International Journal of Advanced Research
in Arts, Science, Engineering & Management

INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA

Impact Factor: 6.551

Development and Social Ethics

DR. SEEMA SHARMA

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Sociology, S.D. Government College, Beawar, Rajasthan, India

ABSTRACT: Development ethics is a field of enquiry that reflects on both the ends and the means of economic development. It typically takes a normative stance, asking and answering questions about the nature of ethically desirable development and what ethics means for achieving development, and discusses various ethical dilemmas that the practice of development has led to. Its aim is to ensure that "value issues" are an important part of the discourse of development.[1]

Key themes

Development ethics typically looks at development theories and practice and their relationships with:

- Social justice
- Human rights
- Basic needs

A major focus of the literature is on the "ethics of the means". This involves asking not only how to realize the goals of development but also what are ethical limits in their pursuit.[1]

Denis Goulet, one of the founding fathers of the discipline, argued in The Cruel Choice (1971) that "Development ethics is useless unless it can be translated into public action. By public action is meant action taken by public authority, as well as actions taken by private agents by having important consequences for the life of the public community. The central question is: How can moral guidelines influence decisions of those who hold power?"

KEYWORDS-development, social ethics, justice, human rights, community, public

I. INTRODUCTION

Ethics or moral philosophy is a branch[1] of philosophy that "involves systematizing, defending, and recommending concepts of right and wrong behavior".[2] The field of ethics, along with aesthetics, concerns matters of value; these fields comprise the branch of philosophy called axiology.[3]

Ethics seeks to resolve questions of human morality by defining concepts such as good and evil, right and wrong, virtue and vice, justice and crime.[4] As a field of intellectual inquiry, moral philosophy is related to the fields of moral psychology, descriptive ethics, and value theory.

Three major areas of study within ethics recognized today are:[2]

1. Meta-ethics, concerning the theoretical meaning and reference of moral propositions, and how their truth values (if any) can be determined;
2. Normative ethics, concerning the practical means of determining a moral course of action;
3. Applied ethics, concerning what a person is obligated (or permitted) to do in a specific situation or a particular domain of action.[2]

Definition

The English word ethics is derived from the Ancient Greek word ēthikós (ἠθικός), meaning "relating to one's character", which itself comes from the root word êthos (ἦθος) meaning "character, moral nature".[5] This word was transferred into Latin as ethica and then into French as éthique, from which it was transferred into English.

Rushworth Kidder states that "standard definitions of ethics have typically included such phrases as 'the science of the ideal human character' or 'the science of moral duty'".[6] Richard William Paul and Linda Elder define ethics as "a set of concepts and principles that guide us in determining what behavior helps or harms sentient creatures".[7] The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy states that the word "ethics" is "commonly used interchangeably with 'morality' ... and sometimes it is used more narrowly to mean the moral principles of a particular tradition, group

or individual."[8] Paul and Elder state that most people confuse ethics with behaving in accordance with social conventions, religious beliefs, the law, and do not treat ethics as a stand-alone concept.[9]

The word ethics in English refers to several things.[10] It can refer to philosophical ethics or moral philosophy—a project that attempts to use reason to answer various kinds of ethical questions. As the English moral philosopher Bernard Williams writes, attempting to explain moral philosophy: "What makes an inquiry a philosophical one is reflective generality and a style of argument that claims to be rationally persuasive."[11] Williams describes the content of this area of inquiry as addressing the very broad question, "how one should live".[12] Ethics can also refer to a common human ability to think about ethical problems that is not particular to philosophy. As bioethicist Larry Churchill has written: "Ethics, understood as the capacity to think critically about moral values and direct our actions in terms of such values, is a generic human capacity."[13]

Ethics is the branch of philosophy that examines right and wrong moral behavior, moral concepts (such as justice, virtue, duty) and moral language. Ethics or moral philosophy is a branch of philosophy that "involves systematizing, defending, and recommending concepts of right and wrong behavior". The field of ethics, along with aesthetics, concerns matters of value, and thus comprises the branch of philosophy called axiology.

Various ethical theories pose various answers to the question "What is the greatest good?" and elaborate a complete set of proper behaviors for individuals and groups. Ethical theories are closely related to forms of life in various social orders.[1]

Origins

The epic poems that stand at the beginning of many world literatures, such as the Mesopotamian Epic of Gilgamesh, Homer's Iliad and the Icelandic Eddas, portray a set of values that suit the strong leader of a small tribe. Valour and success are the principal qualities of a hero and are generally not constrained by moral considerations. Revenge and vendetta are appropriate activities for heroes. The gods that appear in such epics are not defenders of moral values but are capricious forces of nature and are to be feared and propitiated.[2]

More strictly ethical claims are found occasionally in the literature of ancient civilizations that is aimed at lower classes of society. The Sumerian Farmer's Almanac and the Egyptian Instruction of Amenemope both advise farmers to leave some grain for poor gleaners, and promise favours from the gods for doing so.[3] A number of ancient religions and ethical thinkers also put forward some version of the golden rule, at least in its negative version: do not do to others what you do not want done to yourself.[4]

Ancient Greek ethics

While Greek moral thought was originally based on mythology, which provided moral meaning but no comprehensive framework, from the 600s BCE a new moral approach emerged which used rational arguments instead, leading to the rise of philosophy as a distinct mode of thought.[5] This has been especially attributed to Socrates.[5] The Socratic method aimed to establish moral truths by questioning the beliefs of others, rather than by explaining them directly.[6] He opposed the moral relativism of the Sophists, insisting on the formulation of moral principles from beginning.[7] As portrayed in Plato's Republic, he articulates the greatest good as the transcendent "form of good itself".[8] In his personal life, Socrates lived extremely morally. He was chaste, disciplined, pious, responsible, and cared for his friends[9] In the so-called Euthyphro dilemma, he raised the problem of whether divine action was motivated by it being good, or whether it was good because it was divine.[10] In Gorgias he defends the notion that it is better to suffer injustice than to do it.

The key work of Plato's ethics was the Republic, which was focused on conceiving justice, a concept which for Plato was inclusive of wider morality as well.[11] In a dialogue, Thrasymachus argued that conventional morality was a ruse invented to keep the elite in power, which should be discarded in favour of self-interest.[11] Plato responded by planning a utopia and giving a metaphysical theory of what is good.[12] He argued there were five regimes into which different societies could be divided, with the best one being aristocracy, in which "the desires of the inferior many are controlled by the wisdom and desires of the superior few".[13] In contrast, democracy would lead to the degradation of culture and morality, with him arguing that "extreme freedom can't be expected to lead to anything but a change to extreme slavery".[14] Whereas ordinary people were living in an illusion, demonstrated by the allegory of the cave, the theory of forms suggested that objective definitions, as looked for by Socrates, did actually exist.[15] The highest form was that of the Good, which gave purpose for everything in the world and could only be understood by the philosophers.[16]

Aristotle's ethics builds upon Plato's with important variations. Aristotle defined the good as "that at which all things aim".[17] While many different goods were being pursued by different people and activities, that good which is being pursued for its own sake was the supreme good, or what he called eudaimonia, which has been translated as 'happiness' but may be more broadly described as 'flourishing', and involves "living well and doing well", not mere pleasure (which will itself follow).[18] A "great-souled" citizen who lives a life of virtue can expect to achieve eudaimonia, which Aristotle argues is the highest good for man. Following Plato, Aristotle gives a significant role in moral life to the virtues, fixed habits of behaviour that lead to good outcomes; the main virtues are courage, justice, prudence and temperance. The highest form of life is, however, purely intellectual activity.[19] However, the virtues for him are merely the means to an end.[18] Furthermore, he disagreed with Plato on there being a universal transcendental good, instead seeing ethics as practical and particular.[18] Rather, the virtues should be based on finding the golden mean between extremes.[20]

