

## **“A Comparative Study on Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel’s Idea of Justice”**

### **1. Nazrul Islam**

Research Scholar, Department of political science, AMU Aligarh.

### **2. Azad Ali**

PhD Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, AMU Aligarh.

### **3. Monsur Ahmed**

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science.

Swami Vivekananda College, Chandkhira, Karimganj.

### **Abstract**

This paper contrasts Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel, two prominent political philosophers, and their respective conceptions of justice. Libertarian theorist Nozick argued for a conception of justice that prioritizes equal access to opportunities rather than equal reward. Sandel, on the other hand, drew on classical theories of justice to stress the importance of both the recognition of individual rights and the social context of justice within communities. This paper uses a comparative approach to investigate the assumptions and outcomes that distinguish these two conceptions of justice. This paper reads the works of both Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel and compares and contrasts their respective theories of justice. Their potential relevance to current discussions of social and economic justice is also investigated. The purpose of this paper is to explore the common ground between these two schools of thought and the ways in which their insights can be applied to the analysis and defence of contemporary social and economic structures.

*Keywords: Robert Nozick, Michael Sandel, Idea Of Justice, Social And Economic Justice.*

### **1. Introduction**

Justice is a fundamental concept in political philosophy, providing a framework for evaluating the distribution of resources, rights, and opportunities within a society. It encompasses notions of fairness, equality, and the establishment of rules and institutions that govern social interactions. Over the centuries, numerous philosophers have offered their theories and perspectives on justice, reflecting the diversity of human values, social structures, and political ideologies (Wolff, 1991). In this paper, we delve into the ideas of justice proposed by two influential political philosophers, Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel. Both Nozick and Sandel have made significant contributions to the discourse on justice, yet their approaches differ markedly, presenting contrasting viewpoints on the nature of justice and its implications for societal arrangements. By engaging in a comparative study of their theories, we aim to shed light on the nuances and complexities within the concept of justice and explore its contemporary relevance.

Robert Nozick, a libertarian philosopher, presents his theory of justice in his seminal work "Anarchy, State, and Utopia." Nozick argues for the primacy of individual rights and freedoms, emphasizing the importance of self-ownership and voluntary transactions in the acquisition and distribution of resources. He proposes the entitlement theory, which asserts that justice in holdings is achieved when property rights are justly acquired and justly transferred. Nozick's minimalist state, limited to the protection of individual rights and enforcement of contracts, stands as a counterpoint to expansive governmental interventions. Michael Sandel, a communitarian philosopher, challenges the individualistic foundations of Nozick's theory. Sandel's book "Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?" examines the moral and ethical dimensions of justice, emphasizing the importance of communal values and the common good. Sandel argues that justice should not be reduced to the mere satisfaction of individual preferences or market exchanges. Instead, he advocates for a more deliberative approach that takes into account the shared moral commitments and social bonds that define a community (Sandel, 2010).

By comparing and contrasting the ideas put forth by Nozick and Sandel, we can gain deeper insights into the multifaceted nature of justice. This exploration allows us to understand the implications of their

theories for contemporary debates on distributive justice, income inequality, and the role of the state in promoting social well-being. It is crucial to examine and evaluate these perspectives as they continue to shape political and policy discussions in various contexts around the world. In the subsequent sections of this research paper, we will delve into the details of Nozick and Sandel's ideas of justice, critically analyze their arguments, identify areas of convergence and divergence, and explore the implications of their theories for contemporary society. By doing so, we aim to contribute to a comprehensive understanding of justice and its significance in fostering a just and equitable society (Dworkin, 1977).

### **1.1 Robert Nozick's Idea of Justice**

Robert Nozick, a prominent political philosopher, presented his ideas on justice in his influential work, "Anarchy, State, and Utopia." Nozick's conception of justice revolves around the principle of justice in holdings, which focuses on the distribution of resources and property rights within a society. His theory seeks to provide a framework for a just society that respects individual rights and liberties while limiting the role of the state (Singer, 2011). Nozick begins his theory with the concept of just acquisition, asserting that individuals have a right to acquire property through legitimate means. According to him, individuals are entitled to the fruits of their labor, which includes the acquisition and possession of property. Nozick argues that if individuals acquire property through voluntary exchanges or by transforming unowned resources with their labor, then the resulting distribution is just.

