

# Studying Social Inequality with Data Science

INFO 3370 / 5371  
Spring 2023

## Nozick and the Entitlement Theory of Justice

All page numbers refer to  
Nozick, Robert. 1974.  
*Anarchy, State, and Utopia*.  
Basic Books.

Why Nozick at all?

## Why Nozick at all?

“intellectual honesty demands that, occasionally at least, we go out of our way to confront strong arguments opposed to our views. How else are we to protect ourselves from continuing in error?”  
(p. x-xi)

# Wilt Chamberlain

Nozick p. 161

# Wilt Chamberlain

Nozick p. 161

- ▶ “Wilt Chamberlain is greatly in demand by basketball teams”

# Wilt Chamberlain

Nozick p. 161

- ▶ “Wilt Chamberlain is greatly in demand by basketball teams”
- ▶ “twenty-five cents...of each ticket of admission goes to him”

# Wilt Chamberlain

Nozick p. 161

- ▶ “Wilt Chamberlain is greatly in demand by basketball teams”
- ▶ “twenty-five cents...of each ticket of admission goes to him”
- ▶ “people cheerfully attend his team’s games...  
each time dropping a separate twenty-five cents...into a  
special box with Chamberlain’s name on it”

# Wilt Chamberlain

Nozick p. 161

- ▶ “Wilt Chamberlain is greatly in demand by basketball teams”
- ▶ “twenty-five cents...of each ticket of admission goes to him”
- ▶ “people cheerfully attend his team’s games...  
each time dropping a separate twenty-five cents...into a  
special box with Chamberlain’s name on it”
- ▶ “Wilt Chamberlain winds up with \$250,00...larger than  
anyone else”



Should there be a state at all?

Should there be a state at all?

1. a minimal state is justified

Should there be a state at all?

1. a minimal state is justified
2. a more extensive state is not

Should there be a state at all?

1. a minimal state is justified
2. a more extensive state is not

(at least, according to Nozick)

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

What if associations with different clients conflict?

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

What if associations with different clients conflict?

- ▶ Most powerful association would monopolize



# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

What if associations with different clients conflict?

- ▶ Most powerful association would monopolize
- ▶ Forbids others from operating

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

What if associations with different clients conflict?

- ▶ Most powerful association would monopolize
- ▶ Forbids others from operating

Can the monopoly leave non-subscribers unprotected?

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

What if associations with different clients conflict?

- ▶ Most powerful association would monopolize
- ▶ Forbids others from operating

Can the monopoly leave non-subscribers unprotected?

- ▶ No. Moral obligation to protect everyone

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

What if associations with different clients conflict?

- ▶ Most powerful association would monopolize
- ▶ Forbids others from operating

Can the monopoly leave non-subscribers unprotected?

- ▶ No. Moral obligation to protect everyone

At this point, we have a **minimal state**

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

What if associations with different clients conflict?

- ▶ Most powerful association would monopolize
- ▶ Forbids others from operating

Can the monopoly leave non-subscribers unprotected?

- ▶ No. Moral obligation to protect everyone

At this point, we have a **minimal state**

- ▶ Monopolizes force

# 1. A minimal state is justified

p. 52

Suppose there were no state. How would you protect yourself?

- ▶ Protective associations by voluntary subscription

What if associations with different clients conflict?

- ▶ Most powerful association would monopolize
- ▶ Forbids others from operating

Can the monopoly leave non-subscribers unprotected?

- ▶ No. Moral obligation to protect everyone

At this point, we have a **minimal state**

- ▶ Monopolizes force
- ▶ Protects everyone

Concern: Is the minimal state redistributive?

Concern: Is the minimal state redistributive?

- ▶ Some pay



Concern: Is the minimal state redistributive?

- ▶ Some pay
- ▶ Others call for protection

Concern: Is the minimal state redistributive?

- ▶ Some pay
- ▶ Others call for protection

Nozick: No.

- ▶ “the term ‘redistributive’ applies to types of reasons for an arrangement, rather than to an arrangement itself” (p. 27)

Should there be a state at all?


