

Chapter 1 : Social Injustice | Inequality Creates Injustice | Pachamama Alliance

Political injustice has almost certainly followed our species as we became social and evolved into homo sapiens sapiens. Political injustice was the way we lived and political injustice evolved along with society—it was society.

By Tom Stafford 20 April Frans de Waal, a professor of primate behaviour at Emory University, is the unlikely star of a viral video. It began with a TED talk in which de Waal showed the results of one experiment that involved paying two monkeys unequally see video, below. Capuchin monkeys that lived together were taken to neighbouring cages and trained to hand over small stones in return for food rewards. The researchers found that a typical monkey would happily hand over stone after stone when it was rewarded for each exchange with a slice of cucumber. View image of This video is no longer available But capuchin monkeys prefer grapes to cucumber slices. If the researchers paid one of the monkeys in grapes instead, the monkey in the neighbouring cage “previously happy to work for cucumber” became agitated and refused to accept payment in cucumber slices. What had once been acceptable soon became unacceptable when it was clear a neighbour was getting a better reward for the same effort. The highlight of the video is when the poorly paid monkey throws the cucumber back at the lab assistant trying to offer it as a reward. These results and others like them, argues de Waal, show that moral sentiments are part of our biological inheritance, a consequence of an ancestral life that was dominated by egalitarian group living “and the need for harmony between members of the group. In humans, by comparison, we can find stronger evidence that an instinct for fairness can lurk inside the psyche of even the most competitive of us. View image of Credit: Thinkstock The players in the National Basketball Association in the USA rank as some of the highest earning sportspeople in the world. The season is interesting because that is when psychologists Graeme Haynes and Thomas Gilovich reviewed recordings of more than NBA games, looking for occasions that fouls were called by the referees when it was clear to the players that no foul had actually been committed. Whenever a foul is called, the wronged player gets a number of free throws “chances to score points for their team. Missed shot These guys had every incentive to make the most of the free throws, however unfairly gained: But tellingly, it was also lower than average when the team was behind and in need of points “whether honestly or dishonestly gained. If players in one of the most competitive and best-paid sports can apparently be put off by guilt, it suggests to me that an instinct for fairness can survive even the most ruthless environments. View image of Discomfort with the excesses of the financial industry may be innate Credit: Thinkstock At the end of the monkey clip, de Waal jokes that the behaviour parallels the way people have staged protests against Wall Street, and the greed they see there. Yet perhaps these feelings run even deeper. The analysis of the basketball players suggests that when we stand to benefit from injustices “even if they can help justify multi-million dollar salaries “some part of us is uncomfortable with the situation, and may even work to undermine that advantage.

Chapter 2 : 17 Tips for Dominating Injustice 2

The benefits of full employment. One, we live in a period of tremendous chaos and great injustice, especially, as recent events have underscored, regarding white, male privilege.

The answer, some believe, is that such exchanges are wrongfully exploitative. I argue that this answer is incomplete at best, and I elaborate a different one: I also argue that the case for third-party interference with mutually beneficial and consensual exchanges, while normally considered weak, is strengthened once these exchanges are understood as implicated in broader unjust structures. Introduction The prevailing liberal ethos prizes voluntary and mutually advantageous transactions and generally urges that they be protected from interference. Yet such transactions sometimes raise moral red flags. One sort of concern—the one I shall focus on in this paper—arises when one party takes advantage of an unjust situation to get the other party to agree to transact on her terms. What, if anything, is wrong with such advantage-taking? And when, if ever, are third parties justified in preventing its occurrence? I shall argue that standard answers to these questions are incomplete at best. It is typically assumed that what is at stake is exploitation. But exploitation is only part of what might make such transactions wrongful; a distinct sort of wrong is more appropriately labeled complicity in injustice. Thus framing the issue is not just a question of theoretical accuracy but also has important practical implications. My argument will proceed as follows. Section 2 presents three cases that illustrate the problem of taking advantage of injustice and distinguishes that problem from related issues of moral concern. Section 3 assesses the view that such advantage-taking is wrongfully exploitative. Section 4 sketches a different view: Section 6 sums up the results of my inquiry. Setting the Stage The following cases illustrate the phenomenon explored in this paper. B suffers from a serious but treatable disease. In order to reduce costs and get more convincing results, A prefers to test the treatment against a placebo rather than against an existing active treatment. When approached with the offer to participate in the trial, B accepts. He is fully aware of what participation entails. B is a small farmer in a poor country with a largely agrarian economy. International trade policies established by more powerful countries have made it increasingly difficult for farmers like B to sell their goods on the domestic and global markets. As a result, B can no longer rely on his plot of land to provide for his family. He lacks training for other available jobs and cannot expect aid from friends, family, or the state, so the situation looks grim. Then B learns that a newly established factory in a nearby town hires unskilled workers to produce running shoes for a multinational company. Eager for work, B presents himself to A, the local manager. A is quite frank: B lives in a middle-income country where ethnic minorities, and especially their female members, face heavy discrimination. Because she is a minority woman, B is excluded both from most education and employment opportunities available to the majority and from most such opportunities available to minority men. However, as a single mother B needs whatever income she can get. She consequently finds herself moving between various temporary and poorly paid jobs. Right now B is out of luck: Relatively well-off majority couple A proposes to hire B as a domestic servant for subsistence wage. B has no illusions about the job: Analogous cases arise in a range of different contexts. To be sure, poor people have often been harmed by participating in clinical research, working in sweatshops, and perhaps less clearly so performing domestic work. On the contrary, in each case B benefits from the transaction. There is a cost involved, of course, but the expected benefit makes the transaction all-things-considered advantageous to B. Nor does it seem that B fails to give valid consent to the exchange. In each case, B understands what is on offer and is under no pressure from A to accept. Suppose B were offered the treatment for free without having to participate in the trial. Princeton University Press, , chap. While I believe that these latter activities raise precisely the issues I discuss in this paper, I shall leave them out of the discussion because they also raise other issues that would easily distract our attention. Kidney sales, prostitution, and commercial surrogacy are sometimes considered intrinsically objectionable, whereas work and participation in clinical research normally are not. It seems, then, that we are dealing with mutually advantageous and consensual transactions. The question might be raised whether many real-life cases are like these hypothetical ones. It could be argued that research participation, sweatshop

