

Social Justice: An Overview of Indian Perspective

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 January 2019

Keywords

Social Justice, Distribution of resources, Dharma, Rights, Duties

ABSTRACT

Different ideas have been developed by different theorist 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. Indian theorist also has their own opinion about social justice. Some ideas support the caste system in Indian society and advocates that justice should be based on dharma/duties of caste system. But some others criticize caste system and discrimination on the basis of caste system.

1. Introduction

Liberty, equality and justice are pillars of democracy. Social justice is an integral part of justice. The term social justice is a sweeping term in order to incorporate both social equity and monetary equity. Social justice is making a general public or organization that depends on the standards of balance and solidarity, that comprehends and values basic liberties and that perceives the nobility of each person. It is a powerful gadget to limit the sufferings of the oppressed and denied segments of the general public. It needs to raise discouraged area to the degree of uniformity to carry on with an honorable life. The point of social justice is to accomplish a significant level of social, monetary and political balance, which is the authentic desire for each segment of the general public. Different thoughts have been given by various scholar about the idea of social justice. Some western writing discovered this thought pointless while some thought that it was important to keep up intelligibility in the public arena. Justice, in assessment of Plato, depends on obligations while Aristotle's justice is by one way or another dependent on rights. Justice has a good instead of legitimate substance in thought of Plato. Western libertarian masterminds like Nozick, Hayek and so on consider the possibility of social justice meaningless. They uphold least impedance of state in singular life. They advocate that conveyance of assets ought to be founded on merit. Another western scholar John Rawls states that everybody has uniformity of freedom. It implies that one can do what he/she needs to do as per his/her decision. However, he likewise underpins some unique projects for hindrance areas of society. Indian scholar likewise has their own feeling about social justice. A few thoughts uphold the standing framework in Indian culture and backers that justice ought to be founded on dharma/obligations of station framework. Be that as it may, some others condemn standing framework and separation based on rank framework.

2. Social Justice as Duties or Dharma

Justice has stayed a cardinal guideline of Indian public activity during the antiquated period. Justice in Hindu folklore is

associated with social qualities. There was a profound idea like that of Dharma to take care of the issues of Law and life. Justice has been considered to follow their obligations gave by Dharma to every citizen in Hindu social framework. Every individual knew their job that was allocated by 'Dharma' for the advancement of the network. Ruler needed to keep up this framework. Lord had been requested a part in the organization of equity as the most noteworthy expert in the state. Manusmriti has asked King's court as taken care of the legal issues. Ruler's court was called as Sabha. The Sabha was going by the King himself.¹ It has been referenced there as following:

"A lord, envious of researching law cases, must enter his official courtroom, safeguarding a noble manner, along with Brahmanas and with experienced councillors."²

In the Manusmriti, lord has been recommended to enact a law as indicated by Shastras³ and uses of the nation (customs). Manu needed a detail and moment investigation of the cases by the King. Set up laws assisted with keeping everything under control among individual and individual, and among people and proprietors of affiliations like partnerships in a town or an area, or herdsmen.⁴ To keep up a quiet and co-employable society was the genuine concern of Manusmriti. This was an aggregate obligation as everybody would be contributing in looking after Dharma, yet it would be the duty of the King and his committee to guarantee that this occurs and request is kept up in the general public.

Vivekananda additionally acknowledges by one way or another the way of thinking of Dharma. He acknowledges the rank arrangement of Dharma with certain protests. He was an extraordinary Hindu scholar of current period who put forth eager and steady attempts to understand the fantasy of Hindu religion and theory. He drew the quintessence of Hinduism from Upanishads, the Gita and so forth He proposed a Neo-Vedanta reasoning represented assistance, penance and opportunity. He was one of the incredible translators of the Vedanta reasoning in present day times. He supported that there was no contradiction between the different frameworks of thought in Hindu way of thinking. Vivekananda was aware of the presence of position, and furthermore its significance.

