Ethics, Politics & Society
A Journal in Moral and Political Philosophy

THREE KINDS OF SELF-RESPECT IN RAWLS

JORGE CREGO
Universidade da Coruña
jorge.crego@udc.es

ORCID: 0000 0001 7072 6569

Abstract: Rawls's remarks on self-respect have been described as cryptic or ambiguous. The discussion on the meaning of respect and, specifically, Rawlsian self-respect has been considerably influenced by Darwall's distinction between recognition respect and appraisal respect. This paper defends that Darwall's dichotomic misses an important dimension of Rawlsian self-respect which can be termed "value-confidence". This third kind of self-respect concerns one's confidence in the value of the particular conception of the good one has chosen. Value-confidence differs from recognition self-respect, even if both dimensions are intimately connected. The distinction between recognition self-respect and value-confidence resembles the dual nature of moral personality in Rawls and the different roles of basic institutions and communities of interests.

Keywords: dignity, recognition respect, appraisal respect, moral personality, liberalism.

Resumo: As observações de Rawls relativas ao respeito próprio têm sido descritas como crípticas ou ambíguas. A discussão em torno do significado de respeito e, especificamente, do respeito próprio rawlsiano foi bastante influenciada pela distinção de Darwall entre respeito enquanto reconhecimento e respeito enquanto avaliação. Este artigo defende que a dicotomia de Darwall ignora uma importante dimensão do respeito próprio rawlsiano que pode ser chamado de "valor-confiança". Este terceiro tipo de respeito próprio diz respeito à confiança no valor da concepção do bem específica escolhida por uma pessoa. O respeito próprio enquanto "valor-confiança" diverge do respeito próprio ainda que as duas dimensões estejam intimamente ligadas. A distinção entre o respeito próprio como reconhecimento e o respeito próprio como "valor confiança" assemelha-se à natureza dual da personalidade moral em Rawls e aos diferentes papéis das instituições básicas e das comunidades de interesses.

Palavras-chave: dignidade; respeito como reconhecimento; respeito como avaliação; personalidade moral; liberalismo.

Introduction

Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* is perhaps one of the most important works on political philosophy of the 20th century (Cohen, 2008, p. 11; Nozick, 1974, p. 183). This work includes primary goods as one of the most important concepts (Rawls, 1999f, pp. 78–81). Among primary goods, Rawls identifies the social bases of self-respect as "perhaps the most important primary good" (Rawls, 1999f, p. 386).[1] According to this, self-respect could be conceived as perhaps one of the most important concepts in Rawls's theory of justice or perhaps of contemporary political philosophy. At least, the contemporary interest in the topic of self-respect can fairly be associated with Rawls (Dillon, 1995, pp. 2, 37).

Rawlsian self-respect has been considered "cryptic" (Stark, 2012, p. 246), "imprecise" (Brake, 2013, p. 57), or "ambiguous" (Proudfoot, 1978, p. 267). As Kramer defends, "Rawls's scattered remarks on the social bases of self-respect are not easily brought together into a coherent position" (Kramer, 2017, p. 338). This paper contributes to the clarification of the nature of Rawlsian self-respect. As will be demonstrated, previous studies have generally examined Rawlsian self-respect from Darwall's distinction between two kinds of respect: recognition respect and appraisal respect (Darwall, 1977). The central thesis of this paper is that Rawlsian self-respect comprises both recognition and appraisal self-respect but also a third kind of attitude towards oneself which will be termed "value-confidence". The latter implies an attitude of confidence in the value of one's plan of life, of what one has chosen as her conception of the good. This sort of self-regard cannot be identified with any of the two kinds of self-respect Darwall describes. The idea of value-confidence connects with the dual nature of moral persons in Rawls, as generic beings with two moral powers and as particular individuals with particular conceptions of the good. The distinction between value-confidence and recognition self-respect fits in the dual nature of moral personality in Rawls. It also clarifies the connection between self-respect and associations. Section 5 briefly explores this and other relationships to justify how the idea of value-confidence advances our understanding of some important ideas of Rawls. The paper leaves aside an evaluation of Rawls's ideas; it merely attempts to clarify and describe the meaning of self-respect in Rawls.

This paper proceeds as follows. The first section places Rawlsian self-respect in context and describes its basic characterization. Then, the second section presents Darwall's classification of the two dominant kinds of respect and self-respect: recognition respect and appraisal respect. This is followed by an examination of the discussion on the kind of self-respect Rawls integrates into his theory of justice. The fourth section argues that it is not easy to include all Rawlsian ideas about self-respect in Darwall's dichotomic characterization. The section contends that a third kind of self-respect, value-confidence, could complete the description of Rawlsian self-respect. Section five demonstrates

---

[1] In *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls refers to "self respect", not its social bases. However, in *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*, he acknowledges the distinction between "self-respect as an attitude […] and the social bases that help to support this attitude". Rawls then clarifies that the notion of primary goods must be limited to the social bases of self-respect, not to self-respect as an attitude.

that the distinction between value-confidence and recognition self-respect fits into Rawls's conception of moral personality and his description of a well-ordered society. The last section concludes.

1.   Rawlsian Self-respect and the Voluntarist Conception of Moral Personality

Rawls's ideas on the notion of self-respect are to be interpreted within his general view on moral personality (Brake, 2013, p. 64; Doppelt, 2009, p. 13; Krishnamurthy, 2013, p. 181). This section offers a description of his idea of moral personality, the moral powers that define that personality, and the idea of primary goods, in order to put self-respect in its context.

