



Justice, an Individual or Institutional Virtue

ARTICLE INFO

Article Type

Original Research

Authors

Seyed Aboozar Falsafizadeh
Haghighi (*1)

(1) PhD Student, Department of
Public Law, Faculty of Law, Shahid
Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Corresponding Author's Info

Tell: +989177192077

Email: Abozar.falsafi@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-2263-4429

Article History

Received: 12 Apr 2024

Revised: 15 May 2024

Accepted: 07 Jun 2024

Published Online: 01 Jul 2025

ABSTRACT

Background

John Rawls' Theory of Justice can be discussed and documented as a widely used theory during the second decade of the third millennium. In this field, one can never speak about Justice and neglect the theory.

Materials and Methods

The method of present study is descriptive-analytical which has been written by using the main works of John Rawls in the field of the moral principle of Justice and other moral principles. In addition to these Sources, other scientific texts and articles, Persian and Latin books, and Sources have also been used.

Ethical Considerations

The article is written according to the principles of referral and fiduciary and is considered independent and free writing.

Findings

The passing society of today needs to refer to the ideas of John Rawls to search for new examples and concepts of Justice. Rawls imagines people as the owners of ideas and understanding of the concept of Justice and theorizes that using a series of firm documents and inferences of passing from the moral concept of Justice toward political and legal concepts.

Conclusion

The main purpose of this study is to provide summarized criticism on some special political perceptions in Iran's history to change the special perceptions of Justice mostly relevant to concepts such as guardianship, piety, and morality, into a new perception of Justice. Such perception should meet the least needs of citizens and explain the inequalities in special cases properly.

Key words

Justice, individual, institutional, Rawls, Ghazali.

How to Cite this Article

Falsafizadeh Haghighi SA. Justice, an Individual or Institutional Virtue. ILS. 2025; 1(3): 43-58.

Copyright

This is an open access article distributed under CC BY 4.0 License.

© 2025 The Author(s).

INTRODUCTION

Two principles considered by Rawls on Justice are the factors highlighting his theory more than everything. The discussion analyzes the priority of liberalism on the one hand and considers compensatory Justice and social equality on the other hand. It could be mentioned that Rawls has been aimed at conducting the right and left issues of the West in the same direction, which were conflicting. This could make his book attractive for both liberalist thinkers considering liberalism and for Marxists following social Justice. Rawls' theory is as important as Plato's theories. However, some criticisms have also existed on Rawls' theory. Some of the criticism is relevant to the whole theory, and some part is associated with partial discussions. As Rawls aimed to provide a universal theory of Justice with applicability in all societies with different cultures and regulations, he faced serious problems and criticisms from scientists. After that, given the great fear he had of liberal ideology, he tried to adjust his theories with liberal ideology. The book "Political Liberalism" was the fruit of such efforts. The book "Theory of Justice" was published 22 years after the first edition of this book in 1993. The issue of the basis and concept of Justice is not new, and there are many documents on it in the process that remained from ancient Greece. In the conversation between Socrates and Thrasymachus, asking about the basis of Justice gained no answer except "The

Benefit of Strong". The more explicit expression of such an answer is that the measure factors are the Justice of affairs, norms, and criteria made by the elites [1].

This is highly observable in the Platonic elitism in the best way. Therefore, only people with the expediency of executing the Justice are the rulers and the owners of cognition [2]. Such attitude can assign the execution of Justice to the will of a government official, which can be dependent on the personal basis of decision-making, and remind ambiguity of moral virtue/lust in such decision. However, execution of Justice shall be based on the regulations and far from the personal lusts and wills [3]. It is because; lust can deviate even the elected people. The inference is used in political conversations more and less. As people use the prescription of an experienced doctor to treat the diseases, they should follow the votes of elite politicians to execute Justice.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The method of present study is descriptive-analytical which has been written by using the main works of John Rawls in the field of the moral principle of Justice and other moral principles. In addition to these Sources, other scientific texts and articles, Persian and Latin books, and Sources have also been used.