labor, and domestic work do in fact typically harm poor people. Or it could be argued that when the poor pursue such options, they are in fact typically coerced or deceived into doing so. Perhaps one or both of these claims are true. But no reasonable theory would deny that some transactions relevantly similar to those our cases describe are both consensual and mutually beneficial. Regardless of how rarely such transactions occur, we should be able to explain what is disturbing about them when they do occur. The circumstances from which the exchanges arise are not merely unfortunate, but deeply unjust. B is unjustly denied access to basic healthcare in Clinical Trial, unjustly deprived of his livelihood in Sweatshop Labor, and unjustly excluded from education and better employment in Domestic Work. A benefits from these injustices, not by passively receiving gain from them, but rather by actively turning them into profit through interacting directly with B. In short, A takes advantage of injustice. Surely there is something objectionable about such conduct. This assumption is admittedly not beyond criticism in any of the cases. Nor is it particularly controversial, I think, but rather consistent with most plausible theories of justice. As to Domestic Work, I suspect few would disagree that overt ethnic and sexual discrimination in education and the labor market is unjust. Pharmaceutical companies are arguably themselves responsible for the inadequate access to drugs that allows them to conduct placebo-controlled rather than active-controlled trials in developing countries. The second issue is whether A has a positive duty to aid B. After all, most agree that there is a general duty to help the desperately needy when one can do so easily and at little personal cost. Another way is to simply ignore their plight. Proponents of the duty to aid should ask themselves which transgression is worse and why. Whether or not there is such a duty, then, the problem of taking advantage of injustice remains. Exploitation Our question is this: It is sometimes suggested that such behavior is wrongfully exploitative. Hawkins and Ezekiel J. The Ethics of Clinical Research Princeton: Princeton University Press, , pp. For a less demanding version applied to the context of international clinical research, see Jennifer S. In this section, I assess whether it is ultimately convincing. To exploit a person, in a morally pejorative sense, is to take advantage of her in some wrongful way. These theories consider transactions exploitative when they distribute benefits and burdens unfairly. They would therefore not necessarily conclude that our cases involve exploitation; that depends on what standard of fairness one applies. A owes B more. To avoid exploitation, A must offer, for instance, a better chance of receiving effective treatment in Clinical Trial, or a higher wage and better working conditions in Sweatshop Labor and Domestic Work. What is salient for present purposes is that these fairness-oriented theories regard exploitation as transaction-specific. Oxford University Press, ; Allen W. Some disagree; see Stephen Wilkinson, Bodies for Sale: Widening the Lens Oxford: Oxford University Press, , pp. Mayer, on the other hand, discusses sweatshop labor as an example of failing to benefit another as fairness requires. Taking Advantage of Injustice 7 is exploitative depends solely on the terms of that exchange. It does not depend on any feature of the broader social, economic, or political context in which the exchange occurs. Perhaps A does, but it all comes down to what each party can expect to receive from their exchange. The transaction-specific view of exploitation might seem too lenient on exchanges arising from unjust circumstances. Many think that it should, and I agree. There are, generally speaking, two ways in which one might develop that thought. The relevance of background injustice to the morality of individual exchanges might be conceptualized within exploitation theory, by abandoning or amending the transaction-specific view, or independently of exploitation theory. While the first strategy is more familiar, I shall in section 4 pursue the second one. Note that these strategies are not incompatible: So whether or not the first strategy succeeds, there is reason to consider the second one. Still, we should begin by examining the first strategy. Critics of the transaction-specific view hold that we cannot disregard the context in which transactions occur when assessing whether they are exploitative. In particular, we cannot disregard injustices in the background conditions from which the transactions arise. Essential to at least some forms of exploitative exchange is the fact that they prey on pre-existing unjust social arrangements.

Chapter 3 : Any benefits for console game by playing mobile version besides the console link? : Injustice2

Gain Access to Injustice 2 Hack Benefits of Injustice 2 Cheats. So many times, during a game play, players run out of resources that help unlock some important features or even upgrade characters.

Environmental justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. EPA has this goal for all communities and persons across this Nation [sic]. It will be achieved when everyone enjoys the same degree of protection from environmental and health hazards and equal access to the decision-making process to have a healthy environment in which to live, learn, and work. A disproportionate quantity of minority communities for example in Warren County , North Carolina play host to landfills, incinerators, and other potentially toxic facilities. The location of transportation infrastructures, including highways, ports, and airports, has also been viewed as a source of environmental injustice. Among the earliest documentation of environmental racism was a study of the distribution of toxic waste sites across the United States. Section prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin by any government agency receiving federal assistance. To win an environmental justice case that claims an agency violated this statute, the plaintiff must prove the agency intended to discriminate. Section requires agencies to create rules and regulations that uphold section This section is useful because the plaintiff must only prove that the rule or regulation in question had a discriminatory impact. There is no need to prove discriminatory intent. Chester Residents Concerned for Quality Living set the precedent that citizens can sue under section There has not yet been a case in which a citizen has sued under section , which calls into question whether this right of action exists. The actions of many mainstream environmental organizations still reflect these early principles. Therefore, vulnerable communities with fewer political opportunities are more often exposed to hazardous waste and toxins. Environmental elitism manifested itself in three different forms: They disproportionately benefit environmentalists and harm underrepresented populations. They have convinced minority leaders looking to improve their communities that the economic benefits of industrial facility and the increase in the number of jobs are worth the health risks. In fact, both politicians and businesses have even threatened imminent job loss if communities do not accept hazardous industries and facilities. Although in many cases local residents do not actually receive these benefits, the argument is used to decrease resistance in the communities as well as avoid expenditures used to clean up pollutants and create safer workplace environments. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. January Learn how and when to remove this template message One of the prominent barriers to minority participation in environmental justice is the initial costs of trying to change the system and prevent companies from dumping their toxic waste and other pollutants in areas with high numbers of minorities living in them. There are massive legal fees involved in fighting for environmental justice and trying to shed environmental racism. For example, in the United Kingdom, there is a rule that the claimant may have to cover the fees of their opponents, which further exacerbates any cost issues, especially with lower income minority groups; also, the only way for environmental justice groups to hold companies accountable for their pollution and breaking any licensing issues over waste disposal would be to sue the government for not enforcing rules. This would lead to the forbidding legal fees that most could not afford. The community organization and the social values of the era have translated to the Environmental Justice movement. Because the two movements have parallel goals, it is useful to employ similar tactics that often emerge on the grassroots level. Common confrontational strategies include protests, neighborhood demonstrations, picketing, political pressure, and demonstration. In these southern communities, black churches and other voluntary associations are used to organize resistance efforts, including research and demonstrations, such as the protest in Warren County, North Carolina. As a result of the existing community structure, many church leaders and civil rights activists, such as Reverend Benjamin Chavis Muhammad , have spearheaded the Environmental Justice movement. Majora Carter spearheaded the South Bronx Greenway Project, bringing local economic development, local urban heat island mitigation,

