

Amartya Sen The Idea Of Justice

Amartya Sen The Idea Of Justice

Downloaded from
www.everybodystreet.com by Underwood & Collins

INTRODUCTION: REDEFINING THE LANDSCAPE OF JUSTICE

For centuries, philosophers have wrestled with a fundamental question: What is a just society? From Plato’s *Republic* to John Rawls’ *A Theory of Justice*, the dominant tradition has been to search for a perfect, transcendental set of principles that would define an ideally just world. Yet in his landmark 2009 work, **Amartya Sen** offers a radically different path. In *The Idea of Justice*, Sen moves away from the quest for a perfectly just institution and instead focuses on how we can reduce manifest injustices in the real world. This shift—from the transcendental to the comparative—is not just a philosophical nuance; it is a practical revolution in how we think about social justice, public policy, and human freedom.

Sen, a Nobel Prize-winning economist and philosopher, draws on his vast interdisciplinary knowledge—from welfare economics to ethics, from Indian jurisprudence to Western political thought—to build a framework that is at once profoundly intellectual and urgently actionable. In this article, we will explore the key ideas of **Amartya Sen The Idea Of Justice**, unpack why it challenges conventional theories, and consider its lasting impact on our understanding of democracy, development, and human capabilities.

THE CORE THESIS: TRANSCENDENTAL VS. COMPARATIVE JUSTICE

The opening pages of *The Idea of Justice* set the stage for Sen’s primary argument: that the entire tradition of Western political philosophy, from Hobbes to Rawls, has been obsessed with what Sen calls “transcendental institutionalism.” This approach asks: What are the perfectly just social arrangements? Once we identify these ideal institutions, the reasoning goes, we can work towards implementing them.

Sen argues that this focus is both unrealistic and unnecessary. He likens it to arguing about the “perfectly just” shape of a mountain when what we really need is a way to compare two valleys—one clearly more unjust than the other—and decide which one to avoid. In other words, we do not need to know the definition of a perfectly just society to recognize and **reduce manifest injustices**, such as famine, slavery, or systemic discrimination.

Why Transcendental Theory Falls Short

Sen offers several reasons why the transcendental approach is inadequate:

- **Multiple valid ideals:** People reasonably disagree about what a perfectly just society looks like. Is it one with maximum liberty, or one with strict equality? A transcendental theory must pick one, but Sen argues that plurality of reasons is a feature of justice, not a bug.
- **No ranking of imperfect alternatives:** Knowing the ideal does not tell us how to rank two imperfect but actual

situations. For example, even if we know what a perfectly just tax system would be, that knowledge does not help us compare a mildly regressive tax with a mildly progressive one.

- **Practical relevance:** Real-world decisions are about making things less unjust here and now, not about building a utopia. Sen’s comparative approach is designed for exactly these choices.

Thus, **Amartya Sen The Idea of Justice** proposes a shift from “What is perfect justice?” to “How can we advance justice in the world we inhabit?”

THE CAPABILITY APPROACH: JUSTICE AS FREEDOM

Central to Sen’s framework is the **capability approach**. This concept, which Sen first developed in the 1980s, moves the focus of justice from what people have (income, commodities) to what people are actually able to *do* and *be*—their “functionings” and “capabilities.”

Why does this matter for justice? Consider two people who both own a bicycle. For a person in good health with safe roads, the bicycle translates into mobility, access to work, and leisure. For a person with a disability or living in a crime-ridden area, the bicycle does not provide the same set of real freedoms. Traditional measures of income or resource distribution would treat them equally, but a capability lens reveals a clear injustice.

Key Elements of the Capability Approach

- **Functionings:** The states of being and doing that a person achieves (e.g., being well-nourished, taking part in community life).
- **Capabilities:** The real freedom or opportunity to achieve those functionings. Justice, for Sen, is about expanding people’s capabilities.
- **Conversion factors:** Personal, social, and environmental factors that affect how resources are turned into capabilities. Justice must account for these differences.

This approach has profound implications for **economic inequality** and **global justice**. Sen argues that the evaluation of a society’s justice should be based on the substantive freedoms that citizens actually enjoy, not merely on the abstract rights or resources they are formally granted.

IMPARTIALITY AND THE ROLE OF PUBLIC REASONING

How do we decide which injustices to address and which capabilities to prioritize? Sen turns to the concept of **impartiality**, but he redefines it. The classic device for impartiality in modern political philosophy is Rawls’ “original position,” where individuals choose principles behind a veil of ignorance. Sen critiques this as “closed impartiality”—the only voices heard are those within a given society or nation-state.

Open Impartiality: The Voice of the “Other”

Sen proposes **open impartiality**, drawing on Adam Smith’s idea of the “impartial spectator.” When making judgments about justice, we should consider reason from the perspective of people outside our own community, even from different times and cultures. This is particularly important for **global justice**. For example, a policy of providing cheap labor in a developing country might seem acceptable within a national framework, but when we adopt the perspective of the workers themselves—or of a global spectator—its injustice becomes clear.

