

More on actualist and fundamental public justification in political liberalism

*Abstract: The discussion develops further the view that public justification in Rawls's political liberalism, in one of its roles, is actualist in fully enfranchising actual reasonable citizens and fundamental in political liberalism's order of justification. I anchor this reading in the political role Rawls accords to general reflective equilibrium, and examine in its light the relationship between public justification, *pro tanto* justification, political values, full justification, the wide view of public political culture and salient public reason intuitions. This leaves us with the question of how a more plausible, post-Rawlsian political liberalism should understand the commitment to discursive respect and robust discursive equality that is reflected in its view of actualist and fundamental public justification.*

1. Introduction

This discussion develops further the view that public justification in Rawls's political liberalism (Rawls 2001; 2005), in one of its role, is *actualist* and *fundamental*. It is actualist in relation to the social ontology of its constituency: in one of its roles, public justification here includes within its constituency on fully enfranchised, equal footing *actual* reasonable citizens. And it is fundamental in relation to its status in political liberalism's order of justification: for Rawls, conceptions of political justice, including his own theory, *Justice as Fairness* (henceforth JF), are reasonable in the first place only if they are equally acceptable coherently by all actual reasonable citizens. Both features come together in Rawls's view of the political role of an interpersonal, general form of reflective equilibrium—this is the view the reading further developed here puts centre stage. For a short label, we might call this reading the actualist deep view, or simply the *deep view*.¹

To develop the view, I reconstruct in its light the relationship between public justification, *pro tanto* justification, and full justification. I also consider how the constraints of public reason—as they spring from its defining aim, public justification—relate to Rawls's wide view of public political culture and salient public reason intuitions. My focus is on how actualist and fundamental public justification structurally integrates these ideas, and how Rawls compresses into this structure a substantive commitment to liberal political values. It is (mostly) this commitment that indexes Rawls's view of domestic justice to the standpoint of citizens who are reasonable in a problematically substantive sense—which invites familiar concerns about its lack of inclusiveness. This leaves us with a question that is essential for an attempt to salvage what is plausible in Rawls's approach: how should a more plausible, and perhaps more inclusive

¹ That reflective equilibrium has an important political role in Rawls's political liberalism has been observed before: see Laden 2014; Lister 2008; Besch 1998: chapter IV; Nielsen 1994. I develop various elements of the deep view in a series of discussions, as referenced below. The current discussion comes in tandem with Besch 2020. Amongst other things, Besch 2020 contrasts actualist and fundamental public justification with Quong's version of an "internal" conception of political liberalism (Quong 2011), and examines whether Larmore's hypotheticalizing variant of actualist public justification (see Larmore 2015) can accommodate a key objection to political liberalism's view of political legitimacy. This puts center stage the question of what view of discursive respect and discursive equality public justification should adopt. On discursive respect and discursive equality: see also Besch 2014, 2019a and 2019b. Early accounts of Rawls's political turn sometimes lean toward interpreting public justification in political liberalism in actualist terms: see Hampton 1989 and 1993; Campos 1994; Forst 1994; Gaus 1999; Mulhall and Swift 1999; Estlund 1998.

political liberalism construe the commitment to discursive respect and robust discursive equality that is reflected in its view of actualist and fundamental public justification?

My discussion proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides some needed background. Section 3 addresses the political role of (general) reflective equilibrium in Rawls's political liberalism, and relates this to JF's Original Position. Section 4 attends to the ideas of *pro tanto* justification, completeness, and the nature of political values. Section 5 considers full justification and its role in actualist and fundamental public justification. Section 6 draws out constraints of public reason and relates them to Rawls's wide view of public political culture and salient public reason intuitions. Section 7 concludes.

2. Preliminaries

I start with the idea of public justification. To say that a political thing, ϕ (e.g., exercises of political power, political principles, or conceptions of political justice), is publicly justifiable is to say, roughly, that ϕ is authoritatively acceptable by relevant people—alternatively, it is to say that ϕ is justifiable by public reasons, i.e., reasons that are so acceptable. Rawls employs an idea of public justification at different levels of argument, including one level that is fundamental in its order of justification (or so I claim). At this level, public justification seeks equal acceptability by actual reasonable citizens (again, or so I claim). And it is *robustly* public (Postema 1995): ϕ 's equal acceptability by relevant people *constitutes* ϕ 's reasonableness. This makes political liberalism *constructivist* in a weak, justificatory sense (Ronzoni 2010; Besch 2004: part I).

In political liberalism, robustly public justification models a demanding form of equal respect. It respects reasonable citizens as equals not only in relation to the content of justice, but also in relation to the *justification* of that content: in taking equal acceptability by such citizens to constitute the reasonableness of salient political things, political liberalism respects these citizens as equal *authorities* or *co-authors* of public justification (Forst 2017a: 134; 2017b). In different terms, it extends them equal discursive respect, or models their robust discursive equality (Besch 2014; 2019a).

Next, political liberalism extends discursive respect to *reasonable* citizens, but there is little consensus in the field about the content of this idea. For now, only two things matter. First, Rawls uses a notion of reasonableness at different levels of argument and builds different content into it at different levels (Besch 1998: chapter IV.2). E.g., at JF's second stage, "reasonable" citizens accept JF's substantive principles of justice (see below). But Rawls holds, as well, that JF can be reasonable in the first place only if they are suitably acceptable by "us," i.e., from the standpoint of actual *reasonable* citizens (see below)—and here, reasonableness has different content. What matters now is reasonableness only in this more fundamental, *politically basic* sense (Besch 2012 and 2013).

I shall assume that citizens who are reasonable in Rawls's politically basic sense can accept political liberalism's most important political values, whatever exactly these are (Besch 2004: section 14; 2012; see also section 4, below). This means that they are not committed to reject defining commitments of political liberalism. These commitments involve at least the following. A conception of justice, ϕ , is a political liberalism only if ϕ is liberal in content and political in scope of application and form of justification. If ϕ is liberal in content, ϕ prescribes that citizens be allocated rights, liberties and opportunities of special priority and all-purpose means to make use of these things. If ϕ is political in scope of application, ϕ regulates the basic structure of a given society only, or its domain of the political.

