

# Global Rectificatory Justice: A Critical Review

**Attikuppam Umapathi**

Assistant Professor, Political Science,  
City University, Mogadishu,  
Somalia

*Abstract: This paper is an attempt to understand the idea of rectificatory justice at international level and to critically review the arguments presented in its favor by Goran Collste in his book “Global Rectificatory Justice” (2015). The work gains prominence in the backdrop of increasing demands for just distribution of resources at global level. It is a well conceived fact that the inequalities among the nations can be attributed, to some extent, to their past power relations. The past power relations—between the colonial powers and their colonies—left deep cleavages in the possible prospects that these countries could achieve. The staggered positions that these colonial powers and their colonies have occupied in the middle of the twentieth century i.e., at the beginning of the end of the colonialism has left the former colonies without any resources, with shattered institutions and dichotomized epistemic frameworks as a result of the clash between the epistemic frameworks of the colonies and their colonial masters. These staggered positions are perpetually reinforced by the present international economic and political order that rests on the principle of international anarchy. Former colonies are expected to compete with their former colonial masters for economic survival without the privileges that their former colonial masters have practiced during the early stages of their industrialization like enslaving people to labor in their industries, occupying territories for raw material and markets etc. The new international order has pushed the former colonies to be part of different imperial economic systems like WTO and its TRIPS Agreement, World Bank, IMF etc. organizations where voting power is based on the economic contribution of the respective states. These differences in economic power among the nations and the living standards that the individuals of different countries experience are a result of past colonial (and present imperial) practices that needs to be addressed in a just manner. Collste’s work is an attempt to explore theoretical and functional limitations of such a justice.*

*Keywords: Burdened States, Colonialism, Compensative Justice, Epistemic Framework, Epistemic Injustice, Historical Injustice, Imperialism, International Anarchy, Punitive Justice, Rectificatory Justice, Redistributive Justice, Restorative Justice, Slavery.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Inequalities among nations are a reflection of the history of unequal power relations among them. 44 of world’s 45 poorest countries are former colonies—and all the former colonial powers are rich (p-18). This ‘coincidence’ reveals the historical phase—colonialism—that made certain countries extremely powerful and rich at the cost of certain other countries which were pauperized completely. The differences in the living standards and per-capita income of former colonial powers and former colonies say it all. The colonial

powers advanced their economies by exploiting the colonies for centuries. These colonies acted as suppliers of raw material to the European industries—and acted as markets for the finished goods that these European countries have produced with the raw material that they have imported from their colonies. Preferential trade agreements were imposed on these colonies by their respective colonial powers. Raw material from these colonies was extracted by corrupting the local governments and on some occasions by involving imperial companies like East India Company in controlling the entire colonies. Countries in both the Americas benefited from the

labor of the slaves from Africa—brought through slave trading. These slaves literally boosted the economies of Americas without receiving any payment—and they were owned by their white masters like animals. Contrary to this, the kin and the home economies of these slaves in Africa had suffered due to the plundering of their men and material. The European colonial powers completely based their industrial growth on the raw material and markets of their colonies. The indigenous products of these colonies were replaced with industrial products of the European countries. These colonies were made to subsidize the European wars that were fought for colonialism—including the two world wars. And while leaving these colonies the colonial powers left them shattered in civil wars, boundary disputes, and ethnic violence etc. with less chance of state and institution building. The colonial powers have imposed their epistemic frameworks on their colonies thus shattering the previous forms of governance and institutional mechanisms that the colonies had. This epistemic dilemma made the colonies to experience epistemic injustice. Now, with such a history is it just on the part of the former colonies to expect rectificatory justice from their former colonial powers?

