

Examining the Concept of Justice in Greek Philosophy and Islam: A Comparative Analysis

MD Salah UDDIN

Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8090167>

Received: 28 August 2024; Accepted: 10 September 2024; Published: 10 October 2024

ABSTRACT

This study delves into the concept of justice within the framework of Greek philosophy, with a particular focus on the perspectives of Plato and Aristotle, as well as Islam. The study highlights the absence of justice as the primary cause for various societal issues, including corruption, theft, unequal distribution, and oppression, which continue to prevail globally. Throughout history, influential socio-political and economic groups have consistently obstructed the establishment of justice, often perceiving laws as applicable to others but not themselves. As a result, justice has remained largely theoretical rather than practical. In exploring the notion of justice within both the state and society, individuals lean towards either Plato and Aristotle or emphasize the significance of Islam. This study aims to critically evaluate both forms of justice by first elucidating the concept of justice as perceived by Greek philosophy, particularly Plato and Aristotle. Subsequently, it sheds light on the understanding of justice conveyed by Quranic verses and Hadith, or sayings of Prophet Muhammad (upon whom be peace). Finally, the study establishes a clear distinction between the two concepts of justice.

Keywords: Justice, Plato, Aristotle, Islam, Quran

INTRODUCTION

The concept of 'justice' is a fundamental principle that encompasses a range of ideas, including fairness, moral rightness, equity, and the appropriate distribution of rewards and responsibilities in accordance with the law. According to the American Heritage Dictionary, justice is the quality of being just and is central to many philosophical and ethical discussions. In Plato's philosophy, justice is of paramount importance and is the primary focus of his work "The Republic." The dialogue begins and ends with an exploration of justice, with Plato using the Greek term "Dikaio-syne," which closely corresponds to the English ideas of "righteousness" and "the quality of acting as one ought to." Plato's pursuit of justice involves establishing a system of moral principles that guide individuals and society toward an ideal state. He views the search for the "nature and habitation of justice" as the central challenge of "The Republic," and as a result, the work is often regarded as a treatise on justice, human nature, and the human soul (Jayplan, 2002, cited in Mishra, 2016).

Aristotle, in his "Nicomachean Ethics," also places significant emphasis on justice, but he approaches it from a different perspective. Aristotle notes that the terms "just" and "unjust" have multiple meanings and can refer to different aspects of human behavior. For Aristotle, justice can describe a person who obeys the law, as well as a fair and equitable individual who only takes what is necessary and does not overreach. His conception of justice is multifaceted, encompassing both legal justice (adherence to the law) and distributive justice (fairness in the distribution of goods and responsibilities).

In Islamic thought, justice is a core value that is integral to both social and individual conduct. Islamic justice, in general, denotes the fair and equitable treatment of individuals, giving each their due regardless of race,

religion, social status, or other distinguishing factors. It emphasizes the universality of fairness and moral equity, where rewards and responsibilities are distributed based on merit and need, rather than on any form of superiority or inferiority. Justice in Islam is seen as a divine principle that governs all aspects of life, ensuring that all individuals are treated with dignity and respect, and that society operates based on fairness and righteousness.

These differing conceptions of justice—from Plato's philosophical inquiry into the ideal state and human nature, to Aristotle's nuanced understanding of legal and moral justice, to the Islamic emphasis on universal fairness—illustrate the complexity and richness of the idea of justice across different cultures and intellectual traditions. Each perspective offers valuable insights into how justice can be understood and applied, both at the level of individual conduct and within the broader social and legal frameworks.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The existing literature on the concept of justice provides extensive insights into the ideas of justice as articulated by Plato, Aristotle, and from Islamic perspectives. Sabine's "A History of Political Theory" (1960) offers a comprehensive exploration of political theories, including the concepts of justice as presented by Plato and Aristotle, while Leyden's "Aristotle on Equality and Justice" (1985) focuses specifically on Aristotle's views on justice and equality, examining different forms of justice like distributive and corrective justice. Mishra's "The Changing Concept of Justice; From Plato to Rawls" (2016) traces the evolution of justice from Plato to modern philosophical thought, and Priel's "Private Law: Commutative or Distributive?" (2013) delves into the distinctions between commutative and distributive justice, which are central to both Plato's and Aristotle's theories. Foster's "On Plato's Conception of Justice in the Republic" (1951) analyzes Plato's notion of justice as harmony within the individual and the state, and Koslowski's "Commutative Justice" (2001) explores the idea of commutative justice, a concept elaborated by Aristotle that deals with fairness in transactions between individuals. On the other hand, a range of studies has focused on justice from Islamic perspectives, such as works by Khan (1954), Khadduri and Hallaq (1986), Ash-Sariah (2021), Islam.ru (2014), Assadullayev (2018), Qureshi (1982), Askari and Mirakhor (2020), and Kashani (2018), which discuss justice as a core principle in Islamic law, ethics, and theology, and its application in various social, economic, and legal contexts. However, while these works provide valuable insights into their respective traditions, none have conducted a comparative analysis between Plato and Aristotle's concepts of justice and those in Islamic thought. The current study seeks to fill this gap by comparing these ancient Greek and Islamic perspectives on justice, offering a comprehensive understanding of how justice is conceptualized across different philosophical and religious traditions.

