

Relevance of Non-violence on Equality and Justice for Conductive Social Order

Mathura Alda

Ph.D. Research Scholar

P.G. Department of philosophy, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar.

Abstract: The socio-political ideals or moral standards, Equality and Justice, are having an important role model to dissolve social conflicts or violence at tertiary stage to restore and establish peace and prosperity in the society. Violence takes birth when social body loses peace. Similarly, Non-violence takes birth from violence when social body loses peace. But non-violence restores social harmony whereas violence collapse it. Non-violence protects out violence from society in order to appliance equality in the search of equal justice to mass of the State. Problem appears at the application of justice in terms of law business being, applicant, materialist, on the one part, application justice reverse to beneficiaries, on the other hand. This problem also seen in social domain several times. It is clear that rationality, morality and humanity have gone downwards due to lack understanding of result or the end by unjust means. The proper way to vanish all unfair activities are possible through good means of the state of affairs that is the means justifies the ends not vice versa.

Date of Submission: 19-07-2019

Date of acceptance: 05-08-2019

I. INTRODUCTION

It is with human being that everything rationally follows. Human being lives in the society as of his nature and necessity. Society is his major place wherein he forms clan, tribe, community, state and nation in order to endure worth living. Society is not just a gathering of individuals. It is a collective mechanism where all members have unique ideology. Uniqueness is nothing but equivalence service availed social equality and enhanced social interaction midst social subjects and objects in every accommodation and equal proportion. That cultivates good possessions for a fraternity. The well means of possession presupposes moral values and just and unjust notion which bears individual well-being to collective universal well-being. Intending to fulfil this goal the preamble of Indian Constitution admits basic social and political values, justice, equality, liberty, fraternity, secularity, democratic, in order to balance society for sustainable development. These value-based ideals are universal norms and principles for the state and are cored out from inter-relationships of individuals. Without social mechanisms, construed out of state individuals and social order, so called ideals losing their value. As moral values aim to make harmony in the society, so social ideals are core of social life to lead it smoothie. The ideal of social equality is more deeply embedded in the moral consciousness of contemporary societies to term out form of justice than their political rhetoric.

It should be clear that normative concepts are often described as 'values'. They refer to moral principles or ideals such as the concept of should, ought, ought not, ought to be brought about. On the wide sense social and political aspects are ideals. Ideas as disciplines refer the Latin 'disciplina'-abstract noun formed from 'discere', 'to learn', whence also comes 'discipulus', 'disciple' (Hastings, 1908, p.405). Ideas, thus, should have 'ethical inquiry which recognizes the need of discipline in the formation of character, and points to self-discipline as the ideal form'. Though there are distinctiveness have in terms of normative and descriptive concepts, it is sometimes difficult to separate political and moral values because of their base and equal outcome. There are cardinal virtues in Indian culture. Non-violence is one of these values that Gandhi's adherence of that culture. Gandhi practise it in socio-political domain to organise people for establishing harmony of equality and justice in society.

Equality and Justice

Equality is an important socio-political ideal. It is essentially a green modern symbol in progressive model run. The concept of equality arises out of the imperfections of social order. As inequality arise so equality reforms it. Equality does not mean merely uniformity rather the state being equal in status, right and opportunities. It means absence of unfair and unreasonable discrimination among the individuals on the basis of religion, race, caste, sex, region and language. Therefore, equality means absence of inequality. It aims at abolishing conventional discrimination which are irrational and illegal. Justice, on the other hand, refers

absence of injustice. It is a normative concept of morality that concerns every political and social philosophers (Srinivas and Sastry, 1955, p.246). Judging socio-economic-politic equality each and every individual is its basic ideal. The root of justice 'jus' means joining or fitting or to synthesis. It is such political ideal which synthesises rest socio-political ideal. It synthesises individual and state, individual and society and cementing and joining up human beings together. Then, there would be form of justice. Apart from simultaneous function of these, society loses its foundation. It is law which maintains balance both, equality and justice. Laws owe their formulation to certain moral facts and social contingencies. Law can be defined as reasoned formulation of morality, issuing out in form of prescriptions and enactment (Mohanty, 1995, p.230).

The relationship between justice and equality, as stated earlier, is a maze unity. Many inequalities are supported because these are justified in view of the whole system of social values. If equality is against the principle of justice then inequalities are supported. All the equalities are not just, and similarly all the inequalities are not unjust. As justice is concerned whole system of social values whereas notion of equality differs from society to society. With the change of social values, the notion of equality also undergoes to change. Fact that Plato and Aristotle, Greek philosophers, are initially state that justice is virtue when it justified deviation called slavery whereas later time it is regarded as highly unjust because equality by original is an accepted social value now. Similarly, earlier democratic traditions of West, that is before 1918 liberal democracies, women had no right to vote but now equality between man and woman is widely accepted as just.

Inequalities of different kinds have existed in society from time to time but the struggle for equality against inequalities started only when these were regarded unjust. When inequalities give birth to society to social injustice and exploitation then do they become unjust. Inequalities and private property are just in a capitalist society whereas in socialist societies inequalities based on private property are unjust. Hence, the issue of equality or inequality is decided by the whole system of social values. Are these two ideals merged together any point? is a critical apprehension for distinctive value-based society. Both equality and justice are emerged at society, individuals, state, nation and world in form of moral treatment.

