

# Theories of social justice assignment



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

The Security Rights are described as the institutional responsibility to uphold the physical integrity and protection against threats such as murder torture. Psychological threats are also included which believe is a great and underestimated point since that is often the more detrimental kind of abuse. The concept of Psychological threats is very hard to apply internationally due to the fact that proof of harm becomes completely subjective. This subjective nature makes it hard to be universally applied. In terms of these states and societal groups not engaging in these ‘extra-judicial’ activities, I cannot say I fully agree.

I believe that in retain circumstances where the Security Rights of one person who is has violated that of others, can and should be sacrificed to ensure the security rights of others. A common example would be the interrogation of a known suspect with information pertaining to mass violation of Security Rights (I. E. Serial killers and terrorists). In this example I believe it to be perfectly acceptable to carry out whatever is needed (whether that is physical or psychological torture) to prevent the malicious act of others willing to disregard another Security Rights.

For this reason I believe that each and very person deserves this Security Right until they negatively affect, directly or indirectly, that of another person. The second Basic Right addressed is referred to as Subsistence Rights, which outlines the guarantee of a certain range of resources, required by human beings to function with minimal levels of health and education. As a method of fulfillment, this principle says, “Every able adult is expected ?? or at least strongly encouraged – to exert some effort towards meeting these goals”.

I completely agree that within a community, if a person is putting in decent effort to maintain their livelihood, they should be aided in order to meet the basic necessities such as food, water and shelter. However I do not think that help should be given to those who participate in harmful or self-destructive behavior. For example, if a person receiving aid continues to misuse it to fulfill something as a drug addiction or any other activity that may affect the wellbeing of others, they should lose their right to any outside aid.

I also disagree that one society/country' should be obligated to aid another in need. While I obviously think this is the right thing to do, I could never call it a requirement to aid another just because you have more than them at this moment in time. Societies are constantly cycling in prosperity and if giving up extra resources to help another in a time of need means to sacrifice the security of your descendants, you should first protect your own. This is already natural for all humans.

This goes along with a statement later in the Subsistence Rights, which talks about earth's resources that, " must be preserved such that future generations can also meet their basic needs". I agree with this section completely because if we are talking as general as the human species, evolution and generational survival comes most important idea and if we exhaust all resources to satisfy those struggling to survive, we may be stretching our resources too thin and destroying quality of life for our sons and grandsons.

The second of Dry. Puffer's Principles, The Maximum Equal Basic Liberties Principle, is a scheme of Equal Liberties for mentally competent adults that

include; Civil Liberties, Family Rights and Political Liberties. The Civil Liberties refer to individuals' right to freedom of speech, assembly, religion and worship and so on. There is nothing disagree with among the Civil Liberties s long as these liberties do not interfere with all of the Basic Rights Principles already stated.

For example if a person's speech reaches the point where it becomes psychologically detrimental to another person, that freedom should be taken away and addressed in an appropriate matter. Similarly if the person freely chooses their occupation to be a harmful one such as an assassin or a drug dealer, they should also immediately lose that freedom. Among the Family Rights is the right to raise one's children, " however families may be structured in particular societies and cultures – as its adult members e fit, so long as this is within the limits of (legitimate) systems of criminal, civil, and family law'.

Once again as long as the Basic Rights are upheld among every person than all of these claims are legitimate. For this reason I particularly like that this section goes into detail pertaining to the rights of children. One thing I would add which goes along with subsistence rights, that even with perfectly good intentions and parenting skills, a person should not be allowed to bring a child into a society where there is simply not enough resources to go around. This idea of prevention of over population may not e fair to the parents but follows the basic rights principle.

Thirdly, Political Liberties are included in these Maximum Equal Basic Liberties. These outline the rights to campaign, vote, and run for (and hold)

political office and “ If necessary – limitations on large differentials in income and wealth that make even approximate equal worth of political liberties impossible within societies”. While agree with this equality, I do not think it can be internationally applied. It is definitely the ideal within a free democratic state but cannot be applied to nations that use different political structures.

For example I am sure the Queen of England along with any other monarchical political system would find these claims completely ridiculous. For this reason if you want to make this idea universal you would need to first argue for the world acceptance of the democratic system. The third principle that Rawls presents is called the Fair Equality of Opportunity Principle. This refers to the equal opportunity among approximately equal naturally talented individuals when it comes to the acquisition of social positions and offices.

