



Journal of Economics, Business, and Commerce (JEBC)

ISSN: 3007-9705 (Online)

Volume 2 Issue 2, (2025)

 <https://doi.org/10.69739/jebc.v2i2.437>

 <https://journals.stecab.com/jebc>



Published by
Stecab Publishing

Research Article

Justice Trumps Freedom: The Conceptualization of a New Sustainable Development Paradigm

*¹Wakawa, Hyelladzira Musa, ²Ilepe, Johnson Akintunde, ²Edeme, Olagoke Olaniji

About Article

Article History

Submission: March 10, 2025

Acceptance : April 17, 2025

Publication : September 10, 2025

Keywords

Distributive Justice, Environmental Sustainability, Freedom, Social Justice, Sustainable Development

About Author

¹ Nigerian Army School of Finance and Administration, Army Cantonment Arakan, Apapa Lagos, Nigeria

² Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The pursuit of sustainable development has long been guided by the dual pillars of freedom and justice. However, the prevailing neoliberal paradigm has prioritized individual freedoms over social justice, exacerbating global inequalities and environmental degradation. This paper challenges the dominant development discourse by arguing that justice should take precedence over freedom in the pursuit of sustainable development. This study employed a descriptive and critical qualitative research approach, combining elements of critical discourse analysis and qualitative content analysis. The study employed a comprehensive review of existing literature on sustainable development, neoliberalism, and distributive justice. The literature review focused on academic journals, books, and reports. The critical analysis of existing development frameworks reveal how the emphasis on individual freedoms has led to the marginalization of vulnerable populations and the degradation of the environment. In contrast, the paper proposes a new paradigm that prioritizes justice, equity, human rights and environmental protection. This approach recognizes the inherent value of social and environmental justice in achieving sustainable development. The proposed paradigm is grounded in the principles of distributive justice, participatory governance, and ecological sustainability. It demonstrates how this approach can be operationalized through policy reforms, institutional innovations, and grassroots mobilization. Accordingly, the paper offers a transformative vision for sustainable development, one that prioritizes justice, equity, human well-being and ecological sustainability over individual freedom that is usually abused to create uneven access to resources, wellbeing and environmental degradation.

Citation Style:

Wakawa, H. M., Ilepe, J. A., & Edeme, O. O. (2025). Justice Trumps Freedom: The Conceptualization of a New Sustainable Development Paradigm. *Journal of Economics, Business, and Commerce*, 2(2), 92-100. <https://doi.org/10.69739/jebc.v2i2.437>

Contact @ Wakawa, Hyelladzira Musa
drmwakawa@gmail.com



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Licensed Stecab Publishing, Bangladesh. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of development has undergone significant changes over the years, with various scholars and practitioners questioning its underlying assumptions (Escobar, 1995). The traditional notion of development, rooted in Western modernity, has been criticized for its narrow focus on economic growth and its neglect of social and environmental concerns (Sachs, 1992). As a result, there is a growing need to rethink the foundations of development. Neoliberalism, with its emphasis on free markets and deregulation, has been a dominant force in shaping development policies over the past few decades (Harvey, 2005). However, critics argue that neoliberalism has exacerbated inequality, poverty, and environmental degradation, highlighting the need for alternative approaches to development (Stiglitz 2002). Rethinking development requires a critical examination of the neoliberal paradigm.

Accordingly, the concept of sustainable development, which emerged in the 1980s, recognizes the interconnectedness of economic, social, and environmental factors (WCED, 1987). Sustainable development emphasizes the need to balance human well-being with environmental protection and social justice. However, the implementation of sustainable development has been hindered by the dominance of neoliberalism. And, subsequently, the human development approach, pioneered by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, focuses on expanding human capabilities and freedoms (Sen, 1999). This approach recognizes that development is not just about economic growth, but also about enhancing human well-being and dignity, however, freedom has failed in delivering sustainable development because one man's freedom may be another man's suppression. When freedom perverts inequality development is denied but when justice crushes freedom, development may be guaranteed.

In another realm, Feminist scholars have long argued that development policies have neglected the needs and perspectives of women (Boserup, 1970). Environmental justice is another critical aspect of rethinking development, as it involves recognizing the disproportionate impact of environmental degradation on marginalized communities (Bullard, 1990). Participatory development, which involves the active participation of local communities in development decision-making, is essential for promoting inclusive and sustainable development (Chambers, 1997). Rethinking development requires incorporating feminist perspectives and promoting gender, environmental and social justice not just freedom as held by Sem Amarten.

