



Justice as Common Good: Historical Evolution and Philosophical Interpretations

Subrat Kumar Ratha

Masters' Student, Department of Politics and International Studies, Pondicherry University, Puducherry, India

Abstract

Since antiquity, in all ages, justice has been treated as a parameter to capture the social and political insight into a suitable boundary. However, acknowledging justice from a perspective of common good refresh the hidden objectives of justice that needs to be encapsulated. Both western and eastern philosophy, particularly the process of politicisation of justice, tries to accommodate the political sphere of justice into a bottle of common good. Of course, the nature of justice can only be defined as a matter of distributive concept, for instance distribution of primary goods lead to the realization of being a member of political community. Historically the manner of justice has been evolving to pursue a good society, not only for individuals rather the essence of justice enhances the complexity of global interdependence through divers conceptual and theoretical standards. This paper will be analysing the basic historical and philosophical interpretations with regard to justice, moreover the amalgamation of justice with Common Good will also be taken into consideration.

Key Words – Justice, Philosophy, Common Good, Distribution, Interdependence

Introduction

Political philosophy denotes the embodiment of logical reasoning, empirical outlook and epistemological observations. With a sense of rigorous research, the understanding about political society seems incomplete without a basic framework in which all the ideas would come up. The main problem before political philosophy has

been to identify a just human society with an empirical-inputs, however all the philosophers have deliberately been attempting to take a judicious standpoint in this regard. political philosophy, since ancient world, has been trying to answer the questions concerning to justice. As a matter of morality and logic, the term justice has been described from various dimensions of our

human life, for instance justice is something to examine our distributive system or relating to human virtues. Amazingly, the term justice always has a meaning of its own, depends upon the various issues of a political community. It has been defined that justice has to deal with our capacities and consciousness to remove all the injustices, but in a wider sense the term justice can be interpreted as an instrument for distributing all the goods and services amongst people. Evolution of the term justice has a long history, even from the ancient world, where people were confronting with each other for greater good and achievements. Justice signifies the common interests of the society because with the term itself justice has covered all the aspects of human life, thus epistemologically, it would not be wrong to pursue the internal engagements between justice and the common good. The linkages between justice and common good would be totally complementary due to the greater outcomes through which a philosopher will be able to construct a just order by doing good for all not from the self but as a whole.

Research objectives

- To examine the relationship between justice and common good through various historical perspectives.
- To find out major philosophical interpretations pertaining to justice for realizing the distributive standards.
- to acknowledge the confusions within the term common good that makes a severe distinction between good and just.

Materials and method(s)

Methodologically, the paper based on qualitative research in which imaginary instincts and philosophical observations has been given more priority. This paper tries to demonstrate a combination between both historical and

philosophical arguments in proving the essence of the research. The study entirely depends on sources such as academic articles, online website materials and literatures concerning to justice, common good and other related findings. This research paper highlights the internal exchanges between justice and common good by reviewing the major existing literatures.

Justice: what is good for all?

Doing right things for all would be entirely different from realizing the essence of good, although the idea of good has certain characteristics of righteousness but in a political context both the concepts acquire their respective position separately. It is a major problem to be handled about the goodness of a policy or some principles which are being accepted as right but ultimately that right thing will not be satisfied the moral and ethical standard of human society. So, the confusion makes it difficult to declare a particular treatment as good or a common concern. Here we will have to examine the nature of greater good as has been called "common good", the distribution of goods must be resembled the common happiness of a society. Common good, that which benefits society as a whole, in contrast to the private good of individuals and sections of society (Lee, 2016). As a part of moral philosophy, common good has been defined the allocation of different services and facilities which contrast the self-interests, therefore the state has to attach justice as a primary framework through which common good can be realized. From a critical perspective, the distinction between common good and public interests might improve the analysis to make a general argument about the closeness of justice with common good rather than public interests. Public interest reflects the particular

choices or specific demands that would be relevant for their survival, e. g construction of schools, hospitals and other institutions. On the other hand, common good has a more ethical and moral standpoint, for instance the state must extend her power to regulate the human behaviour such as good character, rational enhancements and happiness. Demand for justice expresses our political and moral consciousness and the term justice has been attempting to produce a greater good for the society as a reference for all times. Thus, the philosophical confusion between the two concepts would force to investigate the historical evolution of justice as well as the common good with a comparative standard.

History of justice as a common good

The evolution of justice tries to demonstrate certain historical and philosophical interpretations for examining the real harmony and contradictions between the state and its subject. As a moral concept, justice evolved from a philosophical ground rather than a political society and only for that reason philosophers are more sceptical about its origin. From a political context, justice has to be done through the laws, regulations and juristic interpretations but in a moral ground, justice would highlight our human virtues and ethical regeneration.