FINDINGS

A. Aristotle and His Attitude toward the Concept of Justice

Aristotle has criticized the inference that doctors never offer improper treatment to patients intentionally, and get their wage after treatment and leave the patient. However, the politicians take the majority of the measures based on friendship and enmity. If someone thinks that the doctor will kill the patient for the money, the person refers to the medical books for treatment [4]. Hence, Aristotle seeks Justice to measure "wisdom decorated by all lusts" (Law).

Aristotle separated two concepts of individual Justice, meaning perfect virtue, and Social Justice in the form of "regulative justice" and "distributive justice" in his investigations. However, he used to count Justice as one of the main human virtues, just like Plato and has considered its ethics.

B. Divine Attitude toward Justice and its Logical Consequences

Plato has answered the question about good nature and justice nature neither in "Jomhuri" (Republic) nor in other works. He explains that people never understand goodness directly and understand just its signs. He has always talked about the elegant position of goodness and its priority to the Justice of beauty and truth instead of speaking about the truth and content of goodness. Although the content of goodness

is available for those who can recognize the example of good, Plato never clears such cognition. Such attitude to Justice changes Justice into a divine secret. This is because; it cannot be explained in light of good interests for others even if a few people know it. Now, the question is: is it reasonable to ask about something that is not explainable for others? Whether asking about the nature of Justice cannot be changed into an undue question about the nature of God? Hans Kelsen has given a positive answer to this question in his book "What is Justice? [5].

Although Plato emphasizes that social Justice is obtained following the decision of the ideal state and the labor division among triple classes due to the nature of individuals so that all triple elements of soul result in individual Justice if used in the right position, he knows that such expressions can never specify the content and nature of the Justice. Nevertheless, the expressions can provide conditions for the realization of goodness and Justice by such a state. The connection of the nature of Justice with the hereafter punishment has been emphasized in the Gorgias thesis and at the end of the book "Republic"; although it never reduces the ambiguity of the concept of Justice. The hereafter punishment is an emphasis on the well-known sorting of Justice. Everyone reaches what deserve, and such sorting and definition of Justice can never say something about the content of good and

evil, and the content of Justice as the divider of strengths [6].

Given John Rawls, there is no necessity to use theological or metaphysical teachings to protect the principles of Justice. Also, he believes that it is not necessary to consider other aspects to compensate or correct the inequalities imposed by the two principles of Justice. If the high-handed perceptions of Justice cannot be explained based on general conditions of human life, they cannot be justified [7].

C. The Conditions of Realization of a Good and Just Society by Rawls

Rawls's belief in liberal values claims that just institutions and political virtues cannot be expectations of citizens, institutions, and values of a just and good society; unless they authorize the lifestyle based on citizens' obedience value and support the values. Perception of political Justice must have sufficient space for such lifestyles [8]. Here, the question is: how can we say that when the life values can be obeyed completely, or when the society has sufficient space for such lifestyles until we have no attitude beyond the political attitude? The attitude "Justice as Fairness" can never say from an expanded perspective that various pervasive teachings, which have been authorized, are competent for obedience. Hence, how should the issue be followed?

Rawls answer the question based on his unique abstract concepts (overlapping

consensus and reflective equilibrium) as follows:

By accepting a political perception of Justice on behalf of all reasonable, rational citizens understanding the pervasive teachings in an overlapping consensus, this shows that liberal fundamental institutes of that space provide lifestyles competent for intimate obedience of citizens. However, I think that the political perception of Justice accepted by reasonable consensus is adaptable with all reasonable criteria of critical reflection. Thoughtful reflection of citizens reflected in consensus reveals this issue. This is the most reasonable confidence provided by political liberalism and is also the most thing we can have reasonably that political institutes are good spaces for valuable life methods. Hence, the political society is just and good.

The focus of Rawls on the institutes can be the content of his principles of Justice. However, focusing on institutional selection is not a sign of his inattentiveness to the social realities. Given the theory of "Justice as Fairness", a combination of just institutes and public interest-oriented behavior can form the social realities. The realities can be determined in passing from institutes to the present social conditions [9].