Not least, if φ is political in form of justification, φ does two things. First, φ holds that equal acceptability by reasonable citizens justifies politically. And second, φ holds that salient political things fail to meet that standard already if reasonable citizens actually disagree reasonably about these things—thus, φ attaches a “populist” (Gaus 1996: 130f) interpretation to that standard through which justification accords reasonable citizens a high degree of discursive influence in justification, or “high-purchase” discursive standing (Besch 2018: 596ff; 2019a: 471f). Plainly, then, reasonableness here requires more than, say, reasonability. Intelligent citizens in good moral standing might not be reasonable in this sense. Accordingly, Rawls’s political liberalism from the ground up invites concerns about its inclusiveness (Hampton 1989; Friedmann 2000).

I noted that Rawls employs public justification and reasonableness at different levels of argument. It is hence instructive to consider the structure of his political liberalism. His view centres around two questions. First, should the basic structure of a Western liberal democracy be regulated on the basis of a political and liberal conception of political justice, or some other kind of conception? Second, if it should be regulated on the basis of a political liberalism, what variant of political liberalism should be adopted? Rawls answers the first, fundamental question in favour of political liberalism: only a political liberalism, if anything, is equally acceptable by all actual reasonable citizens. And here, he implicates the idea of robust public justification referred to earlier and puts to work his politically basic idea of the reasonable. My discussion considers the role of equal acceptability by reasonable citizens only at this level of argument.

To answer the second question, Rawls suggests JF. JF itself has two stages, S1 and S2. At S1, Rawls suggest that reasonable citizens, if they were to reasonably and rationally choose principles of basic justice, would adopt JF’s principles and values (Rawls 2001: 80-134). S2 then engages the issue of stability, amongst other things. Rawls defines an ideal of a good citizen—i.e., defined as reasonable (and rational) citizens who accept JF’s principles and values—and argues that a society of such citizens that is well-ordered by JF itself would be stable (Rawls 2005: 11f, 16f, 22-28, 66-82, 94, 97f; Rawls 2001: 8f, 26-29, 116f). He here uses a non-basic idea of the reasonable to articulate a non-fundamental idea of public justification. The reasonable citizens of JF’s well-ordered society are to use JF as a public basis of justification in order to apply JF’s principles to matters of basic justice. The question that this idea of public justification helps to address is whether JF could contribute to the stability of a political order under the conditions that JF’s principles prescribe.

The conceptualization of public justification at JF’s S2 is distinctive for its role at that stage. Public justification here does not actually take place; it is a hypothetical justification that supposes the hypothetical environment of JF’s well-ordered society; it fully enfranchises only the hypothetical reasonable citizens of that society; and it is conception-applying in that it applies JF’s contents to salient matters of justice. Thus, public justification here is *ideal* justification: it includes in its constituency no actual person, but only the hypothetical reasonable citizens of that society.² And it is *conception-applying*, or *lower-order*, in that it applies a given conception of political justice to relevant matters.

² We should not confuse the difference between actualist and ideal justification with another, related one. Actualist and ideal justification differ in their social ontology: the former, but not the latter, includes within its constituency actual people. A second difference concerns the way in which actualist justification includes actual people. Different practices of actualist justification can adopt standards that differ in idealization value. Assume JP

Current discussions of public justification in Rawls's political liberalism often construe it along the lines of its conceptualization at JF's second stage. Thus, it is often discussed as ideal and conception-applying, or perhaps as a highly idealizing, conception-applying form of actualist justification.³ But there is more to it. If we understand public justification in such terms, then even if we uncouple it from its role specifically at JF's second stage, it can confer authority to relevant political things only insofar as the conception of justice it builds on is reasonable. On the view adopted here, this *reverses* the order of dependency between the reasonableness of a conception of political justice and public justification that is at the heart of Rawls's political liberalism. Yes, JF uses an idea of public justification at its second stage. But for this to be of much consequence, JF itself must be reasonable. But is it? And here, actualist and fundamental public justification does its work.

3. Reflective equilibrium

With this I turn to the political role of Rawls's criterion of reflective equilibrium (CRE).⁴ CRE takes the following form (for a conception of political justice, ϕ , and a set of convictions, S):

CRE ϕ is in reflective equilibrium with a set of convictions, S , only if ϕ coheres with S , each member of S is well-considered, and S is internally coherent.⁵

Whose considered convictions count? From what doxastic perspective, or standpoint, must reflective equilibrium be sought?

Rawls prioritizes the standpoint of “you and me,” *actual* people (Rawls 2005: 28).⁶ Any conception of political justice, “to be acceptable, must accord with *our* considered convictions, at all levels of generality, on due reflection, or in what I have called elsewhere ‘reflective equilibrium’” *ibid.*, 8; my emphasis). Thus, to meet CRE, ϕ must articulate and cohere with “our more firm considered convictions,” and “[w]e decide whether the whole conception is acceptable by seeing whether we can endorse it upon due reflection” (*ibid.*: 94). Hence, the test of reflective equilibrium tests how well ϕ “articulates our more firm considered convictions of political

is a practice of actualist justification that counts ϕ as justified only if no-one would reject ϕ when ideally rational. JP's standard is high in idealization value; JP hence includes actual people, but accords them little influence in justification—or low-purchase discursive standing (Besch 2019b: 608ff). However, assume instead that JP requires for ϕ 's justification merely that relevant people do not reject ϕ coherently. JP's standard now is low in idealization value, and can accord people high-purchase discursive standing (*ibid.*). The point: that justification is actualist does not mean that it is populist, or allocates high-purchase standing. But that it accords high-purchase standing does not mean that it is actualist: for it might include in its scope only hypothetical people, like JF's S2-public justification. I assume here that actualist and fundamental public justification includes actual reasonable citizens, and accords them high-purchase standing (Besch 2018: 598ff).

³ E.g., consider the approaches surveyed in Lister 2017.

⁴ The discussion of this section overlaps with Besch 2020.

⁵ See Rawls 2005: 8, 28, 45.

⁶ This needs highlighting. Rawls discusses reflective equilibrium *also* in relation to CRE's role for the ideal reasonable citizens of JF's well-ordered society: Rawls 2001: 9f. It is plain why he sees reason to do so. In his view, political legitimacy requires that political power accord with a conception of justice that is equally acceptable coherently by the reasonable citizens over whom such power is exercised (Besch 2020; 2013; section 6, below). But then political power within JF's well-ordered society is politically legitimate only if it accords with a conception of justice that is so acceptable by the ideal reasonable citizens of that society.

justice, at all levels of generality, after due examination,” and the conception “that meets this criterion” is the one that “is the most reasonable for us” (ibid: 28).