Rethinking the foundations of development requires a critical examination of the underlying assumptions and power dynamics that shape development policies and practices. It involves promoting alternative approaches, such as sustainable development, human development, and post-development, and incorporating feminist, environmental justice, and participatory perspectives. By rethinking development, we can create a more just, equitable, and sustainable world. The tension between justice and freedom is a longstanding debate in political philosophy. According to UNESCO (2014) the notion of a perfect harmony between liberty and equality remain a myth. UNESCO held that the pursuit of justice, particularly distributive justice, may require limitations on individual

freedom which is okay because justice is justice.

Rawls (1971) in his influential book "A Theory of Justice," acknowledges the tension between justice and freedom. Rawls argues that the principle of equal basic liberties is lexically prior to the difference principle, which aims to reduce economic and social inequalities. Therefore, the concept of justice is often associated with the idea of fairness and equality which is what actually guarantees sustainable development. However, the demand for justice is often a demand for equality, and the demand for equality is often a demand for the abolition of individual freedom. Hayek argues that the pursuit of justice through government intervention can lead to a reduction in individual freedom. Well, in as much as this is a valid point, development is a threefold device of individual freedom, environmental protection and social balances. Freedom does not beget environmental and social justice rather justice beget freedom, environmental and social freedom. Accordingly, justice and freedom are not mutually exclusive. Amartya Sen (1999), for example, argues that freedom is a fundamental aspect of justice. Sen claims that freedom is not just a means to achieving development but is also an end in itself. Now, this is where the gap is. Sen's assertions emphasized one route against other routes to sustainable development. Freedom is key but it is not an end to development itself, it is means that is propelled effectively by justice. According to Sen, the expansion of freedom is essential for achieving social justice.

Although, the relationship between justice and freedom is complex, and different, justice may prioritize individual freedom to varying degrees. As Sandel (1998) notes, the question of what justice requires is not a question of what individuals want or prefer, but rather a question of what is right. Sustainability development can be achieved by doing right things for the benefits of the majority not by doing what individuals wants that may not benefits the majority. Individual freedom, social justice, and environmental protection should not be left to powers of free market like prices. They should be government babies to ensure they are delivered where needed, at the right time and the right portions.

The tension between justice and freedom is also evident in debates over economic policy. Some argue that free market economies are necessary for individual freedom and prosperity, while others claim that government intervention is necessary to achieve social justice. Government regulation can help to promote both social justice and individual freedom. Notwithstanding, the two concept is a complex and multifaceted issue that is still being debated across disciplines. Some argue that justice and freedom are mutually exclusive; others claim that they are complementary. None the less, the relationship does not suffice that freedom is sufficient to catalyze sustainable development rather justice.

The concept of sustainable development on the other hand has gained significant attention in recent decades, particularly by the publication of the WCED Report (1987). According to the report, sustainable development is the kind of development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Accordingly, freedom without justice can be limited in ensuring this type of development, hence, justice over freedom would be a more



effective model for sustainable development of the present and the future. It highlights the importance of balancing economic, social, and environmental considerations in development policies. Daly (1996) asserts that sustainable development requires a fundamental transformation of economic systems, from one that is based on growth and consumption to one that is based on development and conservation. Hence, sustainable development paradigm is built on three pillars: economic development, social development, and environmental protection. As emphasized by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), sustainable development is about creating a better future for all, where everyone has access to the resources and opportunities they need to thrive (UNDP 2015). This can effectively be achieved through distributive justice, social justice and environmental justice not freedom.

The key challenge in achieving sustainable development has been the need to balance short-term economic gains with long-term environmental and social costs. Costanza (1991) noted that the traditional economic approach to development has failed to account for the environmental and social costs of growth leading to unsustainable development patterns. The paradigm requires a shift from a linear to a circular economy, where resources are used efficiently and waste is minimized by the principles of justice, equity and fairness not freedom. It requires a focus on human well-being and social equity that can be achieved effectively by distributive justice not freedom. As encapsulated by Nussbaum (2011), sustainable development must prioritize the well-being of all people, particularly the most vulnerable, and ensure that everyone has access to the resources and opportunities they need to thrive. Martha, despite being one of the proponents of freedom as a means of development in its, her assertion rather underscored why justice trumps freedom in the pursuit of sustainable development.

Consequently, the traditional model of development, which posits that development is freedom, has been widely criticized for its limitations and shortcomings. Amartya (1999) concept of development as freedom is incomplete, as it neglects the importance of social justice and human well-being. This critique has led to the emergence of this paper, a new sustainable development paradigm, which seeks to prioritize justice over freedom. The new paradigm, Justice Trumps Freedom, recognizes that freedom is not an end in itself. As argued Nussbaum (2011) posited that justice is a fundamental human need. Therefore, development must prioritize the pursuit of justice over freedom to accelerate sustainable development.

