

# IMPACT OF WORLD RELIGIONS ON THE NEED TO CONSIDER THE PRINCIPLE OF TRUTH IN THE JUDICIAL DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Kyrylo Lehkykh

Candidate of Law Sciences, Head of the Department of Criminal Proceeding and Criminalistics,  
Member of the Kyiv Regional Scientific and Practical Council, Attorney,  
Academy of Advocacy of Ukraine,  
27 Tarasa Shevchenko Blvd, Kyiv, Ukraine, 01032  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8877-4312>  
[legkikh@ukr.net](mailto:legkikh@ukr.net)

**Abstract.** The article analyzes the influence of world religions on the awareness of the need to consider the principle of truth in the process of making Court decisions as a relevant scientific issue, the solution of which will allow establishing ideological grounds for the implementation of moral principles through justice. The author analyzes specific religious norms of the pre-state period, Christian beliefs, Judaism, norms of Muslim law, Buddhism. Taking into account the review, conclusions regarding the influence of world religions on the awareness of the need consider the principle of truth in the process of making Court decisions are formulated.

Religions are the ideological basis for the implementation of moral principles through justice, based on the socio-ethical and cultural systems of their dissemination. Common to all religious dogmas is the need to protect against the basic violations embodied in the commandment; the definition of “evil” by specific religions and the cultivation of its eradication, both by the person himself or herself and through the bodies endowed with the right to administer justice. Religion also obliges a person to obey and take for granted what is unfair and wrong for an individual, promises rewards for suffering in another life, imposes duties for past sins, or promises to punish those responsible for injustice with “bad karma” in the future.

The very semantics of the concepts of justice are contextually distinctive in different religious, historical, and socio-cultural systems. The etymological origin of the concept of “justice” is much more complex for a cohesive conceptualization and is derived from such meanings as coercion, fear, violence, and necessity. Justice in the context of asserting justice can be considered in various categories, notably it must be an unbiased assessment of circumstances based on the “truth” on the basis of equality of the parties, and as our research demonstrates – as a tool for creating safe and harmonious environment for the existence of society. Justice is deemed to be a certain standard of established truth, cultivated by religious norms that are partly beneficial to the authorities. Accordingly, we can define the relativity of the concepts of “just” or “unfair”, since they can be considered both through the Aristotelian *sum cuique* (to each his own), and through the principle of equality and impartiality, as well as a means of influencing society to ensure its security and (or) the interests of the authorities.

**Keywords:** the principle of truth, judgments, justice, religion, Christianity, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism

## INTRODUCTION

The emergence of religious ideas can be perceived as a means of improving humanity. Religion is a criterion of a special spiritual dimension. It forms the basis for motivating a person's moral actions and awakens faith, hope and love in him or her, gives him or her courage and at the same time promotes pacification, asceticism and other virtues necessary for the harmonization of relations with the family and society.

Educating people in the spirit of the rules, requirements and concepts of universal morality is an urgent function of all known religious systems. In their moral basis, these systems are very close, that is if we do not take into account certain ethno-cultural and traditional differences, we find the same axiological priorities in all the sacred books. It involves respect for parents, caring for children and the elderly, helping the poor, looking after the sick and protecting orphans, honesty and benevolence, sincerity and tolerance, avoiding anger and evil, etc. Religious postulates, due to their own natural basis and moral and ethical nature, formed the basis for regulatory and legal regulation. They formed the first ideas about good and evil in the human mind. Subsequently, sacred postulates found their consolidation in the norms, and their protection implemented through the judicial authorities. According to Yu.Tikhonravov, it was in religion that "the ultimate foundation, the ultimate source of any right" was concentrated (Tikhonravov, 1997). Religion contributed to the spiritual growth of a person, which had a direct impact on every process of his life and the society, as well as on court decision-making. It is the role and content of the influence on passing judicial decisions by world religions and on the awareness of the need to take into account the principle of truth is a topical scientific issue. Its solution will allow establishing ideological grounds for the implementation of moral principles through justice.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted in 2023. The following general scientific methods (system method, synthesis, induction, etc.) and a special scientific method (method of legal comparativism) are applied.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Religious norms of the pre-state period, treated as legal, evolved into the sources of law, which, for instance, among the Slavs, were designated by the general term "truth". "Truth is justice (as a property of the righteous, as well as the compliance of actions and deeds with the requirements of morality and law); establishment, principle; truth and verity; virtue, good deeds, righteousness; piety; fulfillment of divine commandments, duty; rightness, rightness, absence of guilt; good name; honesty; vow, promise; oath; command, commandment; decree, rule; set of rules, laws; contract, terms of contract; law; rights; recognition of rights; justification; court; judicial test; law of the court; court costs, fee for calling a witness; witness; confirmation, proof; truthful, fair words, speeches; truthfulness,

