IMSU Journal of Communication Studies
Volume 10, Issue 1, 2026
ISSN: 2682-6321, E-ISSN: 2705-2240
www.imsujcs.com

RAWLS' THEORY OF JUSTICE AND THE MORAL CHALLENGE OF GLOBAL INEQUALITY: TOWARD A COMMUNITARIAN ALTERNATIVE

[1]UMEOGU, Bonaventure Uchenna
[2]OJIAKOR-UMENZE, Ifeoma

[1]Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
[2]Department of Development Communication, Imo State University, Owerri

Corresponding Author: UMEOGU, Bonaventure Uchenna; bonaumeogu@yahoo.com.

Abstract

Global inequality remains one of the most profound moral challenges of the twenty-first century, revealing deep structural disparities in wealth, power, and opportunity among nations. John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* (1971) provides a foundational framework for understanding fairness and distributive justice within liberal societies. However, its nation-centered scope raises critical questions about its adequacy in addressing the moral demands of an interconnected global order. This paper interrogates the limits of Rawls' principles of justice—particularly the difference principle and the original position—when applied beyond state boundaries. It engages cosmopolitan critics such as Thomas Pogge and Charles Beitz, who argue for the global extension of Rawlsian fairness, as well as Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, who propose a capability-oriented alternative to distributive justice. The paper contends that Rawls' later work, *The Law of Peoples* (1999), though an attempt to extend his framework to international relations, insufficiently confronts the moral urgency of global inequality by maintaining the autonomy of national societies as the primary unit of justice. To respond to this limitation, the study explores the ethical potential of integrating Rawlsian justice with African communitarian thought—particularly the Ubuntu conception of relational personhood, which emphasizes moral responsibility, solidarity, and shared humanity. By synthesizing Rawls' concern for fairness with the African vision of communal interdependence, the paper proposes a more comprehensive moral paradigm for global justice—one that transcends borders, prioritizes human dignity, and affirms the universal ethical responsibility to alleviate structural inequality.

Keywords: Global justice; John Rawls; Ubuntu; Communitarianism; Distributive justice; Capability approach

Introduction

The persistence of global inequality stands as one of the most urgent moral and philosophical questions of our age. In a world increasingly defined by globalization, digital interconnection, and transnational dependence, the gap between the affluent and the impoverished continues to widen. This inequality manifests not only in economic terms—income, wealth, and access to resources—but also in opportunities for education, health care, political participation, and human flourishing. The moral discomfort that such inequality provokes has made the question of global justice a central theme in contemporary ethical and political philosophy. Within this discourse, John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* (1971) remains a foundational point of reference, offering a rigorous framework for understanding justice as fairness. Yet, the applicability of Rawls' theory to the global sphere remains deeply contested.

Rawls' philosophical project sought to provide an alternative to utilitarianism by grounding justice not in aggregate welfare, but in fairness and equality of opportunity. Through the conceptual device of the original position and the veil of ignorance, Rawls imagined rational individuals choosing principles of justice without knowledge of their social status, class, race, or natural endowments. The outcome, he argued, would be two principles: first, equal basic liberties for all, and second, social and economic inequalities arranged to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society. These principles, taken together, constitute Rawls' notion of a just social order, one that guarantees fairness, dignity, and moral reciprocity among citizens.

However, Rawls' framework was explicitly designed for the "basic structure" of a single liberal democratic society. Its scope, as Rawls himself emphasized, did not extend beyond national borders. In his later work, *The Law of Peoples* (1999), Rawls attempted to address global justice by proposing principles governing relations among *peoples* rather than individuals. He distinguished between "liberal peoples" and "decent hierarchical societies," arguing that justice among nations required mutual respect, non-aggression, and assistance to burdened societies. Yet critics such as Thomas Pogge, Charles Beitz, and Amartya Sen contend that this extension remains morally inadequate. By maintaining the autonomy of states as the primary unit of justice, Rawls' global framework fails to confront the structural injustices that perpetuate poverty and inequality on a global scale.

The moral challenge, then, is to determine whether the Rawlsian ideal of fairness can be meaningfully applied to a world where the fates of individuals and nations are profoundly interdependent. Globalization has blurred the boundaries of responsibility: decisions made in one part of the world regarding trade, finance, or environmental policy directly affect the lives of millions elsewhere. If justice is fairness, as Rawls insists, can it remain confined within national borders when global institutions, corporations, and policies shape the prospects of entire populations? The philosophical question thus transcends technical debates about distributive mechanisms; it becomes a matter of moral vision—how humanity conceives of its collective responsibility in a deeply unequal world.