Open impartiality is not an abstract ideal; it is grounded in **public reasoning**. Sen insists that justice requires democratic deliberation, debate, and the free exchange of ideas. He famously links democracy not merely to elections but to “government by discussion.” This emphasis on public reason is one of the most powerful themes in **Amartya Sen The Idea of Justice**.

CRITIQUE OF RAWLS AND THE CONTRACTARIAN TRADITION

John Rawls’ *A Theory of Justice* is arguably the most influential work of political philosophy in the 20th century. Sen engages with it deeply, respecting its contributions but also offering sharp critiques. The two main points of departure are:

1. **Focus on institutions vs. actual lives:** Rawls concentrates on designing basic institutions that would be chosen by rational parties in the original position. Sen argues that we must look beyond institutions to what people are actually able to do. A perfectly just constitution can coexist with widespread hunger if conversion factors are ignored.
2. **The problem of fully comprehensive doctrines:** Rawls assumes that rational parties will agree on a single set of principles. Sen counters that in a world of pluralistic values, we need a framework that accommodates multiple reasonable perspectives.

Sen does not reject Rawls wholesale; indeed, he adopts the concept of “primary goods” but transforms it into a focus on capabilities. The **idea of justice** that Sen presents is therefore not a rival to Rawls but a complementary, more inclusive approach that prioritizes **comparative assessment** over transcendental agreement.

JUSTICE, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMOCRACY

One of the reasons **Amartya Sen The Idea of Justice** resonates so strongly with policy-makers and activists is its seamless connection to real-world development. Sen’s earlier work, *Development as Freedom*, argued that development is the expansion of human capabilities. *The Idea of Justice* provides the philosophical foundation for that argument.

Famines and the Role of Democracy

Sen’s famous empirical work on famines demonstrates that no major famine has ever occurred in a functioning multiparty democracy with a free press. This is not a coincidence. He shows

that democracy provides the **public reasoning** necessary to expose and remedy severe injustices. When governments are held accountable through elections and open debate, they are forced to address the needs of the most vulnerable.

Thus, for Sen, justice is not something that can be handed down by a philosopher-king or a set of constitutional clauses. It is an ongoing process of public deliberation, contestation, and democratic practice. This makes his work deeply relevant for issues of **social justice** in an era of rising authoritarianism, inequality, and climate crisis.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS: FROM PHILOSOPHY TO POLICY

While Sen’s book is a work of philosophy, its implications are highly practical. Here are a few key areas where **the idea of justice** as described by Sen has influenced real-world thinking:

- **Human Development Index (HDI):** The United Nations’ HDI, which measures health, education, and income, was heavily influenced by Sen’s capability approach. It moves beyond GDP to capture what people can actually do.
- **Gender justice:** Sen’s analysis of missing women and intra-household inequality highlights how capability failures often affect women disproportionately. Policies aiming at women’s education and agency are direct applications of his framework.
- **Global justice and poverty reduction:** Sen argues for evaluating trade policies, climate agreements, and global governance not by abstract principles but by their actual impact on people’s capabilities, especially the most disadvantaged.
- **Participatory governance:** The emphasis on public reasoning supports practices like citizen juries, deliberative polls, and community monitoring of public services.

CRITICISMS AND ONGOING DEBATES

No major work is without its critics, and **Amartya Sen’s The Idea of Justice** has sparked lively debate. Some scholars argue that Sen’s approach lacks a clear decision procedure: If we have multiple capabilities and multiple reasons, how do we trade them off? Sen’s response is that a perfect ranking is neither possible nor necessary; we only need partial rankings to compare clear injustices.

Others contend that Sen underestimates the importance of structural power and institutions. Martha Nussbaum, a fellow capability theorist, has argued for a more specific list of core capabilities protected by constitutional law. Sen resists such a list, preferring context-sensitive public reasoning.

Despite these differences, the core of Sen’s vision remains powerful: that justice is not a fixed destination but a journey of reducing injustice through reasoned public debate, anchored in the real freedoms of actual human beings.

CONCLUSION: THE ENDURING RELEVANCE OF THE IDEA OF JUSTICE

In *The Idea of Justice*, Amartya Sen does not give us a formula or a blueprint. Instead, he gives us a way of thinking—a way that is humble enough to acknowledge human plurality, yet ambitious enough to demand that we confront suffering and exclusion. By replacing the quest for a perfectly just society with the practical commitment to making our world less unjust, Sen offers a philosophy that is as relevant for a village council as it is for a global summit.

The book reminds us that justice is not a property of institutions alone; it resides in the lives people lead, the choices they can make, and the voices they can raise. For anyone concerned with social justice, economic inequality, or democratic renewal,

Amartya Sen The Idea of Justice remains an indispensable guide—one that invites us not to dream of a perfect world, but to act wisely and compassionately in the one we have.