The "overarching idea" of Rawls's theory of justice is that of the moral person and the well-ordered society (Rawls, 1999f, p. 297; 1999b, p. 171; 1999c, p. 319). Rawls describes moral persons as free and equal persons, having two moral powers.[2] The two moral powers that define a moral person are a capacity for a sense of justice and a capacity for a conception of the good. This paper will focus on the latter since, as will be seen, it is explicitly related to the idea of self-respect. The capacity for a conception of the good is "the capacity to have, to revise, and rationally to pursue a conception of the good", allowing individuals to be free (Rawls, 2005, p. 19). Moral persons have the capacity to choose which are their final ends (Rawls, 1999d, p. 240); they imbue their choices with value. As different commentators defend, Rawls proposes a voluntarist conception of moral personality. Sandel stresses that, for Rawls, an agent is "free to adopt whatever conception of the good he desire[s]" (Sandel, 1998, p. 154). As Doppelt clarifies, in a voluntarist conception of agency "persons' ways of life and conceptions of value have value, are owed a measure of respect […] just because and when they embody their agent's own normative will and judgment" (Doppelt, 1989, p. 824). The moral person chooses her ends and thus turns them into her "good".

Rawls carefully distinguishes between the capacity for a conception of the good and the specific conception of the good a moral person happens to choose. As bearers of a capacity for a conception of the good all moral persons have identical standing and deserve equal respect. The capacity for a conception of the good is a universal moral power, equally present in all moral beings, generic in its form and identical in each of its bearers. As having a specific conception of the good, each individual distinguishes herself from others. Thus, the conception of the good a moral person chooses particularizes her identity and distinguishes her from the generic moral person. Rawls defends

---

[2] As is well known, Rawls reworked his theory with the "political turn" (Weithman, 2010). However, the definition of a moral person and her moral powers remained identical throughout his whole work. He first offered an explanation of these ideas in "Distributive Justice" (Rawls, 1999a, p. 131), revisited them in both editions of *A Theory of Justice* (Rawls, 1971, p. 561; 1999f, p. 491), and presented the clearest description in *Political Liberalism* (Rawls, 2005, p. 19). His last published work, *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*, also includes these ideas (Rawls, 2001, p. 19). Despite the fact that the political turn reformulated the content of the description of moral personality, this paper will not discuss how this reformulation could have affected self-respect.

that any moral person gives unconditional priority to the protection of her generic identity as a bearer of the capacity for a conception of the good, even over the achievement of any particular conception of the good she might happen to have chosen (Rawls, 1999c, p. 313). This distinction between the generic moral person (having two moral powers) and the particular individual (having a particular conception of the good she has chosen) connects with the complex structure of self-respect in Rawls, as will be seen in section 5.

The idea of primary goods is inextricably related to moral powers (Rawls, 1999f, p. xiii). The primary goods are things "generally necessary […] to enable citizens, regarded as free and equal, adequately to develop and fully exercise their two moral powers, and to pursue their determinate conceptions of the good" (Rawls, 2001, p. 88). Some instances of primary goods are basic rights and liberties, income and wealth, or the social bases of self-respect (Rawls, 2001, pp. 58–59). Therefore, since the social bases of self-respect are a primary good, they are necessary resources for the adequate exercise of one's moral powers, including one's capacity for a conception of the good.

A preliminary description of self-respect can be found in *A Theory of Justice*. For Rawls, first, self-respect "includes a person's sense of his own value, his secure conviction that his conception of his good, his plan of life, is worth carrying out. And second, self-respect implies a confidence in one's ability, so far as it is within one's power, to fulfill one's intentions" (Rawls, 1999f, p. 386). Section 3 explores how different authors interpret this and other passages of Rawls's work as describing his idea of self-respect either as "recognition self-respect" or as "appraisal self-respect". Section 4 defends that, besides these two understandings of self-respect proposed by Darwall, it is possible to find in Rawls some references to a third kind of self-respect, which I term "value-confidence". This type of self-respect cannot be reduced to any of Darwall's kinds, even if there are important connections between all kinds of self-respect. Recognition self-respect refers to how individuals perceive themselves as moral persons, as generic bearers of moral powers, detached from any particular exercise of those powers. Appraisal self-respect has one's deeds and character as its object. Value-confidence has one's particular conception of the good as its object. This object cannot be identified with moral personality as the generic possession of a capacity for a conception of the good. A moral person demonstrates value-confidence when she sees her conception of the good as 'worth carrying out'. In the following sections, this paper underlines the importance of value-confidence as an attitude of self-regard of the moral person in the Rawlsian account of self-respect.

2. Darwall's two Kinds of Respect

Darwall offers an influential classification of the concepts of respect and self-respect. Understanding Darwall's ideas about those concepts are essential for any attempt to clarify the Rawlsian conception of self-respect.

Darwall's "Two Kinds of Respect" (Darwall, 1977) has conditioned the discussion on the Rawlsian conception of self-respect. In this seminal paper, Darwall defends that previous accounts of the idea of respect fail to distinguish different meanings of this term (Darwall, 1977, pp. 36–38). He includes Rawls among the authors that have not properly distinguished between these meanings. The author puts forward the argument that there are "two rather different ways in which persons may be the object of respect". Darwall distinguishes between "recognition respect" and "appraisal respect". For this paper, the most interesting difference between them concerns the nature of their "object". Both kinds of respect can refer to moral beings; however, they focus on different elements of our existence. It is worth noticing that persons are not the only possible object of recognition respect. For instance, Darwall speaks of the law as a possible object of recognition respect. He even describes "fatherhood" as a fact of recognition respect. However, probably the most significant object of recognition respect is moral personality. This is the kind of respect that can be associated with Rawls's ideas. Therefore, this paper can work with the assumption that the object of respect and self-respect is always a certain attribute of a moral person.

