CHAPTER - II

CONCEPT OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

It is very difficult to define and completely clarify the concept of justice. We can analyze it by means of certain terms; they can acquaint us with the best possible understanding of justice. A single definition would not suffice to fulfil our aim of study. Why do the people prefer justice to injustice? It is because justice is more beneficial than injustice. In fact, justice is preferable in all circumstances. For injustice brings human beings into a series of disputes and violent acts. Injustice makes them enemies; whereas justice helps them to be friends and creates among them a situation of judicious mind and right action. Injustice is always ranked with ignorance, greed and violence whereas justice is related to wisdom, friendship and virtue. Almost all the thinkers, philosophers and reformers of the world have, in various ways, explained and eulogized the different aspects of justice. Therefore, let us now move towards an observation of certain important ideas of justice so that we can easily understand the motive behind them and also foresee the spirit of social justice.

To begin with Cicero, a Roman philosopher and politician, “Justice is an intrinsic good”. In order to make justice beneficial, he stressed the need of moral obligations and virtues. A man should follow his own nature, which manifests itself in the practical philosophy of mankind. In Cicero’s view, justice is essential to achieve the wholeness of man’s being. A devotion to justice encourages the practice of moral obligations and other virtues like self-confidence and discipline. The Pythagoreans doctrine emphasized “that every citizen should have his special place assigned to him in a just social order”. Pythagoras happened to
relate justice with the numerical mysticism. In his opinion, love, friendship, virtue and justice all are based on certain numbers such as love and friendship are the manifestations of the number of eight. Love and friendship are a harmony, and similarly, any virtue is a harmony. Justice, too, is founded on the harmony among the people of a society. Where there is numerical harmony, there is a just social order, wherein every member is assigned the place for which he is suited, as we find in the system of numbers. This is a mystical manifestation of justice, which is hardly tenable in modern times.

In Greek tradition, there were certain thinkers, who were popularly known as “Sophists”. They were teachers and learned men, or the “wise” ones. In their view, good and evil, moral and immoral, right and wrong, justice and injustice all are relative to individual. That is, justice or injustice and the like things are based on an individual’s desires and feelings. The statement of Protagoras; “Man is the measure of all things”, manifests that right or wrong, justice or injustice, good or bad etc. are not objective, but altogether subjective, or as Producès said, a thing has no value inherent in itself, only man’s use of it, adorns it with certain value. That is why the Sophists did not recognize good, truth and justice as independent of individual’s desires and feelings. Elucidating the same theme, a famous Sophist, Thrasymacus said, justice is that which a powerful individual wishes to be; in fact, justice is an interest of the powerful, though it was contradicted by other thinkers like Socrates, Plato and Aristotle.

For Plato, “Justice is the virtue of the soul. Justice is good, because it is indispensable. Justice is the attribute of an individual, but also of a whole city”. One may agree with Plato, but hardly with Thrasymachus, who defined justice as
an “interest of the strong”, that is, “justice is the advantage of the stronger”, even if it could be obtained in the acts of injustice and violence. This view of justice was, however, vehemently opposed by Secretes, the teacher of Plato, arguing that “no science either prescribes or seeks the advantage of the stronger, but the advantage of the weaker over which it rules”.

Not agreeing with Socrates, Thrasymachus said, “Men revile injustice, not because they fear to do it, but because they fear to suffer it. Therefore, Socrates! Injustice, when great enough, is mightier and freer and more masterly than justice; and, as I said at the start, justice is to the advantage of the stronger, but injustice is profitable and advantageous to oneself”. Socrates disagreed and tried to convince him, “no art or government provides what is for its own benefit, but it provides and prescribes what is for the benefit of the subject, seeking the advantage of him who is weaker, not the advantage of the stronger. It was for this reason, that no one of his own will becomes a ruler and undertakes to set straight the misfortunes of other”. It familiar way, Aristotle asserted that “Justice is a virtue implying a relation to others, for it promotes the interest of another, whether he be a ruler or simply a fellow-citizen”. It may be noted here that justice is related to the interest of society, especially the interest of the weak, even though it is a virtue of the individual.

Epicurus saw justice in his own way. To him, “Social contract” is the root cause of the origin of society. The social life is based on the principle of “Self-interest”. All individuals come together in groups for their self-protection. “Justice and right, as they owe their origin to a social contract, are merely conventional: there is no such thing as absolute justice, and so-called natural rights are rules
of conduct on which men agree because of their utility. All laws and institutions are just only in so far as they make for the security of the individual, that is, in so far as they are useful".5 Thus, justness is closely related to utility, or usefulness. Individuals are just, because it is to their advantage to be just. Apparently, justice is not merely individual; going beyond, it is also a social manifestation; it is the foundation of society; in spite of calling it something intellectual or traditional, justice determines our social and moral relations.

In the view of Confucius, a harbinger of the Chinese culture, justice is the way of life based on people’s organized and harmonious living. His idea of justice inherent in the principle that “man is the measure of man”, that is, man’s good conduct, having begun from family, then community and nation, plays an important role in establishing right relations in the whole of the world. From the standpoint of Mensius, another Chinese philosopher, the foundation of the basic unity of all social relations is the individual. That is why a good and just society is based on individual’s moral conscience. By nature man is good; four virtues are inherent in him: love, righteousness, honesty and wisdom, thus, no society can be good and just, unless individuals come forward and establish human relations based on these four virtues.

The idea of justice is all inclusive. It is not only an intrinsic good, not merely something rooted in feeling, it has also a direct relation with rights and obligations. Justice, in fact, goes beyond the virtue of the individual. For a “Social order can exist only when there are rules of law and justice with objective and universal validity and independent of the subjective individual will. Justice, then, is a virtue whereby to fulfil the juridical obligations….."6 This idea has been well
explained by Prof. Hart, “That individuals are entitled in respect of each other to a certain relative position of equality or inequality. This is something to be respected in the vicissitudes of social life when burdens or benefits fall to be distributed; it is also something to be restored when it is disturbed. Hence justice is traditional, thought of as maintaining or restoring a balance or proportion, and its leading precept is often formulated as “Treat like cases alike”; though we need to add “and treat different cases differently”.7

The nature of justice is complex because of its multi-dimensional base. Yet Prof. Bergbon has expounded the principle of justice in clear terms. For him, “the principle of justice is a compendious one and includes most of other principles which have become the foundation of a moral order. Justice has always evoked ideas of equality, of proportion of compensation. Equity signifies equality. Rules and regulations, right and righteousness are concerned with equality in value. If all men are equal, all men are of the same essence and the common essence entitled to them to the same fundamental rights and to equal liberty”.8 Adding to it, his own definition of justice, Dr. Ambedkar precisely makes it clear that “justice is simply another name for liberty, equality and fraternity”.9

This idea of justice may also be identified with the term “sameness” as was revealed by Brunetto Latini: “Just as justice is an equal thing, so injustice is unequal; and thus he who wants to establish justice tries to make equal the things that are unequal”.10 Yet, underlying every discussion of justice there is the recurrent theme of identical treatment, of the same measure and proportion for all. When it is said, “to each his due”, it means “That each should have a fair share, and a fair share means that, unless there is some justification for acting
otherwise, shares should be approximately the same…. that justice demands, the same treatment for the same difference.

The idea of sameness intrinsically implies the ideals of equality and fraternity to be included when shares of society are distributed to its members.

To David Hume, justice is not a “natural virtue”. It is an “Artifice”, for it arises from circumstances and necessities of mankind. Though the rules of justice may be artificial, yet they cannot be arbitrary, because the idea of justice is related to sympathy and public interest; it is morally approved and is based on human convention developed out of “self-interest”. “And thus justice”, Hume observed, “establishes itself by a kind of convention or agreement; that is, by a sense of interest, supposed to be common to all, and where every single act is performed in expectation that others are to perform the like. Without such a convention, no one would have ever dreamed, that there was such a virtue as justice, or would have been induced to conform his actions to it”. “Self-interest”, as Hume concluded, is the original motive to the establishment of justice; but a sympathy with public interest is the source of the moral approbation, which attends to that virtue. The self-interest, however, is not wild selfishness. It begins with the individual and ends in public interest with sympathy towards people’s sorrows. Since the idea of justice has assumed numerous forms, self-interest as the original motive to the establishment of justice seems to be remote in modern times.

Thinkers like Marx, Engles, Lenin and Mao thought of justice as the establishment of the “Socialist Society” wherein all types of exploitation, especially the economic exploitation of the labour class, is abolished by law and
the state power is controlled by the dictatorship of the proletariat. The economic content of justice is the main plank in the socialist way of life. Prof. Laski eulogized the socialism of Karl Marx, for it was essentially a humanist approach; but he added to economic equality an idea of freedom. “Equality involves up to the margin of sufficiency and identity of responsibility to primary needs and this is what is meant by justice”. The significance of freedom is that it encourages people to do what equality requires from them. Prof. Laski held that socialism and fellowship are the same thing, and to him, the socialists look to be happy in an egalitarian socialist world.¹⁴

In Prof. Brecht’s view, “There are a number of prima vista indications that all ideas of justice, all varieties of thinking and feeling regarding justice, have something in common”. Such ideas exist everywhere as a distinct category of ideas, the term “Justice” or its approximate equivalent exists everywhere; human longing for justice is so universal a factor that no one in public life can neglect presenting his act as just.¹⁵ “In view of these prima vista indications,” Prof. Brecht concluded, “we have good cause for supposing that the universal term justice responds to a universal human need of expression, not only in acquiescence with existing laws but also in criticizing them for lack of justice, and that this universal need relates to a feeling that has at least some elements in common. We have good cause for supposing, further, that these elements must be very important for human nature, since they are tied up with such passionate feeling.”¹⁶ In brief, the ideas of justice cannot be dispensed with easily by any society, or a government, in any age, more so in the modern times.
At times, even the class of exploiters justify the acts, which it does under certain circumstances, the exploiters claim to be the protagonists of justice in the interest of the exploited class. Though it may look strange, yet we may find several instances in the history of mankind, when justice was established, or restored to, by the means of suppression and coercive methods. Even today, there are countries, which pursue the policy of threat and war, blockage and boycott, in order to establish, or restore, peace and justice, where there are continual acts of terrorism, or where there are warring groups engaged in fierce fighting, massacre and genocide, in certain parts of the world.

During the 18th Century, the renaissance movement added a new dimension to the idea of justice; and the French revolution, too, advocated the cause of justice and proliferated its allied ideas far and wide. Respect for human intellect, attraction towards human rights, democratic government, equality of all citizens before law, freedom of thought and expression, etc. were some of the important ideas and ideals, which become popular among the people, and they were, in fact, considered to be the fundamental elements of a just social order. In the direction of adding these elements to justice, the thinkers like Voltaire (1694-1778), Montesquieu (1685-1755), Locke (1632-1704) and Rousseau (1712-1778) made a commendable contribution. They strongly emphasized that the intellectual, political and religious freedom of the individual, freedom of press and elections, political equality and rights must be available to all citizens. Without these rights no one could think of any justice. These thinkers popularized the ideals of liberty, equality, fraternity and natural rights as essentials of justice. Rousseau belonged to the laboring and peasant class, for which he demanded “equal rights and deliverance from social bondage”; and
Voltaire stood for “equal political rights and liberty of thought and conscience for the middle class;”\textsuperscript{17} In brief, all of them stood for the “Rights of Man” in a democratic system.

The thinkers, or the protagonists, of utilitarianism [Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), James Mill (1773-1836), John Augstin (1790-1859), J.S. Mill (1806-1873)] also added a new dimension to the concept of justice. They considered practicability and utility to be the measure of virtue and justice. The value of justice is inherent in “how many individuals derive pleasure from it”, that is, how far it is useful or full of utility in favour of common interest. That which is not useful, or does not contain any utility, cannot be just and ethically justifiable. Thus, “the maximum good of the greatest number of individuals” was regarded as the basis of justice. To them, utility ought to be the measure of good, right, morality, progress and justice. Jeremy Bentham, the brilliant and versatile reformer in the field of law, stressed that “justice must be demonstrated, and the welfare of the needy and the oppressed be protected”. To put it briefly, the utilitarian thinkers advocated that the measure of justice should be utility. Whatever is useless, painful, evil and unjust, must be reformed or changed in the interest of the greatest number of individuals.

F.H. Bradley (1846-1924), the most subtle and best thinker of the theory of “self-perfectionism”, stressed the idea that if each individual does the duties of his station, the place assigned to him as a teacher, worker, a lawyer or a politician, the establishment of a just and good society would be easier. He considered his theory of “My Station and Its Duties” to be the main foundation of justice. Since all individuals differ in their abilities and capacities, their duties,
too, would immensely differ. Each individual must do all his duties, honestly and efficiently, in accordance with the place he has been assigned in society. However, in Bradley's social scheme, every one has right to choose his own place of duties. That is, he can pursue any course of his liking; but once he selects his place, he must do his work devotedly so that the possibilities of social progress and the areas of justice are expanded in the interest of all. In Bradley's view, this is the right way to achieve individual and social good; and there is no contradiction between the two. Thus, grounded in justice, the moral ideal of Bradley adheres to the idea that a man's life, along with his moral duties, mainly completes itself in ordering those perfections, which has been designated as state, and that partly by means of its laws and institutions, even more than this by its own consciousness, provides to man such a life that he lives and must live.  

