Brotherhood in Faith and its Justice-Promoting Functions in a State of "Complex Inequality"

(A review of Michael Walzer's Alawi perspective in the statement "they are either your brothers in religion, or your equals in creation" (*Nahj al-Balagha*, Sermon #53))

Habbibollah Babaie
Assistant Professor, Islamic Sciences and Culture Academy, Qom, Iran (Corresponding Author).
h.babaei@isca.ac.ir

Mahdi Karimi
PhD Student, Baqir al-Olum University, Qom, Iran.
m.karimi@bou.ac.ir

Abstract

The brotherhood model in the words of Amir al-Momenin can be a good model for achieving equality and repudiation of despotism. To achieve social justice, the model "simple equality" has been generally proposed by scholars as a way to perpetuate equality and, in consequence, social justice. Despite all its advantages, the simple equality model faces the serious challenges of disregarding cultural competency and pluralism. Accordingly, the theory "complex equality" was proposed by Walzer as a new approach to underlining cultural pluralism and basing the notion of good on the attitude of distribution. Impeding the spread of inequality and taking account of various notions of goods pave the way for the realization of a complex equality model. In his letter to Malek al-Ashtar regarding the repudiation of despotism, Imam Ali stressed the concept of brotherhood in faith and human equality. The brotherhood model consisting of layers of brotherhood in faith , Islamic brotherhood, brotherhood in faith , and even brotherhood in humanity can be a competing theory in the topic of equality in which social inequality is not only controlled (the negative approach), but it also turns into positive inequality, where everyone sustains loss to the advantage of others (the positive approach). This model of brotherhood which entails relations between ruler and subject not only contains the social despotism that Walzer evades, but it also deals with it. The living model of brotherhood presents a distribution network based on which negative inequalities not only cease to spread in society, but the ground for spreading equality and positive inequality is also provided by fostering brotherhood in complex human networks.

Keywords

Introduction

The problem of authoritarianism and inequality as well as the way to get rid of them is the question that this paper aims to answer. It can be said that the importance of the problem of authoritarianism and the emergence of an unfair distribution process are such that many fairness researchers have come up with some solutions to dispose of it. In the beginning, the paper dealt with Walzer and his answer to the question. Next, with a critical approach, the paper analyzes any solution that underlies the concept of brotherhood and denotes a response to the problem of despotism when looking deep at it. The semantic dimensions of brotherhood, the social influence of this concepts in human relations, and understanding of this concept as a social concept are all incorporated in to the present study to propose a solution to the problem of inequality, despotism and distribution.

Social justice is one of the most important indicators of social, cultural, political, and economic growth in society. In the meantime, the component "equality" assumes a unique role in the realization of social justice. Thus, despite the increasing economic growth of societies, inequality has not only been removed, but also it has been growing (Wright & Brighouse, 2001).

One aspect of why equality has been always an issue in justice-related studies lies in this point. On the other hand, the criterion of equality is semantically prominent in the semantic field of justice, because some philologists designated fairness, equality, and equal division for the term 'justice (Mostafavi, 1982). Accordingly, justice can be synonymous with equality and fairness in many contexts. The signs of equality in the terminology of justice can be traced in the discourse of political philosophers. For Aristotle, one who adheres to the divine honor acts on equal rights (Tusi, 1992). From a religious point of view, the problem of equality is not only a problem, but it is also a general strategy for building a civilization based on justice. The Holy Quran lays emphasis on the sameness of innate divine nature that can be learned as for all human beings (Holy Quran, Luqman, 1), the shared features in creation, blessings, death, and resurrection (Holy Quran, Ghafir, 30), the divine spirit blown to man (Holy Quran, At-Tawbah, 32), the creation of everyone from the same father and

mother, and formation of different ethnicities and nations only for the purpose of being identified (Holy Quran, al-Qiyamah, 14-15). Accordingly, a different model of political, social, and economic needs, actions, behaviors would be reconstructed, based on which the desire for equality appearing to be a quality of human nature, is accomplished, besides achieving exalted religious purposes.

Justice above all manifests itself in its distributive justice which involves the search for sufficient reasons to materialize the process of distribution. According to the British philosopher Bernard Williams, it is always necessary to distribute goods for good reasons (Walzer, 1983). We encounter two chief elements when it comes to distributive justice; the first element is the subject of goods which actually constitutes an answer to the question "equality in what?", which follows the question "why equality?" (Sen, 2016). Reflection on equality belonging gives rise to a different systemof distributive values, which is in turn the origin of various ideas about distributive justice and equality in particular. The second element comes from our response to the question "equality between whom?", which actually sheds some light on the surrounding environment of the conflict over distributive justice.

