Chapter 1
Injustice and Its Many Forms

Abstract What is social injustice and why does it persist? Every day we read about, hear about or see various forms of injustice. Poverty and deprivation exists side by side with conspicuous wealth and enormous privilege; numerous humanitarian crises seem to overwhelm the capacity and political will of nation-states; violence at a regional, local and interpersonal level continues to inflict harm and misery on millions of people; discrimination, endemic racism and prejudice in many forms have become a normalised form of political capital. In order to develop a conceptualisation of injustice, this chapter begins by describing the injustices associated with inequality, refugees and people seeking asylum, stigmatised groups, violence, racism, poverty and the environment. The general mechanisms of injustice are explained before focusing specifically on the role of discrimination, prejudice and privilege in perpetuating and maintaining injustice.

Introduction

> In a way, to be indifferent to that suffering is what makes the human being inhuman. Indifference, after all, is more dangerous than anger and hatred. Anger can at times be creative. One writes a great poem, a great symphony. One does something special for the sake of humanity because one is angry at the injustice that one witnesses. But indifference is never creative. Even hatred at times may elicit a response. You fight it. You denounce it. You disarm it. (extract from a speech by Elie Wiesel, 1999)

The central contention of this book is that social injustice exists, it is not inevitable, and, given that, social workers represent an organised attempt to redress injustice and pursue social justice (see Chaps. 2 and 3). Indeed, the pursuit of social justice is a core value and aim of social work internationally (Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers, 2015; Australian Association of Social Workers, 2010; British Association of Social Workers, 2012; Canadian Association of Social Workers, 2005; International Federation of Social Workers, 2012, 2014; National Association of Social Workers, 2008; Singapore Association of Social Workers, 2004) (see Chap. 2). By drawing on a range of philosophical, sociological, political and psychological perspectives, this book represents an attempt to explore a wide range of theories and

practices of social justice for social work. In doing so, it aims to outline and discuss a repertoire of intellectual and practical resources that social workers may draw from to support practice towards social justice. Before we begin to tackle the concept of social justice, we need to explore what we mean by injustice, and consider some reasons that explain why injustice persists, such as prejudice, discrimination and privilege.

Injustice and Its Many Forms

The Oxford Dictionary defines injustice as a condition that is recognisable as a 'lack of fairness or justice', or something that is 'an unjust act or occurrence' (Oxford Dictionaries, 2017). Its Latin meaning concerns that which is not *just*, or not *right*. Although frequently related together in practice, social and economic injustice (which is our concern in this chapter) can be conceptually contrasted from legal justice—the law is a juridical and state-based instrument that can deliver just or unjust outcomes according to formally sanctioned rules. Laws are bound up in the functions of nation-states, whereas social justice concerns broader moral, political and economic questions such as: How and on what basis should society's rewards and burdens be distributed? How should recognition, inclusion and participation be achieved? In what ways do social attitudes, values and behaviours help or hinder the pursuit of what is right and fair? And what do we mean by things such as right and fair anyway?

At the same time, Sadurski (1984) criticises this distinction between social and legal justice, stating that 'what we usually call "legal justice" is either an application of the more fundamental notion of "social justice" to legal rules and decisions or is not a matter of justice at all' (p. 330). In other words, law is but one institution where matters of social justice or otherwise can find their expression, and law constitutes a practical field where social and legal justice are held as interdependent (Sadurski, 1984). Hence, we cannot dispense with the law as an instrument of social (in)justice. However, we still need to consider social justice in its moral and philosophical sense. We also need to consider the influence of norms and everyday conduct that can lead to social injustice and either frustrate or deliver social justice. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to fully unpack this distinction and debate. Suffice to say, the combined influence of juridical, normative and biopolitical accounts of social justice, along with an explication of distributive theories of justice, and theories of recognition, and how these relate to social work are themes developed throughout this book.

In following the definition of injustice introduced earlier as something that is not *right* or not *fair*, it would be reasonable to argue that society generally is not a utopian vision of social justice, as there are wide disparities between ownership, social status and moral desert. Such disparities exist broadly along lines of gender, class and race (Hick & Murray, 2009; Sen, 1995). For example, it has long been observed in the Marxist analysis that wage distribution and the ownership of property and the means of production is unequal, and that certain groups are thereby able to leverage profit through the control, exploitation and appropriation of the labour of others (Mullaly,

2007; Sen, 1995; Tong, 2009). This situation is neither natural nor inevitable, meaning that privilege (and its corollary, disadvantage) is largely circumstantial, historical, and it is socially and politically engineered, even implicitly through acts of indifference and ignorance (Pease, 2016). Hence, Kallen contends that although social injustice has a definite material reality, the foundations of injustice are often perpetuated by many socially constructed erroneous myths. These myths may include the myth of racial or gender superiority, and the myth that distinctions between majority/minority groups is a numerical one only—in fact, classifications of majority/minority should point towards *unequal power relations* 'not inequalities in numbers (population size)' (Kallen, 2004, p. 32). The social construction of injustice also includes the myth in the epistemological legitimacy of expert, scientific or pseudo-religious power to define truth and reality, thereby rationalising the truth value in oppressive and invalidating labels, categories and arguments for the subordination and subjugation of different knowledges and experiences, cultures and ways of being (Kallen, 2004).

We can further grasp the meaning of social and economic injustice by exploring some specific examples. What follows is not an exhaustive portrait of this formation of injustice, but rather serves to give some illustrations and examples of the definition of social injustice outlined prior.

Inequality

According to Dorling, inequality is both the background and outcome of injustice. He writes:

> Social inequality within rich countries persists because of a continued belief in the tenets of injustice, and it can be a shock for people to realise that there might be something wrong with much of the ideological fabric of the society we live in. Just as those whose families once owned slave plantations will have seen such ownership as natural in a time of slavery, and just as not allowing women to vote was once portrayed as 'nature's way', so too the great injustices of our times are, for many, simply part of the landscape of normality. (Dorling, 2010, p. 13)

One of the big markers of social and economic injustice is the scale and magnitude of wealth inequality, which can appear, in Dorling's terms, to be just *the way things are*. Others may object to this kind of inequality and unsettle its status of being normal. The reason that these examples of inequality strike a sense of injustice in many people (and force them to pause and reflect) is because such a situation seems so unfair, and it is a situation that many people see as being engineered to the advantage of some and disadvantages of a great many others. If it is engineered, then it is not natural and, both in theory and practice, can be altered.