Similarly, the Bhagvada Gita, too, visualized its own idea of justice. It propounded the social theory of justice based on Varnashram-dharma, which means that each individual has to perform the duties of his varna (class) and ashram (stage of life) as assigned to him according to his nature and ability. A man is born with certain innate qualities because of his karmas done in his previous life. That brings his birth into a particular varna and family. Each varna (Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaisha and Shudra) has its own well prescribed duties. By honestly performing the duties of his own varna, an individual can achieve the highest good in life. This leads us to a just society. The conduct, based on the duties of the four varnas, is the main aim of Gita's idea of justice and welfare of human beings. All the Hindu Shastras endeavoured to relate justice with duty, i.e., dharma, which stands for Varnashram Dharma. Thus, justice is that which is
manifested in the performance of Varna-based duties. It is, however, different from the ideal of Bradley’s “My Station and Its Duties”. For in the ideal of Varna Vyavastha, a man has no right to choose his own Varna, but has to accept the Varna where he is born; whereas Bradley’s ideal gives freedom to choose. The varna has its own mechanism to regulate the rules of justice, which ultimately led the Brahmins to stifle the spirit of justice.

Evidently, the above ideas at least elucidate the point that the basis of justice is not merely good-will; it is not sufficient to show respect for justice or moral ideal; and lip-sympathy is far from fulfilling the aim of nay justice. The feelings of justice must be demonstrated in practice through concrete acts. If the ideas of justice, going ahead, come to be true or turn into facts, then the practical possibilities of justice can increase far and wide in the interest of all citizens. Justice is a struggle, an experience in life, where mutually comporting forces, in one way or the other, try to overcome the opposite ones. Since a just society is not merely a single existence, it needs a group of individuals. Society, in fact, consists of individuals; and justice makes it worth living by way of regulatory rules or constitutional provisions. Individual, family, community, society, state, etc. all has important places and roles to play in the practical field of justice. Therefore, justice is that which establishes man’s dignity and social order and harmony; justice is equal and non-partisan, and is also the protector of public interest. Nevertheless, from the stand-point of justice, certain priorities are necessarily legitimate to make it more profitable.

A German philosopher, Nietzsche, visualized the idea of justice, or morality, strangely in his own way. He said that just or moral is that which a
superman desires and does. Man not only protects himself; but he also wants to dominate others, and thus, claims to be powerful. The persons, who advance in the midst of struggle, come up as powerful, and establish their hegemony over others, are really the supermen. Small in number, yet they rule over the weak and poor masses. They become rulers by their own struggle and power. So justice or morality is determined by what they will to be. They prescribe the rules of justice and morality. The weak have no say either in the field of justice or morality; they has to obey what the supermen with them to do. Nietzsche’s idea of justice incidentally happens to be like that of Manu, an ancient Hindu lawgiver. Manu-Smriti established the class of Brahmins as supermen in the form of gods on earth. The Manu-Smriti holds that justice is that which is in the spirit of Varnashram Dharm as earlier referred to. An important similarity, found in the views both of Manu and Nietzsche, is that justice has no universal character, but is based on the superiority of a particular class, the class of the supermen, or the Brahmins; and thus, they considered justice to be class-based and defended the class interest more than public interest, which thinkers like Bradley and Ambedkar would oppose tooth and nail.

The existentialists did not accept justice as a “natural virtue” and said that man is fundamentally free. Man makes his own ideals with a view to bringing about a particular social system in future. The existentialists hold that man’s life is a continuous struggle in the midst of the unity of the process of choice. In Jeanpal Sartre’s view, man cannot escape the exercise of freedom. “Man is condemned to be free”, for freedom is inherent in the existence of mankind. Freedom would remain in life perennially so long as the existence of man continues. Man’s freedom is unlimited, that is, freedom can never be destroyed
by any law or moral rule’ neither can it be rooted out by the coercion of an ideal or any system of obligations. This fact, however, does not exonerate man from responsibility, which is the sole basis of the existential idea of justice. Man is responsible for all his ideals, which he chooses as a free being, whether these ideals are related to justice, morality, democracy or economic welfare. Man’s just ideals, or unjust systems, inspire him accordingly for pursuing his own course of action. In brief, Sartre said, “I am responsible for myself and also for others. In the spirit of my choice, I am creating a certain image (concept) of man.”

The American thinkers like William James and John Dewey, who were the brilliant and benevolent pragmatists, considered justice not only to be an idea, but also a practical thought. In their opinion, the idea of justice, or any other idea, would be useful only when it would yield a useful result. Justice is not a divine law, nor is it any divine right of a king; it is only a behavior closely related to society of human beings, which points towards an order of human relations. The whole American view of justice is an acceptance and identity of democratic values. The elements of a just society there are liberal democracy, economic freedom, universal education, equal social status, respect for ability, use of capability, faith in human rights, free trade, rule of law, supremacy of constitution and inherent in it the dignity of the individual, which stands to be made effective by the organs of the Government (the legislature, the executive and the judiciary).

Here it will be right to say that justice is neither purely a moral virtue, nor strictly an inseparable part of law. Justice is closely related to both morality and
law. This has been well explained by Prof. Hart in these words: “Justice constitutes one segment of morality primarily concerned not with individual conduct but with the ways in which classes of individuals are treated. It is this which gives justice its special relevance in the criticism of law and of other public or social institutions. It is the most public and the most legal of the virtues. But principles of justice do not exhaust the idea of morality; and not all criticism of law made on moral grounds is made in the name of justice. Laws may be condemned as morally bad simply because they require men to do particular actions which morality forbids individuals to do, or because they require men to abstain from doing those which are morally obligatory”. There may be a lot of discussion concerning justice, law and morality; certain complicated questions may also arise before us; nevertheless, justice is closely related to both law and morality. For all of them are, in fact, simultaneously the manifestations of the individual conduct and social relationship.

As the ideas of justice have been explained and elucidated, the structure of justice is very complex, and comprehensive, too. Its functional aspect stands still more complicated and multidimensional. In fact, individuals do differ immensely; yet they have also close similarities. To bring them all under the umbrella of one single standard either of justice, law or of morality, is a tremendous task, something very difficult. There are several moral rules, which some people may regard as just, and some others as unjust. Even accepting that all citizens agree to having certain common rules of morality or of law, we may be confronted with questions such as: Are these rules absolute or relative? Are they man-made or God-created? Are they the manifestations of human feelings or the social circumstances? Are the rules of justice, the laws of
constitution or the ideals of morality the parts of a religion? Can they be separated from religion? What are the forces or factors working behind justice or injustice? One may raise these, or such questions in order to create confusion and confrontation. However, since we are the members of one or the other section of society, we can after salvaging some controversies, raise those questions and problems, which are directly related to bring about a just social order, or which aim at maintaining peace and justice in society, or even wish to create possibilities for a better set-up in future. We cannot, at present, establish for ever a just social system, because men and things change as the human needs dictate or as the natural forces press them to adopt a particular way of life.

After an analysis and ascertainment of the ideas of justice, it may be said that justice is invariably related to man, morality, religion, law, society, state, government, etc; but as a human expression, justice is an index of the present situation. What it has been in the past, is a subject-matter of knowledge, and what it will be in future, is a matter of inference; and how is it being taken in the present, is a matter of discussion and also an opportunity to act upon it. That means, with regard to justice, we can learn something from the past, we can plan for the future; and we can make it effective in the present. In making justice effective and beneficial, morality, religion, law education, state, government, political parties and other institutions can play their respective roles, provided, there is mutual agreement, or harmony and co-operation, to create favourable conditions for it. The positive elements of justice, as derived from the different ideas and aspects, may be presented here as follows:
1. Justice is a virtue of human personality, and is the social manifestation of an individual’s conduct.

2. Justice is social by nature in the sense that it comes into application when two human beings stand together in certain bonds.

3. Justice is intrinsically good, an individual virtue, expressing itself into certain obligations.

4. Justice is an excellence of moral conduct, and the legal base, related to it, makes it more effective.

5. Justice is directly related to rights having corresponding moral duties to be performed by the members of a society.

6. Justice is inseparably linked with the social order, and that encourages citizens to perform responsibly their respective obligations.

7. Justice envisages a well-ordered society grounded in mutual ties between man and man based on secular morality and civil religion.

8. Justice presupposes a well-ordered state to establish and maintain a just social order through constitutional provisions (rule of law and equality of all citizens before the courts of law).

9. Justice upholds the dignity of individual, equal rights, sameness, fraternity as is inherent in the true religious spirit of humanity.

10. Justice is publicly useful, pragmatic and empirical, and has inherent potentiality to manifest itself into sympathy, co-operation and tolerance.
11. Justice is multi-dimensional, consisting of all kinds of justice and emphasizing the need of performing allied legal obligations.

12. Justice, even being the protector of impartiality, public interest and equality, determines certain priorities and preferences as the human needs dictate.

13. Justice is a complex system of human relations in which the unity or harmony of varied interests and needs has a significant place.

14. Justice is sustainable by law and morality as both aim at human welfare and emancipation, even in the midst of natural calamities and social inequalities.

15. Justice is always relative to certain yardsticks, which may be provided to us by law, morality, custom or religion, however, the yardsticks not being absolute and immutable.

Evidently, justice, as closely associated with political rights, social obligations, moral values, economic plans, administrative decisions and legal processes, is a continuous method for making itself acted upon by society, government and other related agencies; and negatively, justice is opposed to injustice, violence, exploitation, suppression, discrimination, untouchability, casteism, apartheid, inequality, intolerance, slavery, forced-labour, class superiority, fanaticism, adultery, theft, telling lies, lust, war, bloody revolution, bonded labour, terrorism, racism, dogmatism, illiteracy, divinity, selfishness, hunger, poverty and the like evils prevailing in a society. Undoubtedly, justice is
a double-edged process, which on the one hand, destroys all the obstructive elements coming in its way; and on the other, establishes or maintains, all the helping elements, values and agencies facilitating its effectiveness. Justice, thus, has both its negative and positive aspects. If justice is a creator, it is also a destroyer. If law makes it effective, then morality and religion make it prosperous. Justice not only takes up the case of the weak and the poor; but it also reforms, or mends, the strong and the rich; and in its long process, justice relates something to it and shuns something as well. This way justice is the protector of individual, the maintainer of society, the weapon of state and the emancipator of humanity.

To conclude, man cannot move and sustain himself without justice; in its absence, society cannot maintain itself; state can never remain stable; and nation’s unity and sovereignty would be jeopardized if justice turns to be a myth. What to say more, the need of justice is self-evident. Still to say it briefly, justice is a man-made social institution, which carefully wards off the past fallacies judiciously, manages the present affairs and humanely plans the future hopes for all the members of a society. We cannot, however, overlook a certain complexity, inherently found in the structure of the idea of justice, nor can we escape a certain multiplicity, apparently faced in the functional process of it. Essentially, we have to accept an intelligent, common-sense and scientific view of justice as a result of the vast changes in the modern world. The idea of justice is the outcome and result of the social and economic conditions of a country as well as the expression of its intellectual capacity for dealing with those conditions in favour of a just society.
The demand for social justice is not as modern as some people think of it. It has been in people’s mind since the hoary ancient times, because that demand is closely related to the management of a social order. The ideas of social justice directly emanated from the nature, mechanism and regulation of a social system. The ancient societies envisaged some sort of justice in their organizations. It is a different matter that the justice, they adhered to earlier, turned into an instrument of injustice or became irrelevant in due course of time.

In order to understand the pressing demand for social justice today in its right perspective, it is necessary to study and review some of the age-long theories of social justice that were prevalent in India and elsewhere. Let us first begin with the Indian perspective.

The most ancient social organization through which the idea of social justice was sought to be implemented is the theory of Chaturvarnya (Varna Vyavastha), that is, the Vedic concept of society in which the people were classified into four varnas: Brahmin, Kashtriya, Vaishya and Shudra. Though its original existence is nowhere now, and if it is, it exists in its most degenerated form i.e. caste system; yet it was envisaged as an organization based on human nature, i.e., guna-Karma theory, and it was meant for social harmony and justice. The Sankhya philosophy regards man as the manifestation of trigunal (sattva, rajas and tamas). In the spirit of these gunas, man does all his Karmas (actions). All human beings, thus, were classified into four varnas according to their guna-karmas so that each individual could earn his livelihood and continue life smoothly as per the rules of Chaturvarnya. The duties of each varna were determined and all individuals were asked to follow the duties of their own varna. No one had to do the duties other than of his own varna. The theory of social
justice was, thus, conceived in the classification of men into four classes along with the division, of duties of each one, strictly to be followed by all members of the Vedic society.

