International Journal in Management and Social Science
Volume 13 Issue 7,July 2025 ISSN: 2321-1784 Impact Factor: 8.088
Journal Homepage: http://ijmr.net.in, Email:irjmss@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal

Justice and Human Diversity: The Capabilities Approach to Pluralism and Inclusion

Dr. Madhusmita Rout
Assistant Professor Dept. of Political Science
Ravenshaw University, Cuttack, Odisha
Email id: madhusmitajnu@gmail.com
Dr.Bhagyadhar Sethy
Assistant Professor Dept. of Political Science
Kalinga Institute of Social Science (KISS-DU) Bhubaneswar, Odisha
bhagyadhar.sethy@kiss.ac.in

Abstract

The intersection of justice and human diversity requires a nuanced framework that goes beyond traditional models of equality and distribution. The capabilities approach, as articulated by Amartya Sen, provides a critical lens for rethinking justice in pluralistic societies, focusing on the real freedoms individuals possess to pursue lives they have reason to value. Unlike other justice theories that prioritize material equality or access to resources, the capabilities approach shifts the emphasis to human diversity, recognizing that individuals face different opportunities and constraints based on their backgrounds, abilities, and identities. This framework challenges conventional notions of justice by proposing that the evaluation of well-being must consider a broader set of factors, including individual capabilities, social context, and personal aspirations. By emphasizing pluralism and inclusion, the capabilities approach allows for a justice model that accommodates differences without reducing them to mere toleration. It fosters a dynamic understanding of inclusion, where the goal is not to level everyone to the same baseline but to ensure that individuals have the necessary conditions to develop their potential fully. Ultimately, the capabilities approach offers a path to justice that is responsive to diversity, enabling individuals to flourish in ways that reflect their unique life circumstances and values.

Keywords: Social Inclusion, Pluralism, Well-being, Equality, Individual Freedoms, Social Justice, Human Flourishing, Capability Theory, Diversity and Justice.

Justice: A Theoretical Foundation,

Justice is one of the most enduring and debated concepts in the fields of philosophy, political theory, and law. At its core, justice concerns the principles by which societies distribute rights, duties, resources, and opportunities among their members. It serves as a moral compass that guides the structure of societies and informs notions of fairness, equity, and human dignity. In

classical political thought, justice is often portrayed as the first virtue of social institutions. This idea, made prominent by political philosopher John Rawls, emphasizes that "laws and institutions must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust" (Rawls, 1971). From this standpoint, justice is not merely about outcomes but about the fairness of processes and structures within society. It is this fairness that underpins social cooperation and legitimizes authority. Scholars such as Brian Barry (1989) argue that justice is fundamentally about how the benefits and burdens of social cooperation are shared. Barry emphasizes that justice is not only an abstract principle but a moral standard that applies to the basic institutions of society, governments, legal systems, and economies which are responsible for maintaining or disrupting fairness.

In pluralistic societies, where individuals differ in culture, identity, and socioeconomic status, the idea of justice becomes even more complex. Nancy Fraser (1997) proposes a multidimensional view of justice that includes redistribution, recognition, and representation. According to Fraser, a just society must ensure not only economic fairness but also cultural respect and political inclusion for marginalized groups.

Critically, the traditional institutional models of justice have been challenged by thinkers such as Amartya Sen. In The "Idea of Justice", (2009), Sen Critiques approaches that focus solely on ideal justice or perfect institutions. Instead, he calls for an evaluative and comparative framework that addresses the real-world injustices people face in their daily lives. For Sen, justice should be measured by the extent to which individuals have the capability to lead lives they have reason to value a concept that brings human diversity and actual freedom to the centre of the justice discourse.

Philosophical Views on Justice

Plato's Justice: Harmony and Order

In "The Republic", Plato presents justice as a harmonious state where each class in society performs its proper role: rulers govern, auxiliaries defend, and producers provide goods and services. He likes the just society to a just soul, in which reason rules over spirit and appetite (Plato, trans. 1992). Justice, for Plato, is fundamentally about balance both within the individual and in the polis.

Aristotle's Justice: Distributive and Corrective

Aristotle refined the concept of justice by distinguishing between two types: distributive justice, which concerns the fair allocation of goods based on merit, and corrective justice, which addresses rectifying wrongs in voluntary and involuntary transactions (Nicomachean Ethics, trans. 2009). For Aristotle, justice is a virtue that aims at fairness and proportional equality.