D. Kelsen and Hayek: Justice as an Individual Trait

On social Justice, it could be mentioned that Justice is in the social relations, institutes, and social structures. The imagination that is clear in the theory of John Rawls' Justice

reminding principles of social Justice as the basis of political structure has been rejected by thinkers such as Kelsen and Hayek. For example, Hans Kelsen says: "Justice is at first a spatial but not necessary description for the theory of social order, responsible for regulating the human interactions. In the second position, Justice is imagined as a virtue for humans because a person is just when he behaves based on the social order norms recognized as Justice. Justice is a social bliss, the existence of which is guaranteed by the social order."

According to this perception, the characteristics such as Justice or injustice can be used for votes of institutes, statements, and social relations such as political system, economic system, educational system, judicial regulations, law, and other elements of social relation structure. However, Hayek believes that the description of Justice or injustice is not relevant to this field because the only proper use of the word "justice" is specified to the conscious human behavior as an autonomous and strong creature. Different aspects of social macrostructure and its statements can be good or bad, efficient or inefficient, but they never can be just or unjust. Hayek says: "only human behavior can be called just or unjust action. By adjusting the terms as real statements, the only imagined meaning is that a person is responsible for creating the statement or opening it to be created. An actual situation

or unchangeable statement may be good or bad, but it can never be just or unjust" [10].

Hence, all affairs not created by human dimension and behavior never encompasses the two characteristics because uncontrollability of that by human eliminated the moral issue of Justice. However, the behavior of people and the decisions attributed to the special organization of the group is the subject of Justice. Hence, the government decisions and institutes of political power are characterized by Justice and injustice.

Passing from the idea of "justice as individual virtue" to "justice as institutional virtue" can differentiate Rawls's theory from the ideas of Plato, Aristotle, and Hayek. Given Rawls, institutional Justice is created in a society, which individuals show interest in understanding justice in any case. Therefore, Rawls believes that Justice needs the achievement of ideal selection covered by ignorance of individual interests. Here, Rawls speaks of Justice as impartiality virtue, not as an individual trait, but also as a situational trait, in which the principles of Justice are selected. According to Rawls, Justice and relevant principles are made by humans, and they have to find a way to achieve principles of Justice. From this perspective, the principles of Justice can be accepted just by referring to conditions of Justice. Following the principles of Justice is a kind of behavior whereby the individuals involved in a common action are regarded as

a group with the same interests and abilities [11].

E. Citizens from the Perspective of Rawls: Possessors of Different Perceptions of Justice

Rawls believes that people attending the institutions obtain a good sense of Justice under just conditions and are ready to act based on their duties to preserve the institutes. Therefore, a perception of Justice creating a stronger sense of Justice with more likely supremacy on discriminative tendencies can make a more sustainable society. Accordingly, a sense of Justice created by a perception of Justice in the human's mind should overcome people's intentions for injustice. Therefore, the desirability of the theory of Justice dependent on relative strength evaluation of the conflicting tendencies is caused by various impulsions, obsessions, and incentives.

Rawls believes that social classes have two moral powers psychologically: "ability to have nature of justice" and "ability to have an image of good" [12].

The ability to have the nature of Justice is the same ability to understand, use, and act based on the public imagination of Justice, which specifies just conditions of social participation. The ability to have the imagination of good is also the same ability to form, appeal, and rational prosecution of imagination of rational interest or good.

Rawls emphasizes that assuming that people in society follow just personal interests, it is impossible to have an effective sense of Justice. In this case, an ideal legislator can design the social institute so that citizens choose behaviors to maximize public welfare because of personal or group interests. In such a society, individuals consider the society just as an instrument to achieve their interests and obey that for such motivation.

People under someone else's authority have a different attitude toward that undoubtedly; however, the whole organization may be just and is designed properly to progress what they regard as a legitimate personal interest. This also is true in the interactions of individuals. The institutes are the human deed defined by public systems of regulations. Obtaining the positions defined by these regulations can usually show special goals and destinations. Justice or injustice of social organizations and the beliefs of humans on these issues can affect social emotions deeply. They specify that they behave with those who accept or reject an institute or tend to reform or defend it.

