

Nina Slanevskaya
St. Petersburg University, Russia

The bond of justice

Justice is usually proclaimed as the highest goal of political life. But it is injustice that reigns in political life. This paradox reminds us of a psychological dilemma about the things, which are desirable and the things, which are desired. One says that it is desirable to have equal rights and a society based on an egalitarian principle, but at the same time one desires to get more than others.

General theories of justice

Adam Smith, a founder of modern economic science and who spoke about the ‘invisible hand’ of self-interest as a drive of economics believed that no ‘human system’ is perfect. The best economic system – liberalism – will fail to achieve its full potential because of ignorance, stupidity, greed, and the failure of individuals, especially bankers, factory owners, and commercial traders, to calculate correctly their own self-interest in the long run.’(quoted in Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 2001: 420)

People are social beings who need a community for living. They work out rules and laws for successfully living together and create political systems with certain social norms.

So we can say that people are politically obliged human beings, they must obey the laws with which they have agreed. In practice not all of us agree and not all of us create the laws. What is the percentage of those who create and what is the percentage of us who agree? Are these laws fair for all of us, or for the majority, or for a small group? Why is the right to protest denied by the government if the government is our servant?

If government is just, it is usually judged by two things: the justice of a particular government’s measures and the justice of political institutions. We assess institutions in the long run and the actions of a particular government, its measures

and laws, within a short period of time. It is important to distinguish these two aspects of government. One can satisfy us and the other one not. People can protest against a particular law but on the whole be satisfied with the political system. The question 'should we consider the protest legitimate or illegitimate' can be answered more easily with the help of the separation of a particular government from institutions.

Thus if the government forbids people to protest, it does so, perhaps not to preserve the political system guarded by a constitution, but to preserve itself.

The theories about obligation, authority and protest explain people's obedience in the following way: people are afraid of social disorder and this fear makes them maintain order, and obey the laws. Biologically humans are all conservative because our organisms try to preserve us from disruptive change. Psychologically people have always tried to protect themselves from uncertainties. They have created laws to regulate social relations, developed natural sciences to control nature, created religions to help themselves to manage things, that were difficult to explain scientifically. Opponents to this point of view say that people can manage without a government or laws or state, life will continue approximately in the same way so the fear of disorder is groundless. Anarchists even assert that to live without a state will be more peaceful because it is the nature of the state, headed by the government and seeking to enlarge its territory, which causes wars.

Obedience is connected with gratitude to the state taught at school and later that gratitude entails obedience to the government, though a state is not a human being and people pay taxes for all the services the state provides. The idea of obligation is widely used in political propaganda. Another idea is that obedience to the law is moral and disobedience is bad. Thus obligation determines obedience.

There is another curious thing, which often occurs in debates over laws and obedience. One asks 'Why should I obey the laws?' and gets the answer, "Because the laws are the rules which must be obeyed by all". This tautological statement needs rearrangement into a falsifiable statement: 'Laws are *just* rules for all which must be obeyed by all', where '*just*' is an independent variable and can be tested by the opinion of people.

Justice is a socially constructed thing. But if we take the Rawls's theory, a representative of a procedural normative theory, we can come to the conclusion that justice is independent from socially constructed conceptions. Rawls's 'Theory of Justice' claims that people, independently of how many we will test and in spite of their pluralistic views on the question, will show the same understanding of justice or what a just social system is (Rawls, 1971). His theory, which is sometimes called a 'Veil of Ignorance' because it demands certain terms for application, namely, the ignorance of their talents, future positions, envy (a feeling of relative deprivation) shows that the same things are desirable by all. They are a maximum of individual freedom and a maximum of state's guaranteed protection in the case of trouble.

