

Historical Perspective on Social Justice

*Joseph Nkang Ogar, Samuel Akpan Bassey **

Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Cross River, Nigeria

Abstract

From antiquity to date, communal clashes, inter tribal even to global crisis of war is antecedented by penetration of ill-will, unfair sharing formula of human and natural resources by a privileged few resulting in high social, economic and political acrimony hence, the growing calls to reframe the politics of poverty reduction and social protection in particular, in terms of extending the 'social contract' to the poorest groups as people are getting increasingly aware of injustice. This premise is on the widening gap between the rich and poor on daily bases. With the increase of awareness, knowledge, technology and the advent of post-modernist era, the quest for social justice has heightened. Even communism and democracy attempt to offer social justice to its natives. Communism states that humans are free to engage in any kind of occupation and express ourselves freely without government interference, unlike the alienated labour society of the capitalist industry: this for communism is social Justice, while democracy thinks equality before law and power to its natives is social justice. All through the era of Philosophy, Philosophers differ on the definition, and what constitute social justice. Until now, there is no unifying explanation on what social justice is and consists of. This paper tends to look into the history of social Justice and different philosophers from different epochs. It also tried to expose the problems inherent in the definition and what constitute social justice, and cautioned that complimentary imperative should be employ to curtail human egoistic tendency that aids social injustice.

Keywords: Social justice, social contract, equality, complimentary reflection

***Author for Correspondence** E-mail: samuelbassey15@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

The idea that 'social contracts' are vital for improvement of peoples living condition should be applauded as an exercise from rational and moral dispositions. The ascent of social contract talk appears to get both from an arrangement of regularizing and ideological worries inside international improvement and an expanded familiarity with the significance of governmental issues in forming advancement approach results. The social contractarians are of the opinion that the 'state of nature' came together to form a social contract in which human beings surrender some of their right to a sovereignty who will in turn will protect its citizens from oppression of any form of injustice. This probably is the main reason that births the formation of civil society (government). Despite government formation it seems as if there is not lasting solution to the problem of injustice in our societies. Down the ages of political thought, various philosophers have differed on the concept of social justice. This paper tends to

expose views and expose the problems inherent in social justice in general.

Social Contractarian

The issue of freedom is the inspiring power behind the social contract theorist. Numerous social contract philosophers concurred that in the state of nature individuals have physical flexibility, implying that their activities are not limited, this made them a minimal more than animals and where slaves to their instincts and impulses [1]. Humans as of that time had no legislature and no law to regulate them. There were hardships and mistreatment, war and injustice in virtually public life [2]. At the height of it, humans decided to come together surrender some of their entitlement and rights to a sovereign – a sovereign is the voice of the law and the outright power inside a given state. The duty of a sovereign is to check the overabundances of individuals in the state and help social justice. The first center of social contract hypothesis, rose in European political thought in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth

hundreds of years, was on inquiries of political power and authenticity as opposed to on more particular issues of public policy. Social contract philosophers for example, Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau – created changing types of social contract hypothesis to distinguish the legitimating grounds of political power, whereby the commitments of rulers and subjects are based on an introduced contract or contracts identifying with these matters [3]. Social contract thinking likewise ran past worries with setting up the true legitimate reason for political power to the legitimating premise for natives living respectively. In connection to current discussions inside international development, the biggest commitment of social contract thoughts originates from John Rawls' fundamental work, a *Theory of Justice* (1972).

Here, Rawls stretches out social contract hypothesis to incorporate the authenticity of all social and political foundations, whereby he contended that individuals would not consent to subject themselves to political power unless certain conditions were set up to guarantee their essential freedom and balance. Accused of re-characterizing the standards of a decent society, and without knowing ahead of time what their financial and political status would like inside it, individuals will try to guarantee that insignificant gauges of freedom and employment are ensured for all as a method for shielding themselves and their kindred subjects from subordination and dejection. The connections to current civil arguments on social assurance – most eminently thoughts around essential salary stipends and a social base are obvious.