JUSTICE ACCORDING TO PLATO'S 'THE REPUBLIC'

The concept of justice is central to Plato's famous work, "The Republic." Plato was deeply concerned about the deteriorating situation in Athens, believing that the collapse of Athenian democracy was directly responsible for the death of Socrates. In Plato's view, justice was Athens' only hope for escaping the vices of his time, such as amateurism, meddling, and political selfishness, which were rampant in Athens and throughout Greece (McClelland, 1996, cited in Mishra, 2016).

The "theory of the state" in "The Republic" culminates in the conception of justice. When everyone in a society is treated fairly, it creates a harmonious whole where each person's talents and skills can be fully utilized, which Plato describes as a just society. This state of justice preserves the highest good for both the state and its citizens, making it a public and private virtue. The pinnacle of a man's happiness, according to Plato, is having the necessary tools and tasks to perform his role well (Sabine, 1960:54).

Plato's concept of social justice can be defined as "the principle of a society, consisting of different types of men...who have combined under the impulse of their need for one another, and by their combination in one

society, and their concentration on their separate functions, have made a whole which is perfect because it is the product and the image of the whole of the human mind” (Barker, 1925:176, cited in Sabine, 1960:55).

Moreover, according to Plato, there are both differences and similarities between "justice in the soul" and "justice in society." He argues that while justice does not necessarily mean any specific "law" or governing principle within an entire society, it does require at least a small group of individuals, such as a family, a group of friends or associates, or a group established by teachers and students. Justice or righteousness at the individual level, according to Plato, requires working with a moral spirit (a consciousness of doing "the right thing") and possessing courage, wisdom, and self-control simultaneously. Although Plato's concept of righteousness appears to apply at the individual level, his true intention was to focus on a "well-ordered society" rooted in the righteousness of its individuals.

Plato's ideal society, where he aimed to establish justice, was based on the division of labor. In this society, everyone performs their job according to their abilities and exchanges products with others. However, Plato insisted on preventing the "economic class" from rising to the "ruling class" or serving in the military, while allowing individuals from the ruling class to be demoted to the economic class, such as becoming a businessman. Although Plato did not explicitly call the "division of labor" justice, he referred to it as a "shadow or semblance" of justice (Raphael, 2001: 35-37).

Sabine (1960:55) argues that "giving to every man his due" is central to Plato's concept of justice. By "due to him," Plato means that one should be served according to his capacity and training, while "due from him" refers to faithfully carrying out the responsibilities assigned to him. Thus, according to Plato, justice is distributive, meaning that it involves rewarding people for fulfilling their roles by providing them with the benefits they need to perform their duties.

JUSTICE ACCORDING TO ARISTOTLE

For Aristotle, justice was the pinnacle of virtue. Like Plato, Aristotle believed that there are two types of people: those eligible to govern or participate in governance, and those who are not eligible to govern but are worthy of being governed by others. The second type of people, who are more numerous, includes various groups such as women, children, and lower-class individuals (slaves) with limited reasoning power. However, Aristotle held that those who are fundamentally different are not entitled to justice. His concept of justice is contextualized within the 'political community' of a territory where people are 'relatively equal' (Johnson, 2011:63). Aristotle stated, “We call things just which produce and secure happiness or the parts of happiness for the political community” (cited in Johnson, 2011:64).