Since society had to meet the needs of different types, it was possible to fulfill them through the four varnas. The Brahmins were entrusted with the work of imparting education, the Kshatriyas were to maintain law and order, the Vaishyas were to cultivate lands and carry on trades, and the shudras were given the menial work of all kinds, that is, their main work was to serve the people of the first three Varnas since they had no aptitude for education and knowledge, no valour to exercise force and no ability to carry out commercial obligations of society. The Brahmins, by nature, were regarded as pure and capable of learning; they were assigned the task of studying the Vedas and to impart Vedic education to the eligible students of the first three Varnas. The Kshatriyas, by nature, were active, enthusiastic and courageous. That is why they were entrusted with the administration of law and order in society. They were also to defend the country in times of war. Since the Vaishyas were unable to do the task of education and defence, they were given the work of cultivating lands along with the management of trade and commerce. Their main business was to supply food-grains and to meet other demands of society. The Shudras, by nature, were regarded as dull of intelligence, learning, valour and ability they were asked to serve the people of other varnas in all possible ways; they had no inherent quality of being learned, capacity of fighting or of exercising ability to manage affairs of trade and commerce; and thus, they were destined to serve.
The social order, based on these four varnas, was divinely ordained, and each individual was born in a particular varna according to his past Karmas. It had its Vedic origins. It was ordained by Prajapati, the Supreme God of the Universe. Since the chaturvarya was established and maintained by Prajapati, it was declared infallible and sacred. Because of its Vedic origins, divine ordination and being inherent in human nature, the theory of Varna Vyavastha was well defended, on one or the other account, by the entire religious texts of Hinduism, including thinkers like Shankracharya and Radhakrishnan. Right from the Vedic times, it was carried on as a sacred and divine institution by the Brahmanas, the Aranyakas, the Dharmashastras, the Smritis, the Upanishad, the Mahabharata and Ramayana the great epics and the Bhagvada-Gita.

The substantiate they theory of social justice, as contained in the chaturvarya, it will be sufficient to quote Bhagvada-Gita, the most sacred religious-text of Hindus. The Gita says:

“To Control conscience, to suppress senses, to suffer for religion, to remain pure inside-outside, to pardon crimes of others, to keep mind, senses and body simple, to have faith in Veda, Shastra, God and heaven, to study and teach Veda-Shastras and to experience the element of the supreme-soul : all these are the natural Karmas of the Brahmin”.

“Valour, brilliance, patience, cleverness, and not to run away from war, to give donation all these are the natural Karmas of the Kshatriya”.

“Agriculture, taming of cows and buying and selling based on true conduct, these are the natural Karmas of the Vaishya. And to serve all the Varnas is also the natural work of the shudra”.
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Dr. Radhakrishnan, too, has well explained it. He said: “The four castes (varnas) represent men of thought, men of action, men of feeling, and others in whom none of these is highly developed… The system of castes insists that the law of social life should not be cold and cruel competition, but harmony and cooperation. Society is not a field of rivalry among individuals. The castes are not allowed to compete with one another. A man born in a particular group is trained to its manner, and will find it extremely had to adjust himself to a new way. Each man is said to have his own specific nature (svabhava), and changes of dharma or function are not encouraged. A sudden change of function when the nature is against its proper fulfillment may simply destroy the individuality of the being”.23 The author of the Bhagvada-Gita was confident that the division of varnas had been done in accordance with the nature and character of each individual:

“O Parantap! The Karmas of the Brahmins, the Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas, and also of the shudras, have been classified on the basis of gunas as produced by nature”.

The Vedas had established Varna Vyavastha, and the Vedas were created by God, and therefore, s Prajapati, or Vishwa-Karma, had created the Varna Vyavastha. Only Prajapati knew the destiny and Karmas of each individual. He was the Lord of Fate of all beings. Prajapati created the Brahmins from his mouth, the Kshatriyas from arms, the Vaishyas from the thighs and the Shudras from his feet; and in the same order, he prescribed their duties. Thus, in the divinely ordained Varna Vyavastha, each individual had to perform his own prescribed duties. This is God’s divine order. For every man got his birth in a particular varna according to his past karmas, or the guna and karmas. That is
why he had to perform the duties of the place or family in which he was born. The Vedic concept of social justice is apparently inherent in the classification of varnas and the prescription of duties. If all the members do their respective duties honestly, as assigned under the Varna Vyavastha, the organization and regulation of society would be harmonious and just. Each one would get justice, and there would be no transgression of one’s nature and duties, i.e., Svabhava and Svadharma.

The original source of the varna-based social justice is God, or Prajapati, who had managed the social life of human beings in regard to the guna-karmas of their past lives. In the Brahmanic or the Hindu way of life, this has been widely accepted as the divine, natural and social justice. It is based on Varnashram dharma; it is not man-made; but originally, the creation of Prajapati, as Gita has said;24

“Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra: this group of the four varnas has been created by Me, according to the guna and Karma division. Thus, being the creator of the work of this world, you take me, the eternal Parmeshwar, as, in fact, the uncreator”.

Hence one may raise a pertinent question. Why were so much pains taken, or vigorous efforts made, to defend the Varna Vyavastha or why was so much emphasis given to its protection and validity? It was considered to be inherent in human nature, and at the same time, it also met the demand of natural and social justice. The Varna Vavastha was also related to the four ashramas (stages), that is, an individual’s life was divided into four stages-Brahmacharya, Grahastha, Vanaprasth and Sannyas, so that performing the
social duties, he could make his future life a better one. When taken together, Varna and Ashram become Varnashram Dharma, which is said to be worth practicing in the individual and social life. It sustains both individual and society, and thus, it is based on an integrated view of human life, as has been claimed by the Hindu philosophers. To them, the Varna Vyavastha would certainly result in social harmony and justice. In this way it has been presented and analysed as a just social order, along with its divine and infallible nature and mechanism.

The position of womenfolk was conjoined with the place of men. The womenfolk would be treated as belonging to the same varna to which their men belonged; but they would not perform the duties of their husbands. They would have to manage the affairs of the family inside their homes, including the upbringing of the children, so that they could provide to their men the pleasures and facilities at home. So far as the matrimonial relationships were concerned, the Brahmin could marry any girl of his own varna and of the other three varnas; the Kshatriya any girl of his own and the other two varnas, the vaishya could marry any girl of his own and that of the last varna; but the Shudra was allowed to marry any girl of his own varna only. Thus, in the varna vyavastha, the matrimonial relationship had to be maintained in the descending order, which meant that the Anulom system was held as valid and just; whereas the Pratilom system was strictly prohibited. The violation of these marriage systems invited severe punishments at the hands of the Brahmins, in order to prevent the Shudras from marrying any girl of the first three varnas. In brief, an argument for Pratilom marriage was put forth that the progeny, born by such relationship, stood to be without the sanction of Dharma.
The Varna Vyavastha, not only meets the demand of natural and social justice, it also ensures the path of spiritual salvation, i.e., Moksha, as stressed by Bhagvada-Gita.25

“Man, by worshipping that Parmeshwar, the Supreme God, who created all the beings, and who sustains this entire world, with the performance of his natural duties, can attain to moksha”.

In compliance with his nature, and, as determined by the Shastras, if a man follows his own Dharma (Svadharma), he would be in a position to attain Moksha. Here Svadharma means the duties of man as prescribed under the Varna Vyavastha. That is how Gita preaches that the chaturvarnya is the complete order of individual virtue and social justice, as it is also the surest way to spiritual salvation. To put it this way, only through svadharma man would be entitled to achieve moksha. As per nature, and, as prescribed by the Shastras, only the Karmas, based on Varnashram Dharma, have been designated by various names in Gita as “Svadharma”, “Sahajkarma”, “Svakarma”, “Svabha-Vaj Karma”, “Svabhavaniyati-Karma”. Thus, the Varna Vyavastha has been accepted by the Hindus, especially the so-called Brahmins, as a complete manifestation of individual snature and social justice, which also leads man to the path of moksha.

1. In the Roman – Greek tradition, it was Cicero, who elaborate the concept of social justice, when he declared, “We are born for Justice, and that right is based, not upon man’s opinion, but upon nature. This fact will immediately be plain if you once get a clear conception of man’s fellowship and union with his fellow-men, for no single thing is so like
another, so exactly, its counterpart, as all of us are to one another”. For Cicero, a state cannot exist on crippled conditions; in fact, “it depends upon, and acknowledges, and gives effect to the consciousness of mutual obligations and the mutual recognition of rights that bind its citizens together. The state is a moral community, a group of persons who in common possess the state and its law”. That is why he called the state, “the affair of the people”. In essence, for Cicero, “Justice is an intrinsic good”, which holds the people together by moral ties and rights. The cardinal principle of Cicero’s theory of justice is respect for rights acquired under the social order which is clear from the nature of the state, “as the people’s affair; and the people is not every group of men, associated in any manner, but is the coming together of a considerable number of men who are united by a common agreement about law and rights and by the desire to participate in mutual advantages”.28

2. A true disciple of Socrates, Plato sought social justice through a social order based on human nature consisting of three main faculties: the rational, spirited and the appetitive. The rational faculty is wise and its main function is to rule and command; the function of the spirited faculty is to show courage in order to maintain law and order in society; and the appetitive faculty of human nature drives itself to the satisfaction of bodily appetites. The highest part of human nature is the rational faculty inherent in reason and wisdom; all its functions happen to be selective and distinct. This is an individual’s philosophical bent of mind. The special qualities of such a philosopher, or wise man are respect, tolerance, reasoning, discipline etc. The reason in such persons is able to guide and rule the
people. It means that an individual in whom reason dominates knows wholly what is good or bad to society. Next to the rational faculty, stands the spirited part of the soul, which shows its strength, and is apt to obey and fight. It is a lively and brilliant faculty to face adventures of life; and all kinds of courageous and enthusiastic acts are performed by this faculty.

The distinctive features of the character of such persons are ambition, love of power, demonstration of courage or strength, fighting spirit etc; they are suitable for maintaining peace and order in society, and are also able to defend the state. The appetitive faculty of the soul, or human nature, comes to the lowest level, in which there is an absence of rational qualities and a paucity of spirited features. Such persons are full of bodily desires and always hanker after their satisfaction. This part drives itself into a series of desires, hunger, thirst, fear, lust, etc. The persons, having such qualities of character, are apt to undertake various physical labours; and thus, they become labourers. All the three faculties, however, are closely inter-related, and the dominance of one in a person makes him having the same nature.  

Evidently, the three main functions of human nature, i.e. soul, are
i) To guide and rule;
ii) To fight and obey; and
iii) To plough and produce.

These functions of the soul, as Plato said, divide human society into three main classes—the rulers, the warriors and the labourers, respectively. The idea of social justice is realized in Plato’s state where each class does its own work and attends to its own duties without meddling in the tasks of other classes. The
power, or authority, of the state must be in the hands of the class of rulers, because its members happen to be wise-men, full of intellect, selfless, honest and learned; they know well the subtle distinction between good and bad, right and wrong, justice and injustice etc. It was Plato, who first presented the idea of the philosopher-king, for he was always a thinker, and also a friend of justice; he could rule in the best possible way with the help of his wisdom and knowledge. The law and order work of the state must be entrusted to the class of the warriors, who love adventures, can take risks and remain ready to fight, or to defend the state against the external forces. For fulfilling the material needs of society, the work of agriculture and production must be given to the class of labourers, because its members are able to undertake physical work; they cannot guide and rule, nor can they protect the state or maintain law and order in society. Thus, Plato envisaged the order of individual and social justice in the division of citizens into three classes according to their nature. 

Plato interlinked individual and social justice together. The individual form of justice manifests itself, when man succeeds in establishing harmony and unity among all the three qualities of wisdom, courage and appetite as inherent in his conscience. In case, this balance is up-set or disturbed, individual rushes towards lust and injustice. So the individual justice means the complete harmony among the three faculties of man’s nature. In a similar way, the well-ordered balance and supervision of all the three classes is the basic idea of Plato’s social justice. Some thinkers, while expressing their views on Plato, emphasized this aspect of justice. According to Prof. Wayper, “To do that work for which one is the most suitable, is the minimum justice”. Prof. Quiyer said, “to give to each citizen role and work according to his nature, is justice”. On Plato’s justice, Prf.
Sabine also said, “Justice is the bond which holds a society together, a harmonious union of individuals each of whom has found his life-work in accordance with his natural fitness and his training. It is both a public and a private virtue because the highest good both of the state and of its members is thereby conserved. There is nothing better for a man than to do his work and to be fitted to do it; there is nothing better for other men and for the whole of society than that each should thus be filling the station to which he is entitled.”

What is, then, Plato’s view of social justice? It is defined as follows:

“Social justice thus may be defined as the principle of a society, consisting of different types of men…. Who have combined under the impulse of their need of one another, and by their combination in one society, and their concentration on their separate functions, have made a whole which is perfect because it is the product and the image of the whole of the human mind”.

