

Normative ethic's and outer and inner behaviour nature influence of moral agent

Omid Ali Ghobadian¹ Morteza Zare Ganjaroodi²

¹ Master's Degree, Moral Philosophy, **University of:** Esfahan Payam Noor,

² Master's Degree, Philosophy, **University of:** International Imam Khomeini and moral philosophy from University of Payam Noor, Tehran south,

Received: May 14, 2015

Accepted: August 27, 2015

ABSTRACT

Normative ethics one of the most important areas of research ethics, that examine ethical norms and standard of action and character. Normative ethics, is divided in to two major approaches: the action-based ethics and virtue-centered ethics. advocates that defenders of action-based ethics emphasis on it and build the moral right and wrong on it is just moral action agent is just action of moral agent. Against, defenders of virtue-centered ethics evaluate the moral right and wrong with the criteria of virtue and intentions of moral agent. It is clear that the adoption of any of the above positions, some changes will be applied in the moral agent's character and action, so that the action based ethics, influenced, outer behaviour and virtue-centered ethics, and the inner behavior of (character) the moral agents.

KEYWORDS: Action-based ethics, Virtue-centered Ethics, Behavior, Action, Virtue, End.

1. INTERDICTION

Moral and ethical challenges of life has long history based on it developed history and origin of ethics can be attributed to the period before the divine prophets. This long history is because of human's essential needs to determine valuing to satisfy their own needs and their interaction with others; in a way that people lastly value everything has for benefit for them and benefit concept was overarched. However this procedure and valuing process had been performed but knowledge and scuffing that not been performed professionally in respect to the normalization; in other words, the ethics was not placed fundamentally belonging to recognition; we can attribute the origin of professional research process upon ethics to Socrates, Greek mythology and ethics founder; in fact, since Socrates, ethical issues were proceeded more than predecessors with research process and more accuracy. Because Socrates analysed ethical issues with his dialectical method, and in his issues referred to determination and ethical proof. This research process in which considers the bases of ethics has been known as moral philosophy. Based on this perspective, it can be said that moral philosophy is a branch of philosophy that attention to fundamental moral issues; these fundamental issues are: How to value, criteria, the manners of ethical terms and etc. Nevertheless, in this field, we are faced with numerous and various issues in which each of these issues are followed related to its category. Different types of moral philosophy branches are:

- Normative ethics
- Meta-ethics
- Applied ethics

Since the central argument of this paper is a reflection of normative ethics, we ignore the description related to meta-ethics and applied ethics. Then, we will discuss in detail the scope of normative ethics and we will learn from the results and related critics. Also we will discuss the effort of normative ethics on the behaviour of moral subjects.

2. Normative ethics

Normative ethics deals with criteria in which anyone can adapt the selected criteria with current condition with adherence to these criteria in various condition and attempts to drive its standard of right and wrong from subjectivity interpreted social behaviour. In fact, it can be said that normative ethics provides guiding and criteria for moral agent for valuing. Nevertheless, moral agent can distinguish good action from bad and virtue from vices with adherence to accepted criteria. So in general definition, normative ethics establishes some criteria for rightness and wrongness, good and evil, virtue and vice, task, rights and etc. (Olia, 2010)[1]. In normative ethics we are faced with general category of actions in the extent that includes all human actions in different areas; however, it can be found that all applied ethics such as medical ethics, driving ethics, and sporting ethics need deterministic criteria in which present in the normative ethics.

Nevertheless, it can be said that with establishment of normative ethics, some criteria are provided in all spheres of life. Applied ethics requires applying specific concept to determine criteria and values. In fact, it is in the extent of properties and concepts that normative ethics set criteria. These concepts includes values and prescriptions that say being good or bad of something; valuable concepts include concepts such as right and wrong, allowed and not allowed and etc. but signified of prescription concepts are a kind of order like should, should not and etc. for instance "this action is good" means that "goodness" reports goodness, permissible and accuracy of this action and in "You should not do this action" means that "should" refers to perspective and on order to the action. The task of normative ethics is that for these concepts will determine criteria, in simple word, normative ethics should tell us that valuable concepts and perspective concepts whether includes actions, merits and rules or deny actions, merits and rules. For this reason, normative ethics is divided into different categories in the extent that includes following school:

- Consequentialism
- Deontological
- Virtue-centred ethics

Point of concern is that Consequentialism ethics and task-oriented are Subsidiaries of action-based ethics. We will discuss about them at detail.