Social Justice

“Justice” is on everybody's lips these days, and may mean practically anything. We hear the cry “Peace and Justice” from society who might wreck existing social orders with innovation and weapon. Other society favor that flawless justice may promptly be acquired by certain money related revisions - as though anything in this world ever could be consummated. As social contractarian presuppose about the condition of nature [4]. It came a period in which residents needed to meet up to surrender some of their rights to a sovereign. The obligation of this power was to

ensure social justice in a state to its locals. Social justice is therefore characterized as advancing an only society by testing injustice and esteeming assorted qualities. It exists when all individuals share a typical mankind and subsequently have a privilege to evenhanded treatment, support for their human rights, and a reasonable distribution of group assets. In states of social justice, individuals are "not be oppressed, nor their welfare and prosperity compelled or biased on the premise of sex, sexuality, religion, political affiliations, age, race, conviction, handicap, area, social class, financial circumstances, or other normal for foundation or gathering participation [5]. Social justice is for the most part likened with the thought of equity or equivalent open door in the public arena. In spite of the fact that balance is irrefutably a portion of social justice, the importance of social justice is entirely more extensive [6], "measure up to circumstance" and comparable expressions, for example, "moral duty" have been utilized to decrease the imminent for acknowledging social justice by legitimizing gigantic imbalances in cutting edge society.

History of Social Justice

The term justice began in Judean writing, and it kept on being utilized as a part in the Biblical scripture [7]. All things considered, the term has a solid verifiable religious association. The Hebrew expressions for justice are “mishpat” and “sedeq” [7]. “Mishpat” was utilized as a part of antiquated archives to allude to the assurance of poor people, the dowager, the outsider, and the vagrant, and to acts that realize justice for their purpose in Jer. 9:23-24. In the Old Testament, this consideration is general and is requested from all individuals Deut. 10:18-19 [8]. The Hebrew root phrase “sedeq” is interpreted as right, justice [8]. At the point when deciphered into English, the words just, justice, worthy motivation, avocation, and legitimize are suitable interpretations of these three Hebrew words [9]. In the New Testament's book of Romans, the root word for right, upright, and exemplary nature is dikaio, which again advance interprets into the English word justice. The term “social” originates from the Hebrew word “tzadeqah”, this means justice or honorableness [10]. It is ordinarily used to mean philanthropy but at the same time is

utilized to mean commitment. At the point when the two words social and justice are combined, this contextualizes the association with the customer and the world [11]. In the New Testament, the anecdote of the Good Samaritan is a case of social justice, showing the idea that we are every one of our neighbors keeper [12]. Paul, writing in the book of Galatians, makes it clear that helping all individuals is not discretionary; it is an order.

All through the historical backdrop of western theory, philosophers have contrasted on what constitute social justice. Cephalus an ancient Greek mythology set up the customary hypothesis of justice. As indicated by him justice comprises in talking reality and paying one's obligation [13]. Polemarchus additionally holds the same perspective of justice however, with a little modification. As indicated by him justice appears to comprise in giving what is legitimate to him [14]. The straightforward ramifications of this origination of justice might be that, justice is doing great to companions and damage to adversaries [14]. Thrasymachus went ahead board to expose his contention; he propounded the radical hypothesis of justice. He characterizes justice as "the enthusiasm of the stronger" [15]. In alternate words, he may be correct. For while, each man represents himself and tries to get what he can, the most grounded is certain to get what he needs and as in a state the Government is the most grounded, it will attempt to get and it will get, whatever it needs for itself.

Glaucon further came forward with his social contract theory, arguing we are only moral because, it pays us or we have to be [16]. Glaucon describes the historical evolution of the society where justice as a necessity has become the shield of the weaker. In the primitive stage of society without law and government, man was free to do whatever he likes. So the stronger one few enjoyed the life at the sufferance of the weaker. The weaker, however, realized that they suffered more injustice. Faced with this situation they came to an agreement and instituted law and government through a sort of social contract and preached the philosophy of just [16]. Therefore, justice in this way is something

artificial and unnatural it is the product of convention. It is through this artificial rule of justice and law that the natural selfishness of man is chained. Plato went ahead board having understood that all speculations propounded by Cephalus, Thrasymachus and Glaucon, contained one basic component. That one basic component was that every one of them regarded justice as something outer an achievement, an importation, or a tradition, none of them conveyed it into the soul or resident in the soul so Plato rejected them. Plato demonstrates that justice does not rely on a chance, tradition or upon outside power. It is the right state of the human soul by the very ways of man when found in the totality of his surroundings. As indicated by Plato in his book *The Republic*, Justice is inward as it lives in the human soul [17]. Plato strikes a relationship between the human living being from one perspective and social living being on the other. Relating to these three components in human instinct there are three classes of the social order which are: Philosopher king – governing class with reason, who are qualified to rule, soldiers - a class of warriors and protectors of the state and lastly artisans who are traders and businessmen in the society (Benson 2007).