Later Greek schools of philosophy, such as the Epicureans and Stoics, debated the conditions of the good life. Both of these schools argued that tranquility should be the aim of life but disagreed on the mean of getting there despite both claiming the Socratic tradition.[21] Epicurus taught that the greatest good was pleasure and freedom from pain.[21] However, the latter was more important, as indulgences should be avoided so they did not lead to want and therefore suffering.[22] Instead, the Epicureans emphasized the quiet enjoyment of pleasures, especially mental pleasure, free of fear and anxiety. Founded by Zeno of Citium, the Stoics thought the greatest good not pleasure but reason and everything in accord with reason, even if painful. Hence, they praised the life of reason lived in accordance with nature.[23] They had been influenced by the Cynics' and Socrates' asceticism and indifference to adversity.[22] The acceptance of the inevitable subsequently became a key aspect of their thinking, based also on their belief in determinism.[24] Whereas the Epicureans believed the universe was essentially meaningless, the Stoics believed that God (understood to be one with the universe) gave meaning to the world.[24] In response to the problem of evil, the Stoics developed the concept of theodicy.[25] The Stoic philosopher Hierocles also developed the concept of morality being based on concentric circles of proximity to the individual, such as family, community and humanity, with the process of bringing the self and the other together called Oikeiôsis.[26]

Indian ethics

The foundation of Hinduism is in the epic of Mahabharata, which contains the concept of dharma, a conception of natural law and the duties required for the upholding of the natural order.[27] Hinduism itself is viewed by its followers as Sanātana Dharma, or the 'Eternal Law', which binds everyone.[28] The four aims of Hinduism are moksha (enlightenment), artha (wealth), kama (pleasure), and dharma.[29] The significance of moksha is that only it can break through maya, the illusion hiding reality, which requires both understanding the impermanence of material reality as well as the attainment of an understanding of the unity of the Self (atman) and the foundation of being (brahman).[29] Moksha also means breaking free from the cycle of reincarnation which is governed by karma, the accumulated balance of good and bad actions by an individual.[30] This was in turn used as a justification for the caste system.[31] During the Axial Age, asceticism and becoming a hermit increased in popularity, sometimes being a reaction to the prevailing social structures.[32] Two significant belief systems emerged from this reaction. Jainism, formalised by the ascetic philosopher Mahavira, according to which enlightenment came through a perfectly ethical life that necessitated a complete renunciation of the killing of any living beings, including the smallest of insects.[33] The other one was Buddhism, founded by the Buddha. Other responses to the era included materialist schools such as Charvaka, which embraced hedonism and rejected spirituality.[32]

The most important of the Buddha's teaching was the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta, at the core of which were the Four Noble Truths.[34] The first of these was duḥkha, the suffering that is part of life.[34] This is also one of the three marks of existence which define life, the others being anitya, the impermanence of everything, and anatman, or the non-existence of the self across time.[34] The second Noble Truth was that all human suffering is caused by desire that cannot be satisfied, and that only be renouncing the desire could the suffering be ended, which was the Third Noble Truth.[35] The final Noble Truth was that desire could only be relinquished by following Noble Eightfold Path.[35] The Eightfold Path consists of eight practices: right view, right resolve, right speech, right conduct, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right samadhi ('meditative absorption or union'; alternatively, equanimous meditative awareness).[36] The Middle Way refers to major aspects of the teaching of the Buddha, either to the spiritual practice that steers clear of both extreme asceticism and sensual indulgence, which is defined as the Noble Eightfold Path, or the Buddha's avoiding of eternalism (or absolutism) and annihilationism (and nihilism).[37] In Mahāyāna Buddhism, śūnyatā ('emptiness') refers to the tenet that "all things are empty of intrinsic existence and nature (svabhava)".[38][39]

Chinese ethics

Confucius, who lived around the same time as the Buddha, was focused mostly on ethical philosophy.[40] He was especially interested in how to create a harmonious society, which he believed was based on two human qualities: ren and li.[40] Ren, the highest principle, describes humaneness, encompassing all the qualities required for ideal behaviour between people.[40] Confucious argued that a form of the Golden Rule should be the guiding principle of all actions.[40] However, he also believed that different forms of behaviour were appropriate in different relationships.[40] The second principle of li embodied this by establishing the need to follow tradition, rituals and other conventional norms.[40]

Natural law ethics

In the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas developed a synthesis of Biblical and Aristotelian ethics called natural law theory, according to which the nature of humans determines what is right and wrong. For example, murder is wrong because life is essential to humans so depriving someone of it is inherently an evil. Education is needed for humans, and is their right, because their intellectual nature requires developing. Natural law theory remains at the heart of Catholic moral teaching, for example in its positions on contraception and other controversial moral issues.[41]

The Catholic practice of compulsory confession led to the development of manuals of casuistry, the application of ethical principles to detailed cases of conscience, such as the conditions of a just war.[42]

Kantian ethics

Immanuel Kant, in the 18th century, argued that right and wrong are founded on duty, which issues a Categorical Imperative to us, a command that, of its nature, ought to be obeyed. An action is only truly moral if done from a sense of duty, and the most valuable thing is a human will that has decided to act rightly. To decide what duty requires, Kant proposes the principle of universalizability: correct moral rules are those everyone could adopt.[43]

Kant's philosophy marks a number of important conceptual shifts in philosophical thinking about ethics. Kant argues that questions about happiness should not be a focus in ethical thought, because ethics should be universal while happiness may involve very different modes of life for different individuals. He also believed this approach was necessary if an ethical theory was to avoid becoming 'heteronomous'; that is, locating the source of proper moral motivation outside of properly moral concerns.

Utilitarianism

In 19th century Britain, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill advocated utilitarianism, the view that right actions are those that are likely to result in the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Utilitarianism remains popular in the twenty-first century.[44]

Both Kantianism and Utilitarianism provide ethical theories that can support contemporary liberal political developments, and associated enlightenment ways of conceiving of the individual.

Twentieth century

The early twentieth century saw many debates on metaethics, that is, philosophical theory on the nature of ethics. Views ranged from moral realism, which holds that moral truths are about mind-independent realities,[45] to evolutionary ethics, which believes ethical practices are merely evolved ways of behavior that led to evolutionary success, to the error theory of J. L. Mackie, which held that the entire notion of ethical obligation is a mistake.[46]

Reflections on the Holocaust, such as those of Hannah Arendt, led to a deepening appreciation of the reality of extreme evil. The Holocaust impacted other Jewish philosophers immensely, for instance, the post-war period saw Emmanuel Levinas develop his 'ethics of the other' and situate ethics as 'first philosophy'.[47] This philosophy showed a focus on the relation to the other in distress as central to the development of ethics and placed ethical theories center-stage in philosophy. Also, in reaction to the Holocaust, rights theories, as expressed for example in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, asserted the inalienable moral rights of humans to life, education, and other basic goods. Another response to the atrocities of World War II included existential reflections on the meaning of life, leading to approaches to ethics based on "the situation" and personal interaction.[48]

In the late 20th century, there was a so-called 'aretaic turn' and renewed interest in virtue ethics. This turn is often traced to a paper by G.E.M. Anscombe entitled "Modern Moral Philosophy". This approach was then furthered and popularized by figures such as Philippa Foot, Alasdair MacIntyre, Rosalind Hursthouse as well as Paul Ricoeur. The revival of this ethical position congruently saw a return to engagement with earlier philosophers associated with moral philosophy such as Thomas Aquinas[49] and Aristotle.[50]

Professional and applied ethics

While mid-twentieth century ethics mostly dealt with theoretical issues, medical ethics continued to deal with issues of practice. The 1970s saw a revival of other fields of applied ethics, the consideration of detailed practical cases in bioethics,[51] animal ethics, business ethics,[52] environmental ethics, computer ethics and other special fields. The development of new technologies produced many new issues requiring ethical debate

II. DISCUSSION

In ethics and social sciences, value denotes the degree of importance of some thing or action, with the aim of determining which actions are best to do or what way is best to live (normative ethics in ethics), or to describe the significance of different actions. Value systems are prospective and prescriptive beliefs; they affect the ethical behavior of a person or are the basis of their intentional activities. Often primary values are strong and secondary values are suitable for changes. What makes an action valuable may in turn depend on the ethical values of the objects it increases, decreases, or alters. An object with "ethic value" may be termed an "ethic or philosophic good" (noun sense).[1]

Values can be defined as broad preferences concerning appropriate courses of actions or outcomes. As such, values reflect a person's sense of right and wrong or what "ought" to be. "Equal rights for all", "Excellence deserves admiration", and "People should be treated with respect and dignity" are representatives of values. Values tend to influence attitudes and behavior and these types include ethical/moral values, doctrinal/ideological (religious, political) values, social values, and aesthetic values. It is debated whether some values that are not clearly physiologically determined, such as altruism, are intrinsic, and whether some, such as acquisitiveness, should be classified as vices or virtues.

