The Imprudent Flower Farmers in Ethiopia: In Search of Moral Justification for Compensation of the Imprudent

Zelalem Mammo Wersema
Master’s Thesis in Applied Ethics
Centre for Applied Ethics
Linköping University
Presented June 2011

Supervisor: Marcus Agnafors, Linköping University
Abstract

This paper tries to search for a moral justification for the compensation of the imprudent. It argues that it is not necessary for individuals to be prudent to have access to wealth and incomes. It argues that as far as individuals are participating in common social venture, this in itself should be considered as a criterion for allowing them from having access to wealth and incomes. It argues, basically, against luck egalitarianism. Luck egalitarianism argues that effort should be the central criterion for having access to goods and services. But this will exclude individuals from having access to goods and services, if they are imprudent and this is unfair. The paper argues that since access to goods and services are central to live a meaningful life other criterion has to be introducing as criterion for distributing of goods and services. I propose that some kind of independent agreement among the participant of a common social venture could be used as a criterion for compensating if anyone fails in his option luck. The content of the agreement could be that some percent of (say 25%) of the initial capital has to be compensated for individuals if he fails in his effort. Having proposed this I have argued that the flower farmers should be compensated even if they fail in the flower industry.
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Introduction: The Moral Dilemma

Recently in Ethiopia introduced a new economic policy that encourages a flower industry. The introduction of the new economic arrangement results in strengthening the already existed inequality. Some are advantaged and others disadvantaged. The disadvantaged groups are those who are already poor. Some of the local farmers that are affected by the introduction of the new economic venture are already poor farmers. In addition to being poor, the system alienates their meager existence. As consequence one can say they live undignified and inhuman life. On the other hand, however, even before the introduction of the new economic arrangement, the winners – the rich who are the owners of the industry – had a living standard which considered being comfortable in some measure.

In looking at the outcome of the introduction of this economic system one could reasonably argues that the farmers are the losers and the industrialists are the winner. The problem is not that there are winners and losers in this game that is common everyday life. But the problems are that the consequence of this lose makes some of the already disadvantage group to live a subsistence meager life which is undignified in every sense. One could say it would have been better for the poor if they did not participate in this economic venture because their situation is worsened than before. Or if one think for the whole group of the farmers one could say that it would have been better if the new economic policy that encourage the flower industry did not introduce in the country because it improves only the situation of the better-off.

I would say that it would have been better for the poor to make an agreement, before the introduction of the policy, with the industrialists that if misfortunes befall on them it should not be so severe to make them live undignified life. But this was not the case. Most economic venture does not make such kind of policy. If a person gamble prudently than he will appropriate that amounts of wealth in which his fortune allows him. If a person is imprudent on the other hand he may lose all of his wealth or property. No one would say it is unfair to deny someone the wholes of his property because he was imprudent. The situation of the flower industry is exactly like gambling. Some gain other loses. Both the winner and the loser do not question the consequence of such gambling on their life. They accept the outcome as if it is the natural way of distributing material resources.
But what can be done other than a lip service for this kind of inequality? In other word is it possible to attack this poverty and inequality? The following are the main question that I will investigate. Is there a moral justification to attack such an economic inequality? That is, is it possible to say that such inequality is unfair? Is it possible to say that it is unfair for the winners of the flower industry to appropriate what the outcome of the flower industry? Is it possible to defend the claim that the farmers are not condemn to live a destitute life even if they fail in the flower industry? Who is responsible for this outcome? Is it individuals, the rich or the poor, responsible for this poverty? Can one hold the rich to be the cause for this Poverty? Or is it the poor themselves that are responsible for their situations. Anyway is the outcome of the economic policy just? Should the poor continue to suffer under this economic order? Can one do something to change the situation? And what reason could be offered to change the situation? Another way of asking the question is that is it fair for individuals to live the consequence of their choice even when they live a destitute life? Or it is possible to compensate people even if they fail in their option luck.

To put this question in the contemporary discussion of political philosophy or more specifically justice in distribution, whether justice require that individuals who fail in their option luck have a legitimate claim to be pull out of destitute in case their choice make them poor; or there is no legitimate claim on the part of those who fail in their option luck to get a legitimate compensation or something like that from the society?

To answer this question I have to consider egalitarians views on justice particularly luck egalitarians view. In the chapters to follow I will try to apply egalitarians conception of justice. And I will show that luck egalitarianism is a morally implausible position. I will argues that luck egalitarianism do not sit well with the intuition of moral equality. That is if one assumes that farmers in the flower industry make an informed and rational choice about their decision to sell lands to the new flower market but end up in destitute, luck egalitarians conception of justice does not permit intervention. For luck egalitarians, from the perspective of justice, one does not find any ground to claim that these farmers have a legitimate claim from others to put out of poverty. In other words it is the requirement of justice that they are left to where they are.

Here I would like to make distinction between moral claims and a claim of justice. When I say whether the farmers have any legitimate claim, I mean claim based on justice, not based on
some kind of morality. To simplify a moral claim is different from a just claim in that there is
no legitimate claim on the parts of the claimants, in the case I will present, for instance the
farmers have no legitimate ground for compensation. This does not mean that there is not any
ground to help the farmers. People may help the farmers based on morality or some kind of
sympathy. However in the sphere of justice the claimants have a legitimate claim on others;
and that this expectation should be fulfilled.

This distinction is very important in the light of some egalitarians attempts to make a different
sphere for morality and justice. Making this distinction, it is easy to say that the fate of the
imprudent would be left to morality. That is nothing makes it unjust to help those who are
imprudent. The imprudent can claim assistance in the name of humanitarian justice. For
instance Tan argues that helping the imprudent is open from egalitarianism point of view. He
argued that there could be” moral reasons for assisting persons in distress that is distinct from
consideration of distributive justice” (Tan, 2008, 676).

Such kind of the distinction is common among egalitarians. For instance Rawls argue for
similar line of thought in The Laws of People. He argues that assistance to people could have
two bases. One is humanitarian base and the other consideration of justice. The two are
different in scope: while consideration of justice is an ongoing process in the sense that there
is no cut-off point, consideration of morality has a cut-off point. That is helping other people
would stop when it achieves its purpose of enabling other people to live a decent life. (Rawls,
as is quoted in Tan, 2006).

Such distinction is also important for the discussion at hand. This paper is working in the
sphere of justice not morality. And the main arguments I will consider is arguments of luck
egalitarians provided in the sphere of justice not morality. Having said this it is possible to say
that luck egalitarians do not necessarily deny that the imprudent could have a claim based on
humanitarian assistant. For instance it is not unjust to help the poor farmers though they fail in
their option luck. The farmers could have a claim based on humanitarian assistant. What is
denied is that since they made a voluntary choice, there is no legitimate ground for
compensation.

Arneson (2006) also argues for similar line of thought in Desert and Equality. He tried to
make similarity between the situation of the imprudent and a criminal. His main motivation, I
think, is to answer the question why we are interested to punish an imprudent through the analogy of why it is desirable to punish a criminal. He asked whether it is inherently good to punish a criminal in and of itself apart from its instrumental purpose. He seems to argue that there is nothing intrinsically good in causing pain on criminals other than its instrumental purpose. He moves in similar spirit when he discusses the nature of the moral status of punishing those who fail in their option luck. He asked whether it is good to punish the imprudent. He answers that there is nothing valuable in punishing those who fail to make a prudent choice. His point is that if punishment has no moral worth in itself, punishing imprudent also have no moral worth. The point of punishing the imprudent is not to cause suffering on them; and nothing wrong with helping the imprudent out of humanity.

This line of thought makes luck egalitarian to be susceptible to the charge that they are insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. For instance Elizabeth Anderson (1999) and Samuel Scheffler (2005) charged luck egalitarians for being insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. But the question is: is adopting luck egalitarian position necessarily entails being unmovable by the suffering of the imprudent? It could be argued that there is nothing bad about helping the imprudent from moral reasons from luck egalitarians point of view. Luck egalitarians could escape this charge by drawing different sphere consideration for assisting people. They may say that from the consideration of morality it is permitted or even required to be moved by the suffering of others whether it is the result of imprudent or not. But it is wrong to help the imprudent out of justice.

The main intention of this paper is to explore why it is unjust for individuals to seek compensation even when they fail in their option luck. I would argue that luck egalitarians deny any compensation for individuals who fail in their option luck. I would argue that this is true for luck egalitarians because of an excessive reliant on choice. Particularly making choice central for distributional principle, I think, is the main flaw of luck egalitarianism. I will argue that choice in itself should not be central to determine access to material good. I will argue that some other principle should constrain the degree and extent of choice in determining the question of access to material resources. I will argue for this position because it seems arbitrary to make choice the decisive determinant of the question of who to get what.

I present as alternative some kind of agreements among the parties in any social venture particularly in area like the economy. This agreement may have different contents but its
major motivation is to investigate and compensate those parties that participate in the common economic cooperation when they fail in their option luck.

This by implication justifies some kind of intervention on the situation of farmers in the flower industry. That is, I will try to show that, following the above argument, the farmers owe compensation from others though they fail in their option luck. This is because engaging in the flower industry, like any other social venture, should take into consideration the very nature of social cooperation, that is, should be beneficial for all groups. And as such it should not let people to be at the mercy of the consequence of their choice.