The Greek Society

The Greek philosopher Plato's definition of justice is more relevance today that 'performance of their respective duties by all classes of the society and non-interference in the functions of other class'. For which his concept on justice is regarded as moral principle, the base of every sanctity, is necessary for modern society since 'unity in diversity' is the name and fame of the state and universe. Non-interference does not indicate non-cooperation but not to make disturbance others' independent duty post because all are rational as well as trained by self and nature and they have adequate knowledge about what ought to do and what ought not. Interference disbalance their duty for duty sake. He indicates human souls three qualities wisdom, courage and appetite. Justice is secured for individual if and only if these qualities get-together in right proportion. Positioning a particular post is a chance and challenges to provide equal service to all irrespective of sex, religion, race, higher class lower class. Class division is not to separate individuals or society but to serve every one equally. When all individuals perform their respective function and do not interfere in the affairs of other classes the justice is secured. Therefore, Plato's notion of justice is compared with the notion of *Swadharma* explained in Indian Sacred text Gita.

Aristotle, being a realist philosopher, emphasised on practical or applied aspect of justice by saying universal and practical justice. He emphasised the theory of distributive justice and proportionate equality. Distributive justice assigns to every individuals' due according to his contributions to the society. This kind of justice is denotable with proportionate equality and it means that everyone should be given in accordance with his social performances and contributions. Injustice arises as much from treating unequal equally as from treating equals unequally.

Modern Society

The idea of equality came into prominence in modern age through the revolutions in Britain in 1649 and 1688, in USA in 1776 and in France in 1789 made right equality by birth as their central plank. These sequences result to Marxist and socialist philosophers in 19th century on economic equality. Marxist tried to establish class less society by dialectic materialism where everything such as family, religion and economic hierarchies disappear from society and promote abolition of private property, heavy progressive and graduated income tax, equal obligation of all to work, combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries and a more equitable distribution of production between town and country, free public school education and the abolition of child labour etc. indicate individuality but well prospers of that particular State to provide justice.

There are some resemblances between Gandhism and Communism because both of their view opposing exploitation of the poor by the rich. Both of them held that capital which was not used for the welfare of the people was an evil and pleaded for better deal to the weaker sections of the society with a view to ensure social equality. Gandhi and Marx differ in the basis of philosophical ideology of spiritualism and materialism.

Gandhi is an apostle of peace, a man who lived and died peace and non-violence (Jain, 2011, p. xvi). He never intended to alter non-violence. Injure others is same as to injure self. Gandhi inject non-violence to society, religion and political realm as moral foundation of existence and progress of society. Fellow feeling of human beings transports goodness ideals for social wellbeing. Non-violence as a value perpetually and permanently subsisting in the world in different forms, in theory and practice, to achieve real goal of life, it most profound insists equal freedom and justice of humanin democracy country in intending to resolve the conflicting global situation.

Ethical norms as living force, their reality cannot be apprehended without empirical regulative utility. Gandhi was well aware of it that for a general human being moral command is conceivable only through voluntary action of an agent. An action to be known as good or bad should be performed voluntarily. If an action is judged in the voluntary framework as good, then the action is morally granted and if an action is judged in the voluntary framework as bad, then the action is not morally granted. No action can be called moral which is not voluntary. Because there are probabilities of dictation by fear or by compression of any kind arbitrary forces these cease to be moral. This voluntary judgement insists another flourish that to accommodate with knowledge of certainty of truth. To have the real characteristics of truth is the good principle and this is morality or appropriate means to acquire knowledge of truth. So, for Gandhi, morality is the yardstick principle of real life and truth of the circumstances is treated as base of morality. Because truth is real and that what is real is also good and what is not good in nature cannot be taken as real or truth. So, Gandhi admits Satya as the destination of the human life and ahimsa as means to realise real destiny. He predicts that each and every good means presupposes good ends. This is the notion of means justifies ends. Even the notion of religion in relation to morality is also intertwined morality at ground. Wherein Gandhi makes bring into line moral value with religious value, but has emphasized on morality. For him, morality is prior necessity of religion and the true morality and the true religion cannot be separate from each other. A religion is not granted as religion if it lacks moral necessity. So, Gandhi's concept of morality is given important from religious outlooks. It is cognitive that the theory without practice is not satisfactory. Religion should practice moral principle only rather it would be dogmatic belief. 'Gandhi believed that a state could be organised largely, though not entirely, on the basis of non-violence, and cited Ashoka's example' (Iyer, 2000, p.185) who became religious from devil one. A non-violent State must be 'broad-based on the will of an intelligent people, well able to know its mind and act up to it' (Harijan, May, 1946).

