

---

# The Primacy of Global Justice in Aristotle's Political Philosophy: Exploring Contemporary Implications

**Jonathan Oluwapelumi Alabi**

Department of Philosophy, University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria

**Email address:**

alabijonathan600@gmail.com

**To cite this article:**

Jonathan Oluwapelumi Alabi. (2023). The Primacy of Global Justice in Aristotle's Political Philosophy: Exploring Contemporary Implications. *International Journal of Philosophy*, 11(4), 101-110. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijp.20231104.12>

**Received:** August 27, 2023; **Accepted:** September 18, 2023; **Published:** December 26, 2023

---

**Abstract:** The concept of justice, a cornerstone in Aristotle's political philosophy, holds intrinsic significance in both historical and contemporary contexts. This article embarks on an intricate exploration of the primacy of global justice within Aristotle's philosophical framework and its far-reaching implications in addressing contemporary challenges. Drawing from Aristotle's perspective on justice within the polis, the article navigates the terrain of his ideas, extending them beyond conventional boundaries and examining their pertinence in the global arena. Aristotle's nuanced definitions of justice lay the foundation for dissecting its role within the community. The dichotomy of distributive and corrective justice adds depth to the discussion, setting the stage for the exploration of justice on a global scale. Indications within Aristotle's writings hint at a broader consideration of justice, encompassing global concerns that transcend political boundaries. The resonance between Aristotle's principles and contemporary global issues, including poverty, environmental degradation, and human rights violations, is brought to light through the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This alignment underscores the enduring relevance of Aristotle's philosophy and its potential to inform contemporary ethical paradigms. Furthermore, the article contemplates the influence of Aristotle's justice-centred ideas on international relations, envisioning its impact on diplomacy, cooperation, and conflict resolution. Acknowledging critiques and counterarguments that question the adaptability of Aristotle's theories to modern complexities, the article upholds the enduring applicability of his principles. Aristotle's emphasis on equilibrium and rectification offers a portal for addressing multifaceted global injustices, even in the intricate web of contemporary interdependence. The article culminates in the assertion that the primacy of global justice within Aristotle's political philosophy reverberates profoundly in the present day. The convergence of his principles with contemporary ethical frameworks, the potential implications on international diplomacy, and the adaptability to intricate global challenges substantiate the perpetual wisdom encapsulated in Aristotle's ideas. Embracing the essence of his philosophy, humanity is poised to forge a path toward a more just, harmonious, and equitable world.

**Keywords:** Justice, Diplomacy, Development, Human Rights, Humanity

---

## 1. Introduction: Aristotle's Political Philosophy

Aristotle, a notable ancient Greek philosopher, established the framework for political philosophy in his writings "Politics" and "Nicomachean Ethics." His philosophy explores the foundations of citizenship, the nature of the city-state (polis), and the quest for justice, establishing a timeless framework that still influences political dialogue today [51]. The foundation of Aristotle's political theory is the idea that people are fundamentally social creatures who express

themselves to the maximum extent in the polis. The city-state stands for a self-sufficient society that is motivated by the welfare of its people. Aristotle thought that justice, which included both absolute lawfulness and personal fairness, was the cornerstone of a healthy polis [45].

The idea of citizenship, in which people actively participate in the political life of the polis, is fundamental to Aristotle's philosophy. Citizens are individuals who have the right to take part in governmental institutions, according to him [72]. This participation entails contributing to the common good, reflecting Aristotle's view that virtue and civic engagement are attributes that make for efficient

government. In Aristotle's philosophy, friendship (*philia*), which promotes harmony and unity within the polis, is crucial [48]. A major component of his philosophy, also distributed justice, calls for the distribution of resources and rewards according to need and merit, assuring fairness and social harmony [56]. Depending on whether they put the interests of the governing class ahead of the interests of the people, Aristotle classified constitutions as either proper (just) or aberrant (unjust) [58].

The political views of Aristotle are consistent with his ethical views. He maintained that political communities exist to help people live moral lives, highlighting how closely related ethics and government are [83]. Therefore, virtues acquired via moral behavior are crucial for successful political involvement and building a peaceful community.

#### *Significance of the Discourse*

The search for justice goes well beyond the confines of specific towns and states in a time when our globe is tied by complex webs of interconnection. It crosses geographies, cultures, and issues, addressing both theoretical and real-world problems that need nuanced viewpoints [91]. Ancient philosopher Aristotle developed a sophisticated knowledge of justice that, while grounded in the circumstances of his period, offers timeless lessons for the current state of the world. In the context of a society marked by interconnectedness and global challenges, his ideas on justice, particularly within the polis, have been exposed to critical study and modification.

It is important to investigate if Aristotle's ideas of justice may be expanded to give direction and answers that transcend boundaries since the twenty-first century presents us with a variety of urgent global concerns, from climate change to human rights atrocities. Investigating the core of Aristotle's idea of justice and how it relates to the global arena reveals a dynamic interaction between conventional knowledge and modern demands. This investigation sheds light on both the advantages and drawbacks of applying his philosophy to the complicated world of international relations, morality, and diplomacy.

## **2. Aristotle's Concept of Justice**

### ***2.1. Aristotle's Definition of Justice in the Context of His Political Philosophy***

The idea of justice occupies a major place in Aristotle's political philosophy as he examines its numerous facets within the framework of a political society [24]. In contrast to Plato's "The Republic," which concentrated on the ideal state, Aristotle's analysis of justice is based on the actualities of political life [65]. His political philosophy is closely linked with his understanding of justice, which emphasizes both its distributive and corrective elements [12].

