

**ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY:
A HYBRID APPROACH**

M.A. THESIS

Cansu Tecir

**Department of Political Studies
Political Studies M.A. Programme**

JUNE 2019

**ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY:
A HYBRID APPROACH**

M.A. THESIS

Cansu Tecir

(419141001)

**Department of Political Studies
Political Studies M.A. Programme**

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Jan Kandiyali

JUNE 2019

İSTANBUL TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ ★ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

**SİYASET FELSEFESİ VE YOKSULLUK PROBLEMİNE
MELEZ BİR YAKLAŞIM**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Cansu Tecir

(419141001)

**Siyaset Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı
Siyaset Çalışmaları Yüksek Lisans Programı**

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Jan Kandiyali

HAZİRAN 2019

Cansu Tecir, a M.A. student of ITU Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences Student ID 419141001, successfully defended the thesis/dissertation entitled “POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY: A HYBRID APPROACH”, which she prepared after fulfilling the requirements specified in the associated legislations, before the jury whose signatures are below.

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Jan KANDİYALİ

Istanbul Technical University

Jury Members: Prof. Dr. Gürcan KOÇAN

Istanbul Technical University

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Faik KURTULMUŞ

Sabancı University

Date of Submission : 3 May 2019

Date of Defense : 13 June 2019

To my beloved mom, dad and Mars,

FOREWORD

I want to present my sincere thanks and plenty of good wishes to my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Jan Kandiyali due to his patient and devoted guidance, beneficial criticisms, advices, encouragement and helpful academic knowledge throughout my research.

I owe a lot to my mom, dad and my dear Mars for their unlimited support and love. I'm deeply thankful to them. I feel lucky to have you guys!

I would like to thank my professors in the department who are Prof. Dr. Gürcan Koçan, Assist. Prof. Dr. Barry David Stocker and Assist. Prof. Dr. Giovanni Mion for their comments, advices and encouragement during master program.

May 2019

Cansu Tecir

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	ix
ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
SUMMARY	xv
ÖZET	xvii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Research Question and The Purpose of The Thesis.....	1
1.2 Methodology	1
1.3 Framework and Chapter Outlines	2
2. CONCEPT OF POVERTY	5
2.1 Defining Poverty	6
2.1.1 Absolute, primary and secondary poverty	7
2.1.2 Relative poverty	10
2.1.3 Capability poverty	15
2.1.4 Intermediate poverty	17
2.2 Wrongs of Poverty	18
2.2.1 Poverty harms integrity of human body and leads to vulnerability	19
2.2.2 Poverty creates injustice and violates basic human rights	20
2.2.3 Poverty leads to experience deficiency of well-being and harms autonomy	21
2.2.4 Poverty harms social relations and identity	23
2.2.5 Poverty undermines freedom	25
2.2.6 Poverty undermines democracy and its values	26
2.3 Is the Concept of Poverty Useful?	29
3. UTILITARIAN APPROACH	35
3.1 What Utilitarian Approach is in General?.....	35
3.2 Classical Utilitarian Approach: Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill	36
3.2.1 Benthamite version of utilitarian approach with its distinctive primary points	36
3.2.2 Mill’s version of utilitarian approach with its distinctive primary points.....	38
3.3 Preference Satisfaction.....	40
3.4 Act-Utilitarian Approach and Rule-Utilitarian Approach.....	40
3.5 Attractive and Unattractive Points in Utilitarian Approach.....	41
3.5.1 Attractive points in utilitarian approach.....	41
3.5.2 Unattractive points in utilitarian approach.....	42
3.6 Rule-utilitarian approach as a remedy to unattractive points of utilitarian approach	48
3.7 Attractive points of rule-utilitarian approach.....	49
3.8 Criticisms for rule-utilitarian approach.....	50
3.9 Implications of Utilitarian Approach on Poverty.....	52
4. RESOURCIST APPROACH	55
4.1 John Rawls’s Theory of Justice.....	56
4.1.1 Basic structure of a society for Rawls.....	57
4.1.2 Equality, respect and self-respect for Rawlsian theory of justice	57

4.1.3 Original position and veil of ignorance.....	59
4.1.4 Primary goods and principles of justice	60
4.1.5 Social minimum and poverty	62
4.1.6 Who are the least advantaged?	63
4.1.7 Definition of poverty for Rawls	65
4.1.8 Implications of Rawls’s theory on poverty: some criticisms from Lotter to Rawls.....	66
4.2 Ronald Dworkin’s Equality of Resources.....	70
4.2.1 Theoretical equal auction	71
4.2.2 Implications of his thoughts on poverty.....	72
5. CAPABILITIES APPROACH.....	75
5.1 Capabilities and Functionings	76
5.2 Agency and Well-being / Freedom and Achievement	79
5.2.1 Sen’s normative account of agency.....	81
5.2.2 Realized agency success and instrumental agency success	82
5.3 Sen’s Idea of Development	84
5.4 Forms of Unfreedom	84
5.5 Essential Freedoms.....	85
5.5.1 Political freedoms.....	85
5.5.2 Economic opportunities.....	86
5.5.3 Social opportunities	86
5.5.4 Transparency guarantees	86
5.5.5 Protective security	86
5.5.6 Role of those freedoms within his approach	87
5.6 Public Dialogue and Participation.....	87
5.7 Life Expectancy.....	87
5.8 Natural Endowments and Social Endowments	88
5.8.1 Relation between social endowments and equality of capability.....	89
5.8.2 Conversion factors.....	90
5.8.3 Some criticism to Sen.....	91
5.9 Implications of Capability Approach on Poverty.....	91
6. HYBRID APPROACH	95
6.1 Main Strengths and Weaknesses of Utilitarian, Resourcist and Capability Approaches.....	95
6.1.1 Utilitarian approach with its main strengths and weaknesses	96
6.1.2 Resourcist approach with its main strengths and weaknesses.....	100
6.1.3 Capability approach with its main strengths and weaknesses.....	105
6.2 Why We Need a Hybrid Approach	108
6.3 What a Hybrid Approach is.....	108
6.3.1 What kind of combination with these approaches	109
6.3.2 Which parts will be bringing together in hybrid approach?.....	110
6.3.3 What differs between hybrid approach and capability approach?	113
6.3.4 Criterias of hybrid approach.....	114
6.3.5 Contributions of hybrid approach	115
6.3.6 Implications of this thesis through hybrid approach	115
7. CONCLUSION.....	117
REFERENCES.....	119
CURRICULUM VITAE	125

ABBREVIATIONS

CA : Capabilities Approach
RA : Resourcist Approach

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY: A HYBRID APPROACH

SUMMARY

Contemporary political philosophy has focused on theories of justice and inequality, however it has little to say about poverty. This is the source of my motivation for this thesis. By this thesis, I aim to find an answer to some questions of what poverty is, what is wrong with poverty, what contemporary theories of social justice imply for poverty and which approach in political philosophy best handles the problem of poverty. Then, in particular, I analyse three basic fundamental approaches within political philosophy namely utilitarian approach, resourcist approach and capabilities approach.

Following that, I argue that a hybrid approach is more useful than sticking to only one of them, for it should be changing and developing according to different circumstances and conditions of being poor with a definition of poverty that partly combines traditional and contemporary definitions of poverty.

The thesis is structured in the following way: I started with the thesis with a conceptual analysis of poverty in order to identify what definitions of poverty are and what it should be. In order to do that, I benefited from the thoughts of many traditional and contemporary thinkers such as Rowntree, Townsend and Sen briefly.

Following that, in the first chapter, I argue that the traditional definition of poverty is insufficient and should be improved through focusing on lacking not just internal resources but also external resources at the same time in order to grasp poverty well. On the other hand, I attempt to elucidate what is wrong with poverty and what is bad about it in order to pay attention to morally challenging and evil human condition that deserves interests and supports of individuals, governments and political institutions.

Besides that, I have three main chapters and each of them focuses on one specific approach. In these chapters, I analyse fundamental approaches of contemporary political philosophy that are mentioned above in terms of their contributions and failures in regard to their primary aims and targets within their fields. Also, each of them is analysed in terms of their implications on poverty. For the main chapters of this thesis, I preferred to specifically focus on the thoughts of Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, John Rawls, Ronald Dworkin and Amartya Kumar Sen.

Then, in the second chapter, I view utilitarian approach in the light of thoughts of Bentham and Mill. Following that, I claim that utilitarian approach is well structured to provide security and equality and to meet basic needs for people through targeting policies and principles that create most happiness for all, however it fails to consider

separateness of people, for it treats society as one big person and it ignores how happiness is distributed among people.

In the third chapter, I analyse theories of John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin with their implications on poverty. Then, I argue that with several strong contributions, Rawls's theory against poverty is able to provide a form of protection that poor people need whereas Dworkin's theory should be modified with social minimum and should not be so strict for wrong choices and mistakes of people. In the fourth chapter, I consider capability approach of Amartya Kumar Sen with its implications on poverty. In the light of that, I argue that the capability approach should be counted as a theory of human development against whole human deprivations, including poverty. Further, I claim that redefining poverty as capability deprivation is far useful to see limitations of traditional concept of poverty and therefore, it should be largely benefitted from capability approach in fight against poverty.

In the fifth and last chapter, I firstly analyse strengths and weaknesses of each approach clearly. Then, in the light of that, I propose and aim to form a hybrid approach instead of sticking and focusing on one of them to imply and handle poverty. Therefore, in that chapter, I offer a hybrid approach that attempts to combine main strengths of resourcist and capabilities approaches and aims to complete their deficient and insufficient aspects in order to imply and handle the problem of poverty. In the light of that, I present what a hybrid approach is and its criterias as an approach. Further, I elucidate its contributions and implications briefly.

Keywords: poverty, political philosophy, approaches, utilitarian approach, resourcist approach, capability approach, hybrid approach, Rowntree, Townsend, Rawls, Dworkin

SİYASET FELSEFESİ VE YOKSULLUK PROBLEMİNE MELEZ BİR YAKLAŞIM

ÖZET

Geçmişten günümüze çağdaş siyaset felsefesi adalet ve eşitsizlik teorileri üzerine odaklanmıştır. Ancak incelendiğinde görülebilir ki, yoksulluk hakkında söylenmiş oldukça az sözü bulunmakta. Bu durum tezim için motivasyon kaynağım oldu. Bu çerçevede tezimle; yoksulluk nedir, yoksullukla ilgili ne sorun teşkil eder, çağdaş toplumsal adalet yaklaşımları yoksullukla mücadele hususunda bize dolaylı ya da direkt olarak ne ifade edebilir ve akabinde bunlar arasından hangi yaklaşım yoksulluk probleminin üstesinden en iyi şekilde gelir sorularına yanıt aramaktayım. Bu sorulara cevap bulmak adına, spesifik olarak, siyaset felsefesindeki üç temel yaklaşımı inceliyorum. Bunlar sırasıyla; faydacı yaklaşım, kaynak temelli yaklaşım ve kapasite yaklaşımı.

Bu anlamda, tezimin amacı bahsi geçen çağdaş siyaset felsefesi yaklaşımlarının yoksulluk problemine bir çözüm sağlama hatta katkıda bulunma kapasitesi olup olmadığını sorgulayıp kavramaktır. Bu amaçla siyaset felsefesi ve yoksulluk üzerine çalışmayı ve bu yaklaşımları bir araya getirerek incelemeyi tercih ettim.

Bu çerçevede, tezimde temel olarak, bu yaklaşımlardan birine tamamen bağlı kalmaktansa, melez bir yaklaşım ortaya koymanın yoksulluğu kapsamlı bir şekilde ifade etme ve yoksullukla en iyi şekilde mücadele hususlarında daha faydalı olduğunu iddia ediyorum. Çünkü yoksulluk problemini en iyi şekilde ifade edip üstesinden gelebilecek olan bir yaklaşım, yoksulluğun geleneksel tanımını geliştirerek hem içsel hem de dışsal kaynak eksikliğine odaklanmalı ve yoksul olmanın farklı koşullarına ve şartlarına göre değişip gelişebilmelidir.

Bu tez, tarafımdan, sırasıyla şu şekilde sıralanmış ve organize edilmiştir. Tezime yoksulluğun varolan tanımlarını ortaya koymak ve olması gereken yoksulluk tanımını belirlemek maksatlarıyla, yoksulluğun konsept analizini yaparak başladım. Bunları yapabilmek için; Rowntree, Townsend ve Sen gibi birçok geleneksel ve çağdaş düşünürün fikirlerinden faydalandım.

Bu çerçevede, tezimin ilk bölümünde, yoksulluğun geleneksel tanımının yetersiz olduğunu ve yoksulluğu iyi bir şekilde kavrayabilmek adına; hem iç hem de dış kaynak eksikliği hususuna odaklanarak bu geleneksel tanımın geliştirilmesi gerektiğini iddia ediyorum.

Ayrıca, yoksulluğun toplumda teşkil ettiği sorunları açıklamayı ve bu sayede, bireylerin, hükümetlerin ve kurumların ciddi anlamda ilgisini ve desteğini hakeden, ahlaki olarak mücadele gerektiren, kötü insani koşullara dikkat çekmeyi amaçlıyorum. Bunun dışında, tezimde her biri ayrı bir siyaset felsefesi yaklaşımına odaklanan üç ayrı temel bölüme sahibim. Bu bölümlerde, bahsi geçen siyaset felsefesi yaklaşımlarını temel amaçları ve hedefleri doğrultusunda, katkıları ve başarısızlıkları açısından inceledim. Ayrıca her birinin dolaylı ya da direct olarak yoksulluk hususundaki ifadelerini analiz ettim. Bu temel bölümler için spesifik olarak Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, John Rawls ve Ronald Dworkin'in fikirlerine odaklanmayı tercih ettim.

Bu çerçevede, tezimin ikinci bölümünde ise, Bentham ve Mill'in düşünceleri ışığında faydacı yaklaşımı ayrıntılı bir şekilde ele aldım ve yoksulluk hususunda değerlendirdim. Bu çerçevede, faydacı yaklaşımın herkes için en iyi mutluluğu yaratan politika ve ilkeleri hedefleyerek, insanları temel ihtiyaçlarıyla buluşturma ve onlara güvenlik ve eşitlik sağlama adına başarılı yapılandırılmış bir yaklaşım olduğunu iddia ediyorum.

Fakat, faydacı yaklaşım insanların çeşitliliğini ve farklılığını değerlendirmede aynı başarıya sahip değil. Çünkü tüm toplumu tek bir insan olarak değerlendirip, insanlar arasında mutluluğun nasıl pay edilmekte olduğunu göz ardı etmektedir.

Tezimin üçüncü bölümünde ise, John Rawls'un adalet teorisini ayrıntılı bir şekilde inceledim ve yoksulluk hususunda değerlendirdim. Yapmış olduğum değerlendirmenin ışığında, Rawls'un adalet teorisinin sunduğu birçok güçlü katkıyla, yoksulluğa karşı, tam da yoksul insanların ihtiyaç duymakta olduğu bir tür koruma formu sağlayabildiğini iddia ediyorum.

Bununla birlikte, bu bölümün ikinci kısmında Ronald Dworkin'in teorisini inceledim. Ancak, Dworkin'in teorisi insanların yanlış seçimlerine ve hatalarına yönelik bu denli katı bir tutum sergilememeli ve insanlara toplumsal adaletin gereği olarak, ekonomik ya da kaynaklar olarak sıkıntıya düştiklerinde; durumun daha da kötüleşmesini önleyen, toplumsal olarak minimum seviyede refahta ve dengede kalmalarını, geçici bir ekonomik gelir sunarak sağlayan bir yaklaşım ve değerlendirme ile yeniden düzenlenmeli.

Tezimin dördüncü bölümünde ise, Amartya Kumar Sen'in kapasite yaklaşımını ayrıntılarıyla ele alıyor ve yoksulluk hususunda değerlendiriyorum. Bu çerçevede, Sen'in kapasite yaklaşımının, sadece spesifik olarak yoksulluğa karşı değil, tüm insani yoksunluklara karşı direnen, kapsamlı bir insani kalkınma ve gelişim teorisi olarak değerlendirilmesi gerektiğini iddia ediyorum.

Ayrıca, kapasite yaklaşımı tarafından, yoksulluğun kapasite mahrumiyeti olarak yeniden tanımlanmış olmasının, geleneksel yoksulluk konsepti ve tanımının sınırlarını ve yetersizliğini görmek ve ifade etmek hususunda oldukça faydalı olduğunu iddia ediyorum.

Tezimin beşinci ve son bölümünde, öncelikle bu üç temel siyaset felsefesi yaklaşımının güçlü ve zayıf yanlarını açık bir biçimde ortaya koymaktayım. Ardından, bunun ışığında, yoksulluk probleminin üstesinden gelme maksadıyla, bunlar arasından bir yaklaşıma bağlı kalmak ve odaklanmaktansa, sadece kaynak temelli yaklaşım ve kapasite yaklaşımı ismindeki iki temel siyaset felsefesi yaklaşımının güçlü yanlarını bir araya getirip, eksik ve yetersiz kalan kısımlarını tamamlayan melez bir yaklaşım ortaya koymayı öneriyor ve amaçlıyorum. Bu öneri ve amaç ışığında, bu bölümde, melez yaklaşımın net bir şekilde tanımlamasını yapmakta ve yaklaşım olarak kriterlerini ortaya koymaktayım. Ek olarak, bu bölümde melez yaklaşımı daha açıklayıcı bir dille ifade etmek adına, kapasite yaklaşımı ile olan temel farklılıklarını ifade etmekteyim. Ayrıca, bu bölümü tamamlarken son olarak, melez yaklaşımın alana ve bahsi geçen yaklaşımlara sağladığı katkıyı ve gelecekte bu konuda yapılacak olan çalışmalarla olası destekleyici etkileşimini açıkladım.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yoksulluk, siyaset felsefesi, yaklaşımlar, faydacı yaklaşım, kaynak temelli yaklaşım, kapasite yaklaşımı, melez yaklaşım, Rowntree, Townsend, Sen, Rawls, Dworkin

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Research Question and The Purpose of The Thesis

The aim of this thesis is that to figure out whether approaches of contemporary political philosophy are capable of providing a solution, even a contribution to the problem of poverty. I preferred to bring them together and study on political philosophy and poverty, for contemporary political philosophy has focused on theories of justice and inequality, however, it has little to say about poverty. It can be said that this is the source of my motivation for this thesis. In that sense, it is reasonable to say that I preferred to lead my academic curiosity in regard to this topic. Following that, in this thesis, I aim to find an answer to the questions of what poverty is, what is wrong with poverty, what contemporary approaches of social justice imply for poverty and which approach in political philosophy best handles the problem of poverty. Then, in particular, I analyse three basic fundamental approaches within political philosophy namely utilitarian approach, resourcist approach and capabilities approach.

1.2 Methodology

I started with the thesis with a conceptual analysis of poverty in order to identify what definitions of poverty are and what it should be. In order to do that, I benefited from the thoughts of many traditional and contemporary thinkers such as Rowntree, Townsend and Sen briefly. Besides that, I have three main chapters and each of them focuses on one specific approach. Then, they connect to each other at the end and beginning of the chapters in terms of their contributions and failures in regard to their primary aims and targets within their fields. Also, each of them is analysed in terms of their implications on poverty. For the main chapters of this thesis, I preferred to specifically focus on the thoughts of Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, John Rawls, Ronald Dworkin and Amartya Kumar Sen. Further, in the fifth chapter, I attempt to form a hybrid approach that aims to complete deficiencies of these three main

approaches and to improve them through its way to handle the problem of poverty. My thesis as a whole represents a mixed level of analysis that is combination of national and international level in regard to poverty. For, firstly, in the chapter of concept of poverty, there is a mixed level of analysis through ideas of Rowntree, Townsend and Sen. Particularly, Rowntree offers an analysis of households in terms human needs and poverty in a national level whereas Townsend presents an analysis mostly based on relative human needs in an international level and Sen offers an international level of analysis by his definition of poverty. Secondly, chapter of utilitarian approach offers an analysis that is national level since it thinks of state and governmental policies in utilitarian sense. Thirdly, chapter of resourcist approach represents a national level of analysis because it deeply reflects on way of distribution of fundamental rights, duties and liberties through basic political, social and economic institutions of a society. Further, Sen offers an international level of analysis by his theory of human development in the chapter of capability approach. Moreover, the chapter of hybrid approach forms a mixed level of analysis, for it is composed of combination of these three approaches.

1.3 Framework and Chapter Outlines

In this thesis, I made a conceptual analysis of poverty in order to search what poverty is and should be and what is wrong with poverty in the first chapter of the thesis whereas in the other chapters, I made a theoretical research to find out what contemporary approaches of social justice imply for poverty and which approach in political philosophy best handles the problem of poverty among them. In the light of that, in the first chapter, I analysed main definitions of poverty namely absolute, relative and capability poverty. Then, I argue that the traditional definition of poverty is insufficient and should be improved through focusing on lacking not just internal resources but also external resources at the same time. This needs to be done even if this would make harder to measure poverty and would prevent benefiting from a whole empirical and theoretical research that has been made since more than a century. For, to grasp and analyse poverty well is more vital than these issues. Further, I define poverty as a humanly imposed condition that can be preventable by other non-poor people and based on involuntarily lacking internal and external

resources that are required to meet basic needs, to have physical efficiency and to have self-realization in a person's life. After that, in the second chapter, I analysed utilitarian theory with its implications on poverty. I basically focus on Benthamite utilitarian approach, Mill version of utilitarian approach and preference satisfaction. Then, I deeply analysed act-utilitarian approach and rule-utilitarian approach as a form of utilitarian approach. I argued that utilitarian approach is well-structured to provide security and to meet basic needs for people through targeting policies and principles that create most happiness for all. I think that rule-utilitarian approach can be an efficient instrument in order to do that. Then, in the third chapter, I analyse John Rawls's theory of justice and Ronald Dworkin's theory with their implications on poverty. I consider Rawls's hypothetical thought experiment based on his device called original position with veil of ignorance and his principles of justice. I argue that with several contributions, Rawls's theory against poverty is able to provide a form of protection that poor people need whereas Dworkin's theory should be modified with social minimum and should not be so strict for wrong choices and mistakes of people. I think that the most important implication of Rawls's theory on poverty is that Rawls offers poor people an opportunity to make a choice for mutual advantage and to have a collective decision on what kind of social arrangements they need.

In the fourth chapter, I consider capability approach with its basic terms such as functionings, capabilities and agency and also its implications on poverty. Capabilities approach defines poverty as deprivation of basic capabilities instead of income or wealth and claims that development should be perceived as the enlargement of human capabilities. But I argue that capabilities approach is quite useful to offer limitations of the concept of poverty. Further, it should be counted as a theory of human development against whole human deprivations, not just specifically poverty but including poverty through redefining poverty as a capability deprivation. In the fifth chapter, I attempt to form a hybrid approach that aims to complete deficiencies of only resourcist and capabilities approaches and to improve them through its way to handle the problem of poverty. Also, I think that such a hybrid approach that is open to changing and developing conditions of being poor would be a more powerful defence against the problem of poverty.

2. CONCEPT OF POVERTY

Does the definition of poverty matter? It certainly does. Today development theory surely considers reducing, alleviating, relieving and finally eradicating extreme poverty as the first and most important goal and measure of development. That criteria remains important since at the present time, number of people who live in poverty is still much more than people who do not even though arguments based on poverty has been changing and transforming from past to today. Conceptualisation of poverty through definition is quite important because a clearer and more transparent definition is not just basic condition of any development policy that focuses on its reduction and elimination, but also very important in order to measure it. For these reasons, to know what poverty is make it matter more than ever.

In this chapter, firstly, I will be describing briefly what poverty is as a concept and analyse its highlights. The question of what poverty is is not an easy one to answer in a definitive way. This is partly because while there is a universal agreement on poverty reduction and its eradication as a predominant target of any development policy, there is little agreement on its definition and identification. In spite of that, I argue that poverty is a humanly imposed condition that can be preventable by other non-poor people and based on involuntarily lacking internal and external resources that are required to meet basic needs, to have physical efficiency and to have self-realization in a person's life. There is a multidimensional nature on how concept of poverty is used. It's obvious that this is not just based on different disciplinary traditions, but also on different theories and ideologies, however, it will be claiming that this multidimensional nature is not just helpful to encourage academics to study on poverty from different areas but also it really makes harder measuring poverty. It sounds a sort of dilemma for current concept of poverty focuses on more than income and wealth. Academics are mostly reluctant to consider poverty as a complex issue unlike the traditional ways of understanding poverty. But, here, the point at issue is whether poverty is just a lack of resources. For people preferring to analyse poverty in a traditional way such as Rowntree, the answer is implicitly "yes" whereas

for Sen and Nussbaum it is “no”. In that sense, there will be a challenge on significance of the traditional definitions of poverty, based on analysis of income or wealth. In that sense, secondly, there will be a debate on what’s wrong with poverty and what’s bad about it. Why people badly off? How should be analysed their worst off? Thirdly, it will be questioning the usefulness of the current concept of poverty and having some discussion with a counter argument on why some people have found the concept of poverty not useful.

2.1 Defining Poverty

What is basic criteria to count as being poor? It is mostly not having sufficient money or income. How much income is appropriate and what it is required for precisely is contestable. Is there any agent that affect being poor? There are diverse debated answers can be given to those questions. Poverty is mostly defined as the lack of financial resources to satisfy a particular range of needs and that certain level of financial resources is used to define a poverty line. However, it is a little incomplete and narrow. For instance, World Bank considers persons who live on less than \$1-a-day as poor. It is not just monodimensional but also quite unethical in terms of poverty line.¹ It seems to me that poverty is a humanly imposed condition that can be preventable by other non-poor people and based on involuntarily lacking internal and external resources that are required to meet basic needs, to have physical efficiency and to have self-realization in a person’s life. According to that, it is possible to consider people as poor if they cannot acquire sufficient resources to keep their physical health, to participate in social activities that seem necessary to be a human being in the society they live in, the most importantly, to have an ability of earning his life in a decent and appropriate way to his own talent and personality. In the next section, it will be turning now to the follow up issue that is definition of poverty in terms of some prominent philosophers from past to today.

¹see Edward, 2006. He argues that we need to develop a morally defensible or justifiable poverty line and a basis for setting it since neither \$1-a-day nor \$2-a-day is enough to assess the requirements of basic needs. To determine an ethical poverty line that is based on basic human needs is proposed by some writers like Thomas Pogge (2007) but another handicap is to define universally acceptable basic needs bundle of goods. For Streeten (1984), it’s quite difficult.

2.1.1 Absolute, primary and secondary poverty

For a proper analysis, it must be started from nearly beginning of poverty studies in 20th century with Benjamin Seebohm Rowntree's concept of poverty. Absolute poverty is sometimes known as subsistence poverty. Rowntree (1901), as original contributor, defines poverty in absolute terms as equivalent sum of money that is needed to obtain minimum required nutrition to survive. His famous study of poverty in York (Rowntree, 1901) offered us a poverty standard for individuals and families, based on estimates of their nutritional and other basic requirements. He calculated a level of income required to have physical efficiency for different sizes of family in order to define primary poverty line and to measure poverty. If subsistence or income was under a minimum, socially acceptable living condition that composed of nutritional requirements and some basic goods to lead a life in dignity, person was in absolute poverty.

In Rowntree's time, it was being believed that there was no unemployment in York, that's why, there was no way to live in poverty. But, Rowntree (1901, 1937) offered an opposite argument toward this notion telling that many workers in York did not have sufficient income capacity to afford requirements of a decent human life and to prove that he calculated what was needed to have "physical efficiency" meaning that a minimum level of nutrition, housing and clothing. His study indicated that a prominent number of families in York were incapable to attain this level. According to him, they were in "primary poverty". In his study (Rowntree, 1901), he determined simple, but rigid primary poverty line because he was aiming to prove existing poverty in York to the conservatives who denied and ignored it. His other concept was on secondary poverty. He made a distinction among primary and secondary poverty. He thought that if income of a family was not enough to obtain minimum necessities for merely "physical efficiency", they were in primary poverty as it was said above whereas income of the family was marginally above the poverty line, but if they managed their budget unwisely, they would be in secondary poverty (Rowntree, 1901, p. 86, 87). According to Rowntree, there were many citizens in York who had sufficient resources to avoid and to prevent primary poverty, but in practice, they did not because they preferred to spend at least some of their resources to other things did not have any contribution to their physical efficiency. It can be

payment to the postage or gambling. The point is that although people had resources to achieve physical efficiency, they could suffer from secondary poverty through their expenditure preferences. But the debate is on whether people are failing to achieve physical efficiency. They were living in the conditions of “obvious want and squalor” although they had enough resources to avoid that misery.