By virtue of having the status of personhood, Darwall states that the recipient automatically deserves recognition respect. He describes recognition respect as "a disposition to weigh appropriately in one's deliberation certain features of the thing in question and to act accordingly" (Darwall, 1977, p. 38). Therefore, the quality of being a moral person is a sufficient condition to deserve recognition respect. The most relevant kind of recognition respect for the clarification of the meaning of self-respect is moral recognition respect. This form of recognition respect implies that we take notice of a moral fact in our deliberations and adapt our behaviour accordingly. Darwall emphasises that the choice of how we must behave once we notice a given moral fact arises simply "because of the feature or fact itself" (Darwall, 1977, p. 40). Once we observe the quality that must be respected, there is no behavioural alternative: we must respect it. To some extent, it is possible to conceive recognition respect as a categorical and an all-or-nothing attitude: it is not a matter of degree, and once we acknowledge the fact of being a moral person, this kind of respect is unconditional.

Appraisal respect has a narrower scope. Its object can only be a moral person's endeavours or character-related features (Darwall, 1977, p. 38). Darwall states that, unlike recognition respect, appraisal respect does not demand any specific behaviour regarding its object. Appraisal respect implies a positive assessment of a moral being, the acknowledgement of her "excellence" either as a person or in certain particular pursuit. Therefore, it is something that not all moral beings necessarily deserve. For him, also, appraisal respect is specifically directed to character, i.e., to those behaviours "which belong to [persons] as moral agents" (Darwall, 1977, p. 43). The fact that being a moral agent is a necessary condition to receive appraisal respect explains that only moral persons can be the object of this kind of respect. Appraisal respect rests on a value judgement and thus it seems to imply the existence of a certain "code of ethics" that guides this positive assessment (Darwall, 1977, p. 41). For all these reasons, the author connects

appraisal respect with the idea of virtue. However, commentators such as Meyers generally accept that appraisal respect is not limited to moral character but can also refer to personal autonomy (Meyers, 1995).[3] One can show appraisal respect to Rawls as an academic because of his excellent moral behaviour regarding his colleagues. But, at least for Meyers, one can also show appraisal respect to Rawls because of his excellent performance as a scholar. If appraisal respect refers to character and excellence, then it depends on the performance of each person. Thus, as Darwall defends (1977, p. 45), "it is not owed to everyone, for it may or may not be merited".

Two differences between recognition and appraisal respect must be underscored. First, the object of recognition respect is always a "fact". Here, that fact can be identified with moral personality. The object of appraisal respect is "character" or, as Brake (2013, p. 61) puts it, an "ability." Second, due to the aforementioned difference between recognition respect and appraisal respect, all moral persons deserve equal recognition respect, but not necessarily the same appraisal respect. Recognition respect is a necessary consequence of the observation of the fact that someone is a moral person. If one identifies an entity as a moral person, then she must adapt her behaviour accordingly and categorically show recognition respect to that entity. On the contrary, one can recognise someone as a moral person and yet rightfully deny that moral person any appraisal respect because of a despicable character present in that person. Appraisal respect can even appear in different measures since it depends on the degree of achievement of a certain excellence. It is not clear what Darwall means with the term "fact" and how it could be opposed to "character" or "action". Here it is possible to assume that the fact of being a moral person is given to an agent but the character of an agent depends on her actions and decisions. As will be defended, in Rawls, moral personality manifests both as a fact and as an ability: it is a fact from the point of view of third parties, but an ability from the point of view of the self. Dillon summarizes the difference with a clarifying statement: "some of our worth is fundamental to us because we are persons rather than trees or rocks, while another kind of worth may be earned through what we do and become" (Dillon, 1992, p. 133).

3.   Rawlsian Self-respect under Darwall's Dichotomy

Darwall's Two Kinds of Respect concludes with a brief section where he states that both recognition respect and appraisal respect "are attitudes which one can bear to oneself" (Darwall, 1977, p. 47). Thus, it is possible to distinguish between recognition self-respect and appraisal self-respect.

---

[3] Darwall (1977, p. 48) distinguishes appraisal self-respect from self-esteem. For him, self-esteem refers to features of a person that have little or no relationship with their activity or character, such as appearance. Darwall argues that Rawls seems to refer to this kind of self-esteem when writing about self-respect.

For Darwall, moral persons demonstrate a lack of recognition self-respect when they do not react against a violation of their rights. This lack of reaction implies a failure to conceive themselves as moral persons. An appropriate weight of one's moral standing as a moral person requires that other individuals respect one's rights. Those who lack this recognition self-respect then do not demand that the behaviour of others adapt accordingly in their interactions. Therefore, an individual that does not react against such a violation of her rights demonstrates an attitude towards oneself that does not weigh properly the fact that she is a moral person.

Darwall offers a clarifying statement to distinguish appraisal self-respect from recognition self-respect: "[o]ne may give adequate recognition to the fact that one is a person and still have a rather low opinion of oneself as a person" (Darwall, 1977, p. 48). Appraisal self-respect refers to an evaluation of one's excellence or virtue as a person or of one's achievements in life. This kind of self-respect evaluates one's behaviour according to one's own conception of what is good, i.e., according to a model one perceives as valuable. One can adequately self-respect herself from the recognitional point of view, accepting she is a moral person and acting accordingly, and yet not appraise herself, assuming she cannot avoid morally blameworthy behaviour and thus cannot achieve excellence in character.

