

Background for “The One Thing No Free Society Can Survive Without”

Ross Levine
Stanford University
June 2026

Overview

This imagined letter in Adam Smith’s voice draws primarily from *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (hereafter TMS, 1759; citations follow the Glasgow Edition, 6th ed., 1790) and *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (hereafter WN, 1776; citations follow the Glasgow Edition, 5th ed., 1789). Citations follow Part–Section–Chapter–Paragraph (TMS) and Book–Chapter–Section–Paragraph (WN).

A note on sources. For this public-facing letter from Adam Smith on justice, TMS and WN are the right anchors: they contain Smith’s most quotable and systematic statements of the foundational claim—and they are Smith’s own published accounts. Smith’s *Lectures on Jurisprudence* (student notes from his Glasgow lectures, ca. 1762–1764; published 1896 and again in the Glasgow Edition in 1978; cited LJ) provide the fuller technical jurisprudential background—his actual taxonomy of injuries, his treatment of contract, succession, and police, and his sources in the natural-law tradition. This background paper cites *LJ* where it sharpens a specific point but does not draw on it as a primary text, as Smith chose not to publish a separate book on jurisprudence.

The previous five letters invoked justice repeatedly but never examined it directly. In “The Invisible Hand,” justice was named as the institutional condition that turns self-interest into cooperation. In “The Danger of Admiring the Wrong People,” misplaced admiration was shown to corrupt the impartial administration of justice. In “Enemies of the Invisible Hand,” monopoly and political capture were diagnosed as attempts to escape the equal rules of justice. In “The First Exception,” the contrast was drawn between a society governed by general rules and one governed by discretionary favor. This sixth letter makes justice itself the subject.

Architecture of the letter. The letter is organized around a single load-bearing claim, stated explicitly in the opening as the spine of the argument:

“Justice is the ground on which strangers can cooperate—and when it gives way, society does not merely suffer; it collapses.”

From this spine, the letter develops its argument: (1) it defines justice in plain terms—the rules against force, fraud, and theft, applied the same to every person, and enforced; (2) it shows that justice so defined is the precondition for cooperation among strangers, and that its absence dissolves the social bond itself; (3) it acknowledges that government has affirmative duties beyond justice (public works, education) but distinguishes these from the strict obligation of

justice; (4) it argues that enforcement, to be just, must be impartial—the same rules applied to the powerful and the friendless alike; and (5) it concludes that impartial enforcement, in turn, requires judges independent of the powers that would corrupt them.

The letter advances five tightly connected claims drawn from Smith’s writings:

1. Justice is the precondition for cooperation among strangers; without it, society does not merely deteriorate but dissolves (TMS II.ii.3.3–4; WN I.ii.2).
2. Justice consists of plain, precise rules forbidding injury—force, fraud, and theft—applied the same to every person and enforced as law (TMS II.ii.1; II.ii.1.9; III.6.11).
3. Government has affirmative duties beyond justice—notably public works and the education of ordinary people—but these rest on public benefit and prudence, not on the strict enforceable obligation of justice (WN V.i.c; V.i.f).
4. Justice in form is not justice in substance: equal rules unequally applied are the corruption of justice itself (TMS I.iii.3; III.3.42–43).
5. The impartial administration of justice requires the institutional independence of the judiciary from executive power (WN V.i.b.25).

As in the earlier background papers, each major claim from the letter is identified and examined against Smith’s texts. Where the letter offers an interpretive synthesis rather than a direct paraphrase, this is noted explicitly.

1. The Spine: Justice as the Ground of Cooperation

Letter’s claim: “The ancient Greek philosophers named four cardinal virtues—wisdom, courage, moderation, and justice. They understood that the last of these held the others together.”

Textual Basis

The letter opens by placing its argument within the classical cardinal-virtues tradition. The four virtues named—wisdom, courage, moderation or temperance, and justice—are identified by Plato in the Republic (Book IV) and elaborated by Aristotle, the Stoics, Cicero, and the broader Western moral tradition that Smith inherited. Smith himself works within this tradition: TMS Part VI discusses prudence, justice, beneficence, and self-command at length, with prudence corresponding to wisdom, self-command to moderation, and justice to its classical counterpart. Beneficence is not one of Plato’s four cardinal virtues as such; Smith gives it a distinct and central place.