Consider for example data from a report by Oxfam (2017), which notes that 'just eight men own the same wealth as the poorest half of the world' (p. 1). This is a staggering statistic, and equally as staggering as the following, quoted from the same report:

- Since 2015, the richest 1% has owned more wealth as the rest of the planet.
- The incomes of the poorest 10% of people increased by less than $3 a year between 1988 and 2011, while the incomes of the richest 1% increased by 182 times as much.
- A FTSE-100 CEO earns as much in a year as 10,000 people working in garment factories in Bangladesh.
- In the US, in the last 30 years, the growth in the incomes of the bottom 50% has been zero, whereas the incomes of the top 1% have grown by 300%. (Oxfam, 2017, p. 2)

As noted by the Oxfam report, this level of inequality—a widening gap between the haves and have-nots—is a breeding ground for conflict, crime, fear, disillusionment and the rise of racism and alt-right political groups capitalising on people's hardship and disenfranchisement (Oxfam, 2017). The root causes of this situation are many and varied, but include: the way that corporations systematically arrange their activities to benefit wealthy shareholders; downward pressure on wages and workers to maximise profit and extract through exploitation maximum labour value; business and political corruption; cronyism and tax evasion; a political system and political discourse that is favourable to business interests (Oxfam, 2017); and the subordination of human and environmental values under the weight of instrumentally narrow economics, driven relentlessly by the machinery of neoliberalism and capitalism (Hamilton, 2003; Sennett, 2006). This situation may also be seen as an artefact of the shifting forms of western imperialism. Imperialism here refers to a ruling power—historically, these were European powers and empires—that is exercised in order to dominate lands and peoples in distant locations, the purpose of which is to exploit people and resources to economically benefit the imperialist empires (Nayar, 2015). While imperialism points to the manifestation of this ruling power, colonisation refers to the specific processes of conquest, settlement and subordination of Indigenous peoples by distant imperial powers. Colonisation entails 'systematic administrative control' (Nayar, 2015, p. 30) as well as the imposition of 'religion, education, language' and the establishment of racial binaries of superiority (said to be the colonisers) and inferiority (said to be the colonised) (Nayar, 2015, p. 31).

This shift in Western imperialism involved the dismantling of the massive colonies associated with the period of 'high imperialism' (Go, 2013, p. 3). Post World War Two, as these same empires crumbled, the world was reconfigured into nation-states. Go (2013, p. 4) suggests that for millions of people, this was a time of hope because 'National independence portended a blessed future—a future whereby colonial exploitation would be replaced with economic "development" and social "progress."' Unfortunately, these hopes have been unrealised due to new forms of imperialism—cultural and economic. Decolonisation resulted in the creation of a 'new, non-colonial ensemble of global institutions [that] came together to govern the persisting imperial network of relationships of dependency, inequality, and economic exploitation' (Tully, 2008, p. 463). The idea that this network of global institutions are a continuance of western imperialism is widely accepted.

Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Displaced People

According to Nipperess and Clark (2016), 'refugees and asylum seekers are forced migrants as opposed to voluntary migrants who leave their own country for a range of economic and other reasons' (p. 196). Indeed, extreme economic poverty or material deprivation are not considered grounds for seeking asylum, nor is displacement due to environmental damage (Benhabib, 2017, online). Displaced people are people who are forced to leave their homes, due to war, persecution or natural catastrophe. Benhabib (2017, online) makes the point that the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol continue to hold legal force but are modelled on refugees as dissidents, prisoners of conscience or resistance fighters—a state of affairs that continues place administrative burdens with regard to proof of threat on nation-states as well as those seeking asylum. Many people seek asylum in other countries, whereas others are internally displaced from their homes but remain within their home country. These people are referred to as internally displaced people (IDP) and this usually refers to 'the forced movement of people from their locality or environment or occupational activities' (UNESCO, 2017, paragraph one). The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) review of displaced peoples reveals that in 2015, there were 65.3 million people who were forcibly displaced (an average of 24 people every minute of every day) (UNHCR, 2015). Of this number, 21.3 million people were accepted as refugees; 3.2 million people were still seeking asylum at the close of 2015 and there were just under 100,000 unaccompanied and separated children (UNHCR, 2015). As noted by Nipperess and Clark (2016), 'most people seeking asylum have experienced significant discrimination and oppression' (p. 199), and stateless people are particularly vulnerable to human rights abuses, persecution and other hazards as they cannot access the safety and support that comes with citizenship and the protection of the rule of law (UNHCR, 2014). Women and children are especially vulnerable within refugee camps. Furthermore, people seeking asylum and refugees are often demonised by governments in attempts to harness political support for tighter and more restrictive border and immigration policies (Nipperess & Clark, 2016).

Discrimination and Stigma

Discrimination is 'the differential treatment of groups or individuals on the basis of their group membership' (Jackson, 2011, p. 21), and stigma concerns a 'stereotypical view of certain groups of people' (Burke, 2006, p. 11). Both can result in patterns of persistently negative treatment towards certain groups and individuals, which may induce in people feelings of rejection, self-stigmatisation, internalised feelings of shame and lowered self-worth (Burke, 2006). Two examples can illustrate how this accounts for injustices: the discrimination and stigmatisation of people with mental illness, and people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer/questioning and allied (LGBTIQA).

According to the National Mental Health and Consumer Forum (2010), 'people with a mental illness are among the most disadvantaged in society, and many experience social and economic hardship as a direct result of their illness' (p. 1). An international survey on depression and the workplace reveals that a majority of people do not disclose their depression to their employers or colleagues for the fear of being discriminated against and stigmatised (SANE, n.d.). Further, a large survey of the experience of discrimination of people with mental health problems found that although people with mental illness may experience positive treatment, they also experienced discrimination in relation to work, family and friends (Reavley & Jorm, 2015). In particular, they experienced avoidance, rejection and being shunned in the domains of family, friends and intimate relationships (Reavley & Jorm, 2015). The prejudices and stigma associated with mental illness underpins discrimination and disadvantage, which can result in social isolation and exclusion, emotional harm, human rights abuses and barriers accessing social and other resources (National Mental Health Consumer & Carer Forum, 2010).

Relatedly, heterosexism and heteronormativity result in homophobia, sexual stigmatisation, discrimination (Kallen, 2004), violence, denigration and crimes towards LGBTIQA people and populations (Irwin, 2016). People with diverse sexualities and genders are more likely than the general community to experience 'violence, harassment and bullying' (Australian Human Rights Commission, n.d., p. 5) in their homes, schools, workplaces, online and in public places. This includes homophobic abuse and violence, sexual violence, assault, verbal abuse, threats and damage to property (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2014, n.d.; Human Rights Campaign, n.d.). This increased violence manifests as human rights violations in the areas of poor health, problems with access to education, decreased standards of living, increased stigmatisation, threats to privacy and security of person (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2014, n.d.; Human Rights Campaign, n.d.), and the prevalence of (poorly understood) intimate partner violence and stalking (Irwin, 2016; National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, n.d.).

Violence, Abuse and Mistreatment

According to philosopher Iris Marion Young, violence is a key component of oppression, and violence is perpetuated on certain groups disproportionately (Young, 1990). Despite legislative instruments to protect certain groups in society from discrimination and abuse (for example, Australian Human Rights Commission, 2012), paternalism and disproportionate distributions of power still lead to the abuse and mistreatment of children, women, older people and people with disabilities (Kallen, 2004). For example, it is well established that although men and women experience domestic violence, 'domestic and sexual violence is overwhelmingly committed by men against women' (ANROWS, n.d.-b, p. 1). Violence against women is a result of gender inequality and assumptions about gender roles and the normalisation of the use of violence in relationships (World Health Organization, 2016). Violence

is considered a major social determining factor in negatively influencing women's health, mental health, the well-being of children, economic inequality, human rights abuses and injuries and mortality (World Health Organization, 2016).