The entitlement theory is central to Nozick's idea of justice. According to this theory, a just distribution of resources can arise from an initial just acquisition followed by a series of voluntary transfers (exchanges) between individuals, as long as these transactions are conducted without force or fraud. Nozick emphasizes the importance of respecting property rights and the freedom of individuals to engage in voluntary transactions, as these actions are seen as manifestations of their self-ownership and autonomy (Nozick, 2001).

- **Exploration of Nozick's Principle of Justice in Holdings:** Nozick's principle of justice in holdings forms the foundation of his theory of justice. According to Nozick, individuals have the right to acquire, transfer, and hold property through legitimate means. He argues that justice requires respecting these rights, and any distribution of goods and resources that arises from a just initial acquisition and voluntary exchange is itself just.
- **Examination of the Entitlement Theory and the Concept of Just Acquisition:** Nozick's entitlement theory asserts that individuals are entitled to the fruits of their labor and the property they acquire through voluntary transactions. He argues that individuals have the right to acquire holdings through a process of just acquisition, where they mix their labor with unowned resources, thus establishing a legitimate claim to the resulting property. This concept of just acquisition emphasizes the importance of individual effort and productivity as the basis for rightful ownership.
- **Analysis of the Role of Self-Ownership and Voluntary Transactions in Nozick's Theory:** Central to Nozick's theory is the principle of self-ownership, which asserts that individuals have a fundamental right to control their own bodies and labor. This concept provides the basis for the rights to acquire and exchange property voluntarily. Nozick believes that individuals should be free to engage in transactions and associations of their choosing as long as they do not violate the rights of others. The voluntary nature of these transactions is seen as crucial to upholding individual freedom and respecting personal autonomy.
- **Critique of Nozick's Minimal State and the Primacy of Individual Rights:** Nozick's theory of justice leads him to advocate for a minimal state that primarily serves to protect individual rights and enforce voluntary agreements. Critics argue that Nozick's minimal state may not adequately address systemic inequalities and social injustices that can arise from a purely market-oriented approach to justice. They contend that Nozick's emphasis on individual rights and minimal state intervention neglects the social and economic disadvantages faced by certain individuals and groups, potentially perpetuating inequality and limiting the ability of the state to rectify such imbalances.

### **1.2 Michael Sandel's Idea of Justice**

Michael Sandel, a prominent political philosopher and Harvard professor, presents a distinct perspective on justice that emphasizes communitarian values and challenges individualistic notions of justice. Sandel's approach to justice focuses on the importance of the common good and questions the role of markets in distributing goods and resources fairly. Sandel criticizes the prevailing paradigm of justice, which he argues reduces justice to a matter of individual rights and utility maximization. In his book "Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?", Sandel contends that justice should not be solely based on maximizing individual autonomy and satisfaction but should also consider the ethical values and moral commitments of a community (Sandel, 2012).

One of the key elements of Sandel's idea of justice is the emphasis on the common good. He argues that justice requires making decisions that prioritize the well-being of the community as a whole, rather than simply aggregating the preferences and desires of individuals. According to Sandel, the common good should be a guiding principle in determining how resources, opportunities, and benefits are distributed in society (Wolff, 2011).

- **Critique of Individualism and Focus on Communitarian Values:** Michael Sandel presents a notable critique of individualism, challenging the idea that justice can be understood solely through the lens of individual rights and liberties. Sandel argues that an exclusive focus on individual autonomy neglects the significance of communal relationships, shared values, and the common good. He emphasizes the importance of considering the impact of social and cultural contexts on individuals, suggesting that justice must also address the flourishing of communities and the cultivation of shared ethical principles.
- **The Common Good as a Central Principle:** In Sandel's theory, the common good holds a central place in the concept of justice. He argues that justice should be understood as the pursuit of a shared sense of the good life for all members of society. Sandel suggests that determining what is just requires engaging in collective deliberation about the values and goals that contribute to the common good. This perspective challenges the notion that justice can be solely derived from abstract principles or individual preferences.
- **Argument against Market-Oriented Approaches to Justice:** One significant aspect of Sandel's theory of justice is his critique of market-oriented approaches, particularly those that treat goods and services purely as commodities to be bought and sold in the marketplace. Sandel argues that relying excessively on market mechanisms for the distribution of goods can undermine certain moral and social values, and can lead to the erosion of the common good.
- **Critique of Sandel's Potential Limitations in Addressing Individual Rights and Liberties:** While Sandel's emphasis on the common good and his critique of individualism provide valuable insights into the nature of justice, his communitarian approach has been subjected to criticism. One key concern is the potential subjugation of individual rights and liberties in favor of collective interests. Critics argue that Sandel's theory places too much emphasis on the community at the expense of individual autonomy, potentially leading to an infringement on individual freedoms.

