CHAPTER – III
PERSON, MORAL CULTURE AND SOCIAL FREEDOM: A PHILOSOPHICAL RE-APPRAISAL

Moral Values reflect the pressing needs of development in the form of ideals or goals which act as a stimulus and motive for action and evaluative criteria for one’s behavior, views and deeds. Moral values are a lived unity between consciousness and behavior; they are lived realization of ideals. Hence, they are complex, socially determined ideas, and reflect a need in the development of a society for personal choice directing the active participation of individuals in a society. The real existence of moral values is impossible without persons and personal choice, attitudes and activities in response to the processes taking place in a society. That is why moral values always have reflected the degree of social freedom embodied in the individual conduct of each because moral values always presuppose a personal concern and attitude. Personal commitment on the part of the individual is proof of the social responsibility and reliability of moral values. Thus, the moral values that they have preached and practiced are the human expression of social truths at a certain stage in the historical development of all human societies.

Two fundamental issues that call for attention with regard to the issues of morality and moral culture are person and society. A society is the setting in which the person exists and acts and thus person and society seem closely interrelated. Hence, an analysis and understanding of any society on the issues of morality and public life provide complexities that are a challenge to theorizing. In the case of India, it consists of traditional realities like caste considerations, corruption in the public life and corruption by corporate houses, lethargy of government machinery, nexus between police and politicians, alleged corrupt practices and ideology that rule the judiciary and the like. These and yet others form the rock-bed of contemporary Indian society. In this regard, India and its caste-based society becomes a more appropriate instance as the laboratory for the consideration of a ‘theory on morality and moral culture’.
Contemporary India faces new and grave difficulties not merely of an economic, political and national nature, but of a new culture where the individuality of a person is questioned and even thwarted. People’s loss of self-confidence, decline of mutual trust, sense of guilt and helplessness, decay of earlier orientations and lack of new ones, declining sex-ratio, collapse of metaphysical rationality with the replacement of instrumental rationality, blind adherence to traditional values have revealed a new crisis. This being the case, what ought the intellectual to do in order to promote a new humanity and individuality? How should one regard the role of the intellectuals in this new world of ours with all the contradictions in the dramatic tensions between the masked integrity and the old hatreds?

Universal Values and Moral Culture

The stultifying of human life and of individual biography is the best proof of social and moral alienation of any society, for how could we strive for the sense of human life without personal presence, universal values, moral equality and justice? Moral alienation is a result of an instrumental model as all-embracing, imposed by force, and therefore breeding fear. Corruption and violence in political life and the relativization of moral values and such other issues are the true roots of moral alienation of people in a given society. The visible side of this alienation is rudeness, indifference, apathy and cruelty, because orthodox and feudal values have not been replaced by rational values as enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic. Thus, it is amply clear that moral values act as a barometer at the level of personal interest in social renovation in all spheres of social life. Traditional values and virtues are being re-assessed and thereby revealing new dimensions, claiming new places in the moral structure of society and new inter-relations in the moral structure of society with social needs and interests.

Universal values represent the achievements of the world’s moral culture when we deal with the generalized social experience concerning the nature of man and his existence. Moral values acquire crucial importance in this age of globalization as the questions about peace and war, ecological danger, hunger and demographic growth, life and rights of individuals are at stake. Universal values reflect and guarantee the rights of people, the respect for human dignity, solidarity,
sympathy, compassion and defense of children, older people and women. The preservation of world peace, search for common goals and the interests of humankind- regardless of ideology, religion or view of life, color of the skin, caste, status and gender- constitute the most important dimensions of universal values.

Among the factors and criteria of social progress, moral culture holds a special place, for it is the system of self-determination in society. It includes the notions and concepts of person and society, good and evil, the purpose and meaning of life, honor and duty, freedom and responsibility, justice and dignity, love and friendship, traditions, rituals, customs, norms, rules, principles and models of conduct; it also consists of ideals and national and common values which were transformed in conformity with the values, emotions, senses, persuasions, views, acts, vital activities, models of life and personal qualities. These are also the main support of the moral culture whose principal function is the regulation of mutual relations of man with nature, society and environment.

