

Reply to William L. McBride

the 20th World Congress of Philosophy, Boston, August 12, 1988

Wonsup Jung
(Seoul National University)

I greatly appreciate Professor William L. McBride's helpful comments on my paper. Thanks to his comments, no body denies in this room that Professor John Rawls is really one of the greatest philosophers in the 20th century. It is a great honor to me that I can have an opportunity to present a paper on such a great American philosopher's conception of justice.

The theoretical models which are designed by most philosophers, I believe, reflect their aspirations to change the existing social conditions. In this sense I would like to say that the models are not the mere reflections of the present, but the blue print for the future. Neither a property-owning democracy nor a liberal (democratic) socialism which I discuss in my paper, is the exact reflection of any existing capitalist or socialist states. Since these models are designed to be compatible with Rawls's theory, they must be regulated by his two principles of justice.

I agree with Professor William L. McBride that J. E. Meade's Socialist State was much closer to the former Eastern Bloc than to Rawls's liberal (democratic) socialism. Unfortunately I did not clarify enough the differences between two regimes. Professor John Rawls's model of a liberal (democratic) socialism may be outlined as follows. 1) the size of public sector is much larger than that under private property economies, 2) the public ownership of means of production are required, 3) competitive

markets are introduced, but except in the case of work of all kinds, market prices have allocative functions but no distributive function.⁷⁾ So a liberal (democratic) socialism which Professor John Rawls has in mind is different from J. E. Meade's.

Professor William L. McBride's second point, as far as I can understand, is as follows: My underlying assumption seems to be that "more is better". In concrete, 1) why would a liberal socialist regime have to prohibit all capitalist enterprise? 2) Would unregulated capitalist ownership tend to drive out worker-managed socialist enterprise? 3) He sees no reason that more is always and necessarily better in the domain of the good.

It is needless to say that certain kinds of capitalist enterprises may be introduced in the small private sectors for the sake of efficiency. But they must be strictly restrained. If not, socialist regime cannot be maintained in the real world. I think that under socialism, the abolition of private ownership of means of production should be required. Since Marx, most socialists have viewed public ownership of means of production as its *sine qua non*. But the public ownership of means of production does not have to be required, though it may be permitted.

Professor William L. McBride says that my citation of Professor A. M. Honoré's chapter on "Ownership" fails to do justice to his analysis of 'ownership'. I agree with Professor William McBride that Honoré seeks to show the ways in which ownership cannot be absolute and is always subject to certain restrictions. I cited his definition only to show what a comprehensive concept the ownership is. Honoré's definition shows it very well. No regime allows the existence of full ownership rights of means of production without any limitation. But it cannot be denied that the ownership under private economies is much wider and more flexible than that under any kinds of socialism.

7) John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, §42.

Furthermore this flexibility of the systems of liberties which can be imagined under private economies is desirable for the personal autonomy. As Professor McBride doubts, unregulated capitalist ownership tends to drive out worker-managed socialist enterprise. But I would like to remind that a property-owning democracy cannot allow unregulated capitalist ownership. Both a property-owning democracy and a liberal (democratic) socialism are proposed to realize Rawls's two principles of justice in the real world. So both regimes already accept the constraints of Rawls's two principles of justice as their preconditions. Of course worker-managed firms may be driven out in the competitive markets due to their inefficiency. But as far as the competition is regulated by Rawls's justice as fairness, it does not violate the fair value of political liberties.

Of course there is no reason that more is always and necessarily better in the domain of the good. But as long as the principles of justice are not violated, more should be preferred to less in the domain of the good. For more is better consistent with 'the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all'.⁸⁾ In Rawlsian Justice, deontological distinction between the Right and the Good and the priority of the former over the latter are presupposed. I accept these presuppositions in my paper without further discussion. These presuppositions are too controversial for me to provide a clear-cut answer due to the complexity of various ethical theories. Now preparing for my doctoral dissertation, this issue is one of the most difficult tasks for me to deal with.

Concerning historical context, I would like to appreciate Professor William McBride again. He gave us a good description of J. E. Meade's historical context. I am not denying that it is different from Americans' as well as Koreans' today. Here I would like to describe Koreans' historical context. Koreans remain the only victim of the Cold War. We have

8) *Ibid.*, p.302.

suffered from three-year Korean War. It was broken out by ideological conflicts and was the most critical confrontation of the Cold War since the end of The World War II. From then till now, some of Koreans live in a so-called “communist society”, that is, North Korea. North Korea had been supported by the Soviet Union. But now it is known to the Western through the problems of its Nuclear Energies and shortage of food supply.

South Korea, the other part of divided Korean Peninsula, has been supported by Western Countries, especially United States of America. From Korean War till now lots of U. S. Armies are in South Korea for the peace of Korean Peninsula. It has achieved a great economic growth by following Western capitalist models. But now it suffers from really serious economic crises, especially receiving the aid of International Monetary Funds (IMF).

But the most important point on which I should place emphasis is that Koreans do sincerely desire the reconciliation of our nation, that is, the reunification of Korean Peninsula. To prepare for the reunification is, I think, Koreans' unavoidable mission. Our Reunification must be the near-coming future for Koreans. But Korean Peninsula was, is, and will be in the neighborhood Powers' complex interests. Koreans should take account of the global dimensions to prepare for their reunification as well as to solve current economic crises. In this sense, I agree with Professor L. William McBride on the final point, that is, Professor J. Rawls's treatments of justice take virtually no account of the global dimension. But I believe that Rawls's property-owning democracy understood as a “mixed” regime will have a great practical implication. And Professor John Rawls's procedural methodology, with which I did not deal in my paper, has also a great practical importance in Koreans' democratizing their political process and preparing for the blue print for the reunified Korean Peninsula.

Thank you very much.