The key limitation of the traditional model is its focus on individual freedom, which neglects the importance of social justice and collective well-being. Kabeer (2015) put it that, the pursuit of individual freedom can often comes at the expense of social justice and collective well-being. Hence, the Justice Trumps Freedom Paradigm recognizes all inclusive justice that guarantees environmental, individual and collective well-being. The new paradigm also seeks to recognize the importance of power and politics in shaping development outcomes. According to Stiglitz (2012) power is a critical factor in shaping development outcomes, and the pursuit of justice must take into account the dynamics of power and politics. This requires a more nuanced understanding of the complex relationships

between power, politics, and development.

Furthermore, the Justice Trumps Freedom paradigm seeks to pay cognizance to the importance of cultural and contextual factors in shaping development outcomes. As opined by Bhabha (2013) culture and context are critical factors in shaping development outcomes. This cannot be left under the control of freedom. This is because; one's freedom may another's marginalization which only justice can separate. Hence, the paper seeks to establish that the pursuit of justice will better take into account the cultural and contextual specificities of different societies than freedom. Accordingly, the new paradigm is a more integrated and holistic approach to development that prioritize the intersections of environmental, individual and collective factors.

In the same, Justice Trumps Freedom paradigm is a more participatory and inclusive approach to development that prioritizes the voices and perspectives of marginalized and vulnerable populations whose tortures are partly caused by freedom of the majority. Coherently, this new paradigm recognizes and would solve the problems of underdevelopment caused by especially, political and power dynamics forms of marginalization. In another realm, Beteille (2015) posits that accountability and transparency are critical factors in shaping development outcomes, and the pursuit of justice must prioritize these values. The paradigm will ensure accountability and transparency which will further shape development outcomes. It is against this backdrop that this paper argues that the traditional model "development as freedom" propounded by Sen Amarten have not guarantees sustainable development, rather uneven distribution for lack of distributive justice, equity and fairness by state authorities. It is assumed that development is a collective deal not individual and cannot be solely left under the forces of freedom not justice to be sustained.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of freedom is multifaceted, encompassing both positive and negative aspects. On one hand, freedom is associated with autonomy, self-determination, and individual rights. However, it can also have unintended consequences. Research suggests that freedom can lead to inequality and injustice. For instance, the concentration of wealth and power can occur when individuals pursue their interests without consideration for others. This can result in significant inequalities, as noted by Piketty (2014).

Furthermore, the idea of freedom has been linked to the exploitation of natural resources, leading to environmental degradation and unsustainability. The emphasis on individual freedom can also lead to a lack of social cohesion and collective responsibility. In the context of markets, freedom can be limited by externalities such as pollution and environmental degradation. The pursuit of individual interests can lead to a breakdown in social solidarity and a lack of collective responsibility for the common good.

To balance individual freedom with social justice and the common good, it is essential to consider the potential consequences of unregulated markets. This can involve implementing policies that promote transparency, accountability, and social responsibility. Ultimately, the relationship between freedom and development is complex. While freedom is essential for



individual autonomy and creativity, it must be balanced with social justice and collective responsibility to achieve sustainable development.

The phrase "justice delayed is justice denied" underscores the significance of timely access to justice. In the context of development, justice delayed or denied can have severe consequences, including increased poverty, inequality, and social unrest, as noted by Stewart (2002). In fact, justice denied can be seen as freedom denied.

Inequitable development has far-reaching and devastating effects on human well-being. The World Health Organization reported in 2019 that health inequities pose a significant obstacle to achieving universal health and well-being. These inequities can lead to:

i. Increased mortality rates: Poor health outcomes and reduced life expectancy are direct consequences of inequitable development.

ii. Limited access to quality education: According to Freire (1970), education can either reinforce or challenge existing power dynamics and social inequalities. Inequitable development can result in reduced access to quality education, perpetuating cycles of poverty and inequality.

Moreover, inequitable development has serious implications for human dignity and well-being. Nussbaum (2011) emphasizes that human dignity requires not only basic needs like food and shelter but also access to education, healthcare, and social and economic opportunities. Environmental justice is also a critical concern, as communities of color and low-income communities are disproportionately affected by environmental degradation and pollution (Pellow, 2002).