positive social influences, access to public open space , and aesthetically stimulating environments. The New York City Department of Design and Construction has recently recognized the value of the South Bronx Greenway design, and consequently utilized it as a widely distributed smart growth template. The first case to use civil rights as a means to legally challenge the siting of a waste facility was in This group was the first organization that found the connection between race and pollution. Southwestern Waste Management, Inc. The two most paramount sections in these cases are sections and To win an Environmental Justice case that claims an agency violated this statute, the plaintiff must prove the agency intended to discriminate. Section requires agencies to create rules and regulations that uphold section ; in Alexander v. Sandoval , the Supreme Court held that plaintiffs must also show intent to discriminate to successfully challenge the government under Affected groups[edit] Among the affected groups of Environmental Justice, those in high-poverty and racial minority groups have the most propensity to receive the harm of environmental injustice. Some studies that test statistically for effects of race and ethnicity, while controlling for income and other factors, suggest racial gaps in exposure that persist across all bands of income. One notorious example is the " Cancer Alley " region of Louisiana. This mile stretch of the Mississippi River between Baton Rouge and New Orleans is home to companies that produce one quarter of the petrochemical products manufactured in the United States. From to , the predominately poor, African American residents of the "West Grove" endured the negative effects of exposure to carcinogenic emissions and toxic waste discharge from a large trash incinerator called Old Smokey. It was not until the surrounding, predominantly white neighborhoods began to experience the negative impacts from Old Smokey that the legal battle began to close the incinerator. Indigenous groups are often the victims of environmental injustices. Native Americans have suffered abuses related to uranium mining in the American West. Churchrock, New Mexico, in Navajo territory was home to the longest continuous uranium mining in any Navajo land. From until , the tribe leased land to mining companies who did not obtain consent from Navajo families or report any consequences of their activities. Not only did the miners significantly deplete the limited water supply, but they also contaminated what was left of the Navajo water supply with uranium. Kerr-McGee and United Nuclear Corporation, the two largest mining companies, argued that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act did not apply to them, and maintained that Native American land is not subject to environmental protections. The courts did not force them to comply with US clean water regulations until After DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides were banned in the United States in , farmers began using more acutely toxic organophosphate pesticides such as parathion. A large portion of farmworkers in the US are working as undocumented immigrants, and as a result of their political disadvantage, are not able to protest against regular exposure to pesticides or benefit from the protections of Federal laws. Banned throughout much of the rest of the world because of the potential threat to human health and the natural environment, Endosulfan is a highly toxic chemical, the safe use of which cannot be guaranteed in the many developing countries it is used in. Endosulfan , like DDT, is an organochlorine and persists in the environment long after it has killed the target pests, leaving a deadly legacy for people and wildlife. Maquiladoras are assembly plants operated by American, Japanese, and other foreign countries, located along the US-Mexico border. The maquiladoras use cheap Mexican labor to assemble imported components and raw material, and then transport finished products back to the United States. Much of the waste ends up being illegally dumped in sewers, ditches, or in the desert. Along the Lower Rio Grande Valley , maquiladoras dump their toxic wastes into the river from which 95 percent of residents obtain their drinking water. In the border cities of Brownsville, Texas and Matamoros, Mexico , the rate of anencephaly babies born without brains is four times the national average. A CBA may favor placing a toxic facility near a city of 20, poor people than near a city of 5, wealthy people. This is due to the way that women typically interact more closely with their environments at home, such as through handling food preparation and childcare. Women also tend to be the leaders in environmental justice activist movements. Despite this, it tends not to be considered a mainstream feminist issue. Department of Agriculture[edit] In its environmental justice strategy documents, the U. Department of Agriculture USDA stated an ongoing desire to integrate environmental justice into its core mission, internal operations and programming. It identified ambitious timeframes for action and promised improved efforts to highlight, track and coordinate EJ activities among its many

sub-agencies. Agency-wide the USDA expanded its perspective on EJ, so that in addition to preventing disproportionate environmental impacts on EJ communities, USDA voiced a commitment to improve public participation processes and use its technical and financial assistance programs to improve the quality of life in all communities. USDA funds or implements many creative programs with social and environmental equity goals, however it has no staff dedicated solely to EJ, and faces the challenges of limited budgets and coordinating the efforts of a highly diverse agency. Background[edit] The USDA is the executive agency responsible for federal policy on food, agriculture, natural resources , and quality of life in rural America. Agency programs, policies and activities can lead to health and environmental effects that disproportionately impact minority and low-income populations. Under Executive Order agencies must develop strategies that identify and address these effects by: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of requires that federal funds be used in a fair and equitable manner. Under Title VI any federal agency that receives federal funding cannot discriminate. Title VI also forbids federal agencies from providing grants or funding opportunities to programs that discriminate. An agency that violates Title VI can lose its federal funding. Although USDA has no staff dedicated solely to EJ, its sub-agencies have many offices dedicated to civil rights compliance, outreach and communication and environmental review whose responsibilities incorporate EJ issues. The details and specific implementation of many of these programs and the performance measures are left to the departments and sub-agencies to develop. Provide targeted training and capacity-building to EJ communities. The Strategic Plan also lists existing programs that either currently support the goal, or are expected to in the future. According to Holmes, some of the challenges of the Strategic Plan process have stemmed from the diverse programs and missions that the agency serves, limitations on staff time, and budgets. The Strategic Plan emphasizes capacity-building in EJ communities, and includes objectives that emphasize communication between USDA and environmental justice communities, including Tribal consultation. Sub-agencies must announce schedules for training programs in EJ communities and to develop new, preliminary outreach materials on USDA programs by April 15, The Strategic Plan also reiterates compliance with the Executive Orders on Tribal consultation and outreach to non-proficient English speakers, and seeks more diverse representation on regional forest advisory committees. Agency leadership has asked its sub-agencies to prepare responses to additional comments that have been received, and the agency will release an interim progress report, prior to winter The measures include environmental justice trainings, new web pages, and potential revisions to staff manuals and handbooks. Sub-agencies began reviewing their existing training in and in their April 9, reports to the USDA EJ steering committee, sub-agencies were asked to describe their goals for enhanced EJ training. As of late April , the sub-agencies were still in the process of describing a baseline of current activities and determining the metrics to evaluate improvement, such as staff time, grant funding or increased programming. Forest Service USFS is working to update its policy on protection and management of Native American Sacred Sites, an effort that has included listening sessions and government-to-government consultation. USDA credits this increased outreach with generating a percent increase in contracts, representing more than , acres of farmland, in its Environmental Quality Incentives Program. The partnership focuses on outreach, fair returns to minority and other small farmers and rural communities, farmworker working conditions, environmental protection and food safety. It also shows, by census tract, the number and percentage of certain populations, such as children, seniors, or households without a vehicle, with low access to grocery stores. The mapped deserts can be used to direct agency resources to increase access to fresh fruits and vegetables and other food assistance programs, according to Blake Velde, an agency scientist and spokesperson on EJ issues. These programs work to administer water and wastewater loans or grants to rural areas and cities to support water and wastewater, stormwater and solid waste disposal systems, including SEARCH grants that are targeted to financially distressed, small rural communities and other opportunities specifically for Alaskan Native villages and designated Colonias. This program provides grants and loans to farmers, ranchers and rural small businesses to finance renewable energy systems and energy efficiency improvements. However, it was not published in the Federal Register as a formal rulemaking and does not create a private right of action or enforcement tool. This performance standard reflects a requirement in DR that required the USDA departmental regulation on rulemaking, DR , to be