2.1. Action-base ethics review

It is worth mentioning that consequentialism and Deontological ethics refers to actions of ethical subject, in fact in this ethics the bases of ethical issues are ethical subject action. In other word, it can be said that action-centred ethics does not communicate with nature and chapter of ethical subject. Nevertheless, to distinguish ethical action from non-ethical action is not referred to nature and desires of ethical subject, because in the prescriptive of this school, only external action and subject can help ethical subject to live in a moral procedure. Also according to this school it can be said that if anyone can organize all appropriate action according to their relations, then they lived morally. For example, normative related to situation-oriented action-based ethics are formed in a way that in X situation Y action should be prior to Z action; if moral subject performs Y action based on this formulation, in fact it performs a moral action and if it selects Z action makes non-moral action. It is worth mentioning that in action-based ethics, the nature of moral subject is not considered and this is because of performing moral action in this school, although moral subject does not have special nature. However, action-based ethics is divided into two groups:

- Consequentialism
- Deontological

Then we discuss each of them in detail.

3. Consequentialism

Consequentialism theory says that substantial or final criterion of true, false, essential and etc. is morally unethical value was created. The final source of direct or indirect should be the rate of relative good or relative predominance of good over evil. Therefore, an action is only applicable if its own or a rule under it, as much as another possible can create the predominance of good over evil or possibly is created; or the meaning is that it will be created and it is wrong only does not perform it. To understand this case we can see aforementioned valuable perspective concepted. As mentioned before, properties like goodness and evil are valuable properties and properties such as should and should not are perspective and imperative affairs. Followers of consequentialism school tell us that good and should are defined with non-moral¹ elements. For example, when consequentialism say that X action is good, in fact they claim is attractive only to special person or creates more enjoyment against less suffer for all people or X action is a help to other; it can be said that these three description defined good property to another components, that is enjoyment for yourself, for all and for others respectively. It should be said that good property is not only restricted to consequentialism school and it is possible to define Good to other properties such as power, maturity and so on. With these description it can be said that consequentialism school is divided to different branches in which in this paper we describe three types of it. They are:

- Egoism
- Utilitarianism
- Altruism
- Egoism

3.1 Egoism

Briefly, egoism means that moral subject should select an action that most pleasure and enjoyment, so in egoism school we only need to look for our own good or prefer it (our good) to others good. (See Floridi, 1998; 246-247)[2]. In other word, if we say that action X is good, in fact we say that action X makes my pleasure and enjoyment, and action X has the most benefit for me, although this action led to harm others. Thomas Hobs, Epicurus are the philosopher presented reasons versus moral egoism.

1. Non-moral

Concept of non-moral in moral philosophy is not equal with immoral, in other word, concept of immoral is out of scope of ethical rules but has not incompatible with ethical rules. Also scope of its inclusion except of Orders worth in ethics. For example "This is a good car"Unethical decision has been made, because despite good has non-moral worth it used to describe things.

3.2. Utilitarianism

Utilitarians believe that an action is good and right in which makes the most benefit to the most people. In fact, ethical utilitarians say that ethical end in which we should follow in all actions in the most possible dominance of good over evil in the world (or the least possible dominance of good over evil. So in utilitarian view the action X is led to good and right character in which this action is led to most pleasure and the least pain for the most human being. Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill are the philosophers provide an evidence to confirm ethical utilitarianism.

3.3. Altruism

The followers of this school believe that an action is good and right in which leads to others benefit; in other words, when we say that action X is a good and correct action, in fact we say that action has been done in favour of others benefit. However good and right are measured by measurement of others benefit in this school. The individuals such as Joseph Butler is the follower of this school.