Aristotle distinguished between two basic forms of justice: general, or universal, and specific, or individual [43]. General or universal justice, according to Aristotle, is intimately related to the idea of lawfulness and conformity to moral

standards in a community. It includes the notion of abiding by the rules and laws that the community has established. General Justice refers to upholding the laws and standards that support the polis's (city-state) general prosperity and peaceful operation [27]. This system of justice places a strong emphasis on respecting the law and preserving the status quo. Therefore, people must adhere to the moral and legal restraints that guide their relationships with others. His position on justice is built around the notion that a well-ordered society is built on the principle of general justice because it creates a framework for peaceful coexistence and the pursuit of both individual and group objectives [30, 60, 90].

Aristotle's idea of individual or justice goes farther in explaining how opportunities, resources, and commodities are distributed within a community. Distributive justice and corrective justice are the further divisions he makes within this type of justice [25, 89]. Fair distribution of rewards, accolades, and advantages among community members is a key component of distributive justice. Aristotle introduces the idea of proportionality in this point of view, by arguing that people should be given portions in accordance with their contributions or qualities [60]. He accepts that there are many perspectives on the foundation of deserts, whether it is birth, money, or virtue, but his major concern is the idea that just distributions must be proportionately fair [27].

### ***2.2. Distributive and Corrective Justice: A Distinction***

- 1) Distributive Justice: Aristotle's idea of distributive justice centers on the equitable distribution of assets, responsibilities, honors, and possessions within a society [26]. It has to do with distributing social advantages in accordance with each person's qualities and efforts. Aristotle believed that distributive justice required treating equals fairly while treating non-equals unfairly [29]. This implies that each person's share should reflect their merit and contribution. By ensuring that each person receives what is owed to them, distributive justice attempts to preserve balance and peace within a community and decides how opportunities and resources are distributed among individuals, it also serves as the foundation for political organizations [19].
- 2) Corrective (Reificatory Justice): When someone wrongs someone else or unfairly benefits himself, corrective justice is imperative. By making amends to the victim and punishing the offender, this type of justice seeks to bring about equilibrium once more. Correcting imbalances brought about by specific violations is crucial, as shown by Aristotle's concept of corrective justice [12]. The penalty or recompense is proportionate to the harm inflicted or benefit gained, according to the mathematical proportion concept, which underlies how it works [38]. In contrast to distributive justice, which focuses on settling general problems, Corrective justice is more focused on addressing the effects of wrongdoing [90].

### **2.3. Role of Justice in Maintaining Social Harmony and the Well-Being of the Polis**

Justice, in Aristotle's opinion, is not only a moral virtue but also a key tenet of the polis (city-state). It is therefore the thread that binds the society together [70], ensuring that everyone lives in peace and contributes to the general welfare. Justice is vital to the stability and development of the polis since it is an organized organization with a wide range of members, interests, and functions [92].

Maintaining societal peace depends critically on distributive fairness. It promotes a sense of justice among citizens by providing resources and honours in accordance with merit [71]. The likelihood of societal upheavals or revolutions is decreased because of this equitable distribution, which keeps disparities from escalating to excessive levels [45]. Based on Aristotle's position, the belief that their efforts will be adequately acknowledged and compensated motivates residents to take an active role in the polis [28].

On the other hand, by ensuring that conflicts are addressed, and imbalances are corrected, corrective justice helps to the wellbeing of the polis. People are more likely to have faith in legal and political institutions when they believe that injustices are remedied through suitable punishment and compensation [63]. In turn, this motivates people to collaborate in sustaining the community's common ideals and fosters faith in the polis's institutions [71].

In conclusion, Aristotle's examination of justice within his political philosophy demonstrates the complexity of the concept. While corrective justice works to restore equilibrium in situations of injury or gain, distributive justice concentrates on the fair distribution of resources based on merit. Both types of justice are essential for maintaining social peace and the health of the polis. Aristotle's idea of justice serves as the foundation for the stability and well-being of society by fostering fairness, resolving conflicts, and preserving balance.

## **3. Global Justice in Aristotle's Idea**

### **3.1. Global Justice**

The concept known as "global justice" seeks to traverse the challenging realm of fairness and moral issues. Global justice's fundamental goal is to address the moral questions and duties that come up when dealing with problems that cut beyond national boundaries and have an impact on people, communities, and sometimes, countries [68]. Global justice adopts a wider viewpoint that goes beyond national borders. It dives deeply into the fundamental issue of what constitutes justice among people on a personal level (Global justice investigations, in contrast to international justice, avoid the state-centric perspective and examine the moral duties that people and different entities, regardless of national affiliations, have towards one another [14].

When concentrating solely on state-level interactions, global justice assessments frequently fail to reveal aspects of linkages, interactions, and systems. These assessments

consider a larger range of individuals, groups, and institutions that might oversee justice-related duties [41]. This viewpoint emphasizes that although governments are important players in influencing the global environment, they are not the only ones doing so. The investigations provide a wider perspective that considers different connections, abilities, and functions outside of the context of states [77]. This viewpoint enables a more thorough investigation of justice commitments and reveals links that could otherwise go unnoticed. While these investigations frequently have an impact on requirements at the state level, they also highlight the obligations of various agents and institutions acting on a worldwide scale.

