e-ISSN:2582-7219



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

Volume 7, Issue 8, August 2024

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA

Impact Factor: 7.521

© 2024 IJMRSET | Volume 7, Issue 8, August 2024| DOI:10.15680/IJMRSET.2024.0708091

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 7.521| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

The Concept of Justice in the Political Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle: A Critical Evaluation

Dr. Sucheta Gupta

Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Government College Bibirani, Rajasthan, India

ABSTRACT: Plato and Aristotle offer two of the most influential accounts of justice in Western political thought. In the Republic Plato presents justice as a harmonious order in which each part of the soul and each class in the city performs its proper function under the rule of reason. Aristotle, in the Nicomachean Ethics and the Politics, treats justice as a virtue concerned with the distribution of goods and the rectification of wrongs according to proportion and law. While both philosophers link justice to the well-being of the political community, they differ in method, in their understanding of equality, and in the institutional arrangements they recommend. A critical evaluation shows that Plato's ideal provides a powerful vision of moral and political unity yet raises difficulties concerning individual freedom and the practicability of philosopher-rulers. Aristotle's more empirical approach offers greater flexibility and attention to existing institutions, yet it retains exclusions based on status and leaves unresolved tensions between distributive and corrective justice. Together the two accounts continue to shape debates about the relation between individual virtue and political order.

KEYWORDS: Plato; Aristotle; justice; Republic; Nicomachean Ethics; Politics; distributive justice; corrective justice; political philosophy

I. INTRODUCTION

The question of justice occupies a central place in the political philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. Both thinkers regard justice as essential to the good life of individuals and to the stability of the political community. Plato develops his account primarily in the Republic, where he constructs an ideal city in order to discover the nature of justice in the soul. Aristotle examines justice in the Nicomachean Ethics as a particular virtue and then considers its political implications in the Politics. Although the two philosophers share a commitment to the idea that justice involves giving each person what is due, their methods, premises, and conclusions diverge in important respects.

Plato proceeds by means of a large-scale analogy between the city and the soul. He argues that justice exists when each of the three classes in the city—rulers, auxiliaries, and producers—performs its own function and does not interfere with the others. The same structure appears in the individual soul, where reason rules the spirited and appetitive parts. Aristotle rejects this degree of idealisation. He begins from the opinions and practices of existing cities and seeks to clarify the concept of justice through analysis of ordinary language and of concrete cases. He distinguishes distributive justice, which allocates honours and resources according to merit, from corrective justice, which restores equality after a wrong has been committed.

A critical evaluation of these accounts must consider both their internal coherence and their implications for political life. Plato's vision offers a rigorous standard of moral order, yet it depends on controversial claims about knowledge, education, and the possibility of philosopher-rulers. Aristotle's treatment is more attentive to the variety of political forms and to the claims of law, yet it embeds exclusions that later readers have found difficult to accept. The comparison illuminates enduring questions about the relation between justice, equality, and the structure of political authority.

II. PLATO'S CONCEPT OF JUSTICE IN THE REPUBLIC

In the Republic Plato has Socrates examine conventional definitions of justice before advancing his own account. Cephalus suggests that justice consists in telling the truth and paying one's debts. Polemarchus modifies this view to mean helping friends and harming enemies. Thrasymachus contends that justice is simply the advantage of the stronger.

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 7.521| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Socrates rejects each of these positions. He argues that a satisfactory account must show justice to be good both in itself and for its consequences, and that it must apply equally to the individual and to the city.

To discover the nature of justice Plato constructs an ideal city in speech. The city arises from the division of labour required to meet human needs. As the city grows, distinct classes emerge: producers who supply material goods, auxiliaries who defend the city, and rulers who govern. Justice in the city is the condition in which each class performs its own function and does not meddle in the work of the others. The rulers, educated in philosophy and trained to pursue the good of the whole, exercise authority. The auxiliaries assist them in maintaining order. The producers attend to economic activity. When this functional order is preserved, the city is just.