This distinction between recognition and appraisal self-respect has influenced the discussion on self-respect. In the introduction of an essential book on the matter, Dillon identifies "two distinct grounds for self-regard: the important fact that one is a person and the quality of one's character and conduct"(Dillon, 1995, p. 18). Therefore, Darwall's dichotomy tends to establish the possible interpretations of the idea of self-respect. Accordingly, the attempts to understand Rawls's conception of self-respect have been influenced by this dichotomy. In section 4 I defend that Rawlsian self-respect includes an element that cannot be reduced to any of Darwall's kinds of self-respect. Nonetheless, some have described Rawlsian self-respect in light of Darwall's proposal and this has obscured this important element Rawls presents in his work.

Many scholars have applied Darwall's dichotomy to describe Rawlsian self-respect, conceiving it as an instance either of recognition self-respect or appraisal self-respect. Darwall himself, in a footnote, considers Rawlsian self-respect as "very close to" appraisal self-respect (Darwall, 1977, p. 48, note 18). Dillon follows Darwall's remarks and stresses that Rawlsian self-respect has to do with "the quality of one's character and conduct", instead of with "the important fact that one is a person" (Dillon, 1995, pp. 19, 32). According to this interpretation, since character and conduct is the object of self-respect in Rawls, he is not thinking about recognition self-respect, whose object is the fact of being a moral person. In some essays on the Rawlsian conception of self-respect, authors identify this conception with "self-esteem" and describe this latter concept in a similar way to how Darwall defines appraisal self-

respect (Deigh, 1983; Lane, 1982; Moody-Adams, 1995; Thomas, 1978).[4] Moriarty and Brake even defend that "most commentators" identify Rawlsian self-respect with appraisal self-respect (Brake, 2013, p. 61; Moriarty, 2009, p. 455). As has been mentioned, the main argument for identifying Rawlsian self-respect with appraisal self-respect is that Rawls seems to identify one's character and conduct, or "an evaluation of one's abilities" (Brake, 2013, p. 61), as the object of his conception of self-respect.

Those who defend that Rawls presented self-respect as recognition self-respect focus on a different feature of his description: his characterization of the social bases of self-respect as a primary good. This interpretation rests on a systematic understanding of Rawls's ideas on self-respect. Due to the position of self-respect in Rawls's whole theory of justice, some argue, that concept must be conceived as recognition self-respect. This systematic understanding, Moriarty (2009, p. 455) seems to intend, should be accepted even against certain literal interpretations of those passages devoted to the concept of self-respect. Following Doppelt, the core of the argument is that appraisal self-respect is too "precarious, variable, and subjective for Rawls' purposes" (Doppelt, 2009, pp. 133–134). Appraisal self-respect implies a positive assessment of one's achievements in life and it is difficult to perceive how this attitude can be connected to the idea of primary goods. Primary goods possess two features which do not fit quite well with appraisal self-respect: (i) they are essential for the exercise of the moral powers of the individual and (ii) they must be guaranteed and promoted by the basic structure of a society. If someone's purpose in life is to become the greatest violinist of all time and she cannot even play the easiest songs, she will probably lack appraisal self-respect. However, she can still develop her moral power for a conception of the good; she can still turn her desire of becoming a violinist into her conception of what's good. Therefore, even if one individual lacks appraisal self-respect she could still be able to exercise her moral power for a conception of the good: appraisal self-respect does not seem essential for that moral power and therefore does not seem an adequate candidate to become a primary good. Moreover, it would be difficult to defend that the basic institutions of a society must promote one's appraisal self-respect and, in the given example, thus strive for one's success as a violinist.

As some authors defend, recognition self-respect "fits more closely with the grounding of the primary goods in the political conception of the person", which implies "a capacity to have a conception of the good – not a high self-evaluation" (Brake, 2013, p. 62). Recognition self-respect implies that we acknowledge the fact that we are moral persons and act accordingly. This kind of attitude is not "precarious, variable, and subjective for Rawls' purposes". Every moral being needs to enjoy recognition self-respect to act as a moral person, and this kind of self-respect is an

---

[4] Thomas (1978, p. 259) early identified Rawlsian self-respect as self-esteem, offering a definition of self-esteem which is essentially identical to Darwall's appraisal self-respect: "the ratio of a person's successes to his-or-her aspirations". This could explain the interchangeable use of both "appraisal self-respect" and "self-esteem" to refer to the same idea.

all-or-nothing attitude, unlike appraisal self-respect. Therefore, recognition self-respect seems an appropriate candidate to be connected with primary goods.

In conclusion, the problem of the Rawlsian conception of self-respect seems to reside in the fact that it involves a kind of attitude which partakes of two characteristics that, in Darwall's dichotomy, are necessarily separated. On the one hand, Rawlsian self-respect depends on character, on an ability. This is a trait of appraisal self-respect. On the other hand, for Rawls, the social bases of self-respect are a primary good, and thus self-respect must be essential for the exercise of the moral power for a conception of the good. Therefore, it connects with the fact that we are moral persons. This is a trait of recognition self-respect. According to the ideas presented in this section, a literal interpretation of Rawls's passages on self-respect and a systematic interpretation of this concept within his theory of justice appear to point to contradictory meanings of Rawlsian self-respect.