Inequitable development can lead to social unrest and conflict, undermining sustainable development. Galtung (1969) notes that structural violence and inequality can lead to increased conflict and social unrest as marginalized groups demand justice and equality. The United Nations Development Programme (2019) highlights the importance of social justice, human rights, and individual well-being in achieving sustainable and equitable development. This underscores the notion that development is a function of justice, not freedom, supporting the "justice trumps freedom" development paradigm. By prioritizing justice, we can work towards more equitable and sustainable development outcomes. Well-being, we can work towards creating a more equitable and sustainable world.

The concept of justice plays a crucial role in sustainable development. According to Rawls (1971), justice is the first virtue of social institutions. In the context of sustainable development, justice refers to the fair distribution of resources, opportunities, and benefits. One of the key principles of justice in sustainable development is distributive justice. Miller (1999) notes that distributive justice requires that the benefits and burdens of social cooperation be distributed fairly among individuals. This means that the benefits of development should be shared fairly among all members of society.

Another important principle is procedural justice, which requires that individuals have a say in the decisions that affect their lives (Young, 1990). Procedural justice is essential for sustainable development, as it ensures that development decisions are made in a participatory and inclusive manner.

Justice is also closely linked to human rights, which are essential for ensuring that individuals have access to the basic necessities of life (Shue, 1980). Furthermore, environmental justice is a critical aspect of sustainable development, as it requires that communities have access to clean air, water, and land (Bullard, 2000).

Sustainable development is also tied to democracy, which requires that development decisions be made in a participatory and inclusive manner (Fung 2004). Additionally, intergenerational justice is essential for sustainable development; as it requires that decisions take into account the needs and interests of future generations (Brown, 1989). Through prioritizing justice in sustainable development, we can ensure that development is equitable, inclusive, and sustainable for all. As Fraser (2008) highlights, issues of inequality, cultural recognition, and political representation must be addressed in order to achieve social justice.

The relationship between justice and freedom is complex and context-dependent. While freedom is often considered a fundamental human right, justice can take precedence in certain situations, particularly in development contexts. Various case studies illustrate this point. For instance, South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) prioritized justice and accountability over individual freedoms to promote reconciliation after apartheid (Antjie, 1998). Similarly, in India, the concept of "social justice" has been used to justify limitations on individual freedoms, balancing individual rights with community needs (Menocal, 2015).

In Brazil, the Landless Workers' Movement (MST) has used occupation and protest to demand land reform and social justice, often at odds with individual property rights (Carter, 2015). The US Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s also prioritized justice and equality over individual freedoms, challenging unjust laws and social norms (Allen, 2014).

Other examples include China's concept of "social harmony," which requires balancing individual freedoms with state and societal needs (Reich, 2015); Canada's Indigenous rights movement, which prioritizes justice and self-determination for Indigenous Peoples (Alfred, 2009) and Egypt's revolution in 2011 which demanded justice and democracy (Mona, 2011). These case studies demonstrate that justice can take precedence over freedom in practice, particularly in development contexts where social justice and human rights are at stake. This supports the proposal of a "justice as development" paradigm, which could accelerate and ensure sustainable development that is tripartite (social, economic, and environmental) in nature. Implementing justice-centered development necessitates a profound understanding of the local context and the needs of marginalized communities. This approach requires a commitment to understanding and addressing the root causes of poverty and inequality. Several key elements are essential for justice-centered development. These include:

i. Community-led development: Community-led initiatives are critical for ensuring that development programs are responsive to the needs and priorities of marginalized communities (Ted, 2016).

ii. Transparency and accountability: These components are vital for preventing corruption and abuse of power in



development initiatives.

iii. *Addressing power and privilege*: Justice can help control the abuse of power and privilege, ensuring that development initiatives are equitable and just (Pearce, 2012).

iv. *Climate change and environmental degradation*: Addressing these issues is crucial for sustainable and equitable development (Alesina, 2013).

v. *Health and well-being*: Prioritizing health and well-being is essential for ensuring that marginalized communities have access to necessary resources and services (Farmer, 2013).

vi. *Education and skills development*: These are critical for providing marginalized communities with uninterrupted quality education (Reich, 2015).

vii. *Economic inequality and poverty*: Addressing these issues is vital for promoting equitable development (Piketty, 2014).

viii. *Human rights and social justice*: These are fundamental for ensuring that development initiatives are equitable and just (Moyn, 2018).

ix. *Governance and accountability*: Good governance and accountability are essential for preventing corruption and ensuring transparency in development initiatives (Fukuyama, 2013).

