



Croatian
International
Relations
Review

—
CIRR

—
XXIX (94) 2023,
120-134

—
DOI 10.2478/
CIRR2023.29.94.06

—
UDC327 (4-6 EU:73:55)

Robert Nozick's Theory of Entitlement

Ammar Ahmed Abbood

Mustansiriyah University, College of Political Science, Political Thought Dept

Email: ammar.ahmed@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Keywords:

Robert Nozick's
Theory,
Entitlement,
Deservingness,
Evidence, Rights

Abstract

This study delves into Robert Nozick's theory of entitlement and its differentiation from other justice theories. He characterises it as a theory devoid of historical patterns. Nozick avoids using the term "redistribution" due to its non-neutral connotations and instead opts for the term justice in property, unlike patterned and ahistorical theories. The theory is founded on three fundamental principles. The initial one pertains to justice in acquisition, dictating the rightful initial steps to property. The subsequent principal deals with justice in transferring property, focusing on the legitimate methods of transitioning between distributions. Lastly, the third principal addresses rectifying the injustices highlighted by Nozick. It addresses various significant issues, such as the distinction between correction within generations and correction between generations.

Introduction

Robert Nozick, an American political philosopher, identified as a libertarian liberal. He is most recognised for his initial publication, "Anarchy State and Utopia," released in 1974. Nozick is recognised for his support of individualism from the fourteenth century and nineteenth-century capitalism. He is not typically viewed as an anarchist, but has been influenced by Murray Rothbard, an individual anarchist. He proposed a form of radical individualism within the state's structure. Nozick argues that the minimal state is the most expensive state that has been justified. Hence, if the state aims to expand its role beyond merely safeguarding against force, contract enforcement, theft, or fraud, individual rights may be violated. Nozick's work emphasises individual rights, as evident from his bold statement in the preface of his book. The preface of the book emphasises the importance of respecting individuals' rights and refraining from actions that would violate those rights (Salahuddin, 2018).

Nozick criticises John Rawls, a prominent political philosopher of the nineteenth century. The author penned a book titled "Theory of Justice," establishing the groundwork for contemporary theories on distributive justice and social equality. The book "Theory of Justice" by Aguayo Westwood (2020) has sparked more commentary and discussion than any other political and social theory book published since World War II. Nozick critiqued John Rawls' theory of justice, particularly Rawls' support for redistribution and an outcome-oriented approach (Aguayo Westwood, 2020; Silveira, 2021). Nevertheless, Nozick dismissed the concept of redistribution. He contended that it breaches the principles of self-ownership. He designated individuals as partial owners of each other. However, he presented his "Theory of entitlement" as a different option. Nevertheless, some critics, like Luke, argue that Nozick's focus on individualism neglects the social context surrounding individuals. Hence, it was proposed that individuals are influenced by their social environments rather than existing in isolation. This paper aims to investigate Robert Nozick's theory of entitlement, focusing on justice in holding, individual rights, and the minimal state.

A significant body of research has examined Nozick's theory of entitlement from various perspectives and angles (Nnajiolor & Ifeakor, 2016; Nweke & Paul, 2023; Onwudinjo, 2023). The study is conducted due to its relevance to current philosophical and political discourse. This theory offers a particular perspective on rights of property, justice, and the liberty of the individual. So, it is pivotal in discussing the concerning governance, social policy, or economics. The examination of Nozick's entitlement theory make researchers show insights into key questions on rights, the state's roles, and the society moral basic structure. This study effectively deals with the sub-questions on deservingness and entitlement. The evidence on the specific rights enhances understanding the complexities in Nozick's theory and applying in the real-world. The current work provides an understanding of political philosophy and discusses many topics like distributive justice, the rights of property, and the independence of the individuals. Thus, the study problem lies in the main question which includes:

RQ1: What is the Robert Nozick's entitlement theory characteristics or implications? This question is subdivided into many to solve the Problem:

RQ2: What is the difference between entitlement and deservingness?

RQ3: How do we know what rights people have?

RQ4: What kind of evidence leads us to believe that people have certain rights but not others?