4.   Value-confidence as a Specific Dimension of Self-respect

In this section, I argue that Darwall's enumeration of two kinds of self-respect does not capture all the possible components of self-respect. First, I demonstrate that some Rawlsian ideas on self-respect are hard to categorise as recognition or appraisal self-respect. Then, I argue that it is possible to describe these ideas as referring to a third kind of self-respect: value-confidence. Moral persons show value-confidence when they are confident that the conception of the good they have chosen is valuable. This dimension of self-respect has one's conception of the good as its object and refers to our moral power for a conception of the good as an ability, open to failure. Once I have presented value-confidence I present a possible explanation of why value-confidence as a dimension of self-respect has been neglected. Last, I explore the connection between value-confidence and recognition self-respect while I defend the independence of the former.

Darwall's two kinds of self-respect do not cover some Rawlsian ideas on self-respect. Rawls (1999f, p. 386) describes self-respect as including "a person's sense of his own value, his secure conviction that his conception of his good, his plan of life, is worth carrying out". He connects self-respect of moral persons with "confidence in the value of their own system of ends" (Rawls, 1999f, p. 297) and with the idea of "a firm confidence that what they do and plan to do is worth doing" (Rawls, 1999b, p. 171). When self-respect is lacking, Rawls asserts, "we feel our ends not worth pursuing, and nothing has much value" (Rawls, 1999d, p. 240). Rawls also identifies a loss of self-respect with "a weakening of our sense of the value of accomplishing our aims" (Rawls, 1999f, p. 156). Without self-respect, "nothing may seem worth doing, or if some things have value for us, we lack the will to strive for them" (Rawls, 1999f, p. 386).

Some of these statements could be related to appraisal self-respect. For instance, Rawls describes self-respect as "a firm confidence in what [persons] do and plan to do is worth doing". Kramer (2017, p. 303) mirrors this statement when he argues that Rawlsian self-respect encompasses appraisal self-respect: "one's favorable attitudes toward one's projects and ambitions and achievements and abilities". However, it is necessary to distinguish what moral persons do and what moral persons plan to do or, as Kramer presents it, one's projects and one's achievements. This distinction is clearer in those passages in which Rawls refers to the value of "accomplishing our aims", not to the value of the ends already accomplished. As concluded in section 3, appraisal self-respect refers to abilities and activities that deserve merit. Therefore, we appraise what we have achieved, not what we plan to achieve. We value our plans or conceptions of the good as proposed and not-yet-accomplished objectives. We value our achievements as already-accomplished plans. A moral person can have value-confidence and yet lack appraisal self-respect, precisely because she has projected a plan of life she cannot accomplish. One can choose to be a virtuous musician as her plan of life and have confidence in the value of being a musician, thus demonstrating value-confidence, and still lack appraisal self-respect because she cannot acquire and exhibit the abilities that must be present in a virtuous musician. Value-confidence, as distinct from the appraisal of our accomplishments, performs an important role in the Rawlsian conception of a moral person.

Other statements resemble recognition self-respect. Rawls (1999c, p. 314; 2005, pp. 308–309) describes the social bases of self-respect as "those aspects of basic institutions which are normally essential if individuals are to have a lively sense of their own worth as moral persons". Here, the sense of one's own worth, self-respect, directly connects with moral personality, the object of recognition self-respect. This description fits with the idea of the duty of mutual respect as "the duty to show a person the respect which is due to him as a moral being" (Rawls, 1999f, p. 297). However, in other passages of his work, Rawls (1999b, p. 171) identifies a sense of one's own worth, i.e., self-respect, with "a firm confidence that what [persons] do and plan to do is worth doing". Here, one's own worth refers to confidence in the value of one's plans. Therefore, Rawls equates the idea of self-respect with two different notions: recognition of one's moral personality and confidence in one's plans. One's value as a moral person and one's confidence in the value of one's conception of the good are closely related since one's value as a moral person depends on the possession of a capacity for a conception of the good. However, both attitudes are different and must be dealt with separately. It is possible to imagine a situation in which a moral being has recognition self-respect but lacks value-confidence. One can conceive herself as a moral person, worthy of recognition respect, and still lack a secure conviction that her conception of the good, for instance, the idea that academic life is valuable, is worth carrying out. In other words, one can acknowledge the important fact that one is a person and still harbour doubts on the value of the specific choices she has made regarding her plan of life.

The passages presented fit into the idea of value-confidence as a distinct attitude towards oneself. Moral persons show value-confidence when they are confident that the conception of the good they have chosen is valuable. Therefore, its object is the specific plan of life or conception of the good the person chooses but, at the same time, attaining value-confidence depends on a functioning capacity for a conception of the good. Value-confidence shares with recognition self-respect the reference to moral powers. However, the object of recognition self-respect is the individual as bearer of the moral power for a conception of the good while value-confidence focuses on the specific conception of the good that the individual has chosen. As will be seen, value-confidence is essentially connected with recognition self-respect, but the two emphasize different perspectives of the exercise of the moral power for a conception of the good.

Furthermore, value-confidence is an attitude that integrates the two characteristics that Darwall presented as separate: it refers to a character, a sort of "ability", and, at the same time, connects with the idea of moral personality. Value-confidence refers to an essential ability of any moral person: the exercise of a capacity for a conception of the good, the ability to perform one of the moral powers. A self-respecting person has confidence in her ability to have a conception of the good and thus sees her chosen plan of life as valuable. At the same time, value-confidence connects with the idea of moral personality because the ability to have a conception of the good confirms our existence as moral persons.