There were four stations, the ministers, the landowners and military individuals, the merchants individuals and the craftsmans, workers and workers in India. He gently protected the rank arrangement of India which keeps three-fourths of the individuals in absolute and mortifying subjection.⁵ He legitimizes his dispute by saying that throughout the entire existence of the India, the three upper positions had, in progression, controlled the general public. He says that offspring of workers and workers haven't the privilege of training in old India. Much number of populace was set on beggary. He tried to set up the since quite a while ago conceded connection between the Aryan races and their relatives in the new world.

Women have likewise endured optional treatment in their home just as in the public eye. In the initial three castes the young men are sent at the ages of ten, eleven and thirteen individually to gurukuls/private instruction establishments and stay there until thirty, 25 and twenty years of age, separately. In any case, in antiquated occasions the two young men and young ladies were getting instruction, however now just the young men are favored.⁶ They arranged supper for their family unit individuals. Be that as it may, they hang tight for some man to go along who is first served, at that point the creatures, the workers, the man of the house and in conclusion the lady of the family. He clarified the old custom of ladies being scorched on the passing of their spouses, on the ground that they adored them so they couldn't live without the husband. They were one in marriage and must be one in death.⁷ An exertion, in any case, is being made to amend the long-existing incorrectly. A decent portion of the way of thinking and traditions that must be adhered to is crafted by ladies during the antiquated occasions, before brutes began to control the land. According to the Hindu the lady currently has her privileges. She stands her ground and has the law on her side. He clarified the terrible state of lady in India⁸ on the ground that Hindu men had such regard for lady that it was thought best not to permit her out. The Hindu ladies were treated with such high regard that they were kept in isolation.

Like Vivekananda and Dharma reasoning, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi/Mahatma Gandhi likewise remains with four layer station arrangement of India. He considers four ashramas/classes/positions again an extraordinary commitment of Hindu religion to society. He says that there is nothing similar to it in the entire world. In any case, the Catholics have the request for celibates relating to brahmacharis, yet not as a foundation, while in India each kid needed to experience the first ashrama.⁹ He feels it as a fabulous origination and furthermore thinks about it as his premise of social justice. In current world the greater part of origination of social justice depends on 'rights' while Gandhi's origination about social equity depends on 'obligations'. He accepts that if each resident follows their appointed part as indicated by Varnashram framework, it will prompt co-activity and soundness in the public eye. Gandhi by and by immovably clung to the antiquated strict tenet of obligation dependent on one's position and status. Gandhi's origination of the station framework doesn't put together it with respect to pride or vain ideas of social predominance, yet on obligations doled out to them explicitly.

Gandhi likewise propounded 'hypothesis of trusteeship' for a fair society. In Gandhi's view, an exceptionally extreme part

of an equitable society is that of responsibility for. He says that what measure of abundance an individual traversed inheritance, or by methods for exchange and industry or through employment and so on doesn't totally have a place with him.¹⁰ What has a place with him is the privilege to a honourable business. The remainder of his abundance has a place with the network and should be utilized for the government assistance of the network. Gandhi needed to grow out of one's ravenousness and feeling of ownership, and to descend disregarding their abundance to the degree of the individuals who procure their bread by work. The worker needs to understand that the rich man is less proprietor of his abundance than the worker is proprietor of his own, viz., the ability to work.

3. Social Justice as Rights:

South Indian scholar Periyar E.V. Ramasamy condemned the thought of Gandhi's Varnasharma Dharma (Code of Casteism).¹¹ Varnasharma framework, in the assessment of Periyar, doesn't make sentiment of confidence among Shudras. He says that fowls, creatures, worms, which are viewed as truant of realism don't have positions, contrasts as high and low, in their own species.¹² In any case, man has every one of these indecencies due to confidence in religion. He accepts that each individual is balanced and they (person) are invested with motivation to think profoundly. They have included themselves into various troubles by abusing his logic. They have made divine beings to discover alleviation from their issues. Rulers appreciated themselves that they were administering individuals as per Manu law/god's organization. Consequently the Brahmins looked for the important protections to keep up the evil of casteism joined to others by birth.