revised to require an EJ evaluation in the rulemaking process.

Chapter 4 : Justice, Inequality, and the Poor | National Affairs

Advantages and Disadvantages of Social Justice In my opinion, social justice is basically the helping out with what's going on in today's society. And it also means being fair with the society, in other words.

Kate Donald 22 January Although the fundamental injustice of poverty cannot be remedied by lawyers alone, legal aid is crucial to a fair and effective justice system. This is the core message of the recent report by the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights to the United Nations General Assembly. Across developed and developing countries, the report emphasizes, people living in poverty are prevented from accessing justice on an equal footing, thereby entrenching and exacerbating their deprivation. It is a powerful way to envisage effective access to justice policies; not just as a right but also as a tool for reducing poverty and inequality and fostering social inclusion. In this conception, legal aid is not just a technical matter for a Ministry of Justice, but a matter of broader socio-economic justice. No government that makes it harder for the poor to navigate through the justice system can claim poverty reduction as a priority – at least not with a straight face. Too often, the public and policy-makers alike think of poverty as simply a lack of income. In reality, it is a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing a chronic lack of resources, capabilities, choices, security and power, all building on each other in a feedback loop of disadvantage. Therefore, eradicating extreme poverty requires tackling all these aspects, as well as improving access to basic goods such as housing, food, education, health services and water and sanitation. Access to justice plays a crucial role in all parts of this equation, as a fundamental human right in itself and also an essential tool for the protection and promotion of all other civil, cultural, economic political and social rights. If people living in poverty do not have access to a remedy when their rights have been violated, or cannot proactively claim their rights and entitlements, then their exclusion, powerlessness and deprivation become entrenched. The vicious circle of poverty and injustice People living in poverty are exceptionally vulnerable to crime, abuse and exploitation. If they do not have the ability to take real and effective recourse against these actions, then impunity and inequality is perpetuated, and their vulnerability is exacerbated. Accountability becomes a sham. Their increased vulnerability and exclusion further hampers their ability to pursue justice; ad infinitum, spiralling down the generations. Poverty will only be defeated when the law works for everyone. Access to justice is crucial for tackling the root causes of poverty, exclusion and vulnerability. Access to justice is also an important lever for gender equality. Women are more likely to be poor, both worldwide and in the UK , but women also face extra burdens or obstacles in accessing justice mechanisms. Gender-based crimes and abuses are often not well legislated for or effectively dealt with ; public stigma and prejudice also play a part in silencing abused women and preventing them from seeking justice. Obstructed access to justice thus feeds the cycle of gendered poverty and violence, and perpetuates impunity for gender-based crimes. Obstacles to accessing justice It is clear that the sustained deprivations endemic to poverty translate into lower levels of legal literacy and awareness of rights. A landlord, an employer, a local authority official; a bank that mis-sold them a high-interest loan; a government that has removed their disability benefit with one sweep of the pen. To challenge these powerful figures requires resources time, money, information that are often lacking. Legal aid is designed to compensate for these vast gulfs in power and money. In parts of Africa the situation is dire. In Sierra Leone had only three lawyers available through its legal aid programme; Malawi had eighteen. In the United States one legal aid attorney is available for every 6, persons while in contrast there is one private attorney for every people. The Legal Aid Society, the largest provider of legal services in the United States, estimates that it turns down eight out of every nine people who request advice and assistance in civil legal matters. Austerity and legal aid In many countries, the number of applications for civil legal aid has risen, while resources allocated to legal aid have decreased as a result of austerity measures. In Ireland, the number of applications for civil legal aid rose by 84 per cent from to for non-asylum related matters, while resources allocated to legal aid have decreased. It is the already-poor and disadvantaged that will suffer most. The cuts overwhelmingly affect family and social welfare law ; the Ministry accepts that it will therefore have a disproportionate impact on women, on black and minority ethnic clients; and on persons with disabilities.

Without equal and meaningful access to legal advice and representation, there is one justice for the rich and another for the poor. The playing field of course is already skewed. These cuts will upend it on to a far steeper gradient. Many of the exclusions to legal aid new and pre-existing explicitly discriminate against the poor. What other demographic so regularly and badly needs to seek justice through housing and immigration proceedings, or welfare appeal boards? In the UK, representation before welfare appeals was never covered by legal aid, but now LASPO means that no free legal advice will be available for the often desperate and frequently disabled people seeking welfare benefit reviews and appeals before first tier tribunals. Under international human rights law, the British government has an obligation to ensure that the poor can enjoy the rights to an effective remedy, equality before the courts and a fair trial in practice, not just in theory or in law. The opportunity for, and benefits of, justice should be available to all. Today this is clearly not the case. Those who need legal advice and assistance should be entitled to it as a right, not a matter of charity. Although the fundamental injustice of poverty cannot be remedied by lawyers alone, legal aid is crucial to a fair and effective justice system and therefore to reducing poverty. Slashing legal aid budgets in a time of recession is heaping misery on misery on the same victims, entrenching the two-tier nature of the justice system and blocking the efforts of many people living in poverty to seek remedy and fairness and a better life.

Chapter 5 : MPs fear benefits reform will become 'burning injustice'

Frans de Waal, a professor of primate behaviour at Emory University, is the unlikely star of a viral video. His academic's physique, grey jumper and glasses aren't the usual stuff of a YouTube.