Plato attests that practical specialization requests from each social class to practice itself in the station of life apportioned to it. Justice for Plato is a kind of specialization. It is simply the will to fulfill the duties of one's station and not to meddle with the duties of another station, and its habitation is, therefore, in the mind of every citizen who does his duties in his appointed place. True justice to Plato, therefore, consists in the principle of non-interference. The State has been considered by Plato as a perfect whole in which each individual which is its element, functions not for itself but for the health of the whole. Every element fulfils its appropriate function. Plato was convinced that a society which is so organized is fit for survival. Where men are out of their natural places, there the co-ordination of parts is destroyed, the society disintegrates and dissolves. Justice, therefore, is the citizen sense of duties. But question bigots his analysis. Are there no people who can multi-task, people who can function well as

military men as well as rulers? If yes will it be just to limit their capabilities to one specialization?

The Republic of Plato serves as an awesome guide. Generally, Aristotle trusts that everything has particular point and man's particular point is to achieve the genuine happiness. He clarifies the idea of justice on the premise of individual life- He says in this field: Justice is in respect to people, and a justice conveyance is one in which the relative estimations of things offered compare to those of the people receiving it. [18], According to Aristotle, justice in individual is the concordance in the human soul, and in the general public is correspondence and extent in the satisfaction and quality. Justice, to Aristotle as to Plato, is ethicalness in real life. Justice implies that each individual from a group ought to satisfy his ethical commitment towards the kindred individuals from his group. Justice in the political sense has two divisions: distributive justice and corrective justice. corrective justice is worried with willful business exchanges like deal, contract outfitting of security, and so forth., and different things like hostility on property and life, honor and freedom"[19]. Distributive justice consists in proper allocation to each person according to his worth or deserts.

This type of justice relates primarily but not exclusively to political privileges. Distributive justice comprises in legitimate portion to every individual as per his value or betrays. This kind of justice relates fundamentally however, not only to political benefits. Stating here in perspective, every sort of political association has its own standard of worth and, in the manner of distributive justice. In a democratic system, the standard of worth is freedom; in oligarchy it is wealth, in aristocracy: virtue. Aristotelian distributive justice is along these lines, the other name for proportionate uniformity i.e., a man's rights, obligations and prizes ought to compare to his legitimacy and social contribution [19]. In the governmental issues of Aristotle, the primary common group for him is the family, which, when complete, comprises of father, spouse, kids, and slaves.

Augustine a Christian philosopher thought of his concocted scriptural way to deal with

social justice. In actuality, the principal section of the City of God insinuates the renowned entry from the prophet Habakkuk, "the just shall live by faith," and Augustine refers to Habakkuk twice, most strikingly at a point where he interfaces the equitable individual (iustus) to the justice (iustitia) due God who leads a dutiful and obedient city as indicated by his grace [20]. The just individual lives by faith, says Augustine, and it is importance for just people to love one's neighbor as oneself and God. For Augustine justice starts and finishes with religious dedication, the affection and reverence of God. Where God does not get his due there can be no justice and no privilege. Against the perspectives of Roman statesmen and philosophers, Augustine contends that God is understandable just through his manifestation. Therefore there can be no justice without Christ.

Aquinas talks about the justice, in his magnum opus, the multi-volume *Summa Theologica*. He concurs with Aristotle in examining specific justice into two sorts, which he calls "distributive" and "corrective" [21]. Aquinas applies this hypothesis of justice to numerous social issues. He keeps up that normal law gives us the privilege to claim private property. Given this characteristic right, burglary and theft must be vile, in spite of the fact that an exemption can emerge if the cheat and his family are keeping in a situation from bounty, in which case, taking is defended and, entirely, not robbery or theft by any stretch of the imagination.

The English political philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) composed *Leviathan*, a book which affected John Locke and the Founding Fathers of the United States [22]. His concept of a social contract between residents whereby each consents to surrender rights to the state is viewed as one of the best thoughts of the Enlightenment. In the antiquated world, the natives' prosperity relied on the temperance or exemplary nature of the ruler. Hobbes contended that the sovereign's energy is the thing that makes the native's conforms to the agreement. This being the situation, justice is not a probability until power has been made. By this contention, we reason that justice is a result of coercive power and contracts are approved by the ruler's

energy, not by the ruler's uprightness or exemplary nature. Hobbes changed the possibility of justice. No more did it need to do with the uprightness or exemplary nature of the ruler, however, it needed to do with an agreement that subjects worked out among themselves to surrender certain rights to a ruler [23]. Hobbes contended additionally that, the ruler's energy makes the native's conform to the agreement. This being the situation, justice is a result of coercive power, and contracts are approved by the ruler's energy, not by the ruler's uprightness or exemplary nature. David Hume who is a radical empiricist was wary of justice as a target, total ethicalness.

