HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

WESTERN CONTEXT

The development of social justice is the development of civilization and culture of mankind. Basically it is a political concept seated in ethics. We see it is the preservation to protect the interests of some class at the cost of others. Ever since the initiation of the concept of State as an Institution and development of such ideas as liberty, equality, and fraternity, rule of law became clearer. Political administration had taken concrete shape requiring such classes as kings, legislations, soldiers and the commons. In fact, it almost become the duty of the elites i.e. kings, legislators to keep as much distance as possible from soldiers and the common man to protect and perpetuate their interests. History is so sophisticated that it does not portray naked truths as such but in the form of freedom, democracy citizenship, exploitation, sovereignty, nationalism, religion and the like. All these words sound intellectual to the core. Actually it is meant to curry the interests of the privileged class. Churchill says politics is such a phenomenon that it takes thousand years to know its periphery.
Social justice principles are not pronounced as such. But it is reflected or discussed in the policies of the Government in terms of welfare of the individual, security, health, education, employment, poverty insurance, and so on. It is an accepted fact that the privileged are ahead of the non-privileged in the above aspects. It has become the one of functions of the modern/current government and the United Nations Organisation to provide security, health, education, shelter to the majority of the citizen irrespective of colour, race and territorial barriers. Thus, social justice is ingrained in the polity. It also ensured social cohesion. "Social cohesion, during the six and half centuries from Alexander to Constantine was secured not by philosophy, not by ancient loyalties, but by force, first that of armies and then that of civil administration, Roman armies, Roman roads, Roman law and Roman officials first created and the preserved a powerful centralized State".

Force was the first instrument of the State to subjugate man to the needs of the king. Slavery was the institution of human subjugation. Aristotle defends slavery as an institution. He speaks of democracy. Unlike modern democracy the Aristotelian democracy does not permit women and slaves to vote.

Belief in God or obedience to the God is another instrument which subjugated man without the use of force. It is a spiritual concept enabled man to obey willfully to the supreme power. Thus Church became more a seat of power. As such, there are two parallel institutions of power controlling polity on different planes - State or the government to control
the individual in mundane affairs and the church to control the individual in religious affairs. Religion became handy for the weak Kings to keep subjects under control. Such kings became orthodox and fell into the trap of religion. Church collected taxes from individuals and amassed lot of wealth. But they were not paying taxes nor spending money for the welfare of the individual. This paved way to revolt against church by Ignaeious Loyola, who founded the society of ‘Jesus Christ’ Exploitation of man in the name of religion by way of obedience and collecting taxes gave rise to revolution in the administration of the Church and revolt of the institution of state against the institution of religion. It paved way for the emergence of the concept of secularism for the first time in history.

Growth of commerce, industry and trade appears to strengthen democracy, but in reality it is the exploitation of the “have-nots” by the “haves”. Russell notes “where commerce and industry flourished the free citizens grew rich by the enslavement of slaves- male in the mines, female in textile industry........ With increasing wealth went increasing isolation of respectable women”2. Russell further notes “… The institution of private property brings with it the subjection of women, and usually the creation of a slave class. On the one hand, the purpose of the community are enforced upon the individual, and on the other hand the individual having acquired the habit of viewing his life as a whole increasingly sacrifices his present to the future”3 Thus individual liberty and community cause are at variance both in thought and in practice.
Rise and fall of the Roman Empire and rise of Christianity are important events in history to trace the development of State. The rise of Roman Empire ended the Greek idea of city-state and the idea of world-state came into being. Maxey remarks “Roman civilization was not destroyed by Christianity any more than Christianity was corrupted by Roman Civilization” Religion dominated the growth of western civilization Christianity and Judaism were the main religion which influence the polity in matters of governance and welfare. In fact, it was more governance than welfare which occupied the minds of thinkers till the time of Locke.

It was monarchy, king was deified, citizen were subjects. The first duty of man was to the State and then came the duty to god and fellowmen. It was time in the west the class structure was stratified as kings nobles and the clergy who were all privileged and the rest were unprivileged.