Support Us Social Injustices Social injustices are prevalent throughout the globe. This complex topic occurs in many different forms and with varying degrees motivation. Social Injustice in South America Ingenious tribes in South America are all are too familiar with the social injustices that accompany the desire for excess profit. Below are a couple cases of indirect and direct social injustices that are occurring in South America as a result of rampant consumerism. The large oil reserve that existed underneath the jungle floor possessed an immense value to the ever growing industrialized world and so the drilling began. Texaco oil company played the lead role in oil mining in the area for a substantial amount of time. The oil mining resulted in environmental contamination due to leakage in pipelines as well as well as open oil pits that were allegedly abandoned. The lawsuit was created to ensure that Texaco oil company took responsibility for the damages inflicted on the environment and the health of local inhabitants. Studies showed an increase in cancer rates, which is believed to be the product of water contamination by the freed oil. Chevron has yet to pay the fine and is attempting to appeal the ruling based on alleged corruption and fraud within the Ecuadorian government. The Achuar and Looming Oil Companies The Achuar are an indigenous tribe that has lived deep in the Amazon rainforest for thousands of years. Until recent decades they were entirely isolated and self-reliant. Their strong connection and respect for their land allowed for them to live in perfect harmony with nature. The Achuar place great value on their dreams and their spiritual connection with nature. It was their dreams that initially cautioned them of a looming threat. Oil companies were drilling in the homes of their neighboring tribes and the destruction was all too evident. The partnership between the Achuar and the modern world is immortalized with The Pachamama Alliance. Epitomizing social equality, The Pachamama Alliance fights for the human rights that the Achuar and all other indigenous tribes are entitled to. The Pachamama Alliance tackles the threat of big oil in the Amazon from two fronts, at ground-zero and at home base. Our organization provides the Achuar with the necessary tools to aid in their fight against big oil directly, while also seeking to change the view of the modern world that is responsible for the value placed on oil. Oil drilling creates a toxic environment, which destroys the basic human rights that all people deserve. In order to end these social injustices a universal change in mentality is essential. The Pachamama Alliance aims to inspire this change by spreading the knowledge of these social injustices and the benefits of active decision making. More on Social Justice.

Chapter 6 : The vicious circle of poverty and injustice | openDemocracy

Injustice2 @InjusticeGame: And with that our grand finals are set! We have @BasicsStupidity going up against @Omg_Nubcakes at @ecthrowdown! Do theinnatdunvilla.com

Ryan Messmore Winter After a financial crisis, a deep recession, and a stalled recovery, it should be no surprise that poverty in America is on the rise. This is a troubling figure, and it should certainly move us to act to help the poor as we strive to grow the economy. But efforts to address poverty in America are frequently derailed by misguided ideology — in particular, by the notion that poverty is best understood through the lens of inequality. Far too often, policymakers succumb to the argument that a widening gap between the richest and poorest Americans is the fundamental problem to be solved and that poverty is merely a symptom of that deeper flaw. Such concerns about inequality are not baseless, of course. They begin from a fact of the modern American economy, which is that, in recent decades, incomes among the poor have risen less quickly than have incomes among the wealthy. And such growing inequality, some critics contend, is both practically and morally dangerous. A growing income divide can foster bitterness and animosity between classes, threaten democracy, and destabilize the economy. Above all, they argue, it violates the cherished moral principle of equality. Implicit in much of the critique of our income divide is the assumption that inequality per se is inherently unjust, and therefore that the gap between rich and poor is as well. That perceived injustice in turn spurs support for redistributionist policies that are intended to make levels of prosperity more equal across society. President Obama commonly uses the language of justice and equality to advance such an agenda — speaking, for instance, of "the injustice in the growing divide between Main Street and Wall Street. Some religious figures have even used their moral concerns about inequality to justify the imposition of specific redistributionist economic policies. For example, Jim Wallis, president of the liberal religious organization Sojourners, has said that inequality in America — "a sin of biblical proportions" — necessitates a higher minimum wage, higher taxes on the rich, and increased welfare spending. But though the gap between rich and poor may be widening, this obsession with inequality — and this preferred approach to mitigating it — are fundamentally counterproductive. They are born of a misconception rooted in a flawed understanding of both justice and economic fact. Even if their premises and objectives were sound, these policies would have perverse unintended consequences — fostering class resentment, destroying jobs, and reducing wages and opportunities for the poor most of all. Such policies also tend to undermine the family and create a culture of dependence on the state — unleashing harmful consequences that would, again, fall disproportionately on the poor. Before we can seriously address the state of the poor in America, then, we need to seriously question some popular assumptions about poverty, equality, and justice. We must ask whether justice is always synonymous with equality, and explore the economic realities underlying the claim that a resource gap is inherently unjust. Indeed, in America, we often use "equality" as a synonym for justice. A just society, we imply, is one in which everyone is treated equally. After all, the guiding first principle of the American founding, according to the Declaration of Independence, was that "all men are created equal. And justice also requires that we recognize these differences. Where people are equal, it is just to treat them the same; where they are different, it is unjust to treat them the same. So in what respects are people equal? According to the Declaration of Independence, all men are equally endowed with rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The author of the Declaration, Thomas Jefferson, wrote elsewhere that no one is born either with a saddle on his back or with boots and spurs to ride his fellow man. In other words, no person has an inherent duty by birth to submit to another, nor does anyone enjoy an inherent right by birth to dominate another. On the basis of this principle, justice demands that all people be treated equally before the law. Moreover, every life, by virtue of being a human life, is equal in value. No matter how young, old, weak, or poor a man may be, his life is just as worthy of respect and protection as any other. No one should be excluded from the opportunity to live freely and contribute to society. But our equal worth as human beings does not mean that we must be treated equally in every sense and in every situation. We need not expect to possess equal faculties; society need not provide us with equal material circumstances. Consider, for instance, an

