

The Complexity in Relationship between Justice, Luck and Desert; A Critical Study

Mou Shili

Research Scholar at the Chan'An University, Xian, China

Tu Fuguan

Research Scholar at the Chan'An University, Xian, China

Tariq Saeed

Research Scholar at the Chan'An University, Xian, China

Muhammad Asim (Corresponding Author)

Assistance Provider in Research, Assistant Professor at the Government Associate College (Boys) Dhoke Syedan, Rawalpindi Cantonment

Email: asimsheikh62@yahoo.com

Publication History:

Received: August 01, 2022

Revised: August 09, 2022

Accepted: August 25, 2022

Published Online: November 01, 2022

Keywords:

Social Justice

John Rawls

Legitimate Expectation

Serena Olsaretti

Bhimasen Hantel

Egalitarianism

Research related to Academic Areas:

Social studies, Mystical studies

Acknowledgment:

This paper was the graduation project of the **Author 01** and **Author 02** while, they contacted **Author 03** and **Author 04** for getting assistance in research.

Abstract

Relationship between justice, luck and desert is a hot topic in mysticism and spiritualism. Therefore, this study looks at the definitions and traditional concepts of justice, luck and the desert. However, the major focus of this study is to find the answer of the question; whether luck and desert overlap the concept of justice or not. Hence, the study utilizes the work of John Rawls, Serena Olsaretti and Bhimasesan Hantel for this purpose.

Copyright © 2022 IMSTS Journal as an academic research-oriented non-profit initiative of Rehmat and Maryam Researches (SMC-Pvt) Limited, working in Islamabad, Rawalpindi, and Lodhran under the Security and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP). This is an open-access article. However, its distribution and/or reproduction in any medium is subjected to the proper citation of original work.

Introduction

The complexity between the concepts of justice, luck and desert emerges when we see certain examples like if there are two children, one is more intelligent and hardworking while, the other is considered as lucky but he is not so intelligent and hardworking. According to the concept of "justice", an intelligent and hardworking child should win in each competition in the school but, the concept of "luck" always defends the child who is considered as lucky but is not hardworking or intelligent. The question at this stage emerges "Is luck overlapped justice?" or "Will luck affect the running of justice?" (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

Therefore, this study tries to critically analyze what are justice, luck and desert, what traditionally the relationship among these concepts has been defined, and, which theories assisted the scholars in tracing out the association between these concepts. In addition, the prime motive of this study is to extract the critical viewpoint from all the existing theories that have to help in finding real connotation between justice, luck and desert regarding proving **“luck and justice do not overlap the concept of justice”**.

Definitions of Justice, Luck and Desert

Before explaining the complex relationship between the three, we should first understand what are justice, luck and desert.

Justice

There are several definitions for defining justice. Generally, the quality or trait for being fair or impartial is called justice or justice is a principle for doing the right thing. And at the legal level, justice is a quality of conforming to the law. To analyze all respective definitions, this study critically analyzes the definition of justice as an act with fairness, fair play, justness, equity, fair-mindedness, impartially, lack of biasedness, neutrality, and, non-partisanship (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

Luck

In general, we could explain luck based on our personal experience of life. According to the Cambridge dictionary’s explanation: Events that favor any individual are called luck (Cambridge, 2019). Because this article will discuss the relationship between justice, luck and desert, here we interpret luck as a sudden or surprising chance for acquiring or finding something, or, a sudden or surprising success/failure through one’s action (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

To observe all the definitions of luck given above, this study critically finds the definition of luck as a sudden or surprising chance to acquire or find something, or, a sudden or surprising success/failure through one’s action (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

Desert

The word “desert” is used with different meanings. However, in the context of “justice” and “luck”, the meaning of the word “desert” is exhibited as follows;

- A situation that can be bad, not interesting, not exciting or useless for people is called a desert (Collins, 2019).
- No longer help or support is called desert (Collins, 2019).
- To stop being involved in any act/event or to stop supporting is called the desert (Collins, 2019).