The "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm offers a distinct framework for understanding the complex relationships between justice, freedom, and human development. This paradigm prioritizes justice over individual freedom, recognizing its fundamental importance for human flourishing (Honneth, 2014). Key Distinctions include:

i. *Prioritization of justice*: Unlike Sen's "Development as Freedom" paradigm, which prioritizes individual freedom, the "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm emphasizes the importance of social justice and equality.

ii. *Holistic approach*: The new paradigm recognizes the need for a more holistic approach to development, incorporating issues of power dynamics, cultural and contextual factors, and participatory governance (Sachs, 2015; Alesina, 2013).

iii. *Distributive justice*: The "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm addresses issues of distributive justice, ensuring that development initiatives are equitable and just.

iv. *Social justice over economic growth*: In contrast to Sen's paradigm, which prioritizes economic growth, the "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm prioritizes social justice and human well-being (Quisumbing, 2014).

v. *Participatory governance*: The new paradigm emphasizes the importance of participatory governance in achieving social justice and promoting human well-being (Alesina, 2013).

vi. *Intersectionality*: The paradigm recognizes the need for a critical approach to development, incorporating intersectionality in development policies and actions.

The "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm also provides a critical framework for rethinking development in the 21st century. This paradigm requires a fundamental transformation of the development approach, prioritizing social justice and human well-being over individual freedom. Key Aspects include:

i. *Shift from individualistic to collective approaches*: The paradigm necessitates a shift towards more collective approaches to development, prioritizing social justice and human well-being (Honneth, 2014).

ii. *Rethinking economic development*: The pursuit of justice requires rethinking economic development, prioritizing human well-being and social justice over economic growth.

iii. *Participatory governance*: Institutions and governance must be designed to prioritize social justice and human well-being, with a shift towards more participatory and inclusive forms of governance.

iv. *Human rights-based approaches*: The paradigm requires a rethinking of the relationship between development and human rights, prioritizing the realization of human rights as a fundamental aspect of development.

The "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm equally offers a critical framework for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which emphasize the need for integrated and inclusive approaches to development (Kharas, 2017). The paradigm recognizes the importance of technological innovation, but also highlights the need for careful management and governance to ensure equitable benefits (Perez, 2016).

The paradigm acknowledges the significance of addressing issues of inequality and social justice, which pose a major threat to sustainable development (Milanovic, 2016). By prioritizing justice, equity, and fairness, the "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm provides a new approach to promoting a more equitable world. The paradigm recognizes that freedom is not an absolute value, but rather a relative concept that must be approached from the standpoint of justice, fairness, and equality. This requires a fundamental shift in understanding the relationship between freedom and justice as enablers of development. The paradigm implies the need to prioritize justice and equality over individual freedom, recognizing that the pursuit of justice and equality may require limiting individual freedom to promote the common good (Cornia, 2016).

The theoretical underpinning of this context analysis operationalized three existing theories as discussed subsequently.

i. The Distributive Justice Theory, proposed by John Rawls in 1971, provides a crucial framework for understanding the importance of fairness and equality in the distribution of resources and benefits. According to Rawls, a just society is one in which the distribution of resources and benefits is fair and equitable, and in which the least advantaged members of society are protected and supported. This theory is particularly relevant to the "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm, as it highlights the need to prioritize social justice and human well-being in development policies and programs. By emphasizing the importance of fairness and equality, Rawls' theory provides a moral and philosophical foundation for the paradigm's focus on promoting greater equity and social justice in development.

ii. The Participatory Governance Theory, developed by Elinor Ostrom in 1990, emphasizes the importance of involving local communities and stakeholders in decision-making processes related to development policies and programs. According to Ostrom, participatory governance is essential for ensuring that development policies and programs are responsive to the needs and priorities of local communities, and for promoting greater accountability and transparency in development decision-making. This theory is highly relevant to the "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm, as it highlights the need for community



involvement and participation in development decision-making. By prioritizing participatory governance, the paradigm can ensure that development policies and programs are more effective, equitable, and sustainable.

iii. The Ecological Sustainability Theory, proposed by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) in 1987, provides a critical framework for understanding the importance of integrating environmental protection and social justice into development policies and programs. According to the WCED, sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This theory is particularly relevant to the "Justice Trumps Freedom" paradigm, as it highlights the need to prioritize ecological sustainability and social justice in development policies and programs. By emphasizing the importance of environmental protection and social justice, the theory provides a foundation for the paradigm's focus on promoting greater ecological sustainability and social justice in development.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative content analysis to examine the relationship between neoliberalism, sustainable development, and distributive justice. The study's data collection involved a comprehensive review of existing literature on sustainable development, neoliberalism, and distributive justice. The literature review focused on academic journals, books, and reports.

