Social – Justice Issues

AbdulRahman Al-Harethi and Imran S. Ansari

Abstract—in this paper we have talked about social-justice issues in general. In particular, we have discussed some types of justice, different views of justice, discussed some problems and solutions. Furthermore, we have cited some instances of unethical behaviors in situations were social-justice issue was the main part to play. In addition, we have even discussed the Islamic view of social-justice issue. We concluded our paper by setting a goal for you that will let you lead a perfectly ethical life hereafter.

I. INTRODUCTION

THIS paper talks about Social-Justice Issues. Well, Social Justice is mostly referred to an ideal society where justice refers to economic status rather than the administration laws. It is based on the idea of a society that gives an individual and groups fair treatment and a just share of the benefits of society, although what is "fair treatment" and a "just share" must remain unclear or subject to interpretation.

There are many of Social-Justice issues universally and locally that can be taken care of on this paper, but we will limit our paper to equity and justice which are the most common values for human to live and survive. Each society or sub-society interprets the issues based on their own frame of reference of values and cultures. For instance, in Islamic culture, the human rights are highly valued were no differences between race, age, sex, cast, creed and faith. The western culture share these values were equal opportunities are on of the top of the decree in all higher education laws.

II. SOME TYPES OF JUSTICE

A. Justice as Harmony:

Justice is a mutual relationship between the different parts of the person or city. A person's soul has three parts – reasons, spirit and desire – and the just person is the one in whom reason commands the other two and each keeps to its tasks. Similarly, a city has three parts – lovers of wisdom, soldiers and workers - and the just city is the one the lovers of wisdom rule the other two, and in which everyone sticks to his or her own, appropriate tasks. This is what Harmonial Justice means.[3]

B. Justice as Natural Law:

For advocates of the theory that justice is part of natural law, it involves the system of consequences which naturally derives from any action or choice. In this, it is similar to the

AbdulRahman Al-Harethi is with the Computer Engineering Department, KFUPM, Saudi Arabia (e-mail: s233121@kfupm.edu.sa).

Imran S. Ansari is with the Computer Engineering Department, KFUPM, Saudi Arabia (e-mail: s246808@kfupm.edu.sa).

laws of Physics: in the same way as the Third of Newton's Law of Motion requires that for every action there must be an equal and opposite reaction, justice requires according individuals or groups what they actually deserve, merit, or are entitled to.[3]

C: Justice as Mutual Agreement:

According to thinkers in the social contract tradition, justice is derived from the mutual agreement of everyone concerned; or, in many versions, from what they would agree to under hypothetical conditions including equality and absence of bias.[3]

D: Theories of Retributive Justice:

Theories of retributive justice are considered with punishment for wrongdoing, and need to answer three questions – why punish? Who should be punished? What punishment should they receive?[3]

E: Utilitarianism:

Utilitarianism means that justice requires the maximization of the total or average welfare across all relevant individuals. This includes:

1. <u>Deterrence:</u> The credible threat of punishment might lead people to make different choices; well-designed threats might lead people to make choices which maximize welfare.
2. <u>Rehabilitation:</u> Punishment might make bad people into better ones. For the utilitarian, all that 'bad person' can mean is 'person who's likely to cause bad things (like suffering)'. So, utilitarianism could recommend punishment which changes someone such that he or she is less likely to cause bad things.
3. <u>Security:</u> Perhaps there are people who are irredeemable causers of bad things. If so, imprisoning them might maximize welfare by limiting their opportunities to cause harm.[3]

III. DIFFERENT VIEWS OF JUSTICE

A. Hume's Theory of Justice:

Justice is discussed in the Treatise in the context of an inquiry into the nature of virtue. Hume begins Treatise by asking 'In what does the distinction between moral good and moral evil consist?', but quickly propounds the view that the objects of moral evaluation are not actions but persons and their qualities. The distinction between virtue and vice is logically prior to that between right and wrong, and actions are regarded only as signs of the possession of relevant qualities. Justice is taken as a virtue which a man may possess.