The importance of justice

What is justice and why is it so important for people? Here we must distinguish the following things: just intention, just action and just result. If one of them is just, it does not follow that the others will be just. Good intention or just intention can bring a bad, unjust result and a just action can bring an unjust result. Here is a well-known example with Robin Hood. Robin Hood's intention to make the poor rich was just, but the procedure of robbing the rich was, for sure, unjust. As for the result it was ambiguous: the outcome is just for the poor and unjust for the rich. Perhaps, some governments had good intentions of creating a law or taking some decisions but it has brought a bad result. Hardly anyone will justify a bad political system just because someone's intention was good. An outcome can be unpredictable and a just intention will not necessarily guarantee a just outcome. For example, the recent monetization programme of social benefits for special groups of people was opposed by pensioners in Russia. This reform can be defined as having a just intention and treated by Putin's government as a just action to improve the system of distributing social privileges and benefits in the form of money to all. But it looked like unjust action for pensioners, resulting in demonstrations all over the Russian Federation – no free will and no choice for people involved, besides stripping or depriving the category of people from social recognition for their contribution to the state expressed in a special form. Could it bring a just result for all or not? It is difficult to say because it is hard to regulate and to calculate the equivalent in money terms under unstable economic conditions in Russia and a general growing distrust in the government's economic policy due to the worsening economic conditions for the majority of the population. Regional authorities admitted that the result could be unjust and adopted the policies correcting the central government's decision by adding some benefits to the categories of people related to the specific conditions of the regions and cities.

Some suggest that a just action should lead to a just result. If you apply a principle of a just action, a just society will be created naturally as some theorists assert. Nowadays a democratic society has become a vague notion, many societies with authoritarian or elitist political systems call themselves democracies, that is why the theorists assert that it is better for us to speak of the democratic principle functioning in the society than to search for a definition of a just society.

It can be illustrated by a well-known technique, described by Barbara Goodwin as 'I cut, you choose'. Anyone who is the second to choose will try to cut a cake as equally as possible. This just action will bring a just result, a cake will be divided into two absolutely equal parts. Laws and constitutions are the instrument for cutting 'equal pieces' for people because justice is desirable and proclaimed as the highest goal of a political community. This principle is called Harrington's law, described by Harrington in his book *Oceana* written in the 17th century. Unfortunately such procedures can be only used in an established

and just social system. Otherwise this principle can be modified into ‘I cut, you choose, but I am not going to eat the piece which is left because I have another cake for myself’. This modified principle can only increase injustice in society (Goodwin, 1992: 347–349). Thus a just action applied in an unjust system will not bring a just result.

J.L. Borges’s *The Lottery in Babylon* and B. Goodwin’s theory ‘Justice by Lottery’ suggest also a just action to apply for creating justice in society (Goodwin, 1992). Borges describes the way justice was created in Babylon via an application of a just action or ‘lottery principle’ alone, without changing the unjust institutions of Babylon. Borges describes a possible just action under unjust political system, which could lead to justice. So the principle ‘I cut, you choose’ can work in an unjust political system creating justice if applied somehow in the way of a random choice to all the people accordingly. Every 60 days people drew the lots for themselves for the following 60 days. They might be of a soldier, a general, a slave, a governor, in sum, any position in the society. Gradually people began to insist on using a lottery system in all aspects of their life, in distribution of goods etc. This means that if people are put in an equal starting position, they regard a principle of lottery as the most just principle for arranging a society.

Barbara Goodwin in her theory ‘Justice by Lottery’ emphasizes that her ‘lottery principle’ unlike Borges’s not only describes a feeling of justice but is meant to create a just system. Governing position allocated by a rota system, perhaps, produces the best egalitarian results. It is essentially just. Positions acquired regularly via lottery make people who are in government work out just laws in order to protect themselves in case they might draw a bad lot next time and so take a place at the bottom of society. Thus a system will be created which is just and protective for all.

Justice and globalization

Let us turn to the global governance now. Perhaps, a liberal project of global governance had good intentions and meant just action via free market but what do we have now?

“Deepening social disparities in and between countries owing to current tendencies and the institutional shape given to globalization” (Kennedy, Messner and Nuscheler, 2002: 185).

“The net worth of world’s two hundred richest people increased from \$400bn to \$1 trillion in just four years from 1994 to 1998. By then, there were nearly two billion humans living on less than \$1 a day” (Coyle, 2000: 8).

“By the late 1990s the fifth of the world’s population living in the highest-income countries had 86 percent of world GDP... while the poorest fifth had only

about 1 percent...” (quoted in Rupert, 2000: 146). The income gap between the wealthiest and the poorest of the world in 1870 was 7 to 1, in 1913 it was 11 to 1, in 1960 it was 30 to 1, in 1990 it was 60 to 1 and in 1997 it was already 74 to 1 (Rupert, 2000: 146).

“In 1997 Russia’s GDP of US\$404 billion had fallen to the level of the Netherlands, and in 1999 matched that of Switzerland, a country with no more than 5 per cent of Russia’s population” (Dieter, 2002: 68).