Fields of study

Ethical issues that value may be regarded as a study under ethics, which, in turn, may be grouped as philosophy. Similarly, ethical value may be regarded as a subgroup of a broader field of philosophic value sometimes referred to as axiology. Ethical value denotes something's degree of importance, with the aim of determining what action or life is best to do, or at least attempt to describe the value of different actions.

The study of ethical value is also included in value theory. In addition, values have been studied in various disciplines: anthropology, behavioral economics, business ethics, corporate governance, moral philosophy, political sciences, social psychology, sociology and theology.

Similar concepts

Ethical value is sometimes used synonymously with goodness. However, goodness has many other meanings and may be regarded as more ambiguous.

Types of value

Personal versus cultural

Personal values exist in relation to cultural values, either in agreement with or divergence from prevailing norms. A culture is a social system that shares a set of common values, in which such values permit social expectations and collective understandings of the good, beautiful and constructive. Without normative personal values, there would be no cultural reference against which to measure the virtue of individual values and so cultural identity would disintegrate.

Relative or absolute

Relative values differ between people, and on a larger scale, between people of different cultures. On the other hand, there are theories of the existence of absolute values,[2] which can also be termed noumenal values (and not to be confused with mathematical absolute value). An absolute value can be described as philosophically absolute and

independent of individual and cultural views, as well as independent of whether it is known or apprehended or not. Ludwig Wittgenstein was pessimistic towards the idea that an elucidation would ever happen regarding the absolute values of actions or objects; "we can speak as much as we want about "life" and "its meaning," and believe that what we say is important. But these are no more than expressions and can never be facts, resulting from a tendency of the mind and not the heart or the will".[3]

Intrinsic or extrinsic

Philosophic value may be split into instrumental value and intrinsic values. An instrumental value is worth having as a means towards getting something else that is good (e.g., a radio is instrumentally good in order to hear music). An intrinsically valuable thing is worth for itself, not as a means to something else. It is giving value intrinsic and extrinsic properties.

An ethic good with instrumental value may be termed an ethic mean, and an ethic good with intrinsic value may be termed an end-in-itself. An object may be both a mean and end-in-itself.

Summation

Intrinsic and instrumental goods are not mutually exclusive categories.[4] Some objects are both good in themselves, and also good for getting other objects that are good. "Understanding science" may be such a good, being both worthwhile in and of itself, and as a means of achieving other goods. In these cases, the sum of instrumental (specifically the all instrumental value) and intrinsic value of an object may be used when putting that object in value systems, which is a set of consistent values and measures.

Universal values

S. H. Schwartz, along with a number of psychology colleagues, has carried out empirical research investigating whether there are universal values, and what those values are. Schwartz defined 'values' as "conceptions of the desirable that influence the way people select action and evaluate events".[5] He hypothesised that universal values would relate to three different types of human need: biological needs, social co-ordination needs, and needs related to the welfare and survival of groups[6]

Intensity

The intensity of philosophic value is the degree it is generated or carried out, and may be regarded as the prevalence of the good, the object having the value.[4]

It should not be confused with the amount of value per object, although the latter may vary too, e.g. because of instrumental value conditionality. For example, taking a fictional life-stance of accepting waffle-eating as being the end-in-itself, the intensity may be the speed that waffles are eaten, and is zero when no waffles are eaten, e.g. if no waffles are present. Still, each waffle that had been present would still have value, no matter if it was being eaten or not, independent on intensity.

Instrumental value conditionality in this case could be exampled by every waffle not present, making them less valued by being far away rather than easily accessible.

In many life stances it is the product of value and intensity that is ultimately desirable, i.e. not only to generate value, but to generate it in large degree. Maximizing life-stances have the highest possible intensity as an imperative.

Positive and negative value

There may be a distinction between positive and negative philosophic or ethic value. While positive ethic value generally correlates with something that is pursued or maximized, negative ethic value correlates with something that is avoided or minimized. Value may have an upper limit. David Manheim and Anders Sandberg argue that modern physics implies an upper limit, even if that limit may be extremely large.[7] Negative value may be both intrinsic negative value and/or instrumental negative value.

Protected value

A protected value (also sacred value) is one that an individual is unwilling to trade off no matter what the benefits of doing so may be. For example, some people may be unwilling to kill another person, even if it means saving many other individuals. Protected values tend to be "intrinsically good", and most people can in fact imagine a scenario when trading off their most precious values would be necessary.[8] If such trade-offs happen between two competing protected values such as killing a person and defending your family they are called tragic trade-offs.[9]

Protected values have been found to be play a role in protracted conflicts (e.g., the Israeli-Palestinian conflict) because they can hinder businesslike ("utilitarian") negotiations.[10][11] A series of experimental studies directed by Scott Atran and Ángel Gómez among combatants on the ISIS front line in Iraq and with ordinary citizens in Western Europe [12] suggest that commitment to sacred values motivate the most "devoted actors" to make the costliest sacrifices, including willingness to fight and die, as well as a readiness to forsake close kin and comrades for those values if necessary.[13] From the perspective of utilitarianism, protected values are biases when they prevent utility from being maximized across individuals.[14]

According to Jonathan Baron and Mark Spranca,[15] protected values arise from norms as described in theories of deontological ethics (the latter often being referred to in context with Immanuel Kant). The protectedness implies that people are concerned with their participation in transactions rather than just the consequences of it.

Economic versus philosophic value

Philosophical value is distinguished from economic value, since it is independent from some other desired condition or commodity. The economic value of an object may rise when the exchangeable desired condition or commodity, e.g. money, become high in supply, and vice versa when supply of money becomes low.

Nevertheless, economic value may be regarded as a result of philosophical value. In the subjective theory of value, the personal philosophic value a person puts in possessing something is reflected in what economic value this person puts on it. The limit where a person considers to purchase something may be regarded as the point where the personal philosophic value of possessing something exceeds the personal philosophic value of what is given up in exchange for it, e.g. money. In this light, everything can be said to have a "personal economic value" in contrast to its "societal economic value."

Personal values

Personal values provide an internal reference for what is good, beneficial, important, useful, beautiful, desirable and constructive. Values are one of the factors that generate behavior (besides needs, interests and habits) and influence the choices made by an individual.

Values may help common human problems for survival by comparative rankings of value, the results of which provide answers to questions of why people do what they do and in what order they choose to do them. Moral, religious, and personal values, when held rigidly, may also give rise to conflicts that result from a clash between differing world views.[16]

Over time the public expression of personal values that groups of people find important in their day-to-day lives, lay the foundations of law, custom and tradition. Recent research has thereby stressed the implicit nature of value communication.[17] Consumer behavior research proposes there are six internal values and three external values. They are known as List of Values (LOV) in management studies. They are self respect, warm relationships, sense of accomplishment, self-fulfillment, fun and enjoyment, excitement, sense of belonging, being well respected, and security. From a functional aspect these values are categorized into three and they are interpersonal relationship area, personal factors, and non-personal factors.[18] From an ethnocentric perspective, it could be assumed that a same set of values will not reflect equally between two groups of people from two countries. Though the core values are related, the processing of values can differ based on the cultural identity of an individual.[19]

Individual differences

Schwartz proposed a theory of individual values based on surveys data. His model groups values in terms of growth versus protection, and personal versus social focus. Values are then associated with openness to change (which Schwartz views as related to personal growth), self-enhancement (which Schwartz views as mostly to do with self-protection), conservation (which Schwartz views as mostly related to social-protection), and self-transcendence (which Schwartz views as a form of social growth). Within this Schwartz places 10 universal values: self-direction, stimulation and hedonism (related to openness growth), achievement and power (related to self enhancement), security, conformity and tradition (related to conservation), and humility, benevolence and universalism (relate to self-transcendence).[20]:523