Literature Review

Robert Nozick was born in Brooklyn, New York, to a Russian-Jewish immigrant father. He was renowned for his work in political philosophy, particularly his book "Anarchy, State and Utopia," which was released shortly after his colleague John Rawls's "A Theory of Justice" at Harvard University. His work was instrumental in solidifying normative political philosophy in the Anglo-American analytical tradition as a respected and influential field in academic philosophy. Additionally, it played a key role in promoting the classical liberal or libertarian viewpoint as a viable alternative to liberal redistribution focused on relative equality. Nozick was not the first or only philosopher to argue for Despite being well-known, this perspective received the National Book Award in 1975 (Shook, 2012).

Robert Nozick became widely known following the publication of his book "Anarchy, State and Utopia" in 1974, where he introduced his libertarian political and moral theory. It, together with John Rawls's theory of justice, was fundamental in shaping political philosophy in the twentieth century and continues to influence political theory today. His theory has sparked significant debate and is respected by a diverse group of intellectuals (Nozick, 2007). The theory proposed a minimal state focused on enforcing contracts and protecting individuals from force, theft, and fraud, contrasting it with a more extensive state. He supports his idea of the minimal state by critiquing prominent arguments in favour of a larger state for achieving distributive justice (Sandel, 1984).

Nozick initially sought to justify the minimal state in contrast to the ideas put forth by individualist anarchists. The author criticises arguments supporting a larger state and their view of distributive justice (Scanlon, 1976). Nozick argues that the only legitimate state is the minimal state that ensures individual rights are not infringed. The functions of this are limited to protecting individuals from theft, fraud, and enforcing contracts. Hence, he established two prerequisites for a state: 1) a strong control over force within a defined area and 2) the assurance of the state's security within its borders. Nozick examined a situation where law enforcement was required due to disputes within a minimal state framework. Individuals may choose to establish a "mutual protection association" in this context. The associations had a twofold function: self-defence and safeguarding individuals' rights for rectification (Abramson, 1981).

All association members are expected to be available to enforce and defend the rights of others in this scenario. Each member is expected to be active and can request assistance from other members for protection. Nozick believed that in a society with a minimal state, individuals could create their own protection groups to settle disputes. Over time, these groups may start competing, leading to potential conflicts. In the end, a single dominant protection group may emerge, leading to a monopoly in that specific area. Nevertheless, critics contend that this process may result in additional conflicts rather than resolving issues. Nozick did not specify whether the dominant group would be private or public, or if there would be any monetary considerations involved.

Research Hypothesis

Based on the questions raised by the problem, the research adopts a hypothesis that:

A contemporary philosopher such as Robert Nozick who chooses to theorize within the (classical) natural rights tradition needs to explain the use of its terms in a contemporary manner, clarify their sources, and deal with various epistemological questions, and this is clear in his theory and the principles on which it is based.

Research Methodology

Research Design

To verify the research hypothesis, we needed to explore various scientific methodologies, including historical methodology and systematic text analysis. The current study utilised a descriptive research design. Descriptive research involves exploring a research topic by providing a detailed description of its characteristics (Atmowardoyo, 2018; Grimes & Schulz, 2002). Descriptive research allows researchers to address questions about specific phenomena. This research method addresses questions related to the characteristics of a specific group or population. The current study also seeks to explore the characteristics and consequences of Robert Nozick's theory of entitlement. Hence, the primary

inquiry led to the generation of multiple sub-questions to thoroughly address the various facets of the issues.

Furthermore, the study also seeks to establish the distinction between entitlement and deservingness. The researcher utilised a descriptive research design to investigate the rights people have based on Nozick's theory. This study aims to investigate the evidence that leads to the belief that individuals have specific rights while lacking others. So, descriptive study suits this work as it helps in thorough exploration, depiction, and investigation of the features and consequences of the theory of entitlement. This study offers a structured approach to systematically examine and describe the features of Nozick's theory, considering its complexity and the need to understand its various aspects.

