ON JUST, JUSTICE AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE: A CRITICAL AND COMPARATIVE DISCOURSE

Sooraj Kumar Maurya[1*]

[1]Ramanujan College, University of Delhi - New Delhi, India (iD) https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6974-5508 ✉ sooraj.au998@gmail.com

Abstract: *Despite being endlessly debated, a unanimous impetus on the nature of just, justice, and distributive justice appears entirely untouched to the desirable scientific certainty so far. Aristotle asserts treating' equals equally and un-equals unequally' but in proportion to their relevant differences. John Rawls says 'justice as fairness.' To both Aristotle and John Rawls, justice meant for the good and a willingness to act by the laws to ensure the highest good of society. Antecedently, both agree that justice is a master imperative for good human relationships and coexistence. However, despite the universal agreement, they differ in many fundamental respects. Aristotle denies the outbound distribution of an individual's rights as only the head of the family has the right to free speech in the family. But, Rawls distributes each right to the individual level. The paper attempts to discuss the similarities and dissimilarities in Aristotle's and John Rawls'ideas of just, justice and distributive justice. It has been argued that the aim of both philosophers was the same, i.e., to find out a theory of justice through which unity, harmony, virtue, and happiness can be attained to the fullest in a nation.*

Keywords: *Just; Justice; Distributive Justice; Rectificatory Justice; Procedural Justice; Substantive Justice*

INTRODUCTION

The concepts of just, justice, and distributive justice have been the most critical issues from its early history to the present day. The popularity of the democratic system of governance has occupied a significant role in all the possible areas of material and non-material spheres of human lives and actions. Traditionally, just, justice, and distributive justice are often considered to deal with the socio-economic, historical, moral, and political dynamics at the human level of consciousness (Miller 1992). The significant rudiments of such a unitary and one-sided approach are that all the human incidents and affairs are developed and determined by keeping humans at the center of human endeavors. Antecedently, disciplines such as ethics, politics, sociology, economics, psychology, and other subjects were not only developed and designed by the humans but also all possible faculties of mental universes, have been considered merely as means to fulfilling and benefitting wholly and solely for the well-being of humans, out there, at large. The approach, as mentioned above, is commonly known as the anthropocentric or Anthropocene approach to human behaviors in the contemporary branches of studying humanities and social sciences (Brennan and Norva 2021). However, the above-mentioned

anthropocentric approach overpowers other methodological ideologies, such as eco-centrism, cosmo-centrism, and bio-centrism, which do not appeal to think beyond human interest and well-being (Gladvin *et al.* 1995).

Consequently, what is just, justice, and distributive justice, appeared to be the most debated normative terms in ethics and political philosophy due to its mere philosophy of Anthropocene. However, the debate is that just, justice and distributive justice can never be understood by restricting the inquiry to the well-being of humans only. Rather, it should be extended from humans to all other creatures (bios) integral to the cosmos.

Thus, just, justice and distributive justice have appeared to be the most relativistic socio-cultural constructs. Nowadays, concerning these normative terms, it is palpable that there is a wide socio-cultural gap between the mindset and ideology of ancient times and that of modern times. In the old-time, human beings were the prime mover and end-in-itself for making and serving the pertinent values and norms in the separate entity's respective socio-economic, geographical, and historical backgrounds. However, in modern times, it has not only been questionable but also broadly at the edge of denial that human beings are the integrated part of the whole universe or cosmos, but apart from human beings, all other creatures such as animals, plants, and non-living entities are as much significance as the human beings are. That led to inclusive thinking that all the biotic and abiotic entities, along with the human being, are essential and play a decisive role in determining the values and norms of the whole cosmos. The revolutionary transmission that brought into one the existing two distinguishable and the two poles apart approaches and the concept of justice was the deep-rooted cause of the transition. For this reason, to show this transition concretely, in the present research paper, Aristotle's conceptions of just, justice and distributive justice have been picked up from ancient times (Clark and Elliott 2001), and John Rawls's theories of just, justice and distributive justice have been picked up from contemporary times.

JUST: THE MEANING AND NATURE

The term 'just' is widely discussed by various philosophers in varied academic endeavors. Commonly, just refers to a status that is devoid of unfairnesses. However, Aristotle and John Rawls have reflected differently on 'just'. Aristotle has discussed 'just' as synonymous with lawful (Haines 2006). If a systemic process of a nation does work following the law and statutes of the respective nation, the nation is in the state of just-ness, or the nation can be said to be a just nation. This leads to the ideation of a concept of being in the state of lawfulness, which explicitly or implicitly sets forth further validation of human actions and processes and systemic actions and processes directed towards the insurance of quality of life and well-being of individuals living out there. Aristotle has explicitly asserted and used the term 'just' and 'lawful' interchangeably (Haines 2006) as both advocate for a group of policies that are geared towards the development of, increase in the representation of, or upliftment of, or aptitudinal or attitudinal transformations of disadvantaged classes, under-represented classes or left out classes of the nation.