Turning to other examples, in the US, African Americans (particularly lower socioeconomic younger males) are far more vulnerable to fatal and non-fatal violent crime than other groups (Harrell, 2007). Adults and children with disabilities and mental illness are far more likely to experience violence and abuse than those without a disability or mental illness (World Health Organization, n.d.). Violence, sexual assault and victimisation of women and girls with disabilities is 'far more extensive than violence amongst the general population' (Frohmader, 2014, p. 1). In Australia, 'Indigenous people are between two and five times more likely than non-Indigenous people to experience violence as victims or offenders' (ANROWS, n.d.-a, p. 1). Finally, war is a conspicuous and horrific illustration of the injustices of violence and conflict. Just over 100 million people died in wars during the twentieth century, many of them civilians, women and children. More recently, it is estimated in 2016 that between 270,000 and 490,000 people have been killed in the Syrian conflict (Black, 2016). The long-term costs and consequences of war and civil conflict (for example, economic costs, health problems, environmental degradation, displacement, psychological harm and trauma, physical injury and disability, and so on) stretch out for many decades, well after the conflict has ended.

Racism

Cultural genocide and imperialism (Young, 1990), and the forced assimilation of Indigenous peoples through colonisation and violence in places like Australia, Canada, New Zealand and North America, has resulted in enduring racisms and contemporary inequalities and injustices (Kallen, 2004). This is not just a historical problem of past generations; for example, the 2017 travel bans and attempts at mass deportation by the Trump administration in the US may be seen as overt illustrations of racial profiling, but as Hernandez points out, racism has always been at the foundation of a 'settler mentality' in the US, and 'immigration control is one of the least constitutional and most racist realms of governance in U.S. law and life' (Hernandez, 2017, paragraph four). Racism is harmful in terms of health and well-being, but also culturally and socially. For example, the ugly history of the 'white Australia policy' and the stolen generations of Aboriginal peoples in Australia stand as a testament to institutionalised racism and discrimination (Briskman, 2007). Aboriginal peoples in Australia are incarcerated at a much higher rate than the general population (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016), and the health and life expectancy of Aboriginal Australians falls way behind the national average (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2014). The background to this is a local and contextually based form of racism bound up in Australia's colonial history and Eurocentrism, which 'include differentiating people and their traditions in ranked orders and placing value on those beliefs that emanate from the West to the detriment of those who do not share those

beliefs and behaviours' (Young & Zubrzycki, 2011, p. 161). The consequences for Aboriginal peoples in Australia are described by Bennett (2013) to include dispossession from land, genocide, protectionist and assimilationist policies that led to further marginalisation and cultural oppression, disadvantage and the subordination of Aboriginal knowledge and experiences to the 'universalisation and normalisation of whiteness as the representation of humanity' (Moreton-Robinson, 2004, p. 77). A similar pattern is outlined by MacDonald and Gillis (2017) in the Canadian context, where they note that 'settler institutions [sought] to contain and re-subjectify Indigenous identities and either reform or destroy them' (p. 51). As stated by Menzies and Gilbert (2013), a commitment to social justice is important for confronting racism and enabling the kinds of knowledge, values and skills that are necessary for guarding against practice that may further compound injustices.

Poverty

A further marker of injustice is poverty, particularly when it is examined in light of the way that wealth is pooled and accumulated unevenly, resulting in the kinds of inequalities discussed in this chapter prior. In 2013, '767 million people are estimated to have been living below the international poverty line of US$1.90 per person per day' (World Bank, 2016, p. 3). Poverty inflicts an injustice on people because it is so harmful to their well-being. This harm is referred to as structural violence, which is a violence metered out from a distance through the conditions and consequences of poverty (Hosken, 2016). Poverty often impacts people who are already vulnerable. For example, it is estimated that 80% of the one billion people with disabilities worldwide live in developing countries, and 20% of people with disabilities live in dire poverty—they endure substandard living conditions and have severely restricted access to health care (Caritas Australia, n.d.).

Poverty is an injustice because amidst the human capacity to produce so much excess wealth and surplus resources, it simply need not exist, and, therefore, poverty is indicative of economic, political and moral failure. The United Nations Millennium Development Goals Report 2015 (United Nations, 2015) notes that since 1990, extreme poverty has declined, and there have been several other global improvements in the areas of universal education, gender equality, child mortality, maternal health, infectious diseases, water and sanitation and debt reduction and technological advancement. This is a positive development and demonstrates that things *can* improve, but such improvements require continual attention and investment of effort if they are to be sustained (United Nations, 2015). At the same time, there is evidence of widespread poverty and disadvantage throughout countries with more advanced economies. In the UK, 'Over 30 million people (almost half the population) are suffering to some degree of financial insecurity' and 'almost 18 million in the UK today cannot afford adequate housing conditions' (Gordon et al., 2013, p. 2). Meanwhile, in Australia, some '2.25 million people (13.9% of all people) were living below the poverty line, after taking in account of their housing costs' and 'one in seven people,

including one in six children, lived below the most austere poverty line widely used in international research (50% of median income)' (Australian Council of Social Services, 2014, p. 8).

Environmental Injustice

Injustice has also been elaborated in relation to ecological and environmental concerns by particularly focusing on global inequality (Roberts & Parks, 2007). Roberts and Parks (2007) explain that despite a burgeoning literature on the many and varied problems associated with climate change and ecological problems, until recently, global inequality as an environmental concern has received little attention. Global and local inequality needs to be factored into serious attempts to resolving ecological problems because inequality:

> dampens utility-enhancing cooperative efforts by reinforcing structuralist worldviews and causal beliefs, creating incentives for zero-sum and negative-sum behavior, polarizing preferences, generating divergent unstable expectations about future behavior, eroding trust and civic norms among different social groups, destabilizing policy coalitions, and making it different to coalesce around a socially shared understanding of what is "fair". (Roberts & Parks, 2007, p. 6)

Their point is that inequality drives non-cooperative behaviour between nation-states, largely due to differential and asymmetrical relations of power, privilege and influence (Roberts & Parks, 2007). Both the causes and consequences of climate change are disproportionately distributed. For example, the global emissions produced by the US is comparable to 136 developing countries, yet the impact of climate change means that 'some populations suffer worst and first, and they are often not those who caused the problem' (Roberts & Parks, 2007, p. 10). The same argument could be made on a smaller scale: inequality and injustice is an anathema to cooperative behaviour, trust, and norms of reciprocity that are important to well-being generally. The protests at the Standing Rock Sioux reservation over the North Dakota oil pipeline (Montgomery, 2016) and the disposal of toxic coal ash in Puerto Rico (Lloréns, 2016) illustrate clearly that environmental issues are inseparable from histories of colonisation, power, economic development, money, and, organised local resistance to the brute force of large corporations over people and the environment (Brueckner & Ross, 2010).

This inequality extends to the use of knowledge about the relation between environments and human beings. In their *Annual Review of Environmental Resources,* Russell and colleagues provide a synthesis of evidence about the effects of nature on human health and well-being (Russell et al., 2013). Their review demonstrated unequivocally that nature has positive effects for the physiological and psychological health of human beings. Moreover, they found that the 'strong positive effects of nature on identity and spirituality are robustly demonstrated for indigenous groups but poorly documented for other cultures' (Russell et al., 2013, p. 494). This review used primarily scientific data that left out anthropological and ethnographic accounts

and data and, as a result 'was skewed toward the individualist, psychological, clinical, experimental, and reductionist studies, and away from more holistic narratives and the anthropological and sociological disciplines' (Russell et al., 2013, p. 476). Yet, it is within these disciplines and narratives that knowledge about the effects of inequality, colonisation, marginalisation and oppression and respectful relations between humans and nature is documented. Thus, despite calls for holistic approaches to understanding and mitigating climate change, the unequal nature of science works against including groups of people who may have different and important knowledges about this relation between human beings and ecosystems.