The imprecise idea that self-respect mirrors respect may explain why value-confidence has been neglected as a dimension of self-respect. Darwall (1977, p. 47) defends that "both recognition respect for persons as such and appraisal respect for an individual as a person are attitudes which one can bear to oneself" and this is why it is necessary to distinguish between recognition and appraisal self-respect. Following this reasoning, studies on self-respect carry the dichotomic structure of respect to the concept of self-respect. However, it is not reasonable to derive the structure of self-respect from a proposed structure of respect. Dillon (1995, pp. 6, 45 note 31) already warned against such an approach, stating that "not all dimensions of respect, even of respect for other persons, translate into modes of self-respect". Similarly, not all dimensions of self-respect translate into modes of respect. Value-confidence is a dimension of self-respect with little interest in the case of respect. In the remainder of the section, I argue that the particularities of Rawlsian conception of moral personality demand a careful distinction between respect and self-respect that underscores the relevance of value-confidence as a distinctive dimension of self-respect.

Value-confidence is a distinctive dimension of self-respect because there is an essential difference between how we experience our own moral personality and how we experience contact with other moral persons. How do we decide we must respect some human being as a moral person? Rawls (1999f, p. 445) defends that "the minimal requirements defining moral personality refer to a capacity and not to the realization" of the two moral powers.

Therefore, respect is due because of a potentiality, even if the moral powers that define moral personality are not yet developed. For Rawls, the majority of mankind presents this potentiality and thus it is reasonable to assume that, in general, identifying someone as a human being implies identifying it as a moral person.[5] Therefore respect depends on the fact of being a moral person itself; the fact that one is a moral person is sufficient for respect to become a duty (1999f, p. 297). Thus, we experience others' moral personalities as a given.

At the same time, we show respect to others "in our willingness to see the situation of others […] from the perspective of their conception of the good" (Rawls, 1999f, p. 297). From this external point of view, the moral person and her conception of the good conflate. By recognising others as moral persons we assume the duty to respect their conceptions of the good. At the same time, by respecting others' conceptions of the good we are recognising them as moral persons.

From an inner point of view, moral personality and the particular conception of the good one happens to choose in a given time, while intimately connected, have relative independence. We do not experience our own moral personality as a given fact but as the result of the active exercise of our moral powers (Doppelt, 2009, p. 134). Moral personality, from the inner point of view, is an "ability"; the ability "to form, to revise, and rationally to pursue a conception of the good" (Rawls, 2001, p. 19; 2005, p. 72). This ability can fail and, when this happens, we lack confidence in the value of our chosen conceptions of the good. We see ourselves as potentially having the capacity for a conception of the good but the exercise of this ability does not provide a conception of the good whose value we assert with confidence. It is possible to imagine a situation in which recognition self-respect exists but value-confidence is absent. For instance, one could have chosen to become a lawyer and still doubt if that conception of the good is a genuinely valuable choice. This individual does not deny her moral personality and can even see her as possessing the capacity for a conception of the good. However, she is not sure that she has exercised this ability properly.

To be sure, the presence of value-confidence as a kind of self-respect does not preclude the connection of Rawlsian self-respect with appraisal and recognition self-respect. On the contrary, value-confidence reinforces or even enables at least recognition self-respect. Therefore, it is reasonable to find passages in which Rawls connects self-respect with appraisal or recognition and this existing connection may explain some imprecisions and ambiguities in

---

[5] To be sure, Rawls (2001, p. 24) does not equate moral personality with humanity. However, he defends that the potential for a minimum degree of moral powers is sufficient for a human being to qualify as a moral person (Rawls, 1999f, pp. 442-443). When dealing with the basis of equality, he states that "only scattered individuals are without his capacity" and seems to minimize the difficulty of "those more or less permanently deprived of moral personality".

the work of Rawls.[6] I contend that value-confidence is a third kind of self-respect that, together with recognition and appraisal self-respect, constitutes the complex notion of self-respect presented by Rawls.

The connection between value-confidence and recognition self-respect manifest in what Meyers (1989, pp. 34–37) terms "chronic regret". If a moral being doubts each and every choice she makes regarding her conception of the good, she could end up doubting her possession of the capacity to form, to revise, and rationally to pursue any conception of the good. In the end, this capacity for a conception of the good depends on the ability to form a valuable plan of life. If a human being does not recognise his moral power for a conception of the good, then she cannot observe herself as having one of the essential capacities of a moral person. Therefore, a chronic loss of value-confidence affects recognition self-respect and undermines this attitude towards oneself. However, the lack of value-confidence does not need to automatically transform into chronic regret and thus affect our standing as moral persons. We can lack confidence in the value of some of our plans of life and still find solitude in other plans we find valuable, thus experiencing our exercise of the moral power for a conception of the good. Furthermore, we may lack value-confidence about all of our plans of life and still recognise ourselves as moral persons. This is so because, for Rawls, there are different social bases of self-respect and some of them may uphold our recognition self-respect in the absence of value-confidence.[7]

In short, the way we identify moral personality in others does not equate to how we experience our own moral personality. In others, their moral powers and their conception of the good are closely interwoven. As Rawls puts it, one way of respecting others' moral personality is respecting their conception of the good. However, we experience our own moral personality through the exercise of an ability, the capacity for a conception of the good. We can see ourselves as moral persons and still lack confidence in the value of the particular conception of the good we have chosen. In any case, value-confidence and recognition self-respect present important connections. For instance, a chronic lack of value-confidence may impinge upon our recognition self-respect.