On the other hand, John Rawls uses 'just' as synonymous with 'fairness'. According to John Rawls, the ultimate obligation of government agencies is to find out the best method to

distribute primary and secondary goods among the citizens of the state (Chapman 1975). In making this inquiry, John Rawls gives affiliation to two tentatively innovative capabilities to initiate these two existential ways of doing distribution of primary and secondary goods among the individuals living out there in a nation. The first is 'original position', and the second is 'veil of ignorance'. The original position is a hypothetical state, or it can also be called the conception of a state or nation. In the 'original position', one starts the distribution of rights and liberties among the individuals. However, this process of distributing rights and laws may not be started if it is not filtered through the "veil of ignorance" (Chapman 1975).

Moreover, during the distribution of laws, rights, and basic liberties among individuals, one should be ignorant of own identity. This conceals an individual's own defining identity, such as age, gender, religion, race, etc. The result of both enabled capacities, such as 'original position' and 'veil of ignorance' will lead to the emergence of a palpable state devoid of unfairnesses and injustices. This is why John Rawls advocates using the term 'just' as an equal or replaceable to "fairness" (Chapman 1975).

JUSTICE AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Aristotle's Theory of Justice

It would not be an exaggeration to say Socrates spent his whole life finding out the real meaning of the term justice. Moreover, he concluded that 'justice is nothing, but minding one's own business' (Whitby 1937, 194). Aristotle's theory of justice initiates with the quest: what is the highest good attainable by human efforts or actions? In general, Aristotle believes that all the incidents, affairs, objects, and subjects have something in common: they seek well-analyzed and defined desirable ends. In particular, human beings also have the same phenomenon (Slakever 1981). All people undergo the attainment of well explained and determined practical terms that would increase the amount of good in their life, which differs from one person to another. While discussing Aristotle's philosophy, he says that all human beings should have only one aim. Answering this, he says that an individual's whole life runs roundabout that particular aim that is nothing but the attainment of real happiness (Ross 2009, 5). According to Aristotle, happiness is the highest of all attainable goods, which many human minds may perceive in different ways and manners. Aristotle says this fact in the following manner:

> Let us resume our inquiry and state that all knowledge and every pursuit aims at some good, what it is that we say political science aims at and what is the highest of all goods achievable by action. Verbally there is very general agreement; for both the general run of men and people of superior-refinement say that it is happiness and identify living well and faring well with being happy; but concerning what happiness is, they differ, and the many do not give the same account as the wise (Ross 2009, 5).

Aristotle puts forth three different explanations regarding happiness: pleasure, wisdom, and virtue. In Aristotle's view, many individuals think of happiness as pleasure; according to Aristotle, this is an animalistic instinct. At the same time, some people believe happiness is an

honor, which Aristotle calls practical wisdom or political wisdom. Furthermore, the remaining few understand happiness in virtue (Ross 2009, 21). According to Aristotle, the last category of people who think happiness in virtue is the apex of human attainment. It is worth mentioning that often, all the discussed kinds of individuals strive to attain happiness for self-gratification, not for the sake of others. It means pleasure, honor, and virtue, all the three types of happiness, are desired for self-gratification, not for their own sake.

Consequently, it can be said there is sufficiently none who wishes happiness only for other than itself. In this regard, Aristotle ultimately concludes that only virtuous acts are self-sufficient. Furthermore, self-sufficiency solely depends on itself and makes life desirable, lacking nothing.

In 'Nicomachean Ethics', Aristotle distinguishes between two types of justice: general or universal and particular (Ross 2009, 5 However, Aristotle does not comprehensively define the meaning and nature of general or universal justice. He has only used the word general justice in the beginning lines of Book V of his book 'Nicomachean Ethics'. According to Aristotle, 'just' (Ross 2009, 5) has two different meanings. The first meaning of the term 'just' forms the ground for universal or general justice. As expressed by Aristotle, the meaning of the notion 'just' is making a ground for universal justice or general justice, "that a conductin accordance with the law" (Ross 2009, 81-1130b). In other words, it can be said that general or universal justice means to act lawfully or in a state of lawfulness. Thus, according to Aristotle, there is no categorical differentiation between that just and law (Ross 2009, 81-1129b). From this background, it is apparent that those acts are just and lawful or according to the law, but what is a lawful act. In reply to the question, Aristotle says that the law or lawfulness denotes a certain kind of behavior aimed at promoting the common interest of the whole society (Burns 1998).