In addressing this tension, this paper argues that Rawls' *Theory of Justice*, though limited in scope, offers a powerful moral vocabulary for articulating global fairness if reinterpreted through broader ethical lenses. By engaging cosmopolitan critiques and incorporating non-Western moral traditions, particularly African communitarian ethics, the paper seeks to reconstruct Rawlsian justice as a truly global ideal. African philosophy, with its emphasis on *Ubuntu*—the belief that "a person is a person through other persons"—offers a moral insight that complements and extends Rawls' principles. Where Rawls emphasizes fairness through impartial reasoning, *Ubuntu* emphasizes solidarity through shared humanity. Together, they reveal justice not merely as institutional arrangement but as moral relationship.

The Core of Rawls' Theory of Justice

John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* (1971) stands as one of the most influential works in twentieth-century political philosophy. It represents a systematic attempt to articulate the moral foundations of a just society based not on utility or merit, but on fairness. Rawls sought to reconcile the tension between liberty and equality that has long preoccupied political thought, offering a framework that secures both individual rights and social cooperation under conditions of impartiality. His approach, often described as "justice as fairness," is both procedural and substantive: it defines fair conditions for choosing principles of justice and specifies the content of those principles themselves.

The Original Position and the Veil of Ignorance

At the heart of Rawls' theory lies the thought experiment of the original position. This hypothetical situation is designed to establish impartiality in the formulation of principles of justice. In the original position,

rational and free individuals come together to determine the basic rules governing the distribution of rights, duties, and resources in society. However, to ensure fairness, Rawls introduces the veil of ignorance, a conceptual device that deprives these individuals of all knowledge of their particular characteristics—such as social class, race, gender, natural talents, or conception of the good.

Behind this veil, each person is ignorant of their position in society and therefore motivated to choose principles that safeguard the well-being of all, including the least advantaged. This device operationalizes the Kantian ideal of moral autonomy: decisions are made not from self-interest but from a standpoint of rational universality. The veil of ignorance thus transforms justice from a matter of power or privilege into a question of fairness grounded in reason.

The Two Principles of Justice

From this original position, Rawls argues, rational agents would agree upon two fundamental principles of justice:

1. The First Principle (Equal Basic Liberties): Each person has an equal right to the most extensive system of basic liberties compatible with a similar system for all. This principle guarantees fundamental rights such as freedom of conscience, thought, expression, association, and political participation. It affirms the moral priority of liberty, reflecting Rawls' commitment to the inviolability of persons as free and equal moral agents.
2. The Second Principle (Social and Economic Justice): Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both:

    a) To the greatest benefit of the least advantaged (the difference principle), and
    b) Attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity.

3. These principles reflect Rawls' belief that while inequalities may be inevitable, they are morally justifiable only if they improve the position of those who are worst off. In this way, Rawls departs from utilitarianism, which permits inequalities so long as they maximize total welfare. Instead, he insists on the moral primacy of fairness and the protection of the vulnerable as the standard of justice.

Justice as Fairness and the Basic Structure

Rawls applies these principles to what he calls the "basic structure" of society—its main political, economic, and social institutions. Justice, for Rawls, is not about isolated moral acts but about the design of institutions that distribute rights, duties, and opportunities. A just society is therefore one whose major institutions are organized so that citizens can cooperate as free and equal persons. This structural focus reflects Rawls' view that social injustice often originates not from individual wrongdoing but from systemic arrangements that privilege certain groups.

The difference principle plays a crucial role in regulating economic and social structures. It legitimizes inequality only if it benefits the least advantaged through mechanisms such as progressive taxation, public education, or welfare systems. By combining this with the principle of equal basic liberties, Rawls envisions a liberal democratic order where freedom and equality are not competing values but mutually reinforcing ones.

Moral Foundations of Rawls' Theory

Underlying Rawls' theory is a moral vision rooted in the Kantian tradition. Justice, for Rawls, is the expression of respect for persons as ends in themselves. The fairness of social institutions must therefore reflect the moral equality of all human beings. His conception of the person as rational, autonomous, and capable of forming and revising a conception of the good anchors his entire theory. This moral anthropology distinguishes Rawls' work from utilitarian approaches that treat individuals as bearers of utility rather than as moral equals.

Rawls also emphasizes the priority of the right over the good, meaning that principles of justice should not depend on any particular conception of happiness or moral virtue. Instead, justice as fairness provides a neutral framework within which individuals may pursue their diverse goals. This procedural neutrality, however, has drawn criticism from communitarian and global theorists who argue that moral and social interdependence cannot be abstracted away from justice.