## II. COLONIALISM AND PAST-INJUSTICES

Most of the migration that is happening in the world is a one sided migration from third world countries to the first world countries. Lack of resources, high density of population, and the colonial borders that cut through cultures, ethnicities, and nations have been the reasons for the world migration crisis triggered by the former colonial countries of the third world. *“Present underdevelopment in the Third World and development in Europe can be explained by a history of exploitation that goes back to colonial times ... and those who are responsible for this exploitation have reasons to compensate for these past (and present) actions”* (p-80). The colonial powers that ruled these colonies have divided these states according to administrative feasibility disregard to the impact that these divisions have caused to the colonial countries. Most of the boundaries reflect a division based on latitudes and longitudes that cut through people dividing their clans, ethnicities and nations into pieces thus throwing them in to different newly created territorial states. These displaced people usually find it difficult to live in the new state as ethnic violence and other forms of identity based discriminations haunt them perpetually alienating them socially, economically and politically (pp. 22-23). Colonial powers occupied colonies in Asia and Africa for resources, markets, and slaves. Most of the African countries that were colonized by the Europeans served these colonial powers as suppliers of slaves, and suppliers of raw material like rubber, cotton, and other agricultural products. The United States depended heavily on the slaves captured from the African continent and exported to the Americas. The colonial powers used violence and murder to suppress the inhabitants of these colonies, and exterminated ethnicities that did not give up to the rule of the colonial powers. Local leaders were given full autonomy and were allowed to maintain their own customary laws so as to make them partners of the colonial powers. These local leaders were

offered with military and administrative support to handle with the administration process, and were asked to prepare the markets for European products. The local leaders, on the behest of the colonial powers, forced their people to shift to commercial crops and production of other raw material that were used for commercial products. Local leaders were pitched against each other in their competition to gain the support of the industrialized west, and people in the colonial countries were divided on the lines of community, ethnicity, caste etc. so as to make them stay divided. The traditional societies that these colonies had experienced for thousands of years earlier to their colonization were torn into pieces with communal, religion and ethnic violence that was induced by the colonial powers. By the time the colonial powers were ready to leave these colonies after the Second World War all most all the colonies were given independence to fight their former brothers or countrymen. These symptoms are clearly visible in the conflicts that we see now in the post-colonial countries like India-Pakistan-Bangladesh, Israel-Palestine, and many other African countries. All the colonial countries were made to pay for the wars that the Europeans fought among themselves like in world wars and the wars that they have waged with colonies in Asia and Africa (pp. 48-62).

To put it simply, *“a blood transfusion took place from the South to the North”* (p-2). And the present inequalities among the nations can be attributed, to some extent, to the past exploitation or injustices. To take a hypothetical example to answer what constitutes exploitation let us consider three conditions and see which condition fits to be called as exploitation. Let us assume that in condition A the colonial powers visits a country in Africa or Asia, and they find some natural resources that were unexplored by the locals or the locals do not know its value or how to utilize it. The colonial powers may extract the underground natural resources without disturbing the locals. Can this be a sufficient condition to be called as exploitation? Since natural resources are part of natural rights to everyone we may find this condition as not so sufficient to be called as exploitation, and we may think that the colonial powers may be just in extracting the underground natural resources. In condition B assume that the colonial power is using some force to make the local population carryout the mining works. In this situation the colonial power is clearly exploiting the labor of the locals, and is siphoning off their output. This condition certainly fits to be called as exploitation. And in condition C just assume that the local people lose their livelihood for various reasons like droughts, famines, plagues etc. or due to their ‘incompetence’ to compete with their colonial masters and start working voluntarily for their survival. This situation apparently does not require force on the part of the colonial power, and things go on smoothly without force. In the bid to compete for the opportunities that the colonial powers provide the local people may start fighting among them, may lower their wages competitively, and may even submit their freedoms to their colonial masters. In such a situation the colonial power is the ‘savior’ of these local people as the opportunities that these colonial masters create is the only livelihood available to the local. Is the colonial power exploiting the locals in such a condition? Or, is the colonial power saving the locals by colonizing them? All the former colonies were made to go

through the conditions that we are assuming through A to C, and the colonial powers started bearing the 'burden' of protecting the locals by colonizing them; the white man's burden—they say (pp. 67-70). The colonial occupation says it all as *"in 1900, 90% of Africa, 56% of Asia, 98% of the South Pacific, and 27% of the Americas were under the colonial rule"* (p-45).

Most of the former colonial countries are unevenly developed because of the practices of their colonial masters who developed the metropolitan areas only and made the surrounding areas satellites of these metropolises. This method of development helped the colonial powers to make these centers the hubs of exploitation. All the satellites surrounding these metropolises supplied raw material to these metropolis which was exported to the colonial powers from these metropolis. The geographical location of these metropolises—in the sea coasts—connecting important sea routes—tells the strategies followed by the colonial powers to develop the metropolitan areas. These metropolitan areas usually harbor the elite sections of the colonial countries who have taken up politics, bureaucracy, commerce etc. once the colonies got independence—and these elite have been acting as the supply chain to the western capitalists in the post-colonial times. This apparently made the nations to fail as the newly emerged colonial nations did not concentrate on nation building like the way it happened in the west as the metropolitan centered elite have been looking to the west and have been acting as agents of the west in exploiting the local people through multinational corporations that usually have western origins or imperial tenets of exploitation. Underdevelopment of development has been the norm that these elites have been following since 'independence'. Meanwhile, the colonial masters have repainted their colonial color with imperialism—tied with globalization that has turned out to be an even better method of exploitation than colonialism as imperialism does not involve occupying or ruling another country physically thus cutting down the administrative costs (pp. 76-82).