This is an insight that has informed the emerging field of ecological social work that is increasingly taken up the orientation to justice that includes a holistic approach to the issue of people in their environments (Boetto & McKinnon, 2018). Boetto and McKinnon (2018, p. 278) suggest therefore that social workers need to urgently acquaint themselves with 'knowledge about the science behind global warming and the implications of environmental degradation on human wellbeing'. This approach to social work encompasses an orientation to justice that includes concerns with environments and ecosystems, recognising the inherent interdependence of humans and their environments. Central to this is a focus on engaging with Indigenous worldviews and ways of knowing (Young & Zubrizycki, 2011). Ife (2013, p. 57) too has suggested that an ecological approach within social work that emphasises holism, sustainability, interdependence, diversity and equilibrium is important but that must be combined with a social justice perspective that 'deals with social equity, oppression [and] human rights'. One of the key ways social work internationally is engaging with environmental injustice is through a focus on the UN Social Development Goals (SDGs) within developing ecological social work frameworks for practice.

The UN Social Development Goals (SDGs) are aimed at addressing these issues of sustainability and sustainable development having been designed to build on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (O'Manique & Fourie, 2016, p. 121). Despite the emphasis on environmental justice, it remains to be seen whether SDGs are able to address the imperialism inherent in systems of development relations between multinational corporations, the private sector and multinational not-for-profit aid agencies that often 'render invisible their current role in the intensification of inequality, environmental destruction, and gender injustice' (O'Manique & Fourie, 2016, p. 122).

Explaining Injustice: Some Organising Concepts

The position of this book is that social (in)justice is not straight line or one dimensional. Each of these states (social injustice or social justice) is contingent on a complex interplay between philosophical and political arguments about human nature, rights, moral principles, and political and economic theories. It includes historical and cultural forces associated with structural and sociological conditions, and it includes psychological attitudes and dispositions that condition and shape belief, general outlook, and interpersonal conduct and behaviours. These perspectives allow

us to consider what sorts of forces are at work that create the conditions for various injustices to flourish. In corollary, it is important to engage with and harness a range of intellectual and practical resources in the interest of the pursuit of social justice. These themes are developed throughout this book, but for now, we move to briefly survey some explanatory concepts that are helpful to give a conceptual language to explaining the mechanisms behind injustice.

In picking up this multifarious point about social (in)justice, Barry (2005) cites Donnison to invoke the phrase 'the machinery of social injustice' as a metaphor that refers to the way that injustice can be thought of as a consequence of many and varied interrelated mechanisms, which need to be understood as working together. That is to say, injustice is the result of a systemic situation, and not merely an isolated event or the result of a single action, situation or problem. Hence, the perspective that must be adopted in order to grasp what injustice is, and what social justice demands, is one that is broadly *systemic* and *holistic*. To think about social injustice means to identify the machinery at work, which may include: the weight of history and circumstance; the dominance of certain social norms and conventions; the particular arrangement of social and economic structures; the acceptability of certain moral propositions, values and beliefs; attitudes, thought patterns and assumptions; behaviours, actions, decisions and forms of conduct; political rationalities and arguments; discourses, conceptual vocabularies, and epistemological positions concerning truth and human nature; and ontological positions concerning reality and how the world is and ought to be (see Chap. 5, this volume).

A key point to take from this concept of the machinery of injustice is the influence of normative ideas about injustice being inevitable. Inevitability is a problematic assumption, but one that has a powerful influence over the way that injustice is rationalised. For example, suffering can be conflated with injustice and take on its own moral rationalisation to such an extent that suffering is imbued with a 'moral authority' (Moore, 1978, p. 80). This moral authority may include an aesthetic idealisation of self-imposed suffering right through to the idea that suffering and injustice that is imposed on people is 'unavoidable or even inevitable' and therefore rationalised as 'morally desirable' (Moore, 1978, p. 80). In both cases, injustice and suffering are assumed to be normal and unavoidable. There are many philosophical and religious positions that contend that not all suffering is necessarily bad, and this may have some merit depending on the situation. For example, the philosopher Frederick Nietzsche argued that suffering was 'positively necessary for the cultivation of human excellence' (Leiter, 2015, p. 9) and any ethical system that promotes happiness or the alleviation of suffering may stultify growth and development. In a similar sense, Buddhism accepts that life and existence is itself suffering, but contends this can be alleviated with thought and practice (Siderits, 2015). But suffering and injustice—although frequently related—are conceptually distinct phenomena, and at some point people will individually or collectively reject the normalisation and inevitability of certain injustices, and this rejection is a site for action and analysis.

In fact, such a rejection is actually necessary to achieve a change. Countering injustice requires a fundamental rejection of it 'at the level of culture, social structure, and individual personality, as groups of people cease to take their social surroundings

for granted and come to reject or actively oppose them' (Moore, 1978, p. 81). Moore explains how this occurs:

> The main process of cultural transformation amounts to an undermining of the prevailing system of beliefs that confer legitimacy, or at least naturalness and some degree of correspondence with ordinary expectations, upon the existing social order. (Moore, 1978, pp. 81–82)

Rejecting the moral authority and inevitability of injustice first requires identifying and problematising the beliefs that prop it up and sustain it. Dorling's (2010) book *Injustice: Why Social Inequality Persists* outlines in great empirical detail five myths or faces that perpetuate and sustain injustice, and each of these can be challenged, critiqued and rejected. These are: elitism is efficient; exclusion is necessary; prejudice is natural; greed is good; and, despair is inevitable.

Elitism is efficient concerns the funnelling of scarce resources to educational institutions and systems that benefit the already well-off in ways that create and sustain hierarchies of education, qualifications and credentialism (Dorling, 2010). The effect of this is a false belief that injustice and inequality is a natural and inevitable result of the divisions between different groups in society. Since different groups have received different educational experiences and opportunities, the result is a patterning of educated haves and have-nots. The 'haves' can use this educational head start to leverage and access further advantages and benefits, which they then claim they are entitled to. Education and university systems are complicit in this division through sorting, assessing, categorising and labelling achievement and failure. Higher education in particular propagates the idea that knowledge is very complex or difficult, and that only specially educated people could possibly understand such matters of complexity; therefore, they receive special benefits and rewards that only they are legitimately entitled to (Dorling, 2010).

As mentioned, poverty and inequality is an example of a widespread injustice. Pushing people into poverty results in a *necessary exclusion* from participation in social, economic and civic life; life that is defined by certain norms (Dorling, 2010). These norms might include having enough to eat, adequate shelter, ability to purchase essentials and participate in leisure activities. These norms are constituted within a social mean or average. Yet, very affluent people can voluntarily exclude themselves from these norms in the upward direction through extreme forms of conspicuous consumption that most people would find impossible to emulate. The problem is that this conspicuous and extreme consumption twists and distorts norms in way that end up artificially manufacturing increasing levels of want and it perpetuates involuntary exclusion from social norms. This exclusion contributes to false beliefs in the necessity of inequality, often fuelled by eugenicist ideologies and discourses about individualism and consumerism (Dorling, 2010).