To evaluate all the respective definitions of the desert, this study critically evaluates the concept of the desert as to get a failure when needed most, to get defeat when needed victory, or, to lose the support of someone when you deserve/need it.

Traditional Concepts about Justice, Luck and Desert in Different Societies

Justice, luck and desert; are such three words, about which, philosophical debates have been continuing for centuries. Moreover, this has also been investigated that concepts about these concepts are

somewhat different in various cultures and societies. However, this study has to analyze traditional concepts of justice, luck and desert separately in different societies.

So, firstly, the traditional concept of justice is described below;

Traditional Concept of Justice

Traditionally, the concept of justice is described under an umbrella of different perspectives and viewpoints (based on equality, ethics, fairness, law, rationality and religion). However, by analyzing different theories and philosophies, this is observed that the concept of “justice” is generally used in terms of “social justice” (Hospers, 1985).

This essay mainly talks about distributive justice. According to the philosophy of “distributive justice”, justice is basically “what (power, respect or wealth) is distributed” between “whom (nation or members of any society) they are to be distributed”, and, “what is the actual distribution”. John Rawls says that “Justice” and especially “distributive justice” is basically “fairness”. On the other hand, the egalitarian school of thought argues that “justice” is only “equality” (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

Traditional Concept of Luck

The term “luck” is described as the events that a person experiences in his / her life with positive or negative outcomes. In fact, this is a general phenomenon that every human being experiences something positive and something bad in his / her entire life frequently. By experiencing something positive or beneficial, the term “being lucky” is used while, getting some worse experience or having loss refers to the term “being unlucky” (Changing-Minds, 2019). Traditionally, luck is considered as an attribute of any person or object by referring to beneficial, constructive, advantageous, or unfavorable results. For centuries, the term “born lucky” is used for such persons who get favorable, beneficial, constructive, or advantageous results in each way of their lives. Historically, the term “luck” appeared in 1480 with defining three aspects;

- Luck belongs to good or bad (Changing-Minds, 2019).
- Luck is a consequence of chance (Changing-Minds, 2019).
- Luck applies to an emotional being (Changing-Minds, 2019)

To look at respective views about luck, this study critically demonstrates the concept of luck as it is a sudden or surprising chance for availing of something good or bad.

Traditional Concept of Desert

The term “desert” refers to the condition of being deserving of something (whether it is good or bad). This term is also used for referring to punishment, blame, revenge and many other relevant topics in moral philosophy. However, the biggest criticism of this concept/philosophy was presented by John Rawls. He argued that a person cannot claim that he/she is born with some sort of superior intelligence (or athletic abilities). He rejected the concept of “natural lottery” as the concept of “desert” usually refers. However, although he rejects the concept of a moral desert, he also agrees that a person gets a reward for his / her good efforts. He uses the term “legitimate expectation” for such rewards instead of using the term “desert” for defining this phenomenon (Wigley, 1998).

Robert Nozick although somewhat agrees with the philosophy of Rawls about the “desert” but also argues that “not only natural talent but virtues of character is also the undeserving aspect of ourselves, for which, we cannot take credit. By such virtues of character, a person takes risky decisions which provide him / her fruitful or destructive results. At the same time, the Libertarian school of thought emphasized Nozick’s argument more comprehensively. They said that people are self-owner of their talents and bodies. They are free in getting advantages from their actions (either positively or negatively, good or bad, constructive or destructive) (Wigley, 1998).

The complexity between Justice, Luck and Desert

Norvin Richards is silent for answers to respective questions which he raised personally. However, he argued that luck existed parallel to the concept of “justice”. Furthermore, answers to respective questions can be found more comprehensively in the work of Serena Olsaretti (Olsaretti, 2008)