### III. EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE

Epistemic framework is a set of ideas or knowledge related practices that define a culture or group of people. According to Rajeev Bhargava *"an epistemic framework is a historically generated, collectively sustained system of meanings and significance, by reference to which a group understands and evaluates its individual and collective identity"* (pp. 86-87). Each country, culture or religion has a particular epistemic framework that defines different aspects of the people like values, customs, economic and political understanding. While each epistemic framework is right in its own sense – in its own time and context – collision of these epistemic frameworks results in vanishing or scattering of certain epistemic frameworks that come under the control of other epistemic frameworks for various socio-economic and political reasons. There is no superior or inferior epistemic practice, and a comparison or weighing of different epistemic practices is logically unsustainable. Nevertheless, certain epistemic frameworks win over other epistemic frameworks in a given time due to the imbalances in their economic and

military might or other forms of domination that may sound acceptable in a given situation. Colonial countries lost their epistemic framework to their colonial masters exactly in this manner. The colonial powers imposed their epistemic framework on their respective colonies thus destroying the local way of understanding things, and the people of the colonies are made to believe that their epistemic framework is inferior to the epistemic framework that their colonial masters have been practicing. Thus, local forms of administration was replaced with western forms of justice, local forms of education was replaced with western education, and local forms of state mechanism was replaced with the Westphalia state system that the colonial powers have been practicing. The locals also seem to have adapted to it as *"the domestic academic elite took over the Western epistemic framework and even identified with the aggressor"* (p-87). This made the colonies to scramble between their own epistemic framework and the alien epistemic framework imposed by their colonial masters thus getting exposed to the epistemic injustice (pp. 86-89). To put it in Bhargava's words *"epistemic injustice is a form of cultural injustice. It occurs when the concepts and categories by which a people understand themselves and their world are replaced or adversely affected by the concepts and categories of the colonizers"* (p-87).

### IV. GLOBAL RECTIFICATORY JUSTICE

The present world economic order is completely unjust in its approach as it is based on a blatant double standard that follows distributive justice at home and competitive political realism at international level. The nation states jealously guard the natural resources that they have shielded through violent expansions. The territorial boundaries that the states have shielded from other states are an example for blatant arbitrariness that the states display in the name of self-determinism of the inhabitants of particular territorial limits. Economically, the international economic system upholds the economic order through institutions like IMF, WTO etc. that work as tools in the hands of the first world countries to cloak their imperialism (pp. 23-24). The voting power in international organizations like World Bank and International Monetary Fund is based on the capital invested by the countries. This makes the first world countries to control the majority of voting percentage—and the decisions that these organizations make based on these voting methods are imposed on the whole world in the name of international economic order. All the structural adjustments, subsidies, emission cuts, tariffs, patents, trade regulations, exchange rates, economic embargo, foreign investment regulations, corporate funding to welfare activities, types of activities that these organizations consider as part of welfare, political or governance related practices they impose on the third world etc. are decided by these organizations through the huge share of votes that the first world countries have got. These organizations in turn influence the voting patterns in UN general assembly thus deciding the international politics as well (pp. 26-29). The present unjust world economic order is protected by the corporations from the advanced countries through a practice called "international resource regime". The

first world countries leave the multinational companies to do business in their own manner in other part of the world, especially the third world countries. The apparent expectation the first world countries are to be blind to how multinational companies conduct their business in the third world is that these companies would bring home the exploits from the third world countries. These multinational companies, often with the aid of their respective first world governments, usually encourage regimes in the third world that lack accountability and transparency—and use these force based nondemocratic governments to extract the natural resources from their respective states and sell it to the multinational companies to siphon them off to the first world countries. These multinational companies engage in different types of conflict creating tactics such as funding violence based organizations to displace the people, funding the governments to suppress opposition, funding the military regimes with weapons etc. to create a situation of insecurity and fear among the inhabitants so as to make them remain passive in all the economic and political aspects of the state. The other ways of making the third world countries to come into terms with the first world is to push these countries to accept the structural adjustments that the World Bank and International Monetary Fund imposes while giving aid. These international organizations get the required funds from the multinational companies routed through the first world companies (pp. 21-25).