The letter’s claim that justice “held the others together” echoes the structural role Plato gives justice in the Republic. But the parallel to Plato should not be pressed too far. Plato’s justice is an expansive harmony-ordering virtue of soul and city; Smith’s justice is much narrower. Smith also gives primacy to justice.

One caution worth flagging: the letter’s claim that a society can “stumble in wisdom, falter in courage, lapse in self-command, and yet endure” is an extension of Smith’s arguments. Smith’s explicit comparative claim concerns beneficence versus justice (TMS II.ii.3.3–4), not all four cardinal virtues. The letter’s extension to the other cardinal virtues is an interpretive move: it generalizes Smith’s structural point about justice’s primacy in a way consistent with his system but not stated in his texts.

Letter’s claim: “Justice is the ground on which strangers can cooperate—and when it gives way, society does not merely suffer; it collapses.”

Textual Basis

The spine sentence is the load-bearing claim of the letter and the single proposition from which the four-step argument is built. It is an interpretive synthesis: the substance is unmistakably Smithian, but the framing combines two distinct passages from Smith’s two books. This combination is faithful to his overall system, but it is acknowledged here for the reader who would otherwise expect a single citation.

Foundational claim (TMS). The first half of the spine—that justice is the condition without which society cannot endure—comes from TMS II.ii.3.3–4, where Smith argues that society can subsist without much beneficence but cannot subsist amid the prevalence of injustice:

“Beneficence, therefore, is less essential to the existence of society than justice. Society may subsist, though not in the most comfortable state, without beneficence; but the prevalence of injustice must utterly destroy it.” (TMS II.ii.3.3)

“[Justice] is the main pillar that upholds the whole edifice. If it is removed... the great, the immense fabric of human society... must in a moment crumble into atoms.” (TMS II.ii.3.4)

The letter’s phrase “when it gives way, society does not merely suffer; it collapses” is a faithful compression of Smith’s contrast between subsisting-in-poorer-form and being-destroyed. The verbs “gives way” and “collapses” maintain Smith’s structural image (pillar, edifice) without colliding with the verbatim “crumble into atoms” quotation, which appears later in the background of the series and is reserved for its proper Smithian place.

Cooperation-among-strangers framing (WN). The second element—that what is at stake is specifically cooperation among strangers—comes from WN I.ii, the famous passage on the division of labor and the impersonal exchange that sustains commercial society. Smith’s point there is that the human achievement of a complex commercial society rests on cooperation among strangers who owe one another nothing personal. The connection between this and the foundational claim of TMS II.ii.3 is implicit in Smith but not stated explicitly in either passage as a single proposition. The spine sentence makes the connection explicit: what is destroyed when justice fails is precisely the framework that allows strangers to cooperate at all. This is the

interpretive move the letter makes, which I believe is well within the bounds of legitimate synthesis—Smith’s system clearly presupposes the linkage, even where he does not state it in a single sentence.

Contemporary illustration. The letter’s extended example—the farmer who grew the wheat, the trucker who hauled it, the warehouse worker, the engineer who designed the chip in the reader’s phone, the clerk who processes payments—renders Smith’s butcher/brewer/baker illustration in twenty-first-century terms. Smith himself updated his examples between editions of WN to reflect the changing commercial world he observed; the letter’s modernization is in this spirit.

