

# Social Justice: An Overview of Western Conception

Kundan Kumar

Ph.D research scholar at Centre for Political studies at Central University of South Bihar, Gaya( Bihar).

---

## ARTICLE DETAILS

### Article History

Published Online: 10 November 2018

### Keywords

Social Justice, Distribution of resources, Rights, Duties

---

## ABSTRACT

Westerns thinkers have presented different ideas about the idea of social justice. Some western literature found this idea unnecessary while some found it necessary to maintain coherence in society. Justice, in opinion of Plato, is based on duties while Aristotle's justice is somehow based on rights. Justice has a moral rather than legal content in idea of Plato. Western libertarian thinkers like Nozick, Hayek etc. find the idea of social justice unnecessary. They support minimum-interference of state in individual life. They advocate that distribution of resources should be based on merit. Another western thinker John Rawls states that everyone has equality of liberty. It means that one can do what he/she wants to do according to his/her choice. But, he also supports some special programmes for disadvantage sections of society. This paper examines different western views of social justice.

---

## 1. Introduction

Different societies have different explanation of Social Justice according to their culture, tradition and context. Justice, in opinion of Plato, is based on duties while Aristotle's justice is somehow based on rights. Justice has a moral rather than legal content in idea of Plato. Western libertarian thinkers like Nozick, Hayek etc. find the idea of social justice unnecessary. They support minimum-interference of state or state. They advocate that distribution of resources should be based on merit. Another western thinker John Rawls states that everyone has equality of liberty. It means that one can do what he/she wants to do according to his/her choice. But, he also supports some special programmes for disadvantage sections. Different western views of social justice like Greek, Utilitarian etc. has been examined systematically.

## 2. Greek thinkers

Greek thinker Plato introduced his contemplations about justice as discussion among Socrates and others in his book 'The Republic'. Socrates was fundamental storyteller of the discourse. This book has been separated into ten sections. The conversation, in this book, has been done about Justice, the order and character of the just city and just man, state, education, forms of government etc. However, the principle contention of Plato in his Republic is a supported pursuit after the location and the idea of justice. Conversation about justice has been done partially I to IV. Plato follows this pursuit with the cycle of end. He audits the various thoughts of justice lastly gives his own. Plato attempts to search for justice in a city as opposed to in an individual man.<sup>1</sup> He says that a city appears in light of the fact that individual in itself isn't independent. Human being is subject to various individuals for their various needs in light of the fact that a man/lady can't do a wide range of work. A person have specialization in some particular aptitude like somebody knows cultivating, different knows carpentry and so forth Plato isolates society of the city into three classes, the guardians/deliberatives; the auxiliaries and the producers/ money making class. Each class has their own particular excellence. Wisdom is excellence of guardians, auxiliaries' virtue is fearlessness and moderation is virtue of

producers/ money making class. Plato continues to look for intelligence, mental fortitude, and balance/balance in the city. He discover astuteness among the watchman rulers, boldness among the auxiliaries (or assistants), moderation among all classes of the city in concurring about who should administer and who ought to be dominated. He advocates that each class should focuses on their own work.<sup>2</sup>

He characterizes justice in the city as the state in which each class performs just its own work, not intruding in crafted by different classes. It will result into joy of entire city. In the event that a woodworker attempts to manage the work of a shoemaker or a shoemaker that of a craftsman or their trading instruments or respects with each other, or even a similar man attempting to do both is hurtful for city. It will prompt pulverization of the city. As indicated by Plato, "Intruding among the classes, of which there are three, and exchange with each other is the best damage for the city and would most effectively be called outrageous wrongdoing".<sup>3</sup> Having and doing of one's own and what has a place with oneself would be consented to be justice.<sup>4</sup> Plato finishes up his underlying appraisal of the city overall. On the off chance that the city in general is glad, at that point people will be cheerful.

