

Review

Social Justice and Special Persons: A Philosophical Enquiry

Albert Ulutorti Green

University on the Niger/ St. Paul's Theological College, Awka, Nigeria.

Correspondence should be addressed to: getdatonly@gmail.com | <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3641-3948>

Abstract: In the Nigerian socio-legal environment, this study examines social justice for unique persons philosophically. It explores how constitutional provisions, statutory frameworks, judicial interpretations, and societal structures promote or hinder inclusion in relation to normative goals of justice and the lived reality of people with disabilities. The study is based on the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999), which guarantees dignity, equality, and freedom from discrimination, and the Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act, which protects disabled people. Nigeria's commitment to inclusion includes UNCRPD commitments. Legal and constitutional frameworks are weakly implemented due to structural disparities, limited enforcement, and cultural shame, according to the research. Accessibility impediments, insufficient compliance mechanisms, and underdeveloped disability jurisprudence impede judicial interventions, which are constitutionally entitled to enforce rights and issue binding injunctions. Special people are marginalised in education, healthcare, employment, infrastructure, and communication due to systemic hurdles. The study ethically contrasts societal dignity with the exclusion of unique people from meaningful participation. It finds that social justice in Nigeria involves structural restructuring, cultural reorientation, and active participation in governance and decision-making, not just legal acknowledgement. The study concludes that justice must evolve from formal declaration to substantive realisation to secure equal participation and human dignity.

Keywords: Social Justice, Special Persons, Nigeria, Disability Rights, Inclusion, Legal Framework, Equality

Introduction

Globally, social justice rhetoric has dominated intellectual, political, and legal progress. Social justice is fairness in resource, opportunity, and advantage distribution and recognition of each person's dignity and worth. Today, Nigerians with physical, sensory, intellectual, or psychosocial disabilities face unequal social justice. Some daily situations

defy justice despite constitutional and legislative guarantees.

Cultural attitudes, economic constraints, and institutional inefficiencies affect unique people in Nigeria. Architecture, discrimination, and exclusionary laws often create disability. Social justice extends beyond legal recognition to include how society defines fairness, equality, and human dignity for its most vulnerable.

Social justice raises philosophical questions about equality and state and society's duty to the poor. Should justice be pure equality, where everyone is treated equally, or equity, where resources and opportunities are distributed by need and circumstance? Special needs people need deliberate accommodation and structural adjustments, hence this topic is crucial. Failure to achieve these criteria promotes inequality and damages the moral foundation of any equitable society.

Nigerian courts seem to promote social justice. The 1999 Federal Republic of Nigeria Constitution guarantees dignity, equality, and non-discrimination. The Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act safeguards disabled people's rights and promotes their full participation in society. Nigeria also signed the UNCRPD, embracing disability rights and inclusion.

These laws do not guarantee substantive justice. Public facilities are inaccessible, schools are inadequate for different learning needs, and special needs employment is scarce. Social stigma and cultural ideas that marginalise and exclude disabled individuals are more concerning. These situations raise doubt on legal protections and social fairness. Philosophically, this work addresses social justice in Nigeria for exceptional persons. Philosophy of justice, legal frameworks, constitutional laws, and judicial activities are critically examined. The study uses normative concepts and empirical data to explain exclusion and propose solutions for a more inclusive and just society.

This study's theory-practice connection is important. Philosophical fairness considerations provide the moral context for inclusion, while legal instruments provide structure. Without successful implementation and social acceptance, neither is enough. Thus, this study examines current frameworks and criticises their boundaries, highlighting the need for a more holistic approach that integrates ethical reasoning, legal enforcement, and social reform.

The study addresses these issues philosophically and legally. Nigerian laws and court processes are examined to establish their effectiveness in promoting inclusion and the ethical consequences of exclusion using acknowledged justice concepts. The difficulties of

deaf and other marginalised individuals often highlight social justice failures.

Special needs social justice is morally and legally needed. When a society fails to protect and empower its most vulnerable, its ethics and social cohesion suffer. This study suggests a rethinking of justice that goes beyond formal assertions to encompass actual inclusion, genuine respect for human dignity, and a commitment to equality in all its forms.

Clarifying the Core Ideas of Justice and Human Difference

A complete explanation of the key principles is needed to address social justice for distinct people. Justice and exceptional individuals must be defined to avoid confusion in the analysis. This section precisely articulates these fundamental concepts in philosophical reasoning and Nigerian socio-legal context.