On trust versus enforced rules. The letter takes deliberate care, in this section, to specify that what enables cooperation among strangers is not “trust” in the casual modern sense—personal confidence, social capital, faith in goodwill—but rather “the certainty that the rules of justice are equally and effectively enforced.” This is the more Smithian formulation. Smith’s argument in WN I.ii is precisely that commercial cooperation does not require benevolence or trust between the parties:

“It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest.” (WN I.ii.2)

On the consequences of failure. The letter names the consequences of failed justice in concrete and series-consistent terms: “the invisible hand falters. Specialization narrows. Markets contract. Prosperity dwindles.” This connects the present letter to Letter 3 (“The Invisible Hand”) and Letter 4 (“Enemies of the Invisible Hand”), and the chain of consequences—specialization, markets, prosperity—traces the same causal sequence Smith develops in WN I.iii (the extent of the market limits the division of labor) and WN I.viii (the division of labor enriches a nation). The letter’s point is that this entire economic chain rests on the prior framework of impartially enforced justice. A reader of the earlier letters will recognize the connection; a new reader will hopefully find the consequences clear even without reading those earlier letters.

The internal aphorism. The letter compresses the spine still further into the line “a society without justice is not a worse society; it is no society.” This is fully consistent with TMS II.ii.3.3.

2. What Justice Is: The Explicit Definition

Letter’s claim: “Justice is the set of rules that forbids us from injuring one another, applied equally to every person. Do not use force against your neighbors. Do not defraud them. Do not take what is theirs. These rules are precise, public, and, critically, the same for everyone—the powerful and the weak alike.”

Textual Basis

This section makes explicit what the letter’s argument requires the reader to hold: a plain, concrete definition of justice. Each clause is grounded in Smith.

Justice as negative duty. The triad “do not use force... do not defraud... do not take” is the letter’s compression of Smith’s broader account in TMS II.ii.

Smith characterizes justice primarily as a virtue of forbearance:

“We may often fulfil all the rules of justice by sitting still and doing nothing.”
(TMS II.ii.1.9)

Smith’s account in TMS II.ii.1 develops the same triad in slightly different language: justice consists in not robbing, not defrauding, and not coercing. The letter’s plain-language rendering preserves Smith’s content while replacing the eighteenth-century vocabulary.

A note on the taxonomy. The triad “force, fraud, and theft” in the letter is a compressed modern rendering, not a complete Smithian taxonomy of injury. Smith’s fuller account, developed at length in *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, distinguishes injuries to person (life, body, liberty, reputation), to estate (property, contract, succession), and to the rights one holds against other particular persons. Jurisprudence proper, in Smith’s sense, comprises the entire body of rules a judge or arbiter would apply—including contract, title, restitution, and the treatment of promises—not only the prohibitions against affirmative aggression. The letter’s triad captures the most prominent and accessible class of these duties (those forbidding affirmative injury) and is faithful as far as it goes, but a reader pursuing Smith’s full jurisprudential picture will find injuries to reputation, contract, and succession equally part of justice in his strict sense.

Precision and public character. The letter’s claim that the rules of justice are “precise” and “public” tracks Smith’s grammar simile in TMS III.6.11, which compares the rules of justice to those of grammar (“accurate in the highest degree, and admit of no exceptions or modifications”) and contrasts them with the looser maxims of the other virtues. See Section 7 below for the full development of this point.

Equal application. The letter’s definition closes with the claim that the rules are “the same for everyone—the powerful and the weak alike.” This is built into Smith’s definition of justice itself: the rules of justice track the act, not the person, and are owed in the same way regardless of station. The full development of this point appears in Section 5 below.

Letter’s claim: “That is all. Justice is not charity. It is not the correction of every misfortune. Those are the work of beneficence—which a humane society cultivates. But they are not the foundation on which a free society rests.”

Textual Basis

The second paragraph of the section distinguishes justice from charity and from the correction of misfortune. Three points are worth noting.

Beneficence, not kindness. The letter uses “beneficence” rather than “kindness” in this paragraph. This is Smith’s own technical term and is the more accurate one. Beneficence in Smith’s vocabulary is a category broader than the modern English “kindness”: it encompasses

generosity, charity, friendship, gratitude, and the relief of hardship—all positive action toward the good of others. “Kindness” in modern English usually means a warmer, narrower disposition. The letter’s use of “beneficence” better captures what Smith assigned to private moral life (TMS II.ii.3.1–3).

