



ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at <http://www.journalijdr.com>

IJDR

International Journal of Development Research

Vol. 13, Issue, 09, pp. 63694-63699, September, 2023

<https://doi.org/10.37118/ijdr.27142.09.2023>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE, HUNGER, FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

***Martinho Borromeu, Luis Maia, Nicolau Borromeu, Duarte da Costa Barreto, Marciana Almeida Soares and Elda Alves Sarmento**

Senior Researchers of the Faculty of Philosophy and Human Sciences of National University Timor Lorosa'e (UNTL)

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 19th June, 2023

Received in revised form

27th July, 2023

Accepted 20th August, 2023

Published online 29th September, 2023

KeyWords:

Philosophy, Justice, Social Inequality, Hunger, Food Production and distribution.

*Corresponding author:

Martinho Borromeu

ABSTRACT

The article aims to offer philosophical analysis of social justice in relation with hunger and food production. Justice, since the first issue, has been the subject of study both among philosophers and among theologians, politicians and thinkers or legal experts. However, if there are questions about justice, could not be determined what measures are used to determine something is fair or not. Various answers about justice usually never or rarely satisfying so that continues to be debated, so it can be concluded that the various formulations of justice is a relative statement. This issue ultimately encourages many people to take a shortcut by submitting formulation of justice to the legislators and judges who will formulate it based on their own considerations. Debates on this theme involve all ethical issues regarding food production and its distribution in society, due to food sovereignty in capitalist society and agrarian reform projects that are not implemented, there is an industrial production of food, but that doesn't suit everyone. Causing hunger in the most distinct places in capitalist society, specifically in Brazil. Reflecting an entire relationship with social inequality, which does not guarantee the right to food and the lack of a National Policy on Food and Nutritional Security.

Copyright©2023, Marise Ramos de Souza et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: **Martinho Borromeu, Luis Maia, Nicolau Borromeu, Duarte da Costa Barreto, Marciana Almeida Soares and Elda Alves Sarmento. 2023.** "Philosophical analysis of social justice, hunger, food production and distribution". *International Journal of Development Research*, 13, (09), 63694-63699.

INTRODUCTION

In the world, the economic crisis associated with the phenomenon of globalization has negatively impacted the economic conditions and social well-being of all countries, whether they are rich or poor. Particularly in Latin America, the crisis has notably accentuated the problems associated with underdevelopment, mainly poverty, inequality, economic stagnation, unemployment and insecurity. In this context, there are two major scenarios in Latin America that occupy and concern today: the insertion of local economies in the context of globalization in terms of competitive advantages and the stagnation of economic development and the decline in the quality of life of the population due to the world economic crisis. In both scenarios, the national state is obliged to intervene decisively through the implementation of public policies aimed at social change, through an economic policy aimed at social well-being. One of the reasons for the high level of well-being and prosperity in rich countries is the role played by the State as a promoter of economic and social development. It has meant long periods of effort and sacrifice, efforts that basically rested on internal savings, investment in capital and technology and, mainly, on public investment made for the formation of human and physical capital. All of this has translated into high levels of economic progress, well-being and human development for

its population. In contrast, poor and developing countries do not have a sufficient base of economic and political will to allow them to invest the necessary resources to overcome poverty and social backwardness. In particular, Latin America stands out for unjustifiable levels of poverty and social and economic inequality. Currently, the forms of space production that guarantee the growth and survival of capitalism in most Latin American countries are focused on the primary sector, a result of the advance in commodity production and large-scale mining. Both constitute dominant productive forms in the configuration of the Latin American space. These are not linear processes, nor are they unambiguous, nor is their continuity guaranteed. Both for the crisis that has affected the world economy since 2008 (or even before), and for the social resistance to this model of functioning on a planetary scale. The world economy, although it overcame the threat of the Great Depression in 2013, lives what the Nobel Prize in Economics 2001, Joseph Stiglitz (2014, p. 4) defines as the Great decadence, such as the inexorable decline in average income, 50% unemployed youth in Greece and Spain, continuation of austerity policies with their consequent recessive effect and, jointly, the slowdown in growth in emerging. However, the accelerated expansion of commodity production (such as soybeans in Latin America and the World) 2 generates multiple positive expectations, obscuring or silencing the respective criticisms. And apparently this puts us before the following dilemma: the soy boom, and concomitantly the agribusiness, 3 the key that will allow

many countries in Latin America and the poorest areas of the world to generate a new type of development and raising half or more of their respective populations? This is an encouraging prospect for the satisfaction of a need as basic as access to food? In fact, we consider the result to be the reverse. But this forces us to redo a long way to unmask (as much as possible) the beliefs and statements that associate this productive boom in agriculture with the solution of a good part of the problems of hunger and poverty in the countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa.