honesty; justification; cases, important circumstances, questions.” Thus, the words “Truth” or “untruth” (“injustice”) could denote almost any act of a person. The truth was an object, that is, it could be either provided or demanded. Providing the truth assumed taking an oath or being fair about something. And the right to demand the truth involved trials or casting lots trusting in the will of God. The truth could be forfeited through confusing the system (Ryazanov, 2018).

If we consider the stages of development of religions among the nations of the world, we can distinguish certain patterns inherent even to completely isolated social groups. Thus, first primitive ideas related to early religious beliefs (magic, animism, fetishism, totemism, etc.) did not yet comprise and could not comprise the ideas of God. It is considered that due to the limited knowledge of nature and the human, primitive people were inclined to mystify every phenomenon or object, which could not be apprehended (primarily, those reflected in a particularly positive or exceptionally hostile form on one’s biological and physical existence). Specifically, a primitive man perceived every phenomenon of nature as the action of some creatures that were invisible and inaccessible to the mind.

According to the mythical view, divine forces turned chaos into space and created the universe. The cosmos is a modern universe where harmony and order must exist. Breaking order leads to the return of chaos. According to N.V. Spitsa, good and evil, order and destruction, the birth of a new and dying, numerous meaningless and unsuccessful attempts – everything in the world is balanced. Evil is necessary in a certain sense, because good is founded on its basis. In any society, there must be a certain amount of “evil”, “chaos”, “destruction”, and “wandering”, because within this framework only something meaningful might arise, something that did not exist before, unprecedented and unknown until a certain time. Moreover, chaos isn’t always evil. It is not a destructive factor, but rather a force that leads the system to an attractor, to the tendency of self-structuring of a nonlinear medium (Spitsya, 2010). Thus, from the point of view of synergetics, the cosmos of the previous structure forms elements of chaos for the structure located above, which the latter arranges, resulting in a new quality. Each level of the system corresponds to particular inherent parameters of order, that is, limitation of the degree of freedom. In society, the function of order parameters is performed by laws. Violation of order parameters causes a decrease in the hierarchical level of the system, that is, a return from space to chaos. The introduction of order parameters, notably, restrictions and prohibitions, contributed to the development of the system and its transition to a new quality. That was the role played by numerous taboos, thus they supporting the existence of the community (Caillois, 2001).

Human legal views were formed and developed as an inherent part of the mythological worldview, because it was in the myth, where the knowledge of the eternal, just, harmonious and perfect was consolidated. At that stage, a human did not separate himself or herself from the natural cosmos, but considered himself or herself a part of it. Mythology contributed to the harmonization of the individual, society and nature. It explained the connection between the past, present and future, formed the first ideas about the value system in the human mind. Mythology influenced through divine laws that guided human behavior. In their actions, people were guided by well-known, generally accepted rules of behavior in society, customs, and traditions, which were based on these laws. They were an integral part of the entire public life, formed the basis of any right and were a criterion for checking the legality of human actions.

An important attribute of life in such a society was a sense of collectivity. The conditions of human existence were such that the family and the tribe recognized themselves as unity in the full sense of the word. Consequently, a certain conglomerate was formed, which dictated a particular model of behavior based on the relationship with the natural and internal needs of groups of people and was considered correct for this group. Going beyond the rules established responsibility depending on the specifics of the groups. For example, in New England, someone who kills or eats a person from their fraternity and someone who violates the law of exogamy are called in one word. He or she is not just responsible for the death of a person, he or she weakens, cripples the complex existence of the group, harms the social and cosmic space of which this person is a part. It was believed that the weakening, injury, and harm caused to this existence would not have become less if the perpetrator had been executed. It would be tantamount for the group to killing themselves. At worst, they limited themselves to expelling the criminal from the community, in order not to spread shame. However, the group avoids encroaching on his life directly (Caillois, 2001).