Rawls seeks a situation in which power and wealth are distributed justly among people. By Justice, Rawls means social Justice by. It means that the ultimate goal of Rawls is not individual virtue. However, he also tries to regulate Justice Principles to solve the conflicts of individuals justly in society [13]. It is not easy to trace political processes with

the ability to meet the goals mentioned above.

The political process is a process relevant to the approval and revision of regulations on monitoring executive branches of the government. The legislative councils, and the officials of the executive power, and the political forces under the institutes' supervision may take measures despite the Constitution. There is no legal prohibition for such actions in the usual sense of the word. Therefore, the behavior of political officials is conducted almost not using legal restrictions but using what is morally authorized in their looks. As no system and equilibrium ideas in the Constitution cannot create invisible power like the process governing the economic system to be relied on to obtain just consequence, it is necessary to have a general sense of Justice. Hence, it seems that the proper theory of politics in a just ruling system needs a theory in Justice to determine how moral feelings can conduct public affairs.

It is not easy to find the answer. Some difficulties return to a proper understanding of the nature of humans, and some others return to a proper understanding of the nature of the policy. No one of the perceptions can be obtained easily and need lots of effort. Noam Chomsky, a famous American Philosopher, and Linguist answer the question about the nature of human as follows:

“By looking at the consequences of human nature, you can see everything. You can see many self-sacrifices, lots of braveness, lots of trueness, lots of destruction, and everything you want to see. This can show you nothing” [14].

However, Rawls considers two main characteristics for human society: conflict of interests and sharing interests. Conflict of interests means that everyone wants to gain the most share in working with others. Sharing interests has resulted from the reality that all people can have a good life under social cooperation and benefit from such social participation. Hence, to organize the social situation, a series of rules and principles should be regulated to have the best method of distributing wealth and resources based on the incentives of conflict and cooperation. The realization of social Justice is guaranteed by the observance of these principles [15].

However, which traits in individuals guarantee the achievement of institutional Justice? Rawls's early theory emphasizes the rationality of individuals, and Rawls's recent theory emphasizes their reasonability. The early Rawls describes individuals rationally so that they select principles of social life principles to meet their interests and long-term goals. These moral principles are selected based on rational choice and are agreed upon by these individuals. As a result, they understand the basic structure of the society and psychological rules, political affairs, and principles of economic theory at

first despite unawareness about their situation. Hence, they can take arbitration and select something based on guessing and rational decision-making and choice [16].

However, recent Rawls emphasizes reasonability. He believes that individuals are reasonable when they pay attention to others. Reasonable individuals want to behave based on principles, which they and others can understand. Reasonable individuals consider the effect of their behavior on the good life of others in their decision-making [17].

Hence, John Rawls tries to bridge the gap between moralities and law. Chapter 8 of the book "A Theory on Justice" has specified three perceptions of the moral learning process and their differences at first. Then, after differentiating the authority-based ethics, community-based ethics, and principles-based ethics, he says that the reasonability of any perception of Justice depends on the explanation of the moral growth process, which will be learned during the process. In addition to emphasizing that any moral attitude is a complicated structure of ideals and orders and encompasses all elements of behavior and emotion, Rawls emphasizes many truths hidden in these perceptions. Therefore, it would be better to combine them naturally.

F. Three Axial Rules in Moral Psychology

Rawls presents the combination in the frame of three rules in the moral psychology, which

can connect individual Justice and institutional Justice in his opinion:

The first rule: assume that the family institutes are just, and parents love their kids and express their love by supporting the kid. Hence, the kid understands their love and kindness and falls in love with them in the step of growing up.

The second rule: assume that empathy is actualized in the city by acquiring such attachments and dependencies based on the first rule, assuming that the desired social organization is just and is regarded just by people. Then, friendly attachments and trust in others are created simultaneously that other citizen's act based on their responsibilities and are loyal to the ideals of their position.