A consequence of the view that social and economic exclusion is natural and necessary is *prejudice*, which Dorling (2010) says 'grows like mould, based on elitist myths in times of exclusion' (p. 21). From a prejudicial view, inequality is assumed to be the result of individual differences and individual weaknesses and failings. Such assumptions are often based in essentialist views of human nature, which contend that there are certain inherent qualities in some groups of people that makes their

social position (be it privileged or disadvantaged) simply the result of the natural order of things. For example, 'the poor in particular are now subject to a widespread prejudice whereby, it is nastily and quietly said, they must have something wrong with them if they are not able to work their way out of poverty' (Dorling, 2010, p. 28).

The unrestrained normativity of *greed* as a human value is part of the fabric of injustice. In the 1987 movie 'Wall Street', fictional character Gordon Gekko—a corporate raider addressing a meeting of shareholders—outlines his argument concerning the human nature and righteousness of greed. He states:

> Greed, for lack of a better word, is good. Greed is right. Greed works. Greed clarifies and cuts through the essence, of the evolutionary spirit. Greed, in all of its forms – greed for life, for money, for love, for knowledge – has marked the upward surge of mankind. (Stone, 1987).

In reality, proponents of this view have just learnt to be less blatant about it than Gordon Gekko. Nonetheless, this view that greed is natural and right is widespread and institutionalised, even though according to Dorling (2010) it is actually a fairly recent view associated with individualism and advanced capitalism. The problem with such a view is that it has dangerous consequences and side effects, which render its so-called moral 'goodness' suspect. These side effects include: a falsely propagated view that children who benefit from large inheritances must have worked hard for it themselves when they perhaps did not; growing inequalities and prejudices that are normalised and naturalised; increased, and at times, spectacular and bizarre levels of consumption and its associative inefficiencies and waste; corruption of institutions, but also a corrupted false consciousness that contends the super-wealthy are vitally needed in order to create a trickle-down of jobs and taxes that benefit the less well-off; and, increasing insensitivity and general lack of social empathy to the plights and struggles of the disadvantaged (Dorling, 2010).

Finally, the *inevitability of despair* arises out of injustice (Dorling, 2010). Despair creeps into our social existence and consciousness in the form of mental ill health (particularly persisting and rising anxiety and depression), poor and inequitable health outcomes, the ever-increasing use of medications, alcohol and other drugs, and materialist acquisition as distractions and panaceas to the deleterious effects of the inevitability of despair (Dorling, 2010).

Prejudice, Discrimination and the Links to Injustice

Dorling's (2010) analysis includes the role of prejudice in perpetuating and sustaining injustice. Prejudice is a form of 'prejudgment', which refers to 'making assumptions about others in the absence of knowledge about them' (Jackson, 2011, p. 10). This proclivity for early judgment in the absence of information happens to be common to the way people think and make judgments generally. Laden (2001) suggests that the social aspects of a person's identity serve as shorthand ways to locate each

other socially. These aspects are generally non-reciprocal and do not rely on actual relationships with other people. Further, prejudice appears to be common across all groups and societies (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 2000), precisely because prejudice serves certain social functions. These functions are:

- *Utilitarian*—prejudice is a way of helping people fit in with peer groups to gain benefits and avoid punishments
- *Self-esteem*—prejudice is a response to differences and unfamiliarity, which may threaten a sense of self
- *Value-expressive*—prejudice is a way of safeguarding 'the security social norms provide' (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 2000, p. 26)
- *Cognitive*—prejudice is a cognitive process of organising the complexity of reality into parts, concepts, heuristics and categories (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 2000).

Psychological factors such as frustration, anger, insecurity and feelings of rejection can drive people's prejudices and make them 'impervious to the sorts of logical arguments that could expose fallacies in their beliefs' (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 2000, p. 27). Hence, people tend not to make judgments about justice rationally or analytically; rather, judgments are generally spontaneous and based on intuition, and although nuanced, this intuition is generally automatic and devoid of conscious reflection or scrutiny (Robinson, 2013). The problem is when this human capability operates uncritically and unreflectively, because it results in a patterning and general acceptance of stereotypes and essentialist ideas about human beings, which, when supported by dubious scientific claims, reach the level of accepted wisdom and consensus (Jackson, 2011).

Prejudices and stereotypes are perpetuated and circulated in everyday discourses, habits, attitudes, beliefs and under the ambit of what may sometimes appear as ordinary harmless behaviour (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 2000). However, these are not harmless: prejudices and stereotypes are a kind of knowledge—they masquerade as 'truths' that profoundly shape people's perceptions of each other. Prejudices and stereotypes shape how people behave and interact towards each other and they are a particular contributory factor in discrimination. For example:

> The boss who negatively evaluates gay employees, the teacher who gives preferential treatment to children from affluent families, and the landlord who refuses to rent to certain groups all show interpersonal discrimination. (Jackson, 2011, p. 21)

This interpersonal discrimination—which concerns individual behaviours—is patterned and layered into the conduct and operations of institutions, resulting in situations that 'systematically disadvantage some groups' (Jackson, 2011, p. 21), and, by corollary, other groups are able to maintain and shore up their privilege and advantage over others (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 2000; Jackson, 2011; Pincus, 2000). While institutional discrimination has an intentionality to it—and may sometimes include overt acts of discriminating against people based on their gender, age or ethnicity—structural discrimination is more pervasive and difficult to detect and respond to because it is often based on a form of *neutrality* (Pincus, 2000). For example, the lending practices of banks may favour middle-class people with assets and secure

jobs they can use to securitise their loans, and when companies downsize staff, they may shed part-time or casual staff first—who are more likely to belong to minority groups—thereby retaining their permanent and executive managerial class, who are more likely to belong to dominant groups (Pincus, 2000). These decisions may not be overt acts of discrimination per se, and they may not break any particular anti-discriminatory laws, but, as examples of structural discrimination, their net effects serve to shore up the interests, advantages and privilege of some groups of people, while further disenfranchising others (Pincus, 2000).

Privilege

Privilege is deeply connected to social norms, which includes judgments on what is considered *normal*: the way things are and ought to be, the correct measure of things, the right way to be, what is proper, and so on (Wildman & Davis, 2000). Individuals and groups in society will identify and become identified with these norms that confer privilege upon some, but not others. The maintenance of systems and patterns of privilege can serve to perpetuate and reinforce injustices.