Moral culture is a reflex product of man and society. It is also the moral rules which correct the mutual relations between people, their consciousness, psychology, acts and vital activities. The beginning of morality, its imperatives and taboos at the dawn of human history, reflect an understanding that man lives not by himself without other people, but must have some rules for social life. Upon that thesis, we draw the following conclusions:

1. Morality began at the same time as human society and before moral culture.

2. The concepts of morality and moral culture are interconnected, but are not identical, the latter being broader than the former.

3. At the present time moral culture is developing and improves human life through individual forms of activity and social-historical practice.

4. The essence of moral culture is to become aware of every man as necessarily related to other people.
5. The subjects of a moral culture must include everyone in order to improve persons and society in their indissoluble and versatile connections and interconnections.

Moral culture is a measure of moral values and their practical realization in all the spheres of social activity by persons, groups, communities or society. An important characteristic of the subject of moral culture is an alignment of national and common values, with priority given to common values in consciousness, action, communications and practice. It is the formed self-awareness of man as a member of an ethnos, group, social stratum, society and, of course, his civic, social, human duties and responsibilities.

Moral culture is founded on the historical, moral ethics of a tradition and at the same time is oriented on present and future values. It unites such factors of development as change and stability. As a dynamic system of society, it has the chance and the means to secure its stability, development and progress. In the new historical, social, economic and cultural situation it is necessary to understand this. The moral orientation for modern man can and must include the moral values, ideas and views of such famous scholars, poets and philosophers of Asia as Rudaky, Beruny, Farabi, Buddha, Mahavir Jain and Kabir.

For Rudaky, good actions are the measure of the intellect. In the thoughts of Al-Farabi, mutual aid must be a principle of collaboration as a condition for achieving human ideals. Beruni taught that duty is the main principle of "one's achieving activity in the world," that knowledge is the way to improvement, and that one must care for other people.

The highest social value of the culture is said to be its unity. The acquisition of moral culture is founded upon the education of the intellect, emotions, senses and will. The brain is the basis of human actions; but one's emotions constitute the internal, spiritual world of a person as a moral force confirming goodness, truth, beauty, responsibility, achievement, knowledge, patriotism, honor, duty, justice, friendship, love and dignity. Moral culture, therefore, concerns the formation, development and manifestation of the creative
essence of man. The process of reforming society, its change, development and progress, are examples of the creative activity of man. At the same time the stability of society is a condition and foundation of social development. This cannot be described without its subject who is oriented by social, cultural and moral values. In the process of such activity, one changes oneself and at the same time improves social relations, assisting in both their stabilization and their progress.

Orienting life on moral norms, ideas and principles manifests moral culture and strengthens the interconnections and interactions between people and their improvement. A human being has only the potential or possibility to be a "whole subject"; for its formation and development moral culture plays a great role, together with other components of culture and social-historical factors. Man and the world are connected and interact on the basis of moral values.

These considerations underline the idea that moral culture is the complex of social and individual moralities. Individual morality is the means, method and form for the realization of the moral value of man and society. It is a condition and factor of the moral cultural development and the self-improvement of every person. The actions of the morally cultured person follow the norms, rules and principles of society. They do not contradict the main interests of man and society, but coordinate one’s activity with the interests of other people and subordinate one’s own interests to those of society. Therefore, individual and social morality, professional ethics and moral culture are important factors in the development of personality and social progress. This requires the highest development of social and individual consciousness and of the self-awareness, self-education and self-improvement of the person. By it one becomes aware of one’s needs and interests, and of one’s civil, professional, human duty, dignity and responsibility.¹

One of the main characteristics of personality is to be self-critical, that is to say, the ability to relate to oneself as to another person — the objective analysis of one’s own actions and the correction of one’s own mistakes. Self-improvement takes place through the connection between a self-critical personality and his or her sense of responsibility. Moral culture is the creative activity of people and its
result. Circumstances change and new tasks appear as people look for new activities, ways and methods of self-improvement. These are connected with the characteristics of the subject of moral activity and one’s spiritual and emotional experience.