Philosophical and social changes affected social justice (Mishchuk et al., 2019). Social justice ensures equal access to opportunities, resources, and rights for all. This definition of fairness goes beyond equality. It entails contextualising inequities and preventing systemic disadvantage. When evaluating extraordinary people's lives, formal equality and substantive justice are crucial.

Social justice is tied to community morality. A just society favours the weak, says John Rawls (Fletcher, 2025). This concept encourages societies to actively solve inequalities rather than surface equality. This raises major questions about whether Nigerian social institutions support specific goals or are merely symbolic.

Who's distinctive is also important. Nigerians use it to describe people with physical, visual, hearing, intellectual, and psychological issues. However, medical definitions of special persons are inadequate. A narrow view blames the individual and ignores systemic barriers to involvement. A greater understanding shows that individual and environmental factors cause impairment. Communication is limited for deaf persons without sign language interpretation or captioning (Rink, 2024). Disabled wheelchair users are only considered in buildings without ramps, lifts, or other access. Disability becomes more about society's insensitivity to difference than personal weakness.

The Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act identifies structural barriers to inclusion (Amucheazi & Nwankwo, 2020). The Act promotes accessibility, non-discrimination, and equitable participation, underlining that justice requires proactive structural transformation. The 1999 Federal Republic of Nigeria Constitution respects the dignity and equality of all, although it often applies only to certain people.

Social perception is crucial to understanding special persons. Disability is stigmatised in many Nigerian communities as a sign of misfortune, vengeance, or spiritual peculiarity (Osukwu, 2019). These views marginalise unique citizens and prevent their full integration. Therefore, true social justice must address legal, institutional, and societal constraints.

Consider the diversity of remarkable people. Deaf persons have very different experiences than those with visual or intellectual disability. Each group has unique difficulties that require specialised solutions (Matende & Svongoro, 2025). Mobility-impaired people may value physical accessibility, while cognitively challenged people may need supported schooling. A universal justice system is inadequate.

These ideas indicate that social justice changes with context. Continuous evaluation of how social institutions aid or impede participation is needed. Special people should be understood as a recognition of diversity that requires appropriate accommodation and respect, not a limitation. This section concludes that social justice for unique people requires a change from disability as an individual concern to a society commitment. It stresses that justice must be ethical, practical, and responsive to reality. Without this clarity, legislative, institutional, and societal discussions would lack conceptual footing.

Philosophical Foundations of Social Justice

The issue of social justice is philosophical. It determines social propriety, fairness, and morality. Philosophical convictions regarding human nature, equality, rights and accountability underpin laws and rules (Das et al., 2024). These philosophical origins shape how society treats and includes remarkable people.

John Rawls' justice as fairness underpins social structure evaluation. A just society adopts fairness principles impartially, says Rawls (Nwagbara & Orji, 2024). His "veil of ignorance" thought experiment encourages people to establish a community without knowing their status rich, poor, able-bodied, or crippled. Since anyone is vulnerable, rational people want to protect the most vulnerable. This argument strongly promotes exceptional persons, highlighting that justice requires active support for the disadvantaged.

Equity and equality differ similarly. Equality means equal resources, opportunity, and treatment (Dworkin, 2018). This appears fair, yet it ignores changing needs and circumstances. Equity understands that people start at different locations and need different interventions to achieve identical results. Accessible infrastructure, inclusive education and

special needs assistive technology are needed for equity. Equitable treatment excludes without these measures.

A related philosophy is human dignity. Human dignity anchored in moral theory and many legal systems, values all humans. This principle forbids cognitive or physical discrimination. Respect, inclusivity and empowerment are essential to honour remarkable people. Denial of education, employment, or public life is morally wrong not administrative.

The social justice ideology emphasises rights. Society and the state must protect individual rights. Civic, political, social, and economic rights. Rights-based strategies turn charity into entitlement for particular people (Gready, 2008). Instead of generosity, people have rights to participation, accessibility, and equal opportunity. Combating condescending disability talk requires this transformation.