Plato then applies the same structure to the individual soul. The soul contains three parts: reason, spirit, and appetite. Justice in the soul exists when reason rules, spirit supports reason, and appetite obeys. The just person is therefore one in whom the rational part directs the other elements toward the good. Plato maintains that the justice of the city and the justice of the soul illuminate each other. The large letters of the city make the smaller letters of the soul easier to read. This analogy allows him to argue that justice is a kind of psychic and political harmony rather than a mere external relation between persons.

The education of the guardians forms a crucial part of the account. Future rulers undergo a long programme of physical training, music, mathematics, and dialectic. Only those who demonstrate both intellectual capacity and moral character are permitted to rule. Plato argues that such rulers will possess knowledge of the Form of the Good and will therefore be able to order the city correctly. The abolition of private property and of the conventional family among the guardians is intended to prevent conflicts of interest and to ensure that rulers identify their own good with the good of the city. These arrangements are presented as necessary conditions for the realisation of justice.

III. ARISTOTLE'S CONCEPT OF JUSTICE

Aristotle treats justice in Book V of the Nicomachean Ethics. He distinguishes universal justice, which is coextensive with complete virtue in relation to others, from particular justice, which concerns the fair allocation of external goods. Particular justice is further divided into distributive and corrective forms. Distributive justice allocates honours, wealth, and other divisible goods according to a principle of geometric proportion. Equals should receive equal shares; unequals should receive unequal shares in proportion to their relevant merit. The standard of merit may vary. In democracies it tends to be free birth; in oligarchies it is wealth; in aristocracies it is virtue.

Corrective justice operates in transactions, both voluntary and involuntary. It restores equality when one party has gained at the expense of another through breach of contract, theft, or injury. The judge aims to equalise the loss and the gain by means of arithmetic proportion, without regard to the prior merit of the parties. Aristotle illustrates the point with the image of a line divided into equal segments. The task of corrective justice is to re-establish the midpoint after it has been disturbed. Law provides the general framework within which both distributive and corrective justice are applied. A just law is one that aims at the common advantage and that treats like cases alike.

In the Politics Aristotle connects justice with the nature of the political community. The city exists for the sake of the good life, not merely for survival or economic exchange. Justice is therefore the ordering of offices and honours in a manner that promotes the virtue and well-being of the citizens. Different constitutions embody different conceptions of distributive justice. Democracy distributes political power equally among free men; oligarchy distributes it according to wealth; aristocracy according to virtue. Aristotle evaluates these constitutions according to the extent to which they serve the common good rather than the interest of a particular group. He regards the polity, a mixture of democratic and oligarchic elements, as the most practicable form for most cities.

Aristotle's account is more empirical than Plato's. He surveys existing constitutions, notes the claims advanced by different groups, and seeks a mean between extremes. He accepts that perfect justice may be unattainable and that law, though imperfect, provides a necessary stabilising force. At the same time he insists that justice cannot be reduced to mere legality. A law that systematically advantages one class at the expense of the common good is unjust even if it is formally enacted. The standard remains the flourishing of the political community understood as a partnership in virtue.

© 2024 IJMRSET | Volume 7, Issue 8, August 2024| DOI:10.15680/IJMRSET.2024.0708091

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 7.521| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE TWO ACCOUNTS

Both Plato and Aristotle regard justice as an objective order rather than as a mere convention or as the advantage of the stronger. Both link justice to the proper functioning of the political community and to the cultivation of virtue. Plato's functional harmony and Aristotle's proportional equality can be seen as different expressions of the idea that each person should receive and perform what is appropriate. The differences, however, are substantial. Plato constructs an ideal city in order to reveal the nature of justice; Aristotle begins from the practices and opinions of existing cities and seeks to refine them. Plato emphasises the rule of philosophical knowledge; Aristotle emphasises the rule of law and the participation of citizens who possess practical wisdom.

On the question of equality the two philosophers diverge sharply. Plato's ideal city is hierarchical. Political authority is concentrated in the hands of a small class of philosopher-rulers. The majority of citizens are excluded from rule on the ground that they lack the requisite knowledge. Aristotle also accepts hierarchy, yet he allows a wider range of constitutional forms and recognises that different cities may justly adopt different standards of merit. His doctrine of distributive justice according to proportion permits degrees of equality that Plato's functional model does not. Aristotle's corrective justice, moreover, treats the parties as equals before the law once a transaction has occurred, regardless of their prior status.