Simple equality

One of the most important indicators of justice is equality. However, simple equality can to certain degree satisfy the need for a model of justice based on which a unified system of distribution is applied to particular goods. In this approach, regardless of entitlement, differences and inequalities, impartial and same distribution is pursued. Simple equality involves a simple distribution situation (Walzer, 1983). In this case, entitlement, inequality, and differences are not taken into consideration. Given this, the realization of justice suggests impartial consideration to the perimeter that envelopes beneficiaries (Maccormick, 1996), and the same look at the whole perimeter of beneficiaries who are the subject and place of simple distribution. In this case, without regard to men's innate entitlement and differences, a unified situation is created, wherein social justice is realized in a simple model by overlooking all personal and social characteristics. However, simple equality

regime won't last long, because the processes governing market's economic transactions would practically and quickly give way to new inequalities (Walzer, 1983). The inequalities emerge from men's innate differences with respect to personal talents and pluralist features of society that encompasses various cultural, historical and political contexts. On the other hand, unequal characteristic of public guilds and strata, which helps to the realization of personal and social goals, seems to yield to some sort of intentional inequality at the heart of society. According to religious scholars, "if people were the same and equal, they would have been annihilated. For Khaje Nasir, society's function is served with the difference between guilds and strata of people in accepting the work designated for them. For him, the world gain strength and human being's livelihood system is set to work from the rise of each, as this existence of this being won't take place without collaboration and collaboration without people is inconceivable" (Tusi, 1992).[1]

Thus, the notion of simple equality is challenging in many ways, and it is impossible to assume a situation where simple equality can be ensured for a long time. It can therefore be said that equality is the formation of a complex relationship between people generate a good action and share and divide it among themselves (Walzer, 1983). Hence simple equality which promotes a simple form of distributing goods gives way to a complex equality as a theory suggesting the possibility of perpetuating equality in a complex model. The difference between public and private goods[2] and the discrepancy

---

1. Belbin divides the members of a team into nine classes; planner, monitor and evaluator, coordinator, resource investigator, implementer, finisher, team-worker, shaper, and specialist (Belbin, 2010). This division demonstrates that we can uphold some kind of special work inequality in order to achieve social purposes.

2. It should be noted that for economists there is a difference between public and private goods. According to the theory of public goods, the goods are inexhaustible, as the use of the goods by a single person does not contain the use of others, but private goods are different, in that the use by a single person kills the chance for others to use them (Oakland, 1987). Thus, the subject of distributive justice and particularly equality is private goods, but sometimes it is possible that access to public goods serves as the subject of distributive justice.

between various forms of private goods provide a diverse space of distributions that inhibits simple equality approach from covering this space and putting forward stable strategies for administering distributive justice. In this case, the search for a coherent criterion suggests an incorrect understanding of distributive justice (Walzer, 1983).

Complex equality

A closer look at society and its various cultural and social differences, while recognizing the plurality of such a society, we see some kind of equality that is characterized by diversity. Therefore, it can be said that the idea of equality is faced with two different types of diversity; the first is the diversity of human beings, and the second is the diversity of variables based on which equality is measured (Sen, 2016). The two ends of the multiplicity drive us to make a transition from simple equality to a complex model of equality, so that the basis for the structure of social justice is provided in a complex model. According to Walzer, we are experiencing a complex egalitarian society where there are a host of small inequalities without giving way to other inequalities in the process of transition (Walzer, 1983). Thus, the entire society is comprised of small inequalities, but the inequalities each are maintained in their domains and are not passed on to other domains. In this way, complex inequality is perceived in the entire society.

The distribution mechanism has been always in transition, because distribution criterion is constantly changing. Throughout history, market is one of the most important distributive mechanisms for social goods; however, no integrated distribution system has been yet introduced (Walzer, 1983). Thus, distribution mechanism is not a simple mechanism based on which we can put forward a simple model of distribution. For this reason, principles of justice are multifaceted. According to sociologists, particularly Walzer, principles of justice are basically pluralistic. Different social goods are distributed on different grounds and based on different methods and different factors (Walzer, 1983). However, according to Walzer, none of the three criteria namely free exchange, entitlement, and the need for the realization

of a distribution mechanism is considered a general criterion for administering distributive justice (Walzer, 1983). Hence it is necessary to search for another approach to distribution, based on which we can elaborate on the existing multiplicity in distributive societies. It can be said social concepts including goods have the quality of social meaning. According to this view, the semantic field is defined in the areas of culture, age, and civilization (Izotso, 1995). However, the complex quality approach is accomplished in accordance with society's understanding of social meanings in general and the meaning of good as a social concept in particular. To walzer, the principle of complex equality prompts us to study social meanings, so that we can test different domains of distribution from inside (Walzer, 1983). According to Walzer, by considering different scopes of social meanings and independence of each area from other areas, it is intriguing to propose complex egalitarianism that results in social equality within pluralist and independent societies (Miller & Walzer, 2003). In this perspective, Walzer sets out to uphold the requirements of pluralism on the one hand, and on the other hand organize distribution process within a fair and equitable framework. Therefore, Walzer comes up with complex equality in an attempt to achieve the two goals; this, however, legitimizes inequality and sets forth such concepts as entitlement, "putting everything in its place", as well as concepts playing a chief role in justice, and interprets it equality, and removes the ground for changing dominating good to goods in other fields by taking advantage of distribution according to their special criterion. The structure of complex equality entails some features according to Walzer, three of which can be addressed as follows;

Denunciation of despotism: for Walzer, the nature of despotism is the desire to dominate the whole world outside a particular sphere (Walzer, 1983). By negating the effect of distributive privilege from one domain to another, complex equality causes the person who has a distributive privilege in another domain to dominate other goods due to that social good. Therefore, a complex equality stands against dictatorship. It provides a set of relations rendering any dominance impossible (Walzer, 1983). By negating dominance, the independence of distributive spheres is kept, and every individual will do

well in any of distribution spheres (Walzer, 1983). In this view, a special criterion for fair distribution is defined for each sphere and every good; in which case, the citizens of such society form a class society, so that everyone has access to part of goods in a special way. With the process of complex equality, dominating good that systematically gives way to other types of goods such as opportunities, power, and fame during the process of simple equality (Walzer, 1983) would be contained in its special sphere and hence the negation of dictatorship and dominance.