Ancient Civilization: justice as a virtue

Ancient Greek political developments were more organized and systematic as compared to the medieval Christianity. They were given a systematic articulation about the political institutions, education system and essentially a coherent idea on justice. The starting point of western political philosophy was the ideas of Socrates and subsequently two other philosophers

– Plato and Aristotle, all of them had discussed about the nature of justice and laid the foundation of good as reflection of justice. Plato derived his philosophical foundation from Socrates as a disciple, moreover Plato had discussed with his master about the nature of justice and finally they landed up on virtue. For Plato justice was a matter of proving one's own internal goodness without being a hurdle for other fellow beings. The virtue of a state being reflexive of creating a system of well- being, including establishing a constitution where both individual and social demands could be attended by a process of supply (Bhandari, 2014). Searching for good in Plato's theory of justice can be revealed with the fact that platonic Ideal state was a manifestation of virtues, even the women were oriented for education and politics. Greek society was divided into three major classes and this classification came with a proper education system through which a good political order could be built-up. These three classes, working in proper correlation, will insure the maximum of well-being throughout the state. Every member of the community must be assigned to the class for which he proves himself best fitted. Thus, a perfect harmony and unity will characterize both the state and every person in it (Donning, 1966). Unlike his master Plato, Aristotle was more realist in terms of institution and government, in his celebrated work "politics" Aristotle defended the necessity of a state for realizing good life. Living in a political society might improve our aspiration to achieve the greater good such as protection, development of inner goodness and fullest realization of life. As far as justice is concerned, Aristotle presented a distributive standard which has been used as a modern tool for analysing the distribution of different assets. Aristotle believes that every

things have especial aim and man's especial aim to reach the real happiness. He said the concept of human happiness basis of his discussion, and explains the concept of justice on the basis of human life (Hamedi, 2014). The teleological method was the guiding pillar for recognizing the entire philosophical constructions, Aristotle had decided the final goal of the both living and non-living things and ultimately the goal would be to achieve an ever-lasting happiness. In his theory of justice, Aristotle emphasised on the principle of equality in determining the distribution of goods and services. The criteria had to uphold the treatment of person according to their status, Aristotle defined common good with respect to the engagement of public in the political life e. g the duties of citizens. Apart from that, Aristotle was in favour of retribution where criminal activities could be minimized. In a philosophical ground it can be interpreted that both Plato and Aristotle presented the foundation of justice by making the common good for the society. Individualistic areas were really missing in Greek political philosophy, therefore the political community tended to improve the livelihood of its members.

Medieval Christendom: justice as a way for salvation

After the demise of Greek city-states, several fragmented and small cities were emerged. Probably it was the time of Jesus Christ, during this timeline all the discussion about politics were taking place within the boundary of Christian church. Around 320 A.D, Christianity took a serious momentum under the throne of Emperor Constantine and by himself the Christian religion got recognition as an official religion for the entire Roman Empire. The church dominated all intellectual life until the Renaissance of the 15th

century (Robinson, 2006). The overall definition of justice and the common good has been redefined under the wall of Christianity, secular political analysis was about to vanish from the public discourse and Church – state came as an ultimate guardian in making political developments. With the expansion of Christian church human life had been seen from two dimensions – material life and the divine life. The political philosophy during this period was supposed to be theocratic rather than reason-centric, unlike Greek political tradition medieval thoughts share its intellectual paroxysm with an invisible world called the “City of God”. The division of world came with the writings of St. Augustine, his celebrated piece “The City of God” emerged as a finest philosophical edifice of the then Christendom. His two city defines the moral strength of an individual to prove his preference, on the contrary Augustine also asserted that the love for god would bring greater happiness than the earthly counterpart. Human beings are intrinsically irrational and volatile. This is why god has sanctioned earthly government to preserve the peace. But the true destiny for all human beings lies elsewhere – that are really citizens of an eternal kingdom beyond this one (Robinson, 2006). Engaging oneself with the love to acquire the city of god has been accepted as a method good and justice because Augustine believed the earthly life of man would be much worse only for their competing interests. Augustinian common good emphasises on the renunciation from earthly desires and looking for a god driven world that gives the real pleasure of justice. During medieval history, an astonishing account on justice was proposed by Thomas Aquinas, he explained common good through the lens of Aristotle.

Aquinas was much concerned with the difference between common good and private good, according to him the tyrannical government will not be able to distribute the fruits of justice because the ruler himself possessed certain narrow interests. Aquinas highlighted the need for shared notions of justice and of what benefits the political community. Yet, Aquinas was not only concerned with the flourishing of political societies, but also conceived of human as part of a universal moral order (M.M & C, 2010). Having been argued about the connection between common good and justice, medieval period made no significant justifications as it was in Greece. But the fullest development of public morality and virtuous life was emphasised without having a political unification.