4. Task-oriented

Task-oriented school is against the consequentialism school; the vote centre of task-oriented individual is established based on ethical action in which can describe good, evil, should and should not regardless referring to the results, so the criteria of true or false of action will not only be referring to results or creating maximum pleasure towards pain, but also an action can has only ethical value. For example, if we consider an action such as lying a consequentialist can recognize correctness and non-correctness of that action referred to its outcomes, but a task-oriented person recognize correctness and non-correctness of that action apart from the gained results. A typical example of task-oriented theory in ethical is Immanuel Kant, a Germany philosopher. The famous rule of Kant is "act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law." (Kant, 1994; 274)[3]. in fact Kant believe that all ethical actions should go through the law network. According to this rule an action is ethical in which lead to general rule and does not lead to moral contradiction and an action is non-moral in which is not led to general law and makes contradictions. However, from the task-oriented individuals view, an action is correct in which ethical agent act based on related rules and regularities and ignore the resulted of that action; in other word, in this type of ethics, the act itself is valuable. For example, lying action is a shameful act in task-oriented theory, although it is not led to good results. Generally, we can describe task-oriented school like this: "An action is good and correct associated to that task even it is not led to pleasure of individual, society and etc. this purpose is because of its value of action.

5. The similarities and differences in consequentialism and task-oriented school

According to the description mentioned in the text, we can say that consequentialism school is reduced the moral concept to non-moral concepts. In fact, the reduction process is a way that if the result of an action is led to more good (whether your own good and pleasure, others pleasure and human beings pleasure), that action is a moral and right action and an action is not act based on this process, it is non-moral and incorrect action. So according to consequentialism school we should refer to the results of an action and distinguish good and correct from evil and incorrect with adherence to the results. But the followers of task-oriented school disagree with this approach, because from their view just referring to the results of an action cause moral and non-moral actions, but the action itself has moral and non-moral value, even if the action does not lead to significant result for the individual, family and society, but there is a similarity between consequentialism and task-oriented school in which both schools consider the moral agent special importance in a way that only character and action of ethics makes ethical issues. So in the approach of action-based approach. The nature and character of moral action is not important to distinguish correct action from incorrect action. It is worth mentioning that some followers of action-based ethics are considered nature and desires of correctness of ethical act along with importance to ethical agent act; for example Immanuel Kant emphasizes to character of ethical agent along with the action based on duty. For example, in the perspective of Kant; ethical merit is measured not only in terms of action results of an individual or his natural outgoingness, but also is measured in term of the desire of agent to obey ethical rules. So, we cannot restrict all moral system of action-centred philosophers to the field of moral agent character, but take care of character, behaviour and the action of moral agent against their nature and desire is very important.

6. The effect of action-based ethics on moral subject

In this section, we present the investigation of action-based ethics effects on moral agent, in fact we aim that refer to the effects and results and related outcomes of individual provide this situation in ethical life. If

moral agent selects the self-centred approach, the range of his action's benefit come back to his own. In this approach, moral agent can be criticized from different perspectives; for example, one of the existing critics about moral self-centred is that moral agent performs an action in different condition in favour of itself, even if ignores the others right. It is clear that this action is our moral evidence apart from the common understanding. But if moral agent chooses another way to live morally, there are also some problems. Suppose that we always think about others and prefer their require to our requires, we should say that this bases is not a whole because it is possible that other-willy be intrinsic and natural and this can be a moral topic like mother love whether human being or non-human forwards his child. Each animal loves his infant intrinsically. Can we say that mother's love towards their children is a moral task influenced the nature? (Motaharri, 1988; 97)[4]. certainly, actions which have performed naturally are not only moral action, but also is an error to altruism school in which rationality has the least importance. For example, suppose that altruism is right in conditions that one of the outcomes of altruism is self-forgiveness, so has the forgiveness moral implication in all cases? Suppose the answer is not, so do we act morally with this answer? Certainly, forgiveness action is not morally live in most situations. Especially when forgiveness action is to show up clothes to others. Hence, moral Utilitarianism is below the proactively ethics. Suppose that moral agent selects the rule-cantered moral Utilitarianism, so against all conditions act based on this school. It means that an action is good in which has the most benefit to the most people. For instance, consider a situation in which a moral agent killed his rich father and gave a part of possesses to buy a playground to poor children and another part for investment in medical research to rare diseases, so do the moral agent perform a moral action? (view in gensler, 1998; 111-124)[5].