In the third segment of his *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, Hume contends that open utility is the sole source of justice. To place that case in setting, we can take note of that, similar to Hobbes, Hume sees all qualities, including that of justice, as got from our interests [24]. Any ethicalness, he keeps up, is attractive in that it furnishes us with the lovely sentiment endorsement; and any bad habit, including that of injustice, undesirable in that it gives us the excruciating feeling of dissatisfaction. So as to qualify as ethicalness, one action must be valuable or pleasant to him and others [25].

Immanuel Kant places more noteworthy accentuation on motives and not simply on thought processes. Profound quality applies to every objective being, and an ethical activity is characterized as one that is dictated by reason, not by our exotic driving forces [26]. Since an activity is moral by virtue of its being contemplated, the ethical worth of an activity is controlled by its intention (motives), or the purpose for the activity, not by its outcomes [27]. We can decide the value of the intention behind any given good activity by asking whether we could transform those motives into a generally appropriate reason for all individuals, under a common framework [28]. Thusly, an activity is moral just when it encapsulates a maxim under a widespread acceptable law. Kant calls it a "categorical imperative" which implies that we should act in a manner that we could will the saying as indicated by which we act to be a general law not necessarily our motive [29]. When we

perceive the all-inclusiveness of good law, we should likewise perceive that it applies similarly to all individuals. We should likewise guarantee that our activities don't keep other individuals from acting as per good law. Kant imagines a perfect society which social justice is inherent in which individuals are on the double both the creators and the subjects of the laws they comply. Profound quality is situated in the idea of flexibility, or independence. Somebody with a free or self-sufficient will does not just act but rather can reflect and choose whether to act givenly. This demonstration of thought recognizes a self-sufficient will from a heteronomous will. John Stuart Mill a utilitarian also opines in the discussion on social justice. In his exposition of Utilitarianism, Mill contends that, respect for people rights, "the most sacred and binding portion of morality" is perfect with the possibility that justice lays on utilitarian contemplations [30]. Critic of utilitarianism has express dissatisfaction of utilitarian concept of justice.

This is based on the utilitarian standard of what is right in behavior, is not the operator's own particular joy, rather than of all concerned. As the method for making the closest way to deal with social justice, utility would charge that laws and social courses of action ought to put the enthusiasm of the entirety over the joy of each person [31]. A standout amongst the most compelling political philosophers of the twentieth century wrote a huge book titled *Theory of Justice*. For Rawls, the standards of justice are rule that decide a reasonable determination of irreconcilable circumstances among people in a general public. Rawls states, justice is the "basic structure of society" [32]. The fundamental structure is the essential subject of justice since its belongings are so significant and present from the beginning. Rawls' hypothesis of justice spins around the adjustment of two crucial standards of justice which would, thusly, ensure an equitable and ethically worthy society. The first principle of Equal Liberty says: Every individual has an equivalent right to the most broad freedoms good with comparable freedoms for all (Egalitarian). The second principle which is called the difference Principle: Social and

economic disparities ought to be masterminded with the goal that they are both (a) to the best formal of the slightest advantaged people, and (b) appended to workplaces and positions open to every single under state of balance of chance [33]. A key issue for Rawls is to show how such standards would be universally adopted, and here the work verges on general moral issues. Robert Nozick in his book is *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, is fundamentally worried with the dispersion of property, and contends that justice includes three thoughts: Justice in securing: how you first obtain property rights over something that has not beforehand been possessed, Justice in exchange: how you get property rights over something that has been to you by another person; Rectification of injustice: how to reestablish something to its legitimate proprietor, if there should be an occurrence of injustice in either obtaining or exchange [34]. Nozick's hypothesis of justice claims that whether a circulation is just or not depends completely on how it occurred.

