https://doi.org/10.69974/glslawjournal.v3i1.36

Law, Justice and Globalisation

Professor Srikrishna Deva Rao[1]

Abstract

Law and justice are inter-related and interconnected concepts. More often, the concept of justice is perceived from the lens of the administration of justice, where the state institutions are responsible for guaranteeing justice. Justice is an important virtue of all social institutions and significant part of law and justice system. Indeed, securing justice is the ultimate aim and purpose of the law.

Justice as an individual virtue guides legal and moral theory and acts as the framework for ethical behaviour. The conception of justice is widely based on what is morally acceptable behaviour that conforms to the socially acceptable principles. Justice is an evolving idea that has the potential to produce harmony between different groups and communities in the society. Today, globalisation has transcended the world and integrated human beings and societies. It is in this context, it is pertinent to explore the relationship between law, justice and globalisation and analyse the role of law as a means to secure justice with the advent of globalisation.

In this article, I will briefly explore four ideas centred on law, justice and globalisation. The first part will discuss the notion of justice and its interrelationship with law. The second part will analyse the different dimensions of justice. The theories of justice are explained in third part introducing John Rawls, Robert Nozick and Amartya Sen and preliminary reflections on globalisation by Santos, William Twining and Upendra Baxi. The last part will look at the ameliorative aspect of justice which is access to justice.

Law and justice and its interrelationship:

People have always wondered about justice as long as they have talked about the law. Justice is often claimed as something inherent in law or sometimes justice may be a measure of testing law. So, in a system of rules, that is, law, apart from its substantive content, some procedural aspects of it should also have justice inherent in it. Fairness in procedural law has been given the same significance as that of

[1] Professor Srikrishna Deva Rao, Vice Chancellor, National Law University Delhi. I am thankful to Ms. Eluckiaa A. of National Law University Odisha and Mr. Arudhra Rao of NLU Delhi for their inputs in preparing this article.

substantive justice. Even Article 21 of our Constitution guarantees that *"no person shall be deprived of life and personal liberty except according to the procedure established by law".* The Indian Supreme Court in *Maneka Gandhi* (1978), *Hussainara Khatoon* (1980) and several other catenae of cases have held that this "*procedure*" mentioned in Article 21 should be reasonable, just, and fair. The process of importing the 'due process' clause has constitutionalised the criminal justice system in India.

Justice is a discursive concept. In ancient times, it was generally perceived to mean fairness and equity. The *Aristotelian idea of justice* that helped to build the foundation of most '*occidental theories of social justice'* means *to give each one what is due as deserved by him/her.* In the Nicomachean Ethics, it was advocated those goods ought to be distributed to individuals based on their relative claims.[2] This did not mean equality for the person so concerned but rather reward per merit or virtue.

This *Aristotelian idea of justice* prevailed also in the ancient Indian tradition of the *Dharma shastras*. In the Indian context, Justice is broadly depicted as '*Dharma*'. The concept of *Dharma* has attained prominence in the era of the Epic *Mahabharata* and *Dharma* emphatically became synonymous with the idea of justice. *The Mahabharata says clearly, "Whatever has its beginning in Justice that alone is Dharma. Whatever is unjust and oppressive is Adharma (against Dharma)"*[3].

From *Aristotle's* times, it has been controversial to see whether all laws must be contrasted with one's sense of justice. Is it necessary that in all cases, a set of legal rules will bring justice? Is it even possible to understand what will be just in all circumstances? Is it possible to frame rules for all circumstances? Sometimes, do you ever feel that what someone had done is not injustice, but you cannot give reasons for the same? Should the conception of justice always be accompanied by reasoning?

Lord Mansfield famously advised a newly appointed colonial governor to *"consider what you think justice requires and decide accordingly"*.[4] But he told him to *"never give your reasons; for your judgement will probably be right but your reasons will certainly be wrong."*

But the notion of justice is wider than this. Justice is a complex concept and mutually coterminous with law. It is the goal of the law, the central value of the legal system. The general purpose of the law is the realisation of justice. It is the standard for evaluating the law. It is a single exclusive solution for what is just and unjust.

St. Augustine once said, "*Justice being taken away, then, what are kingdoms but great*

[2] Beever, A., 2004. Aristotle on Equity, Law, and Justice. *Legal Theory*, 10(1), pp.33-50.
[3] M.V. Nadkarni, Interrogating the Idea of Justice, 58, IEJ, (2010)
[4] Campbell, J., 1876. *The Lives of the chief justices of England.* Toronto: R. Carswell, Volume 2, Chapter 40.

robberies?" Justice is so integral to the law that not only philosophers, but even ordinary people tend to identify law with justice and therefore the expression '*unjust law*' seems like an oxymoron. Furtherance of justice is thus considered as the primary function of law. Consequently, law devoid of justice seems like a ship without a rudder.