Moreover, in this sense, justice means a right configuration that appeals to individuals to do just deeds or actions. Aristotle says that this is called the virtue of the righteousness of moral justice, which is nothing but a virtue directed to benefit others, not for self. Suppose 'just' is veiled as justice in general or general justice. It can be said that universal justice is in the form of the supreme virtue of sticking to and working by law. Aristotle has expressed the incapability of applying universal justice at all times; for this reason, he has given a different kind of justice, i.e., particular justice (Ross 2009, 82-1130a). It was needed where no possibilities were left to follow the general or universal justice frameworks. Aristotle realized that some acts might not agree with the laws, but still, they are useful. That is why Aristotle developed the theory of particular justice.

The second type of justice is particular justice which opts for the second meaning of the term 'just', which stands for equality or exact or fair mean (Ross 2009, 82-1130a). Thus, particular justice upholds the state of fairness and equality. This kind of justice is based on distributing external or commensurable goods in fair proportion. For instance, a just wage is a wage in proportion to the detailed account of the labor done by that laborer. Moreover, the term 'fair' denotes a status between too much and too little. The term 'equal' denotes a status between more and less (Ross 2009, 1133a). Thus, it can be said that a just law is an ideal mean between two extremes, too much and too little or more and less.

The meaning of the term 'just' can formulate a different form as particular justice, which means treating equals equally and unequal unequally with their several conditions.

Interestingly, Aristotle does not discuss much 'general justice'. It was Plato who talked about this kind of justice at length. Nevertheless, he did not say anything about particular justice. Unlike Plato, Aristotle pays attention more to 'particular justice'. Providing an important place to the 'particular justice' is that particular justice is related to the justice of everyday life, such as distribution, exchange, retribution, and voluntary participation of rational individuals in social affairs (Ross 2009, 1132b). While universal justice is a kind of supreme virtue, which is being continued as an ideal that has to be attained by the individuals, practically never attained at all.

Aristotle's philosophy of universal justice is quite interesting to be followed. The ideas such as the rule of law, equality before the law, and lawfulness were worthy of being the mindset of individuals and states from ancient to modern times. It is possible for some thinkers not to agree with this thought. However, the deviation from this was arbitrary and was directed through some morally and legally impermissible policies and laws for nullifying or impairing the effects of equality (Burns 1998). When it comes to particular justice, Aristotle appears to signify the kind of justice as a morally permissible and desirable distribution of commensurable goods, disadvantages, and benefits among ordinary people (Burns 1998). From this discussion, it can be said that particular justice is a system of norms, unlike the commonality of general justice, which is responsible for integrating society as a whole. Consequently, Aristotle has classified justice into two types, namely, distributive justice and rectificatory justice. In his words, "The just as the fair and equal: divided into distributive and rectificatory justice" (Ross 2009, 82-1030a).

The first one is that distributive justice is rested on the rudiments of the thought that everyone should be given his due concerning the contributions to the state. In other words, distributive justice appeals that a just distribution of consumable goods should be done on equal or unequal terms. The concept of distributive justice asserts that treating equals equally and un-equals un-equally implies that an individual's right, duty, and reward should be in proportion to his merit and contribution to the state. Hence, according to this view of justice, both notions of just and proportionate are considered synonymous. It is also an intermediate status between too large and too small or too much and too little (Ross 2009, 85-1131a).

It is mandatory to mention that the distribution is not arbitrary and blindfolded. Agent must consider several particulars, such as what is his or her share in proportion to his or her unequal worth or merit of an individual. According to the visualized ratio, the distribution would take place. This distribution mode takes place according to the geometrical proportion (Ross 2009, 84-1131a). Along with this, sometimes distributions occur in society according to the individual concerned.

The second type of particular justice is commutative, rectificatory, or corrective justice (Ross 2009, 86-1131b). This type of justice is required when one person performs some actions against another in such a manner that the agent gains and the victims suffer. Applying the core idea of this kind of justice is the best way to solve these unequal gains and suffering. There is a dire need to return the agent's morally impermissible benefits and return them to the victims. Hence, equality is restored by punishing the agent and compensating the victims. It is needed to be motioned that restorative justice does not demand or look into the status of an individual in the die course of awarding a penalty or compensation. Instead, it has to be taken into account the nature of the disadvantages caused to victims and the benefits gained by agents (Ross 2009,

86-1133b). Thus, in this process, the individual's status is not considered. For this reason, justice follows the law of arithmetic proportion.