Modern era: justice as a matter for distribution

Modern conception of justice evolved from the cradle of a great historical ramification called as – “Renaissance”. It may be a contentious job for many to make a comparative analysis between the two historical contradictions, End of medieval Christendom on the one hand and reformation of European societies through reason and intellect on the other. A paradigm shift took place in the history of mankind when people were started questioning with regard to the existence of Church and Theological politics. The potential threats which had been restricted human mind to explore his or her tendencies came to an end with the emergence of secular politics and unification of nation states. Thinkers of the modern era became increasingly comfortable breaking from the main stream to pursue their own independent reasoning (Pomerleau, n.d.). With a comparative insight, modern analysis on common good might show up a negligible appearance on justice because at the beginning of modernity philosophers were

observed a unified political society. Development of political unification was started with the emergence of Machiavelli. His most readable work was “The Prince”, in which Machiavelli had to defend a strong unified Italy and tried to emancipate the whole society with his Civic Virtue. Although Machiavelli thought that republics with a measure of popular support were the best form of government, he realized the most people are more interested in security than the morality of their government (Robinson, 2006). Not directly but in a different way the realization of justice had made available for all, especially in the 16th and 17th century sovereign statehood came into flourish. Another radical argument on common good was presented by an English political philosopher whose intellectual capacity has been mesmerised our modern debates on political philosophy, Thomas Hobbes started his career as a tutor but in the horizon of philosophy he has been considered as a controversial figure. Having been stated his philosophy from an insecure individualism and finally warp up his intension in enforcing an absolute sovereignty. In his famous work – “Leviathan”, Hobbes maintained a robust standpoint by considering the facts of pre- political and pre- social era of the human history, for whom this situation was not conducive for developing a fair and just human order. No arts; no letters; no society; and which is worse of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short (Hobbes, 1886). By identifying the human nature, Hobbes developed the path through which the common good could be secured. A contract had to be signed by the people without allowing their sovereign master as a part of it and this contract was made available for preserving the

life and security of individual. Hobbesian common good detached the individual freedom and established a tyrannical political society where justice seemed as an outright authority of the state. In the social contract tradition, justice has been given importance only just to overcome the barbaric state of nature. John Locke presented another gateway by allowing people to pursue their own inalienable natural rights, in his contract authority had to be guided by the natural rights. Lockean justice took a different connotation in understanding the individual rights and limited government, he allowed his people to revolt against the authority those who violates the natural rights. Despite two extremes, social contract philosophy got a vital motion from the writings of Rousseau, whose philosophy revived the ancient Greek methods of analysis where morality takes more dominance over the power and authority. In his Social Contract, JJ Rousseau came up through his natural education and corrupt civilization. As he mentioned that man is born free but every he is in chain, this observation tries to uncover a crucial illustration on human nature under a natural society. The principle of common good, in Rousseau's philosophy, placed before the general will that they pursue. The collective will of the people defined a well- organized political society, however the sovereign power derives from the public what he called as – popular sovereignty. Social contract theory opened up the environment for liberal analysis but the entire philosophy is never be freed from diverse criticisms. From the enlightenment school, Immanuel Kant proposed a different account on justice and common good. Kant tried to answer a dilemma between ethical theory and consequentialism, in his famous formula – “categorical imperative” expresses the

rationality to differentiate between right and wrong. The categorical imperative contains three major formulas through which the behaviour and political society could be attained the just and goodness – firstly, principle of universality; secondly, the principle of respect; thirdly, principle of autonomy. Another famous argument in Kantian Philosophy was to attain the stage of “Perpetual Peace” by establishing a world government.

Immanuel Kant was a champion of human morality and defined through the lens of categorical imperative, despite criticism Kant's contribution inspired the entire world and finally landed up with the formation of League of Nations which tend to promote common good in our century. the idea of justice and common good has largely been influenced by the utilitarian philosophy that stands for the sake of majority to enjoy the fruit of happiness, unlike previous attempts, the principle of happiness has been considered as justice. In utilitarian tradition, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill were the two English philosophers whose ideas broadened our understanding about the pleasure with its effect on common good. Jeremy Bentham defined a scientific analysis through which the level and intensity of happiness could be measured. He claimed the individual's preference on the basis of hedonism e. g a particular work can be judged through the pleasure that the worker has experienced during his working hours. The idea of justice, according to Benthamite thoughts, rooted in his principle of utility and the principle of utility seems to be applied with a proper legislation. Bentham, like Aristotle, had argued about the necessity of punishment, therefore the extreme happiness of a person would not be able to ruin the

happiness of the other fellow beings. But the application of happiness made hurdle for minorities because the greatest happiness had to satisfy the need of the majorities. By highlighting the problems of Benthamite utilitarianism, John Stuart Mill approached a more humanist perspective within the purview of pleasure and pain. Mill tried to justify his arguments about justice in promoting the principle of social utility. He described five dimension of justice such as (1) respecting others' legal rights; (2) respecting the moral rights; (3) just to distribute what a person deserves; (4) unjust to break ones' faith; (5) judgement should be impartial. Mill rejected the principle of equality as an essential to our understanding of justice and he considered that justice always goes beyond generic right and wrong to involve what some individual person can claim from us as his moral rights (Pomerleau, n.d.). another significant dimension of Mill's philosophy was the role of qualitative happiness, women voting rights and democratic insights. According to Mill "it is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied" (Mill, 1879). Through his philosophy, mill had extended the scope of justice by including minorities and rights of the individual, therefore the concept of common good was more widened than Jeremy Bentham. The debate on justice and common good entered into a new era, the era of ideological diversions, where different perspectives were supposed to make their arguments in favour of justice and its betterment.