The first chapter tries to discuss why luck egalitarians do not match with one’s conviction to be sensitive to the situation of individuals who fail in their option luck. This discussion proceeds on making distinction between the principle of desert and the principle of equality. That is the principle of desert and the principle of equality considered to be integral to the philosophy of luck egalitarianism. It is necessary to make a separate discussion of the two. This is because it is the incompatibility of the two, I think, would lead the luck egalitarians to be insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. That is, it is important to exhaust discussion on the two principles and to see the implication of this discussion on the flower industry.

In chapter two, I will discuss the main arguments of luck egalitarians on responsibility. What factors makes individuals to be immune from responsibility and what factors entails responsibility. Particularly I will focus on what reasons make luck egalitarians to be insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. In chapter three I will discuss how luck egalitarianism necessarily justifies punishing the imprudent and show how this seems inconsistent with its main ideals and inspiration.

In chapter four I will discuss why luck egalitarians fails to live up to its ideals. I will discuss why luck egalitarians more attracted to the principle of choice and how this excessive reliant on choice undermine the principle of equality. In the concluding I will discuss what should be done to live up to the ideals of equality. I will argue, following Peter Vallentyne’s (2002) ideas, why it is necessary to device another criterion, in addition to the principle of choice, which would determine access to material goods. I will argue people should make some kind of consent before engaging in any economic venture to protect some individuals or groups against bad fortune when particularly it leads to destitute.
In the meantime, I would argue that to be insensitive to the situation of the imprudent farmers in Ethiopia is not compatible with the moral conviction that individuals should live a meaningful life. I would argue that to let the poor farmers punished by the consequence of their choice is unfair. I would argue the poor farmers should get compensation based on justice though they are imprudent. This position could be justified by the belief that common social venture should be beneficial to all the participants. When it is difficult or impossible to make it beneficial for all, participants should be protected from slipping into destitute. The farmers are the participant of the common economic venture of the flower trade. And their participation is critical for the success of the whole enterprise. Though they make a wrong decision they should be compensated by the other parties.

The question of how to determine the level of compensation would be solved by making some kind of binding agreement among the participants before the common venture. For instance the content of the agreement could declare that all participants should get compensation proportional to a quarter of their initial investment in the common venture in case they fail in their option luck. This principle could be used to rectify the loss of the farmers who fail in their option luck in the past. At the same time it could be used to regulate and constrain common venture in the future.

Chapter One

1.1 Introduction

In the introduction part I have presented a moral dilemma in the flower industry. I have said the main reason to discuss what I will discuss in this paper is in search of a better moral theory that could easily explain the moral belief that individuals should be allowed access to material condition though they fail in their option luck. To apply this principle to the case at hand, even though the poor farmers have mistakenly failed in their choice, it is counter-intuitive to let them live a life of destitute. To let them live a destitute life is to be insensitive to the situation of the farmers. And I would argue that justice requires that the farmers should have a claim to some kind of compensation from others though they fail in their option luck.
This, I think, should be the requirement of justice. Justice requires, as some argues, equal concern and respect for individuals. And this in turn requires that individuals should have a legitimate claim to some resources even when they fail in their option luck. But this seems contradictory for luck egalitarianism. For luck egalitarianism justice requires that all individuals be treated with equal concern and respect. But this permit that individuals should pay the cost of their choice. In short, if initial situation of individuals are roughly the same then justice require that choice will determine the question of who to get what. According to this view it seems that those who make a better and prudent choice should get most out of society and those imprudent should suffer for their choice. This shows that luck egalitarians excessively rely on choice as the main factor that determines access to material goods to be determined by choice.

In this chapter I will proceed in two general ways. First I will argue in two ways. First luck egalitarianism considered to have commitment for human equality. That is the desire to be concerned to the interest of all people equally is the main attraction of luck egalitarianism. It is this concern for equality, I think, that leads to the belief that the life chance of individuals should not be influenced by factors which are arbitrary from moral point of view. It argues the life of people should be influenced by events whose occurrences are somehow influenced by the agents themselves. And this leads to the belief that among different factors that affects the life of people, only choice should be considered as morally relevant. And that choice should rise as a decisive factor to determine the question of distribution.

Holding the other critics aside, it is possible to show inconsistency and unacceptability within egalitarianism view. In the second part of this chapter I will show that if one belief that the life chance of individuals ought not to be influenced by factors beyond their control, then it is inconsistent from common sense point of view to make individuals fully responsible for every choice they make. I will argue for this position following Richard Arneson. In a famous article in *Equality and Equal Opportunity for Welfare*, he argues that that every choice does not entail full responsibility. His main ideas are that even when people have the same resources at hand and have similar opportunity they may end up in different welfare. And the main reason for this difference in equality identified in unequal power to choose an execute choice. But he argues that such factors are arbitrary from moral point of view. Arbitrary because it is genetic disposition and early socialization experience, not the individual himself, that determines these
capacities. His conclusion is that individuals cannot be fully responsible for every choice they make (Arneson, 1988, 76).

This distinction could help to clarify ideas in the flower industry. The first is that the association of freedom of choice and moral responsibility is very weak. That most choices are not as free as is supposed. Most individuals’ voluntary choices are not as free as the egalitarians might think. Most decision supposed to reflects deliberation and free choice, but this is not the case. From this one may say that to hold individuals responsible for their bad choice is implausible. Individuals cannot be fully responsible for the consequence of their act. If this is the case then to discriminate individuals from access to goods which are basic to let them to live their conception of the good life is unfair. It is unfair to make some people live a destitute life on the justification that they make a mistaken choice.

The blaming and praising of individuals has to wait until it is known that or it is shown that they are personally responsible for the blame or praise. Likewise before saying that the imprudent should burden the consequence of every choice, it is necessary to see that whether they are personally accountable for their choice. As Arneson notes social and biological factors could be decisively affects choice. And it would be wrong to blame the imprudent for making an imprudent choice. This is because making choice may be beyond their control. And if one applies the same principle in the flower industry one can also required to investigate the reason for farmers’ failure in their option luck. Otherwise the poor farmers may be wrongly punished for factors which they may have no ability to influence.

1.2. Insensitivity to the suffering of the imprudent.

In the introduction part of this paper I have tried to show that for luck egalitarians, the question of who to get what is to be solely determined by choice. That is distribution should be choice-sensitive. If an individual become rich or poor because of his choice, then this is a just holding. But one consequence of this position is that it is insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. If an individual becomes poor because he make a mistaken choice, say of a lifestyle, then justice permit that omission is justified. That is there is no injustice involved in letting the imprudent to suffer his own choice.
This could even be the requirement of justice. Luck egalitarians believe that individuals have to bear the cost of their choice. This means inequality is justified if it is the result of choice. If some become poor because of their choice and others becomes rich because of their choice, then equal concern and respect requires that justice has to be indifferent to the resulting situations. For luck egalitarians this is the most important way of showing equal concern and respect for individuals. To apply this percept to the case at hand if the poor farmers choose to trade with their land but end up in total poverty, then justice permit or even requires that there is no need for a legitimate compensation for the farmers. One may feel bizarre to learn that one show equal concern and respect for the farmers by leaving them to live a destitute life.

One may ask to whom are we showing respect and concern. An ordinary way of showing concern to the situation of the farmers is by helping them to put out of poverty. That is help is the natural way to show one’s concern to the situation of the farmers. But here one should not be mistaken about the situation of the luck egalitarians. They do not deny any kind of help given to the poor farmers. They may say morality permit or even requires that help is given to the poor farmers. They do not deny aid to the poor farmers on the basis of some sympathy or out of benevolent act. What they deny is that the poor farmers have no legitimate claim to get out of poverty. That is there is no legitimate basis to redistribute resources for the poor farmers.

However the motivation of redistribution to the poor farmers is very different than redistribution that the poor farmers may legitimately claim in the realm of justice. And one easily understands that I am working in the realm of justice, not morality. Thus I am required to discuss the basis of egalitarians rejection of redistribution to the farmers who become poor by choice.

To make the discussion more clear what is the basis of redistribution for luck egalitarians? What justice requires in the realm of distribution? In other word why it is unjust to help the poor farmers in the case of the flower industry? For luck egalitarians justice requires that one has to show equal concern and respect to the interest of individuals. This means showing respect and concern for the farmers includes care and sensitivity for their plight. And one way of showing care is through helping the farmers to put out of poverty. If this is the case then why it is unjust to help the poor farmers though they make a mistaken choice when they gamble on their land?
It is not difficult to guess why luck egalitarians may refuse redistribution to the farmers on the claim of justice. Two reasons can be given. On the one hand, there is the claim of others and on the other hand we have duty for ourselves. The first principle holds that when we make transfer we have to observe that our action does not violate the rights of others. In this case when we help the farmers it should not be at the expense of violating the rights of the rich. This means helping to the poor farmers should not be at the expense of the owner of the flower industry. We should not redistribute precisely because it violates the legitimate right of the owners of the flower industry.

The second reason why luck egalitarians refuse redistribution in the case of the imprudent is that all individuals should be accountable to his own action. The poor must be accountable to their action. That is there should not be redistribution based on justice in the case of failure in option luck because people should be responsible for their action and this is the only sensible way to hold them accountable. This reason for redistribution withholds resources from the poor farmers on the reason that they should suffer the consequence of their choice.