At this time, the individual is faced with moral dilemmas. In fact utilitarians talk about tactics. Because from the view of task-oriented people, the action of murder is itself non-moral, although had led the best result to the most people. Now we refer to second group of action-based individuals task-oriented. One of the consequentialism shortcoming was that human being look for the benefits of an action, but task-oriented philosopher like Kant consider the applicable rationality of human apart from any benefit to himself. The shortcoming of this task-oriented school is that in this approach, a moral agent cannot consider any motivation and benefit for herself. Motaharri said that: "If Ali-ben-Abi Taleb Hasrat had the benefit of parity, could he enjoy from doing this? If he did not enjoy, he could not do a moral action. (Motaharri, 1988; 108)[6]. so a moral agent cannot do a moral action in which does not consider the consequent of it. Hence, we investigated two types of action-based ethics and showed that in both group moral agent is in a condition cannot find completely an ethics towards maturity. Another major critics of action-centred approach is that action-centred ethics has not considered a place for internal rules, merits, natures and human desires, however, during the writing part of the axis we face with parts of such perspective, but the point is that action-base ethics does not consider a position for development of human virtues and believes that position of ethics is just for action. Furthermore, it should be said that aside from actions of moral agent, dignity and character are not affectless to judge about right and wrong of perspective of moral agent. As some philosopher have established beyond and says that when we admire an action, we just consider motivation that causes to doing that. Foreign action does not have any point. All virtues action give their point just from their motivation.

7. Virtue-based ethics

Virtue ethics is one of the three major approach in normative ethics in which emphasizes against the task-oriented school and is against the consequentialism school measured correctness and incorrectness of action with the results (Hursthouse, 2012)[11]. Virtue ethics is one of the three major approaches to normative ethics, often contrasted to deontology, which emphasizes duty to rules, and consequentialism, which derives rightness or wrongness from the outcome of the act itself. (See Hursthouse, 1999: 1-24) [7]. generally, virtue-centred ethics includes nature, desires and intrinsic of moral agent. Therefore, virtue-based ethics emphasizes on internal action and behaviour of moral agent. This not mean that in this kind of ethics, there is not a guide to action and character, but the nature of moral agent is very significant. Historically, the virtue-based ethics has a long history. in his Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle, like Plato before him, argued that the pursuit of eudaimonia is an "activity of the soul in accordance with perfect virtue (See Aristotle, 2000: 3-23) [8]. In fact, the term of Eudaimonia is a state variously translated from Greek as 'well-being', 'happiness', 'blessedness', and in the context of virtue ethics, 'human flourishing (See Pojman and fieser, 2009: 146-169) [9]. Hence, from Aristotle perspective, if people look for their happiness they performed based on excellent virtue. The question is that how can achieve to happiness? The answer of Aristotle is the complete list of virtues. These are:

- Self-esteem
- Bravery
- Moderation
- Justice
- Honesty
- Forgiveness (magnanimity)
- Love

Aristotle showed the way of achievement to us. He says that each of these characterize are gained just with practice and practice. Actions includes in these virtues just are gained with considering the intermediate of each.