But the actual people that Rawls refers to must also be *reasonable*. Rawls, I take it, assumes JF stands some chance to meet CRE. But if the group of people from the perspective of whom JF must meet CRE includes on equal footing people who *cannot* coherently accept political liberalism’s most important political values—i.e., political liberalism’s *unreasonable* people—then CRE from the outset *disqualifies* JF. Thus, this group can include on equal footing only people who *can* coherently accept these values, i.e., *reasonable* citizens. Rawls thinks that there are such people and that he and (some of) his readers qualify.

However, if the reflective equilibria of “us”, actual reasonable citizens, count, they count *equally*: only if *each* actual reasonable citizen can coherently accept ϕ in a manner that satisfies CRE will ϕ be reasonable, or most reasonable, “for us,” the group of *all* such citizens. Thus: Rawls construes the reasonableness of a conception of political justice as a function of its ability to attain a form of interpersonal, general reflective equilibrium (Rawls 2001: 31) for actual reasonable citizens.⁷

I take it to be unproblematic in this context to understand views to the effect that salient political things depend for a salient political merit on being equally acceptable by relevant people as reflecting a commitment to the public justifiability of these things, or of claims to the effect that they have that merit. Thus, the above suggests we attribute to Rawls *Actualist Public Justification* (for conceptions of political justice, ϕ):

APJ ϕ is reasonable if and only if ϕ is equally acceptable coherently by, or publicly justifiable to, actual reasonable citizens,

where ϕ is “equally acceptable coherently” by actual reasonable citizens α and β only if each can accept ϕ in a manner that meets CRE, and citizens are “reasonable” only if they do not reject political liberalism’s most important liberal political values (below, I sometimes refer to the kind of reasonableness that APJ confers as “APJ-reasonableness”). On this view, CRE is a condition of public justification: Rawls confirms this reading when he writes that a conception of political justice, when it attains public justification, is affirmed in reflective equilibrium (Rawls 2001: 29; 2005: 388).

On the reading suggested here, actualist public justification is fundamental in political liberalism’s order of justification. For Rawls, a conception of political justice is reasonable, or most reasonable, only if it meets APJ. Where a conception fails to do so, it must be revised or rejected, depending on what option is favored by the considered judgments of actual reasonable citizens. I note, as well, that APJ-justification is actualist in the first instance in relation to the people included within its justificatory scope. APJ-justification accords full discursive respect to *actual* reasonable citizens—as opposed to, e.g., the hypothetical citizens of JF’s hypothetical, well-ordered society.⁸

⁷ Rawls also distinguishes narrow from wide reflective equilibrium, which differ primarily in the scope and depth of the reflection through which equilibrium is reached. Rawls prefers wide equilibrium (Rawls 1974: 8f; 2001: 29-32; 2005: 387f). Note that reflective equilibrium can be wide even if some commitments remain *fixed points* throughout an agent’s attempt to attain wide equilibrium. On the deep view, the commitment to not reject liberal political values plays the role of such fixed points for reasonable citizens.

⁸ Note that there is a difference between inclusion in public justification’s *primary* constituency and other forms of inclusion. E.g., it has been argued that political liberalism should engage unreasonable people—e.g., through

Before I move on, I observe how APJ relates to Rawls's Original Position (OP)—which is often assumed to do important justificatory work in its own right in Rawls's conception of justice. In *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls describes OP as modelling an idea of reasonable and rational choice that satisfies pure procedural justice (Rawls 1971: 136ff)—an idea such that if any actual citizen cannot accept OP's results, such as JF's principles of justice, then this must be owed to that person's irrationality or unreasonableness. However, Rawls's mature work suggests a different picture:

[OP] models what *we* regard—*you and I, here and now*—as fair and reasonable conditions for the parties [of OP] ... [OP] also models what *we* regard as appropriate restrictions on reasons for adopting a political conception of justice ... Given these features, *we* conjecture that the conception of political justice the parties would select is the conception that *you and I, here and now*, would regard as reasonable and rational and supported by the best reasons. Whether the conjecture is borne out will depend on whether *you and I, here and now*, can, on due reflection, endorse the principles adopted. (Rawls 2001: 30; all emphases are added.)

OP models what “you and I, here and now” see as proper constraints on reasons to adopt a conception of political justice. OP's success as such a model turns on whether OP's results match what “you and I, here and now” regard as reasonable and rational, or as supported by the best reasons. Accordingly, OP is “a means of public reflection and self-clarification” that aims to help “us” attain “deeper self-understanding” and “greater coherence among all our judgements,” with the help of which “we can attain wider agreement among one another” (Rawls 2005, p. 26).

What people does Rawls refer to? As I read him, these are the people from the standpoint of whom JF must be coherently acceptable in order to qualify as reasonable. This suggests: OP is a reconstructive tool to clarify implications of the self-understanding of actual reasonable citizens. OP's success as such a tool turns on whether OP's results cohere with their considered judgments—which they assess from their perspective. If OP's results match their self-understanding, this can advance JF's public justification. But if OP's results do not do this, OP does not aid JF's public justification—in which case reasonable citizens must decide whether to revise or reject JF. Either way, their considered judgments have the last word.

On this reading, it is *not* the case that if actual citizens cannot accept OP's results, this must speak to their irrationality or unreasonableness. At least in relation to *actual reasonable citizens*, the dependency is *reversed*: if they cannot coherently accept OP's results, this calls into question the reasonableness of *OP* (or, for that matter, *JF*) if this is the conclusion favoured by their considered judgments. Thus, in at least one sense OP does *not* model pure procedural justice: OP's results depend for their reasonableness on matching the considered judgments of actual reasonable citizens, including judgments about what is or is not politically just.

One upshot: if anything, Rawls's mature view of the role of OP *confirms* the fundamental status of actualist public justification in political liberalism's order of justification. OP does not compete with APJ. Rather, OP is subservient to APJ in that it is a tool to assist actual reasonable

arguments from conjecture (Rawls 2005: 465) or buck-passing strategies (Quong 2011: 236ff). But this does not include them in public justification's primary constituency: it does not recognize them as people for whom ϕ must equally be acceptable for ϕ to be APJ-reasonable (see Besch 2012).

citizens in clarifying their considered judgments—while OP’s usefulness as such a tool (and so its role in political liberalism) depends on whether its result are equally acceptable by these people.