Care ethics enhances justice. Care ethics promotes empathy, interdependence and relationships, while traditional theories emphasise rules and rights (Hamington, 2019). It understands that humans are intrinsically related and that societies run best when they prioritise care for members, especially the weak. The deeply rooted communal ideals of Nigeria support this perspective. Cultural ideals often differ from reality, especially in treating extraordinary persons.

Also important is exclusion's morality. Outstanding people are intentionally excluded from society (Barnes, 2019). Exclusion restricts education, employment, and social and political engagement. Exclusion stops people from attaining their potential, making it bad philosophically. Society suffers when many people lose their voices . The philosophical principles demonstrate justice is active. It requires purposeful social structure design, policy assessment, and inequity reduction. For extraordinary people, this means practical inclusion, not just symbolic recognition. Building environments that value and accommodate differences is necessary.

Philosophy also critiques legal and institutional structures. Laws like the Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act promote justice and inclusion, but their effectiveness depends on their implementation (Okata, 2024). If implementation is inadequate or inconsistent, theory and practice diverge, hindering justice. The philosophical basis of social justice involve rethinking priorities and institutions. They want convenience to justice, exclusion to inclusion, and apathy to responsibility corrected.

These ideas must be adopted by Nigeria to fully integrate special needs persons into daily life.

Legal and Constitutional Foundations in Nigeria

Social justice for special people in Nigeria is founded on state rights, responsibilities, and obligations. These laws enforce morals, enabling justice. These clauses' effectiveness depends on interpretation, implementation, and social adoption. The 1999 Constitution is Nigeria's supreme law (Daniel & Unuabonah, 2021). Chapter IV of the Constitution guarantees life, dignity, liberty, and non-discrimination. These rights pertain to all citizens, even special ones. The dignity rule forbids cruel or degrading treatment, addressing disability marginalisation and mistreatment.

Equality before the law ensures justice and legal protection under the Constitution (Fedchenko). They provide a solid normative foundation, yet their generality and lack of specificity are occasionally criticised. Theory-based constitutional safeguards fail to remove concrete barriers to full participation and inclusion.

The pioneering Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act of Nigeria fills these gaps with disability rights legislation. The Act legitimises disability rights with accessibility, non-discrimination, and equal opportunity standards. It outlaws employment, education, and public service discrimination and requires accessible public areas and transportation.

This law promotes inclusion as a requirement, not charity. The law fines noncompliance to guarantee public and private organisations accommodate special needs. It creates regulatory entities to enforce and correct infractions. Many institutions lack information, resources, or political will to meet standards, so implementation is inconsistent. Nigerian local and international law supports special needs social justice (Babatola, 2023). The country signed the UNCRPD, which protects and promotes disability rights. Convention promotes dignity, non-discrimination, full participation, and accessibility. Nigeria embraced international norms into its laws and policies with this treaty.

International agreements and domestic enforcement are difficult. The impact of treaties like the UNCRPD depends on their domestication and integration into national legislation (UDOAKPAN, 2022). This growth has been sluggish in Nigeria, and local approaches must meet international standards. Social justice's formal promises vs. execution issue endures.

Public policy and administration are required by law. Government policies impact special people beyond constitutional and statutory laws. Policies on education, healthcare, employment, and infrastructure affect legal rights. Inclusion in education and healthcare helps impaired children learn and receive care. Legal protections are symbolic if ignored. Remember, the law is not alone. Cultural, economic, and institutional aspects impact its effectiveness. Limited resources, stakeholder ignorance, and deep-rooted social biases may limit disability rights enforcement. Law reform and social change are needed to fix these difficulties.

Nigeria's social justice laws and constitution are bolstered by disability-specific rules and international standards. Poor enforcement and institutional commitment often undercut these advantages. Only part of justice is done. Social justice for extraordinary people requires more than legal rights. Laws set rights and norms, but implementation, legal support, and social acceptability matter. Without these features, laws may become unreal. Understanding justice requires critical analysis of law interpretation and application.

Judicial Interpretations and Court Interventions in Nigeria

Constitutional and statutory laws preserve special individuals' rights, but the judiciary interprets and applies them (Eskridge Jr, 2023). Courts uphold justice by making legal principles enforceable. In Nigeria, judicial interpretation bridges the gap between legislative meaning and actual experience, especially for marginalised populations like the disabled.

The Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) Constitution permits courts to resolve disputes and uphold fundamental rights. Courts can enhance rights, clarify legislation, and hold public and private organisations responsible through this mandate. This function is especially important for special individuals because many of their impediments come from systemic behaviours and institutional neglect rather than legislative texts.

Courts promote social fairness by upholding fundamental rights (Dikrurahman, 2025). Discrimination and exclusion can be addressed in court under constitutional principles on equality, dignity, and freedom from discrimination. Courts must decide if institutions' actions or omissions infringe these rights. When infractions are found, courts may impose compliance, damages, or structural improvements.

Judges have also helped interpret the Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act. The Act offers precise accessibility and non-discrimination rules, but its success depends on how courts interpret and enforce it. Judicial verdicts can

affect future behaviour when public institutions fail to offer accessible facilities or discriminate against disabled people in employment. Thus, the judiciary settles conflicts and shapes social standards.

The judiciary can promote social justice for exceptional people, albeit with limitations. Access to justice is a big concern. Access to the judicial system is difficult for disabled people due to court building inaccessibility, lack of sign language interpreters, and financial restraints (Birnbaum, 2022). These barriers can deter people from suing, restricting judicial remedies. Paradoxically, the institution created to preserve justice becomes a place of exclusion.

Another drawback is the reactive legal system. Systemic concerns may endure without litigation since courts only interfere when cases are brought. This reactive approach might prolong injustice for special persons, who often lack the resources or support to start legal proceedings. Even with favourable judgements, enforcement is difficult. When they demand major institutional changes or financial investment, court orders may be ignored or inadequately implemented.

Despite these obstacles, judicial activism has advanced marginalised groups' rights in Nigeria.

Progressive interpretation of constitutional provisions has allowed courts to expand rights to address modern challenges (Tigre & Urzola, 2021). Disability-specific jurisprudence is still emerging, but judicial innovation is possible. Courts may transform inclusion and equality by emphasising the spirit rather than the letter of the law in their interpretation.

The judiciary's connection with other branches of government is equally crucial. Courts interpret and enforce laws, but the administration implements and the legislature creates strong legal foundations. Without cooperation or commitment between these branches, judicial decisions may be ineffective. A court may order accessible infrastructure, but without executive action and budgetary allocation, it may not be delivered.

Judicial interventions also depend on public awareness and attitudes (Mack et al., 2018). Legal triumphs work best when reinforced by a societal shift toward inclusion and diversity. Without such assistance, court rulings may be seen as isolated episodes rather than systemic change catalysts. Integrating legal strategies with advocacy, education, and community engagement is crucial.

Considering how judicial interpretations advance social justice for exceptional persons, the court plays a crucial but limited role. It can enforce rights, set precedents, and combat discrimination. However, institutional hurdles, accessibility concerns, and the socio-political environment hinder its efficacy.

The judiciary's contribution to social justice depends on how its decisions are executed and internalised by society. The courts give special people in Nigeria hope and remind them of the fight for inclusion. The pursuit of justice requires strengthening this institution through increased accessibility, awareness, and enforcement.

Judicial Interpretation and Enforcement of Disability Rights in Nigeria

Social justice depends on the Nigerian court, especially for those whose rights depend on legislation, interpretation, and enforcement. Courts enforce laws, interpret constitutions, and assess state and non-state conformity. The 1999 Nigerian Constitution established the judiciary as an independent department of government with the power to interpret, enforce, and resolve disputes.

Chapter IV of the Constitution requires judges to protect unique rights (Bharmal, 2021). These rights include legal equality, nondiscrimination, and dignity. The Constitution has been interpreted to protect disabled people without specifically declaring disability rights. Courts can challenge unconstitutional laws, policies, and institutional practices that violate human dignity or equity.

The constitution preserves unique person rights, but courts have intentionally and gradually interpreted the statute. Nigerian high courts and appellate courts can issue declarations of rights, anti-discrimination injunctions, and statute compliance orders. Public and business entities need court orders to enforce legal rights.

Prohibition of Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities increased special person rights. This law transcends the Constitution by outlawing handicap discrimination and ensuring accessibility in public infrastructure, education, transit, and employment. Institutional enforcement and noncompliance sanctions are set. For this Act to work, judges must interpret and implement it.