Data Collection and Interpretation of Findings

Various research articles were consulted as reliable data sources to gather information on Robert Nozick's theory of entitlement for the current study. Utilising data from these sources bolstered the study's credibility. After reviewing various articles, entitlement theory has been elucidated in alignment with Nozick's theory of entitlement. Various theories, including ahistorical, historical, patterned, and unpatterned theories, have been examined. Furthermore, aligned with the research inquiries, the findings section encompasses three crucial categories for deriving conclusions from this theory. The concept comprises the principle of justice in acquisition, the principle of justice in transfer, and the principle of rectification of injustice. A descriptive study design has allowed the researcher to thoroughly investigate and describe various aspects of Nozick's theory of entitlement.

Results

Entitlement Theory

He introduces a unique concept of distributive justice known as the "entitlement theory." (Nozick, 1999, p. xi). According to Robert Nozick, rights take precedence over all other moral considerations when viewed as negative and understood as imposing a side constraint. These rights are absolute and should not be infringed upon for the greater good, other rights, or any other rationale. They are inherent and not established by legal or customary means, as they exist regardless of human intervention. According to Nozick (1999, p. 34). Nozick focused on rights and differentiated them from entitlements, naming his theory the "Entitlement theory of justice in holdings" (Mack, 2014).

There is a distinction between entitlement and desert. There is a structural similarity between desert claims and claims related to entitlement, which can cause confusion. However, desert is a normative concept, whereas entitlement is more of a social or empirical concept. Desert and entitlement may overlap in some instances, but not always (Feldman, 2016).

Entitlement relies on the presence of a social or legal institution. For instance, if an institution has a rule granting privileges to individuals with specific advantages, those who possess these advantages are eligible for the privileges. Regarding desert claims, they may not always rely on legal frameworks or social contracts. An individual could be deemed deserving of a privilege even in the absence of explicit rules within their society. In such instances, the individual may merit something despite lacking formal entitlement. Similarly, an individual in a society may be entitled to something based on established rules, even if they do not merit it (Feldman, 2016). Robert Nozick differentiates his theory of justice, known as the theory of entitlement, from other theories by elucidating the nature of different concepts of distributive justice (Nozick, 2013) and emphasising key distinctions among various justice theories. He categorised the theories of justice into two distinct types.

Ahistorical Theories

These theories are referred to as result theories or principles of current justice. The theories centre on the structure of the current distribution and its ability to achieve a desired goal or end state. They examine the result of the distribution, such as the utilitarian conception that aims to maximise total benefit without concern for individuals or potential harm. John Rawls (Nickel, 1990) established the Difference Principle as one of the current principles of justice, stating that social and economic inequalities should benefit the less wealthy.

Historical Theories

In this theory, evaluating the fairness of a distribution is based on how the distribution was created, considering past actions and circumstances such as effort, deservingness, or merit (Nozick, 1973, p. 50).

Then Robert Nozick classifies these theories into two types: (Skoble, 2020):

Patterned theories

Various theories propose specific patterns for distributing resources among individuals in society based on natural dimensions like work, need, and advantages. Karl Marx suggests distribution based on work, need, and advantages, while John Rawls prioritises the less fortunate. These theories aim to achieve distributive justice, unlike Nozick's historical "entitlement theory," which he argues is Unpatterned (Skoble, 2020). Patterned theories for distributive justice involve capturing the outcomes of individuals' labour through methods such as taxing wages or profits. This is akin to taking away time from employees, and this procedure may cause those who base decisions on fairness to feel Ownership of property is akin to having limited authority and influence over an illogical and constrained entity (Eryilmaz, 2019).

Un Patterned Theories

These theories suggest that fairness is not defined by a specific pattern, but

rather by certain premises that are considered fair regardless of the resulting distribution. Robert Nozick categorises his justice theory (Nnajofofor & Ifeakor, 2016) as one of those theories that does not prescribe a specific distribution pattern to determine individual shares. Instead, it is established through specific procedures that can indicate who has and who does not have the right to what they own.

Robert Nozick contrasts historical principles with end state principles. He is convinced that the fundamental principles of the theory of entitlement can clarify the essence of other distributive justice concepts and their shortcomings. He explains his theory on distributive justice as a historical concept, where justice is determined by the method of distribution. On the other hand, end state justice and patterned historical principles as studied by (Edie, 1982) revolve around the idea that fair distribution hinges on the quantity of items to be distributed based on structural principles governing the equitable allocation of income and wealth.