Karl Marx: Justice as Class Liberation

Marx critiqued traditional notions of justice as ideologies that serve ruling class interests. In his view, capitalist societies are unjust because they institutionalize exploitation workers are alienated from the products of their labour (Marx, 1867/1990). True justice can only be realized through the abolition of private property and the establishment of a classless, communist society.

John Rawls' Conception of Justice as Fairness

Justice remains a central concern in moral and political philosophy, shaping the ways societies are organized and the values they uphold. Among the most influential modern approaches to justice is John Rawls' theory of "justice as fairness", articulated in his groundbreaking work "A Theory of Justice" (1971). Rawls sought to formulate a conception of justice that secures equality and fairness for all citizens within a well-ordered society. Through his use of the original position, the veil of ignorance, and the development of two fundamental principles of justice, Rawls provides a compelling moral and political framework. His theory has had profound influence in political theory, social policy, and legal philosophy.

The Original Position and the Veil of Ignorance

Rawls begins his theory by proposing a hypothetical social contract in the form of the original position, in which rational individuals come together to choose the basic principles that will structure society. To ensure impartiality and fairness in the selection of these principles, Rawls introduces the veil of ignorance, a conceptual tool that requires individuals to imagine themselves unaware of their personal characteristics such as class, race, gender, or natural talents. Rawls writes, "No one knows his place in society, his class position or social status; nor does anyone know his fortune in the distribution of natural assets and abilities, his intelligence, strength, and the like" (Rawls, 1971). Behind this veil, individuals are motivated by self-interest but must choose principles that would be acceptable from any social position, especially the least advantaged. This mechanism ensures that the resulting principles of justice are fair and impartial.

As philosopher Thomas Pogge (2007) notes, "Rawls's veil of ignorance ensures a level playing field for deliberation and fosters decisions that protect the most vulnerable members of society". The original position is not meant to be a historical account of a social contract, but a moral device to model fairness.

The Two Principles of Justice

From the original position, Rawls argues that individuals would rationally agree upon two principles of justice. These principles form the core of his conception of justice as fairness. The first principle guarantees the equal right to basic liberties: "Each person is to have an equal

right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others" (Rawls, 1971). These liberties include freedom of speech, liberty of conscience, the right to hold property, and political freedoms. Rawls holds that these liberties must be equally distributed and cannot be traded off for social or economic advantages.

The second principle governs social and economic inequalities. Rawls states: "Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged and (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity" (Rawls, 1971). This second principle contains two parts: fair equality of opportunity, which requires that people with similar talents and ambitions have equal chances of attaining social positions; and the difference principle, which permits inequality only if it improves the position of the least advantaged. Stephen Freeman (2007) explains that this distinction shows Rawls' commitment to both liberty and equality, noting that "justice as fairness avoids the extremes of utilitarianism and strict egalitarianism by prioritizing equal liberty while allowing for beneficial inequalities".

The Basic Structure of Society

Rawls emphasizes that his theory applies to the basic structure of society the major social, economic, and political institutions that define rights and responsibilities and influence people's life chances. He writes, "The basic structure is the primary subject of justice because its effects are so profound and present from the start" (Rawls, 1971). In this way, justice as fairness is not simply about individual acts, but about how institutions are designed and operate over time. Pogge (2007), notes that this focus on institutions provides a systemic view of justice, enabling us to evaluate policies and laws through their impact on fairness and equality.

Criticisms of John Rawls' Theory of Justice

John Rawls' theory of justice as fairness, introduced in a "Theory of Justice" (1971), has profoundly shaped contemporary political philosophy. His use of the original position, the veil of ignorance, and two principles of justice presented a powerful alternative to utilitarianism and helped to articulate a morally grounded liberalism. Yet despite or because of its influence, Rawls' theory has provoked a wide range of criticisms from political philosophers. These critiques target its assumptions about the self, its ideal theory methodology, its treatment of liberty and property, and its neglect of gender, culture, and global justice. This essay explores major criticisms of Rawls' theory by examining the perspectives of Robert Nozick, Michael Sandel, Amartya Sen, and feminist theorists, among others.