This is an explanation, a definition, of Plato’s theory of social justice, which means, as he conceived, “giving to every man his due”, in the light of what each one is, that is, keeping in mind his capacity and training, while having what is due from him in the honest performance of those tasks which have been assigned to him in view of his nature, or of his being a member of the particular class. In Plato’s view, social justice apparently stands for the performance of the class-based duties according to the nature of men. So far as the position of womenfolk is concerned, Plato placed them under the system of “Communism of Wives” in order that they could give society the best of progeny and no one could indulge in disputes relating to the possession of his children, whether mine or of
others. The bringing up of all children, their education and training, all such tasks were entrusted to the state.

Obviously, in both Varna Vyavastha and Plato’s scheme of things, the principle of justice is to have and do what is suited to one’s capabilities and place in society; to mind one’s duties and not be meddlesome. To them, the ideal society forms a complete unity, one large family. The just course is that which an individual pursues according to the prescribed duties as per his nature. The way of social justice is the supreme path of duties and the state is subject to defend and maintain the Varna Vyavastha according to dictates of the shastras and Plato’s order of society. In both of these social orders, the state is a part and parcel of society. The idea of social justice in Varna Vyavastha leads one towards the goal of Moksha and in Plato’s social order towards supreme happiness. In each scheme, a just man is entitled to achieve the highest goal of human life, that is, Moksha or Supre Happiness.

To Plato, justice was a virtue, an expression of moral conduct and righteousness, but Aristotle went a step ahead and discovered its nature inherent in morality, scientific insight and constitutional rule. He put it into “general justice” and “particular Justice”. The general justice is the whole good of society; it is moral conduct; it is public good; it is a virtue. This justice asks man to think not of himself but of his neighbours and other people. The particular justice is a part of the whole justice. It expresses itself into a limited area, though the contents of both general and particular justice do not differ. Again Aristotle divides the particular justice into distributive justice and corrective justice.
The distributive justice is related to the distribution of posts, rewards, honours and other advantages by the state to individuals on the basis of their capacities and abilities. Aristotle regards that since human beings are unequal by nature, their merits are different, and they contribute to the betterment of society and state according to their natural capacities and abilities. In proportion to these, citizens should be provided with posts, rewards, honours and advantages by the state. Aristotle, thus, propagated the doctrine of “proportionate equality” as the basis of distributive justice. The true equality for human beings is not numerical, but proportionate. The controlling power in a state should not be vested in a single class, for it would kill the spirit of distributive justice. The best state is that which is founded on proportionate justice based on merits of the individual, and not on birth, wealth, liberty and equality. A complete equality among the citizens is not possible in any respect of human life.

Aristotle also visualized the need of corrective justice. Even if justice in distribution has been tolerably secured within a particular community, various circumstances like accidents, agreements by individuals, group rivalries, robberies and breach of contracts, may arise to disturb it, and the right way of meeting such disturbances was referred to by Aristotle as corrective justice. Its main aim is to protect life, property and liberty of citizens, that is, to correct the corrupt designs of certain individuals who try to disturb the social order. For Aristotle, the corrective justice is not revenge, but some sort of compensation. He discarded the principle of “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth”, for it is not a true compensation; it is a revenge, which cannot be an act of justice. All that the state can do is to try to prevent such action by some sort of protection
(i.e. the police), by deterrence through the prospects of various forms of punishments, by special restrictions and by moral education.

Evidently, the distributive justice is to be maintained through corrective justice, and that too, is to be carried on by justice in exchange, or some sort of reward and punishment. The spirit of justice in exchange stands for most of the exchanges that actually take place like exchanges of services, and are essentially a part of distribution. The people can exchange the products of their labour, and the state can well organize this aspect of distribution and exchange. The justice of reward and punishment has assumed an important position in modern states. Rewards may be given as compensation in various ways; but in implementation process, punishment naturally calls for more attention than reward that is why as parts of social justice, the theories of punishment like the preventive theory, the deterrent theory, the retributive theory, the reformative (the educative) theory, were introduced and elaborated by thinkers from time to time.

What is the view of social justice as conceived by Aristotle? In view of the general conception of justice, it may rightly be explained that to Aristotle, the spirit of social justice lies in a just arrangement of society which would mean a model in which each one does efficiently the work for which one is fitted by nature of one’s capacities and abilities, and receives accordingly what is necessary to enable him to continue his work. Thought the state regulations can only be accepted as general, not as applying to every individual instance, yet the laws of a state as Aristotle urged, can only provide for what is best in general.
The most important element added to the concept of social justice by Aristotle was the rule of law which has received a special attention in modern societies.

In Aristotle’s idea of social justice, the supremacy of Law is accepted as a mark of a good state in comparison to the class of wise rulers. The law has an impersonal quality, and no one, however good he may be, can dispense with it. The law is not a magistrate, but it gives to the magistrate an authority by which he administers justice in society. It is a moral quality endowed with an authority of the constitution. The constitutional rule is consistent with the dignity of the subject, and the constitutional ruler rules by consent of the subject and is quite different from a dictator or the rule by a class. The constitutional rule, as Aristotle thought, contains three main elements:

i) It is the rule in the public or general interest as distinguished from a factional or tyrannous rule in the interest of a single class or individual;

ii) It is lawful rule in the sense that government is carried on by general regulations and not by arbitrary decrees;

iii) Constitutional government means the government of willing subjects as distinguished from despotism supported by force.

Though Aristotle has not defined precisely the “constitutional rule”, yet the rule of law is an indispensable condition of a moral and civilized life. Apparently, the social life cannot be separated from law and justice which is embedded in social intelligence and tradition. This also includes in itself a political rule by law and custom. The social justice must, therefore, include the factors of subordination to law, constitutional rule, and must also be based on freedom and
consent on the part of its subjects. The constitutional rule must give due regard
to morality, virtue, wisdom, custom and tradition in the interest of social justice.
Aristotle also suggested that public opinion must be admitted to be not only an
unavoidable force but also, up to a point, a justifiable standard in a social and
political system. In Aristotle’s view, the middle path between two extremes is the
foundation of a happy and just order, that is, if people’s life is disciplined and
kept away from different types of extremes, the possibilities of social justice may
be increased immensely; in short, his theory of social justice was opposed to
extremes of all kinds.

In ancient India, disagreeing with the theory of social justice, as said to be
inherent in Varna Vyavastha, the thinkers belonging to Charvaka, Jain and
Buddhist communities, developed a humanistic view of social justice. The
Charvaka philosophy wanted to establish a social order of free individuals, who
could pursue their aim of seeking pleasures in their own ways. It did not accept
any divine or Vedic theory of social justice, nor did it relate social justice to any
idea of the past karmas, or the God’s grace. In Charvakean view, a free life for
man meant achieving maximum pleasures of his own choice; there should be no
barriers of caste or creed in the pursuit of pleasure including the restrictions
relating to conjugal relations. This way the charvakas rejected all the Vedic
concept of life and society, or of life after death and also the ideas of past karma
and rebirth.

The theory of social justice in the Buddhist way of life is purely humanistic
and empirical, or secular. It did not find any reason for classifying human beings
into water-tight compartments as the Vedic or Platonic view of justice had done.
The Buddhist view believed that human nature was unique and each individual had his own personality; it related social justice to the righteous conduct of men. The purity of mind of all individuals and their righteous conduct would be capable of establishing a peaceful and just social order. To perform mutual duties in a society is possible without dividing human beings into rigid classes. In a just society, the laymen and the Bhikkhus, the two main counter-parts, perform their respective social obligations well in the interest of the whole of society. The laymen have to minister to the Bhikkhus by showing affection and regard for them in their actions, speech and thoughts, by giving them a warm welcome and ample hospitality and by providing generally to their material needs, so that the Bhikkhus could devote much of their time in religious meditation and purification, or in education and training of their minds, along with the practice of moral precepts prescribed for them by the Bhikkhu Sangha.

The Bhikkhus, in return, have to show their affection for the laymen by restraining them from evil courses of action, by exhorting them to do what is good, just and honourable, by entertaining kindly feelings towards them, by imparting knowledge to them, by dealing with their difficulties and doubts, and by teaching them the way of righteousness based on various kinds of Silas; they ask the laymen to practice Panch-Silas: not to kill, not to tell a lie, not to undertake theft, not to indulge in adultery and not to entertain intoxicants of any kind. If all the laymen practice the Panch-Silas, the spirit of social justice will be strengthened and proliferate among the people. One the one hand, the Bhikkhus live a life of various Silas, and on the other, they inspire the laymen to follow the same way, so that the whole of the social order flowers with fellow-feelings, by
the practice of Silas. Though each Sila is practiced by an individual, yet in it is inherent the feelings of social respect and justice. These are the Silas, which sustain the social life of the human beings. The practice of Silas by both men and women will certainly be beneficial to all.

Here it will be right to emphasize that the Buddhist theory of social justice is closely related to the practice of Silas, though the republican system of government of a State can also be helpful in enriching and implementing the ways of social justice. The life of Silas is based on the middle path of Buddha, and the peaceful and just life is invariably linked with the practice of the middle path. A life, indulged in extremes, is always painful, full of sufferings. The Buddhist social view is free from all divine dispensation or rigid rules of religious nature. Man’s conduct is wholly responsible for Kushal or Akushal, good or bad, social order. The basic-elements of a Kushal (good) order are the middle path, non-violence, non-theft, true speech, celibacy, non-intoxication, no-adultery, mutual respect, co-operation, sympathy, friendship, compassion, pure mind, equality and freedom; whereas the forces of an Akushal (bad) order are unrighteousness, dishonesty, lust, greed, jealousy, violence, lies, theft, intoxication, adultery, injustice, exploitation and oppression. In brief, the righteous conduct, based on Silas, has a decisive role in the Buddhist concept of social justice, which would have no contradiction with any administration based on the rule of law, or any liberal-democratic way of life. This concept is overwhelmed with the spirit of morality and human fellowship; it has no relation to any supernatural forces; and is wholly grounded in common welfare of all human beings.
The Jain way of life, too, endeavoured to seek social harmony and justice through righteous conduct of the individual. Unless an individual was prepared to show respect for the lives of other individual, there could be no just order of human relations. The Jain view of life also prescribed Panch-Sila for an individual’s righteous conduct as was done in the Buddhist way of life. Obviously, for both of them, justice is a matter of good conduct, respect for human beings, and non-violence. They asked the people to practice Ahimsa (non-violence) in order that each one could show respect for the lives of all beings. The purity of heart, the practice of ahimsa, the regard for human dignity and the way of Silas constitute the basic contents of social justice in Jainism as well as in Buddhism. They did not think it proper to classify human beings into the rigid classes, nor did they sanctify their social position by any kind of divinity and infallibility of Religious Texts. Thus, the strength of social justice lies in self-regulation and self-discipline, the feelings, of friendship, compassion and fraternity. Social justice is not merely an affair of law or the state power; but it may also be effective through morality and religion. Almost all the thinkers have emphasized this aspect of social justice, though some fanatics have dragged the moral and religious precepts into narrow-mindedness and dogmatism which have resulted in detrimental forces to the spirit of social justice.

Theistic religions like Islam, Christianity and Judaism have a different view of social justice. Each one saw its concept as a manifestation of Divine Law as revealed to their respective prophets. The religious texts of these religions provide us with a view of the world and man’s place in it. Each religion (Islam, Christianity or Judaism), contains a set of social rules in the light of which, a community, a social order, has to be established and maintained. Justice is to be
enforced not so much by the State as by the code of conduct through the guidance and supervision of their priests. The social justice, to them, is the gift of Divine Law and is administered by the grace of Allah or God. Its process will be determined in accordance with the rules as prescribed in the religious texts; even the nature and form of law shall be determined by them. Thus, the theistic religions have linked social justice with the spirit of Divine Revelation and Holy Books, and the social orders of Islam, Christianity and Judaism are the expressions of their theological beliefs, which are hardly to be challenged by any authority of society or that of a State.