The characteristic of pluralism; the task of complex equality is to endorse pluralism. Thus, Walzer argues that a unified and acceptable version of pluralism is conceivable (Walzer, 1983). This unified version is the same complex egalitarian system in which plural society is not desperate to ignore cultural, ethnic, economic, and political characteristics of its citizens in order to achieve justice. Complex equality requires the defense of boundaries; it creates a complex structure by distinguishing between goods and different groups of people (Walzer, 1983). In this way, pluralism yields to pluralism in society with respect to the criterion of distribution, as sets of plurality along with pluralism criteria are addressed by distributive justice.

The negation of monopoly; complex egalitarian viewpoint invalidates the monopoly of distributive justice by mixing pluralism and negation of despotism. According to this view, when social meanings are from each other, it would be necessary that distributions becomes independent—that is, each social good or sets of goods is a separate sphere that includes a specific distributive criterion (Walzer, 1983). As such, on the one hand, a set of basic and primary goods that consist of the entire material and moral world cannot be conceived in the same way as sets of conditions that give rise to minimalistic thinking about a particular distribution (Walzer, 1983). On the other hand, by negating primary goods, the claim that the verification of a single criterion for such goods is the genesis of general principles of justice is debunked.

Despite Walzer's effective criticismwhere goods desired by him are confined to the goods of liberal democratic societies, and justice shifted to the matter of relativity (Vaezi, 2009), there are remarkable points in Walzer;s

ideas that must be taken into account when dealing with justice and quality and designate an answer to it. In the same vein, embracing plurality in society, negating monopoly and despotism, and the linking of the pluralism and distributive justice are important matters that need to be concerned with in order to proceed with the studies on justice and equality. By proposing the claim about complex equality, Walzer somewhat managed to answer the criticisms on simple equality. However, Walerz's complex society is a set of intertwined inequalities that they may be drawn to complete inequality at any moment when a special good prevails. Although Walzer strives to introduce citizens of the society as guardians of complex equality, the type of equality obtained in such a society has a permanent and unstable character, in the sense that inequality changes from a sphere to other spheres at any moment in the process of transition.

Nevertheless, it seems that Walzer's theory and his account of addressing despotism and distribution are insufficient, but the problem he raised about justice and equality persists in today's world; thus, it is necessary to keep on developing theory in this regard, so that we can arrive at a clear solution to the problem of despotism and distribution. What is proposed in this article is the notion of brotherhood in religious and Islamic attitude and its functions in providing answers to the problem of equality and inequality in Walzer's discourse.

Model of brotherhood in religious attitude

The notion of brotherhood in religious attitude is synonymous with the concept of equality as a term in contemporary political culture. It not only has the capacity of serving the purpose of equality, but it also has more important objectives in response to such problems with a broad semantic scope in the field of social ethics.

In Islamic heritage brotherhood is an inextricable link between members of society. While consisting in religious values and benefitting from divine characteristic, it is one of the cornerstone of social stability. From the standpoint of Muslim scholars of ethics, the relation between two persons is sometimes established by accident, e.g. two neighbors who keep each other's

company deliberately. Brotherhood in religion is something of this sort and realized on a voluntary basis (Ghazali, 2006). Therefore, the element of volition contributes to the meaning of brotherhood and is realized by the voluntary acceptance of religion. This level of brotherhood, which is realized so, is not at odds with that of brotherhoodin humanity which encompasses all human beings on a social basis regardless of their religious characteristics. Just as it is not in conflict with the brotherhood made as a pledge between two Muslims, it is believed to be of gradual levels in the concept of brotherhood.

Commonness and dissociation in brotherhood

1. the component "commonness" in brotherhood; according to the Quranic verses and concepts, brotherhood is made as a result of a partnership in something; it does not matter whether the commonness exist between infidels or believers. Regarding infidels because of their disbelief, the Holy Quran calls them brothers and says "do not be like those who disbelieved and said about their brothers" (Holy Quran, al-Baqarah, 2). The same interpretation "brother" is used for believers because of their commonness in their belief; "the believers are but brothers (Holy Quran, al-Hujurat, 10). In the same way, the extravagant and wicked persons are interpreted as brothers because of their sameness in the violation of rights; "the wasteful are brothers of the devils" (Holy Quran, al-Isra, 27). As for prophets (PBUH) and their relations with their bands, the term "Akh" (brother) "behold, their brother Noah ... their brother Hud…their brother Lut….their brother Salih said to them: Will you not fear (Allah)" (Quran, Ash-Shu'ara, 106, 124, 142, 161; Amoli, 2009). The important point is that commonness is a relative matter as it cannot be achieved in the same size and same end all the times. Accordingly, brotherhood is a relative concept that may consists of a wide range of minimal brotherhoods (with minimum commonalities) and maximal brotherhoods (with maximum commonalities within and outside the realm of a religion. That is, brothers who share their nationality, religion and creed feel greater brotherhood than those with less in common. It is worth noting that any kind of communion does not result in brotherhood, but rather it would be brotherhood when an amiable approximation

and spiritual closeness are forged between two persons or groups. Nonetheless, the more commonalities, the easier the approximation between hearts will be, but it is likely for less commonalities to have amiable communion. Cordial closeness is feasible when there is something in common, not necessarily material or earthly but a human and spiritual one (not necessarily religious). Therefore, hearts should be united in brotherhood, and if there is no consensus among the hearts, even though people and things stand next to each other and there seems to be a community, no real community and brotherhood will be formed (Amoli, 2010d).