Serena Olsaretti also exhibits the complexity of these three concepts. She portrayed the example of two athletes. According to her, there are two athletes; one is so hard-working; committed to daily exercise. He also takes care of his body too. On the other hand, the second athlete considers being lucky. He always thinks that he deserves victory in each competition. Now, the concept of “justice” argues that a hardworking athlete must be victorious in each competition whereas; the second athlete always wins in each competition because he considers being lucky. Now, the concept of “desert-based justice” argues that the second athlete deserves to be victorious because he was born lucky. Then, does to be hardworking a fault of the first athlete, or, is there any fault of the first athlete that he did not born lucky? Is this fairness of nature, or, does nature also believe in injustice? Of course, neither there is an existence of desert-based justice nor luck have to overlap with the concept of justice. (Olsaretti, 2008). Some supporters believe that there is no desert-based justice. Because we can't confirm that someone has finally got the rewards due to her efforts or behavior (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

However, critical analysis of Olsaretti’s work sometimes increases the confusion about the concept of “luck” when she argues that luck is beyond the control of any person, luck exhibited by chance, luck has no scientific reason but it exists irrationally, luck is basically a result of wishful thinking or poor reasoning, luck is one sort of self-fulfilling prophecy, and, the spiritual dimension of luck counts this concept as rational and logical among dogmatic societies (Olsaretti, 2008).

On the other hand, Bhimasen Hantal says that the relationship between justice, luck and desert can be easily under by the concept/theory of Distributive Justice. Thus, this study tries to find out the critical way that Bhimasen Hantel argues that the concept of distributive justice is a comprehensive approach to understanding the relationship between justice, luck and desert (Olsaretti, 2008).

This study investigates how Bhimasen Hantel defines the relationship of justice, luck and desert under the paradigm of distributive justice whereas; according to him, distributive justice is based on the sub-concepts of social justice, fairness and property rights and welfare maximization. Now there is a need to understand how respective sub-concepts facilitate the theory of distributive justice in defining the relationship between justice, luck and desert. So, firstly, this study critically evaluates what is social justice.

Social justice defines the relationship between the individual and society. This theory observes how individuals avail distribution of wealth, opportunities, and privileges within the same society. However, the concept of “social justice” is totally different from “cosmopolitanism”. Cosmopolitanism discusses the global community with shared morality whereas; the concept of “social justice” deals with only one society (Hantal, 2019). At the same time, the concept of “social justice” is also different from the concept of egalitarianism. On one side, egalitarianism describes that all people are equal in terms of rights, value and status but, the concept of “social justice” does not consider all people equally. According to George C. Homans, the concept of social justice only defends the reward for only those persons who contribute. Therefore, the reward should only be proportional to the level of contribution. On the other hand, economist Friedrich Hayek says about the concept of “social justice” as “justice is only a result of individual behavior, and, unpredictable market forces” (Hantal, 2019) (Homans, 2019).

To analyze both concepts given by George C. Homans and Friedrich Hayek, it is investigated that the concept of “social justice” is actually a concept of relational justice which is only concerned with the relationship between individuals and their cooperation/engagements/ contributions (Homans, 2019).

On the other hand, during critically analyzing the concept of fairness as the second sub-concept of distributive justice, this study evaluates that the sub-concept of “fairness” is also extracted from the book “A theory of Justice” written by John Rawls where he used the word “social contract” for referring the concepts of “justice” and “social justice” in the form of “fairness” (Young, 2013). Rawls (rejecting the viewpoint of the utilitarian theory of justice) portrays two principles of fairness; fairness is when each person has equal basic liberties within a similar system, and, fairness is when social and economic inequalities have to tackle (Young, 2013).

Next, this study has to investigate the third sub-concept of distributive justice called “property rights”. This concept is also extracted from the theories of constitutional economics and libertarianism. However, Robert Nozick, in his book “Anarchy, State and Utopia”, argues that social justice has only occurred when each person has the same good (especially some sort of equal property rights) (Nozick, 2014).

Lastly, the study finds welfare maximization as the fourth sub-concept of distributive justice regarding defining the relationship between justice, luck and desert in a more comprehensive way. This sub-concept is the product of utilitarianism or the utilitarian school of thought. According to utilitarianism, justice only exhibits when there is the maximization of total or average welfare for all the inhabitants of any society. The concept of welfare maximization is also called “impartial welfare consequentialism” in which human welfare is involved. Supporters of this sub-concept argue that justice is basically a justification of actions and institutions for the welfare of mankind (Papageorgiou, 1980).