Nigerian courts can legally enforce compliance. Mandatory building accessibility injunctions, employment or service discrimination restraining orders, and rights violation damages are examples. Courts can also establish disability rights for public and private institutions. Such court rulings are hard to enforce. Not following court rulings is a serious issue. Institutional resistance, limited funds, and administrative apathy may delay judicial

accessibility or non-discrimination decisions. Little enforcement makes judicial findings symbolic.

Access to courts is another issue. Due to physical, communicational, and economic constraints, many unique people struggle with legal action. Deaf litigants struggle in court without sign language interpretation. These limits prevent judicial recourse and violate the fundamental right to justice.

Courts that liberally enforce fundamental rights demonstrate progressive interpretation. By generously interpreting constitutional provisions, courts can preserve unprotected areas. This view holds that the Constitution upholds human dignity, equality, and fairness. Effective interpretation can increase extraordinary individuals' legal position and make institutions more inclusive.

However, institutional context greatly affects judicial performance. The executive branch executes court orders, and clear laws outline rights and responsibilities. Political will and institutional cooperation are needed to implement well-reasoned decisions. Only structural dependency limits judicial power. Disability-related case law in Nigeria is inconsistent and weakens special person rights jurisprudence. Very few disability rights cases limit courts' precedent-setting power. Creating new cases that impact judicial interpretation requires legal knowledge, litigation skills, and advocacy.

Structural Inequalities and Social Barriers Affecting Special Persons in Nigeria

Beyond constitutional guarantees, legislative safeguards and judicial interpretations, structural inequalities and societal impediments impede social justice for different Nigerians. Institutional design, resource allocation, infrastructure, and social norms may cause them. Even with legal rights, implementation is limited.

Structured physical inaccessibility failure. Schools, hospitals, government buildings, and transit networks typically neglect handicaps (de Duren et al., 2021). Mobility and sensory impaired people cannot participate in public life without ramps, lifts, tactile walks, and accessible signs. Public infrastructure must be accessible under the Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act, however enforcement is inconsistent.

Uneven education is another issue. Despite inclusiveness, many schools lack qualified staff, infrastructure, and appropriate instructional materials for special needs. Sign language interpreters or subtitles help deaf pupils communicate. Insufficient education and professional opportunities perpetuate marginalisation and poverty.

Employment injustice makes society unequal. Disability workers generally work low-paying, informal occupations (Morwane et al., 2021). They may be unproductive or costly for employers. These concepts contravene Nigeria's Constitution and disability laws' equality and non-discrimination standards. Labour economy disadvantages unique people regardless of skills or credentials.

Medical care is likewise hard to get. Few hospitals have disabled-friendly infrastructure and communication. Without translators, doctors may misdiagnose or abuse deaf patients. Physically challenged people may face inaccessible healthcare. Gaps in public service show neglect.

Deaf persons are excluded for communication issues. Poor sign language integration in public institutions, media, and education hinders civic and social engagement. Without accessible communication, constitutional information and participation are difficult. This eliminates individual needs and viewpoints from public conversation and decision-making.

Many Nigerians interpret disability via culture and religion (Onwuatuegwu, 2024). Social stigma, superstition, and morality can surround disability. These ideas can cause family bias, social isolation, and community marginalisation. Constantly occurring detrimental attitudes are tougher to abolish legally.

Poor institutions make things worse. Insufficient funds, coordination, and enforcement plague government disability policies. Thus, well-designed policies make little difference. Few monitoring systems exist, and public and private organisations comply inconsistently.

Poverty worsens disabilities. Special needs individuals may lack financial resources, assistive devices, and supportive services to fully participate in society. Poor economic conditions isolate education, healthcare, and justice. Disability and poverty create a cycle of vulnerability requiring expert care (Mezzina et al., 2022).

Unique Nigerians struggle due to structural inequality. This affects resource allocation, institution design, and societal attitudes. Legal systems cannot overturn these limits. Social justice demands structural transformation, not legal consistency, for particular needs. Changing public infrastructure, education, jobs, healthcare, and cultural stereotypes. Lacking fundamental improvements, equality is theoretical.

Ethical and Social Evaluation of Inclusion in Nigeria

Social justice for different individuals in Nigeria requires ethical and social examination of inclusion. Laws and constitutions ensure equality and non-discrimination, but how a society treats its most vulnerable indicates its morality. Ethical behaviour differs substantially from legal promises. Respect for human dignity is crucial. Constitutional logic and moral philosophy value everyone, regardless of cognitive or physical disabilities. The 1999 Nigerian Constitution protects human dignity and prohibits degrading treatment. Discrimination, abuse, and stigma against distinctive persons create ethical problems concerning constitutional preservation.