2. dissociation even with brotherhood: brotherhood does not mean objectivity and all-embracing commonness between two individuals and groups. Brothers have differences in spite of their brotherhood. The upshot of brotherhood appears exactly in the context of differences, where a brother finds communion with his different brother (what is not he himself), and present himself as a servant to his religious and brother in humanity. In other words, it is basically impossible that brotherhood takes place between individuals without any differences, and if so, this brotherhood bears no fruit where everyone is the same. Accordingly, Prophet Muhammad recited a bond of brotherhood between Abu Dharr and Salman and called them brothers, while Abu Dharr was so different from Salman that it was held that if Abu Dharr knew what was going on in Salman's heart, he would have definitely killed him (Majlessi, 1983).

Fraternity and models coming from it

Fraternity is viewed as a social relationship model; brotherhood is a social relationship model between members of society. The relationship is a fraternal relationship that can be a model of communication which is able to link the normative and value system to social characteristics. People without contribution to society in the process of communicating with each other are individuals living separately and lacking social identity. Men and women are people without identity when they are not members of a special society (Walzer, 1983). To this end, it is necessary that the relationship between members of society be formed in such a way that it endorses a common

structure of culture, politics, economics, and so on. Philosophers have proposed extensive discussions about unity and identity. For them, every person is characterized and distinct with respect to his/her existence. According to Sadra, existence is indivisible from individuality (al-Shirazi, 2010). According to this philosophical view, the system of social relations is shaped in the context of various characteristics by maintaining members of society's individuation. Thus, from the vantage point of political philosophers, just as kinship between individuals forges affinity and unity between them, citizenship and membership in a society can be seen as a social relationship (Walzer, 1983). Given that social relationship is a crucial concept in the realization of society, culture, and general structure of community, this concept assumes an important role in the doctrine of brotherhood, as we can say that brotherhood is a communicative model based on which a meaningful relation is forged between individuals; the relation plays a role in shaping social reason. On the one hand, it is the cornerstone of a sociological situation outside of tribal, national, geographical, and historical ties, and, on the other hand, the institution of religion is characterized as a way of creating a sense of attachment and dependence among human beings. Assigning each group of people to a geographical region is a natural motive to meet basic needs, but we should bear in mind that nature requires a united community so as to attain its ends and celebrate its accomplishments (Tabatabaei, 1971). The Holy Quran lays emphasis on the necessity of community over teachings of religion, antithesis, and relation of thoughts and ideas on the basis of the Holy Quran and the model of education (Tabatabaei, 1971). The relation of thoughts, while ensuring the realm of ideas, can achieve social unity. Therefore, on the one hand, everyone becomes sensible of his individual characteristic, i.e. thinking, and on the other hand bring the institution of society to unity and sublimity. According to this view, the model of fraternity in Islam is a significant relation between members of society, which is the basis of social reasoning and relies on divine teachings. The result would be that the system of brotherhood in faithis a unifying system that provides the ground for a communicative model together with social excellence and sublimity, while adhering to pluralism and diversity of tastes.

Fraternity as a model of voluntary inequalities: with a shift from self to other, and from individual ethics to social ethics, conflict-based equations change in the scope of justice.

Moral virtues resulting from fraternity status address addresses the issue of fairness conflict, because the subject of justice is a right as it causes conflict and a right which is the subject of conflict won't last long with the realization of moral virtues, but the concepts such as "caring" or "empathy" are realized, and every person relinquishes his right for the sake of virtue and confer it on another person out of keenness. In such circumstances, positive and voluntary inequalities give way to unwanted and negative ones, as concealed violence is controlled and annihilated in a state of unwanted equality which keep threatening social security. Basically in the atmosphere of voluntary inequalities, the one who is deprived and his deprivation is voluntary is not irritate at least by his mental factor, but instead he revels in this deprivation. However, the deprived person is annoyed by his deprivation in the first place in involuntary inequalities, which is a case of social determinism where he attempts to break the social order in order to liberate from himself and suffering inflicted upon him.

Fraternity as a caring model; caring suggests paying attention to other people and being concerned about their agonies and problems, and is a model for building a fair society. The virtue of caring can be considered a structural concept in the context of brotherhood according to which a person not only respect his brother's rights and honors him, but he also protects his brother and the fraternal relationship. In this approach, the virtuous view is replaced with a entitlement-based view. In the same vein, ethics of caring is one of the theories that was set forth in the contemporary era by researchers of ethics in order to link between individual ethics and social ethics (Stole and LeBar, 2016). According to this view, when members of society are concerned about caring for one another, the institution of the society would be protected against violence, injustice, and oppression. In contrast, the society whose members benefit from the feature of caring each other, social goods would take place. According to this view, caring can provide the foundations for social justice, as the society will break free from social evil with such a

character. Accordingly, the content of justice would take on a masculine, rigid, and rule-based form, while society is in need of more flexible contents in order to achieve social goods. The contents is the same ethics of caring. What can lead a society into perfection is a flexible and motherly affection. As a mother regarded as a symbol of compassionate and caring for her children provides the happiness of her children, it is necessary that the ground for eradicating social evil and establishing social goods be prepared throughout society by extending this feature to all members of society and realizing ethics of caring in the entire society. Therefore, the person who has ethics of caring pays attention to the happiness and prosperity of others; in which case, the basis for social growth is provided as human being stops caring about himself and extreme individualism.

