

Pyokyeong Son
Submitted 5 Dec. 2022

Rawls argues that "behind the veil of ignorance," "in the original position" of contracting (these are technical terms in Rawls with explicit definitions), the right strategy to employ in the strategic interaction problem everyone faces is not maximizing (expected) preferences, but the strategy of "maximin." What is this strategy and why does he advocate it?

Rawls's *original position* is a state of nature in which rational egoists are in equal standing; his *veil of ignorance* is a characteristic where "no one knows his place in society, his class position or social status." In such a situation Rawls argues for a *maximin* strategy—choosing the "maximum of the minimums." He argues that under the following conditions the maximin strategy is optimal:

1. **There is knowledge of likelihood of outcomes after the contract is made.** Unless satisfied one may instead weigh payoffs based on the probability of that outcome to make a decision. *This condition is true on the assumption of the veil of ignorance*—nobody knows what will happen post-contract.
2. **The minimax strategy's worst-case payoff is an acceptable one.** *This condition is likely as it is* reasonable to assume that the two principles of justice will lead to a system that is efficient enough guarantee at least a "satisfactory minimum" for its inhabitants.
3. **Any payoff worse than the minimax strategy is unthinkably unfavorable.** *This is likely true* as any other strategy would lead to a social organization scheme that involves slavery, serfdom, or other "serious infractions on liberty," and thus rejected by the first principle of justice.

Everyone employing the minimax strategy means that one imagines themselves being the worst-off person, and choose a list of rights which maximizes guaranteed benefits in this worst-case. Thus the constructed society is one where the worst-off individual is maximized in their benefits.

(245 words)