The theory of global justice attempts to clarify the difficulties of justice on a global level by focusing on important elements. It entails recognizing pressing issues with global justice, coming up with answers to those issues, deciding who oversees solving them, outlining the steps that agents should follow, and establishing these views within a normative framework [37]. These ideas seek to broaden our comprehension of the world and direct moral judgments toward international concerns. Global justice issues emerge when acts taken within one state have a detrimental effect on citizens of another state, or when institutions, laws, or practices that operate across borders have the potential to benefit or lessen damage to people living in other countries [20].

### **3.2. Extension of Aristotle's Concept of Justice to a Global Context**

The primary tenets of Aristotle's philosophy focus on the concepts of fairness, virtue, and the preservation of a healthy balance in interpersonal interactions. Although this idea was first developed in the context of city-states, it is exciting to wonder whether it may be applied to a global setting in the linked world of today. This subject is clarified by looking at Aristotle's ideas of justice, the difficulties of applying them universally, and their ramifications.

Aristotle distinguished between distributive and corrective justice as the two basic categories of justice [19, 38]. To ensure that people are treated fairly and are given the opportunities and resources they deserve, distributive justice demands the distribution of resources. On the other side, corrective justice focuses on addressing inequalities brought about by either voluntary or involuntary transactions. These types of justice are fundamental to Aristotle's conception of the successful operation of a society.

It may be possible to build on Aristotle's emphasis on corrective justice to apply his theory of justice on a global scale [26]. In this area of justice, imbalances are balanced, peace is restored, and harm brought on by unjust actions is addressed [4]. Many global issues, from environmental degradation to human rights breaches, have cross-border ramifications in today's linked globe and can be effectively handled via the perspective of corrective justice, for example, some scholars have evaluated human rights within its context [7], and while others have assessed its potency in addressing

climate change issues .

Environmental degradation is one of the most urgent global problems since it transcends national boundaries [2].. Ecosystems, way of life, and future generations are all impacted by pollution, deforestation, and climate change. Therefore, nations may work together to repair the damage these actions produced by employing Aristotle's theory of corrective justice. Shared obligations for ecosystem restoration, emissions reduction, and the adoption of sustainable practices may be included [86]. As a solution, a worldwide framework for environmental corrective justice can be created by jointly correcting the environmental harm that has been done.

Human rights abuses make it difficult to apply justice within certain nation-states. Genocide, human trafficking, and institutional prejudice are examples of atrocities that call for a global reaction [25]. Aristotle's emphasis on putting wrongs right is consistent with the desire to make victims whole and hold offenders accountable [81]. A worldwide strategy for redress might be shown by establishing international procedures that prosecute offenders and compensate victims [52].

Economic disparities both inside and between countries have significant global effects. The contemporary world economy is interconnected, with decisions made about money in one place having an impact on markets in other places, especially in developing countries [9]. Cooperative measures to reduce wealth gaps, maintain fair trade practices, and help less developed nations may be required to apply corrective justice to economic imbalances [61]. A worldwide framework for economic corrective justice might be sought through repairing economic injustice and working towards equitably distributed prosperity.

This expansion of Aristotle's idea of corrective justice is crucial since it calls for global collaboration and a common commitment to solving these global problems [89]. The difficulties' interconnectedness calls for international cooperation that goes beyond national concerns [55]. In response to it, international treaties, agreements, and organizations that support the ideals of corrective justice may be a part of this collaboration.

### **3.3. Principles in Aristotle's Writings That Suggest a Consideration of Justice Beyond the Polis**

Although Aristotle's writings on ethics and politics mostly focus on justice inside the polis (city-state) [8], there are hints and principles that might be taken as implying a consideration of justice beyond the polis in his works. These cues offer perceptions into how Aristotle's philosophy may be utilized in more extensive, even universal, circumstances.

- 1) *Universal Justice and Natural Law*: Aristotle presents the idea of "universal justice," which denotes abiding by the law and engaging in morally upright conduct [42]. This larger understanding of justice involves the idea of abiding by a natural rule that transcends the boundaries of towns and extends beyond the polis [82]. This shows that justice has a universal and ethical dimension that

may extend to relationships outside of the city-state and is not limited to political institutions.

- 2) *Distributive Justice and Common Good*: Aristotle's study of distributive justice, which deals with the distribution of benefits and honours within the polis, is founded on the idea of the common good [49]. He contends that for there to be justice, rewards, and honours must be given out in a way that benefits the entire society [15]. This idea of pursuing the common good may be used in more general contexts when concerns of justice encompass the welfare of mankind.
- 3) *Friendship and International Relations*: The ethical discussion of friendship (philia) by Aristotle has value for international relations. He makes distinctions between friendships based on their value, enjoyment, and virtue [87]. The concept of virtuous friendship might be applied to interactions between nations, even if he mostly addresses them in the context of interpersonal relationships [79]. Subsequently, a more equitable international order could result from the promotion of moral ties between states.
- 4) *Cosmopolitanism and Citizenship*: The way in which Aristotle discusses the "citizen of the world" (cosmopolites) in his "Politics". He was aware of an identity that extended beyond the polis. He makes the claim that people have a common identity as humans, which is consistent with the notion of cosmopolitanism [40]. His idea of a "citizen of the world" alludes to the possibility of thinking about justice on a larger scale, even while he admits the practical constraints of a worldwide political community [11].
- 5) *Corrective Justice and Global Issues*: Aristotle's emphasis on corrective justice, which seeks to make things right and undo injustice, offers a framework for dealing with universal problems [12]. To remedy transnational environmental damage or seek restitution for past injustices, for example, international contexts might benefit from using the concepts of restoring balance and repairing harm [86].