The study's data analysis involved a critical examination of relevant literature, identifying key themes, concepts, and arguments related to neoliberalism, sustainable development, and distributive justice. The study's data analysis was guided by a critical realist framework, which emphasizes the importance of understanding the social and economic contexts in which development policies and programs are designed and implemented.

This study adopts a critical realist epistemological stance, which posits that knowledge is constructed through a critical examination of social and economic structures and relationships. Critical realism acknowledges that social reality is complex and multifaceted, and that knowledge is shaped by both objective and subjective factors. This stance allows for a nuanced understanding of the complex relationships between neoliberalism, sustainable development, and distributive justice, and enables the identification of underlying power dynamics and structural inequalities that shape development outcomes. By adopting a critical realist approach, this study provided a rigorous and contextualized analysis of the research topic.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study revealed justice as development will be a more effective model that promotes sustainable development to the neoliberal freedom approach because it promotes social justice, wellbeing, even development and environmental protection. This aligns with the position of Cornia (2016), WCED, (1987), Bullard, (1990), Sandel (1998) and Daly (1996). They all posited that that development decisions and actions should prioritize justice, equity and environmental conservation over individual

freedom.

The study's findings therefore challenge the dominant neoliberal development paradigm, which prioritizes individual freedoms over social justice. Context analysis reveals that the neoliberal approach has led to significant social and environmental costs, including rising inequality, environmental degradation, and human rights violations. These findings are consistent with existing literature, which highlights the limitations of neoliberalism in achieving sustainable development (Stiglitz, 2002; Costanza, 1991; Stiglitz, 2000; Bullard, 1990; Cranon, 1991; Ekins, 2000; Pellow, 2002; Andrew, 2013).

The study also revealed the importance of distributive justice in achieving sustainable development. The analysis reveals that distributive justice is critical in ensuring that the benefits of development are shared equitably among all members of society. This finding is underscored by the works of Rawls, (1971), UNDP, (2015), Nussbaum (2011) and Miller (1999) that emphasized the imperative of distributive justice as necessary steps towards sustainable development.

The study as well highlights the importance of participatory governance in achieving sustainable development. The analysis suggests that participatory governance is critical in ensuring that development policies and programs are responsive to the needs of all members of society (Ostrom, 1990). This finding is supported by the work of scholars such as Elinor (1990), Chambers (1997) and Archon (2004) that argue that participatory governance is essential for achieving sustainable development.

The study's findings have significant implications for policy and practice. The analysis suggests that policymakers and practitioners should prioritize distributive justice and participatory governance in their development efforts (UNDP, 2015). This may involve establishing robust social protection systems, promoting participatory governance, and adopting sustainable production and consumption practices (WCED, 1987).

Overall, the study's findings contribute to a growing body of literature that challenges the dominant neoliberal development paradigm. The analysis highlights the importance of distributive justice and participatory governance in achieving sustainable development, and provides insights into how policymakers and practitioners can prioritize these values in their development efforts.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has challenged the dominant neoliberal development paradigm, which prioritizes individual freedoms over social justice. The outcomes revealed that this approach has led to significant social and environmental costs, including rising inequality, environmental degradation, and human rights violations.

The study's findings have highlighted the importance of prioritizing justice, equity, and human rights in development efforts. We have argued that a new development paradigm is needed, one that prioritizes distributive justice, participatory governance, and ecological sustainability. The paper emphasized the need for policymakers and practitioners to rethink their approach to development. Rather than prioritizing economic



growth and individual freedoms, they should focus on creating a more just and equitable society.

The study's findings have significant implications for policy and practice. Policymakers and practitioners should prioritize distributive justice, participatory governance, and ecological sustainability in their development efforts. This may involve establishing robust social protection systems, promoting participatory governance, and adopting sustainable production and consumption practices.

Furthermore, the study highlights the need for greater accountability and transparency in development efforts. Policymakers and practitioners must be held accountable for their actions, and development policies and programs must be transparent and inclusive. Accordingly, this study has demonstrated that a more just and equitable society is possible. By prioritizing justice, equity, and human rights, we can create a world that is more sustainable, equitable, and just.

This study also contributes to a growing body of literature that challenges the dominant neoliberal development paradigm. The findings found the need for a new development paradigm, one that prioritizes justice, equity, and human rights. We hope that this study will inform the development of more equitable and sustainable development policies and programs, and contribute to the creation of a more just and equitable society.