Putting forward the stages of ethical development , Colberg considers six stages for human being until he understands the pure concept of justice, but Giligan opted for the notion of caring instead of the concept of justice. According to him, the concept of caring, in light of its motherly content, leaves no room for the concept of justice which involves masculine and rigid content. Once caring is realized, ethical and social disorders can be treated, and social morality and hence disorder and inequalities will come to an end. Giligan believes that the path to personal and social well-being is caring-based ethics (Jorgensen, 2006).

It is worth noting that while a few advocates of ethics of caring are seen as feminists as they basically find ethics of caring at odds with justice. However, there are many who bridge the gap between personal ethics and social justice by using this concept. Slote in this category finds justice independent, while underscoring virtue of caring as a means of social justice (Slote, 2003). When it comes to caring, a shift from self to other takes place; morality and affection takes the place of law in society. For Slote, the one who adheres to ethics of caring is concerned with his conduct as to how it affects others (Slote, 1998). On the basis of this morality, it can be said that ethics of caring approach has a positive end to the realization of social justice, but while theories of justice all have negative ends to protect individual interests. Ethics of caring is an agent-based virtue which is based

on the incentive that consists in behavior, which means that a better world is ahead of us if it is realized (Slote, 1998).

Fraternity as a model of empathy; empathy means the ability to see what it is like to be them and look at the world from their viewpoint and by their feelings, which has been considered the basis of modern virtue ethics. It also suggests emotional motivation in ourselves when someone else feels a pain, so that the pain raids us (Slote, 2007). Likewise, empathy calls for a recognition of how the other thinks and feels, hence our appropriate emotional reaction to him (Baron-Cohen, 2011). According to Hume, empathy is the transmission of emotion between two persons, in the sense that if someone experiences a feeling, this will pass on to someone else as well (Slote, 2007).[1]

As with caring, this concept can be introduced in the semantic structure of brotherhood. In this approach, the brother is empathetic with his brother, and he bases his relationship on this empathy. The role that the empathy can play in resolving social strife demonstrates the importance of this concept in the establishment of a society based on fraternity. Empathetic belongingness is the suffering observed by an observer in someone else. The two-sidedness of empathy causes the individual to drive out his selfishness needed for extreme individualism, so that he considers goods in the context of deprivation and necessary for all people rather than for himself only.

The relationship between empathy and caring is of significance. In fact, empathy is the chief mechanism for caring, benevolence, and compassion (Slote, 2007). Caring is invigorated in the process of empathy. The link between empathy and caring prompts us to become more responsible for those who are experiencing suffering and hardship (Slote, 2007). Once caring and its

---

1. It is necessary to note that such concepts as empathy and caring in the modern Western literature were set forth within the framework of ethical sensualism. Due to its relative approach and substantive difference as against Islamic ethics, though we take account of the distance between our evaluation and the perspective of sensualism and its relativity, our focus is directed toward the virtuous dimension of moral belief that sensualists dealt with and its origin is human's philanthropic sentiments which entail an innate dimension; the moral concepts were introduced only because of their contribution to the concept of brotherhood. Addressing the critiques that ethical sensualism faces undoubtedly calls for another work.

practical mechanism - empathy- are realized, we have a distributive system where the person can build a distributive model by relinquishing his material interests and personal goods in favor of others; the model can help to administer justice in social dimension. Hence the two individual virtues can serve as a bridge between social morality and social justice in a broader, more thorough, and deeper perspective.

The motivation behind empathy is benevolence. According to this feature, a person drives out his selfish nature and display virtuous behavior with the intention of being nice to others. In accounting for the nature of benevolence, Hutchson lays emphasis on the relation between benevolence and ethical sensualism, as well as the link between benevolence and egoism, but at the same time he invalidates egoism in order to encourage benevolence (Roberts, 2013). Alternatively, this concept can function as a bridge between individual virtue and social justice. It can be said that general benevolence as a moral method can be a basis for social justice (Slote, 2003). Conversely, following the motive for benevolence, compassion starts intriguing the person, driving him into an emotional approach to the surrounding world. Compassion was properly defined by Smith as moral sentiments: compassion is the joy that is felt at the time of observing others' suffering. When we see their living situation… that is, when we see what it is like to be them, it is as if we are inside their bodies and a single person with them in some ways (Lamper, 2005).

It should be noted that the concept of empathy is an integral part of the broad concept of brotherhood. The reiterating religious advice on the need for empathetic treatment with religious brothers and the whole people demonstrates the position of this concept following brotherhood. In this respect, brotherhood cannot be accomplished outside the realm of empathetic behavior; that is, it is only realized by means of empathetic behavior.[1]

---

1. For instance, we can cite a part of Imam Ali (a.s)'s letter to Malik al-Ashtar, "Beware! Fear God when dealing with the problem of the poor who have nothing to patronize, who are forlorn, indigent and helpless and are greatly torn in mind. This example and similar examples are abundant in the Quranic verses and narrations, emphasizing the need for empathy between the members of society and government's empathy with its people.

