

Discussion topic

Finance



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Response to Week 12 Discussions: Defining Justice Can justice be comprehensively defined by the ment ‘ giving people what they deserve, as implied by Sandel? In my view, justice is not as simple as that statement implies. People have different deserving interests, which are often clashing. This is depicted in the case of Casey Martins, a physically challenged golfer, who sought legal redress after the PGA rejected his request of using the golf cart during tournaments.

It can be said that the decision of Professional Golfers is a contravention of the laws which limits discrimination of persons on the basis of disability. Thus, it would be justified to say that Casey Martin should have been allowed to use the cart in the PGA tours but justice was sacrificed by denying Casey the freedom to use his cart at the expense of the golf fraternity that would have been affected by the golfers’ action. Indeed, the decision that was taken could also be defended on the basis that he was a physically challenged golfer and allowing him to use a cart could affect the outlook of the game. Thus, one may argue that justice may have been used accurately granted because the decision was reliant upon matching equal entities and equal people.

All these give the impression that theory of distributive justice perpetuates impartial justice. One can explain justice in theoretical aspects by viewing it behind a curtain of ignorance, which means that our personalities, class, moral characters, luxuries and talents are not exposed. It is agreeable that justice was purposed at giving people what they deserve. However, as discussed, it does not give everyone what is deserved.