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**Criminal Justice**

**Should Unjust Social Conditions Reduce Criminal Responsibility?**

The connection between social and criminal justice brings up significant concerns about justice and accountability in the legal system. Therefore, this brings us to one of the most essential controversies: whether other social conditions, such as injustice or oppression, should lessen criminal responsibility. This presentation tends to support the integration of the criminal justice system with social justice, where Bazelon (1981) postulates that social injustice is at the root of criminal justice and should, therefore, be considered when tracing blame. However, this approach is more extended than successful in covering more enormous societal wrongs and, simultaneously, being a threat to individualism and legal frameworks. It will compare and contrast the two sides of this argument in this essay and analyze whether or not including social justice approaches to criminal justice would boost or reduce crime.

**Con Position: The Risks of Reducing Criminal Responsibility**

Reducing criminal responsibility due to unfair socioeconomic circumstances runs the danger of weakening accountability and the deterrent power of the legal system (Jorgensen, 2022). Rules and regulations are made to maintain social order and as well define what is right and wrong. The cases should not be allowed to justify criminal conduct because doing so may mislead others that it is okay to engage in unlawful activities in given circumstances and thus reduce personal responsibility. Such an attitude might erode the rule of law and lead to the growth of criminality as the negative implications of criminal behavior are reduced. If people believe that their social circumstances can decrease their legal responsibility, the effectiveness of legal penalties may be severely diminished.

Studies reveal that there is a relationship between crime and conditions of poverty and the absence of many educational opportunities. Crime is indeed significantly related to class, race, and poverty, but one's environment does not predetermine one's behavior. For example, statistics presented by the U. S Department of Justice also reveal that even though youths from disadvantaged neighborhoods are more involved in criminal activities, the majority of them are not involved in any criminal activities (Gramlich, 2024). It shows us again that an individual's free will and morality play a massive role in the crime. Lowering accountability based on social conditions may prove cyclical in criminal matters as it might eliminate the deterrence formulated by law and possibly trigger a higher rotation of crime.

Moreover, the proposal to incline criminal responsibility depending upon the social conditions would lead to inequality in the implementation of the law and a violation of equal justice. Enhancements for violations based on distinctions in private history also threaten sentencing fairness in the current system. Prison sentences are already problematic for the legitimacy of the justice system. The existence of a legal framework that does not consider a suspect responsible for a crime depending on his or her social status may result in a lack of confidence in the law by the public, hence disrespect of the same. In terms of accountability, sustaining its consistency and relevance is crucial since equal administration of justice cannot be achieved where some people are in prosperous socioeconomic status compared to others (Rastan, 2022).

**Pro Position: Addressing Social Justice to Reduce Crime**

Proponents contend that considering unfair socioeconomic circumstances while assessing criminal liability might result in a more compassionate and just legal system. Most criminals are deeply impacted by different aspects of their surroundings, including poverty, discrimination, and scarce or nonexistent opportunities. These factors, as reported by Bazelon (1981), compromise the autonomy of choice, noting that criminal responsibility should be examined from the broader socio-cultural, economic, and environmental perspective. When the concept of criminal justice is connected with social justice, the legal system can look for more than punitive solutions to criminal justice issues.

Restorative sentencing and restorative justice theory claim that recidivism can be reduced through a correctional intervention that is centered on the psychosocial background of the offender. For instance, some nations, such as Norway, have adopted criminal justice principles based on social justice, where the rehabilitation of offenders is encouraged (Jones, 2021). Reduced recidivism rates explain that Norway's justice system outweighs the punitive framework of other countries, including the USA, in helping prevent and reduce crime. Such systems try to understand that crime is not always the result of a person's flaws or moral weaknesses present in society.

Furthermore, understanding the root causes of crime as provoked by unfair social circumstances allows the justice system to pursue change in the entire society. Admitting the connection between crime and social injustice can lead to calls for policies to solve societal problems such as education, mental health services, and economic barriers. When social justice concepts are incorporated into criminal justice, they provide interventional opportunities to help society's most vulnerable, thus decreasing crime rates. This approach enables sustainable crime prevention by concentrating on developing equitable social relations, thus helping to develop a just society. By taking such steps, the justice system can, therefore, promote the need for change in social processes since most of the offenders end up as such due to conditions that lead them to commit crimes (Thomaidou & Berryessa, 2023).

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, such as the fairness of social circumstances, applying unjust circumstances to lessen criminal responsibility is another issue that sparks concerns between two contradicting approaches: individualism and collectivism. Although eradicating criminal responsibility according to social circumstances may harm the effectiveness of legal deterrence and encourage more criminal activities, it can also be regarded as a chance to treat the causes of crimes and enhance society's justice. Meeting these considerations is not easy as it calls for unlocking the challenges that come with it so that the justice system can continue to be fair but at the same time accept that there are social factors that do shape human behavior.
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