

Material Desire and Social Justice: A Comparative Ethical Analysis

Wenzhuo Zhao

National Key Research Institute of Daoism and Religious Culture, Sichuan University, 610064, Chengdu, China

Abstract Material desire is a persistent yet ethically ambivalent dimension of human life. Rather than simply treating it as either a moral obstacle or a legitimate pursuit, this paper situates material desire within a set of competing ethical frameworks and examines the conditions under which it may be justified in relation to social justice. Kantian ethics subjects desire to universal moral constraints, whereas utilitarianism evaluates it in terms of aggregate welfare. By contrast, Zhuangzi's thought shifts the discussion by questioning the expansion of desire itself. When environmental ethics is taken into account, the implications of material desire extend beyond social distribution to ecological limits. In this sense, material desire cannot be assessed solely within human-centered frameworks. The argument advanced here is that material desire becomes ethically defensible only when it is simultaneously constrained, socially situated, and ecologically moderated.

Keywords Material Desire; Social Justice; Ethics; Kantian Deontology; Utilitarianism; Zhuangzi; Environmental Ethics

1. Introduction

Material desire is not merely a psychological inclination but also a structural force embedded in modern social life. In contexts shaped by consumer expansion and economic differentiation, its ethical status has become increasingly unstable. While the pursuit of material goods is often associated with productivity and individual fulfillment, it simultaneously intensifies inequality and places growing pressure on ecological systems [1,2].

The difficulty, therefore, does not lie in determining whether material desire should be affirmed or rejected. Rather, it lies in clarifying how it is to be delimited. Once detached from normative constraints, material desire tends to amplify asymmetries in resource distribution; yet when it is excessively restricted, it risks weakening the motivational basis of social activity. What is at stake, then, is not the existence of desire itself, but the conditions under which it may be rendered compatible with justice.

The following analysis approaches this issue by placing different ethical traditions into a relation of tension rather than simple comparison. Deontology emphasizes constraint, utilitarianism foregrounds consequences, while Daoist thought reframes the problem by questioning the expansion of desire itself. Considered together, these perspectives make it possible to examine more precisely how material desire operates within competing normative logics. This paper contributes to the study of social justice

Received: June 1, 2026

Revised: June 18, 2026

Accepted: June 20, 2026

Published: June 22, 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee Axon Academic Publishing Institute, Hong Kong, China. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

DOI:10.67148/fahss-2026-257

by offering a comparative ethical analysis of material desire and clarifying the conditions under which it may be aligned with principles of fairness and sustainability.

2. Ethical Traditions and the Problem of Material Desire

Kantian ethics does not deny the existence of material desire; instead, it restricts its authority. What ultimately matters is not whether desire is present, but whether it determines action. Once inclination overrides the capacity for universalization, it ceases to possess moral legitimacy [3]. In this sense, the ethical difficulty of material desire lies in its tendency to instrumentalize others.

The pursuit of wealth or consumption does not become problematic because of its content alone, but because of the form it takes—specifically, when others are reduced to means. From this perspective, social justice is not achieved solely through redistribution, but depends upon a prior condition: that desire remains subordinated to moral law.

A utilitarian perspective shifts the focus from moral form to outcome. Material desire is assessed in relation to its contribution to collective well-being [4]. Under certain conditions, it may function as a productive force, generating economic growth and expanding opportunity. At the same time, however, this justification remains unstable. Aggregate welfare often obscures distributive asymmetries, as the satisfaction of some people's desires may coincide with deprivation for others.

As Rawls [1] has argued, inequalities require justification in terms of their benefit to the least advantaged. From this standpoint, unregulated material desire rarely satisfies such a condition. It therefore cannot be assumed that the pursuit of desire will naturally align with the requirements of justice.

Zhuangzi does not attempt to regulate desire; he problematizes its expansion. The issue is not how desire should be distributed, but why it continues to proliferate. Excessive attachment to material acquisition produces not only social imbalance but also psychological disturbance.

The notion of wuwei should not be understood as passive withdrawal. Rather, it points to a refusal to intensify artificially generated needs. By loosening attachment to acquisition, the individual may recover a form of equilibrium that cannot be secured through accumulation. From this perspective, social harmony depends not only on institutional adjustment, but on a transformed relation to desire itself.

When environmental ethics is introduced into the discussion, the problem acquires an additional dimension. Material desire, when extended across global systems of production and consumption, exceeds ecological limits and generates consequences that extend beyond present distributions [5].

This shifts the ethical question in a significant way. It is no longer sufficient to ask whether resources are fairly distributed; it becomes necessary to consider whether patterns of desire themselves are sustainable. Intergenerational justice becomes relevant precisely at the point where present desire compromises future conditions of life. In this sense, material desire must be situated within ecological constraints rather than treated as an independent variable.

3. Material Desire and Justice in Practice

Material desire often generates ethical dilemmas by placing individual interests in tension with collective responsibilities. Decisions regarding consumption, economic activity, or resource use frequently involve trade-offs between personal benefit and

social impact. These conflicts cannot be resolved through a single ethical framework; rather, they reveal the need for a pluralistic approach that incorporates multiple normative considerations.

Kantian ethics demands adherence to moral principles, utilitarianism emphasizes consequences, and Daoist philosophy calls for restraint. Together, these perspectives highlight the complexity of ethical decision-making in contexts shaped by material desire. The challenge is to navigate these tensions without reducing ethical judgment to either rigid rules or purely instrumental calculations.

The relationship between material desire and social justice becomes particularly evident in the domain of resource allocation. The pursuit of material goods is not evenly distributed across society; it is shaped by structural inequalities that determine access to opportunities and resources. When material desire is coupled with unequal starting conditions, it may reinforce rather than mitigate social disparities.

From the standpoint of social justice, it is necessary to consider not only individual intentions but also institutional arrangements. Ethical reflection must therefore extend beyond personal conduct to include the design of systems that regulate economic activity and ensure fair distribution. Without such considerations, the pursuit of material desire risks perpetuating cycles of inequality.

The ethical evaluation of material desire also involves attention to its psychological effects. Excessive desire is frequently associated with anxiety, dissatisfaction, and diminished well-being. From this perspective, restraint is not merely a moral requirement but also a condition for individual flourishing.

Zhuangzi's emphasis on inner equilibrium provides a useful lens for understanding this dimension. By reducing dependence on external acquisition, individuals may achieve greater autonomy and stability. This suggests that ethical approaches to material desire should incorporate not only normative principles but also insights into human psychology and well-being.

4. Conclusion

Material desire cannot be reduced to a single ethical determination. It operates across multiple registers—as inclination, as an economic driver, and as a source of imbalance. The frameworks examined here do not converge, yet their tension remains instructive.

Deontology restricts desire through moral law, utilitarianism evaluates it through consequences, while Daoist thought calls into question its expansion. Environmental ethics introduces an additional constraint by situating desire within finite ecological systems.

Taken together, these perspectives suggest that the ethical status of material desire depends less on its mere presence than on its form and limits. It becomes problematic when it expands without constraint, consolidates advantage without redistribution, or exceeds ecological capacity. Conversely, it becomes defensible only when it is normatively regulated, socially mediated, and ecologically bounded.

References

- [1] Rawls, J. (1971). A theory of justice. Harvard University Press.
- [2] Sandel, M. (2009). Justice: What's the right thing to do? Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- [3] Kant, I. (1997). Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals. Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Mill, J. S. (2001). Utilitarianism. Hackett Publishing.
- [5] Schlosberg, D. (2007). Defining environmental justice. Oxford University Press.