Rowntree (1901) described primary poverty simply as lack of resources required to obtain “physical efficiency”, corresponding to a set of goods including food, rent, and others, as a level of total earnings that are not enough to gain the minimum necessities and to keep that efficiency. By “physical efficiency” he purported a life that is protected towards dangers to health. For him, people who were below minimum needed expenditures were living in absolute poverty. Absolute and primary poverty is quite similar to each other and ensure universally practicable line of poverty, but they are far away to represent deprivation of social needs that is important condition of humanity (Jones, 1990). While they are defining poor in absolute terms through level of subsistence, they must also consider what is socially acceptable in addition to physical survival (Hull, 2007, p.9).

According to Rowntree’s study, distinctive condition of workers in York was that there were some of them living in poverty in spite of having financial resources to prevent it. The case is that they preferred to use at least some of their own money for things that did not improve or contribute to their physical efficiency and therefore, they could not achieve to attain it. The question is whether people are failing to achieve physical efficiency. For me, they are failing because some people may not just have an ability to convert their economic resources into physical efficiency but also may not have talent to manage their budget or to cook. In addition to that, they may also prefer to use some of their own money on different things not contributing their physical efficiency such as alcohol, gamble, ticket for a concert or travelling. This indicates that human beings need more than physical efficiency, based on their different talents and choices different than animals. Rowntree (1937, p. 126, 127) also said that the poor cannot live on a “fodder basis” referring to animal feed. It’s clear that he was sensitive to people living in secondary poverty because he told that working people are human as much as people with more money and therefore, they need to realize their pleasures just as all people do, but without paying dearly for

them (Rowntree, 1901, p. 311, 312; 1937, p. 126, 127). Also, secondary poverty is chance for Rowntree to compensate the lack of relativity in the absolute and primary poverty. At first, Rowntree (1901) preferred to define primary poverty line in financial terms with an adequate set of goods in narrow terms, but by 1937 he gave up making a distinction between primary and secondary poverty. Instead of that, he added various things that could be counted in personal interests and entertainment such as tobacco, alcohol, newspaper and attending to some social activities including theatre or concert. He mentioned this as “little more than the cost of a cocktail” (Rowntree, 1937, p. 12). He speaks of a cocktail to refer to a working family’s demand for entertainment. He was aware of what kind of readers he had, therefore, not to be blamed as too wasteful and gentle in the arrangement of necessities to live in a minimally decent life, he made a comparison between hard money management of the poor with a low income and the easy and luxurious expenditures of the rich with a higher income. Also, he compares the suggested and required daily calorie intake of a man earning his life through physical work (3,400) with the existing calorie intake of a gentleman living in a West End Club² (5,148) (Rowntree, 1937, p. 75).

It is possible to say that Rowntree does not aim explicitly to offer a moral argument toward poverty, but his arguments can be seen implicitly in a moral way. His understanding of secondary poverty should not be blamed as a sort of immoral wastage. On the contrary, it seems to me that it is a moral attitude against brutality of poverty through aiming to provide psychological and social protection, in a sense, prevention toward shame occurred as its consequence. It is obvious that poverty is a dehumanizing, insulting human condition that’s needed to be eliminated as a moral duty. But the issue needed to be questioned is whether bad condition of the poor is issue or responsibility of a cocktail drinking man in a West End Club. If it is, why? Does it require to be compensated? These are the questions that will be answered in the next sections. Rowntree offered a poverty standard and pioneering analysis of poverty in his time. However, his definition of poverty is inadequate, for he is too

² West End is western district of Central London in England, known as area of fashion stores and theaters.

strict for needs. Therefore, it should be developed. To focus on physical efficiency and expenditure preferences of people in traditional understanding of poverty lead to question what people need, how those needs are determined and what money is spent for. Also, is to satisfy basic needs enough to live in a decent life? Are basic needs same for all human beings? To answer these questions, I will analyse relative poverty and theory of needs in the next section.

2.1.2 Relative poverty

The question on what money is used for leads to a distinction between absolute and relative poverty. Absolute and primary poverty as similar to each other is how it is just like being explained above. But what is relative poverty? The thought of relative poverty derived from some observations of Adam Smith (1776) in England of his time and was developed by Peter Townsend (1979) and others, essentially based on the idea of not having enough to be accepted and to do what is socially expected and supported in the society a person lives in. Rowntree's strict understanding of human needs and one-dimensional definition of poverty lead him to explore an alternative one.

In that sense, Townsend (1954, 1979) formulated a definition of poverty as a response to Rowntree's definition and research. He questions whether it is possible to consider people as not poor just because they have minimum level of resources including food, housing and clothing to keep their physical survival and health. Obviously, for him, it is not. He criticized Rowntree's standard of poverty as not being linked properly to the "budgets and customs of life of working people" (Townsend, 1954, p. 132). His thoughts are different than Rowntree's on how money should be spent by poor people. He blames Rowntree and the other scholars like him to hope poor people to behave in a way "like skilled dieticians with marked tendencies towards puritanism about their food preferences (Townsend, 1954, p. 133). In that sense, Townsend (1954, p. 133) argues that such an expectation on behaviors and preferences of poor people would lead to "virtues of self-denial, skill and knowledge not possessed by any other class of society". For these reasons told by him, he needed to form a different definition of poverty than Rowntree. According to that, poverty must be grasped relative to the approved forms of behavior in the communities where people live in with the influence of customs

accepted by the society (Townsend, 1954, p. 134). In the light these arguments, Townsend (1979, p. 31) considered poverty in terms of relative deprivation and defined it in the following way,

Individuals, families and groups in the population can be said to be in poverty when they lack the resources to obtain the types of diet, participate in the activities, and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or are at least widely encouraged or approved, in the societies to which they belong. Their resources are so seriously below those commanded by the average individual or family that they are, in effect, excluded from ordinary living patterns, customs and activities. (Townsend, 1979, p. 31)

This paragraph includes a number of distinct but also interrelated ideas on what is traditional or customary, approved and needed to escape from exclusion caused by poverty. When people do not have or limited access to resources, Townsend (1979, p. 31) claims that this also means an exclusion “from ordinary living patterns, customs and activities” for poor people. In that sense, a relative definition on poverty argues that people must be considered as poor when they do not have sufficient resources required to participate, in the “customs, activities and diets” mostly accepted by the society they live in, represented in the mode of life in the community they belong (Townsend, 1979, p. 54-88). His relative definition of poverty shows us that he thinks on relativity and poverty in terms of needs through asking how we determine what we need (Townsend, 1979, p. 50-54).

It's clear that in his argument he considers relative poverty based on judgements that are made by members of a particular society through an acceptable and approved life standard for people living in that society. He perceives poverty as a deprived lifestyle in multiple way mostly based on unfulfilled needs including income and some resources allowing person to participate in the community not to be ashamed, and those needs, he argues, are socially determined, vis a vis, custom and society play important and decisive role on what we need, in other words, his understanding of poverty cannot be absolute, for what we need depends on changing social expectations and life standards in a particular society (Townsend, 1979, p. 50-54). In that sense, he is consciously stimulating some thoughts of Adam Smith (1776) on what counts as necessary in British society of his time to be able to participate in daily social life and to appear in public without being ashamed. In the England of Smith's time, Smith (1976 [1776], p. 869-872) argued that an ordinary artisan could

not participate in public life without shame if he was not slipping on a linen shirt and leather shoes unlike in Scotland wooden clogs were approved according to Smith's observations. In fact, the relation between poverty and shame is based on arguments belong to Robert Walker (1995, p. 120), who said that poverty is socially constructed every day by individuals and institutions through shaming poor people. This issue will be analysed in detail in the section called wrongs of poverty.

It seems to me that there are two important arguments in Townsend's relative definition of poverty. One is that it shows us how poverty as lack of resources lead to not to participate in the activities mostly approved in the society poor people live in and how their poverty gives rise to social exclusion. The second is that poverty is defined as relative in comparison to the life standard in a particular society. For instance, it is true that grasp of poverty would not be same in a hunter-gatherer society or in a tribe with a modern, industrial society (See Lotter, 2007, p. 9). However, it is possible to argue that there are two weaknesses of that definition. One weakness is that he does not offer a concrete argument on what includes social participation. It is too vague. To make it clearer it should be questioned whether it is possible to make a non-optional list of activities to participate, approved by most of a particular society as a part of an accepted life standard. In that sense, the words used by Townsend such as "types of custom and social activity" just represent a wide range of human activities. Therefore, what is required is to limit the necessities of social participation in a particular society (See Lotter, 2007, p. 9, 10). Second weakness is that although his definition based on relative core of poverty is true in a sense, it is not complete.

There are two questions must be asked. First, is it enough to define a sort of poverty that leads to social exclusion just in the basis of social conditions of a particular society a person lives in? Second, is it possible to decide on a society's level of poverty through identifying whether such social activities are available to join or people who belong to that society are capable to participate? (See Lotter, 2007, p. 9, 10). What is needed is a more universal standard feasible to all human societies, compromising on Townsend's definition of relative poverty. In that sense, John D. Jones (1990, p. 67) also tells that forms of living are identified by a particular society in the basis of "historical situation in which they live". Jones (1990, p. 67) aims to

combine the notion of a mode of life customary “with the notion of a style of living that is decided by a particular society to be “minimally fit and appropriate for people and thus minimally required for an appropriate realization of human dignity.”

Also, Narayan et al (2000, p. 3) criticizes that point by telling that “As we moved more deeply into analyses of poor people’s experiences with poverty, we were struck repeatedly by the paradox of the location and social group specificity of poverty, and yet the commonality of the human experience of poverty across countries” But, he also tells, “the maintenance of cultural identity and social norms of solidarity helps poor people to continue to believe in their own humanity, despite inhuman conditions” (Narayan et al, 2000, p. 4, 5). To define a broad, universal set of social activities without harming “social norms of solidarity” and “cultural identity” in a particular society, it must be looked into whether human needs are universal. Maslow (1943) was one of the first academics to work on human needs as a distinct field. He aimed to identify whether there are certain factors that motivate humans to act with respect to specific rules. By his research, he improved “a theory of human motivation” and presented five motivations that form “basic human needs”. His five ranked stages of needs are interrelated and follow a hierarchy, therefore, it’s called “Maslow’s hierarchical theory of needs”. In that sense, he argued that satisfying physiological needs, which are directly linked to human’s survival, was human being’s essential motivation.

After that, he follows needs for safety, love, esteem and self-actualization. In this basis, he claims, “A person who is lacking food, safety, love and esteem would most probably hunger for food more strongly than anything else” (Maslow, 1943, p. 373). For Maslow (1943, p. 388), there is no compulsory to fully satisfy each basic need to pass the less basic one. Just needed a level of appropriate satisfaction to pass to the next level. However, he also tells that in some conditions, hierarchy can be cancelled for some people. He says, “Who is to say that a lack of love is less important than a lack of vitamins?” (Maslow, 1943, p. 394). All people have an inherent tendency to look for satisfaction of mentioned needs with their ultimate aim of having self-actualization. Maslow (1943) denoted that all humans share the same common needs.

Also, following Maslow, Alderfer (1968) proposed universality of needs through categorizing Maslow’s five set of needs into three stages known as “Existence,

Relatedness and Growth” a) the need to exist, containing physiological and safety needs b) the need for relatedness, containing love and esteem c) the need for growth amount to self-actualization. Alderfer defends his three stages of needs as more persistence and less hierarchy.

Max-Neef (1991) as an economist who was related to human need in an economic basis has a system with no certain hierarchy to categorize human needs, but physiological needs are his only exception that must be well enough met to survive for a human. He pointed that all human beings share the same common needs, that is to say, universal human needs. However, it differs, among cultures, based on how an individual prefers to meet his needs. Individual’s attribute to satisfy their needs differs in each society. In that sense, Max-Neef (1991) composed of a matrix called as “Matrix of Needs and Satisfiers” to classify need and to explain what it means to satisfy them. According to that, it’s argued that needs are same for all societies, but each society differs in methods that are used to identify how individuals prefer to satisfy their needs (Max-Neef, 1991). In the light of that, it can be said that human needs are objective in nature, in contrast to Townsend, and possible to consider it as universal in a sense.

However, individuals’ wants, choices and ambitions are subjective and different (See Fernandez-Huerta, 2008). Also, it is argued that needs are goals in universal condition, but desires, wants and choices are goals that cannot be seen as universal because they arise from subjective thoughts of each human (See Doyal and Gough, 1991). Desires and wants form ways of meeting needs that are same for all individuals (Max-Neef, 1991). To have a more universal standard for poverty and human needs would be more useful than Townsend’s relativity to measure poverty well.

Another critic on relative poverty is that it’s considered as a matter of inequality, not poverty and in that sense, it’s argued that having less than other people is not the same issue with being poor (Shaw, 1988, p.30). Sen agrees that critic with his Cadillac example. He tells that a person cannot be counted as poor just because he can only afford to buy one Cadillac whereas others can buy two (Sen, 1983, p. 159). He defines poverty in the basis of deprivation of capability in contrast to Townsend’s

definition of poverty in terms of relative needs and social activities. This is the issue of the next section.

2.1.3 Capability poverty

To a more structural and comprehensive definition of poverty, it must be looked into studies of Amartya Sen (1985, 1992, 1999) who advises us to redefine poverty as deprivation of basic capabilities instead of income or wealth, claiming that development should be perceived as the enlargement of human capabilities rather than maximizing utility, pleasures or income. He argues that low or lacking income or financial resources is just one of the multiple ways in which humans can suffer capability deprivation, for low income is explicitly one of the important causes of poverty since lack of income can be a basic reason to be deprived of capability for a person (Sen, 1999, p. 87). It is clear that in that account, there are some key concepts such as “functionings” and “capability”.

Sen (1992, p. 39, 40; 1997) describes capability as “a set of vectors of functionings, reflecting the person’s freedom to lead one type of life or another.” whereas functionings represent “a person’s beings and doings” meaning that it shows us “what we can do” and “what we can be” in the life. According to Sen (1992, p. 39, 40), a functioning shows us what a person is and does, including has adequate nutrition, safe and well shelter, clothing, good job, living long and happy life, has self-respect, participating in the community life and has supportive friends, colleagues and family members. However, it can be said that a capability indicates a person’s ability to achieve a functioning. Sen (1980) perceives a person’s capability set as a whole of alternative sets of functionings that a person could achieve.

In the light of these thoughts, it is possible to argue that Sen (1993, p. 41) considers poverty as a failure to achieve particular basic capabilities, in other words, as an inability to realize certain important functionings in a minimum appropriate level. In that sense, it is clear that for him, poverty is a form of unfreedom that prevents a person to lead a life that he wants to live, since he argues that capability to function gives us freedom to choose among possible livings that we want to live (Sen, 1992, p. 40). For Sen, a good society must be free due to that his work on poverty and capability can be considered on development as a form of freedom against poverty

(Sen, 1999; 1992, p. 41). He considers resources as merely instruments to obtain freedom, therefore, he prefers focusing on objectives of development instead of some specific means such as income or wealth (Sen, 1992, 1999). Sen redefines poverty as being deprived in the basis of capability through considering role of financial resources on poverty as instrumental and conceiving lack of income as an important cause of capability deprivation. According to Sen's definition, a poor person is deficient of an adequate capability set and unable to achieve any valuable functioning in his life. But, is poverty really deprivation of capability? To define poverty as capability deprivation can be seen problematic in some ways. Firstly, it is thought that lack of financial resources is an important reason of capability deprivation, but there might be other reasons to be deprived. For instance, a person as a woman or a minority may be deficient of capability because of a discriminatory law or tradition without dependence on any resources. Also, a disabled person, ill-health or low skilled person may suffer from lessen capability as independent from restricted income or financial resources.

There are two questions must be asked. One is whether it would be neutral to consider a person with a medium income or financial resources, but reduced capability set as poor. In fact, some people think that it would not (See Wolff, p. 9-10; Wolff et al, 2015, p. 26). For, it is thought that it would be wrong to define a person who is discriminated, unskilled with bad health as poor if he is financially in a good condition. I admit that it is a hard condition to decide. But we cannot ignore important role of having an adequate capability set to convert resources into abilities. Therefore, being financially strong or having plenty of internal resources is not enough itself. If a person does not have an adequate capability to convert those resources, they mean nothing. Let me explain this by an example. I want you to imagine someone who has a washing machine in one's own house but does not have electricity and enough water to use that machine in his town. In that condition, the question should be whether existence of that washing machine in that house means anything. I think that it is not. For, that person is not capable of using washing machine in order to make his life easier. In other words, he is deprived of adequate capability to convert his resource into ability. Second is whether every sort of deprivation is poverty. It is thought that it is not.

For instance, Richard Hull (2007) opts for use of deprivation instead of poverty because he argues that poverty does not refer to all kinds of deprivation. In a sense, this means that all forms of deprivation are not poverty. In fact, poverty does not elucidate all sorts of deprivation, even if it attempts to do, it would be hard to measure it. But, to eliminate all forms of deprivation would presumably eliminate poverty as well as other forms of deprivation not caused by a lack of resources. Secondly, for Sen, poverty is the most important cause of capability deprivation as known. But this understanding will be changing to grasp poverty as lack of income and resources. By that, it is criticized that studies and researches based on a traditional thought defining poverty as lack of resources since more than a century will be wasting. But, according to me, it is more vital to grasp and analyse poverty by a better and more comprehensive definition than that wasting past researches. In addition to that, it is thought that replacing traditional definition of poverty with capability deprivation will be leading to some problems based on measurement (See Wolff et al, 2015; Lister, 2004). Then, it is said that there is no mostly approved existing measure of capability poverty that is appropriate in both poor and rich countries. Resource based definition of poverty is clearer than that in terms of measurement (See Wolff et al, 2015; Lister, 2004).

Yes, it may be harder to measure poverty by that definition. But I admit that criticism as just consequence of defining poverty through a more comprehensive way. However, besides that, it is important to say that defining poverty in terms of capability is quite useful to show the limitations of traditional concept of poverty due to mentioned reasons. Therefore, to redefine poverty in the basis of lacking capability should not be refused, for, it helps us to see how much insufficient and limited its traditional definition and encourages us to reconsider the problem of poverty. Rather, theory of capability is also good in the basis of human development and Sen's work must also be considered as an important concept based on lack of human development and freedom, yet poverty must be seen as the most important but not only factor of them.

2.1.4 Intermediate poverty

Further, a contribution to definition of poverty comes from Hennie Lotter (2011, p. 155) defining poverty as "a distinctively human condition". He argues that poverty is

a condition that is peculiar to only human beings. For instance, according to his argument, there is no way to consider a bear as poor unless it is living in a bad condition under the root of a poor human except the usage of poor as meaning of pity. His another argument paid attention is “intermediate poverty” referring that in spite of having enough economic capacities and resources to meet adequate food, clothing, housing and healthcare to be able to be good and healthy in a physical sense, if people still cannot participate in some activities judged as traditionally or socially important to be a human in the society they live in. Lotter (2011, p. 156) defines this as intermediate poverty.

2.2 Wrongs of Poverty

Why is poverty wrong? This leads to a morally important question of why others should care and pay attention to people living in poverty and feel obliged and responsible to alleviate and even to eradicate that poverty. For, it’s a troubling human condition and everyone has a risk to be poor during his life, therefore, it demands empathy and support of non-poor people. there are multiple questions needed to ask. For instance, does poverty require compensation of bad conditions of people living in poverty? In that case, does it matter that cause of poverty is undeserved bad luck or just personal mistake of the poor? One argues that individuals have a moral responsibility and duty to the conditions of the poor and obliged to work in cooperation with governments. Others claim that governments have a much more specific responsibility on their citizen’s bad living conditions than liability of each individual (Wolff et al, 2015, p. 44, 45).

However, poverty considered as “recognised evil” by Gordon et al (2000, p. 81) has seriously diverse and harmful impacts on people’s lives and it destroys millions of people’s lives throughout the world with its devastating effects, but many non-poor people, particularly in developing countries pay no attention to that avoidable and preventable human condition, therefore, to grasp seriously its troubling condition is important for a moral evaluation and challenge against it. In that sense, to ask what’s wrong with poverty and what’s bad about it is quite important, for given answers to those questions also elucidate why poverty is morally challenging and an evil human

condition that deserves the attentions and supports of both each individual, governments and political institutions.

2.2.1 Poverty harms integrity of human body and leads to vulnerability

Poverty harms bodily integrity of human as a result of its seriously negative effects on physiological health conditions. Some people have much more risks of death than others because of preventable negative conditions deriving from poverty. Poverty makes poor people more vulnerable to risks. Therefore, they can die or lose their bodily integrity for multiple reasons including deficient or insufficient food, reduced resistance to even easily curable diseases as a result of insufficient nutrition, no healthcare, exposure to bad weather conditions because of unsafe shelter and inadequate clothing. Also, it is argued that poverty leads to suffer from low physical and mental growth, meager personal development, hunger and even death (Lotter, 2011, p. 62, 63). All harms bodily integrity of human, therefore, Gordon (2002, p. 74) conceives poverty as “the world’s most ruthless killer and the greatest cause of suffering on earth.” In those conditions, it is reasonable to say that poverty also leads to powerlessness, voicelessness and vulnerability.

Lack of power amounts to incapability to do something, to affect society with own achievements, to realize one’s own goals, to make choices from different options without any force, to participate in social and political activities, to have a voice in public sphere and to have sufficient and adequate resources to lead a decent human life (Lotter, 2011, p. 260). It’s clear that poor people see themselves as powerless due to these incapacibilities deriving from lack of internal and external resources. Also, lack of voice, political rights and liberties makes the poor powerless in the basis of participation and dependent to other people’s decisions about them (Mabughi and Selim, 2006, p. 185).

The poor’s participation to polls and the extent of civil and political liberties achieved by them indicate their level of powerlessness and vulnerability. (World Bank, 2000/2001). Vulnerability as a condition of exposure to external and internal risks composed of shocks (drought, wars, illness), stress, external risks and internal defenselessness (Mabughi and Selim, 2006, p. 185). Poor people suffer from risks, for they are deprived of sufficient resources to protect themselves against unsafe,

uncertain and vulnerable conditions and to cope with harming loss (Mabughi and Selim, 2006, p. 185). In that point, it is important to ask why some people are exposure to such devastating human conditions, but others not require to analyse its another impact, that is, injustice.

2.2.2 Poverty creates injustice and violates basic human rights

Poverty creates a form of injustice coming from unequal relationship between the poor and the rich (Campbell, 2007). This derives from mostly unfair distribution of material goods and resources among them (Rawls, 1999). So, unfair share of wealth and resources forms great injustice because of troubling conditions it causes such as suffering, hunger and premature deaths (Pogge, 2011, p. 335). In that sense, unjust access to resources and their unfair distribution among world citizens leads to vast injustice. This also gives rise to a question of whether to eliminate poverty is the issue of justice or charity as a duty (Lotter, 2011). Poverty also attacks to most fundamental human right, that is, right to live in dignity and also is an invasion to the right to survive as a result of bad inadequate living conditions deriving from it.

For instance, Thomas Pogge (2007; 2011) considers freedom from poverty as a human right, for he argues that poverty is a human rights violation because for Pogge (2011, p. 335) all humans have right to share Earth equally and people sharing unproportional amount of wealth are violating this right through excluding and denying people living in poverty. Also, to reject or to ignore the poor's right to have fair share of wealth and resources leads to great injustice and Pogge (2011) advises institutional reforms to put an end to the violation of basic human rights and exclusion of the poor.

Also, Tasioulas (2007) have an analysis called "interest theory of human rights". According to that, he claims that rights preserve human interests including security, property, and necessity of having a life worth to live. But, poverty harms directly these human interests and violates person's right to have them. In addition to that, Henry Shue (1996, p. 9) claims for three basic human rights compose of liberty, security and subsistence (meaning like income and close to absolute poverty). According to him, subsistence is ability to consume what is required to lead as decent, healthy and active life in usual length without any bad and sad interference

(Shue, 1996, p. 23). For him, these rights including liberty, security and subsistence are preconditions to use and to benefit other rights, therefore, they must be called as “basic rights” (Shue, 1996) and poverty violates these rights through preventing to enjoy them. Also, there is an obvious violation of right to be free from poverty by governments. According to Pogge (2007; 2011), governments can also violate the right to freedom from poverty through institutions and government policy that cause an extension of severe poverty. But, Campbell (2007) argues that governments have instruments to alleviate severe poverty through compensating or retrieving poor people’s legal debts and encouraging economic and welfare policies. In that point, it seems to me that legal legitimacy of governments must be questioned. What makes a government legally legitimate?

2.2.3 Poverty leads to experience deficiency of well-being and harms autonomy

Joseph Raz (1986) claims that political authorities are lawful or legitimate so long as they improve well-being of citizens linked to them. He considers well-being as ability to achieve valuable personal goals. According to him, the only way to develop a person’s well-being is to help and to support him to achieve those goals, but he does not approve to realize goals instead of that person. For him, the role of political authorities is to develop well-being of their citizens through helping and supporting them to pursue valuable goals. Also, he argues that governments and political institutions must support and preserve political freedom in order to improve citizens’ well-being (Raz, 1986).

Autonomy is also important for well-being. He advises supporting conditions required for autonomy for development of well-being. He defines autonomy as being author of his own life without dependence on someone or something. In that sense, these conditions compose of capacity to choose goals a person value without dependence on anything and to have appropriate diversity of options. Raz does not specifically talk about poverty. However, for him, there are two responsibilities of political authorities that are needed to improve well-being of citizens linked to them. First one is that to do that they must help and support their citizens to realize valuable goals whereas second is that they must support and preserve political freedom. These two duties may help preventing poverty (Wolff et al, 2015, p. 44-46). There are some reasons for that. Firstly, people living in poverty may be

deprived of internal resources such as confidence, knowledge and education and external resources including income and services and these deficiencies make it harder to realize valuable goals for poor people. Even if they realize a goal, it may not be valuable such as killing someone and this is equal to not pursue any valuable goal for Raz. Secondly, poverty undermines not just physical well-being, but also mental well-being is harmed due to high level of stress, disappointment and anxiety, in addition to insufficient economic resources to obtain basic needs, in order to come through bad living conditions deriving from poverty (Lotter, 2011, p. 66-70). Insufficient income to meet immediate needs has influence upon a person's capacity to protect their bodily health with an appropriate medical care (Lotter, 2011, p. 68). Also, it's argued that depression and psychological suffering are quite widespread among people living in poverty (Lotter, 2011, p. 70; Lister, 2004, p. 125; Narayan et al, 2000).

In addition to that, economic uncertainties some people have such as seasonal workers and farmers are also hard to cope with because their level of income may change from month to month or maybe even week to week, and this uncertain condition makes their life miserable and painful (Townsend, 1979). However, in the light of Raz's theory, it is also possible to argue that poor people have less or diminished autonomy (See Wolff et al, 2015, p. 44-46). In other words, poverty harms the conditions required for autonomy since it affects ability to choose, freedom to do and appropriate diversity of options to make a choice among them. In the end, it can be said that poverty undermines a person's freedom, for it may force someone to steal under bad living conditions to survive. Why does poverty undermine a person's autonomy? For, it limits ability to choose and restricts options (See Wolff et al, 2015, p. 44-46). Let me explain this in detail.

Poverty harms capability to choose for person in poverty. Further, in the long term, this harm may be harder and may undermine abilities required to compose comprehensive goals and to decide their implementation in their lives. Also, poor people may not know how to realize their goals and may not trust their ability to achieve them. But governments and their political institutions can help people to be aware of and achieve their autonomy to realize their life goals (See Wolff et al, 2015). Poverty also restricts options. In other words, it leads to an insufficient

diversity of options for a poor person to make a choice among. A poor person may not have valuable options to choose among due to lack of internal and external resources. Also, a person suffering from poverty may not have an adequate job and level of income that help him to obtain his own important goals and beside that, his life may be full of working for physical survival and satisfaction of basic needs. But, this lack of time and other deficiencies undermine his capacity to choose and to obtain aims. In that sense, at the end, it harms his autonomy (See Wolff et al, 2015).

2.2.4 Poverty harms social relations and identity

Poverty leads to unethical relation between the rich and the poor through denial of the poor in the society. So, such an unequal relationship between the poor and the rich also causes a lack of mutual recognition the poor deserves to have (Honneth, 1995; Campbell, 2007). Therefore, it should be demanded mutual recognition among them to provide full human flourishing and self-realization for the poor. Taylor (1992, p. 26) says, “Due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people, it is a vital human need” and Honneth (1995) emphasizes importance of foundation of relations based on mutual recognition as a precondition for self-realization. He also underlines valuable role of social relations to improve and to protect a person’s identity.