In my view, the concept of luck and desert are basically the parts of justice that have distributive nature. Following justice-based principles and norms, if someone deserves welfare maximization or the right to own something (like property), this is called desert whereas; if someone avails fulfillment of any wish by the process of welfare maximization, this is called luck. However, I think we also can't discuss desert-based distributive justice alone. Because the justice of social and economic distribution is not determined by our desert claims. If we rely on a personal desert claim, then 1000 people will have 1000 standards to describe

justice. To a large extent, justice should be considered the background conditions, and be expected that everyone should have a fair chance (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

To see such interpretations about complexity in the relationship between the concepts of “justice”, “luck” and “desert”, this study has to find ways for tracing out actual relationship between Justice, Luck and Desert. For this purpose, this study has to analyze different theories which have defined the relationship between justice, luck and desert. The core purpose of analyzing all respective theories is just to prove whether luck and desert overlap the concept of justice or not (Papageorgiou, 1980).

For this purpose, this study has to divide into two sections where the first section has to convince that luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice whereas; the second section is based upon the contradictory side of this hypothesis. So, firstly, the core idea of this study has to be proved that “luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice”.

Luck and Desert do not Overlap the Concept of Justice

Numerous scholars believe that luck and desert do not overlap in the concept of justice. During examining their views points, this study finds several scholars even argue that luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice but actually, they are also confused at various points when they try to define the concepts of luck and desert. However, scholars like Inigo Gonzalez Ricoy and Axel Gosseries (who wrote the book “Institutions for Future Generations” in 2016), Clara Sabbagh and Manfred Schmitt (who wrote the book “Handbook of Social Justice Theory and Research” in 2016, Herlinde Pauer-Studer (wrote the book “Encyclopedia of Democratic Thought” in 2013), Alexander Kaufman (wrote the book “Distributive Justice and Access to Advantage” in 2015), and, Susan L. Hurley (wrote the book “The Law of Peoples: With “The Idea of Public Reason Revisited” in 2003) comprehensively analyzed the luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice. Although, they used several existing theories for proving respective hypotheses they generally prove that justice is an independent variable whereas; luck and desert are dependent variables; rely on the concept of justice (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

Critical citation of their work facilitates this study to find out the theories, by which, respective authors tried to prove the core idea of this study. Thus, this study traces out that except for the theory of “religious egalitarianism”, almost all the theories are considered as the supportive philosophies for proving that luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice. For example, as egalitarianism, in general, portrays equality for all people, this study critically evaluates that all the sub-theories of egalitarianism except “religious egalitarianism” assist this study to prove the concept of justice as the determining force for the concepts of luck and desert (Scheffler, 2003). Furthermore, during analyzing different concepts given by John Roemer in his book “A Pragmatic Theory of Responsibility for the Egalitarian Planner” (1993), this study critically noted that equality in any society can only mean equality in the ownership of productive assets. Although it does not mean that a productive asset must be an occupied property, it can be a job or economic opportunity such as to initiate any business activity, run any business, get any job, or, earn as per the skills and talent (Roemer, 2019).

Although social scientists like G. A. Cohen and Jon Elster also endorsed him in their respective views actually, they both are Marxists. Furthermore, during discussing Dworkin, Roemer argues that Dworkin’s viewpoint about “luck” has no rationality instead of getting as per the skills, talent and effort. In fact,

Roemer tries to describe the relationship between justice, luck and desert are only that justice is based upon equal opportunities within the society. Every person within the society should have equal opportunities while, there should be no segment of society that claims or blame to be deprived of any opportunity, right, or possession (Roemer, 2019). In addition, Roemer as a social egalitarian further illustrates that the concepts of “luck” and “desert” can only be applied in any society when “justice” would prevail. In the existence of “justice”, if someone avails good profit, better earnings, or the best job, he/she deserves that. Similarly, if he/she surprisingly avail the highest profit, the boom in earning or promotion in job, this is definitely his / her good luck that is exhibited as per his / her talent and skill. Thus, by summarizing all the facts, it is finalized that the relationship between justice, luck and the desert is based upon rational ideology. No one can claim himself or herself to be lucky by birth or whatever he/she deserves except to get as per his / her skills and talent. Furthermore, it is also concluded that the concepts of “luck” and “desert” are dependent upon the concept of “justice” as John Roemer wanted to describe (Roemer, 2019).