The relief of misfortune as beneficence. The letter assigns “the correction of every misfortune” to beneficence, not to government. This is faithful to Smith. The relief of hardship, for Smith, is primarily a matter of private beneficence—the work of individuals, families, religious institutions, and friendly societies—rather than a duty of the sovereign as such. Smith discusses the parish-based poor relief of his own day in WN, but he does not affirmatively argue that government has a strict duty to relieve hardship as part of its core function. The letter accordingly assigns this work to “beneficence—which a humane society cultivates,” without overclaiming what government’s role might be.

What government does have a duty to provide. The letter takes care, in Section 3 (“What I Did Not Mean”), to acknowledge separately that government does have affirmative duties beyond justice: public works and the education of ordinary people (WN V.i.c - V.i.f). These are distinct from beneficence in Smith’s thought: he grounds them in public benefit and the prudent provisioning role of the sovereign, not in beneficence as a moral virtue. The letter’s structure honors this distinction by treating private beneficence and public provisioning in separate sections rather than conflating them.

Smith’s own metaphor at TMS II.ii.3.4 calls beneficence “the ornament which embellishes” the building, contrasting it with justice as “the main pillar.” The letter preserves Smith’s foundational claim but avoids the term “ornament,” which in modern English risks sounding dismissive of beneficence in a way Smith did not intend. The substantive Smithian claim that beneficence is structurally subordinate to justice is preserved.

3. Related Context: Why Justice May Be Enforced and Kindness May Not

The letter takes the enforceability of justice as given and does not develop the Smithian argument for it. This section supplies the argument, since it underlies the letter’s implicit move from definition (Section 2) to impartial application (Section 5 of this paper, and the corresponding section of the letter).

Smith grounds the enforceability of justice in resentment—specifically, in the resentment that an impartial spectator shares with the injured party. Beneficence, however admirable, is not enforceable:

“Beneficence is always free, it cannot be extorted by force...” (TMS II.ii.1.3)

Justice, by contrast, may be enforced, because its violation does positive harm that an impartial spectator recognizes as a proper object of resentment and punishment. In TMS II.ii.1–2, Smith argues that the violator of justice is properly an object of punishment because the impartial

spectator goes along with, and shares in, the resentment of the person injured. This converts a private grievance into a basis for a public rule: an act is unjust when any impartial observer would recognize the injury and concur in the resentment.

The distinction matters because it explains why kindness must be left to conscience while justice may be compelled by law. Smith's principle is plain: beneficence "cannot be extorted by force" (TMS II.ii.1.3). I dramatize this idea in the letter with the line "A gift compelled is no gift; a generosity demanded by force defeats the moral character of the act.," where I am trying capture Smith's principle that where beneficence is forced, the moral character that gives it value is destroyed in the forcing.

4. What Government Owes Beyond Justice: Public Works and Education

Letter's claim: "Nor did I mean, by placing justice at the foundation, that government has no further duty... the state should make provisions for public works that private interest alone will not adequately supply—the roads, bridges, and harbors on which commerce depends, and the education of ordinary people..."

Textual Basis

This passage was included to forestall a misreading. Because the letter assigns charity, the relief of hardship, and the distribution of wealth to beneficence (the "ornament" in Smith's metaphor), a reader could wrongly conclude that Smith regarded all government action beyond the enforcement of justice as optional private kindness. Smith held no such view, and the passage corrects it directly. The claims here are well grounded in the *Wealth of Nations*.

Public works. In WN V.i.c, Smith identifies the erecting and maintaining of "public works" and "public institutions" that "facilitate the commerce of the society" (WN V.i.c.2; WN V.i.d.1) — roads, bridges, canals, harbors—as a proper duty of the sovereign, precisely because, though advantageous to the society as a whole, the profit "could never repay the expense to any individual," (WN V.i.c.1) and so private interest will not adequately supply them. The letter's formulation—"what private interest alone will not adequately supply"—is a close paraphrase of Smith's rationale.

Education. In WN V.i.f, Smith argues that the state has a real interest in the education of ordinary people, and proposes a specific institutional remedy. His diagnosis is the one the letter invokes: the division of labor, which enriches a nation, can also stupefy the worker confined to a few simple operations. Smith writes that such a man "generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become."