While believe this principle does an excellent job of setting mass society requirements that disallow any type of discrimination due to race, gender etc... I do not think that the idea of universal access to equal high-quality education is just or possible. This ‘ equality’ would remove incentive for success in competition upon which our society thrives on. If everything was equal than there would be no private school for those financially advantaged who have put in additional investments and sacrifices (time, money) to ensure a higher level of education for themselves or their descendants.

Higher education has become a commodity over time just like any other precious resource and any attempt to equalize it for all would mean cutting

down those who have worked harder to attain it. The fourth principle titled, The Modified Difference Principle, develops just boundaries concerning economic and material inequalities. While Puffer's principle recognizes that total equality within mass societies is most likely impossible, it also states that these elites are only just if they maximally benefit the least materially advantaged persons.

On the other side of this, the principle maintains that these inequalities are not be great enough to allow for the undermining of; (a) equal worth liberties required by due process in civil and criminal law and (b) a persons' self respect. This principle does an excellent job of distinguishing to whom these claims are to be applied. It reads that it applies directly to non-able persons which is a very just requirement being it is not their fault they cannot contribute and earn enough. In contrast it says the principle should be applied indirectly to able adults, the only ones that should receive the aid are those who lack genuine opportunity.

This indirect application of the principle creates a very grey area as people can make their own opportunities. Also, their level of effort towards being productive and seizing opportunity is not easily measured and can surely be faked (for example, there are many people who manipulate the unemployment payments and work illegally to gain extra income). This makes these 'equalizing industries very difficult to regulate effectively. The principle also states that it should be applied between societies so that per capita use of natural resources is equal.

I do not fully agree with this because the forced decisions made about resource distribution undermines the voting power of people within societies and begins to interfere with peoples' basic rights. Overall I am tentative to equalize societies in such a manner because while these institutions may not completely erase the incentives for people to compete and “ efficiently pursue educational, productive, and creative activities”, the most competitive entrepreneurs and discoverers will in some way be discouraged to completely fulfill potential and will result in the overall deceleration of human advancement in all areas.

The fifth and final principle presented by Rawls is called The Social and Economic Democracy Principle, which addresses the need for adults to have an equal right to participate in decision-making processes within large scale and public social and economic institutions (which one is a member). Having this principle not be applied directly to private associations, small business and so on make for a vague criteria of what is large or small and makes for a very blurry line between need for participation.

Also am unsure if this principle is intended to be applied across borders but if it is then I must contest it because it is not fair for peoples' within a society to lose their proportion of participation to those who transfer from one society to another, In conclusion each of these five principles make very justifiable claims that could be implemented to promote a more morally sound society. However, whether it is a good thing or not, some of these ideas threaten the level of competition throughout our society and knowing the greed of humans, may never be successfully executed.

Also when these large-society oriented principles begin to be applied internationally, things become much more complicated as the cultural perspective and economic incentives vary unbelievably. Similarly these principles may begin to violate each other when the decision power of societies or countries (violating basic rights) is taken away in the name of equality. A final concern is the equilibrium between international equality of resources during the present and the need to support future generations who will follow our path on this planet.

Should we sacrifice the consumption insurance of our children for the well being of individuals internationally who we will never see or hear from? I do not believe the Just Savings Principle and the Basic rights of peoples' can be simultaneously maintained in our world due to the issue of overpopulation. With the world growing exponentially in number as it is, it is not possible to pass on equal levels of consumption and availability of resources without implementing one or both of two things.

One option, which China has already tried, is the disallowing of families to have children at their own discretion, thus limiting peoples' basic rights as well as their family rights contained in the Maximum Equal Basic Liberties Principle. Or, second we would need to completely violate the Modified Difference principle and simply rely on the idea of survival of the fittest. This survival of the fittest scenario would of ours allow families or societies to be wiped out of existence, thus allowing those left to prosper, maintain Sustenance Rights, and fulfill the Just Savings Principle in benefit of their descendants.