St. Augustine recognized two kinds of rights – divine and human. Human rights originate from the laws of the State and in the sphere of State activity men are duty bound to obey it. Divine rights originated from the church and their sphere of activity was religion. Divine rights were also said to be moral rights which played havoc in the minds of people as there was an everlasting fear of hell among Christians. Thus religion exploited polity in the name of securing heaven after the death of individuals. Western society was openly religions. It was believed that no man hoped to enter into the heaven without the blessings of Roman Church.
Feudalism was prevalent in those days. Maxey notes, "The important thing for us to consider is not what caused feudal society, but what feudal society caused to political authority. The anarchy following the disintegration of the Western Empire placed the small land owner in a defenseless position, and the most immediately practicable for him to do in order to gain security was to consign his estate to a neighbouring baron and receive it back as a fief. This would entitle him to the shelter of the baron's castle and the aid of the baron’s troops. In order to augment their military strength, large land owner who almost invariably were nobles, found it expedient to apportion their estates among the neighbouring gentry as fiefs."

Feudalism had a long grip over western society. The advent of the divine right theory of Kings to explain obligation to the state minimized the influence of ecclesiasticism over the community. Political authority gained sacredness. Though the theory of Divine Right is no longer in currency, Disraeli notes "that the divine right of Government is the keystone of human progress."

The arrival of ‘The Prince’ changed the political thought since 15th century. It is a treatise on the management of the problems of the State, written by Machiavelli. Machiavellian dictum that ‘might makes right’; the end justifies the means’ or necessity knows no law ‘made inroads into the moral administration of the State. He made State administration more
a cunning act than the honest act of the king to address the grievances of his subjects. It was human control rather than human welfare was in the agenda of The Prince.

Concepts like Sovereignty, citizenship, family, law, distinction between state and government gave concrete shape to the development of the concept of social justice. "Sovereignty" says Bodin, "is the supreme power over citizen and subjects, unrestrained by laws". It is a power which has its origin in the people acting as a corporeality, and originates in the will of the people.

It is from divine right of kings to the rights of man that the divinity observed in the individual. "Obedience is, man's destiny, he deserves nothing better, and he has no rights" said to be told by Napolean Bonaparte evaporated in course of time. Contractual theorists formulated a theory of nature. According to this theory "man in the state of nature was free and absolutely and utterly free and, so far as his own might and cleverness could avail subject to no will but his own".

Thinkers vary on the nature of State of nature. If it was brutish and nasty for Hobbes, it was a state of bliss for John Locke. Rights were natural to men as they were in non-social state in the state of nature in Hobbes and non-political in Locke. If men formed a contract it was to escape from the reign of violence in Hobbes and in case of Locke it was to protect private property and to maintain the rule of law. Hobbes denies
inherent right to property. Locke guarantees the same. For Locke, the State of nature was also a State of equality wherein all the power of "jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another". Locke was the first philosopher to recognize property as inherent right of men, it is inherent because labour is ingrained in it. But Hobbes did not divorce politics from ethics as Machiavelli did. "Man is born free, but everywhere in chains,"9, reflect the State of nature of Rousseau. Rousseau reminded the duty of men to the sovereign by way each giving up his part of right to be associated in the General Will. Thus, social justice concept evolved with the requisition of the right of man over the sovereign. Requisition of right to liberty and right to property marks beginning of the realization of individual good. Individual in society is always a member of the class or community. Whether individual has to preserve his rights for the general welfare of the community or has to sacrifice his right for the sake of the community and the role of the State in maximizing individual and community welfare will be discussed in "Chapter IV.

ii) INDIAN CONTEXT

In western societies we do not come across a fragmented society in the form of caste or sub-caste. It was more a class. A class of capitalists exploit a class of labourers. Agriculture land owners exploiting agricultural labourers. Indian society marks a clear difference in terms of patterns of life in society. There is graded inequality in Indian Society. It speaks of four Varnas. Varnas are not classes they are castes by
themselves. A class, is one which identifies, shares power by itself with any other group or community which have commonality. Be it labour, agriculture, banking slavery as such. Where as a caste cannot. It is purely regimented, do not find pride in identifying with any other class. Sharing is among the members of the caste. There is no horizontal movement in caste, but it moves only vertically. Class has both horizontal and vertical movement in society. If western society is linear Indian society is gradational. Papacy had an edge over royalty during the middle ages. But once secularism became one of the ingredients of state administration papal supremacy was relegated to the second place. It is not so in India. Priestly class continued to dominate the administration even after the end of the colonial era. In other words the Indian society is conditioned by the prescriptions of Vedas & Dharmasastras. The prescriptions are not drawn on the basis of social life but all facets of life is dictated by them as ‘they’ desired.