This culture plays a great role in the realization of a society in which objective social relations, laws, norms and the moral atmosphere give persons the possibility and right to choose for oneself their convictions, profession, place and mode of life and self-improvement, thereby enabling one to transform one’s relations to oneself, to other people, to nature and to society. Moral norms, rights, principles, values and criteria are the basis of such transformations and moral culture is the main factor in the education of a personality and the promotion and progress of a society. As the subject of moral culture the person has special needs which conform to norms of morality as with his or her purpose, tasks and characteristics. The person respects laws and has rights shared by all members of society; one fulfills one’s duties according to the demands of morality and the progressive development of society.

Moral culture is manifested in human desires as one lives in accord with his group, society and nation. The human person has his or her own national and common values; one knows one’s place, role and responsibility before society and before oneself. It is a special state of emotions, consciousness, will, needs, wishes, interests, forms and methods manifest in all spheres of personal activity. The significance of the person depends upon one’s character, the level of knowledge and of the development of one’s consciousness, and upon the measure of one’s self-education and self-improvement. These are engaged in social practice as defining the purpose and meaning of one’s life.

Here the human is always the end, never the means (Immanuel Kant). The development and self-improvement of the person and of society is the end. This is the task and foundation of moral culture because social progress has the improvement, self-improvement and development of persons as its main goal. For the development of modern civilization, moral culture is the main factor. Only this is able to safeguard positive achievements and exclude negative tendencies.
Every epoch needs a special moral culture for the person and society. The great significance of moral culture lies in its specific but non-coercive method of overcoming the negatives. These methods are: the system of education, information, self-education and self-improvement, social opinion, awareness of law and self-awareness, and, according to this, the methods, activity and practice of goodness. Moral culture is specific to a society, but is a common and universal method of mutual understanding and collaboration between people as ethnicities, nations and countries. It is the main source and factor of social progress, because it has a great influence on social and individual consciousness and their activities and on the characteristics of social relations.

Morality is a visible indicator of human culture, a mirror of the nature of individuals and peoples. The "characters" of Theophrastus and La Bruyère are still alive among us, though fashionably dressed, more educated, acting in different circumstances, and possessed of different value orientations and attitudes. Morality is a universal measure of the spiritual and cultural perfection of humans as the supreme goal and absolute value. Morality is an aspect of human culture, the touchstone not only of what an individual is, but also of what one should be as a person and citizen. The individual is a moral being whose social nature reveals itself through the notions of good and evil, virtue and vice. It is by knowing a person's morals that one can best understand him or her.

Humans are believed to be the only moral beings; no other living creature on the Earth--and perhaps in the whole Universe--is endowed with mind and reason, with consciousness and self-consciousness, with personality, free will and conscience. The most universal among all those features is one's moral strength, making the person as a thinker, worker and creator, responsible not just for his physical and intellectual perfection, but above all for the harmony of the world. Human development along the spiral of progress becomes possible and effective only when meeting the more humanitarian than technological condition that one's inmost human feelings, thoughts, ideas, goals and means, words and deeds correspond to morality.
Otherwise, humankind would be confronted by monstrous destruction, for the "non-humanized" technological sphere, which does not possess the features of a real sphere, contains within itself forces capable of destroying human civilization and culture. The revolutionary changes of the contemporary world challenge us to create a global morality which recognizes universal moral values and develops a contemporary moral culture.

Man is the only moral being (*homo moralis*) whose intimate world, consciousness and conduct function in terms not only of utility, but also of beauty and good. Since the evolution of *homo sapiens* in prehistoric times, its nature has acquired a moral essence. No other creature can be held responsible for all its deeds. For man this extends not only to the behavioral but to the intellectual as well. Charles Darwin wrote that the moral creature is able to reflect on its past deeds and their motivations, to approve of some and to condemn others. Man is the only creature that could be so defined; it is the greatest difference between humans and lower animals.