Personality traits using the big 5 measure correlate with Schwartz's value construct. Openness and extraversion correlates with the values related to openness-to-change (openness especially with self-direction, extraversion especially with stimulation); agreeableness correlates with self-transcendence values (especially benevolence); extraversion is correlated with self-enhancement and negatively with traditional values. Conscienciousness correlates with achievement, conformity and security.[20]:530

Men are found to value achievement, self-direction, hedonism, and stimulation more than women, while women value benevolence, universality and tradition higher.[21]:1012

The order of Schwartz's traits are substantially stability amongst adults over time. Migrants values change when they move to a new country, but the order of preferences is still quite stable. Motherhood causes women to shift their values towards stability and away from openness-to-change but not fathers.[20]:528

Moral foundations theory

Moral foundation theory identifies five forms of moral foundation harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, in-group/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sancity. Harm and fairness are often called individualizing foundations, while the other three factors are termed binding foundations. The moral foundations were found to be correlated with the theory of basic human values. The strong correlations are between conservatives values and binding foundations.[23]

Cultural values

Individual cultures emphasize values which their members broadly share. Values of a society can often be identified by examining the level of honor and respect received by various groups and ideas.

Values clarification differs from cognitive moral education:

- Value clarification consists of "helping people clarify what their lives are for and what is worth working for. It encourages students to define their own values and to understand others' values."[24]
- Cognitive moral education builds on the belief that students should learn to value things like democracy and justice as their moral reasoning develops.[24]

Values relate to the norms of a culture, but they are more global and intellectual than norms. Norms provide rules for behavior in specific situations, while values identify what should be judged as good or evil. While norms are standards, patterns, rules and guides of expected behavior, values are abstract concepts of what is important and worthwhile. Flying the national flag on a holiday is a norm, but it reflects the value of patriotism. Wearing dark clothing and appearing solemn are normative behaviors to manifest respect at a funeral. Different cultures represent values differently and to different levels of emphasis. "Over the last three decades, traditional-age college students have shown an increased interest in personal well-being and a decreased interest in the welfare of others."[24] Values seemed to have changed, affecting the beliefs, and attitudes of the students.

Members take part in a culture even if each member's personal values do not entirely agree with some of the normative values sanctioned in that culture. This reflects an individual's ability to synthesize and extract aspects valuable to them from the multiple subcultures they belong to.

If a group member expresses a value that seriously conflicts with the group's norms, the group's authority may carry out various ways of encouraging conformity or stigmatizing the non-conforming behavior of that member. For example, imprisonment can result from conflict with social norms that the state has established as law.

Furthermore, cultural values can be expressed at a global level through institutions participating in the global economy. For example, values important to global governance can include leadership, legitimacy, and efficiency. Within our current global governance architecture, leadership is expressed through the G20, legitimacy through the United Nations, and efficiency through member-driven international organizations.[25] The expertise provided by international organizations and civil society depends on the incorporation of flexibility in the rules, to preserve the expression of identity in a globalized world.[26][

Nonetheless, in warlike economic competition, differing views may contradict each other, particularly in the field of culture. Thus audiences in Europe may regard a movie as an artistic creation and grant it benefits from special treatment, while audiences in the United States may see it as mere entertainment, whatever its artistic merits. EU policies based on the notion of "cultural exception" can become juxtaposed with the policy of "cultural specificity" on the liberal Anglo-Saxon side. Indeed, international law traditionally treats films as property and the content of television programs as a service. Consequently, cultural interventionist policies can find themselves opposed to the Anglo-Saxon liberal position, causing failures in international negotiations.[27]

Development and transmission

Values are generally received through cultural means, especially diffusion and transmission or socialization from parents to children. Parents in different cultures have different values.[28] For example, parents in a hunter–gatherer society or surviving through subsistence agriculture value practical survival skills from a young age. Many such cultures begin teaching babies to use sharp tools, including knives, before their first birthdays.[29] Italian parents value social and emotional abilities and having an even temperament.[28] Spanish parents want their children to be sociable.[28] Swedish parents value security and happiness.[28] Dutch parents value independence, long attention spans, and predictable schedules.[28] American parents are unusual for strongly valuing intellectual ability, especially in a narrow "book learning" sense.[28] The Kipsigis people of Kenya value children who are not only smart, but who employ that intelligence in a responsible and helpful way, which they call ng'om. Luos of Kenya value education and pride which they call "nyadhi".[28]

Factors that influence the development of cultural values are summarized below.

The Inglehart–Welzel cultural map of the world is a two-dimensional cultural map showing the cultural values of the countries of the world along two dimensions: The traditional versus secular-rational values reflect the transition from a religious understanding of the world to a dominance of science and bureaucracy. The second dimension named survival values versus self-expression values represents the transition from industrial society to post-industrial society.[30]

Cultures can be distinguished as tight and loose in relation to how much they adhere to social norms and tolerates deviance.[31][32] Tight cultures are more restrictive, with stricter disciplinary measures for norm violations while loose cultures have weaker social norms and a higher tolerance for deviant behavior. A history of threats, such as natural disasters, high population density, or vulnerability to infectious diseases, is associated with greater tightness. It has been suggested that tightness allows cultures to coordinate more effectively to survive threats.[33][34]

Studies in evolutionary psychology have led to similar findings. The so-called regality theory finds that war and other perceived collective dangers have a profound influence on both the psychology of individuals and on the social structure and cultural values. A dangerous environment leads to a hierarchical, authoritarian, and warlike culture, while a safe and peaceful environment fosters an egalitarian and tolerant culture.[35]

Value system

A value system is a set of consistent values used for the purpose of ethical or ideological integrity.

Consistency

As a member of a society, group or community, an individual can hold both a personal value system and a communal value system at the same time. In this case, the two value systems (one personal and one communal) are externally consistent provided they bear no contradictions or situational exceptions between them.

A value system in its own right is internally consistent when

- its values do not contradict each other and
- its exceptions are or could be
  - abstract enough to be used in all situations and
  - consistently applied.

Conversely, a value system by itself is internally inconsistent if:

- its values contradict each other and
- its exceptions are
  - highly situational and
  - inconsistently applied.

Value exceptions

Abstract exceptions serve to reinforce the ranking of values. Their definitions are generalized enough to be relevant to any and all situations. Situational exceptions, on the other hand, are ad hoc and pertain only to specific situations. The presence of a type of exception determines one of two more kinds of value systems:

- An idealized value system is a listing of values that lacks exceptions. It is, therefore, absolute and can be codified as a strict set of proscriptions on behavior. Those who hold to their idealized value system and claim no exceptions (other than the default) are called absolutists.
- A realized value system contains exceptions to resolve contradictions between values in practical circumstances. This type is what people tend to use in daily life.

The difference between these two types of systems can be seen when people state that they hold one value system yet in practice deviate from it, thus holding a different value system. For example, a religion lists an absolute set of values while the practice of that religion may include exceptions.

Implicit exceptions bring about a third type of value system called a formal value system. Whether idealized or realized, this type contains an implicit exception associated with each value: "as long as no higher-priority value is violated". For instance, a person might feel that lying is wrong. Since preserving a life is probably more highly valued than adhering to the principle that lying is wrong, lying to save someone's life is acceptable. Perhaps too simplistic in practice, such a hierarchical structure may warrant explicit exceptions.

Conflict

Although sharing a set of common values, like hockey is better than baseball or ice cream is better than fruit, two different parties might not rank those values equally. Also, two parties might disagree as to certain actions are right or wrong, both in theory and in practice, and find themselves in an ideological or physical conflict. Ethonomics, the discipline of rigorously examining and comparing value systems enables us to understand politics and motivations more fully in order to resolve conflicts.