Likewise, it is argued that all this is very viable for Latin America, given its natural resources according to this new design of capitalist accumulation. To achieve this desired development, it would be enough to respect and follow the new rules. (productive, technological, commercial, institutional) dominant on a planetary scale. However, another is the panorama when we observe that the hunger and energy unsustainability, present on the world stage, come from the model of capitalist growth and accumulation; whose uses, increasingly intensive, regressive and degradation of space, territory and its resources, are the result of the concentration of wealth, with its repeated crises on accumulation. In Latin America in particular (but also in other countries of Asia and Africa) since the new millennium, capital appreciation has been generated through increasingly intensive forms of the exploitation and export of primary goods, such as crops associated with biofuels - soybeans, sugar cane, corn, palm-hydrocarbons-gas and oil - and metals and minerals - gold, silver, copper, bauxite and other minerals. In all these cases, prices are set internationally and tend to have a sustained growth that leads to food crises concomitant with their consequences of hunger, which usually precede crises later recognized as financial, energy and economic crises, with widespread recessions.

Justice: Theories that examine the issue of justice in depth have been carried out since ancient Greece. The concept of justice at that time, comes from thinking about the attitude or behavior of humans towards each other and the natural environment. This was done by philosophers. The essence of various philosophical thoughts consists of various objects that can be divided into two groups. First, the material object is everything that exists or that may exist, that is, the whole, both natural concrete and non-material abstract such as soul or spiritual, including abstract values such as truth values, justice values, the essence of democracy and so on. The second form of the object is the point of view or the purpose of thinking and investigating material objects, which is to understand deeply, to find the truth or right of what is being investigated as a material object, Nursyam (1998, p. 45). Theories that examine the issue of justice in depth have been carried out since ancient Greece. The concept of justice at that time, comes from thinking about the attitude or behavior of man towards his neighbor and the natural environment. This was done by philosophers. The essence of various philosophical thoughts consists of various objects that can be divided into two groups. The first material object is everything that exists or that may exist, that is, the whole, both natural concrete and non-material abstract such as soul or spiritual, including abstract values such as truth values, justice values, the essence of democracy and so on. The second forma object is the point of view or purpose of thinking and investigating material objects, namely understanding deeply, finding the truth or right of what is being investigated as a material object, Rawls (1971), said” Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a semilar liberty of theirs”.

In line with the first principle above, Plato said that individual justice, the basic characteristics of justice must be found in the state, by saying that: “let us enquire first what it is the cities, then we will examine it in the single man, looking for the likeness of the larger in the shape of the smaller, Gie (1982, p. 22). Although Plato said so, it does not mean that individual justice is synonymous with justice in the state. It's just that Plato saw that justice arises because of adjustments that give a place that is in harmony with the parts that make up a society. Justice is realized in a society when each member performs well

according to his or her ability to function according to or in harmony with him. At this point of view, Plato emphasized the importance of harmony in the life of the nation and state.

If Plato emphasized his theory on harmony or alignment, Aristotle emphasized his theory on balance or proportion. According to him, in the country everything must be directed towards noble ideals, namely goodness and kindness must be seen through justice and truth. The emphasis on balance or proportion in Aristotle's theory of justice, can be seen from what he does that the equality of rights must be the same among the same people, Rapar (1991, p.82). What this means is that on the one hand it is true to say that justice also means equal rights, but on the other hand it must also be understood that justice also means unequal rights. Aristotle's theory of justice is based on the principle of equality. In the modern version of this theory, it is formulated with the expression that justice is carried out when things that are alike are required equally and things that are unequal are treated unequally. Theoretically, Plato's concept of justice is based on the philosophy of idealism, while Aristotle's concept of justice departs from the philosophy of realism. Plato's philosophy bases itself on the nature of ideas that are absolute and eternal. The foundation of his philosophy is to believe in and fully accept the real world as objectivity. In this philosophical view, the real world is fully accepted as a totality which is the source of all that exists, Rapar (1993, P. 92). The real world is hierarchically arranged and related and forms a totality in which meaning and order can be achieved by humans through their minds. Reason is a tool for knowing and this knowledge provides norms regarding good and bad that are useful for humans, as Plato said, justice is an orderly arrangement of people who control themselves, Rapar (1993, P. 102). Aristotle, on the other hand, emphasized his philosophy on consciousness, meaning that in Aristotle's view, the central point is the awareness that exists in a thinking subject.

The second is the difference principle. Rawls (1971, p.303) said that: “Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage, and (b) attached to positions and office open to all”. This second principle is a modification of the first principle which requires equality for everyone. This modification applies if it benefits everyone. Apart from that, this principle also appears to be aimed at modern society which already has a complete order, even though the intention is to provide equality in employment opportunities or to provide an equal and equal role, however, however, it has been shown that there is serious concern, not to forget and leaving other people who find it difficult to obtain positions and opportunities in economic activities. So socio-economic differences must be regulated so as to benefit less fortunate citizens.