The third rule assumes that the capacity of empathy is actualized in the person by forming such attachments based on the early two rules. Also, assume that social institutes are just and are regarded just by all people. In this case, a corresponding sense of Justice is formed in the individuals when they find out that the organizations benefit themselves and other people, to whom he/she pays attention.

By explaining the process, Rawls draws the path of achievement from individual to institutional virtue. In this pattern, the two issues are not conflicting, but also, they are complementary elements. Also, Rawls provides other signs of a connection between the two axes.

The assumption that human beliefs on good life are revisable has been firmly accepted in the liberal tradition [18]. The critical reading of Rawls from the specific idea shows that comprehensive ideas on goodness and Justice can vary from time to another time and from a place to another. Here, some part of the common beliefs of humans on fundamental issues of society remains. In the article "Kantian Constructivism in Moral Theory," Rawls says: "people are not dependent on their special perceptions of goods and ultimate goals of a special time. They can revise and change their perception. They can ignore their current goals to estimate its value" [19].

Rawls refers to the differences between growing and using two moral powers and realized natural talents. In his opinion, the differences are higher than the level of essential affairs, so that a person can have social cooperation. For example, the judicial virtues are the perfection of the moral power of the sense of Justice. He assumes that there are a variety of abilities to gain these virtues. The powers include reason and imagination, the ability to be impartial and adopt a more comprehensive perspective, as well as a special sensitivity to the concerns and situations of others [20].

It should be noted that Rawls is not a follower of moral perfectionism. He never accepts that social Justice can be defined based on spiritual, cultural, and philosophical perfections. This is because; perfectionism in any form is loyal to a kind

of fatalism in the field of morality. However, Rawls tends to present a theory based on no presumption of good and perfection. Instead, he believes that identifying truth is preferred to identifying good to determine the basis of the fundamental structure of the society [21].

The inferences of Rawls have finally resulted in two principles of Justice, which can be accepted by the majority of people in his opinion:

- 1- Everyone has the absolute and same right to the widest system of fundamental liberties, adapted with a similar system of liberty for all.
- 2- Social and economic inequalities should be regulated in such a way that can cover these

Aspects:

- a) To make most interest for the most deprived people of the society
- b) The achievement of jobs and positions is provided for all people under fair and equal opportunity [22].

The two principles of Justice include the concept of procedural field justice. The differences in moral powers of citizens cannot result in similar differences to allocate initial commodities such as political rights and liberties. On the contrary, the fundamental structure is arrayed in such a way that includes required institutes for field justice so that citizens can have access to public means to grow and train their basic capabilities and achieve just opportunity to

use them in the best way; provided that their capabilities are in the normal range. They should use the guaranteed opportunities provided for them justly.

G. Four Responsibilities of Government Institutions from Rawls' Perspective

To this end, Rawls has determined four responsibilities for the government, which different institutes should take:

First, the institute (help or assistances) should create a competitive price system and prevent an extremist situation in the market. However, the interference is ineffective until the time that geographical difference and taste of families do not allow reconstruction of a good competence based on the principle of dispute.

Second, the institute "consolidation" takes measures to achieve perfect utilization. According to Rawls, the two institutes are aimed at providing economic efficiency of the market together.

Third, the institute "Social Transfers" analyzes the un-purchasable requirements and interferes in meeting the least social needs.

Fourth, another institute is responsible for wealth distribution and provides some kind of social Justice through providing good financial conditions for all people and making required reforms in ownership rights [23].

It could be mentioned that the fundamental institutes and the public policy of Justice as fairness are aimed to be impartial on the comprehensive teachings and relevant perceptions. Impartiality of goals means that the institutes and policies are impartial so that all citizens can confirm them in the framework of public political perception.

It could be mentioned that Justice as fairness is a political perception, and moral philosophy is not applicable. The principles, regulations, and values of that cannot be the result of using philosophical-religious teachings. However, they also form a series of critical moral values that are properly relevant to fundamental social structure. These are political values created differently from other relations because of specific characteristics of political relations.