Historical justice principles suggest that individuals' situations or previous behaviours can result in different entitlements or deserving outcomes. Unlike end state principles, historical justice argues that injustice can arise when transitioning from one distribution to another that is structurally similar, as the new distribution may infringe on individuals' entitlements or deserving outcomes and may not align with the actual history (Nozick, 1999, pp. 168-169). Furthermore, many individuals find it unacceptable for a theory to be considered acceptable without considering the historical background of the current wealth distribution, regardless of its form. Considering the process of distribution and how individuals obtain entitlement to things is crucial when formulating a theory of social justice.

Historical principles of justice contrast with end-result principles regarding how past circumstances or actions can lead to unequal entitlements. Understanding the principles of entitlement to property involves distinguishing them from other historical principles like the principle of distribution based on moral merit. While both are historical principles, they differ in how they determine distribution patterns. The principle of public benefit is replaced by the principle of moral merit, as any distribution principle is considered a pattern by Nozick if it determines distribution based on an unchangeable principle (Sandel, 1984). Nozick discusses a moral theory centred on rights, where rights are considered primary and function as absolute constraints. These restrictions set boundaries on what can be done within the rules. Some actions or types of actions are deemed impermissible due to conflicting with individuals' rights (Bader & Meadowcroft, 2011). From this perspective, Nozick does not accept the term "distributive justice" when introducing his theory (Entitlement Theory) as he considers it biased. Nozick's theory starts with what he terms "property justice," which is founded on three fundamental principles: justice in acquisition, justice in transfer, and justice in rectifying injustice (Farrelly, 2003).

First: The Principle of Justice in Acquisition

The foundation for the concept of justice in earning, as outlined by Robert Nozick, can be traced back to John Locke's theory on the origin of private property. According to this theory, individuals own their work because they own themselves, and anything from nature that is combined with their work becomes their property, if there is enough left for others in society ([Christiano & Christman, 2009](#)). However, Nozick raises several questions about this perception of John Locke ([Nozick, 1999, p. 174](#)).

Robert Nozick raises several questions regarding the problems raised by the idea of the right of primary Property, including: What are the limits of that action and mixing with the thing such that it makes that thing his property? Then what are the limits of this possession? Is the acquisition taking place according to a specific plan? When an astronaut, for example, identifies a place on the surface of Mars and explains it, are the requirements for that blending met? Will the astronaut only own the planet, or will he own the entire uninhabited universe? Will Property happen by simply clarifying or specifying the place that the person will own, or will this be done according to a specific program or plan? If this Property is according to a specific plan, what is this plan and is it a small area, and why in that area and not somewhere else? ([Friedman, 2014](#)).

Robert Nozick argues that improving something should not automatically grant full ownership of it, especially if the unowned things that are being improved are scarce. This is because once something becomes someone's property, it alters the status of other things ([Wolfe, 2003](#)).

Robert Nozick delves into John Locke's principle of acquisition, particularly focusing on his stipulation that "there remain enough good things for others." Interpreting this condition as ensuring that the situation of others does not deteriorate, private property would lose its legitimacy if acquiring something previously unowned does not guarantee it won't harm others' status. Nozick argues that allocating property of something that no one owns could potentially benefit others rather than harm them. The initial possession could serve as motivation for others to own and work with other things, like the first owner, which could be seen as a fair exchange for their loss of other things ([Knowles, 2003](#)).

Robert Nozick also disputes the idea that John Locke's condition (leaving enough and good for others) was once valid but is no longer applicable. Disputing this assertion, he leaned on his argument, known as the argument of going backwards. He concluded that if the condition is no longer valid, then it was never valid to begin with, as it would result in permanent and inheritable property rights. Put simply, if private property of common objects in the natural world started off legitimately, then the series of distributions that followed and led to the current distribution would have to be fair ([Farrelly, 2003](#)).

According to Robert Nozick, if someone causes harm to others due to

possessing something naturally, they have violated John Locke's private property condition. Therefore, that person must compensate those affected to maintain the validity of their right to property. If those who have been harmed are not compensated, then the property in this situation would breach the principle of justice in acquisition and would be considered illegal property. Causing harm to others can be seen in two ways: first, by depriving them of the chance to enhance their situation through a particular property or another. Another point to consider is that the person can no longer freely use the property as before (Wolfe, 2003; Nozick, 1999, p. 178).