Certain historical practices that are now considered as exploitation played a major role in deciding the wealth of the countries. The practice of slavery in US from 17th century through 19th century, and its practice in the European countries for many centuries till the end of the 19th century played a major role in enhancing the economies of these countries and downsized the economies of the African countries at the same time. Slavery during these centuries was not voluntary; it was forced on the Africans. Africans were captured by the western powers and they were exported to the Americas like cargo. Slaves were considered as commodities that can be brought in the market and the Americans used to own slaves like if they owned animals. These slaves were forced to work for their white masters for subsistence provisions and were forced to work in the fields without wages. The slaves were made to go through depressing experiences as they were denied freedom, individuality, and the hope of returning back to their home land. This practice certainly put the economies of the US and various American countries in a better shape and denied the same to the African nations from where these slaves were abducted. A rectificatory justice is highly applicable in this context as it was the slave trade that put the economies of the African nations in a weak position. But the countries that have benefited from the slave trade argue that the then international system had no laws or practices that restricted or banned slave trading, and that they have followed the law of the day. This explanation completely misses the point that the present economic position that the western countries have been enjoying can be said to be a result of their past practices (at least partially) which put them in a dominant position. This certainly is an issue that falls under the domain of the rectificatory justice. Now let us consider an example where individuals X and Y were equals a hundred years ago. Due to various reasons, like the slavery or other

forced practices, assume that X enslaves Y, and makes her to remain a slave for the rest of her life. Y was robbed of her freedom, individuality, opportunities to prosper independently, and opportunities to make private property. After a 100 years the lineage of X and Y are tend to be unequal in their economic positions and other societal positions. The lineage of Y may or may not have recovered from the losses that their forefathers had to experience because of their enslavement by X. Now, is it just to expect compensation from X's lineage for the injustices that her forefathers have caused to the forefathers of Y? Certainly, or most plausibly, the lineage of Y may have been equals to the lineage of X without the enslavement of Y's forefathers by X's forefathers. Or, contrary to this, Y's lineage may have prospered more than the prosperity that the lineage of X has achieved. In such a situation, especially if Y's lineage is to be in a pauperized condition, is it not just to expect X's lineage to be part of the rectificatory justice?

Rectificatory justice is an “*obligation of peoples whose ancestors exploited or oppressed their vulnerable contemporaries*” (p-31). In general, inequalities among nations can be attributed to the exploitative power relations that these nations have been practicing. The present international order is a continuation of the colonial past in the form of different types of hegemonies practiced at various levels. It is a blatant truth that the present international economic and political order is based on the power components of the countries. A country like France or UK has a veto power in the UN whereas countries like India and Indonesia are denied the same rights. Africa and South America put together do not have a veto right. It is not so hard to understand that international relations are practiced in the background of international anarchy as it gives the powerful nations the required advantage. In such a situation the burdened states are bound to be burdened perpetually ensuring self-determinism meaningless (pp. 90-104). The per-capita average of the natural resources used in a country vis-à-vis global average per-capita may be useful to come to the conclusion whether a country has overused its natural resources or whether its natural resources are underused. A country with high per-capita resource usage vis-à-vis the global average indicates that the country's natural resources have been overused. On the contrary, a country's low per-capita usage of natural resources vis-à-vis to global average means that the country's natural resources have not been exploited sufficiently vis-à-vis other countries. These countries have the moral obligation to allow the natural resources to be exploited by the countries that have high per-capita average. This argument may sound awkward, but the historical factors point to the fact that the countries that have higher usage of natural resources than the global average are colonial countries—and the over usage of natural resources was the result of their colonial past where the occupying countries have exploited all the strategic resources—and have left these colonies in poor condition. Besides, colonialism is not a practice of past as it is still in practice in different forms of imperialism practiced through multinational corporations, international institutions, global economic structures, and an international anarchy of states that favors the imperial countries all the time (p-21). Only a rectificatory justice aimed

at addressing the past injustices can give self-determinism to these former colonies.