This is why I believe (at least in our situation of overpopulation) that when deciding on a theory of Global Justice to live by, there is no way to escape the choice between lowering the quality of life (or eliminating the possibility of existence all together) of either your children or those around the world occupying the planet also. After examining these principles and their implications, we see they do not automatically choose between capitalist or socialist economic arrangements.

With the consideration that it is perfectly possible that a socialist economy may recognize the private ownership of small-scale business (or even medium-sized) as legitimate within their system, it appears that these principles are leaning almost completely toward a socialist economic arrangement. This socialist acceptance of private ownership of small businesses is contained in David Caricature's idea of Economic Democracy, which is similarly contained in the agreeing five principles written by Dry.

Prefer. Since this would not be a basic right within the socialist society but rather a legal right (and possibly a moral right) we cannot say that these principles 'automatically' choose a socialist economic arrangement even though it is essentially in accordance with their legal and moral guidelines. As previously discussed, Dry. Prefer has created a concise, yet specific set of fundamental principles associated with importance of respecting and aiding the fulfillment of the basic rights of human beings.

Also he argues, which I broadly agree with, that any economic component of a theory of social justice must be applied internationally along with being applied within a given nation. Along with these social justice principles

presented by Dry. Prefer, there are also specific environmental ethics, (referring to Interspecies Justice such as justice or morality between humans and other organisms) which he provides practical guidelines of improvement. The overarching issues that Dry.

Prefer addresses and explains to be interconnected are those of world hunger (including extreme poverty in general), population pressures and environmental degradation and destruction. As said in the Subsistence Rights section of Prefers Basic Rights principle, ACH person should be guaranteed the resources necessary to function normally. Due to the inability to satisfy this guarantee, the issue Of world hunger as become an international concern. In the essay, “ World Hunger, Moral Theory and Radical Relativism”, Dry.

Prefer first narrows the viable resolution theories by eliminating those that are empirically nuns portable. When looking at the connection between overpopulation as the root problem to world hunger, Dry. Prefer points out that as Mammary Seen and others have exhibited, famines and starvations are not the consequence from a literal lack f food within particular societies but is the lack of an adequate entitlement system to adequate nutrition (as we saw in the movie The Business of Hunger countries are exporting large amount of food during times of starvation).

This is an amazing truth unknown to most people that disprove Harden’s argument that our planet is in a “ lifeboat” situation (meaning wealthy nations permits or requires not to aid the starving countries). I agree completely that this is reason for the objection Of the idea that carrying

capacities have been exceeded even though it is definitely a danger we must realize in connection with other issues. This revelation along with the sorting out of the next six resolution ideas ( 2. Should the world hunger problem be addressed on an individual basis or by the social, economic, and political institutions, policies, and programs? 3.

Is the issue of saving people a matter of charity or is it a matter of justice? 4. Should the issue be analyzed in terms of duties of justice and principles of distributive justice, or moral rights? 5. If concluded (4) to be moral rights, than which rights should be recognized 6. Comparative moral strength of all of the components of an adequate theory of social justice and the impact this makes on the issue of world hunger? 7. Do people have an obligation to help people within their borders or those outside of their borders) brings us to the analysis of Marmarouk Ken's moral and empirical evaluation of the world hunger problem.

Dry. Prefer presents Marmarouk Ken's three important ideas, which I find extremely compelling and viable. One is the idea that goods and services are not valuable in themselves. He says their value rests on what they can do for people. This idea that may seem very simple has become lost in the profit driven world we live in which results in a very imbalanced distribution of goods. Second, he asserts that the capability to be well nourished relies not only on food entitlement, but also other goods and services such as health and education.

This wise assessment is also accompanied by the fact that ' there is no real evidence to doubt that all famines in the modern world are preventable by

human action”. Prefer believes which I agree with, that Rawlins theories offer a well-worked out system of priority relations among good, whereas Ken’s do not. The conclusion of the analysis of these first seven hypotheses brings us to the eighth and final proposal that presents the best and most logically just elution to the massive epidemic of world hunger. This eighth proposal is the emphasis on the formation of the institutions, programs and policies needed to solve this emergency.