The temperance found in the city then looked for in the individual soul.<sup>5</sup> For this reason, Socrates makes a similarity between the parts/classes of the city and the spirit (the city-soul relationship) of a person. He has likewise isolated human spirit in three sections. One section is master in count though spirit/courage is characteristics of other part and third piece of soul inclines toward their cravings more with which it cherishes, hungers, thirsts etc. So forth Calculative part is rational part while the part having wants is irrational. The situation of spirit part moves among rational and irrational as per time and circumstance, however it attempts to move towards calculation part more. Plato concludes that calculative part should manage, since it is savvy and has planning pretty much the entirety of the soul, and for the spirit part should be dutiful to calculation and its ally.<sup>6</sup>

Plato's disciple Aristotle advocates that each art and every inquiry, and comparatively every activity just as choice, is held to focus on some 'good'.<sup>7</sup> Individuals have nobly announced

that the good is that at which everything aims. This good is most prominent and is a 'good' in the most elevated sense. In the state the good focused on is justice. He discusses eleven types of good ideals and among them 'justice' is the best. In justice, each excellence is summarized.<sup>8</sup> As indicated by Aristotle, "everybody wishes to state that justice is such a trademark based on which individuals are arranged to do just things and based on which they act fairly and wish for just things".<sup>9</sup> He says that the word 'just' has two distinct implications. The main significance of the word just demonstrates to act as per set up law or rule.<sup>10</sup> In this sense Justice is slanted towards a 'ethical inclination' which demands men to do just things and act justly. It has certain definitive guidelines of human direct and characterized position to execute these principles. He likewise says it 'Universal Justice'. Second meaning discusses about 'equality' or, 'fair mean'.<sup>11</sup> It is otherwise called 'particular justice'. Particular justice has two types: (i) Distributive Justice and (ii) Remedial or Corrective justice. Distributive justice is concerned about distribution of resources to re-establish fairly balance, so this implies equality in some sense. It points advantage of the entire network. Along these lines, this thought likewise states about the Aristotle's idea of Social Justice. Justice which is to build up, through the distribution of resources, will be corresponding in light of the fact that it considers equality must be equal for equals.<sup>12</sup> Equal gets equal treatment and unequal gets unequal treatment in the process distribution. Yet, question emerges here is, equality or inequality in what kind of thing? It supports merit as the premise to choose equity in the public eye and dissemination of assets depends on certain legitimacy. By the by, all don't mean something very similar by merit; rather, leftists state it is opportunity; oligarchs, riches; others, great birth; blue-bloods, ethicalness. Justice in this sense is worried about proportionate proportion of commensurable products. Aristotle utilized a genuine case of some pipe players to explain his rationale of legitimacy. He says that if some pipe players are equivalent in aptitude; we should not give a bit of leeway in instruments to those of better birth, for that would not empower them to play any better.<sup>13</sup> It is a type of Justice which designates troubles as per the person's capacity to convey them and accords uphold in sums which fluctuate with the requirements of the people. For this situation there is important to include in any event four terms: the people for whom it turns out to be simply ought to be at any rate two, the things in question and the issues of concern.<sup>14</sup>

Rather than distributive justice of Aristotle, Corrective justice treats all people similarly. It plans to re-establish what an individual had lost because of the treachery of the general public. This justice keeps from infringements of one directly over the other. All laws identified with business exchanges are managed inside the medicinal and remedial activities. It happens in exchanges, both intentional and automatic.<sup>15</sup>

### 3. Utilitarian view:

Distribution of resources as indicated by utilitarians depends on 'greatest happiness for the greatest number of people'/'utility', with the goal that it can move into happiness or pleasure of individuals, not pain. Utility is property/quality/value of any article which shows that whether it will in general deliver benefit, advantage, joy, happiness, or satisfaction or to forestall the incident of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness to the