In relation to the second principle above, Miller (1999, p.1) said:

“In order for an action to be fair, it is necessary to pay attention to workload, work performance, duties and responsibilities, rights and obligations of each individual who will receive services from other people who want to give or do something for him. The elements above refer to the definition of the concept of justice which says that give everyone what is due. For example, in the teaching and learning process, if there is a student entitled to get a score of ten, then give him a value of ten. And vice versa, if there is a student who deserves a zero score, then give him a zero score. This kind of action may trigger a negative reaction from students who get a zero score, with a thousand and one self-justifying arguments. Teachers are reviled and branded as unfair people. Faced with this kind of condition, the teacher should argue back by saying that he has taken a fair action by giving each student what is due. But if there are still students who still feel that it is unfair, it is a matter of feeling, and not action. The measure of justice does not depend on one's feelings, but depends on the considerations and actions of the person giving justice. Likewise, if a farmer is entitled to receive a subsidy of five kilos of rice, he will also be given rice in a fair amount for him”.

The third is the principle of equality to obtain opportunities for everyone, namely economic inequality must be arranged in such a way as to provide opportunities for everyone to enjoy it. Regarding this third principle Friedmann (1971, p. 385) said:

“In a formal and general sense equality, is a postulate of justice. Aristoteles “distributive justive” demands the equal treatment of those equal before the law. This like any general formula of justice is however, applicable to any form of government or society; for it leaves it to a particular legal order to determine who are equal before the law... Equality in rights, as postulated by the extension of individual rights, ini principle, to all citizens distinct from a privileged minority”.

Christman (2002, p.62), supports the third principle by saying that “justice demands equality. Thus, we must give each person what is due. If an employer pays salaries to 80 people, except for 2 people, then the employer does not deserve to be called a fair person. The concept of justice in modern times is characterized by the development of thoughts about freedom, among others, the emergence of liberalism, which is a trend that grew in the Western world at the beginning of the XVII century AC. This school bases itself on the values in the ethical teachings of the Stoic school, especially individualism, moral sanction and the use of reason. In the field of politics, the conception of democratic government is adopted that can guarantee the achievement of freedom. The tradition of liberalism strongly emphasizes individual independence. The term liberalism is closely related to freedom, the starting point on freedom is the main line in all liberal thought, Lyman (1987, p. 63).

In contrast to liberals, adherents of utilitarianism reject the use of the idea of natural law and The Voice of reason in their theories. The concept of justice in this stream is based on the principle of benefit and human interests. Justice is characterized as a virtue that is entirely determined by its usefulness, that is, its ability to produce the greatest pleasure for many people. This theory was criticized by anti-utilitarianism pioneered by Dworkin dan Nozick. According to them utilitarianism that prioritizes the welfare of the majority, causes minorities or individuals whose preferences are not represented by the majority within a country to be ignored and as a result they are harmed or deprived of their rights, Rawls (1971, p. 43). For utilitarian opponents, Justice rejects the argument that some people's loss of Liberty can be justified on the principle of greater benefits enjoyed by others. Therefore, in a just society, the freedom of equal citizens remains unchanged, the rights guaranteed by Justice are not subject to political bargaining or to the consideration of social interests, Rawls (1971, p. 48).

The same understanding is expressed by Rudolph (1967, p. 96) defining justice as: “redressing a wrong, finding a balance between legitimate but conflicting interest. This definition illustrates that the value of justice is inherent in the purpose of law. The idea of justice was reflected by the decree against the commission of cruel punishments, prohibiting the punishment for the second time of the same offense. Reject the application of legal regulations that impose criminal against acts committed before there are regulations that regulate them, reject the establishment of laws that abolish the rights and property of a person. Another theory stating that justice is inherent to the purpose of law was put forward by Tourtoulon who firmly stated “lex injusta non est lex” i.e. unjust laws are not laws. on the contrary, the idea of justice demands the granting to everyone the right of protection and self-defense, Paul Siegart, et. all (1986, p.22). The theories put forward by experts, in general, include freedom, opportunity and the power of opinion and prosperity. Various definitions of justice that point to the above, among others, can be seen from the notion of justice, as formulated in The Encyclopedia Americana (1972, p.263):

“the constant and perpetual disposition to render every man his due”; “the end of civil society; “the right to obtain a hearing and decision by a court which is free of prejudice and improper influence”; “all recognized equitable rights as well as

technical legal right”; “the dictate of right according to the consent of mankind generally”; “conformity with the principle of integrity, rectitude and just dealing”.