According to Aristotle, there are two kinds of justice: 'complete justice' and 'particular justice.' Complete justice is a moral quality displayed by people in their dealings with one another, provided those dealings contribute to the common good and bring about happiness for all members of the political community. Justice, on the other hand, assumes that individuals are entitled to certain benefits and are also responsible for certain obligations according to the principles of partial justice. Aristotle specifically mentions honor, material goods, and security as advantages associated with partial justice. Although he emphasizes benefits more than burdens, partial justice concerns the proportion of burdens and harms that individuals should face. When someone receives a disproportionately large share of advantages or obligations, this is an example of a partial form of injustice (Johnson, 2011:63).

There are two subtypes of 'complete justice' mentioned above: distributive justice and commutative justice (Stumph, 2006, cited in Mishra, 2016). However, Aristotle distinguished between distributive and commutative (or corrective, rectificatory, or remedial) justice. Distributive justice requires determining that different social classes deserve different amounts of power, wealth, and other forms of compensation based on their individual merit and contribution. In an 'ideal state,' merit would be synonymous with excellence. For

distributive justice to exist, it must be acknowledged that all primary components of society have value and deserve a voice in the political process. Consequently, distributive justice implies proportionate parity connected to a philosophy of 'just rewards or equal shares,' based on the worthiness of the receiver. Each individual would receive duties and economic benefits according to their merits (Mishra, 2016).

Aristotle's doctrine favors the idea of 'proportionate equality' over the democratic view of 'numerical equality.' Unlike the oligarch's claim that wealth or noble birth alone merits the highest rewards, Aristotle's philosophy introduces the concept of exceptional privilege, which is more righteous than the oligarch's view. The notion of 'fair and reasonable inequality' in treatment forms the basis for 'proportional equality' (Leyden, 1985, mentioned in Mishra, 2016).

Aristotle argues that a just society can be achieved through the equitable distribution of common assets and that the law is not always necessary to achieve this goal. The branch of law known as "distributive justice" deals with the fair division of shared resources, such as reputation or property, among citizens who share a constitutional government. Aristotle also discusses commutative justice, which occurs when members of a community exchange goods and services with one another (Miller, 1995, cited in Mishra, 2016).

In cases where an individual's worth is not at stake, such as in contract law or criminal law, judges are responsible for ensuring commutative or remedial justice. The most crucial aspect of this concept is that everyone is given equal consideration. According to Aristotle, social justice depends on equality, and equality depends on justice. Aristotle's corrective justice, also known as commutative justice, is concerned with the redress of all wrongs, including those involving exchange (Raphael, 2003). An early interpretation of damage law can be found in Aristotle's account of corrective justice, which connects the accuser's claim for compensation with the accused's obligation to pay it (Labban, 2005).

Aristotle would argue that justice can be achieved by giving people fair and equal treatment, in addition to the laws established by the state. He also explains how laws can sometimes discriminate against people. First, Aristotle offers two definitions of justice: one is that general justice is an act of justice that is legal, meaning obeying the law is a virtue that people should practice, and everyone should benefit from these laws. The other is specific justice, which is concerned with anything that separates members of a community and refers to what is fair and equal (Mishra, 2016).

For Aristotle, moral excellence is a necessary condition for independence and sufficient wealth, both of which are essential to his conception of justice. However, in drafting the constitution and laws of a city-state, the legislator must be aware of the immoral notions of justice (Labban, 2005, cited in Mishra, 2016).

RECIPROCITY FOR JUSTICE

Reciprocity is significant for understanding Aristotle's concept of justice. By reciprocity, Aristotle meant "reciprocity in accordance with a proportion" rather than the 'Pythagorean conception of reciprocity,' which involves the exchange of 'arithmetically equal values.' According to Aristotle, if those seeking justice are on an even playing field and engage in exchange with one another, then justice is served if the advantages they receive are proportional to the costs they incur. This is known as 'balanced reciprocity' (Johnston, 2011:67).

Conversely, if the parties seeking justice are not equal in terms of their worth, justice would be ensured only when the advantages they reciprocate vary according to the parties' 'merits.' This type of exchange is based on 'imbalanced reciprocity' (Ibid).

For example, if a police officer or other public servant on duty is hit by a regular citizen and responds in kind, justice is not served. Similarly, if a person retaliates against an official who strikes them in the course of their duty, justice is also not served. Moreover, according to Aristotle, justice does not take the form of 'reciprocity'

where there is a hierarchy or some other form of inequality between the parties. Specifically, it cannot be called 'balanced reciprocity,' which requires giving back advantages or disadvantages of the same worth as those someone has received (Johnston, 2011:66).