elementary-school class. It would be foolish and unjust to insist that the teacher and a third-grade student have equal say regarding every choice made in the classroom — including who gets to determine classroom rules, set the curriculum, and assign homework. It would also be wrong to insist that every student — regardless of ability, effort, and achievement — receive exactly the same grade. This distinction was made particularly clear in the writings of James Wilson, a signer of the Declaration of Independence and one of the six original justices of the Supreme Court. When we say, that all men are equal, we mean not to apply this equality to their virtues, their talents, their dispositions, or their acquirements. In all these respects, there is, and it is fit for the great purposes of society that there should be, great inequality among men. With regard to all, there is an equality in rights and in obligations. The natural rights and duties of man belong equally to all. Thus, when we address fundamental human dignity and worth — our standing before God and the law, and the value of individual lives — equal treatment of all is required. In most other contexts, however, justice calls for treating different people differently. To begin, a sound notion of economic justice must account for aspects of human equality as well as inequality. For instance, since all human beings possess equal dignity and an equal claim to life, a just economic system must seek to keep citizens from falling below a baseline of subsistence and dignity. A wealthy society should not stand by while some citizens starve, for instance. This threshold will differ according to circumstances; the baseline in a modern wealthy society will not be the same as that of a pre-modern or developing society. But the same principle applies: By virtue of equal humanity, every person should have access to at least the basic resources required to sustain life in his society. In the United States, this has come to include not only food, clothing, and shelter, but also free public education, legal representation in courts of law, emergency medical care, and other forms of basic welfare. But establishing a baseline of dignity does not mean that the responsibility for providing these essential resources must belong exclusively to government. We should not narrow the obligation to only the state when, in fact, many social institutions — including families, private charities, churches, and businesses — share responsibility for sustaining a just society. The state should maintain the social conditions that allow these other institutions to contribute, in appropriate ways, to a minimum provision of basic economic resources for all citizens. Civil-society institutions like families, churches, and community groups, in turn, are better equipped to fulfill mutual obligations and enable people to care for one another. In other words, the state generally creates the conditions for a just society, and the institutions of civil society help citizens live out that vision of justice. For people who would otherwise slip through the cracks, government should step in to provide a basic safety net, but only as a last resort, temporarily, and in ways that support — rather than crowd out — civil society. In many cases, of course, we will seek more than the minimum level of provision for one another. A sense of justice may spur citizens to work for — and petition government for — better education, less expensive health care, or more jobs in their communities. Above the baseline of necessity, however, debates about these kinds of improvements should be treated as matters of public priorities and the prudential use of community resources, not of basic human equality. Moreover, once crucial rights have been secured and the basic subsistence level of resources has been provided, the differences between individuals should be acknowledged and respected. As James Madison argued in Federalist No. 10, from the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results. This does not mean that if we are free we have no obligations to others; it does mean, however, that providing material equality is not one of those obligations we have to others — and, indeed, that having government make it such an obligation would be unjust. This principle was ably articulated by Nathaniel Chipman, a lieutenant in the Revolutionary War who went on to be elected to the U.S. Both ought, as to their continuance, and the influence which attends them, to be left to the conduct of the possessor. To exclude the meritorious from riches and honors, and to perpetuate either to the undeserving, are equally injurious to the rights of man in society. It verges on the extreme of tyranny. Indeed, the quest to establish equality through redistribution rather than to protect equality through equal respect of fundamental rights runs the risk of doing an injustice by failing to take account of those differences among individuals. Justice surely demands that we care for the poor, and requires us to help them find ways out of poverty. But justice does not demand that we understand poverty through the lens of equality. Why, then, do so many Americans focus exclusively on income gaps

when they take up the problem of poverty? Why does their appeal to justice primarily take the form of an attack on economic disparities? By drawing on startling statistics about just how much the wealthiest Americans have, for instance, they seek to arouse moral indignation aimed against the rich. Their arguments, however, tend to be both factually unsound and conceptually incoherent. For one thing, these critics exaggerate the degree of inequality and the growth of inequality in America. For instance, when most media outlets report on economic inequality in our country, they use a "money income" measurement provided by the Census Bureau each year. But this measurement is problematic for several reasons. First, money income alone does not tell the whole story. Thus it does not take into account the Earned Income Tax Credit, food stamps, the school-lunch program, public housing, Medicare, and Medicaid. It also excludes the equalizing effects of taxes on income. A study by the Congressional Budget Office compared the share of total income in America held by households in different income groups before and after paying taxes from to While the top quintile contains One reason is that the quintiles are based on a count of family households rather than of individuals. For this purpose, a household is defined as a person or group of related persons living in a single housing unit. In America, high-income households tend to include married parents both of whom often work , while low-income households tend to include unmarried parents or the elderly. As a result, each household in the top income quintile tends to contain more people than each household in the bottom quintile. Once employee health benefits and government transfers are added, the effects of taxation are accounted for, and quintiles are adjusted to contain equal shares of population, the picture looks much different: Moreover, as a group led by Richard Burkhauser of Cornell University recently showed, the rise in income inequality in America since the early s has been smaller and has grown more slowly than in the two decades before. The American ideal of equality, as discussed above, does not demand equal wealth or income. And the economic facts do not support the notion that unequal wealth causes hardship for the poor. The implicit assumption behind the case for the injustice of income inequality is that the wealthy are the reason why the poor are poor, or at least why they cannot escape their poverty. If this claim were true, it would be much easier to connect income inequality with injustice, and so to justify a redistributionist agenda. Yet this assumption rests on another economic premise that itself is highly dubious: Moral critics of inequality often portray total national income as if it were a pie: Much of the moral debate about income inequality seems to rest on this zero-sum theory. The super rich have a much bigger piece of the pie than they used to, and that means a smaller piece of the pie for all the rest of us. Through ingenuity and higher productivity, our country generates new income.

Chapter 7 : Characters: Injustice 2

Arguments relating to benefiting from injustice often consider the lasting effects of historic actions, committed some considerable time in the past. Calculations of advantage and disadvantage stemming from historic injustice will, of necessity, have to refer to complicated counterfactuals.

Restorative Justice Reparations While it is difficult to give a complete and adequate definition of justice, most observers can recognize clear examples of serious injustice when they arise. Some actions, such as theft and murder, are commonly recognized as unjust by governments and prohibited by domestic law. However, there are also systemic forms of injustice that may persist in a society. These traditions and structures give rise to profound injustices that can be difficult to recognize. If voting or litigation procedures, for example, are perceived to be unjust, any outcome they produce is liable to be unstable and produce conflict. When the procedure in question has to do with employment or wages, such issues can lead to serious economic and social problems. In the most extreme cases of maldistribution, some individuals suffer from poverty while the elite of that society live in relative luxury. All of these conditions may lead individuals to believe that they have not received a "fair share" of the benefits and resources available in that society. Even more serious than the injustices discussed above are war crimes and crimes against humanity. During wartime, individuals sometimes perform acts that violate the rules of just war set forth in international law. When soldiers engage in wars of aggression, attack non-combatants or pursue their enemies beyond what is reasonable, they commit not acts of war, but acts of murder. Such conflict can also lead to severe human rights violations, including genocide, torture, and slavery. If the subordinate group believes that it lacks the power to change things through political or diplomatic means, it may conclude that the only effective way to pursue justice is through violent confrontation. In addition, because the dominant group typically has more power to inflict harm, such struggles often fail. Therefore, violence is often an ineffective way of addressing injustice, and many believe that it should be used only as a last resort.