Economic values are values which are ascribed to goods and services. Values as spiritual aspect impact on spiritual domain of man. And values as intellectual dimension has direct impact on mind. All of these, social, spiritual and intellectual, are different life forms of man. All of these are integrated into a whole and one can be thought of isolated from other sets of values. The problematic question of morality is bound up with the problem of social good. It is a question for wellbeing of social construction or social formation, and of what society consists of. Society, obviously, exists for the wellbeing of individuals. Thus, morality defines itself into that which is good for all. It leads the community for good and prosperity. Prosperity of society will be possible through serving of one another, caring each other and promoting sharing in the community. Ahimsa should sustain every spear of values, economic, spiritual and social, to form the true principles to the State thus moral principles and norms which cream outed from socio-cultural activities and good relationship of individuals through sharing-caring-cooperation events build everlasting moral stream. That everlasting stream of humane elements; love, compassion, tolerance, fellowship, sacrifice, service to the disables, in capacitated flora and fauna became universal values.

Moral values are active energy. Mankind has to acquire these eternal lineal values through self-discipline to lead himself toward cosmic stance called '*Pūrūsārths; Dharma, Artha, Kama and Mokṣa*' (Mohanty, 1995, p.xvi) to a complete wellbeing. Man makes a new format customary law that makes a new living track. They vary with time, place, situation and persons since provide moral doctrine. Fact is that, the notions of good and bad, right and wrong, vice and virtue become relative. It makes cultural relativity.

As human beings, though some want society to have some degree of solidarity, the only achievable basis is for people to be linked together horizontally as equals. Unless we enjoy an equal status as citizens, we cannot have equal status in social life more general. Equality of citizens must have equal voting rights, equal welfare rights, and so forth justice. If people are not associated politically as equals, they will certainly not enjoy social equality. Equally, there are cases where it is a matter of contingency, from the point of view of justice, whether a certain practice exists at all, but given that the practice does exist, questions of justice or fairness arise in the course of its operation. Here it is required rational necessity to judge that what ought to take as decision which would be good for the state in order to establish justice and that would be equally applied to the citizen of the state.

What has this to do with social equality? If we want our society to be egalitarian, then we will try to shape our distributive practices so that the emergence of hierarchy is discouraged; in particular we will try to avoid the emergence of large-scale, cumulative inequalities of advantage which make it difficult for people to

live together on terms of equality, even if politically they are all defined as equals. This is the current situation in liberal democracies: formally, everyone enjoys equal rights of citizenship and this is important but materially there are large, cumulative inequalities in education, in organizational power and in income, and this is important too, because it means that these societies are still effectively class-divided. It is because material means of violence. "The way she, India, can promote peace is to offer successful resistance to her exploitation by peaceful means. If she can do this it will be the largest contribution that any single nation will have made towards world peace" (Young India, 4.7.1929). In case of application of justice there is requirement of perfect means that correspondence of state of affairs will have the such real end. That end must be True so that it would be equally applicable to all irrespective of caste, creed and sex.

II. CONCLUSION

It is believed that neither the cause of justice nor the cause of equality has been helped political philosophers who have run sustaining two ideas together under the heading of 'egalitarian justice'. Instead, people need to think about two kinds of equality: equality in distribution, which in some cases, but not often, is a requirement of justice, and the quite distinct idea of equality of status, or social equality. This too has implications for distribution, but they are much less direct and depend upon sociological claims about the way in which differences in income or education, say, are converted into inequalities of social class. Here, it is claimed, equality can shape the practice of justice whereas justice itself remains silent. It is not part of individual case that the two kinds of equality must necessarily conflict; on the contrary equal citizenship and the concrete rights that attach to it provides an essential starting point from which moves towards a wider social equality can be made. But they are different, nonetheless, and draw upon different political traditions: distributive equality from the tradition of liberalism, social equality from social democracy and socialism. Anyone who seeks to defend equality is open to easy caricature by critics of that notion, and so it is important to be clear from the start about precisely which form of equality is being advocated.

There is a necessity of do balance and maintain non-violence prospects to the state that is for the people, of the people and by the people. The state is concatenation of individuals, belonging from distinctive communities, regional cultures, ideologies and values construing national heritage. The cardinal virtues of non-violence only can maintain state stable and sustainable for that Gandhi's dedication to which identify India as birth place of non-violence. The important of it, not at late but situations demand to protect and promote, has made been realised all over the world and termed 'International Day of Non-violence' to obey it as is which commemorates spontaneously to Father of the Nation India.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Gandhi. M.K., (2011). *India of My Dreams*, Rajpal and Sons, Delhi.
- [2]. Hastings, James, (1908). *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 1, T. and T. Clark, New York.
- [3]. Iyer, R.N., (1973). *The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, Oxford University Press.
- [4]. Jain, Vidya, (2011). *Peace, Non-violence and Gandhian Concerns*, Rawat Publications, Jaipur.
- [5]. Mohanty, A. K., (1995). *Philosophy of Value*, Centre of Advanced Study in Philosophy, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar.
- [6]. Srinivas, K., and Sastry, V.K., (1955). *A Concise Dictionary of Philosophy*, D.K. Printworld (P) Ltd. New Delhi.

Mathura Alda. "Relevance of Non-violence on Equality and justice for Conductive Social Order." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*. vol. 24 no. 07, 2019, pp. 39-42.