and familiar with the theory of The question that comes to his mind is: to what extent can this theory be realized on a factual and objective level? These principles took the following form:

- a) Everyone has the same and irrevocable right to a demarcation of sufficient equal fundamental freedoms, which is consistent with the same system of freedoms for all." (Rawls, p. 148)
- b) The phenomena of social and economic equality must meet two conditions: first, inequality must relate to jobs and positions that are open to all in conditions of equal opportunities, and second, inequalities must be in the greatest interest of the members of society who are the least in status (this is the principle of difference)." (Rawls, p. 148)

Accordingly, Rawls prioritizes the first principle over the second, as the first relates to constitutional issues and fundamental freedoms such as freedom of expression and thought. The second is related to equity of opportunity and the management of inequalities that fall within the scope of distributive justice.

a) The principle of freedom: This principle guarantees the fundamental freedoms of individuals community, and this What John Rawls reads in Say:" The first principle simply requires that certain types of Rules, those that defines freedoms basic, that shall apply to every person equally and shall allow for a maximum broad freedom compatible with a similar freedom for all", meaning all political freedoms. (John Rawls, 1993, p. 97)Such as election, freedom In property Personality, ascending Positions of responsibility, freedom of thought and expression... etc

Rawls has given priority to this principle over the second, and this is due to the importance of equal freedom, its moral status over the principle of disparity in the distribution of economic benefits and centers of power, without neglecting justice, with his constant emphasis on the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms, and this priority did not come out of

nowhere, especially since this principle achieves that balance between the abolition of the trade-off between fundamental rights and freedoms that involve under The first principle and the social and economic interests arranged by the principle of difference . All this confirms that Rollzian justice in essence is based on the idea of creating a kind of balance between individual freedom and equality, the latter is the balance by which the weight is measured and determined, while freedom represents the second hand, in which all fundamental rights and freedoms are placed and thus occupy the first place and have absolute value compared to the rest of the economic and social rights and freedoms, and thus achieve a just democratic society that achieves for itself a good organization.

Perhaps this is why Rawls made fundamental rights and freedoms an issue that cannot be negotiated or waived in any form, because they are linked to human dignity as the essence of the human being.

b) The principle of inequality: This principle stipulates difference or inequality, which says that all types of economic and social differences must be accepted, and this is what it stipulates in his saying: "Situations of economic and social inequality must be arranged where they are:

- Reasonably expected as being for the benefit of each person.
- Access to positions and positions should be open to all", and (John Rawls, 1993, p. 92)meaning According to Rawls, everyone should take advantage of the same opportunities to access the various jobs and social situations that benefit his neighbor, or what is known as the principle of equal opportunities.

This principle, which is marked with the second, contains what Rolls calls the liberal principle of fair equality, so the principle of differencein the power to control and control the most important aspects of human life of social and economic inequality as the backbone of the life process has worked through this principle to settle social and economic disparities where the greatest benefit to the least benefit of wealth.

Thus, in Rawls's view, the former two principles constitute a basis for equity, since they prevent the use of natural talents and social conditions as a privilege for political and social privilege, that is, they are principles

that prevent natural inequality in order to build an original position of equality, equality in fundamental freedoms from which also derive forms of social disparities, differences and differences that do not harm the less fortunate in society. They are principles whose selection takes place in a situation where everyone is deprived of information that establishes prejudices. The latter principle is due to the Italian thinker Pareto, a principle related to the economic system.

The implication of this principle is that an economic system is effective if it cannot be modified in such a way that such adjustment improves the conditions of some, at least one individual, without further deteriorating the conditions of others, even if it is one individual. It harms the circumstances of others, but this latter meaning is not related to the principle of effectiveness as formulated by Pareto, but rather to Rolzi's modification of it. (Ahmed Al-Sadiqi, 2013, p. 56),

These principles apply to duties and rights, and determine the distribution of economic and social privileges. In the perspective of justice theory, the social structure is divided into two almost distinct parts, with the first principle logically referring to the second and the second logically. Thus, a distinction is made between aspects of the social system that guarantee equality of fundamental freedoms for everyone and manifestations that evaluate social and economic inequalities. It is essential to note that it is possible to create a list of fundamental freedoms, among which the most important are political freedoms such as the right to vote, the holding of public office, freedom of expression, assembly, freedom of thought and awareness, freedom of the person, which includes protection from psychological pressure and physical torture, protection against arbitrary arrest and detention, the right to personal property, etc.

