

Government Redistribution of Income is Theft

ESSAYPRO How To Order Reviews About Us Write My Essay DBA: EPRO Log In Sign Up

WRITING SERVICE AT YOUR CONVENIENCE

**You - Send us your homework
We - Do it all for you**

Grab your original paper for just \$10 per page with a free plagiarism report included

Write My Essay!

Calculate the price

Writing Rewriting Editing

Essay (any type) ▾

College ▾ 2 weeks ▾

1 page / 275 words ▾ +

Double spaces Single spaces

\$11.4

Write My Paper

NO MORE SLEEPLESS NIGHTS...
100% PLAGIARISM-FREE ESSAYS. ANY TOPIC OR DIFFICULTY CAN BE HANDLED!

EssayPro Reviews 4.9

ResellerRatings 4.9

Sitejabber 4.8

LINK => <http://787787.com/writing-service?355792812>

If a person obtains something fairly, the government should not take it away from them. The government would be stealing if they were to take from people when the goods were obtained fairly. If the person had stolen something then it would be fine for the government to take it back and return it to the original and proper owner. Nozick feels that inequality is fine as long as the inequality was fairly made. If one person works to become rich and another person does not work, Nozick sees it as just for one to be rich and the other to be poor. This can be shown in the family example. In the family example there is a family with two children, one child is eighteen and the other is eight. One child is ten years older and has a job, unlike the younger child. According to Nozick the older child having more than the other because the younger child has no source of income is fine. The older child should be able to have more and make choices that benefit them without considering the younger child. The older child's choices do not need to reflect the younger child's interests. The parents who are representing the government in this example, have no right to tell the older child to consider the younger child in all the older child's choices. The older child is fairly making an inequality between themselves and their sibling. If the older child was stealing from the younger child to make the inequality, then the parents would have a duty to step in to correct the inequality because that would be unfair. Nozick has another aspect to his theory called the Lockean Proviso. Originally the proviso was about land and

property rights. One person could not justly take all the fertile land in an area. They could only take a portion of it. In the middle of paper, an individual who is receiving the things more than it benefits the individual who is having their things taken away. Rawls justifies this in his book by calling it redistribution and saying it is being done to make a more equal society. Unfortunately, giving theft a different name does not change what it is. Returning to the family example, if the older child was told that their money was being redistributed it would not change the end result. If an inequality is fairly made it is just. If one person has something that does not make another person entitled to some of it because the second person has less. The government should not take from one group and give to another because one has more.

Bibliography
Rawls, John. Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical. 1985. Print.
Nozick, Robert. Anarchy, state, and utopia. New York: Basic Books, 1974. Print.

Other Articles:

- [California A-G Requirements](#)
- [Essay Contest Winner Announcement](#)
- [Qualitative Thesis Proposal Format](#)
- [Swl Case Study](#)
- [On Importance Of Outdoor Games](#)
- [Power Systems Engineer Cover Letter](#)
- [Looking At The Different Social Work Theories Social Work](#)
- [Resume Clinical Research Coordinator Sample](#)
- [Department Education Nyc Papers Research](#)
- [The Hybrid Segmentation Method Psychology](#)
- [Great Words To Use In A Resume](#)