According to Robert Nozick, there are key social factors in John Locke's theory that support the importance of private property, especially when addressing concerns about individuals who cannot own property in a system that allows for private property. In this system, social production flourishes because the means of production are controlled by those who can utilise them most effectively and efficiently. Having private property allows individuals to select a specific model or type of adventure without having to convince others, thus promoting experimentation. Furthermore, it safeguards future generations by enabling individuals to set aside resources from present use for future markets, and it offers additional labour sources that contribute to employment (Farrelly, 2003).

Robert Nozick also argues that ownership of an item can be acquired not just by combining human labour with a natural resource, but also through voluntary property exchanges (Aniume, 2017). The exchange comes in various forms, including trade, gift, inheritance, and more, which symbolise the second method of obtaining private property rights.

Second: The Principle of Justice in Transfer

Robert Nozick discusses various methods of transferring property. There are both legal and illegal ones. Legitimate methods involve free and voluntary exchanges between individuals, like trade, gift-giving, donations, and charity. Transferring private property acquired legally is solely a matter between individuals if it is done voluntarily. Illegal methods involve actions that hinder the fair transfer of private property among individuals, like theft, fraud, and similar activities. In this regard, the fundamental rights to dignity and subsistence are considered to be superior than the claims of private property (Sanghera & Satybaldieva, 2012). Explaining the initial rightful steps of property is guided by the principle of justice in acquisition, while the legitimate methods of transitioning from one distribution to another are determined by the principle of justice in transfer. Hence, a fair distribution stems from a preceding fair distribution when executed through legitimate methods, and any outcome of a fair process conducted in fair steps is inherently equitable (Plant, 2010, p. 102).

While the concept of justice in acquisition is crucial to the theory of entitlement, Robert Nozick emphasises the significance of justice in transmission. He argues against philosophers who oppose the entitlement

theory due to their support of patterned theories, stating that Liberty does not align with patterns. Based on the principle of justice in transfer, a transfer is considered fair only if it is voluntary. Robert Nozick uses a hypothetical scenario involving the basketball player "Wilt Chamberlain" to demonstrate the incompatibility of patterned theories with Liberty, as the latter always contradicts patterns ([Fried, 1995](#)).

In a hypothetical example by Robert Nozick, it is assumed that there exists a preferred distribution, referred to as the first distribution, where each person has an equal share according to a pattern, with possible variations in the shares. Next, Wilt Chamberlain negotiates a new agreement with his team, outlining a share of the earnings generated by ticket sales for his games. This arrangement allows him to benefit from his popularity among fans, who willingly pay to watch him play. Everyone voluntarily contributes a specific amount to Chamberlain, leading to a revised distribution known as the second distribution, ultimately increasing Chamberlain's wealth ([Bader & Meadowcroft, 2011](#)).

Robert Nozick worked on distributive justice ([Nozick, 2013](#)). Nozick asks whether the second distribution is just if the first distribution was just, and people willingly moved from it to the second distribution, transferring parts of their shares that they had received under the first distribution? If people have the entitlement to dispose of their resources resulting from the first distribution, does it not then imply that they have the entitlement to give them to Chamberlain, or to exchange them for watching his match? Then can anyone complain about the justice in transportation that was achieved in this way? Almost every other individual has his/her legitimate share according to the first distribution, according to which there is nothing that another person has the entitlement to claim against in the name of justice ([Nozick, 2007, 2017](#)).

Robert Nozick put forth his hypothesis (Chamberlain) as a compelling argument emphasising the benefits of property rights and asserting that they are incompatible with liberal redistribution policies. He also presented a philosophical argument suggesting that property rights stem from the fundamental principle of self-ownership ([Cohen, 2011](#)).

Nozick's theory revolves around the concept of the "self-Property of itself," emphasising the importance of individual rights. According to him, society must uphold these rights, treating individuals as ends in themselves rather than means to an end, in line with the Kantian principle. The Kantian principle also necessitates a theory of rights ([Maliks & Follesdal, 2013](#)), as rights uphold the presence of individuals as autonomous entities and acknowledge the presence of individuals who are unique from each other. An individual can provide a means of support for someone else.