The Poor: One of the most debated problems in the field of economics, politics, philosophy and ethics is poverty, understood as a socioeconomic condition of multidimensional and complex nature that limits the well-being of people and the economic development of countries. Poverty can be addressed from a disciplinary and multidisciplinary perspective, as well as from a theoretical and practical point of view. In a traditional way, those individuals, families and groups of people whose monetary resources in comparison with a predetermined line of well-being, they are so limited that they force them to be excluded from a minimally acceptable way of life. As can be seen, monetary income is the variable commonly used for the measurement of poverty, also known as absolute poverty. This criterion of analysis of the problem constitutes one of the main limitations of public programs against poverty implemented by countries, since reducing its purpose to the fact that the poor have a monetary income that puts them above a predetermined poverty, neglects several determinants and conditioning factors of the problem, since poverty is a multidimensional and complex problem in the nature of.

In this way, there is a complex causality of poverty that goes beyond the simple concept of income, because it has a multifactorial character, being the result of the combination of macro, micro and contingent factors (shocks) faced by families and people. In particular, there are two forms of manifestation of poverty whose determinants are different: chronic and transient. Chronic poverty is associated with low endowment of assets in a seizure of social services linked to social processes that aim to attribute meaning to it, implies thinking, first of all, about the particularities of such processes and the strategically positioned social subjects of the home. By its structural nature, it tends to perpetuate itself in the long run. For its part, temporary or temporary poverty is identified with the life cycle of families and with socioeconomic and health shocks they face; although it constitutes the largest component of the overall poverty situation that a country faces, its duration is short-term. Therefore, it is necessary to identify the determining variables of the input and output processes. Poverty, as well as the factors that determine and condition chronic poverty, understood as a state of permanent poverty, which is related to structural limitations (education, training, health situation, etc.), as well as transient poverty, associated with a temporary and temporary situation, such as loss of work. For all this, it must be recognized that the main methodological problem of studies on poverty in the world is the prevalence of static approaches, basically focused on the analysis of variable income and some social deficiencies. Therefore, the measurement of poverty, the product of these linear investigations, explains neither the nature nor the origin of the problem itself, since it only quantifies the number of poor families and people according to their income level versus a welfare line and a basket of disabilities previously determined. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the problem from a complex and multidimensional and holistic perspective, where the simple number is not the expression of the reality experienced by those who suffer. Therefore, it is urgent to apply analysis methodologies that allow identifying its origin and dynamics and, thus, propose the design of more effective public policies against poverty.

Inequality: From an economic point of view, inequality refers to how a person's income in the country or region is distributed among the population. To do this, an indicator is used the one known as “Gini coefficient”, a parameter that measures the level of inequality in the income distribution on a scale ranging from 0 to 1, depending on the degree of concentration. In this way, a coefficient of 0 would be indicative of the absence of inequality, while a parameter of 1 would mean a total concentration of wealth. Historically, in all countries of the world the Gini coefficient observed an increasing trend, regardless of its degree of development and ideological orientation. A) for example, over the past 30 years, China's Gini coefficient has gone

from 0.27 to 0.48; over Brazil it remains at 0.50; in Sweden from 0.20 to 0.25; and in the United States from 0.30 to 0.38. Even the coefficient on a world scale (0.70) shows an alarming concentration of Fortune. Poverty and inequality go hand in hand, which translates into economic, social and economic instability. The policy in the countries, as well as low human development. This is evident, since the growth in income inequality of the population limits access to health and education and fuels poverty and insecurity. Theoretically, inequality and poverty have an ambiguous economic relationship, because although those who concentrate wealth tend to invest more based on economic incentives, large disparities in the distribution of income among the population can become economic inefficiency, since a population with limited purchasing power does not contribute to the formation of the domestic market.

However, the most obvious effect of inequality is that it closes access to education, health and other basic satisfactions that constitute the pillars of human capital and productivity of countries. All this translates into high levels of poverty and insecurity, so common in Latin America. Thomas Piketty (2014) in his famous book *Capital in the 21st century*, he posits that the distribution of wealth is currently one of the most debated polemical issues within contemporary political economy, and that debate on the subject is more loaded with theoretical speculation and political and social prejudices than with objective information and facts. For this reason, he argues that it is time for economists, researchers, and policymakers to put the issue of inequality at the center of Economic Analysis, just as nineteenth-century economists did. Income distribution ranked second in economic priorities as an optimistic view of the economy pointed to a self-balancing economy and a decrease in inequalities in the long run, which as is evident has not happened and will not happen in a capitalist system that aims only at profit and the accumulation of capital by the few. This increasingly accentuated relationship requires a large mass of people without income, to meet such ambitions in this production model.