On the other hand, as political egalitarians believe in the concepts of “equality before the law”, “one person, one vote, and “equal rights for free speech”, the relationship between justice, luck and desert political egalitarianism can be defined as; the entire political system should be based upon “justice” where everyone has equal political rights without any discrimination (Wood, 1995). Similarly, for the followers of political egalitarians, the desert can be defined as “only the followers of rules and regulations within the state/society deserve what state/society rewards them for their corporation”. Some of its examples are “security of life”, the security of business”, and, “protection from uncertain disasters” (Wood, 1995). At the same time, luck, for political egalitarians, is only when someone avails the results as per his / her will or wish. Its better example can be a victory of any political party for its voter (Wood, 1995). So, this study examines that justice is only the base of any political system where the concept of the desert is the reward by the state/society for the followers of rules and regulations. Similarly, luck is the sudden gift or destruction by the state/society in case of following/breaching any law (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

Further moving towards looking at the proof of the hypothesis, this study reaches the philosophy of economic egalitarianism defined by numerous scholars (defined upon) regarding proving that luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice. During observing the relationship between justice, luck and desert under the perspective of economic egalitarians, it is examined that Roemer portrays “economic egalitarianism” as he portrayed “social egalitarianism”. For him, there is no difference in describing the relationship between these concepts under social egalitarianism and economic egalitarianism (Agell, 1993). This relationship can be critically defined as; the concepts of luck and desert are dependent upon the concept of justice (Agell, 1993). Similarly, only justice can determine what anyone has to deserve or how anyone can be lucky (Agell, 1993). At the same time, luck is nothing but a reward by distributive justice according to the efforts, contribution or cooperation (Agell, 1993).

Now, moving towards a way forward, this study critically finds different supportive perspectives for respective hypotheses under the paradigm of cultural egalitarianism. As per the traits of cultural egalitarianism, justice means equal opportunities for all within any society/state (Kahan, 2012) Furthermore, there must not be any discrimination against any cultural segment by rules and regulations imposed by the state/society (Kahan, 2012). At the same time, followers of cultural egalitarianism believe

that there must not be one-sided favor to any cultural segment in terms of rules and regulations (Kahan, 2012). Moreover, desert means what someone deserves under experiencing the same rules and regulations within any state/society whereas; a person can only be lucky when he/she gets a reward from the state/society after following equal rules and regulations (Kahan, 2012).

Then, this study critically analyzes some supportive arguments from the philosophy of legal egalitarianism regarding proving the respective core idea. In fact, during critically evaluating the viewpoints of the proponents of legal egalitarianism, this study finds the perspective of legal egalitarianism about the relationship between justice, luck and desert as; justice is based on equality among men and women (Borrillo, 2019). Similarly, laws should not undermine men or women regarding delivering them equal opportunities in each aspect of life (Borrillo, 2019). Furthermore, during equal participation, what someone deserves (either man or woman) is called desert (Borrillo, 2019). On the other hand, receiving some sort of benefits, profits, promotions or advantages while experiencing equal opportunities is called luck (Borrillo, 2019). At the same time, the concepts of “luck” and “desert” have legal roots. Both concepts cannot be defined irrationally (Borrillo, 2019). In the end, a critical examination of legal egalitarianism exhibits that the concepts of luck and desert always depend upon the concept of justice (Borrillo, 2019).