For Taylor (1992, p. 33, 34), identity amounts to “who we are” and “where we’re coming from” and he argues that one’s own identity is based on one’s dialogical relations with others. This means that formation of identity is strongly influenced by equal recognition. In that sense, it’s claimed that identity needs to be recognized by significant others and this makes it vulnerable to recognition (Taylor, 1992, p. 36). It’s clear that formation of identity requires “open dialogue and equal recognition” as core value of a democratic society and rejection of those harms people denied, ignored like poor people (Taylor, 1992, p. 36). Therefore, it is possible to argue that poverty harms formation of identity, for the poor is not recognized, is ignored by the non-poor. Due to such conditions, it is important to say that poverty also undermines self-respect and human dignity.

For instance, Lotter (2011) considers poverty as an important threat to human dignity and self-respect of people suffering from poverty. For, to respect human dignity of a person amounts to recognize and to identify someone equally as a human and to treat

with a minimum level of morality as equal to all, therefore, unequal treatment to a person in insulting living conditions of poverty harms human dignity and self-respect (Lotter, 2011, p. 109-115). Also, a poor person is forced to live in worse life standards than others and to live in underestimation of the non-poor people due to lack of resources, as a result, experience lack of respect and loss of dignity and this makes living in poverty harder for them (Lister, 2004). Moreover, non-poor people do not pay attention to insulting inhuman conditions of poor people, therefore, poor people also suffer an affront of not to be cared by them (Lotter, 2011, p. 65). In that point, what's needed is a "politics of universalism" underlining "equal dignity of all citizens" and "equalization of rights and entitlements" to prevent occurrence of class distinction between the rich and the poor as first and second class (Taylor, 1992, p. 37). He argues that people suffering from poverty and deprived of citizenship rights are counted in second class status and they need urgent "equalization" (Taylor, 1992, p. 38).

It's argued that the politics of equal dignity depends on the thought that all humans are equally worth to respect and the worth here refers to "universal human potential" meaning a capacity shared by all humans, in the light of that, Taylor (1992, p. 41) argues, "each person deserve respect." This potential is required to shape and to define one's own individual and cultural identity that must be equally respected for all (Taylor, 1992, p. 42). However, poverty makes a person incapable to realize own potential and identity. For these reasons, poverty harms recognition and identity that are basic human needs as a form of oppression and domination in the social relations. Also, injustice and inequality caused by poverty cannot be eliminated just through providing material goods or resources, but also a person living in a society with poor living conditions must have "mutual recognition" with the rich because one deserves it as a human. Also, it harms formation of individual and cultural identity and protection of social norms of solidarity. For, Narayan says, "The maintenance of cultural identity and social norms of solidarity helps poor people to continue to believe in their own humanity, despite inhuman conditions." (Narayan et al, 2000, p. 4, 5).

2.2.5 Poverty undermines freedom

Poverty strongly harms freedom as one of the most obstacles for it. However, in contrast to that argument, some scholars argue that the poor is not less free than the rich. There are two definitions of freedom that can be seen as a framework of it that is negative and positive freedom by Isaiah Berlin (1969). According to that, it's argued that negative liberty requires no interference by state or other people whereas positive liberty is capability to have own self-determination, to realize own potential and to take control of own life as its author. In that sense, it can be said that negative liberty refers to absence of interference and obstacles, but positive liberty amounts to presence of control (Berlin, 1969). But positive freedom is mostly accused to be used to justify some forms of tyranny and to cause a threat of oppression.

However, it seems to me that it's possible to cope with these threats through using our own reason. Berlin is ambiguous in regard to the argument that poverty undermines freedom, for he says that it depends on whether we see poverty as caused by other people. If we do, then we can say that it limits negative freedom. Material deprivation is not counted as an interference. This means that for him, interference must derive from state's or other people's actions. It seems to me that Berlin (1969) and his concept of negative freedom ignore and deny a fact that is, most of the world population is unfree due to their hard and bad living standards and unable to emancipate themselves and this is great interference on a person's live.

In contrast to Berlin (1969), Jeremy Waldron (1991) considers poverty and freedom from the perspective and conditions of homeless people. For Waldron (1991), homelessness limits a person's ability to have one's own safe shelter and good job, therefore, it's an important barrier to freedom. He identifies ignored and rejected rights of homeless people in a society through his study and states restricting force of poverty on a person's lives and freedoms. He argues that a society must be composed of equals in terms of rights and freedoms. It's claimed that to exist requires having a place (Waldron, 1991). In that sense, it is possible to say that the ability to exist is limited by private property, for to be the owner of a private property gives a person some particular rights such as ability to exclude the non-owners. This means that a person can use police forces to send someone unknown out of his own property, however, there is no way to do that in public spaces such as parks, subways and

bridges. Waldron says that a homeless person is always dependent on the grace of society, for homeless are not allowed to have a safe shelter under the roof of a private property. They can just take shelter in public sphere that are shared by all such as parks, subways and bridges. In that sense, it's said that freedom of a homeless person is limited to the degree of a perception of communal life a society has (Waldron, 1991). For Waldron (1991), freedom referring to non-interference of state or other people, in other words, negative freedom means nothing for a homeless person living in a park without food and a safe shelter. But, according to negative freedom, a homeless is counted as free unless someone attend to move him away by force from the area he lives in. So, it's obvious that homelessness undermines a person's freedom, limits his desire for some privacy and harms his self-respect and dignity just like poverty did. Also, G. A. Cohen (1989) says that poverty as lack of money carries with lack of freedom and he blames scholars denying that to aim to relieve their remorse as well-off people. For Cohen (1989), lack of money means lack of freedom. He thinks that to be deprived of money is not the only condition limiting a person's freedom, but one of the most significant of them. He defends his argument through challenging two movements of freedom argued by right-wing perspective.

2.2.6 Poverty undermines democracy and its values

Basic democratic values placed in modern constitutional democracies, mostly based on inspiring thoughts of French Revolution in 1789, compose of liberty, equality and solidarity are at risk under circumstances of poverty. In democracies, liberty comprehends a diverse set of rights that serve citizens to preserve their various forms of liberties (Lotter, 2011). Firstly, these rights ensure citizens ability to make choices in their life according to their own judgements and thoughts. Secondly, they are important to provide facilities to citizens to be able to participate in social and political activities in accordance with citizens' own choices. Thirdly, they protect citizens from any arbitrary and unjust interference coming from state or other people. In the light of those said, it is possible to argue that these liberties ensure a life standard under the protection of rights against any unfair and unjustified interference on citizens' lives for the citizens subject to them. Until now, mission of rights and liberties sound really good, however, a question must be asked, that is whether these liberties mean if a citizen is unable to make a choice because of lacking resources to

lead a life in a good health and in harmony with his choices. The answer is exactly no in my opinion, these liberties mean nothing under troubling living conditions of poverty for Lotter, too (Lotter, 2011, p. 109-110). The point is whether citizens has ability or capability to make use of these liberties (Sen, 1999).

Another important feature of modern democracies must be equality of citizens, in other words, equal concern of them. Citizens can be seen as unequal in terms of many dimension such as talent, capacity, level of education, weight or length, but they must be treated and judged equally in respect to their humanity and dignity (Narayan et al, 2000; Lotter, 2011). To respect human dignity of a citizen amount to recognize and to identify someone as human, therefore, to treat one with a minimum level of morality as equal to all (Lotter, 2011, p. 109-111). For his reason, unequal treatment to citizens in the conditions of poverty also harms human dignity as mentioned before. Last one is solidarity that requires a form of reconciliation among citizens in the basis of mutual interests and advantages, shared values and resources of Earth in order to live jointly in a social harmony. In that sense, Lotter (2011) consider democracy as the best way for citizens to make them possible to live jointly in a social cooperation and harmony to survive and to have self-realization. Also, Sen (1999) argues that there is no way to live in poverty in a democratic political system, for if it occurs, in the next elections, government caused poverty will not be re-elected. But Sen may be wrong because today poverty unfortunately occurs in democracies, too and undermines democracy and its values including liberty, equality and solidarity. Now, it will be analysed in detail how it does.

Firstly, poverty rejects equal treatment to all. For, basic values of a modern democracy require right to have equal respect and treatment for all just for the sake of being human. However, poverty denies equal dignity of each person through inhuman living conditions deriving from it and undermines human dignity and self-respect (Lotter, 2011). Poverty as a lack of internal and external resources does not treat all equal. For instance, in absolute poverty, people do not have sufficient income capacity required to ensure adequate nutrition, clothing and safe shelter in order to obtain their physical health (Rowntree, 1901, 1937) whereas in relative poverty, people have appropriate resources to provide basic needs and to maintain physical health, but they cannot participate in any social activities that are seen as a

sign of being human in the society they belong to such as wedding ceremony, visiting family for Christmas or getting ticket for a concert (Townsend, 1979). For Lotter (2011), poverty requires collective responsibility of all since it comes from wrong choices of humans, not a natural disaster. Further, it is clear that poverty rejects equal attention for each person's interests and needs. In other words, inhuman conditions of poverty do not treat each person equally for their basic needs and interests required to protect their physical health and to provide self-realization in the basis of development. By that, it violates a democratic rule. To make it clearer, the point is that a person living in poverty has insufficient limited resources to ensure his own basic needs including food, clothing, shelter and self-realization whereas a rich person has a plenty of resources to survive and to achieve his own goals. Besides that, poor people are exposure to shame in society he lives in due to lack of appropriate clothes.

Secondly, poverty undermines political participation. For, in modern democracies, all people must have equal political rights and liberties, however, poor people have restricted ability to realize their own goals within that democratic system due to their lack of resources as different than the non-poor (Lotter, 2011, p. 115). It's argued that non-poor people are more advantaged in the basis of rights and liberties because of their greater possessions such as assets, education, high capability to realize their goals (Rawls, 1971). But it's claimed that economic inequalities between the poor and the rich transform political inequality through harming equal political participation and active voice of the poor (Lotter, 2011, p. 115). According to Bohman (1996) and Dryzek (2000), this transformation eminently undermines public deliberation and dialogue. For, it's said that active participation of the poor can be blocked or restricted through some blind arguments such as low capacity of the poor to attend in a democratic deliberation (Bohman, 1996; Dryzek, 2000).

It's clear that poverty undermines political participation. It seems to me that poor people's political rights and liberties are being violated through excusing their poor living standards and limited or low capacities for self-realization. However, democratic values clearly require that each person has right to participate to any public deliberation and dialogue as free and equals with equal voice and chance to influence public opinions and decisions that deeply affect their lives (Lotter, 2011).

However, Isaiah Berlin (1969) sets up a hierarchical relation between basic needs to survive and equal treatment based on political rights. He argues that equal treatment to the poor through equal political rights means nothing without providing basic needs such as food, clothing, shelter and medical care. This means that for him, equal treatment begins with helping them to meet basic needs before political rights. However, it seems to me that Berlin undervalues possible influence of political rights in a poor person's life, for if a poor person has an active political participation in public sphere, his thoughts and actions may affect and change public opinions and attitudes on poverty. This means that he may have an opportunity to escape from poverty through active political participation (See Gutmann and Thompson, 1996). It may be right to give priority to meet basic needs instead of political rights and liberties in absolute terms. However, it seems to me that to assign equal political rights to all may be helpful to pay attention to troubling conditions and harms of poverty on poor people through active political participation of the poor in public sphere. If one of the most important problem of the poor is to be ignored by the non-poor, it is possible to solve that problem through creating social consciousness on poverty with effective participation of the poor.

2.3 Is the Concept of Poverty Useful?

A plenty of philosophical study questions usefulness of the concept of poverty and mostly sticks into one of the concepts they analysed. However, here what's aimed to do is to analyse concepts that were mentioned previously in terms of their contributions and usefulness to the literature and it's reasonable to say that it would be wrong to stick into a concept because it must be able to change according to circumstances and conditions of being poor with a comprehensive and all-inclusive definition of poverty.

Firstly, traditional definition of poverty in absolute terms based on lack of income or economic resources is useful to focus on physical efficiency and expenditure preferences of people living in poverty because it leads to question what people need, how those needs are determined and what money is spent for. Also, it caused question of whether to satisfy basic needs is enough to live in a decent life and basic needs is same for all human beings. Given answers those give a rise to a new concept

of poverty called relative poverty. So, it is reasonable to argue that researches in traditional concept of poverty encouraged to ask new questions, to make further studies and made a background to relative poverty in an opposite way. However, it's criticized just to focus on lacking economic resources such money or income, but it's argued that there are plenty of resources affecting capability and well-being, that are internal (skills, talents) and external (income, assets and wealth) (Rowntree Foundation Report, 2009; Wolff, 2018). Secondly, it's seems to me that there are two important arguments in Townsend's relative definition of poverty. One is that it shows us how poverty as lack of resources lead to not to participate in the activities mostly approved in the society poor people live in and how their poverty gives rise to social exclusion. The second is that poverty is defined as relative in comparison to the life standard in a particular society. However, it is possible to argue that there are two weaknesses of that definition. One weakness is that he does not offer a concrete argument on what includes social participation. It is too vague. Second weakness is that although his definition based on relative core of poverty is true in a sense, it is not complete or deficient. There are two questions must be asked. First, is it enough to define a sort of poverty that leads to social exclusion just in the basis of social conditions of a particular society a person lives in? Second, is it possible to decide on a society's level of poverty through identifying whether such social activities are available to join or people who belong to that society are capable to participate? (See Lotter, 2007, p. 9, 10).

What is needed is a more universal standard feasible to all human societies, compromising on Townsend's definition of relative poverty. To define a broad, universal set of social activities without harming "social norms of solidarity" and "cultural identity" in a particular society, it must be looked into whether human needs are universal instead of relative needs of Townsend. To argue that all human beings share the same common needs, that is to say, universal human needs, however, it differs, among cultures, based on how an individual prefers to meet his needs is more useful for both the social norms of solidarity in a society and poverty literature (Maslow, 1943; Max-Neef, 1991). Also, to have a more universal standard for poverty and human needs would be more useful than Townsend's relativity to measure poverty well. Thirdly, capability-based definition of poverty considers

living standard of a person in the basis of what one can do and be. Sen advises us to redefine poverty as deprivation of capability rather than lack of resources. However, some scholars argue that if it is done, some problematic conclusions may occur. Then it is said that to define poverty as capability deprivation can be problematic in some ways. First one, it is true that lack of financial resources is an important reason of capability deprivation, but there might be other reasons to be deprived. For instance, a disabled person, ill-health or low skilled person may suffer from diminished capability as independent from restricted income or financial resources. There are two questions must be asked.

One is whether it would be right to consider a person with a medium income or financial resources, but reduced capability set as poor. In fact, most of us might say that it would not. In other words, well-off people who do not live in poverty may suffer from capability deprivation. To be deprived of capability does not require to be deficient of income. But this does not make one with income poor in the eyes of most people. However, we should ask whether it matters to have an external resource such as income, any product or entitlement to services if we cannot use them or convert them into abilities. Let me explain this with an example. I want you to imagine living an area where there is no electricity and water in houses. But luckily you have a washing machine in your home, but you cannot use it. This is exactly what capability deprivation attempts to indicate. For, it questions whether people can convert their external resources into abilities to lead a life as they please. Therefore, it is insufficient to be owner of any external resource if a person is deprived of adequate internal resources such as strengths and skills in order to benefit from them. Therefore, I argue that we should consider deprivation of both internal and external resources when we think of poverty.

Second is whether every sort of deprivation is poverty. It is not. But this is not an obstacle to see converting role of capability in regard to resources. On the other hand, it has been criticized that if poverty is redefined, replacing traditional definition of poverty with capability deprivation makes measuring poverty hard, for there is no mostly approved existing measure of capability poverty that is appropriate in both poor and rich countries. Then, it is said that resource-based definition of poverty is clearer than that in terms of measurement. However, it seems to me that it

is not such a big problem. It is just consequence of way we prefer to define poverty. In fact, we could have a bigger problem based on limited and incomplete grasp of poverty if we were stick to its traditional definition. Thirdly, it is thought that such a redefinition would waste whole empirical and theoretical research that has been made since more than a century and therefore, traditional definition of poverty should be retained in a level. But I disagree that argument, for presenting more comprehensive and developed definition of poverty would not waste previous empirical and theoretical research. It shows us that we are developing in our researches and thoughts in regard to poverty. Also, my definition of poverty comprehends partly its traditional definition through including lack of external resources. But, deprivation of external resources is not enough alone to grasp poverty.

Further, poverty as one of the most important signs of low or lacking capability deserves to be studied in detail with a particular interest. In that sense, defining and considering poverty in terms of capability is very useful to grasp the limitations of the concept of poverty. Also, theory of capability is good in the basis of human development. Then, Sen's work must also be considered as an important concept based on lack of human development and freedom. Due to mentioned reasons, to redefine poverty in the basis of lacking capability should not be refused immediately. In the light of those, my definition of poverty is that poverty is a humanly imposed condition that can be preventable by other non-poor people and based on involuntarily lacking internal and external resources that are required to meet basic needs, to have physical efficiency and to have self-realization in a person's life. In my definition, internal resources correspond to personal resources such as strengths, skills and education whereas external resources refer to income, wealth and entitlement to services. So, it is reasonable to say that it brings with these three definitions of poverty together.

Firstly, poverty primarily depends on involuntarily lacking internal resources that are required to meet basic needs and to have physical efficiency like absolute poverty. Secondly, it also based on involuntarily lacking external resources that are required to have self-realization such as participating in community life in harmony to what definition of relative poverty did. Thirdly, it is a humanly imposed condition that can

be preventable by other non-poor people. These aspects of my definition are in harmony with capability poverty. For, it considers lack of internal resources such as strengths, skills and education, then it also makes agent in charge with preventing and changing condition of poverty because an agent is someone who acts and brings about change and also has the ability to “effectively shape their own destiny and help each other” as non-poor people (Sen, 1999, p. 11). So, according to my definition, a person who are deprived of internal and external resources is poor. For, this deprivation shows us that this person is not capable of meeting his basic needs, having his physical efficiency and achieving his self-realization in his life. Further, if a person with medium income or wealth cannot sustain such a good life fitting to his existing external resources, this shows us that he may not have adequate internal resources to convert his external resources into abilities in order to lead a life as he pleases. So, such lacking conditions in regard to resources make a person poor.

3. UTILITARIAN APPROACH

In the previous chapter, I made a conceptual analysis of poverty with its essential historical definitions. In this chapter, I will continue by viewing utilitarian theory with its remarkable essential points, particularly its implications in regard to poverty in order to figure out whether utilitarian approach is capable of handling the problem of poverty. Firstly, in order to do that, I will focus on particularly primary arguments of classical utilitarians such as Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill even though there are number of different types of utilitarian thinking such as preference or welfare utilitarian thinking.

Secondly, I will briefly analyse preference satisfaction as the current way to achieve happiness. Thirdly, I will view two important forms of utilitarian approach such as act-utilitarian approach and rule-utilitarian approach with their criticisms. Then, I will consider attractive and unattractive aspects of utilitarian approach. Finally, I will analyse implications of utilitarian thinking on poverty. I ask whether utilitarian approach is capable of handling problem of poverty. Following that, I will argue that utilitarian approach is well-structured to provide security and to meet basic needs for people through targeting policies and principles that will impartially create the greatest happiness for all, but it fails to consider separateness of persons, for it treats society as one big person. Also, it ignores how happiness is distributed among people.

3.1 What Utilitarian Approach is in General?

Utilitarian approach is a comprehensive, well-structured moral and political theory that seeks to promote impartially human happiness of each person with equal treatment and that attempts to achieve self-development of each person through leaving them alone and allowing them making their own choices in order to make them leading their own lives as they pleases (Bentham and Mill, 2003; Klosko, 2013; Kelly, 2003). It is paraphrased as theory of equal treatment and essentially founded

on a premise that each person ought to be treated as equals (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 37). Plus, it is a consequentialist theory, specifically, it pays attention to the consequences of actions (Klosko, 2013, p. 383). For a detailed analyse, it must be looked for arguments of Bentham and Mill as classical utilitarians.

3.2 Classical Utilitarian Approach: Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill

Bentham argues that human beings have been naturally managed by pain and pleasure and they are in charge to identify “what we ought to do” and “what we shall do”. On the other hand, they’re seen as “standard of right and wrong” and they govern people in their all actions, thoughts and behaviors (Bentham, 2003, p. 17). The utility is defined as creating “benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness”, then it’s thought that happiness is the only desirable end (Bentham, 2003 p. 18; Mill, 2003, p. 186). It’s proposed “the greatest happiness principle” that tells us that actions are right in accordance with their tendency to promote happiness whereas actions are wrong in accordance with their tendency to promote misery (Mill, 2003, p. 186). In other words, this principle considers ever action or rule according to its tendency to increase or diminish human happiness (ibid, p. 186). Following that the main target is to maximize happiness for all affected (Bentham, Mill, 2003). For a better analysis, distinctive primary points of Bentham and Mill must be viewed.

3.2.1 Benthamite version of utilitarian approach with its distinctive primary points

As a hedonistic utilitarian, primary notion of Bentham’s utilitarian thinking is based on pleasure and specifically he claims that pleasure functions as being in charge of how people behave and as standard to consider one’s behavior as right or wrong (Klosko, 2013, p. 382). Firstly, his utilitarian thinking is based upon a universal fact that people seek for pleasure and prevent from pain (ibid, p. 412). He thinks that all pleasures are akin to each other in terms of quality and then, claims that “pushpin is as good as poetry” as long as quantity of pleasure deriving from two different activities is equal (ibid, p. 389). However, it might be hard to identify certain quantities of pleasure coming from them due to interpersonal differences. For instance, some of people might see pushpin as better than poetry and the others might not. Therefore, it would not be easy to prove that their quantities of pleasure

are equal (ibid, p. 389, 391). Also, he is criticized due to that quantitative analyses of pleasure and his utilitarian theory is blamed to be a philosophy that is suitable for pigs, for it's thought that people are considered more like pigs since they consent easy pleasures instead of struggling for ideals, in other words, choose pushpin rather than poetry, for it's argued that pleasure is not the only thing that is demanded for a good life and can make people happy (Mill, 2003, p. 188; Bennett, 2010, p.70).

Besides that, secondly, Bentham represents business part of utilitarian approach according to Mill and in the light of that, it can be said that for him, it's important to work for and promote public good, following that, he thinks that public policies should be evaluated in accordance with their consequences for people affected by them with the end of the greatest good of the greatest number (Klosko, 2013, p. 391). Also, the aim of legislation is to look for the greatest good for society (ibid, p. 396). Thirdly, he demands accountability to the public from government officials and in order to have that, he aims to improve administrative structures to make sure that they protect public interest and work for it, plus his utilitarian thinking gives people chance to demand extensive state services for a better quality of life (Klosko, 2013, p. 406).

Moreover, he rejects the notion of rights and uses politics as instrumental in order to promote human happiness (ibid, p. 408). Also, he advocates limited and controlled government with strong commitment to individual freedom. In the light of that, government should not get involved in lives of individuals and individuals should be left alone in order to pursue their own happiness (Klosko, 2013, p. 408, 409). According to his utilitarian thinking, happiness is the only human good that is desired for its own sake (McClelland, 1996, p. 457). In addition to that, his primary viewpoint is related to legislator, for he is widely interested in reforming social institutions in order to make society better and happier place by using utilitarian thinking and calculation (Klosko, 2013, p. 412; McClelland, 1996, p. 456). It's argued that as a utilitarian John Stuart Mill completes gaps that is left undone through his philosophy by Bentham. In order to see that gaps, it must be look for his distinctive points within his theory in comparison to Bentham.

3.2.2 Mill's version of utilitarian approach with its distinctive primary points

Mill's first distinctive point is that his idea of utility is separated from Bentham's. He made a qualitative distinction between pleasures as high and low pleasures, mostly in order to prevent criticisms toward utilitarian approach such as philosophy for pigs (Mill, 2003, p. 186, 187). In the light of that, high pleasures are viewed as pleasures that would not be sacrificed or traded at the expense of any sensual pleasure by an educated and cultivated person (Mill, 2003, p. 186, 187; Kelly, 2003, p. 326). Mill has a famous argument in regard to that. He claims, "it's better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied" (Mill, 2003, p. 188). By that, it's argued that the pig and the fool may not accept these estimations, for "they only know their own side of the question" and "the other party to the comparison knows both sides" (Mill, 2003, p. 188; Klosko, 2013, p. 434). So, it's reasonable to say that the right estimation is only obtained through a person with experience of both sides (Klosko, 2013, p. 434).

However, Bentham is only interested in the greater quantity of pleasure and does not question source of happiness (ibid, p. 434). In that line, for Bentham, sufficient swinish facilities and pleasure like scratching an itchy place must predominate the pleasures based on intellectual and creative faculties of humankind (Kelly, 2003, p. 327). In other words, Bentham thinks that if humans had enough of swinish pleasures such as food, sex, sleep, this would predominate any pleasure deriving from liberty, creativity, intellect and individuality (ibid, p. 327). However, Mill refuses such a perspective even though he admits the primary points of psychological hedonism and by doing that, he does not put himself in a position that forces him to accept accusation of others telling that Bentham's perspective degrades humans in a level that is not better than swine (Kelly, 2003, p. 327). His qualitative and quantitative distinction among pleasures permits him to argue that some activities are superior to others, for developing intellectual abilities causes a superior life for a person (Klosko, 2013, p. 435). Also, for him, happiness based on quantitative terms is not actual superiority. Besides, he thinks that people with such a happiness live a lower form of life and have a lesser form of happiness rather than their achievable capacities (ibid, p. 435). Secondly, following these arguments, it can be said that Mill's understanding of happiness mostly depends on active human self-development

(McClelland, 1996, p. 476). John Gray considers his view of well-being and happiness as Neo-Aristotelian or eudaimonistic (Kelly, 2003, p. 329). According to that view, human good is included many constituents such as pleasure, individuality and autonomy (ibid, p. 329). Also, according to Crisp, Mill was related to build a function of the general welfare through aggregating individual utilities (Kelly, 2003, p. 329).

Moreover, he makes a significant contribution to traditional utilitarian idea of good government. For him, appropriate governmental action is viewed as a humanitarian demand to increase human happiness and to remove human misery and pain as much as possible (McClelland, 1996, p. 476). But he also argues that to realize happiness producing duties and tasks is not sufficient for an efficient government. Then, he underlines that government must also encourage intellectual cultivation and development of its citizens in the greatest probable degree (ibid, p. 476). In addition to that, he advocates active participation in politics with a representative democracy, self-development of citizens, principles of utility and absence of interference with other people including government on self-regarding actions, for he considers them as important instruments to have a further progress in society (McClelland, 1996, p. 478). Following that, according to him, all human progress occurs as an outcome of liberty, apart from early phases of social development, therefore, he argues that all future progress is based on liberty (ibid, p. 479). He thinks that people have a potential to develop because he says,

Human nature is not a machine to be built after a model, and set to do exactly the work prescribed for it, but a tree, which requires to grow and develop itself on all sides, according to the tendency of the inward forces which make it a living thing. (Mill, 2003, p. 134)

In that sense, it's reasonable to say that according to Mill, a person must be left alone to achieve her complete potential with self-development and to practice her capacity to choose, besides, even if her choices are incorrect or inadequate, it must be allowed her to make her own choices in order to develop herself (Klosko, 2013, p. 427). On the other hand, as different from Bentham and Mill, current utilitarians are less probable to claim that happiness is based on pleasure (Bennett, 2010, p. 71). Today, the most preferred conception of happiness is preference satisfaction (ibid, p. 71).

3.3 Preference Satisfaction

Its essential claim is that satisfying one's preferences makes one happier (Bennett, 2010, p. 71). It's argued that the idea of preference satisfaction corresponds to an improvement on hedonistic utilitarian approach, for it's asserted that people demand not just pleasure, but also plenty of other things (ibid, p. 71). It's told that people have a tendency to satisfy their preferences and to indicate their priorities by their actions. However, people have to share limited resources in order to satisfy their preferences, so it can be said that their preferences may conflict each other (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 21). In that condition, an important question comes up, that is, whose preferences will be chosen to satisfy? (ibid, p. 21). Besides, when people have selfish or illegitimate preferences to satisfy, the question is whether they must be counted into the utility calculation due to equal treatment to the interest of each person. These questions will be responded under the section of unattractive aspects of utilitarian approach (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 26, 27). Before that, we will analyse some forms of utilitarian approach such as act-utilitarian approach and rule-utilitarian approach.

3.4 Act-Utilitarian Approach and Rule-Utilitarian Approach

It seems that act-utilitarian approach and rule-utilitarian approach are opposed to each other. Act-utilitarian approach is advocated as the system of normative ethics by J. J. C. Smart (1973, p. 9). It's argued that act-utilitarian approach is a form of utilitarian approach in which rightness or wrongness of an action is determined according to the consequences of the action itself whereas rule-utilitarian approach is a form of utilitarian approach in which rightness or wrongness of an action is determined according to goodness and badness of consequences of a rule that everybody should implement the action in such conditions (ibid, p. 9). According to Smart (1973, p.30), if a utilitarian chooses to practice action A instead of its alternative action B, it occurs just because doing A will make that person happier rather than what action B will do (Bennett, 2010, p. 55). In other words, it is reasonable to say that act-utilitarian approach applies the utility principle to each possible act whereas rule-utilitarian approach justifies the rules according to maximization of happiness for all affected. However, some utilitarians argue that

rule-utilitarian approach undermines act-utilitarian approach (Lyons, 1965; Hare, 1963, p. 130-136). In the next section, I will attempt to find out what attractive and unattractive aspects of all these different forms of utilitarian approach I discussed. Then, I will search what can be done to solve its basic problems.