Interestingly, the concept of justice in Aristotle's philosophy also accepts that all the material and non-material structures have the only ultimate goal: the fullest realization and actualization of the real happiness of human beings. For this reason, all the socio-economic and political structures should be molded in the way that they are meant to realize real happiness in their lives. Thus, it can be mentioned that justice is the core idea of Aristotle's philosophy that has the goal of the full-fledged development of society. A just society is a community where all individuals live in harmony with equality and amity.

John Rawls' Theory of Justice

In his book 'A Theory of Justice', John Rawls presents his theory of justice. He offers some of the core ideas related to the theory of justice. Based on these ideas, he establishes his central thesis, i.e., justice as fairness which is nothing but a theory of justice that generalizes and carries to a higher level of abstraction of the traditional conception of social contract or utilitarianism and intuitionism. Moreover, he considers some differences between these views and his justice as fairness (Chapman 1975). So justice is defined through a procedure that claims to be fair. According to Rawls, "justice as fairness" (Rawls 1971, 10).

Furthermore, John Rawls, to formulate his theory of justice, has proposed two pre-requisites that will lead to conceptualizing his normative idea of justice. The first one is the 'veil of ignorance'. In the following way, it can be understood that if men are unknown to their identity or the power to choose or be in what gender or sex they want to be, this would have been in the hands of some higher authority. This will lead to an obvious question about how the distribution of the rights to each gender should be done specifically. Such a gender is given the greater rights' or everyone should get equal rights and liberties to realize self-potential. According to Rawls, in this situation, the rights and laws would be distributed equally among the individuals irrespective of personal characteristics. Reasonably, in the 'veil of ignorance', the distributor knows the basic principles of science, politics, and economics, and the distributor does not know his/her identity, gender, religion, and ethnicity. This hypothetical state of a human being is called an original position, where your consciousness is placed back in time before you are born. You are behind the veil of ignorance where the subject's identity is curtailed in this state. John Rawls means that at that time, you have no idea whether you will be born in wealth or poverty, if you are going to be Chinese or American, black or white, intelligent or not talented or not, etc. John Rawls asserts that the problem is that people would choose principles out of their self-interest. A rich person would not agree to redistribute wealth because he does not want to lose. In this original position, you would support the fundamentals of building a just system. According to Rawls, if you do not know if you will be born with an illness or not, you would surely be in favor of free healthcare. If you do not know if you will be born into poverty or wealth, you would be in favor of free education for all (Chapman 1975).

John Rawls asserts that in the 'original position' in a 'veil of ignorance', any rational person would support the following ideas of justice. There are two kinds of justice. The first is procedural justice, and the second is Substantive Justice. John Rawls' has discussed both types

of justice. According to John Rawls, If a subject 'X' and 'Y' are similar, both the subjects should be treated in the same way. Hence, the underlying notion is that one should treat cases alike. This concept of justice is quite similar to the conception of the common civil code, which is derived from the liberty principle of liberalism.

The ideology of liberalism accepts liberty as its initial value; in any circumstances, the ideology cannot compromise an individual's liberty (Arrow 1973). Hence, the ideology is rested on the concept of the basic notion of possessive individualism. Possessive individualism is a concept according in which all the things an individual attains by using his talent and capability belong to him. None can snatch these things from him; he keeps all the rights to have these assets. Whatever assets are, if gained by using the talent and capability, belong to the individual; otherwise, the individual does not keep any assets. Affirmative action is a means to ensure social justice in society (Cahn 2002). That leads to acting on a policy of preference that advocates moral sacrifices for others' welfare. This notion seems contrary to the fundamental postulates of 'treating as the same'. So, the assertion derived from this obtained thought does not support any preferential hiring policy in any institution. It would be interesting to know that all the followed procedures are undoubtedly fair; that is the only reason this kind of justice is procedural justice. So, justice is defined through a procedure that claims to be fair. From this very underlying assumption of justice, Rawls claims "justice as fairness" (Rawls 1971, 10), which should be understood as the holistic vision of justice (Rawls 1971, 10).

The principles of justice that John Rawls asserts are those that free and rational people would accept in an initial or original position of equality. No one knows his place in the society; his class, rank, or status; his fortune in the distribution of natural assets and ability; his intelligence, strength, the like, or even his conception of the good (Arrow 1973). Thus, men deliberate behind the veil of ignorance and determine their rights and duties. Strictly speaking, there is nothing like a liberal theory of equality. John Rawls exposes the face of liberalism, which acceptance was for the realization of equality of all individuals emphasizing the care of the least privileged. Although, it can be seen that liberals such as Lock, Bentham, and Mill support equality. He argues that the principles of justice are those that free and rational individuals would choose in the veil of ignorance as to their position in the society they might occupy.