4. *Pro tanto* justification

We have just seen how actualist and fundamental public justification relates to OP. I now address two other ideas of justification that surface in Rawls’s *Reply to Habermas* (Rawls 2005: 372–434)—*pro tanto* and full justification. What matters here is their relationship to actualist and fundamental public justification. I start with *pro tanto* justification.

What is *pro tanto* justification? Rawls answers with a focus on the justification of *conceptions of political justice*. To justify a conception of political justice, ϕ , *pro tanto* is to show, or demonstrate, that ϕ offers an ordering of political values that is “complete,”

[t]hat is, the political values specified by it can be suitably ordered, or balanced, so that those values alone give a reasonable answer *by public reason* to all or nearly all questions concerning constitutional essentials and basic justice. This is the meaning of *pro tanto* justification. By examining a wide range of political questions to see whether a political conception can always provide a reasonable answer we can check to see if it seems to be complete. (Rawls 2005: 386; see also 454ff; first emphasis is added.)

How does this contribute to the *justification* of a conception of political justice? One part of an answer seems to surface in Rawls’s claim that ϕ , when it is complete, answers “all or nearly all questions concerning constitutional essentials and basic justice” *by public reason*—where public reason “aims for public justification” (ibid: 465), or equal acceptability by reasonable citizens. Another part is entailed in the view that completeness is attained by ordering *political values*. I first address political values and then tie in public reason. After this, I consider degrees of completeness and different views of *pro tanto* justification. An answer to the question just asked will then emerge.

Rawls’s view of political values is sophisticated. These values share three features.⁹ Two are prominent:

- (i) if δ is a political value, then δ is part of, or entailed in, the public political tradition of a relevant society, S; as Rawls exclusively focuses on the USA of his time with its liberal political tradition, as a value that is part of this tradition, δ is also liberal in content);
- (ii) if δ is a political value, then δ applies to S’s domain of the political *only*.

Rawls calls values “general” if they are non-political in the sense of (ii), or in relation to their scope of application. He calls values “comprehensive” if they are non-political in the sense of (i), their source or origin. He stipulates that all comprehensive values are general. And he assumes that all comprehensive values not only are not equally acceptable by all reasonable citizens, but that they are the subject of (actual or probable) reasonable disagreement between them.

This brings us to a third feature of political values. It is reflected not in what Rawls says about their nature, but in the use that he makes exclusively of ideas or conceptions that he claims to be political values. Rawls assumes not only that there are values that are coherently acceptable by all reasonable citizens, but also that there are values that no such citizen can coherently reject

⁹ This follows Besch 1998: chapter I.3. See also Leland and Wietmarschen 2012.

(call the latter values “reasonably non-rejectable”). Rawls assumes, as well, that values of the two kinds are not comprehensive, but are always political. This suggests,

- (iii) if δ is a political value, δ has membership in the only family of values that includes values that are coherently acceptable by all reasonable citizens and values that are reasonably non-rejectable.

This ties completeness to public reason and its aim, public justification. If ϕ answers relevant political questions on the basis of political values, these answers are based on values that are acceptable, if not non-rejectable, by all reasonable citizens. Other things being equal, then, these answers can be used in public reason, i.e., reasoning under the aim of equal acceptability by all reasonable citizens, when these questions arise in political practice. This renders ϕ useful, and recommends it, if we also assume that conceptions of political justice should be able to offer guidance in such matters that is consonant with that aim. Thus: to justify ϕ *pro tanto* is to show that ϕ is useful in this way.

Correspondingly, Rawls-type completeness can come in degrees. Several conceptions of political justice might provide answers “to all *or nearly all* questions concerning constitutional essentials and basic justice,” while some are better at this than others—e.g., ϕ_1 might provide *more or more important* answers than ϕ_2 . Consequently, there are at least two readings of *pro tanto* justification. On a strong reading, ϕ possesses *pro tanto* justification not simply if ϕ passes the threshold of completeness, but only if ϕ provides an ordering of political values that is *more* complete than the orderings offered by ϕ ’s competitors. On a weak reading, ϕ possesses *pro tanto* justification already if ϕ passes the threshold of completeness.

On the strong reading, to reject a *pro tanto* justifiable conception of political justice is to reject the conception that *best* serves the aim of public justification, or that is *most* useful, given that aim. But this, I take it, cannot be reasonable on Rawls’s account. On the weak reading, to reject a *pro tanto* justifiable conception does not mean to reject the most useful conception so long as there is another *pro tanto* justifiable conception that is more complete, and hence more useful. And here, it can be reasonable to reject a *pro tanto* justifiable conception; in fact it can be unreasonable *not* to do so.

Which reading sits better with Rawls’s views? This seems to be the weak reading. In his later writings, Rawls uses the label “political liberalism” as referring to a family of conceptions of justice (see Rawls 2005: 450ff). Each member of this family provides an ordering of political values, and so will possess *some* degree of completeness and be able to attain *some* degree of *pro tanto* justification. And, of course, Rawls assumes that it is, or can be, reasonable to accept JF at the expense of other members of that family. But then it can be reasonable to reject a conception of political justice even if it attains (a degree of) *pro tanto* justification. This suggests the weak reading. So construed, the possession of (*some* degree of) completeness and the ability to attain (*some* degree of) *pro tanto* justification are best seen as markers of a conception’s membership in the family of political liberalism.

Does this answer why demonstrating completeness contributes to justification? Not yet. Consider how *pro tanto* justification relates to public justification. Two possibilities are these:

- I1 Public justification identifies the set of APJ-reasonable conceptions of political justice, while *pro tanto* justification shows, or is part of what identifies, which member in this set is most useful.
- I2 To demonstrate that a conception of political justice possesses *pro tanto* justification is part of, or contributes to, its public justification: to demonstrate

completeness is to show that ϕ can be used in ways that are APJ-reasonable.

Which interpretation is preferable? Upfront, both seem plausible, given the few things Rawls says about the nature of *pro tanto* justification in relation to conceptions of political justice. Still, the above recommends I2. Why?