The famine: According to the World Bank, in the world there are 1.4 billion people in poverty, whose daily income is less than 1.25 dollars per day, a figure insufficient to acquire the most basic food for survival and, therefore, they go hungry. Said figure constitutes the official limit established by said multinational body to classify those who are in conditions of extreme poverty or food poverty. Thus, a quarter of the world's population lives in this condition. In this way, hunger and poverty in countries and in their regions feed each other, constituting both sides of the same coin. Hunger is a deplorable word, a rare and much talked about concept. In the words of Caparrós, “we know hunger and we have no idea what hunger is (2014, p. 21). The issue of hunger that has become common and is a source of social economic and political conflict. That is why politicians, technicians and bureaucrats responsible for the government of rich and poor countries, as well as multinational organizations prefer to talk about synonyms: malnutrition, malnutrition, food poverty, extreme poverty, food insecurity. From the point of view of economic and political science, the problem of hunger is approached impersonally by government politicians and policymakers, multinational and regional institutions and organizations. In this way, the question of hunger in the world and what to do with it becomes an abstract topic: hunger, fighting hunger, reducing hunger. This abstract view of the problem does not allow us to see that behind hunger there are human beings who experience it; this hunger does not exist without the existence of those who suffer it. Finally, the important thing is not hunger, but the people who suffer (Caparrós, 2014). The use of abstract and technical terms to refer to hunger and its consequences avoids the emotion and human implications of the term itself, allowing anti-hunger policies to specify their object of study. In this way, it is common to hear the terms such as malnutrition and lack of food. The result of their investigations and studies on the problem, are general technical documents, understandable only to a few; documents full of purpose and good intentions on an issue faced by millions of people in the world. The issue of hunger has become a cliché, a reflection of poverty and a purpose of well-being. Therefore, hunger is assumed not in terms of an individual event, but as a general situation, a state

of affairs, a conjunctural crisis. In this way, the hungry individual becomes part of the statistics, of the numbers. According to Caparrós (2014), the issue of hunger, especially in Western countries, has become a banal case, an *Entelechy*. In this way, hunger would be a metaphor because it is not a subject for debate: it does not produce reflection because it has no objection. Speaking out against hunger is laughable because no one is in favor of it. Hunger produces the illusion that common causes are possible, that we will be unanimous, that all together move forward: “all Against Hunger” (Caparrós, 2014, p. 507).

In short, it can be argued that hunger is the ultimate metaphor for poverty: its most indisputable expression. Poverty is relative, for some it is poverty which for others would be a relief and for others absolute misery. Hunger, on the other hand, is not debatable. Hunger is a more indisputable expression of poverty, point at which any debate for hunger is poverty that does not admit opinions, does not admit delays (Caparrós, 2014). Among the technical terms established to refer to hunger is malnutrition as for the structural and most severe degree of hunger, the so-called acute conjunctural malnutrition, a technicality with which the problem of hunger is usually called. Since its fundamental cause are atmospheric phenomena, earthquakes, floods, droughts, pests, etc. It is thought that because it is a fortuitous event, the problem is beyond the control of governments and therefore there is no direct responsibility from them, leaving its solution to at the expense of world well-being and the goodwill and political interests of the rulers. Structural malnutrition, or structural hunger is another thing, there if there is direct responsibility of multinational organizations and their directors, of states and their governors and public policy makers (policy makers). Here we are no longer dealing with a natural catastrophe, but with a chronic problem of pressing and permanent hunger, about which little is said and no one wishes to recognize in its entirety. That is why structural hunger, structural poverty is spoken of in numbers, in cold numbers. Comparatively, hunger is easy to justify, it is enough to blame the unpredictability of nature, the disasters of war. Structural hunger is chronic in nature, perpetuated over time, it is not a fortuitous and fleeting situation, it is a condition that is transmitted from generation to generation, from the parents of children and especially in poor and underdeveloped countries. As it is common to refer to in numbers, it is estimated that in the world about 2 billion human beings suffer; this is equivalent to one third of the inhabitants of the Earth. The United Nations, when proclaiming its Millennium Goals in 2000, established as its first purpose to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger in the world. According to the said organism, the extremely poor are those who do not have income and/or consumption of daily food for US\$ 1.25. In a world characterized by abundance and wealth, the presence of hunger is totally unjustifiable. From an economic point of view, it is extremely absurd, as those who suffer tend to be unproductive at work, have learning difficulties and their health is seriously impaired.

In this sense, hunger negatively influences people's capabilities and freedoms (Sen, 1999). The ideologues of neoliberalism imposed the idea that the problem of hunger lies in the insufficiency of food production, and not in matters of distribution and speculation of food. In this way, the responsibility corresponds to the climatic, unpredictable causes of nature. There is no explicit recognition that the root cause of extreme poverty is implicit in the foundations of orthodox liberalism that encourages financial speculation on staple foods, policy liberalization wages, income concentration, and thus inequality and poverty. Hunger is transmitted between generations and creates poverty traps from which it is difficult to get out. By limiting the productivity of individuals, hunger also causes limitations economic growth of countries and is one of the main factors of political and social instability in the world. This is the main concern of the countries, and therefore the struggle. The fight against hunger concerns everyone, poor and rich (Caparrós, 2014). Hunger, in addition to the social and economic costs it represents, mainly means the daily death of thousands of human beings. Ban Kin Moon, Secretary General of the United Nations summarized this situation in the following figures: every four seconds a person dies of hunger, malnutrition and associated diseases, 17 people every minute, 25