An example conflict would be a value system based on individualism pitted against a value system based on collectivism. A rational value system organized to resolve the conflict between two such value systems might take the form below. Added exceptions can become recursive and often convoluted.

- Individuals may act freely unless their actions harm others or interfere with others' freedom or with functions of society that individuals need, provided those functions do not themselves interfere with these proscribed individual rights and were agreed to by a majority of the individuals.
- A society (or more specifically the system of order that enables the workings of a society) exists for the purpose of benefiting the lives of the individuals who are members of that society. The functions of a society in providing such benefits would be those agreed to by the majority of individuals in the society.
- A society may require contributions from its members in order for them to benefit from the services provided by the society. The failure of individuals to make such required contributions could be considered a reason to deny those benefits to them, although a society could elect to consider hardship situations in determining how much should be contributed.
- A society may restrict behavior of individuals who are members of the society only for the purpose of performing its designated functions agreed to by the majority of individuals in the society, only insofar as they violate the aforementioned values. This means that a society may abrogate the rights of any of its members who fails to uphold the aforementioned values.

III. RESULTS

Ethics involves systematizing, defending, and recommending concepts of right and wrong behavior.[1] A central aspect of ethics is "the good life", the life worth living or life that is simply satisfying, which is held by many philosophers to be more important than traditional moral conduct.[2]

Most religions have an ethical component, often derived from purported supernatural revelation or guidance. Some assert that religion is necessary to live ethically. Simon Blackburn states that there are those who "would say that we can only flourish under the umbrella of a strong social order, cemented by common adherence to a particular religious tradition".[3]

Buddhist ethics

Ethics in Buddhism are traditionally based on the enlightened perspective of the Buddha, or other enlightened beings who followed him. Moral instructions are included in Buddhist scriptures or handed down through tradition. Most

scholars of Buddhist ethics thus rely on the examination of Buddhist scriptures, and the use of anthropological evidence from traditional Buddhist societies, to justify claims about the nature of Buddhist ethics.[4]

According to traditional Buddhism, the foundation of Buddhist ethics for laypeople is the Pancasila: no killing, stealing, lying, sexual misconduct, or intoxicants. In becoming a Buddhist, or affirming one's commitment to Buddhism, a layperson is encouraged to vow to abstain from these negative actions. Buddhist monks and nuns take hundreds more such vows (see vinaya).[citation needed]

This approach avoids basing Buddhist ethics solely on faith in the Buddha's enlightenment or Buddhist tradition, and may allow more universal non-Buddhist access to the insights offered by Buddhist ethics.[5]

The Buddha provided some basic guidelines for acceptable behavior that are part of the Noble Eightfold Path. The initial precept is non-injury or non-violence to all living creatures from the lowest insect to humans. This precept defines a non-violent attitude toward every living thing. The Buddhist practice of this does not extend to the extremes exhibited by Jainism, but from both the Buddhist and Jain perspectives, non-violence suggests an intimate involvement with, and relationship to, all living things.[6]

Theravada monk Bhikkhu Bodhi has observed:

Buddhist ethics, as formulated in the five precepts, is sometimes charged with being entirely negative. ... [I]t has to be pointed out that the five precepts, or even the longer codes of precepts promulgated by the Buddha, do not exhaust the full range of Buddhist ethics. The precepts are only the most rudimentary code of moral training, but the Buddha also proposes other ethical codes inculcating definite positive virtues. The Mangala Sutta, for example, commends reverence, humility, contentment, gratitude, patience, generosity, etc. Other discourses prescribe numerous family, social, and political duties establishing the well being of society. And behind all these duties lie the four attitudes called the "immeasurables" – loving-kindness, compassion, sympathetic joy, and equanimity.[7]

Christian ethics

Christian ethics is a branch of Christian theology that defines virtuous behavior and wrong behavior from a Christian perspective. Systematic theological study of Christian ethics is called "moral theology".

Christian virtues are often divided into four cardinal virtues and three theological virtues. Christian ethics includes questions regarding how the rich should act toward the poor, how women are to be treated, and the morality of war. Christian ethicists, like other ethicists, approach ethics from different frameworks and perspectives. The approach of virtue ethics has also become popular in recent decades, largely due to the work of Alasdair MacIntyre and Stanley Hauerwas.[8]

There are several different schema of vice and virtue. Aquinas adopted the four cardinal virtues of Aristotle (justice, courage, temperance and prudence), and added to them the Christian virtues of faith, hope and charity (1 Corinthians 13). Other schema include the Seven Deadly Sins and the Seven virtues.

Confucian ethics

Confucianism and Neo-Confucianism emphasize the maintenance and propriety of relationships as the most important consideration in ethics.[9] To be ethical is to do what one's relationships require. Notably, though, what you owe to another person is inversely proportional to their distance from you. In other words, you owe your parents everything, but you are not in any way obligated towards strangers. This can be seen as a recognition of the fact that it is impossible to love the entire world equally and simultaneously. This is called relational ethics, or situational ethics. The Confucian system differs very strongly from Kantian ethics in that there are rarely laws or principles which can be said to be true absolutely or universally.

This is not to say that there has never been any consideration given to universalist ethics. In fact, in Zhou Dynasty China, the Confucians' main opponents, the followers of Mozi argued for universal love (Chinese: 兼爱; pinyin: jiān ài). The Confucian view eventually held sway, however, and continues to dominate many aspects of Chinese thought. Many have argued, for example, that Mao Zedong was more Confucian than Communist. Confucianism, especially of the type argued for by Mencius, argued that the ideal ruler is the one who (as Confucius put it) "acts like the North Star, staying in place while the other stars orbit around it". In other words, the ideal ruler does not go out and force the people to become good, but instead leads by example. The ideal ruler fosters harmony rather than laws.

Confucius stresses honesty above all. His concepts of lǐ (Chinese: 理), yì (Chinese: 義), and rén (Chinese: 仁) can be seen as deeper expressions of honesty (Chinese: 誠; pinyin: chéng; lit. 'sincerity') and fidelity (Chinese: 孝; pinyin: xiào) to the ones to whom one owes one's existence (parents) and survival (one's neighbours, colleagues, inferiors in rank). He codified traditional practice and actually changed the meaning of the prior concepts that those words had meant. His model of the Confucian family and Confucian ruler dominated Chinese life into the early 20th century. This had ossified by then into an Imperial hierarchy of rigid property rights, hard to distinguish from any other dictatorship. Traditional ethics had been perverted by legalism.

Buddhist influence

Buddhism, and specifically Mahayana Buddhism, brought a cohesive metaphysic to Chinese thought and a strong emphasis on universalism. Neo-Confucianism was largely a reaction to Buddhism's dominance in the Tang dynasty, and an attempt at developing a native Confucian metaphysical/analytical system.

Germanic Neopagan ethics

Germanic Neopagans, including followers of both Asatru and Theodism, try to emulate the ethical values of the ancient Germanic peoples (Norse or Anglo-Saxon).