Rectificatory justice at international level can be said to be an ideal that is derived from John Rawls's theory of justice where the people of a nation—who are involved in an original position—form a contract that is aimed at just distribution of the privileges and burdens of the society within a nation. Rectificatory justice can be conceived as an extension of the principle of original position to international level as Rawls himself has proposed in his seminal work *The Law of Peoples*. Rawls argues that nations should involve in some form of distribution mechanism that tries to address the inequalities that are prevalent among the nations. Rawls defines distributive justice at international level as sharing the burdens of the “burdened states”. Rawls calls states that have failed, or struggling to provide decent opportunities to its citizens as burdened states, and attributes the failure of these states to “internal factors”. Apparently, Rawls failed to look at the historical reasons that have contributed to the burden of these burdened states. Rawls understanding of justice at international level is limited to sharing the grievances of the states in the present international order and is based on cooperation among the nations in all spheres to avert the burden of the burdened states. This insignificant range of justice is apparently limited to some amount of cooperation between the advanced and the burdened states that could possibly alleviate the burden of the burdened states to some extent. But this type of justice certainly cannot be called as rectificatory justice as this idea is not placing any responsibility on the colonial powers for the burdens of the burdened states. As discussed earlier, colonial powers are responsible for putting their former colonies in a burdened position by exploiting their resources, by dividing their boundaries, by destroying the local industries, and by mitigating the social cohesion. These colonies have been struggling since their independence from their colonial masters as they are unable to find resources, unable to rebuild the divided boundaries, unable to bridge the necessary social cohesion that is required for a nation building. While Rawls idea that the nations should cooperate with each other to mitigate the burdens of the burdened states can be said to be right – it itself is not sufficient to address the injustice that these burdened states have been forced to bear with. Attributing the failures to the internal factors after robbing these countries for centuries cannot be called as justice. Rectificatory justice is something that is aimed at rectifying the wrong deeds of the past. Besides, the wealth that the advanced countries are enjoying is a derivative of their imperial plunder that put them in an advanced position in the global competition. These imperial powers benefited from their imperial past from the services of slaves from African nations, in the form of raw material from these colonies, through the markets that these colonies were turned to, and through the taxation on the colonies that were siphoned off to the pockets of the colonial powers. Now, an international level justice in the form as proposed by Rawls cannot become a justice unless these past mistakes are rectified (pp. 29-31).

Rectificatory justice is different from restorative justice or compensative justice as the later two types of justices are limited in their scope and possibility. Restorative justice is trying to restore the lost aspects of an individual or group

because of an act of injustice. This type of justice has limited applicability as it is not possible to restore everything – for example a lost life, or lost childhood, or lost freedom. Similarly, compensative justice also is limited in its applicability as it is not possible to compensate something in a satisfactory manner all the time – for example colonization continued for 500 years or so, and it is not possible for the post-colonial powers to compensate the loss that the former colonial countries have lost over a period of 500 years. Similarly, caste system, gender differences and other types of discriminations have been there for millenniums and it is not possible to compensate the losses that these individuals or groups have experienced. Hence, compensatory justice is applicable for limited aspects within a short history. Therefore, restorative justice and compensatory justice are not suitable to address a gross injustice like slavery or colonialism that many countries and vast majority of the people from these countries have experienced for hundreds of years. Deviating from these types of justice rectificatory justice is something that is concerned with justice in an overall sense that is not particular about restoring the same things that were lost because of the past injustices nor is it an attempt to compensate accurately for the past wrongs – rather – it is justice in just terms that is within the possible limits—and emphasizes on acceptance of the moral responsibility by the kin or countrymen who have committed injustice—and stresses on compensation in a reasonable manner. Compensation may not be necessary in all cases as sometimes the individuals or groups that have suffered injustice long back may have recovered from it and may be are in a more or less decent or well off position now thus eliminating compensation as a part of justice. In such cases an apology by the perpetrator acknowledging the injustice itself becomes rectificatory justice (pp. 115-120). Rectificatory justice has to take into account the broader losses that the aggressors have inflicted on their colonies. It may include different types of redressing the past injustices through acts like apologizing; acknowledging the fact that certain type of injustice was committed on a particular country or region, it may include a reasonable compensation that is deemed fit according to the present circumstances of the aggressor and the receiving party etc.