Furthermore, Rawls has discussed primary social goods (Arrow1973). There are things that every rational man is presumed to want, including rights and liberties, opportunities, powers, income, wealth, and basic self-respect. John Rawls has given two principles of justice which are the guiding ideas of justice as fairness:

First: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive scheme of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others (Rawls 1971, 53).

Second: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all (Rawls 1971, 53).

Or

First principle: Each person has the same indefeasible claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties, which scheme is compatible with the same scheme of liberties for all.

Second principle: Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions:

    a. They are to be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of

fair equality of opportunity;

b. They are to be to the greatest benefit of the least-advantaged members of society (the difference principle) (Rawls 1971, 54).

The two rules mentioned above are the bedrock of Rawls' theory of justice, through which two forms of equality deal with the elimination of substantial inequalities. Indeed, the first principle of equal fundamental liberties is reflected primarily in the political constitution. Every person has to give the rights and laws that would please him and at the same time worthy of being provided for another one. Moreover, the second principle applies to a different situation where primarily economic inequalities are palpable.

In the dialectical situation among both the principles, the first principle of justice prioritizes the fulfillment of the second principle. Moreover, within the second principle, fair equality of opportunity takes precedence over the "difference principle" (Rawls 1971, 54). In the second section of the second principle, Rawls makes a great pattern of a conception of justice that would improve the chances of the least advantaged members of society. In other words, inequality is only justified when it results in the poor being better off in the social dimension. Rawls calls this the difference principle. The difference principle admits to inequalities to the extent that the well-being of the worst member can be ensured to be maximized (Rawls 1971, 55). Discussing here is interesting that Rawls says that "men agree to share one another's fate" (Maurya 2018).

According to Rawls' conception of justice, the first rule is right in general conditions, but if the situation is critical so that the first rule cannot solve the problem, here comes the second rule. The second rule of justice is nothing but a form of social justice (Arrow 1973). The second rule of Rawls' theory of justice should be accounted as directed to secure the rights for past wrongdoings. The wrongdoings were executed by violating either one of the above principles. Hence, commensurable primary goods have to be compensated for the victims of past injustices as a remedy for the effects of their current under-representation and absenteeism from significant workplaces. Thus, there is an urgent requirement to change current distributional practices to make the left out sections uplifted and elevated to the desirable certainty. It is also needed here to help them in the position to realize the same efforts.

It is clear as a crystal by the above discussion that John Rawls supports the policy of preferential treatments and affirmative action. Still, the fundamentals are different from Utilitarian and Intuitionist. It is not an irrational or insane belief. For instance, Rawls' theory of Affirmative action is not completely derived from the sole factor of intuitionism. It can fairly be understood by Rawls' statement as follows: "A conception of justice cannot be deduced from self-evident premises or conditions on principles; instead, its justification the matter of the mutual support of many considerations of everything fitting together into one coherent view" (Rawls 1971, 19).

Thus, Rawls does not deduce his theory of justice from any self-evident truth, but rather his theory is derived from an individual's belief which is coherent with other individuals in the community. Hence, he has given a more significant role to the community than an individual. Nevertheless, it does not entail that he did not take anything from intuitionism (Arrow 1973).

For instance, utilitarianism is the idea that the moral worth of an action is wholly derived

from the contribution to the overall utility of the activities designed to maximize happiness or pleasure for all. Thus, the individual is essential here, but it should imply the greatest happiness for the most significant number of people. Rawls asserts that utilitarianism ignores the separateness and distinctness of an individual. Hence, he does not identify that justice is a state "what free individual would select to regulate the very social cooperation under fair conditions" (Maurya 2018). Utilitarianism upholds that morality should guide character so that consequence is best for people.

Hence, it can easily be said that John Rawls has taken some very ideas of intuitionism to formulate his ideas of compensatory justice. It is worth mentioning that he did not copy the complete patterns of the same. In the same way, he did with utilitarianism. For instance, John Rawls has accepted Kant's conception of a free and rational being. John Rawls emphasized: "In the original position, the parties assume that they are rational and able to manage their affairs in society. Therefore they do not acknowledge any duties to self, since this is unnecessary to further their good" (Rawls 1971, 218). It denotes that persons are ends in themselves, and maxims of morality have been a critical factor in constantly proving individual as a 'moral autonomy', i.e. 'freedom and liberty'. The thing, which makes a difference in the line, is the characteristic of making the decision coherent with public reason. It proves that Rawls does not follow the backward-looking argument. It is because he agrees to see the actions that proved intrinsically valuable. However, they should not be followed until it is not coherent with the public interest. Further, the forward-looking argument does not fit John Rawls. It is because Rawls never talks, in his writings, about throwing the individual's freedom and liberty to assure the community's interests.