I assume that all APJ-reasonable conceptions of political justice are political liberalisms. If so, all possess some degree of *pro tanto* justification. But if we know that ϕ is APJ-reasonable, what job could then be served by showing that ϕ is also *pro tanto* justifiable? That is, it seems that I1 would have to construe *pro tanto* justification in terms of the *strong* reading of such justification identified earlier. *Pro tanto* justification makes a contribution to the justification of an APJ-reasonable conception if such a conception possesses *pro tanto* justification only if it *best* serves the aim of public justification, or is *most* useful, given that aim. As we have seen, though, there are reasons to prefer the weak reading of *pro tanto* justification—this suggests I2. According to I2, *pro tanto* justification is part of public justification, or, perhaps, a modality of it. On this reading, in order to show that ϕ is publicly justifiable in APJ's sense, one important thing to do is to show that ϕ is useful in the sense that ϕ 's political values can provide APJ-reasonable answers to “all or nearly all” questions about constitutional essentials and matters of basic justice.

Not least, we can distinguish in Rawls's view *pro tanto* justification a structural and a substantive element. Structurally, *pro tanto* justification is a form of justification that proceeds by demonstrating that a candidate conception of political justice can answer a relevant corpus of relevant questions on the basis of values that are equally acceptable by all relevant people, so that these people can use these answers when they reason publicly, under an aim of equal acceptability by relevant people. Rawls grafts on this structure a substantive commitment to political liberalism's political values—values, that is, that are indexed to a *given* political tradition, that are *liberal* in content, that apply to the domain of political *only*, and, importantly, that are equally acceptable, if not non-rejectable, by political liberalism's reasonable citizens.

That Rawls's political liberalism indexes *pro tanto* justification to political values is unsurprising, given its commitment to extend equal discursive respect to actual reasonable citizens. But we can disentangle Rawls's insight that completeness matters for the reasonableness of a conception of political justice from his view of the scope of discursive respect. If we believe that discursive respect should not be restricted to political liberalism's reasonable citizens (or at least not prior to further argument), we can agree that a conception of political justice must be complete, but disagree with or bracket the claim that its completeness must be a function of its ordering exclusively of Rawls-type political values.

At any rate: even within Rawls's framework, we cannot know in terms of what values completeness must be demonstrated unless we know what values are equally acceptable, if not non-rejectable, by all relevant people. And for this, we need to know who should be accorded discursive respect in public justification. Rawls-type political values (and they alone) may enter the pool of values in terms of which completeness must be demonstrated just in case these values (and they alone) are equally acceptable, if not non-rejectable, by all relevant people.

5. Full justification

Rawls claims that a conception of political justice must be capable of “full justification” (Rawls 2005: 386). What is this? Full justification

is carried out by an individual citizen as a member of civil society. (I assume that each citizen affirms both a political conception and a comprehensive doctrine.) In this case, the

citizen accepts a political conception and fills out its justification by embedding it in some way into the citizen's comprehensive doctrine as either true or reasonable, depending on what the doctrine allows. (Ibid.)

Roughly: a conception of political justice, ϕ , has full justification for an agent if she accepts ϕ and ϕ is (or can be) "in some way" embedded into her comprehensive doctrine. Thus, full justification involves integrating a conception of political justice with the contents of comprehensive doctrines (or *vice versa*—see below).

Why does this matter? First, full justification matters in relation to the stability of a conception of political justice: when ϕ attains full justification for an agent, her acceptance of ϕ is substantiated by her comprehensive doctrine and so can be stable, or more so than it might otherwise be. Second, full justification matters in relation the aim of reasonable overlapping consensus: for ϕ to attain reasonable overlapping consensus is or involves for ϕ to attain full justification for each reasonable citizen.¹⁰ Accordingly, third, full justification seems to matter for public justification—at least if we for now assume that ϕ , to attain reflective equilibrium for each reasonable citizen, must be capable of full justification for each of them. Especially the third reason makes full justification relevant here.

Here, then, are two observations. First, if full justification (partly) is a matter of embedding a conception of justice into an agent's comprehensive doctrine, then it can come in degrees. One conception, ϕ_1 , might be able to integrate more fully with the contents of Betty's comprehensive doctrine (i.e., her comprehensive views) than another, ϕ_2 ; hence, ϕ_1 might be able to be more fully justified for her than ϕ_2 .

Second, to require conceptions of justice to be capable of full justification seems to *elevate* the role of comprehensive doctrines in public justification. The above suggests this:

1. To be publicly justifiable—i.e., to meet APJ— ϕ must be coherently acceptable by each reasonable citizen in a manner that meets CRE, the criterion of reflective equilibrium. To this end, ϕ must be capable of full justification for each reasonable citizen: after all, if ϕ cannot integrate *at all* with their respective comprehensive doctrines, how could it be coherent for them to accept ϕ ? The point: as ϕ 's public justifiability depends on its capacity for full justification, ϕ must be tailored to the contents of the comprehensive doctrines of the citizens for whom ϕ must be capable of full justification.

Rawls *denies* the conclusion. He stresses that the contents of comprehensive doctrines "have no normative role in public justification" (Rawls 2005: 387)—which implies that a conception of political justice must *not* be tailored to the contents of any comprehensive doctrine. What is in play here is political liberalism's signature commitment to justificatory neutrality (Larmore 2015: 67), i.e., the view that public justification should avoid justifiers or reasons, widely conceived, that are the subject of reasonable disagreement—construed as disagreement that can arise between reasonable citizens (Rawls 2005: 55; Larmore 2015: 68-74; Macedo 1991: 47, 71). For Rawls, no conception of political justice counts as equally acceptable by all reasonable

¹⁰ As it is worth noting, for Rawls, political liberalism is to pursue the aim of reasonable overlapping consensus not only in JF's well-ordered liberal society, where all doctrines are reasonable, but also here and now, where not all doctrines are reasonable. But in on-ideal conditions, it seeks an overlapping consensus only in relation to the reasonable doctrines that are then present (Rawls 2005: 36; Besch 1998: chapter I).

citizens that is, or is based on what is, the subject of (actual or probable) reasonable disagreement (Besch 1998: chapter II; 2017: 599f). And he stipulates that *all* comprehensive views are the subject of reasonable disagreement. Hence, for Rawls, *no* comprehensive view can serve as a justifier or reason in public justification.

Thus, political liberalism reaches an impasse. Its commitment to justificatory neutrality pushes it to deny comprehensive doctrines a justificatory role in public justification—which excludes a justificatory contribution of full justification. But the role it gives to the reflective equilibria of reasonable citizens in public justification pulls in the opposite direction if we assume (plausibly, it seems) that the availability of these equilibria depends on the availability of some level of coherence between a conception of political justice and the comprehensive views of reasonable citizens. And these things are in tension since the requirement of justificatory neutrality must be satisfied not only in public justification that is carried out *on the basis of* a reasonable conception of political justice (call this conception-*applicative* justification), but also in public justifications that establishes such a conception as reasonable *to begin with* (call this conception-*constitutive* justification).