It is difficult to confine the concept of justice within the narrow and strict definitional boundaries. It is not only a 'rule book conception' but also a 'rights-based conception'. Earlier theorists like *John Rawls and Robert Nozick* focused on distributive justice and even in their theories; there was a clear relationship between justice and rights. However, *Ronald Dworkin* grounded justice in rights.[5] Of course, rights have always played a huge role and social choices and political morality were driven and dictated by the considerations of rights. This is evident from the writings of *John Locke*[6] and *Kant*[7]. This can also be found in the American and French constitutions as well. But *Bentham* and *Marx*[8] criticised this. *Bentham* was particularly critical about natural rights and advocated a goal-based theory, utilitarianism.

This created a clear distinction between rights-based justice and goal-based justice. The requirement of a rights-based justice was generated from a concern for some individual interest whereas, the goal-based justice, propagated the desire to do something that will be of interest to the community as a whole.

One of the biggest criticisms of utilitarianism is the status it accords to individual rights. But in a rights-based approach, any interest of a particular individual is not denied even if it is not shared by others. So, the interest of each individual qua individual is sufficient to generate the moral requirement.

But how do we derive these rights? Many of these rights are constituted by certain inherent public goods. But in an intolerant society, the freedom of speech will have a diminished value.[9] *Joseph Raz* said that it is a *"public good, and inherently so, that this society is a tolerant society, that it is an educated society, that it is infused with a sense of respect for human beings, etc. Living in a society with these characteristics is generally of benefit to individuals"*.[10]

In a democratic country, rights play a significant role, they are valuable commodities. *Feinberg* remarked that "[a] *world without rights, no matter how full of*

[5] Dworkin, R., 1978. *Taking rights seriously*. London: Duckworth.
[6] McClure, K., 1996. *Judging Rights*.
[7] Gewirtz, A., 1995. *Reason and Morality*. Chicago, III.: Univ. of Chicago Pr.
[8] Campbell, T., 1983. *The Left and Rights.* London: Routledge.
[9] Mill, J.S., 1859. *On Liberty*. [S.I]: Arcturus.
[10] Joseph Raz, Ethics in the Public Domain (1994). Raz, J., 1994. *Ethics in the Public Domain.* Oxford: Claredon press.

benevolence and devotion to duty, would suffer an immense moral impoverishment … A World with claim-rights is one in which all persons, as actual or potential claimants, are dignified objects of respect."[11]

Dworkin, however, said justice is grounded in rights and therefore, if a judge commits an error about a lawfully guaranteed right then it is a "*matter of injustice*".[12] *Dworkin* believed that rights triumphed over the justification for political decisions. To quote one of his controversial examples, *"if someone has a right to publish pornography, this means that it is for some reason wrong for officials to act in violation of that right, even if they (correctly) believe that the community as a whole would be better if they did"*.[13]

Even then, *Dworkin* himself concedes that there may be circumstances where interference with the right of an individual may be justified, and he calls them "*special grounds*".[14] He says that "*rights*" are not gifts from gods but those who take rights seriously should accept the ideas of human dignity and political equality.

Justice should not merely be confined to the distribution of power, rights, opportunity, and self-respect, wealth, income, etc. The scope of justice is broader than distributive justice. There are many dimensions to the concept of justice. The political thought of the time period has always influenced the conception of justice. In ancient times, justice was regarded as a virtue of the society as a whole and focused on the well-orderedness of institutions that promoted happiness and harmony among citizens. However, modern thought does not have conception and now focuses on liberating individuals to define his or her ends. I will briefly discuss the various theories of justice.

Theories of Justice:

JOHN RAWLS

John Rawls propounded his principles of justice in the Theory of Justice in 1971.[15] It is a magnum opus and a standard reference to contemporary debates on Justice. It builds on a rights-respecting welfare state. Rawls's theory of justice is a significant shift from the 'old faith' of utilitarianism. Utilitarians accepted inequalities and the social arrangements were such that some people benefitted at the expense of others. He suggested that the political sphere must be based on a doctrine of human rights protecting specific basic liberties and interests of individuals. He focuses on the

[11] Feinberg, J., 1966. Duties, Rights, and Claims, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 3 (2): 137-144.
[12] Dworkin, n4.
[13] Dworkin, R., 1985. *A Matter of Principle*.
[14] Dworkin n4.
[15] To know more about *Rawls'* work, see Pogge, T., 2007. *John Rawls: His Life and Theory of Justice*.

maximisation of liberty with constraints that are essential to protect liberty itself. *Rawls* introduces a concept of *'original position'* and *'veil of ignorance'*.