What do we mean by privileged groups and individuals? Goodman (2011) begins with a broad classification of privileged or dominant groups as generally including white, male, upper middle class, able-bodied, heterosexual and gender conforming. This is a fairly broad-brush classification that is commonly used to suggest a description of a privileged group, but it may contain several exceptions and there are limits to how far we can push categorical notions of privilege. Therefore, Goodman (2011) expands the concept of privilege to include a range of intersecting *attributes*, which we have summarised following:

- *Normalcy*—privileged groups exercise their dominance by propagating norms that are taken to be standards of acceptability against which other groups are contrasted and judged. For example, norms associated with speech, dress and comportment.
- *Superiority*—privileged groups promote the idea (sometimes unconsciously) that their culture, norms and standards are superior to others. For example, arguments that appeal to assimilation typically adopt the idea of superior versus inferior cultures and lifestyles.
- *Cultural and institutional power and domination*—privileged groups are able to monopolise power, ideology and worldviews in such a way that these manifest in institutional discourse, norms, policies, rules, laws and behaviours. For example, a corpus of psychological knowledge where research subjects were white male college students, and this knowledge is then used to develop diagnostic and assessment tools, which are institutionalised in mental health services.
- *Privilege*—privileged groups are able to use their privilege to leverage 'benefits or unearned advantages' (Goodman, 2011, p. 18). Such benefits accrue to people in ways that makes them appear natural or invisible. For example, heterosexual

couples can display their affection in public without fear of reprisal or recrimination in ways that homosexual couples often cannot.

- *Lack of consciousness*—privileged individuals do not have to constantly think about their social identity, or negotiate their social environment. For example, holding an important community meeting in a venue that does not have wheelchair access, or calling an after-hours business meeting at short notice, which may present difficulties in attending for an employee who is a sole parent with caring responsibilities for young children.
- *Denial and avoidance of oppression*—privileged individuals may deny the existence of oppression precisely because they do not bear the brunt of it, or because acknowledging oppression causes discomfort. For example, when a privileged person chooses to define racism as only consisting of slurs and insults, this denies and avoids racism that includes institutional discrimination and widespread injustice.
- *Sense of superiority and entitlement*—Privileged individuals may become accustomed to their social and political advantage and its benefits in such a way that they expect that they are entitled to further benefits, even at the expense of others, and even if such benefits are unearned. For example, expecting preferential treatment for no other reason than believing that 'you deserve it'.
- *Multiple identities and experience of privilege*—privilege is the result of differential, combinatory and intersecting identities and positions that result in different experiences of privilege and disadvantage. For example, the combination of being white, male, middle class, is different from being black, male and middle class. Both may carry elements of privilege for different reasons, but this privilege is divergent rather than symbiotic.
- *Resistance to seeing oneself as privileged*—privileged individuals may not *feel* privileged because all people experience difficulties and struggles of some kind by virtue of being human, which is phenomenologically unique and personal to them. Further, the concept of privilege may have negative connotations, which may conflict with a person's sense of themselves as being a 'good person' (adapted from Goodman, 2011, pp. 12–31).

Years of conditioning can manifest in deeply ingrained emotional responses and attitudes and values that are hard to dispense with. The socialisation process that all people experience from birth onwards is pervasive and formative. It is built out of and reinforced by family, tradition, culture, school, media, norms, values, rules, sanctions, punishments, rewards and benefits (Harro, 2000). Despite being constrained intellectually by reasoning and conscious intent, prejudice may seep out in subtle and indirect ways, gently influencing the way people feel, the way they interact with each other, the way they filter their perceptions, make judgments and decisions, and how they directly or even symbolically defend and 'protect conventional values' (Jackson, 2011, pp. 14–15). This defence may be used to justify injustices and inequalities as being normal, natural, or the way things are or ought to be. This may also apply to stereotypes that on face value actually seem positive:

> …positive stereotypes may serve to perpetuate inequality. Stereotypes that depict women as supportive, kind and nurturing have not shattered the glass ceiling, brought women's salaries on par with men's, or eliminated violence against women. (Jackson, 2011, p. 19)

It is the positivity of some stereotypes that contribute to their currency, traction and social acceptability. Because privilege is associated with group membership it should be seen as 'inherited rather than earned' (Jackson, 2011, p. 23). People may be very reluctant to accept this proposition and reflect critically on their privilege, because:

> Acknowledging that privilege exists on a group level implies that one may have benefited personally from it. Recognizing this requires that one critically evaluate the belief that society functions fairly and also the belief that everything one personally has, one deserves. (Jackson, 2011, p. 23)

Social workers are not infallible to this turn of events. Although social workers should be alert to interpersonal discrimination that may function in their practice, they also need a critical analysis and response to the way that organisations, policies and rules and norms operate to produce discriminatory effects, such as reproducing truths and knowledge that continue the cycle of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination. The proclivity for social work to unwittingly contribute to injustice even at the same time it professes an allegiance to social justice is well documented (Morley, 2016; Pease & Nipperess, 2016). The concepts of White privilege and critical Whiteness theory are gaining purchase in social work theory and education in places like Australia, as a way to critically interrogate the invisible and largely unexamined epistemological and ontological Eurocentric assumptions in social work theory and practice (Moreton-Robinson, 2004; Walter, Taylor, & Habibis, 2011; Young & Zubrzycki, 2011). White privilege here refers to the social and political benefits that being White delivers people, benefits which are typically unconscious, invisible and devoid of critical scrutiny (Walter et al., 2011). Engaging with whiteness 'can uncover new knowledge into race-based barriers to practice and that this is especially pertinent to social work's practice with Indigenous people and peoples' (Walter et al., 2011, p. 7). In social work, critical reflection is also offered as a form of knowledge and method for practice to assist social workers to critically examine their values, attitudes, beliefs, prejudices, privileges and actions (Fook & Gardner, 2007; Morley, 2008, 2012). Other examples to attune social workers to their reflective capabilities on their social positioning and privilege may include cultural competence education (Abrams & Moio, 2009), service user perspectives (Beresford & Boxall, 2012), Indigenous knowledges (Calma & Priday, 2011; Fejo-King, 2011; Rowe, Baldry, & Earles, 2015), critical supervision models (Noble, 2016), and dialogical and transformative social work education pedagogies (Jones, 2009).

Conclusion

Social welfare arrangements and social policies are the practical expressions of contested positions on social justice (Colby, Dulmus, & Sowers, 2012). Social work is

located in the context of these welfare and social policy arrangements, and the practice of social work means confronting the realities of social injustice daily. Therefore, social workers are in a prime position to throw a spotlight on injustices, and to contribute to debates, arguments and actions towards social justice, and how these might be translated into policy and social welfare arrangements (Colby et al., 2012). This contribution may also include connecting with various social and political movements to challenge and critique neoliberal capitalism and globalisation (Ferguson, 2007). In support, Gay (2012) draws on a Kantian moral principle to argue that peace and justice are not only possible, but that we are morally bound to pursue these ideals by rejecting the homogenising tendencies of domination and militarism, expressed in discourses and techniques that include 'sexism, heterosexism, racism, ethnocentrism, nationalism, and classism' (Gay, 2012, p. 7). Chapters 2 and 3 extend this discussion by considering the formation of social justice in the ethics, mission and purpose of social work, as well as tracing the history and practice of social justice work in social work.

References

Abrams, L. S., & Moio, J. A. (2009). Critical race theory and the cultural competence dilemma in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(2), 245–261.

ANROWS. (n.d.-a). Fast facts: Indigenous family violence. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://anrows.org.au/sites/default/files/Fast-Facts—Indigenous-family-violence.pdf.

ANROWS. (n.d.-b). Violence against women: Key statistics. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://media.aomx.com/anrows.org.au/s3fs-public/Key%20statistics%20-%20all.pdf.

Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers. (2015). The code of ethics of ANZASW (Chapter 3). Retrieved May 19, 2015, from http://anzasw.org.nz/documents/0000/0000/0664/Chapter_3_Code_of_Ethics_Summary.pdf.