Periyar thought about that casteism and Hinduism were very much the same. He needed that Hinduism ought to go altogether. Periyar looked to guard the privileges of the Dravidians/Shudras against Aryan control. He censured the Aryans for presenting a crooked and severe social framework in Indian culture. Periyar understood that all philosophies of the elites depended on 'Aryan hypothesis of race' for the strength. The 'Aryan view' was received excitedly by the Indian elites as another model for getting position. As indicated by this Aryan hypothesis Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas were considered as the relatives of the attacking Aryans, while Shudras and Untouchables were accepted to be the family members of the local vanquished occupants. In this new hypothesis Aryan plunges were guaranteed as 'twice-born' status and 'Dravidian' or 'non-Aryan' plummets were asserted as 'Shudra'. The high rank elites of India started to take Aryan and Sanskrit culture as the premise of Indian ethnicity. He considered Brahmins as the agents of Hindu pomposity and the fortification of social injustice.¹³

Jotirao Phule additionally contradicted the control of Aryans based on racial predominance. He was the first Indian in quite a while who battled for the everyday person, the discouraged and for Indian ladies. His vision was to reproduce the social request based on social equality, justice and reason. The 'Aryan hypothesis of race' established the most powerful normal talk for examining rank and society in Phule's time. Hence, Indian civilisation was viewed as principally a subsidiary of Aryan civilisation and the position framework was

praised as a method by which individuals of assorted racial and social foundations were united and exposed to the cultivating impact of the Aryans. Phule essentially switched Aryan racial prevalence hypothesis by contending that the low stations were the first occupants of the nation. They were oppressed and abused by vanquishing Aryans. It was the affirmed and genuine perspective on Jotirao that the antiquated history of India was only the battle among Brahmins and non-Brahmins.¹⁴

Phule says that India had gone through Brahmanical imperialism before British expansionism. Brahmanical imperialism has its underlying foundations in certain Hindu sacred writings that give divine support to position based separation and mastery. Phule recognizes the beginnings of Brahmanical oppression as infringement by the Brahmins of an advantaged position for themselves as Bhudev. This not just helped them legitimize unbalanced utilization of justice in ordinary issues, yet in addition let them proper a position more celebrated than that of a divine being. He accepted that force had moved to pen from blade hence dalits should attempt to get this new force. He additionally accepted that Brahmins might never want to see an informed lower station.¹⁵

Bhimrao Ambedkar remains against the rank/varnashram arrangement of India. He reprimands separation and unapproachability dependent on station. Dr. Ambedkar thinks about that there are two thoughts of social justice: (1) social justice as represented by a perfect component and (2) social justice as administered by a person who has virtue of brain for example profound quality or human qualities i.e freedom, organization and fairness. The primary thought was given during the early Vedic period which depends on origination of God and the karma standard. Second thought was pushed via Carvaka, Buddhism and Jainism and they offered supremacy to man and his upright activity as opposed to offering significance to the celestial component.¹⁶

His idea of social justice depended on human qualities, for example, liberty, equality and fraternity. These three are fundamental to run a popular government. Liberty has two sorts: (A) Civil liberty and (B) political liberty. Common liberty alludes to (1) Liberty of movement which is another name for independence from capture without fair treatment of law (2) Liberty of speech (which obviously incorporates freedom of thought, freedom of perusing, composing and conversation) and (3) Liberty of action. The primary sort of liberty is obviously basic. Not just key it is likewise generally basic. The second sort of liberty which might be called opportunity of assessment is significant for some reasons. It is a fundamental state of all advancement scholarly, good, political and social. Where it doesn't exist the norm becomes generalized and all inventiveness even the most vital is disheartened. Liberty of action implies doing what one jumps at the chance to do. It isn't sufficient that freedom of activity ought to be formal. It must be genuine. So comprehended, liberty of action implies viable capacity to do explicit things. Genuine freedom of action exists just where misuse has been demolished, where no concealment of one class by another exists, where there is no joblessness, no neediness and where an individual is liberated from the dread of losing his employment, his home and his food as a result of his activity. Political liberty comprises justified of the person to partake in the outlining of laws and really taking shape and undoing of governments. According to Dr. Ambedkar liberty gives individuals the opportunity of

articulation in his activity. Through liberty the concealed gifts of the individual are communicated. It empowers people to fix his predetermination.¹⁷