Significance and Scope

Rawls' *Theory of Justice* provides a coherent moral justification for the modern welfare state and continues to shape debates about distributive fairness. However, its scope is explicitly limited to a single, well-ordered society. Rawls maintains that principles of justice apply primarily to the internal structure of a state, where citizens share a common political culture and moral conception of fairness. This restriction becomes the central point of contention in discussions of global justice. If fairness is a moral ideal derived from impartial reasoning, can it justly stop at national borders?

This question marks the transition to the next section, where the paper examines the moral and practical limits of Rawls' theory when confronted with global inequality. While Rawls successfully redefines justice for domestic society, his framework appears less equipped to handle the ethical complexities of an interdependent world marked by extreme disparities in wealth and opportunity.

The Moral Limits of Rawls' Theory of Justice

Rawls' *Theory of Justice* remains a monumental achievement in modern moral and political philosophy. It systematizes fairness through reason, order, and the contractual imagination of human equality. Yet, for all its intellectual clarity, the Rawlsian project reveals significant limitations when confronted with the moral reality of global inequality.

The Nationalist Scope of Justice

Rawls' framework is explicitly designed for the "basic structure" of a single, self-contained liberal society. The original position assumes a closed society, where individuals are born, live, and die within the same national boundaries. This assumption, while methodologically convenient, becomes morally problematic when extended to a world of profound interdependence. As Charles Beitz (1979) argued in *Political Theory and International Relations*, if the original position is a device for ensuring impartiality, consistency demands its application to the global sphere. If individuals behind the veil of ignorance do not know their social position, they also should not know their nationality, as national affiliation is as morally arbitrary as class or talent.

Rawls' refusal to extend the original position globally suggests that the moral force of fairness stops at national borders. Yet this position is difficult to defend on Rawls' own terms. If the arbitrariness of birth into a particular social class justifies redistribution, why does the arbitrariness of birth into a particular nation not justify global redistribution? This inconsistency lies at the heart of the cosmopolitan critique.

The Law of Peoples: An Inadequate Response

In *The Law of Peoples* (1999), Rawls attempts to address international justice, but his framework remains circumscribed. He distinguishes between "liberal peoples" and "decent hierarchical peoples," arguing that justice among peoples requires non-intervention, mutual respect, and a duty of assistance to "burdened societies." However, several limitations are evident.

First, Rawls excludes from the scope of justice the vast inequalities that exist *between* peoples. His duty of assistance is aimed at helping burdened societies achieve well-orderedness, not at rectifying global distributive injustice. Second, by treating "peoples" as the primary moral units, Rawls obscures the ways in which global economic structures—shaped by affluent nations—perpetuate poverty and inequality. As Thomas Pogge (2002) argues in *World Poverty and Human Rights*, the global order is not a collection of isolated societies but an integrated system whose rules systematically disadvantage the poor. Rawls' framework, by focusing on states rather than the global institutional order, fails to address these structural injustices.

Third, the Law of Peoples permits vast inequalities between societies so long as each is internally well-ordered. This conclusion sits uneasily with Rawls' own difference principle, which requires inequalities to benefit the least advantaged *within* a society. If fairness requires that domestic inequalities benefit the worst-off, why does fairness not require the same at the global level?

Cosmopolitan Critiques: Pogge and Beitz

The most forceful critiques of Rawls' nationalist framework come from cosmopolitan theorists. Charles Beitz (1979) contends that the original position should be globalized: individuals behind the veil of ignorance would not know their nationality and would therefore choose principles that regulate global distributive justice. Beitz argues that the existence of global economic interdependence creates a global basic structure analogous to the domestic basic structure, making principles of distributive justice applicable internationally.

Thomas Pogge (2002) goes further, arguing that the global order itself is a coercive institutional scheme that shapes life prospects across borders. Wealthy nations and international institutions—the World Bank, IMF, WTO—establish rules governing trade, debt, and investment that systematically disadvantage developing countries. For Pogge, the duty of justice is not merely to assist the poor but to reform the global institutional order that perpetuates poverty. This is a more demanding requirement than Rawls' duty of assistance.

The Capability Alternative: Sen and Nussbaum

Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum offer another important critique, shifting the focus from resources to *capabilities*—what people are actually able to do and be. Sen (2009) argues that justice cannot be reduced to the distribution of primary goods, as Rawls proposes. Instead, justice must be assessed in terms of human capabilities: the real freedoms people have to pursue lives they have reason to value. Nussbaum (2011) develops this into a list of central capabilities—life, bodily health, affiliation, control over one's environment—that any minimally just society must secure for all citizens.

