

Principles of Social Justice In Contemporary Western Philosophy

The views of Contemporary philosophers on the principles of social justice have varied. John Rawls' principle of difference sought to avoid total equality as disparities make the less fortunate members of society better off than they would be under strict equality. Supporters of the doctrine of strict equality defended the principle of allocating material goods to all members of society equally. Advocates of the "fair-luck doctrine" advocated distributionist principles that adequately took into account the considerations of responsibility and luck in economic life. While merit-based principles similarly assert the moral roles of responsibility and luck, they tend to defend more than what people deserve for their work.

Proponents of the principles of welfare or utilitarianism assert that material goods and services have no value in themselves but are as valuable as they are in wealth. Therefore, they assert that distributive principles must be designed and evaluated according to how they affect their welfare, whether they are maximal or distributed. Contrary to previous principles, proponents of liberal principles criticize any distributionist model that seeks economic patterns, such as maximization, equality of welfare, or material goods. They assert that the pursuit of such patterns grapples with the most important ethical demands of freedom or private property.

Whatever the diversity of views on the principles of social justice, it is a social economic system aimed at removing large economic disparities among the strata of society. It describes the idea of a society where justice prevails in all its aspects, rather than just in the justice of the law. In general, social justice is the provision of fair treatment and a participatory share of the good of society.