

Yet, Bentham's maxim, "Each is to count for one, no one for more than one", is too simple to be realistic and moral. It is unrealistic because it overlooks the fact that every person is far more strongly attached to his relatives and friends than to strangers: he ~~will engage in some favoritism unless~~ is incapable of full impartiality unless preferring a friend to a stranger is likely to result in gross injustice. And the maxim is not quite moral either because the weaker deserve to be treated better than the strong, precisely in order to redress inequalities and thus maximize justice. Thus if a child and a strong adult fight over a loaf of bread, the right thing to do is to take sides with the former. Likewise in the case of a conflict between a powerful nation and a weak one over a resource ~~xxxxxx~~ available to both. ~~xxxxxxx~~ No just and humane judge will be even-handed in all cases ~~xxxxxyxxxxxxx~~, although they will not allow self-interest to interfere. In short, radical or simple egalitarianism is neither realistic nor right: Recall Ch. 6, Sect. . . .

41720173