thousand per day, nine million per year. These figures are alarming for everyone. For this reason, the governments of countries, experts and multinational organizations continually speak out against the main causes of hunger, according to them: natural disasters (floods, storms, plagues and droughts), overexploitation of the environment and antiquated agricultural practices, climate change and its obvious consequences (deforestation, soil erosion, salinization and desertification), conflicts of human origin (Wars, human displacements, etc.), the lack of Agrarian infrastructure in most poor countries (agricultural machinery, seeds, irrigation, warehouses, roads), the corruption of the governments of poor countries and, finally, financial speculation that increases food prices in the world. Ultimately, all this leads to the presence of hunger and poverty traps in countries.

In this way, the poor have hunger and their hunger imprisons them in their poverty. Notwithstanding the above, everyone agrees agreement on the fact that the Earth produces more than enough food to meet the needs of the world's population. In this sense, Sen (1981), Nobel Prize in Economics in 1998, believes that the problem of hunger that families suffer is due to the lack of access to food, not that there is not enough food; that is, it is a problem of distribution, access, right to food and not of production or availability of food. This claim is validated with experience history, where many of the world's worst famines have occurred in contexts of normal food production worldwide. In other words, hunger is not only a function of the production and supply of food, but more than anything, of its distribution, of its access to it by the population. It is always easier and politically correct to blame nature for the problems of hunger, than to recognize that the issue is a problem of distribution and right of access something so Elementary for human life. This perspective necessarily leads to the analysis of the relationship between poverty-hunger-inequality processes under new methodological approaches, capable of covering the whole and the parts of the problem, that is, under a complex and transdisciplinary perspective.

The latin american context: According to Galeano (2008), in our oppressed regions, called developing countries by multinational organizations, the system has multiplied hunger and fear, wealth continues to concentrate and poverty to spread. The International equipment continues to work: Countries at the service of goods, men at the service of things. In this way, the international division of Labor consists of some countries specialize in winning and others in losing. In this region of the world, which we now call Latin America, he was precocious: he specialized in losing. Therefore, Galeano (2008) he says that this is a region of Open Veins, and the question is: is Latin America a region of the world condemned to humiliation and poverty? Convicted by whom? God's fault, nature's fault? The oppressive climate, the inferior races? The religion, the customs? Is not misfortune the product of history, made by man and which by men can therefore be undone?

Hoje, a América Latina aparece para o mundo como um verdadeiro enigma. Nos anos sessenta, as previsões previam que esses países teriam um futuro de progresso sustentado devido à sua excelente dotação de recursos naturais e recursos humanos, boa localização geográfico, comparando-o, por isso, com o Sudeste Asiático. No entanto, o prognóstico não foi cumprido de forma alguma. Isso se chama o enigma da América Latina, o que aconteceu?

There is no very clear explanation for this situation, when this contradiction is observed between the potentialities, the possibilities and this overwhelming poverty that permeates the countryside and the city of almost all countries in the region. In a context of economic backwardness, poverty and inequality, corruption in Latin America is an obstacle to development and a central cause of poverty and extreme poverty in the Society of our time. In this sense, according to Kliksberg (2007) there is a thirst for Ethics in large areas of the world, especially in Latin America, so it recommends putting in place implementation of public policies capable of combating corruption, inequality, iniquity and social injustice.

The role of inequality is central in Latin America, there is no future with great inequalities, so the role of the state is fundamental; however, there is a general devaluation of public policies. This idea propagated by neoliberal economics that it is possible without the state, and that it is a historical waste, that the best government. It is the non-governmental, it is deeply impregnated in our countries. This has led to the belief that without public policy instruments, it is possible to combat the core problems of poverty and inequality. In this way, in Latin America the institutional framework has been reduced indiscriminately. The public service, the civil service is discredited and a good number of public policies of a social and economic nature. Currently, Latin America presents a generalized picture of what is known as "paradoxical poverty", because the alarming. The poverty figures do not correspond to the privileged allocation of natural resources of the region, and not even with the levels of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Per capita. Such is the paradox of broad levels of poverty amid potential wealth. In short, in Latin America a development model that integrates ethical dimensions is needed, since today it is not enough to limit oneself to the laws of the market and the neoliberal economy. Solidarity must be fostered, since a development model that does not take into account persistent social inequalities will not be able to prosper at all. In this context, in Latin America there is a thirst for ethics, there is a need to overcome the division between ethics and economics are present today. In this sense, Kliksberg argues that despite the social and economic inequalities characteristic of the Latin American region, the results of the neoliberal economic tests applied in the eighties and nineties, it is possible to create a new reality by giving a human and ethical profile to growth. He argues that economic growth is meaningless if it does not translate into an inclusion and dignity of the great majorities (2007).