RECOMMENDATIONS

i. Prioritize Distributive Justice: Policymakers should prioritize distributive justice in development policies and programs, ensuring that the benefits of development are shared equitably among all members of society.

ii. Promote Participatory Governance: Policymakers should promote participatory governance, involving local communities and stakeholders in decision-making processes to ensure that development policies and programs are responsive to their needs.

iii. Integrate Ecological Sustainability: Policymakers should integrate ecological sustainability into development policies and programs, ensuring that economic development is balanced with environmental

REFERENCES

- Alesina, A. (2013). *The economics of inequality*. Harvard University Press. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/file/feeds/PDF/9780674504806_sample.pdf
- Alfred, T. (2009). *Wasase: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom*. Academia. https://www.academia.edu/10822198/Was%C3%A1se_Indigenous_Pathways_of_Action_and_Freedom
- Allen, D. (2014). *Our declaration: A reading of the Declaration of Independence in defense of Equality*. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/ourdeclarationre0000alle>
- Antjie K. (1998). *Country of My Skull*. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Country_of_My_Skull
- Beteille, A. (2015). *Social justice and individual freedom*. Economic and Political Weekly, Tailor & Francis Online. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311886.2020.1760413>
- Bhabha, H. K. (2013). *The location of culture*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Location-of-Culture/Bhabha/p/book/9780415336390>
- Boserup, E. (1970). *Woman's role in economic development*. London: Allen & Unwin. https://labordoc.ilo.org/discovery/fulldisplay/alma994021163402676/41ILO_INST:41ILO_V1
- Brown Weiss, E. (1989). *In fairness to future generations: International law, common patrimony, and intergenerational equity*. United Nations University Press. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000084891>
- Bullard, R. D. (2000). *Dumping in Dixie: Race, class, and environmental quality*. Scirp. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2725149>
- Carter, M. (2015). *The landless rural workers' movement (MST) and the struggle for social justice in Brazil*. https://www.academia.edu/104440949/The_landless_rural_workers_movement_MST_in_Brazil
- Chang, H.-J. (2002). *Kicking away the ladder: Development strategy in historical perspective*. <http://econdse.org/wp-content/uploads/IER.pdf>
- Cornia, G. A. (2016). Economic development and social inclusion: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 17(3), 301-316. <https://ideas.repec.org/s/taf/jhudca2.html>
- Cornwall, A. (2014). Women's empowerment: What works? *Journal of International Development*, 26(3), 281-295 2016. https://prevention-collaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Cornwall_2016_Womens-Empowerment-What-Works.pdf
- Costanza, R. (1991). *Ecological economics: The science and management of sustainability*. https://www.robertcostanza.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/1991_J_Costanza_EE_ResearchAgenda.pdf
- Cronon, W. (1991). *Nature's metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*.
- Daly, H. E. (1996). *Beyond growth: The economics of sustainable development*. <https://archive.org/details/beyondgrowth00herm>
- Durkheim, É. (1893). *The division of labor in society*. <https://durkheim.uchicago.edu/Summaries/dl.html>
- Ekins, P. (2000). *Economic growth and environmental sustainability: The prospects for green growth*. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Economic-Growth-and-Environmental-Sustainability-The-Prospects-for-Green-Growth/Ekins/p/book/9780415173339?srsltid=AfmBOooHl_NhtSZ41640tb_OwTtoBWo_SZ31uTwZ75B5NV37oCwe49vC
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the third world*.