According to him, a group of rational individuals will come together and agree upon a set of principles which will be the general notion of justice. He makes certain assumptions here. He says that the decision will be made by them acting in rational self-interest and with the knowledge about the set of competing claims. Since these rational individuals are wearing a veil of ignorance, they will be ignorant about certain things like their age, gender, height, physical abilities, economic status, class position, social status, intelligence, natural talents, and other things that may physically distinguish from one another. In these conditions when they are not aware of these characteristics, *Rawls* says that their resultant set of principles will be fair. Thus, his theory is about justice as fairness.

The technique used by this set of rational principles to arrive at the notion of justice is called *"reflective equilibrium*". There are certain general principles and they may be the existing principles or principles introduced by rational persons. These general principles are compared and contrasted with the considered judgments to arrive at an equilibrium. For example, slavery may be the existing general principle but according to our considered judgment, we know that slavery is wrong and inhuman so the rational persons in original position wearing a veil of ignorance will reject slavery after attaining a reflective equilibrium. So the resultant decision in a reflective equilibrium is either to change the existing principle or to change the considered judgment.

We all agree with *John Rawls* about the importance of justice as first basic virtue of society. The primary subject of justice is wherein fundamental rights and duties determine social cooperation. *Rawls* focuses on creating a just society. He emphasised on social cooperation. His theory focuses on a set of principles on social arrangements and he wants to assign rights and duties and significant aspects of all institutions in society. He stresses upon a shared concept of justice "where everyone accepts and agrees the same principles of justice that guides societies."

This shared concept of justice has many advantages. It adds to the efficiency, stability, and viability of the human community. *Rawls* says that any conception of justice should be looked at from a broader perspective as it is the most important virtue of social institutions.

From the original position, while wearing a 'veil of ignorance', he says that two principles of justice will be agreed upon. The *first principle* states that each individual by birth inherently acquires basic liberties. The *second principle* dictates that social and economic inequalities can be justified only when it empowers the

marginalised communities. He firstly advocates to ensure fairness and equal opportunities to the disadvantaged people in employment. This is also the foundation and principle of equality clause of article 14 in the Indian Constitution. *Rawls* says that these formulations are tentative and apply to all societies. They regulate the fair balance of social and economic opportunities. For *Rawls,* the first step is to distribute certain primary goods. These primary goods are those goods that a rational man needs for his life. These primary goods can be classified into social primary goods (like rights, liberties, powers, opportunities, income, wealth) and natural primary goods (like health, intelligence, imagination).

ROBERT NOZICK

One of the most provocative works of *Robert Nozick* is "Anarchy, State and Utopia". The first part of the book is about a minimal night-watchman state. He envisages a minimal state whose narrow functions are to give protection against force, theft, fraud, enforcement of contracts, etc.[16] He develops a conception of justice called "*entitlement theory*". According to entitlement theory, economic goods arise already encumbered with rightful claims to their ownership and he completely opposes redistribution. He says that a person's holdings are just if acquired through just original acquisition or just transfer. It can also be acquired through the rectification of injustices in the first two senses. Finally, in the book, he gives a utopia with "a system of diverse communities organised along different lines and perhaps encouraging different types of characters, and different patterns of abilities and skills".[17] *Nozick* was against the concept of redistribution.[18] He compared "taxation of earnings from labor is on a par with forced labour".[19] *Nozick's* central argument for rejecting distributive theories rests on their failure to cohere with the idea of personal liberty. He sees the right to property as an extension of individual liberty.