Final Considerations

We agree with Harvey (2009, pp. 64-116) when he states that the root cause of all crises in the system is excessive accumulation or overcapacity, that is, the impossibility of profitable reinvestment that makes it difficult to carry out the process of expanded accumulation (growth). The various dynamic centers of capital accumulation compete on the world stage due to strong currents of over possible accumulation and may they all succeed. Even if this introduces crises of localized devaluation, or, if not, geopolitical struggles arise between the regions (Harvey, 2009, p. 105). Since the beginning of the global crisis of 2006-2008 it has become more evident throughout the world that capitalism is a system of social relations instituted to legalize the oppression of the majority by a privileged minority. What is even more noticeable when we find out that five years after the peak of the financial crisis, American billionaires are doing better than ever, according to data published by Forbes magazine. The total fortune of the 400 richest Americans is currently at 2 trillion dollars (1.5 billion euros), about 300 billion more than the previous year and more than twice as much as ten years ago. In short, speculative practices are present both in the case of oil and also in the case of food and appear before and after each crisis, at the origin and its consequences. Rising food prices, for example, preceded the 2008 financial crisis. And then this same financial crisis led investors to turn to the futures market for raw materials-rice, wheat, corn and soybeans - as they speculated on the possibility of rising prices and more insurance in this market. This has increased food prices even more than it has since the 2006 food crisis (Holt-Giménez;Patel, 2012).

The speculative operation and interactions that occur between different sectors of economic activity are clearly reflected in the following example, the deregulation of the banking system introduced in the 1980s and 1990s allowed banks to invest in other areas of the economy, such as in raw materials. Commodity traders also began investing in financial markets. Traditional agricultural firms have developed investment banking branches, while traditional financial services firms have become importers of raw materials. All these intersections made it difficult to control food speculation and did not allow preventing a crisis in one sector of the economy (such as

mortgage bankruptcy) from affecting other sectors (Holt-Giménez; Patel, 2012). Actions linked to financial speculation were present in the two world crises with the greatest repercussion in recent history (that of the 1970s and that of 2006-2008). In the first, because it was she who gave rise to and consolidated the financial system in the central role that it currently plays in the economic context. And in the second, because the succession of bankruptcies of financial institutions and large banks was the trigger that showed that behind the bailouts and bankruptcies were hiding doubts and fraudulent financial operations. In the first, speculation around the price of oil triggered the crisis. In the second, speculation crosses numerous sectors, in general, linked to commodities (food, oil, biofuels); although it was in the real estate sector the first where speculative action. Although it is often argued that the global crisis begins in the United States in late 2007 or early 2008, it is not too risky to assume that its origins date back to 2006, when a huge flow of speculative capital was operated that promoted the rise in food prices and the food crisis in the World Cup of 2006. This speculative modality was partially concealed. Rather, this same crisis has been globally visible when it reaches Wall Street, The Financial District of New York, the center of power and the world, when it affects the daily life and life of the richest among the rich and when its pattern of consumption and accumulation is at stake (even more so if it expands later, as it did, to other First World countries - Europe, Japan and other developed countries).

In this context, Latin America adds its specific problem, which is that of acute and persistent social inequality, which in the crisis becomes more evident and cannot be combated, despite having had more than five years of unprecedented growth (2003-2011: annual average of 5%, except for 2009 in which the global crisis impacted, generating an average fall of 2%-Manzanal, 2013, p.28). Regarding this issue and the food and energy crisis, Da Silva, Gómez and Castañeda (2008) argue about Latin America in two different images in the same region: on the one hand, a sustained growth that we have not seen since the 1970s, between 2003 and 2007 the economy grew by almost 5% on average. On the other hand, the emergence of a set of new factors, global transformations such as changing climate patterns, rising food prices and the energy crisis, which pose a risk to food security and poverty eradication. Two realities that come together due to imbalances between growth and rural poverty, which makes our region stand out as the most unequal on the planet. In the face of exacerbated consumption, incalculable wealth and growth (which the crisis itself seems to drive) causes the majority of the world's population to be in poverty or underconsumption. Social situations with such obvious injustices put democracy at risk, promoting clashes between neoconservatives and resistance movements, for power and territory. The future is a social construct that is difficult to predict and direct. Even so, part of the reality described leads us to ask ourselves: Are we reaching the end of the cycle? Are they feasible in the medium term profound changes in the economic, political-institutional and sociocultural model? These are very difficult questions to visualize and recognize. Finally, we have no doubt that struggles and resistances in defense of basic resources (such as health, land, water, biodiversity, housing) of identity and culture will play a central role. In this framework, the research more equality, less inequality, will constitute the engine of the political struggle. And we think it is possible that this is the only open way to face the speculation and financialization of the economy that translates into social and territorial expropriation. If so, surely a new reality will open up before us.