## V. SUMMARY

Calls for different forms of justice to address different types of injustices are not a new phenomenon. It is as old as the human civilization. Thinkers from ancient philosophy like Aristotle defined justice as “*for in the case also in which one has received and the other has inflicted a wound, or one has slain and the other been slain, the suffering and the action have been unequally distributed: but the judge tries to equalize things by means of the penalty, taking away from the gain of the assailant ... therefore, corrective justice will be the intermediate between the loss and gain*” (p-6). The form of justice that is applicable in a particular situation depends completely on that particular situation. Compensative justice, for example, takes care of the possible compensation that could ease the injustice that has been committed whereas restorative justice tries to restore what the individual has lost

through a particular injustice and punitive justice simply tries to punish the culprits to make them regret the injustice that they have caused to others and to instill fear among the others about such consequences if they have any motives of committing injustice to others. Each of the above forms of justice has its own advantages in providing justice and establishing a particular just order. But all the above forms of justices fail to address a particular situation; severe injustices done to large group of people or countries by other groups or countries in history. The generations that have committed the injustices and the generations that have suffered the injustices may have gone long back but the unjust order that has resulted because of these past injustices may have been haunting the present generations of the past sufferers. The suffering can be economical like the way the post-colonial countries are suffering because of their colonization by the western masters. Or, it can be traumatic and intimidating like the way the survivors of the holocaust are suffering. Sometimes it can include both like the way Africans are suffering because of their enslaved history that was extensively carried out from fifteenth through nineteenth century by the west, especially by the Americas to boost their economy.

When trying to address these types of past injustices different types of justices like restorative justice, compensatory justice, punitive justice or redistributive justice may not be suitable because restoring the lost lives or freedom, compensating the injustices of hundreds of years, punishing the dead culprits or redistributing the present resources as compensation for past exploitation may not be possible and may not address the injustices that were committed in the past. A combination of the above justices based on the context with added dimension of willingness to accept and acknowledge the past injustices may be more suitable and may address the past injustices in an approximate or symbolic manner. Its applicability may vary depending on the type of injustice that was carried out in the past and the present situation of the victims or culprits, or the kin of the culprits or victims, or their countries or ethnicities. X's forefathers may have enslaved Y's forefathers and as a result the lineage of Y may be suffering economic and political disadvantages—and lineage of X may be in a well off position economically and politically – fully or partially because of the exploitation carried out by their forefathers. Some form of redistributive justice that redistributes the present political and economic resources between the X's lineage and Y's lineage may be appropriate in such a situation. To take another example, country X may have colonized country Y for centuries—and as a result country X may be in a well off position whereas country Y may be suffering because of the past exploitation that they had to experience due to their history of colonization. In such a situation it is just to expect

that country X should try to address the resultant economic burdens of country Y in an appropriate manner. To take yet another example, country X may have inflicted traumatic experiences on country Y like murder, genocide, racial suppression, enslavement, economic exploitation through colonization etc. Now, the injustice involved in this scenario is too burdensome to be addressed by the present generations of the culprits—and too burdensome to be borne by the present generations of both the culprits and the victims. In such a situation a rectificatory justice that involves inducing some economic benefits from the aggressor to the sufferer, allowing reasonable migration from Y to X, apologizing and acknowledging the past act of genocide or enslavement—and accepting the obligation to treat the present and their subsequent generations in an equal manner, and enlightening the society in general about the nature of injustice that was committed etc. methods may address the past injustices.

Rectificatory justice is difficult to be practiced as it involves justice that demands the people and the society to move back into historical injustices—and at the same time asks the present generations to bear the burden. Even if the present generations of the culprits are ready to commit for rectificatory justice, functional difficulties may arise to implement it in a precise manner. For example, both the colonial powers and the colonies may have disintegrated and formed into a different set of states. Similarly, the advantages or disadvantages of the past injustices may have eased off partially or completely—or the results may have been distributed in an uneven manner – some culprits even losing because of their aggression and some victims even benefitting because of the past injustice. Similarly, it may not be possible to precisely locate the individuals or groups who have suffered injustice or who have inflicted injustice on others. This type of functional difficulties in designing and implementing rectificatory justice makes it prone to gross distortion that may actually fail to address the core aspects or actors of the past injustice. Nonetheless, as presented by Collste, some form of rectificatory justice is necessary to address the past injustices—and the idea may play an important role, if applied in a broader sense—in addressing historical injustices like colonialism, genocide, holocaust, racial segregation, slavery, caste discrimination, gender inequalities and various forms of socio-economic and political inequalities that were committed in history or have been in practice for a long time.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Collste, G. (2015). *Global Rectificatory Justice*. Hampshire. Palgrave MacMillan.