Morality is the noblest feature of human nature and culture; it leads to infinite perfection—but could lead also to fanaticism and superstition. Man is a moral being not only potentially, but actually as well; the moral is as characteristic of man as is the aesthetics. At the same time, the human properties of mind, speech, work, creativity, aesthetic attitudes, laughing, desires, will, temperament and conscience undergo historically determined changes which differ in their cultural meaning. This raises the concrete question of the nature and main characteristics of moral culture.

**The Concept of Moral Culture**

The notion of "moral culture" is related to the concepts of human civilization and culture. What today we call culture, the ancient Greeks called upbringing. Although the terms differ, the problems of barbariousness, civilization and culture are treated in Tacitus' work, *About the Origin and Living Places of the Germans* (98 B.C.). At that time words like "civis" (citizen), "civitas" (society) and "civilis" (civic), which expressed the characteristic features of urban life, its virtues and merits, morals and customs, cultural *mores* and sophisticated conduct,
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entered into circulation in Rome. It is widely known that the word "culture" originated from Latin as a derivative of the verb "colere" which initially meant cultivating land and growing plants—hence, the notion "cultus agri" or "cultura agri", ie, agriculture. Gradually the word "culture" assumed also a figurative meaning, expressing the process of systematic upbringing and education or the process of physical, intellectual and moral formation and development, of the perfection and self-perfection of the individual, of one's endowments and gifts, attitudes and abilities, aptitudes, features and properties. For the celebrated Roman tribune and philosopher, Cicero, "Cultura animi philosophia est", thereby underlining the rational-volitional and moral specificity of human nature. This motto may have been the first attempt to mark the content of the notion "spiritual and moral culture". The term "culture" gained a new sense and meaning, namely, the development of the human spirit through the formation of certain mental abilities, intellectual properties and moral virtues. It meant concern about the ennoblement and purification of life. In the Middle Ages the expression "cultura mentis", i.e., mental or spiritual culture, spread widely.

It is necessary to point out that a number of scientists as well as scientific schools consider the notions "civilization" and "culture" to be synonyms, and to include morality in their content. This tendency is expressed by E. Taylor in the following words: culture ethnographically comes from knowledge, beliefs, arts, morality, laws, and customs and adopted by society. Thus, French literature mainly uses the term "civilization", whereas Germanic and Anglo-Saxon literatures use "culture".

There is a great divergence of views exist in the definition of culture. One of the earliest definitions of culture, which is often quoted and considered valid even today, is given by E.B.Tylor. According to him, culture is the sum total of the beliefs, ideas, customs, laws, morals, arts and other capabilities and skills acquired by man as a member of society. B. Malinowski defines culture as the total way of life and the instruments-mental, social and material- of which this way is constituted, whereas for Bidney, culture is the product of the agro facts, artifacts, socifacts and mentifacts. Culture in this latter sense, is a thing that exists. Accordingly, culture has a threefold function:
1. It serves first to adapt man to his natural environment. Culture, in this way, comprises the means and methods by which man reacts to his environment, his means of acquiring food, the implements that he uses for it such as tools, weapons, cooking utensils, husbandry, and the means of transportation etc.

2. Culture further comprises man’s reactions to his social groups, his social institutions as the family, the kinship group, sibs and clans, political institutions and laws, the position of man, woman and child in these institutions, the customs of birth, mating, death and funeral, property rights and inheritance and in general all laws and customs regulating private and social life. Culture also comprises man’s creative and artistic activities and their products, his ornaments, carvings and sculptures, his paintings and drawings, his music and dancing, his story telling, myths and legends and poems and riddles.

3. Culture finally comprises man’s beliefs about a transcendent world, his beliefs in the existence of superhuman powers and beings, the lower and higher deities, ghosts and spirits, demons and goblins, the existence of a soul, life after death and so on.  

It is universally admitted that only man has an ethical evaluation and religion and it is the human subject who is capable of enjoying art. It is only man who is capable of ceremonies and rites resulting from his beliefs and magical practices. In short, man alone has culture. The development of culture, at least to some extent, is dependent on man’s free will and creativity, which includes his desires, caprices, vices, knowledge and ignorance. This implies that man is as much the creator of culture as its product and carrier. Man, when he created a cultural form, reacted in a certain manner but need not be so given his free will and creativity. Man, on the other hand, is the child of a particular age, society, and convention, which we call as tradition. This possibility refutes cultural determinism and consequently, the development of culture cannot be worked out and foreseen in the manner of the natural sciences by generally valid laws and principles, which determine the course of cultural development. Laws and
principles of cultural development are valid only in a general and approximate degree.