3.5 Attractive and Unattractive Points in Utilitarian Approach

Utilitarian thinking has both supporters and opponents like other political and moral theories within the field. Besides, more importantly, it has not just remarkable aspects that are worth to advocate, but also it has some aspects that must be criticized and fixed in order to make it more consistent and beneficial theory. For instance, some argues that utilitarian approach is the only consistent and well-ordered moral philosophy whereas Williams (1973) claims that utilitarian approach is incapable of helping and it's inevitable to be vanished for it, on the contrary, for Hare (1984) the maximization of human happiness is a good core point for morality (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 10, 11).

3.5.1 Attractive points in utilitarian approach

There are some particular attributes of utilitarian approach that make it an attractive theory as a political morality. Firstly, utilitarians aim to promote human happiness, welfare or well-being, impartially for each person living in the society. It's an important aim since it's reasonable to say that happiness is something valuable, for each of us value it in their own lives and wants to obtain it (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 11). Secondly, it's a consequentialist theory that checks consequences of an action or policy in order to justify it. If consequences are good for everyone affected or involved, it can be said that it is a good or justifiable action or policy (ibid, p. 11). Following that, it's likely to argue that consequentialism within utilitarian approach prevents to occur "arbitrary moral prohibitions" (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 11). This means that an action or policy is considered morally bad just if it makes one's life worse and this kind of consequentialism is viewed attractive, for it protects people from arbitrary judgements of other people in regard to morality (ibid, p. 11) For instance, if someone considers an action as morally wrong just because it is inadequate for one's personal thoughts, utilitarian approach indicates that a person is suffering from that action (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 11).

Thirdly, for utilitarian approach, only positive changes in human happiness and welfare makes any action or policy morally right with no effect of any custom, religion or culture, therefore, it is considered as “historically progressive”, for it wants traditional, cultural or religious rules to be checked and tested toward their contribution to human development (ibid, p. 12). Therefore, it’s inclined to protect people from any harm or oppression deriving from any authority over them, for this reason it’s seen as an important instrument for fight against prejudice and superstition (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 12). In addition to that, it remarkably pays our attention to importance of human happiness and well-being and demands us to check rules and policies for their contribution on human well-being (ibid, p. 12). This means that primary social institutions are responsible to act in harmony with utilitarian principles (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 21, 22).

Above all, it aims to treat people as equals (ibid, p. 37). In other words, it offers equal treatment and consideration to all, so it considers all affected equally in a situation, for according to utilitarian thinking, human beings are important and importance of each is equal (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 43). According to Hare and Harsanyi, this is the probable easiest way to offer equal consideration to each person (Hare, 1984, p. 107; Harsanyi, 1976, p. 35). Plus, it is obvious that it is applicable to not just individuals, but also actions and governments. Besides, it is simple to practice on governmental policies. As it was mentioned previous sections, it attaches importance to human self-development and progress. Therefore, it seems to me that it is well-structured to provide security and equality and to meet basic needs for people. Thus, it is clear that it has some encouraging attractive values, but other than this, it has also some unattractive aspects that need to be discussed.

3.5.2 Unattractive points in utilitarian approach

First one is that utilitarian thinking has a clumsy nature, therefore it is “self-defeating” (Bennett, 2010, p. 61). This is due to the way to do utilitarian calculation, and in order to do that calculation, it is arranged all possible courses of action available to one and figured out for each alternative with every probable cost related to it and every probable benefit. After that, it is figured out what is the course of action that provides the best probable benefits over costs (ibid, p.61). But problem is that there are great numbers of possible alternatives available to an individual and

this adds up to suffocating amount of utilitarian calculation. This is one point self-defeating for utilitarian approach because it was claiming that making the world or society better and happier is the primary value of utilitarian approach (Bennett, 2010, p. 61). However, if utilitarian agents become busy through spending their entire time to make these calculations, then they do not have any remaining time to achieve their own happiness or prevent or alleviate their own pain (Bennett, 2010, p. 61).

Second one is that utilitarian approach does not take into account special relationships that require some kind of personal attachment and obligation such as family, friends, colleagues, etc (Bennett, 2010, p. 61; Kymlicka, 2002, p. 22). For, the morally obliged individual is called as u-agent by David Brink (1986), then such a u-agent who determines how to act according to utilitarian calculations argue that they have the same moral relationship with every person, in other words, no one has a morally distinctive feature in the basis of relationship for them. It is clear that this argument does not allow people to have special relationships (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 22). But, in contrast to utilitarian thinking, for instance, a person prefers to spend his time and money particularly for his own family members or friends rather than other people, and this connection among people requires special consideration and obligation to these people in comparison to other people (Bennett, 2010, p. 61).

In fact, the issue is that existence of such an attachment among people goes against utilitarian commitment to equality, impartiality and public welfare (Bennett, 2010, p. 61). William Godwin considers special relationships and attachments as reflect of “binding nature of promises”, then he argues that people should make their choices according to the greater effect on general welfare rather than connections deriving from special relationships (Bennett, 2010, p. 62). But this utilitarian attitude ignores intimate feelings of people toward their relatives, friends, and this makes utilitarian approach awfully harsh, for it demands people to forgo those connections and attachments, and this makes utilitarian approach too hard and demanding (ibid, p. 62). Also, such an attitude goes against our everyday morality and customs (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 22-24). Third one is that it is argued that according to moral common sense, people are obliged to help each other as a duty especially in particular extreme conditions, but besides that they also have their own “spare time” in order to realize their own projects (Bennett, 2010, p. 62). For, a human life that is

worth to live requires to have some achievements and to realize a project that will be giving some meaning to our lives and actions (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 26). However, utilitarian thinking offers no “spare time” to people. For instance, if a person is reading a novel, it is expected to provide greater impact on total human happiness or welfare by doing that, but if a person is occupied with reading a novel while others are needy to help, a utilitarian considers this as just “selfish indulgence” (Bennett, 2010, p. 62). In other words, as requirement of utilitarian decision-making, actions of u-agent are dependent on other people’s commitments rather than his own (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 26).

Bernard Williams (1981, p. 51, 53) argues that this leads to a sort of “alienation” between people and their commitments and projects that make their lives more meaningful and better. Problem is that it is expected from a person to spend equal and same effort for other people’s projects with his own. By that, it is demanded to sacrifice his commitments and projects at the expense of more utility (ibid, p. 51, 53). Williams (1973, p. 115) also tells us that judgements of u-agent will be “a function of all the satisfactions which he can affect from where he is and this means that the projects of others, to an indeterminately great extent, determine his decision.”. In that condition, u-agent will be far restricted in regard to his preferences on how to lead his own life, what kind of person he desires to be and his job opportunities. After all, he will not be a free person and will be deprived of a personal area to form and realize his own commitments and projects in order to lead his own life freely as he pleases (ibid, p. 115).

It shows us that both special relationships and all personal projects are threatened by utilitarian morality (Bennett, 2010, p. 62). This means that utilitarian approach may demand people to abandon their personal commitments and pleasures at the expense of general welfare and happiness, but it seems too demanding even if it is right in terms of utilitarian ground (ibid, p. 62). More importantly, it gives people no opportunity to lead their own life through forming and realizing their own aims and projects, and forces people to make self- sacrifice (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 26). If we consider Godwin’s utilitarian thoughts through making a comparison among two worlds, in the first one, people are free to have special relationships such as friendship, kinship and love, to improve their skills, to make their own projects and

to choose personal interests such as playing violin and reading novel whereas in the second one, people are not allowed to do those things, but it is obvious that these sorts of special relationships, personal achievements and interests are a prominent source of happiness in a person's life and for this reason, it's argued that the first world is happier than the second one (Bennett, 2010, p. 62, 63). Utilitarians like Godwin belongs to the second world and it is important to notify that aim of utilitarian approach is to make world happier, so it seems that utilitarian approach contradicts to its primary aim and therefore, it is self-defeating in that point, too (ibid, p. 62, 63).

In addition, it can be said that utilitarian approach causes immoral consequences and it is self-defeating again, for it would not allow people to have social customs such as promising and having special relationships that promote general happiness and welfare (Bennett, 2010, p. 63). It is self-defeating since its way of decision-making is too unwieldy to use. If it is used, it would be no remaining time from utility calculation in order to promote happiness (ibid, p. 63). Also, it's argued that utilitarians have an unrealistic notion of human capacity and rationality. According to them, human beings are primarily rational maximizers and aim to maximize their own interest and/or the public interest. According to that perspective, people would be good in calculating diverse alternatives and their costs and benefits, but in contrast to that, it's said that human beings do not think and behave in that way. In other words, they do not make a calculation on each action. Instead, they lead "patterns of behaviour", and create habits. By those patterns, they do not have to deal with unlikely duty of calculating each action (Bennett, 2010, p. 63).

Plus, it is also argued that utilitarians overvalue the capacity of human rationality to cope with "social context", then the fact is that human beings are "social creatures" and they have a limited capacity to think and behave beyond their social environment. In other words, it's claimed that social structure and environment is far effective to shape people's way to think and behave, this means that people's ways to think and behave are socially conditioned (ibid, p. 63). It's said that the patterns of behavior human beings create and lead are social and something shared with other people. In that sense, it's claimed that human beings largely lead socially constituted practices and rules instead of shaping themselves in accordance with their own utility

calculation. Briefly, it seems that act-utilitarian thinking does not conform to the ways human beings think and behave (Bennett, 2010, p. 63). Another unattractive point is that utilitarian approach harms minorities in society through its way of decision-making. Following that, preferences of minorities might be undermined by preferences of majority during utility calculation. Also, utilitarian approach gives equal weight to each sort of preference. Due to that, illegitimate, selfish or abusing demands of majority can be satisfied in order to maximize utility. For instance, by that, heterosexual majority may demand homosexual minority to be punished. It's obvious that all preferences are not legitimate and informed. In the light of that, it can be said that to count such preferences in the utility calculation would be unfair and discrimination toward minorities in the society. Therefore, satisfying such unfair and illegitimate preference is far immoral (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 27).

Moreover, some utilitarians argue that giving priority to the utility calculation would diminish utility in the very opposite way (Goodin, 1995, p. 22; Singer, 1977). For, they think that this would harm social cooperation, produce fear, anxiety and mistrust, and lead to diminish value of human life and freedom (Goodin, 1995, p. 22; Singer, 1977). Also, people may tend to misuse those utilitarian principles in order to not keep promises or discriminate among people for the sake of common good (Bailey, 1997). In addition, it's blamed to have an inadequate account of equality. For, it's claimed that utilitarian approach has misread the notion of equal consideration for each person's interest. This mistake enables some people, particularly minorities to be treated less than equals and makes them instruments for aims of other people (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 37). Therefore, Rawls (1971, p. 24) who is not a defender of utilitarian approach blames it to be involved less equality. He thinks that utilitarianism needs more equality, for he argues that in utilitarianism the right action is identified according to maximization of good instead of equal consideration for individuals. He also advises that the general happiness must be maximized only if it is done in a "fair" way (Rawls, 1971, p. 24; Smart, 1973, p. 37). Further, according to him, there are no restrictions placed in right, justice and preference satisfaction within utilitarian approach in order to determine which satisfaction is to be obtained. Therefore, for him, unfair selfish preferences should not be included into social calculation in order to protect people's right from

implausible demands and preferences of other people (Rawls, 1971; p. 24). In addition, another unattractive point occurs in the satisfaction of external preferences. Ronald Dworkin (1977, p. 234) makes a distinction among preferences such as internal and external. Internal preferences are related to the goods, resources and opportunities in which someone demands available to oneself whereas external preferences refer to the goods, resources and opportunities in which someone demands available to other people (ibid, p. 234). It's argued that external preferences may be subject of some criticisms and prejudices. For instance, a person may demand gays less resources and opportunities, for she considers them less worthy of concern and respect in comparison to others. It seems that including such external preferences into utility calculation might lead to unfair and immoral consequences (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 38). Furthermore, it is likely to mention another illegitimate preference that is based on the demand to have more than fair share of resources that belong to someone. This is named as "selfish preference" by Kymlicka (2002, p. 38, 39). It's qualified as selfish, for those people pay no attention to an important fact that other people also need for resources as requirement of their legitimate right. Those selfish preferences are mostly irrational, non-sensical and uninformed (ibid, p. 38, 39).

Question is that whether such preferences should be added into utility calculation. However, it is claimed that a sufficient theory based on equal consideration must differentiate among different sorts of preferences according to their legitimate moral importance and do not include illegitimate preferences such as external preferences and selfish preference into utility calculation in order to prevent immoral and unfair consequences (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 37). Obviously, in order to do that utilitarian approach needs such a mechanism to be able to prevent and eliminate all unattractive points. In fact, all unattractive points help us to decide what form of utilitarian approach ought to be followed. For, it is clear that source of most unattractive point is act-utilitarian approach, its procedure of decision-making or utility calculation (Bennett, 2010, p. 64). So, question is whether rule-utilitarian approach can be a remedy. It can be argued that rule-utilitarian approach can perform as a check mechanism on illegitimate actions, preferences and policies (ibid, p. 64).

3.6 Rule-utilitarian approach as a remedy to unattractive points of utilitarian approach

In the previous section, it was analysed deficient and unattractive points of utilitarian approach mostly deriving from act-utilitarian approach and its procedure of decision making and calculation. For this reason, it's reasonable to say that the feasible form of utilitarianism is rule-utilitarianism based on an essential fact that "Human beings are rule-followers rather than rational maximizers" (Bennett, 2010, p. 64). The problems that have been mentioned previously have mostly occurred if act-utilitarian approach is preferred to perform as a form of utilitarian approach. For, act-utilitarian approach is a form of utilitarian approach that applies utilitarian way of thinking to each possible action whereas rule-utilitarian approach is a form of utilitarian approach that claims that human beings follow patterns of behavior like following rules and implements the utilitarian thinking to those rules instead of individual acts (ibid, p. 64). It's argued that a society formed by diverse rule-governed practices and institutions is more useful and efficient for utilitarian moral thinking since people decide on practices, institutions and rules that will create greater happiness when people get involved in them instead of individual actions (Bennett, 2010, p. 64).

Besides that, on rule-utilitarian approach, it is performed indirectly through the rules rather than direct calculation of utility. Following that, a person has to figure out what rule to be followed in a certain situation and then, should act in accordance with that rule. This is the way to figure out what a person ought to do in a certain situation according to rule-utilitarian approach (ibid, p. 64). Furthermore, in order to identify the difference between act and rule utilitarian approach, it should be looked for their distinct criteria of right action. For act-utilitarian approach, an action is right in a particular situation if it concludes greater happiness than any alternative possible actions whereas for rule-utilitarian approach, an action is right if it is included in a rule and following that rule lead to greater happiness rather than an alternative possible rule (Bennett, 2010, p. 64). It is argued that utilitarian approach is self-defeating, for people who act in accordance with act-utilitarian approach calculate the utility of each possible action, therefore would not be trusted by their fellows and such a society composed of those individuals would be less happy than a society that cares to keep promises (ibid, p. 64). It is important, for rule-utilitarian approach

makes a comparison between two worlds. In the first world, there are promises to be kept whereas in the second one, there are no promises. If the first world becomes happier than the second one, keeping promises becomes a rule that ought to be followed. For instance, this method can be applied to special relationships such as family and friendship. If the world that allows people to form such relationships is a happier place than the opposite one, “support your family and friends” ought to be followed as a rule in that case (Bennett, 2010, p. 64). For these reasons, rule-utilitarian approach gives a promise to figure out the problems related to simple form of utilitarian approach that is act-utilitarian approach. In that point, it actually figures out the problem of unwieldy calculation of utility. It also solves the problems that make utilitarian approach self-defeating. It seems reasonable to claim that applying act-utilitarian procedure does not cause to the best possible results whereas following rules that shares more common point with claims of customary morality can have greater results than the other (ibid, p. 65). In the next section, it will be looked for its attractive points in detail.

3.7 Attractive points of rule-utilitarian approach

First one is that rule-utilitarian approach alleviates and controls aspects of utilitarian approach that directs people to perform immoral actions. In other words, it plays an effective role of control mechanism in order to prevent and eliminate immoral actions, preferences and policies. For instance, example of punishing the innocent (Bennett, 2010, p. 65). If we consider that according to rule-utilitarian approach, it should be presumed that people follow the rules of institutions and practices and should be compared two possible worlds. In the first world, there is an institution that gives officials an authority to punish the innocent if doing that provides an adequate benefit to the general welfare, for the motive of punishment is directly based on consequentialist procedure whereas in the second world, there is an institution of punishment that has a rule telling that only guilty is to be punished (ibid, p. 65). The question is which world has a greater happiness. John Rawls (1955) has a paper named as “Two Concepts of Rules”. In that paper, he claims that the former world is the worse one, for it offers an unaccountable authority to legal officials in order to punish the innocent when doing that is beneficial for the general welfare, but such an

authority is open to be abused easily and plus, it leads citizens to feel insecure with a fear to be arrested or to be charged with any crime. For Rawls (1955), the happier one would be the world that punishes only the guilty. So, “punish only the guilty” is a rule that should be followed by people, for it gives the best results in comparison to its alternatives (Bennett, 2010, p. 65). In that sense, rule-utilitarian approach seems to alleviate some criticisms to simple version of utilitarian approach, and it offers a morality that includes principles in which people are intuitively attached due to customary morality (ibid, p. 65). Also, it elucidates rationally people’s attachments to those principles and confirms them. For rule-utilitarian approach, what justifies the attachment to these principles is the fact that following them leads to good results for society (Bennett, 2010, p. 65). In spite of its all contributions, rule-utilitarian approach is also criticized in a few points.

3.8 Criticisms for rule-utilitarian approach

Firstly, for the deontologist, rule-utilitarian approach will not be persuasive because rule-utilitarian practice of respecting rights is instrumental in order to create the greatest happiness. In that sense, according to rule-utilitarians, rights are legitimate just if respecting them causes the greatest happiness. For a deontologist, this perspective is wrong since it is thought that basic rights represent “dignity of human personality” and it remains important if does not lead to a happier world, in other words, its value does not change according to results deriving from it (Bennett, 2010, p. 66). However, such a perspective is viewed as a “taboo” by rule-utilitarian and not accepted (ibid, p. 66).

Secondly, it is argued that rule-utilitarian approach might abandon a utilitarian to unhappiness (Bennett, 2010, p. 66). Also, a utilitarian might feel that rule-utilitarian approach is not sufficiently utilitarian because it sacrifices a lot from the original context of the theory and turns into “rule worship” (ibid, p. 67). According to rule-utilitarian approach, actions are rights as long as they comply with rules that cause greater happiness. So, the question is what points within rule-utilitarian approach that does not satisfy utilitarians that stick to radical version of it. Rule-utilitarian approach elucidates rationally why people ought to follow moral rules in utilitarian grounds. It’s claimed that breaking promises can cause a plenty of bad results. The

first one is that it can resent the promisee. The second one is that it can cause disappointment and suffering. The third one is that it can harm feeling of trust and secure. The fourth one is that society would be worse and less happy if people could not trust each other (Bennett, 2010, p. 67). However, in contrast to that, J. J. C. Smart offers an example that argues that bad results of breaking promises are predominated by the good results of it. Smart demands us to imagine that a person is stuck in a desert island with a rich man who wants this person to promise that if that person can leave the island and he cannot, this person will be in charge to give his huge wealth to do local riding club. Smart asks whether this person should keep his promise to that rich person. A rule-utilitarian will consider that right action is to keep promise, for a person will comply with a “socially beneficial rule” by doing that. However, Smart argues that if it is viewed in the basis of its positive and negative aspects, no one will be resented because of breaking the promise, for the promisee is not alive. There will be no harm to “social practice of promise” because no one knows the promise except them. In that point, according to Smart’s thinking, he just may harm his own attachment to promise as a bad result and it is a small badness rather than goodness that is provided if man’s wealth is given to a hospital. However, it just seems to me that example of Smart is just an exception and does not represent the common shared by all. In the light of that example, as an act-utilitarian, Smart still thinks that it should not be such hurried up to throw away act-utilitarian approach (Bennett, 2010, p. 67).

He also claims that rules might be beneficial to act-utilitarian people, but they should not be used to decide rightness or wrongness of an action. Instead, they should just be viewed as “guides” according to him (*ibid*, p. 67). The most important thing is that he does not admit rule-utilitarian approach as different form of utilitarian approach. Instead, he argues that rule-utilitarian procedure should bring about a developed act-utilitarian approach (Bennett, 2010, p. 68). Further, some utilitarians argue that rule-utilitarian approach undermines act-utilitarian approach (Lyons, 1965; Hare, 1963, p. 130-136). Also, it’s claimed that to a great extent, a suitable rule-utilitarian approach would be equal to act-utilitarian approach (Lyons, 1965; Hare, 1963, p. 131-136). But, Harsanyi (1977b) goes against this. He argues that it does not make any sense whether there is concrete and logical distinction between

act-utilitarian approach and rule-utilitarian approach, for it is claimed that rules that are capable of maximizing utility may not provide a constant protection for the rights of minorities in the society. Also, some act-utilitarians like Hare (1984, p. 109, 110) argues that self-sacrifice and satisfaction of illegitimate preferences are necessary to treat people as equals within act-utilitarian approach. However, it seems to me that Hare's argument undermines liberty aspect within utilitarian approach, for people who are forced to make sacrifice from their personal projects, interest and special relationships at the expense of more utility would be free to lead a life as he pleases. In the next and final section of the chapter, I will analyse implications of utilitarian approach on the problem of poverty in the light of these discussed issues of utilitarian thinking.

3.9 Implications of Utilitarian Approach on Poverty

It is clear that utilitarian approach fails to consider separateness of persons, for it treats society as one big person and it also ignores how happiness is distributed among people. Also, as we have seen in the previous sections, it has a primarily controversial concept of equality that is open to unfair and immoral consequences for minorities in society due to its procedure of utility calculation. The question is whether it is capable of handling problem of poverty. However, in spite of all its deficiencies and unattractive aspects that I have been discussed, I argue that utilitarian approach is well-structured to provide security and to meet basic needs for people through targeting policies and principles that create most happiness for all. It is likely to offer plenty of causes in order to prove and advocate that argument.

First of all, it is applicable to not just individuals, but also actions and governments. Also, it is simple to practice on governmental policies for poverty and it can be easily tailored to actual life and state policies for the advantage of the poor. It aims to offer equal treatment to all and to consider each person's interests equally and impartially although it treats some people less than equal while doing that. If we turn back to Benthamite utilitarian approach, we can see that Bentham was aiming to develop administrative structures and government that will protect and work for public good and was also demanding extensive state services from government for a better quality of life. he was also demanding accountability to the public in order to check

any policy that harms public interest. Plus, he was widely interested in reforming social institutions according to how entire society is affected by existing conditions and what could be done to heal as remedy. Further, while doing that, it considers all affected equally. It is reasonable to say that all these attitudes are in the advantage of the poor. On the other hand, by moving forward one step, Mill was thinking that to realize happiness producing duties and tasks is not sufficient for an efficient government. In addition to that he was arguing that government must also encourage intellectual cultivation and development of its citizens in the greatest possible degree in order to advocate their self-development since for Mill, human happiness mainly corresponds to human self-development. Also, he was supporting active participation in politics as an important instrument to have progress in societies. According to him, all human progress occurs as an outcome of liberty. Therefore, he advocates people to achieve their self-development through making their own choices, seeking for high pleasures and leading a life as they please. Their aims and thoughts are capable to offer a sort of self-help and governmental support to the poor people in order to improve their living conditions.

Besides, the most important thing is that as utilitarian both Bentham and Mill do not allow people to be poor as requirement of principle of utility. For, it seems that poverty leads to an implausible unhappiness. Therefore, if poverty occurs, utilitarian approach generally should call for elimination of poverty due to its primary aim. Following that, it can be said that if utilitarian approach is employed, it cannot have widespread poverty in a society with one exception. However, if a person is happy when he is poor, utilitarian approach thinks that there is no need to fix and support through giving him resources. Secondly, we have seen how procedure of utility calculation could be harming and how utilitarian approach has a primarily controversial concept of equality that is open to unfair and immoral consequences particularly for minorities in society due to that calculation. But we have also seen that these deficiencies are mostly unattractive aspects of act-utilitarian approach and can be fixed through preferring rule-utilitarian approach. For, rule-utilitarian approach alleviates and controls aspects of utilitarian approach that directs people to perform immoral actions. In other words, it plays an effective role of control mechanism in order to prevent and eliminate immoral actions, preferences and

policies. For, according to rule-utilitarian approach, an action is right if it is included in a rule and following that rule leads to greater happiness rather than alternative possible rule. By that, people get away from unwieldy nature of utility calculation and can identify some rules and principles that will make policies in order to eliminate poverty. For instance, by rule-utilitarian approach, it can be implemented a rule of providing basic resources or health insurance for poor people who are deprived of them. Therefore, I argue that rule-utilitarian approach is better to handle the problem of poverty.

Also, Mill is a rule-utilitarian implicitly and his rules based on liberty, qualitative pleasures, self-development, active participation in politics can be far helpful in order to improve conditions of poor people in the long run. But, at the same time, Mill's utilitarian reasoning in regard to poverty might say that poverty requires no interference if a poor person is happy to lead such a poor life and forms no threat or potential harm to other people. For, it is viewed as a self-regarding sphere of a person according to him. In the light of those, it is reasonable to say that rule-utilitarian approach does not allow people to live in poor conditions due to leading to unhappiness and pain with that exception. However, it is still implausible not to support poor people if they are happy. Instead, poor people should be supported even if they are happy.

4. RESOURCIST APPROACH

In the previous chapter, I analysed utilitarian approach that seeks to promote impartially human happiness of each person with equal treatment and that attempts to achieve self-development of each person through leaving them alone and allowing them making their own choices in order to make them leading their own lives as they please. However, in this chapter, I will view John Rawls's theory of justice and Ronald Dworkin's theory with their implications on poverty. In contrast to consequentialist nature of utilitarian theory, their theories are right based and resourcist. Rawls discuss equal and fair distribution of resources among people and criticizes utilitarian approach for not depending on equality sufficiently. He blames utilitarian approach to be unfair in terms of illegitimate preferences. Following that, by his theory of distributive justice, Rawls promises to offer more equality among people much more in comparison to what utilitarian approach has provided.

On the other hand, Dworkin analyses impacts of unchosen circumstances on people's lives such as differences in talent, unchosen native endowments and handicaps. His basic argument is that it is unjust for some people to lead a life with burden of unchosen circumstances without their own choices. For, others do not face such difficulties just due to their good fortune. Therefore, he argues that they deserve to be compensated. In the light of those, in the first part of the chapter, I will consider Rawls's hypothetical thought experiment based on his device called original position with veil of ignorance and his principles of justice whereas in the second part of the chapter, I will analyse Dworkin's theory based on a hypothetical auction. Further, in the third part of the chapter, I will view their implications on poverty and I will argue that with several strong contributions, Rawls's theory against poverty is able to provide a form of protection that poor people need whereas Dworkin's theory should be modified with social minimum and should not be so strict for wrong choices and mistakes of people.

4.1 John Rawls's Theory of Justice

Rawls's theory of justice (1971, 1993, 2001) entitled as 'justice as fairness' is mostly seen as one of the most important approaches that is worth to pay attention in the basis of social justice, distributive justice and liberty as an alternative to utilitarian approach. His idea of justice as fairness is basically associated with the way to distribute fundamental rights and duties through basic social institutions and to identify the distribution of advantages with social cooperation (Rawls, 1971, p.4-6, 47, 2001, p. 5, 6). It is offered by him a theory framed a basic structure, that is what he calls, meaning that the political, social and economic institutions of a society. It's reasonable to say that the power of his conception of justice as fairness depends on his attention that is paid to liberty and equality since he says, "All inequalities be justified to the least advantaged" (Rawls, 1971, p. 250).