The capability approach challenges Rawls' framework by insisting that justice requires attention to *outcomes* for individuals, not merely the fairness of institutional rules. Applied globally, it demands that we assess global inequality not by comparing state-level resources but by examining the capabilities of the world's most disadvantaged individuals. This shift from institutions to human flourishing provides a powerful moral lens for addressing global inequality.

The Moral Challenge of Global Inequality

Global inequality is not merely an economic disparity; it is a profound moral crisis that exposes the gap between humanity's moral aspirations and its structural realities. The scale of contemporary inequality is staggering: according to Oxfam (2023), the world's richest 1% own nearly twice as much wealth as the entire global population. Such disparities are not natural or inevitable; they are produced and reproduced by global institutions, historical legacies of colonialism, and contemporary economic policies.

Structural Injustice and Complicity

Iris Marion Young (2011) offers a valuable framework for understanding global inequality through the concept of *structural injustice*. Structural injustice occurs when social processes systematically disadvantage certain groups, not because of individual wrongdoing but because of the normal operation of institutions. In the global context, structural injustice manifests in unfair trade rules, tax havens that deprive developing countries of revenue, and debt regimes that perpetuate dependency.

The challenge of structural injustice is that responsibility is diffuse. No single actor—no corporation, no government, no international institution—is solely responsible for global poverty. Yet all are implicated. This diffusion of responsibility is precisely what Rawls' state-centered framework fails to capture. Addressing global inequality requires moving beyond state-based assistance to a more robust account of shared responsibility for global structural arrangements.

Interdependence and Shared Humanity

The moral challenge of global inequality is deepened by the recognition of human interdependence. Globalization has created a world where the fates of individuals in different countries are intertwined. A financial crisis in one region triggers unemployment on another continent; carbon emissions from wealthy nations imperil the livelihoods of the world's poorest. This interdependence generates moral demands: if our actions affect others' life prospects, we have responsibilities toward them.

Yet interdependence alone does not specify the content of these responsibilities. Here, Rawls' framework—with its emphasis on fairness and reciprocity—offers a starting point, but it requires expansion. The necessary expansion, this paper argues, can be found in African communitarian thought.

Integrating Rawlsian Justice with African Communitarian Thought

African communitarian philosophy, particularly the *Ubuntu* tradition, offers moral resources that complement and extend Rawls' framework. Where Rawls emphasizes fairness as the product of rational agreement, Ubuntu emphasizes responsibility as the expression of shared humanity. Together, they provide a more comprehensive vision of global justice.

Ubuntu: Relational Personhood

The concept of *Ubuntu*, central to Southern African philosophy, is often summarized in the Nguni saying: *Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*—"a person is a person through other persons." This aphorism expresses a metaphysical claim: personhood is not an individual property but a relational achievement. One becomes fully human through relationships of mutual recognition, care, and responsibility.

Kwame Gyekye (1996) distinguishes between "moderate" and "radical" communitarianism, arguing that African thought typically embraces the moderate version: the individual is not subsumed by the community but is constituted through it. This relational conception of personhood has profound implications for ethics. If the self is constituted through relationships, then moral obligations are not

external constraints on individual autonomy but expressions of the self's own being. To harm another is to diminish oneself.

Ubuntu and Distributive Justice

Applied to distributive justice, Ubuntu shifts the moral focus from individual rights to communal flourishing. Thaddeus Metz (2007) argues that Ubuntu grounds a principle of distributive justice: we should prioritize the worst-off not merely because fairness demands it, but because the well-being of each is intertwined with the well-being of all. Where Rawls' difference principle is justified by rational self-interest behind the veil of ignorance, Ubuntu justifies it by the recognition that one's own humanity is incomplete without the flourishing of others.

This relational grounding offers a more robust foundation for global justice than Rawls' contractarian framework. If personhood is constituted through relationships, then national boundaries cannot limit moral responsibility. My humanity is constituted not only through relationships with fellow citizens but through relationships with all persons whose lives intersect with mine—including those in distant countries whose labor produces the goods I consume, whose environment is affected by my carbon emissions, and whose poverty is shaped by the global institutions I support.

Synthesizing Rawls and Ubuntu

The synthesis of Rawlsian fairness and Ubuntu ethics yields a moral framework with several distinctive features:

1. **Global scope**: Justice applies to all persons, regardless of nationality. The relational nature of personhood entails that moral responsibility is universal, not state-bound.
2. **Structural focus**: Following Rawls, justice concerns the basic structure of institutions. But the basic structure is now global: international trade regimes, financial institutions, and environmental agreements are subject to principles of fairness.
3. **Relational grounding**: The justification for these principles is not merely rational self-interest behind a veil of ignorance but the recognition of shared humanity. Justice is not only fair but also *communal*—an expression of our interdependence.
4. **Capability orientation**: Incorporating insights from Sen and Nussbaum, the framework focuses on what people are actually able to do and be. Global justice requires not merely the distribution of resources but the cultivation of conditions for human flourishing.
5. **Responsibility for structural injustice**: Drawing on Young's framework, the synthesis emphasizes shared responsibility for global structures. Responsibility is not only individual or state-based but collective and forward-looking.