Every member of the Muslim Society is bound to fulfil the onerous duty to advance all the processes of development and justice in the name of Allah. In the Islamic view, development and justice, economic progress, social justice and welfare all go together. The social justice is said to be based on the quality and fraternity of all Muslim citizens of a country. “Social Justice, equality of opportunity and co-operation come”, as the “basic objectives of Islam’s economic system”. Since all the natural assets are the gifts of Allah, these should be well distributed among the believers in Allah. Thus, the Islamic view emphasizes the need of “distributive justice”, and in order to make it effective, it considers five things to be necessary.

i) Making arrangements for training, and then rendering assistance in finding gainful employment to those unemployed and looking for work in accordance with their ability

ii) Enforcing a system of just remuneration for those working.
iii) Making compulsory arrangements for insurance against unemployment and occupational hazards, old-age pensions and survivors benefits for those who can afford to provide for this.

iv) Providing assistance to those who, because of disability, physical or mental handicaps, or adolescence, are unable to support themselves or to attain a respectable standard of living by their own effort.

v) Collecting and distributing Zakat and enforcing Islamic teachings among the people.\textsuperscript{36} For enforcing social and economic justice, Islam does not rely on law alone or the state power; it rather stresses on inner faith in Allah, prayers, teaching of Quran, Zakat, moral training or Muslim brotherhood to change the heart of Muslims in favour of justice; when these do not deliver the goods, Islam stands “for the use of the coercive powers of law to establish justice by force”.\textsuperscript{37}

In Christianity, the principle of social justice lies in the teaching, “Love God, and love man and practice righteous conduct”. Virtuous conduct towards all is the basis of social justice. All human beings are the children of God. So the righteous conduct is the manifestation of the spirit of justice. God loves man and showers his love on man but looks at what a man does for others; and thus, God is the distributor of justice. God is always worth-loving and also pardons man. However, God does all that for a man, who after shunning all distorted mental state and the feeling of rebellion humbly submits himself to the will of God. Self-surrender is in the hands of man, to forgive is God’s prerogative. God created man as a free being, and whatever he does, he is fully responsible for it. It is the bounden duty of human beings to have faith in a just God; and they must firmly
believe that it is the justice which ultimately wins. This is an indication towards the last judgement.\textsuperscript{38} In Brief, in order to love God and to do justice every man must practice the purity of conscience and the purity of mind, and essentials for it, are honesty, self-sacrifice, good-will, purity of character, love towards neighbours and service of humanity.

The main principle of Judaism is complete monotheism. In it, the individual conduct or the social set-up is based on God's commandments, which allow certain things to be done and certain things not to be done. Judaism manages social affairs by accepting the existence of both rich and poor in society. The poverty is the result of man's sins, and is a punishment given by God; whereas richness is also the result of God's justice. The Jews, on their social level, like to mix up only among the members of their own community; while being liberal in politics, they keep themselves limited to their own group of people. They regard social justice wholly dependent on God's will; Judaism still is the main source of their social order. Though the Jews are far advanced in the fields of education, culture, science, technology, politics, economic prosperity, etc.; but in their social system the religious institutions play decisive roles; rather these institutions dominate other aspects of social life. Thus, justice in various fields in influenced or dominated by religion; and social justice is nothing but to do certain permitted things and to negate those which are not allowed to be done. In brief, the basic source of social justice is religion, i.e. Judaism, and this religion is God's revelation to mankind.\textsuperscript{39}

What is the relation between God and justice? Or else, what is God's justice or Divine Law? It is well explained by Prof. Radhakrishnan in these
words: “It is the embodiment of the mind and will of God. God is its supervisor, Karmadhyaksha. Justice is an attitude of God… Every act, every thought is weighed in the invisible but universal balance-scales of justice. The day of judgment is not in some remote future, but here and now, and none can escape it. Divine laws cannot be evaded. They are not so much imposed from without as wrought into our natures. Since is not so much a defiance of God as a denial of soul, not so much a violation of law as a betrayal of self. We carry with us the whole of our past. It is an ineffaceable record which time cannot blur nor death erase.”

This is the Hindu view of justice, and thus, in the series of religions, like Islam, Christianity and Judaism, which believe in God’s justice, or Divine laws, also comes Hinduism in the form of Varnashram Dharma, as explained earlier. These theistic religions are mutually different in their contents and principles; they differ in the social codes; and their protagonists and followers go to different places of worship. Nevertheless, they have agreed to accept the human situation and social justice as wholly dependent on God’s will and grace.

The saints of medieval India, undoubtedly, sounded the innermost depths of the common consciousness, and endeavoured to seek and strengthen the spirit of social of social justice through the grace of God. Human life was regarded as a great gift of God. It could get rid of worldly life of greed, poverty and social degradation only by divine grace. Suppression of desires, restraint on individual’s lavish living, detachment from family relations, non-attachment in social affairs, etc. were taken as ingredients of a good life. Moksha was widely highlighted; social justice based on equal secular relations was neglected, for ultimate equality before God was preached. The Bhaktas believers in God were not interested in social revolution for justice. The dominant feature of spiritualists,
including the Bhaktas and the Sufis, was escapism, a search for solace in the ideas of other-worldliness. They sought social justice in the kingdom of God and Allah, but not in empirical world. Thus, in medieval India, social justice was linked with the kingdom of Ishwar, God or Allah; the social situation, good or bad, was acclaimed as the result of divine justice; and it was also thought that ultimately after death, justice would be done to all.  

The whole social life in medieval India was based on casteism, feudalism, inequality and exploitation. The doors of education, knowledge and light were strictly closed to the Shudras and Untouchables. The path of enlightenment, which was thrown open to the lower caste people as a result of the powerful movements launched by Mahavira and Buddha, was again forbidden for them. Caste determined man’s profession and his status in society. No one had any existence outside his caste. Excommunication for violating the caste rules was more dreadful than death itself. Mutual exclusiveness was the essence of the caste system. It fostered division and narrowness. It stifled individual initiative and the spirit of co-operation. Every individual activity was governed by caste rules and the fatalistic doctrine of Karma, which ran counter to freedom, creativity and human dignity ultimately killed the spirit of social justice; it also blocked the way of economic welfare and denied the grant of political rights to a large number of people.

The social philosophy of Varnashrama Dharma, resulting in caste and untouchability, had broken the unity of Indian national life. It had prevented the growth of democracy and mutual co-operation. The advent of Islam, its fanaticism and aggressiveness, hindered the development of a common humanity.
There was no cohesive force to encourage the spirit of social justice. If at all it existed, it was reduced to the bonds of caste. The spirit of social alienation was at its height and the religious fanaticism did not allow any social assimilation, and that brought down the spirit of social justice to its lowest rung. The creed of pessimism was developed as a philosophy of life, and escapism became the mode of the entire medieval life. The saints and Sufis preached equality before God, and thus, the transcendental concept of social justice was projected as a panacea for the existing unjust social order.

In the midst of conflicts between Hinduism and Islam, strict caste rules, religious rites, metaphysical subtleties, cruelties inherent in untouchability, social alienation among different groups and communities, it was Kabir who stood for drastic changes in the existing social order and values which could restore to man his proper place in society. He challenged the divinity of the Varnashrama Dharma and doubted the authority of Vedas, Upanishads, Epics, Smritis and other sacred books. He asked the Hindus to abolish the caste system and also chided the Muslims for their social narrow-mindedness. Kabir claimed for the shudras and the untouchables perfect equality not only before God, but also in social life. The spirit of social justice was well preached by him. His approach was democratic rooted in both spiritualism and humanism. Through his spiritual principle of one God and one humanity, Kabir did much to elevate the social and moral attitude in Indian society creating thereby an atmosphere of social justice grounded in the equality of all human beings.42

Guru Nanak, too, emerged as the protagonist of social unity through oneness of God. He did not accept the divinity of Varnashrama Dharma. He
was very critical of the prevalence of a socially unjust and morally indefensible caste system. He upheld the equality of all men as men, the organic fusion of the social and spiritual life, of worship with the fulfillment of social obligations. Guru Nanak endeavoured to create the spirit of social justice through the principle of oneness of God and the brotherhood of all men as all the human beings were created by God. He believed in the moral order of the world. He emphasized the need of restoration to Shudras and the untouchable a dignified place in society. All men were brothers, the beings of one God, and they must live as brothers, guiding their actions by love and justice.

The movement, launched by Kabir, Nanak and other saints and reformers of medieval India, stood for radical changes in social relations. Their social attitude was democratic and humanistic in its approach tinged with theistic spiritualism, which meant that the lowest was equal to the highest in the eyes of God. Though they were all true supporters of social justice essentially based on spiritual equality, yet the medieval economic and political situation did not help it. The feudalistic dominance, the Hindu conservatism, the Islamic aggressiveness, the emergence of new castes and sects, the prevalence of untouchability, the wide-spread illiteracy and ignorance, the continuity of forced labour, the poverty and exploitation of one class by powerful castes and feudal, the deep-rooted fundamentalism, the religious discrimination and distance, the political rivalries and the like, all vitiated the atmosphere and killed the spirit of social justice during the medieval period in India. However, yearning for social justice could not be completely wiped out because of its inalienable base in human relations. Its roots were not thrown out, but were watered by certain good men and
movements, even during the medieval society. That is why the spirit of social justice was rejuvenated by even stronger protagonists of it in the modern times.\textsuperscript{43}

The social process of modern India began with an urge for renaissance which infused in man an insight for freedom, democracy and humanism. Freedom was conceived as the realization of individuality and augment of creativity. Democracy stood for bringing people together for co-operation and consensus, whereas humanism asked them to concentrate their attention on the problems of empirical man. Thus, the liberation of man became a social problem to be solved through the transformation of the social structure. The spirit of reflection and criticism, which was silent in medieval society, finally broke out in open revolt against authoritarianism, national subjugation, fanaticism, divinity of Shastras, fundamentalism, tyranny of caste and Varna. With the beginning of the modern age, the concept of social justice assumed a new meaning; it was no more abstracted from the practical life; it attracted the attention of all; and compelled the common men and thinkers, too, to see that the spirit of social justice could find its fullest realization only in social life. The social outlook began to change. The emphasis shifted from God to man, from metaphysical to empirical, and from transcendental life to a mundane existence.

The new spirit of social justice was influenced by Christianity, Western education and British administration. Christianity undermined the feelings and practices of caste and untouchability. It infused in Indians an urge for equality not only before God, but also in church and society. That is why a large chunk and society. That is why a large chunk of Hindus, particularly the lower caste people, embraced the religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian religion had some positive
effects upon the social transformation. It roused a sense of human dignity among the low caste people by giving them economic and medical help. The Christian missionaries served them socially, and for their educational uplift, they started opening schools for the children of the lowly and weak. It was, in fact, one mode of social justice, which was grounded in social service and educational expansion, and that accelerated the process of social change in India. The Christian concept of social justice got momentum more through education, welfare work, medical help and liberal behavior-pattern than the grace of God.

The British rule in India brought with it some new dimension in the concept of social justice. It started making it more effective through bureaucracy, judicial system, education, communication, welfare activities and democratic tendencies. The British outlook undermined the disruptive role of religions. It introduced a process of secularization of Indian social life, that is, making India a secular state through the constitutional recognition of the equality of all citizens before the law, which was unprecedented in the social history of this land. Consequently, the doors of education and employment in administrative set up were opened to the low caste people, especially the Shudras and the untouchables, who had been reduced to the dirt and dust during the medieval period.

The main agencies of social justice under the British rule came to be the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. The role of religion in the field of social justice was now relegated to the background, and the state emerged as a powerful instrument of social justice in Indian society. The process of secularization and empirical progress was strengthened, and that brought to
Indians a sense of nationhood, which impelled them to be united and to be free from the British regime. The rapid evolution of modern Indian under the Christian and western influence, the revivalistic and renaissance urge, the rise of secularism and nationalism, the educational and communicational expansion, the introduction of uniform judicial system, the political awakening etc. profoundly stirred people’s mind to change in the sphere of social values and human relations. The moral and religious concepts were redefined in relation to people’s needs.

The spirit of social justice continued to emanate from the human situation with an urge for national freedom and political emancipation during the 19th century India. To the concept of justice was added the spirit of patriotism and nationalism. That is, all patriots and nationalists, irrespective of any caste, creed and movement, were brothers; they were equal citizens of India; no one low, no one high; and to live like brothers and friends. The poor economic condition was also related to social justice and national freedom which meant that India must be freed from the British rule. Only in a free India, her people could hope for a just social and political order, economic welfare, educational advancement, moral and religious regeneration, democracy and liberalism. That was also a hope for the emancipation of the Shudra, the untouchables, the primitive tribes and the other backward classes of India. Hence all aimed at national freedom.

However, a controversy arose during the national movement whether political reform should precede the social reform or social reform must precede the political reform. The protagonists of both sides were intellectuals, reformers and politicians. There were three approaches to this controversy. One section of
the reformers stood for social reform while remaining under the protection of the British rule. The second section vehemently opposed it and argued for the priority of political reform followed by social reform in free India. A third section adopted an attitude of inter-dependence, that is, social and political reforms were so intertwined that neither could be separated from the other. Though a priority was given to political freedom, yet the underlined theme was clear that the suppression and oppression of the weaker sections of Indian society could no longer be tolerated, and the spirit of social justice had to be realized before and after India become a free nation. The hope for social justice, however, was vitiated when the communal riots broke out at the time of political freedom and the unity of India was battered and broken by the fundamentalists. The feuds between the Hindus and the Muslims still darken the spirit of social justice in free India, though its other aspects have gained prominent place in our polity.

The spirit of social justice right from the Vedic times to this day continued to be strengthened, though in its varied forms. At times, remaining at the lowest rung of the social ladder, it has now assumed a serious and wide-spread form as a movement. It has manifested itself in different dimensions through various agencies. Let us therefore, proceed to analyse the principles of justice, the exact concept of social justice, its different forms in which it is obtained to the people and its agencies through which it is highlighted and carried on in India’s national life.