Brother in religion and brother in humanity

In one respect, brotherhood can be divided into two types; 1- brotherhood in faith "The believers are but brothers" (Holy Quran, al-Hujurat, 2); brotherhood in humanity "every man, whether or not he likes, is the brother of another man"[1]. Amir al-Muminin also said "O'Malik: Habituate your heart to mercy for the subjects and to affection and kindness for them. Do not stand over them like greedy beasts who feel it is enough to devour them, since they are of two kinds, either your brother in religion or one like you in creation" (Nahj al-Balagha, Letter. 53). Prophet Muhammad (pbuh)'s speech and practice undermines the same logic. He found human societies equivalent to each other and side by side in accordance with common human-centered principles of education, saying that "Different classes of people from the time of Adam to the present resemble the tooth of a comb" (Majlesi, 1983)[2]. It is apparent that it is not about Muslims only, but it is people in general. Hence, different classes of people are the same as the tooth of a comb, which must stand side by side in the queue at a short distance (Amoli, 2010a). Importantly, although brotherhood in faith is different from brotherhood in humanity, some kind of fraternity and brotherhood can be envisaged among religious people (at least followers of Abrahimic religions) as much as they have common faith as faith and religiosity are something relative. In other words, if a religiousperson of a different religion has faith in God, he can equally forge brotherhood and fraternity among themselves. But if these religious people have more in common concerning their faith in the monotheistic religions, stronger brotherhood will be formed among them. In the same way, if there are commonalities within a religion like Islam, closer and stronger brotherhood will be established; what has not happened between Muslims and Jews or

---

1. Professor Javadi Amoli says concerning this remark: "if a narrative document is found, it can be the most vivid and universal interpretations of Islamic internation law" (Amoli, 2010c).

2. In another narration by the Prophet Muhammad (pbuh), it is said that he gave the example for believers: "المؤمنون كاسنان المشط يتساوون فى الحقوق بينهم ويتفاضلون بأعمالهم" (Muhaddith Nuri, 1987).

Christians[1]. Islamic brotherhood can be weakened or intensified even within Islam; that is, brotherhood can heighten and grow stronger as much as there is affinity for thought, belief and behavior. Accordingly, it is not the case that brotherhood can apply in a single society during one step and only in one class of people, but brotherhood in religion is something gradual and relative, which is formed relative to his religiosity and faith as well as commonalities in his faith. One can take advantage of the whole hierarchy of fraternity among religious people within the framework of fraternal society, building a religion-based and commendable society.

But what has been emphasized in this article is brotherhood in humanity, so that some sort of human and ethical relationship between human beings on a global scale can be cited, thanks to a review of its ethical aspects among all religious and non-religious people, and the least possible yet effective commonalities in social relations can be underscored as well. It is glaringly apparent that we cannot debase other people enjoying the same human values and disregard their moral rights in a situation where one considers and believes in his innate and human values as something in common between himself and others.

Brotherhood in humanity is not something learned but something inherent and arisen from human's nature common among human beings. From the Islamic point of view, human beings have incompatible nature but an innate nature adaptable to one another. Unity, faith, monotheism, affection, brotherhood, and reforming trait are all derived from man's human innateness and common spirit "Then He inspired it (soul) to understand what is right and wrong for it" (Holy Quran, Ash-Shams, 8), based on which we can create some kind of coherence and harmony in a human-based society. On the other hand, enmity, hatred and otherness fighting arise from human nature which is in conflict with other—"He created man from a sperm-drop; then at once, he is a clear adversary" (Holy Quran, An-Nahl, 4). Now, whoever close to his innate nature has

---

1. Regarding the idea that Islamic brotherhood and brotherhood in religion (including Abrahimic religions) at different levels arise from brotherhood and ethics and social solidarity (Amoli, 2007).

a path paved for affection, unity, and brotherhood, even though he is not seemingly a Muslim. Conversely, whoever remote from his innate nature and closer to his material and earthly nature is less likely to experience brotherhood, even though he is apparently Muslim. From this standpoint, a hypocrite, unbeliever, and polytheist are closer to this nature, and yet they totally ruined their divine innate nature by bearing malice—he failed who corrupted it" (Holy Quran, Ash-Shams, 7-10). And again they would have appeared as "Adde Khesam" (while he is very severe in your opposition). Thus, if common human nature, since they are human, is concerned and stressed, a man can provide the basis for the emergence of some kind of brotherhood, friendship, and coherence and universal unity as much as human commonalities exist (Amoli, 2010b). Basically, monotheistic nature is the asset of universal unity, as God Almighty placed it inside human beings such that none is devoid of it in any generation. Professor Javadi puts it in this regard: the sole focus of human beings and unity of human societies is their monotheistic nature which is something objective, developmental, eternal and enduring, because nature does not arise from climatic properties, where it changes as they do so, nor has it been confined to a particular point in time so that it perishes as time passes, and nor is it exposed to other events so that it wears out with accidents and changes, but it continues to overlook every land and environment at any time and rules any tradition and ritual of any tribe or race and the like; because human's soul is single and monotheistic nature embedded in his existence is impeccable against matter and immune to the rules governing the nature of history…the result would be that "universal unity" cannot be accomplished without a developmental and universal bond, or any bond not conforming to human's monotheistic nature is transient and perishable. Man's interest in the monotheistic nature and its demands bind human brotherhood with fraternity (Amoli, 2007).