1. a minimal state is justified
2. a more extensive state is not



(at least, according to Nozick)

## 2. A more extensive state is not justified


(At least, according to Nozick)



Philadelphia 76ers press photo, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons

## 2. A more extensive state is not justified

(At least, according to Nozick)




People voluntarily pay Chamberlain

Philadelphia 76ers press photo, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons

## 2. A more extensive state is not justified

(At least, according to Nozick)




People voluntarily pay Chamberlain

He gets lots of money

Philadelphia 76ers press photo, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons

## 2. A more extensive state is not justified

(At least, according to Nozick)



People voluntarily pay Chamberlain


He gets lots of money

Could a morally justified law  
redistribute Chamberlain's income?

Philadelphia 76ers press photo, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons

## 2. A more extensive state is not justified

(At least, according to Nozick)



People voluntarily pay Chamberlain

He gets lots of money

Could a morally justified law  
redistribute Chamberlain's income?

Nozick: That law requires “continuous  
interference with people’s lives”  
which is morally unjustified

Philadelphia 76ers press photo, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons



# Entitlement theory of justice

p. 151

“Whatever arises from a just situation by just steps is itself just.”

1. original acquisition of holdings
2. transfer of holdings

**Nozick:** If people acquire things justly,  
then whatever distribution results is just

**Rawls:** A just distribution is the one that  
we would choose in the original position

**Nozick:** If people acquire things justly,  
then whatever distribution results is just

**Rawls:** A just distribution is the one that  
we would choose in the original position

What is fundamentally different in the logic of the arguments?

**Nozick:** If people acquire things justly,  
then whatever distribution results is just

**Rawls:** A just distribution is the one that  
we would choose in the original position

What is fundamentally different in the logic of the arguments?

— historical principles

**Nozick:** If people acquire things justly,  
then whatever distribution results is just

**Rawls:** A just distribution is the one that  
we would choose in the original position

What is fundamentally different in the logic of the arguments?

- historical principles
- end-state principles

Nozick p. 153

**Nozick:** If people acquire things justly,  
then whatever distribution results is just

**Rawls:** A just distribution is the one that  
we would choose in the original position

What is fundamentally different in the logic of the arguments?

- historical principles
- end-state principles

Nozick p. 153

Could they ever lead to the same conclusion about redistribution?

# Past injustice

Nozick p. 152

# Past injustice

Nozick p. 152

“Not all actual situations are generated in accordance with the two principles of justice in holdings...some people steal from others, or defraud them, or enslave them”



# Past injustice

Nozick p. 152

“Not all actual situations are generated in accordance with the two principles of justice in holdings...some people steal from others, or defraud them, or enslave them”

“If past injustice has shaped present holdings...what...ought to be done to rectify these injustices?”

# Past injustice

Nozick p. 231

“past injustices might be so great as to make necessary in the short run a more extensive state in order to rectify them”

Learning goals for today

# Learning goals for today

By the end of class, you will be able to

- ▶ justify a minimal state

(per Nozick)

# Learning goals for today

By the end of class, you will be able to

- ▶ justify a minimal state (per Nozick)
- ▶ critique any more extensive state on the grounds of individual rights (per Nozick)

# Learning goals for today

By the end of class, you will be able to

- ▶ justify a minimal state (per Nozick)
- ▶ critique any more extensive state on the grounds of individual rights (per Nozick)
- ▶ draw contrasts between
  - ▶ historical principles of justice Nozick
  - ▶ end-state principles of justice Rawls

# Learning goals for today

By the end of class, you will be able to

- ▶ justify a minimal state (per Nozick)
- ▶ critique any more extensive state on the grounds of individual rights (per Nozick)
- ▶ draw contrasts between
  - ▶ historical principles of justice Nozick
  - ▶ end-state principles of justice Rawls
- ▶ recognize how these different logics could both lead to redistribution today
  - ▶ Example: Correcting past injustice

## Extra: Nozick critiquing Rawls

p. 214

“Notice that there is no mention at all of how persons have chosen to develop their own natural assets. Why is that simply left out? Perhaps because such choices also are viewed as being the products of factors outside the person’s control, and thus ‘arbitrary from a moral point of view.’”

“This line of argument can succeed in blocking the introduction of a person’s autonomous choices and actions (and their results) only by attributing everything noteworthy about the person completely to certain sorts of ‘external’ factors. So denigrating a person’s autonomy and prime responsibility for his actions is a risky line to take for a theory that otherwise wishes to buttress the dignity and self-respect of autonomous beings; especially for a theory that founds so much (including a theory of the good) upon persons’ choices.”