Here is the table of the growth processes in the world economy, 1966–2007 presented by Heribert Dieter (Dieter, 2002: 68):

Table 1. Growth processes in the world economy, 1966–2007

1. Real gross domestic product, average annual change in per cent						
	1966–1973	1974–1990	1991–1997	1997	1998 ¹	1998–2007 ²
World	5.1	2.8	2.3	3.2	1.8	2.9
Industrialized countries	4.8	2.6	2.0	2.7	1.9	2.3
US	3.0	2.5	2.9	3.8	3.3	n.a.
Japan	9.7	3.9	1.3	0.9	–2.5	n.a.
Germany ³	4.6	2.1	1.5	2.0	2.8	n.a.
Asia	5.5	6.3	8.5	6.4	2.4	5.7
China	9.0	9.0	11.8	9.1	7.2	n.a.
India	3.7	4.9	6.6	5.0	4.7	n.a.
Latin America	6.6	2.5	3.3	5.1	2.5	3.7
Russia	6.6	3.6	–7.1	0.9	–5.0	n.a.
Africa ⁴	4.7	2.1	2.4	3.5	2.4	3.8
2. Real per capita income, average annual change in per cent						
Industrialized countries	3.9	2.0	1.3	2.2	1.4	1.9
Asia	2.9	4.3	6.9	4.9	1.0	4.3
Latin America	3.9	0.3	1.5	3.5	1.0	2.2
Russia	5.6	2.7	–7.0	1.2	–4.7	n.a.
Africa ⁴	2.0	–0.9	–0.2	0.5	–0.5	1.0

¹ Estimate. ² Prognosis. ³ To 1991: without former East Germany. ⁴ South of the Sahara.

Source: World Bank 1998: 194–195.

Dieter comes to the conclusion that a world economy model geared to de-regulation and market-based solutions ‘appears unsuited to the twenty-first century’. He claims also that the ‘existing world trade order is constantly being under-

mined' by the projects of regional integration on the part of the European Union (EU) and the United States (US) which will lead to increased competition between their projects and the World Trade Organization (WTO) as a global trade system. So perhaps we deal again with our paradox about 'desirable' and 'desired', but on the higher international level regarding the activities of the USA and the EU in relations to the whole world. Justice, as a socially constructed concept, is the most important perception promoting harmony in society both at the national level and at the global level. Discussion of the just state government has turned into the discussion of just global governance. People seek epistemic and normative unity in dealing with the world.

Globalization, or more specifically, global governance, intensifies local inequalities and amplifies the state's inequality in the international system. The wrong model of global governance has brought about global economic inequalities leading to global social tension and to use of violence. The number of ethnic conflicts increased due to the globalization processes of migration of cheap labour, dislocation, a feeling of relative deprivation due to the new means of communication and impoverishment of the population. When the 'economic pie' becomes small and not enough for all in the society everyone wants to get a 'desired' bigger piece. Thus the increase of ethnic conflicts is caused by economic weakness of the society and a feeling of relative deprivation both at the individual level and at the national level. The settlement of the conflicts either by global institutions or by local governments often fails because it is global governance which causes the increase of local conflicts.

The Roman philosopher Cicero (106–43 B.C.) in his *De Republica* argued that community pursuing a common good for fulfillment of their shared interests could succeed in that if only their community had a 'bond of justice'. That means that only the community's system of justice can enable its common good to be pursued successfully. Importantly, for both Cicero and Aristotle, 'what constitutes the common good is not simply given: it is a matter for political debate and decision-making' (Gilbert, 2000: 106). People who live under a tyrant or an oppressive majority lack a bond of justice and can have neither proper political debates nor success in promoting a common good, because there is no bond of justice which could help people to believe that their interests are protected by the system of laws, and that they are a part of this community.

Ethnic conflicts and terrorism are due to the stress from group's frustration to achieve justice in society. A terrorist-anarchist refuses to negotiate with a government or to be convinced of the necessity to obey its laws. The existing language of legal and political systems can express only the interests of those who govern the society and create laws. The state invents a self-justifying moral ideology speaking about the sanctity of life which in reality means a sanctity of property because there is no real respect for life for those who do not have property or who have a basically different opinion. Thus terrorists propose 'violence merits vio-

lence 'and 'ends justify the means'. John Dollard claims that aggression is always a consequence of frustration, which always leads to some form of aggression which brings catharsis – a release of aggressive energy. He also reveals the interdependence between economic frustration and aggression as a displacement of this frustration (Dougherty, Pfaltzgraff, 2001: 239).