The Marxist view of social justice is quite different from those we have analysed so far. It believes that the idea of justice has developed through he ages. It has no fixed and immutable nature. The concepts of social justice change from one age to the next due to changes in economic relations. The
economic base of any society plays a decisive role in establishing and maintaining the social justice. As a rule, justice as the relations between classes is brought into being by the economic structure of society. The ruling class vindicates the existing economic relations based on exploitation of the toiling class by the capitalist class, while the revolutionary class, the exploited sections of society, criticize and negate them by the proletariat revolution. Marxism has elucidated the concept of justice and measured it in relation to the vital needs of natural social development. Hence the Marxist ethics first associates the concept of justice with the idea of liberating society from the exploiting class, and “Social justice attains its summit in communist society, in which all traces of social and economic distinctions disappear”.44

The Marxist theory of justice recognizes class struggle as a matter of social reality and tires to direct it towards a just society, in which classes are abolished through class struggle, that is, through a violent overthrow of the capitalist society. When the economic basis of society under capitalism is abolished and the controlling power comes into the hands of the proletariat, the entire superstructure (law, morality, culture, religion, etc) changes into the favour of people’s public interest. Under communism social interest becomes the prime aim of the government, and the state also becomes an instrument of social justice. Since the laws and the legal provisions of the socialist society fully correspond to the people’s interests, the right to private ownership of land and industries, is abolished. The just social order expresses itself into collectivism, that is, the collective spirit of co-operation, mutual assistance and mutual trust. Under socialist society, people receive equal wages for equal work. Here lies the justness of the socialist principle of distributive justice. The implementation of
the cardinal principle of communism “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” would imply that society has established full economic equality, the cornerstone of social justice. Then, there will be no repression and exploitation, and with the disappearance of the classes, the state will also wither away. The society under communism will be capable of sustaining itself by people’s honesty and insight who will perform their duties without any external force. The moral conscience of the whole people will be so exalted that everybody will produce in full collective spirit as to satisfy the material needs of society. The society will be quite a peaceful one giving to each one according to his needs.

The Gandhian ideology stands opposed to Marxism, because in it, religion has a prominent place; whereas the Marxist view is quite secular, and has no place for any religious thought. Gandhiji was fundamentally influenced by the philosophy of Varnashram Dharma; he was a staunch supporter of it. He also took it as a natural quality of human nature; he believed in its divinity and infallibility. But at the same time, Gandhiji visualized social justice in the establishment of a Sarvoday Samaj. The main aim of Sarvodaya Samaj is said to be the interest or the welfare of all citizens. It would have no untouchability; all members would undertake physical labour; there would be no forced labour, child labour and victimization of womenfolk; and the material needs of all members would be fulfilled through love and co-operation. However, Gandhiji felt that the establishment of such a Sarvodaya Samaj would never be possible on the basis of the rules of Manu-Smriti, though he continued to believe in Varnasharm Dharma as a true religion. He got inspiration from Ruskin’s famous book: “Unto The Last” for the Sarvodaya Samaj; and he endeavoured to bring
and organize people by means of truth, non-violence, satyagrah, love of God. Gandhiji stressed the need of mutual love, sympathy and brotherhood among the people coming together for bringing about the Sarvodaya Samaj. In his view, the members of such a society would be called as “Satyagrahis” (the holds of truth) in the sense that they would continuously be doing satyagrah for a just social order by the means of truth, love and non-violence. The staunch Gandhiates like Vinobha Bhave and Jaiprakash Narayna also highlighted the idea of Sarvodaya Samaj and endeavoured to strengthen it, though at present no one is interested in its idea and establishment because of its being a utopia.

In modern times, the scientific spirit, the technological progress and the higher education of all kinds, have helped in increasing the possibilities of social justice. Science has struck had at those absurd presuppositions of the religious sects and religions, which had obstructed the way of human reason and freedom. There was a time when there was so much religious interference in the fields of psychology, medicine, biology, geology and geography that for man’s welfare and happiness, only primitive things were sought to apply; religion was regarded as prominent, while new discoveries were decried or hated by the religious fanatics. Nevertheless, the new discoveries in the fields of science, medicine and technology, have encouraged man to be bold and to endeavour to make his own destiny by himself. Man could apply his own reason and make efforts to solve human problems. In order to provide equal opportunities for social, economic or material progress, men could come forward and establish their relations on the principles of equality, impartiality and fraternity.
In fact, the progress in the fields of science, technology and medicine, has destroyed considerably the barriers of caste, community or creed, which were prevalent among the people; it has disproved as unnatural the ideas of purity said to be inherent in the ideologies of racialism and class-based superiority; and it has also destroyed all those presuppositions of the so-called religions, which had encaged man in the world of false dreams and rewards. The scientific outlook and approach has broken the chains of dogmatism and fanaticism, and thus, has freed man from the shackles of superstition and supernaturalism. As a result, man has been continuously advancing in the field of social justice much more boldly than ever. In brief, the knowledge of science has created some new dimensions in the field of social and economic justice by the means of newspaper, television, film demonstration, transport, communication, computer system, etc., and it has linked up all these advancements with the empirical and material prosperity of human beings.

After observation and analysis of the various ideas and theories of social justice, it is easier to claim that social justice is not one thing, a single idea, or a theory alone. It consists of a number of elements; its nature and process is very complex; its scope is immensely wide; it may be adorned with several meanings; and more and more contents can be added to it. It is, therefore, not possible to contain social justice in one formula, or it cannot be defined strictly in fixed terms. Here, however, it may be explained, or expanded, in certain premises as follows:

1. Social justice is based on the dignity of the human personality, its respect and honour, and human brotherhood; and it is basically related to the nature, organization and the functional way of a society.
2. Social justice emphasizes the need of equitable distribution of economic benefits, equality of political rights, social duties, legal obligations, constitutional methods and devotion towards nation and constitution.

3. Social justice, being the upholder of public interest and being impartial, recommends and grants certain necessary priorities and reservations.

4. Social justice is man-made, an order of human relations, a way of virtue and righteous conduct, and in its empirical form, it gives us effective and practical results.

5. Social justice is the guardian and protector of the interests of the handicapped, disabled, poor and downtrodden, deprived and destitute, including the most backward classes.

6. Social justice, being inherent in the equality before law, universal education and the right to religious conviction, is vehemently opposed to caste discrimination, untouchability and birth-based social prestige.

7. Social justice, being relative to religion, is the supporter of religious tolerance and communal harmony, and is also, within the national limits, an inspirer for the welfare of all mankind.

8. Social justice is a will for the service of all suffering human beings, and is, in varied forms, the supporter of its implementation and is also a method to provide resources needed for it.

9. Social justice is a continuous process of serving, uplifting and developing all the weaker sections, broken families and helpless individuals of a
society in the best possible ways, and is also an identification of the
demonstration of respect and honour, liberty, equality and fraternity
towards them.

10. Social justice is a comprehensive concept that aspires for the
establishment of those legal provisions and moral principles, which
envisage to plan and make it effective in practice in order to bring about
right relations between man and man in all aspects (political, economic,
moral, religious, empirical and scientific of human life emphasizing the
need of an integrated approach.

Thus, Social justice, relating to each and every society, community,
country or a nation, is a complex order of human relations; to define its nature
and make it an effective affair, is a difficult and stupendous task to perform. In a
country like India, it is much more difficult to make it enforceable, where
numerous religions, sects and cultures exist; all types of people, castes and
tribes live and where mutually opposing political parties, historical conflicts and
social differences are prevalent. India is a land, where, after independence,
casteist tension, communal discord, religious intolerance, social alienation,
feudalist behavior, political rivalry, psychological untouchability, casteism in
administration, economic exploitation, social suppression, educational
backwardness, forced labour, fanaticism, dogmatism, orthodoxy, Hindu-Muslim
enmity, terrorism, etc. have apparently become challenges to all the citizens. All
these are obstructive elements in the way of Social justice. Nevertheless, the
foundation of social, economic and political justice, as laid down in India’s
Constitution, has not yet been disturbed and dismantled; rather its concept has
emerged more popular among the people; and a close struggle between the facilitative and obstructive elements, relating to the movement for social justice, has been going on in this country.

After pondering over the different aspects of social justice, a thought comes to the mind that in Indian society, where there exist the administration of the Constitution, the rule of law, the liberal culture, the faith in God, the belief in the equality of all beings before Almighty, the abundance of philosophical wisdom, the ancient knowledge, numerous religions, sects, holy ideals, moral virtues, human values and immense economic or natural resources, why is there so much negligence and indifference towards the problem of social justice? Why do the depressed people, weaker sections and the backward classes not get social justice? Why are there the crores of people called Chamar, Bhangi or Untouchables in our democratic polity? What are the reasons the crores of children are living as illiterate, deprived and destitutes? What are the factors that cause utter poverty, diseases like plague and malaria and widespread unemployment, bonded labour and the like? Where do we lack in our efforts to cope with these problems? These are the questions, which generally agitate our minds and compel us to find suitable answers. In fact, these questions directly illustrate that in Indian society, if, on the one hand, there are friends of social justice; on the other, there also exist the deadly enemies of it. there are people, who stand to accelerate the movement for social justice, but there are also some forces, which intentionally obstruct its process, functioning and implementation.

The friends may be put aside for the time being but not the enemies of social justice. Some of the silent and vociferous enemies are as follows:
Dharma is an essential part of human life and society. Righteous conduct, or just behaviour, is Dharma; but it has been unnecessarily associated with false view, which causes all suffering and injustice. What is the false view? There is no definition of a false view; however, it manifests itself in various forms such as beliefs in supernatural power, kingdom of heaven, immortality of soul, retributive theory of Karma, reincarnation and salvation of soul, i.e. Moksha. In fact, these do not form Dharma; they are the ingredients of a Mazhab. Dharma is directly related to man and his welfare. A false view distorts the right view and also lowers the dignity of man; it creates distortions and evils in a social order; and thus, vitiates the establishment of right relationships between man and man.

The belief in a supernatural power negates man’s effort; it relates man’s condition to an external power such as God, fate, the invisible divinity, miracle and magic. This indicates that there is nothing in the hands of man. Man is simply a toy before these forces; and he moves or dances, as directed by them; and consequently, the belief in the supernatural powers negates man’s intellect, his spirit of freedom and investigation. He is so baptized that he does not believe in the efficacy of his own effort; but waits for a miracle to happen in order that he could get justice and all his sufferings could be redressed by the grace of God. With this, is also associated the belief in the kingdom of heaven, where God rules. Certain Mazhabs consider the kingdom of heaven to be the “Dharma-raj”, for there is the direct rule of God. Only God administers justice there. Man gets all facilities, pleasures and comforts in it. It will be the result of man’s good actions that he gets admission in the kingdom of heaven. Can such a view make social justice a reality in human life?
Another concept of the false view is the immortality of Soul. It is said that a non-material soul resides in man’s body, which is eternal and immortal. When man dies, his body comes to an end, but not the soul. This soul carries all the impressions of good or bad actions that a man has done, and takes next birth according to his karmas. A complete account of man’s karmas is said to be kept in “Adrashta” (Unseen), which is managed by God himself. Only God determines man’s next birth in accordance with his good or bad Karmas. Whatever man does, he gets the consequences of his actions. Here comes the role of retributive theory of karma, which is quite opposed to social justice in this world. Nobody knows to what extent one gets justice in the kingdom of heaven, which exists nowhere. It is only an imagination, unknown and unseen. It has no validity based on any reason. The effects of various human karmas may certainly be observed in this material world; but to leave the “karmaphal” (result of action) at the mercy of external forces, is a Mazhab-based conspiracy to make all the human efforts meaningless or irrelevant in the present life. This is the one aspect of a false view that negates a just empirical order.

Social justice is an affair of the present society; it has no relation to any unseen world. However, almost all the Majhabi sects endeavour to associate man’s present social situation or his poverty, ignorance, drudgery, deprivation and suffering with his karmas done in the past life. According to them, man is what he had done in the past life. If a man is born in a poverty-ridden family, or in a rich family, or is born as a disabled, blind or deformed, it is all due to his good or bad karmas, done in the past life. This is known as the retributive aspect of karma theory, which is an enemy of social justice, because it is taken for granted that the concerned individual or family has been facing hardship and
suffering in consequence of the past karmas. Instead of getting due attention, or just treatment, he is ignored and left to suffer at the hands of his Fate. The Mazhabi view supports such a state of human affairs; but this is a very dangerous enemy of social justice. If the retributive theory of karma is supposed to be true, it leaves no chance to improve man’s condition in the present. All his karmas will be reshaping his life in the future birth, for this life has already been determined by his past karmas. That is, if good karmas are done at present, they will yield good result only in next birth as the Gita has also supported it. This Hindu theory of retributive karmas is certainly an unjust view of false belief. What may be the purpose of such a theory? It has only one purpose, that is, to exonerate the state or society from all the responsibility for the dire poverty or the groveling conditions of the poor, weak and the lonely. So unhesitatingly, this theory of karma, as a false view, is the most dangerous enemy of social justice.