Furthermore, there are not only the egalitarians who believe that “luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice”. There are also proponents of the philosophies of mutualism and meritocracy who believe in respective hypotheses. As mutualism advocates a society having free markets and usufruct (occupation and use), this study critically investigates the principles of mutualism as; justice only exists when there will be; equal utility for men and women without any discrimination, equal opportunities for men and women regarding involving in social, political or economic activities, equal rights for men and women regarding possessing property or getting profit / earning from the property, and, equal wage system for men and women in all the industries, organizations or institutions without any discrimination (Plant, 2016). Similarly, Desert, as per the principles of mutualism, means what a man or woman deserves as per his / her contribution to any task, affair, or activity (Plant, 2016). Furthermore, for mutualists, luck is the unexpected sudden ratio of profit or earnings that a man or woman gets while contributing equally (Plant, 2016).

Similarly, this study also traces the philosophy of meritocracy in between different writings of scholars who prove that “luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice”. As meritocracy is a political system that favors the political vesting of political powers and economic gains on the bases of achievements, efforts, and talents rather than any other factor, this study, by critically evaluating the works of “The Rise of the Meritocracy” written by Michal Dunlop in 1958 and “Meritocratic Education and Social Worthlessness” written by Khen Lampert in 2012, this study critically finds the supportive arguments for proving the core idea as; justice is based upon the Meritocracy whereas; social inequalities only exist when there is no meritocracy (Lampert, 2013). They also believe that meritocracy can be implemented by functional human social institutions (Lampert, 2013). Furthermore, according to them, the desert is a status or respects any person deserves as per his / her merit (Lampert, 2013). Moreover, through critical analysis of respective books, this study finds that, for the followers of meritocracy, luck is the surprising reward any person he/she receives according to merit (Lampert, 2013).

To see, observe and analyze all the critics, this has been proven that “luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice”.

However, there is another viewpoint. Some scholars are confused about determining the position of luck and desert in front of the concept of justice. In fact, they sometimes, believe that luck and desert sometimes overlap the concept of justice. So, this study also tries to trace out how they find respective perspectives with what kind of supportive arguments.

Luck and Desert Overlap the Concept of Justice

Several scholars strongly believe in the existence of luck and desert as the superstitious forces in the world. Moreover, among different rational scholars, numerous scholars become confused too during defining the complexity in the relationship between the concepts of justice, luck and desert. So, directly or indirectly, they try to prove that “luck and desert overlap the concept of justice”. Among respective scholars, of them are Jon Mandle (who wrote the book “Rawls's 'A Theory of Justice: An Introduction” in 2009), Alexander Kaufman (who wrote the book “Distributive Justice and Access to Advantage” in 2015), Sebastiano Maffettone (who wrote the book “Rawls: An Introduction” in 2010), and, Graham F. Wagstaff (wrote the book “An Integrated Psychological and Philosophical Approach to Justice” in 2001) (Brouwer, 2019, pp. 1-4).

During critically analyzing their work, this study finds respective scholars are not only egalitarian but they have mostly religious oriented too. So, their work can be counted as work under the paradigm of “religious egalitarianism”. By evaluating respective works, this study extracts the views of scholars about religious egalitarianism as religious or spiritual equality. In theological spheres, religious egalitarianism generally refers to the equality in rights, authorities and responsibilities among genders and different social, cultural, linguistic, or political groups as per the directions of the religion. Several religions existed in the entire world but, a universal fact among them is found that almost every religion talks about equality. However, the interpretation of the word “equality” is different in different religions (like Islam). In Islam, a woman has half shared in property inheritance as a man. Similarly, testimony by a woman can also be considered as half of a man in Islam. However, there is no principle of discrimination between men and women in Islam in terms of race, culture, region, language, or politics. The same is the case with the Sikh religion where equality exists in all spheres of life except between the genders. Hinduism has also some sort of same belief where a woman had to forcefully sacrifice on the funeral pyres of her deceased husband till the occupation of India by Sultan Mehmood Ghaznavi (Seshat, 2019).