AMARTYA SEN

Amartya Sen in his book, "*Idea of Justice*" discussed about two aspects of justice, '*Niti*' and '*Nyaya*'. '*Niti*' is the organisational propriety and *'Nyaya'* is the realised justice. Just having behavioural correctness, such as '*Niti*' alone is not enough in the society, we need an all-encompassing and most crucial value, *Nyaya'* to make a just and fair

[16] Nozick, R., 2005. *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Also see Fried, B., 2005. 22 *Social Philosophy and Policy* 221.
[17] Fried, B., 1995. 24 *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 226.
[18] There were lot of criticisms against this notion. See Paul, J., 1981. *Reading Nozick*; Wolff, J., Nozick, R., Campbell, T., 2001. Justice.
[19] See Macey, J., 2006. 23 *Social Philosophy and Policy* 255; Murphy, L., and Nagel, T., 2002. *The Myth of Ownership, Taxes and Justice.*

society. *Sen* argues that '*Niti*' converted into *'Nyaya'* and *'Nyaya'* - based justice has to become the indispensable element of society. The dichotomy between these two concepts of justice forms the foundation of his book.

Amartya Sen advocates that the first step of justice should be to identify injustice and making efforts to remove it from society. Rather than dreaming about a just society or some flawless set of rules one can try is prevent manifest injustice in society and the world.

The Indian Supreme Court in *Hussainara Khatoon echoed similar sentiments. It observed, that, "Justice, a commodity which is tragically beyond the reach and grasp of large number of under trial prisoners. Law has become for them instrument of injustice."* The court further observed that, " *the legal and judicial system has to be revamped and restructured so that such injustices do not occur and disfigure the fair and other wise luminous face of our nascent democracy*".

FLUTE AND THREE CHILDREN: *Amartya Sen* gives us a story of a flute to explain the pluralistic nature of justice. He narrates an engaging anecdote of three children (*Ann, Bob,* and *Carla*) in his book. These three children quarrel over a flute. The basis of the claim for '*Ann*' was that she is the only one who can play it; for '*Bob*', he has no other toy to play with and for *'Carla'*, she made the flute. Assuming all these claims to be true, *Amartya Sen* is of the view that one can cite an instantly conceivable reason for giving the flute to any one of them.

Utilitarians would favour '*Ann'* and so will the *Aristotelians*, though for completely different reasons. Whereas *Egalitarians* would go with '*Bob*', *Libertarians* will see reason in '*Carla's'* claims. These are all assumptions. We need to get the right answer. But at times there will be a plurality of answers and one cannot be distinguished from the other as more right or less right. The concept that there can be only one fixed typecast of the just society and that all other those who do not conform to this stereotype are to be seen as falling off from this concept does not appear reasonable in the face of pluralism that does certainly exist in the modern world.

'Martha Nussbaum' and '*Amartya Sen'* approached justice by emphasising human capabilities.[20] '*Amartya Sen'* rejects the utility-based approach and resource-based approach. He argues for a freedom-based capability approach. He focuses on the capability of a person to do things he or she has a reason to value. Therefore, a person's advantage should be assessed in terms of opportunities that he/she has a capability to achieve like others over things that he/she has a reason to value. We should be free to determine what we want, what we value, and ultimately, we

[20] "Capability and Well-being" in ed Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen, The Quality-of-Life 1993.

should be free to choose. This capability approach that Sen advocates may be more closely related to the opportunity aspect of freedom but it also includes a process aspect. Thus, it is not completely focused on the outcome. The capability approach accommodates questions of social justice in terms of unequal parties. This theory can be used to assess societies and social institutions and it will draw attention to the expansion of human capabilities of all members of the society. The strongest feature of this approach is that it concerns the plurality of different features of our lives.

This theory focuses on those capabilities that are essential to achieve various combinations of functioning. So, this means that Sen does not talk about comparing individual capabilities but the combination of functioning. Thus, he is not talking about means of living but opportunities of living.

This capability approach to justice is similar to '*Finnis'* basic goods of human flourishing.[21] This even has respect for pluralism. Different countries can give effect to this capability approach differently. The goal of this capability approach is on capability and not on functioning. For example, people should be given opportunities to lead a healthy lifestyle, but they should not be penalised for unhealthy choices. This approach is quite controversial in some cases. For example, not penalising unhealthy choices has been the central point of debate about liver transplants for the alcoholic.

STORY OF DANIEL AND SUSANA: This is a famous biblical story and used to be often quoted by the eminent Jurist *Late Shri Ram Jethmalani* in public gatherings as well as to clients and solicitors. The story begins with an innocent woman, '*Susana'* who was falsely accused of adultery by two elders. She was condemned to death. Our Hero, '*Daniel'* from the crowd gets up, and said, "*she is innocent*". He said, I want to question the two old men separately. And he asked them, "*Where did you see her committing adultery*". Each gave a different place. The lady was acquitted. *'Daniel'* is regarded as the first lawyer in history. A lawyer is one who is grounded in logic, driven by equity, eloquence, courage, speaking the power of truth, clear thinking, and impeccable integrity.