That all are equal according to the first principle. This means that infringement of the fundamental freedoms protected by the former principle can never be justified, nor can it be replaced by the economic and social privileges of the greater number.

The Deontological character and the argument that right takes precedence over good according to Rawls

In his theory of justice, John Rawls prioritizes right over good, meaning that, according to him, the principles of justice should come before the pursuit of welfare and the common good. It is the opposite of utilitarians who proceed from goodness, well-being and benefit.

The right has been considered complementary to the good, despite the precedence of the first over the second, especially since people differ in their professions for what benefits and what harms or what brings them happiness, but they will not differ in what is justice and what is injustice, especially since this view is glorified by man since time immemorial and he seeks to preserve it, which indicates that justice is a comprehensive concept while the concept of good is special, because justice is a means by which other values are weighed. It is on one side and the rest of the values on the other where it always prevails, and then it is the value of values and the criterion that also reconciles conflicting values with different perceptions of goodness.

It also means that in designing society and developing public policies, priority must be given to achieving justice and fundamental guarantees for the individual. In other words, even if a particular policy can increase public welfare or achieve good, if it causes a violation of fundamental rights or unfairly increases social disparities, that policy must be unacceptable from Rawls' perspective.

The principle of prioritizing right over good is reflected in his concept of justice, where Rawls makes sure that individual rights and fundamental freedoms must be fundamentally protected and that social disparities must be justified on the ground and in accordance with the principle of difference, even at the expense of increasing the common good. This approach aims to ensure that society is built on the basis of justice before any other considerations.

The primacy of right over good refers to a concept that gives preference to protecting the fundamental rights and personal freedoms of the individual over the achievement of the common good or collective benefit. This concept reflects the importance of preserving the rights and

fundamental guarantees of the individual without sacrificing them for the sake of achieving a collective interest or increasing public welfare.

There is a great difference in defining what justice is from the good, and the latter is defined as "the thing that magnifies the good" (John Rawls, 1993, p. 153) and with a kind of precision between institutions and actions that make the available alternatives right to produce the greater good or with an equal amount of good relative to the institutions and actions that exist as real possibilities.

In his theory, Rawls strongly defends the primacy of justice because it is an essential element that he later called political liberalism: societies are known to be fair and not benevolent.

Rawls's critical presentation of the liberal conception of justice

The theory of Rawls justice has taken a great deal of attention and in all fields, especially philosophical and political, its author is a philosopher and a seasoned politician and being also the necessary intellectual background for its students in political justice, which they sought to develop later through what Rawls wrote in the first formulation Theory of Justice or Justice as Fairness Reformulate, which later became the center stage in Western philosophy, so All that Rawls served in his theory was the methodological tools of analytic philosophy, epistemology, language philosophy, and even the productions of the social sciences and classical social contract theory, which he employed in a new way according to the Rawls contract as the first strategy of justice theory. The principles of justice also contributed to the equitable reconfiguration of basic social and political institutions, with all citizens agreeing on a single view from a hypothetical perspective called the original situation, which is different from the normal situation in Hobbes' philosophy. Although it He was a prominent liberal philosopher, making many points that reflected his reservation and critique of the liberal conception of justice. Among these points are:

a) *The fate of social justice:* In his book "The Theory of Justice", Rawls proved that classical liberalism does not contain that strong concept of social justice, liberals agree on individual freedom and fundamental rights, but they do not have adequate solutions to the problems of

economic and social disparities that have left many negatives such as exploitation, the spread of class, the increase in poverty, and the spread of injustice.

b) Advantages of the wealthy: Liberals have obtained wealth and power economically and socially, which has led to an increase in class and the spread of poverty among the public, meaning that the rich have gotten richer and the poor have become poorer, this is a cause of concern for Rawls and is consistent with his principle of justice, the principle of difference, which demands that economic differences be in favor of the weakest in society.

c) The control of social institutions by the powerful: Rawls criticized liberals on this point as well because the rich would take all the wealth and leave nothing to the less fortunate, prompting critics to assert that this could empower economic and social forces and undermine the principles of justice.

d) Gender discrimination: Rawls stresses the importance of gender discrimination in justice, meaning that individual differences of people must be taken into account when determining the principles of justice, so some believe that classical liberalism does not adequately deal with discrimination and individual circumstances.

e) Protecting minority rights: Rawls stressed the importance of protecting minority rights in society, arguing that a liberal conception could fail to achieve this goal if minority rights were not well protected.

