

edewlogics

Ade Ronke

©edewlogics, all rights reserved

Authors Notes

This work is brought to you without prejudice, with great beliefs in truth, decency, dignity and inclusion in science. To support endeavors such as this that may be found on my website: [www.edewlogics.com](http://www.edewlogics.com), please donate to the free books for life cause today. You can also support the cause by supporting music by ril on Bandcamp. Thank you.

[ril - BANDCAMP](#)

[DONATE TO SUPPORT THE FREE BOOKS FOR LIFE CAUSE](#)



## On Justice: the need, the blunder, the monster

The disparity between liberty and justice is as much as the equivocation of justice as fairness as a burning free train unaware of its departure while perpetually and unproportionally trying to port. When you cross the inequality notation over in mathematics to achieve something as a means to an end, you must change the direction of the symbolic representation. That burning free train is not merely an abstraction.

Bear with the need to discuss mathematics and physics here briefly. For mathematical minds, the conception of divergence instantly implicates the conception of convergence as some opposing reality in limits and continuity.

For a reasoning distinctive mathematical mind like mine, this conception within its limits and outside it, is erroneous in nature. Astronomically I reason that the conception of divergence in physics must also implicate convergence in an eventual spatial-temporal framework. My intuition with the knowledge of physics implied it and I have drawings in chapters 10 and 11 of an-animated life, *alw* for the same conception without much explanation yet. That will come later.

That is, the error in calculus is not in some infinitesimal conception of continuum but that of separable spatial-temporal frameworks. It is in the misconception of space, in this case, spatial disparities and propensities. For instance, convergence and divergence don't act similarly in the differential  $x$  coordination and  $xy$  coordination. But this is a subject of discussion in future chapters of an-animated-life, *alw*.

It is very important to note here that conception matters and it is largely, especially for distinction of mind and freedom of intellect, individual. Therefore conceptual perspectives are also distinct and individualistic. We cannot merely imagine this as some imagination. They are owned by individuals in consideration.

That said, the purpose of this essay is a subject everyone has the right and duty to be knowledgeable on—justice. Why is this important, especially for those who do not understand the physics and the mathematics I discussed earlier?

The procession of justice, its procedural instigation, its social-political implications, applications, impressions and oppression affects our life whether we like it or not. I learned this especially in an incurably hard way. I am still fighting for justice in places I wouldn't have thought injustice would be, live, breed. Conception matters. It is the realistic aspect of justice. It should never be

undermined as something lesser, yet more importantly, for something idealistic, something Utopian.

This essay was conceived upon my stroll upon *Justice as Fairness* by John Rawls in a free books library. The book of political philosophy describes “justice as fairness”, “society as a fair system of cooperation”. “Cooperation” is a very enigmatic word because it requires consent and consent requires a meeting of minds, that is, a full and adequate understanding of what you are agreeing to. So, we must find out the meaning of “fairness”. Fairness has three main definitions relevant to this essay.

- Quality of being light colored
- Beauty
- Non discriminatory impartiality or just treatment

If I was to be sarcastic at this moment, I will say justice is not for the ugly. But this serious discussion cannot afford to be peripheral. Ironically, so it is, especially because Rawls defines “justice as fairness” as “conceptual”, something that cannot afford to be merely peripheral. The first definition, the “quality of being light colored” is rather exposing, that is, it is apparent and attention drawing. There is a level of conceptual procession to it but it is rather perceptual conception. There is no cognitive conceptual procession to it except for perception. Perception is a subject of consideration, an inferential variable rather than cognitive machinery for rationality or reasonability.

The second definition, “beauty,” is particular and loud in its attempt to demand attention but not for any reason deeply reasonably or essentially conceptual but as a by-product of our senses. Beauty cannot be reasoned. Something that is either present or not present and can never be both present and not present or both absent and not absent cannot be rationalized. It is rather easy, does not demand conceptual procession. Non-human animals understand the affinity of beauty and can never be able to, in any measure of neurological procession align it with justice. There is no intellectual procession to it.

Here, you must now follow this line of thought and you must see it as I see it. Every relativity in English from one word to another is usually rationalized. I should know because I have studied it and I work with it everyday. However could anyone rationally link fairness to justice in any proper capacity based on the relativity between the words?

Let’s look at the saying, “all is fair in love and war.” The relativity here is apparent. It is a brute rationale for the harsh realities and savagery of war. One may argue it is quite an opposing reality to what may be foundational to any reasonable or rationalizable sense of justice. But I don’t want to be too harsh

here. Rawls has brought across some rather biblical sense of utopian idealism here that may be reasonable, maybe, but it is not rationalizable.

I don't want to say this is rather anti-realism, because I don't want to fall into that abstract realism hole where beauty becomes thoroughly redundant as well. Yet it isn't. In realism, it would be made separable from the perceptual inferential variable it is. It would be in the particular referential and in the general inferential. Regardless, it is not cognitive. And the realistic procedural nature of conceptual realism becomes an abstraction in perpetuity of inferential-cognitive deduction of particular, nonparticular induction of possible rationalizable or reasonable judgment calls.

While justice retains the definition of near perfection in this case, if not perfection as “justice is fairness”, it is non-realizable. It is an abstraction wormhole of perpetual incongruity or may I rather say, “ugliness.” It is not equivocal or equitable—cannot be in the equation for particular and necessary life but always an overwhelming aspect of it.

That is, in realistic terms that has nothing to do with realism or antirealism, it is that perpetual incongruity. It is ugly or it is not justice. It cannot be fair to victims from the inception of a crime, down the non enumerative rabbit hole of judicial procession towards a measure of possible equivalence of crime to punishment. Therefore relativistic and non-relativistic perspectives matter.

That justice is fairness is from a narrow and particular perspective, much of a privileged rather than objective one. This notion, a personal inclination or tendency rather than conception of justice is redundantly actualizable, semantically externalizable. That is, one is more emotionally induced without much need for the procedural necessity of rationalization or reasonability than the other. It is rather a blunder, a mistake made in the making of society that must always be ratified for its very own merit, unreasonable, un-rationalizable but must always be accounted for.

It is important here that I discuss equality and liberty without visiting the same non-enumerative rabbit hole implied. Rawls sows the seeds of some utopian form of unity by developing a conflict between equality and liberty evoking a yield to “cooperation,” necessitating a “framework of thought” on which the consensus of “justice as fairness” is established.

I find that the conflict implied between equality and liberty is not merely incongruent in their medium of influence, that is, psychoaffective, a notion irrelevant to the levity of the act and influence of justice, socioaffective. Justice should be fundamentally extraneous of the two. The realistic perspective rather nullifies the possibility of conflicting interest. I find complacency and complimenting consensus in unreasonable and unrationalizable conceptions of

justice when it is indeed “beneficial” to qualifiers in the concession to the notion of “justice as fairness”.

Justice must exist and persist for the need of its integrity—the end to its own end. There isn't a realistic or integral aspect of it that fairness has the ability to capture. Justice is a conceptual and procedural necessity to the wellness of being in society, a sociopolitical need, a sociopolitical blunder, a sociopolitical monster.

[ril - BANDCAMP](#)

[DONATE TO SUPPORT THE FREE BOOKS FOR LIFE CAUSE](#)