The role of the individual also differs. In Plato's account the justice of the individual is modelled on the justice of the city. The well-ordered soul mirrors the well-ordered polis. Personal fulfilment is achieved through the performance of one's proper function within the larger whole. Aristotle grants greater independent weight to individual virtue and to the variety of human goods. While he agrees that human beings are political animals who realise their nature in the city, he does not require the same degree of psychic and institutional unity that Plato demands. The result is a conception of justice that is more accommodating of difference and of the claims of private life.

V. CRITICAL EVALUATION

Plato's account of justice possesses considerable philosophical power. The analogy between city and soul provides a unified explanation of moral and political order. The insistence that rulers must possess knowledge of the good offers a clear standard against which actual governments can be measured. The educational programme and the restrictions on private property among the guardians address real problems of corruption and divided loyalty. Yet the account faces serious difficulties. The claim that only philosophers can know the Form of the Good is difficult to verify and leaves open the possibility of error or abuse. The abolition of the family and of private property for the guardians raises questions about psychological feasibility and about the costs imposed on those who are asked to forgo ordinary human attachments. The rigid functional division of the city limits individual choice and appears to sacrifice the freedom of the majority for the sake of an ideal harmony that may never be realised.

Aristotle's treatment avoids some of these difficulties by remaining closer to political experience. His distinction between distributive and corrective justice clarifies different contexts in which claims of fairness arise. His willingness to consider a range of constitutions and to evaluate them according to the common good provides a flexible framework for political judgement. The emphasis on law as a relatively impartial standard offers a practical check on personal rule. Nevertheless, Aristotle's account is not free of problems. The acceptance of slavery and the exclusion of women and manual labourers from full citizenship embed inequalities that later readers have rejected. The criterion of merit in distributive justice remains under-specified; different groups can and do disagree about what counts as relevant merit. The tension between the claim that justice aims at the common good and the recognition that most actual constitutions serve partial interests is never fully resolved.

A further difficulty concerns the relation between justice and happiness. Plato argues that the just person is happier than the unjust person even if the just person suffers external misfortune. The harmony of the soul is itself a good. Aristotle agrees that virtue, including justice, is a constituent of eudaimonia, yet he also holds that external goods are necessary for a complete life. This difference affects the practical implications of each theory. Plato can more readily counsel acceptance of hardship in the name of justice. Aristotle's position leaves more room for the claim that severe deprivation of external goods can impede the exercise of virtue. Both views continue to inform contemporary debates about whether justice requires only fair procedures or also attention to outcomes and to the conditions of human flourishing.

© 2024 IJMRSET | Volume 7, Issue 8, August 2024| DOI:10.15680/IJMRSET.2024.0708091

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 7.521| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

VI. CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE

The accounts of Plato and Aristotle remain relevant to contemporary discussions of justice. Plato's emphasis on the need for knowledgeable and public-spirited rulers finds echoes in arguments for meritocratic selection, for civic education, and for institutional safeguards against corruption. His warning that unchecked appetite and factional conflict destroy political order continues to resonate in analyses of democratic dysfunction. At the same time, liberal and democratic theorists have rejected the concentration of power in a guardian class and have insisted on broader rights of participation and on constitutional limits to authority.

Aristotle's distinction between distributive and corrective justice has influenced modern theories of social justice and of legal remedy. Debates about the fair allocation of resources, offices, and opportunities frequently return to questions of relevant merit and of proportion. Aristotle's attention to the variety of constitutional forms and to the importance of the middle class has informed discussions of mixed government and of the social conditions of political stability. His recognition that law must aim at the common good rather than at the advantage of a particular group supplies a standard for criticising legislation that systematically benefits one section of society.