gathering whose intrigue is thought of: if that party be the community in general, then the happiness of the community: if a particular individual, then the happiness of that individual.<sup>16</sup> Utilitarian theory has been given by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. His theory depends on the mental precept of gratification which continues on the assumption that man is a conscious being, an animal of feeling and reasonableness. This theory accepts that nature has set humanity under the administration of two sovereign bosses, pain and pleasure.<sup>17</sup> They oversee us in everything we do, in all we state, in all we figure: each exertion we can make to lose our coercion, will serve however to exhibit and affirm it. There are four discernable sources from which pain and pleasure are being used to stream: the physical, the political, the moral and the religious.<sup>18</sup> Pain and pleasures having a place with every one of them are fit for giving a coupling power to any law or rule of direct. A stand of government is said agreeable when it increases pleasure of individual and diminishes pain since person gets inspiration by the longing to acquire pleasure and stay away from pain.

Bentham's utility principle implicitly consist the idea of justice and state incorporate it through legislation. Bentham considered 'idea of justice' as subordinate idea of utility.<sup>20</sup> He doesn't recognize individual human rights. Bentham wrote a paper named '*Anarchical Fallacies*', in which he criticized the most famous manifesto of such rights in his day, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen received by the French National Assembly in August, 1789. He was not set up to recognize a general or specific human right to justice since he had no regard for common rights. He thought about natural rights as simple nonsense. Bentham's notion of subordination of justice to utility is further apparent by the way that he reprimanded existing overall set of laws by the model of the 'principle of utility'. He dismissed appeal to 'Natural law'. He didn't accept contract as a reason for the State and political commitment official on all individuals from the State on this premise.<sup>21</sup> Instead of both these confounded convictions Bentham subbed the 'Principle of utility'.

Bentham's concept of utility pulled in John Stuart Mill (J.S. Mill) and he upheld this theory. In any case, he presented subjective delight alongside quantitative one.<sup>22</sup> He says that it is smarter to be an individual disappointed than a pig fulfilled and preferred to be Socrates disappointed over an imbecile fulfilled. He needs an away from of what things it remembers for the thoughts of agony and joy. He stressed that the utilitarian's rule of joy is benevolent instead of prideful, since it needs bliss of all concerned. Among the utilitarians, one of the main issues of lawful way of thinking to which Mill recommended a methodology not the same as that of Bentham was the centrality that ought to be ascribed to the idea of justice. Mill accepts that in all times of theory, probably the most grounded deterrent to the gathering of the convention that Utility or Happiness is the rule of right and wrong has been drawn from the idea of Justice. He recognizes feeling of justice as a particular impulse and may yet require, similar to our different senses. He recognized various ascribes to distinguish between justice and injustice.<sup>23</sup>

Justice implies something which it isn't just option to do, and wrong not to do, however which some unique individual can guarantee from us as his moral right. Mill thinks about that we should treat all equally well (when no higher obligation

precludes) who have merited similarly well of us, and that society should treat all equally well who have merited similarly well of it. This is the most elevated dynamic norm of social and distributive justice; towards which all institutions, and the efforts of every prudent resident, ought to be made in the most extreme conceivable degree to unite.<sup>24</sup> All people are regarded to reserve an option to equality of treatment.

Utilitarian's perspectives reflected an unequal distribution of resources on the basis of satisfaction or happiness. But, there is a possibility that the rights of disadvantaged sections may have to sacrifice for the happiness of the privileged classes of society. John Rawls criticized utilitarians for the treatment of individual as a means.<sup>25</sup> He accompanied a systematic theory of distribution of resources. He accepts that a theory anyway elegant and economical must be dismissed or amended in the event that it is false; moreover laws and organizations regardless of how effective and very much masterminded must be improved or abrogated on the off chance that they are treacherous.<sup>26</sup> Justice, as indicated by Rawls, is the main prudence of social foundations, as truth is of frameworks of thought. Being first ideals of human exercises, truth and equity are solid in the public eye. He considers society as relationship of people who in their relations to each other perceive certain standards of lead as authoritative and who generally act as per them.<sup>27</sup> These guidelines indicate an arrangement of co-activity needs the improvement of those partaking in it. Although a society is a co-operative venture for mutual advantage, but it is also witness conflict as well identity of interests. Irreconcilable situation happens to get the more noteworthy advantages created by their coordinated effort. So as to seek after their finishes, all of them lean towards a bigger to a lesser offer.