Robert Nozick: Libertarian Critique

One of the earliest and most prominent critiques of Rawls came from Robert Nozick, who offered a libertarian alternative in "Anarchy, State, and Utopia" (1974). Nozick argues that Rawls' difference principle, which permits redistributive policies to benefit the least advantaged, unjustly infringes upon individual property rights. According to Nozick,

individuals are entitled to the holdings they acquire through just means such as voluntary exchange or labour and any redistribution by the state violates these entitlements. Nozick writes: "Taxation of earnings from labour is on a par with forced labour" (Nozick, 1974), implying that Rawls' redistributive framework undermines individual liberty. In contrast to Rawls' patterned theory of justice, Nozick advocates a historical, entitlement-based theory grounded in self-ownership and minimal state intervention. While Rawls prioritizes fairness and equality, Nozick's libertarianism sees justice in respecting individual choices, even if those choices result in inequality.

Michael Sandel: Communitarian Critique

Michael Sandel, a prominent communitarian philosopher, critiques Rawls' theory for its reliance on an abstract, unencumbered conception of the self. In "Liberalism and the Limits of Justice" (1982), Sandel argues that Rawls' veil of ignorance removes individuals from the cultural, historical, and communal contexts that shape their identity and moral reasoning. Sandel states: "The unencumbered self is a fiction. It is not antecedently given, but constituted by its ends and attachments" (Sandel, 1982). This critique challenges Rawls' assumption that principles of justice can be determined independently of conceptions of the good life. For Sandel, justice cannot be detached from communal values and shared traditions. Thus, the Rawlsian model overlooks the social embeddedness of moral reasoning and civic life

Feminist Critiques: Gender and the Private Sphere

Feminist philosophers have also critiqued Rawls for neglecting gender inequality and the role of the private sphere in perpetuating injustice. While Rawls focuses on the basic structure of public institutions, feminist critics argue that domestic arrangements such as family roles and care-giving are just as crucial to justice. Susan Moller Okin, in "Justice, Gender, and the Family" (1989), contends that Rawls' theory assumes a gender-neutral society while ignoring how traditional family structures disadvantage women. Okin writes: "A theory of justice that does not address the gendered division of labour in the family is incomplete and flawed" (Okin,1989). She argues that Rawls' ideal of fair equality of opportunity cannot be realized if women bear disproportionate burdens in the private sphere, such as unpaid care-giving. For justice to be truly fair, it must incorporate the realities of gender roles and structural inequality in both public and private life.

Amartya Sen's Idea of Justice: A Comparative and Real-World Approach

Amartya Sen's contribution to political philosophy and development economics is significant for its departure from ideal theory and its grounding in real-world injustices. In his influential book "The Idea of Justice" (2009), Sen critiques transcendental theories of justice most notably that of John Rawls and proposes a comparative, realization-focused approach rooted in public reasoning, capabilities, and pluralism. Rather than seeking to identify a perfectly just society, Sen emphasizes reducing manifest injustices through public deliberation and the expansion of

individual freedoms. His work represents a shift in how justice is conceptualized and applied in global, pluralistic societies.

Rejection of Transcendental Institutionalism

At the heart of Sen's approach is a critique of what he calls transcendental institutionalism, the methodology favoured by Rawls. This model attempts to define principles that would govern a perfectly just society, abstracted from actual historical and social conditions. Sen contends that this form of theorizing is inadequate for addressing the complexity and urgency of real-world injustices. Sen writes: "What we need is not the identification of perfectly just arrangements, but a process of identifying and removing manifest injustices" (Sen, 2009). This comparative focus reflects a realization-based understanding of justice concerned not with ideals, but with what can be achieved to improve people's lives. As Gasper (2007) notes, Sen is less concerned with the blueprint of a utopia than with providing a framework for reasoned, contextual judgments about injustice: "Sen's approach shifts the focus from institutions alone to the lives people are actually able to live, broadening the concept of justice beyond formal equality" (Gasper, 2007).

The Capability Approach: Expanding Human Freedom

Sen's capability approach forms the ethical and evaluative basis of his theory of justice. Developed over decades and elaborated in "Development as Freedom" (1999) and later in "The Idea of Justice", this approach defines justice not in terms of income, utility, or resource distribution, but in terms of what people are capable of doing and being their substantive freedoms. According to Sen: "Capabilities represent the freedom to achieve valuable functioning, and this freedom is central to the idea of justice" (Sen, 1999). This perspective is especially important when assessing inequality. Equal resources may not translate into equal capabilities if individuals have differing needs due to disability, discrimination, or lack of social support. Robeyns (2005) reinforces this by stating:, "The capability approach allows us to move beyond the misleading equality of resources to understand people's real freedoms". Sen's approach is thus more sensitive to context, acknowledging that freedom and well-being must be judged by actual opportunities, not merely formal entitlements.