Of course, one way out of this impasse is to *reject* that justificatory neutrality must be satisfied also in conception-constitutive justification. E.g., we might adopt a convergence view of the justification of a conception of political justice that allows political *and* non-political values to serve as justifiers or reasons for a conception of political justice, while we require justificatory neutrality of conception-applicative justifications that apply a convergence-justified conception of justice to matters of basic justice. And that such a conception can attain full justification might matter greatly for its ability to be convergence-justifiable as reasonable.

Alas, Rawls does not take this option. Instead, he denies that public justification depends on full justification. Yes, it must be possible to embed a reasonable conception of political justice into the reasonable doctrines of relevant people. But this is not a condition of public justification. If anything, it is a constraint on *comprehensive doctrines*. How so? Consider again a passage quoted from earlier already:

Public justification happens when all the reasonable members of political society carry out a justification of the shared political conception by embedding it in their several reasonable comprehensive views. In this case, reasonable citizens take one another into account as having reasonable comprehensive doctrines that endorse that political conception, and this mutual accounting shapes the moral quality of the public culture of political society. A crucial point here is that while the public justification of the political conception for political society depends on reasonable comprehensive doctrines, this justification does so only in an indirect way. That is, the express contents of these doctrines have no normative role in public justification; citizens do not look into the content of others' doctrines, and so remain within the bounds of the political. Rather, they take into account and give some weight to only the fact—the existence—of the reasonable overlapping consensus itself. (Rawls 2005: 387.)

While the first sentence is compatible with the view that full justification (and, by that token, reasonable overlapping consensus) *is* a condition of public justification, the rest of the passage stresses the opposite. Yes, public justification depends on reasonable comprehensive doctrines, but only “indirectly.” What matters is only that they can be expected to endorse and “in some way” embed a conception of political justice that reasonable citizens accept as their “shared

political conception.” Accordingly, in publicly justifying such a conception, reasonable citizens “remain within the bounds of the political.”

As I read this, it puts to work two sets of stipulations. First, the stipulation that reasonable citizens are committed to the view that a conception of political justice must be justifiable on grounds that are equally acceptable by all reasonable citizens. On the assumption that political values alone can serve as such grounds, this commits reasonable citizens to publicly justify such a conception exclusively on the basis of political values—or to “remain within the bounds of the political.” Second, Rawls assumes that reasonable citizens affirm reasonable comprehensive doctrines (Rawls 2005: 59), but he stipulates, as well, that reasonable doctrines cohere with the commitments of reasonable citizens.¹¹ Consequently, at least if ϕ is the only conception of political justice that is so justifiable, reasonable doctrines may be expected to endorse and “in some way” embed ϕ .

Thus: public justification does not depend on, but rather *dominates* full justification, and it does this in a manner that leaves no substantive role to full justification in the selection of a conception of political justice. Call this the *strict view* of full justification. It secures the role of justificatory neutrality as a constraint on conception-constitutive justifications. And it does this by limiting the doxastic material that CRE operates on. Recall: APJ requires ϕ to be coherently acceptable by reasonable citizens—coherently, that is, in a way that meets CRE. Upfront, this suggests that ϕ ’s coherent acceptability depends, as well, on ϕ ’s ability to cohere with the comprehensive views of these citizens. But the strict view denies this possibility. And so ϕ ’s coherent acceptability can only turn on ϕ ’s ability to cohere with the *political values* that reasonable citizens adopt—which by hypothesis are equally acceptable by all reasonable citizens. This, then, is one upshot of Rawls’s dictum that a conception of political justice must be “freestanding” (Rawls 2005: 374ff).

There might be an opening for a different view of the role of full justification—call it the *relaxed view*. Rawls, we have seen, concedes that it can be reasonable to reject one *pro tanto* justifiable conception of political justice (or one variant of political liberalism) in favour of another. Now, the public justification of a conception of political justice might not exclusively involve demonstrating its completeness. But assume it does take this form. On the relaxed view, then, considerations of full justification can provide grounds to publicly prefer one *pro tanto* justifiable conception over another if and when it is equally acceptable by all reasonable citizens to let these considerations make this difference. Suppose there are two *pro tanto* justifiable conceptions, ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , where ϕ_1 integrates more fully than ϕ_2 with the reasonable doctrines of (some) reasonable citizens. On the relaxed view, this provides ground to prefer ϕ_1 , if preferring ϕ_1 for this reason is suitably acceptable.

Should we prefer the strict view or the relaxed view? This is unclear. Both track the priority of the aim of equal acceptability by actual reasonable citizens. The strict view translates this priority into the requirement that justificatory neutrality be satisfied in conception-constitutive justifications—this is part of the point of political liberalism’s application of the principle of toleration to philosophy (Rawls 2005: 10), and it reflects the depth of its commitment to accord equal discursive respect to actual reasonable citizens (Besch 2018: 598ff).

¹¹ This differs from Rawls’s official view of reasonableness in comprehensive doctrines (Rawls 2005: 59), but it reflects the criterion of their reasonableness actually at work in view. See Besch 1998: chapter I.3, and Mandle 1999: 90-94.

But the relaxed view often seems in play where Rawls suggests that the compatibility of a conception of political justice with the comprehensive doctrines of reasonable citizens marks an important merit that has to do with its public justifiability. After all, as he puts it in a passage quoted earlier, *public justification* happens when reasonable citizens carry out full justification, while CRE conditions the *reasonableness* of a conception of justice.

But for what is relevant now, we need not decide between the strict view and the relaxed view. What matters here is only that both views reflect the fundamental role of public justification.

6. The wide view of public political culture and the public reason intuitions

Before I conclude, I address two additional matters. First, how does public justification relate to Rawls's "wide" view of public political culture? Second, how does political liberalism's view of the scope of public justification relate to its idea of political legitimacy and the "public reason intuitions" (Enoch 2015: 114ff)? I address both matters in turn.