Ancient Indians had monarchies as well as republics. It is to be borne in mind that irrespective of the type of Government in society had invariably favoured Brahmin caste and suppressed Sudras. The suppression of Sudras was on social, political, economic and educationally too. The suppression is clear in the Dharmasutras of Manu, Gauthama, Vishnu and Vyasa. What are these Dharmasutras? These are codes of conduct prescribed to the King as well as to the individuals. They are the views, rather the personal views of some individuals.
They are not discourses but codes on the matters of social obligation, duties of various castes; proper way for a righteous king to rule and to punish transgressors in his kingdom; the appropriate social relations between men and women of different castes and of husbands and wives in the privacy of the home; birth, death and taxes; cosmogony, karma and rebirth; ritual practices; error and restoration or redemption; and such details of every day life as the procedure for settling traffic accidents etc., They are not philosophical treatises since their preaching are not rational but based on the authority of Vedas. They have not viewed life in its totality but only in compartments. They confine lives of individuals to the Jatis or Varnas into which the individual is born. The individual is not supposed to act freely outside the domain of his jati or varna.

Further, Dharmasstras are not laws. They are known as Smruthi. But at the Dharmasastra of Manu is translated as 'the law of manu'. In political parlance or in any parlances of state the laws are those which have the sanction of the state. Some kings in past punished their subjects as per the codes of the Dharmasastras. It is to be known whether those kings legitimately adopted Dharmasastras as laws of the state, or following Dharmasastras illegitimately because the superiority of Brahmanas was not questioned. Invariably Brahmanas were advisors to the King. Thus Dharmasastras have attained the status of 'laws'. Unquestionable practice of these Dharmasastras has become a custom or habit in society. They have also become the lores and the mores of society.
Dhamasastras regard Veda as both immanent and transcendent. Both aspects of the Veda are generated out of the Brahman caste. The pride place of the priestly class in the social structure is authorized by the Veda and continually reinforced by the subsequent teachings of the priests. For the dicta of the priests are, inevitably grounded in the Veda. "... By his very birth a priest is a deity even for the gods and the only authority for the people in this word, for the veda is the foundation in this matter".

Manu: At the beginning it shall be known that there is no coherence and consistency in Manu's writings. Because, writings of Manu are not philosophical. "To moral, for Manu, is to particularize - to ask who did what, to whom and when" says A.K. Ramanujan. (quoted by Brian K. Smith in introduction) Manu says, "from his mouth he created the priest, from his arms the ruler from him thighs the commoner and from his feet the servant". This is the reason for the creation of created four types of classes, called the varnas: Brahmin, Kshtriya, Vysya and Sudra. The functions of the classes is prescribed. "For priests, he ordained teaching and learning, sacrificing for themselves and sacrificing for others, giving and receiving. Protecting his subjects giving, having, sacrifices performed, studying trading lending money and farming the land are for a commoner. The Lord assigned only one activity to a servant: serving these (other) classes without resentment".
Regarding property Manu says, "when a learned priest finds a treasure that was previously hidden, he may take it everything without leaving anything, for he is the overlord. But when the king finds ancient treasure hidden in the earth he should give half to the twice born and put half in his treasury". Manu's Dharmasastra is a full code of life of an individual. He favours paternal family. The woman, the Brahmin woman in particular is always inferior to her husband. Regarding education, he denies education to the sudras. Veda is glorified at its best in Manu. There is no scientific basis for the codes of Manu.

**Gauthama**

According to him the primary duty of the king is to protect the interests of the tax payers. The king was the master to all except the Brahmins. Administration of justice was guided by the injunctions of the Vedas.

The king is to be associated with a purohita for collaborating in ritualistic functions and there is to be co-operation between religious and political authorities. While administering justice the king is to be guided by the injunctions of the Vedas. When the king is to arrive at a decision on conflicting evidences he has to ascertain the truth from the Brahmins and others who are well-versed with the Vedic literature. A Brahmin is not to be visited with corporal punishment. In the infliction of punishment the following considerations have to be borne in mind:

(i) the social status and physical strength of the criminal
(ii) the nature of the crime and
(iii) the deliberation on whether the guilt has been perpetrated for the first time or has been repeated.

Gautama is a strong supporter of the institution of private property and he lays down that ownership is obtained by (a) inheritance (b) purchase (c) partition of property among co-purchases (d) seizure and (e) finding ownerless lost property.