H. Characteristics of Political relation from Rawls' Perspective

According to Rawls, political relation includes two important characteristics at least:

First, the individuals are in interaction with the fundamental structure of society. The structure of fundamental institutes is dependent on the political society, and no one can enter into them or leave them optionally.

Second, political power is always a coercive power, which the government supports to execute the regulations. However, in the constitution-based regime, political power is

the power of citizens against legal entities too. The power is imposed on the citizens in the position of individuals regularly. Therefore, the people may not accept the acceptable reasons for explaining the general structure of the Constitution. In accepting the structure, they may be unaware of lots of regulations approved by the parliament they follow.

Therefore, it could be mentioned that the government defends the rights and freedoms of citizens as the best judge of self. The government is a load that individuals should tolerate to achieve their goals. Also, the government should be controlled in a restricted activity arena to provide maximum liberty for the citizens [24].

Rawls's political liberalism traces different domains of political issues by explaining these characteristics. The said domain includes unique and certain values, which are specified using a good method. From this perspective, the political issue is different from the community issue because a community issue is optional contrary to a political issue. The political issue is also different from family, and individual issues, because the two domains are emotional despite the political issue.

The political perception, along with its fundamental and unique values, is substantive. First, it means that the perception is codified to be used for the fundamental structure of the society at first. Secondly, it presents unique political values

with no reliance on independent, nonpolitical values.

Political perception never denies other values relevant to the community, family, and individual issues. Also, it never claims that political values are independent of these values. Rawls reminds the issue of sustainability in the democratic society and infers that achieving such sustainability and preservation of social sustainability needs political perception of Justice and political domain so that they can be the focal point of overlapping consensus. It means that the domain should gain practical teachings, which have gained fans over time; otherwise, the constitution-based institutes cannot be stable.

I. Ghazali's Approach to Politics

Imam Mohammad Ghazali, the owner of detailed theses in religion and politics on the power of Imam-Sultan and denial of equality-based approach among people, says that some people believe that they have the right to disobey the orders of Imam if his commands are against God's will. However, they believe that they have to obey someone who orders obeying God, even if the person is not Imam.

Opposition to Imam in disobeying God and obeying a person other than Imam to obey God's commands has a single verdict. Therefore, Imam and non-imam are equal if both of them order obeying the Almighty God. Ibn Moqafa believes that Satan deviates from obeying Imam by saying "all

people are same and equal". Another group believes that people have to obey the commands of the Imam regardless of adjustment with the commands of God. "No one can interfere in the works and orders of leader and Imam because people are subjects of submission and obedience". Also, Ibn Moqafa' has considered the belief an insult to Imam's spiritual position since it causes the forbidden of God to be considered lawful. The people of virtue and good deny both interpretations of the term "in the sin of the Creator; one should not obey the "creature" and defend the theory. The followers of the first theory are right about the disobedience of the creature in the sin of the Creator, although they are wrong where they say obeying the commands of Imam is fruitless.

Those who order obedience of Imam in special cases are right, although those ordering obedience of Imam in all unclear affairs is wrong [25].

The aim of disobedience of the creature in the sin of the Creator is all binding orders of God. If Imam orders to cancel certain religious affairs, such as prayers and fasting, and Hajj, obedience is unauthorized. However, people should obey the commands of the Imam in other cases assigned to the Imam by God. These affairs include managing wars, collecting and dividing the public treasury, appointing and dismissing the government officials, deciding on cases with no rules on them, and executing the

limits with no sentence in the Quran and tradition.

Ghazali supported the caliphate system at first and considered the caliph as the basis of religious necessity in Islamic society. Then, however, he supported the Seljuk regime in "Nasiaht Ul-Moluk" without speaking about the caliphate system. At the same time, Ghazali used Iranshahri deas too and called the sultan as the person elected by God and as the shadow of God on the earth [26].