Justice, Nozick contends, is about regarding individuals' (regular) rights, specifically, their rights to property and their rights to self-proprietaryship [34]. We should permit individuals the opportunity to choose what they need to do with what they possess. Every individual is discrete, and we should regard their self-sufficiency. Individuals are 'closures in-themselves', and we can't utilize them in ways they don't consent to, regardless of the fact that, that would prompt some gathered 'more noteworthy great' (e.g. other individuals getting what they require). This has a radical conclusion: to remove property from individuals with a specific end goal to redistribute it as per some example abuses their rights. In any case, this is precisely what tax collection (with the end goal of redistribution) does. Nozick thinks property rights are vital in light of the fact that they get from 'self-proprietaryship'.

As seen above, definitions and perspectives differ about social justice from political theorist and philosophers. Social justice is something every one desires. Tragically, it seems to have expected an ideological identity over the span of the latest couple of decades. Generously more fundamental and more

troublesome is the subject of the degree of social justice. The issue lies in the way it can be administered without influencing someone else's rights, what are the measuring sticks in which it can be measured and controlled. In all actuality we are individuals and moral agents with conscience with restrictions and irresolute human instinct. Because of the confinements that describe our being, we are not generally in a position to react and surrender to this basic interest which is the main reason for social justice. These are those undecided minutes when we have a tendency to exceed, to blow up, or put ourselves first when interacting and doing business, or when we neglect to meet certain desires coordinated towards us since we have the normal slant to ensure our interests. Regular case of this sort of circumstance possess large amounts of all human social orders were what it takes to maintain ones interest is proportionate to those measures expected to subvert it. This subversion is most purported in those measures the subject sets out upon towards dispensing with contenders self-assertiveness in the incorrect conviction that he can secure his interests without considering the interests of others.

The pressure between the personality and the world achieves its crest in those circumstances where we compare what it takes to monitor private intrigue incorrectly, and now and again, unequivocally with the benefit of everyone. If human ego as free moral agents can be in check it would help limit the problem of social injustice in the world. The principle of "do unto other what you expect to be done to you" is very vital when interacting with persons. This principle is also in accordance, complimentary ontology. Complimentary reflection philosophy gives man a necessary condition for "allowing the limitations of being to be the cause of our joy" [35] as this is communicated in the basics of complementarity which states: permit the confinement of being to be the reason for your bliss. Each one of those measures required towards self-safeguarding, regardless of the possibility that they are performed for the benefit of all, have no authenticity on the off chance that they are selective of the interests of others and look for their authenticity all alone terms. Everyone at every given times

should endeavor to act within this two principles, as there are no standard yardstick apart from the human reason to determine and administer social justice. These principles help in checking human excess which often causes social injustice. Having these two principles informed in our mindset will often make the world a better place [36].

CONCLUSION

We live in a world characterized by commoditization and increasingly precarious employment, weak politics but strong markets, weak distributive concerns but strong individual interests. Postmodern conceptualizations distinguished three tendencies. First, that insecurity and hazards become increasingly universal. Second, those societies become more and more individualized. Third, that the new risks increase inequalities and injustices against the poor. Everyone is yelling for social justice? There is so much perplexity about the significance of “justice” regardless.

The most recent version of the Encyclopedia Britannica contains no article under the heading “Justice”. Most theorists trusted that social justice propels uniformity, grasps freedom and improves welfare. Social justice correspondence grasps freedom and improves welfare. It is likewise about rights, respect and voice for all social justice advances value, handles opportunity and updates welfare. Social justice drives reasonableness, handles flexibility and updates welfare.

The emergency of today requires redistribution apparatuses, financing widespread social arrangement. Whatever we think social justice is, it is tied down to man interactions and ego. If man’s ego can be put under check with the two principles which states that “do unto others what you expect to be done to you” and complimentary ontology imperatives which states that “allow the limitation of your being to be the source of your joy” it will so help to limit the problem of social injustice globally even the beastly tendency of man inhumanity to man with its attendant denial, exploitation and subjugation.