Globalization or restructuring of capitalist production increases the social power of employers and investors, reducing the power of governments, communities and citizens. It is a new form of 'democracy' based on ownership of property, or democratically unaccountable concentrations of 'private' power (Rupert, 2000: 78). The disciplinary power of mobile capital makes governments reduce benefits in different ways to dependent classes of citizens, the unemployed, the elderly, the poor and the middle class in favour of the investor class. It is afraid of reducing permanent unemployment or of raising wages. Antiglobalists do not want to allow free markets and private profit to determine social outcomes. The neo-liberal market-based agenda is denounced as antidemocratic by antiglobalists.

Fred Bergsten, the director of the Institute for International Economics said in 1999: "Most trade types thought the merits of free trade were so obvious, the benefits were so clear, that you did not have to worry about adjustments – you could just let the free market take care of it. The sheer political gains of the anti-globalization side in the last few years have made the free trade side realize that they have to do something to deal with the losers from free trade and the dislocations generated by globalization" (quoted from Rupert, 2000: 143).

In 1999 the USA's President Clinton called for the construction of new consensus and to put a 'human face' on the global economy (Rupert, 2000: 144). Clinton proposed better cooperation between International Labour Organization (ILO) and the WTO and the IMF, to adopt the new *Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work* presented by ILO and to take some measure of debt relief.

The resistance to global governance can be observed in the following main areas:

- In the critical discourse concerning the weakening position of the state, democratic basis for the global civil society, origin of global terrorism, the influence of non-governmental, intergovernmental organizations and so on. The extension of economic privatization means the extension of private corporate business power into politics and cultural and social life. It is not moral to put private property over human needs and introduce free market principle in all sphere of social life.
- In the post-conflict zones, where international organizations try to implement a liberal project and feel the local resistance. The regimes of post conflict zones are anti-democratic because they are created without general people's consent.
- In the resistance to international regimes. The regional and global trade regimes are anti-democratic because they are supervised by business without pub-

licly elected representation. Any trade regime increases a social power of business, which can compete with the existing social and political power in the country and can lead to business totalitarianism and substitution of democracy. Neoliberal regime, *The global intellectual property rights regime*, for example, preserves the hegemony of the rich countries via preventing access to knowledge to poor countries, especially important in the age of quickly developing technologies. Thus it is the principle of justice, which gives moral force to breaking the law and resisting domination of rich countries.

- In the resistance to the politics of global financial and trade institutions embodying global governance. The international financial and trade organizations are unaccountable to the public and the officials of these organizations are not elected, thus the power of these organizations is antidemocratic. Global financial organizations try to get a grass root support via NGOs (non-governmental organizations) for more successful implementation of their projects. And for that they involve opposition groups of NGOs in the governing structures of their organizations. They also allow small adjustments of their policies and accuse the leaders of NGOs of lack of democracy in their own elections of leaders and in their expression of public opinion.

The globalization from below demands the fundamental principle of democracy – citizens' participation in the decisions which affect their lives. The ethical aspect of democracy as a norm is very important for people although democracy is treated nowadays as the best utility-maximizing method, i.e. as a procedure not an end.

Different ideologies present a different understanding of just government, which can be extended to global governance. For liberalism social justice is distribution according to merit and contribution to a society with legal equality of opportunities. They agree with a state's limited interference in the fields of education, health and other welfare measures due to natural inequalities. They also consider that all people have the ability to govern themselves, thus equal rights for voting. To implement the merit-based system of justice and real equality of opportunities, there must be an economic regulation and welfare measures. Without government's interference the merit-based system increases the underlying inequalities of liberal society.

For socialists equality is the most important political ideal. 'For each according to his need' is the criterion for distribution of goods and opportunities. This principle of equality and need spreads to the political field and personal rights. Merit is less important than need though it is admitted to use merit as criterion for jobs. Socialists underestimate the factor of human envy or relative deprivation. The socialist society will try to reduce the gap between wealth and poverty based on principle 'according to the need'. If it is not your primary need why do you want to have more? Why do you want to have more than a normal human being needs?

Natural justice

The theory about ‘natural justice’ emphasizes the idea that in nature there is no justice or injustice and the concepts of justice and injustice were intended to construct social relationships to regulate each other’s social activities.