In summary, even though Aristotle's major concern was with justice inside the polis, his philosophical ideas and notions have parts that might be seen as implying that justice should be considered outside of the city-state. These signs offer a foundation for adapting Aristotelian ethics to more general situations, enticing us to consider how his theories could influence debates of justice on a grand scale.

### **3.4. Potential Challenges or Limitations in Applying Aristotle's Principles of Justice to a Global Scale**

#### *Diverse Cultural Contexts*

Questions concerning the relevance of Aristotle's ideas to today's varied global environment have been raised by the fact that his teachings originated from the cultural and socioeconomic standards of ancient Greece [27, 47, 53]. Attempting to establish a universal framework for justice might result in conflicts of values due to cultural differences in how virtues and the common good are defined. Finding a

middle ground that upholds shared ethical standards while respecting cultural diversity is difficult.

#### *Global Inequalities*

The topics of global economic, social, and political disparities were outside the purview of Aristotle's debates of justice since they were limited to a tiny city-state [67]. A broad reworking of his beliefs is necessary to address discrepancies within societies with notable income gaps or between rich and developing countries. The difficulty is in adjusting Aristotle's ideas to the scope of global injustices and bringing them into harmony with the quest for justice.

#### *Scope of Political Community*

Aristotle expressed doubts about the viability of a worldwide political community by recognizing the constraints of a political community beyond a certain size [72]. His vision of global justice has practical difficulties due to the complexity of governance, representation, and decision-making across many cultures and languages [35]. It is extremely difficult to strike a balance between international collaboration and local sovereignty.

#### *Global Cooperation*

Aristotle placed a strong emphasis on civic virtue and engagement in local politics [51]. The application of these concepts to global issues like climate change and international conflicts calls for cooperation across a wide range of parties with different interests. Fostering collaboration while considering various viewpoints and interests within the context of global justice is a problem.

#### *Complex Interdependence*

Applying Aristotle's ideas can be difficult because of how intertwined everything is in the current world, particularly how economies are interdependent [75]. It is difficult to define the "common good" [31] when considering the interests of nations and stakeholders with different objectives since the effects of decisions sometimes have cross-border repercussions. Using this complexity to pursue justice calls for creative solutions.

## **4. Contemporary Relevance of Global Justice: Context of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**

In modern moral and ethical frameworks that place a premium on respect for human dignity, social responsibility, and sustainability [23], Aristotle's ideas of justice—rooted in the restoration of balance, the rectification of injury, and the promotion of the common good [26]—find resonance. We reveal a cogent strategy for dealing with global issues while keeping core values as we investigate how these principles interact with utilitarianism, human rights theory, and environmental ethics.

The common good and the welfare of society are stressed by Aristotle, and this is consistent with utilitarianism, a moral philosophy that aims to maximize happiness [62]. We instinctively give the highest priority to efforts that result in the greatest well-being for the majority when we apply

Aristotle's ideas to urgent global concerns like poverty and environmental destruction [59]. The concept that pursuing acts that are advantageous to the group builds a just and flourishing international community, is shared by both points of view [88].

#### *Poverty*

The focus on distributive justice by Aristotle is relevant to the problem of poverty. He posits that to create an equitable distribution of wealth, resources should be distributed in accordance with virtue and merit [10, 32, 46, 64]. In a global perspective, this refers to resolving economic inequality between countries and guaranteeing the fulfilment of fundamental human needs [3]. His views are in line with initiatives to fight global poverty since they emphasize redressing disparities and advancing equitable economic possibilities. His ideas of justice may be put into practice by using tactics like fair trade, ethical investing, and responsible development [17].

The emphasis on distributive justice in Aristotle's writings is in line with SDG 1, which aims to eradicate all types of poverty. His belief in allocating resources in accordance with merit and virtue is in line with the objective of establishing equal wealth distribution on a global scale [74]. Justice's guiding principles can assist in the fight against poverty and the advancement of shared prosperity by tackling economic inequalities and making sure that fundamental necessities are addressed.

#### *Environmental Degradation*

The common good and Aristotle's views of justice are intertwined. Future generations are impacted by the environmental issues we currently face, such as habitat degradation and climate change [5]. Recognizing the intergenerational component of justice is essential to applying Aristotle's ideas. Addressing the environmental damage resulting from current acts while taking the long-term effects into account is necessary to restore equilibrium [18]. His emphasis on virtue is also consistent with environmental ethics [78], emphasizing good stewardship and appreciating the intrinsic worth of the natural world.

In the context of environmental sustainability, Aristotle's ethical precepts have additional meaning. His idea of corrective justice, which focuses on making amends for wrongdoing, reflects the seriousness with which SDGs 13 (Climate Action) and 15 (Life on Land) [85] stress the need to reduce the harm brought on by environmental deterioration. His worldview, which emphasizes the interconnection of people and ecosystems [94], is reflected in the demand for international collaboration to safeguard the health and well-being of the earth [36].

#### *Human Rights Violations*

The idea of restorative justice proposed by Aristotle is particularly pertinent when discussing abuses of human rights [33]. His emphasis on repairing damage and regaining equilibrium [54] is consistent with the goal of holding offenders responsible for their acts. Ensuring that those who perpetrate injustices are held accountable and that victims get the help and recompense they need is part of upholding

human rights. This notion is consistent with contemporary initiatives to create international legal systems and organizations that address crimes against humanity, genocide, and other serious human rights breaches [66].