Both philosophers raise issues that contemporary political theory continues to address. The relation between individual rights and the common good, the role of education in forming citizens, the justification of political authority, and the place of equality in a just society all receive early and systematic treatment in their works. A critical reading does not require acceptance of every institutional proposal they advance. It does require engagement with the questions they pose about the moral foundations of political order and about the conditions under which human beings can live well together.

Plato's rejection of conventional definitions of justice serves a larger purpose. By showing that common opinions lead to contradictions or to the endorsement of injustice, he prepares the ground for a constructive account. The long discussion with Thrasymachus establishes that justice cannot be reduced to the interest of the ruling group. If it could, the stronger would have no reason to restrain themselves, and the city would dissolve into conflict. Socrates' subsequent construction of the ideal city is therefore not a digression. It is an attempt to exhibit a form of order in which the good of each part is compatible with the good of the whole. The functional definition that emerges—each doing its own work—avoids the partiality that characterises the rejected definitions.

The educational programme for the guardians is designed to produce rulers who will not be tempted by private advantage. Music and gymnastics shape character in early years. Mathematics and dialectic later direct the mind toward intelligible reality. The final stage, the vision of the Form of the Good, is presented as the knowledge that enables a ruler to order the city correctly. Plato acknowledges that few will complete this education. The scarcity of suitable rulers is accepted as a fact about human nature. The institutional arrangements that follow—common property, common meals, and the absence of private families—are intended to reinforce the effects of education by removing the ordinary incentives to partiality. Whether these arrangements could sustain themselves over generations remains an open question that Plato himself explores in the later decline of the ideal city.

Aristotle's analysis of distributive justice begins from the observation that people disagree about the relevant standard of merit. Democrats claim that free birth entitles all citizens to equal shares of political power. Oligarchs claim that wealth should determine shares. Aristocrats claim that virtue should be the criterion. Aristotle does not dismiss these claims outright. He notes that each contains a partial truth. Free birth is relevant in a community of citizens; wealth is relevant to the contributions that sustain the city; virtue is relevant to the end for which the city exists. The task of political judgement is to determine which standard, or which combination of standards, best serves the common good in given circumstances. This approach leaves room for constitutional variety while still providing a critical standard.

Corrective justice, in Aristotle's account, operates independently of the distributive principle that governs the allocation of offices and honours. Once a voluntary exchange or an involuntary injury has occurred, the prior merit of the parties is set aside. The aim is simply to restore the equality that the transaction disturbed. This separation allows Aristotle to maintain that a wealthy person who has been defrauded is entitled to restitution even if the defrauder is poor, and that a poor person who has committed theft must make restitution even if the victim is rich. The distinction prevents distributive considerations from undermining the security of transactions. At the same time, it raises the question of

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 7.521| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

how far background inequalities should be allowed to affect the capacity of parties to enter fair transactions in the first place—a question Aristotle does not fully address.

The analogy between city and soul in the Republic is both a methodological device and a substantive claim. Methodologically, it allows Plato to examine justice on a larger scale before returning to the individual. Substantively, it asserts that the same structural relations that produce justice in the city produce justice in the soul. Reason corresponds to the rulers, spirit to the auxiliaries, and appetite to the producers. When each part performs its proper function under the guidance of reason, both the city and the soul are just. Critics have questioned whether the analogy holds with equal force in both directions. The city is composed of separate persons who can be assigned distinct roles; the soul is a single entity whose parts are not similarly separable. Plato appears to treat the analogy as sufficiently close for his purposes, yet the differences between political and psychic order remain a point of continuing discussion.

Aristotle's evaluation of constitutions in the Politics rests on the distinction between correct and deviant forms. Kingship, aristocracy, and polity aim at the common good; tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy aim at the advantage of the rulers. The classification is not merely descriptive. It supplies a normative standard. A constitution is just to the extent that it serves the good life of the citizens rather than the private interests of a section. Aristotle recognises that most actual cities fall short of this standard. He therefore examines ways in which deviant constitutions can be made more stable and less unjust. The recommendations concerning the middle class, the mixture of oligarchic and democratic institutions, and the importance of law all reflect this practical concern. The ideal remains the community ordered toward virtue, yet the analysis extends to the imperfect conditions in which most political life occurs.