Diverse perspectives

Liberal

Ideological evolutionism has drawn the basic argumentative line between one another on the basis of their perspectives. By reviewing the history, liberal perspective and its evolution traced back to the tradition of social contract. But the principle of justice was not there as it was in the writings of John Rawls. A Harvard professor, a renowned philosopher of 20th century, John Rawls has been placed himself at the most distinguished level that no one can deny. In his "A Theory of Justice", Rawls tried to define the idea of justice as the primary good of a just society and he visualised what would be a just society look like? Those who argue that justice should not be allowed to come in the way of social advancement and progress, run the risk of causing the moral degradation of society (Gouba, 2009). Rawls followed a unique path to reach at the principle of justice, moreover he had criticized the utilitarian attempt on justice for ignoring the least advantage. As a critic of social contract, he defined the whole natural condition as the "Original Position" where no one could be able to predict their future because they were really unknown about their present status. At this juncture, Rawls used his famous "Veil of Ignorance" to prove the original position and the starting point of the process of realization that what is really just for them? Here, as Rawls mentioned in his famous work, all the persons are intended to choose two basic principles of justice in which a proper channel of distribution can be seen as good. The first principle refers to the liberal assumption – all the persons are equal in terms of their basic individual liberty and rights, and in second principle Rawls has maintained two basic lines – firstly, all the offices will be open for

free competition (principle of equality) and secondly, the distribution should satisfy the least advantage (principle of difference). Rawls followed a comparative path between both liberal and egalitarianism, thus his philosophy on justice is more concerned about the holistic development of the society with the two principles of justice. On the contrary, his own academic colleague Robert Nozick had made a critical statement about Rawlsian justice. But as a libertarian, Nozick is opposed to compromising individual liberty in order to promote socio – economic equality and advocates a minimal state as the sort that can be socially just (Pomerleau, n.d.). Nozick in his entitlement theory of justice defined the importance of private property and should be detached from the state intervention. Because Nozick developed his whole philosophical castle within the range of inalienable individual rights which are based on principle of acquisition, transfer and ratification. The concept of common, in the writings of Nozick, would be a competing manifestation between the individual rights and social utility.

Marxist

The main tension of capitalism has been discussed and well- articulated by Marxian interpretations. The most important reaction against capitalism came with the publication of a great book – The communist Manifesto, written by two major philosophers Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels. As a critique of Hegelian Dialectics, Marx mentioned that “the philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point is to change it” (Marx, Theses on Feuerbach, 1969). Marxist philosophy espouses three crucial historical narratives such as German Idealism, English Economy and French Revolution. Marxian method

of analysis is called the “Dialectical materialism” in which Marx had answered the process of history and a series of exploitative struggle between two dominant classes on the basis of productive capacity and its control. But for Marx, Capitalism is superior as compared to other productive system because of the privatisation of labour not the proletariat. In capitalistic economy the labourer has to sell his congealed labour just to survive and subsequently the manner of exploitation alienated from four spheres of life. Marx did not mention directly about the principle of justice with regard to the common good, but in his Critique of political economy Marx urged for the elimination of private property which could be considered as a conducive condition for justice. The basic logic of Marx’s theory of justice is that the relations of distribution are to be interpreted not through political and legal concepts of fairness and justice, but through the relations of production are to be interpreted through productive labour (Xinsheng, 2015). Marxian theory of justice defines the problem of capitalism and how to overcome through the blooded revolution, therefore justice would be a product of classless society where the production could be owned by the society as a whole. Another important dimension of Marxian theory is the principle of distribution, all the previous models of distribution have been falsified e. g the desert principle and the utilitarianism. As Marx mentioned about the distribution – “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” (Marx, 2003). With a reaction to capitalism, Marxist doctrine of justice had justified the humanistic dimension of justice, thus the manner of distribution must uphold the necessities of the people those who are supposed to work without selling their labour. Common good in

Marxist philosophy refers to the end of class hostility and exploitation through the establishment of a stateless society.

