

Chapter 11- Two principles of Justice, page no 53

"These principles primarily apply, as I have said, to the basic structure of society and govern the assignment of rights and duties and regulate the distribution of social and economic advantages. Their formulation presupposes that, for the purposes of a theory of justice, the social structure may be viewed as having two more or less distinct parts, the first principle applying to the one, the second principle to the other. Thus we distinguish between the aspects of the social system that define and secure the equal basic liberties and the aspects that specify and establish social and economic inequalities. Now it is essential to observe that the basic liberties are given by a list of such liberties. Important among these are political liberty (the right to vote and to hold public office) and freedom of speech and assembly; liberty of conscience and freedom of thought; freedom of the person, which includes freedom from psychological oppression and physical assault and dismemberment (integrity of the person); the right to hold personal property and freedom from arbitrary arrest and seizure as defined by the concept of the rule of law. These liberties are to be equal by the first principle."

According to Rawls' first principle, "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". I wanted to add marriage equality to the above mentioned freedoms. However, <sup>for</sup> my argument of marriage equality ~~does not only~~ <sup>not only</sup> extend <sup>to</sup> ~~the~~ LGBTQ community but also to more than two individuals irrespective of their sexual orientation or sex. I think marriage as an institution should not be restricted to only two people in a heterosexual or homosexual relationship. I think that if three, four, five or even more people <sup>who</sup> have a common understanding and <sup>a</sup> romantic relationship amongst each other, ~~they~~ <sup>they</sup> should be allowed to enter into a multi-party marriage. It is essentially, <sup>a</sup> set of individuals who have decided to spend the rest of their lives together. ~~The society~~ <sup>be</sup> should allow <sup>to</sup> ~~them~~ <sup>to</sup> enter into a marriage which ~~not only~~ <sup>not only</sup> includes sharing of income and property, but also inheritance and tax.

Please say at slide # 17

Great addition! Stephen Macedo, a theorist at Princeton, just came out this year with a book in which he argues against your position, but that position (yours) is nevertheless hard to refute. Perhaps one could argue (arg)

that if a multiple-person marriage harmed some of the individuals in it (one or more "wives," for example), then no-one would choose this principle in the original position for fear of being one of those harmed. But this argument would have to rest on a presumption of harm.

→ Rawls is deontological. Priority of the right over good.  
→ Rousseau. Rawls was free and liberal.  
Lexical priority is more important.

\* National origin is as arbitrary as social class. Original Position

\* ~~There~~ *thin*