He adds:

"But in every improved and civilized society this is the state into which the labouring poor, that is, the great body of the people, must necessarily fall, unless government takes some pains to prevent it." (WN V.i.f.50)

And

“The more they are instructed, the less liable they are to the delusions of enthusiasm and superstition, which, among ignorant nations, frequently occasion the most dreadful disorders. ... They [educated people] are more disposed to examine, and more capable of seeing through, the interested complaints of faction and sedition ...” (WN V.i.f.61).

Smith’s actual institutional proposal, however, is more carefully calibrated than “the state should provide education.” He proposes that the public may facilitate, encourage, and even impose upon “almost the whole body of the people” the necessity of acquiring basic literacy and arithmetic—through small parish schools, partly publicly subsidized and partly user-funded, with some examination in fundamentals as a precondition for setting up in certain trades. The letter’s wording—that the state should “make provisions for” such education—is intended to accurately track Smith’s proposal rather than overstating it. This is the closest element in Smith to what is sometimes called a “capabilities” view of government: public action to preserve the intellectual and civic capacities of ordinary citizens.

The crucial distinction. The letter marks these as “duties of a prudent government, weighed by the public benefit,” rather than as instances of justice. This tracks Smith’s own architecture: public works and education rest on grounds of public benefit and are to be weighed by prudent legislators, whereas justice is the strict, enforceable framework owed in every case. The clause “the condition without which no other public good is secure” is an interpretive synthesis but a faithful one: it states the priority relation implicit throughout Smith’s system—public works, education, and prosperity are all built upon, and depend upon, the secure administration of justice, not the reverse. The passage therefore strengthens rather than qualifies the letter’s central thesis.

One caution: the letter does not present poverty relief as a government duty on the same footing as roads and schools. Smith was far more explicit about public works and public education than about poverty relief as a state function. This avoids attributing to Smith a modern welfare-state position he did not hold, while still making clear he was no advocate of indifference to the poor (see WN I.viii.36, where Smith insists “No society can surely be flourishing and happy, of which the far greater part of the members are poor and miserable.”). I will discuss this in a future letter.

5. Equal Rules, Equally Applied

Letter’s claim: “When the powerful man and the friendless man commit the same act and meet two different laws, you do not have justice tempered by mercy. You have privilege wearing the mask of law.”

Textual Basis

This section makes the third step in the letter’s deduction: if justice must be enforced, it must be enforced impartially. The substance is grounded in Smith. He repeatedly observes that the

administration of justice historically tilted toward wealth and rank. In TMS I.iii.3, he notes the asymmetry by which the faults of the great are indulged while those of the humble are punished:

“The profligacy of a man of fashion is looked upon with much less contempt and aversion, than that of a man of meaner condition.” (TMS I.iii.3.4)

Smith argues throughout TMS I.iii.3 (“Of the corruption of our moral sentiments, which is occasioned by this disposition to admire the rich and the great”) that spectators are reluctant to expose or censure the failings of persons of high station, and therefore judge the powerful with systematic leniency, undermining the natural sense of justice. I am taking some editorial license when using phrases such as “privilege wearing the mask of law,” but I believe they faithfully dramatize Smith’s point that partial application empties justice of its substance.

The letter addresses our own era directly (“your own age not excepted”; “the temptation is perennial, because it is profitable”). This is me taking some editorial license rather than a Smith quotation, but it is consistent with Smith’s view that the bias toward wealth and rank is a permanent feature of human moral psychology (TMS I.iii.3), not an accident of any one century. The passage names a mechanism—that there will always be those with the means to obtain an exception—which generalizes Smith’s account of how privilege corrupts impartial administration.

6. The Independence of the Judiciary

Letter’s claim: “If justice is to be impartial, those who administer it must be independent of those who hold power... ‘When the judicial is united to the executive power, it is scarce possible that justice should not frequently be sacrificed to, what is vulgarly called, politics.’”