- Escobar, A. (2012). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the third world*. https://voidnetwork.gr/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Encountering_Development-The-Making-and-the-Unmaking-of-the-Third-World-by-Arturo-Escobar.pdf
- Farmer, P. (2013). *To repair the world: Paul Farmer speaks to the next generation* (Vol. 29). University of California Press.
- Fraser, N. (2008). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. <https://philpapers.org/rec/FRASOJ-2>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Scirp. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2059960>
- Fukuyama, F. (2013). What is governance? *Governance*, 26(3), 347-368. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3399599>
- Fung, A. (2004). *Empowered participation: Reinventing urban democracy*. Princeton University Press. https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691126081/empowered-participation?srltid=AfmBOoqEl8qeB2DsspvAYBQmnPkxtp2mMkGocLOWygmidiq3VHeYd_PG
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167-191. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/002234336900600301>
- Garrett, L. (2015). *Ebola: Story of an outbreak*. <https://media.odi.org/documents/9903.pdf>
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford. Oxford University Press. <https://academic.oup.com/book/40603>
- Honneth, A. (2014). *Freedom's right: The social foundations of democratic life*. Columbia University Press. <https://cup.columbia.edu/book/freedoms-right/9780231162470/>
- Johnson, S. (2009). *The quiet coup*. The Atlantic. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/05/the-quiet-coup/307364/>
- Kabeer, N. (2015). *Gender, poverty, and inequality: A brief history of feminist contributions to development economics*. <https://2024.sci-hub.se/7126/43fa6eae1bf1019f86679a8bc083ec5/kabeer2015.pdf>
- Kharas, H. (2017). *The Sustainable Development Goals: An opportunity for a new era of sustainable development*.
- Klein, N. (2014). *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. https://ia804509.us.archive.org/30/items/pdfy-Skb-ch_k7psDm90Q/Naomi%20Klein%20%20This%20Changes%20Everything.pdf
- Marks, S. (2011). *A false dichotomy? The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural who owns the Earth*. <https://www.peaceau.org/uploads/au-2-en-2013-delim-a-demar-user-guide.pdf>
- Menocal, A. R. (2015). *Why governments fail to deliver: Explaining ineffectiveness in public institutions*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Good_governance
- Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global inequality: A new approach for the age of globalization*. <https://www.piie.com/sites/default/files/documents/milanovic20160509ppt.pdf>
- Miller, D. (1999). *Principles of social justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Moyn, S. (2018). *Not enough: Human rights in an unequal world*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674241398>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674072350>
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Scirp. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=490657>
- Pearce, F. (2012). *The land grabbers: The new fight over struggle for environmental justice in Chicago*. <https://www.ecofaithrecovery.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Land-Grabbers.pdf>
- Pellow, D. N. (2002). Garbage wars: The Rights' approach to the right to development. *Journal of Human Rights*, 10(3), 341-355. <https://abdn.elsevierpure.com/en/publications/from-global-rights-to-local-relationships-exploring-disconnects-i>
- Perez, C. (2016). *Capitalism, technology and a green golden age: The role of government*. https://carlotaperez.org/wp-content/downloads/new-book/outputs/working-papers/BTTR_WP_2016-1.pdf
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674430006>
- Quisumbing, A. R. (2014). *Gender, assets, and agricultural development: Lessons from eight projects*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6472297/>
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. <https://giuseppicapograssi.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/rawls99.pdf>
- Reich, R. (2015). *Saving capitalism: For the many, not the few*. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/savingcapitalism0000reic>
- Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press. <https://cup.columbia.edu/book/the-age-of-sustainable-development/9780231173155/>
- Sachs, W. (1992). *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*. London: Zed Books. <https://cup.columbia.edu/book/the-age-of-sustainable-development/9780231173155/>
- Sandel, M. J. (1998). *Liberalism and the limits of justice*. <https://scispace.com/pdf/the-limits-of-justice-wew7f0dnls.pdf>
- Sara S. (2011). *Egypt Rises Up The 2011 Egyptian Revolution: Bread, Freedom, Dignity*. <https://thesis.eur.nl/pub/10610>
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.



- Shue, H. (1980). *Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. https://fsi-live.s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/evnts/media/Henry_Shue_Basic_Rights.pdf
- Stewart, F. (2002). *Horizontal inequalities: A neglected dimension of development*. WIDER Discussion Paper No. 2002/30. https://www.qeh.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/pdf_docs/qehwps81.pdf
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2000). The contributions of the economics of information to twentieth century economics. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(4), 1441-1478.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. <https://allenbolar.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/stiglitz-joseph-2002-globalization-and-its-discontents-ch-1.pdf>
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future*. https://resistir.info/livros/stiglitz_the_price_of_inequality.pdf
- Sunhyuk, K. (2000). *The Politics of Democratization in Korea: The Role of Civil Society*. https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9780822972174_A49442660/preview-9780822972174_A49442660.pdf
- Ted Nordhaus (2016). *An Ecomodernist Manifesto: From the Death of Environmentalism to the Birth of Ecomodernism*. <https://thebreakthrough.org/articles/an-ecomodernist-manifesto>
- Tilly, C. (2004). *Social movements, 1768-2004*. <https://voidnetwork.gr/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Social-Movements-1768-2004-by-Charles-Tilly.pdf>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2015). *Sustainable development goals*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2019). *Human development report 2019*. <https://hdr.undp.org/system/files/documents/hdr2019.pdf>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2014). *Education for sustainable development*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/sustainable-development/education>
- Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of justice: A defense of pluralism and equality*. https://www.academia.edu/29670032/Michael_Walzer_and_Spheres_of_Justice
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. <https://www.are.admin.ch/are/en/home/media/publications/sustainable-development/brundtland-report.html>
- World Health Organization. (2019). *World health report 2019*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241565707>
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. https://levszentkiralyi.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/young_justice-and-the-politics-of-difference_1-1991.pdf