Equality ties men together through reciprocities, co-activity and social compassion. Uniformity implies precisely the equivalent or comparable in measure, sum, number, degree, worth, or quality. It is a term precise enough in material science and arithmetic, yet clearly vague when applied to individuals. Ambedkar accentuates on 'moral equality'. It is declared against imbalances in physical quality, gifts, industry, and riches. It rejected that prevalent physical quality has an ethical option to execute, eat, or persecute individuals just on the grounds that it is predominant. To gifts and riches, the ideal of good fairness makes a comparable forswearing of right. What's more, in fact few can envision themselves to have predominant physical quality, abilities and abundance will retain from inferiors every ethical right. In such conditions government and abundance would go to prevalent physical quality; while ideals and gifts would serve the beast man. A general public with no regard for human characters is a band of burglars.¹⁸

Ambedkar says that fraternity implies a feeling of basic brotherhood, all things considered, all Indians being one individuals. It is the standard which gives solidarity and solidarity to public activity. Fraternity fortifies social orders and provides for every individual a more grounded individual enthusiasm for essentially counselling the government assistance of others. It drives him to recognize his emotions just as others. With an attitude to fraternity, he comes like informatively to be aware of himself as being one who obviously pays respect to other people. The benefit of other people becomes to him a thing normally and essentially to be gone to like any of the states of being of our reality. Where individuals don't feel that entireness of compassion for all others, concordance in the overall course of their direct is unthinkable. For an individual in whom social inclination isn't created can't however force himself to think about the remainder of his individual creatures as adversaries battling with him for the methods for joy when he should try to overcome all together that he may prevail in himself. Every individual will have compassion and regard for other people. This is what Dr. Ambedkar called social democracy.¹⁹

Dr. Ambedkar's idea of social justice is a lifestyle, giving each man his perfect spot in the public eye. Its standards might be: to live decently, to regard all, to harm nobody, and to give each man his due with no fake segregation as a top priority and unnatural characterization in the public eye. Different standards of social justice are the matchless quality of established principle, correspondence under the watchful eye of the law, protecting central rights, execution of obligations, adherence to social and legitimate commitments, lastly, a resolute confidence in the estimations of equity, freedom, equity, brotherhood and respect of human character. In this manner, as per Dr. Ambedkar the idea of equity doesn't simply mean the dispersion of social riches, however fundamentally a lifestyle dependent on freedom, correspondence and organization. To put it plainly, the pith of Dr. Ambedkar's idea of social justice is the solidarity and equity of every single individual, autonomously of contemplations of class, position, sex and station, regarding regard, rights, kindness, common love, compassion, resilience and noble cause towards individual creatures, the nobility, everything being equal, the

nullification of rank differentiation, instruction and property for all, kindness and delicacy. Dr. Ambedkar demanded social justice since it incorporates a wide range of equity, to be specific, lawful, financial, political, divine, strict, characteristic, distributive, regulatory as likewise government assistance of youngsters and ladies.²⁰

4. Conclusion:

Social justice has been primarily considered as to follow one's *dharma* in Hindu mythology. In Manusmriti, society has been distributed in four Varnas/sections. Each varnas has their defined role in society. They have to follow it. This system is known as Varnashram system. Manu, Gandhi, Vivekananda, Balgangadhar Tilak etc. supports this Varnashram system. They believe that if each Varna follows their assigned duties, there will be social justice in society. While Vivekananda considers Varnashram system as open system, others consider it as close system. Vivekananda thinks that one can upgrade their Varna from bottom to upper in Hindu system according to his/her performance in this life. It means that a Shudra can be at the position of Brahmana. Whereas Manu and others believe that one can't change his position in Varna hierarchy in this life, he/she can get higher position in Varna hierarchy in next life on the basis of his/her good works of this life. So, in the Hindu social system idea of social justice is more or less based on duties.