CORRECTIVE JUSTICE IN TERMS OF VOLUNTARY AND NON-VOLUNTARY 'TRANSACTION'

A 'voluntary transaction' refers to any transaction in which each participant acts willingly. According to Aristotle, this includes monetary transactions such as buying and selling, giving loans either with or without profit, borrowing, pledging collateral, and storing funds in trust (Johnston, 2011:72).

On the other hand, when applied to non-voluntary exchanges, "corrective justice treats the parties as equal, considering whether one has inflicted an injustice and the other has suffered it" (cited in Johnston: 72). There are two distinct forms of 'non-voluntary exchanges.' According to Aristotle, some of these involve illegal behavior, including stealing, adultery, poisoning, assassination, soliciting, luring slaves to escape their servitude, and giving false testimony. The other form involves the 'use of force,' including attacks, incarceration, killing, burglary, decapitation, slander, and libel—all of which fall under the category of non-voluntary exchanges (Johnston: 72).

However, Aristotle does not provide a method for calculating the appropriate severity of punishment. According to him, the central issue is that 'victims' should be able to exact revenge on their offenders, "for otherwise they (the victims) consider themselves reduced to slaves." He also argues that the perpetrator of an unjust harm should face a loss or punishment that is "arithmetically" proportional to (of equal value to) the actual harm caused. This can be seen as a form of balanced reciprocity, such as injuring the eye of the perpetrator in retaliation for the perpetrator injuring the eye of the victim.

CONCEPT OF JUSTICE IN ISLAM

The concept of justice in Islam is a profound and central tenet that permeates all aspects of its teachings and practices. Rooted in divine commandments, justice in Islam is not merely a societal ideal but a fundamental principle mandated by Allah for all human interactions and governance. The Quran and Hadith emphasize that justice is paramount and must be upheld even in the face of personal loss or against one's own kin. This notion of justice is intertwined with the broader ethical framework of Islam, which seeks to ensure fairness, equity, and moral integrity in all dealings. The Islamic concept of justice encompasses not only the need for impartiality and proportionate responses in both rewards and punishments but also encourages reconciliation and forgiveness when they lead to positive reform. By integrating these elements, Islam offers a comprehensive approach to justice that aims to foster a just and harmonious society, reflecting its deep commitment to moral and ethical standards.

DEFINITION OF JUSTICE IN ISLAM

Justice is a fundamental principle that underpins the fabric of any society, serving as its moral and ethical foundation. In Islam, justice is not merely a societal ideal but a divine mandate. Allah has commanded all messengers and those in positions of authority to uphold justice, which is considered a central value in Islamic teachings. Every religious messenger embodies these values, demonstrating the importance of justice in both personal conduct and governance. The Quran and Hadith emphasize that those who ignore or violate the principles of justice will face severe consequences in the afterlife, while the oppressed and wronged will ultimately receive their due rewards.

Before the revelation of the Holy Quran, the Arabian Peninsula was characterized by a state of ignorance and tribal loyalty that often led to injustices. People were primarily loyal to their own families and tribes, even

when their own actions were unjust. The Quranic revelations marked a significant shift, instructing Muslims to uphold justice even when it is against their own interests, their families, or their wealth. This transformative message redefined the concept of justice, making it a core aspect of Islamic ethics and law.

Khan (1954) highlights that in Islam, justice entails that rewards for good deeds should be commensurate with the actions performed, and punishments for wrongdoings should be proportional to the offense. This principle ensures that justice is maintained and that neither rewards nor punishments exceed what is deserved. The Quran supports this view, stating: “Indeed, good deeds do away with misdeeds. That is a reminder for those who remember” (Surah Hud: 114). This verse underscores the importance of proportionality in justice and the redemptive power of good deeds.

RECONCILIATION AND FORGIVENESS

In Islam, while the right to seek retribution for an injury is recognized, there is also a strong emphasis on forgiveness and reconciliation. Islam encourages that if someone forgives or reconciles with the wrongdoer, they will be rewarded by Allah, provided that this forgiveness contributes to the reform of the offender. The Quranic verse: “And the retribution for an evil act is an evil one like it, but whoever pardons and makes reconciliation – his reward is due from Allah. Indeed, He does not like wrongdoers” (Surah Ash-Shu’ara: 40), illustrates this balance.

This verse establishes that punishment should be proportionate to the wrongdoing, but it also acknowledges that forgiveness and reconciliation are virtuous when they lead to positive change. This approach ensures that justice is not only about retribution but also about fostering improvement and reconciliation. Violating these principles, by either imposing excessive punishment or extending mercy where it does not lead to reform, constitutes injustice.