Dwijas were not to be abused or assaulted by Sudras. The Sudra would be punished with by severing of the limb with which he offends. There was a strict prohibition of having a sexual relationship between a Sudra and an Aryan woman. On the other hand there was no code to maintain the purity of Sudra woman. Sudra would not recite Vedic hymns. If he does, his tongue could be cut off, if he remembers Vedas his body to be split into two. If a Brahmin abuses a Sudra no monitory penalty was levied.

**Baudhayana**

Baudhayana enjoins upon the king the maintenance of the supremacy of the duty of protecting the subjects where for he receives as his 16 ⅔ percent of their produce. The king is to choose a purohita and to act according to his instructions. He categorically forbids the escheat of the property of a Brahmana to the ruler. But he also quotes a very significant verse from Vasistha, “let him treat Brahmanas who tend cattle, those who live by trade, land) those who are artisans, actors (and bards), servants or usurers, like sudras” 13. Thus he visualizes the possibility of the
enforcement of the social demolition of a degenerate Brahmīn through political means.

With regard to witnesses, Baudhayana wants a strict conformity to truth and integrity on their part. He points out that by giving false evidence, a man kills his three generations of ancestors. Baudhayana maintains that even for heinous crimes the maximum punishment for a Brahmīn in his banishment from the kingdom and he categorically asserts; “A Brahmāna, forsooth, shall not suffer corporeal punishment for any offence” 14. Baudhayana equates murder of Sudras to killing of birds like crows, owl, and peacocks. He had deep commitment for royal authority. Brahminical ascendancy and patriarchy. Like Manu, he opposed to the independence of woman. He emphasized the view that the social order must be as prescribed in the scriptures. He prescribes that the Vedas should not be preached by a Brahmīn “... as long as he is within the hearing or sight of Sudras and Apapatras”15.

Apastamba:
Apastamba is a strong supporter of Vedic sacrificial cult and he enjoins that sacred fires should burn daily. His sanction of Agnipooja is in conformity with the Vedic religious tradition. Along with other exponents of Dharmasutra tradition, Apastamba lays down that, in the kingdom no person should suffer hunger, disease, cold or heat, be it through non-availability of resources or deliberate. Protection is the pre-eminent function of the king.
The criminal code of Apastamba is rigorous. He lays down that a servant and a herdsman who neglect their work are to be flogged. If cattle trespass on the cultivated land of others, then the owner of the corps is to make them lean by impounding them.

While lawful taxes are to be collected from all sections of the society, Brahmin and women were exempted from paying tax. A Sudra also is exempted from paying tax. Similarly blind, dumb, deaf and diseased persons are exempted from paying taxes. Apastamba prescribes very cruel punishment for the transgression of sexual morals. For him, the sanctity of the marriage vow is an uppermost concern and its transgression leads to hell. Sometimes he also prescribes banishment for the offence of the adulterers. He says that a Sudra who commits adultery with women of one of the three higher castes is to be awarded death sentence. His rigorous code against Sudras, at times appears reprehensible. He says "The tongue of a sudra who speaks evil of a virtuous person, belonging to one of the first three castes shall be cut out. A sudra who assumes a position (equal to that of a member of one of the first three castes) in conversation on the road, on a couch, in sitting (and on similar occasions) shall be flogged. In case (a sudra) commits homicide or theft, appropriates land (or commits similar heinous crimes) his property shall be confiscated and he himself shall suffer capital punishments. But if these offences to be committed by a Brahmana, he shall be made blind by tying a cloth over his eyes."
Vasistha:

Vasistha sanctions violence for the maintenance of social structure. He regards it as perfectly legitimate for a Brahmin and a vysya to take up arms for self-defence. He opposed to female emancipation. He categorically maintain that women are not to be given independence.

Vasistha lays down that unless a person knows the Veda he cannot be regarded as a Brahmin. Learning in Vedic literature is a vital attribute for a Brahmin.

Vasistha categories certain classes of persons who are exempted from paying taxes. They are (a) srotriya (b) an employee of the government (c) a protector less person (d) an ascetic (e) children (f) very old men (g) young men (h) widows (i) unmarried females and (j) wives of employees. No taxes are to be paid on the dry grass, forests, places of combustion and mountains.