REFERENCES

- Caparrós, M. El hambre. Argentina, Ed. Planeta, 2014.
- Cepal. La hora de la igualdad. Brechas por cerrar, caminos por abrir. Santiago, Naciones Unidas, 2010.
- Christman, John. 2002. Social and political philosophy: a contemporary introduction, London: Routledge.
- Da Silva, G., S. Gómez e R. Castañeda. Boom agrícola y persistencia de la pobreza rural en América Latina. Revista Española de Estudios Agrosociales y Pesqueros, N° 218, 2008.
- Fao. El estado de la inseguridad alimentaria en el mundo. Crisis económicas: repercusiones y enseñanzas extraídas”, wfp/fao, Roma, 2009. Disponible em ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/012/i0876s/i0876s.pdf
- Fao Statistical Yearbook 2013. World Food and Agriculture, Roma.
- Fernández Nadal, E. e G. D. Silnik. Entrevista a Franz Joseph Hinkelammert. Cuadernos del Pensamiento Crítico Latinoamericano, N° 43, 2012.
- Galeano, E. Las venas abiertas de América Latina. México: Siglo XXI Editores, 2008.
- Gie The Liang. 1982. *Teori-teori Keadilan*. Yogyakarta : Sumber Sukses, P.22.
- Harvey, D. O novo imperialismo, 3ª ed., San Pablo, Edições Loyola, 2009.
- Holt-Giménez, E. e R. Patel. ¡Rebeliones alimentarias! La crisis y el hambre por la justicia, México, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas/Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2012.
- Kliksberg, B. Ética y desarrollo. La relación marginada. Argentina: El Ateneo-BID, 2007.
- Krugman, P. ¿Una nueva crisis en puerta?”. Ieco Clarín, 2 de febrero 2014, Buenos Aires, 2014.
- Lyman, Tower Sargent, 1987. *Ideologi-Ideologi Politik Kontemporer*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Manzanal, M. Poder y desarrollo. Dilemas y desafíos frente a um futuro ¿cada vez más desigual?”, en Manzanal, M. y M. Ponce, 2013.
- _____. La desigualdad del desarrollo? Controversias y disyuntivas del desarrollo rural en el norte argentino, Buenos Aires, Ediciones ciccus, 2013.
- _____. e González, F. Soberanía alimentaria y agricultura familiar. Oportunidades y desafíos del caso argentino”, Realidad Económica, 255, diciembre, Buenos Aires, iade, pp. 51-67, 2010.
- Miller, David. 1999. Principles of social justice,, London: Harvard University Press.
- Mohammad Nursyam. 1998. “Penjabaran Filsafat Pancasila Dalam Filsafat Hukum. Sebagai Landasan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional”. Disertasi. Universitas Airlangga Surabaya, p.45.
- Piketty, T. El capital en el siglo XXI. México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2014.
- Rapar, J.H. 1991. *Filsafat Politik Plato*. Jakarta : Rajawali Press.
- Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*, Massachussets: The Bellnap Press of Havard University Press, p. 310.
- Rudolf, Heimanson. 1967. *Dictionary of Political Science and Law*. Dobbs Fery: oceana Publication.
- Sachs, I. Bionergias: Uma janela de oportunidade. In: Abramovay, R. (org.), Biocombustíveis. A energia da controversia, San Pablo, Editora Senac. Revista de ciencias sociales, segunda época N° 25, otoño de 2014, pp. 27-44, 2009.
- Sen, A. Bienestar, justicia y mercado. Serie Pensamiento Contemporáneo, Ira. Reimp, España: Paidós, 1981.
- _____. Desarrollo y Libertad. México: Editorial Planeta, 1992.
- Siegart, Paul. 1986. *The Lawfull Right of Mankind an Introduction to the International Legal Code of Human Right*. New York: oxford University Press.
- Stiglitz, J. Economía mundial: el Gran Decaimiento. Ieco Clarín, 2014, Buenos Aires.
- Svampa, M. Consenso de los Commodities y lenguajes de valoración en América Latina. Nueva Sociedad, N° 244, marzo-abril, 2013.
- The Encyclopedia Americana, Volume 16 Americana corporation, New York, 1972
- Un Millennium Project. Investing in Development. A practical plan to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, uk and usa, 2005.
- Von der Weid, J. M. Agrocombustíveis: solução ou problema? In: Abramovay, R. (org.), Biocombustíveis. A energia da controversia, San Pablo, Editora Senac, 2009.
- W. Friedmann. 1971. *The State and The Rule of Law in Mix Economy*. London : Steven & Son.