According to Robert Nozick, seizing the fruits of someone's labour is akin to imprisoning the individual and forcing them to work in a particular job. When individuals are required to carry out a particular job without facing any consequences, their work and its objectives are determined by

someone else, making that person the owner of part of the outcome. This is akin to having partial control and authority over something that belongs to them (Nozick, 1999, p. 172).

Third: The principle of Rectification of Injustice

Understanding the principles of primary acquisition and transfer is crucial in determining an individual's entitlement to a good or possession. Yet, in practice, individuals may not consistently follow these two principles. Human history involves more than just acquiring and passing on knowledge; it is a narrative of slavery, conquest, theft, and deceit. To tackle such injustices, the theory of entitlement needs to be grounded in a corrective principle to effectively address these issues (Farrelly, 2003).

Robert Nozick assumes - in a somewhat idealistic manner - that a theoretical exploration of these matters will result in the establishment of the principle of rectification. This principle involves analysing historical information about past situations and injustices, as well as information about the events that have occurred because of these injustices up to the present. This analysis helps in arriving at a description of the current state of property in society (Nozick, 1999, p. 152). To effectively apply the principle of rectification, you need access to multiple pieces of information: Accessing information about past injustices is necessary to identify the victims and perpetrators involved in illegal acquisition or transfer. To establish the correct compensation, it's crucial to understand the property distribution that would have occurred without the injustice. This information is essential for calculating the damages caused by the injustice (Farrelly, 2003).

Addressing the complex issues surrounding the principle of rectification becomes challenging when the principle of correction is given due consideration. For instance: How feasible is it to trace back and identify the injustice? Is the principle of rectification limited to material matters only, or does it also consider moral issues? The greater the return, the less reliable the information. It needs to establish the responsible party for compensation; should the heirs of slave owners pay the heirs of slaves for the injustice inflicted on their ancestors, for example? Should non-indigenous people pay the price for the injustices committed against indigenous people, like American society? Does the developed country pay the price for the injustices committed against developing countries? (Farrelly, 2003). In addition, Robert Nozick also contends that if the principle of rectification leads to multiple property descriptions, decisions must be made on which one to pursue, with distributive justice and equality considerations potentially influencing these decisions (Nozick, 1999, p. 155).

Discussing the principle of rectification has brought up specific challenges, such as the need to differentiate between intergenerational rectification and intragenerational rectification. One concept involves compensating living victims for rectification, while the other addresses all types of injustice to ensure a fair distribution based on historical principles of

acquisition and justice. This poses a significant challenge for Nozick's theory ([Farrelly, 2003](#)).

Robert Nozick acknowledges that he did not address the principle of rectification, as it is challenging to establish the justice or legality of the initial possessions that shaped the current economic situation. Tracing assets back through generations to determine their origins can be quite challenging, especially when trying to ascertain if they were acquired through violent, coercive, or fraudulent means. It can be challenging to ascertain if those currently in power have benefited from historical injustices, like the enslavement of African Americans or the expropriation of Native American property ([Farrelly, 2003](#)).

Robert Nozick uses patterned principles of distributive justice to address intergenerational injustices as the most practical approach to correcting past injustices that may be significant enough to require long-term solutions. In the short term, a more comprehensive state needs to be established to address the issue, which may involve implementing taxes, providing compensation, or utilising other methods. Nevertheless, the objective of these measures should not solely focus on attaining equality, but rather on rectifying past errors and injustices ([Bellamy, 2002](#)).

Discussion and Conclusion

From the above mentioned in this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

There are two problems associated with the principle of rectification in the atypical entitlement theory of Robert Nozick, namely:

Robert Nozick's theory of justice, known as "the theory of entitlement," sought to elevate the worth of the individual and protect their individual rights by emphasising independence, freedom, and human dignity. These concepts are rooted in the Kantian principle of treating individuals as ends in themselves, rather than to an end. It is evident from his stance that he is against any type of material equality.