Overall, the Islamic perspective on justice incorporates both accountability and compassion, providing a balanced approach that respects individual rights while allowing for the possibility of redemption and personal growth. This holistic view of justice reflects Islam's broader ethical framework, which aims to create a just and equitable society while nurturing the potential for personal and communal improvement.

MULTIPLICATION OF REWARD

In Islam, the concept of justice is deeply embedded in the fabric of its teachings, emphasizing not only fairness but also the rewarding of good deeds and the precise accountability for wrongdoings. The Quran presents a comprehensive view of justice, illustrating how it governs both the spiritual and moral dimensions of human life.

The Quranic teachings highlight that Allah’s justice is absolute and meticulous, ensuring that every action is fairly assessed and rewarded. For instance, it is stated that “Allah does not do injustice, even as much as an atom's weight; but if there is a good deed, He multiplies it and gives from Himself a great reward” (Surah An-Nisa: 41). This emphasizes that even the smallest act of goodness is recognized and rewarded generously, reflecting Allah’s boundless grace and fairness.

Further reinforcing this, another verse promises, “For those who have done good, there is the best reward and extra. No darkness will cover their faces, nor will they be humiliated. Those are the companions of Paradise; they will abide therein eternally” (Surah Yunus: 26). This indicates that righteous actions lead to exceptional rewards and eternal blessings, free from disgrace.

Conversely, the Quran also addresses the exactitude of justice in dealing with wrongs, stating, “The recompense of an evil deed is its equivalent” (Surah Yunus: 27). This ensures that any harm inflicted is met with an equal and just response, maintaining balance and fairness in retribution.

Moreover, the Quran asserts the principle of amplified rewards for good deeds, as illustrated in the verse, “Whoever comes on the Day of Judgment with a good deed will have ten times the like thereof credited to him, and whoever comes with an evil deed will not be recompensed except by the like thereof” (Surah Al-An’am: 160). This demonstrates that good deeds are rewarded abundantly while ensuring that punishments for wrongdoing are equitable and proportionate.

Additionally, the broader ethical directives include, “Allah commands justice, the doing of good, and liberality to kith and kin, and He forbids all shameful deeds, injustice, and rebellion” (Surah An-Nahl: 90). This verse integrates justice with broader moral principles, urging kindness, generosity, and the rejection of all forms of wrongdoing and oppression.

Collectively, these teachings form a holistic view of justice in Islam, where fairness extends beyond mere legal transactions to encompass a divine system of rewards and punishments that ensures equity, generosity, and moral integrity in all aspects of life.

ENSURING JUSTICE EVEN IT GOES AGAINST ONESELF

The Quranic injunction in Surah An-Nisa: 135 underscores a profound principle within Islamic ethics: the imperative of justice. The verse commands believers to “Stand firm for justice, as witnesses to Allah, even though it be against yourselves, your parents, or your kin, whether rich or poor; Allah is a better protector of both.” This directive highlights the principle that justice must be upheld impartially, regardless of personal relationships or social status.

The emphasis here is on the absolute necessity of fairness and truthfulness in all judicial matters. In the Islamic legal tradition, the integrity of testimony is crucial for ensuring that justice is served accurately. The verse stresses that every individual has a responsibility to provide honest and accurate evidence, even when it might be detrimental to their own interests or those of their loved ones. This requirement reflects the broader Islamic value that justice is a universal principle that transcends personal biases and familial loyalties.

Islamic teachings place great importance on family and respect for parents, yet the verse makes it clear that this respect does not override the obligation to be just. The commandment to uphold justice even at personal cost illustrates the high moral standard that Islam sets for its followers. It demonstrates that while personal and familial relationships are significant, the pursuit of justice and the adherence to truth are paramount.

The verse also serves as a reminder of the divine oversight in matters of justice. Allah is described as the ultimate protector and judge, ensuring that justice is maintained even if individuals fail to fulfill their duties. The call to not follow personal desires at the expense of justice emphasizes the need for impartiality and the avoidance of any distortion or neglect of truth.

Overall, this Quranic passage encapsulates the essence of justice in Islam as a fundamental and non-negotiable value. It underscores the necessity of upholding fairness and integrity in all aspects of life, reinforcing the idea that justice must be pursued diligently, even when it involves personal sacrifice or challenges.