Within Christianity, Christian scholars believe that equality exists among people of all economic, ethnic or racial classes as per the teachings of Jesus Christ. Although the Bible gives the authority to parents over their children and, to husbands over their wives, Christian scholars call such principles as the ideals of egalitarianism. On the other hand, the concept of egalitarianism is somewhat different in Judaism than the other religions. It allows women regarding leading services with men publicly as per the direction in the Torah (Seshat, 2019).

Furthermore, for tracing out how religious egalitarians prove that “luck and desert overlap the concept of justice”, this study critically examined that almost every Abrahamic religion talks about equality. However, the concept of “equality” varies in all religions. The such conflicting and complex situation forces atheists

to project their views about “pure equality” among men and women without any discrimination at any state at any condition. However, generally, as per teachings of different religions, the relationship between justice, luck and desert can be defined as; there is a lot of differences between the concepts of “justice” and “equality” in Abrahamic religions, especially Christianity and Islam. For them, “justice” means “to put something in its accurate place” whereas; equality means “every person is equal (either man or woman). Both; Christian and Muslim scholars believe that Abrahamic religions determine some limits for men and women. These limits are based upon the principle of distributive justice while, men and women are equal within the respective limits (Seshat, 2019).

On the other hand, critical evaluation of religious egalitarianism facilitates this study in tracing out the concept of the desert as; this concept belongs to the commitment of any person to the teachings of his / her religion. As he/she has to devote himself/herself to following religious teachings as he/she has to deserve more blessings and success from the divine (Seshat, 2019). Furthermore, for all religions including Abrahamic religions, the concept of “luck” belongs to the sudden fulfillment of prayers or wishes from God. Religious teachings usually refer that some people are so pious in their acts that they have been closed to God/divine. Thus, God/divine fulfills their wishes as suddenly as they pray (Seshat, 2019).

So, to evaluate respective paradigms under religious egalitarianism, this is a clear exhibition that supporters of respective philosophies are confused in determining the positions of justice, luck and desert. And, at several stages, they overlap luck and desert upon the concept of justice whereas sometimes, they totally declare that luck and desert overlap the concept of justice (in case of following religious practices).

Conclusion

In proving the core idea, the respective study analyzed works presented by a lot of scholars where some tried to define that “luck and desert do not overlap the concept of justice” while some were confused in determining such a relationship. Moreover, several writers argued that “luck and desert overlap the concept of justice”. Critical evaluation of their work facilitates this study to categorize scholars into two groups where the first group chooses different ways for defining how luck and desert do not overlap in the concept of justice while the other group tried to religiously elaborate that luck and desert overlap the concept of justice. During critical analysis of all the works under both categories, this study has to finalize the views about the core idea as; justice only exists where equality is exhibited whereas; during equal participation, what someone deserves (either man or woman) is called the desert. Likewise, luck is nothing but a reward by distributive justice according to the efforts, contribution or cooperation.

References

- Agell, J. (1993, December). *Egalitarianism and Growth*. Retrieved May 07, 2019, from Jstore: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3440911>
- Allen, A. (2011, December). *Michael Young's The Rise of the Meritocracy: A Philosophical Critique*. Retrieved May 07, 2019, from Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233019905_Michael_Young's_The_Rise_of_the_Meritocracy_A_Philosophical_Critique
- Borrillo, S. (2019, March). *Women's Movements and the Recognition of Gender Equality in the Constitution-Making Process in Morocco and Tunisia (2011–2014)*. Retrieved May 08, 2019, from