Robert Nozick sought to safeguard private property from infringement, drawing inspiration from John Locke's theory of rights. He developed a theory of justice in property to challenge ahistorical theories of justice that distribute based on principles rather than historical entitlements. This contrasts with utilitarianism and John Rawls' principle of difference, as well as historicism's reliance on the principle of merit.

Robert Nozick's theory reflects a strong emphasis on individualism, dismissing notions of solidarity and social cooperation. Nevertheless, he revised this in his subsequent works, advocating for a more comprehensive state that ensures human solidarity as a foundation for collective efforts. This shift in his role exemplifies a philosopher's quest for truth without making assertions with this tool, he feels confident adjusting his stance or

shifting the direction of his thoughts and expanding on them. Robert Nozick did not fully address the issues he raised about correcting injustices across generations and acknowledged the challenges of achieving this in *The Principle of Rectification of Injustice*.

Nevertheless, this does not go against Nozick's approach, emphasising discovery and raising issues for readers to infer solutions to complex issues. He faces criticism for proposing distributive justice principles as the sole practical means to correct injustices across generations, despite criticising and rejecting these principles in his theory. Robert Nozick confuses self-Property with private property in his theory of justice. Robert Nozick's theory, particularly in the initial acquisition issue, appears to align with American policy's inclination to exert global dominance. This is evident when he provides examples related to astronauts and their entitlement to property in space based on the principle of initial acquisition. Similarly, his libertarian proposal and extreme individualism shape his views on American globalisation paths and goals.

Research Implications

This work has significant theoretical and practical implications offering a deeper insight into entitlement and deservingness. It examines the distinctions enhancing understanding the ethical principles of the theory under study. It also stresses the philosophical variances between entitlement-based justice and need-based justice. Also, the evaluation of individuals' entitlements according to Nozick's theory contributes to the epistemological debates on the rights essence and validation. It can increase understanding the fundamentals of legal and moral rights. The examination of its evidence contributes to its theory. It creates confidence in specific rights and doubt in others. This has provided insights into the empirical and normative of the Nozick's theory. In addition, this assessment helps in the determination of the strength and validity of claims on individual rights in the framework of Nozick.

Furthermore, this work practically contributes to the field. The examination of the Nozick's theory implications and features gives insights into discussing property rights, redistribution, and the state role. This approach provides findings assisting policymakers in developing policies aligning with the concepts of individual rights and minimal government interference. The findings may affect ethical and legal decision-making. The analysis establishes a theoretical basis to evaluate many aspects possibly pertaining to individual liberty, justice, or property rights. Also, understanding Nozick's theory may guide advocacy work to promote individual rights and limit state interferences. Grasping the implications makes advocates capable of articulating principled arguments effectively. This approach possibly helps in the protection of the freedoms of individuals and restrict their rights breach.

Limitations And Future Research Indications

The present work shows some limitations possibly studies by future researchers. It centred on the executing descriptive research design. Its findings heavily rely on the existing literature. It maybe emerging perspectives are lost with some features of Nozick's theory. Addressing this issue can be done by future researchers studying various alternative methodologies involving empirical studies or other interdisciplinary methods for delving deeper into the characteristics and consequences of Nozick's theory. Also, upcoming researchers conduct interviews with policymakers or legal experts with knowledge of this theory. So, they provide more valuable insights on practically applying this theory.