According to Rawls, if action is ensuring the total welfare of the society, i.e., its results are favorable to community welfare, this should not be the only factor to adopt this action in the future also, rather one should see its level of conserving the individuals' freedom and rationality. If the action cares about these factors, it should undoubtedly be followed and implemented in the same community. Hence, each one has to be counted for one and nobody for more than one. The use of a particular kind of justice should not be understood as merely eliminating the inequalities prevailing at significant workplaces. Instead, the government formulates norms or normative theories to ensure the total welfare of the society. This goal appears to be the most desirable goal of a government and a nation. The point shows that establishing standards does not build in one day, but rather it needs an in-depth philosophical debate and investigation. That leads to the different opinions of proponents and opponents.

Furthermore, the government of a nation should create situations in which all the individuals can realize and entertain themselves to the desired end. Only then can society attain a harmonious state. Unlike this, societies are disintegrated into several forms based on different morally impermissible criteria in the contemporary era. All these disintegrations are the unequal and partial distribution of laws and rights in the community. That has created two separate classes in which a type of individual got higher rights and laws than the other one. Thus, the first group is entertained more than they should cheer.

The second group is welcoming fewer laws and rights than they should cheer. These factors create a difference that results in different kinds of imbalances and disparities or injustices. Situations like this can be traced in most societies. To remove the injustice, equality

should be assured. That leads to the emergence of a particular kind of justice like affirmative action. In its ideal form, affirmative actions are those actions in types of some special laws and rights that are done in society to pull the targeted, deprived, or backward class into the mainstream of the community. They have been treated as a differentiated member based on their caste, creed, color, and sex. This differentiation led the class into an underrepresented class in every sector of society. Thus, it is now apparent that affirmative action is a kind of compensatory justice. It will lead to the nation's total welfare, which is the genuine requirement of today's society (Cahn 2002, XII).

A question remains untouched from coverage of the reasonable evaluations that come from many different sides and many different lands. Whether the exercise of impartiality, fairness, and equality should be evaluated with limited frameworks within a culture with shared attitudes and priorities, the approaches to justice presented by Aristotle and John Rawls can be taken into account. For instance, Aristotle's theory of justice takes place in Western classical times, and the other is John Rawls, a great philosopher of modern times.

There is a noticeable gap between these two-mile stones. For instance, Aristotle has given two straits of justice. The first one is universal or general justice and the second one is particular justice. Similarly, John Rawls has given two straits of justice the first principle, which is universally applied to society. Furthermore, the second one is the second principle of justice which is applied to situations where the normative framework of the first principle cannot be followed. Further, both Aristotle and John Rawls' justice meant the goodness and willingness to act by the laws to ensure the highest good of society. Antecedently, both agree that justice is a master imperative for good human relationships and coexistence.

However, along with these similarities in the normative frameworks of justice, many differences are also within. For instance, Aristotle says that all lawful things are just in universal justice. On the other hand, John Rawls' in his first principle that all laws, which are the essential characteristics of liberalism, are just and should be implemented in society. It can be said that Aristotle never specifies himself and the laws, but John Rawls asserts that the laws and rights based on liberalism are the only things that will help ensure the welfare of the individual. Thus, John Rawls's attached to the individuals' well-being more than the public's well-being. Rawls sees the well-being of society in the well-being of the individual.

On the other hand, Aristotle is attached to the societal rights for the community's well-being. For this reason, Aristotle denies the dispersion of equal freedom, equal rights, and fair laws at the individual and family level; because he thinks that the right to equality and liberty at the family level would destroy the family (Nelson 2017, 57). Thus, Aristotle denies the outbound distribution of an individual's rights as only the head of the family has the right to free speech in the family. In this regard, Nelson's assertion is worthy of being explained: "families require strict hierarchical relationships. The husband must rule like a monarch, and the children must obey their parents; we would no longer agree that the husband should 'rule', but the idea of hierarchy and discipline in raising children is still influential" (Nelson 2017, 57).