Simple fraternity and complex fraternity

Just as simple equality is imprudent and unfeasible, simple fraternity is neither wise nor feasible. Commonalities in faith and Islam are not the same whether

it be in a religious society or Islamic society or in the realm of religious society. Hence the fraternities arising from the commonalities would not be the same. When it comes to diversity, multiplicity, and relativity, fraternity can no longer be delineated in the same way and size in any state with respect to religious, Islamic and faith brothers. And when fraternity comes in different forms, grades and practice, as time or context play a role for the sake of it, it gives way to complex, intertwined, and multifaceted fraternity. The lack of simplicity in fraternity and the emergence of differences in human relations prepares the ground for non-fraternity. In fact, the other side of non-simple and complex fraternities is complex non-fraternity. In human relations, the less the level of fraternity, the more obvious the differences will be, and some sort of non-fraternity appears; and the more activated non-fraternity becomes, the more the possibility of cruelty in political and social arenas will be. Now, if we decide to limit and prevent the development of inequalities from one sphere (e.g. religion) to another, then we can attain a network of fraternities in a human society that can strive more effectively to address despotism than the system of simple equalities, making distribution system more just. In this approach, fraternity and brotherhood is the foremost principle in human societies at the macro level of humanity (brotherhood in humanity). Although brotherhood in humanity cannot cover all commonalities of people in different societies, all human relations are influenced continually in all societies, encouraging profound fraternity and brotherhood in humanity. The essence of the brotherhood, albeit in the least human commonalities, prepares the ground for the development of fraternity and restriction of non-fraternity. Nonetheless, we cannot observe non-fraternity at the least level of humanity; that is, if all men have human priorities in terms of human value and dignity, then everyone will be brothers in the same end and there would be no discrepancy. However, humanity grown and develops, which means that as humanity grows more and more, so does human order. Indeed, if everyone is human, while some are more human, becoming more human would never cause any conflict and non-fraternity among human beings, but instead it heightens and spreads human space and brotherhood. But when non-human behaviors break out in a

human society, non-fraternity will start to happen in the same range, preparing the ground for clashes and violations. Ethnicity, language, gender play no role in inhumane behavior. What causes a man to exhibit inhumane behavior–– baghy (injustice) and Taadi (violation), the Quranic terms.

In short, brotherhood in humanity is a kind of human ethics in interacting with non-Muslim others; just as human ethics promote human fraternity and brotherhood among the members of society, albeit with different belief, when it comes to human beings. The Holy Quran says "*Allah does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes-from being righteous toward them and acting justly toward them. Indeed, Allah loves those who act justly*" (Holy Quran, al-Mumtahanah, 8). This is God's universal rule for all human strangers. Until they inflict no harm to a Muslim and have no fight with the Islamic system, they can live in peace because they are human; this is the compliance with the principle of human rights and philanthropy. In light of the human respect and dignity, that Imam Sadiq (a.s) says "It is not appropriate for a Muslim to accuse a Jew, a Nasrani, and Majosi of something that he has no knowledge of" (Amoli, 2012). Likewise, Imam says elsewhere "If a Jewish man keeps you company, you should treat him with courtesy". Amir al-Mumenin also reported Muhammad's visit to a Jewish patient (Amoli, 2012). This all indicates human dignity for the men of letters as well as others who had no belief but they are endowed with human innate nature (human's innate value), so we have to consider this in our (Muslim's) social relations. The important point is to restrict non-fraternity and prevent it from spreading from one sphere to another. Separating non-fraternity in one context from fraternity in other contexts protects society against plurality and dispersion in a plural situation. A variety of verses stressing the repulsion of evilness can be mentioned in this case, where any form of sin and evil, e.g. non-fraternity, emerges, we have to confine and put an end to it, not allowing it to spread.

The important point that must bear in mind or even keep using is that voluntary inequalities arise from the context of fraternity. That is, when brotherhood in humanity or brotherhood in religion and Islam or brotherhood

in faith are forged, the context of fraternities form inequalities that people and brothers fuel deliberately and give their own rights up to others, and prefer the inequality to legal equality; in which case, the resulting social order is more reliable and conform to the principle of fairness.

What is more important to note, however, is the issue of violence in unwanted equality, which is one of the serious threats to social relations. Such covert and constant violence cease to exist in voluntary inequalities arising from the atmosphere of fraternity and brotherhood at all levels and types, on the ground that such inequalities are voluntary in the first place, and secondly they are not against but in favor of the conquered and condemned atmosphere in society, and thirdly such inequalities are disturbing rather than fragile to the affluent and wealthy people. This can be a way out of despotism on the one hand, a fairly equitable distribution in a plural society.

Conclusion

We have to acquiesce to complexities in order to achieve justice in society. Thus, if we want justice to be realized, equalities and fraternities have to be complex. Now, considering the concepts set forth following the concept of fraternity, such virtues as self-sacrifice, compassion, affection and caring are important moral grounds that make it possible for despotism and inequality in distribution to emerge far more than what Walzer claimed. With a positive approach, Walzer addressed the problem of distribution and attempted in spite of monopolizing people behind the walls of inequality and unequal situations to prevent it from spreading from one sphere to another. However, regarding complex fraternity suggested in this article, the problem of distribution and despotism were addressed with a positive approach. The members of a religious utopia where everyone defined himself as a member attached to others rather than apart from them and grown in a context of religion and humanity not only had no desire to impose power on each other, but they also vied with each other for giving or even conferring their right to one another. Therefore, the problem of despotism can be addressed through a control from inside, i.e., human morality, in addition to a control from outside,