It is clear that Aristotle ethics has the consequentialism ethics (The same. 104) [10]. That means in many situation we should recognize the correct action based on our evidence. Therefore, the bases of Aristotle ethics is based on virtue-centred ethics, but his moral method is associated with consequentialism ethics. We should consider that in his view, the consequence is like gaining happiness. In age of Enlightenment, some philosophers were favour in virtue ethics, one of them was famous philosopher, David Hume [33]. Hume considers to dignity of moral agent and also considers the position of human virtues in human emotions. He knows these emotions common to all human beings and refers it as common sense. In his perspective, if human emotions be refined from selfishness, then understand of each virtue in any situation will motivate praise for people. Hume says: frame the model of a praise-worthy character, consisting of all the most amiable moral virtue: give instances, in which these display themselves, after an eminent and extraordinary manner: you readily engage the esteem and approbation of all your audience, who never so much as enquired in what age and country the person lived, who possessed these noble qualities: a circumstance, however, of all others, the most material to self-love, or a concern for our own individual happiness. (Hume, 1751:79-80)[12]. Although Hume's ethical approach, is beside and based on the virtue-centre, combined with the teleology position, but in his philosophy dignity and promote human good features is so important. After Hume virtue-centre moral in west, almost seemed to decline and the teleology was raised in various forms. Furthermore, the virtue-based ethics has revived in the west with Mrs. Anscombe's views. (Student of Ludwig Josef Johann Wittgenstein). In her book "Modern moral philosophy" in 1988. Mrs. Marta nospam was also represented the virtue theory in international development approach. It is worth mentioning that scholars of Islamic ethics have considered the importance of virtue-centered ethics. Therefore, the bases of virtue-based ethics to internal properties of moral agent includes: nature, motivations, desires and human virtue.

8. The effect of virtue-based ethics on the behavior of moral agent

Virtue-centered ethics is considered the characterization of moral agent against action-based ethics; this is when we gave the importance of action-based ethics. Then, in this paper we present the critics and investigation of effects of virtue-centered ethics on moral agent. One of the critics is that it does not provide a complete extent to virtues, in other words, there is no consensus of virtue-centered followers. For example, regarding what are the most important virtues, Aristotle proposed the nine listed earlier (just above Historical origins): wisdom; prudence; justice; fortitude; courage; liberality; magnificence; magnanimity; temperance. In contrast, one modern-era philosopher proposed as the four cardinal virtues: ambition/humility; love; courage; and honesty (See Kaufmann, 1961: 317-388) [11]. Also Christianity that it is based on virtue ethics, just emphasizes on one virtue in morality and it is love, we can call this theory as Originality the Love. So the moral agent who will be follower of the doctrine of virtue don't know that which one of virtues are principle and which are derived and from accessories made of principles. In fact he just has understood these virtues from environment and culture that lived in it. More important criticism it's that virtues from each culture to another are with dispersion and diversity. In other word it is possible values and virtues in a society are something and in other society are something else. Yet the moral agent can't claim the objectivity, Universality and confirmed the authority of the virtues of his society. Furthermore people like Hume may also defend the integrity, goodness, badness, right and wrong are confirmed and authorized by all mankind and all humanity in every culture, rise up to confirm the conventional virtues. The problem with this theory is that all virtues are authorized by human but the dispute is over the evidence, in fact all people acknowledge the virtues like generosity, courage, justice and ...but the example of the virtues in cultures will be different with each other. For example justice is a praiseworthy virtue in all societies and cruelty is vices, but examples of justice in country X maybe are different with examples of justice in country Y. for example justice is a death sentence for murder in country X while life imprisonment considered to be that murder as justice in country Y. also another issue that moral agent will be face with it in virtue-centred sect is teleology. In other word humans always care about moral action and end of it. Even in mere task-oriented. We have discussed to explain this section in existing criticism on task-oriented.

9. The similarities and differences in the ethical and moral virtue-based

We knew that in perspective of followers of action base weather in area of consequentialism or in area of task-oriented, action and reaction of moral agent has proper role and against in virtue-base ethics character and moral agent's virtues play an important role. Furthermore, we cannot set a logical divide between the two recent cases. It's because of that some consequentialist made virtue cantering as their profession in their moral system. An example of this case is Immanuel Kant that referred to it in content. In this side of case some virtue-centres are consequentialist. For example Aristotle that his virtue-centre system is twins with task-oriented and somewhat egocentrism ethics. So in a logical divide we can say that the ratio between action-base moral and virtue-centre moral is a public and private relation. Explanation of this case has four way.

1. Some consequentialist are not virtue-centre.
2. Some consequentialist are virtue-centre.
3. Some virtue-centres are not consequentialist.
4. Some virtue-centres are consequentialist.