Ghazali quotes from Prophet Mohammad: "in the early times, people have slept, and scientists were awake; today, scientists slept, and people have died. What is the benefit of the words of a dead and bored person? At this time, the vote of people has been ruined, and all people have bad wills. Without the fear, politics, sultan, and king, people never obey commands."

The fear of the sultan as the representative of political power and sense of social integration is important in the ideas of Imam Mohammad. Therefore, although he has not authorized the closeness of religious experts and cruel king, he considers two stipulations on this verdict. One of them is used when the king commands, and kingship is canceled in disobedience, and the people become brave.

The emphasis of Ghazali on the fear of the braveness of citizens is one of the main issues of all Iranshahri policies, which is mentioned in all theses. It could be found that using the experience obtained from

political relations; he found that achievement of ideal politics was impossible. Hence, he left religious policymaking. In the political idea of Ghazali, Sultan is a person who has lost credit and glory. He says: "the king should have politics and glory so that everything is in the right place and people are safe in the society". Ghazali says about the deformation of the world: "in the time of Prophet Mohammad, people were seeking religion, and they seek the worldly things today." The corruption of scientists and the violence of the sultan can explain the domain of governance as the foundation of the nature of time. In all of his theses, Ghazali has described them with different interpretations. It seems that Abu Hamed has also called kings the reason for the deformations of nature of time and disorganization of the state, just like other policymaking authors.

In terms of emphasizing the glory of the king and the necessity of preventing the braveness of people, Ghazali is approaching Hobbes. However, he prescribes personal Justice in differentiating the dignity of individuals and explicit expression of denying the equality of people and the necessity of obeying Imam. However, this is rarely observable in the Imami political thoughts.

Hobbes believed that liberty destroys in case of lack of security, and fears, sadness, and the short and isolated life of people will be continued [27].

The government should do its best to provide security for citizens to avoid such disasters to achieve liberty in the light of security. By preferring security and restricting liberty because of the preservation of security, Rawls reviews Hobbes's political theory [28].

Ghazali thought about the solution late and in the last years of his life. Hence, he used to talk on behalf of deprived people and attack all state officials impatiently. However, he could never be successful. He did his best in a short time, although no one of the cruel officials heard him. However, his efforts were like a sedative for the oppressed people [29].

CONCLUSION

In the political theory of Rawls, ordinary people are the audiences, although sultans and kings, and political elites are audiences of Ghazali. As mentioned, Ghazali believed that many governance affairs depended on the Imam's decisions and orders. The attitude conflicted with the attitude considering all people as the owners of perception and the select branch in Justice. However, Rawls's political theory is not just relied on the institutions. Chapter 8 of his book "A Theory on Justice" shows how people adapt their perceptions of Justice with institutional perceptions. The study selected Ghazali's theory because people can see themselves in the mirror of his ideas today more than ever. We have to accept that today's approach to Justice is still

personal. People connect the concept of Justice to the concept of piety and show it to the horizon of observance of morality in daily life. Here, a theory is needed to connect the individual concept of Justice to the institutional concept and pass from individual morality to encompass the social interest and experience.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

The article is written according to the principles of referral and fiduciary and is considered independent and free writing.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Planning and writing of the manuscript was done solely by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest was reported by the author.

FUNDING

This Research received no external funding.

REFERENCES

- [1] Pitkin H. "Justice: Socrates and Thrasymachus", Trans, Mostafa Malekian, Kian, 2000; 5(4): 66-80.
- [2] Nouri M. The Concept of Justice in the Political Philosophy of Plato and John

Rawls, Political-Economic Information, 2015. pp. 304-3017.

[3] Rasekh, Mohammad (2009). Supervision and balance in the constitutional rights system. Tehran: Derak, 2009. pp. 54-72.

[4] Aristotle P. Trans. Hamid Enayat, Tehran: Pocket Books Company affiliated to Amirkabir Publishing House, 2011. pp. 150-159.

[5] Hans K. What Is Justice, University of California Press, Qom: Publications Taha, 1971. pp. 150-159.