Implications for Global Justice

This integrated framework yields concrete implications for how we understand and address global inequality.

Reforming Global Institutions

If global justice requires fairness in the global basic structure, then international institutions must be subject to principles of fairness. The World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization, and other global governance bodies should be redesigned to ensure that they do not systematically disadvantage developing countries. This requires reforms in trade rules, debt relief, tax cooperation to prevent evasion, and democratic participation in global decision-making.

Rethinking Development Assistance

From the perspective of Ubuntu, development assistance is not charity but obligation. The duty to assist burdened societies is not merely a duty of benevolence but a recognition that one's own humanity is incomplete while others suffer. However, assistance must be structured not to perpetuate dependency but to enable capabilities and self-determination. The goal is not to create well-ordered societies in Rawls' sense but to enable communities to flourish according to their own conceptions of the good.

Climate Justice

Climate change exemplifies the need for a global framework of responsibility. Wealthy nations have contributed disproportionately to emissions while the poorest nations suffer the most severe consequences. A Rawlsian-Ubuntu framework demands that mitigation and adaptation efforts prioritize the most vulnerable and that historical responsibility be recognized. Climate justice is not an optional extra but a requirement of global fairness and shared humanity.

Conclusion: Toward a New Moral Consciousness of Global Justice

The question of global inequality, at its deepest level, is not an economic puzzle but a moral revelation. It discloses the failure of humanity to live according to the truth of its interdependence. Rawls' *Theory of Justice* remains one of the most courageous attempts to rationalize fairness, yet its state-centered scope limits its capacity to address the structural injustices of the global order.

The cosmopolitan critiques of Pogge and Beitz, the capability approach of Sen and Nussbaum, and the relational ethics of Ubuntu together point toward a more adequate framework. This paper has argued that integrating Rawlsian fairness with African communitarian thought yields a vision of global justice that is both principled and relational—one that recognizes the demands of fairness while grounding those demands in the recognition of shared humanity.

Such a framework has profound implications. It requires us to see global institutions as part of the basic structure of justice. It demands that we take responsibility for structural injustices that transcend national boundaries. It calls for a moral transformation in how we understand ourselves—not as isolated individuals or citizens of particular states, but as participants in a shared human community.

The world today stands at a crossroads. Its technological power has outgrown its moral maturity. Unless humanity learns again that the essence of existence is co-existence—that reason must be guided by compassion, and that justice must begin with recognition—it will continue to perfect its systems while fragmenting its soul. The task before philosophy is not simply to interpret Rawls or critique the global order, but to reawaken the moral imagination of humanity.

Global inequality is not only a question of economics or politics—it is a question of being. To answer it is to rediscover the ontological vocation of justice: to make visible, in human relations, the invisible unity of life. Only through this renewal of moral consciousness can justice cease to be a theory and become what it was always meant to be: a living testament to the sacredness of every human being.

References

Beitz, C. R. (1979). *Political theory and international relations*. Princeton University Press.
Beitz, C. R. (2000). Rawls's law of peoples. *Ethics*, 110(4), 669–696.
Gyekye, K. (1996). *African cultural values: An introduction*. Sankofa Publishing.

Letseka, M. (2000). African philosophy and educational discourse. In P. Higgs, N. C. G. Vakalisa, T. V. Mda, & N. T. Assie-Lumumba (Eds.), *African voices in education* (pp. 179–193). Juta.
Metz, T. (2007). Toward an African moral theory. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 15(3), 321–341.
Metz, T. (2022). *A relational moral theory: African ethics in a global context*. Oxford University Press.
Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
Oxfam International. (2023). *Survival of the richest: How we must tax the super-rich now to fight inequality*. Oxfam Briefing Paper.
Pogge, T. (2002). *World poverty and human rights: Cosmopolitan responsibilities and reforms*. Polity Press.
Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.
Rawls, J. (1999). *The law of peoples*. Harvard University Press.
Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.
Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. Doubleday.
Wiredu, K. (1996). *Cultural universals and particulars: An African perspective*. Indiana University Press.
Young, I. M. (2011). *Responsibility for justice*. Oxford University Press.