In general, it can be argued that Rawls's critique of the liberal conception is based on his vision of justice as outlined in the concept of the principle of difference, which makes attention to social and economic differences and improving the conditions of the most fortunate in society one of the goals and priorities of justice.

Rawls's goal in his theory of justice as well as his political liberalism remains the possibility of a stable and just society in which all citizens live in peace according to constitutional democratic principles and a political conception of a society that will be embodied in a society that guarantees the good of its citizens in the sense that it is "able to survive

through time and to ensure the support of its citizens who remain divided because of their religious, philosophical and moral doctrines"

(John Rawls, 1993, p. 133)

Conclusions

Rawls's theory of justice is a unique theory, especially since it has taken the character of universality and totalitarianism, in addition to its nature, the essence of which includes the culmination of contractual philosophies, and therefore he emphasizes that the main goal of his theory is not metaphysics or epistemology, but rather a practical goal in the first place, pointing out that it does not present itself as a correct perception, but as a basis for a conscious and voluntary political consensus between free citizens and equals, and it is characterized by depth Rawls' goal behind this theory remains to resurrect hope in political liberalism and to create a kind of balance between freedoms, rights and duties in order to achieve justice again, which no matter how the ages, mentalities and philosophical tendencies change, it remains the demand of all peoples.

However, this article cannot surround all its aspects and objectives, but what has been reviewed confirms that it is a theory with political visions that can be achieved in liberal societies with democratic traditions, and despite the studies carried out on this theory in the Arab world and internationally, it is still open to other studies in the future. John Rawls's work on justice theory has greatly influenced the philosophy of politics, the themes of social and distributive justice, and the role government should play in promoting a just society. His ideas continue to be studied and widely debated in contemporary political and moral philosophy.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Algerian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research MESRS, for their financial aid and technical support.

References

- Thoreau, Henry David. 2016. "Walking." In *The Making of the American Essay*, edited by John D'Agata, pp. 195–167. Minneapolis: Graywolf Press.

-
- Sadeghi, Ahmed. 2013. *A Critical Analytical Reading of John Rawls' The Theory of Justice*. Rabat: Arab Scientific Center for Research and Human Studies.
 - Al-Zahir, Ahmed Jamal. 1988. *Studies in Political Philosophy*. Irbid, Jordan: Al Kindi Library for Publishing and Distribution.
 - Deckerspenny, Anthony, & Minogue, Kenneth. 1996. *Flags of Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Translated by Nassar Abdel Allah. Egypt: Publications of the Egyptian General Book Authority.
 - Ross, Jacqueline. 2001. *Contemporary Ethical Thought*. Translated by Adel Al-Awa. Lebanon: Oueidat Publishing and Printing.
 - Dorthy, Jean-François. 2009. *The Philosophies of Our Time: Their Currents, Doctrines, Flags, and Issues*. Translated by Ibrahim Sahraoui. Algeria and Beirut: Difference Publications, Arabic Science Publishers.
 - Rolls, John. 2017. *A Theory in Justice*. Syria: Publications of the Syrian General Book Authority, Ministry of Culture.
 - Rawls, John. 2009. *Justice as Equity, Vol. 1*. Edited by the Arabic Organization for Translation, translated by Haidar Haj Ismail. Lebanon.
 - Johnston, David. 2012. *A Brief History of Justice*. Translated by Mustafa Nasser. Kuwait: Publications of the National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters.
 - Bleman, Abdelkader. 2017. *The Mental Foundations of Politics*. Algeria: University Press Office.
 - Rawls, John. 1987 and 1997. *Theory of Justice*. Translated by D.-U. Audard. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
 - Rawls, John. 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.