In this section Prefer presents empirical analyses and policy suggestions compatible to Rawlins theory, yet original in nature. Prefer asserts that the most important component of the solution to world hunger consists in nation-states, themselves, implementing the policy of national food self-reliance. Following this policy in order of importance is need for fair arrangements of international trade and developmental aid. The policy of food self-reliance creates the best chance for societies to meet their subsistence needs by demanding focus on certain issues.

First of all societies need to make sure that land is distributed and used in a fair and efficient manner meaning, the arable land is mostly used to grow staple foods that people in those cultures normally eat rather crops for export. Another crucial component of the policy is that entitlement systems are in place, which guarantees that people have access to adequate nutrition. The ideas concerning the national food self-reliance policy make much more ensue than Ken’s focus on raising the income of people so they can buy food. Live this policy is the best way to ensure the nutrition and survival of anyone affected by world hunger. As we saw in the video “ The Business of Hunger”, third world countries like Senegal are being destroyed

by this normalization and internationalization of economic mechanisms for food production and distribution. Sadly, we saw in that movie, these third world countries are producing more than enough food to support themselves yet are starving due to the profit driven exportation of crops.

The only problem is that in order to successfully implement such a policy, you must first fix the unjust and money-motivated international economic system that is exploiting these agricultural countries for money and leaving them to starve. As “The Business of Hunger” showed, the Dominican Republic’s economy is largely controlled by a massive company that produces and exports sugar. The government does not provide any basic needs for its people and allows for the exploitation of the country by these companies.

Similar in corruption, countries like the Philippines have military forces patrolling the country to rush rebellious farmers who lost everything including their land to the big companies. The land is just taken without regard for the people that rely on it resulting in widespread poverty and starvation. I believe that as an intermediary step to fully implementing the policy of national food self-reliance (as it will have many corrupt, wealthy cooperation’s opposing it), wealthy countries like the United States should be heavily taxed on the importation of food from third world countries.

This would promote the slow down of exportation in these countries and aid in the overall goal of the sectional food-self reliance policy. The next important world issue is that of overpopulation. While we have seen that it is not the root cause of the previous issues of world hunger, it is still a very interconnected issue that puts a lot of stress on societies as well as the

planet. While we may not have reached our ‘ carrying capacity’ yet, we are definitely on a quick path to surpassing it.

As we see in Puffer’s explanation of environment justices’ concerns, this overpopulation is in countless ways leading to the environmental degradation and resource depletion that is occurring all over the world. Similarly these other factors both contribute to overpopulation as well as one another, creating this triangular connection of these monumental planetary problems. While it may seem that these connected issues such as overpopulation and poverty will start to level each other out, we are finding that it is not the case.

For example we would expect poorer societies to have less children due to their inability to feed them (this should counteract overpopulation). However, Prefer points out, “ the so-called “ Many Hands Phenomenon” which is the fact that very poor people tend to have more children, rather than less, because in many particular situations the extra “ hands’ (I. E. Workers) are a financial benefit rather than a burden since they are cheap (unpaid) sources of labor for working the land, gathering water and firewood from increasingly distant places, or even for selling flowers or candy (etc. On the streets in urban areas”. This counterintuitive and desperate phenomenon is just one of many example of the problems with the level of interconnectivity among these three huge dilemmas. Another example Prefer exhibits is the Social-scientific studies of cultural norms in favor of having larger families with the idea that the more children very poor people have the better chance there is that at least one of those children will become economically successful

enough to take care of their parents in their old age or when they become too ill or injured to work.

In response to these previous examples of overpopulation, Prefer presents his support for the so-called demographic transition. This demographic transition describes the transition from high growth rates toward lower more sustainable rates. Prefer explains that critical condition to achieving this transition is through the development of a “social safety net”. This means that people will not reproduce in such a desperate manner if their basic needs (including their social security in case of old age or inability to work) are guaranteed.

Prefer also recognizes the importance of access to family planning (in terms of both education and contraceptive technologies) as well as the empowerment of women by giving them more opportunities for gaining social status outside of the roles of mother and child-rear. I completely agree with this idea of the social safety net to contribute to the demographic transition.

However, this is only one piece of the puzzle to attaining a sustainable growth rate as advancements in medicine and many other factors are contributing to this exponential expansion of our race. Also, even if we assume these third world governments are financially capable of providing this safety net, the effect on reproduction rates will be very delayed. Think there will be such a delay because fulfillment of these basic rights are not going to immediately suppress the desperation to survive that these poor people have been dealing with for generations.