Roger Caillois comes to an interesting conclusion: in a society with dispersed power or in a society with a head (master) and concentrated power, the composition of the two “parts” is balanced in quantity and authority, that is, what is balanced by a similar or opposite inequality of quantity and authority (one compensates for the other) determines the concept of the order of the world. What is allowed to members of one fraternity is forbidden to members of another; what is allowed to a prince is forbidden to the masses, and vice versa. The purpose of bans is to protect the system that has been established in a certain way from any encroachments (Caillois, 200).

Thus, the primary need for prohibitions and punishments for their violation, concerned the formation of a sustainable life of a community, gave the organization influence and made it strong. This made it possible to ensure and provide the life of an individual therein. The existence of an individual directly depended on the strength of the community, with which it was connected. Thus, a strong group was a key factor, something that all its members should strive for, something that did not cause objections, was considered right and fair, was supported by the fear of bringing trouble to the community and punishing the guilty, and fostering obedience in other members thereof. The compliance and punishment for violations took place through the implementation of self-regulation in the pre-state period, and later by bodies that had the right to administer justice already in the state.

So, Jason Boatwright when considering the etymological origin of the English words Justice and Justice, which have a common root “jus”, in his work “History, meaning and use of the words Justice and Justice” (2018) indicates the competition of four sentences of the etymological origin of the word, each of which is full of nuances regarding the content and differs significantly from each other. He offers 4 concepts of the origin of these words. In particular, the first “jus” is interpreted as “command, fear and violence”. It comes from the Latin word “jussi”, which means “what is determined by human or divine laws”. The second one explains “jus” in the sense of “need” and possibly “request, distribution” and is derived from the Greek adjective “δεος”, which means “correct”. And this is not in the sense of “fair, proper or legal”, but in the sense that it is mandatory or necessary. The third is based on its origin from Sanskrit “jus” as a connection, a yoke. The fourth explains “jus” as “life” and probably “limitations”. In this version, the etymology explains the origin of “jus” from the

Proto-Indo-European noun in the meaning of “life force, eternity”. When the words “justice” and “equity” were adapted into English, each of them retained a difference in the meaning of the root word for a long time (Boatright, 2018).

It is in etymological research that the processes of lexical development of the identification of the concept of justice and equity, as well as historical evidence of their use, are revealed. Accordingly, they can be used to explain the origin of the root “jus” in the words Justice derives from the idea of imposing a duty on a person.

With the emergence of the state, the duty to provide justice was assigned to the judge, who, having received power from God, was given the right to apply his laws, commandments, and instructions. In specific cases, priests, pharaohs, and sages could be judges. They were assisted by prophets, preachers, and oracles. The main components of justice were both the divine laws themselves, on the basis of which the judge made decisions, and the interests of society and the state, as in the dilemma of Pontius Pilate regarding the proclamation of clemency to those sentenced to death.

Under the influence of Christian beliefs, the idea of law and justice developed and changed. Christianity distinguished between laws as operating in the divine sphere and norms provided to man by the Holy Scriptures. The latter were attributed to divine origin and were considered mandatory and superior to any secular legislation. From the point of view of Christianity, the concept of law has a clearly defined meaning – the law of God. Secular law, notably written law, does not always coincide with the Christian ideals of truth, goodness, and Justice. In the era of separation of church and state, which is taking place in our time, it determines the separation of secular law and canonical law. However, the understanding that in addition to written law, there is an even higher truth, A Higher Law, and a higher Justice has apparently been forever fixed in the human consciousness when God, in relations with his creatures, adheres to the strictest rules of impartiality and justice.

Man, to some small extent, is called to be a kind of co-ruler on Earth, so to speak, God’s intercessor in establishing righteousness and exercising justice. This understanding of the function and responsibility of a political ruler is central, particularly in the Hebrew scriptures, starting with Moses, the Lawgiver. Later, these functions were assigned to other “judges” and rulers.

In St. Paul’s speeches, this sounds more insightful. He prophetically wrote about the semi-divine nature of civil governance: “let every person submit to governing authority, for there is no authority but God, and those that exist have been established by God. Therefore, those who resist power resist what God has appointed, and those who resist are condemned... (The Ruler) is God’s servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not carry the sword (strength) in vain; he is a servant of God to execute his wrath on the offender” (Romans 13: 1-2, 4).