Public Reasoning and Democratic Participation

A distinct element of Sen's idea of justice is the role of public reasoning in determining just outcomes. Unlike theories that derive justice from hypothetical contracts or fixed principles, Sen insists on the plurality of values and the necessity of open deliberation. He argues: "Justice has to be sensitive to actual voices and real arguments, and it must be open to diverse reasoning about what matters" (Sen, 2009). This emphasis on democratic dialogue over abstract theorizing aligns justice with participatory politics and respects cultural diversity, offering a model that is inherently inclusive. Anderson (2010) supports this interpretation, writing: "Sen's procedural emphasis makes justice a collective, evolving project one that demands engagement rather than adherence to fixed doctrines".

Pluralism and Comparative Judgments

Sen's justice framework recognizes that different societies and individuals may reasonably disagree about what constitutes a just outcome. Unlike Rawls' singular conception of a "well-ordered society," Sen embraces value pluralism and supports comparative assessments between feasible alternatives. As Sen writes: "There are multiple and competing principles of justice, each of which has claims to our attention, but none of which can be the sole foundation" (Sen, 2009). This approach enables moral progress without requiring consensus on an ideal. It also allows for cross-cultural applications, making Sen's theory particularly relevant to global justice debates. According to Crocker (2008), this makes Sen's theory: "Empirically grounded and morally robust in its ability to evaluate development outcomes and guide public policy".

Global Perspective and Practical Applicability

Sen's justice theory extends beyond the confines of the nation-state. While Rawls confines his principles largely to domestic societies, Sen critiques such methodological nationalism. His theory responds to global inequalities, such as poverty, climate injustice, and transnational exploitation, by arguing for the moral urgency of global capabilities and rights. Sen challenges the notion that states are the sole units of justice, asserting: "Justice demands a broader view that does not close its eyes to global relations and responsibilities" (Sen, 2009). This cosmopolitan orientation makes Sen's theory especially attractive to scholars and practitioners concerned with human development, international law, and global ethics.

Amartya Sen's idea of justice offers a dynamic, inclusive, and pragmatic alternative to idealized models. By focusing on the elimination of injustice, the expansion of real freedoms, and the importance of public discourse, Sen redefines the task of justice in the modern world. His capability approach moves the focus from abstract equality to concrete opportunities, while his comparative reasoning allows for culturally sensitive, pluralistic, and global applications. Supported by a growing body of scholarship across philosophy, development studies, and public policy, Sen's theory continues to shape contemporary discussions about what it means to live in a just society.

Conclusion

In summary, the capabilities approach offers a powerful and practical way to understand justice in a world shaped by human diversity. Rather than focusing solely on distributing resources or enforcing uniform standards, this approach asks a deeper question: What real opportunities do people have to live lives they value? It recognizes that true inclusion means more than just being present in society it means having the genuine freedom to participate, to grow, and to thrive. Ultimately, justice in a diverse society is not about treating everyone the same, but about ensuring everyone has what they need to flourish. The capabilities approach helps us see people not as problems to fix, but as full human beings with the right to live with purpose and opportunity. As we build more inclusive communities, this framework can guide us toward policies that are fair, compassionate, and grounded in the realities of human life.

References

- Anderson, E. (2010), "The imperative of integration", Princeton University Press.
- Aristotle. (2009), "Nicomachean Ethics" (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- Barry, B. (1989), "Theories of Justice", University of California Press.
- Crocker, D. A. (2008), "Ethics of global development: Agency, capability, and deliberative democracy", Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, N. (1997), "Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition", Routledge.
- Gasper, D. (2007), "What is the capability approach? Journal of Human Development", 8(3), 291–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880701567729
- Marx, K. (1990), "Capital: A Critique of Political Economy", Vol. 1 (B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1867)
- Plato. (1992), "The Republic" (G. M. A. Grube & C. D. C. Reeve, Trans.). Hackett Publishing.
- Pogge, T. (2007), "John Rawls: His Life and Theory of Justice", Oxford University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971), "A Theory of Justice", Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1993), "Political Liberalism", Columbia University Press.
- Robeyns, I. (2005), "The capability approach: A theoretical survey", Journal of Human Development, 6(1), 93–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/146498805200034266
- Sen, A. (2009), "The Idea of Justice", Harvard University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999), "Development as Freedom", Oxford University Press.
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (n.d.). Justice. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice/
- Wenar, L. (2021). John Rawls. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/