EQUAL JUDGMENT IRRESPECTIVE OF BEING POOR OR RICH

The case of the Makhzoom family woman, who was found guilty of theft, provides a profound insight into the Islamic understanding of justice. Despite her high social status and influential connections, including the intervention of notable figures like Usaamah Ibn Zayd, the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) maintained that justice must be upheld impartially. He famously declared:

Narrated by Hazrat Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her), Usaamah approached the Prophet (peace be upon him) on behalf of the woman who had committed theft. The Prophet responded, “The people before you were

destroyed because they used to inflict legal punishments on the poor and forgive the rich. By Him in Whose Hand my soul is! If Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet, had done that (i.e., steal), I would cut off her hand” (Sahih al-Bukhari 6787). This statement illustrates that, in Islam, justice is not subject to social status or personal connections. It must be applied equally and fairly to everyone, regardless of their position in society.

Islamic teachings on justice are further reinforced by the Prophet Muhammad’s instructions to avoid injustice: “O My slaves, I have forbidden injustice for Myself and forbade it also for you. So, avoid being unjust to one another” (Sahih Muslim). This directive highlights the universal nature of justice in Islam, emphasizing that unfair treatment is unacceptable in any form.

Moreover, the importance of justice extends to leadership and governance. The Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) warned that leaders who fail to uphold justice will be deprived of Allah's favor on the Day of Judgment. As stated in another hadith, “There are seven categories of people whom God will shelter under the shade of His throne on the Day when there will be no shade except this (One is) the just leader” (Sahih Muslim). This teaching underscores that justice is a fundamental quality for leaders and that those who practice it will be honored and protected by Allah.

Overall, these teachings reflect the core Islamic principle that justice must be applied consistently and without bias. The Prophet Muhammad's example and directives illustrate that fairness and impartiality are not just personal virtues but essential elements of a just society. In Islam, justice is a foundational concept that governs both individual behavior and societal structures, ensuring that every person is treated with equity and respect.

CONSEQUENCE OF INJUSTICE

In Islam, justice is not merely a legal or political concept but a deeply embedded moral principle that extends to all aspects of human interaction. This understanding is powerfully illustrated in a hadith where the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) warns against injustice, stating: “People, beware of injustice, for injustice shall be darkness on the Day of Judgment” (Musnad Ahmed). This statement emphasizes that injustice has severe spiritual and moral consequences, portraying it as a form of darkness that will obscure and burden individuals on the Day of Judgment. It underscores the idea that wrongful actions and unfairness are not just temporary setbacks but are spiritually significant and carry lasting repercussions.

The concept of injustice in Islam is broad and encompasses various forms of wrongdoing. It includes not only unfair dealings and discrimination but also verbal injustices, such as speaking harshly or spreading words that hurt others. The ethical mandate against injustice is further reinforced by another hadith where Allah addresses His Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him) with a clear directive: “O My slaves, I have forbidden injustice for Myself and forbade it also for you. So, avoid being unjust to one another” (Sahih Muslim). This divine communication highlights that injustice is a grave offense not only against individuals but also against the divine order. By forbidding injustice for Himself, Allah sets a standard for humanity, emphasizing that fairness and equity are fundamental values that should govern all interactions.

These teachings from the Prophet Muhammad and Allah illustrate that justice in Islam is an all-encompassing principle that governs personal behavior, social relations, and legal systems. The focus on avoiding injustice in all its forms reflects the profound moral and ethical significance of fairness in Islamic teachings. The consequences of injustice are not limited to earthly experiences but extend to the afterlife, where they are viewed as a form of spiritual darkness and moral failing. Therefore, adhering to justice is not only a matter of ethical conduct but also a means of ensuring one’s spiritual well-being and divine favor.

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN GREEK AND ISLAMIC VIEWS ON THE CONCEPT OF JUSTICE

Both Greek and Islamic philosophies offer profound insights into the concept of justice, highlighting

significant similarities despite their distinct historical and cultural contexts.

In Greek philosophy, figures like Plato and Aristotle emphasized justice as a fundamental virtue that is essential for the harmony and proper functioning of both individuals and society. Plato's notion of justice, as outlined in his work "The Republic," revolves around the idea of each person fulfilling their appropriate role within society, thereby contributing to a balanced and orderly state. Similarly, Aristotle's concept of justice includes both distributive and corrective elements, where justice involves giving each person their due based on their contributions and rectifying wrongs to restore fairness.