This religiously certified right of the authorities obliged them to maintain justice on Earth. The goal of a true Christian state is to establish divine justice and prevent judges from violating social order, the ideas of justice, equality, and benevolence.

In quotations of the Holy Scriptures, it is indicated that the descendant of King David, Josaphat, while carrying out judicial reform, admonished the judges: “look what you do: for you do not judge for people, but for the Lord, and he is with you when you judge. So let the fear of the Lord be upon you: proceed with caution, for the Lord our God has no falsehood, no complacency, no bribery” (the Holy scripts of the Old and New Testaments, 1992).

Certain ethical requirements for the conduct of legal proceedings are laid down in the main book of Christianity – the Bible. So, in particular, in the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount of Jesus Christ, it is defined: “Blessed are those who are cast out for righteousness, for their kingdom is heaven” and “Blessed are you, if they will disgrace and persecute you, and they will slander you with every evil word for my sake. Rejoice and rejoice, for your reward is great in heaven. For they also persecuted the prophets who were before you “ (Matthew 5: 10-11). That is, in Christianity, “truth”, as well as patience for the sake of justice, is one of the grounds for obtaining the Kingdom of Heaven and “eternal life”.

In Peter’s Epistle to the Philippians, it is noted that “everything that is only true, that is honest, that is just, that is pure, that is loving, that is respectful, if there is any virtue or something praiseworthy, think about it! What you have learned, what you have received, what you have heard and seen in me, do so, and the God of peace will be with you” (Phil. 4:8; 4:9).

In fact, all the basic principles of law (freedom, responsibility, justice) are Christian issues in their value basis. Legal views are always linked to moral ideals. The Gospel of Matthew States: “depart from me, you who commit iniquity!” (Mt. 7:23). “You love justice and hate iniquity” (Ps. 45:8); “Law and justice are the foundation of your throne; mercy and faithfulness go before you” (Ps. 89: 15); “Blessed is the tree that serves justice” (Sag. 14:7); “and the work of justice will be peace, and the fruit of justice will be peace and security for life” (Isa. 32: 17); “Woe to you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites, for you give tithes of mint, dill, and cumin, and forsake what is most important in the law: justice, mercy, and faith. Both should be done and should not be left out” (Matt. 23:23).

The central categories of biblical reality are the court and judicial activity. The Old Testament states: “I know that the Lord will give justice to the poor and intercede for the rights of the poor “(Ps. 139: 13); “for lack of justice, not one perishes” (Pr. 13: 23); “to do justice is a joy for the righteous, but a horror for the wicked” (Pr. 21: 15); “in matters of dispute, they will be judges. They will judge according to my right” (Ezek. 44:24).

In the time of Moses, courts and officials were obliged to perform their official duties in good faith, not to commit corrupt acts, to observe the principle of equality, giving them the following instruction: “you will not distort the laws, you will not count on the person, and you will not take gifts, because gifts blind the eyes of the wise and distort the words of the just” (Deut. 16:19).

Law also belongs to the basic principles of justice, because Peter’s Epistle to the Romans states that “for even before the law, sin was in the world, but sin is not counted if there is no law” (Rom. 5:13).

A significant Christian principle of justice is the principle of equality: “when you judge, do not pay attention to the face; listen to the small as well as the great; do not be afraid of anyone” (Deut. 1:17); “you will not condone the poor in his claim” (Exodus 23: 3); “do not bend judgment to the side of your poor in his claim” (Exodus 23:6).

An important role in the biblical texts belongs to the duty of witnesses to give truthful testimony in the trial: “do not bear false witness against your neighbor” (Exodus 20:16); “do not spread false rumors. You will not lay your hand with the unjust, to be a witness of unrighteousness “(Exodus 23:1); “you will not deny falsely, and you will not speak falsely against one another” (Lev. 19: 11); “He who tells the truth does justice; a false witness is

deceit" (Prov. 12: 17); "The Evil witness mocks justice, and the mouths of sinners devour iniquity" (Prov. 19: 28); "my mouth will not speak falsehood, my tongue will not speak falsehood" (Job. 27: 4); "A True witness does not speak falsehood; a false witness breathes falsehood" (Prov. 14:5); "By Your commandments I have become wise, so I hate every false path" (Ps. 119: 104); "a false witness will not escape punishment; he who breathes lies will perish" (Pr. 19:9). "Let the judges Judge well; and when it turns out that the witness is a false witness, and that he testifies falsely against his brother" (Deut. 19:18).