#### 4. Rawlsian View:

Rawls' primary concern is social justice. He focuses on basic structure of society, or all the more precisely, the manner by which the significant social establishments disperse crucial rights and obligations and decide the division of focal points from social participation. He understands the political constitution and the chief monetary and social courses of action as significant organizations. Subsequently the lawful security of opportunity of thought and liberty of conscience, serious business sectors, private property in the methods for creation, and the monogamous family are instances of significant social organizations. The significant institutions characterize rights and duties of person and impact their life possibilities. Rawls needs a society based on co-operation. He doesn't want contest in dissemination of distribution of fundamental rights & duties and in the division of advantages. Along these lines, he supported a theory of social contract, grown basically by Locke, Rousseau, and Kant. He doesn't consider about original contract to enter a specific culture or to set up a specific type of government. Or maybe, he attempts to show that principles of justice for the fundamental structure of society are the object of the first understanding/contract. These principles have been picked by the free and rational people worried to their own advantages. They acknowledge these standards in an underlying situation of correspondence as characterizing the major terms of their affiliation. These standards are to control all further arrangements; they indicate the sorts of social participation that can be gone into and the

types of government that can be set up. Rawls called this way of regarding the principles of justice as 'Justice as fairness'.<sup>28</sup>

In justice as fairness, the original position of equality corresponds to the state of nature within the ancient theory of social contract. Original position is taken into account as a strictly theoretic state of affairs. Nobody is aware of his place in society, his category position or status, nor will anyone grasp his fortune within the distribution of natural assets and skills, his intelligence, strength, and also the like at original position. Such position of individual at original position has been termed as 'veil of ignorance'<sup>29</sup> object by Rawls. The principles of justice are chosen behind a 'veil of ignorance' and this ensures that nobody is favoured or deprived within the selection of principles by the result of natural probability or the contingency of social circumstances. Participants within the initial state of affairs have been thought-about as rational and reciprocally impartial. This doesn't mean that the participants are egoists however but they are conceived as not taking an interest in one another's interests. Since all are in similar condition and nobody is ready to style principles to favour his specific condition, the principles of justice are a result of a fair agreement. 'Justice as fairness' conveys the thought that the principles of justice are agreed in an initial situation or original position hence they are fair.

Rawls asks about few set of principles, for selecting among the varied social arrangements, on the premise of that division of benefits and correct distribution of rights & duties are going to be done. These principles are the principles of social justice: they direct in distribution of rights and duties within the basic establishments of society and that they outline the acceptable distribution of the advantages and burdens of social co-operation. The first subject of the principles of social justice is that the basic structure of society, the arrangement of major social establishments into one theme of cooperation. These principles are to control the assignment of rights and duties in these establishments and that they are to see the acceptable distribution of the advantages and burdens of social life. Rawls states that a society is regular once it's not solely designed to advance the good of its members however once it's conjointly effectively regulated by a public conception of justice. That is, it's a society within which (1) everybody settle for and is aware of that the others accept constant principles of justice, and (2) the essential social establishments usually satisfy and are usually noted to satisfy these principles. One might imagine of a public conception of justice as constituting the basic charter of a regular human association.

He developed two principles. The two elementary principles of Rawls' original theory of social justice are:<sup>30</sup>

- (1) every person has equal right to the foremost intensive system of non-public liberty compatible with a system of total liberty for all
- (2) Social and economic difference are to be organized in order that they're each

(a) reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage (so that the least well off people are made as well off as possible, which could mean giving an unequal/greater amount to the people least well off)

(b) attached to positions and offices hospitable all (so that everybody in society incorporates a reasonable chance of getting the positions in society that build selections regarding inequalities)

These principles primarily apply to the basic structure of society. They're to control the assignment of rights and duties and to manage the distribution of social and economic benefits. These principles assume that the system will be divided into two additional or less distinct parts; the primary principle applies to the one and also the second to the opposite. They outline and secure the equal liberties for each national. They conjointly specify and establish social and economic inequalities. The essential liberties of citizens are, roughly speaking, political liberty (the right to vote and to be eligible for public office) beside freedom of speech and assembly; liberty of conscience and freedom of thought; freedom of the person along with right to hold personal property; and freedom from discretionary arrest and seizure as outlined by the construct of the rule of law. These liberties are all needed to be equal by the primary principle, since citizens of a simply society area unit to own constant basic rights.