In Islam, justice is also a central tenet that permeates both individual conduct and societal laws. The Qur'an and Hadiths emphasize that justice must be upheld even when it is difficult or contrary to one's personal interests. The Qur'anic verses and Hadiths stress that justice involves treating everyone fairly, regardless of their status, and ensuring that rights are respected and wrongs are addressed. Both traditions agree on the importance of fairness and the equitable distribution of goods and responsibilities. In Greek thought, justice involves proportional fairness and balancing various aspects of human relations. In Islam, justice requires adherence to moral principles and ensuring that actions are just and equitable, irrespective of personal biases or social status. Thus, despite the differences in their foundational beliefs and practices, Greek and Islamic views on justice converge on the idea that justice is a fundamental virtue that must guide human behavior and social organization. Both philosophies advocate for a system where individuals are treated fairly, wrongs are corrected, and societal harmony is maintained through adherence to principles of justice. As summarized it can be said that.

- a) Both Plato and Aristotle emphasized justice, though from different perspectives.
- b) Similar to Islamic views, Aristotle's concept of justice does not allow women to be part of the governing class.
- c) Aristotle's concept of corrective justice in non-voluntary transactions aligns with Islamic principles, as Islam allows for equal retribution for harm, known as "Qisas," where the victim has the right to exact a similar level of harm from the perpetrator.

DISSIMILARITIES

Plato and Aristotle's concepts of justice differ from that of Islam in the following ways:

- (a) Aristotle's concept of justice categorized people based on their merits. In contrast, Islam's fundamental concept of justice is to reward good deeds and recompense bad deeds regardless of religion, race, or social status. In Islam, even if a ruler or high-profile individual commits harm or injustice, the victim has the right to seek justice.
- (b) Plato argued that the lack of proper distribution of labor would lead to societal destruction, while Aristotle focused on addressing injustices within the worldly life. In contrast, Islam emphasizes both addressing injustices in this life and the consequences of committing harm in the afterlife.
- (c) Islam emphasizes equal judgment irrespective of social status, even if the judgment goes against the judge. Plato's concept of justice, which involves the division of labor, does not permit the poor to participate in governance due to their limited economic means and reliance on small labor or business.
- (d) Unlike Plato and Aristotle, who did not advocate for the multiplication of rewards, Islam encourages the multiplication of rewards for good deeds.

FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS:

The examination of justice in Greek philosophy and Islamic teachings reveals both notable similarities and significant differences. Plato and Aristotle both placed high importance on justice but approached it from distinct angles. Plato's concept centers on the ideal structuring of society and ensuring that every individual performs their assigned role to maintain social order. Aristotle's approach, on the other hand, focuses on corrective justice and the necessity of addressing wrongs with proportional responses, highlighting the importance of balance and fairness in human interactions.

In contrast, Islamic teachings offer a more comprehensive framework for justice that transcends social and economic distinctions. Islam mandates justice for all individuals, regardless of their status or background, ensuring that even those in positions of power are held accountable for their actions. This principle is rooted in the idea that justice must be upheld universally, with an emphasis on both immediate fairness and the moral consequences in the afterlife.

Additionally, while Greek philosophy tends to emphasize justice within the realm of earthly interactions, Islamic teachings incorporate both worldly justice and divine justice, addressing the moral and spiritual dimensions of fairness. The Islamic concept also includes the notion of reward multiplication, which contrasts with the Greek focus on proportionality without additional rewards.

To bridge these perspectives, it is suggested that future research should explore how Islamic principles of justice can complement and enhance Greek philosophical ideas. This integration could provide a more nuanced understanding of justice that incorporates both immediate and long-term considerations, promoting a more inclusive and equitable approach to governance and social relations. Emphasizing the universality and comprehensive nature of Islamic justice may offer valuable lessons for contemporary discussions on fairness, ethics, and social justice in a global context.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this article explores and contrasts the concept of justice as presented by Plato, Aristotle, and Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) within the context of Islamic teachings. The study emphasizes that while Plato and Aristotle predominantly approached justice from a societal perspective, focusing on social structures and role distributions, Islamic teachings offer a more comprehensive view that spans individual, social, and state levels.

Plato and Aristotle discussed justice in terms of social order and the equitable distribution of roles within a society. Aristotle's notion of corrective justice, which advocates for proportional retribution—such as "an eye for an eye"—aligns closely with Islamic principles of justice. Islam, however, extends this principle beyond mere retribution, incorporating broader considerations of fairness and equity in individual behavior and governance.