Also, it is possible to say that he has important moral perceptions on the elimination of poverty and the improvement of condition of the poor due to he pays attention to society of inequalities and attempts to develop position of the least advantaged that is correspond to the poor among the members of the society. If poverty is considered as a consequence of choices people make on the structure of their society and as a result of unequal and unfair distribution of material resources, chance and opportunities, to such an extent, both existence of poverty and affluence in a society is placed in the collective responsibility of whole society. If it's true to think in that way, to analyse Rawlsian hypothetical thought experiment in terms of poverty would be compulsory, for, Rawls (1971) offers poor people an opportunity to make a choice and to have a collective decision on what kind of social arrangements they need in the basis of equality. The first part of the chapter aims to analyse Rawls's theory of justice and its implications on poverty and the condition of the poor. I will consider his hypothetical thought experiment including original position, veil of ignorance, social primary goods and difference principle with their implications on poverty. Secondly, it will be considered Rawls's grasp of equality, respect, self- respect and liberty in comparison with poverty. Thirdly, it will be resolved his thoughts on basic structure of a society and its connections with poor unfair living conditions. The last section will offer a Rawlsian definition of poverty based on his theory of justice.

4.1.1 Basic structure of a society for Rawls

Rawls aims at “a well-ordered society” and “social unity” appropriate to citizens of a democratic society (Rawls, 2001, p. 8, 9). In that sense, he does not offer a list of initial assumptions. Instead, he presents some primary thoughts for a democratic society. His idea of society is based on “a fair system of social cooperation” with citizens as “free and equal persons” (Rawls, 2001, p. 18, 19). This form of society tells us that Rawlsian society and its citizen has a capacity to understand and implement principles of justice through social cooperation. Also, they have a capacity for the concept of good for all. It’s important to say that basic structure of society is important for both Rawls as a subject of his theory of justice and poor people. For, according to him, this structure composes of basic institutions that defines person’s rights and duties and influence on their life prospects as divided into two separate parts as political institutions and economic, social institutions (Rawls, 1971, p. 6, 7, 47). By that, it’s claimed that inequalities in the basic structure have impacts on person’s chances and opportunities in their own lives and identify their personal expectations and hopes as an individual (Rawls, 1971, p. 6, 7).

For, it’s said that in the basic structure, there are different social positions individuals belong to, however, these positions are capable to materially influence one’s life like the poor’s (Rawls, 1971, p. 7, 13). In that sense, it’s obvious that basic structure in society has strong impacts on person’s own lives and to fix it in a good way and to make it more just would develop life standards of people living in that society (See Lotter, 2010, p. 154) For instance, lack of economic resources undermines chances of poor people to have personal development and an adequate job. Thus, it’s clear that inequalities and unfair positions in the basic structure disturb Rawls. In that point, it must be questioned what equality amount to for him with important dimensions such as respect and self-respect.

4.1.2 Equality, respect and self-respect for Rawlsian theory of justice

His theory of justice intends to make social cooperation possible, even if it’s hypothetical, for the sake of mutual benefit of each person in society with the condition that allows every person to participate as equals (Rawls, 1971). It can be argued that Rawlsian equality and grasp of justice offers equal respect for all and carries with important aspects and impacts related to benefit of the poor (Lotter,

2010). In addition, his idea of a society that offers equal treatment and respect for all is related to his refusal on justification of inequalities placed in utilitarianism (Rawls, 1971, p. 14). However, in that point what does self-respect amount to in his way of thinking? For Rawls (1971, p. 440), people who have self-respect consider their own lives as worth to live with a self-confident motivation to realize their plans and aims in their life. He argues that each human deserve respect not in terms of his social position but as a moral person (Rawls, 1971, p. 440).

Also, it's claimed that respect to each person must be placed in both institutions and constitutions of a society, for according to Rawls's first principle of justice, equal treatment to all ensures ground of self-respect in a just society (Rawls, 1971, p. 178, 179). Rawls (1971, p. 440) argues that social conditions that lead to loss or harm of self-respect must be eliminated at any expense. For, people may experience negative feelings like depression as a result of it and may lose their motivation to realize their wishes and aims because they may start to see them as unavailing and useless (Rawls, 1971, p. 440). In a similar sense, poor people are unfairly forced to admit less thing than what they need in their own lives and what the other people have (Lotter, 2010, p. 155, 156). For Rawls (1971, p. 181), it can be seen as a loss or harm of self-respect since he criticizes "lesser prospect of life for the sake of others".

On the other hand, if it is likely to view poverty both as a result of choices people make on the basic structure of society and as a result of unequal and unfair distribution of income, chance and opportunities, to such an extent, in that condition, both existence of poverty and affluence is placed in the collective responsibility of whole society. When it is thought in that way, to analyse his hypothetical thought experiment based on original position and veil of ignorance would be vital in the basis of poverty. For, through his theory of justice, Rawls (1971, p. 18, 19) offers poor people an opportunity to make choices for mutual advantage and to have collective decisions on what kind of social arrangements they need in the basis of equality. Despite its hypothetical structure, in original position unequal and disrespectful treatment for poor people and their unfair conditions are fixed through given opportunity of choice and treatment as equals. Therefore, now it's necessary to resolve his hypothetical thought experiment in an extensive frame.

4.1.3 Original position and veil of ignorance

Original position is a hypothetical thought experiment on choice that corresponds to the state of nature in traditional social contract theories (Rawls, 1971, 2001). According to that, people are placed in the original position with two tasks. First is that they're entitled to choose the principles that compose the basic structure of society. Second is that they're authorized to choose the principles that will be implemented to individuals. To treat all people as equals in that process, particular conditions must hold. To protect the choice of principles of justice from partiality and unfairness, they must be chosen behind "veil of ignorance" Rawls (1999, p. 118) thinks that this condition of choice will be useful to "nullify the effects of specific contingencies that put men at odds and tempt them to exploit social and natural circumstances to their own advantage"

For, behind the veil of ignorance, people are deprived of particular information that may lead to make a choice just toward their own advantage. Therefore, parties do not know their place in society such as class and social status, their race and gender, their possible luck in the distribution of natural wealth, abilities and talents like intelligence and singing and certain conditions of their society like economic, political and cultural situation. This means that they're fairly placed as free and equal persons with no advantaged or disadvantaged position coming from their natural fortune and social conditions. Thus, they do not have any chance to tailor principles of justice to their own benefit (Rawls, 1971, p. 12).

However, they have limited information of the conception of the good. For, if they do not, it would not possible to decide which principles to choose. In that sense, Rawls (1999, p. 123, 124) tells that parties have a form of rational plan of life without detail and to some extent, they know the principles of economy and human psychology to be able to choose. So, it can be said that Rawls's theoretical device called original position achieves something ethically valuable and important for the poor. It equalizes people through veil of ignorance and to some extent it removes chance of people to differentiate themselves from the others. It is argued that in a sense parties are "forced to choose for everyone" and obliged "to take the good of others into account" (Rawls, 1971, p. 140, 148). In other words, they are compelled to question what if they were the most advantaged or least advantaged in society. So,

it is reasonable to say that one of the strengths of Rawls's theory for an account concerned with poverty, is that it asks us to consider things from the situation of the worst-off and consider whether poverty or inequality can be justified from their perspective. Further, choosing principles of justice in a just way to each position in a society gives his theory of justice fairness for all. For, by original position, people who are ignored, denied and excluded from society like poor people become apparent in the basis of their living conditions because more advantaged people are forced to imagine and consider lives of the least advantaged, well- off or poor people and to take notice it in decision making process. The point is that the way of thinking and decision making gives full respect for poor people and chance to live in a just society as equals.

By now, it has been analysed mostly how Rawls (1971) perceive social cooperation that are placed among equals and its contribution for the poor or least advantaged. For, it's clear that his idea of social cooperation among equals is for mutual advantage that is quite benefit for the poor or least advantaged in society. In fact, he restricts the most advantaged through not to have right of "veto over the benefits available for the least favoured" (Rawls, 1971, p. 80). However, another point is that he often refers to the least advantaged or least favoured in his theory, but it must be asked that who are they and how are they distinguished? To reply this question, his idea of primary goods must be introduced first.

4.1.4 Primary goods and principles of justice

Primary goods refer to diverse "social conditions and all-purpose means" that are required for people to improve, to implement their moral powers and to obtain their conception of the good (Rawls, 2001, p. 57). These goods are needed by people to lead a complete life as free and equal persons (Rawls, 2001, p. 58). His account of primary goods is not just based on "psychological, social or historical facts", but it also includes "requirements of social life" with "a political conception of the person as free and equal, endowed with the moral powers, and capable of being fully cooperating member of society" (Rawls, 2001, p. 58). In that sense, he differentiate five sorts of primary goods: (i) "the basic rights and liberties" like "freedom of thought" and "liberty of conscience" these are seen as basic conditions to obtain appropriate development, (ii) "freedom of movement and free choice of occupation

against a background of diverse opportunities” (iii) “ powers and prerogatives of offices and positions of authority and responsibility”, (iv) “income and wealth”, (v) “the social bases of self-respect” (Rawls, 2001, p. 58). Primary goods can be controlled and distributed by a society, in that sense, Rawls (1971, p. 62) argues that all rational people demand them to realize their own aims and plans in their lives. He wants us to suppose an initial distribution in which primary goods are equally shared by each person. His principles of justice are implemented. If any inequality occurs as a result of initial equal distribution, it is only justified if it makes every person more affluent (Rawls, 1971, p. 62). For Rawls, this distribution can be considered as a criterion for equality. In that point, his principles of justice must be introduced in detail, for, they identify how people’s share of primary goods is arranged (Rawls, 2001, p. 59).

Rawls’s just society is ruled by two principles of justice: first principle argues that each person has an equal right to have the most extensive and appropriate disposal of equal basic liberties that are compatible with a same disposal of liberty for all (equal basic liberties principle). Second principle is about (a) social and economic inequalities that are arranged to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged (difference principle) and (b) that are connected to offices and positions open to all through conditions of fair equality of opportunity (fair equality of opportunity principle). So, it’s said that all social primary goods including liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect are distributed except an unequal distribution of these goods is to the benefit of the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971). His hypothetical distribution attempts to indicate transformation of his general conception of justice into his two principles of justice (Rawls, 2001, p. 59). His difference principle, in other words, his second principle of justice is related to social and economic advantages that occur as a result of social cooperation (Rawls, 1971, p. 15, 43). This means that according to him, every person must have the right to fair equality of opportunity and all inequalities must develop the life of the least advantaged people because it is justifiable just in that way. Through the principle of fair equality of opportunity, it’s aimed that people who have identical talents and abilities and wish to benefit from them should have similar chances and the same prospect of achievement in their life without respecting any social

conditions they were born in (Rawls, 1971, p. 73, 74). He says that all inequalities must be to the benefit of the least advantaged member in society, for he aims to compensate undeserved inequalities and social positions (Rawls, 1971, p. 100, 101). However, besides that, it's argued that his difference principle (his second principle of justice) is justified to the benefit of the least advantaged people. For the most advantaged people, he justifies his argument through telling that every person's well-being is based on social cooperation and he says that because he must make the most advantaged eager for cooperation with the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971, p. 103). For, according to him, the cooperation must be just and plausible for both sides (Rawls, 1971, p. 103).

However, it is considered as an exploitation of the least advantaged through offering them proposals that are hard to reject due to their deficiencies such as inability and unemployment (Lotter, 2010, p. 159). In that sense, Lotter perceives this as "unacceptable and disrespectful conduct towards fellow citizens in a Rawlsian society consisting of people with equal dignity and moral worth" (Lotter, 2010, p. 159). In contrast to Lotter, it seems to me that Rawls's ideas based on equal dignity and moral worth can be a good advocacy against shame for disrespectful treatments of rich people towards poor people around the world. In fact, the difference principle tells the least advantaged to consider better abilities of the most advantaged as social assets that can be used for the benefit of all, so through that greater talents are employed to make everyone's life better and more developed (Rawls, 1971, p. 107).

4.1.5 Social minimum and poverty

The idea of social minimum is defined as a minimum level of well-being that does not allow people to fall as a requirement of social justice, therefore, it is argued that a priority must be given to it among other principles of social justice (Peffer, 1990; Waldron, 1986). However, Rawls (1971, 2001) rejects it as an approach to justice through justifying the difference principle that depends on "the strains of commitment". The idea of social minimum is refused in the original position by him, for parties in the original position would take the risk of being worse to the extent that they consent to the greater inequalities if they accept it. For Rawls (1971, 2001), another problem of social minimum is to choose and to set minimum level according to changing conditions.

However, later, he decided to consider it as a part of “constitutional essentials” in response to Waldron (1986) who criticized him due to not to accept the importance of social minimum for justice. In spite of that he does not mention about that in revised versions of his books. In despite of accepting importance of the social minimum, he is reluctant to change his two principles of justice according to that. In political liberalism, Rawls (1993) considers social primary goods as all-purpose means, however, does not make any adjustment in his theory. Alternatively, he prefers to focus on moral pluralism.

As a result, it’s clear that he denies the importance of the social minimum in the expression of his principles of justice through his writings and does not include it in his theory by underlining its value for justice and respect for all. Lotter (2010) criticizes and elucidates Rawls’s attitudes toward social minimum in a different way. According to him, moral attitudes of Rawls perceive vital importance of the social minimum as the requirement of physical survival whereas his theoretical obligations do not let him to justify the idea of social minimum and to modify his theory according to that. If it’s taken in a clearer way, it can be argued that Rawls is aware that he must accept it, but he does not know how to do. The issue is that “The social minimum does not coherently fit into his theory” (Lotter, 2010, p. 163). Besides all, the most important point required to tell is that this can be considered as a crucial deficiency in his theory in the basis of the poor.

4.1.6 Who are the least advantaged?

Rawls’s difference principle demands that the basic structure of society must be arranged in the basis of social and economic inequalities that are to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971, 2001). However, who are the least advantaged in his theory? The group of the least advantaged comprises people who are more disadvantaged than others in terms of family and class, natural endowments, fortune and luck according to measures that depends on social primary goods (Rawls, 1971; 1999, p. 83). However, it is not offered an explicit definition of who identifies as the least advantaged in a society, but he says, “it seems impossible to avoid a certain arbitrariness in actually defining the least favored group” (Rawls, 1999, p. 84).

On the other hand, it is presented two possible definitions: first one is that the least advantaged is identified as people with nearly the income and affluence of the unqualified worker whereas second one is that it is defined as people with less than half of the average income and affluence (Rawls, 1999, p. 84). In that sense, his theory is exposed to some critics, for it allows people with their own choices to identify themselves as members of the least advantaged or favored and to be obliged to the benefits required through difference principle.

Richard Arneson (1990) offers an objection against that. It seems that to be member of the least advantaged class in a society is identified with the primary goods that people get pleasure in their lives. It's argued that there are some "counterintuitive conclusions" about that (Arneson, 1990). It's elucidated with an example based on life choices of four people, called Smith, Black, Jones and Johnson. It's said that Smith and Black both graduated from a high-quality law school with high grades and are capable of making a choice among good job options. But Black decides to be a Wall Street lawyer with a stressful life and high income whereas Smith prefers to be an artist with a median income and a lively working condition. On the other hand, Jones and Johnson both did not go to college and graduated from an average school with median salable skills. Yet, Jones decides on being an artist whereas Johnson becomes an unqualified worker (Arneson, 1990).

According to Rawls's definition of the least advantaged, Smith is considered as the least favored due to his income is beneath the average income, that is also level of income get by the unqualified worker. In that sense, it's known that Rawls's difference principle demands us to increase the life prospects of the least advantaged to the greatest degree and both Smith and Johnson are counted as members of this group due to their median income. But the point is question of whether it is morally right to treat them same (Arneson, 1990). For, although Smith had a sufficient capability offering him many opportunities and options to lead a life with more income, he decided to be an artist and accepted to live with an average income. However, in contrast to that, due to Johnson had a limited capacity with a low level of education, he had never chance to choose a job with high income. Also, it's said that Johnson preferred hard working conditions as being worker instead of the life of an artist. It's thought that Johnson deserves to be called as poor and to have benefits,

but Smith does not (Arneson, 1990). For, Smith became poor with his own choice whereas Johnson is poor due to his lack of capacity and insufficient level of education. Therefore, it's argued that Smith should not have the same benefits with Johnson. In that point, his basic argument is that justice does not demand us to compensate bad living conditions and inequalities that are chosen voluntarily by people themselves (Arneson, 1990). In his later articles, Rawls takes into account Arneson's objection and propounds to include leisure to the content of primary goods. This attitude of Rawls shows us that people who prefers not to work will be owning extra leisure conditioned as equal to the least advantaged. Through that, those people are not obliged to public funds. However, according to Arneson, Rawls's solution does not solve the difficult situation offered by him. He claims that distributive justice must be related to the inequalities based on opportunities that people encounter without their own choices (Arneson, 1990). However, it seems to me that Arneson's objection is not humanitarian and realistic in a diverse sense. It can be elucidated through following footsteps of his example.

First of all, Johnson as a well-qualified and educated person is accused to be poor due to not to choose a job with a higher income. But, if Johnson chose to lead a life as a lawyer with more income, he might not be successful and happy because higher money may not be a sufficient incentive to make him do his job with love. So, at the end, a failed lawyer may earn less and live in a worse condition than his life as an artist. Secondly, he implicitly makes a comparison between a worker and artist in the basis of their labor and talks about how much they are remunerated. It sounds quite disrespectful and unequal. Also, Johnson with talented or not as an artist does not have to work as a lawyer just due to have a graduation on that. The point is that Arneson does not respect to people's choices in their own lives. People can also make mistakes with their wrong choices, but no one is perfect and everyone should have right to make mistakes and deserve to be compensated in a certain level even if they are living in poor conditions as a result of their own choices.

4.1.7 Definition of poverty for Rawls

In the light of his theory of justice, for Rawls (1971, 2001), it's reasonable to define poverty as lack of social primary goods whereas the poor is identified as those who are the least advantaged or favored members in a society. As it's mentioned in the

previous section, to define the least favored group is quite complex for Rawls (1971, p. 98). His identification of the least advantaged members in a society corresponds to unqualified worker with less than half of the median income (Rawls, 1971, p. 98, 99). As a criticism, it's argued that this definition is not capable of setting an absolute and complete distinction between the poor and the non-poor. Also, it is based on quantitative measures related to the extent of attainable material resources. In that sense, it's claimed that it is more quantitative rather than moral. So, it's claimed that Rawls's definition of the poor does not fit into and comprehend moral and political values of his theory of justice. Therefore, it is considered as insufficient and inappropriate by Lotter (2010, p. 164).

4.1.8 Implications of Rawls's theory on poverty: some criticisms from Lotter to Rawls

Rawls's conceptual structure and intellectual source are criticized in the sense of poverty by Lotter (2010). Rawls uses them to explain his moral perceptions against poverty. However, according to him, these are not seen as accurately appropriate to provide a form of protection that poor people exactly need (Lotter, 2010, p. 149). It's argued that his moral perceptions are not capable of supplying a consistent, simple system of thought for poverty as much as plausible in his liberal theoretical framework (Lotter, 2010). In addition to that, it's claimed that there is a weakness in his theory that is about his thought of social minimum (Lotter, 2010, p. 150).

It's accepted that the thought of social minimum is capable of favorably preserving advantage of the poor, however, Lotter (2010, p. 150) blames Rawls not to be able to "neatly and coherently accommodate this idea in his theory of justice" and he considers Mill's perspective that is close to the idea of social minimum as more accomplished. In that sense, he attempts to redefine Rawls's first principle of justice through emphasizing value of respect in his theory of justice (Lotter, 2010). As a result, by Lotter, it's claimed that Rawls's theory of justice is not fully capable of elucidating poverty in a complete way with its all-important elements that need to be elaborated. In that point, the basic criticism is that Lotter (2010, p. 150) argues, "Rawls's theoretical framework is inadequate, as his moral intuitions about the need to eradicate poverty do not fit seamlessly into his liberal theory of justice". Rawls (1971, 2001) considers poor people as the least well-off or the least advantaged in a

society of inequalities. For Lotter (2010, p. 150), it is not an appropriate depiction of the poor due to inadequate basis that it depends on. He aims to reformulate Rawls's thought of social minimum in a way that is coherent with important connection among justice and respect. For that, he defends to be given "equal priority to securing individual political liberties and to protecting fundamental security for everyone" and offers an alternative first principle of justice stressing importance of respect for every citizen in comparison with Mill's thoughts on justice to provide security and to meet basic needs (Lotter, 2010, p. 151).

There are important various aspects of Rawls's theory of justice that demands us to be analysed for its implications on poverty and poor people such as his thought of justice, his basic structure of society and his focus on self-respect and equality. For Rawls (1971, p. 14), justice boils down to provide mutual advantage among equals through social cooperation. This definition might have strong impacts for poor people who are denied and excluded from society. For, it's argued that to be considered as equals may contribute to improve self-respect and humiliated social and economic condition of the poor (Lotter, 2010, p. 151). Also, having equal respect may help the poor to participate and affect public decisions in a democratic system. To be treated with respect and participation to public decisions may give them to have opportunity to influence and even to change decisions that make their living conditions harder (Lotter, 2008; Gutmann and Thompson, 1996).

Participation in public dialogue is strongly worth to pay attention for the benefit of the poor, for Young (2003, p. 103) argues that if public dialogue is dominated by the rich to preserve and to improve their advantages at the expense of the poor, this makes the poor more defenceless and powerless due to democratic values cannot accomplish to preserve dignity, respect and advantage of the poor. That's why, it's argued that Rawls's thought of justice paying attention to social co-operation among equals for mutual advantage can contribute to enhance participation of the poor to decision making processes that influence his life standards (Lotter, 2010, p. 151). For Rawls (1971, p. 4, 6), a just society is a society of equals that aims to have mutual advantage for everyone involved to social cooperation. This is what social cooperation amounts to for the poor. Also, fair distribution for him corresponds to mutually agreed principles of justice that ensure a just, neutral and unprejudiced

standpoint from struggle of interests to have a solution for disagreements (Rawls, 1971, p. 5). This aspect is important and valuable for poor people since they are prevented and deprived of participation in political activities and public dialogue as a result of their insufficient resources. For, they are perceived as not having enough improved capacity and resources in order to get involved in a democratic activity (Bohman, 1996, p. 15; Young, 2003; Lotter, 2008). This shows us that they are not treated equal in comparison to non-poor people. However, democratic thought of Rawls within his theory of justice provides respect for all including the poor through participation as free and equal citizens with the opportunity to affect public decisions that have an influence on their lives (Lotter, 2010, p. 152).

Poor people's needs are ignored or insufficiently supplied through unequal political participation (Lotter, 2008; Gewirth, 1984, p. 564). For, it's argued that "political effectiveness of the civil liberties is itself distributed largely in accordance with the existing distribution of economic power" (Gewirth, 1984, p. 564). Unfortunately, the poor has really low amount of the both. Thus, they do not have opportunity to compete politically as equals with the rich. As a result of that, their needs are ignored, rejected or insufficiently supplied. But, Rawls's democratic thought in his theory of justice destroys that. His idea of free public reasoning by equal citizens is important to obtain common good beyond self-interest through social cooperation and consensus (Bohman, 1998, p. 402). Although poor people are subject of public decisions, they are prevented to participate in public dialogue due to their powerlessness to influence (Bohman, 1996, p. 125, 126).

It seems to me that Rawls's theory provides a "fair and inclusive process of communication" and experience of political participation for all. (Fraser, 2009, p. 155; Lotter, 2010, p. 153). However, it is thought that his definition is not capable of setting an absolute and complete distinction between the poor and the non-poor, for it is based on quantitative measures related to the extent of attainable material resources. In that sense, it's criticized to be more quantitative rather than qualitative. So, it's argued that Rawls's definition of the poor does not fit into and comprehend moral and political values of his theory of justice. In addition, it's claimed that his moral perceptions are incapable of supplying a consistent and simple system of thought for poverty as much as plausible in his liberal theoretical framework (Lotter,

2010). Therefore, it's seen as insufficient and inappropriate in that basis (Lotter, 2010, p. 164). Also, his attitude towards social minimum is seen as inconsistent with his theory and important deficiency in terms of the poor in his theory (Lotter, 2010, p. 163). In spite of its several criticisms of Lotter (2010, p. 149), I argue that Rawls's theory of justice against poverty is precisely able to provide a form of protection that poor people exactly need. For, he offers poor people an opportunity to make a choice for mutual advantage and to have a collective decision on what kind of social arrangements they need. Further, I think that unequal and disrespectful treatment for poor people are fixed through given opportunity of choice and treatment as equals. Besides, I claim that his principles of justice might have strong contributions to the poor. For, his first principle argues that each person has an equal right to have the most extensive disposal of equal basic liberties, but his second principle composes of two section. According to first section, social and economic inequalities are arranged to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged. This is called as difference principle. It is clear that the least advantaged in a society is the poor.

Also, according to second section, offices and positions open to all through conditions of fair equality of opportunity. I think that such a society composed of these principles will be far beneficial for the poor. Besides, I'm aware of the importance of the social minimum for the poor and I agree to Lotter in one point, that is, I think that Rawls is also aware of the importance of the social minimum as requirement of physical survival, but his theoretical obligations do not let him to justify the idea of social minimum and to modify his theory according to that. Further, it can be argued that Rawls is aware that he must accept it, but he does not know how to do. The issue is that "The social minimum does not coherently fit into his theory" (Lotter, 2010, p. 163). It is likely to consider this as an important deficiency in his theory in terms of the poor. On the other hand, the point that differs me from Lotter is that I think that this deficiency should not prevent us to see strong contributions of his theory for the poor. I still argue that his theory has ability to provide a form of protection that the poor needs, but it is not sufficiently simple as a whole theory to adapt it to governmental policies and rules in actual life to alleviate poverty basically. Further, his device called original position is a thought experiment that lead us to see how people decide and form structure of a just society. But, to

reach such an objectivity among people in an actual practice would not be possible. In other words, his theory is a great guide to lead, but quite hard to practice in that sense. In the second part of the chapter, I will analyse thoughts of another resourcist theorist, that is, Ronald Dworkin.

4.2 Ronald Dworkin's Equality of Resources

Ronald Dworkin's equality of resources is widely considered as one of the important admitted approaches in the basis of luck egalitarianism and social justice. He prefers equality of resources to equality of welfare and refutes it with several objections. One is that equality of welfare necessitates to compensate a person who makes mistakes and ruins his life standards repeatedly and to sustain his standard of welfare as much as equal with other people's (Dworkin, 1981). According to him, people must be seen responsible for the results of their own choices. Also, he says that people must not be held responsible for their choices that were made under unchosen circumstances. This is Dworkin's criticism of Rawls. In the light of that, Dworkin (1981) claims that people's destinies and fortunes should, as much as possible, be identified through their own choices on their desires and expectations about their life. His basic argument is that it is unjust, for some people, to lead a life with burden and liability of unchosen circumstances without their own choices whereas others do not encounter such difficulties and sufferings just due to their good fortune. In that sense, Dworkin's egalitarianism ponders over two points that must be questioned. One is which conditions of a person are brought along brute luck rather than option luck, in other words, a person's own choice. Second is what can be done to give an end or at least to relieve that unjust inequality emerged through brute luck? As an egalitarian, Dworkin (1981) aims to make an equal and envy-free distribution of resources through a theoretically organized auction. He analyses impacts of unchosen circumstances such as differences in talent, unchosen native endowments or internal resources and existence of handicaps on people's lives. In that sense, he attempts to transform brute luck into option luck through his hypothetical insurance opportunity. In this section, firstly, it will be replied to those two questions through analysing his theoretical equal auction, his arguments on unchosen circumstances through brute

luck and option luck and his hypothetical insurance market. Secondly, it will be discussed what poverty would be for Dworkin according to his approach.

4.2.1 Theoretical equal auction

Ronald Dworkin's argument for resource egalitarianism depends on his well-known thought experiment involving a group of people who are shipwreck survivors washed ashore on a widowed island as a result of an accident. However, they do not have any chance to be saved for a long time and luckily there are plentiful resources and no native population in the island (Dworkin, 1981, p. 285). Immigrants, Dworkin calls them like that, admits a rule among them arguing that no one has an entitlement to any of these resources previously and in that sense, they also approve to make an equal division of these resources through an auction following a test that is called "envy test" (Dworkin, 1981, p. 285). Then, he demands people to gather all tradeable resources in auction. Each immigrant is devoted equal chips in order to bid and bidding goes on until no one desires to change any of one's own bid with other people's bids. This is the way to distribute resources among immigrants.

Dworkin (1981, p. 285) offers an envy-test. According to that envy test, when the auction is done, if anyone from immigrants wants to choose someone else's bundle of resources instead of his own bundle, it cannot be said that division of resources is equal in that condition. So, by that test, it is checked whether division of resources is equal (Dworkin, 1981). By that theoretical auction among members of a society, Dworkin (1981) attempts to offer an opportunity to people in order to live their lives as they choose under a fair structure for interaction to each other without further redistribution.