5.   Value-confidence and Recognition Self-respect and the Dual Character of Moral Personality

The distinction between value-confidence and recognition self-respect mirrors many relevant pairs of ideas in Rawls's theory of justice. This distinction, then, suitably adapts Rawls's conception of moral personality to the

---

[6] For instance, Rawls connects one's own worth with the fact of being a moral person (1999c, p. 314; 2005, pp. 308-309) but also with "a firm confidence that what [persons] do and plan to do is worth doing" (1999b, p. 171).

[7] For instance, equal basic rights and liberties, a social basis of self-respect (Rawls, 2005, p. 82), may reinforce recognition self-respect even if value-confidence is in danger. If we perceive that public institutions see ourselves as free and equal moral persons and respect our moral powers, we may gain recognition self-respect despite our inner experience with those moral powers.

structure of self-respect. These parallels reinforce the interpretation of Rawlsian self-respect I have presented. In this section, I briefly explore these parallels through the distinction of two qualities of moral persons: their generic nature as moral persons and their specific nature as bearers of a specific conception of the good. After I present this distinction, by way of example, I connect it with various pairs of concepts: (i) the idea of moral powers and the idea of a conception of the good, (ii) the highest-order interest and the higher-order interests of moral persons, (iii) public identity and moral identity, and (iv) the political society and communities of interest.

In Rawls, a moral person presents a dual character. Any moral person is an instance of the generic moral person, i.e., the abstract bearer of the two moral powers, essentially equal in each and every moral person. Thus, as generic moral persons, individuals are no more than bearers of two moral powers. At the same time, any moral person is a specific moral person, with a specific conception of the good or plan of life that distinguishes herself from the idea of the generic moral person.

The dual character of moral personality rests on the distinction between the moral power for a conception of the good and the conception of the good as such. As Rawls defends (2001, p. 21), in a well-ordered society, moral personality does not rest on a particular conception of the good, but on the capacity of changing and revising any conception of the good, as the generic moral power to form a specific conception of the good freely. Moral personality is "independent from and not identified with any particular conception of the good, or scheme of final ends". This distinction between the moral power for a conception of the good and the conception of the good as such, and the independence of the former from the latter, justifies Rawls's distinction between the "highest-order interests" and the "higher-order interests" of moral persons, as well as the subordination of the latter to the former (Rawls, 1999c, pp. 312–313; 1999e, p. 365).[8]

This duality of moral personality also affects our identity. Rawls (2001, pp. 21–22; 2005, pp. 30–31) distinguishes between public and moral identity. Their public identity refers to their generic moral personality, separated from any particular conception of the good. In Rawlsian liberalism, the generic nature of this public identity assures that all citizens possess the same basic rights and duties, independently of the conceptions of the good they happen to embrace. Moral identity refers to their specificities as defined by their conceptions of the good. Moral identity is relevant, for if we suddenly lost our commitments to a specific conception of the good "we would be disoriented and unable to carry on" (Rawls, 2001, p. 22). We would still be generic moral persons and our public identity, duties, and rights, would not change. We would still be worthy of recognition respect even if our value-confidence were at risk.

---

[8] In *Political Liberalism*, Rawls describes all three interests as "higher-order interests", but still presents the latter as "subject" to the former (2005, p. 413). Therefore, it is reasonable to retain the idea of highest and higher-order interests.

This dual character of moral personality is what the difference between recognition self-respect and value-confidence expresses. Recognition self-respect addresses the self as a generic moral person and value-confidence addresses the self as a specific moral person. If I have recognition self-respect, I see myself as a functional generic moral person, equal to all other moral persons in my possession of two moral powers. If I have value-confidence I see myself as a specific moral person, with a specific conception of the good that I happen to value. Moral persons must both possess recognition self-respect and value confidence. First, value confidence is a valuable basis for recognition self-respect, since it assures that individuals see themselves as possessing a functional capacity for a conception of the good. Conversely, lacking value-confidence, individuals may suffer chronic regret and doubt about their status as moral persons. Second, value-confidence prevents apathy and cynicism (Rawls, 1999f, p. 386), for individuals see the value in their ends and strive to accomplish them.

The last pair is closely related to the topic of self-respect and this connection has not yet been comprehensively examined. Rawls (2001, pp. 20–21) distinguishes between the political society and "communities of interest". In Rawls's theory, a political society does not share any conception of the good or any specific end. A well-ordered society shares the idea of citizens as free and equal moral persons, but it treats all conceptions of the good as equal, "in the sense that they are not evaluated at all from a social standpoint" (Rawls, 1999e, p. 373). The public sphere is generic in the sense that sees all citizens as generic moral persons. Basic institutions and the principles of justice thus function as social bases of recognition self-respect: they respect citizens as generic moral beings. But Rawls also explores how a well-ordered society supports value-confidence. Public institutions cannot support confidence in the value of specific plans of life, since this would go against neutrality (Rawls, 2005, pp. 192–194). Supporting our value-confidence is the function of "communities of interest" or "associations". Rawls (1999f, pp. 386–387) describes two essential circumstances that support self-respect: the Aristotelian principle and "finding our person and deeds appreciated and confirmed by others who are likewise esteemed and their association enjoyed". When he specifies the role of associations, their connection with value-confidence is clearer: "It normally suffices that for each person there is some association (one or more) to which he belongs and within which the activities that are rational for him are publicly affirmed by others. In this way we acquire a sense that what we do in everyday life is worthwhile". For Rawls, this supports the first aspect of self-respect, i.e., "a person's sense of his own value, his secure conviction that his conception of his good, his plan of life, is worth carrying out". An association is a "community", i.e., "a body of persons united in affirming the same comprehensive, or partially comprehensive, doctrine", sharing values and ends (Rawls, 2001, pp. 3, 20). The members of an association at least partially share the same conception of the good or plan of life, and once we see that others appreciate the same plans that we appreciate, our confidence in the value of those plans increases. Thus, associations promote value confidence, while the political community promotes recognition self-respect. In conclusion, as Rawls defends (1999f, p. 477), self-respect (both as recognition and as