It may be undoubtedly stated that morality correlates not only with civilization, but also with culture. In this context morality and culture are main conditions and forms of a human way of living with its activity, communication and conduct. The genetic correlation between them emerged in the early days of human history and civilization as moral phenomena showed themselves to be among the most essential elements of human culture.

As an organic part of human culture morality is an active and universal socio-cultural phenomenon. It develops as man sees "the laws of good" as laws of his own will and conscience. As a culture it consists mainly in the active attitude of human beings towards the world—both natural and social: a human virtue is a specific moral and psychic ability to create good in the form of certain good deeds. In the same way, vices are not mere feelings or thoughts, but cause evil deeds. Man deals only with those moral values which are involved in his activity or behavior and make them part of his culture. Thus, the construction of the world of moral values and phenomena is a real historical process based on the dialectics of the objectifying and de-objectifying moral consciousness and behavior as essential elements in the human assimilation of the world.

Morality without practical implementation and a corresponding culture would not only create a conflict in one's mind, but actually alienate the individual from the world; a morality defined only as a dimension of mind or consciousness would have nothing in common with the real world. Hence, the link between morality and life is one of the most important factors constituting morality as a socio-cultural phenomenon.

Morality is a treasure house of human culture which promotes humankind. It characterizes the individual, not in the isolated sense of an Adam or Robinson Crusoe, but in his quality as a cultural-historical personality and a citizen of society. It is the richness of man's social relations in a particular ethnic group, social class or cultural unity.
In a certain sense, moral culture creates man, for it reflects the moral principles and values of human society and community. It is the quintessence of the spiritual power of man and is most manifested in philanthropy and compassion. But it is a sophisticated value, complex with many faces which reflect that actual morality functions as a real, not an imaginary, cultural phenomenon. Because its main forms are the moral culture of personality, on the one hand, and the moral culture of society, on the other, its theoretical analysis leads logically to the question of the social dynamics of moral values, their cultivation in the consciousness and behavior of people as well as of each person. Hence the challenge of our time is not only of a political, economic and spiritual renovation, but moral renovation of personality in society. A totalitarian society as a synonym of the uncivil "has everywhere denied the personality in the individual" (Karl Marx).

In our crisis situation, not only society, but the individual must seek moral and cultural revival in order to avoid further moral decline. The recent situation as characterized by new political thinking, revolutionary upheavals, impetuous development of the technological sphere and the ecological menace, makes the problems of personal moral culture of utmost importance. The following sections focus upon two of these problems, namely, the culture of moral feelings, and knowledge and beliefs.

**Culture of the Emotion**

The contemporary understanding of culture, based more on the rational than on the emotional nature of man and overlooking their harmony, is quite one-sided. This understanding differs basically from the ancient concept which associates the person with spiritual perfection and the moral self-development.

Since antiquity Eastern peoples have coined the notion "culture of the heart", in the sense of a culture of feelings. It is often forgotten that the greatness of the human spirit reveals itself not so much, and not only, in thoughts, ideas, and knowledge, but also in feelings, attractions and passions. That is why it comes as no surprise that Eastern culture devotes so much attention to purity of mind, feelings and experience. The notion of culture is understood more as a culture of
heart than of mind: spiritual harmony could not be achieved only through a culture of mind and intellect; one needs the other inner culture of heart and feelings.

In this sense, the culture of the feelings and emotions characterize above all our moral feelings. Hence, the Cambridge Platonists chose, from among all human abilities, one peculiar "seemly ability" which was called by them "a feeling of virtuousness". The English Enlightenment pointed out the essence of moral feelings as an ability to differ between good and evil, between virtue and vice. Feelings and mind were looked upon as different cognitive abilities, moral feeling being called "an inner eye". Usually they considered it unnecessary to analyze moral beauty, for one was struck by it at a first sight. The good caused admiration and love without question and was accepted even by those who do not work intellectually or construct precise notion.