[6] Vaezi A. Critique of theories of Justice, Qom: Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute Publications, 2014. pp. 172-184.

[7] Rawls J. A Theory of Justice, Trans. Morteza Nouri, Tehran: Markaz Publishing, 1999. pp. 450-464.

[8] Rawls J. Political liberalism, Trans, Musa Akrami, Tehran: Sals Publications, 1996. pp. 315-327.

[9] Amartya Kumar S. The idea of Justice. Trans. Ahmad Azizi (2012). Tehran: Ney Publishing, 2009. pp. 507-514.

[10] Fredic H. The Mirage of Social Justice Law, Legislation and liberty, Routledge and Kegan paul, 1976. pp. 31-40.

[11] Bashirieh H. Liberalism and Conservatism, Volume II of the History of

Political Thought in the Twentieth Century, Tehran: Ney Publishing, 2014. pp. 117-119.

[12] Telis Robert B. Rawls Philosophy, Trans, Khashayar Deihimi, Tehran: Tarh-e Nou Publications, 2001. pp. 413-420.

[13] Malekian, Mustafa "Justice and fairness and rational decision making", Tehran: Critique and Opinion, 1997; 11(1): 80-94.

[14] Michelle P, Shuffle J, Understanding power; Noam Chomsky's constant concern. Trans. Ahmad Azimi Blourian, Tehran: Rasa Cultural Services Institute, 2001. pp. 371-378.

[15] Akhlaqi G. The relationship between power and Justice in political jurisprudence. Qom: Al-Mustafa International Translation and Publishing Center, 2011. pp. 74-85.

[16] Brown S, Collinson D, Wilkinson R, One hundred philosophers of the twentieth century. Trans. Abdolreza Salar Behzadi. Tehran: Ghoghnoos Publications, 1998. pp. 164-172.

[17] Nassaj H, Ali Hosseini A, Bagheri Ejieh A. Analysis and evaluation of diversity and tolerance in John Rawls' political thought. Journal of Theoretical Policy Research, 2017; 2(2): 173-200.

[18] Kymlicka W. Multicultural citizenship. Trans. Ibrahim Eskafi (2015). Tehran: Shirazeh Ketab-e Ma Publishing, 1995. pp. 167-182.

[19] John R, Kantian constructivism in moral theory, Journal of Philosophy, 1980; 77(9): 515-572.

[20] Rawls J. A retelling of Justice as fairness, Trans, Erfan Sabeti, Tehran: Ghoghnoos Publishing, 2001. pp. 275-286.

[21] Vaezi A, John Rawls; From the theory of Justice to political liberalism. Qom: Book Garden, 2007. pp. 92-100.

[22] Wolf J, (1996). An Introduction to Political Philosophy. Trans. Hamid Pajuhesh (2012). Tehran: Ameh Book Publishing, 1996. pp. 249-260.

[23] Knight J, Gutsche E. Great political books from Machiavelli to the present day. Trans. Hossein Shahidzadeh, Tehran: Amirkabir Publications, 2001. pp. 542-553.

[24] Held D, Models of Democracy. Trans. Abbas Mokhber, Tehran: Roshangaran Publications, Women's Studies, 1987. pp. 408-416.

[25] Tabatabai J, History of political thought in Iran; Considerations in theoretical foundations. Tehran: Kavir, 2017. pp. 96-117.

[26] Hashemi M.(1997). Ghazali's political logic. Teacher of Humanities Quarterly, 1997. pp. 128-155.

[27] Rawls J. Distributive Justice. In: Philosophy, Politics, and Society. Edited by Laslett P, Runciman W. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976. pp. 52-59.

[28] Mahmoudi A. Justice and freedom. Tehran: Cultural Institute of Contemporary Thought, 1997. pp. 123-128.

[29] Hassani A, (1984). Ghazali anti-oppression and justice ideas, Keyhan Farhangi, 1984; 12(5): 36-51.

COPYRIGHTS

© 2025 The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, as long as the original authors and source are cited. No permission is required from the authors or the publishers.