Associated with the retributive theory of karma, is the idea of heaven, where exists God’s kingdom. Religions like Hinduism, Christianity and other religious sects of thinkers like Kant and Radhakrishnan, imagined and visualized that if a man does not get due results of his good karmas in the present world, he will be entitled for them in the future life. This is an idea to satisfy those who do hard labour, live honestly and produce things for the whole of society, but do not get due reward, equitable wages for their karmas. They are allured that if not in this world, they will get all happiness and comforts, as results of their good karmas, in the heaven or in the kingdom of God; so they must have faith in God’s justice to get rewards for their good karmas. God is the maintainer of all accounts of man’s karmas, and the kingdom of God is the safest place for
justice. God is the ‘karmadhyaksha’, i.e., one who dispenses and administers justice to each according to his good or bad karmas. Who is to verify all this dispensation? It is certainly a misbelieve that was designed to befool the toiling masses lest they should unite to revolt against an just social order dominated by the evil forces. It is the conspiracy to beguile those, who demand their due shares in the name of social justice, so that the status-quo remains as usual, and the vested interests continue to exploit the oppressed people; this is a way to throttle the voice of humanity. Thus, the belief in heaven or the kingdom of God is a well designed enemy of social justice.

In this context, if we consider and examine the Niskam Karma theory of the Bhagvada Gita, it will be quite relevant to the theme we have discussed so far. For it is the karma theory that has been acclaimed as just and useful by almost all the Hindu thinkers, saints and seers. The simple and general meaning of Gita’s Niskam Karma is to perform honestly those duties, which have been prescribed for each varna of the Chaturvanya order. It means that to perform the prescribed duties under Varnashram Dharma, without any desire for getting the result (Phal), is Naskam; karmas yield equivalent results; they are, however, left to God, i.e., Parmeshwar, to decide how to reward or punish the doer according to his karmas. Those, who worship God and do their duties, without willing to have results as they wish, get admission into God’s heaven, and like Gods and goddesses, will enjoy all kinds of comforts. Only in the context of Chaturvanya system, Niskam theory has been high lighted by the Gita. If a Shudra does serve all the three varnas honestly, God himself will allot him a place in the Vaishya varna in his next birth; and in a similar way, I he continues to perform devotedly the duties of Vaishya varna or that of Kshatriya varna, he will be certainly reborn.
in the Brahmin varna. Thus, the lovers of God, or his devoted bhaktas, continue to do their duties as prescribed in the Varna Vyavastha, from one birth to another, the Almighty Parmeshwar himself will take care of them. It is said that the Niskam Karma reckons with the material or the context in which individual is born; it regards the past as determined. It allows that the future is only conditioned by man's karma, tempered by God's grace and mercy. The theory of Niskam Karma, as based on the Varnashram Dharma, does not accord with the spirit of social justice. For social justice emphasizes the need for knowing the results (Karmaphal) of those duties, which the weaker sections of society have to perform. Karmas, no doubt, produce effects; but they do not go beyond the present world; they affect men in this empirical world. Niskam theory evades and postpones justice to the next birth for which there is no guarantee in future. The present social order, as it clearly appears, cannot be maintained with the help of Niskam Karmas, for they cannot work and sustain those, who toil and produce things for the whole of society. Whosoever does his work, or duties related to his profession, must get his due in the present life; to postpone that for the next birth is nothing but a blatant injustice.

Even the concept of Moksha contravenes the spirit of social justice. It has been described in Indian philosophies and religions in different forms. The theory of Moksha necessarily pre-supposes the existence of a permanent soul. When a man worships and completely devotes himself to the service of God, or totally surrenders himself before God and shuns all the worldly charms or relations, he becomes entitled to Moksha. The man, who regularly seeks and pursues the goal of Moksha, has no involvement in worldly affairs. Participation in movements like social justice has no relevance to him; he is determined to
achieve the highest bliss, i.e., Parmanand, to be one with Brahma. His knowledge, karma and devotion all are directed towards that goal. Moksha is said to be the union of man with God, or the realization of oneself as Brahma-rupa; still it means going of soul to heaven, and the like. So Moksha is not one thing; but leaving aside the Buddhist Nirvana, all kinds of Moksha do not give any heed to social participation. The concept of Moksha, thus, has no relationship with an active social life. From this point of view, Moksha, as the highest aim of human life, neglects the process of social justice as a hinderance to that goal. Instead, the seeker of Moksha, shuns all family and social obligations as hellish obstacles; he leaves society in status-quo. Moksha, in fact, is an individual aspiration; its social aspect is negligible; and one has to shun all worldly relations. Whether one gets Moksha or not, is a very doubtful proposition, but its concept does not energize the process of social justice in any way; rather it creates misbeliefs and superstitions.

The false view also includes the theory of reincarnation, i.e., Avtarvada, as has been widely accepted in Hinduism, especially enunciated by the philosophy of Gita. The Gita has explained this theory in clear terms that whenever Dharma, namely, Varnashram Dharma, is in danger, is violated or terrorized by the anti-forces, Parmeshwar himself takes birth, that is, re-incarnates, in human form, destroys all those, who oppose Dharma. Then Parmeshwar re-establishes Dharma and saves it from all anti-forces. He, thus, maintains the dignity and divinity of Varnasharam Dharma. They theory of Avtarvada is the main discovery of Hinduism and Gita philosophy. One may ask: which Dharma is protected or re-established by Parmeshwar? It is neither Christianity, nor Islam, not even Buddhism and other sects; but only varnashram
Dharma, which is well protected and maintained by Parmeshwar, taking human forms, from time to time. In fact, the idea of Avtarvada is closely related to Varnasharm Dharma, which is itself, in the form of Varna Vyavastha, an enemy of social justice. The shudras and untouchables never got justice and respect in society, nor Parmeshwar helped them to rise in life since times immemorial. Thus, a false-view, in any form can never be conducive to the process and implementation of social justice. What is the utility of a false view that is opposed to social participation or the emancipation of the poor, lowly and the weak of our society?

Yogya, sacrifice of animals, worship, shradha, death-feast, priesthood, etc. are also the aspects of false view. From social standpoint, these cannot be said to be the religious duties, because they do not have any relation with man’s righteous conduct. Dharma is righteous conduct strictly based on man’s sheels, which purify human mind, make human conduct just and bring human social order to a disciplined path. A false view alienates man from the realities of social life so that his immediate problems can be evaded, or postponed for the future. The false view gives undue importance to wild hope, superstition, fanatic tendency, priesthood, violence, fatalism, other-dependent feeling, dogmatism and fundamentalism; it drives man into the imaginative world of allurements. This way man forgets man, and clings to those ambitions, which do not have any relevance to man’s righteous and just conduct. In such a situation, the false view does not help the movement of social justice; rather it alienates man from its process. The false view, therefore, neglects the ongoing process of social movement and undermines it, and also relegates it into the backround. It clearly manifests itself into dogmatism, irrationalism, fanaticism, communalism, other
worldliness, and the like forms, which ignore the latest discoveries of science and technology that are needed to facilitate the process and implementation of social justice. In brief, the infallibility and divinity of shastras, divine governance or dispensation, reincarnation, transmigration of soul and its moksha, retributive karma, are the false ideas, which elbow out the responsibilities of a just social and moral order.

A powerful enemy of social justice is Brahmanism, which manifests itself in its trinity form-varna, caste and untouchability. This enemy has a long tradition, and is also rooted in Shastras. Whenever the tradition of Brahmanism is attacked by its critics, all the Brahmanic forces, including the divine Shastras, come forward to defend it. In fact, it is said that Brahmanism is a philosophy that had emanated from the Vedas. Since the Vedas are divine and infallible, the principles of Brahmanism are also divine and infallible. Under the scheme of Varna Vyavastha, as it was classified into four varnas, the Brahmins were kept at the tope and the shudras at the bottom, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas being in between them. In fact, it was claimed that Chaturvanya was based on guna-karma theory; but in due course it degenerated into an instrument of inequality, oppression and exploitation. Those, who became the victims of caste and untouchability, were reduced to mere ciphers, worse than beasts, in Brahmanical social order. This Brahmanic order is now wholly based on birth, not on any worth, of the individual. The theory of Brahmanism manifests itself into social inequality, injustice, forced labour, bonded labour, illiteracy, economic exploitation and cultural domination. All this deprives men of their human rights, equal opportunities and also of their becoming real human beings. So Brahmanism keeps the shudras, untouchables and other lower castes away from
the rays of social justice, and due to its coercive intentions, they lose their dignity
and respect; their individuality and personality have no status in the Brahmanic
social order.

The trinity of varna, caste and untouchability is synonumous with the
practical life of Hindu society. On the one hand, it has produced prominent
thinkers and intellectuals, and on the other, it has created illiterate and ignorant
masses by denying them the right to education, property and arms. A few have
abundants wealth, immense property and resources; but most of the people are
poverty-ridden without having means for their subsistence. This way the
Brahmanic trinity has transformed the masses into living grave-yards, for they do
not feel they exist in society. A host of saints and seers, reformers and
philosophers came forward to help the people but all of them justified and
defended the tenets of Varnashram Dharma, the root of Brahmanic social order.
That is why it became impossible to root out caste and untouchability, the two
by-products of Varna Vyavastha. The philosophy of Brahmanism, as a doctrine
of social inequality, remains a strong enemy of social justice. After
independence, the barriers, or the practice of untouchability have come to be
minimized; but the feelings of casteism have increased in a large volume. Its
ill-effects are widely felt in all walks of our national life. In political parties, posts
and tickets for elections, are decided on the basis of castes. In regions, where
particular castes dominate, it is most likely, the parties will allot tickets only to
persons belonging to them. Casteism has also entered into general
administration; it has gripped the police functioning, which blurs the chances of
fair and honest public dealings. Our observations confirm that whether there are
panchayat elections Parliament or Assemblies elections, college and university
elections everywhere caste considerations prevail. Casteism does not allow some professions to certain castes, whereas it permits the Brahmins to pursue all the professions including agriculture. Due to the continuity of reservations, along with fresh ones, the feelings of caste, low and high, i.e., caste discriminations, have emerged bolder than ever. The Mandal movement has sharpened the caste-struggle, and has brought all the forces of casteism into social conflicts and political rivalries. The doors of temples, particularly those of big ones, are still closed to Chamars and Bhangis. The shackles of casteism, not only vitiate the process and movement of social justice, but also causes immense blockage of social cohesion, economic progress and cultural harmony in this land. Thus, casteism, as manifestation of Brahmanism, is the biggest enemy of social justice in India.

Associated with the trinity of varna, caste and untouchability, feudalistic behaviour is another enemy of social justice. This feudalistic behaviour, tendency or attitude, manifests itself in the forms of Thankurvada and Jatvada in rural areas, in remote villages of Indian society. The main feature of such feudalism is that the former rulers, their sons and in-laws, and also big zamidars (land owners), still feel that they belong to the class of rulers, they regard themselves as the descendants of former Kings, Nawabs and Subedars, and behave accordingly with all pomp and show, power and dignity, though they do not deserve such social status. In this class come Rajput, Thankur and Jat castes, which own mostly agricultural lands. As feudalisists did in the medieval times, the powerful zamidars of these castes keep the lower caste men and women as bonded labourers, and they also employ their children on meager wages. The so-called feudalists do not give them due wages, nor do they provide them
satisfactory working conditions. They regard themselves as the lords of society, the supermen, and regard others, the shudras, chamars and the bhangis as less than men, worse than cats and dogs. They do not allow them delicious foods, good clothes, or pucca houses to live in; and if the boys and girls of the new generation of these lower caste people, wear goods clothes, speak good languages, or buy televisions or motor cycles, because of their being in government jobs, the feudalists do not relish all that, and create several difficulties for them; they make efforts to lower down their newly emerging equal social status and prestige in their own villages; they disturb their marriage processions in order to dishonour them and they object to their riding on horses and engaging musical bands. Who can expect favourable attitudes from the feudalistic elements in favour of social justice? They still live with the medievalistic mentality and arrogance. Thus, it may be asserted that feudalism, as manifest in the forms of Thakurvada, Jatvada and Zamidari domination, still stands as one of the traditional enemies of social justice.