The eighteenth century French materialists considered man outstanding because of his intellectual and moral abilities. According to them, mind, genius and virtue all were the result of human upbringing and the influence of surroundings. First among natural human inclinations was the ability of sensation and feeling "which give birth to all intellectual and moral feelings." In his System of Nature P. Holbach wrote that our moral ideas are more real than theology, but are not innate, but are based on experience as the only adequate indicator of what is useful virtuous, honest or dishonest and deserving respect. Or which is the same, man learns to evaluate people according to their actions and the feelings such actions awake in him. In this way, he forms his images and feelings of good and evil, just and unjust, virtue and vice, moral and amoral.

Indeed, we could hardly define morality without the notions of experience and feelings. Moral culture presupposes not only a certain knowledge and good education, but also emotional richness of personality. In his famous Letters on Aesthetic Education, Schiller wrote of the damage which derives from a disparaging attitude towards emotions and feelings. What we need is a "sound" or "kind" mind, and that prudence which expresses the harmony between mind and heart.
Culture of emotion and feeling reveals the power of human feelings aimed at good and goodness, at love and compassion, at justice and humanity. It reveals the narrow-mindedness of the abstract and pedantic, deprived of impulses, attractions and desire. To live only according to the prescriptions of mind would be boring and weak. For rational and moral creatures true culture lies in the harmony between heart and mind, feelings, thoughts and intentions, ideas and beliefs, words and deeds.

Man is born to be free, joyous and happy, to bask in optimistic warmth and pure feelings. As positive feelings are natural to man, he can be cheated and deceived, and thus made to pay a high price for his mistakes. Dostoyevski wrote that bewilderment of mind disappear more quickly than that of heart, which are the most important. Errors of heart cannot be corrected by facts and knowledge for processing such facts; mistakes of heart absorb and infect them.

Culture of the emotion is without excess and wastefulness; it excludes the extremes of emotion and feeling, of affectation and passion. It reflects the tendency of the human spirit towards perfection and harmony, encouraging noble thoughts and actions by wise moderation, discipline and self-discipline. Culture of the heart saves human dignity by making impossible unrestrained rudeness, impudence, arrogance, hard-heartedness, violence, callousness and any indifference, no matter to whom.

Culture of the heart/emotion expresses that most intimate emotional and psychological relation of man which is love towards people as human beings, towards oneself and towards the world. It embodies the uplifting power of moral feelings which represent the basic matrix of human life, the essence of human existence and communication. Its supreme expression is the unselfish and all-forgiving human love revealed in the Ten Commandments, whose deepest sense is compassion as good heartedness and good deeds. Thus, the "best ruling principle" for our conduct is the pursuit of such deeds as will ensure for us "the love of our fellowmen".

What is more, under the impact of scientific-technological progress, emotional crises grow deeper and more complicated. The loss of emotional and
psychological direction increases. In the state of transition the individual experiences an acute emotional crisis due to which he changes his attitude towards people. He is susceptible to alienation; the disturbance and the destruction of one's self-image and of the image of the other lead to the painful feeling not only of a "lost soul" (T. Shibutani) but of a "lost heart" as well. In consequence personal self-confidence decreases into apathy and indifference towards life, into total despair and even suicide. Culture of the heart rejects the emotional "blindness" and "deafness", the heartlessness, unscrupulousness and inhumanity which easily could turn our world from a heaven into an inferno. It is manifest as ability to overcome despair, anxiety, unrest, apathy, melancholy, depression and other negative aesthetic feelings and moods.

This is not so much the result of education as it is an end in itself. It is a result of appropriate upbringing which does not inhibit the natural tendencies in man, but elevates them aesthetically and morally. However, this would not be possible without the culture of mind which, in its ethical aspects, consists of personal moral knowledge and beliefs.