But why this is the only sensible way for distribution of wealth in the society? There may be different ways or mechanism for distribution in a society. Why choice and responsibility is the only way to distribute burden and benefit in a society? That is why effort and ambition are the sole factors that should govern distribution in a society.

The problem is that the implication of this view could be an unacceptable. If someone makes a good decision and has made a good effort then he deserves to live an affluent life without considering how his life affects the life of others. And if an individual’s become poor because he is not hard workers or makes a bad choice he has to pay for his own mistakes and this imply that his families and may be others dependant on him should suffer.

Is this fair? Is it not fair for instance to transfer a resource to the poor farmers if his choice makes his and his families fate permanently tied with poverty? Why this distribution unjust for luck egalitarianism is that it violates the legitimate expectation of the rich. That is the rich has the legitimate right to hold what they posses. If the rich becomes rich by choice then it is wrong to transfer to the poor by taking from the rich. Why? This is because the rich has a legitimate claim over his property. And it is violating the requirement of justice to take from
the rich to the poor without his informed consent. Justice requires that we have to show equal concern and respect to individuals, including to the poor and the riches. This means justice does not require the transfer for the poor farmers by taking from the riches. This is because the rich has a legitimate right over his property.

But one may ask what about the poor farmers? Do they have no legitimate right not to live a destitute life? Is it fair to be insensible towards the plight of the poor farmers? This brings the question of what entitle people to hold some property or what makes individuals to have a legitimate deserve over some property. For luck egalitarians if an individual accumulate wealth through his labor and effort, he has a legitimate right over his property. Likewise if people become poor because he was careless or makes a bad choice about what is good, then he deserves his poverty.

Here it is natural to ask why we respect the legitimate expectation of individuals if doing this entails letting others to live a destitute life. Why it is unjust not to take part of the wealth of the owner of the flower industry and transfer it to the poor farmers though it is the result of their option luck? Why it is unjust to help the poor farmers though their decision at one point in time alienates them from having access to the basic primary goods to use Rawls phrase?

This question leads us to the luck egalitarians conception of what justice is. Justice requires that individuals have a legitimate claim for goods if they obtain it justly. The criterion of deservingness or what individuals legitimately entitled to is the question I will discuss soon. The main idea of deservingness is that if individuals deserve what they posses then it is unjust to take away part of their claim without their consent. And doing so entails the violation of their right. And equal concern requires that we have to respect individuals’ right by respecting their legitimate expectation. On the other, if an individual does not deserve what he posses then justice requires that part of the undeserved possession should be transferred.

### 1.3 Ex-ante equality.

Now I will discuss the criterion of luck egalitarians deservingness. For luck egalitarians income or wealth is undeserved if it is derived from factors over which the individuals has no control. Here control and influence is very critical. That the question of what individuals
legitimately claims is restricted only to those claims in which he is responsible for its cause or if the person is influenced the occurrences of the event.

Broadly there are two categories of factors. One category of factors is circumstances in which individuals found themselves accidently, such as social or natural circumstances. It is given that individuals have no power or ability to influence such kind of circumstances because these are beyond his power to control. In other words individuals cannot influence where to end up in this situation. Second is that circumstance the individuals has a power to influences, control, or avoid. These factors are not arbitrary because the individuals can be implicated. For instance I can deliberately influence whether to end up as a school teacher or as a security guard.

This distinction is important because it has a bearing for redistribution. Wealth or income should be governed to redistribution if they are the result of those arbitrary factors that are beyond the control of his power. Justice requires or permits that inequalities attributable for brute luck are governed to the principle of redistribution. If I get wealth as a result of accidents, then morally speaking, I do not deserve this wealth. If I get wealth through inheritance from my families or I become rich because my god father give as a gift, then I do not deserve none of this. I make no conscientious effort to bring about this wealth. So morally speaking I do not deserve these. And others could make a claim over this wealth. In other word, others also have an equal legitimate expectation over the wealth that I got through gift or inheritance. Morally speaking the gift and the inheritance belongs to all equally. If this is the case then justice permits or even requires that this wealth be transfer to others on some criterion. It is sensible to say that inequalities created as a result of such kind of factors should be governed to the principle of distribution.

However, those inequalities that are attributable to individual’s effort or labor are not to be redistributed. If I get a wealth through my own effort or labor or if I make a deliberate effort to bring about my wealth, then I deserve to hold it. I have a legitimate claim over it that includes excluding the right of others over the property. Properly speaking it is my wealth. No one has a legitimate right over my property. I deserve the wealth because I created or earned it. Thus it should not be transferred to others unless I am consented.
To apply this principle to the case at hand what luck egalitarians tells us is that whether the inequalities in the flower industry is the result of morally arbitrary factors or not? If they are the result of morally arbitrary factors then it has to be governed to redistribution. That is the poor farmers may have a legitimate claim over the resources of the rich if the rich obtains their wealth through chance. But if it is the result of choice then justice requires that the rich has a legitimate claim over their resources and it is unjust to transfer without their agreement.

Then I am expected to investigate how the inequalities in the flower industry are arise to know whether it is attributable to chance or effort. And let me assume that I have a sufficient data that informs me that, for the sake of the argument, the inequalities in the well-being of the poor farmers and the rich industrialists is the result of morally arbitrary factors over which the individual have no control. If this is the case then luck egalitarians would favors the redistribution. One of the motivations of the luck egalitarians is to offset the impact of luck on the quality of life of peoples. Given this is it is presumed that if the inequalities are the result of luck then there is a support from the luck egalitarians to redistribution.

But this is not the direction I want the paper to take. I want to investigate a moral justification for inequalities that is the result of choice. Let assumes that before the introduction of the flower industry, both the farmers and the owners of the industry are equal in some morally relevant factors. This could be equality in resource or welfare. This is to ensure ex-ante equality; that is, they had an equal opportunity or resources. After this initial equality they decide to engage in the flower industry. But the outcome of this decision turns some to be poor and others rich. And this inequality is so severe that the poor even fail to satisfy their basic need. Now the question is: is the redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor is justifiable? In other word is redistribution justified if it is the result of choice?

To give a direct answer, luck egalitarians would disagree with this. This is because justice should concern itself with unearned resource. But resource one gets through option luck is earned resource that the owner deserves to own. And to transfer this earned resource without the consent of the owner is wrong. Here it is important why egalitarians refuse redistributing resources if the one who claim is in the condition of poverty. The main idea is that the poor deserve to be punished for his failure. By this means all human beings are responsible for their life if they starts with a just background condition. But if he fails then he has to bears the consequence of his choice.
1.4 Ex-post equality

Here it is important to see that luck egalitarianism are motivated by the desire to offset the impact of luck on the life of people but once luck is equalized, then any resulting distribution would be the result of personal interests and desires. That is once individuals situation are equalized in some way, then that is all about the justice. The point of justice is to prepare the way before choice. But once the ground is leveled then it is not the territory of justice to interfere or justice has no legitimate base. It is up to the decision of individuals to determine the distribution of goods and services.

People have desires and interests. Their action and decision is guided by their preferences. Dworkin is arguing in this spirit when he argues, in *what is equality: Equality of Welfare*. Particularly he argues that individuals have to take responsibility to their expensive tastes. One reason for this is that they deliberately cultivate this taste. Why he should be responsible is that he brought into existence the desire to have an expensive taste. He should be responsible to satisfy his desires; the society has no duty to satisfy such kind of tastes. The intension of Dworkin seems to show individuals’ choice has to determine the question of distribution one’s individuals have their fair share. One’s individuals have this fair share then it is up to them to determine what kind of life to live given their fair share. Those individuals have to adjust their conception of the good life based on their fair share of resources (Dworkin, 1984, 240).

But if individuals become poor because they are unable to adjust their conception of the good with the fair share at their disposal they themselves are responsible for their situation. Individuals are responsible for their desire and interests, simply because they are under their control. Individuals should be responsible for what happens after fair share is determined because it is their desire and interests that lead to the choice they make and these desires and interests could be attributable to the individuals themselves. If a person with expensive taste end up in poverty because he choose to live spend most of his time in leisure he is personally responsible for his situation.

At first sight it seems the argument is fair. That is it seems that the outcome of choice after equality of initial position should be fair because it is in line with a common sense conception of responsibility or accountability. Assume that two persons R and Z have equal initial
advantage in both natural and social circumstance. They have the same natural capacity and social advantage. To use Kymilika (2002) example one choose to work hard with his land and the other want to make the land a play ground for tennis. And after sometime the one who work hard get more income than the other and inequality is created. Or even to expand the case at hand let assume that, for the sake of example, before the introduction of the flower industry the country is populated by some group of people having the same social and natural advantage. Let also assume that there would be no brute luck involved in outcomes. That is any outcome is the function of only of option luck.

Having equal social and natural advantage people can use their resources as they see it fit. People have their own interests, as Rawls says, may be these interests are first-order interest such as the desire to choose, form and revise their own conception of the good by themselves (Rawls,1981). If this is the case then the individuals who live in Ethiopia before the introduction of the flower industry also believe that it is valuable, intrinsically or instrumentally, to engage in the flower industry. However as is described this choice ends up in reducing some to the mere level of existence and other in affluence. The losers of the game are so impoverished they even cannot satisfy their needs. Is it a fair situation to transfer part of the earned income of the rich to the poor who are imprudent?