Aristotle's emphasis on punishing wrongdoers and redressing injustices corresponds ideally with SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) [16]. His ideas and his objectives both support a society that upholds human rights addresses injustices and reduces inequities. Global justice can be achieved through judicial systems and cooperative efforts, aligning with Aristotle's idea of harmony [34].

## 5. Discussion of the Possible Influence of Aristotle on International Relations and the Quest for Global Justice

Aristotle's deep understanding of justice transcends the polis to influence international relations, paving the path for an increasingly just and corresponding world. His ideas on justice are based on the maintenance of balance and the common good. We unravel a tapestry of moral diplomacy and cooperative efforts on the international stage as we explore the potential effects of prioritizing global justice on diplomacy, collaboration, and conflict resolution and look at examples of international agreements and organizations reflecting this pursuit.

In the field of international relations, Aristotle's idea of justice to restore equilibrium [13] is a resonant one. His emphasis on fair relations provides a framework for developing understanding and collaboration among nations in a world distinguished by varied cultures, economies, and political systems. To build a more harmonious international order, the pursuit of global justice pushes governments to resolve inequities in power, resources, and influence.

The promotion of global justice can transform diplomacy by putting a strong emphasis on moral concerns and respect for one another. Nations can participate in discussions that go beyond self-interest and advance general well-being by respecting the common good and addressing inequalities. By transforming diplomatic exchanges from simple power struggles to cooperative initiatives meant to address common problems, this strategy raises the legitimacy and potency of international discussions.

Furthermore, there is a significant effect of global justice in resolving conflicts. Reconciliation and enduring peace are concepts that are in line with Aristotle's premise of repairing harm [50]. Even in the middle of long-standing hostilities, nations may find common ground by apologizing for historical wrongs and working to restore justice. Through a dedication to fairness and equity, the pursuit of global justice encourages diplomatic solutions that meet the complaints of all parties involved and promotes long-lasting peace.

The pursuit of international justice is exemplified by several agreements and organizations. For instance, the United Nations exemplifies Aristotle's ideas by giving

countries a forum to work together on global issues with an emphasis on human rights, development, and peacekeeping [73]. As nations come together to correct ecological imbalances brought on by excessive emissions, the Paris Agreement on climate change is another example of global justice in action.

In conclusion, Aristotle's theories of justice have a significant impact on world affairs. It is possible that the quest for global justice may transform diplomacy by encouraging moral concerns and cooperative solutions. Nations may advance towards a more equal and interconnected world by putting the common good first and addressing disparities. The concepts of global justice are evident in international accords and organizations, and they serve as a compass for countries trying to negotiate the intricacies of a continually changing international environment.

## 6. Criticisms and Counterarguments

Although the application of Aristotle's philosophy to issues of global justice gives encouraging insights, critics claim that his concepts may have trouble addressing the complexities of a globally connected world.

### *First criticism: Cultural relativism and diversity*

Due to cultural variation, critics contend that Aristotle's ideas of justice, which are based on Greek virtue ethics, may not be relevant to all people [96]. They draw attention to the peril of imposing a Western intellectual framework on cultures with different values and practices. For instance, the definition of "fairness" or "balance" in one culture may be very different from that of another [21, 22].

The argument put up by supporters in response to this criticism is that while cultural settings vary, some universal truths may be drawn from Aristotle's philosophy [1]. The pursuit of justice, undoing of wrongs, and the common good have universal appeal [84]. Therefore, his concepts may be modified without losing their essential meaning to fit with various cultural situations rather than imposing a strict framework.

### *Second criticism: Difficulty of Global Issues*

Aristotle's philosophy, which was initially intended for small communities, has drawn criticism for possibly failing to adequately handle contemporary complicated global issues including climate change, cybersecurity, and global health [92]. These complex problems require sophisticated fixes that go beyond the purview of his ideas [6].

Defenders claim that despite their complexity, these issues may still be tackled from the perspective of Aristotle [57]. His worldview offers a moral framework for resolving even the most complex global issues by emphasizing shared accountability, harm rectification, and cooperative efforts. Instead of providing technological answers, it's important to frame the ethical implications of these problems [80].

### *Third criticism: Power dynamics and realpolitik*

The focus on justice and balance that Aristotle places would not be compatible with realpolitik, where power

dynamics frequently rule, according to skeptics [39]. Pursuing global justice could be seen as foolish under anarchic international systems and may not effectively address power imbalances.

Advocates claim that tackling power disparities is the key area where Aristotle's theory is applicable [69]. His beliefs can act as a check on hegemonic tendencies by promoting reparation for wrongs and equitable wealth allocation [76]. By addressing the primary reasons why wars are stoked by inequality, the pursuit of global justice may improve stability.

#### *Adaptability to Complex Challenges*

Aristotle's philosophy, despite having its roots in ancient Greece, is remarkably adaptable. While not a solution to all world problems, its emphasis on justice, balance, and the common good serves as a moral compass. A complete framework for addressing complex concerns like climate change, technology ethics, and social justice may be developed by fusing his concepts with modern knowledge and resources.

## 7. Conclusion

Aristotle's view of justice emerges as a compass that may navigate the complexity of our interrelated world in the complicated web of international relations. While criticisms point out the possible hazards of applying antiquated concepts to contemporary problems, rebuttals underline the ideas' ongoing relevance and flexibility. The voyage through the worlds of diplomacy, collaboration, and international relations reveals a strong connection between the goal of global justice and Aristotle's philosophy.