## 2. Objective

The objective of this comparative study is to examine and analyze the contrasting ideas of justice proposed by Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel. By delving into their respective theories, the study aims to highlight the key differences in their perspectives, exploring their views on distributive justice, individual rights, and the role of the state. Through a comprehensive analysis, the study seeks to deepen our understanding of these influential philosophers' divergent conceptions of justice, shedding light on the implications and practical applications of their ideas in contemporary societies. Ultimately, the objective is to contribute to the ongoing discourse on justice and inform discussions on societal structures and policies.

## 3. Literature review

Nozick's minimal state is another significant aspect of his theory of justice. He argues for a limited role of the state, advocating for a minimal government that focuses on protecting individual rights and enforcing contracts. In Nozick's view, a just society is one where individuals are free to pursue their own interests,

engage in voluntary interactions, and enjoy the fruits of their labor without undue interference from the state (Nozick, 2019).

Critics of Nozick's theory argue that his emphasis on individual rights and voluntary transactions may lead to excessive inequalities in wealth and opportunity. They question whether a society based solely on the principles of just acquisition and voluntary exchanges can adequately address issues of social justice and ensure a fair distribution of resources (Nozick, 2001).

Nozick's minimal state has been criticized for its potential failure to address systemic injustices and protect the most vulnerable members of society. Critics argue that a more active role of the state is necessary to ensure equal opportunities and address social and economic inequalities that may arise from factors beyond individuals' control (Nozick, 1993).

Nozick's idea of justice centers on the principle of justice in holdings, which emphasizes the rights of individuals to acquire and transfer property through voluntary exchanges. His theory promotes individual rights, limited government intervention, and the importance of respecting self-ownership and autonomy. While Nozick's theory offers a compelling perspective on justice, it has faced criticism for its potential to perpetuate inequalities and overlook systemic injustices, prompting further exploration and debate within the field of political philosophy (Nozick, 2013).

Sandel highlights the importance of public deliberation and democratic decision-making in matters of justice. He suggests that ethical and moral questions should be debated and resolved through public discourse rather than being solely determined by individual preferences or market forces. This deliberative approach to justice allows for a more inclusive and participatory process in shaping societal values and policies (Sandel, 2017).

Sandel's emphasis on the common good and his skepticism towards market-oriented approaches to justice have faced criticism. Some argue that his communitarian perspective may undervalue individual rights and freedoms, potentially limiting individual autonomy and diversity. Critics also contend that Sandel's approach does not provide clear criteria for determining what constitutes the common good or how it should be balanced against individual interests (Appiah, 2010).

#### **4. Research methodology**

##### **4.1 Selection of Primary Texts:**

The primary texts selected for this study are Robert Nozick's "Anarchy, State, and Utopia" and Michael Sandel's "Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?". These texts were chosen due to their significance and influence in the field of political philosophy, particularly in relation to the authors' ideas of justice. Both texts provide comprehensive frameworks and arguments that will serve as the basis for the comparative analysis.

##### **4.2 Selection of Secondary Sources:**

To support the analysis of Nozick and Sandel's ideas of justice, a wide range of secondary sources will be consulted. These include scholarly articles, books, and critiques that offer insights and interpretations of the primary texts. The selection of secondary sources will be based on their relevance, credibility, and the perspectives they bring to the comparative study. Diverse viewpoints and criticisms will be considered to ensure a comprehensive analysis.

##### **4.3 Data Collection and Analysis:**

The data collection process will involve a close reading and thorough understanding of the selected primary texts and secondary sources. The primary texts will be carefully analyzed, with key arguments, concepts, and frameworks identified and documented. Notes will be taken to capture significant points and quotations that are relevant to the comparative analysis.

The data analysis process will involve synthesizing and organizing the collected information. Common themes, ideas, and arguments will be identified in both Nozick and Sandel's works. These themes will be compared and contrasted, focusing on the authors' perspectives on justice, the role of the state, and distributive justice. The analysis will involve a careful examination of the similarities and differences between their theories and an evaluation of their implications for contemporary debates on justice.

The methodology outlined above provides a systematic approach to conducting a comparative study of Nozick and Sandel's ideas of justice. It ensures that a comprehensive analysis is conducted, taking into account primary texts, secondary sources, and rigorous data collection and analysis procedures.