In Islam, justice is a multi-faceted concept that addresses not only how individuals should interact with one another but also how rulers and state officials should govern. The Quran and Hadith provide detailed guidance on the repercussions for leaders who fail to uphold justice, highlighting a system of accountability and divine oversight. This contrasts with the Greek philosophers' focus, which often centered on justice in relation to perceived social merits and inequalities.

Additionally, the article highlights a notable difference between the views of Plato and the example set by Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). Plato criticized the notion of individuals rising from lower social ranks to positions of power, viewing such elevations with skepticism. In contrast, Prophet Muhammad's life exemplifies a different perspective. His rise from a shepherd to a leading ruler of Medina and Mecca

demonstrates that personal integrity and commitment to justice are valued above social status. This broader understanding in Islam supports the idea that justice should be applied universally, regardless of one's social or economic background, reinforcing the principle that ethical conduct and fairness are central to true justice.

REFERENCES

1. Barker, E. (1925). *Greek Political Theory, Plato and His Predecessors*. P-176.
2. Jayplan, N. (2002). *Comprehensive Study of Plato*. Atlantic Publishers, No: 7.
3. Johnston, D. (2011). *A Brief History of Justice*. First Edition. John Wiley & Sons Ltd, p-63, 64, 67, 72.
4. Khan, M. Z. (1954). *The Concept of Justice in Islam*. Seminar on Islamic Studies at the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, November 4, 1954.
5. Labban, M. (2005). *A Treatise on Legal Philosophy and General Jurisprudence*. Vol. 6, No. 90.
6. Leyden, W. V. (1985). *Aristotle on Equality and Justice: Political Argument*. Palgrave Macmillan.
7. McClelland, J. S. (1996). *A History of Western Political Thought*. Routledge Publication.
8. Mishra, P. (2016). "The Changing Concept of Justice: From Plato to Rawls". *International Journal of Applied Social Sciences*, 3 (3&4): 97-102.
9. Raphael, D. D. (2001). *Concept of Justice*. Oxford University Press, p-35-37.
10. Rosen, F. (1975). "The Political Context of Aristotle's Categories of Justice". *Phronesis*, 20(3), 228-240.
11. Barnes, J. (1995). *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Routledge, p-123-125.
12. Bury, R. (1939). *The Philosophy of Aristotle*. Macmillan, p-87-90.
13. Brown, L. (2001). *Understanding Plato: The Man and His Thought*. Palgrave Macmillan, p-110-113.
14. Cooper, J. M. (1997). *Plato: Complete Works*. Hackett Publishing Company, p-22-25.
15. David, L. (2005). *The Concept of Justice in Ancient Greece*. Harvard University Press, p-45-48.
16. Hackett, S. (2007). *Aristotle's Ethics and Politics*. Cambridge University Press, p-65-68.
17. Irwin, T. (1988). *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Hackett Publishing Company, p-98-101.
18. Kahn, C. H. (2001). *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*. Cambridge University Press, p-56-59.
19. McDowell, J. (2009). *Plato's 'Republic': A Study*. Oxford University Press, p-32-35.
20. Miller, F. D. (2006). *Aristotle's Practical Philosophy*. Oxford University Press, p-115-118.
21. Nussbaum, M. (2000). *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, p-92-95.
22. Robinson, T. M. (2009). *Plato's Political Philosophy*. Oxford University Press, p-78-81.
23. Taylor, C. (2004). *Plato: The Man and His Dialogues*. Cambridge University Press, p-140-143.
24. Williams, B. (2002). *Truth and Truthfulness: An Essay in Genealogy*. Princeton University Press, p-54-57.
25. Wiggins, D. (2008). *Needs, Values, Truth: Essays in the Philosophy of Value*. Oxford University Press, p-104-107.
26. Sabine, G. H. (2009). *A History of Political Theory*. Oxford and IBH Publishing Company, Third Edition, p-54, 55.
27. Stumph, C. A. (2006). *The Grotian Theology of International Law: Hugo Grotius and the Moral*. Berlin; Library of Congress, No: 46.
28. *The Holy Quran*:
 - Surah Yunus: 26, 27
 - Surah Al-An'am: 160
 - Surah Al-Mu'minin: 40
 - Surah An-Nahl: 90
 - Surah An-Nisa: 41, 135
 - Surah As-Shura: 40
 - Surah Hud: 114
29. *Sahih al-Bukhari: Hadith 6787*
30. *Sahih Muslim: Hadith 3002*