For luck egalitarians it seems this is unfair. Justice is intended only to mitigate the impact of luck on the life of people. And the inequality at hand is the result of choice, not luck. This means it is wrong to transfer part of the income of the rich to the poor. Part of the reason for this is people can control their choice. Or people can influence or affect their choice. So when the farmers make a choice they should have to see the consequence of their act. And they could have declined the trade. But the fact that they choose shows that they are ready to make the necessary responsibility.

The main idea here is that choice by its very nature entails responsibility. This means individuals before making a choice would deliberate and make calculation. And it is up to them to identify risks. Given this all choices would entail responsibility. This means the poor farmers has to bear the consequence of their act. That if it is assumed that both the farmers and the industrialists have their fair share at the beginning and the farmers become poor because they make a poor choice or failed in their option luck, then there is no injustice is involved.
But this idea does not seat with the conception of human equality very well. It may be true that people should be responsible for their choice. Because relative to natural lottery and social circumstances, individuals have a better control over choice. Does this entails individuals are fully responsible for the choice they make in the sense that all factors that led to choice are derived from our own volition and that we have a full control over them. This question is very important because it could tell us the nature of luck egalitarianism consistency on their idea of the principle of control. If something is beyond the control of individuals then they could not be responsible. But if it is under the control of them they have to be responsible.

One way of rejecting the conclusion that people should be punished or rewarded by the consequence of their choice is by showing that individuals cannot be fully responsible for the choice they make. As I discussed, Arneson argues in similar spirit. That is he argues that people cannot be fully responsible for all the choices they make. There are biological and social factors that influence choice but are arbitrary from moral point of view. And this helps luck egalitarianism to escape the charge that they make people fully responsible for all choices they make. Could this idea save the imprudent poor farmers in Ethiopia?

I will argue that even if there is a revision of luck egalitarianism, it could not be accepted fully. This is because still it justifies extreme inequality. Even for this revised luck egalitarianism, like the crude one, desert is the main integral parts of justice. And this central importance given for the principle of desert could justify some inequality that seems unfair.

Consequently, I would argue that, even this revised version of luck egalitarianism that is defended by Arneson should be rejected. I would argue distributive justice should not be solely determined by the principle of desert because desert ultimately makes choice central in excluding or including human from their share of resources. I think even If some idea of desert is acceptable, it should not rule out equality. However before proceeding to this discussion I will conclude the previous chapter.

1.5 Conclusion

I have tried to show that among many factors that could influence the life prospects of individuals, egalitarians consider choice as morally relevant factor. And they believe that the question of distribution should be determined by this principle. And the main reason making
choice central to distribution is that people could be responsible for the choice they make. So choice and responsibility is almost central to egalitarianism theory of justice. And if one applies this line of argument to the flower industry one could conclude that it is the requirement of justice that one has to be insensitive to the situation of the poor farmers. If the farmers become poor as a result of their choice no injustice involved in being insensitive to their suffering.

But this conclusion may not be endorsed by all luck egalitarians. Luck egalitarians like Arneson may argue that even if the farmers made choice they may not be responsible for their choice. Could this version of egalitarianism save the poor imprudent farmers? I will discuss this in the next chapter.

Chapter Two

2.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I have tried to show that egalitarians principle of equality requires that inequalities that are the result of factors beyond which the individuals have no control should be governed to the principle of justice. However at the same time they also argues that inequality if are the result of choices should not be regulated by justice. One of the implications of this position is that inequality would be just if it is the result of choice and this position could be used to justify insensitivity to the situation of an imprudent.

But some may argue that luck egalitarianism could escape this critic by arguing that not all choices entails responsibility. That is it may revise itself to claim responsibility only for those choices that are the result of volunteer deliberate choice. As such it may claim that only those choices entail responsibilities that are the free choice of individuals. Richard Arneson is one of the proponents of this idea.

Could this revised version of the luck egalitarianism justify sensitivity to the situation of the imprudent? I would argue that this position could be used to argue that some choice if are free and deliberate make individuals responsible for their choice. And this implies that, if individuals shown to be personally responsible for the imprudent choice they make, may
justify insensitivity to the situation of the imprudent. To show the idea using the flower industry, the revised version of luck egalitarianism may defend the situation of the poor farmers. To demonstrate this assumes that there is distinction, even within choice, among morally arbitrary and morally relevant factors. And the situations of farmers are cause by factors which is beyond their power to control. Can this position justify some kind of sensitivity to the situation of the bad choosers in the flower industry?

I would argue that this view does not defend sensitivity to be shown to the poor farmers precisely because it gives central importance for choice. And if choice is given a central importance then this position cannot defend the claim of the poor farmers; rather it justifies insensitivity to the situation of the poor farmers. This is because the new version still believes in the old criterion; that is it gives central importance to the principle of choice. If choices are given unconstrained role in determining the question of who to get what inequality would be acceptable though the life of individuals are full of misery.

I am not arguing against the idea that individuals should not assume responsibility for the free choices they make. My idea is against the degree of importance given to choice. I believe unless choice is constrained by some other independent principle this new version cannot defend the situation of the poor. But before discussing how to constrain choice, I have to show how this new version of luck egalitarianism entails insensitivity to the situation of the imprudent.

2.2 Morally arbitrary and relevant factors

The main purpose of this chapter is to exhaust the idea of luck egalitarianism on choice. That is I will discuss what factors are under the control of human that entails responsibility and those other factors that are beyond the control of individuals. And I will discuss how these factors influence life prospects of individuals. Call the first group Well-being Entailing Factors and the others Well-being Denying Factors. The first group of factors is factors since they are under the full control of the individual, they should determine the level of well-being of a person. These factors give individuals the right to control whatever consequence entails as a result of taking advantage of those factors or fail to take advantage of those factors. The other groups of factors are well-fare neutral factors. Those are factors their presence or absence
should have no bearing on the life prospects of individuals. That is their presence should not advantage the agent and their absence should not disadvantaged the agent.

The focus of this chapter is to look for well-fare entailing factors according to the new version of egalitarianism. And the main idea is to explore whether these factors could be the base for redistribution of resources. At the end of the chapter I will argue that basing choice/luck distinction is a trivial criterion as a standard for redistribution of resources. This is because if one follows it to its logical conclusion it leads to unacceptable conclusion.

The first unacceptable conclusion of this position is that it punishes the imprudent. It punishes the imprudent by excluding them from access to goods which may be considered as central to live a meaningful life. But one could argue it is unfair to exclude anyone from access to the primary goods: from wealth and income. Many philosophers argue that material goods are central to live a meaningful life. Access to material goods or resources is an important component of the good life. That lacks of these resources jeopardize one’s conception of a meaningful life; it could waste the whole life of individuals. If the primary goods are so central to the life of people why its access would be determined by solely by choice?

The second unacceptable consequence of the new version is choice is the nature of the punishment it entails. The concept of choice embedded in it the idea of praise and blame. That if a person succeeds in his choice he would be praised. But if he fails then he would be punished. But one may ask why the imprudent should be punished? Is there a moral reason to punish the imprudent? That is what entails punishment? Is punishing the imprudent morally required? One can draw a parallel between punishment in retribution and punishment in distribution. In retributive justice punishing he who fails to conform to the law is justified on different reasons. A criminal will be punished in a society. Different reason could be given for inflicting pain on the criminal. But I think the main reasons are not to cause deliberate pain to suffer the criminal. Inflicting of pain is justified on grounds such as to teach the criminal or to teach the larger society.

One could ask the same question in the case of the imprudent. Does punishing the imprudent good in and of itself or there are other independent reason for punishing the imprudent? The answer to this question to some extent determines how to treat the imprudent. I do not think that punishing the imprudent is good in and of itself; it must has some other purpose. Arneson
for instance in *Desert and Equality* argues in similar spirit when he argues that the situation of the imprudent. He argues that punishing the imprudent in and of itself is not morally desirable or good. Rather it has an instrumental purpose (Arneson, 2006, 284)

If this is the case then what justifies being insensitive to the situation of the imprudent? One may argues that punishing the imprudent is not good in itself; it would be bad only if compensation to the imprudent violates the right of others. This is an acceptable reason but does not justify being insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. That is it is possible to recognize the legitimate expectation of the rich and at the same time being sensitive to the situation of the imprudent. One can achieve this if he makes an arrangement that in some sphere of life that are deemed to be significantly affects one’s access to the resources. One can make an agreement that if any party that is involved in the venture turn out to be impoverished then, for instance, 30% of his initial wealth would be compensated. This does not violate the legitimate expectation of the rich but would be showing sensitivity to the situation of the imprudent.

But I do not think that for luck egalitarians punishing the imprudent has instrumental reason; I think it has an intrinsic. Or I will show that the position of the luck egalitarians support this view. But this is unacceptable. I think there is no acceptable reason to cause pain on the imprudent. And this is one consequence of adopting luck egalitarian and the reason for its rejection.

In summary I will argue that the new version of luck egalitarianism is unacceptable for two reasons. First it gives unconstrained status for choice and unnecessarily punishes the imprudent. And these two reason leads to the rejection of luck egalitarianism. But before rejecting this new version I will present the new version.