Aristotle's philosophy transcends the confines of ethnocentrism by recognizing the coexistence of universal principles and cultural variety. It promotes a flexible adaptability that recognizes various situations while fostering a sense of fairness, justice, and shared accountability. A tapestry made of threads representing universal human values is created by the complex network of cultural views.

Our time's complexity calls for strong ethical foundations. Despite coming from a bygone age, Aristotle's emphasis on justice and balance can still be useful in solving today's complex global issues. By addressing the ethical components of complex situations, it reframes them and places the moral imperative of global justice alongside political and economic factors.

Aristotle's ideas serve as a counterweight in a setting where power dynamics frequently influence decisions, attempting to achieve harmony amid differences. They promote justice as a useful instrument to resolve problems caused by injustice rather than as an idealistic paradise. Thus, while presenting a normative framework to aim towards, the goal of global justice, informed by Aristotle's philosophy, corresponds with contemporary real political circumstances.

When employing Aristotle's philosophy, we don't try to apply antiquated solutions to contemporary problems. Instead, we incorporate his ideas within the framework of modern knowledge, resources, and partnerships. The

product is a tapestry that addresses problems like climate change, technology ethics, and breaches of human rights with moral clarity and a firm dedication to the greater good.

In conclusion, Aristotle's theory of justice is more than simply a vestige of antiquity; it is a living light that illuminates the complex maze of international justice. His thoughts remind us that, despite complexity, balance, and fairness remain timeless ideals that may help create a just world for all as we negotiate the problems of our day.

---

## References

- [1] ADEYINKA, A. A. (2017). THE CONCEPTS OF JUSTICE IN ARISTOTLE'S PHILOSOPHY: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIO-POLITICAL LIFE IN NIGERIA. *Nigerian Journal of Social Studies* Vol. XX, 2, 155-169.
- [2] Adler, M. D. (2007). Corrective justice and liability for global warming. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 155(6), 1859-1867.
- [3] Assembly, G. (2015). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 11 September 2015. New York: United Nations.
- [4] Atapattu, S. (2020). Climate change and displacement: protecting 'climate refugees' within a framework of justice and human rights. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, 11(1), 86-113.
- [5] Babatunde, E. O. (2020). Distributive justice in the age of climate change. *Canadian Journal of Law & Jurisprudence*, 33(2), 263-292.
- [6] Barker, E. (2013). *Greek political theory*. Routledge.
- [7] Barker, K. (2022). Human rights and redemptive-corrective justice in Bob Marley's music. *Political Messaging in Music and Entertainment Spaces across the Globe*. Volume 2., 53.
- [8] Beever, A. (2004). Aristotle on equity, law, and justice. *Legal theory*, 10(1), 33-50.
- [9] Bhambra, G. K. (2020). Colonial global economy: towards a theoretical reorientation of political economy. *Review of International Political Economy*, 28(2), 307-322.
- [10] Boyles, D., Carusi, T., & Attick, D. (2009). Historical and critical interpretations of social justice. *Handbook of social justice in education*, 2, 30-42.
- [11] Bradshaw, L. (2009). Hobbes and Aristotle: Science and Politics. *Matter and Form: From Natural Science to Political Philosophy*, 133.
- [12] Brickhouse, T. C. (2014). Aristotle on corrective justice. *The Journal of Ethics*, 18(3), 187-205.
- [13] Broekman, J. M. (1986). Justice as equilibrium. *Law & Phil.*, 5, 369.
- [14] Brooks, T. (Ed.). (2023). *The global justice reader*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [15] Bueno, J. L. C. (2017). Economics, chrematistics, oikos and polis in Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas. *Journal of Philosophical Economics*, 10 (Articles).