i.e. someone in authority. The distributive model developed from fraternity and civil responsibility prepares the ground in which one tends to altruism rather than egoism, creating a human-based distributive system in order to achieve spiritual goals and ethical virtues. This distributive system is built on forgiveness and endowment rather than achievements, and is in pursuit of social purposes and spiritual intentions rather than personal goals and bodily pleasures. As a result, the model of brotherhood is a system of ethical concepts and supreme human themes at social level, and has by far better efficiency on the basis of brotherhood complexity in religious, Islamic, and human layers. Piety and self-control in the clean conscience of a member of a religious society impede the compulsory dominance of religious society's members over each other, and social interaction of ethical concepts facilitates an empathetic relationship between brothers. And by complying with ethical and human laws, any form of despotism and authoritarianism will be nullified and the human multiplicity would be recognized as a chance for utilization and service. The concept of brotherhood in this view is not a simple but a multidimensional concept, and one in that many of concepts in the realm of ethics and law can be embedded owing to its semantics and with regard to the epistemic contexts associated with it. The concept of brotherhood in this view is essentially considered to be religious; that is, it has an ethical, general and universal history just as many other religious concepts; value-based concepts such as compassion, empathy, caring, affection and other concepts mentioned earlier in this article; while clarifying the sublime construction of this social concept, they open up a common chapter in the contemporary Western literature. In this worldview, the element of brotherhood is considered as a chain of human concepts which are the common denominator of divine religions, creating a universal morality. By making the transition from the area of nationality to the sphere of the world, the component of brotherhood in this approach becomes the cornerstone of a moral movement toward the realization of equality on a transnational level.

References

1. *Holy Quran*.

2. *Nahj al-Balagha*

3. al-Shirazi, S. (2010). *Philosophical Treatises*. Tehran: Sadra Islamic Wisdom Foundation Publications.

4. Izotso, T.(1995). *God and Man in the Quran* (A. Aram, Trans.). Tehran: Farhang Publishing.

5. Baron-Cohen, S. (2011). *The science of evil: On empathy and the origins of cruelty.* New York: Basic Books.

6. Belbin, R. M. (2010). *Team roles at work* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam, London: Butterworth-Heinemann.

7. Edelglass, W. (2006). Levinas on Suffering and Compassion. *Sophia, 45*(2), pp. 43-59

8. Ghazali, A. (2006). *al-Ehya Olom al-Din*, Damascus: Dar al-Fakr.

9. Javadi Amoli, A. (2007). *The Unity of Communities in Nahj al-Balagha*, Qom: Esra Publications.

10. Javadi Amoli, A.(2010a). *Islam and International Relations*, Qom: Esra Publications.

11. Javadi Amoli, A. (2010b). *Tafsir-e Tasnim* (Vols. 4, 9, 10, 22). Qom: Esra Publications.

12. Javadi Amoli, A. (2012). *Mafatih al-Hayat, Qom*: Esra Publications.

13. Jorgensen, G. (2006). Kohlberg and Gilligan: Duet or duel? *Journal of Moral Education, 35*(2), pp. 179–96.

14. Lampert, Kh. (2005). *Traditions of compassion*: From religious duty to social activism. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

15. Maccormick, N. (1996). Justice as Impartiality: Assenting with Anti contractualist Reservations. *Political Studies,* XLIV, pp. 305-310.

16. Majlesi, M. B. (1983). *Bihar al-Anwar*. Beirut: Dar al-Ehya al-Tarath al-Arabieh

17. Miller, D. & Walzer, M. (2003). *Pluralism Justice and Eauality*. London: Oxford University Press.

18. Mostafavi, H. (1982). *al-Tahqiq fi Kalamate al-Quran*. Tehran: al-Ketab al-Tarjomeh Center.

19. Muhaddith Nuri. (1987). *Mustadrak al-wasa'il*. Qom: Mu'assisa Al al-Bayt li

Ihya' al-Turath.

20. Nouri, H. (1988). *Mustadrak al-vasaa'al va Mastnabet al-Mas'al*. Qom, al-Bayt Institute (A.S).

21. Oakland, W. H. (1987). In A. J. Auerbach & M. Feldstein (Ed.), "Theory of public goods," *In Handbook of Public Economics* (Vol. 2). Elsevier.

22. Roberts, T. A. (2013). *The Concept of Benevolence*: Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Moral Philosophy. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

23. Sen, A. (2016). *Equality and Freedom* (H. Fesharaki, Trans.). Tehran: Shirazeh Publications. Ketabe Ma.

24. Slote, M. (1998). The Justice of Caring. *Social Philosophy & Policy Foundation*, *15*(1), 99. 171-195.

25. Slote, M. (2003). *Morals from motives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

26. Slote, M. (2007). *The ethics of care and empathy*. London: Routledge.

27. Tabatabaei, M. (1971). *al-Mizan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an.* Beirut: al-Elmi Publication Institute.

28. Tusi, Khaje Nasir. (1992). *Nasseri's Ethics*. Tehran: al-Islamieh al-Elmieh Publications.

29. Vaezi, A. (2009). *Review of Theories of Justice*. Qom: Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute Publications.

30. Walzer, M. (1983). *SPHERES OF JUSTICE, A Defense of Pluralism and Equality.* United States: Basic Books.

31. Wright, E. O. & Brighouse, H. (2001). *Complex Egalitarianism: A Review of Alex Callinicos 'Equality'*. Historical Materialism (March).