

CAUSES OF NON-MUSLIM COMMUNITIES WEAK IN SAFETY OF MORALITY

Majid Givi, Dr.Mohammad Mehdi Mazaheri, Dr. Amir Abbas Alizamani, Dr. Mehdi Dehbashi

Department of Religion philosophy and New theology, *Isfahan Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran*

Abstract

Ethics seeks to resolve questions dealing with human morality—concepts such as good and evil, right and wrong, virtue and vice, justice and crime. Religious communities are more successful to identify and protect areas of personal and social ethical norms. In this paper, to prove this claim, we are going to describe models of ethical governance. According to our findings, morality is a human phenomenon, several factors may lead to a person to moral decline, so expect utopia devoid of any alien have not even a society of religious people, because many people vulnerable to slip but you can expect the best style of governance.

Keywords: moral relativists, morality, governance, Religion

INTRODUCTION

Wisdom and power are the two great blessing God has granted to man. In fact, those two God's blessed human actions are worth. The man are called creatures honor, has an advantage over other creatures, finds power to detect Pure from impure, discern good and evil, , make decisions and choices. This man is a social creature with such traits and capacities and collective prerequisite dos and don'ts of social life. Primary rules and dos and don'ts of social and ethical in human life is a common principle among secular societies and religious communities.

But what is ethics? Is there a common definition about it? Are ethics issues always and everywhere the same? What we need to do and what not to do? What matters are good and what kind of matters are bad? How feasible is Morality protect Mechanisms in society? The ethic must to explain and discuss these questions.

The term comes from the Greek word *ethos*, which means "character". The super field within philosophy known as Axiology includes both ethics and Aesthetics and is unified by each sub-branch's concern with value (Baier, 1958). The word ethics in English can mean several things. It can refer to philosophical ethics -- a project that attempts to use reason in order to answer various kinds of ethical questions. It can also be used to describe a particular person's own, idiosyncratic principles or habits. For example: "Joe has good ethics." It may also be used to characterize the questions of right-conduct in some specific sphere, even when such right-conduct is not examined philosophically: "business ethics," or "the ethics of child-rearing" may refer, but need not refer, to a philosophical examination of such issues. This article describes philosophical ethics, which is more or less synonymous with "ethical theory," but this is not the

exclusive use of the term "ethics" in English. Even something such as "bioethics," may be addressed from a philosophical or non-philosophical perspective. For example, a non-philosopher may well have an opinion about end-of-life care, and such an opinion falls within the domain of bioethics. Thus bioethics is not an exclusively philosophical subject, just as ethics in general is not.

According to Richard Paul and Linda Elder of the Foundation for Critical Thinking, "most people confuse ethics with behaving in accordance with social conventions, religious beliefs and the law", and don't treat ethics as a stand-alone concept (Paul and Elder, 2006). Paul and Elder define ethics as "a set of concepts and principles that guide us in determining what behavior helps or harms sentient creatures"(Paul and Elder, 2006). 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 (Deigh, 1995)."

According to Muslim scholars in terms of morality, ethics is the repetition of an act of carnal queens are coming, if queens looking to repeat the good act, it is called good creation (Kholq Hosn) and if the action arises from the habit, it is called rogue creation (Kholq Razil). So, the origin of the good or bad deeds are called ethics (Majlesi, 2003).

So in general we can say: "Ethics is inner and psychological characteristics of human beings" and, according to some scientists, some of the actions and behavior of inner mood is due to human, it is also a moral (The first is traits Ethics and the second is moral behavior) (Mohammadi Gilani, 2008).

Religious communities are more successful to identify and protect areas of personal and social ethical norms. In this paper, to prove this claim, we are going to describe models of ethical governance.