Communitarian

Antagonistic nature between individual and society influenced the discussion on political philosophy, particularly with the emergence of excessive individualism in the west and degradation of social good. Liberal political expansion had forced to evaluate the potential threats to common good and communitarian ethics after the publication of John Rawls's A theory of justice. The importance of community was explored in the writings of different western political analysts, proposed as communitarianism. As a social philosophy, in contrast to the theory of individualism, communitarianism explains the role of society in shaping the human nature and extending more value to the social good rather than individual autonomy. Communitarians examine the ways shared conceptions of the good are formed, transmitted, justified and enforced (Etzioni, 2015). The role of common good, in communitarian philosophy, has been defined an outcome of individual's social role and all the embedded values pertaining to social utilities. Michael Sandel, a communitarian philosopher, took a diversion by criticizing the ideas of Robert Nozick and excessive individualism, as a communitarian he applied the method of John Rawls and described it as a community of fellow members. Sandel was concerned about the collective identity of the people rather than their isolationism, however the collective endeavour takes precedence over the individualism because Sandel believed that socio- economic equality is the primary requirement for a just society. Through interpersonal relationships of

community, we establish "more or less enduring attachments and commitments" that help define who we are, as well as the values that will help characterize our sense of justice as a common good that cannot be properly understood by individuals detached from community (Pomerleau, n.d.). Sandel highlighted the improvement of society instead of the individualistic interpretations, he defined justice as what is good for the social context? – "as members of this family or community or nation or people, as bearers of this history, as sons and daughters of that revolution, as citizens of this republic" (Sandel, 1998). The social perspective of justice has been forwarded by Michael Walzer, an American political theorist, by acknowledging the problem of philosophical approach to distributive justice and placed a particular social context in distributing the goods and services. In his thrilling work – "Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism and Equality", Walzer argued for a better distributive justice system. Walzer defined his own conception as "different social good ought to be distributed for different reasons, in accordance with different procedures, by different agents; and all these differences derive from different understanding of the social goods themselves – the inevitable product of historical and cultural particularism" (Walzer, 1983). Unlike liberals, where the principle would be – one size fit for all, Michael Walzer determined the spheres of justice by extending support to the social and cultural dimension of individual life. In his famous concept of "complex equality" he proposed a theory of good which had a social- specific and cultural- dependent connotation. The method of distribution would not be equal for all the fellow members of a society, thus distributive system must adhere the

real needs and goodness of social development. Both Sandel and Walzer have proposed a rival conception that would deter the mainstream liberal philosophy and might take up the community as a powerful source of individual as well as common good.

Feminist

Since antiquity, the distinction between man and women has been socialized through different physical and artificial appearances. In a natural standard, however, the sexual heterogeneity makes the division of labour between both the male and female such as child bearing, rearing and physical labour. These are the natural inequalities that are really far away from our intellectual questions, for instance a male can't claim for his pregnancy because the god has made the male without a womb and similarly a female would not be able to demand for a muscular body because of the genetic variations. In contrast, women are oppressed, depressed and male – dominated not for their natural qualities but the cultural and social dogmas have been evolving in different parts of the world which is a gender issue. To counter these horrible effects on women, a new way of thinking has emerged both in the academic and social sphere – the idea of feminism. If we take a glance on feminism, it is not an ideology rather a counter revolution against the age-old discriminations perpetuated by male and male- dominated cultures. Feminism, the belief in social, economic and political equality of the sexes. Although largely originating in the west, feminism is manifested worldwide and is represented by various institutions committed to activity on behalf of women's rights and interests (Brunell & Burkett, 2020). Feminist perspective of justice highlights the potential threat to the development

of women and the procedures for countering it. In all the historical stages women were denied from their basic rights such as property rights, voting rights and representation. The demand for justice had emerged during the period of enlightenment, but in a philosophical environment the equality and liberty for women was degraded in the writings of Rousseau. It was Plato whose benevolent attitude made the possibility for having a true equality amongst male and female. In the modern era, JS mill and Marry Wollstonecraft were the two major philosophers and both were the supporter of voting rights and equality of education. On the basis of ideology, the feminist movement has experienced different demands such as Radical feminism, liberal feminism, eco feminism and multicultural feminism. For a detail understanding, the feminism can be described through its wave and emergences, however there are three crucial waves of feminism. First wave of feminism occurred during the late 19th and early 20th century, it was mainly happened for voting rights and equal contract in property. First wave of feminism ended with the passage of the 19th constitutional amendment bill in US congress for granting right to vote for women. The second wave of feminism started with the slogan, "personal is political" by 1960s and 1980s. the main theme of the second wave was to counter inequality and discrimination, Betty Freidan in her famous *The Feminine Mystique* criticized the physical and household domination on women. The third wave took a different path to address the exploitation and oppression on women, with a realist vision they came up with ethnic, racial and religious denominations and their lasting impact on women. Apart from the previous attempts, in an era of globalization the entire meaning of feminism has

been redefined. Globalization has facilitated new shapes, institutions and rhetoric where the notion of universal human rights is a powerful justificatory principle embedded in specific institution. Globalization constitutes a new framing for feminist politics that assist in discursive presentation and new opportunities for argumentation (Walby, 2002). The common good in feminism denotes the end of exploitations and discriminations in all the dimension of socio-political and economic life, thus an equal social order with liberty and justice should be established.