Both philosophers confront the problem of how justice can be realised when human beings are imperfect. Plato's solution is to concentrate authority in those who have undergone the most rigorous education and to remove from them the ordinary sources of corruption. Aristotle's solution is to rely on law, on the participation of a reasonably virtuous citizen body, and on constitutional devices that prevent any single group from dominating. The first solution risks creating an unaccountable elite; the second risks diluting the standard of justice in the effort to secure stability. Contemporary readers continue to weigh these risks when they consider proposals for expert rule, for civic education, or for institutional checks on majority power. The ancient texts do not resolve the dilemma, but they state it with unusual clarity.

The place of women and of slaves in the two accounts reveals limits that later traditions have contested. Plato allows women of the guardian class to share in rule if they possess the requisite nature, yet he does not extend this possibility to the majority of women. Aristotle denies that women and slaves possess the full deliberative capacity required for citizenship. Both positions rest on claims about natural differences that subsequent philosophy and political practice have rejected. A critical evaluation must therefore distinguish the formal structure of each theory of justice from the particular applications the authors made. The formal claims—that justice involves proper function or proportional equality—can be assessed independently of the exclusions the philosophers accepted. Such an assessment leaves open the possibility that the core ideas retain value even when their original social applications do not.

VII. CONCLUSION

Plato and Aristotle offer distinct yet related conceptions of justice. Plato presents justice as the harmonious functioning of the parts of the city and of the soul under the direction of reason and philosophical knowledge. Aristotle presents justice as a virtue of proportion that governs the distribution of goods and the rectification of wrongs within a political community ordered toward the common good. Plato's ideal supplies a demanding moral standard but encounters difficulties of practicability and of individual freedom. Aristotle's more empirical account offers greater institutional flexibility yet retains exclusions and leaves the criterion of merit open to dispute. The critical evaluation of both accounts clarifies enduring problems in political philosophy: the relation between knowledge and authority, the meaning of equality, and the connection between personal virtue and the structure of the political community. These problems remain central to contemporary reflection on justice.

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 7.521| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

REFERENCES

1. Plato. (1992). Republic (G. M. A. Grube, Trans.; C. D. C. Reeve, Rev.). Hackett.
2. Aristotle. (1999). Nicomachean ethics (T. Irwin, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Hackett.
3. Aristotle. (1998). Politics (C. D. C. Reeve, Trans.). Hackett.
4. Annas, J. (1981). An introduction to Plato's Republic. Oxford University Press.
5. Kraut, R. (1992). The defense of justice in Plato's Republic. In R. Kraut (Ed.), The Cambridge companion to Plato (pp. 311–337). Cambridge University Press.
6. Vlastos, G. (1973). The theory of social justice in the polis in Plato's Republic. In G. Vlastos, Platonic studies (pp. 111–139). Princeton University Press.
7. Irwin, T. (1995). Plato's ethics. Oxford University Press.
8. Miller, F. D. (1995). Nature, justice, and rights in Aristotle's Politics. Oxford University Press.
9. Keyt, D. (1991). Aristotle's theory of distributive justice. In D. Keyt & F. D. Miller (Eds.), A companion to Aristotle's Politics (pp. 238–278). Blackwell.
10. Broadie, S. (1991). Ethics with Aristotle. Oxford University Press.
11. Cooper, J. M. (1999). Reason and emotion: Essays on ancient moral psychology and ethical theory. Princeton University Press.
12. Nussbaum, M. C. (1986). The fragility of goodness: Luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy. Cambridge University Press.
13. Schofield, M. (2006). Plato: Political philosophy. Oxford University Press.
14. Rowe, C., & Schofield, M. (Eds.). (2000). The Cambridge history of Greek and Roman political thought. Cambridge University Press.
15. Mulgan, R. G. (1977). Aristotle's political theory. Oxford University Press.
16. Barker, E. (1959). The political thought of Plato and Aristotle. Dover.



INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

| Mobile No: +91-6381907438 | Whatsapp: +91-6381907438 | ijmrset@gmail.com |

www.ijmrset.com