For practicing injustice and for mixing ‘desirable’ with ‘desired’, a social category can be introduced and turned into a social fact (Gilbert, 2000: 12–14). The term ‘race’, for example, has become a ‘social fact’. ‘Race’ was introduced by scientists for proving that black natives in the colonies belonged to a different species of human beings which needed the guidance of the whites. It was implemented in the time of the Enlightenment based on their specific approach, saying that knowledge leads to progress, which leads to the happiness of people in the end. So black people taught by the whites could be much happier. Later it was proved scientifically that there is even a stronger distinction between white people themselves than between white and black and skin colour does not influence mental ability. In spite of this ‘race’ did not disappear. It has become a useful social construct for unjust social treatment. If a social category is introduced into society and there are constant attempts to practice it it becomes a social fact and starts functioning.

David Marsh and Paul Furlong suggest that it is ‘discursive construction of globalization that effects government economic policies, rather than the real processes of globalization. They assert that there was no evidence that Britain was locked into a globalized political economy but the Blair Government declared that the pursuit of neo-liberal policies was inevitable and there was no alternative. Thus their conclusion is “it is not the ‘reality’ of globalization that is shaping British economic policy, but the dominant discursive construction of that reality” (Marsh and Furlong, 2002: 35). The authors also speak about transformationalist approach to globalization. The global processes limit our actions but we can regulate or transform them in our turn.

If we speak about justice for a nation or the right for secession we can find a debate on similar lines between primordialists and instrumentalists based upon the idea of discursively constructed reality. Primordialists are convinced that ethnicity is an inborn feeling and nationalism is the expression of a primordial feeling, that is why secession is inevitable and the ethnic group should have its own state. It is just to have its own territory.

Instrumentalists declare that ethnicity is simply used instrumentally for nationalism as the precondition for creating a nation which will demand its territory for creating its own state. According to E. Gellner, first appears nationalism and then a nation (Gellner, 1970). Thus the argument that each nation should have a state because ethnicity is an inborn feeling and nationalism is inevitable will be denied by instrumentalists. The right to protest or the right to secession will be questioned. So in the case of instrumentalists we come across anti-foundationalist

ontology and interpretist epistemology used by post-structuralists and post-modernists. Ethnicity plays no important role in society, it is simply stimulated by political leaders who claim that ethnicity is a decisive factor for creating its own political system suitable for a particular ethnic group which can manage its political and social life better on a separate territory. According to post-structuralists it is a discourse about ethnic groups and their needs, which creates reality.

Unlike anti-foundationalists, conservatives use foundationalist position. They insist that justice is based upon an existing set of distributions or hierarchical order in the socio-political organization and based on natural laws or God's will. Thus what we have is just. But the mere fact of existence is not equal to the value. This approach will prefer to engage a positivist epistemology for the facts from the existing practice or interpretist's for an explanation of traditions and will insist that no changes should be introduced to create a just social order. Traditions have selected the best rules for society. Their opponents will argue and say that all that is old was new some time ago.

Justice is discussed in relations to 'historical guilt' and 'historical entitlement' or the demand for historical rights. Thus in the USA there will be a certain quota of places at universities for Blacks or at some enterprises for women. Irrespective of their abilities or professional qualities they will be taken whilst others are refused. It will be perhaps justice from a historical point of view but injustice from the contemporary situation. Special rights for some groups of citizens are discussed as being just or unjust for the majority because a principle of equal rights is violated.

If we take the poorest countries and the debt relief issue could it be considered just if global governance will allow special rules or debt relief for these countries? Amartya Sen points out, that 'It is not only the poor that worry about the poor but there are others too who worry about the sense of justice in public policy', 'So I think those who take the view that you cannot deal with poverty and inequality until the country is a lot richer, really ought to examine if they are advising a dictatorial or a democratic government' (Sen, 2004). Applied to the global level, the question in focus is if global financial institutions are going to allow debt relief to the poor countries or not, in other words if global governance is going to be dictatorial or democratic.