Indian standpoint

Indian civilization is the oldest and culturally-improved as compared to the western counterparts. From Vedic era, justice has been evolving as a product of ruler's virtue and a kind of Dharma which is embedded in the Hindu Mythology. Self-responsibility for one's own position in society meant that the hierarchy of classes was itself regarded as a reflection of Karmic justice (Underwood, 1978). Interestingly, the role of justice in ancient India was almost similar to the platonic ideal state where the individual position was under the virtue. With passage of time, the entire anatomy of justice had been changed and confined to the caste violation and discrimination. Since later Vedic phase, Indian social life experienced a serious downturn by propagating continuous oppression for lower caste people. Several instances were there to fill up the gaps between ancient and Modern India such as Raja Ram Mohan Roy's reformations, abolition of Sati System and widow remarriage. During the early 19th century, the notion of justice in India was to overthrow all the historical wrongdoings. The most illustrative account on justice came up by the

emergence of MK Gandhi and his Hindu- oriented philosophy

MK Gandhi

Gandhian political philosophy, from its originality, developed in the light of toleration, communal harmony and non- violence. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi had a long profile of achievements, started his journey as a lawyer and finally took over the responsibility for India's nationalist struggle for Independence. Gandhi's famous weapon was Satyagraha – with a combination of two words “Satya” (truth) and “Agraha” (to grapple with). Satyagraha, in Gandhian thought provides the philosophical foundation for practices of civil disobedience against the state, and against undesirable practices within the community (Chandhoke, 2008). Interpretation on justice, for Gandhi, was a realistic vision without that was supposed to be acquired in just mean. He defined justice from the grassroot level through participation, local self-determination and women empowerment. Gandhi was in favour of moral regeneration, through the method of trusteeship, all the member of a given society would enjoy the property as a common good. His philosophical articulation and active involvement in India's freedom struggle gave a new insight for justice, for instance Gandhian perspective touches all the aspects of human life such as economic freedom, political engagement and dignified social life. Having been influenced by Hindu Mythology, MK Gandhi followed a unique path for the attainment of justice – a utopian state called “Ramarajya”. Gandhi believed that the praxis of social justice aims at a utopian- a religious utopia, very much in the context of India (Hindu) thinking and tradition. He terms it ramarajya (reign of Rama, or kingdom of Rama),

where justice would prevail as it used to during the reign of the legendary Lord Rama (Palakkappillil, 2014). On the matter of untouchability and racial discrimination, Gandhi had a personal experience during his tour to South Africa where he faced racial discrimination and finally ended up such heinous crime through his civil disobedience. Gandhi argued about the abolition of social discrimination, in his Hind Swaraj, he prioritized the end of untouchability which out which the independence would be meaningless. Gandhi declared that the removal of untouchability was an essential condition for his concept of swaraj. For Gandhi, swaraj was not only expulsion of the British from India but also the liberation of society from slavery (Biswas, 2019). Gandhi had a rare capacity to uphold the generous concerns, however the idea of justice can be understood through his large areas that have been covered. At the local level, Gandhi tried to enforce gram swaraj through both political and judicial autonomy. Gandhi has been visualized as a spiritual anarchist, he developed the path for self- sufficiency and classless social order. Despite his profound vision, Gandhi had a strong disagreement with BR Ambedkar regarding the matter of caste system and Hinduism.

BR Ambedkar

An erudite lawyer, a greatest reformer of India, Dr B R Ambedkar structured down all the notion of justice in improving the depressed sections of the Indian society. His vision had impressed the contemporary debates on justice, Ambedkar condemned the brutality that was being propagated by upper- caste Hindus and started demanding a peaceful and respectable livelihood for Dalits. Gandhi's philosophy has also been falsified by Ambedkar, for instance Gandhi was not a

supporter of mechanised economy but Ambedkar believed the industrial economy would be able to abolish the division of labour. Ambedkar declared Gandhian philosophy to be suited only for privileged leisure class, which is vindicated by the class status of the present torch- bearers of Gandhism (Karuppusamy, 2020). Ambedkar also claimed the untouchability as a political issue whereas Gandhi had a belief that untouchability was a part of social inequality. It is imperative to understand the separate electorate proposed by Britishers but in contrast, despite disagreements, Ambedkar and Gandhi signed the historical Poona pact in 1932. In the constitutional history of India, Ambedkar was designated as the chairman of drafting committee for framing the Indian constitution. Ambedkar's concept of distributive justice was based on a casteless society (Das, 2017). He never thought about the abolition of Hinduism from its very root, on contrast Ambedkar tried to solve this issue through the constitutional reforms. For improving the standard of backward class, he maintained the equal wage labour, inter caste marriage and reformist Hinduism. He envisioned social justice as a prerequisite for political justice. He introduced to the concept of equality and revolution in attaining justice (Anand, 2017).