Recall some constraints that Rawls ties into public justification:

2. To be publicly justifiable (i.e., to meet APJ), ϕ must be coherently acceptable by each reasonable citizen:
 - (i) ϕ must hence be based on justifiers or reasons that satisfy justificatory neutrality: these justifiers or reasons must not be the subject of reasonable disagreement;
 - (ii) ϕ must hence be based on political values only;
 - (iii) ϕ must hence be based on values that are indexed to a *given* political tradition, that are *liberal* in content, that apply to the domain of political *only*, and that are equally acceptable, if not non-rejectable, by political liberalism's reasonable citizens;

and, perhaps:

 - (iv) ϕ must be complete and more capable of full justification than other eligible conceptions of political justice.

The first three constraints, and perhaps all four, are necessary for ϕ 's public justifiability. And as public reason "aims for" public justification, as Rawls puts it, it is natural to assume that public reasoning, at least when it *carries out* public justification, must comply with these constraints. We may hence call them the *constraints of public reason*.

At first pass, this seems to contradict Rawls's wide view of public political culture. According to Neal (2008), the wide view *relaxes* Rawls's inclusive view of public reason—which itself marks a more inclusive departure from his initial, exclusive view. According to the exclusive view, reasonable citizens may not invoke non-political values or reasons in public political debate. Rawls later opts for a more permissive, inclusive view of public political debate (Rawls 2005: 247f). On this view, reasonable people may invoke non-political values or reasons in public political debate provided (i) this strengthens the ideal public reason and (ii) these values or reasons are *at the time* accompanied by suitably supportive political values. The wide view finally relaxes this by replacing (ii) with the weaker condition that reasonable citizens must "in due course" provide "public reasons to support the principles and policies our comprehensive doctrine is said to support" (ibid: 453; see also 442, 462ff). Thus, Rawls concedes that

reasonable citizens may invoke non-political values or reasons in public political debate so long as doing so remains suitably tethered to public reason.

But if public political debate invokes non-political values or non-public reasons, it cannot instantiate reasoning that satisfies the constraints of public reason. Thus, is Rawls's wide view incompatible with these constraints? It is not. And here I return to the matter of labels referred to earlier. While Rawls proposes the exclusive and inclusive views as views of *public reason*, he refers to the wide view as a view of *public political culture* (ibid.). And he *contrasts* what people may do on the wide view and what they must do to satisfy the constraints of public reason (Rawls 2005: 455f, 461f). The shift in labels from "public reason" to "public culture" matters. As seems to herald that not all stretches of debate that instantiate public political culture—say, public political debate—must also instantiate public reason.

This prompts a way to reconcile Rawls's wide view with the constraints of public reason. We can understand the view in light of a distinction between two idioms or strands of public political debate, namely, (i) debate that (directly) aims for public justification and to which the constraints of public reason apply, and (ii) debate that does not (directly) aim for this and that need not meet these constraints. Accordingly, only type-(i)-debate instantiates public reason proper and must meet the relevant constraints. In light of (i) and (ii), the wide view does not entail that public political debate must always instantiate public reason, or must do so even when debate invokes non-political values or reasons. Instead, it articulates a more differentiated view of public political debate according to which such debate is not co-terminus with an exercise of public reason, and hence need not always meet the constraints of public reason (although the view would still assume that such debate must always remain tethered to public reason). This, I submit, is how we should understand Rawls's wide view of public political culture.

Not least, I relate APJ to political liberalism's idea of political legitimacy.¹² On Rawls's liberal principle of legitimacy (LPL), political power must be exercised "in accordance with a constitution the essentials of which all citizens may reasonably be expected to endorse in the light of principles and ideals acceptable to them as reasonable and rational" (Rawls 2005: 217). Yet these must be principles and ideals that are justifiable *as* reasonable and rational within a conception of political justice that is reasonable (Besch 2012 and 2013). And such a conception counts as reasonable only if meets APJ—which reflects political liberalism's commitment to extend equal discursive respect to actual reasonable citizens. The point: political power here is politically legitimate only if it is justifiable on the basis of a conception of political justice that is equally acceptable by all actual reasonable citizens.

Of course it is problematic to from the outset restrict (full) inclusion in the constituency of public justification to political liberalism's reasonable citizens—a point that has often been made. But what matters now is that this is not incompatible with political liberalism's understanding of the "public reason intuitions" (Enoch 2015: 114ff). These intuitions amount to the view that political power can be reconciled with the freedom and equality of citizens only if it is equally justifiable to them. It has been argued that political liberalism cannot accommodate these intuitions since it is at least initially committed to reconcile the freedom and equality of *all* citizens with political power (ibid: 122-126); yet if such power is equally justifiable only to reasonable people, little is done to accommodate the freedom and equality of anyone else.

¹² The remainder of this section follows Besch 2020.

However, political liberalism sits better with a different interpretation. As Macedo puts it, it respects as “free and equal (...) all those who pass certain threshold tests of reasonableness: we respect those whose disagreement with us does not impugn their reasonableness” (Macedo 1991: 47, 71). This suggests: political liberalism aims to reconcile with political power the freedom and equality *not* of everyone, but of every citizen that it *respects as free and equal*, namely, *reasonable citizens*. The point: political liberalism’s restriction on the scope of discursive respect and hence its restriction on the constituency of actualist and fundamental public justification coheres with its understanding of the public reason intuitions. Thus, political liberalism indexes not only discursive respect and public justification to the standpoint of reasonableness, but also its attempt to reconcile political power with freedom and equality.

7. Conclusion

This discussion developed a reading of Rawls according to which an actualist idea of public justification plays a fundamental role in his political liberalism. According to this reading, Rawls’s political liberalism holds that any conception of political justice, to be reasonable in the first place, must be equally acceptable coherently by actual reasonable citizens.

We found that Rawls’s mature view of OP confirms the fundamental role of actualist public justification. OP’s role depends on whether OP’s results are suitably acceptable by the actual reasonable citizens from the perspective of whom any conception of political justice must coherently be acceptable in order to be reasonable in the first place.

Rawls-type *pro tanto* justification, too, ties in with actualist and fundamental public justification. We cannot know in terms of what values *pro tanto* justification must demonstrate completeness unless we know what values are suitably acceptable by relevant citizens. That Rawls’s political values (and they alone) may enter the pool of values in terms of which completeness must be demonstrated springs from the stipulation that only these values are suitably acceptable by relevant people.

Next, full justification ties in with actualist public justification insofar as it tracks the priority Rawls attaches to equal acceptability by actual reasonable citizens. On the strict view, full justification is dominated by actualist and fundamental public justification. On the relaxed view, full justification can make a limited contribution to such justification if and when this is consistent with the aim of coherent acceptability by actual reasonable citizens.