The second principle applies to the distribution of financial gain and wealth and to the planning of organizations that build use of variations in authority and responsibility. Whereas the distribution of wealth and financial gain needn't be equal, it should be to everyone's advantage, and at constant time, positions of authority and offices of command should be accessible to all or any. One applies the second principle by holding positions open, and then, subject to the present constraint, arranges social and economic inequalities in order that everybody advantages.

## References

1. Plato. *'The Republic'*. Tr by Allon bloom. Second Edition. (New York: Basic books,1991),45.
2. Ibid, 98.
3. Ibid,113.
4. Ibid,112.
5. Ibid, 113.
6. Ibid, 120.
7. Aristotle. *'Nicomachean Ethics'*. Tr. by Robert C. Bartlett and Susan D. Collins. (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2011), 25.
8. Ibid, 116.
9. Ibid, 114.
10. Ibid, 119.
11. Ibid, 118.
12. Aristotle. *'The Politics'*. Translated by T. A. Sinclair, Revised & represented by Trevor J. Saunders. (London: Penguin books, 1992),209.
13. Ibid,209.
14. Aristotle. *'Nicomachean Ethics'*. Tr. by Robert C. Bartlett and Susan D. Collins. (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2011),119.
15. Ibid, 120.
16. Bentham, Jeremy. *'An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation'*. (Kitchener: Batoche books, 2000), 15.
17. Ibid,14.
18. Ibid, 27.
19. Ibid,15.
20. Hart, H.L.A. *'Essays on Bentham Jurisprudence and Political theory'*. (New York:: Clarendon Press, 2001), 51.
21. Warnock, Mary. *'Utilitarianism and On Liberty'*. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 9.
22. Mill. J. S. *'Utilitarianism'*. (Auckland: The Floating press,2009), 16.
23. Ibid,79-82.
24. Mill. J. S. *'Utilitarianism'*. (Auckland: The Floating press,2009), 112.
25. Rawls, John. *'A theory of justice'*. (London: The Belknap press, 2005), 28.
26. Ibid, 3.
27. Ibid, 4.
28. Rawls, John. *'A theory of justice'*. (London: The Belknap press, 2005), 11.
29. Ibid,12.
30. Rawls, John. *'A theory of justice'*. (London: The Belknap press, 2005), 60.
31. Nozick, Robert. *'Anarchy ,State and Utopia'*. (New York: Basic books, 2013), 150.

## 5. Libertarian view:

In opposition to Rawls' theory of justice, Robert Nozick has developed the thought of social justice as entitlement. He doesn't support any reasonable distribution. He regards any distribution of resources as just, as long because it passed in accordance with three principles:<sup>31</sup>

- a) Original acquisition of holdings: the method by that unheld things might come back to be command
- b) Transfer of holdings: method of deed a holding from another who holds it
- c) Rectification: any unjust transfers are to be corrected by compensation

## 6. Conclusion:

Different theorists have given different explanation of Social Justice. Justice, in opinion of Plato, is based on duties while Aristotle's justice is somehow based on rights. Justice has a moral rather than legal content in idea of Plato. Western libertarian thinkers like Nozick, Hayek etc. find the idea of social justice unnecessary. They support minimum-interference of state or state. They advocate that distribution of resources should be based on merit. Another western thinker John Rawls states that everyone has equality of liberty. It means that one can do what he/she wants to do according to his/her choice. But, he also supports some special programmes for disadvantage sections.