Textual Basis

This is the fourth and final step in the letter’s deduction, and the most institutional. It rests on an explicit passage in the Wealth of Nations:

*“When the judicial is united to the executive power, it is scarce possible that justice should not frequently be sacrificed to, what is vulgarly called, politics.”
(WN V.i.b.25)*

The letter quotes this passage verbatim. Smith continues in the same passage to argue that judicial impartiality requires that the judge be separated from, and not dependent upon, executive power, since such dependence makes impartiality nearly impossible. The letter’s surrounding claim—that a judge dependent on the ruler for office, income, or safety “cannot be trusted to rule against the ruler”—is faithful to Smith.

Smith’s broader argument in WN V.i.b is that the regular and impartial administration of justice is what gives every person security in their rights and property, and that this security depends on judicial independence. The letter’s framing—that separating the judge from the prince “is how a society builds the impartial spectator into its very government”—joins Smith’s jurisprudence

(WN V.i.b) with his moral psychology (the impartial spectator of TMS III.3). It is not a sentence Smith wrote, but it accurately joins two strands he clearly held: that justice must be impartial, and that impartiality requires institutional independence.

On the line “Your Founders understood this—and built a republic on it.” The letter uses this phrase as an American constitutional bridge, not as a claim of direct causal influence. Two things support the framing. First, Smith was read in founding-era America: Jefferson acquired editions of *Wealth of Nations* during his time in France and at later periods, and the work was in his Monticello library; Hamilton engaged with Smith in his *Report on Manufactures* (in part to argue against Smith’s free-trade orthodoxy as much as to draw on him); and Smith was familiar to other leading founders as part of the wider Scottish and British political-economic literature of the time. Second—and this is the load-bearing claim—the American Constitution embodies judicial independence in its institutional structure: Article III provides federal judges with tenure “during good behaviour” and salaries that may not be diminished while they hold office. This is the institutional expression of the principle Smith articulates at WN V.i.b.25, whatever the precise channels of influence. The letter’s framing therefore makes a modest and defensible point: the principle Smith stated, in the same year as the Declaration, found its American institutional expression in Article III. The letter does not claim that Smith caused the constitutional provisions; it observes that the founders recognized, and the Constitution embodies, the principle Smith articulated.

7. Related Context: Why Justice Can Be Reduced to Precise Rules

The letter does not develop the further point that justice, unlike the other claims a society makes upon its members, can be codified into exact and enforceable rules. This material is supplied here as background, since it explains a feature presupposed by the letter’s third and fourth steps: that justice can be administered through impartial general rules at all.

Because the rules of justice track what any impartial person would recognize as injury, they can be stated with a precision the other virtues do not allow. This is the point of Smith’s well-known grammar simile:

“The rules of justice may be compared to the rules of grammar; the rules of the other virtues, to the rules which critics lay down for the attainment of what is sublime and elegant in composition.” (TMS III.6.11)

Smith’s point is that the rules of justice are “accurate in the highest degree, and admit of no exceptions or modifications,” whereas the maxims of the other virtues are “loose, vague, and indeterminate.” Grammar can tell you with precision whether a sentence is correctly formed; it cannot tell you whether the sentence is beautiful. Justice is like the former: it specifies exactly what we must not do. Beneficence is like the latter: it points toward what is admirable without reducing to a determinate rule. This precision is what makes justice, uniquely among the claims a

society makes upon its members, capable of being codified into enforceable law—which is what allows the institutional argument of the letter’s third and fourth sections to get off the ground.

8. The Closing Architecture: Biographical Anchor and the Verbatim TMS Quotation

Letter’s claim: “My friends, from my lectures at Edinburgh and Glasgow, through both my books, I returned again and again to the centrality of justice in free societies: ‘Justice... is the main pillar that upholds the whole edifice. If it is removed... the great, the immense fabric of human society... must in a moment crumble into atoms.’”

Textual Basis

The letter’s closing section has three elements worth documenting: a biographical anchor, the letter’s only verbatim quotation of Smith’s most famous statement on justice, and a closing call to the reader.