- [16] Chaleta, E., Saraiva, M., Leal, F., Fialho, I., & Borralho, A. (2021). Higher education and sustainable development goals (SDG)—potential contribution of the undergraduate courses of the school of Social Sciences of the University of Évora. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 1828.
- [17] Child, C. (2015). Mainstreaming and its discontents: Fairtrade, socially responsible investing, and industry trajectories. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130, 601-618.
- [18] Coeckelbergh, M. (2015). *Environmental skill: Motivation, knowledge, and the possibility of a non-romantic environmental ethics*. Routledge.
- [19] Cotti, G. (2023). Criminal and Constitutional Populism Under the Aristotelian Framework. *Trento Student Law Review*, 5(1), 19-67.
- [20] Culp, J. (2020). Special Issue on Global Justice and Education. *Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric*, 12(01), i-ii.
- [21] Darlington, R. B. (1971). Another look at “cultural fairness” 1. *Journal of educational measurement*, 8 (2), 71-82.
- [22] Daverth, G., Cassell, C., & Hyde, P. (2016). The subjectivity of fairness: managerial discretion and work–life balance. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(2), 89-107.
- [23] Dawkins, C. E. (2018). Elevating the role of divestment in socially responsible investing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153, 465-478.
- [24] Edor, E. J. (2020). John Rawls's Concept of Justice as Fairness. *PINISI Discretion Review*, 4(1), 179-190.
- [25] Endyka, Y. C., Muhdar, M., & Sabaruddin, A. K. (2020). Environmental Justice in Intra Generations: An Overview of Aristotle's Distributive Justice to Coal Mining. *Indonesian Comparative Law Review*, 3(1), 25-34.
- [26] Englard, I. (2009). *Corrective and Distributive Justice: from Aristotle to modern times*. Oxford University Press.
- [27] Engle, E. (2008). Aristotle, law and justice: The tragic hero. *N. Ky. L. Rev.*, 35, 1.
- [28] Evanoff, R. (2010). Bioregionalism and global ethics: A transactional approach to achieving ecological sustainability, social justice, and human well-being. Routledge.
- [29] Finley, M. I. (2013). Aristotle and Economic analysis. In *Studies in Ancient Society (Routledge Revivals)* (pp. 26-52). Routledge.
- [30] Foster, S. E. (1997). Virtues and material goods: Aristotle on justice and liberality. *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 71(4), 607-619.
- [31] Frémeaux, S. (2020). A common good perspective on diversity. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 30(2), 200-228.
- [32] Frey, L. R., Pearce, W. B., Pollock, M. A., Artz, L., & Murphy, B. A. (1996). Looking for justice in all the wrong places: On a communication approach to social justice. *Communication Studies*, 47(1-2), 110-127.
- [33] Gavrielides, T., & Artinopoulou, V. (2016). *Reconstructing restorative justice philosophy*. Routledge.
- [34] Gerson, L. P. (2017). *Aristotle and other Platonists*. Cornell University Press.
- [35] Groves, C. (2019). Sustainability and the future: reflections on the ethical and political significance of sustainability. *Sustainability Science*, 14(4), 915-924.
- [36] Gulseven, O., & Ahmed, G. (2022). The State of Life on Land (SDG 15) in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Social Ecology and Sustainable Development (IJSESD)*, 13(1), 1-15.
- [37] Guo, S., Lin, X., Coicaud, J. M., Gu, S., Gu, Y., Liu, Q.,... & Zhang, C. (2019). Conceptualizing and measuring global justice: Theories, concepts, principles and indicators. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 12, 511-546.
- [38] Hage, M. Y., & Ningrum, P. K. (2022). Corrective Justice and Its Significance on the Private Law. *JILS*, 7, 1.
- [39] Hall, R. A. (2019). *The Justice of War: Its Foundations in Ethics and Natural Law*. Lexington Books.
- [40] Hayden, P. (2016). Cosmopolitanism Past and Present. In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Ethics and International Relations* (pp. 43-62). Routledge.
- [41] Herzog, L. (2021). Global reserve currencies from the perspective of structural global justice: distribution and domination. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 24(7), 931-953.
- [42] Hewitt, A. (2008). Universal justice and *epieikeia* in Aristotle. *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek and Roman Political Thought*, 25(1), 115-130.
- [43] Heyman, S. J. (1991). Aristotle on Political Justice. *Iowa L. Rev.*, 77, 851.
- [44] Hutchinson, D. S., & Johnson, M. R. (2012). Protreptic aspects of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*.
- [45] Inamura, K. (2015). *Justice and Reciprocity in Aristotle's Political Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- [46] Jackson, B. (2005). The conceptual history of social justice. *Political Studies Review*, 3(3), 356-373.
- [47] Jackson, J. H. (2018). Sovereignty-modern: a new approach to an outdated concept. In *Relocating Sovereignty* (pp. 425-445). Routledge.
- [48] Jang, M. (2018). Aristotle's political friendship (*politike philia*) as solidarity. *Aristotle on emotions in law and politics*, 417-433.
- [49] Knoll, M. A. (2016). The Meaning of Distributive Justice for Aristotle's Theory of Constitutions. *Πηγη/Fons*, 1, 57-97.
- [50] Kraut, R. (2002). *Aristotle: political philosophy*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- [51] Kristjánsson, K. (2022). The primacy of civic virtue in Aristotle's politics and its educational implications. *History of Political Thought*, 43(4), 607-636.
- [52] Lagoutte, S. (2021). The Role of State Actors Within the National Human Rights System. In *The Domestic Institutionalisation of Human Rights* (pp. 13-30). Routledge.
- [53] Landman, T. (2002). *Issues and methods in comparative politics: an introduction*. routledge.
- [54] Laplante, L. J. (2014). The plural justice aims of reparations. *Transitional justice theories*, 66-84.