REFERENCES

1. Smith S. State sovereignty as social construct. *Igarss*. 2014. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2>
2. Hindess B. *Locke’s state of nature. History of the Human Sciences*. 2007; 20(3): 1–20p. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0952695107079331>
3. Lessnoff M. (Ed), *Social Contract Theory* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd). 1990.
4. Young IM. Responsibility and Global Justice: a Social Connection Model. *Philosophy and Social Policy*. 2006; 23(01): 102–130p. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0265052506060043>
5. Skitka LJ, Morgan GS. The social and political implications of moral conviction. *Political Psychology*. 2014; 35(SUPPL.1): 95–110p. <http://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12166>
6. Scherlen A, Robinson M. Open Access to Criminal Justice Scholarship: A Matter of Social Justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*. 2008; 19(1): 54–74p. doi:10.1080/10511250801892961
7. Hemphill B. Social Justice as a Moral Imperative. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2015; 3(2): doi:10.15453/2168-6408.1150
8. Originally published in New Dictionary of Theology. David F. Wright, Sinclair B. Ferguson, J.I. Packer (Eds), 590–592p. Reproduced by permission of the author.
9. Hemphill B. Social Justice as a Moral Imperative. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2015; 3(2).
10. Keller T. *Generous justice: How God’s grace makes us just*. New York, NY: Penguin Group. 2010.
11. Social justice: To be or not to be? *Advance for Occupational Therapy Practitioners*. 2011; 27(7): 8p.
12. Ogar, J. N., Ogar, T. E., & Anyim, M. N. M. (2016). Selected Issues in Biomedical Ethics and its Social Implications: African Consideration. *International Journal of Research*, 5.
13. Broadbent M. *Studies in Greek genealogy*. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1968.
14. Plato, Shorey P. *The republic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 2006.

15. Nicholson PP. *Unravelling Thrasymachus' Arguments in "The Republic."* *Phronesis*. 1974; 19(3): 210–232p. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4181941>
16. Kirwan C. *Glaucon's challenge*. *Phronesis*. 1965; 10(2): 162–173p. <http://doi.org/10.1163/156852865X00130>
17. Plato, Shorey P. *The republic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 2006.
18. Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics*, Translated by Commentaries and Glossary by Hippocrats G. *Apostle*, D. Redial Publishing, London, Book E, 1980; 5p.
19. Akpan, B. S., & Odohoedi, C. C. (2016). History of Substance in Philosophy. *cal*, 5, 254-270.
20. Bhandari DR. *Reprint History of European Political Philosophy*, Bangalore, Bappco, the Bangalore Press. 2002; 5–54p.
21. Elshtain JB. Augustine and the Limits of Virtue. *Augustinian Studies*. 1993; 24: 187–194p.
22. Mendelson M. *Saint Augustine*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 2010; 1–93p. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0149.00194>
23. Pigden CR. *Hume on Motivation and Virtue: New Essays*. *Hume on Motivation and Virtue: New Essays*. 2009.
24. Morris CW. *The Social contract theorists: critical essays on Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau*. Critical essays on the classics. 1999.
25. Pigden CR. *Hume on Motivation and Virtue: New Essays*. *Hume on Motivation and Virtue: New Essays*. 2009.
26. Murphy JG. *Hume and Kant on the social contract*. *Philosophical Studies*. 1978; 33(1): 65–79p. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00354282>
27. Bird G. *A Companion to Kant*. *A Companion to Kant*. 2007; <http://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996287>
28. Rohlf M, *Immanuel Kant*. In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2016; Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/kant/>
29. Bird G. *A Companion to Kant*. *A Companion to Kant*. 2007; <http://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996287>
30. Rohlf M. *Immanuel Kant*. In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2016; Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/kant/>
31. Berger FR. 1979 John Stuart Mill on Justice and Fairness. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*. May 2015; 115–136p. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.1979.10717097>
32. Rawls J. *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press. 1999; Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=kvpby7HtAe0C&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=A+Theory+of+Justice&ots=ti7rv7Bba-&sig=btlO9jsUFUVo0hFNpQbn50PU1GE>
33. Leebaw BA. The Irreconcilable Goals of Transitional Justice. *Human Rights Quarterly*. 2008; 30(1): 95–118p. <http://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2008.0014>
34. Eyo, E., & Ogar, J. N. (2014). The Socratic “Man know thyself” and the problem of personal identity. *Sophia: An African Journal of Philosophy*, 15(1), 69-73.
35. Gendler TS. Robert Nozick. *Philosophical Review*. 2003; 112(1): 106–110p. <http://doi.org/10.1215/00318108-112-1-106>
36. Asouzu I.I. *The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection in and beyond African Philosophy*, Calabar University Press. 2004; 367–380p.

Cite this Article

Joseph Nkang Ogar, Samuel Akpan Basse. Historical Perspective on Social Justice. *Omniscience: A Multi-disciplinary Journal*. 2016; 6(3):