Vishnu:

Vishnu discusses the economic foundations of the political system. Mines are to be under the monopolistic possession of a king. The Brahmins are to receive half of treasure found by the king. A Brahmin who has found a treasure may monopolize it entirely while other castes are to receive only part of the treasure. Vishnu was very much in favour of Brahminical class. He enjoins upon the king the norm of bestowing landed property upon the Brahmins. Landed property gifted to Brahmins is not to be re-appropriated by the king.
The guilty Brahmin is not be awarded corporal punishment but are only to be banished from the realm with the body being branded. Even for murdering another Brahmin, the culprit Brahmin is not be awarded death sentence but only to be banished with a figure of a headless corpse impressed upon his forehead. Thus Vishnu’s legal code is lenient to Brahmins. But he is stringent no others., He maintains the norms of social superiority and subordination. If an inferior spits on a person superior to him in caste, he shall loose both lips. Similarly, for using abusive language, the former is to lose his tongue. He also goes to the extent of stating that if a person of humble birth mentions the name or caste of a superior person, revealingly, an iron pin ten inches long is to be thrust into his mouth.

There are Dharmastras of Katyayana and Vyasa but does not require special treatment except mentioning Vyasa Smurthi which recognizes Sati System. Thus Dharma Sutras emphasize a political philosophy which was favourable to Brahmins and suppressive to the Sudras. Obviously, Sudras were like roots of a tree which absorbs nutrients and minerals from the soil and supply the same to the trunks and leaves which are the upper caste men. In fact, Indian society anchored in this domination and segregation. To maintain and to penetrate the same it inculcated the theory of Karma in the mind of polity and denied education to the Sudras. It also prohibited association and interaction of Sudras with any other three castes. Obviously, such practices had sanctions of the king or King endorsed these views of Dharmasastras to propitiate the Brahmincal caste. By any
standard these practices are unethical to the individual and to the society. Not only the codes of Dharmasastras are unethical but unscientific as crime and punishment are not proportionate. The crime committed by a Brahmin are not cognized at all but the crime committed by a Sudra is more than cognized. The vivid description given in Dharmasutras about society and position of Sudras does not require further analysis of status of individuals in Indian society. What made Indian polity to tolerate such humiliation, insult and suppression over the ages? To answer this question an attempt is made in the next Chapter. Thus injustice was inbuilt in the system and perpetuated through the vehicles of unscientific ideas.

This cult of Dharmasastras continued to the times of Mahabharata. In Shantiparva it is noted that the master is the owner of the property of the Sudras. There is some liberty to the Sudras in performing sacrifices. But they were prohibited by two words - Swaha and Vashat and the Mantras. In Mahabharata, Dharma is the foundation of the political systems and Maryada is the foundation of body polity. Mahabharata upholds traditional caste-system, transmission of private property and adherence to ritualistic cult.

The Puranas: are 18 in number. They are:

1. Skanda purana
2. Padma purana
3. Narada purana
4. Siva purana
5. Varaha purana
6. Vishnu purana
The 18 puranas mainly derives their themes from the Mahabharata upholding the four-fold caste system. They preach the supermancy of Brhamanas to the kings. The Bhagavat purana says, if a liberal Brahma with a large family is deprived of his means of subsistence then the cruel king (who had expropriated the wealth of the Brahmans) will have to reside in hell for the same number of years on the total number of drops of tears fell from the priests eyes at the time of weeping. Thus the main desire is to immunize Brahminical property against confiscation and expropriation, remarks U.P. Sharma.

The Padma Purana is interesting for the crude tale for the origin of Nishadas who reside in hills and forests. It is said that when king Vena was captured by the Brahmins and other priests because of his having
deformed specimen the priests asked him to sit down (nisida). Hence forward his descendents began to be called Nishadas. Stories of this kind are abundant in Puranas. They fed the polity with false and un-scientific notions about non-Brahmins. The tales of this kind are nothing but myths. Myths being told repeatedly over years remained in the minds of the polity as in-erasable stain.

It was Buddhism which abhorred caste system and challenged the pretensions of the Braminical superiority. Buddha championed social equality and did not recognize Vedas and Upanishads. He called to ban idol worship. He was the first philosopher to recognize evil as real. Orthodox Indian thought did not believe in the reality of evil. According to them evil is only transitory and the end is bliss for them. Buddha said explained suffering is due to apetite for things, the evil can be eradicated when desires are annihilated. Finally, he taught the doctrine of liberation resulting from full experience and comprehension of life.

