

# Social and criminal justice in moral perspective

[Sociology](#)



The question as to whether Walmart offered Jacob a fair wage of \$8.75 an hour is just or not is dependent on the moral theory with which it is analyzed. According to consequentialism theory, Walmart offered Jacob a just salary. The intention of Jacob was to get a job with a salary that could sustain him. Moreover, the motor of consequentialism theory is "the end justifies the means", Jacob was offered fair dues. Additionally, through the theory of regularianism, the theory proposes that an act is considered moral if it is in line with the set rules. According to the 2012 federal laws, an employer is required to pay at least \$7.25 per hour, and in this regard, Walmart has justifiably given Jacob fair pay (Christopher, 2013).

The decision of alderman to let Walmart operate in Chicago equally draws the attention of social justice. In as much as the company had fulfilled all the obligations and regulations that permit it to operate in Chicago, it still violated social ethics. This is due to the fact that the wages that the company pays its new employees are too little to sustain them effectively and the fact that the CEO of the company earned large benefits. However, for the alderman to make payments to the employees just before a company is allowed to operate in the city, there should be rationalization between the earnings of the senior members and those of the new employees.

## Discussion 2

The concept of distributive justice demands that the government operates within the best interest of the situation. In this regard, the American government through the application of distributive justice must purpose to mitigate in situations that are most probably going to cause harm. Since the report of global warming by the sixteen experts conflict with that of the American Physical Society, the government should act in the best interest in <https://assignbuster.com/social-and-criminal-justice-in-moral-perspective/>

saving the situation. Application of distributive justice would thus demand that the government continues with the measures to prevent global warming as it is of more interest than inaction.

As an individual, the concept of the communicative justice would enable the action taken towards the report on global warming to be that geared towards the benefit of the society. In the normal process of mitigation against global warming, the society pays taxes for the eradication of the greenhouse gases. It is thus important to eliminate the unnecessary taxes if the report reveals that there is no actual effect of the greenhouse gases to the atmosphere. It will thus be unconstitutional to levy taxes to the community if the money is spent on actions that lack scientific indications (Christopher, 2013).

Redistributive justice, unlike revenge, is only directed to correcting the wrong without further implications to the offenders. In the context of pollution, the businesses, which emit a large amount of carbon oxide into the environment, are the offenders of the ecosystem. It would thus be the constitutional duty of the government to correct these systems with a fair implication to the businesses. The government will only tax the companies and the businesses for the charges in the maintenance of the greenhouse gas effect in the ration of their contribution to the effect and not charging all the taxpayers for the same levies.