Responding To Injustice Many scholars and activists note that in order to truly address injustice internationally, we must strive to understand its underlying causes. These causes have to do with underdevelopment, economic pressures, various social problems, and international conditions. It is only by understanding and ameliorating these root causes and strengthening civil society that we can truly protect human rights. There are various ways to address the political, economic and social injustices mentioned above. Whether a response proves to be appropriate and effective depends on the nature of the grievance. Addressing political injustice is often a matter of developing institutions of fair governance, such as an accountable police force and judiciary. Legislative action and executive decision-making should likewise be held accountable. Such measures are sometimes a matter of reforming state institutions or revising state constitutions. In cases where some groups are excluded from political participation, the state can remedy violations of political rights by promoting political inclusion and empowering subordinate groups. Public decision-making should respond to the will of the citizens, and members of the society should have the opportunity to participate in the formulation, execution, and monitoring of state policies. In other words, a culture of political involvement and public participation should be fostered. This is often accomplished through the strengthening of the economy and civil society in conjunction with democratization efforts. In some cases countries require outside assistance for election monitoring, nation-building programs and the development of governmental infrastructure to make their political system more stable. Addressing systemic economic injustice is often a matter of economic reforms that give groups better access to jobs, health care, and education. In many cases, lack of access to basic services stems from enormous inequalities in resource distribution. Redistribution of benefits and resources can thus be an important component of social structural changes to remedy injustice. There are various institutional and economic development reforms that might be put in place to raise living standards and boost economic growth. In addition, by creating social and economic safety nets, states can eliminate tension and instability caused by unfair resource allocation. For example, development of programs that provide assistance for the poor, pensions for the elderly, and training and education for workers help remedy injustice,[12] tax reform, giving workers the right to unionize and demand

a fair wage, advancing ecological policies to protect and preserve the environment, and improving access to land ownership can also help in particular cases. During periods of postwar adjustment and peacebuilding efforts, long-term economic policy must aim to achieve equity, or balance in the distribution of income and wealth. Such efforts to ensure a just distribution of benefits following conflict are typically accompanied by democratization efforts to ensure a more balanced distribution of power. When neglect of economic rights stems from the destruction caused by protracted conflict, countries may require outside aid to remedy injustice and avoid future instability. Humanitarian aid and development assistance are often needed to help a society build its economic resource base and ensure that the needs of its citizens are met. Issues of distributive justice are in this way central to any reconstruction program that aims at economic vitalization and rebuilding post-war economic systems. Responding to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity Severe violations of basic rights to life and physical safety are sometimes enacted through government policies or inflicted during the course of warfare. It is commonly recognized that government leaders and soldiers, as well as civilians, must be held accountable for perpetrating such injustices. International humanitarian law has been enacted to preserve humanity in all circumstances, even during conflicts. Various international committees are in place to monitor compliance with human rights standards and report any violations. When breaches occur, the perpetrators must somehow be brought to justice. According to the notion of retributive justice, past acts of injustice or wrongdoing warrant punishment. Those who perpetrate war crimes or crimes against humanity should be brought to justice. When injustices are committed in the initiation or the conduct of warfare, retribution is typically accomplished through international courts or tribunals that carry out war crimes adjudication. In other cases, human rights violations form part of national policy. Most believe that government officials should be held accountable for institution policies of apartheid, forced disappearance, torture, or genocide. Such breaches are typically brought to the attention of international tribunals or tried in an international court. Punishment is thought to reinforce the rules of international law and to deny those who have violated those rules any unfair advantages. In addition, many believe that punishment deters other would-be offenders from committing similar crimes in the future. However, international law and adjudication is often insufficient to address grave injustice. When breaches do occur, they are brought to the attention of international tribunals or a war crimes tribunal. As conditions escalate in violence and more individuals are taken prisoner, tortured, or executed, it becomes more difficult to resort to the legal path. Historically, the United Nations has likewise played a central role in dealing with international justice issues. Many maintain that massive violations of human rights, such as genocide and crimes against humanity, warrant military intervention. If, through its atrocious actions, a state destroys the lives and rights of its citizens, it temporarily forfeits its claims to legitimacy and sovereignty. However, this sort of response is limited, because governments are often reluctant to commit military forces and resources to defend human rights in other states. Otherwise, such interventions are likely to simply cause more injustice. He also talks about ways to increase post-conflict stability through gradual democratization and the fostering of civil society. A central goal of responding to injustice is paving the way for future peace. Once conflict has ended and policies of oppression have been repealed, society members face the task of rebuilding their society. Many believe that measures aimed at restorative justice are well-suited for this task. Restorative Justice is concerned with healing wounds of victims and repairing harm done to interpersonal relationships and the community. It can play a crucial role in responding to severe human rights violations or cases of genocide. Huge advances are made when governments tell the truth about past atrocities carried out by the state. War crimes inquiries and truth commissions can aid in the process of memory and truth telling and help to make public the extent to which victims have suffered. Restoration often becomes a matter of restitution or war reparations. In cases where clear acts of injustice have taken place, some type of compensation package can help to meet the material and emotional needs of victims and remedy the injustice. Repentance can also help to re-establish relationships among the conflicting parties and help them to move toward reconciliation. In some cases, conflicts can end more peacefully when parties acknowledge their guilt and apologize than when formal war crimes adjudication or criminal proceedings are used. In cases of civil war, because the line between offenders and victims can become blurred, a central goal of peacebuilding is to restore the community as a whole.

Restoration often becomes tied to the transformation of the relationship between the conflicting parties. However, such restoration cannot take place unless it is supported by wider social conditions and unless the larger community makes restorative processes available. Many note that an adequate response to injustice must involve social structural changes , reconstruction programs to help communities ravaged by conflict, democratization and the creation of institutions of civil society. Only then can the underlying causes of injustice be remedied. Lynne Rienner Publishers, , 9. Theory and Practice, ed. Publishers, , Temple University Press, , The Responsibility to Protect: International Development Research Centre, , Use the following to cite this article: Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess.