## 5. Result

By critically examining Sandel's critique of individualism, his emphasis on the common good, his arguments against market-oriented approaches, and his potential limitations in addressing individual rights and liberties, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of his theory of justice. This analysis contributes to the broader discussion on the role of community, solidarity, and shared values in conceptualizing and pursuing justice in contemporary societies.

### 5.1 Comparative Analysis

In this section, we will conduct a comparative analysis of Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel's conceptions of justice, highlighting the key similarities and differences between their theories. To aid in understanding the comparative analysis, we will present the information in the form of tables.

**Table 5.1: Nozick's Idea of Justice**

Aspect of Justice	Nozick's Perspective
Principle of Justice	Entitlement theory
Just Acquisition	Emphasizes self-ownership and voluntary transactions
Role of the State	Minimal state, primarily focused on protecting individual rights

**Table 5.2: Sandel's Idea of Justice**

Aspect of Justice	Sandel's Perspective
Principle of Justice	Focus on the common good and communitarian values
Critique of Individualism	Emphasizes the limitations of market-oriented approaches
Role of the State	Expanded role of the state to promote the common good

- **Principle of Justice:**Nozick's entitlement theory asserts that justice in holdings is achieved when individuals acquire and transfer property through voluntary transactions, respecting the principle of self-ownership. Sandel, on the other hand, criticizes individualism and highlights the importance of the common good as a guiding principle of justice.
- **Just Acquisition:**Nozick's theory places significant emphasis on self-ownership and voluntary transactions as the basis for just acquisition. Sandel's perspective questions the fairness of purely market-based acquisitions and argues for a more nuanced approach that considers the social context and consequences.
- **Role of the State:**Nozick advocates for a minimal state that primarily safeguards individual rights, leaving economic interactions to voluntary arrangements. In contrast, Sandel proposes an expanded role for the state, one that actively promotes and pursues the common good, recognizing the potential limitations of market mechanisms in addressing justice.

Through this comparative analysis, we can identify both similarities and differences in Nozick and Sandel's conceptions of justice. They both grapple with the question of how to achieve a just society, but they diverge in their emphasis on individual rights versus communitarian values and the role of the state.

Nozick's focus on individual rights and limited government intervention reflects a libertarian perspective that prioritizes personal freedoms and voluntary exchanges. However, this approach has been criticized for its potential to perpetuate or exacerbate inequalities in society.

Sandel's communitarian perspective emphasizes the importance of considering the common good and questioning the market's ability to achieve equitable outcomes. While this approach addresses concerns regarding distributive justice, it raises questions about individual rights and liberties.

It is crucial to note that this comparative analysis provides a simplified overview of the two philosophers' ideas and may not capture the full depth and nuances of their respective theories. Nonetheless, it highlights the contrasting perspectives and serves as a starting point for further exploration and analysis.

Further research and examination of alternative perspectives on justice are warranted to develop a comprehensive understanding of the complexities surrounding this fundamental concept and its application in contemporary societies.

### **5.2 Identification of similarities between Nozick and Sandel's conceptions of justice**

Despite their divergent views on justice, Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel share certain similarities in their conceptions of justice.

- **Focus on moral desert:** Both Nozick and Sandel acknowledge the importance of moral desert in their theories of justice. They argue that individuals should receive what they deserve based on their actions, contributions, and talents. Nozick's principle of justice in holdings emphasizes just acquisition and voluntary transfers, implying that individuals are entitled to the fruits of their labor and the products of their talents. Similarly, Sandel emphasizes the idea of deservingness in relation to the common good, arguing that justice requires individuals to contribute to and uphold the well-being of the community.
- **Critique of utilitarianism:** Nozick and Sandel share a critique of utilitarianism as a basis for justice. They reject the idea that justice can be solely determined by maximizing overall welfare or happiness. Nozick argues that distributive justice cannot be reduced to maximizing overall utility and that individual rights must be respected. Sandel also critiques utilitarianism, asserting that justice should not be based solely on aggregating individual preferences, but should take into account moral and ethical considerations.