Resistance to global governance

Speaking about the gap between rich and poor societies Paul Kennedy in his article on *Global challenges at the beginning of the twenty-first century* remarks, 'Yet it rarely occurs to us to think that all the earth's other species – be it sheep, cod, or sparrow – have roughly the same standards of living and consume roughly the same amounts as every other sheep, cod, or sparrow each day. But human

beings permitted a situation to arise in which certain of their societies enjoy levels of consumption 200 times greater than other societies” (Kennedy, 2002: 8–9). He illustrates his remark by the table *GDP per capita, Purchasing Power Parity US\$ in 1998* showing this gap and where we can read that in the USA the income was 29,605 US\$, meanwhile in Tanzania 480. As for the regions/group in OECD it was 20,357 but in Sub-Saharan Africa – 1,607.

Table 2. Gap between rich and regions and selected countries (GDP per capita, PPP US\$)*

Country	Income	Country	Income
US	29,605	Russian Federation	6,460
Kuwait	25,314	Thailand	5,456
Singapore	24,210	China	3,105
Canada	23,582	Indonesia	2,651
Japan	23,257	India	2,077
UK	20,336	Pakistan	1,715
Korea, Republic	13,478	Haiti	13,83
Chile	8,787	Nigeria	795
Brazil	6,625	Tanzania	480
Region/Group		Region/Group	
OECD	20,357	South-East Asia/Pacific	3,234
Latin America and Carribean	6,510	South Asia	2,112
Eastern Europe/CIS	6,200	Sub-Saharan Africa	1,607
Arab States	4,140	LDC**	3,270
East Asia (excluding China)	13,635	LLDC***	1,064

* = Purchasing Power Parity; ** = Less Developed Countries; *** = Least Developed Countries.

Source: Human Development Report 2000.

Judging from the table it is not surprising that global governance has got resistance on the global level as well. Peter Wilkin considers global governance as an antidemocratic and elite driven process in compliance with the Washington consensus agenda of liberalization, privatization, and deregulation (Wilkin, 2003: 78–97). The new tendency of the antiglobalization movement is to establish transnational linkage with similar thinking groups of people for democratic principles. According to liberal ideology antiglobalists’ resistance should be overcome for the sake of order and it must be done via negotiations and problem solving.

In modern democracies protesters are usually condemned because there are legal ways to change things through the vote. If a non-oppressed and non-permanent minority takes a direct action against the majority’s will expressed by the government it is condemned. But after a thorough analysis of a democratic state system, one can notice it is imperfect and that it is not the majority that a minority confronts but a government. The majority on the contrary can support a minority. Thus the right to protest is based on the injustice and immorality of laws or policies

of a concrete government but the government tends to mix itself with the whole political system and acts on behalf of the state, suppressing the movement of protesters as a danger for the peaceful existence of citizens who want to preserve this particular political system.

There has been a debate for a long time and there is no agreement as to whether just government is objective reality or subjective perception. Those who say that it is objective add that only a just government is legitimate and an unjust one is correspondingly illegitimate. The opponents insist that a just government is a subjective imagination of people. A consent theory prevails in discourse about legitimacy of a just state which can be also called theory of 'imagined consent'. The essence of it is that people have created a political system and expressed their consent to obey a government, which they think is just.

Marxists will argue that obligation in class society on the part of the exploited class is a false consciousness and the exploited class is deprived of knowledge about a real situation. Thus treatment of obligation within the frameworks of different ideologies will be different. The idea of obligation from humanitarian has developed into a political, that is obligation to a particular political regime. Protests can have different ways of expression: creating closed communities for living, civil disobedience, emigration, revolution, secession and so on.

Is it legitimate for a minority group or individuals to perform direct acts to change laws if they live in a democratic country and can express it by voting? This question is not so simple as it may seem. It is important to establish the permissible direct action of protest for liberal democratic societies because the majoritarian system of democracy leaves the minority permanently unsatisfied and outside the framework of democracies.

Civil disobedience is considered to be principled, purposeful and public. Principled because protesters do not seek personal gains, purposeful because it is for changing particular laws but not a system in itself, public because it needs publicity. The revolutionary wants to overthrow the system and does not accept punishment from the system, which is unfair. It refers to terrorists-anarchists as well. Civil disobedience can be performed for moral or political reasons.