Australian Association of Social Workers. (2010). *Code of ethics*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Association of Social Workers.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2016). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander prisoner characteristics. Retrieved April 6, 2017, from http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4517.0~2016~Main%20Features~Aboriginal%20and%20Torres%20Strait%20Islander%20prisoner%20characteristics~5.

Australian Council of Social Services. (2014). Poverty in Australia 2014. Retrieved May 5, 2016, from http://www.acoss.org.au/images/uploads/ACOSS_Poverty_in_Australia_2014.pdf.

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2012). Disability: Know your rights. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/content/pdf/disability_rights/dda_brochure.pdf.

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2014). Face the facts: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex people. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/FTFLGBTI.pdf.

Australian Human Rights Commission. (n.d.). Violence, harassment and bullying and the LGBTI communities. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://bullying.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/content/pdf/bullying/VHB_LGBTI.pdf.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2014). The size and causes of the Indigenous health gap: Australia's health series no. 14. Cat. no. AUS 178. Retrieved April 6, 2017, from http://www.aihw.gov.au/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=60129547777.

Barry, B. (2005). *Why social justice matters*. Malden, Oxford: Polity Press.

Benhabib, S. (2017). 2017 Alfred P. Stiernotte Lecture: Seyla Benhabib. Retrieved June 6, 2018, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-XYdaipgV64&list=PLV19SJTJj162krLtUiicQsWWke3GVwdFx&index=30&t=4159s.

Bennett, B. (2013). The importance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander history for social work students and graduates. In B. Bennett, S. Green, S. Gilbert, & D. Bessarab (Eds.), *Our voices: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander social work* (pp. 1–25). South Yarra: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beresford, P., & Boxall, K. (2012). Service users, social work education and knowledge for social work practice. *Social Work Education, 31*(2), 155–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2012.644944.

Black, I. (2016). Report on Syria conflict finds 11.5% of population killed or injured. Retrieved April 6, 2017, from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/feb/11/report-on-syria-conflict-finds-115-of-population-killed-or-injured?nl=morning-briefing&em_pos=large&emc=edit_nn_20160211.

Blumenfeld, W. J., & Raymond, D. (2000). Prejudice and discrimination. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castañeda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 21–30). New York and London: Routledge.

Boetto, H., & McKinnon, J. (2018). Social work, sustainability and the environment. In M. Alston, S. McCurdy, & J. McKinnon (Eds.), *Social work fields of practice* (3rd ed., pp. 277–292). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Briskman, L. (2007). *Social work with indigenous communities*. Annandale, New South Wales: Federation Press.

British Association of Social Workers. (2012). The code of ethics for social work: Statement of principles. Retrieved August 3, 2017, from https://www.basw.co.uk/codeofethics/.

Brueckner, M., & Ross, D. (2010). *Under corporate skies: A struggle between people, place and profit*. Fremantle, Western Australia: Fremantle Press.

Burke, P. (2006). Disadvantage and stigma: A theoretical framework for associated conditions. In J. Parker & P. Burke (Eds.), *Social work and disadvantage* (pp. 11–26). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Calma, T., & Priday, E. (2011). Putting Indigenous human rights into social work practice. *Australian Social Work, 64*(2), 147–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2011.575920.

Canadian Association of Social Workers. (2005). Code of ethics. Retrieved May 19, 2015, from http://casw-acts.ca/sites/default/files/attachements/CASW_Code%20of%20Ethics.pdf.

Caritas Australia. (n.d.). Disability. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://www.caritas.org.au/learn/global-poverty-issues/disability.

Colby, I. C., Dulmus, C. N., & Sowers, K. M. (2012). *Social work and social policy: Advancing the principles of economic and social justice*. New York: Wiley. Retrieved from Ebook Library http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1106530.

Dorling, D. (2010). *Injustice: Why social inequality persists*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Fejo-King, C. (2011). The national apology to the stolen generations: The ripple effect. *Australian Social Work, 64*(1), 130–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2010.542564.

Ferguson, I. (2007). *Reclaiming social work: Challenging neo-liberalism and promoting social justice*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Fook, J., & Gardner, F. (2007). *Practising critical reflection: A resource handbook*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Frohmader, C. (2014). Fact sheet: Violence against women with disabilities. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://www.pwd.org.au/documents/temp/FS_Violence_WWD%27s.pdf.

Gay, W. C. (2012). Community and diversity. In D. Poe (Ed.), *Communities of peace: Confronting injustice and creating justice* (pp. 3–8). New York: Rodopi.

Go, J. (2013). *Postcolonial sociology*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Goodman, D. (2011). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating privileged groups* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gordon, D., Mack, J., Lansley, S., Main, G., Nandy, S., Patsios, D., … PSE Team. (2013). The impoverishment of the UK: PSE UK first results: Living standards. Retrieved July

22, 2016, from http://www.poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/The_Impoverishment_of_the_UK_PSE_UK_first_results_summary_report_March_28.pdf.

Hamilton, C. (2003). *Growth fetish*. Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Harrell, E. (2007). Black victims of violent crime: Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/bvvc.pdf.

Harro, B. (2000). The cycle of socialization. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castañeda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 15–21). New York and London: Routledge.

Hernandez, K. L. (2017). America's mass deportation system is rooted in racism. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://theconversation.com/americas-mass-deportation-system-is-rooted-in-racism-73426.

Hick, S. F., & Murray, K. (2009). Structural social work. In M. Gray & S. A. Webb (Eds.), *Social work theory and method* (pp. 86–97). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Hosken, N. (2016). Social work, class and the structural violence of poverty. In B. Pease, S. Goldingay, N. Hosken, & S. Nipperess (Eds.), *Doing critical social work: Transformative practices for social justice* (pp. 104–119). Crows Nest, New South Wales, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.). Sexual assault and the LGBTQ community. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://www.hrc.org/resources/sexual-assault-and-the-lgbt-community.

International Federation of Social Workers. (2012, March 3, 2012). Statement of ethical principles. Retrieved 16 June, 2016, from http://ifsw.org/policies/statement-of-ethical-principles/.

International Federation of Social Workers. (2014). Review global definition of social work. Retrieved April 27, 2014, from http://ifsw.org/policies/definition-of-social-work/.

Ife, J. (2013). *Community development in an uncertain world: Vision, analysis and practice*. Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Irwin, J. (2016). Working for equality and difference: (De)constructing heteronormativity. In B. Pease, S. Goldingay, N. Hosken, & S. Nipperess (Eds.), *Doing critical social work: Transformative practices for social justice* (pp. 254–267). Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Jackson, L. M. (2011). *The psychology of prejudice: From attitudes to social action*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Jones, P. (2009). Teaching for change in social work. *Journal of Transformative Education, 7*(1), 8–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344609338053.

Kallen, E. (2004). *Social inequality & social injustice: A human rights approach*. Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Laden, A. S. (2001). *Reasonably radical: Deliberative liberalism and the politics of identity*. New York, USA: Cornell University Press.

Leiter, B. (2015, Winter). Nietzsche's moral and political philosophy. Retrieved October 16, 2018, from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2015/entries/nietzsche-moral-political/.