However, the impact of this initial move is modified when Hume arrives at the detailed discussion of justice, for justice is defined, not as a disposition or an attitude of mind, but as a set of principles governing men's actions. The virtue of justice must consist in acting in conformity to these principles.[1]

B. Spencer's Theory of Justice:

Spencer understood the distinction between Absolute and Relative ethics thus: Absolute ethics is the study of those oral principles which should be adopted and followed in ideal circumstances; that is to say, in a society which is constituted as it should be. Relative ethics is the study of those principles which should be followed in existing society, taking account of its imperfections. The need for a system of Relative ethics is fairly clear, since the consequences of acting on ideal principles in an imperfect society might be disastrous. Spencer, however, argues that Absolute ethics is the proper subject-matter for scientific (or philosophical) study. His books on ethics contain a system of Absolute ethics, a set of principles for a perfect society. His attitude towards Relative ethics is not entirely clear. In his first work, *Social Static's*, he appears to dismiss it out of hand:

. . . it will very likely be argued that, whereas the perfect moral code is confessedly beyond the fulfillment of imperfect men, some other code is needful for our present guidance. . . . To say that the imperfect man requires a moral code which recognizes his imperfection and allows for it, seems at first tight reasonable.[1]

C. Kropotkin's Theory of Justice:

While Hume was a consummate philosopher, and Spencer a mediocre one, it is very doubtful whether Kropotkin should be thought of as a philosopher at all. Certainly, it cannot be disputed that his leading role was that of a pamphleteer and a propagandist. Most of his books were compiled from leaflets, articles, and speeches written primarily for political purposes, with the result that their theoretical level is closer to the political tract than to political philosophy. It might therefore be considered obligatory to approach Kropotkin as a political agitator, and to apply to his works criteria appropriate to tracts and manifestos, rather than criteria appropriate to political philosophies. Previous commentators have adopted this view, outlining Kropotkin's plans and ideals, and contenting themselves with a few critical remarks on their realism or utopianism. It has not been felt useful to subject Kropotkin to the kind of critical scrutiny one might apply to Rousseau or Marx. Two reasons can be given for departing from this pattern and for treating Kropotkin in the same manner as Hume and Spencer. Kropotkin himself thought that he was doing something more than producing revolutionary calls to action. He believed that he was creating a political philosophy of anarchism, which would place anarchist principles on a scientific basis; hence, in large measure, his analysis of the role of 'mutual aid' in human evolution, and his history of ethics. Second, there *are* things of philosophical interest in Kropotkin, particularly in this context his analysis of the concept of justice.[1]

D. Social Justice in Sociological Perspective:

In my inquiry up to this point I have tried to explicate the familiar idea of social justice, first by separating its three distinct, conflicting elements, and then by showing how each element corresponds to a different way of viewing society, represented in my analysis by the political theories of Hume, Spencer, and Kropotkin. Each of these images of society (the stable order, the competitive market, the solidaristic community) plays a part in the thinking of our contemporaries. Any given person will adhere most closely to one image in particular, and to the corresponding conception of justice. Rather than explore the reasons for these individual differences, however, I want to ask whether ideas of justice do not vary systematically from one social context to the next. Some writers have suggested that men everywhere share a common sense of justice, which can be expressed as a general principle that incorporates more specific conceptions of justice. Although this may hold of the most basic notions of justice (such as the golden rule: treat others as you would like them to treat you under similar circumstances), I shall try to show that substantive ideas of social justice--the principles used to assess the distribution of benefits and burdens among the members of society-- take radically different forms in different types of society. To do this, I shall start by comparing the social ideas characteristic of three such types. The types will be referred to as primitive societies, hierarchical societies, and market societies. Our own society will later be presented as a modified form of market society.[1]

E: Islamic View

Allah talks about Social-Justice in Qur'an at many places. For an instance, Surat Al-Hujuraat, Ayah number 13. So this shows us that instead of just blindly looking at the worldly perspective of Social-Justice, we must even look into our faith because Allah loves his man on the basis of his level of Faith in Allah and not on the basis of wealth or money or any sort of richness.