Social inclusion involves meaningful engagement in all parts of life, not only institutions (Sharma, 2023). Many strange Nigerians are excluded from decision-making, education, employment, and public discourse. This unethical "silent exclusion" places people in a system that doesn't identify or accommodate them.

Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act displays state's ethical commitment to inclusion. Legislative purpose vs. implementation presents moral concerns. Companies that discriminate against disabled personnel or refuse accessible locations violate laws and ethics.

Social norms complicate ethics. Disability is still seen as pity, superstition, or a burden by many. Paternalistic beliefs can see outstanding people as charity recipients rather than rights-holders. Putting people's conditions before their potential is unequal. Religion and culture influence disability morality. Although their implementation differs, many religions teach compassion and care for the weak. Special people don't always lead but donate. Separate inclusion is wrong.

Ethics of inclusion require accountability. Government, institutions, communities, and individuals deliver justice. School, employment, healthcare, and family ethics prohibit marginalising exceptional people. Ignoring this obligation promotes systematic unfairness, even with supportive laws. Voice and visibility are moral. Special people are under-represented in policy, decision-making, and leadership. Increases autonomy and participative ethics. Policy-affected people must shape just services. Without it, inclusiveness may patronise.

National social development is affected by inclusiveness. Leaving out extraordinary people reduces creativity, productivity, and potential. Ethics-utilitarians consider this inefficient use of human resources, whereas rights-based people consider it a violation.

Both situations lower society's potential. Despite obstacles, progress is clear. Activity, awareness, and policy implementation indicate a gradual but necessary inclusivity shift. Advances are unequal and focused in cities, excluding rural areas.

Toward a More Inclusive and Just Society in Nigeria

Social justice measures must be reconsidered because legislative standards don't fit Nigerian demands. For inclusive society, we need legal, institutional, educational, economic, and cultural reforms (Cerna et al., 2021). Rebuilding society for full participation, decency, and equal opportunity is more vital than meeting special needs.

Enhance inclusive law enforcement. The disability discrimination ban protects accessibility, non-discrimination, and equal opportunity. However, enforcement is inadequate. Regulatory bodies need budget, surveillance, and punishment to ensure public and commercial compliance. The absence of enforcement may make legal rights symbolic. Institutional change matters. Government agencies must include disability inclusion into their operations, not only as a policy option (Narayanan et al., 2021). Accessible public spaces, inclusive communication, and diverse services are needed. Start institutional design with inclusion.

Change is necessary in education. A quality education for all pupils, including deaf ones, demands inclusive institutions (Levesque & Duncan, 2024). This includes inclusive teacher training, assistive technology, and sign language interpretation when needed. Work, social interaction, and economic independence are guaranteed by education. Economic inclusion counts. Government and company employment policies should promote disability hiring and retention. Anti-discrimination laws, workplace changes, and inclusive hiring incentives reduce labour market barriers. Economic empowerment enables talented people contribute to society and the nation.

Clinics and hospitals need disabled-friendly communication and facilities (Scheffler, 2021). ASL interpreters and accessible information help deaf people find doctors. Health rights are uneven without them. Public knowledge and cultural reorientation are necessary for inclusion. Education, media, and community activism must challenge handicap discrimination. To eliminate stigma and promote diversity, social attitudes must change gradually. Social, not legal inclusion is needed.

Community and religious institutions matter. Modelling morality promotes inclusivity. These groups may turn disability sympathy into rights by exercising dignity, equality, and compassion. Empowerment and participation exceed charity.

Inclusive societies require decision-making. Request input on people-affecting policies. Politicians, bureaucrats, and community leaders ensure government input. This improves democracy and accountability. Additionally, urban and rural planning must prioritise universal design. Infrastructure should anticipate human ability variation, not exclusion. Without alteration, communication, transportation, and public services are widespread.

Conclusion

Social justice for special persons in Nigeria is examined in this philosophy dissertation through legal, constitutional, judicial, structural, and ethical lenses. The fundamental worry is the gap between legislative equality guarantees and disabled people's lived experiences in school, job, healthcare, infrastructure, and social interaction.

The Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) Constitution protects dignity, equality before the law, and nondiscrimination, creating the framework for justice. The Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act also guarantees accessibility in important areas and forbids disability-based discrimination. Nigeria's ratification of the UNCRPD, which establishes global inclusion and equality standards, enhances its commitment.

Legal instruments alone cannot guarantee social fairness, the inquiry found. Lack of disability-specific jurisprudence, court order compliance, and accessibility restrict legally empowered judicial interpretation and enforcement. Infrastructure, education, healthcare, and employment inequalities increase exclusion, making legal protections difficult for unique individuals.

Discrimination against extraordinary people affects morals. Social perceptions can reflect stigma, misunderstanding, and exclusion notwithstanding constitutional and legal protections of dignity and equality. That ideal and reality conflict reveals that justice is a moral, cultural, and legal issue that requires multilayered change.

The essay also underlined that inclusion must go beyond symbolism to meaningful engagement. Unique people must actively build society's institutions, policies, and future for true social justice. This includes inclusive education and employment, lifelong accessibility, and addressing cultural assumptions that impede participation.

Finally, Nigerian special needs social justice is underway. Though legal and policy frameworks have improved, execution remains the major challenge. Real inclusion demands constant commitment from government, judiciary, civil society, and the public.

Law enforcement, ethics, and culture change are needed. A really just society treats everyone equally and structures its processes accordingly. Nigeria may achieve this aim by moving from promises to action and incorporating unique people into all facets of life.

Recommendations

1. The Nigerian government should strengthen the enforcement capacity of existing disability laws, especially the Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities (Prohibition) Act. This involves not only increasing the funding and operational strength of regulatory agencies but also ensuring that clear monitoring systems are in place to track compliance across public and private institutions.

2. There is a need for the full implementation of accessibility standards in all public infrastructure, including schools, hospitals, transportation systems, and government offices. This recommendation requires the adoption of universal design principles that ensure physical, visual, and communication accessibility for all special persons.

3. The education system should be restructured to fully support inclusive learning at all levels. This includes training teachers in special education methodologies, integrating assistive technologies, and ensuring that communication support systems such as sign language interpretation are widely available for deaf learners.

4. Public awareness and cultural reorientation campaigns should be intensified to address stigma and negative stereotypes surrounding disability. These campaigns should involve media organizations, religious institutions, community leaders, and civil society groups.

There should be increased participation of special persons in governance and decision-making processes at all levels. This includes representation in policymaking bodies, advisory councils, and community leadership structures. Their lived experiences provide essential insight for designing effective policies that address real needs.

References

1. Amucheazi, C., & Nwankwo, C. M. (2020). Accessibility to infrastructure and disability rights in Nigeria: an analysis of the potential of the discrimination against persons with disability (prohibition) act 2018. *Commonwealth Law Bulletin*, 46(4), 689-710.
2. Babatola, M. J. (2023). Social Order and Legal Framework for Disability Rights: An Overview of Disabled Living Conditions and Potentials in Nigeria. *Collection Management*, 1-15.
3. Barnes, C. (2019). Understanding the social model of disability: Past, present and future. In *Routledge handbook of disability studies* (pp. 14-31). Routledge.