2.3 Responsibility and choice

As discussed in chapter one luck egalitarians are sensitive to factors over which the individual has no control. But for factors over which the individuals have control they leave the place for effort to determine the question of who to get what. In other word they are insensitive to inequalities if it is the outcome of free choice under fair background condition.
Most egalitarians, such as Rawls and Dworkin, assume that justice is required to level the background condition over which people interact. These views commonly assume that justice is required to level the ground for fair competition. And the desire to level of differences reflected in equalizing some initial holding of resources. However there are people who doubt the claim that justice is relevant only to equalize resources. They believe justice is required even after the equalization of resources. This is the ground of criticism against Dworkin resources approach to equality and also the base of Sen Critics against Rawls’ the Primary Goods. The critics truly observe that even if individuals have equal resources at their disposal they may end up in different welfare. Two individuals having the same bundle of resources may end up in having different welfare. If one believes that justice should concern itself only with ex-ante distribution than he will accepts any further distribution as just.

But there are a number of critics against this view. The critic is that such an ex-ante view of distributive equality ignores the outcome of inequalities after the initial situation. For instance Dworkin argues that once individuals have an equal ex-ante distribution of resources, further inequality is justifiable because the result is the outcome of a fair situation. But one weakness of this view, as is outline in Sen and Arneson, is that individuals do not have equal ability to change equal resources into equal welfare. One reason for this is that people may have different biological disposition and different level of socialization that affects choice making and choice execution abilities.

And these factors are beyond their control. In the sense that individuals have no control over and thus are not responsible. The conclusion Arneson reached is that if this is the case then the equal resource may not be a plausible way of rendering the idea of equality. This is because luck operates even after resources are equalized (Arneson, 1988, 79).

The implication of this view is that all choices do not entail full responsibility. People are responsible only for those choices that are voluntarily made. One consequence of this position is that inequalities that are the result of such kind of voluntary choices should not be redistributed. That is individuals who make a difference in such situation deserved to own their labor; and those who fail only in their voluntary choice should be punished. And inequalities that result from such inequality are deserved. The individual who make the right choice should be rewarded because he has to be praised for his effort. This is because his
achievement is caused by not genetic or social factors over which he has no control, but through individual factor in which he is solely responsible.

Likewise an individual should be blamed for those failures that result not from factors over which he has no control, but from his personal weakness. This new version of egalitarianism does not grossly punish all failures; it rather punishes those failures that are only attributable to individual weakness. From these it could be concluding that all choices do not entail full responsibility. To make people fully responsible one has to see that the action is out of the full control of individuals.

Could this argument from conscientious choice support some kind of distribution as legitimate in the flower industry? To apply these principles one should not grossly charge all farmers as fully responsible for their choice. On this view making of choice in itself does not entails responsibility. The poor farmers may claim compensation for their situation if, for instance, someone able to show that their choice largely reflect the impact of biological factors or early socialization experiences. If one able to determine this one can plausibly argues that the farmers requires compensation because their life is affected by factors over which they are not personally responsible.

Could this view defend the situation of the imprudent farmers in the flower industry? I will argue that it could not justify sensitivity and compensation to the poor farmers. This is because this new version gives unconstrained importance for choice. And I will argue that this is the basic weakness of the new version.

2.4 Equality and choice

For the revised luck egalitarians version distribution still should be choice sensitive and endowment insensitive. But there is a revision over the previous form of gross responsibility for choice. That is even if individuals have equal resources at hand their choice making and executing abilities may be affected by genetic makeup and early socialization. Call the first argument, argument from genetic disposition and the second argument from early childhood socialization experience.
The main idea of this view is that to make individuals full responsible for their action and choices we have to consider that all individuals have the same abilities to choose and execute their decision. There are people who are better at doing the necessary action and decision to utilize opportunities. There are also other people who have less ability to choose and execute the better alternative due to factors over which they have no control. In such situations it is implausible to hold people responsible for their choice.

To apply this principle to the case at hand, distribution of the resources from the poor to the rich is justified at two levels. First if the rich obtains their wealth as a result of choice over which they have no control. This could happen for two reasons. First if at early childhood they are socialized to have a good character tics that help them to have the ability to make a sound choice and to execute their choice with the will to power. Now this character may not be voluntarily cultivated. But they happen to have because their parents or guardians brought them up to have such personal quality. The same is true for biological factors.

However to find such kind of parents and guardian is pure chance. And from the moral point of view this is arbitrary and thus the rich do not deserve this. This means, if it is choice that makes them rich, this rich has to be governed to the principle of distribution because they are not responsible to produce all the wealth by conscientious choice. Portion of the wealth they got should be subjected to the principle of redistribution because precisely they do not earn it. And if they do not earn it, they do not deserve it. And that segment of the income should be apportioned and be given to those who deserved to get.

Could this argument justify the poor farmers in Ethiopia? It will be early to make a conclusion. One has to wait and investigate the grounds of the farmers’ imprudence. One could see that even if the rich gets their wealth by chance and that they have no legitimate claim over this wealth, this does not necessarily imply that all that are poor have an equal legitimate claim over this unowned resource. Only those who become poor not by choice but by chance that deserve to get this wealth. It is wrong to give this for those who are poor by choice.

Egalitarianism opposes the idea of redistribution to those who become poor by choice. And this has a devastating consequence on the discussion of the flower industry. That is luck egalitarians may not support distribution of the resources from the industrialist to the poor farmers. This is not because the industrialists have a legitimate claim over this resource but
because the poor farmers may not deserve to get this wealth. They may not deserve this wealth because their poverty might not caused by morally arbitrary factors. If the circumstance they found themselves in was the result of morally arbitrary factors than it would have been justified to transfer part of this resources.

What does this imply in principle? Does luck egalitarian punish the imprudent or do they not consider the situation of the poor? I will come to this discussion in the subsequent chapter but for now I will end this discussion here and passed to the other discussion.

If the poor farmers become poor by factors over which they have no control then they should not be punished for what they should not be responsible. That is if the poor become poor as a result of failure to make a right decision that is attributable as such not to lack of personal conscientious choice but to some genetic or socialization factors, then their poverty is not deserving. They should not be punished for this. It is beyond their power to control. And that the poor has to be compensated. This compensation justified by the same egalitarian principle. That is egalitarians, as has been discussed so far, is a principle to offset the impact of morally arbitrary factors on the life of people. And if choice making and executing abilities are arbitrary from the moral point of view, then this justify compensation.

To summarize the main points all choice in itself do not entails full responsibility. Even in making choice there may be morally arbitrary factors. All individuals may not have equal capacity to make a sound choice or to execute their choice or both. And this capacity, as Arneson argues, may be the result of biological or social factors that are beyond the control of individuals. No one should be advantaged or disadvantaged by these morally arbitrary factors. This view may justify compensation for the situation of the poor farmers. If the poverty of the farmers are caused by social or biological factors or both then they deserve compensation. Their situation is the result of morally arbitrary factors.

2.5. Desert and Choice

The above discussion is only one face of the coin. That is redistribution should compensate individuals if their life prospects is affected by factors over which they have no control. But at the same time it also oppose redistribution if it is the result of factors over which the individual has the power to control or influence. If inequality is the result of factors over which they are
responsible for then redistribution is unjustified. If for example the rich gets their wealth through factors over which they are only responsible, then redistribution is unjust. It is unjust because the rich deserve his wealth because he earned it. It violates his rights to distribute the wealth of the rich. This means one is not justified in transferring the wealth of the flower plant owners because they earn their wealth.

Likewise his view may deny compensation to the poor. Assume that have become poor as a result of factors over which he has control over. He becomes poor not because as a result of factors over which he has no control, but as a result of factors over which he is responsible. For instance even if the farmers had equal social and biological endowment they fail to use this. Then based on this principle of redistribution which is sensitive to choice the poor farmers deserved to be poor. It is wrong to compensate the imprudent.

Therefore this argument could be used to deny individuals access to goods which have central importance for their life. This view may argue that the poor farmers in Ethiopia deserved their poverty because it is the result of their choice. If people are poor by choice, under equal background condition, then there is no injustice involved. This argument could be used to justify inequality that is the result of choice. In other words it is unjust to compensate individuals who live in poverty if it is the result of choice.

By way of summary, in the above discussion, I have tried to show that even a revised version of luck egalitarianism does not necessarily save the imprudent. This new revised forms of egalitarianism is superior from the previous one in that it does not consider all the outcome of choice as the full responsibility of the choice makers. It believes that choices could arbitrary affected by pure luck if for instance it is influenced by biological and social factors that affects the choice making and executing capacity of individuals.

This new version seems to justify compensation of the imprudent. But a little reflection shows that there is a little difference that makes on the life of the imprudent. It could have saved the life of the poor farmers, for instance in the case of the flower industry, if it is shown that the choice of the farmers were the result of morally arbitrary factors. But if one could show that the choice of the farmers are purely attributable to their own personal weakness that is under their influence then the same principle could be used against compensation of the poor farmers.
The above discussion show that luck egalitarianism is insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. This seems consistent with the observation of others. For instance Elizabeth Anderson in *What Is the Point of Equality* argues that luck egalitarians are insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. Samuel Scheffler in *Choice, Circumstance and the Value Of equality* argues that the luck egalitarians are insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. My discussion also shows that luck egalitarianism is insensitive to the situation of the imprudent.