Dalit epistemology claims more or less about rights in their idea of social justice. Mahatma Jotirao Phule, E.V. Periyar Ramaswamy, Babasaheb Ambedkar, Narayanswami etc. attacked the system of exploitation at all levels in Hindu social system. They developed their vision of Indian society as an

alternative to the upper caste understanding of India. They wanted to reconstruct the social order on the basis of social equality and justice. They advocated to provide legal rights to their people, so their people can save themselves from illegal physical, financial, social and political damage. Proportional representation according to population in Indian system was also demanded. It was considered that with this proportional representation, their people can participate in opinion making and decision making of Indian system. Their voices should get a space in system because they are also a part of this Indian system. Ambedkar wants liberty for their people. He wanted that there should not be any hindrance in selection of one's job. One can opt his/her job according to his/her choice. There should be liberty to present one's ideas. Ambedkar also wanted fraternity among different section of society.

Another Indian thinker Amartya Sen has different idea about social justice. His idea is based on capability. He says that government should focus on capability on human being, not on the distribution of resources. Capability leads to well-being of a person. Amartya Sen's idea of social justice tries to make society less unjust at the place of perfectly just. Sen identifies that social arrangements should make it possible for individuals to build their capabilities. The effectiveness of government action should be judged according to an individual's capability to do things and the freedom of individuals to choose between different ways of leading their lives. Sen's approach to social justice focuses on assuring individual capacities to gain optimal wellbeing in their circumstances. He defines poverty as the deprivation of these basic capabilities.

References

1. Manu. 'Manusmriti'. CH VII. 1. Available at https://archive.org/stream/ManuSmriti_201601/Manu-Smriti_djvu.txt. Accessed on 29 Aug 2019.
2. Manu. 'Manusmriti'. Ch VIII.1. at https://archive.org/stream/ManuSmriti_201601/Manu-Smriti_djvu.txt. Accessed on 29 Aug 2019.
3. Manu. 'Manusmriti'. Ch II. 12. At https://archive.org/stream/ManuSmriti_201601/Manu-Smriti_djvu.txt. Accessed on 29 Aug 2019.
4. Manu. 'Manusmriti'. Ch VIII.219, 232. At https://archive.org/stream/ManuSmriti_201601/Manu-Smriti_djvu.txt. Accessed on 29 Aug 2019.
5. Vivekananda. 'Complete works of Vivekananda'. At http://ramakrishnavivekananda.info/vivekananda/volume_3/reports_in_american_newspapers/hindu_civilisation.htm
6. Vivekananda. 'Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda'. Vol 3, At http://ramakrishnavivekananda.info/vivekananda/volume_3/reports_in_american_newspapers/manners_and_customs_in_india.htm
7. Vivekananda. 'Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda'. At http://ramakrishnavivekananda.info/vivekananda/volume_3/reports_in_american_newspapers/india_her_religion_and_customs.htm
8. Ibid
9. Gandhi, Mahatma. 'What is Hinduism?'. (New Delhi: National Book Trust, 1994), 54.
10. Gandhi. M. K. 'Trusteeship'. (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Mudranalaya, 1980), 4.
11. Ramasamy. Periyar. E. V. 'Collected Works of PERIYAR E.V.R.' (Chennai: The Periyar SelfRespectPropaganda Institution), 53.
12. Ibid, 55.
13. Michael. S.M. 'Dalits in Modern India'. (New Delhi: Sage Publication, 2007), 112.
14. Ibid, 91.
15. Ibid, 118.
16. Jammanna, A. 2017. 'Dr.B.R.Ambedkar's Philosophy of Social Justice on Indian Society'. In Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies. Vol- 4/37. p. 8737.
17. Narke, Hari. 'Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches'. vol. 3. (New Delhi: Dr. Ambedkar Foundation, 2014), 98.
18. Narke, Hari. 'Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches'. vol. 3. (New Delhi: Dr. Ambedkar Foundation, 2014), 96.
19. Ibid, 97.
20. Jammanna, A. 2017. 'Dr.B.R.Ambedkar's Philosophy of Social Justice on Indian Society'. In Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies. Vol- 4/37. p. 8737.