DISCUSSION

Philosophical ethics investigates what is the best way for humans to live, and what kinds of actions are right or wrong in particular circumstances. Ethics may be divided into four major areas of study:

Meta-ethics, about the theoretical meaning and reference of moral propositions and how their truth values (if any) may be determined. Meta-ethics has always accompanied philosophical ethics. For example, Aristotle implies that less precise knowledge is possible in ethics than in other spheres of inquiry, and he regards ethical knowledge as depending upon habit and acculturation in a way that makes it distinctive from other kinds of knowledge. Meta-ethics is also important in G.E. Moore's *Principia Ethica* from 1903. In it he first wrote about what he called *the naturalistic fallacy*. Moore was seen to reject naturalism in ethics, in his Open Question Argument. This made thinkers look again at second order questions about ethics. Earlier, the Scottish philosopher David Hume had put forward a similar view on the difference between facts and values. Studies of how we know in ethics divide into cognitivism and non-cognitivism; this is similar to the contrast between descriptivist and non-descriptivists. Non-cognitivism is the claim that when we judge something as right or wrong, this is neither true nor false. We may for example be only expressing our emotional feelings about these things. Cognitivist can then be seen as the claim that when we talk about right and wrong, we are talking about matters of fact. The ontology of ethics is about value-bearing things or properties, i.e. the kind of things or stuff referred to by ethical propositions. Non-descriptivists and non-cognitivists believe that ethics does not need a specific ontology, since ethical propositions do not refer. This is known as an anti-realist position. Realists on the other hand must explain what kind of entities, properties or states are relevant for ethics, how they have value, and why they guide and motivate our actions (Miller, 2009).

Normative ethics, about the practical means of determining a moral course of action. Normative ethics involves arriving at moral standards that regulate right and wrong conduct. In

a sense, it is a search for an ideal litmus test of proper behavior. The Golden Rule is a classic example of a normative principle: We should do to others what we would want others to do to us. Since I do not want my neighbor to steal my car, then it is wrong for me to steal her car. Since I would want people to feed me if I was starving, then I should help feed starving people. Using this same reasoning, I can theoretically determine whether any possible action is right or wrong. So, based on the Golden Rule, it would also be wrong for me to lie to, harass, victimize, assault, or kill others. The Golden Rule is an example of a normative theory that establishes a *single principle* against which we judge all actions. Other normative theories focus on a *set* of foundational principles, or a set of good character traits. The key assumption in normative ethics is that there is only *one* ultimate criterion of moral conduct, whether it is a single rule or a set of principles. Three strategies will be noted here: (1) virtue theories, (2) duty theories, and (3) consequentialist theories (Unwin, 1999).

Applied ethics draws upon ethical theory in order to ask what a person is obligated to do in some very specific situation, or within some particular domain of action (such as business). Applied ethics is the branch of ethics which consists of the analysis of specific, controversial moral issues such as abortion, animal rights, or euthanasia. In recent years applied ethical issues have been subdivided into convenient groups such as medical ethics, business ethics, environmental ethics, and sexual ethics. Generally speaking, two features are necessary for an issue to be considered an "applied ethical issue." First, the issue needs to be controversial in the sense that there are significant groups of people both for and against the issue at hand. The issue of drive-by shooting, for example, is not an applied ethical issue, since everyone agrees that this practice is grossly immoral. By contrast, the issue of gun control would be an applied ethical issue since there are significant groups of people both for and against gun control (Sahakian et al, 1993).

Descriptive ethics, also known as comparative ethics, is the study of people's beliefs about morality. Descriptive ethics is on the less philosophical end of the spectrum, since it seeks to gather particular information about how people live and draw general conclusions based on observed patterns. Abstract and theoretical questions that are more clearly philosophical -- such as, "Is ethical knowledge possible?" -- are not central to descriptive ethics. Descriptive ethics offers a value-free approach to ethics, which defines it as a social science rather than a humanity. Its examination of ethics doesn't start with a preconceived theory, but rather investigates observations of actual choices made by moral agents in practice. Some philosophers rely on descriptive ethics and choices made and unchallenged by a society or culture to derive categories, which typically vary by context. This can lead to situational ethics and situated ethics. These philosophers often view aesthetics, etiquette, and arbitration as more fundamental, percolating "bottom up" to imply the existence of, rather than explicitly prescribe, theories of value or of conduct. The study of descriptive ethics may include examinations of the following:

- Ethical codes applied by various groups. Some consider aesthetics itself the basis of ethics-- and a personal moral core developed through art and storytelling as very influential in one's later ethical choices.
- Informal theories of etiquette that tend to be less rigorous and more situational. Some consider etiquette a simple negative ethics, i.e., where can one evade an uncomfortable truth without doing wrong? One notable advocate of this view is Judith Martin ("Miss Manners"). According to this view, ethics is more a summary of common sense social decisions.
- Practices in arbitration and law, e.g., the claim that ethics itself is a matter of balancing "right versus right," i.e., putting priorities on two things that are both right, but that must be traded off carefully in each situation.

- Observed choices made by ordinary people, without expert aid or advice, who vote, buy, and decide what is worth valuing. This is a major concern of sociology, political science, and economics (Toner, 2000; Thompson, 2012).

Ethics seeks to resolve questions dealing with human morality—concepts such as good and evil, right and wrong, virtue and vice, justice and crime.

Many moral norms has raised from human nature and there is common in human. In many societies acts such as slander, treachery, cruelty, rape or indecent act Slander are bad and things such as honor, courtesy, kindness, loyalty, justice, etc. are upholds.

But some of the ethical dos and don'ts are in different communities that we saw value difference.

These differences are sometimes to such an extent that may be act or belief in one culture may be considered as a valuable and mature, but the same act or believe in another culture not only is not option value but even anti-intellectual retardation value. For example, relationships between the two sexes in a society like Iran, both culturally and in terms of practical religious adherence is despicable and unacceptable. But this relations in European societies as a free, legal and signs of modernity and enlightenment.

With this interpretation, the moral obligation of society can generally be classified under three headings.

- Mandatory concepts: Dos and Don'ts , duty
- Value concepts: Good and Bad
- Value concepts related with Mandatory: right and wrong or true and false (Sadr, 1999).

Based on this classification, we can determine the types of models and performance requirements of morality in society can be summarized in three categories:

- Set of moral rules enforced by community leaders and government authorities.
- Set of moral rules enforced by demands of maximum number of people and government and people authorities.
- Set of moral rules enforced by the God, prophets and government and people and Individual authorities.

First and second class called moral relativists and third class who believe in the name of morality. It means that assuming the first and second be believed relativism and flexible of morality.

In this view, the individual or community recognition and selection has considered true and should ethical criteria, because of the conceptual people and communities ideas differences, a moral judgment cannot be universal and permanent. But the third was believed that morality as a set of behavioral necessary and unnecessary is with the absolute sense. Based on in accordance are with divine commandments and reason and nature and stabile always and everywhere. So, first reviewed for the first and the second model have accepted, this reviewed is relativism in Moral that it is better to be drawn primarily a clearer picture of it.

Moral relativism may be any of several philosophical positions concerned with the differences in moral judgments across different people and cultures. *Descriptive* moral relativism holds only that some people do in fact disagree about what is moral; *meta-ethical* moral relativism holds that in such disagreements, nobody is objectively right or wrong; and *normative* moral relativism holds that because nobody is right or wrong, we ought to tolerate the behavior of others even when we disagree about the morality of it. Not all descriptive relativists adopt meta-ethical relativism, and moreover, not all meta-ethical relativists adopt normative relativism. Richard Rorty (1982), for example, argued that relativist philosophers believe "that the grounds for choosing between such opinions is less algorithmic than had been thought", but not that any belief is equally as valid as any other (Rorty, 1982).