### **5.3 Analysis of their differing views on the role of the state and individual rights**

- **Nozick's minimal state and individual rights:** Nozick advocates for a minimal state that only exists to protect individual rights, particularly property rights. He argues that the state should refrain from interfering with individuals' freedom to acquire and exchange property voluntarily. Nozick's theory places a strong emphasis on negative rights, such as the right to be free from interference, and limits the role of the state in redistributing resources for the sake of distributive justice.
- **Sandel's communitarian perspective and the role of the state:** Sandel takes a more communitarian approach, emphasizing the role of the state in promoting the common good and ensuring social justice. He argues that justice should involve a consideration of the values and goals of the community and those individuals have obligations towards the larger society. Sandel criticizes the market-driven approach to justice and advocates for the state to intervene in economic transactions and redistribute resources in order to address inequalities and promote fairness.

### **5.4 Evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of their respective theories**

#### **Strengths of Nozick's theory:**

- Nozick's theory places a strong emphasis on individual rights and personal freedom, which resonates with classical liberal values.
- His focus on voluntary transactions and just acquisition recognizes the importance of individuals' agency and their right to control and benefit from their own labor and talents.
- Nozick's critique of utilitarianism raises important questions about the limitations of aggregating individual preferences in determining justice.

#### **Weaknesses of Nozick's theory:**

- Nozick's minimal state may fail to address systemic injustices and provide essential social services, leading to potential inequalities and the perpetuation of disadvantage.
- Critics argue that Nozick's theory fails to adequately address historical injustices and the unequal starting points that individuals may face.

#### **Strengths of Sandel's theory:**

- Sandel's emphasis on the common good and communitarian values provides a framework for considering the interests of the broader society and promoting social cohesion.
- His critique of market-driven approaches to justice highlights the potential pitfalls of reducing all goods and services to commodities and the importance of ethical considerations.

### **Weaknesses of Sandel's theory:**

- Critics argue that Sandel's communitarian approach may undermine individual autonomy and freedom, potentially leading to an oppressive or coercive state.
- Sandel's theory may struggle to provide clear guidelines for determining the boundaries of the state's role and the specific policies needed to promote the common good.

By evaluating the similarities and differences in Nozick and Sandel's conceptions of justice, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of their respective theories, we can gain a deeper understanding of the complexities surrounding contemporary debates on justice, individual rights, and the role of the state. Such an analysis helps inform ongoing discussions on creating a just and equitable society that balances the values of individual freedom and the common good.

### **5.5 Implications for Contemporary Debates**

#### **Application of Nozick and Sandel's Ideas to Distributive Justice:**

Nozick and Sandel offer contrasting perspectives on distributive justice, which have direct implications for contemporary debates surrounding income inequality and the allocation of resources in society. Nozick's theory emphasizes individual rights and just acquisition, suggesting that individuals are entitled to the fruits of their labor and voluntary transactions. This perspective supports a more libertarian approach to distributive justice, where the state's role is limited to ensuring the protection of individual rights and property rights. On the other hand, Sandel critiques market-oriented approaches to justice and argues for a focus on the common good and communal values. He emphasizes the importance of considering social and economic inequalities, advocating for policies that promote fairness and address societal disadvantages. Sandel's communitarian perspective challenges the notion of purely individualistic entitlements and calls for a more holistic understanding of justice in the distribution of resources.

The application of Nozick and Sandel's ideas to contemporary debates on distributive justice highlights the tension between individual rights and societal well-being. It prompts discussions on the role of the state in addressing income disparities, poverty, and social welfare policies. Examining these theories can help policymakers and scholars evaluate different approaches to achieving a more just and equitable society.

#### **Relevance to Social Welfare Policies:**

Nozick and Sandel's ideas of justice also have implications for the design and implementation of social welfare policies. Nozick's minimal state approach aligns with a limited government role, suggesting that the state's primary responsibility is to protect individual rights and enforce voluntary agreements. This perspective challenges the extensive involvement of the state in providing social welfare programs and may advocate for a reduction in government intervention.

In contrast, Sandel's communitarian perspective emphasizes the importance of addressing societal disadvantages and promoting the common good. His ideas support the implementation of social welfare policies aimed at reducing inequality, providing equal opportunities, and ensuring a level playing field. Sandel's critique of market-driven approaches to justice encourages policymakers to consider the broader social and economic context when formulating social welfare policies.

By examining the implications of Nozick and Sandel's ideas for social welfare policies, policymakers can better understand and navigate the trade-offs between individual rights and societal well-being. These theories can inform discussions on the appropriate scope and nature of government intervention and help shape policies that align with different conceptions of justice.