- [55] Lenzen, M., Li, M., Malik, A., Pomponi, F., Sun, Y. Y., Wiedmann, T.,... & Yousefzadeh, M. (2020). Global socio-economic losses and environmental gains from the Coronavirus pandemic. *PloS one*, 15(7), e0235654.
- [56] Leontsini, E. (2021). Egalitarian Aristotelianism: Common Interest, Justice, and the Art of Politics.
- [57] Ludwig, P. W. (2020). *Rediscovering Political Friendship: Aristotle's Theory and Modern Identity, Community, and Equality*. Cambridge University Press.
- [58] Maffi, A. (2021). The Role of the Law in the Classification of Democratic Constitutions in Aristotle, *Pol. IV. FILOSOFICKY CASOPIS*, 125-142.
- [59] Marseille, E., & Kahn, J. G. (2019). Utilitarianism and the ethical foundations of cost-effectiveness analysis in resource allocation for global health. *Philosophy, Ethics, and Humanities in Medicine*, 14(1), 1-7.
- [60] Maurya, S. K. (2021). The concept of justice in reference with philosophies of Plato and Aristotle: a critical study. *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs*, 7(3), 250-266.
- [61] Milani, F. (2021). COVID-19 outbreak, social response, and early economic effects: a global VAR analysis of cross-country interdependencies. *Journal of population economics*, 34(1), 223-252.
- [62] Mill, J. S. (2016). Utilitarianism. In *Seven masterpieces of philosophy* (pp. 329-375). Routledge.
- [63] Moody-Adams, M. (2023). Philosophy and the Art of Human Flourishing. *Philosophy and Human Flourishing*, 280.
- [64] Moroni, S. (2020). The just city. Three background issues: Institutional justice and spatial justice, social justice and distributive justice, concept of justice and conceptions of justice. *Planning Theory*, 19(3), 251-267.
- [65] Mukherjee, S., & Ramaswamy, S. (2011). *A history of political thought: Plato to Marx*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd..
- [66] Nasution, A. R. (2017, December). Acts of terrorism as a crime against humanity in the aspect Of law and human rights. In *2nd International Conference on Social and Political Development (ICOSOP 2017)* (pp. 346-353). Atlantis Press.
- [67] Neral, A. (2013). The Theories of Justice and its Correlation with Law. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 151-160.
- [68] Nielsen, K. (2019). World government, security, and global justice. In *Problems of international justice* (pp. 263-282). Routledge.
- [69] Okin, S. M. (1987). Justice and gender. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 42-72.
- [70] Oko Elechi, O., Morris, S. V., & Schauer, E. J. (2010). Restoring justice (ubuntu): an African perspective. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 20(1), 73-85.
- [71] Papouli, E. (2019). Aristotle's virtue ethics as a conceptual framework for the study and practice of social work in modern times. *European Journal of Social Work*, 22(6), 921-934.
- [72] Peterson, A. (2020). Character education, the individual and the political. *Journal of Moral Education*, 49(2), 143-157.
- [73] Rafiq, J. (2021). Role of United Nations in Post Cold War Era: Iraq Invasion as a Case Study. *Indian JL & Legal Rsch.*, 2, 1.
- [74] Ramanujam, N., Caivano, N., & Agnello, A. (2019). Distributive justice and the sustainable development goals: Delivering agenda 2030 in India. *Law and Development Review*, 12(2), 495-536.
- [75] Reyers, B., & Selig, E. R. (2020). Global targets that reveal the social-ecological interdependencies of sustainable development. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 4(8), 1011-1019.
- [76] Said, M. Y., & Nurhayati, Y. (2021). A review on Rawls Theory of Justice. *International Journal of Law, Environment, and Natural Resources*, 1(1), 29-36.
- [77] Samuels, R., & Samuels, R. (2020). Logos, global justice, and the reality principle. *Zizek and the Rhetorical Unconscious: Global Politics, Philosophy, and Subjectivity*, 65-86.
- [78] Sandler, R. L. (2013). Environmental virtue ethics. *International encyclopedia of ethics*.
- [79] Schwarzenbach, S. A. (1996). On civic friendship. *Ethics*, 107(1), 97-128.
- [80] Sellers, B. G., & Arrigo, B. A. (2022). The narrative framework of psychological jurisprudence: Virtue ethics as criminal justice practice. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 63, 101671.
- [81] Simonelli, A. C. (2021). Climate displacement and the legal gymnastics of justice: is it all political?. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 35(2), 303-312.
- [82] Simpson, P. (2014). Aristotle on Natural Justice. *Studia Gilsoniana*, (3), 367-376.
- [83] Sison, A. J. G., Ferrero, I., & Redín, D. M. (2020). Some virtue ethics implications from Aristotelian and Confucian perspectives on family and business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 165, 241-254.
- [84] Stalley, R. F. (1989). Justice and Law in Plato and Aristotle-Spiro Panagiotou (ed.): *Justice, Law and Method in Plato and Aristotle*. Pp. iv+ 210. Edmonton, Alberta: Academic Printing and Publishing, 1987. Paper, Can \$18.95. *The Classical Review*, 39(2), 256-257.
- [85] Thapa, P., Mainali, B., & Dhakal, S. (2023). Focus on Climate Action: What Level of Synergy and Trade-Off Is There between SDG 13; Climate Action and Other SDGs in Nepal?. *Energies*, 16(1), 566.
- [86] Thornton, F. (2021). Of harm, culprits and rectification: Obtaining corrective justice for climate change displacement. *Transnational Environmental Law*, 10(1), 13-33.
- [87] Van Hoef, Y., & Oelsner, A. (2018). Friendship and positive peace: Conceptualising friendship in politics and international relations. *Politics and Governance*, 6(4), 115-124.
- [88] Weinrib, E. J. (1989). Aristotle's Forms of Justice. *Ratio Juris*, 2(3), 211-226.
- [89] Weinrib, E. J. (2002). Corrective justice in a nutshell. *The University of Toronto Law Journal*, 52(4), 349-356.
- [90] Weinrib, E. J. (2020). The gains and losses of corrective justice. In *Restitution* (pp. 547-567). Routledge.
- [91] Wonders, N. A., & Jones, L. C. (2021). Challenging the borders of difference and inequality: Power in migration as a social movement for global justice. *Handbook of Migration and Global Justice*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 296-313.

- [92] Yack, B. (2023). *The problems of a political animal: Community, justice, and conflict in Aristotelian political thought*. Univ of California Press.
- [93] Young, C. M. (2006). Aristotle's justice. *The Blackwell Guide to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, 179-197.
- [94] Zabaniotou, A. (2020). A systemic approach to resilience and ecological sustainability during the COVID-19 pandemic: Human, societal, and ecological health as a system-wide emergent property in the Anthropocene. *Global transitions*, 2, 116-126. [Original source: <https://studycrumb.com/alphabetizer>]