If a witness gives false testimony during the trial, a review of the cases is provided: "go back to the court, because these people have made false testimony against her" (Dan. 13:49). The necessity of multiple evidences for an objective resolution of a dispute is emphasized: "a witness alone has no value against anyone for any transgression, or for any crime, or for any guilt that someone sins with them: one the word of two witnesses or on the word of three witnesses, the case will become valid " (Deut. 19: 15).

In turn, Judaism, as one of the modern Jewish theologians Joseph Soloveitchik writes, requires that a person respond by shouting to any pain, responding to any injustice. Moreover, Judaism believes that a person who is indifferent to pain and misfortune, who has come to terms with the filth and injustice of life, is not able to appreciate beauty and goodness. Those who do not insist on meeting their legitimate needs also ignore the concerns of other people. Human morality, which is based on Love and brotherhood, on a compassionate attitude to other people's misfortunes, is impossible if you are indifferent to your own needs, to your own suffering. This is why Judaism rejects the way of life that does not recognize legitimate human needs. (Lubsky, Lubka, 2009).

Truth and justice among Jews and Christians are not based on the need to save the soul. Later the religiously born concept of justice in its semi-secularized form has become ubiquitous in Western cultures and fundamental in the administration of Justice.

If Christianity is called primarily the religion of love, then Islam, as the researchers note, is primarily the "religion of Justice" (Rosen, 2000).

The Iranian-Islamic ideologist Khamenei notes that Islam and justice are two sides of the same coin, and the goal of Islam as a religion is the prosperity of society on the basis of social justice. This thesis is confirmed in the symbolism of Islam itself, where one of the symbols of justice is the scales, which reflect the inherent Justice requirement of a balanced, proportional – that is, impartial, equal (the principle of "al Nasaf") – attitude to all things, in accordance with the natural order established by God (Kiryuhin, 2010). The Arabic word "Adl", "Adolat", meaning "justice", has several meanings. First of all, it is the same, equal attitude of anyone to all members of the community, it is the equality of people among themselves, it is actions that meet generally recognized moral and legal norms, it is conscience, correctness, impartiality, loyalty, reliability, accuracy, truth, it is justice and it is a counterweight to tyranny, injustice, and evil (Khairulloev, 2007).

As the researcher of Muslim law S.F. Khairulloev notes, one of the basic provisions for Muslim law defines that "respect for justice means coordinating one's action with the requirements of the natural order of things" (Khairulloev, 2007).

The principle of justice also occupies an important place in Muslim law. It should be noted, that following monotheism, justice is considered one of the most important and significant foundations of Sharia law (Khairulloev, 2007). "Allah does not forbid you to be friendly and

just to those who did not fight you because of faith and did not drive you out of your homes. Indeed, Allah loves the just “ (Surah 60, verse 8).

The famous Muslim educator Abu al-Ala al-Maududi considered two aspects of Justice. First, care must be taken to ensure that everyone enjoys their rights without restriction. Sometimes it can be equality. In other cases, it is important that everyone gets what they deserve. Secondly, it is “Ihsan”. The commandment “Ihsan “in Surah” Nahlya” of verse 90 refers to all actions and deeds, to the attitude of the servant of Allah to his Lord, as well as to the family, community and humanity, and “Ihsan” also includes friendliness and willingness to help his relatives. In public life, this is even more important than justice: it is the foundation of a healthy society, and “Ihsan” is its improvement. Justice protects society from cruelty and violation of rights, and “Ihsan” makes life in it beautiful and worthy (Blokha, 2016). Thus, the pinnacle of improving one’s own spiritual foundations should be Ihsan – sincerity in all actions before the eyes of Allah. A person should only love what is needed and like Allah, and hate what Allah hates. At the same time, it is not enough to act in such a way that God is pleased – you need to fully contribute to the multiplication of good and righteousness in the land of Allah. If someone tends to reach heights on this path, it means that they are approaching Allah. Ihsan is an ideal that every deeply religious person strives for in the name of their own spiritual uplift and flourishing in Islam.