Dworkin (2000, p. 322, 323) makes a distinction among resources as personal and impersonal. Following that personal resources of a person represents his "physical and mental health and ability", "general fitness and capacities", "wealth-talent", "innate capacity to produce goods or services that others will pay to have" whereas impersonal resources are defined as "resources that can be assigned from one person to another" such as his "wealth and the other property he commands, and opportunities provided to him" (ibid, 322, 323). According to equality of resources, people should have access to reach equal amount of resources, but people have

different sorts and amounts of personal resources because of their natural endowments that restricts their ability to produce impersonal resources (Dworkin, 2000, p. 73-92; p. 81, 287, 322). Following that according to him, unequal distribution of resources as a result of choice is acceptable, but as a result of natural endowments, it is not. Natural endowments are defined as attributes of a person that restricts his ability to produce impersonal resources and to achieve his own aims such as handicaps and lack of talent (Dworkin, 2000, p. 81, 287, 322; Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 144). Following that, Dworkin's basic argument is that it is unjust, for some people, to lead a life with burden of unchosen circumstances without their own choices. For, there are others who do not face such difficulties just due to their good fortune.

For instance, due to a bad fortune, a blind person has no ability to see as a personal resource. Therefore, he argues that they deserve to be compensated. However, there is no possible way to redistribute personal resources, but Dworkin (2000, p. 73-92) proposes "a hypothetical insurance market" that can be used for compensation of unequal amount of personal resources by a redistribution of impersonal resources. It is reasonable to say that he analyses the impacts of unchosen circumstances on people's lives such as differences in talent, unchosen native endowments and handicaps. By that theoretical equal auction and insurance market, he aims to compensate people's unchosen differences in talent, abilities, their natural endowments and handicaps. But, according to him, people must be held responsible for the results of their own choices. Therefore, it can be said that he is too strict to wrong choices and mistakes of people. For, this means that if a person makes a wrong choice in his life, he does not deserve any compensation for the bad results of his choice (Dworkin, 2000).

4.2.2 Implications of his thoughts on poverty

I claim that his strict attitude to wrong choices and mistakes is quite harmful in terms of the poor. For, this means that if a person is poor due to his own wrong choices, he does not deserve any compensation in accordance with Dworkin's reasoning. I think that his reasoning is too harsh and should be modified with a social minimum and should not be so strict for wrong choices and mistakes of people. By social minimum, it is meant as a minimum level of well-being that does not allow people to

fall as a requirement of social justice (Peffer, 1989; Waldron, 1986). For, I think that everyone should have right to make mistakes or wrong preferences in his own life and does it, too, but without paying dearly for them.

5. CAPABILITIES APPROACH

In the previous chapter I viewed resourcist approach (RA) that focuses on fair distribution of resources among people by tracing thoughts of John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin. But, in this chapter, I will analyse capabilities approach (CA) of Amartya Kumar Sen (1985, 1992, 1999) who claims that development should be perceived as enlargement of human capabilities instead of maximizing utility, pleasures, income or resources. Sen has censured resources-based approaches such as Rawls's and Dworkin's, for not attaching sufficient importance to all aspects of human diversity, in order to see personal differences of converting resources to capabilities by virtue of handicaps of some people, is considered as underrating main point of problem of humans (Sen, 1984, p. 323).

Besides, he argues that there are some conversional factors such as personal, environmental and social, in order to convert resources to capabilities and he blames theories based on equality of resources to ignore such factors. He thinks that a theory of justice should pay attention to people's capabilities instead of resources. Following that, he defends a moral aim that all individuals should have a substantive freedom in order to lead a life they have reason to value. For that, he focuses on a person's functionings and capabilities as their achievements and, their potential and opportunity to achieve. Thus, it's reasonable to say that his main objection to Rawls and Dworkin is that they only pay attention to means rather than ends (Sen, 1990; 1992, p. 38). For these reasons, CA is seen as an alternative to the resourcist approaches of Rawls and Dworkin who focus on income or wealth as basic issue of social justice and, to utilitarian thought based on maximization of happiness for all. In the light of those, in this chapter, firstly, I will focus on Sen's capabilities approach and its primary concepts such as capabilities, functionings, agency, freedoms. Then, I will analyse his perspective on human development and well-being. Also, I will look for relation between social endowments and equality of capability. Then, I will view how diverse social endowments create unfair

inequalities and their influences on human development. Secondly, I will analyse his conversion factors that are employed to convert resources to capabilities. Thirdly, I will offer some criticism on his approach from Thomas Pogge. For instance, I will question whether capability approach presents anything in regard to social justice. Then, I will view implications of capabilities approach on poverty and question whether it is capable of handling the problem of poverty.

5.1 Capabilities and Functionings

Sen's understanding of development is based on his idea of capabilities perceived as a sort of substantive freedom. Sen (1992, p. 39, 40; 1997) describes capability as "a set of vectors of functionings, reflecting the person's freedom to lead one type of life or another" whereas functionings reflect "a person's beings and doings" meaning that it indicates us "what we can do" and "what we can be" in life. According to Sen (1992, p. 39, 40), a functioning shows us what a person is and does, including has adequate nutrition, safe and well shelter, clothing, good job, living long and happy life, has self-respect, participating in the community life and has supportive friends, colleagues and family members. It is reasonable to say that a capability indicates a person's ability to achieve a functioning (Wolff, forthcoming, p. 12, 13).

Sen (1980) considers a person's capability set as a whole of alternative sets of functionings that a person could achieve. In that point, it can be said that in a sense, capabilities are a person's opportunities whereas functionings are related to achievements or what a person actually is and does in his life. Therefore, it is argued that it should be paid attention to the capabilities of people in order to provide them an opportunity to lead a life they value and they have reason to value (Sen, 1992). Sen offers no list of capabilities and functionings that correspond to important achievements. For, he pays attention to value of having options or preferences in the basis of capability and value of choosing itself without imposing by anyone for selecting a functioning to practice. It is thought that this is strength of his theory (Wolff et al, 2015, p. 14). Sen (1984, p. 334; 1985, p. 6-11) mostly elucidates human functioning with his example of riding a bicycle. He argues that people cannot know what they will be able to do with goods only by knowing its characteristics (Sen, 1985, p.6). Instead, he claims that it must be looked for functionings of a person. He

argues that both to own a commodity and command over the characteristics of the goods a person own is a personal matter, but quantification of characteristics does not become different according to personal features of owning a commodity, that is, it does not change from person to person (ibid, p. 6). In his example of bicycle, Sen tells that characteristic of a bicycle is transportation, whether or not a person owning the bicycle is able-bodied or handicapped (Sen, 1985, p. 6). In that situation, functionings identifies what a person can achieve with commodities and characteristics at one's command (ibid, p. 6).

The point that must be paid attention is that when it is made a comparison between a disabled person and an able-bodied person, they may differ in capabilities to do many things with a same commodity such as riding a bike (Sen, 1985, p. 7). He defines functioning as an achievement of a person, related to what one can do and be by considering a component of condition of that person. Therefore, he argues, "it has to be distinguished from the commodities which are used to achieve those functionings", in other words, he tells, "bicycling has to be distinguished from possessing a bike" and "also from the happiness generated by the functioning" (ibid, p. 7). This means that he does not determine riding a bike with pleasure a person had due to ride. Therefore, he says,

A functioning is different both from (1) having goods (and the corresponding characteristics), to which its posterior, and (2) having utility (in the form of happiness resulting from that functioning), to which it is, in an important way, prior. (Sen, 1985, p. 7)

In that sense, it can be said that there are different distinctions existing among the bicycle, the action of cycling, any mental state coming from riding it or owning it such as happiness or sort of pleasure or utility that comes along with the cycling and some afterwards effects of the cycling (Crocker, 2008, p. 164). Actually, for Sen, bicycle itself is only an object or commodity that can be bought or sold, that have several things one can do with that, for instance, one may buy and own it, be close to it and sitting on it but, not be riding it (ibid, p. 164). Sen considers bike as necessary but, not enough alone in order to ride since he identifies riding "as both process and result, at the end, an achievement of the rider" (Crocker, 2008, p. 164). Besides, according to him, it does not matter whether rider has enjoyed or some pleasure while riding, it's still an achievement. In accordance with Sen, there are strong

differences between owning a commodity and benefiting it. For instance, it is argued that owning a bike does not add up to benefit it, in other words, owner of the bike may be a handicapped person or someone who just not to know how to ride it. Sen says that a commodity has some characteristics and functions due to its nature. He tells that for instance, a bike has characteristic of transportation and function of movement, at the end, gives a satisfaction or benefit to someone who rides it. For Sen, this means that a person needs a set of capabilities to turn commodities and services one has into benefit in one's own life.

In other words, he argues that to own a resource or commodity is not enough itself, for a person should have capability to convert resources or commodities into ability to use and benefit it or to ride a bike, most importantly, to realize one's ends and to live a life what one wants. If a person gives a bike to someone who are handicapped or does not know how to ride it, it means nothing, useless. Further, Sen argues that set of functionings composes capability since it includes all achievable human functionings, that's why, he says, "capability to function represents the various combinations of functionings (beings and doings) that a person can achieve" (Sen, 1992, p. 40). It seems that capability indicates us what a person can do and that person's freedom, since Sen says that capability to function gives a person freedom to choose a life from possible livings one wants to live. Therefore, he defines capability as "a set of vectors of functionings, reflecting the person's freedom to lead one type of life or another" (ibid, p. 40). This means, "the capability set in the functioning space reflects the person's freedom to choose from possible livings" (Sen, 1992, p. 40).

In contrast to that, income is only capable of offering freedom to a person in order to buy commodity, but Sen thinks that what capability to function offers is more valuable and comprehensive in terms of development and living standards of a person (ibid, p. 40). For, Sen criticizes resource-based approaches focused on primary goods by Rawls and Dworkin through telling that "comparisons of resources and primary goods cannot serve as the basis for comparing freedoms" (ibid, p. 38). Also, he thinks that to own primary goods is not enough itself, for person must have capability to convert primary goods into ability to realize one's ends and to live a life what one wants to live (Robeyns, 2010, p. 74). Thus, it is reasonable to say that

according to Sen, a functioning shows us what a person is and does, including has an adequate nutrition, safe and well shelter, clothing, good job, living long and happy life, at the same time, has self-respect, participating in the community life and has supportive friends, colleagues and family members. Further, it can be said that capability indicates us a person's ability to functioning. Also, a person's capability set is perceived as a whole of alternative sets of functionings that a person could achieve (Wolff, forthcoming). Besides, Sen has an agency-oriented CA. Therefore, in the next section, I will view his concept of agency.

5.2 Agency and Well-being / Freedom and Achievement

Agency is perceived as ability to “effectively shape their own destiny and help each other” and agent is defined as someone who acts and brings about change by Sen (1999, p. 11, 53, 281). CA has an agency-oriented structure. Some scholars question an issue of selecting and weighting of capabilities and functionings. Then, they ask what it means to be doing well in a person's life and which capabilities and functionings are the most important and vital. Sen replies to these questions through his agent-oriented capability approach (Sen, 1999, p. 11, 53, 281). According to that, individuals and groups should decide and answer these questions for themselves, since they have ability to “effectively shape their own destiny and help each other” (Sen, 1999, p. 11) and to be “active participant (s) in change, rather than... passive and docile recipient (s) of instructions or of dispensed assistance” (Sen, 1999, p. 281) as an agent.

Sen also associates agency with well-being and considers achievement of well-being as one of the significant aims of the agent (Sen, 1992, p. 57). He views agency and well-being as distinguishable and separate, but equally important and interdependent (ibid, p. 57). For him, they are aspects of human life which indicate us individuals' and groups' way to do and call for “respect, help, protection” (Sen, 1992, p. 39-42; 1999, p. 189, 190). Sen's development ethics makes distinction between (1) agency and well-being and (2) achievement and freedom (Sen, 1992, p. 56-62). Sen connects agency to some concepts such as freedom and well-being and discuss “agency aspect” and “well-being aspect” of a person and their relations to freedom and achievement (Sen, 1992, p. 56). He argues that one needs to know a person's “actual

achievement” and “the freedom to achieve” to analyse person’s position in a social arrangement (Sen, 1992, p. 31). In order to grasp well, it must be looked for what he means by achievement, freedom to achieve, agency freedom and agency achievement and how those are related to his agency-oriented capability approach. In Sen’s development ethics, basic thought of these two concepts, agency and well-being is offered through an essay called “Agency and Well-being: The Development Agenda” in 1995. But, before that, in his initial account, Sen published articles and books especially through 1992 and 1993.

Initially, it may not be easy to understand term “agency” and “agent” like term “capability”, can be a little confusing. Sen defines agent “as someone who acts and brings about change” and “whose achievements can be judged in terms of her own values and objectives” (Sen, 1999, p. 18, 19). He also defines a person’s agency achievement as “the realization of goals and values she has reason to value, whether or not they are connected with her own well-being” (Sen, 1992, p. 56). It seems to me that it can be grasped as one’s ability to decide and act according to one’s own values or has reason to value, but it does not matter whether this action contributes to one’s own well-being. He also defines agency achievement as “the person’s success in the pursuit of the totality of her considered goals and objectives” (ibid, p. 56). Following that, he makes a distinction agency achievement and well-being achievement and argues that “the freedom to achieve functionings” is related to a person’s own well-being” (Sen, 1992, p. 56). In that point, it should be asking what well-being mean for Sen. For Sen, a person’s well-being relates to one’s own wellness or advantage, it does not matter whether it is conclusion of person’s own efforts or acts, those of other people or effect of conditions (Robeyns, 2010, p. 75; Crocker, 2010, p. 151). Sen also tells that a person’s own well-being, whether functionings or capabilities, is considered as part of a person’s goals because a person may also obtain objectives that diminish one’s own well-being and as well put an end to one’s own life (ibid, p. 75; p. 152). Sen explains what well-being means in the following way:

The well-being of a person can be seen in terms of the quality (the ‘well-ness’, as it were) of the person’s being. Living may be seen as consisting of a set of interrelated ‘functionings’, consisting of beings and doings. A person’s achievement in this respect can be seen as the vector of his or her functionings. The relevant functionings can vary from such elementary

things as being adequately nourished, being in good health, avoiding escapable morbidity, premature mortality, etc., to more complex achievements such as being happy, having self-respect, taking part in the life of the community, and so on. The claim is that functionings are constitutive of a person's well-being, and an evaluation of well-being has to take the form of an assessment of these constituent elements. (Sen, 1992, p. 39)

In Sen's development ethics, another distinction occurs between "agency freedom" and "well-being freedom". Agency freedom is "one's freedom to bring about the achievements one values, and which one attempts to produce" whereas well-being freedom is "one's freedom to achieve those things that are constitutive of one's well-being" (ibid, p. 57). Also, it can be said that to realize agency freedom in agency achievements means to achieve well-being or non-well-being objectives or aims and to have freedom of will and action to do (Robeyns, 2010, p. 75). As I mentioned before, for Sen, agency and well-being are not "independent of each other", instead they are "distinguishable and separate, but thoroughly interdependent" (Sen, 1992, p. 57).

5.2.1 Sen's normative account of agency

Initially, Sen's concept of agency was descriptive: it defined human motivation beyond self-interest (Robeyns, 2010, p. 75). However, increasingly, after 1993, Sen's descriptive account of agency provides a space for both self-regarding and other-regarding human motivation (Sen, 1990b, p. 54; Crocker, 2010, p. 153; Robeyns, 2010, p. 76). So, for Sen, people are more than "strict maximizers of a narrowly defined self-interest" (ibid, p. 54; p. 76). But normative account propounds that human agency is something human beings has reason to value, to realize in their lives and to implement collectively in their groups or communities and institutions (ibid, p. 153; p. 76). In that sense, it is argued that not only in the individual level, but also in the community level, agency should be implemented for Sen, since in the individual level, the agents can and should form and determine their own lives whereas in the community level, by fulfilling joint or collective agency, communities can and should select, weigh and exchange capabilities and functionings (Robeyns, 2010, p. 76, 77). Sen argues, "this idea of agency success is based on a straightforward comparison between the objectives I wish to promote- or what I would in fact promote if I were the effective agent- and the actual realization of those objectives (no matter who does the actual promoting)" (Sen, 1992, p. 58). Already in

1992, it is argued that he started to move in the direction of this normative account of agency through his initial distinction between well-being and agency and the argument of two kinds of agency achievement or success: (1) “realized agency success” that is considered as more “generic” and comprehensive account of agency and (2) “instrumental agency success” that is more specific and “active or participatory” account of agency (Sen, 1992, p. 58; Robeyns, 2010, p. 77; Crocker, 2010, p. 153).

5.2.2 Realized agency success and instrumental agency success

In realized agency success, someone’s goals, whether self-regarding or other regarding, are realized, yet, someone or something else may be a reason or a “lever” of the achievement or success (Sen, 1992, p. 57-58; Robeyns, 2010, p. 77; Crocker, 2010, p. 153). Sen’s generic account of agency allows an individual or group to implement or “control” the “levers” of change (ibid, p. 58; p. 77). Also, this generic concept of agency emphasizes something important, that is, institutions and other people can help or contribute us to realize our own goals or objectives (ibid: 77). In that sense, Sen tells that a person’s ability or potential to realize diverse valuable functionings may be substantially increased by public action or policy (Sen, 1999, p. xi-xii).

It seems to me that this perspective makes a room to promotion of social justice and alleviation of poverty through sympathy for others and commitment to ethical norms since to help or contribute someone requires having sympathy. Sen supports and strengthens that argument in the following way: He says, “If ... individuals as social persons have broader values and objectives, including sympathy for others and commitment to ethical norms, then the promotion of social justice need not face unremitting opposition at every move” (Sen, 1990b, p. 54). In that sense, it’s claimed that Sen’s distinction between well-being and agency yields space for a conception of freedom and responsibility in terms of person’s actions and decisions, but the important thing is that this responsibility shows us that as I mentioned before, human beings are more than “strict maximizers of a narrowly defined self-interest”, for although people sometimes make an effort to develop their well-being, it does not mean that they do not dedicate themselves for the sake of something that is beyond and even against their own welfare, according Sen’s concept of agency (Sen, 1990b,

p. 54; Robeyns, 2010, p. 76). So, I told before that persons can have objectives that diminish their well-being or put an end to their life and then, that distinction Sen puts forward tells us that agents may obtain not only their self-interested goals, but also altruistic or other-regarding goals at the expense of losing their health, friends, and even life itself (Sen, 1999). This means that an agent may realize one's own agency through acting on regarding or caring other persons' objectives and well-beings (Sen, 1999). That's why, Sen thinks that the fruitful fulfillment of development policies can and should be based on persons' sense of fairness and being treated fairly (Sen, 2006; Robeyns, 2010, p. 76). If we turn back to instrumental agency success called specific and "more participatory" kind of agency, someone as an agent oneself creates things with one's own efforts and has an "active part" in some collective or joint action (Sen, 1992, p. 58).

Sen defines a person's agency achievement as ability to decide and act according to things one values or has reason to value, but it does not matter that this action personally fruitful or not whereas agency freedom as freedom to decide, to act and to be fruitful and effective, but a person's agency freedom is improved "not only when we actually do something, but when something we value occurs when we had nothing to do with its occurrence but would have chosen it had it had the chance and the means" (Crocker, 2010, p. 153; Robeyns, 2010, p. 75). In 1992, he explains close relation between values and what he called "active or participatory" agency. (Sen, 1992, p. 58; Robeyns, 2010, p. 79; Crocker, 2010, p. 156). He emphasizes the importance of realizing our goals through our own efforts or actions or jointly with others (Sen, 1992, p. 58; Robeyns, 2010, p. 79; Crocker, 2010, p. 156).

However, after 1992, he seems to make a common meaning of agency less important than it really is and to avoid to discuss non-participatory agency and also, focus his attention on agency only in the perception of what he called "instrumental agency success" in 1992 (Robeyns, 2010). After concept of agency, another important concept that must be paid attention is development. Sen (1992, 1999) analyses development of a society and conditions of a person according to his substantive freedoms, in other words, capabilities. In that sense, he argues that it is possible to improve capabilities through strong public policies that can be affected and changed by fruitful usage of participatory capabilities of people in public. In the light of that,

it seems to me that in next section, it should be analysed his idea of development and forms of freedom and unfreedom within capability approach.

5.3 Sen's Idea of Development

Sen (1985, 1992, 1999, p. xii) claims that development should be considered as the enlargement of human capabilities rather than maximizing utility, pleasures or income, at the same time, as “an integrated process of expansion of substantive freedoms that connect with one another”. According to that, both expansion of human capabilities and integration of economic, social and political determinants have a high priority for development. For Sen, this perspective gives us chance to see better importance of development of diverse institutions including markets, governments, political parties and capabilities for opportunities to have a public dialogue and participation. He also takes into account the effects of cultural and social norms on person's opportunities. For instance, he pays attention to given traditional gender roles within some societies and their strong influence to limit the opportunities of women through his approach. It is argued that development necessitates to eliminate diverse forms of unfreedoms such as ineffective institutions, social arrangements and lack of political freedoms. In that sense, he identifies some forms of unfreedom and freedom within his approach. In that point, it would be reasonable to talk about that.

5.4 Forms of Unfreedom

Sen (1992, 1999) considers poverty as a form of unfreedom due to deficiencies caused by it. For, he claims that there are many people suffering from diverse forms of unfreedom including famines, under-nutrition, little access to healthcare, lacking sanitation, safe and well shelter and premature morbidity. It is clear that lacking or limited access to basic human needs is seen as an important form of unfreedom such as healthcare, education, employment and social and economic security. Also, inequality between men and women is considered as important with its impacts on the freedoms and opportunities of women.

Another source of deprivation argued by Sen (1999, p. 38, 39) is the lack of political liberty and the ignorance of basic civil rights. It is argued that democratic rights are

closely connected to economic security. For, Sen claims that famine does not emerge in democracies since if a government allows its occurrence, it is not re-elected. The importance of political liberties is strongly emphasized in his theory. For, political participation and civil liberties are considered as important concerns of human freedom. Sen does not offer a list of basic capabilities; however, he makes a list based on essential freedoms. In the next section, it will be analysed that with what freedom means for him.

5.5 Essential Freedoms

Sen (1999, p. 37, 38) determines freedom with two important functions namely evaluation and effectiveness. According to the first one, freedom ensures a basis to consider achievement and development of a society through evaluating it in terms of capabilities and freedoms people have. In that sense, it is argued that capabilities are basic requirements for a successful and developed society. For, it is thought that more extensive capabilities have the ability to make people more active through playing an active role in shaping their own destiny, protecting their advantage, affecting and even changing the society they live in, helping and supporting others. All of them is quite important and valuable for the process of development. These thoughts are helpful to shape his idea of agent, but this was the issue of previous sections. Before that, it should be analysed his list of basic freedoms. They have instrumental importance for Sen (1999, p. 38) since they assist people to lead a life they want through protecting their extensive freedom. These are listed in the following way:

5.5.1 Political freedoms

For Sen (1999, p. 38), it can be seen as “freedom of political expression” meaning that the opportunity to analyse and to criticize state authorities, to participate in political dialogue and discussion, to have a voice about “who should govern” with “what principles” and freedom to make a choice among different political parties as a part of voting right.

5.5.2 Economic opportunities

It is described as “the opportunities that individuals respectively enjoy utilizing economic resources for the purpose of consumption, or production or exchange” (Sen, 1999, p. 39). It is argued that “economic entitlements” of a person are based on resources that are had and “the conditions of exchange such as relative prices and the working of the markets” (Sen, 1999, p. 39). Sen objects to arbitrary restrictions on participation in markets, for he argues that this attitude restrains development and growth. He prefers free markets instead of centrally planned economies since he thinks that they can make wrong choices and decisions for people. He worries about that. Besides that, even if a centrally planned economy did not make any mistake, it would be still problematic for Sen (1999) claiming that people should be free to make their own choices.

5.5.3 Social opportunities

It is argued that social arrangements made for education and health are sort of social opportunities that have the ability to affect person’s substantive freedoms or capabilities to live in a better way. These opportunities are seen as important due to their power to manage personal lives through providing to live a healthy life, preventing premature mortality and ensuring “more effective participation in economic and political activities” (Sen, 1999, p. 39). For instance, preventing illiteracy and supporting education can be useful to encourage participation in a society.

5.5.4 Transparency guarantees

Sen (1999, p. 39) argues that trust is the strength of a society in the basis of “transparency guarantees” associated with “the need for openness that people can expect”. In other words, it is the freedom to do business with a person under the protection of revelation and transparency with the related laws. It is considered as important due to provide protection against corruption, lacking responsibility and doing business behind a veil (Sen, 1999, p. 39).

5.5.5 Protective security

It aims to secure people harshly affected by material changes in their own lives such as starvation and strict conditions of extreme poverty through providing a social

safety net including institutional arrangements such as unemployment grants and additional incomes (Sen, 1999, p. 39, 40).

5.5.6 Role of those freedoms within his approach

Freedoms are thought as important in order to assist to protect capabilities. Sen (1999, p. 39, 40) argues that most attention has been attached to the changes in the income of a person. For, it is thought that increased and improved financial conditions can contribute to fund public services and to promote social security. Sen (1999, p. 40) tells that producing social opportunities with services including public education, medical care, free and active media can be helpful to promote not just economic development, but also alleviation in mortality rates. Also, birth rates can be decreased through encouraging importance of basic education, particularly based on female literacy and training on fertility attitudes. However, it seems to me that it should be paid attention to principles and processes, not just freedoms and security. For instance, he does not offer a principle of freedom precisely. Instead, he prefers to focus on different experiences and aspects of development. Also, he does not put them in order due to his regarding of complexity and diversity of human lives. However, this attitude makes it harder to apply his approach in practice. He advises and encourages public dialogue to do that (Wolff et al, 2015, p. 14, 15).

5.6 Public Dialogue and Participation

Public dialogue is considered as an important functioning in itself for Sen, but most importantly, it is very necessary for a working “agency oriented” view of capability approach (Sen, 1999, p. 11, 53, 281). If any disagreement occurs between development policies and cultural and social norms of a society, Sen advises public dialogue to handle it through freedom to choose and to have a voice in public. Nothing is imposed to follow by state or custom codes, in contrast, each person is free to choose what to follow within his approach. To make it clearer, it must be looked into his idea of agency and agent (Wolff et al, 2015, p. 15).

5.7 Life Expectancy

Sen (1999, p. 96) considers lifespan as a significant capability. He offers an example about people from African American community, who has higher income than

people in developing countries, but are not living longer. Therefore, he thinks that income is not the right way to measure poverty (Wolff et al, 2015, p. 14). So, if actual issue is based on capability rather than income, then it must be looked for relation between social endowments and equality of capability.

5.8 Natural Endowments and Social Endowments

In order to do that, firstly, it must be looked for distinction between natural endowments and social endowments. Natural endowments such as “handicaps and lack of talents” are defined as attributes of a person that restricts this person’s ability to produce “impersonal resources” and to achieve their ends or desires by “psychological or biological processes” (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 144). Following that it is argued that socially produced inequalities are occurred due to “social processes” that are interrelated to social endowments of people (ibid, p. 144, 145). In that sense, a social endowment is defined as an attribute of a person that intrinsically does not make any influence on life expectancies of the person, instead, it is interrelated to social structures and social processes that have effects on the person’s ability to produce “impersonal resources” and to achieve their ends (ibid, p. 145). It can be said that social endowments influence lifespan expectancies of a person in a different way that what natural endowments do.

For instance, skin color is offered as an example. Skin color is considered as a “personal attribute” that turns into a “social endowment (race)” in our societies due to its interaction with social structures and processes such as “history of slavery and colonialism, an ideology of white supremacy and black inferiority”, by that means, it is argued that it has ability to influence life chances and opportunities of a person. But, these inegalitarian influences do not occur by nature, in other words, it is said that they would not occur in a society in which skin color has “no social meaning” through social structures (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 145). In that point, it can be said that natural endowments cause inequalities through “biological and psychological processes” whereas social endowments influences “position of individuals” through “social structures” that adds up to “the accumulated effects of patterns of human behavior” (ibid, p. 145). For this reasons, social endowments are seen as far important in order to grasp the essence of inequality. Then, it should be

asked what is the relation between social endowments and equality of capability?
What do social endowments play a role in equality of capability?

5.8.1 Relation between social endowments and equality of capability

From perspective of capability approach, it is argued that social conversion factors enclose social processes that have interaction with social endowments (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 147). In other words, this means that people differ in terms of their abilities to convert resources into abilities (ibid, p. 147). Then, Sen (1990) tells that equality of capability is sensitive to the influences of social endowments and related social processes, for the capability approach pays attention to aims rather than instruments of well-being, in other words, to capabilities rather than resources (ibid, p. 147). In order to clarify it, gender is offered as an example. It's argued that in a gender hierarchical society, women become a subject of discrimination in terms of their labor. Following that, same internal resources such as skills and knowledge will allow women to attain less capability sets in comparison to men with similar resources, so that example shows us how gender becomes a social endowment that has interaction with social structures (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 147).