4. Bharmal, M. (2021). Judicial Interpretation: An Analysis in Context of Part III & IV of the Constitution. *Indian JL & Legal Rsch.*, 3, 1.
5. Birnbaum, E. G. (2022). Assessing the Accessibility of the Judicial System's Arrest-to-Parole Timeline for People who are d/Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing.
6. Cerna, L., Mezzanotte, C., Rutigliano, A., Brussino, O., Santiago, P., Borgonovi, F., & Guthrie, C. (2021). Promoting inclusive education for diverse societies: A conceptual framework. *OECD education working papers(260)*, 0_1-57.
7. Daniel, F. O., & Unuabonah, F. O. (2021). Stance and engagement in selected Nigerian Supreme Court judgments. *English Text Construction*, 14(2), 231-252.
8. Das, S., Singh, K., Kumar, R., Singh, J. N., & Kumar, P. (2024). Exploring the multifaceted landscape of human rights: a comprehensive analysis of theoretical frameworks. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 3346-3365.
9. de Duren, N. R. L., Salazar, J. P., Duryea, S., Mastellaro, C., Freeman, L., Pedraza, L., Porcel, M. R., Sandoval, D., Aguerre, J. A., & Angius, C. (2021). Cities as spaces for opportunities for all: building public spaces for people with disabilities, children and elders.
10. Dikrurahman, D. (2025). The Role of Courts in Addressing Social Inequality. *Journal of Law and Social Politics*, 3(1), 27-36.
11. Dworkin, R. (2018). What is equality? Part 2: Equality of resources. In *The notion of equality* (pp. 143-205). Routledge.
12. Eskridge Jr, W. N. (2023). Reliance Interests in Statutory and Constitutional Interpretation. *Vand. L. Rev.*, 76, 681.
13. Fedchenko, V. THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW AND THE COURT: ENSURING JUSTICE AND THE RULE OF LAW. CURRENT ISSUES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF UKRAINIAN LEGAL EDUCATION AND SCIENCE IN THE PRESENT DAY AND POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION, 413.
14. Fletcher, L. (2025). A modern theodicy: John Rawls and The Law of Peoples. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 24(1), 92-110.
15. Gready, P. (2008). Rights-based approaches to development: what is the value-added? *Development in practice*, 18(6), 735-747.
16. Hamington, M. (2019). Integrating care ethics and design thinking. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155(1), 91-103.
17. Levesque, E., & Duncan, J. (2024). Inclusive education for deaf students: Pass or fail. In (Vol. 26, pp. 125-126): Taylor & Francis.
18. Mack, K., Anleu, S. R., & Tutton, J. (2018). The judiciary and the public: Judicial perceptions. *Adelaide Law Review*, The, 39(1), 1-35.
19. Matende, T., & Svongoro, P. (2025). Stakeholders' concerns regarding the standard of Sign Language interpretation in Zimbabwe's Justice System: Implications for access to justice. *Journal for Translation Studies in Africa*, 7, 1-20.

20. Mezzina, R., Gopikumar, V., Jenkins, J., Saraceno, B., & Sashidharan, S. (2022). Social vulnerability and mental health inequalities in the “Syndemic”: Call for action. *Frontiers in psychiatry*, 13, 894370.
21. Mishchuk, H., Samoliuk, N., & Bilan, Y. (2019). Measuring social justice in the light of effectiveness of public distributive policy. *Administratie si Management Public*(32), 63-76.
22. Morwane, R. E., Dada, S., & Bornman, J. (2021). Barriers to and facilitators of employment of persons with disabilities in low-and middle-income countries: A scoping review. *African Journal of Disability*, 10, 833.
23. Narayanan, S., Terris, E., & Cole, D. (2021). Disability inclusion in operations. In *Responsible business operations: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 115-135). Springer.
24. Nwagbara, R. G., & Orji, C. P. (2024). John Rawls' Ethical Principles of Justice as a Solution to Problems of Social Cooperation and Injustice in Contemporary Democratic Societies. *IAAJAH-IGWEBUIKE: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 10(2).
25. Okata, I. (2024). Exploration of Nigeria's discrimination against persons with disabilities (prohibition) act, 2018-a legal practitioner's perspective.
26. Onwuatuegwu, I. N. (2024). Exploring Disability within Igbo Cultural Identity: A Philosophical Inquiry. *International Journal of Language, Literature and Culture*, 4(5), 593073.
27. Osukwu, C. (2019). Disability, performance, and discrimination in the service to humanity. *International Review of Mission*, 108(1), 52-64.
28. Rink, I. (2024). Communication barriers. In *Handbook of accessible communication* (pp. 33-68). Springer.
29. Scheffler, G. (2021). Equality and Sufficiency in Health Care Reform. *Md. L. Rev.*, 81, 144.
30. Sharma, R. (2023). Promoting social inclusion through social policies. *Capacity Building and Youth Empowerment*, 76, 617.
31. Tigre, M. A., & Urzola, N. (2021). The 2017 Inter-American Court's Advisory Opinion: changing the paradigm for international environmental law in the Anthropocene. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, 12(1), 24-50.
32. UDOAKPAN, A. U. (2022). THE RIGHTS OF MENTALLY CHALLENGED PERSONS IN NIGERIA: LESSONS FROM THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (UNCRPD) OLABISI ONABANJO UNIVERSITY, AGO].



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>).