CONCLUSION

From the above discussion of Aristotle's and John Rawls' theories of justice, it is very interesting to note that both theories have their virtues. Moreover, both philosophers have tried to solve practical problems such as how the allocation and distribution of rights, laws, and primary goods can be done with the help of specific normative theories of justice. Let us look at the socio-economic and historical conditions of the society of Aristotle with that of John Rawls. It can be concluded that there were many graspable socio-cultural differences. Moreover, the internal aspect of society differs from one to another - the same reason applies to Aristotle and John Rawls's theories of justice. For instance, both philosophers have caught the attention of the intellectuals of their own time. However, as for John Rawls, his opportunity and difference principles were the most remarkable principles among all other theories of justice since time immemorial.

Moreover, his liberty principle (the first principle of justice) had also spaced to the egalitarian's concern for individuality. It is commendable that John Rawls' theory of justice is that he emphasized 'Pareto Optimality' or 'Pareto Efficiency' to eliminate purely economic inequalities among individuals. While discussing the nature of inequalities, these are sometimes economic, social, political, psychological, cultural, or many more kinds. This relative nature of societies and desirable theories of justice do not question the universality and objectivity of theories of justice. Rather, there is an extreme urgency to understand the factuality and practicality of the issues in particular situations. And then, we should go for relative solutions, which is known as methodological relativism. That is why the theories of justice of Aristotle and John Rawls both were ethical and conducive to repairing the recurrent socio-economic and historical issues and concerns faced by the individuals of the respective time. The question arises when one starts to evaluate Aristotle's theory with that of modern and contemporary problems of individuals. In this situation, Aristotle might not be that much appropriate to address the current issues.

In the same way, If Rawlsian theory of justice might not be suited to the desirable extent when one starts to disregard the situation in which John Rawls has developed his theory. For instance, a formula of algebra will do justice when we apply it in algebra; but when a person uses this in arithmetic, it will not work. It is because; there is a difference in nature and individual distinctiveness of a theory or formula. In the same way, determinants of justice are relative depending upon the socio-economic and historical situations of the respective society. So, my stand is that a theory of justice should be formed by the method of corroboration in the society by looking at its own social, cultural and historical situation, where justice is needed. This can be said more as *nīti* mentioned in *bhāratīya darśan* based on the *śrutī* rather than a theory of justice

From the above discussion of Aristotle's and John Rawls' theories of justice, it is candid and transparent that justice should not be taken as definite and fixed axioms or maxims, which can be used to eradicate injustices of any sort, disregarding any sort the relativity and subjectivity of conditions and subjects. However, corroboration is quite helpful and valuable by looking at its own social, cultural, and historical situations where justice is needed. This can be said more as *nīti* which considers the following numbers of the socio-economic, geographical, and historical backgrounds of the separate entity in which the just-ness is being applied. Despite

varied forms in the various fabrics of the world, there is a common element running through these variations of the use that is justice is aimed at ensuring the common interest of entire individuals. For instance, in Aristotle's and John Rawls' discussion of justice, the central theme of their focus was to show the path to the attainment of the well-being of the whole society theory of social justice applied to the basic institutional structure of a modern democratic state.

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Statement of human rights:

This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any authors.

Statement on the welfare of animals:

This article does not contain any studies with animals performed by any authors.

Informed consent:

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

1. Acharya, Ashok, and Bhargava Rajeev. 2011. "Political Theory: An Introduction". New Delhi: Pearson Publication.
2. Arrow, K. J. 1973. "Review of Some Ordinalist-Utilitarian Notes on Rawls's Theory of Justice by J. Rawls".*The Journal of Philosophy*, *70*(9), 245–263. https://doi.org/10.2307/2025006.
3. Bergmann, Barbara R. 1996."In Defense of Affirmative Action". New York: A New Republic Book: BasicBooks.
4. Burns, T. 1998. "Aristotle and Natural Law". *History of Political Thought*, *19*(2), 142–166. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26217500.
5. Brennan, Andrew, and Lo, Yeuk-Sze. "Environmental Ethics". *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/ethics-environmental/
6. Clark, B. S., & Elliott, J. E. 2001. "John Stuart Mill's Theory of Justice". *Review of Social Economy*, *59*(4), 467–490. http://www.jstor.org/stable/29770132
7. Cahn, Steven M. 2002. "Affirmative Action Debate", In; Cahn Steven M. (ed)Routledge. New York and London.
8. Cahn, Steven M. 1993. "Affirmative Action and the University: A Philosophical Inquiry". Pennsylvania: Temple University Press.
9. Chapman, J. W. 1975. "Review of 'A Theory of Justice', by J. Rawls". *The American Political Science Review*, *69*(2), 588–593. https://doi.org/10.2307/1959089.
10. Cohen, Carl, and Sterba, James P. 2003."Affirmative Action and Racial Preference: A Debate".USA: Oxford University Press, pp. 199-200.
11. Duncan Myrl L. 1981. "The Future of Affirmative Action: A Jurisprudential/ Legal Critique." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* <eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ275618>.
12. Whitby, G. Stanley. 1937. "Socratic justice". *International Journal of Ethics* 47 (2):193-209.
13. Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T.S. 1995. "Shifting Paradigms for Sustainable Development: Implications for Management Theory and Research". *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(4), 874–907. https://doi.org/10.2307/258959.
14. Haines, W. A. 2006. "Aristotle on the Unity of the Just". *Méthexis*, *19*, 57–77. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43738767.
15. Heywood, Andrew. 2015."Political Ideologies: An Introduction".United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan Education.
16. Heywood, Andrew. 2015. "*Political Theory: An Introduction".*United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan Education.
17. Maurya, Sooraj Kumar. 2020. "Onto Nature and Forms of Affirmative Action," *International Journal of Social Science, Innovation and Educational Technologies,* 1:03, 272-280.https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3977172.
18. Maurya, Sooraj Kumar. 2020. "Affirmative Action: A Movement to Attain Gender Equality". *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7 (18), 227-234. doi:10.31838/jcr.07.18.34.
19. Maurya, Sooraj Kumar. 2021. "Roots, Routes, and Remedies of Gender Discrimination: An Ethical Discourse," *Psychology and Education Journal*, *57*(8), 820-834.