But luck egalitarianism is not only insensitive to the situation of the poor, but also punishes the imprudent for morally unacceptable reason. In this part I will evaluate the moral justification of the luck egalitarians insensitivity to the situation of the imprudent. I will do this in two ways. First I will show that luck egalitarians punish the imprudent for failure to make a prudent choice. That is I will show that luck egalitarians insensitivity to the situation of the poor almost equivalent to punishing the imprudent for moral purpose.

Chapter Three

3.1. Argument for punishing the imprudent

Luck egalitarians are insensitive to the situation of the imprudent. If one tries to understand why this is the case then one can see that two reasons could be offered. The first reason, as has been seen, is that compensating the situation of the imprudent is unfair to the rich. That is the desire to recognize the legitimate expectation of the one who got his wealth by choice. And to take the legitimate claim of individuals without their consent is wrong. For luck egalitarians the only source of redistribution of a wealth is only if the wealth is unowned morally speaking. And a resource or a wealth is unowned if it belongs to someone who did nothing to earn the wealth. Since this is unowned by implication it belongs to all. And individuals, with some reservation, have a legitimate expectation to get some share over this unowned resource.

But a wealth is not subjected to the principle of justice if a person obtains his wealth by his own choice or conscientious effort. Morally speaking this wealth belongs to him; no one has a legitimate claim over this resource. Luck egalitarians reject redistribution from the rich who obtains his wealth by choice, to redistribute to the imprudent precisely because it violates the
right of an individual’s who has a legitimate claim. This holds true in the case the flower industry. Luck egalitarians are insensitive to the situation of the poor farmers because compensation requires resource and if this is taken from the industrialist it is wrong because it violates the legitimate claim of the industrialists. The moral status of refusing compensating the imprudent seems only to have an instrumental purpose. That is refusing to give to the imprudent is not bad in itself. But it is bad because it violates the right of the rich.

This seems consistent to Arneson idea that punishing the imprudent has an independent reason than causing a deliberate pain. In *Desert and Equality* he argues that punishing the imprudent has no moral value. He argued that “Compensation to the imprudent is declined for the simple reason that there is someone before him in the queue that deserves priority”.

However a close examination of the implication of the luck egalitarians shows that the luck egalitarians, contrary to the view of Arneson, give an intrinsic moral value to punishing of the imprudent. Luck egalitarian principle shows that being an imprudent in and of itself is bad. That is to make a wrong choice or incapable of executing the choice brings punishment.

As I suggest in the last chapter the principle of egalitarians seems to imply this moral stand. Imagine the case of the flower industry. Imagine also that part of the wealth of the owners of the flower industry came from pure luck. As Arneson suppose, assume that the owners of the flower industry were lucky because their genetic makeup and their early childhood experience gave them a better advantage at making and implementing choice. Assume also that a luck egalitarians on close analysis found that the owners of the flower industry do not deserve part of their wealth. Assume also that surprisingly, consistent with the luck egalitarians view, the owner of the industry agree to give up part of their wealth that was attributed to accident. And the luck egalitarians decided that he will distribute this undeserved wealth to others. Now the question is who are the candidates that suppose to have a legitimate claim over this unowned resource?

Whoever is included as a legitimate claimer it is not difficult to see that the poor farmers who failed in the flower industry are not included as a candidate. Why I will answer this question as the analysis advance and the question is not also difficult to see. One needs only to see the principle of luck egalitarians distribution. Luck egalitarians belief that only those portions of resources, morally speaking, belong to no one has to be distributed. In other words only
resources those are attributable to morally arbitrary factors. And this resource has to be
distributed to those who are at disadvantage as a result of morally arbitrary factors. It is
difficult for the luck egalitarians to identify individuals whose life is worsened by morally
arbitrary factors. But he knows that those who become poor by choice are automatically
excluded.

In the case of the flower industry the poor farmers has to be excluded because they themselves
are responsible for their situation. As a result they are excluded from compensation. But why
the poor farmers are excluded? Or why the luck egalitarians being sensitive to the situation of
the poor farmers? Do the luck egalitarians believe that the poor farmers have to be punished
by his imprudent decision? It seems that this is the reason. The luck egalitarians punish the
poor farmers for no other reason than the reason that this poor fails in making a right choice.

Arneson may argue that this is not the case. He may argues that the luck egalitarians
insensitivity to the situation the poor farmers is not motivated by the desire to punish the poor
farmers or even being sensitive to his situation. As have seen above he may argues that the
luck egalitarians has to be insensitive to the situation of the poor farmers because there are
other people in the line of compensation whose situation are more sensitive to that of the poor
farmers. The situation of the poor farmer is sensible, but there are other people who deserve
more sensitivity than the poor farmers. There may be people who become poor by accidents.
And these people deserve more priority over the poor farmers.

At first glance this argument seems fair. That when there is demanding situations we have to
give priority according to some criterion. And luck egalitarianism is also a prioritarianism
principle. It gives priority based on some deserving principle. A person who is poor by
accidents have a more moral claim for compensation than the one who become poor by
choice. But if both are poor why it is necessary to make discrimination? Is not the base of this
discrimination is that one makes a wrong choice and the other make no choice? And that the
first should be denied compensation for the same reason? Luck egalitarians may say that luck
egalitarians do not deny for the sake of punishment but it is a matter of priority. A most fair
question to ask the luck egalitarians is to say when he believes that according to luck
egalitarianism principle there will be time in which the compensation of the poor farmers
would be justified? Two answers could be given. The first is that when there are no people
who are more demanding than the poor farmers. That is if there no people whose life are
affected by morally arbitrary factors. However, practically speaking this view seems implausible. There will be no time when the life chance of individuals purely affected by option luck. And as far as there are people whose life is affected by pure chance then the poor farmers may not be compensated.

The second answer luck egalitarians may give for the above question is that the poor farmers will be compensated if there is an extra unit of resources left from compensating those whose life is affected by pure chance. That is if there are plenty of resources to compensate the situations of the poor by chance, and if a more resource is left then the poor farmer could be compensated. But still this position seems implausible. Two things should present for this view to be plausible: either there should be no scarcity of resources or that there should exist no one whose life is affected by morally arbitrary factors. I think both are impossible. I discussed the latter case above. The former case is also impossible for the world as it is known is full of scarcity. This means there will be no future time where the compensation of the poor farmers justified.

Does this analysis support the claim that even if luck egalitarian does not explicitly admit punishing the imprudent, but this is the case? Even if luck egalitarians do not admit that he punishes the poor farmers for failure to make a right choice, his action together with the facts entails almost the same consequence. In the face of scarcity of resources and people who do more deserve than the poor farmers, it is unlikely for the poor farmers to get compensation. This is almost equal to punishing them to for their failure in their option luck. Even if Arneson say that there is nothing intrinsically good about punishing the imprudent, as the analysis shows this is the case.

3.2. What is wrong with luck egalitarianism?

When one discuss the luck egalitarian insensitivity to the imprudent two things comes to mind. The first is that it is an egalitarian theory in the sense that it cherishes the moral ideal of human equality. There are no agreements among luck egalitarians what constitute the idea of human equality. Some says equality of individuals involves equality of resources, other says it involves equal opportunity and still others hold it involves equality of welfare. But all share one idea in common in that all believes that equality of human requires equal treatment in some respects.
On the other hand, however luck egalitarian distributive principles also cherish the principle of desert. This principle states that justice demands that, as has been discussed, people who are more deserving should enjoy higher well-being than those who are less deserving. This principle connotes the idea that well-being should be proportional to desert.

That is for luck egalitarians equality does not apply in all sphere of human life. It is relevant only in some aspect of life, and other aspect of life should be free from the leveling process. But one’s equality is achieved in the relevant way then justice is not necessary. For instance Dworkin limit equality only at the starting position. But once equality is achieved at the beginning then redistribution of resources would be the result of individual’s effort. For Arneson, too, the fate of individuals would be determined by their personal effort once all have equal opportunity for welfare.

However, there are situation when the two principles do not sit in comfort to one another. While the principle of equality requires equal treatment of individuals dictates equal concern for their wellbeing, the principle of desert requires that equal respect dictates people should enjoy the fruit of their conscientious choice. It is not difficult to find a situation where the two ideals conflict and luck egalitarians give an overriding weight to the principle of desert.

Imagine a world where, as a result of the effort of the luck egalitarians, the life of people influenced only by factors which is morally speaking under the control of individuals. There are no individuals whose life is affected by morally arbitrary factors. The impact of brute luck on the life of people in other word is none. I know this is impossible but it helps to show the case more vividly.

Once the impact of luck is neutralized throughout the life of people, what govern distribution of resources? Once the impact of brute luck is controlled, I think the principle of desert would govern the distribution. In this ideal world the wellbeing of individuals should be governed by their conscientious choice. This is compatible with the principle of luck egalitarians that distribution should be sensitive to choice. This shows that the principle of desert has more moral value then the principle of equality for luck egalitarianism.
Giving priority for desert over equality has a number of unacceptable consequences. One consequence is that it denies individuals access to income and wealth which is central to the life of individuals. This leads to extreme inequality which could be contrary to the concern for others. Assume that there arise a distribution that makes some extremely poor and others extremely rich. The level of poverty is so high people suffers but others are so rich that their life seems unreasonable.