Brahmanism is not limited to the class of Brahmins alone; it is a widely spread social disease. For it is a mentality that is found almost in all sections of our society. Brahmanism is an ideology, a mental attitude, that regards one class or an individual superior to another class or an individual; some are supermen; others are incapable of being so; they are inferior. The basic principle of Brahmanism is social inequality; it is a way of life based on the feelings of high and low, superior and inferior, wise and illiterate etc; it is a mentality, a state of mind, that encourages man to feel superior, excellent and to keep the opportunities of progress, education and development limited to one class or certain individuals alone; and thus, this ideology neglects the uplift of the poor,
lowly and the weak. Such mentality is generally found in all higher castes and that prevents the depressed and oppressed classes from advancement in social life. This creates an environment of ill-will, hatred, enmity and envy against them. The mentality of Brahmanism encourages those elements, which obstruct the mainstream of social justice by raising such issues, r legal disputes, that prevent its implementation. So the pace of social justice becomes slow and unnecessary things come in the forefront. The feelings of Brahmanism manirest themselves not in individual aspects, but also in the shape of communal violence and casteist tension. This stands for social status-quo, that is, the Brahmins and the other higher castes are superior, because they were born in these families; whereas the chamars and the bhangis are inferior, because they were born in lower families. The Brahmanic philosophy prevents them to be superior on the basis of merits they have acquired; it opposes equality and dignity due to them in the present set-up. This ideology is strictly and traditionally based on birth, and overlooks worth and merits of the depressed, the lowest and the weakest in society. Brahmanism is the ideology, a method, to obstruct the ways of social justice, as its enemy, Brahmanism operates in various forms.

In Indian society, Mazhabi fanaticism is an enemy of social justice. It is also a manifestation of the false view. We have almost all sects, mazhabs and dharmas; they have their own concepts and rules of conduct; and they also stick to them at all costs. There are certain Mazhabi, forces which create orthodox elements and regard their own religions wholly true and divine; while they regard others as inferior and untrue. This is the reason that the vested interests have cropped up in every Mazhab; they are self-centred persons; and are also violent in their dealings. They create numerous obstructions in the way of social
cohesion and justice, and these fanatic forces flare up in the form communal riots from time to time in order to establish their hegemony over the common people. The mazhabi fanaticism expresses itself into communalism that in turn manifests itself into various forms such as discrimination, ill-will, community hatred, disputes, riots, rapes, killings and lootings, leading towards bloody clashes and slaughter of innocent women and children of communities involved therein. These events not only do not help the process of social justice and peace, but also leave several persons and families in utter disgust; they are rendered homeless, hopeless and unemployed since their houses and properties are destroyed by the anti-social elements. The communal riots, as engineered by the fanatics, badly and mostly affect the poor, lowly and the weak of all communities. In brief, the mazhabi fanaticism, also called as religious fundamentalism, stands as a violent enemy of social justice.

Associated with the religious fundamentalism, another trinity-divinity, infallibility and superstition, is also an enemy of social justice. When a religious ideal, or otherwise any thing or a belief, is invested with divinity, infallibility or superstition, then, it is regarded as God-given, something impossible to change, even though it may be fouling and vitiating the social environment. If it is violated or criticized on reasonable grounds, it is taken as an interference in one’s religious affairs. Since that is God-given, or based on Holy-Texts, it becomes divine, infallible and also superstitious, even though it may be having no relevance in the present order. The ideals and beliefs of such nature become universal and all-pervasive, beyond any criticism, examination or change. A sort of fear envelops them so that if they are opposed, one will invite divine wrath, and will be punished by divine forces or God; he may face numerous hardships
and difficulties because of his opposition to divine laws. Varna, Caste, Shastra, religious-text, temples, mosques, churches, etc. all have been invested with the feelings, or fears of divinity, infallibility and superstition. As a result, on the one hand, the common men and women do not dare change these old-age beliefs, and on the other, the fanatics and dogmatists continue to rule and exploit their so-called religious sentiments. These elements certainly obstruct the process and movement of social justice, as enshrined in the Constitution, which is quite secular and empirical, and is not God-given, nor is it divine and infallible; it is based on human values and may be changed according to man’s needs. This, the fanatics do not like and want to keep and continue social status-quo, and that certainly goes against the spirit of social change and justice.

To regard the religious-texts as God-given, divine or infallible, does not facilitate and brighten the prospects of social justice. For the codes of conduct, the social rules, are centuries old that do not fulfil the hopes and needs of modern men and societies. The Manu-Smriti and the Gita, for instance, still justify the validity and relevance of the Varna Vyavastha; they have prescribed strict social rules, which are regarded as divine and infallible. The social order, that has been associated with the Vedas, too, does not support the movement of social justice. Social justice is based on the provisions of the constitution; whereas these religious-texts do not accord with its philosophy and provisions. In a similar way, there are several mazhabi books, which have such rules and directives that oppose the existing laws, on the basis of which Indian administration, peace and order are maintained. In declaring these religious-texts as divine and infallible, the intention might have been to prevent any revolt against those mis-beliefs and superstitions, the strict social rules that came to be
associated with them. However, the dynamic forces of justice and equality, change and transformation, today, have come forward to challenge the vested-interests, or the fanatics and the fundamentalists, in order to bring about events in favour of human rights and obligations in the larger interest of mankind. So there is a struggle between the forces of change and that of status-quo. Which wins ultimately? Only time and circumstances will testify.

Trisna is a forceful enemy of social justice. It may be for getting fame and popularity, or to get a son or a child in case there is none in a family; but it is certainly for amassing wealth and property, which is more dangerous. Trisna drives man to collect more and more money, and also towards the pleasures of the sense organs, i.e., Indriyas. The Buddha, Karl Marx and India’s Constitution makers, understood its inbuilt nature. The Buddha said that Trisna is the cause of all human suffering. Man is entangled in pursuing satisfactions of his desires, he himself remains frustrated, full of suffering; but also creates troubles for others; he, thus, causes material and mental suffering to fellow beings. He snatches the legitimate things of other people by hook and crook, because of his lustful desires. This way he obstructs the way of social cohesion and welfare. This is the reason why the Buddha emphasized the need for controlling Trisna in individual and social life. In Indian tradition, Trisna has been condemned as a source of tension and suffering; it is the degrading tendency of human nature; and therefore, it is said to be opposed to social harmony and justice.

The Buddha made it very clear that “Contentment is the biggest wealth”, i.e., “Santosh Param Dharma”. By this, the Mahakarunika meant only that man should not hanker after wealth blindly, which has no limits. The rich men
continue to amass enormous wealth; the kings increase the boundaries of their kingdoms one after another; and lusty persons keep their senses indulged in satisfying their desires; but the thirst for such things, i.e., Trisna, is never quenched; that desires for wealth, estate and lust are never satisfied. The Buddha taught us that the desire for various advantages, pleasures and comforts, creates Trisna; when this turns into ownership, then the desire of ownership never dies and remains persistent in man’s mind; thus, it becomes greed. This greed, or an uncontrolled desire to collect wealth or other things, is Trisna, which creates evils such as to exploit others, to tell lies, to hurt the weak, to commit adultery, to take intoxicants, to oppose and denigrate others. In this way, Trisna, as greed, lust and blindly hankering after things, obstructs the path of social harmony, equality and justice.

The makers of India’s Constitution, too, realized the detrimental effects of Trisna. Initially, citizens had a fundamental right for property; but later on it was abolished, because it contravened the spirit of the provisions that emphasized the need for equitable distribution of national wealth and material resources, equality of opportunities and non-concentration of wealth or the means of production into a few hands. The constitution exhorts us that the economic order of society should develop in a way that could provide citizens equal wages for equal work, remove poverty and apparent imbalances in people’s life. All this indicates that if the national wealth, or the means of production, are concentrated in a few hands, it goes against the basic spirit of social justice. That is why the constitution places an emphasis on preventing the concentration of wealth in larger interest of society.
Karl Marx, too, emphasized a similar point when he said about the privatization of industries and natural resources, i.e., the right to private property is the root of all economic ills. The desire for wealth and property drives man to exploit the poor and the weak, to take more work and to give less wages to them. This tendency is the root cause, which opposes the process of economic justice. In society, then, emerges two major classes, the exploiters and the exploited; the former continues to exploit, to oppress, the latter; and therefore, in the process of socio-economic justice, the abolition of the right to private property, as emphasized by Marx, will be beneficial to all the workers, or the toiling people. Greed for property is the greatest weakness of human beings. That is why the Buddha, Karl Marx and a host of other thinkers, saints and seers, condemned Trisna; and this way they thought of it as an enemy of justice and humanity. The Buddha applied moral virtues too control it; Karl Marx emphasized the need for the nationalization of all means of production and the abolition of private property by the State; whereas the Constitution provided legal provisions to check and remove the evil of the concentration of wealth in a few hands. In brief, Trisna, as lust for power and wealth, or as greed for self-interests, pushing aside the claims of society has been, and still continues, to be an enemy of social co-operation and justice.

Almost in all human societies, there exist certain dogmas, which do not help social justice to be a practical proposition. Dogma is a set of beliefs held by any authority or group, which others are expected to accept without argument. Dogmatism is a way of thinking based on unalterable concepts and formulae regardless of the specific conditions of time and space, i.e., ignoring the principle that truth must prevail. The source of dogmatism is to be found in the religious
faith, in church dogmas or holy beliefs, which are asserted as indisputable truths, above criticism, and sacred to all believers. Dogmatism manifests itself in our society in various ways: Sati-Pratha, Kanya-vadha, child marriage, death feast, dowry system, inequality of womenfolk and the like, which constitute anti-social and anti-justice forces. Dogmatism has ruined the life of womenfolk by denying them equal status, equal pay for equal work: choice for re-marriage, facilities for education, in brief, a free social life. For they are kept outside the decision-making process in family affairs: the birth of girls is regarded as inauspicious, and they are also deprived of equal shares in ancestral properties. In the Hindu society, when a woman is branded as door of hell (Narak ka dwar), how is it possible to fully provide social justice to womenfolk? Thus, dogmatism, as an enemy of social justice, leads to sectarianism, rejection of creativity, condemnation of criticism, examination and investigation, denial of freedom of thought and expression, and ultimately, it leads to superstitious beliefs and fanatic tendencies.

Racialism is an ideology, which justifies social inequality, economic exploitation and wars, by arguing that people belong to different races: some superior, and other inferior. Racialism does not recognize the common nature of human beings; their features, by nature, immensely differ; and it, thus, arbitrarily divides them into classes as high and low, superior and inferior, or as supermen and weak. The racial prejudices apparently exist in American and Western societies against the Negroes, even against the Asian people. The classes, or individuals, obsessed with the feelings of racial superiority regard others as sub-human beings, and behave like lords of the world. This kind of racialism is
certainly a strong enemy of social justice, and its manifests itself into apartheid, colonization, superman-tendency and blatant discrimination and inequality.

Almost in all societies of the world, it is found that some sections regard themselves as superior as descendents of a pure race. Each member of such a racial group does not like to mingle with other people; they keep their matrimonial relations limited to their own group. For instance, the Jews in Israel, the Brahmins and also the Aryas in India, the Whites in South Africa, the Pathans in Afganistan, etc. regard themselves as the people of superior races; and their arrogant behaviour, or other practice, manifest themselves into apartheid, blatant discrimination, violent outbursts and other obstructions in the way of social equality for those, who are fighting for it. these so-called superior races do not favor adequate civic facilities, political or human rights, to the people of other communities, castes and classes; as a consequence, these depressed and oppressed persons do not get equal opportunities for employment in private and public establishments; and are also deprived of dignified social status, even if they deserve it because of their merits. The blacks in Western countries and the shudra-untouchables in Asian lands suffer mostly in heinous ways on account of the so-called superiority of racial groups. They are, however, not silent and inactive; they have come forward; and started demanding equitable shares in social health and natural national wealth. The possibilities of social equality and justice have increased to a great extent, though the racial prejudices, apartheid feelings and the caste injustices, still exist to thwart the process and emancipation of the poor, lowly and the weak in different societies of the world. Besides, racialism also expresses itself into racial colonies and concepts of supermen. The races, which are well-to-do and have
state power in their hands, endeavour to transform the small and weak countries into colonized regions in order to serve the national interest of the powerful countries. Certainly, they provide some modern facilities and comforts to them, including some employment opportunities; yet the small and weak countries, their inhabitants, do not get adequate political freedom, social equality and justice, for being fulfledged nations to be at par with other free nations. This way they become victims of injustice, exploitation and oppression. Such tendencies and policies were well supported by thinkers like Manu and Nietzsche, who advocated that only those, who are superior in race, mind and intelligence, deserve to rule the poor, lowly and the weak. They supported the doctrine of social inequality, ideas of class-based rule and morality as well, and they also said that only the supermen were entitled to have virtues of courage and justice. In brief, the ideas of superman and colonization, socio-economic imperialism and political protectionism are apparently, based on feelings of hatred, injustice, exploitation, oppression and racial inequality, which stand as strong enemies in the way of social justice.

Social justice is obviously an active movement. Those, who need it badly, only their efforts can make its process and implementation an effective affair. To make social justice available, and to procure its advantages for the needy, is not an easy task. It has several enemies, some strong, some unpopular, which create obstructions in the path of social justice. Therefore, in order to create more possibilities and solid prospects for social justice, it is essential to counteract its enemies with all legitimacy, vigour and vitality. It is an arduous task, which only the friends of social justice can undertake and perform for its early fructification.
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