GLOBALISATION: SOME PRELIMINARY REFLECTIONS

'Anthony Giddens', defines globalisation as a process of intensification of worldwide social relations. The local events shaped by world events, that is 'glocalism', the localism + globalism = glocalism. It has brought changes in ideology, ethics, politics, and society.

[21] Finnis, J., 1998. *Natural law and Natural Rights*.

'William Twining' refers to globalisation as those *"processes which tend to create and consolidate a unified world economy, a single ecological system, and complex network of communications that covers the whole globe, even if it doesn't penetrate to every part of it."*[22]

Globalisation makes the world more interdependent and it has stimulated a revival of debates about law and justice. In contemporary times, the world is witnessing rapid growth in all fields. With these changes with the advent of globalisation, does it have an impact on the notion of justice?

'Boaventura de Sousa Santos' gave two concepts of *'globalised localism'* and *'localised globalism'*. *'Globalised localism'* signifies a global phenomenon becoming a local phenomenon like Coca Cola, English language, etc. whereas *'localised globalism'* is when a local phenomenon changes to accommodate the changing needs. These are illuminating features to understand the deep impact of globalisation on individuals and society.

'William Twining' explains globalisation and its impact on law and jurisprudence. It has brought fundamental challenges to general and specific jurisprudence. We can see the revival of general jurisprudence from a global perspective.

GLOBALISATION AND LEGAL THINKING: Globalisation stimulated fundamental rethinking in several disciplines including changing national and societal boundaries. Globalisation challenged the traditional black box theories which studied municipal law and international law in isolation. International law can no longer be studied as the relation between the states. Multinational Corporations, NGOs, militants play an important role.

Many scholars have tried to trace the origin of the globalisation process. Some believed that it can be traced back to modernity and capitalism while others believe that it started with ground- breaking inventions in the 19th Century. However, most of these globalisation studies are from the developed countries' perspective but *'Upendra Baxi'* views globalisation from the developing countries' perspective. *'Upendra Baxi'* in his address to the International Centre for Ethnic Studies, Sri Lanka, has described three stages of globalisation. He said that the first phase of globalisation is the '*colonial imperialism*' over long stretches of time and space throughout the world. He described the second phase in great detail. He calls this phase '*globalism'* or the age of human rights. According to *Baxi*, this phase is marked by an international efflorescence of concern for human rights and standards of international justice. The Emergence of the United Nations system, enunciations of human rights, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), and the expansion

[22] Twining, W., 2000. *Globalisation and Legal Theory*.

of human rights to collective groups-women, indigenous peoples, specially abled, prisoners, migrants, dispossessed people, and also children which was further extended to the right of self-determination, economic and cultural rights marks this phase. There were various declarations adopted like the UN Declaration of 1975 concerning Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interest of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind, Tokyo declaration of 1971 addressed to the medical profession in dealing with situations of torture, cruelty, degrading, and inhuman treatment: 1982 General Assembly Proclamation of the Code of Medical Ethics, the UN Committee on Crime Prevention, Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, Lawyers and Judges: the 1986 Ottawa Declaration on Health for All, New International Information Order, 1969 UN Declaration which proclaimed the duty on developed countries to give 1% of their GNP as aid volume target and to ease the loan conditions to developing countries, etc.

The third phase is the contemporary phase which is an Era of trade retaliation and debt problem- market-friendly liberal ideologies-collective interdependence becomes the collective dependence of the South on the North. In this phase, the World is full of an endless chain of shopping arcades or department stores.

According to *Baxi* the cost of allowing foreign direct investment reflects in the gross disregard of human rights. The Trade and Investment Regime has polarized the Global North- Global South conflict. There is de-governmentalizing the national governments in the global south. Hence today, the nation's budget would be more aligned to the institutions like the World Bank which are dominated by the global North.

The initial understanding of human rights was the idea of universal human rights-rights for all and special protections guaranteed to the more vulnerable sections of the societies (such as minority rights). Against this universal idea, now according to Baxi, there is a trade-related and investment-friendly idea of human rights emerging. Under this paradigm, the human rights of human beings are being overlooked to give preference to the human rights of global corporations. Corporations now claim a right of freedom of speech and expression in terms of claiming, in imitation to the U.S. Supreme Court's extension of the rights guaranteed under the First Amendment- for freedom of commercial speech. It basically means, that the corporation can claim this right even when they face petitions for trying to advertise unsafe/hazardous products in the halo of safety. '*Upendra Baxi*' is right in his approach when he criticizes the emerging SLAPPS

Doctrine[23] in Europe and U.S.A. Thus, the activists now face charges for speaking against a corporation, and their right of free speech is ranked under the right of commercial free speech of the companies.