But this is not compatible with the concern for the life of individuals? What motivates one to care about the life of others? Why the luck egalitarians are concerned with the life of people? That I think is the moral equality of people. They believes that all human beings are equal and this entails the precept that one has to be concerned the life of people equally. If this is the case then is a luck egalitarians justified in interfering in the life of the poor though they are poor as a result of imprudent choice? I think there is no justification for luck egalitarians to redistribute resources in the above mentioned ideal world. He cannot interfere to compensate the situation of the poor.

It is not difficult to find the reason for withdrawing from compensating the situation of the poor by choice. Luck egalitarianism believes in the principle that distribution should be sensitive to choice. And this principle permits or even requires that desert should govern distribution if the impact of luck on the life of people is controlled. But there is no reason to suppose that the outcome of option luck always fair. There could be people who may suffer as a result of their option luck. But luck egalitarians cannot compensate to the situation of this poor. This I think is its overemphasis on the principle of desert. But this overemphasis on the principle of desert may leads to undermining of the principle of equality.

Chapter Four

4.1. Introduction

In the last chapter I have argued that luck egalitarians are insensitive to the situation of the imprudent and that this is because of its overemphasis on the sole role choice as central to make a life and death decision on access to the life of individuals. But this seems incompatible with the basic tenants of egalitarianism. Egalitarianism gives central importance to equality.
This makes the belief that the life of people should not be arbitrary affected by factors which are beyond their control. However it also a principle of desert; it believe that choice should be central to determine distribution. It assumes that conscientious choice should be given unconstrained role to determine access to material goods. But this belief is has a consequence which is counter-intuitive to our moral intuition. In this chapter first I will discuss the principle of equality in luck egalitarianism, and then I will show how the principle of desert is in conflict with the principle of equality.

4.2 The principle of equality

Luck egalitarianism as a political ideal embedded as its main feature the principle of equality. Of course the main feature of luck egalitarianism, as a principle of egalitarianism, is its emphasis on the principle of equality. Equality or the desire to bring equality among individuals is one of the most important moral ideals of egalitarianism. This concern for the equality of individuals reflected in most of their writing.

Moreover most of its moral principle also reflects their concern for human equality. The moral ideals that no one should be advantaged or disadvantaged by factors beyond personal control, for instance this basic concern for the equal worth of human life. A number of writing of egalitarians reflects this concern. For instance Dworkin (1981), in equality of what: equality of resources argues that distributional principle must be insensitive to endowments. And his arguments to equalize resources in pre-social stage—that is before entry into society—express his concern for equal treatment of individuals.

In my view this is an important contribution of for the concept of equality. His ideas that distributional principle should be insensitive to natural lottery are taken from Rawls. Rawls in A Theory of justice argues for instance that the life prospects of individuals should not be influenced by factors in which they are not responsible. And this seems intuitively true. That there are a number of factors that affect the life prospects of individuals: the life chance of individuals, to a large extent, influenced by so many factors. Some of these are arbitrary from “moral” point of view. The kind of ethnic group I am born in or the kind of country I am born are morally arbitrary. Why they are morally arbitrary because I was not chosen in advance where I should belong; pure brute luck assigns me where I should belong.
Particularly this view, it seems to me, progressive in light of some ideology of feudalism or caste society. It clearly captures the equal worth of human life. It is more advantageous particularly to those whose life is negatively influenced by the morally arbitrary factors. If the life of human are equal than all, including the poor should have equal opportunity and resources to live a meaningful life. And if one is concerned to bring about desirable state of affairs that are conductive to live a meaningful life then one has to eliminate those obstacles that impedes individuals’ attempt to live their conception of the good life. Positively one should also provide what could be rationally provided to enable people to live a meaningful life.

There could be a number of requirements to equalize the condition of human life. I am not to consider all the case that contributes to the realization of the principle of equality; but I will focus only on that economic condition that is supposed to bring equality among individuals. These economic conditions could be narrowly defined as conditions that improve or impoverish the well-being of individuals or their conception of the good life.

Rawls (1971) in *A Theory of Justice* argues that there are certain things that all human beings want irrespective of their conception of the good. That is whatever else people wants they all wants something in common and this is the primary goods. They are central to human life because it enable one to live his conception of what give meaning to human life. In other sense without such goods human practically cannot or would be difficult to realize their conception of the good. Among these are accesses to material resources. That all human beings should have a certain level of access to these material resources.

It is in this spirit that the great luck egalitarians writers render meaning to the idea of equality. Though different luck egalitarians differ in their conception of what must be equalized, they all belief that it is the equal moral worth of individuals that justify equalization of the equalisandum. For instance Dworkin argues for the equalization of resources and Arneson argues for the equalization of equal opportunity for welfare. But one could ask why we should equalize the equalisandum. The world as it is known is full of example where the life of individuals are determined by factors some of which are under the control of the individuals but most of which, and the most important of them, are beyond the control of humans. The life prospects of human as Rawls says determined by from the beginning by morally arbitrary factors.
And these morally arbitrary factors undermine the life worth of peoples. That all individuals, as common sense suggest, have only one life chance. And that people should live their life in a meaningful way. And if all human life has equal worth then all should have equal opportunity and ability to live their conception of the good life. But this requires the offsetting the impact of morally arbitrary factors from the life of individuals. And the luck egalitarians are motivated by the desire to bring equality that wants to offset the impact pure luck of life individuals.

Egalitarians are not only cherishing the human equality but also that they are also prioritarianism. By prioritarians I mean a moral view which gives priority to the well-fare of the less well-off members of a society. That is in situation where we are going to give one more unit of welfare for two individuals, X and Y, then one is going to give the extra welfare for X if Y is better-off than X. This could be found in the writing of major luck egalitarians. For instance Dworkin idea of the hypostatical insurance market is intended to compensate to the situation of the worse off members of the society. That is the hypothetical insurance company is almost similar with the institution of state (Kymilika, 2002, 79). The insurance company payment for the victims is similar with state compensation policy for the worse off. If one reflects on the desire of luck egalitarians to sympathize with the worse off, one could say they are concerned not only to bring equality but also give priority to the disadvantaged.

Of course this prioritarianism may not constitute an independent principle; it is an extension of the principle of equality. It is the principle of equality that requires unequal treatment or giving priority. If I have one dollar and to give this to starved people A or B, and I realize that A ate his breakfast this morning and B ate breakfast only two days before, then equal concern for the situations of the two requires me to treat them unequally, that is I will give to the more starved. It is in this spirit that luck egalitarians also prioritarians. For instance the desires of the luck egalitarians to compensate the situation of the disable express this prioritariansm principle.

But if one reflects why the luck egalitarians concerned for the worse off, one could see that she is motivate by the desire to bring equality. For instance Dworkin argues that the equal treatment of people requires not only equalizing social primary goods but also natural primary goods. This is because like the social primary goods they also affect one’s well-being. And the
disabled in comparison to the able-bodied are at disadvantage. And if one concerned with equal concern for the life of people, one should also compensate those who are unlucky in the natural lottery. This is explained by the luck egalitarian desires to bring human equality.

Luck egalitarians show their concern for the life of humans by eliminating the impact of morally arbitrary factors from the life prospects of the life of individuals. But a close reflection on the definition of what makes some factor morally arbitrary and others morally relevant, seems to be confused. Why choice considered as morally relevant and deserves special status as the sole factors for determining well-being. Why choice is the sole morally relevant factors for determining one’s access to material resources. Is there a principle that could complement choice as the principle of distribution? I will discuss this point further in the subsequent discussion; but for now I will turn on the other side of the luck egalitarian face.

4.3 Distribution as choice-sensitive

As has been shown the distribution principle that is favored by luck egalitarianism should be insensitive to morally arbitrary factor such as natural endowments. However it should be sensitive to morally relevant factor such as choice. However a distribution principle that is sensitive to choice and insensitive to endowments justify some kind of desert principle. And this principle of desert could be shown to be incompatible with the principle of equality.

The flower industry could be a best example to show the incompatibility of the principle of desert and equality. The principle of equality including its corollary the principle of priority favors the poor farmers. However the principle of desert favors the owner of the industry. If one is luck egalitarian, how one is to handle this moral dilemma? To illustrate the case, the principle of equality requires that we have to treat individuals equally. And the equal treatment of individuals requires that since the poor farmers are worse-off in well-being in comparison to the owner of the flower industry, we have to give an additional resource to the poor farmers. That is the principle of priority favors the conditions of the poor farmers. And if it is possible then we have to transfer to the poor. That is if one is to give one additional unit of welfare either to the poor farmers or the owner of the plant, then justice dictates that we have to transfer to the poor.
However the principle of desert argues for the contrary. That is the principle of desert favors transfer to the owner of the industry. The principle states that the welfare of individuals should be proportion to their effort or desert. The more a person makes an effort or succeeds in his option luck the more deserving he is. Which means since the owner are succeed in their option luck they deserve a better life. The converse also true, that is the less a person is succeeds in his option luck the less well-being he deserves. This means the poor farmers also less succeeds in their option luck; which means they deserve to live a worse-off life.

