

## **Introduction**

This world is populated by different types of living beings. Among them human beings are pre-eminently rational who are endowed with sentiment and social consciousness. Among the other living being, human life is too much complicated. At every step in their life they encounter some difficulties or moral dilemmas to take a right decision that are based on nothing but justice.

First of all a question arises in our mind that, what is justice? In order to comprehend this, it is necessary to understand what injustice is and how to prevent it? People turn to realize the meaning and importance of justice when they have experienced or faced injustice. Therefore, injustice is strong and powerful equipment through which everyone can understand the significance of justice. So, justice is a decisional as well as an active system that helps one to fight against the wrong activities. Experience of injustice force an individual that he or she tries to bring justice through the correction of that injustice or at least he or she can try to fight against this injustice that it could further be prevented.

Justice is one of the most important concepts in moral and political philosophical thought. This concept has its origin since the time of Greek philosophers. After that, justice was discussed and analysed by many sociologists, economists, philosophers, political thinkers in different times in different ways. But, yet it is not a precise concept and it is also cryptic and enigmatic in nature. It is one of the complicated notions of thought. Justice is a term that has ambivalent import. So, we could not find any universal definition of it. It is very difficult to define the term

‘justice’ or express it in one line, as it is a dynamic concept. Due to the advancement of society, the thought and the ideas are in flux. Naturally in this pace-changing society, the concept of justice is also changing. It has been modified in accordance with different places, times, perspectives, conditions and circumstances prevailing in each age. It is not possible to predict conclusively that, what is right today will be right in future too.

The word ‘justice’ is derived from the Latin word “Jus”, “Justus” and “Justitia” and connected with the word “Jungere” that means joining or tie. This suggests the quality of being right or reasoning or just. In a way, it symbolizes perfection. The “Oxford English Dictionary” defines a person as “just” who typically “does what is morally right” and offering the fair treatment for people on the basis of principle of justice, that demands equal rights to all.

But the political philosophers want to get beyond from these kinds of definitions and consider that, justice has a different nature, such as, moral virtue of character, desirable quality to political society and an important element for ethical and social decision-making.

The etymological meaning of the term justice according to Berker is as follows---

**The word ‘jus’ conveys the idea of valid custom to which any citizen can appeal, and which is recognized and can be enforced by a human authority.<sup>1</sup>**

Justice is an idea through which we can morally distribute any good things in the society, e.g.,-freedom, rights, power, wealth, leisure and so on.

---

<sup>1</sup>. Nepal, P. and Thami, A., *An Introduction to Politics*, p-212.

Justice is a most important component to every people and it is the highest attainable goal in every society as well as to every individual. Hence, justice has to draw and conjoin a harmonious balance between duties and rights of the citizens which are followed by the respective constitution of every country. In every society people want to live their life peacefully. Without justice it is impossible to set up peace. Justice and peace both are inter-connected with each other and we cannot separate one of them from the other. Whenever injustice happened, at same the time movement for justice is in progress.

The concept of justice usually is used in two senses—broader and narrower. In broader sense it is an eternal and absolute concept and as relative concept it differs from society to society. On the other hand, in narrower sense, justice is connected with the legal system and legal process in a society.

In history of political philosophy it has been found that the term ‘just’ and ‘justice’ both bears a comprehensive use. Perhaps, we have lost one of the senses that the Greeks have used. Justice is equivalent with virtue in general, but still we use this concept in many diverse contexts to make distinctive moral and political points. Such as, we often use the term just men, just actions, just states of affairs and so forth.

When we call an action as just that means it usually attempt in such a way that a just state of affair comes out. If we have not any distinct criteria for evaluating justice of states of affairs then we fail to determine an act as just or unjust. Therefore, without a prior identification of justice of states of affairs it is not possible to judge an action as just or unjust.

But every state of affairs cannot be properly described as just or unjust. First of all, it must involve those beings who are sentient and rational. It must be a state of affairs where at least one of a sentient being is suffering from burden and enjoying a benefit. The question of justice arises when one of the sentient being is affected in either one of these ways, otherwise the questions of justice cannot arise. From the actions of sentient being a state of affairs follows. And it has been considered only as a product of natural case, we do not raise the questions about its just or unjust aspect.

Therefore, justice in its widest sense invokes the acquirement of those kinds of matter which is just as well as it includes philosophical discourse about justice. It has manifold grounds and many diversified outlooks and perspectives. Even it includes the concept of moral rightness based on law, equity, religion, rationality ethics and fairness. Often the general interpretation of justice is classified into the province of social justice (that is seen in religion, theology and philosophy) and procedural justice (that is seen in the course of law).

The doctrine of justice is different in every culture. Early theories about justice were advocated by the Ancient Greek Philosophers Plato and Aristotle. Plato does not put too much emphasis on procedural portion of justice rather he gives more stress on substantive aspect of justice. Throughout the history of justice many different theories have been found. In 17<sup>th</sup> Century Locke discussed about the theory of natural law and social contract theory. Social contract theory claims that, justice emerged from the mutual consent of each and every individuals concerned. In 18<sup>th</sup> Century, utilitarian (Specially John Stuart Mill) asserted that, justice holds the best result for the greatest number of people, but the major fault remain present in their theory as that, justice is not being done for those who do not considered amongst the greatest number.

Egalitarians uphold that, justice only deals with the equality. John Rawls advocated a social contract argument to set up that justice or the distributive justice is a form of fairness. Robert Nozick conceived a consequentialist view of distributive justice and interprets that, property rights-based justice increase the overall wealth of an economic system. Many thinkers believe that, justice is equality. But the fact is that, equality is equally a value or mystical concept. It is a relative subject-matter that, what may be the idea of equality for me; it may not be equal to a wage labour or other member of the society. Therefore, it would fail to set an appropriate standard of justice for others.

However, these types of comparative approaches are very helpful for the advancement of justice, as this comparative process somehow makes some debate. As a result, multiple opinions are comes from this debate and thereby, it may be possible that, it helps to prevent one-sided or partial and unipolar explanations.