Lloréns, H. (2016). In Puerto Rico, environmental injustice and racism inflame protests over coal ash. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://theconversation.com/in-puerto-rico-environmental-injustice-and-racism-inflame-protests-over-coal-ash-69763.

MacDonald, D., & Gillis, J. (2017). Sovereignty, indigeneity and biopower: The carceral trajectories of Canada's forced removal of indigenous children and the contemporary prison system. *Sites: New Series, 14*(1), 35–55.

Menzies, K., & Gilbert, S. (2013). Engaging communities. In B. Bennett, S. Green, S. Gilbert, & D. Bessarab (Eds.), *Our voices: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander social work* (pp. 50–72). South Yarra: Palgrave Macmillan.

Montgomery, S. L. (2016). Victory at Standing Rock reflects a failure of US energy and climate policy. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://theconversation.com/victory-at-standing-rock-reflects-a-failure-of-us-energy-and-climate-policy-69881.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2004). Whiteness, epistemology and Indigenous representation. In A. Moreton-Robinson (Ed.), *Whitening race: Essays in social and cultural criticism* (pp. 75–88). Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Moore, B. (1978). *Injustice: The social bases of disobedience & revolt*. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Morley, C. (2008). Teaching critical practice: Resisting structural domination through critical reflection. *Social Work Education, 27*(4), 407–421. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470701379925.

Morley, C. (2012). How does critical reflection develop possibilities for emancipatory change? An example from an empirical research project. *British Journal of Social Work, 42*(8), 1513–1532. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcr153.

Morley, C. (2016). Critical reflection and critical social work. In B. Pease, S. Goldingay, N. Hosken, & S. Nipperess (Eds.), *Doing critical social work: Transformative practices for social justice* (pp. 25–38). Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Mullaly, R. P. (2007). *The new structural social work* (3rd ed.). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

National Association of Social Workers. (2008). Code of ethics of the National Association of social workers. Retrieved August 3, 2017, from https://www.socialworkers.org/pubs/code/code.asp.

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (n.d.). NISVS: An overview of the 2010 findings on victimization by sexual orientation. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/cdc_nisvs_victimization_final-a.pdf.

National Mental Health Consumer & Carer Forum. (2010). NMHCCF advocacy brief: Stigma, discrimination and mental illness in Australia. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://nmhccf.org.au/sites/default/files/docs/final_version_stigma_discrimination.pdf.

Nayar, P. K. (2015).*The postcolonial studies dictionary*. New York, United Kingdom: Wiley.

Nipperess, S., & Clark, S. (2016). Anti-oppressive practice with people seeking asylum in Australia: Reflections from the field. In B. Pease, S. Goldingay, N. Hosken, & S. Nipperess (Eds.), *Doing critical social work: Transformative practices for social justice* (pp. 195–210). Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Noble, C. (2016). Towards critical social work supervision. In B. Pease, S. Goldingay, N. Hosken, & S. Nipperess (Eds.), *Doing critical social work: Transformative practices for social justice* (pp. 39–51). Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

O'Manique, C., & Fourie, P. (2016). Affirming our world: Gender, justice, social reproduction and the sustainable development goals. *Development, 59*(1–2), 121–126. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41301-017-0066-0.

Oxfam. (2017). Oxfam briefing paper: An economy for the 99%. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/bp-economy-for-99-percent-160117-en.pdf.

Oxford Dictionaries. (2017). Injustice. Retrieved April 6, 2017, from https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/injustice.

Pease, B. (2016). Interogating privilege and complicity in the oppression of others. In B. Pease, S. Goldingay, N. Hosken, & S. Nipperess (Eds.), *Doing critical social work: Transformative practices for social justice* (pp. 89–103). Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Pease, B., & Nipperess, S. (2016). Doing critical social work in the neoliberal context: Working on the contradictions. In B. Pease, S. Goldingay, N. Hosken, & S. Nipperess (Eds.), *Doing critical social work: Transformative practice for social justice* (pp. 3–24). Crows Nest, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Pincus, F. L. (2000). Discrimination comes in many forms: Individual, institutional, and structural. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castañeda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 31–35). London and New York: Routledge.

Reavley, N. J., & Jorm, A. F. (2015). Experiences of discrimination and positive treatment in people with mental health problems: Findings from an Australian national survey. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 49*(10), 906–913.

Roberts, J. T., & Parks, B. C. (2007). *A climate of injustice: Global inequality, North-South politics, and climate policy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Robinson, P. H. (2013). *Intuitions of justice and the utility of desert*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rowe, S., Baldry, E., & Earles, W. (2015). Decolonising social work research: Learning from critical Indigenous approaches. *Australian Social Work, 68*(3), 296–308.

Russell, R., Guerry, A. D., Balvanera, P., Gould, R. K., Basurto, X., Chan, K. M. A., ... Tam, J., (2013). Humans and nature: How knowing and experiencing nature affect well-being. *Annual Review of Environmental and Resources, 38,* 473–502. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012312-110838.

Sadurski, W. (1984). Social justice and legal justice. *Law and Philosophy, 3*(3), 329–354. https://doi.org/10.2307/3504657.

SANE. (n.d.). Research bulletin 18: The impact of depression at work. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from https://www.sane.org/images/PDFs/1405_info_rb18.pdf.

Sen, A. K. (1995). *Inequality reexamined*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sennett, R. (2006). *The culture of the new capitalism*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Siderits, M. (2015, Spring). Buddha. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/buddha/.

Singapore Association of Social Workers. (2004). *Singapore Association of Social Workers Code of Professional Ethics* (p. 3). Singapore: Singapore Association of Social Workers.

Stone, O. (Writer). (1987). *Wall street*. In O. Stone, E. Kopeloff, & E. R. Pressman (Producer): 20th Century Fox, Universal Pictures, Warner Bros.

Tong, R. (2009). *Feminist thought: A more comprehensive introduction*. Colorado: Westview Press.

Tully, J. (2008). Modern constitutional democracy and imperialism. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 46,* 461–493.

UNESCO. (2017). Displaced person. Retrieved June 26, 2018, from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/displaced-person-displacement/.

UNHCR. (2014). Statelessness. Retrieved April 6, 2017, from http://www.unhcr.org/547451cc6.html.

UNHCR. (2015). Global trends: Forced displacement in 2015. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://www.unhcr.org/en-au/statistics/unhcrstats/576408cd7/unhcr-global-trends-2015.html.

United Nations. (2015). The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%201).pdf.

Walter, M., Taylor, S., & Habibis, D. (2011). How white is social work in Australia? *Australian Social Work, 64*(1), 6–19.

Wiesel, E. (1999). The perils of indifference. Retrieved April 6, 2017, from http://www.sojust.net/speeches.html.

Wildman, S. M., & Davis, A. D. (2000). Language and silence: Making systems of privilege. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castañeda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings in diversity and social justice* (pp. 50–60). New York and London: Routledge.

World Bank. (2016). *Poverty and shared prosperity 2016: Taking on inequality*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Health Organization. (2016). Violence against women. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/.

World Health Organization. (n.d.). Violence against adults and children with disabilities. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from http://www.who.int/disabilities/violence/en/.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Young, S., & Zubrzycki, J. (2011). Educating Australian social workers in the post-Apology era: The potential offered by a 'Whiteness' lens. *Journal of Social Work, 11*(2), 159–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017310386849.