Although we can use the word some instead of more in principles number 1 and 3. Because this word is better to show the differentiation and redemption of this two case with each other.

10. Effect of normative ethics on Behaviour of moral agent

It is clear that moral agent will be in case of acceptance each of schools aforementioned the cause and source of changes in outward ethic (Action) and inward ethic (dignity). This figure is that moral agent will be under influence of inserted votes and beliefs in school aforementioned. It should be said that moral agent care about in case of acceptance consequentialism school (apart from the egocentrism schools) to outward ethic and his action against the others and as a result stay safe from many of non-moral cases like apart loss, failing to fulfil promises But also Neglected the consequences of his behaviour for a few. It's because of scope of inclusion each of consequentialism schools summarize in specific area. For example, the agent who select utilitarianism school from consequentialism schools as his pattern ethics, focuses on the maximum establishes for more people, but also will be ignored from infliction of the same action, although it take the scope of the few people or agent who choose task-oriented as a pattern for his behaviour, first he attention to his tasks, for example moral agent will avoid from harm to others, fail in fulfil promise and the other unpleasant actions. But still will be unaware than that action. In both of them we can say that moral agent in consequentialism school apply his maximum attention on normative ethic. But against, the agent who set the votes of virtue-centre school as his pattern, give too care about inherent ethic, mean his intentions and character. For example maximum attention of virtue-centre moral agents is on inherent ethics and in other word they do not attention to their actions, but instead their major efforts will spend of virtues like generosity, justice and like that. The point is that we cannot draw a comprehensive and barrier divide for each of two action base and virtues centre case. Perhaps the action base moral agent also attention to growth of his virtues and in the other side, virtues centre agent conscious or unconscious attention to his actions and ethics.

In any case, we can say that moral agent in any of these cases, will be develop some shortcoming in his moral ethics way. But it does not change that we ignore from positives and performances of these two cases. It should be say, since the range of ethical discussion demands many concrete actions, then accepting a specific theory and a special thinking school would not be helpful, but the point is applying the required ethic (normative and inherent) from moral agent in in situation is different.

RESULT

What is for moral agent from normative ethics is insight and dignity of outward and inward ethic, in fact if moral agent accept effort spent approach in action, he has attention to normative ethics and against if he try to development of good character at himself far of attention to actions, then he has developed his inherent behaviour. What is important and worthy for living to the moral agents is special attention to the conditions. However moral agent in many case will close in remoteness ethic. But how to apply normative moral act is just base on author agent in variety of conditions ahead. So that when action question (normative and inherent) justify asked from moral agent, he present a reasoned and persuasive reason to justify their behaviour.

REFERENCES

1. Olia, Masoud, (2011), *Culture descriptive moral philosophy*, Tehran, Hrms.mz Press.
2. Floridi, Luciano; (1998). Craig, Edward. "*Egoism and Altruism*". Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy.
3. Kant, Immanuel, (1994), *The Noble Descent of Duty* in P Singer (ed). Ethics. Oxford University Press.
4. Motaharri, Morteza, (1989), *Education in Islam*, Tehran, Sadra Press.
5. Gensler, Harry. J., (1998), *ethics: a contemporary introduction*, first published byroutledge.
6. Motaharri, Morteza, (1989), *Education in Islam*, Tehran, Sadra Press.
7. Hursthouse, Rosalind, (2012). *Virtue Ethics*. In Zalta, Edward N. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy
8. Aristotle, (2000). *Nicomachean ethics*, translated and edited by: Roger Crisp, Cambridge university press.
9. Pojman, L.P., & Fieser, J., (2009). *Virtue Theory. In Ethics: Discovering Right and Wrong*, (6th ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
10. Pojman, L.P., & Fieser, J., (2009). *Virtue Theory. In Ethics: Discovering Right and Wrong*, (6th ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
11. Kaufmann, W., (1961). *The Faith of a Heretic*. Doubleday & Co.
- 12- Hume, david,(1751),*an enquiry concerning the principles of morals*, LONDON: Printed for A. MILLAR, over-against Catherine-street in the Strand.