Hindu ethics

Ethics is called Nitisastra (Sanskrit: नीतिशास्त्र)[11] in ancient texts of Hinduism.[12] Ethics and virtue are a much debated[13] and an evolving concept in ancient scriptures of Hinduism.[14][15] Virtue, right conduct, ethics and morality are part of the complex concept Hindus call Dharma – everything that is essential for people, the world and nature to exist and prosper together, in harmony.[16] As P.V. Kane, the author of the History of Dharmasastra said, the term "Dharma" does not have a synonym in English language. While it is often interpreted as meaning "duty", it can mean justice, right, moral, good, and much more.[17]

Ethics are explained in Hindu philosophy as something that cannot be imposed, but something that is realized and voluntarily lived up to by each individual. For example, Apastamba explained it thus: "virtue and vice do not go about saying – here we are!; neither the Gods, Gandharvas, nor ancestors can convince us – this is right, this is wrong; virtue is an elusive concept, it demands careful and sustained reflection by every man and woman before it can become part of one's life.[18]

Ethics that constitute a dharmic life – that is a moral, ethical, virtuous life – evolve in vedas and upanishads. Ethical subjects and questions are debated by various schools of Hinduism, quite extensively, in numerous texts on what is right conduct, when, how and why.[12] Over time, new virtues were conceptualized and added by ancient Hindu scholars, some replaced, others merged. For example, Manusamhita initially listed ten virtues necessary for a human being to live a dharmic life: Dhriti (courage), Kshama (forgiveness), Dama (temperance), Asteya (Non-covetousness/Non-stealing), Saucha (inner purity), Indriyani-graha (control of senses), dhi (reflective prudence), vidya (wisdom), satyam (truthfulness), akrodha (freedom from anger).[19] In later verses, this list was reduced to five virtues by the same scholar, by merging and creating a more broader concept. The shorter list of virtues became: Ahimsa (Non-violence), Dama (self restraint), Asteya (Non-covetousness/Non-stealing), Saucha (inner purity), Satyam (truthfulness).[20][21]

The Persian historian Al Biruni who visited and lived in India for 16 years in the early 11th century, describes the concept of ethics and virtuous behavior among Hindus of his times. Of ethical mandates among Hindus, a literal translation of his Persian language manuscript includes (1) A man shall not kill; (2) nor lie; (3) nor steal; (4) nor whore; (5) nor hoard up treasures.[22] These correspond to five Yamas of ancient Hindu ethics: Ahimsa (non-violence), Satya (truth, non-falsehood), Asteya (non-stealing), Brahmacharya (celibacy if unmarried and non-cheating on one's partner if married), and Aparigraha (non-possessiveness).[23] In addition to these five negative things to abstain from, Hindu ethics also recommends five positive things to strive for as Niyamas: Śauca (purity in body, speech and mind), Santosha (contentment, acceptance of circumstances with optimism), Tapas (perseverance, meditation, austerity), Swadhyaya (lifelong learning) and Pranidhan (right attitude, contemplation).[23][24] An ethical life in Hinduism is essential for a liberated life, one without craving, one that is content, attained through knowledge and by abstaining from evil.[25]

Hindu literature variously discuss ethics as one or more of four topics: (1) Gunas that is inner tendencies of conduct found in every individual (in large measure, psychology); (2) Purushartha that is proper aims of life for every individual for self-development and happiness (dharma, artha, kama and moksha); (3) Ashramas that is ethics for an individual in

different periods of one's lifetime (ethical expectations for a child are distinguished from those for adults, old age); and (4) Varnasramas that is ethics and conduct for every individual in relation to society.[12] Ancient literature at the foundation of various Hindu traditions primarily discuss the first three, while the last has attracted greater attention since the 18th century. Some early 20th century literature wondered if ethics was ever a serious topic of study in Hinduism.[26] Later studies have yielded the above four approaches to ethics in different schools of Hinduism, tied together with three common themes:[12][26][27] (1) ethics is an essential part of dharma concept,[28][29] (2) Ahimsa (non-violence) is the foundational premise without which – suggests Hinduism – ethics and any consistent ethical theory is impossible,[30][31] and (3) Ethics cannot always be dualistically or non-dualistically reduced from first principles, ethics is closely related to moksha (self realization and spiritual freedom) with Vivekacudamani stating, "individuals with self knowledge and spiritual freedom are inherently self examining and ethical" and "ethics, freedom and knowledge require each other".[28][32] In addition to the above four topics in Hindu ethics, scholars[33][34] state that the karma doctrine of Hinduism is part of its ethical theory compendium.

The Bhagavad Gita – considered one of the epitomes of historic Hindu discussion of virtues and an allegorical debate on what is right and what is wrong – argues some virtues are not necessarily always absolute, but sometimes relational; for example, it explains a virtue such as Ahimsa must be re-examined when one is faced with war or violence from the aggressiveness, immaturity or ignorance of others.[35][36][37]

Islamic ethics

The foundational source in the gradual codification of Islamic ethics was the Muslim understanding that mankind has been granted the faculty to discern God's will and to abide by it. This faculty most crucially involves reflecting on the meaning of existence, which, as John Kelsay in the Encyclopedia of Ethics phrases, "ultimately points to the reality of God." Therefore, regardless of their environment, humans are believed to have a moral responsibility to submit to God's will and to follow Islam (as demonstrated in the Qur'an and the Sunnah, or the sayings of Muhammad [Quran 7:172-173]). [38]

This natural inclination is, according to the Qur'an, subverted by mankind's focus on material success: such focus first presents itself as a need for basic survival or security, but then tends to manifest into a desire to become distinguished among one's peers. Ultimately, the focus on materialism, according to the Islamic texts, hampers with the innate reflection as described above, resulting in a state of jahiliyya or "ignorance".[38]

Muslims believe that Muhammad, like other prophets in Islam, was sent by God to remind human beings of their moral responsibility, and challenge those ideas in society which opposed submission to God. According to Kelsay, this challenge was directed against five main characteristics of pre-Islamic Arabia:[38]

1. The division of Arabs into varying tribes (based upon blood and kinship). This categorization was confronted by the ideal of a unified community based upon Islamic piety, an "ummah";
2. The acceptance of the worship of a multitude of deities besides Allah – a view challenged by strict Islamic monotheism, which dictates that Allah has no partner in worship nor any equal;
3. The trait of muruwwa (manliness), which Islam discouraged, instead emphasizing on the traits of humility and piety;
4. The focus on achieving fame or establishing a legacy, which was replaced by the concept that mankind would be called to account before God on the day of resurrection;
5. The reverence of and compliance with ancestral traditions, a practice challenged by Islam – which instead assigned primacy to submitting to God and following revelation.

These changes lay in the reorientation of society as regards to identity and life of the Muslim belief, world view, and the hierarchy of values. From the viewpoint of subsequent generations, this caused a great transformation in the society and moral order of life in the Arabian Peninsula. For Muhammad, although pre-Islamic Arabia exemplified "heedlessness," it was not entirely without merit. Muhammad approved and exhorted certain aspects of the Arab pre-Islamic tradition, such as the care for one's near kin, for widows, orphans, and others in need and for the establishment of justice. However, these values would be re-ordered in importance and placed in the context of strict monotheism.[38]

Furthermore, a Muslim should not only follow these five main characteristics, but also be more broad about his morals. Therefore, the more the Muslim is applying these rules, the better that person is morally. For example, Islamic ethics can be applied by important verses in the Quran. The most fundamental characteristics of a Muslim are piety and humility. A Muslim must be humble with God and with other people:

"And do not turn your nose up to people, nor walk pridefully upon the earth. Surely Allah does not like whoever is arrogant, boastful. Be moderate in your pace. And lower your voice, for the ugliest of all voices is certainly the braying of donkeys."

—Surah Luqman 31:18-19

Muslims must be in control of their passions and desires.

A Muslim should not be vain or attached to the ephemeral pleasures of this world. While most people allow the material world to fill their hearts, Muslims should keep God in their hearts and the material world in their hand. Instead of being attached to the car and the job and the diploma and the bank account, all these things become tools to make us better people. Morality in Islam addresses every aspect of a Muslim's life, from greetings to international relations. It is universal in its scope and in its applicability. Morality reigns in selfish desires, vanity and bad habits. Muslims must not only be virtuous, but they must also enjoin virtue. They must not only refrain from evil and vice, but they must also forbid them. In other words, they must not only be morally healthy, but they must also contribute to the moral health of society as a whole.

You are the best community ever raised for humanity—you encourage good, forbid evil, and believe in Allah. Had the People of the Book believed, it would have been better for them. Some of them are faithful, but most are rebellious.

—Surah Al Imran 3:110

Muhammad summarized the conduct of a Muslim when he said: "My Sustainer has given me nine commands: to remain conscious of God, whether in private or in public; to speak justly, whether angry or pleased; to show moderation both when poor and when rich, to reunite friendship with those who have broken off with me; to give to him who refuses me; that my silence should be occupied with thought; that my looking should be an admonition; and that I should command what is right."

Islam is a way of life and it does not work in isolation. In a business practice for example, the Muslims are call to adhere good business ethical values, does not cheat, and does not charge interests to the buyers. Research has also observed how Islamic religiosity influences work ethics[39] and business ethics.