20. Maurya, Sooraj Kumar. 2018. "A Critique of John Kekes' Arguments of Affirmative Action". *Zenith International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *8*(9), 402-412.
21. Maurya, Sooraj Kumar. 2020. "A Reply to Luois P. Pojman's Article "The case Against Affirmative Action". Conatus – Journal of Philosophy, 5(2), 87-113 Doi: .12681/cjp.23660.
22. Maurya, Sooraj Kumar. 2020. "Does Gender Discrimination Rest on a Mistake?". *Journal of Talent Development and Excellence*, *12*(2s), 3938-3949.
23. Maurya, S. K. 2021. "The Concept of Justice in Reference with Philosophies of Plato and Aristotle: A Critical Study". *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs*, *7*(3), 250-266. https://doi.org/10.47305/JLIA21370250m.
24. Maurya, S. K. 2018. "John Kekes' Arguments of Affirmative Action: Revisited". *International Journal of Research and Analytic Reviews*, Volume 5, Issue 3. Pg. No.207y-211y.
25. Maurya, S .K. 2018.*"*Affirmative Action: A Quest for Descriptive Approach". *Review of Research*, Volume 7, Issue 11. Pg. No.108-112.
26. Maurya, S .K. 2018."A Critique of John Rawls' Theory of Affirmative Action". *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, Volume 5, Issue 8. Pg. No.684-690.
27. Maurya, S .K. 2018. "John Rawls' Argument of Affirmative Action: Revisited".*Review of Research*, Volume 7, Issue 10. Pg. No.60-63.
28. Maurya, S. K. 2018. "John Kekes ' Arguments of Affirmative Action : Revisited" 5 (3): 207–11.
29. Maurya S. K. 2018. "'JohnRawls Argument of Affirmative Action: Revisited.'" *Review of Research*. doi:10.9780/2249894X.
30. Miller, D. 1992. "Distributive Justice: What the People Think". *Ethics*, *102*(3), 555–593. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2381840
31. MacKinnon, Catriona. 2018. "Issues in Political Theory", Second edition, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
32. Mill, Stuart. John. 2015. "Utilitarianism". New York: Dover Publications, Inc. Mineola, pp. 1-22.
33. Nelson, Brain R. 2017. "Western Political Thought: From Socrates to the Age of Ideology". Second edition, New Delhi: Pearson Publication, Delhi.
34. Rawls, John. 1999. "A Theory of Justice: Revised Edition".Massachusetts: The Balknap Press of Harvard University: Cambridge.
35. Ross. W.D (Tr). 2009. "The Nicomachean Ethics", Revised with an Introduction and Notes by Lesley Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
36. Sandel, Michael J. 2010. "Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?"USA Inc: Penguin Group, USA Inc.
37. Salkever, S. G. 1981. "Aristotle's Social Science". *Political Theory*, *9*(4), 479–508. http://www.jstor.org/stable/190685
38. Sowell, Thomas. 2004. "Affirmative Action Around the World: An Empirical Study".New Haven & London: Yale University Press, Preface, p. 191.
39. Taylor, Robert S. 2009. "Rawlsian Affirmative Action."*Ethics, vol.119 no.3,* pp 476-478.,doi: 10.1086/598170.