Of course, these thoughts and beliefs to moral relativism, not just today's, especially socialists and materialists, but the Kalbi in earlier times that were a tribe of Greeks and Mazdakian in Iran, believed this idea and acted on it. But the major Muslim thinkers tend to be stable, it is

ethical and non-relativistic, because most religious teachings have strengthened the criterion of having rules and criteria of authenticity, ethics, and morality. Appears in some documents immortality lawful and unlawful religious, moral judgments can be interconnected firm (Majlesi, 2003).

But the distinction to the principle of moral relativism have serious drawbacks many aspects:

- 1- Conflict with the principle of perfection and the seal of prophecy, immortality and the teachings of Islam; The Holy God says in Maedeh Sura, the verse 100 "Say: "Not equal are things that are bad and things that are good, even though the abundance of the bad may dazzle thee; so fear Allah, O ye that understand; that (so) ye may prosper."
- 2- Rationality of ethical judgments conflict with moral relativism; because accepting relativism, we will face with a set of paradoxes about right and wrong in the same issues. While in our opinion, there are only true and real morality system. And other systems that closely in case it is moral, are true and valid, because moral is seek instincts and spiritual forces (Motahari, 1984).

CONCLUSION

Belief to comprehensive monitoring and immediate of divine to acts, in addition to strengthening human motivation lies in the moral sense of God's presence in human mind. And this inevitably will increase tendency to the God and will strong faith fundamentals. And the home of morality is the soul, not the mind and morals is characters of the Self-Traits and not body, range of it is from human existence awareness and ethics will be as a function of the amount of his existence knowledge especially when it is combined with some of his inner feelings.

From Compare and contrast is obtained the mentioned conclusion that the deviation from point of view of the Quran is not a relative phenomenon, because recognition criteria and separation of deviation endurance or deviate from the right is an categorical imperative, however based on other views, the deviation is a relative phenomenon in terms of time, place, culture and values of a society is different (Salimi and Davari, 2002).

Thus, as noted above, because morality is a human phenomenon, several factors may lead to a person to moral decline, so expect utopia devoid of any alien have not even a society of religious people, because many people vulnerable to slip but you can expect the best style of governance.

References

- Baier, Kurt, *the Moral Point of View: A Rational Basis of Ethics* (Cornell University Press, 1958).
- Deigh J. (1995) in Robert Audi (ed), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*.
- Majlesi, M. Baqir ibn Muhammad Taqi, (2003). *Bihar al-Anwar*, Vol 10, Jamkaran Publication.
- Miller, C. (2009). *The Conditions of Moral Realism*. *The Journal of Philosophical Research*, 34, 123-155.
- Mohammadi Gilani, M., (2008), *Islamic moral lessons*, shade publication, Tehran
- Motahari, M., (1984), *Islam and the present day*, Tehran, Sadra
- Paul, R.; Elder, L. (2006). *The Miniature Guide to Understanding the Foundations of Ethical Reasoning*. United States: Foundation for Critical Thinking Free Press.
- Rorty, R. (1982). *Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sadr, S. M., (1999) a criterion to distinguish moral from immoral, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies - Islamic Propagation Office Hozeh Qom Seminary*, No. 13-14, particularly *Philosophy of ethics*, spring and summer Issue.
- Sahakian, William S. & Sahakian, Mabel Lewis (1993) *Ideas of the Great Philosophers*. pp. 32-33

- Salimi, A., Davari, M., (2002), *Sociology of Deviance*, Institute of Science, Qom
- Thompson, Dennis F. "Political Ethics." *International Encyclopedia of Ethics*, ed. Hugh LaFollette (Blackwell Publishing, 2012).
- Toner, James Hugh (2000). *Morals under the Gun: The Cardinal Virtues, Military Ethics, and American Society*. Baltimore: University Press of Kentucky.
- Unwin, N. (1999): "Norms and Negation: A Problem for Gibbard's Logic", *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 51(202), pp.60-75