Amartya Sen

Another philosophical sketch has come up from Amartya Sen, an economist and great name in the theory of justice. In his book "The Idea of Justice", Prof. Sen described a unique path without hampering the both individual and social level. The analytical tool that he pursued is known as Realization – focused comparative approach. Sen was quite suspicious about his predecessors who were developed the principles of justice without

making any points about the injustices that they had. In his celebrated work, Sen defined the concept of “Transcendental Institutionalism” by criticizing Rawlsian assumption that made a distinction between two interrelated problems – the problem of feasibility and the problem of redundancy. The first problem expresses the practical reasoning behind a single set of principles and its inadequacy to establish a just procedure. In second place, prof. Sen maintained that the just social arrangement is not a sufficient condition because of the comparative advantage. Through his unique approach, Sen has demonstrated several philosophical attempts from the western political philosophy, namely Adam Smith, Kant, JS Mill and so on. The reason behind such arrangement was to achieve the fruit of justice by realizing the basic problems of the society and how to remove those challenges through the process of injustice alleviation. Dealing with a complex issue like justice and its relevance in practical sense, Sen suggested that one might revert back to the ancient Hindu thought which examines the concept of Niti and Nyaya. Niti in Sanskrit legal thinking deals with just rules and institutions, while Nyaya is about its realization. Niti is an abstract exercise that, if implemented completely, would result in maximum welfare and justice (Sakhuja, 2010). Sen is famous for his capability approach and throughout his economic analysis capability makes enormous sense about the real power of the of social choice. In his approach, Sen criticized the Rawlsian original position where people were directed by their impartial negotiation but this negotiation was limited by “closed impartiality”. In contrast, Sen followed the path of “open impartiality” proposed by Adam Smith. Through the impartiality of judgement, individual could be

able to find out the problem of his or her originality. Sen thus underscores the importance of public reasoning for justice throughout the book, and he regards democracy, especially when understood as ‘government by discussion’ rather than the Schumpeterian ‘government by elections’ as a particularly appropriate form of public reasoning, which can serve to increase the ‘objectivity’ of political solution. All the philosophers have been discussed the problem of justice in different level with diverse interpretations, some are more sceptical about the existing social order and some were made a comparative understanding about the true nature of justice. Eventually, it would be better to claim that good can never be ignored from the velocity of justice, both are complementary and end in themselves.

Towards global justice: The highest form of common good

Recently United Nation world food programme has been selected for the Nobel Peace Prize for 2020. As a largest Humanitarian organization, UNWFP alleviated chronic food insecurity in 88 countries by assisting 97 million people. This statistical data may be rejected for the sake of a better number, but no one could ostensibly be able to criticize the motivation and a sense of justice behind this programme. The reality of assessment in this job would be to develop a critical understanding about the Global Justice, however in the international sphere the term has variedly been used to indicate both the philosophical and realistic attitude for cosmopolitanism. Global justice inquires take individual human beings as of primary concern and seek to give an account of what fairness among such agents involves (Brock, 2015). Justice at the global level must be

visualized a cross national and transcendental humanism where the people would be treated as equal irrespective of their nationality, religion and race. The question of global are being used repeatedly since the first world war, after the devastation of humanity the Wilsonian fourteen points could be seen as the first step toward the global justice.

With a comparative insight, till the end of the cold war the definition of global justice was confined only to the protection of human lives and the promotion of democracy. Unfortunately, the all the proxy war that were undertaken during the cold war defined as a biggest threat to global justice e. g the military intervention in Vietnam, Cuba and Afghanistan took millions of lives. Even after the cold war the promotion of democracy in Non-democratic nations was the foundation of US foreign policy strategy, during Bush administration the famous metaphor – “War on Terror” defines the craziness of US led democratic interventions. in recent years, the idea of global justice has changed with its anatomical and physiological improvements, for instance now the scholars are using environmental as well as artificial threats for global justice. Climate change, terrorism, racial violence, wealth inequality and redistribution and migrant issues are the most pernicious and non -conventional problems of the globalized world. Globalization, from its very origin, has settled down the age -old problems such as trade barriers and human capital, in contrast the era of globalization has widened the gaps between the rich and the poor by opening up the world market for open competition. The solution to these problems would be many, from a foundational sphere, the national government must have to work in a democratic manner. In the regional sphere the

organizations such as ASEAN, OPEC and SAARC are supposed to work for the elimination of humanitarian problems. Last but not the least, the International institutions remain the core panacea for global crisis. everyone may have the right to live in a just society, but we don't have an obligation to live in a just society. The right to justice is the right that the society one lives in be justly governed (Nagel, 2005). Global justice occupies the most central position in the contemporary discourse on justice and the common good has also been securing through continuous assessment of individual as well as international initiatives.