value-confidence) is supported by "the public recognition of just institutions, together with the full and diverse internal life of the many communities of interests that the equal liberties allow". The public recognition supports recognition self-respect while the internal life of communities of interest support value-confidence.

6. Conclusion

This paper has argued that, to understand Rawls's ideas on self-respect, it is necessary to avoid the dichotomic proposal of Darwall and incorporate the idea of value-confidence. This third kind of self-respect is different from, although related to, recognition and appraisal self-respect. This thesis has provided a deeper insight into the cryptic and imprecise notion of self-respect in Rawls.

Value-confidence is a specific dimension of self-respect which refers to the confidence a moral person has in the value of the conception of the good or plans of life she has chosen. It is different from recognition self-respect because the latter has moral personality as its object, it implies that one sees herself as a moral person. At the same time, value-confidence connects with recognition self-respect because confidence in the conceptions of the good we choose proves our possession of the ability to form a conception of the good and thus that we are moral persons.

The distinction between value-confidence and recognition self-respect reflects the distinction between a generic moral person, bearer of moral powers, and a specific moral person, bearer of a specific conception of the good. This duality is present in many Rawlsian ideas, such as the distinction between a public and a moral identity. It also mirrors the different roles of basic institutions (directly promoting recognition self-respect) and communities of interest (promoting value-confidence). Since these similarities have been presented by way of example, further research might explore the conjoint effect of basic institutions and communities of interest in the different dimensions of self-respect.

References

Brake, E. (2013). Rereading Rawls on self-respect: Feminism, family law, and the social bases of self-respect. In R. Abbey (Ed.), *Feminist Interpretations of John Rawls* (pp. 57–74). The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Cohen, G. A. (2008). *Rescuing justice and equality*. Harvard University Press.

Darwall, S. L. (1977). Two kinds of respect. *Ethics*, 88(1), 36–49.

Deigh, J. (1983). Shame and self-esteem: A critique. *Ethics*, 93(2), 225–245.

Dillon, R. S. (1992). How to lose your self-respect. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 29(2), 125–139.

Dillon, R. S. (1995). Introduction. In R. S. Dillon (Ed.), *Dignity, character and self-respect* (pp. 1–49). Routledge.

Doppelt, G. (1989). Is Rawl's Kantian liberalism coherent and defensible?. *Ethics*, 99(4), 815–851.

Doppelt, G. (2009). The place of self-respect in a theory of justice. *Inquiry*, 52(2), 127–154.

Kramer, M. H. (2017). *Liberalism with excellence*. Oxford University Press.

Krishnamurthy, M. (2013). Completing Rawls's arguments for equal political liberty and its fair value: the argument from self-respect. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 43(2), 179–205.

Lane, R. E. (1982). Government and self-esteem. Political Theory, 10(1), 5–31.

Meyers, D. T. (1989). *Self, society and personal choice*. Columbia University Press.

Meyers, D. T. (1995). Self-Respect and autonomy. In R. S. Dillon (Ed.), *Dignity, character and self-respect* (pp. 218–248). Routledge.

Moody-Adams, M. M. (1995). Race, class, and the social construction of self-respect. In R. S. Dillon (Ed.), *Dignity, character and self-respect* (pp. 271–289). Routledge.

Moriarty, J. (2009). Rawls, self-respect, and the opportunity for meaningful work. Social Theory and Practice, 35(3), 441–459.

Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state, and utopia*. Blackwell.

Proudfoot, W. (1978). Rawls on self-respect and social union. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 5(3), 255–269.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice* (1st ed.). Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1999a). Distributive justice. In S. Freeman (Ed.), *Collected papers* (pp. 130–153). Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1999b). Distributive justice: Some addenda. In S. Freeman (Ed.), *Collected papers* (pp. 154–175). Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1999c). Kantian constructivism in moral theory. In S. Freeman (Ed.), *Collected papers* (pp. 303–358). Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1999d). Reply to Alexander and Musgrave. In S. Freeman (Ed.), *Collected papers* (pp. 232–253). Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1999e). Social unity and primary goods. In S. Freeman (Ed.), *Collected papers* (pp. 359–387). Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1999f). *A theory of justice* (2nd ed.). Belknap Press.

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness: A restatement* (E. Kelly, Ed.). Belknap Press.

Rawls, J. (2005). *Political liberalism* (2nd ed.). Columbia University Press.

Sandel, M. J. (1998). *Liberalism and the limits of justice* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Stark, C. A. (2012). Rawlsian self-respect. In M. Timmons (Ed.), *Oxford studies in normative ethics* (Vol. 2, pp. 238–261). Oxford University Press.

Thomas, L. L. (1978). Morality and our self-concept. *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 12(4), 258–268.

Weithman, P. (2010). *Why political liberalism? On John Rawls's political turn*. Oxford University Press.