Walzer considers that the right to protest is a normal component of a democratic society (Walzer, 1970). His idea was that our belonging to the state is not voluntary, but our participation in trade unions, churches and political parties is voluntary. There can be contradictions between our loyalties to these organizations, that we chose voluntarily and the state, which we did not choose voluntarily or give consent to. We have the right to support the organization that we have chosen voluntarily; it is a just protest. It is a basic principle of liberalism – freedom of choice. If we take the recent burning of property by Arab young people in France, it was not their freedom to choose the country, it was their parents' decision. The frustration has lasted for a long time and has brought about aggression with a typical displacement of frustration on something else, for example cars or

other property. It is not quite right to say that these young people do not want to integrate into the French society. They are already well integrated into the French society. The French political culture insists on the expression publicly and in mass the political disagreement with the wrong policy of the government. The Arab young protesters demonstrated that they have incorporated French political ideals about freedom, equality and fraternity.

On the global level, the modes of resistance to global governance are defined by Ian Selby as the following (Selby, 2003: 15):

1. simulated adherence to the norms of global governance,
2. quiet everyday activity devoted to avoiding and bypassing power,
3. confrontational opposition to its practices and institutions.

The discussion of obligation, freedom and the right to protest is important for controlling the development of the state and elitism of the government, elitist institutions and the rise of state or global power. Modern society tries to employ persuasive ideology and covert manipulation to create the impression of one's own choice under the liberal democratic governance. Thus under liberal democracy it is much easier to govern people.

Conclusion

Just government as much as just global governance is understood in different ways within different ideological frameworks. As for post-structuralists discussion of justice and injustice is an attempt to control social activities in society through discourse. Just government can be treated as an imagined concept adjusted to the ideology supported by the very government of the nation-state. But the consensus concerning what is just for this particular society is a necessary framework for the successful functioning of this society, be it nation or global society.

Justice is important for people and desirable in creating a political system though it is difficult to achieve due to human imperfection.

'Protest' is a phenomenon that reveals the clash in the discourse of society and serves as a 'critical warning' to a dominating discourse supported by the government or global governance. It shows that a dominating discourse should be changed if the government or global governance wants to preserve the existing regime and authority.

However if discourse is forbidden and protesting is suppressed like under an authoritarian regime it is not possible to introduce a new necessary discourse in time.

An authoritarian regime collapses much quicker than a liberal democracy just because of the absence of the self-preserving mechanism of protests.

Bibliography

- Dougherty, J.E. and Pfaltzgraff, R.L. (2001), *Contending Theories of International Relations. A Comprehensive Survey*, Longman, New York.
- Gellner, E. (1970), *Concepts and society*. In: *Rationality*, ed. B. Wilson, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Gilbert, P. (2000), *Peoples and Nations in Political Philosophy*, Edinburgh University Press.
- Goodwin, B. (1992), *Using Political Ideas*, Chichester, John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Kennedy, P., Messner, D. and Nuscheler, F., eds. (2002), *Global Trends and Global Governance*, Pluto Press, London: 185.
- Marsh, D. and Furlong, P. (2002), *Ontology and epistemology*. In: *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, eds. D. Marsh and G. Stoker, Palgrave Macmillan: 35.
- Rawls, J. (1971), *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press.
- Rupert, M. (2000), *Ideologies of Globalization. Contending Visions of New World Order*, Routledge, London.
- Selby, J. (2003), *Introduction*. In: *Global Governance, Conflict and Resistance*, eds. F. Cochrane, R. Duffy and J. Selby, Palgrave Macmillan: 1–18.
- Sen, A. (2004), *How does a developing country such as South Africa overcome great income disparity and deal with poverty?*. In: *Financial Mail*, August 6.
- Walzer, M. (1970), *Obligations*, Harvard University Press.
- Wilkin, P. (2003), *Against global governance? Tracing the lineage of the anti-globalization movement*. In: *Global Governance, Conflict and Resistance*, eds. F. Cochrane, R. Duffy and J. Selby, Palgrave Macmillan: 78–97.

The bond of justice

Summary

In this paper the author provides an introduction to the concept of the bond of justice. A framework is provided that begins with an overview of the role of justice in society, starting with the fundamental need of humans to have a set of rights based on sound principles. The author then goes on to analyse the concept of justice with regards to obedience towards government and other important institutions, before questioning its importance to the individual. Several important theories are touched upon, including the ‘justice by lottery’ and ‘I cut, you choose’ concepts.

The paper then focuses on more global themes, namely global governance and the relevance of the bond of justice within a globalized world. The author highlights that as the world’s financial inequalities increase, so do its judicial inequalities. Before concluding, the paper hints at the obligation of institutions and individuals to maintain justice, and looks at what can trigger protests against injustice.