Conclusion: A road ahead

21st century has revolutionized the entire human race, from enlightenment to post- modernism and Homo sapience to super human, development seems materialistic and freedom has paralyzed. Human beings are really obsessed about the technological dictatorship, no way to overcome but the beacon of hope is still flourishing in our mind. The evolution of human history would be interpreted from its continuous decline, instead of improvement we are supposed to detach our inspirational history for the sake of developed-individualism. From the starting point, human beings were more involved with the process of distribution and finally achieved the principles of doing such job. The debate on justice as a common good refers the goodness of human mind rather than the principles that are intended to produce a just environment. Some recent developments are necessary to mention such as, Black live matters, Women Rights, environmental justice, Upliftment of Backward class in India and so on. It is not a part of matter but a part of greater good e. g when we are demanding justice for the environment so

indirectly, we are concerned with common good because all of us are aspiring for fresh air to consume. But at the same time the road for justice is not free from hurdles, the large disparity between peoples in the developing countries and overlapping institutions imposes several questions before a political philosopher. Justice should be treated as basic human needs rather than just a component of the just society, however the goodness of the individual will be able to produce the long-term justice those who consider themselves as capable. Justice does not distribute what we really deserve, rather it has an inner power to up lift our status and dignity in attaining the perpetual emancipation.

References

- Anand, A. (2017, August 4). Seeing Justice Through Ambedkar's eyes. Retrieved from Forward Press: <https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.forwardpress.in/2017/08/seeing-justice-throughambedkar-eyes/%3famp>
- Bhandari, S. (2014). The Ancient and Mordern Thinking about Justice: An Appraisal of the Positive Paradigm and the Influence of International Law . Ritsumeikan Annual Review of International Studies, 10.
- Biswas, S. (2019, september 29). Gandhi denounced caste and untouchability. Retrieved from National Herald: <https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.nationalheraldindia.com/amp/story/opinion%252Fgandhi-denounced-caste-and-untouchability>
- Brock, G. (2015, march 6). Global Justice. Retrieved from Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice-global/>
- Brunell, L., & Burkett, E. (2020, september 23). Feminism. Retrieved from Encyclopaedia Britannica: <https://www.britanica.com/topic/feminism>
- Chandhoke, N. (2008). Quest for Jutice: The Gandhian Perspective. Economic & Political Weekly, 3746.
- Das, N. (2017). Thoughts of Dr Bhim Rao Ambedkar. New Delhi: Centrum Press.
- Donning, W. (1966). Political Theories - Ancient and Medieval. Allahabad: Copyright.
- Etzioni, A. (2015). Communitarianism. The Encyclopedia of Political Thought, 1.
- Gouba, O. P. (2009). An Introduction to Political Theory. New Delhi: Macmillan .
- Hamedi, A. (2014). The Concept of Justice In Greek Philosophy (Plato nad Aristotle). Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 1165.
- Hobbes, T. (1886). Leviathan. London: George Routledge and Sons.
- Jaede, M. (n.d.). The Concept of the Common Good. British Academy , 1.
- Karuppusamy, K. R. (2020, october 2). 'Never a Mahatma': A Look at Ambedkar's Gandhi. Retrieved from The Wire: <https://www.com/amp/s/m.thewire.in/article/history/mahatma-gandhijayanti-ambedkar-caste/amp>
- Lee, S. (2016, February 15). Common Good . Retrieved from Encyclopedia Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/common-good>

M.M, K., & C, G. (2010). Common Good. In M. Beaver, Encyclopedia of Political Theory (pp. 239-242). Los Angeles: Sage.

Marx, K. (1969). Theses on Feuerbach. Moscow, USSR: Progress Publishers .

Marx, K. (2003). Critique of the Gotha Programme . USA: International Publishers .

Mill, J. S. (1879). Utilitarianism . London : Longmans, Green, And Co.

Nagel, T. (2005). The Problem of Global Justice. Philosophy and Public Affairs, 113-147.

Palakkappillil, J. P. (2014). The Gandhian Concept of Social Justice. In M. Reich, Routledge International Handbook of Social Justice. Abingdon: Routledge.

Pomerleau, W. P. (n.d.). Western Theories of Justice. Retrieved from Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: <https://iep.utm.edu/justwest/>

Robinson, D. (2006). Introducing Political Philosophy. United States: Totem Books.

Sakhuja, N. (2010). Amartya Sen and 'The Idea of Justice'. Northern California: Asia Society.

Sandel, M. J. (1998). Liberalism and the Limits of Justice. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Underwood, F. B. (1978). Aspects of Justice in Ancient India. Journal of Chinese Philosophy, 271285.

Walby, S. (2002). Feminism in a global era. Routledge, 533-557.

Walzer, M. (1983). Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism and Equality. United States: Basic Books.

Xinsheng, W. (2015). A Fourfold Defence of Marx's Theory of Justice. Social Sciences in China, 5-21.