Ameliorative function of justice: Access to Justice

Law is an instrument of social change and played leading light for positive progressive change for ameliorating conditions of the poor, vulnerable, and the marginalised. Access to justice is one such ameliorative function of catering to the unmet legal needs of citizens. Access to justice is also a constitutional right, it is the perambulatory promise and duty of 'putting the power of law in the hands of people.

Mauro Cappelletti has identified three waves of access to the justice movement- *firstly*, the delivery of legal services to the poor, *secondly*, to extend legal representation to diffuse interests, and *thirdly*, community dispute resolution system.[24] I would like to add the *fourth wave* as legal empowerment combining all the other three waves.

The Gujarat Legal Aid Committee way back in 1971 memorably observed that 'the ignorance and illiteracy of law of poor lead to helplessness, and further impoverishment', the committee further observed 'if poor people are educated in their rights and obligations, it would serve three important ends. Firstly, it would rescue them from legal troubles arising out of the sheer ignorance. Secondly, it would enable them to consult a legal professional in time, which would avoid subsequent legal difficulties and prevent unnecessary litigation. Thirdly, it would empower and unshackle the poor, because knowledge itself is the biggest power and lastly, it would achieve a major goal of making citizens self-reliant.

Another aspect of expanding the ameliorative function of justice is to explore ways and means to find alternatives to the problem of the massive 'justice gap' that exists between huge demand of legal services to the poor and inadequate resources of trained lawyers. This justice gap excludes "other" people and communities from justice delivery and thus it becomes necessary to address injustice perpetuated by this.

The recent survey on Global Insights on Access to Justice 2019 in 101 countries underscores the barriers and hardships people face to solve every day legal

[23] SLAPPS or Strategic Law Suits Against Public Participation, are basically suits filed by Corporate Managers against activists who criticize their companies or their products, for injunctions to protect their company's reputation.

[24] Cappelletti, M., 1981. Access to Justice and the Welfare State. *Michigan Law Review*, 81 (4), 1006.

problems. The key findings are:

I. *"Justice problems are ubiquitous and frequent. Approximately half (49%) of people surveyed experienced at least one legal problem in the last two years.*
II. *Justice problems negatively impact people's lives. 43% of those surveyed reported that their legal problem adversely impacted their lives. They experienced physical or stress-related ill-health as a result of their legal problem.*
III. *Most people do not turn to lawyers and courts. About 29% of people do not go to lawyers or courts, instead seek help from family members or friends to resolve their problem.*
IV. *People face a variety of obstacles to meeting their justice needs, beginning with their ability to recognize their problems as having a legal remedy."*

The challenge to the justice gap cannot be solved simply with more lawyers, judges, and courthouses. A paradigm shift and thinking are required. The services of lawyers are costly and least accessible to the common citizen, the justice system is tainted by delays and inefficiencies and perhaps a formal legal process may not be the remedy desired by the people and the times we live in. Thus, paralegals are trained from the community to act as a bridge between law, society, and people.[25]

Conclusion

The Indian values of justice are reflected in the age-old virtues of *prema (love), karuna (compassion), daya (pity), and feeling for others.* The idea of justice and its several debates, appeals to all stakeholders of justice: judiciary, lawyers, and legal academia to forge new knowledge, skills, methods, and measures to promote the cause of justice.

Justice to all is the spirit behind the legal aid movement in India spanning over five decades. It advocates using the power of law to make the world a fair and just place for people to live in. The Indian National Education Policy, 2020 also underscores the wider access to justice and timely delivery of justice.

The issues of Justice are more relevant and vital in this new abnormal pandemic situation, where '*public*' became 'personal' and we all are slowly becoming more self-centred rather than helping others. I know this will be only a temporary phase.

Let, me conclude with memorable observations of *'Bertrand Russell'*. He observes in his autobiography that, "*three passions governed his life, the search for love, search for beauty and pity for the suffering of humankind. Love and knowledge lead upward toward the heavens and whereas pity led him towards the earth."*

[25] Rao, S., 2012. Paralegal Education in India: Problems and Prospects. *NLUD Journal*, Vol. 1 2012.