Biographical anchor. The phrase “from my lectures at Edinburgh and Glasgow, through both my books” is historically accurate. Smith delivered a celebrated series of public lectures in Edinburgh in the late 1740s under the patronage of Lord Kames; he was appointed Professor of Logic at the University of Glasgow in 1751 and Professor of Moral Philosophy in 1752, lecturing in that chair until 1764. His two books are *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) and *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776). The claim that Smith “returned again and again to the centrality of justice” is borne out by his corpus: TMS Part II is devoted to justice; TMS Part III develops the impartial spectator on which justice rests; TMS Part VI (added in the 1790 edition) returns to the cardinal virtues including justice; WN Book V treats the administration of justice as the second great duty of the sovereign; and the *Lectures on Jurisprudence* (delivered 1762–1764, published 1896 and 1978) constitute an entire course on the subject.

The letter quotes TMS II.ii.3.4 in full at the close.

Letter’s claim: “Guard justice. Everything you value rests upon it.”

Textual Basis

The closing call. The letter ends on the word justice itself, the concept the entire letter has been defining and defending. “Everything you value rests upon it” restates Smith’s priority claim (TMS II.ii.3.3–4) in personal form, converting the social analysis into a direct address to the reader.

Conclusion

Every major claim in “The One Thing No Free Society Can Survive” is grounded in Adam Smith’s writings. The letter opens by placing its argument within the classical cardinal-virtues tradition (Plato, *Republic IV*; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*; the Stoic and Ciceronian inheritance Smith worked within) and proceeds from a single load-bearing spine—that justice is

the ground on which strangers can cooperate, and that its failure dissolves the cooperative bond on which society itself depends. From this spine the letter (1) defines justice plainly—the rules against force, fraud, and theft, equally applied and enforced; (2) shows that this is the framework that makes cooperation among strangers possible; (3) distinguishes the strict obligation of justice from government’s wider duties of public provision; (4) argues that the rules must be applied to the powerful and the friendless alike; and (5) concludes that impartial application requires judicial independence. Each step rests on identifiable Smith material: TMS II.ii.3 and WN I.ii for the spine; TMS II.ii.1 and III.6.11 for the definition; WN V.i.c and V.i.f for the affirmative duties of government; TMS I.iii.3 and III.3.42–43 for the equal-application argument; and WN V.i.b.25 for the judicial-independence argument. The letter closes (Section 8 of this paper) with a biographical anchor and the verbatim TMS II.ii.3.4 quotation, held in reserve until that moment so that Smith’s own most famous formulation lands as the culminating note, followed by the call “Guard justice. Everything you value rests upon it.”

Five clearly flagged interpretive syntheses appear: (1) the opening generalization of justice’s structural primacy to all four cardinal virtues (Smith’s explicit comparative claim concerns beneficence; the extension to wisdom, courage, and moderation is consistent with his system but goes beyond his exact statement); (2) the spine sentence joins the foundational claim of TMS II.ii.3 with the cooperation-among-strangers framing of WN I.ii; (3) the claim that public works and education, though genuine duties of government, rest on justice as “the condition without which no other public good is secure”; (4) the claim that judicial independence is how a society “builds the impartial spectator into its government”; and (5) the framing of the American founders as having “built a republic on” the principle Smith articulated at WN V.i.b.25—used as an American constitutional bridge (Article III’s good-behavior tenure and salary protection embody the principle) rather than as a claim of direct causal influence. Each joins strands Smith held explicitly, and none introduces a position foreign to his texts.

A final caution on terminology. Smith’s concept of justice is narrower than the term’s contemporary usage, and narrower than its classical usage as well. For Smith, justice is principally commutative—the forbearance from injury and the impartial enforcement of rules—rather than distributive in the modern sense, and narrower than Plato’s expansive sense of justice or Aristotle’s justice that includes distributive allocation. I tried, in the letter, to mark this distinction, assigning the relief of hardship and the distribution of wealth to beneficence rather than to justice, while separately acknowledging—consistent with *Wealth of Nations* Book V—that government nonetheless has affirmative duties of public provision grounded in public benefit. Readers who use “justice” in the broader modern sense, or in the broader classical sense, should understand that the letter, following Smith, employs the narrower meaning.