- Cambridge University Press: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/women-as-constitutionmakers/womens-movements-and-the-recognition-of-gender-equality-in-the-constitutionmaking-process-in-morocco-and-tunisia-20112014/5513957DD91FD5C8AA065FEBDE2D9FF1>
- Brouwer, H. (2019). *Desert, Luck, and Justice*. Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Cambridge. (2019). *Luck*. Retrieved May 01, 2019, from Cambridge Dictionary: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/luck>
- Changing-Minds. (2019). *What is Luck?* Retrieved May 04, 2019, from Changing Minds: <http://changingminds.org/explanations/meaning/luck.htm>
- Collins. (2019). *Desert*. Retrieved May 03, 2019, from Collins Dictionary: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/desert>
- Hantal, B. (2019). *Social Justice: 7 Theories of Social Justice - Explaine*. Retrieved May 5, 2019, from Your Article Library: <http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/economics/social-justice-7-theories-of-social-justice-explained/39830>
- Homans, G. C. (2019). *George C. Homans, the human group and elementary social behaviour*. Retrieved May 05, 2019, from Infed: <http://infed.org/mobi/george-c-homans-the-human-group-and-elementary-social-behaviour/>
- Hospers, J. (1985, January 01). *Justice versus Social Justice*. Retrieved May 03, 2019, from Foundation for Economic Education: <https://fee.org/articles/justice-versus-social-justice/>
- igley, S. W. (1998). *The Role of Desert in Distributive Justice*. Retrieved May 04, 2019, from London School of Economics and Political Science: <http://etheses.lse.ac.uk/1504/1/U113641.pdf>
- Kahan, D. M. (2012). *Cultural Cognition as a Conception of the Cultural Theory of Risk*. Retrieved May 07, 2019, from Springer Link: https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007%2F978-94-007-1433-5_28
- Lampert, K. (2013). *Meritocratic Education and Social Worthlessness*. Retrieved May 08, 2019, from Palgrave Mcmillan: <https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9781137324887>
- Mutualism. (2019). *WHAT IS MUTUALISM?* Retrieved May 07, 2019, from Mutualism: <http://www.mutualist.org/id24.html>
- Nozick, R. (2014, June 22). *Robert Nozick's Political Philosophy*. Retrieved May 06, 2019, from Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nozick-political/>
- Olsaretti, S. (2008, June). *Justice, Luck, and Desert*. Retrieved May 05, 2019, from Oxford Handbooks Online: <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199548439.001.0001/oxford-hb-9780199548439-e-24>
- Oxford. (2019). *Justice*. Retrieved May 03, 2019, from English Oxford Living Dictionary: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/justice>
- Papageorgiou, G. J. (1980, April). *Social Values and Social Justice*. Retrieved May 06, 2019, from Jstore: https://www.jstor.org/stable/142930?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

- Plant, P. (2016, April 01). *From mutualism to individual competitiveness: Implications and challenges for social justice within career guidance in neoliberal times*. Retrieved May 08, 2019, from Ingenta Connect:
<https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/nicec/jnicec/2016/00000036/00000001/art00002>
- Richards, N. (1986, April). *Luck and Desert*. Retrieved May 05, 2019, from Jstore:
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2254027>
- Roemer, J. E. (2019). *Equality and Responsibility*. Retrieved May 07, 2019, from Boston Review:
<http://bostonreview.net/archives/BR20.2/roemer.html>
- Salahuddin A, S. (2017). *Robert Nozick's Entitlement Theory of Justice, Libertarian Rights and the Minimal State: A Critical Evaluation*. Retrieved May 04, 2019, from Journal of Civil and Legal Sciences:
<https://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/robert-nozick8217s-entitlement-theory-of-justice-libertarian-rights-and-the-minimal-state-a-critical-evaluation-2169-0170-1000234-97787.html>
- Scheffler, S. (2003). *What Is Egalitarianism?* Retrieved May 06, 2019, from Jstore:
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3558033>
- Seshat. (2019). *Axial-Age Religions and the Z-Curve of Human Egalitarianism*. Retrieved May 08, 2019, from Seshat: <http://seshatdatabank.info/seshat-projects/axial-age-egalitarianism/>
- Wood, G. S. (1995, January 09). *Thomas Jefferson and the Idea of Equality*. Retrieved May 07, 2019, from AEI Bradley Lecture Series: <http://www.aei.org/publication/thomas-jefferson-and-the-idea-of-equality/>
- Young, W. H. (2013, February 14). *Social Justice and Fairness*. Retrieved May 05, 2019, from National Association of Scholars: https://www.nas.org/articles/social_justice_and_fairness