Attempts to reestablish ethics and re-conceptualize Islamic ethical theory had emerged during the 20th century by figures like: Muhammad Abdullah Draz, Muhammad Iqbal, Alija Izetbegović, and Taha Abdulrahman who developed a religious contractarian theory of ethics.[40]

Jain ethics

Jainism teaches five ethical duties, which it calls five vows. These are called anuvratas (small vows) for Jain laypersons, and mahavratas (great vows) for Jain mendicants.[41] For both, its moral precepts preface that the Jain has access to a guru (teacher, counsellor), deva (Jina, god), doctrine, and that the individual is free from five offences: doubts about the faith, indecisiveness about the truths of Jainism, sincere desire for Jain teachings, recognition of fellow Jains, and admiration for their spiritual pursuits.[42] Such a person undertakes the following five vows of Jainism:

1. Ahiṃsā, "intentional non-violence" or "noninjury":[42] The first major vow taken by Jains is to cause no harm to other human beings, as well as all living beings (particularly animals).[42] This is the highest ethical duty in Jainism, and it applies not only to one's actions, but demands that one be non-violent in one's speech and thoughts.[43][44]
2. Satya, "truth": This vow is to always speak the truth. Neither lie, nor speak what is not true, and do not encourage others or approve anyone who speaks an untruth.[43][41]
3. Asteya, "not stealing": A Jain layperson should not take anything that is not willingly given.[42][45] Additionally, a Jain mendicant should ask for permission to take it if something is being given.[46]
4. Brahmacharya, "celibacy": Abstinence from sex and sensual pleasures is prescribed for Jain monks and nuns. For laypersons, the vow means chastity, faithfulness to one's partner.[43][41]
5. Aparigraha, "non-possessiveness": This includes non-attachment to material and psychological possessions, avoiding craving and greed.[41] Jain monks and nuns completely renounce property and social relations, own nothing and are attached to no one.[47][48]

Jainism also prescribes seven supplementary vows, including three guṇa vratas (merit vows) and four śikṣā vratas.[49][50] The Sallekhana (or Santhara) vow is a "religious death" ritual vow observed at the end of life, historically

by Jain monks and nuns, but rare in the modern age.[51] In this vow, there is voluntary and gradual reduction of food and liquid intake to end one's life by choice and with dispassion,[52][53] In Jainism this is believed to reduce negative karma that affects a soul's future rebirths.[54]

Jewish ethics

Jewish ethics may be said to originate with the Hebrew Bible, its broad legal injunctions, wisdom narratives and prophetic teachings. Most subsequent Jewish ethical claims may be traced back to the texts, themes and teachings of the written Torah.

In early rabbinic Judaism, the Oral Torah both interprets the Hebrew Bible and delves afresh into many other ethical topics. The best known rabbinic text associated with ethics is the non-legal Mishnah tractate of Avot, popularly translated as Ethics of the Fathers. Generally, ethics is a key aspect of non-legal rabbinic literature, known as aggadah, and ethical teachings are found throughout the more legal (halakhic) portions of the Mishnah, Talmud and other rabbinic literature. This early Rabbinic ethics shows signs of cross-fertilization and polemical exchange with both the Greek (Western philosophical) ethical tradition and early Christian tradition.

In the medieval period, direct Jewish responses to Greek ethics may be seen in major rabbinic writings. Notably, Maimonides offers a Jewish interpretation of Aristotle (e.g., Nicomachean Ethics), who enters into Jewish discourse through Islamic writings. Maimonides, in turn, influences Thomas Aquinas, a dominant figure in Catholic ethics and the natural law tradition of moral theology. The relevance of natural law to medieval Jewish philosophy is a matter of dispute among scholars.

Hellenistic influence

Ethics in systematic form, and apart from religious belief, is as little found in apocryphal or Judæo-Hellenistic literature as in the Bible. However, Greek philosophy greatly influenced Alexandrian writers such as the authors of IV Maccabees, the Book of Wisdom, and Philo.

Much progress in theoretical ethics came as Jews came into closer contact with the Hellenic world. Before that period the Wisdom literature shows a tendency to dwell solely on the moral obligations and problems of life as appealing to man as an individual, leaving out of consideration the ceremonial and other laws which concern only the Jewish nation. From this point of view Ben Sira's collection of sayings and monitions was written, translated into Greek, and circulated as a practical guide. The book contains popular ethics in proverbial form as the result of everyday life experience, without higher philosophical or religious principles and ideals.

More developed ethical works emanated from Hasidean circles in the Maccabean time, such as are contained in Tobit, especially in Chapter IV. Here the first ethical will or testament is found, giving a summary of moral teachings, with the Golden Rule, "Do that to no man which thou hatest!" as the leading maxim. There are even more elaborate ethical teachings in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, in which each of the twelve sons of Jacob, in his last words to his children and children's children, reviews his life and gives them moral lessons, either warning them against a certain vice he had been guilty of, so that they may avoid divine punishment, or recommending them to cultivate a certain virtue he had practised during life, so that they may win God's favor. The chief virtues recommended are love for one's fellow man, industry, especially in agricultural pursuits, simplicity, sobriety, benevolence toward the poor, compassion even for the brute and avoidance of all passion, pride, and hatred. Similar ethical farewell monitions are attributed to Enoch in the Ethiopic Enoch (xciv. et seq.) and the Slavonic Enoch (lviii. et seq.) and to the three patriarchs.

The Hellenistic Jewish propaganda literature made the propagation of Jewish ethics taken from the Bible its main object for the sake of winning the pagan world to pure monotheism. It was owing to this endeavor that certain ethical principles were laid down as guiding maxims for the Gentiles, first of all the three capital sins, idolatry, murder, and incest, were prohibited (see Sibyllines, iii. 38, 761; iv. 30 et seq.). In later Jewish rabbinic literature these Noachide Laws were gradually developed into six, seven, and ten, or thirty laws of ethics binding upon every human being.

Scientology ethics

According to Stephen A. Kent, Scientology's ethics is "a peculiar brand of morality that uniquely benefitted (the Church of Scientology) ... In plain English, the purpose of Scientology ethics is to eliminate opponents, then eliminate people's interests in things other than Scientology. In this 'ethical' environment, Scientology would be able to impose its courses, philosophy, and 'justice system' – its so-called technology – onto society."[55]

Secular ethics

Secular ethics is a moral philosophy in which ethics are based solely on human faculties such as scientific reason, sociobiological composition, or ethical intuition, and not derived from purported supernatural revelation or guidance. Secular ethics comprise a wide variety of moral and ethical systems including consequentialism, freethinking, humanism, secular humanism, and utilitarianism, among others.

The majority of secular moral concepts are based on the acceptance of natural rights and social contracts, and on a more individual scale of either some form of attribution of intrinsic value to things, Kantianesque ethical intuitionism or of a logical deduction that establishes a preference for one thing over another, as with Occam's razor. Approaches such as ethical egoism, moral relativism, moral skepticism, and moral nihilism are also considered.

Shinto ethics

Shinto beliefs start with an assumption of the inherent goodness of humans as descendants of the kami.[56] By the 6th century CE, Shinto had drawn from a Chinese idea that good people will adhere to societal norms, and emperors have a divine mandate to bring about the "desirable and required order".[56] Shinto adherents are to "realize and carry out the will of the kami and the ancestors in the family, the community, and the nation".[56]

Although State Shinto reinforced subordination to the emperor and the state, Shrine Shinto is a situation-based ethical system that emphasizes right actions toward others, versus adherence to a specific belief system.[57] Shrine Shinto also stresses gratefulness for "blessings of the kami", and maintaining harmony with the emperor and the world.[57]

Taoist ethics

Laozi (Lao Tzu) and other Taoist (Daoist) authors argued for an even greater passivity on the part of rulers than did the Confucians. For Laozi, (Lao Tzu) the ideal ruler is one who does virtually nothing that can be directly identified as ruling. Clearly, both Daoism and Confucianism presume that human nature is basically good. The main branch of Confucianism, however, argues that human nature must be nurtured through ritual (li 禮), culture (wen 文) and other things, while the Daoists (Taoists) argued that the trappings of society were to be gotten rid of.