It is important to know important Sanskrit works on Buddhism for Buddha taught in pali language. Pali was the language of the common man. Sanskrit was the language of the Brahmins. Vedas are written in Sanskrit. No sudra could read Veda. Thus, Vedic or Sanskrit language was distanced from the common man by prescribing to read it. Buddhist scholars writing in Sankrit drawn Vedas to the reach of non-Brahmins. Main Buddhist Sanskrit works are:
1. Saudarananda of As va ghosha
2. Buddachritam of Asvaghosha
3. Lalita – Vistara
4. Mahavastu – Avadana
5. Mula- sarvastivada – vinaya vastu
6. Mahayaanasutra samgraha
7. Divyavadana
8. Jatakamala
9. Samadhiraja Sutra
10. Lancavatara sutram
11. Ashta sahasrika prajna paramita
12. Gandavyuba sutram
13. Saddharma Pundarika Sutram
14. Suvarna Prbha Sutram
15. Avadana Satakam
16. Avadana Kalpalata
17. Nagarjuna’s works
18. Siksha Samucchaya
19. Bodhicaryavaatara
20. Abhidharmadipa

Buddha explains life-cycle scientifically as cause and effect. Politicall administration, according to Buddha must be Dharmic. A Dharmic king is a benevolent king and he treats in subjects like his children. Most of the above mentioned works discusses a particular king who rules according to dharma or
iii) Jnaticuitra (strength derived from relation & friends)
iv) Chaturanga (strength of the four wings of the army)
v) Prajanabala (mental and intellectual potency)

It is interesting to see how Buddhic works counter the Vedic and Puranic notions of the creation of the four varnas from the different limbs of prajapati, the veda purustha. In Mahayana sutra sangraha it is argued that if the hypothesis that origination of Brahamana from the mouth, Kshatriya from shoulders vysya from the thighs and sudra from the foot) is correct then Prajapali should have four organic or physiological places of origin (Yoni and bhoga). There is no proper reply to this devastating criticism from vedic pundits. Further, if only four Varnas born out of Prajapati, then how the chandalas, mlechnas as well as other animals like cows, elephants and horses were born? Thus the hollowness of the dogmatic Brahmanical theory is exposed. These criticism of the creation of the creation of four Varnas stand in true defence of social equality and non discrimination. V.P.Varma remarks “in the context of Brahmanical dogmatism and dominant inequalities which spent pages after pages in preaching social stratification, even this limited defense of social equality has a very significant social and political importance and is of considerable moral worth” 17
Divyavadana contains a devastating attack on the four-fold Hindu Varna structure. It says that people with deformed limbs as well as diseased persons are found in all the varnas. Black, fair-skinned and dark-skinned persons are also found in all of them. From the anatomical standard as well as psychological standpoint of experiencing pleasure and pain, there is no difference among the people nor is there any distinction on account of organs. Hence varna cannot be said to be four fold. No person is born of wind.

Unfortunately, scientific attack on the Varna theory was not percolated and did not anchor in the polity. This is so perhaps denial education to the common man and the effect of Karma theory advocated by Brahmin pandits. Further, kings did not appoint or did not give status to Buddhist scholars as they were over crowded and over powered by Brahminism. That Buddhist seeds could germinate and fructify outside India shows the truism of Buddhism.

Jainism also preached against the Brahminical cult. But its effect was confined to few areas. How these various streams of thought perpetuated exploitation and why the Indian Polity made no social revolution despite the hardship experienced by the majority of the population, whether any measures undertaken to correct this historical injustice in a domestic setup would be taken up in the next Chapter. Social Justice, in the sense of equal distribution of material benefits, equality of status and of opportunity,
universal right to education, equality before law were not the ingredients of Indian Polity though there were republics at that time. Whether there was monarchy or republic state administration adopted Vedas and Dharmasutras as accepted codes of administration. Buddhism was a period of enlightenment in the history of social justice. No other thinker before Buddha thought of social justice. Fellow feeling or fraternity, eradication of Varna system, that is, the establishment of social equality, annihilation of desires which cause misery, gave death blow to orthodox Vedic thought. Yet, seeds of injustice which were at the rock-bottom of Indian soil could not be burnt completely as they germinated with the passing away of Buddha.
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