Not least, the wide view of public political culture and the public reason intuitions cohere with actualist and fundamental public justification. The latter coheres with it insofar as political liberalism’s view of political legitimacy requires merely that political power be reconciled with the freedom and equality of reasonable citizens. The former coheres with it as the wide view allows for more than one idiom of public political debate—where one idiom is, or can be, subject to the constraints of public reason as they spring from APJ.

All this supports the view that Rawls’s political liberalism builds on an idea of actualist and fundamental public justification that extends discursive respect to actual reasonable citizens, or models their robust discursive equality. But it also brings out limitations of Rawls’s view: the constraints political liberalism imposes on actualist and fundamental public justification, and with it on discursive respect, limit its plausibility. APJ-justification coheres with a political and liberal view of justice since (i) APJ-justification includes within its scope on fully enfranchised footing only reasonable citizens, while Rawls stipulates that (ii) liberal political values, and they alone, are suitably acceptable by such citizens. Without (i) and (ii), the commitment to actualist and fundamental public justification seems to give expression to emancipatory and egalitarian

values that might make the view attractive for many. With (i) and (ii) in place, however, the view looks like a form of public dogma (Besch 2012).

This leaves us with questions. Suppose we reject (i) and (ii), above. What conception of political justice is publicly justifiable if we adopt a different, perhaps more inclusive view of the standpoint from which conceptions of political justice must equally be acceptable coherently, or a different, perhaps more inclusive view of the values that such a conception must contain? That is, how should actualist and fundamental public justification in political liberalism construe its underlying commitment to discursive respect and robust discursive equality?

If we aim to salvage in Rawls's view what seems attractive, then these issues are amongst the many that stand to be explored more.

References

- Besch, T. M. (1998). *Über John Rawls' politischen Liberalismus*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
- Besch, T. M. (2004). *On Practical Constructivism and Reasonableness*. PhD diss., University of Oxford.
- Besch, T. M. (2012). Political Liberalism, the Internal Conception, and the Problem of Public Dogma. *Philosophy and Public Issues*. 2 (1), 153–177.
- Besch, T. M. (2013). On Political Legitimacy, Reasonableness, and Perfectionism. *Public Reason* 5 (1), 58–74.
- Besch, T. M. (2014). On Discursive Respect. *Social Theory and Practice*. 40 (2), 207–231.
- Besch, T. M. (2018). Public Justification, Inclusion, and Discursive Equality. *Dialogue*. 57 (3), 591–614.
- Besch, T. M. (2019a). On Robust Discursive Equality. *Dialogue*. 58 (3), 465–490.
- Besch, T. M. (2019b). On Justification, Idealization, and Discursive Purchase. *Philosophia*. 47 (3), 601–623.
- Besch, T. M. (2020). On Actualist and Fundamental Public Justification in Political Liberalism. Manuscript. Available at <https://philpapers.org/rec/BESOAA-2>.
- Campos, P. F. (1994). Secular Fundamentalism. *Columbia Law Review*. 94 (6), 1814–1827.
- Enoch, D. (2015). Against Public Reason. In D. Sobel, P. Vallentyne, & S. Wall (Eds.), *Oxford Studies in Political Philosophy* (Vol. 1, pp. 112–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Estlund, D. (1998). The Insularity of the Reasonable: Why Political Liberalism Must Admit the Truth. *Ethics*. 108 (2), 252–275.
- Forst, R. (2017a). *Normativity and Power: Analyzing Social Orders of Justification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forst, R. (2017b). Noumenal Alienation: Rousseau, Kant and Marx on the Dialectics of Self-Determination. *Kantian Review* 22 (4), 523–551.
- Friedman, M. (2000). John Rawls and the Political Coercion of Unreasonable People. In V. Davion & C. Wolf (Eds.), *The Idea of a Political Liberalism: Essays on Rawls* (pp. 13–33). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gaus, G. (1996). *Justificatory Liberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gaus, G. (1999). Reasonable Pluralism and the Domain of the Political: How the Weaknesses of John Rawls's Political Liberalism Can Be Overcome by a Justificatory Liberalism. *Inquiry*. 42 (2), 259–284.
- Hampton, J. (1989). Should Political Philosophy Be Done Without Metaphysics? *Ethics*. 99 (4), 791–814.

- Hampton, J. (1993). The Moral Commitments of Liberalism. In D. Copp, J. Hampton, & J. Roemer (Eds.), *The Idea of Democracy* (pp. 292–313). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laden, A. (2014). Constructivism as Rhetoric. In J. Mandle & D. Reidy (Eds.), *A Companion to Rawls* (pp. 59–72). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Larmore, C. (2015). Political Liberalism: Its Motivation and Goals. In D. Sobel, P. Vallentyne, & S. Wall (Eds.), *Oxford Studies in Political Philosophy* (Vol. 1, pp. 63–88). Oxford: Oxford University Press. LeBar (2008)
- Leland, R. J. & Wietmarschen, H. (2012). Reasonableness, Intellectual Modesty, and Reciprocity in Political Justification. *Ethics* 122 (4), 721–747.
- Lister, A. (2008) Reflective Equilibrium: Epistemological or Political? *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*. 26 (2), 266–279.
- Lister, A. (2017). Public Reason and Reciprocity. *Journal of Political Philosophy*. 25 (2), 155–172.
- Macedo, S. (1991). *Liberal virtues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mulhall, S. & Swift, A. (1996). *Liberals and communitarians*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Neal, P. (2008). Is Public Reason Innocuous? *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 11 (2), 131–152.
- Nielsen, K. (1994). How to Proceed in Social Philosophy: Contextualist Justice and Wide Reflective Equilibrium. *Queen's Law Journal*. 20(1), 89–138.
- Postema, G. (1995). Public Practical Reason: An Archeology. *Social Philosophy and Policy*. 12 (1), 43–86.
- Quong, J. (2011). *Liberalism Without Perfection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1974). The Independence of Moral Theory. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*. 48, 5–22.
- Rawls, J., & Kelly, E. (2001). *Justice as Fairness: a Restatement*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. (2005). *Political Liberalism* (Expanded edition.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ronzoni, M. (2010). Constructivism and Practical Reason: On Intersubjectivity, Abstraction, and Judgment. *Journal of Moral Philosophy*. 7 (1), 74–104.