Briefly, Sen (1992, p. 117-128) essentially thinks that social endowments such as gender, class and race produce unfair inequalities. Thus, it is claimed that any inequality formed by a social process that has interaction with a social endowment will come out when it is made a comparison of capabilities among people (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 147). If it is preferred to evaluate inequalities in aims (capabilities) instead of instruments (resources), it is argued that "capability egalitarianism" spontaneously contains those inequalities produced by social endowments, for social endowments are considered as "constitutive factors" in the process of formation of well-being (ibid, p. 147). However, this does not mean that equality of capability can offer an efficient analyse for all socially formed inequalities. It is just argued as main point that equality of capability does not ignore any factor that affects people's well-being such as social endowments in contrast to equality of resources. Besides, it is paid attention to inequalities produced by social processes that depends on social endowments as different from equality of resources (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 148). So, it is clear how diverse social endowments create unfair inequalities and their influences on a person's capability sets and

development. Therefore, it's reasonable to say that capability approach prefers to focus on ends (capabilities) rather than means (resources), for it is thought that a person needs to have capabilities in order to convert resources into ability to realize one's own ends and to live a life what one wants to live. In that point, in order to clarify that, I will view conversion factors that are employed to convert resources into abilities through capabilities.

5.8.2 Conversion factors

Sen (1983) analyses "personal and impersonal resources" in his theory. Like as I mentioned above, he explains that through his example of bicycle. Following that, according to Sen, bicycle is not valuable itself as an impersonal resource. All we know that bicycle is used as a transportation, for it helps us to mobile. But, what if owner of that bicycle is someone who is handicapped, who live in a hill or a flooded area, who is limited by social customs from riding one's own bicycle, in that case, this person cannot have benefit from capabilities that could be formed by that commodity. For this reason, for Sen (1983), impersonal resources are considered as only means to achieve valuable ends such as capabilities.

In that sense, it is argued that the conversion of such impersonal resources into capabilities and functionings requires three sorts of conversion factors such as personal, environmental and social (Sen, 1992, p. 79-87; Robeyns, 2005, p. 99; Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 136). Personal conversion factors are personal attributes such as "intelligence, talents, skills and physical condition" whereas environmental conversion factors are attributes of the environment such as frequency of natural disasters like "earthquakes or floods" (Sen, 1992, p. 79-87; Robeyns, 2005, p. 99; Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 136). On the other hand, social conversion factors are attributes of the society a person lives such as "social norms, discriminating practices, societal hierarchies, gender and racial norms, infrastructure, public goods and social structures" that influences different aspects of a person in a different way (Sen, 1992, p. 79-87; Robeyns, 2005, p. 99; Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 136). It is argued that personal conversion factors are equivalent to Dworkin's idea of personal resources in which I mentioned in the previous chapter, but he is criticized not to be involved in other conversion factors such as environmental and social (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 136). Following that, therefore, Sen (1984, p.

323) resource based approaches such as Rawls's and Dworkin's criticize due to not attaching sufficient importance and attention to all aspects of human diversity, for he blames them to undervalue main problem of existing interpersonal differences among people in order to convert resources into capabilities. For these reasons, Sen (1990) argues that a theory of justice should focus on capabilities rather than resources. But he is criticized in terms of notion of justice by Thomas Pogge (2002).

5.8.3 Some criticism to Sen

Thomas Pogge (2002) considers capability approach insufficient in comparison to Rawlsian resourcism. Following that he criticizes capability approach, for not presenting any standard of social justice. In other words, he argues that capability approach cannot offer "a public criterion of social justice" that can be a strong and valid challenge against resourcist thoughts (Pogge, 2002, p. 167; Berges, 2007, p. 16, 17). He thinks that Sen exaggerates the difference between the capability approach and resourcist approaches. Then, according to Pogge (2002), this overrated difference corresponds to nothing more than an argument whether "natural human diversity" should be compensated. Particularly, natural human diversity means that mental or physical attributes that lead to lower ability for people to convert their resources into valuable functionings and that are not produced by "past or present social injustice" (Pogge, 2002; Berges, 2007, p. 17). Pogge argues that resourcist approaches can conform to human diversities just like what capability approach does (ibid, p. 17). So, he does not justify capability approach as "a self-standing theory of social justice" in spite of its contributions to resourcist approaches (ibid, p. 17, 18). Further, Pogge considers every capability inequality as an injustice that might require compensation or improvement (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 148).

5.9 Implications of Capability Approach on Poverty

The capability approach (CA) is an extensive normative framework that is used in a wide range of fields, including mostly development studies, welfare economics and political philosophy. It is also possible to use it in order to consider many dimensions of individual well-being such as inequality, poverty and injustice. Following that it rejects to consider maximization of utility and income as development and does not accept income as a measure of human well-being. From perspective of poverty,

according to Sen (1999, p. 87), inadequate income is an important and strong condition for a poor life but, not enough alone to consider well-being. That's why, instead of those, he prefers to focus on indicators of "substantive freedoms" one enjoys leading a kind of life one has reason to value by considering "individual advantages in terms of capabilities that a person has" (ibid, p. 87).

Then, he argues that poverty must be seen as deprivation of basic capabilities rather than only low income that reflects standard identification of poverty (ibid, p. 87). In other words, it is also defined as "failure to achieve certain minimal or basic capabilities, which means that "the ability to satisfy certain crucially important functionings up to certain minimally adequate levels" (Sen, 1993, p. 41). It is clear that by Sen (1993), poverty is considered as a failure to achieve particular basic capabilities and as an inability to realize certain important functionings in a minimum appropriate level. Further, according to him, poverty is a form of unfreedom that prevents a person to lead a life that one wants to live, for he argues that capability to function gives a person freedom to choose among possible livings that one wants to live (Sen, 1992, 1999, p. 37, 38).

Besides, he demands people to have agency that corresponds to an ability to "effectively shape their own destiny and help each other" and to be an agent who acts and brings about change (Sen, 1999, p. 11, 53, 281). Like as I mentioned in the previous sections, he also considers resources as merely instruments to obtain freedom. Therefore, he prefers to focus on objectives of human development instead of income and criticizes resource-based theories such as Rawls's and Dworkin's. For, he argues that to own resources is not enough itself since a person should have capability to convert resources into abilities to realize one's ends and to live a life what one wants. So, he pays attention to all aspects of human diversity through viewing conversion factors people have. I argue that capability approach is quite useful to offer limitations of the concept of poverty, but it should also be counted as a theory of human development against whole human deprivations, not just specifically poverty. For, it should be accepted that Sen offers a more structural definition of poverty than others like as I mentioned in the first chapter of my thesis but it has also been criticized that replacing traditional definition of poverty with capability deprivation will be leading some problems based on measurement (Wolff

et al, 2015; Lister, 2004). For, there is no mostly approved existing measure of capability poverty. But, according to me, it is not such a big problem. It is just consequence of way we prefer to define poverty. In fact, we could have a bigger problem based on limited and incomplete definition of poverty if we were stick to its traditional definition.

Besides that, most importantly, it is thought that studies and researches based on a traditional thought that defines poverty as lack of resources since more than a century will be wasting. But I also disagree to that. For, having more comprehensive and developed definition of poverty would be better to grasp and to handle it. This does not waste previous studies in regard to poverty. In contrast, it indicates us that we are moving forward and developing in our studies of poverty. Therefore, I define poverty as a humanly imposed condition that can be preventable by other non-poor people and based on involuntarily lacking internal and external resources that are required to meet basic needs, to have physical efficiency and to have self-realization in a person's life. My definition supports my thoughts. For, in my definition, internal resources correspond to personal resources such as strengths, skills and education whereas external resources refer to income, wealth and entitlement to services.

6. HYBRID APPROACH

In the previous chapters, I have analyzed what poverty is and what is wrong with it. Then, I have searched what contemporary approaches of social justice imply for poverty. Following that, in my last chapter, I viewed capability approach of Amartya Kumar Sen (1985, 1992, 1999) who claims that development should be perceived as enlargement of human capabilities instead of maximizing utility, pleasures, income or resources and defines poverty as capability deprivation. However, in this chapter, I ask which approach among them best handles the problem of poverty. Then, with all criticisms from all approaches I have analyzed in the previous chapters such as utilitarian approach, resourcist approach and capabilities approach, I propose to form a hybrid approach in order to handle the problem of poverty.

For, I argue that a hybrid approach is more useful than sticking to only one of them, for it should be changing and developing according to different circumstances and conditions of being poor with a comprehensive and resourcist definition of poverty. In this chapter, firstly, I will attempt to explain main strengths and weaknesses of these three approaches. Then, I will clarify how to combine these three approaches in one particular approach. Secondly, I will elucidate why we need a hybrid approach to handle the problem of poverty. Following that, I will explain what the hybrid approach is and what its criterias are. Thirdly, I will indicate primary differences between hybrid approach and capability approach. Further, I will express contributions of the hybrid approach to other approaches I have analyzed in the previous chapters and to field. Then, I will also analyze its implications.

6.1 Main Strengths and Weaknesses of Utilitarian, Resourcist and Capability Approaches

Utilitarian approach, resourcist approach and capabilities approach have both strengths and weaknesses like other political and moral theories within the field. In that sense, it is reasonable to say that they have not just remarkable and strong aspects that are wise to add them into the hybrid approach but also they have some

weak aspects that would not help us to handle poverty and therefore, that must be left outside of the hybrid approach. In the light of that, in that section, I will consider their strong and weak aspects particularly in regard to the problem of poverty.

6.1.1 Utilitarian approach with its main strengths and weaknesses

Utilitarian approach has plenty of strength that makes it beneficial and powerful as a political morality, particularly in regard to poverty. First strength of it is that utilitarians aim to promote human happiness, welfare or well-being. Such an aim is not just simple but also remarkable, for happiness is something valuable and is desired to be reached for everyone in their own lives (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 11). It seems to me that this makes utilitarian approach capable of reaching everyone in a society through that aim. On the other hand, secondly, its consequentialist structure is one of its strengths because it allows us to check consequences of an action or policy in order to justify it in terms of its harms and benefits. It is a strength, for it is likely to claim that by its consequentialist structure, it gives us an opportunity to prevent “arbitrary moral prohibitions” and harming social traditions (ibid, p. 11). This corresponds to a utilitarian attitude that makes an action or policy morally bad if it makes one’s life worse or less happy. By that, it protects people from arbitrary judgements of other people in regard to morality and social customs (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 11).

Further, its another strength is to be considered as “historically progressive” for, it wants traditional, cultural or religious rules to be checked and tested toward their contribution to human development (ibid, p. 12). That’s why, it is inclined to protect people from any harm or oppression deriving from any authority over them, for this reason, it is seen as an important and efficient instrument for fight against prejudice and superstition (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 12). Then, it remarkably pays our attention to importance of human happiness and well-being, and demands us to check rules and policies for their contribution on human well-being (ibid, p. 12). This means that primary social institutions are responsible to act in harmony with utilitarian principles (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 21, 22). This makes it far powerful in regard to poverty in that sense. In addition, another strength of it is that it aims to treat people as equals (ibid, p. 37). So it considers all affected equally in a situation, for according to utilitarian thinking, human beings are important and that importance of each is

equal (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 43). Utilitarian approach is seen as the probable easiest way to offer equal consideration to each person (Hare, 1984, p. 107; Harsanyi, 1976, p. 35). Following that, its easiness and simplicity can be considered as one of its important strengths. Moreover, another important strength of utilitarian thinking is its applicability to not just individuals, but also actions, rules and governments, and its simplicity to practice on governmental policies. Further, it is aware of how much important human self-development and progress and attaches importance to that. Also, it seems well-structured to provide security and equality and to meet basic needs for people. In addition to that, it can be said that rule-utilitarian approach is the most significant strength of it, for it has ability to handle and figure out weaknesses of utilitarian thinking deriving from deficiencies and unattractive points of simple form of utilitarian approach that is act-utilitarian approach (Bennett, 2010, p. 65). For, it actually figures out the problem of unwieldy calculation of utility and also solves the problems that make utilitarian approach self-defeating (ibid, p. 65).

In spite of all these strengths, utilitarian approach has also some important weaknesses that need to be paid attention. Weaknesses of utilitarian approach mostly derive from act-utilitarian approach particularly due to its procedure of utility calculation and its primarily controversial concept of equality. In that sense, first weakness of utilitarian thinking is its clumsy nature, therefore, it is considered as “self-defeating” (Bennett, 2010, p. 61). This is due to its way to do utilitarian calculation. Problem that makes utilitarian approach weak in that calculation is that there are great numbers of possible alternatives available to an individual and this adds up to suffocating amount of utilitarian calculation. This makes it weak and self-defeating because it was claiming that making the world or society better and happier is its primary value (ibid, p. 61). But, if utilitarian agents become busy through spending their entire time to make these calculations, then they do not have any remaining time to achieve their own happiness or prevent or alleviate their own pain (ibid, p. 61). Its second weakness is based on its harming attitude toward special relationships. Particularly, it does not take into account special relationships that require some kind of personal attachment and obligation such as family, friends, colleague, etc (Bennett, 2010, p. 61; Kymlicka, 2002, p. 22). For, the morally obliged individual called as u-agent by David Brink (1986) determines how to act according

to utilitarian calculations and have the same moral relationship with every person, in other words, this means that no one has a morally distinctive feature in the basis of relationship for them. Clearly, this argument indicates us that utilitarian thinking does not allow people to have special relationships (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 22). But, in contrast to that, a person prefers to spend his time and money particularly for his own family members or friends rather than other people, and this connection among people requires special consideration and obligation to these people in comparison to other people (Bennett, 2010, p. 61). In fact, obviously, such existing attachments among people goes against utilitarian commitment to equality, impartiality and public welfare (Bennett, 2010, p. 61). In fact, obviously, such existing attachments among people goes against utilitarian commitment to equality, impartiality and public welfare (Bennett, 2010, p. 61). In other words, this utilitarian commitment does not fit to human beings' habitual ways of living and that makes it weak.

Third weakness of it is based on its ignorance that people needs to have their own "spare time" and to realize their own projects (Bennett, 2010, p. 62). For, it is clear that a human life that is worth to live requires to have some achievements and to realize a project that will be giving some meaning to our lives and actions (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 26). However, utilitarian thinking offers no "spare time" to people, for as requirement of utilitarian decision-making, actions of u-agent is dependent on other people's commitments rather than his own (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 26; Bennett, 2010, p. 62). Bernard Williams (1981, p. 51, 53) argues that this leads to a sort of "alienation" between people and their commitments and projects that make their lives more meaningful and better. Problem is that it is expected from a person to spend equal and same effort for other people's projects with his own. By that, it is demanded to sacrifice his commitments and projects at the expense of more utility (ibid, p. 51, 53). In that condition, u-agent will be far restricted in regard to his preferences on how to lead his own life, what kind of person he desires to be and his job opportunities. After all, he will not be a free person and will be deprived of a personal area to form and realize his own commitments and projects in order to lead his own life freely as he pleases (Williams,1973, p. 115). It shows us that both special relationships and all personal projects are threatened by utilitarian morality (Bennett, 2010, p. 62). For these reasons, it is reasonable to argue that such

procedure of utilitarian decision-making and its unrealistic expectations from people are very important weaknesses of it. Fourth weakness is that it causes immoral consequences and it's self-defeating. For, it would not allow people to have social customs such as promising that promote general happiness and welfare (Bennett, 2010, p. 63). Further, its another weakness is that it has an unrealistic notion of human capacity and rationality. For utilitarian thinking, human beings are primarily rational maximizers and aim to maximize their own interest and/or the public interest. According to that, people would be good in calculating diverse alternatives and their costs and benefits, but in contrast to that, it's said that human beings do not think and behave in that way. In other words, they do not make a calculation on each action. Instead, they lead "patterns of behaviour", and create habits. By those patterns, they do not have to deal with unlikely duty of calculating each action (Bennett, 2010, p. 63).

Moreover, its another weakness is that utilitarians overvalue the capacity of human rationality to cope with "social context", then on the contrary, the fact is that human beings are "social creatures" and they have a limited capacity to think and behave beyond their social environment. This means that people's ways to think and behave are socially conditioned (ibid, p. 63). In that sense, it's claimed that human beings largely lead socially constituted practises and rules instead of shaping themselves in accordance with their own utility calculation. Briefly, it seems that act-utilitarian approach does not conform to the ways human beings think and behave (Bennett, 2010, p. 63). Further weakness of utilitarian approach derives from its attitude toward minorities in society. It harms minorities in society through its way of decision-making. Particularly, preferences of minorities might be undermined by preferences of majority during utility calculation. Also, utilitarian approach gives equal weight to each sort of preference. At first sight, that sounds something good. But, if we deeply reflect on that, it can be seen that due to this attitude, illegitimate, selfish or abusing demands of majority can be satisfied in order to maximize utility. It's obvious that all preferences are not legitimate and informed. To count such preferences in the utility calculation would be unfair and discrimination toward minorities in the society (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 27). In that point, it is reasonable to say that this unfair condition makes it weak in that sense. Then, its further weakness

presented by John Rawls (1971) is that there are no restrictions placed in right, justice and preference satisfaction within it in order to determine which satisfaction is to be obtained. Therefore, for him, unfair selfish preferences should not be included into social calculation in order to protect people's right from implausible demands and preferences of other people (Rawls, 1971; p. 24). So, it seems that lack of control mechanism in regard to preference satisfaction is its another weakness.

Moreover, it's likely to mention an another weakness in regard to negative effect of its utility calculation. Specifically, some utilitarians argue that giving priority to the utility calculation would diminish utility in the very opposite way (Goodin, 1995, p. 22; Singer, 1977). For, they think that this would harm social cooperation, produce fear, anxiety and mistrust, and lead to diminish value of human life and freedom (Goodin, 1995, p. 22; Singer, 1977). This does not fit to its promise of greater happiness and better society. Also, there is a potential of weakness, that is, people may tend to misuse those utilitarian principles in order to not keep promises or discriminate among people for the sake of common good (Bailey, 1997). In addition, its another weakness is based on its inadequate account of equality. Specifically, it's claimed that it has misread the notion of equal consideration for each person's interest. Then, this mistake enables some people, particularly minorities to be treated less than equals and makes them instruments for aims of other people (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 37). Even though rule-utilitarian approach has capacity to handle those weaknesses deriving from act-utilitarian approach, its principles are incorporating with other theories (Bennett, 2010, p. 64).

6.1.2 Resourcist approach with its main strengths and weaknesses

John Rawls's theory of justice and ideas of Ronald Dworkin have both some strengths and weaknesses. I will start with Rawls's theory. It is likely to offer certain strengths related to his theory based on a theoretical device called original position that is a hypothetical thought experiment on choice (Rawls, 1971, 2001). The first and main strength of his theory is his idea of fairness in regard to distributive justice and liberty. For, his idea of justice as fairness is basically associated with his way to distribute fundamental rights and duties through basic social institutions and to identify distribution of advantages with social cooperation (Rawls, 1971, p.4-6, 47, 2001, p. 5, 6). In the light of that, second strength of his theory is based on his

attention paid to liberty and equality. For he says, “All inequalities be justified to the least advantaged.” (Rawls, 1971, p. 250). In that sense, for Rawls (1971, p. 4, 6), a just society is society of equals that aims to have mutual advantage for everyone involved to social cooperation. Then, its third strength is his notion of fair distribution. For him, it corresponds to mutually agreed principles of justice that ensure a just, neutral and prejudiced standpoint from struggle of interests to have a solution for disagreements (Rawls, 1971, p. 5). Then, fourth strength is his idea of society based on “a fair system of social cooperation” with citizens as “free and equal persons” (Rawls, 2001, p. 18, 19). It is a strength, for he aims to reach a structure of society that is well-ordered and democratic through a fair system based on social cooperation with participation of free and equal citizens (ibid, p. 8, 9, 18, 19).

Further, his attention to basic structure of society is a remarkable strength within his theory since it depends on an important aim. For, particularly, it is argued that inequalities in the basic structure have impacts on a person’s chances and opportunities in their own lives and identify their personal expectations and hopes as an individual (Rawls, 1971, p. 6, 7). Then, it is said that in the basic structure, there are different social positions individuals belong to and these positions are capable to materially influence one’s life (Rawls, 1971, p. 7, 13). Therefore, he aims to fix such inequalities and unfair positions in the basic structure through his theory of justice mostly based on his notion of social cooperation for mutual benefit, primary goods and principles of justice. In that sense, it is reasonable to say that his idea of society and his way to distribute fundamental rights and duties through basic social institutions are important strengths. For, he presents some primary thoughts for a democratic society through them. This form of society tells us that Rawlsian society and its citizen has a capacity to understand and implement principles of justice through social cooperation for mutual benefit. Also, they have a capacity for the concept of good for all (Rawls, 1971). Then, another strength of his theory is his fair and equal way to provide social cooperation. Particularly, his theory of justice intends to make social cooperation possible through his thought experiment that is original position with veil of ignorance, even if it is hypothetical, for the sake of mutual benefit of each person in society with the condition that allows every person

to participate as equals (Rawls, 1971, 2001). According to that, people are placed in the original position are entitled to choose the principles that compose the basic structure of society and the principles that will be implemented to individuals. To treat all people as equals in that process and to protect the choice of principles of justice from partiality and unfairness, they must be chosen behind “veil of ignorance” (Rawls, 1971, 2001).

This condition of choice is a strength because Rawls (1999, p. 118) aims to “nullify the effects of specific contingencies that put men at odds and tempt them to exploit social and natural circumstances to their own advantage”. For, behind the veil of ignorance, people are deprived of particular information that may lead to make a choice just toward their own advantage. Therefore, parties do not know their place in society such as class and social status, their race and gender, their possible luck in the distribution of natural wealth, abilities and talents like intelligence and certain conditions of their society like economic, political and cultural situation. This is a strength, for this means that they’re fairly placed as free and equal persons with no advantaged or disadvantaged position coming from their natural fortune and social conditions and thus, they do not have any chance to tailor principles of justice to their own benefit (Rawls, 1971, p. 12). This should be counted as the most important and valuable strength for it achieves something ethically valuable and important for the least advantaged or the poor in society. Particularly, it equalizes people through veil of ignorance and to some extent it removes chance of people to differentiate themselves from the others. It is argued that in a sense parties are “forced to choose for everyone” and obliged “to take the good of others into account” (Rawls, 1971, p. 140, 148). In other words, they are compelled to question what if they were the most advantaged or least advantaged in society. It is quite remarkable for an account concerned with poverty and inequality, for it asks us to consider things from the situation of the worst-off, and consider whether poverty or inequality can be justified from their perspective.

Moreover, choosing principles of justice by such a just way is important strength since people who are ignored, denied and excluded from society like poor people become apparent and then, more advantaged people are forced to imagine lives of the least advantaged, well- off or poor people and to take notice it in decision making

process. This is what we exactly need in our societies. Further, his primary goods make also his theory strong. For, primary goods refers to diverse “social conditions and all-purpose means” that are required for people to improve, to implement their moral powers and to obtain their conception of the good (Rawls, 2001, p. 57). In other words, these goods are needed by people to lead a complete life as free and equal persons (ibid, p. 58). They are important strenghts for he argues that all rational people demand them to realize their own aims and plans in their lives (Rawls, 1971, p. 62).

There is a further strength related to how primary goods are shared among people. He wants us to suppose an initial distribution in which they are equally shared by each person. In that point, his principles of justice are implemented. If any inequality occurs as a result of initial equal distribution, it is only justified if it makes every person more affluent (Rawls, 1971, p. 62). For him, this distribution can be considered as a criteria for equality. Therefore, such a fair distribution makes his theory stronger. So, another important strength derives from his principles of justice, for fair share of primary goods is arranged through them (Rawls, 2001, p. 59). Particularly, his just society is ruled by his two principles of justice: first principle offers equal basic liberties for all. Second principle is about arranging social and economic inequalities to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged and providing fair equality of opportunity to all. So, it’s said that all social primary goods including liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and bases of self-respect are distributed except an unequal distribution of these goods is to the benefit of the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971). Thus, briefly, it is clear that his notion of equality, grasp of justice and idea of just society offer equal respect and treatment for all (Rawls, 1971, p.14; Lotter, 2010). Therefore, they compose of important dimensions that form the main strenghts of his theory. But, in spite of valuable strengths, his theory has also some weaknesses.

The first weakness is that objectivity placed in original position is hard to practice in actual life. People might not be so objective when they decide to what kind of society they want to live and how to arrange it. In that sense, they might be reluctant to adopt such a criteria of equality and justice in which Rawls implemented. But, this condition does not change how his theory is a good guide in regard to what ought to

do in terms of equality and justice. The second weakness is that he is not attaching sufficient importance to all aspects of human diversity, in order to see personal differences of converting resources to capabilities by virtue of handicaps of some people (Sen, 1984, p. 323). Particularly, being owner of resources may not be enough to benefit from them. Instead, people may need to have capability to convert resources into abilities in order to lead their lives as they please (ibid, p. 323). Rawls does not pay attention to that in his theory. Further, third weakness is that he does not offer social minimum in his theory. According to me, it is not a harsh weakness that cannot be tolerated because it offers a good form of protection to the least advantaged members of society. I think that he is aware of that lack, but his theory does not fit to add social minimum into it.

On the other hand, Dworkin's ideas based on resource egalitarianism have both some strengths and weaknesses. The first strength is that his distinction among resources as personal and impersonal (Dworkin, 2000, p. 322, 323). According to him, personal resources of a person represents his "physical and mental health and ability", "general fitness and capacities", "wealth-talent", "innate capacity to produce goods or services that others will pay to have" whereas impersonal resources are defined as "resources that can be assigned from one person to another" such as his "wealth and the other property he commands, and opportunities provided to him" (ibid, 322, 323). Second strength is based on his perspective to natural endowments. For, he argues that according to equality of resources, people should have access to reach equal amount of resources, but people have different sorts and amounts of personal resources because of their natural endowments that restricts their ability to produce impersonal resources (Dworkin, 2000, p. 73-92; p. 81, 287, 322). In other words, he does not accept unequal distribution of resources as a result natural endowments since he thinks that natural endowments are defined as attributes of a person that restricts his ability to produce impersonal resources and to achieve his own aims such as handicaps and lack of talent (Dworkin, 2000, p. 81, 287, 322; Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 144). In that sense, it is reasonable to say that his awareness in regard to importance of natural endowments is the main strength of his thoughts. Then, he proposes to offer compensation only to people with burden of unchosen circumstance without their own choices. Also, for him, unequal

distribution of resources as a result of choice is acceptable. This sensitivity to choice forms main weakness of his thoughts. For, his harsh attitude does not give people any chance to make wrong choices and decisions in their own lives. Therefore, he has an unrealistic perspective of human being, for he is not aware that people are always open to mistakes and deserve to be compensated with a social minimum just because they are human. Also, for me, another weakness is that his procedure of envy-test is too subjective and untrustable in order to check fairness in the egalitarian distribution of resources within his thought experiment.

6.1.3 Capability approach with its main strengths and weaknesses

There are some strengths and weaknesses of capability approach and I will explain them briefly. The first and foremost strength of capability approach is that it offers a comprehensive and well-ordered theory of human development through his primary concepts such as capability, functioning and agency; and further, it attaches sufficient importance to all aspects of human diversity in order to see personal differences of converting resources to capabilities by virtue of handicaps of some people (Sen, 1984, p. 323).

Second strength is about his argument based on relation between capability and resources. According to that, he claims that to be owner of a resource is not enough itself, for a person needs to have capabilities in order to convert resources into abilities to realize one's own ends and to live a life what one wants to live (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 147, 148). Third strength depends on its awareness to importance of natural and social endowments. For, natural endowments such as "handicaps and lack of talents" are defined as attributes of a person that restricts his ability to produce "impersonal resources" and to achieve his ends or desires by "psychological or biological processes" (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 144). Then, it is argued that socially produced inequalities are occurred due to "social processes" that are interrelated to social endowments of people (ibid, p. 144, 145). In that sense, a social endowment is defined as an attribute of a person that intrinsically does not make any influence on life expectancies of the person. Instead, it is interrelated to social structures and social processes that have effects on the person's ability to produce "impersonal resources" and to achieve their ends (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 145).

Another important strength is its attention to the relation between social endowments and equality of capability. In that sense, Sen (1992, p. 117-128) essentially thinks that social endowments such as gender, class and race produce unfair inequalities and have important influences on a person's capability sets and development. Following that, it is argued that social conversion factors enclose social processes that have interaction with social endowments (Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 147). In other words, this means that people differs in terms of their abilities to convert resources into abilities (ibid, p. 147). In that point, its attention to conversion factors is a strength. Particularly, Sen (1983) analyses "personal and impersonal resources" in his approach. He explains this through his example of bicycle. Then, according to him, bicycle is not valuable itself as an impersonal resource. All we know that bicycle is used as a transportation, for it helps us to mobile. But, what if owner of that bicycle is someone who is handicapped, who live in a hill or a flooded area, who is limited by social customs from riding one's own bicycle. In those conditions, this person cannot have benefit from capabilities that could be formed by that commodity. Therefore, for Sen (1983), impersonal resources are considered as only means to achieve valuable ends such as capabilities. In that sense, it is argued that the conversion of such impersonal resources into capabilities and functionings requires three sorts of conversion factors such as personal, environmental and social (Sen, 1992, p. 79-87; Robeyns, 2005, p. 99; Pierik and Robeyns, 2007, p. 136).