Taoist ethics ask for a greater sense of being and less identification with the act of doing. Taoist passivity nurtures, cultivates and prepares an atmosphere that allows the majestic and the real to shine, which influences society for the better.

"If you want to awaken all of humanity, then awaken all of yourself; if you want to eliminate the suffering in the world, then eliminate all that is dark and negative in yourself. Truly, the greatest gift you have to give is that of your own self-transformation." – Lao Tzu

Wiccan ethics

Wiccan morality is largely based on the Wiccan Rede: 'An' it harm none, do what ye will' -- old-fashioned language for 'as long as you aren't harming anyone, do as you wish'. While this could be interpreted to mean "do no harm at all", it is usually interpreted as a declaration of the freedom to act, along with the necessity of thinking through and taking responsibility for the consequences of one's actions.[58]

Another element of Wiccan Morality comes from the Law of Threefold Return, which is understood to mean that whatever one does to another person or thing (benevolent or otherwise) returns with triple force.[59]

Many Wiccans also seek to cultivate a set of eight virtues mentioned in Doreen Valiente's Charge of the Goddess,[60] these being mirth, reverence, honour, humility, strength, beauty, power and compassion. In Valiente's poem they are ordered in pairs of complementary opposites, reflecting a dualism that is common throughout Wiccan philosophy.

Zoroastrian ethics

In Zoroastrianism, the purpose in life is to become an Ashavan (a master of Asha) and to bring happiness into the world, which contributes to the cosmic battle against evil. Zoroastrianism's core teachings include but are not limited to:

- Follow the Threefold Path of Asha: Humata, Huxta, Huvarshta (Good Thoughts, Good Words, Good Deeds).[61]

- Charity is a way of maintaining one's soul aligned to Asha and to spread happiness.[62]
- The spiritual equality and duty of the genders.[63]
- Being good for the sake of goodness and without the hope of reward (see Ashem Vohu).

IV. CONCLUSION

Moral development focuses on the emergence, change, and understanding of morality from infancy through adulthood. The theory states that morality develops across a life span in a variety of ways and is influenced by an individual's experiences and behavior when faced with moral issues through different periods of physical and cognitive development. Morality concerns an individual's reforming sense of what is right and wrong; it is for this reason that young children have different moral judgment and character than that of a grown adult. Morality in itself is often a synonym for "rightness" or "goodness." It also refers to a specific code of conduct that is derived from one's culture, religion, or personal philosophy that guides one's actions, behaviors, and thoughts.[1]

Some of the earliest known moral development theories came from philosophers like Confucius, Aristotle and Rousseau, who took a more humanist perspective and focused on the development of a sense of conscience and virtue. In the modern-day, empirical research has explored morality through a moral psychology lens by theorists like Sigmund Freud and its relation to cognitive development by theorists like Jean Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg, B. F. Skinner, Carol Gilligan, and Judith Smetana.

Moral development often emphasizes these four basic fundamentals: First, feeling or emotion aspect: these theories emphasize the affective aspect of moral development and include a number of altruism theories. Second, behavioral aspect: these theories mainly deal with moral behavior. Third, Cognitive aspect: these theories focus on moral judgment and moral reasoning. And fourth, Integrated perspectives: a number of theorists have also attempted to propose theories which integrate two or three of the affective, behavioral, and cognitive aspects of morality.[2]

REFERENCES

1. Verst, Ludger; Kampmann, Susanne; Eilers, Franz-Josef (July 27, 2015). Die Literaturrundschau. Communicatio Socialis. OCLC 914511982.
2. ^ a b c Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy ""Ethics"". Archived from the original on January 18, 2018. Retrieved January 7, 2012.
3. ^ Random House Unabridged Dictionary: Entry on Axiology. Archived March 3, 2016, at the Wayback Machine
4. ^ Martinez, Veronica Root (October 23, 2019). "More Meaningful Ethics". University of Chicago Law Review. Chicago, IL. SSRN 3474344. Archived from the original on July 30, 2022. Retrieved November 18, 2021.
5. ^ An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon. New York, Harper & Brothers. 1889. p. 349.
6. ^ Kidder, Rushworth (2003). How Good People Make Tough Choices: Resolving the Dilemmas of Ethical Living. New York: HarperCollins. p. 63. ISBN 978-0-688-17590-0.
7. ^ Paul, Richard; Elder, Linda (2006). The Miniature Guide to Understanding the Foundations of Ethical Reasoning. United States: Foundation for Critical Thinking Free Press. p. NP. ISBN 978-0-944583-17-3.
8. ^ John Deigh in Robert Audi (ed), The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy, 1995.
9. ^ Paul, Richard; Elder, Linda (2006). The Miniature Guide to Understanding the Foundations of Ethical Reasoning. United States: Foundation for Critical Thinking Free Press. p. np. ISBN 978-0-944583-17-3.
10. ^ "Definition of ethic by Merriam Webster". Merriam Webster. Archived from the original on October 24, 2016. Retrieved October 4, 2015.
11. ^ Williams, Bernard. Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy. p. 2.
12. ^ Williams, Bernard. Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy. p. 1.
13. ^ "Are We Professionals? A Critical Look at the Social Role of Bioethicists". Daedalus. 1999. pp. 253–274.
14. ^ a b c "What is ethics?". BBC. Archived from the original on October 28, 2013. Retrieved July 22, 2014.
15. ^ "Non-Cognitivism in Ethics | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy". Archived from the original on November 11, 2020. Retrieved June 18, 2011.
16. ^ Miller, C (2009). "The Conditions of Moral Realism". The Journal of Philosophical Research. 34: 123–155. doi:10.5840/jpr_2009_5.

17. ^ Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter (2019), "Moral Skepticism", in Zalta, Edward N. (ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2019 ed.), Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, archived from the original on July 28, 2020, retrieved July 28, 2020

18. ^ Cavalier, Robert. "Meta-ethics, Normative Ethics, and Applied Ethics". Online Guide to Ethics and Moral Philosophy. Archived from the original on November 12, 2013. Retrieved February 26, 2014.

19. ^ a b c d e William S. Sahakian; Mabel Lewis Sahakian (1966). Ideas of the Great Philosophers. Barnes & Noble. ISBN 978-1-56619-271-2.

20. ^ Velusamy, N.; Faraday, Moses Michael, eds. (2017). Why Should Thirukkural Be Declared the National Book of India?. Unique Media Integrators. p. 55. ISBN 978-93-85471-70-4.

21. ^ a b N. Sanjeevi (1973). First All India Tirukkural Seminar Papers (2nd ed.). Chennai: University of Madras. p. xxiii–xxvii.

22. ^ a b Professor Michiel S.S. De De Vries; Professor Pan Suk Kim (2011). Value and Virtue in Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective. Palgrave Macmillan. p. 42. ISBN 978-0-230-35709-9.

23. ^ Nussbaum, Martha (1987). Non-Relative Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach.

24. ^ a b John Newton, Ph.D., Complete Conduct Principles for the 21st Century (2000). ISBN 0-9673705-7-4.

25. ^ Adler 1985, p. 194.

26. ^ a b Shafer-Landau & Cuneo (2012), p. 385

27. ^ Stratton-Lake (2014) "Intuitionism in Ethics" – December 15, 2014. Archived November 25, 2018, at the Wayback Machine

28. ^ Stratton-Lake (2013), p. 337

29. ^ Ancient Ethical Theory Archived May 15, 2019, at the Wayback Machine, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

30. ^ a b Ivanhoe, P. J.; Van Norden, Bryan William (2005). Readings in classical Chinese philosophy. Hackett Publishing. p. 60. ISBN 978-0-87220-780-6. he advocated a form of state consequentialism, which sought to maximize three basic goods: the wealth, order, and population of the state

31. ^ Fraser, Chris, "Mohism Archived March 21, 2019, at the Wayback Machine", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Edward N. Zalta.

| Mobile No: +91-9940572462 | Whatsapp: +91-9940572462 | ijarasem@gmail.com |