The commandments that form the basis of the “moral code” of the Qur’an – “respect Allah, do not forget about the day of judgment, be God-fearing, break your pride, be gentle, submit to the authorities and powerful of this world, because they are from God” are aimed at educating a person not only a religious feeling, but also humility before secular authorities, not only fear of God, but also fear of punishing people in real, earthly life. Although all are equal before Allah, all are his slaves, in real life there is no such equality, and the faithful must strictly adhere to the hierarchy of the social structure that exists, in particular, do not look with envious eyes at the benefits that Allah has given to some of the chosen ones (Surah 20, verse 131). The Koran treats social inequality as a Divine Will, and only what is predetermined for you by God happens to a person (Lubsky, Teremko, Lubka 2008). This served as a tool of pacification, obliging to voluntarily comply with the instructions of the authorities. A person “stitched” with the dogma of the benefits of suffering or retribution for past sins, saw justice in his own oppression.

In turn, the leading motive of the moral concept of Buddhism is humanity, which consistently develops through the humanistic concept of the individual, defending its value, and demanding respect for it. Buddhism seeks to establish the spiritual balance of a person, inner distance from everything, because the world (Samsara) is the greatest evil. At the same time, Buddhism recognizes the need to live and act, as well as the fact that a person cannot live in society and be independent of it. But at the same time, he insists on focusing a person’s attention on their inner being, psychological state, self-absorption and appropriate moralizing (Lubsky, Teremko, Lubka 2008).

The Dhammapada (roughly translated as “the way of truth”), which is a kind of “Bible” for Buddhists and dates back to 563-483 BC, contains the following teachings of the Buddha: “he mocked me, beat me, defeated me, robbed me, and those who harbor such thoughts do not calm their hatred. He mocked me, beat me, defeated me, robbed me, and those who do not bring up such thoughts calm their hatred. Hatred never stops because of hatred in this world; because of love alone, it stops. This is the eternal law” (Dhammapada, 1954).

Buddhism is primarily a contemplative religion. However, since ancient times, it has been an instrument of social justice based on the basic principle of compassion. Accordingly, all people follow their own choice of behavior model, which will have its own consequences for it (karma). If this choice is determined by wisdom and compassion – she will be happy, if she is full of greed, hatred and delusion – the result will be suffering. As an affirmation of social justice, Buddhists believe that the land is generous and rich, but cannot provide for everyone equally. When some decide to take a smarter one for themselves, others are left with nothing. Thus, inequality is created, from which jealousy, distrust, lies, crime, and violence sprout. To cope with these challenges, people invent social constructs such as laws, customs, classes, private property, and government.

The main task of the government is to ensure the safety and well-being of people, ensuring that poverty does not become excessive. This is based on the concept of dharma, which means that in life it is necessary to adhere to the principles of nature and agree with the right. A truly noble and righteous ruler lives in harmony with the Dharma, ruling without violence or coercion.

“What is the duty of the noble Emperor? Depending on the Dharma, honoring it, cherishing it, it is necessary to establish protection and protection according to the Dharma for one’s own household, troops, nobles and vassals, for Brahmins and household members, city and Village People, ascetics and religious people, for animals and birds. Let not any crime in the kingdom prevail in you, but give property to those who are in need” (Cakkavatti Sihanada Sutta).

In the field of social justice, the best example of a ruler who followed the Buddha’s advice is king Ashoka (C. 304-232 BC). We know about Ashoka from Buddhist and other Indian legends, as well as from his own words inscribed in edicts found all over India (The Edicts of King Asoka).

Ashoka inherited a vast empire across much of northern India, which he persevered in strengthening and spreading with terrible human losses. After converting to Buddhism, he felt great remorse for his own actions, and expressed his sadness and repentance. This fueled the extreme policy of nonviolence through which he ruled the largest empire in the world at the time. Among many other innovations, he declared an amnesty for prisoners and measures against them, such as rehabilitation; banned the slaughter of many animal species; established medical care for humans and animals; and created a system of appeals so that people could pass on their concerns to their king.

Although Ashoka was a Buddhist, there is little particularly Buddhist in his politics. Rather, he was talking about dharma, ruling according to the principle of righteousness, which was taken as the basis of all religions in India. The main thing in his policy was to support all religions: he said that a person is never helped by his own religion if he despises another religion, and when a person helps others, he supports all religions.