Further strength is his idea of substantive freedom. According to that, he defends a moral aim telling that all individuals should have a substantive freedom in order to lead a life they have reason to value. For that, he focuses on a person's functionings and capabilities as their achievements and, their potential and opportunity to achieve (Sen, 1990; 1992, p. 38). Therefore, the most important strength of his approach is its primary concepts such as capability, functionings and agency. For, his understanding of development is based on his idea of capabilities perceived as a sort of substantive freedom (Sen, 1992, p. 39, 40; 1997). Sen (1980) considers a person's capability set as a whole of alternative sets of functionings that a person could achieve. In that point, it can be said that in a sense, capabilities are a person's opportunities whereas functionings are related to achievements or what a person actually is and does in his life, including has adequate nutrition, safe and well shelter, clothing, good job, living

long and happy life, has self-respect, participating in the community life and has supportive friends, colleagues and family members. Sen (1992, p. 39, 40). Therefore, it is argued that it should be paid attention to the capabilities of people in order to provide them an opportunity to lead a life they value and they have reason to value (Sen, 1992). Also, Sen thinks that to own primary goods is not enough itself, for person must have capability to convert primary goods into ability to realize one's ends and to live a life what one wants to live. (Robeyns, 2010, p. 74). Then, it can be said that to be owner of a good capability set determines a person's development. On the other hand, another important strength is that capability approach has an agent-oriented structure (Sen, 1999, p. 11, 53, 281). For, agency is perceived as ability to "effectively shape their own destiny and help each other" and agent is defined as someone who acts and brings about change by Sen (1999, p. 11, 53, 281).

Moreover, his idea of human development presented through his approach is a strength. For, Sen (1985, 1992, 1999, p. xii) claims that development should be considered as the enlargement of human capabilities rather than maximizing utility, pleasures or income, at the same time, as "an integrated process of expansion of substantive freedoms that connect with one another". According to that, both expansion of human capabilities and integration of economic, social and political determinants have a high priority for development. For Sen, this perspective gives us chance to see better importance of development of diverse institutions including markets, governments, political parties and capabilities for opportunities to have a public dialogue and participation. He also takes into account the effects of cultural and social norms on person's opportunities. For instance, he pays attention to given traditional gender roles within some societies and their strong influences to limit the opportunities of women through his approach. It is argued that development necessitates to eliminate diverse forms of unfreedoms such as ineffective institutions, social arrangements and lack of political freedoms.

Beside these strengths, capability approach has also some weaknesses. The first one is that it extremely underestimates the role of resources in human development although it is right in regard to importance of capability and conversion factors. The second weakness is that it does not offer an argument based on what kind of basic structure of society and state arrangements we need. He demands us to eliminate

diverse forms of unfreedoms deriving from ineffective institutions, social arrangements and lack of political freedoms for the sake of human development. But, he does not tell us concretely how we can do that. Third and last weakness is that it does not tell anything in regard to social justice (Pogge, 2002). In the light of these strengths and weaknesses of each approach, we should question why we should prefer a hybrid approach instead of one of these approaches and why we need it. Therefore, in the next section, I aim to offer an answer to that.

6.2 Why We Need a Hybrid Approach

Hybrid approach is needed since these three approaches are not sufficient alone to grasp and to handle poverty. But, hybrid approach offers us a guiding path to grasp and to handle poverty in a comprehensive way. Particularly, it shows us what we ought to do in regard to poverty and how we should grasp it. It is more powerful and beneficial as combination of just two of them, namely, resourcist approach and capabilities approach in fight against poverty. For, it makes a remarkable balance on competing values of the two. This is what a correct theory should do and that's why we need it. For, we particularly need an approach that is not just capable of completing deficiencies and leaving weaknesses outside and but also forms a beneficial balance on competing values and principles of the two in regard to the problem of poverty. In the formation of hybrid approach, I preferred to leave utilitarian approach outside because when we looked into utilitarian approach, things that are valuable within it are incorporating with other approaches. Then, in the next section, in the light of those, I will define what hybrid approach is.

6.3 What a Hybrid Approach is

Hybrid approach is a hybrid of advocating aspects of these two approaches in terms of poverty such as resourcist approach and capability approach. In other words, hybrid approach is a hybrid system of thoughts that offer us a just society literally composed of equals who impartially chooses principles of such a just society and implements principles of justice and but also composed of agents who has ability to bring change in regard to poverty and human development. In the light of those phrases, it is clear that hybrid approach attempts to complete deficient and

insufficient aspects of current approaches in order to handle the problem of poverty. Therefore, in that point, it is reasonable to say that hybrid approach is an approach that aims not only to handle the problem of poverty through completing and improving deficient and insufficient aspects of current approaches, but also to improve itself through changing and developing according to different circumstances of being poor without sticking to traditional definition of poverty. It offers us a beneficial balance on competing values of current approaches and plays a role of life saver glue by combining such current approaches and making them stronger in order to handle poverty. Then, in that point, it must be asked what kind of combination should be implemented with these approaches to form the hybrid approach.

6.3.1 What kind of combination with these approaches

In that section, I attempt to explain how these approaches should be combined and how these different theories fit together. First of all, I organize a hybrid approach that is formed through combining these two approaches that are resourcist approach and capabilities approach according to my definition of poverty and their strenghts that help us to handle the problem of poverty. In the formation of hybrid approach, I preferred to leave utilitarian approach outside because when we looked into utilitarian approach, things that are valuable within it are incorporating with other approaches. Then, I aim to combine them by uniting their main aspects that are not reconcilable. It is better to explain this by an example.

For instance, for resourcists, what matters is something objective that is resources but on the other hand, for capability approach, what matters is capability. At first, their main aspects may not seem as reconciled. But if we consider resources as internal and external resources, we can accommodate them in one approach. For, internal resources correspond to personal resources such as strengths, skills and education whereas external resources refer to income, wealth and entitlement to services. In the hybrid approach, the most important thing in regard to capability is its important role to convert resources into abilites that will help us to lead our lives well. Its another importance that is paid attention is to be owner of a good capability set in a person's life. In the light of those, resource is the main aspect for hybrid approach in harmony with my definition of poverty. For, I simply thought that aim of hybrid approach is to handle poverty as we know. When they are combined in that way, they can serve

well together for their common aim. Following that, in the next section, I will explain which parts of these two approaches will be bringing together in the hybrid approach and how hybrid approach should be.

6.3.2 Which parts will be bringing together in hybrid approach?

After that, in that point, the most important thing is that which parts of resourcist approach and capabilities approach that will be bringing together in the hybrid approach in order to make it beneficial and strong for handling the problem of poverty. In other words, in that section, question that requires to be replied is what hybrid approach is composed of and how it should be. First of all, in a hybrid approach, thought of a just society should be performed and such a just society should be society of equals (Rawls, 1971). Following that, it must pay attention to fair distribution of fundamental rights, duties and liberties through basic social institutions (Rawls, 1971). In that sense, mutual advantages should be distributed with social cooperation (Rawls, 1971, p. 4-6, 47, 2001, p. 5, 6). In other words, society of equals should aim to have mutual advantage for everyone involved to social cooperation (Rawls, 1971, p. 4, 6).

Also, in hybrid approach, there must be a fair distribution of primary goods. For that, it should be applied mutually agreed principles of justice that ensure a just, neutral and prejudiced standpoint from struggle of interests to have a solution for disagreements (Rawls, 1971, p. 5). Further, all inequalities should be justified to the benefit of the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971, p. 250). Secondly, in hybrid approach, basic structure of society should be well-ordered and democratic in “a fair system of social cooperation” with participation of citizens as “free and equal persons” (Rawls, 2001, p. 8, 9, 18, 19). Such a basic structure is important in regard to poverty and should be placed in hybrid approach. For, inequalities in basic structure have impacts on a person’s chances and opportunities in their own lives, and identify their personal expectations and hopes as an individual (Rawls, 1971, p. 6, 7). Also, different social positions placed in the basic structure are capable to materially influence a person’s life (Rawls, 1971, p. 7, 13). Therefore, in the hybrid approach, it must be aimed to fix such inequalities and unfair positions in the basic structure through notion of social cooperation for mutual benefit, primary goods, and principles of justice (Rawls, 1971). So, briefly, it is reasonable to say that it must be applied a particular

notion of equality, grasp of justice and idea of society within hybrid approach. Following that, the idea of society should offer equal respect and treatment for all (Rawls, 1971, p. 14; Lotter, 2010).

Thirdly, people should be impartial as much as they are in the original position. They should make their choices and decisions impartially like they are behind “veil of ignorance” (Rawls, 1971). Then, they should choose the principles that compose the basic structure of the society they live in. Also, they choose the principles that will be implemented to individuals. In that process, all people should be treated as equals. Therefore, people should pretend that they are really in the original position and behind veil of ignorance and be impartial as requirement of equality and fairness. So, it can be said that the hybrid approach should equalize people through impartiality and should remove chance of people to differentiate themselves from the others. Then, they should consider the things from the situation of the worst-off (Rawls, 1971). Following that, people should be “forced to choose for everyone” and obliged “to take the good of other into account” (Rawls, 1971, p. 140, 148).

Choosing principles of justice through such a just way is important in hybrid approach, for by that, people who are ignored, denied and excluded from society like poor people become apparent in the basis of their living conditions because more advantaged people are forced to imagine and consider lives of the least advantaged, well- off or poor people and to take notice it in decision making process. In that sense, primary goods should be applied in hybrid approach. For, they are necessary to lead a complete life as free and equal persons (Rawls, 2001, p. 58). Further, principles of justice should also be implemented for a just, developed and unpoor society. Also, they are primarily needed to have a fair share of primary goods (Rawls, 2001, p. 59). In the light of principles of justice, in hybrid approach, each person should has an equal right to have the most extensive and appropriate disposal of equal basic liberties that are compatible with a same disposal of liberty for all. Then, social and economic inequalities should be arranged to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged. Also, offices and positions should be open to all through conditions of fair equality of opportunity (Rawls, 2001, p. 59). This means that in hybrid approach, all social primary goods including liberty and opportunity, income and wealth and bases of self-respect should be distributed, except an unequal

distribution of these goods, to the benefit of the least advantaged or to the poor (Rawls, 1971).

Furthermore, hybrid approach should be aware of importance of natural and social endowments. Then, it should offer compensation to both option and brute luck just due to humanity. It should not be so sensitive to choice. In other words, it should not be so strict for wrong choices and mistakes of people. For, it should be aware that people can make mistakes because they are not perfect. This also means that it should have a realistic sense of human being. Following that, it should offer a social minimum to compensate when it is required for people who are in trouble. Moreover, it should pay attention to the importance to have a good capability set (Sen, 1999). It should be aware that people need capabilities to convert resources into abilities in order to realize their ends and to lead a life as they please. Following that, it should include term of agency (Sen, 1999). For, only an agent can get rid of and handle the problem of poverty. Therefore, in order to handle the problem of poverty through hybrid approach, we need a society that composes of agents. For, an agent is someone who acts and brings about change and has ability to “effectively shape their own destiny and help each other” (Sen, 1999, p. 11, 53, 281).

Then, it should adopt an understanding of human development based on idea of capabilities perceived as a sort of substantive freedom (Sen, 1992, p. 39, 40; 1997). In that sense, all individuals should have a substantive freedom in order to lead a life they have reason to value. For that, it should focus on a person’s functionings and capabilities as their achievements and their potential and opportunity to achieve (Sen, 1990; 1992, p. 38). In other words, hybrid approach adopts capabilities and functionings because they are remarkable signs of a good life, for capabilities are a person’s opportunities whereas functionings are related to achievements or what a person actually is and does in his life, including has adequate nutrition, safe and well shelter, clothing, good job, living long and happy life, has self-respect, participating in the community life and has supportive friends, colleagues and family members (Sen, 1992, p. 39, 40). These aspects are needed by everyone to lead a decent and good life with self-development and free from poverty. Further, it should aim to eliminate diverse forms of unfreedoms such as ineffective institutions, social arrangements and lack of political freedoms as requirement of human development.

Besides, when it defines poverty, it should not be stick to traditional definition of poverty. Rather, it should be aware of natural and social endowments and should take into account of internal and external resources. In this respect, I'm close to the capability approach. But, it has been criticized for not being easily measurable in regard to its poverty definition. I think that it is not such a big problem. It is just consequence of way of defining poverty. In the next sections, I will explain what differs between hybrid approach and capability approach. Then, in the light of those, I will explain what criterias the hybrid approach should have in harmony with its aims.

6.3.3 What differs between hybrid approach and capability approach?

Hybrid approach is close to the capability approach. But there are also some important differences among them. First of all, capability approach does not question what kind of basic structure of society we need in regard to poverty. But hybrid approach thinks over that. It adopts a just society composed of equals in a well-ordered, democratic and fair system with participation of free and equal persons. Secondly, capability approach does not deeply think of what kind of state arrangement we need in order to handle poverty. Sen (1999) just argues that there is no way to live in poverty in a democratic political system, for if it occurs, government that is responsible from poverty will not be re-elected in the next elections. But Sen might be wrong because today poverty unfortunately occurs in democracies, too. It is obvious that in regard to cope with poverty, we need to put forth something stronger as an addition to his argument of democracy such as fairness. Therefore, for instance, hybrid approach focuses on fair distribution of rights and duties through social and political institutions. Thirdly, capability approach does not ask how we can provide political participation with impartiality and fairness in a democratic system. But hybrid approach does. It gives people an opportunity to be placed as free and equal persons with participation to choose principles that compose basic structure of their society and principles that identifies justice. In addition, capability approach prefers to focus on individuals and their development. But hybrid approach believes in necessity to focus on not just human development, but also fair distribution of external resources through social and political institutions. For, it is aware of how much important they are in regard to

poverty. Further, capability approach does not offer any principle or thought in regard to justice. But hybrid approach does. For, it thinks that choice of principles related to justice is vital for the poor in order to provide them a fair and equal position in society and to offer them fair distribution of external resources. Particularly, a fair and equal position in society is needed by the poor more than ever. For, we need them to participate in the community for playing their role to rearrange the society all we live in and to cope with the problem of poverty together in social cooperation through protecting our mutual benefits. For, poverty is not just the problem of the poor people or the governments. It is the common problem of society. Therefore, capability approach offers us a beneficial way for human development whereas hybrid approach provides a comprehensive guide to grasp and to cope with poverty.

6.3.4 Criterias of hybrid approach

By following this path, it is likely to offer some criterias for hybrid approach. First of all, it must be resourcist. Secondly, it must be impartial and fair in terms of reorganizing arrangements of a just society. Then, it must offer equal opportunity and offices to all and must have principles applying justice. Thirdly, it must offer equal respect and treatment to all. Also, it must not be so sensitive to choice. Particularly, it should be aware that human beings are not perfect. So, it should not allow people to fall down due to bad results of their wrong choices or mistakes. Therefore, in hybrid approach, it is a necessity to provide an opportunity for people to have social minimum and compensation to both option and brute luck when they need. Moreover, it must pay attention to importance to have good capability set in order to acquire self-realization and development and to fight against all human deprivations including poverty. Plus, it must be agent-oriented and attach importance to have capabilities and functionings in order to convert resources into ability that is necessary to lead our lives as we want and to realize our ends.

Then, it must adopt an understanding of human development based on improvement of capabilities and functionings and mental cultivation of a person. But, in definition of poverty, it should not be stick to traditional definition. It should offer a definition of poverty that is more comprehensive and better to grasp and handle poverty. In order to do that, it must be aware how natural and social endowments are important.

Further, it should apply certain sense of equality, grasp of justice and idea of society. Then, it should concern to fair distribution of primary goods. Following that, it should focus on the least advantaged people in society and justify all inequalities to the benefit of them. Lastly, it should give priority to mutual advantage with social cooperation in society. As an addition to those, I will explain contributions of hybrid approach in the next section.

6.3.5 Contributions of hybrid approach

Hybrid approach is always open to change, and development and its working procedure is problem-based. It can be said that its mission is to combine strengths of these two approaches that have insufficient ability to defeat the problem of poverty on their own. Therefore, its primary contribution is to objectively display strong and weak aspects of these two approaches against poverty and to produce one strong approach that can defeat poverty. While it is doing that, it makes a balance on competing values of each approach. This makes it strong and useful in fight against poverty.

6.3.6 Implications of this thesis through hybrid approach

This thesis based on respectively concept of poverty, analysis of contemporary approaches of social justice in regard to poverty and elimination of poverty through hybrid approach should be seen just as an important beginning for further studies related to poverty in future. There are many further things to do in regard to that issue. But its mission should be to encourage others to think and to study further about that. For, by its arguments and thoughts, it leads us to reconsider and to discuss the concepts of democracy, justice, human rights and human development again. It offers us a new path to think of such these concepts in regard to poverty. When we reflect on how to grasp and to handle the problem of poverty through this thesis, it also encourages us to contemplate how a fair and democratic society that is free from poverty should be. Therefore, it opens us new doors to knock and to get in.

7. CONCLUSION

In this thesis I have considered respectively what poverty is, what is wrong with poverty, what contemporary approaches of social justice imply for poverty and lastly, which approach among them best handles the problem of poverty. In order to find a respond, I analysed three basic fundamental approaches namely utilitarian approach, resourcist approach and capabilities approach. I argued that a hybrid approach is more useful than sticking to only one of them, for it should be changing and developing according to different circumstances and conditions of being poor, with a comprehensive definition of poverty. Following that, I decided to form a hybrid approach that is combination of resourcist approach and capability approach. Then, I argue that hybrid approach had a mission to complete deficiencies of these two appraoches and to improve them through its way to handle the problem of poverty. Therefore, I claimed that it should be structured as sensitive to bad conditions of people even if they are deriving from wrong choices or mistakes of people and should offer compensation for that.

For, I argued that every person should have right to make mistakes and wrong preferences in his own life without paying dearly for them. I advised social minimum as an efficient instrument in order to prevent people to fall down sharply in bad conditions. Further, I offered and defended a definition of poverty primarily based on lacking internal and external resources. But I argued that hybrid approach should also be sensitive to capability to function basically in order to provide resources into abilities to live a life as we want to lead. Also, it should provide equal treatment to all and allow them to be free in public dialogue and decision-making. By doing that, it gives poor people an active role to solve their problem of poverty and it is aimed to make them agent.

REFERENCES

- Alderfer, C. P.** (1968). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 4: 142-175.
- Arneson, R.** (1990). Liberalism, Distributive Subjectivism and Equal Opportunity for Welfare, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 19 (2), 158-194.
- Bailey, J.** (1997). *Utilitarianism, Institutions and Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, C.** (2010). *What Is This Thing Called Ethics?* Newyork, NY: Routledge
- Bentham, J., Mill, J. S.** (2003). *Utilitarianism and On Liberty*. (2nd ed.). edited with an introduction by M. Warnock. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Berges, S.** (2007). Why the Capability Approach is Justified, *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 24(1), 16-25.
- Berlin, I.** (1969). *Four Essays on Liberty*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bohman, J.** (1996). *Public Deliberation: Pluralism, Complexity and Democracy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Brink, D.** (1986). 'Utilitarian Morality and the Personal Point of View', *Journal of Philosophy*, 83 (8), 417-38.
- Campbell, T.** (2007). 'Poverty as a Violation of Human Rights: Inhumanity or Injustice'. Thomas Pogge (ed). *Freedom from Poverty as a Human Right*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, G. A.** (1989). 'On the Currency of Egalitarian Justice', *Ethics*, 99(4), 906-944
- Crocker, D. A.** (2008). *Ethics of Global Development*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crocker, D. A., Robeyns, I.** (2010). 'Capability and Agency' in Amartya Sen, (ed) by C. W. Morris. Cambridge: Cambridge University of Press.
- Doyal, L., Gough, I.** (1991). *A theory of human need*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dryzek, J. S.** (2000). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dworkin, R.** (1977). *Taking Rights Seriously*. London, Duckworth.

- Dworkin, R.** (1981). 'What is Equality? Part 2: Equality of Resources, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 10 (4), 283-345.
- Dworkin, R.** (2000). *Sovereign Virtue: The Theory and Practice of Equality*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press
- Edward, P.** (2006). The Ethical Poverty Line: A Moral Quantification of Absolute Poverty, *Third World Quarterly*, 27 (2), pp. 377-393.
- Fernandez-Huerga, E.** (2008). The economic behavior of human beings: the institutionalist/post keynesian model. *J Econ Issues* 42(3).
- Fraser, N.** (2009). *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gewirth, A.** (1984). 'Practical Philosophy, Civil Liberties, and Poverty'. *The Monist*, 67(4), 549-568.
- Godwin, W.** 'Enquiring Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness (various editions), 1 (2).
- Goodin, R.** (1995). *Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, D., Christina, P., Townsend, P.** (2000). 'Absolute and Overall Poverty: A European History and Proposal for Measurement', in David Gordon and Peter Townsend (eds), *Breadline Europe: The Measurement of Poverty*, Bristol: The Policy Press, pp. 79-105.
- Gordon, D.** (2002). 'The international measurement of poverty and antipoverty policies', in Peter Townsend and David Gordon (eds), *World Poverty: New Policies to Defeat an Old Enemy*, Bristol: The Policy Press, pp. 53-80.
- Gutmann, A., Thompson, D.** (1996). *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Harsanyi, J.** (1976). *Essays on Ethics, Social Behavior and Scientific Explanation*. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Harsanyi, J.** (1977a). *Rational Behavior and Bargaining Equilibrium in Games and Social Situations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harsanyi, J.** (1977b). 'Rule-utilitarianism and Decision Theory', *Erkenntnis*, 11: 25-53.
- Hare, R. M.** (1963). *Freedom and Reason*. London: Oxford University Press
- Hare, R. M.** (1984). 'Rights, Utility and Universalization: Reply to J. L. Mackie, in Frey 1984, 106-21.
- Honneth, A.** (1995). *The Struggle for Recognition: The moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- Hull, R.** (2007). *Deprivation and Freedom*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, J. D.** (1990). *Poverty and the Human Condition: A Philosophical Inquiry*, Lewiston New York: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Joseph Rowntree Foundation.** (2009). *Reporting Poverty in the UK*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Kelly, P.** (2003). *Political Thinkers from Socrates to the Present*. Boucher, D., Kelly, P. (Ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. pp. 307-43
- Klosko, G.** (2013). *History of Political Thought an Introduction Volume II: Modern* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Kymlicka, W.** (2002). *Contemporary Political Philosophy an Introduction*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lister, R.** (2004). *Poverty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lotter, H. P.** (2007). 'Defining poverty as distinctively human', *University of Johannesburg, HTS*, 63(3).
- Lotter, H. P.** (2010). *Refashioning Rawls as a True Champion of the Poor*, *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies*, 37 (1), 149-171
- Lotter, H. P.** (2011). *Poverty, Ethics and Justice*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Lotter, H. P.** (2008). 'Poverty as Threat to Democratic Values', *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 22(2), 175-193.
- Lyons, D.** (1965). *Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mabughi, N., Selim, T.** (2006). *Poverty as a Social Deprivation: A Survey*. *Review of Social Economy*, 64(2), 181-204.
- Maslow, A. H.** (1943). *A Theory of Human Motivation*. *Psychol Rev*, 50(4), pp. 370-396.
- Max-Neef, M.** (1991). *Human Scale Development – conception, application and further reflections*. New York and London: The Apex Press.
- McClelland, J.S.** (1996). *A History of Western Political Thought*. London: Routledge.
- Narayan, D. With Patel, R., Schafft, K., Rademacher, A., and Koch-Shulte, S.** (2000). *Voices of the Poor: vol.1, Can Anyone Hear Us?* New York: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.
- Peffer, R.** (1990). *Marxism, Morality and Social Justice*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Pierik, R., Robeyns, I.** (2007) *Resources versus Capabilities: Social Endowments in Egalitarian Theory*. *Political Studies Association*, vol. 55, pp. 133-152.

- Pogge, T.** (2002). 'Can the Capability Approach be Justified?', *Philosophical Topics*, 30 (2), 167-228.
- Pogge, T.** (2007). 'Severe Poverty as a Human Rights Violation'. Thomas Pogge (ed). *Freedom from Poverty as A Human Right*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pogge, T.** (2011). 'Allowing the Poor to Share the Earth', *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, 8 (3), 335-352.
- Rawls, J.** (1955). 'Two Concepts of Rules', *Philosophical Review*, 64 (1955): 3-32.
- Rawls, J.** (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Rawls, J.** (1993). *Political Liberalism*. Columbia University Press.
- Rawls, J.** (1999). *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J.** (2001). *Justice as Fairness. A Restatement*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Raz, J.** (1986). *The Morality of Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robeyns, I.** (2005). 'The Capability Approach: A Theoretical Survey', *Journal of Human Development*, 6 (1), 93-114.
- Rowntree, B. S.** (1901). *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*. London: Macmillan.
- Rowntree, B. S.** (1937). *The Human Needs of Labour (Revised Edition)*. London: Longmans Green & Co.
- Sen, A.** (1980). 'Equality of What?' in *Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Vol. i., McMurrin, S. M. (ed.). Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, pp. 195-220.
- Sen, A.** (1983). 'Poor, Relatively Speaking'. *Oxford Economic Papers* 35, pp. 153-169.
- Sen, A.** (1984). *Resources, Values and Development*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 307-24.
- Sen, A.** (1985). *Commodities and Capabilities*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Sen, A.** (1990). 'Justice: Means versus Freedoms', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 19 (2), 111-21.
- Sen, A.** (1992). *Inequality Re-examined*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Sen, A.** (1993). 'Capability and Well-being', in M. Nussbaum and A. Sen (eds), *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 30-53.
- Sen, A.** (1995). 'Gender Inequality and Theories of Justice', in M. Nussbaum and J. Glover (eds), *Women, Culture and Development*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 259-74.

- Sen, A.** (1998). 'Mortality as an Indicator of Economic Success and Failure', *The Economic Journal*, 108 (446), 1-25.
- Sen, A.** (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Shaw, B.** (1988). 'Poverty: Absolute or Relative', *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 5, pp. 27-36.
- Shue, H.** (1996). *Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. (2nd ed.). Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Singer, P.** (1977). 'Utility and the Survival Lottery', *Philosophy*, 52: 218-22.
- Smart, J. J. C., & Williams, Bernard** (1973). *Utilitarianism: For and Against*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A.** (1776 (1776)). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Cause of the Wealth of Nations*. Republished, R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner (ed). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Streeten, P.** (1984). 'Basic Needs: Some Unsettled Questions'. *World Development*, 12(9).
- Tasioulas, J.** (2007). 'The Moral Reality of Human Rights'. Thomas Pogge (ed), *Freedom from Poverty as A Human Right*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Charles,** (1992). *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Townsend, P.** (1954). Measuring Poverty. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 5(2), 130-137.
- Townsend, P.** (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. London: Penguin.
- Waldron, J.** (1991). *The Right to Private Property*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Waldron, J.** (1986). 'John Rawls and the Social Minimum'. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 3(1), pp. 21-33.
- Walker, R.** (1995). 'The Dynamics and Social Exclusion' in G. Room (ed). *Beyond the Threshold. The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Williams, B.** (1981). *Moral Luck*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolff, J., & Lamb, & E., Zur-Szpiro, E.** (2015). *A Philosophical Review of Poverty*. UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.jrf.org.uk/>
- Wolff, J.** (forthcoming). *Beyond Poverty*. Blavatnik School of Government, University of Oxford.

- Wolff, J.** (2018). 'The Ethics of Anti-Poverty Policies', in the Routledge Handbook of Ethics and Public Policy ed. Annabelle Lever and Andrei Poama. London: Routledge.
- World Bank** (2000/2001). World Development Report 2000/2001. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Young, I. M.** (2003). 'Activist challenges to deliberative democracy' In Debating Deliberative Democracy, Fishkin, J. S. & Laslett, P. (ed), 102-120. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name Surname: Cansu Tecir

Place / Date of Birth: Antakya / 02.08.1989

Adress: Osmanağa mah. Suleymanpasa Sok. 44/4 Bahariye/Kadıkoy Istanbul

E-mail: cansutcr@gmail.com

EDUCATION:

BA: Yeditepe University / Political Science and International Relations (2012)
Hague University of Applied Sciences (2011-2012) Exchange Student Program

MA: Istanbul Technical University (ITU) Political Studies. (2019)