If this is the case then which principle should the luck egalitarians overrides? Or which principle has more weight to the luck egalitarians? And which principle should have more weight in general? I think the principle of desert has more value than the principle of equality in this case and in general in the case of luck egalitarians if the two values are in conflict. Now I will show how the principle of desert is more important than that of equality.

The above example shows that the additional well-being should be given to the poor farmers because they are the less well-off. But this construction of the argument is not incomplete in two ways. First it has to be known that luck egalitarians are not concerned with the equalization outcome. But in the case the flower industry, the condition of the farmers and the owners shows a result or an outcome. That is the plight of the poor and the rich are the outcome of option luck. If the luck egalitarians are concerned with outcome, their concern confined only to evaluate the initial situation. But if the initial situation is just, then the outcome is just. This means if the luck egalitarians were to know that the poor becomes poor by choice and the rich become rich by choice, than they affirm the result of this choice as just.

Luck egalitarians principle requires that benefit has to be determined by conscientious choice. In this case if the owners make a good choice or conscientious choice, and the farmers make imprudent choices then they have to bear the consequence of their choice.

Second the above example is also not complete in other respects. That is the luck egalitarians favor giving the worst off the additional well-being because he does not know the sources of this well-being. And to complete the picture, one has to tell where one has to obtain the resources that have to be transferred. The source of resources is important in determining the moral status of a distribution. For instance one obtains windfall resources and distributes that to people who are poor by choice; it does not violate a legitimate right of others. But if one
transfer resources from the rich who become rich by conscientious choice, then the transfer is wrong for it violates the right of the rich.

Thus it is important to make clear the source of transfer to know how the luck egalitarians evaluate the moral nature of the transfer. In other word if it is known that it is part of the wealth of the industrialists that is going to be transfer to the poor farmers the luck egalitarians will stand against this transfer. This is because luck egalitarians are concerned only to regulate the impact of morally arbitrary factors from the life prospects of people. But the wealth of the industrialists derived from the conscientious effort. And it is unjust to transfer the wealth of people if they obtain it through their choice.

But once this complete picture is given it could be shown that luck egalitarians override the principle of equality for the principle of desert. That in situation where the two ideals are in conflict, luck egalitarians give more moral weight to the principle of desert.

4.4 Conclusion

The principle of desert sometimes crowd out the principle of equality. As the flower industry shows the luck egalitarians concern for producing a state of affairs where those who are the deserved get the better well-being. But this principle shows an excessive reliant on choice as a standard of distributional principle. Even if some practice of responsibility is acceptable, it is morally arbitrary to let choice make a life death decision on individual’s access to the material goods and resources that are central to their life. A sensible view of justice is that part of the question of who to get what is to be determined by some principle which also makes some constrain on the role choice in determining who to be included and to be excluded from having material resources.

Chapter Five

5.1 Introduction

Why are luck egalitarians concerned with the choice? The principle of desert states that it is morally better or good when people live according to their choice, as in the case of Dworkin
and / or conscientious choice, as in the case of Arneson, with equal background condition. The emphasis is on the rewarding desert understood as prudence or conscientious choice or punishing the imprudent or the unconscientiously choicer.

An overemphasis on choice as the sole determinant of access to material life is unacceptable given its consequence on the life of people. That is the consequence of choice on the life of people acceptable, given the central importance of material goods on the life of people? If one reflects on the consequence of wrong choice on one’s access to material resource one can see that some other complementing principle is necessary to complement choice. In the following chapter first I will discuss the consequence of giving central importance to choice. Then I will explore, following Peter Vallentyne’s idea of complementing choice by some other independent principle.

5.2 Consequence of choice

As the flower industry shows one consequence of punishing individuals for imprudence is that it excludes them from having access to goods which are central to live a humanely life? They are excluded because they fail to make a prudent choice. It is one thing to ask whether it is fair to exclude people from lifelong welfare merely because they make an error at one point in their life time. But it is another thing to ask whether one could accept the consequence of choice particularly in light of the importance of material goods on the life of people. Giving central importance to income and wealth, Rawls in A Theory of Justice argues that they are important and central to the life of people in the sense that all wants them whatever else they want.

Now if income and wealth have such central importance on the life of people, why such a big issue as having access to goods that is central to human life would be depend on the ability to make a prudent decision? That is to put the question in more concrete terms, why we make the life of the farmers full of suffering on the presumption that they make an error either in choosing their good or executing their choice or both. That is it fair to make the whole life of individuals worse-off on the reason that one point in time they make imprudent decision?

Answering this question is based on, among other things in weakening the moral bases of choices and presenting an alternative to choice as a criterion for distribution. To begin with
why choice is more morally relevant than other factors to determine distribution? In other word why choice is the only morally relevant factor; what the determining feature of choice is? The second question is to what extent choice should determine the distribution of material goods and advantages. Is there other independent factor that could constrain or limit choice?

To begin with the question why the right to access for material good would be determined decisively by the ability to make prudent choice? Why we depends access to important material conditions that is central to human survival and flourishing on such trivial issue as the ability to make a prudent choice? Why choice is morally relevant than other factors?

The idea of choice seems central to egalitarians such as Rawls, Dworkin and Arneson. They make choice or the capacity to determine one’s conception of the good life as good in its own right. For example for Rawls any conception of justice should be neutral to the idea of the good. It is the responsibility of individuals to choose, form and revised their conception of the good by themselves. Not only that they must be responsible but also be free to make and act on their conception of the good. Dworkin in *Equality of What: Equality of Resources* argues that individuals should be responsible to make their own choice by themselves. That everyone should take responsibility for its life by themselves. If people fail in their option luck then they have to burden its consequence. Included in this idea is that of choice and prudence. That people should choose their conception of life by themselves. This is good in and of itself.

But how choice obtains its status as a standard to determine individual’s access to material goods? What makes choice morally valuable than other factors as distributional standard? One of the implications of the assertion that choice is morally more valuable is that always the life of choice is good whatever its effects on the welfare of individuals. But one could ask why it is bad when my life prospects are affected by the country where I born and good when my life is affected by my own conscious effort, though my welfare is very poor in both cases? Why it is morally bad when I have a lower well-being when this well-being is the result of the economic status of my country and the moral value of my well-being changed to positive or become good when my well-being is low but it is the result of my personal weakness.

It is very difficult to make a decision in these cases. Take another example: imagine a two individual world. Assume both of them are poor. But the first person becomes poor because he is born into an arid area where there are little natural resources. And the second become poor
because he is lazy. Now morally speaking which one is better? Is it the situation of the first or the second person morally superior though they have equal welfare? If one believes that only choice is morally relevant than he has to approves the situation of the second person as better. That is if he has asked to choose then he has to choose poor by choice. But why being poor is far better off morally than being poor by accident? And what implication could such kind of choice have on the status of choice as a standard to determine choice more morally relevant than other factors.

It is obvious to find why the egalitarians choose the former. If one is poor by choice this implies that there is freedom included in the first case. That is the person become poor because he wills it or at least he had an effective alternative; and this seems to imply that freedom in and of itself is more valuable. That is a life of poverty is more valuable if it is the result of choice and what makes it more valuable is the implicit recognition of liberty. But the question is: even if it may be true that the life of choice is more valuable than a life devoid of it, how we can jump to the conclusion that choice must be the decisive factor in determining access to material resources.

The straight forward answer is that choice entails responsibility; that the life of choice assumes implicitly responsibility. And individuals should assume responsibility to all their choice. To some extent this is true. That social life in general requires that. One has to take responsibility for his actions. But is it possible to conclude that choice should be the criterion to determine the question of who should get what? That is the sphere of the economy should be governed by the same principle of responsibility? Given the central importance of material goods on the life of people, access to these goods should not determined by choice alone.

When people choose one states of affairs over the other than they know the opportunity of doing this. And they should be prepared to accept the situation that results from it. This seems true that when one choose to do something he has to be willing to accept whatever consequence fall as a result of his decision if he chooses in ideal condition. There is no problem with it the problem arises if such kind of choice constitutes a life and death consequence on the life of individuals. If the results of such kind of decision could significantly affects the life of people then it has to be controlled.
Having this consequence in mind how is it possible to limit or complement choice? As there is no space, I will not discuss the first option but I will discuss the second. It is possible to make a sphere or a region that determines to what extent individuals should take responsibility. For instance, in the cases where the decision of individuals could lead them to lose the bases of their welfare a principle could be formulated. In the flower industry laws could be formulated to compensate all stakeholders to get compensation if the impact of their decision spill over into the sphere of livelihood. That is if a party could ends in poverty as a result of being involved in the common venture of the flower industry then he has to get 30% compensation. This is a liable way to control or make limitation to choice and the subsequent responsibility. But to make responsibility only on the basis of choice seems to put the most important part of our life on trivial criterion.

5.3 Conclusion

I have tried to show that excessive importance given to choice may have a dire consequence. Taking into consideration this consequence, access to material goods has to be determined by some other criterion. This could be done at least by formulating a principle that could complement choice. This is not difficult to make. Individuals could be make to expect as fair only that amount of goods that is in compatible with the compensation of the imprudent. That is their fair share is that which remains after compensation is given to the imprudent.
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