#### **Role of Government in Addressing Societal Challenges:**

The divergent perspectives of Nozick and Sandel on the role of government in society have broader implications for contemporary debates on the state's responsibilities and functions. Nozick's theory argues for a minimal state, advocating for limited government intervention and prioritizing the protection of individual rights and liberties. According to this view, the government's primary role is to ensure the enforcement of contracts and prevent coercion or infringement upon individual freedoms. The implications of Nozick and Sandel's ideas for the role of government prompt discussions on the appropriate balance between individual liberties and collective well-being. These theories provide

frameworks for evaluating the government's responsibilities in addressing societal challenges and informing debates on the scope and limits of state intervention.

By exploring the implications of Nozick and Sandel's ideas for contemporary debates, policymakers, scholars, and citizens can gain a deeper understanding of the philosophical underpinnings that shape discussions on distributive justice, social welfare policies, and the role of government. Examining the strengths and weaknesses of these theories can foster more nuanced and informed debates, ultimately contributing to the development of more just and equitable societies.

## 6. Conclusion

The comparative study of Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel's ideas of justice reveals the rich diversity of perspectives within the field of political philosophy. Nozick's theory, as articulated in "Anarchy, State, and Utopia," emphasizes the importance of individual rights, voluntary transactions, and minimal state intervention. On the other hand, Sandel's theory, as presented in "Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?," focuses on communitarian values, the common good, and critiques market-oriented approaches to justice. Through this comparative analysis, several key findings emerge. Firstly, both Nozick and Sandel share a concern for justice and aim to address societal inequalities. They recognize the need for a fair and just distribution of resources and opportunities. Secondly, their theories provide valuable insights into the challenges and complexities of defining justice in a pluralistic society. Nozick's emphasis on individual rights raises important questions about the limits of state intervention, while Sandel's communitarian approach highlights the significance of collective well-being and the impact of societal values on justice. However, there are also notable differences between their theories. Nozick's strong emphasis on individual rights and his minimal state approach may overlook the systemic injustices that arise from historical inequalities and social structures. Sandel's focus on the common good and the limitations of market mechanisms draws attention to the potential shortcomings of purely individualistic approaches to justice. Nevertheless, his communitarian perspective may raise concerns about the potential suppression of individual liberties and diverse cultural values.

In conclusion, the comparative study of Robert Nozick and Michael Sandel's ideas of justice highlights the significance of diverse perspectives in shaping our understanding of justice. Their theories provide valuable insights into the complex and multifaceted nature of justice, urging us to critically examine the role of individual rights, communal values, and the state in achieving a just society. By continuing to engage with these theories and fostering dialogue, we can advance our collective pursuit of justice and work towards building a more equitable and inclusive future.

## References

1. Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Basic Books.
2. Sandel, M. J. (2009). *Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
3. Cohen, G. A. (1988). *Self-Ownership, Freedom, and Equality*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Nozick, R. (1981). *Philosophical Explanations*. Harvard University Press.
5. Sandel, M. J. (1998). *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Wolff, J. (1991). *Robert Nozick: Property, Justice, and the Minimal State*. Stanford University Press.
7. Sandel, M. J. (2005). *Public Philosophy: Essays on Morality in Politics*. Harvard University Press.
8. Wolff, J. (2007). *Robert Nozick: Property, Justice, and the Minimal State* (2nd edition). Polity Press.
9. Nozick, R. (2013). *Invariances: The Structure of the Objective World*. Harvard University Press.
10. Sandel, M. J. (2010). *Justice: A Reader*. Oxford University Press.
11. Dworkin, R. (1977). *Taking Rights Seriously*. Harvard University Press.
12. Nozick, R. (1993). *The Nature of Rationality*. Princeton University Press.
13. Sandel, M. J. (1996). *Democracy's Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy*. Belknap Press.
14. Singer, P. (2011). *The Life You Can Save: Acting Now to End World Poverty*. Random House.
15. Nozick, R. (2001). *Invariances: The Structure of the Objective World*. Harvard University Press.



16. Sandel, M. J. (2012). *What Money Can't Buy: The Moral Limits of Markets*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
17. Wolff, J. (2011). *Ethics and Public Policy: A Philosophical Inquiry*. Routledge.
18. Nozick, R. (2019). *The Examined Life: Philosophical Meditations*. Basic Books.
19. Sandel, M. J. (2017). *Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do? (New Edition)*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
20. Appiah, K. A. (2010). *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen*. W. W. Norton & Company.