

Suppose that the members of a social group are ranked (objectively or subjectively) in order of competence, seniority, power, income, or any other respect. I.e., each individual is assigned a natural number A_n ^{in the given respect.} This number A may or may not be the same as the rank D the individual deserves, or believes he deserves. If D differs from A , an injustice has been committed: one that hurts or favors the person in question. More precisely, we may stipulate that the degree of injustice involved in assigning rank A to the individual equals $i = D - A$. When the individual has been underrated, $i > 0$; when he has been overrated, $i < 0$; and he has been justly rated if $A = D$. In other words, we may introduce

DEFINITION 1 Let S be a social group every member of which can be ranked with regard to some characteristic c . Call A the actual, and D

the deserved rank a member p of S has been assigned in regard ϵ . Then the degree of justice involved in the actual ranking of p in the regard ϵ is

$$J_{\epsilon}(p) = 1 + A - D .$$

Clearly,

$J_{\epsilon}(p) = 0$ iff p has been justly rated in regard ϵ

$J_{\epsilon}(p) < 1$ iff p has been underrated " "

$J_{\epsilon}(p) > 1$ iff p has been overrated " "

Needless to say, this measure of justice presupposes the idea of justice
, in particular a technodemoeracy .
as desert, and is inherent in any meritocracy. It would make no sense in
a radically egalitarian society, where nobody deserves more than anybody else.