Similarly, these assurances are only going to aid their financial security to the point of sustenance and the desperation of poverty will still exist and it is human nature to desire the improvement of whatever situation you are in (mostly the poor; example: just because you can eat, the desperation for new clothes, than bicycle will still exist). While in no way do I disagree with this theory, I think there needs to be some other positive reinforcement for the reduction in childbirth that will have quicker results (such as financial rewards).

The third part to this triangular connection of 21st century, planet wide problems is environmental degradation. Environmental degradation comes in many forms such as; resource depletion, erosion and of course pollution. In connection with world poverty, Preker points out how experts in the field have shown that the most destructive groups of people on the planet are the richest 20% and the poorest 20%. The wealthiest people are environmentally destructive because we consume such an incredible amount of resources and consequently, are also responsible for the emission of a large and disproportionate amount of pollution. For example, the population of the United States currently has about 5% of the world's population but uses 20-25% of the earth's resources every year and produces between 20-25% of the world's pollution every year. These wealthy nations have only briefly been mentioned concerning the other issues but in this case, Preker draws attention to theories of limiting developed countries' immense destruction on the environment. The Kyoto Protocol was adopted in hopes of cutting back the greenhouse gas emissions of developed nations by 5% by 2012.



However, Prefer believes that it should be our duty to go above and beyond that protocol which is his reason for his institutional proposal of a Carbon Credit Scheme to control greenhouse gas emissions. This Carbon Credit Scheme would allow developing societies to barter their carbon credits (or rights) to emit certain greenhouse gases. This scheme would require massive transfers of environmentally friendly technology and capital to the developing world from the developed world, while encouraging both to adopt clean energy and other green technologies.

This argues for a new global order where wealth and power becomes more evenly distributed and attempt to keep the goal of preventing earth from warming more than eight degrees Celsius (at the equator) by 2050. This goal is attainable if the worldwide emission greenhouse gases for the next 100 years are cut in half (6 billions tons per year to 3). The organization to implement such a worldwide change is called hypothetically called the Planetary Management Authority.

I think that this theory of Carbon Credit and a new world order is a fantastic idea that significantly helps both the problem of environmental degradation as well as that of international inequality among developed and developing nations. Do not agree with the reasoning of the disproportionate distribution of credits between developed and undeveloped countries that the developed entries deserve less since they are much more responsible for the current pollution. While this may be true, penalizing the developed nations will only cause the lack of cooperation with the idea.

Also the excess of credits for developing countries will only allow them to pollute in excess just like the currently developed countries did once (and two wrongs don't make the environment right). Overall do think this scheme and new world order, if possible to successfully implement would do the world a great service. In response to growing need for fair trade and a more equitable international economic system, Prefer presents an institutional proposal that would compliment the Carbon Credit Scheme. His proposal is the implementation of a Dobbin Tax on international currency transactions.

This proposed h% on current volumes of currency would raise another 5300-400 billions for 3rd World development along with the added bonus of making currencies more stable. Am completely for the implementation of this Dobbin Tax for several reasons. First believe that at such a percent, those paying the tax will not be greatly discouraged, while those in 3rd world countries receiving the velveteen money would be greatly benefited. Also I believe this along with taxed food from 3rd world countries would aid in the preliminary steps necessary for the realization of the national food self-reliance policy.

On the other hand, this Tax would be difficult to pass, as the large international cooperation's (who often, whether its fair or not, have more voting power) that will be paying this tax will not be receiving any of the benefits. While each of these proposals presents the opportunity for improvement in regard to these interconnected world issues, we cannot expect any of them even if implemented successfully) to sufficiently address the problem in the long run. It seems that each of these ideas presents a temporary fix to a much larger issue that will remain unsolved.

As Prefer and Escherichia would both agree, real, long-term advancement will remain unrealized until we bring about an improved socioeconomic system. For Prefer and Escherichia, these socioeconomic societies that could solve these issues on both a national and international level would be democratic market socialist societies. From there further international improvements would eventually require a worldwide iteration of such societies. Capitalism is viewed by Escherichia as a predatory system that continually generates ruthless inequalities.