References

- Abramson, E. M. (1981). Philosophization Against Taxation: Why Nozick's Challenge Fails. *Ariz. L. Rev.*, 23, 753. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/arz23&div=26&id=&page=>
- Aguayo Westwood, P. (2020). The role of the sense of justice in Rawls' theory.
- Aniame, K. O. (2017). *Evaluation of Robert Nozick'S Entitlement Theory*
- Atmowardoyo, H. (2018). Research methods in TEFL studies: Descriptive research, case study, error analysis, and R & D. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(1), 197-204.
- Bader, R. M., & Meadowcroft, J. (2011). *The Cambridge companion to Nozick's anarchy, state, and utopia*. Cambridge University Press. <https://search.worldcat.org/title/The-Cambridge-companion-to-Nozick's-Anarchy-state-and-utopia/oclc/725297871>
- Bellamy, R. (2002). *Liberalism and pluralism: Towards a politics of compromise*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203007327>
- Christiano, T., & Christman, J. (2009). *Debates in Political Philosophy*. Wiley Online Library.
- Cohen, G. A. (2011). *On the currency of egalitarian justice, and other essays in political philosophy*. Princeton University Press. <https://www.vitalsource.com/products/on-the-currency-of-egalitarian-justice-and-other-g-a-cohen-v9781400838660>
- Eddie, M. D. (1982). Distributive Justice: Historical vs. End-State Principles and the Optimal Redistribution. *Michigan Journal of Economics*, 5.
- Eryilmaz, E. (2019). A critical assessment of John Rawls's theory of justice as fairness. <https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12623340/index.pdf>
- Farrelly, C. (2003). Introduction to contemporary political theory. <https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/an/4912202>
- Feldman, F. (2016). *Distributive justice: Getting what we deserve from our country*. Oxford University Press.
- Fried, B. (1995). Wilt Chamberlain revisited: Nozick's "justice in transfer" and the problem of market-based distribution. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 226-245.

- Friedman, M. D. (2014). Libertarian Philosophy in the Real World. <https://www.torrossa.com/it/resources/an/5209615>
- Grimes, D. A., & Schulz, K. F. (2002). Descriptive studies: what they can and cannot do. *The Lancet*, 359(9301), 145-149.
- Knowles, D. (2003). Natural law and practical rationality. In: JSTOR.
- Mack, E. (2014). Robert Nozick's political philosophy.
- Maliks, R., & Follesdal, A. (2013). Kantian theory and human rights. In *Kantian Theory and Human Rights* (pp. 1-7). Routledge.
- Nickel, J. W. (1990). Rawls on political community and principles of justice. *Law and Philosophy*, 205-216.
- Nnajifor, O. G., & Ifeakor, C. S. (2016). Robert Nozick's entitlement theory of justice: a critique. *OGIRISI: a New Journal of African Studies*, 12, 170-183. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/og/article/view/141255>
- Nozick, R. (2007). The entitlement theory of justice. *LaFollette H.*
- Nozick, R. (2013). Distributive justice. In *Modern Understandings of Liberty and Property* (pp. 179-260). Routledge.
- Nozick, R. (2017). Distributive justice. In *Distributive Justice* (pp. 3-61). Routledge.
- Nweke, C., & Paul, O. O. (2023). Robert Nozick's Entitlement Theory And Resource Management and Control in Nigeria. *OCHENDO: An African Journal of Innovative Studies*, 4(3). <https://aciol.org/index.php/ochendo/article/view/3569>
- Onwudinjo, A. (2023). On The Justice of Limits: A Critique of Nozick's Entitlement Theory of Justice. *AJAP-AMAMIHE Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 21(4). <https://www.igwebuikerresearchinstitute.org/ama mihe journal article.php?paper=300>
- Salahuddin, A. (2018). Robert Nozick's entitlement theory of justice, libertarian rights and the minimal state: A critical evaluation. *Journal of Civil & Legal Sciences*, 7(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2169-0170.1000234>
- Sandel, M. J. (1984). *Liberalism and its Critics*. NYU Press. <https://nyupress.org/9780814778418/liberalism-and-its-critics/>
- Sanghera, B., & Satybaldieva, E. (2012). Ethics of property, illegal settlements and the right to subsistence. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 32(1/2), 96-114.
- Scanlon, T. (1976). Nozick on rights, liberty, and property. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 3-25.
- Shook, J. R. (2012). Dictionary of early American philosophers. <https://www.torrossa.com/it/resources/an/5203727>
- Silveira, D. C. (2021). John Rawls' theory of justice and the role of reasonableness. *Mutatis Mutandis: Revista Internacional de Filosofia*(17), 39-49.
- Skoble, A. J. (2020). *The Essential Robert Nozick*. Fraser Institute. <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1427104/the-essential-robert-nozick/2041818/>
- Wolfe, C. (2003). *Liberalism at the crossroads: an introduction to contemporary liberal political theory and its critics*. Rowman & Littlefield. <https://www.abebooks.com/9780742532717/Liberalism-Crossroads-Introduction-Contemporary-Liberal-0742532712/plp>