Similarly, our Prophet Muhammad (SAW) for whole of his life treated mankind with justice and Allah had recommended Him to do so. For instance, there was an incident were our Prophet Muhammad (SAW), while fixing the positions of the warriors in a war, hit one of the Companions and in return the Companion had kissed the Prophet's abdomen. So this shows us that we must be fair and full of love for each other.

Having said all this, we must also realize that the other religions too have almost the same principles in a way or other.

IV. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

The feelings and experiences of inequality between people and individuals are the basic issues that cause worse complaints and aggression. So, let us now turn our focus towards specific examples of social issues that refer to equity which are depicted in age, class, disability and gender. These issues almost raise controversial situations between generations or people of different or similar societies.

For example, a generation gap has been generated when on older age groups of people sharply differ from younger age groups of people on the values and behaviors were one side holds the power economy or positions and the other side feels that they are deprived of the benefits of the power. Therefore, they feel they feel that they are discriminated and their rights to own are at risk. Moreover, some classes of society may monopolize some of the wealth or privileges that facilitate the monopoly of owning technology that are not available to the other classes and hence, the deprived class or low class people feel that they are in injustice society with regards to their ability to own or to have the tools or skills that are owned by the rich class people. Subsequently, the job opportunities to progress in life, at many instances, are clear examples of injustice and inequality.

As an another instance, *'Homelessness may represent a single acute episode in a person's life, or a condition into which individuals enter and exit repeatedly over the course of their lives.¨* (*Neil, et al, 1992:8*). In its publication, Australia's Welfare 1999, Services and Assistance, the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) pointed to five situations on which definitions of homelessness tend to focus. These are:

- currently living on the street;
- living in crisis or refuge accommodation;
- living in temporary arrangements without security of tenure-for example, moving between the residences of friends or relatives, living in squats, caravans or improvised dwellings, or living in boarding houses;
- living in unsafe family circumstances-for example, families in which child abuse or domestic violence is a threat or has occurred;
- living on very low incomes and facing extraordinary expenses or personal crisis.[4]

Globalization, as a solution:

- Globalization can be seen as an economic phenomenon, which increases interaction, or integration, of national economic systems which grow through international trade, capital flow and investment.
- Globalization is the rapid increase in cross-border economic, social, technological exchange under conditions of capitalism.
- The sociologist, Anthony Giddens, defines globalization as a decoupling of space and time, emphasizing that with instantaneous communications, knowledge and culture can be shared around the world simultaneously.
- A Dutch academic Ruud Lubbers defines it as a process in which geographic distance becomes a factor of diminishing importance in the establishment and maintenance of cross border economic, political and socio-cultural relations.[4]

V. CONCLUSION

According to a statement by Smith: "The Haight Ashbury Free Clinics is a community-based non-profit health care agency dealing with many of society's most difficult problems, including primary health care, chemical dependency, AIDS prevention and treatment, and women's health issues. All of these services are rooted in the Free Clinic's philosophy that evolved when the first Clinic opened in June 1967:

- ■ Health care is a right, not a privilege. It should be free at the point of delivery for all who need it.
- ■ Primary health services should be comprehensive, non-fragmented, and decentralized.
- ■ Medicine should be demystified, non-judgmental and humane. Health care should be delivered in a courteous and educational manner. When possible, patients should be permitted to choose among alternative methods of treatment.
- ■ Health care skills, with an emphasis on preventive medicine, should be transferred to worker and patient alike. The worker and patient should be permitted to practise and share these skills.
- ■ Health care should be delivered via a team philosophy, granting respect and authority to each team member's skills and expertise.
- ■ Community and worker input should be established. Free medical clinics should be responsive to the people who use them and work in them."[2]

In conclusion, we would like to say that we must make an aim for ourselves, for our nations and for this world of ours that we will live in this world with peace, love and harmony by caring for others, sharing with others, not as a requirement of the nation but doing it ethically to keep up our instincts and make this world a better place to reside in.

REFERENCES

[1]   Miller, David, *Social Justice.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1979.
[2]   Spence, Jan, http://www.shareinternational.org
[3]   Wikipedia
[4]   http://www.erc.org.au