Chapter 8 : Injustice 2: How to Link the Mobile Account & What You Get

Injustice 2 is one of the best fighting games in years, offering an immersive story mode, fantastic combat and a ton of solo and multiplayer content. However, NetherRealm's new comic-book brawler.

Overview[edit] Organizational justice is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct. The four proposed components are distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. Corporate social responsibility[edit] A concept related to organizational justice is corporate social responsibility CSR. Organizational justice generally refers to perceptions of fairness in treatment of individuals internal to that organization while corporate social responsibility focuses on the fairness of treatment of entities external to the organization. Corporate social responsibility refers to a mechanism by which businesses monitor and regulate their performance in line with moral and societal standards such that it has positive influences on all of its stakeholders Carroll, Thus, CSR involves organizations going above and beyond what is moral or ethical and behaving in ways that benefit members of society in general. Inputs refer to what a person perceives to contribute e. Types[edit] Three main proposed components of organizational justice are distributive, procedural, and interactional justice which includes informational and interpersonal justice. Distributive[edit] Distributive justice is conceptualized as the fairness associated with decision outcomes and distribution of resources. The outcomes or resources distributed may be tangible e. Perceptions of distributive justice can be fostered when outcomes are perceived to be equally applied Adams, Procedural[edit] Procedural justice is defined as the fairness of the processes that lead to outcomes. When individuals feel that they have a voice in the process or that the process involves characteristics such as consistency, accuracy, ethicality, and lack of bias then procedural justice is enhanced Leventhal, A construct validation study by Colquitt suggests that interactional justice should be broken into two components: Interpersonal justice "reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities and third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes". Informational justice "focuses on explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion". Proposed models[edit] Three different models have been proposed to explain the structure of organizational justice perceptions including a two factor model, a three factor model, and a four factor model. Many researchers have studied organizational justice in terms of the three factor model e. Greenberg proposed a two-factor model and Sweeney and McFarlin found support for a two-factor model composed of distributive and procedural justice. Through the use of structural equation modeling , Sweeney and McFarlin found that distributive justice was related to outcomes that are person-level e. The accuracy of the two-factor model was challenged by studies that suggested a third factor interactional justice may be involved. Bies and Moag argue that interactional justice is distinct from procedural justice because it represents the social exchange component of the interaction and the quality of treatment whereas procedural justice represents the processes that were used to arrive at the decision outcomes. Colquitt demonstrated that a four-factor model including procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice fit the data significantly better than a two or three factor model. Thus, rather than focus on justice as the three or four factor component model, Byrne suggested that employees personify the organization and they distinguish between whether they feel the organization or supervisor have treated them fairly interactional , use fair procedures procedural , or allocate rewards or assignments fairly distributive justice. A number of researchers used this model exploring the possibility that justice is more than just 3 or 4 factors e. The role of affect in perceptions[edit] One of the key constructs that has been shown to play a role in the formation of organizational justice perceptions is affect. The precise role of affect HH in organizational justice perceptions depends on the form of affectivity being examined emotions, mood, disposition as well as the context and type of justice being measured. Affect may serve as an antecedent, outcome, or even a mediator of organizational justice perceptions. Affect and emotions can be part of the reactions to perceived injustice, as studies have shown that the more injustice that is perceived, the higher degrees of negative emotions are experienced. In addition, affect can act as a mediator between justice perceptions and actions taken to redress the perceived injustice. Affect plays this role in equity

theory such that negative affective reactions act as a mediator between perceptions and actions, as emotional reactions to justice motivate individuals to take action to restore equity. The findings of Barsky and Kaplan show that both state and trait level negative affect can act as antecedents to justice perceptions. State and trait level negative affect are negatively associated with interactional, procedural, and distributive justice perceptions. Conversely, positive state and trait affectivity was linked to higher ratings of interactional, procedural and distributive justice. Based on the research regarding the central role of affect in justice perceptions, Lang, Bliese, Lang, and Adler extended this research and studied the idea that sustained clinical levels of negative affect depression could be a precursor to perceptions of injustice in organizations. Thus, affect can serve as an antecedent to justice perceptions in this instance. Antecedents of perceptions[edit] Employee participation[edit] One antecedent to perceptions of organizational justice is the extent to which employees feel that they are involved in decision-making or other organizational procedures. Communication[edit] A second antecedent to organizational justice perceptions is organizational communication with employees. Justice climate[edit] Perceptions of organizational justice can be influenced by others, such as co-workers and team members. Outcomes are affected by perceptions of organizational justice as a whole or by different factors of organizational justice. Commonly cited outcomes affected by organizational justice include trust, performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors OCBs , counterproductive work behaviors CWBs , absenteeism, turnover, and emotional exhaustion. Trust social sciences The relationship between trust and organizational justice perceptions is based on reciprocity. Job performance The impact of organizational justice perceptions on performance is believed to stem from equity theory. This would suggest that when people perceive injustice they seek to restore justice. One way that employees restore justice is by altering their level of job performance. Procedural justice affects performance as a result of its impact on employee attitudes. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment[edit] Main articles: Organizational citizenship behavior[edit] Main article: Organizational citizenship behavior Organizational citizenship behaviors are actions that employees take to support the organization that go above and beyond the scope of their job description. As organizational actions and decisions are perceived as more just, employees are more likely to engage in OCBs. Karriker and Williams established that OCBs are directed toward either the supervisor or the organization depending on whether the perception of just stems from the supervisor or the organization. Counterproductive work behaviors[edit] Main article: Counterproductive work behavior Counterproductive work behaviors CWBs are "intentional behaviors on the part of an organizational member viewed by the organization as contrary to their legitimate interests" Gruys and Sackett, , p. There are many reasons that explain why organizational justice can affect CWBs. Thus, the more perceptions of procedural injustice lead employees to perceived normative conflict, the more it is likely that CWBs occur. Absenteeism and withdrawal[edit] Main article: Absenteeism Absenteeism, or non-attendance, is another outcome of perceived injustice related to equity theory Johns, Failure to receive a promotion is an example of a situation in which feelings of injustice may result in an employee being absent from work without reason. Additionally, withdrawal, or leaving the organization, is a more extreme outcome stemming from the same equity theory principles. Emotional exhaustion Emotional exhaustion, which related to employee health and burnout, is related to overall organizational justice perceptions.

Chapter 9 : Taking advantage of injustice | Erik Malmqvist - theinnatdunvilla.com

Redistribution of benefits and resources can thus be an important component of social structural changes to remedy injustice. There are various institutional and economic development reforms that might be put in place to raise living standards and boost economic growth.