The Buddhist approach to justice begins with individual behavior. The Moral Law of karma, in which good actions give rise to positive consequences, and bad ones – negative ones, is at its core. Buddhism has proven historically compatible with various forms of political regimes. Since Buddhism has traditionally focused on monks, it has limited itself to general social prescriptions, notably the five commandments of good behavior (do not kill, steal, cheat, commit sexual offenses, or take alcoholic beverages). A special characteristic

of Buddhism is its loyalty to existing political regimes. Accordingly, rulers often patronized Buddhism, providing protection and resources in exchange for the blessing of monks and the broader political legitimacy it gave them.

## CONCLUSIONS

Consequently, religions act as an ideological basis for the implementation of moral principles through justice, based on socio-ethical and cultural systems of their dissemination. Common to all religious dogmas is the need to protect against the basic violations embodied in the commandment, the definition of “evil” by specific religions and the cultivation of its eradication, both by the person himself and through the bodies endowed with the right to administer justice. Religion also obliges a person to obey and take for granted what will be unfair and wrong for him, promises him rewards for suffering in another life, imposes duties for past sins, or promises to punish those responsible for injustice with “bad karma” in the future.

The very semantics of the concepts of justice are contextually different in different religious, historical, and socio-cultural systems. The etymological origin of the concept of “justice” is much more complex for a clear conceptualization and, quite possibly, is based on such meanings as compulsion, fear, violence, necessity.

Justice in the context of asserting justice can be seen in different categories: it must be an unbiased assessment of circumstances based on the “truth” on the basis of equality of arms, and as follows from our research – as a tool for creating safe and harmonious conditions for the existence of society. In world religions, we see an understanding of fair justice through the direct impact of social, economic, and political conditions on its establishment. Justice acts as a certain standard of established truth, cultivated by religious norms that are partly beneficial to the authorities. Accordingly, we can define the relativity of the concepts of “just” or “unfair”, since they can be considered as through the Aristotelian “*suum cuique*” (to each his own), and through the principle of equality and impartiality, and as a means of influencing society to realize its security and (or) the interests of the authorities.

## REFERENCES

- Blokha, Ya. E. (2016). The principle of justice in Islam. *Philosophical Horizons*, 35, 212-219.
- Boatright J. (2018). The History, Meaning, and Use of the Words Justice and Judge. *St. Mary's Law Journal*, 49(4), 727-748. Retrieved from <https://commons.stmarytx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=thestmaryslawjournal>
- Cailliois, R. (2001). *Man and the sacred*. University of Illinois Press.
- Cakkavatti S.S. *Digha Nikaya 26*. Retrieved from <http://www.palikanon.org/en/sutta-pitaka/transcribed-suttas/majjhima-nikaya/141-mn-87-piyajtika-sutta-born-from-those-who-are-dear.html>
- Khairulloev, F.S. (2007). *The principle of justice in Muslim law* [Doctoral dissertation, Law sciences].
- Kiryuhin, D. (2010). The concept of justice in Orthodoxy and Islam. *Scientific notes of the National University “Ostroh Academy”*, Ser: Philosophy, 7, 198-207.
- Lubsky, V.I. & Lubsky, M.V. (2009). *History of religion*. Kyiv, Ukraine: Center for Educational Literature.
- Lubsky, V.I., Teremko, V.I. & Lubsky, M.V. (2008). *Religious Studies*. Kyiv, Ukraine: Akademydav.
- Rosen, L. (2000). *The justice of Islam: comparative perspectives on Islamic law and society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ryazanov, M. (2018). The relationship between the concepts of «truth» and «law» in the Slavic legal culture. *Entrepreneurship, economy and law*, 5, 214-218.

Spitsya, N. V. (2010). Peculiarities of the interaction of chaos and order in the self-organizing processes of society: problems of the measure category in the context of research by E. Sedov. Humanitarian Bulletin of Zaporizhzhya State Engineering Academy: Collection of Scientific Works, 43, 152-165.

The Dhammapada (1954). Thera N. (tr.) London: John Murray.

The Edicts of King Asoka. An English rendering by Dhammika, Ven. S. Retrieved from <https://www.cs.colostate.edu/~malaiya/ashoka.html>

The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. A complete translation from the original European, Aramaic and Greek texts. (1992). Ukrainian Bible 63 DC, United Bible Societies.

Tikhonravov, Yu. V. (1997). Fundamentals of Law Philosophy. Herald.