**Moral Knowledge and Beliefs**

The emotional and the rational coexist in a state of productive contradiction: feelings urge the mind to greater alertness, whereas mind purifies feelings. Hence moral culture does not exaggerate the importance of the emotional elements of morality at the expense of the rational, but organically unites knowledge and feelings, affects and passions, with temperament, character, personal will and conscience. Knowledge regarding ideas and ideals, norms and rules, requirements and duties which express the value of the good does not exist as impersonal information. Between moral knowledge and deed always function the corresponding beliefs without which it would be impossible to grasp one's personal view of life, value orientation and civil position. From this point of view, moral culture consists in harmony between "heart" and "mind" and in negation of "laziness of spirit", "atrophy of will and conscience", "emotional deafness and blindness", and rational frigidity. In the structure of social and individual moral consciousness, knowledge of values exists not as impersonal information, but in
the form of ideas and beliefs. The link between moral consciousness and moral conduct is based not only on the emotions and feelings, but also on knowledge and beliefs.

Moral knowledge is the "fruit" of the "tree of knowledge of what is good and what is evil." This functions on three levels. The first is the sphere of traditional human relations, which function in the form of manners and customs. Traditional moral relations provide us with knowledge on the common sense level, which implies that each nation makes its ethics. Common sense accumulates everyday experiences and wisdom over many generations; by this it corrects individual delusions and wandering in life through the socialization and formation of man as a moral being. However, common sense is effective mainly in stereotypical situations, insofar as it symbolizes the traditions and moral principles which have been proven true over time. These are vitally necessary for every human community because they ensure a healthy moral and psychological atmosphere. But in the case of problematic situations which exceed the boundaries of everyday life, common sense often prescribes wrongly and becomes a prejudice. Thus, the competence of common sense in the sphere of moral decisions is quite limited.

The second level of moral knowledge is that of "practical reason". While criticizing Kant's apriorism, we would agree regarding the leading role of practical reason in the moral regulation of human actions. Its task is to formulate the basic moral principles and norms which constitute the so-called "categorical imperative" or imperative of morality. His notion of a genetic link between the categorical imperative and mental culture, and the development of the whole system of human culture, are quite fruitful. This tendency to exalt, or at least to recognize, the rational aspect of morality was further developed by Hegel, according to whom man seeks both his freedom and the grounds of morality through meditations.

The third level of moral knowledge, namely, moral beliefs and views provides the ideological content of human activity and conduct. Moral views are characterized by such features as rationality, tenacity and distinctness. Their
principles and norms can be stated and rationally argued. By rationalizing the adopted principles of conduct, one ensures their more profound assimilation, so that moral beliefs develop late into moral views. As ordered into a system these constitute the individual's moral outlook on life, which is the most important component of his general view of life, nature and society.

Knowledge is the initial step in the formation of individual moral consciousness. It helps provide the individual with orientation regarding good as opposed to evil in the maze of interpersonal relations. However, Socrates pointed out the paradox that, a man could be very well-informed regarding what is good and what is evil while, at the same time, acting amorally. This "paradox" reveals that, without transformation into corresponding beliefs, the knowledge of good and evil, of virtue and vice, remains but a prerequisite for human actions, conduct and relations.

Moral beliefs, which are the ideological foundation of virtuous conduct, develop through the recognition of the vital importance of the directive force of moral values. These are internalized, they merge organically into emotions and feelings, thereby linking feelings, knowledge and practical action. Such beliefs represent moral knowledge that is deeply rooted in human consciousness. At the more conscious level they directly influence the choice of motive, decision-making and its execution. Thus, moral norms manifest not only an informational, but an algorithmic character. Based on certain beliefs, they have a special place in the hierarchy of models, uniting the "tactical" and "strategic" elements of human activity and grounding the contemporary concept of the functional organization of human behavior. Value orientation as the highest model of motivation implies an active civil role by the person.

Moral knowledge could function only if and when it develops into the corresponding beliefs of the person: when transformed into moral beliefs ideas about good and evil become a great moral power. Ideas captivate our thoughts, subordinate our beliefs and direct our consciences. They are bonds from which man cannot free himself without tearing out his heart; they can be defeated only by being subject to them.
Moral beliefs are the subjective grounds of sanity and responsibility, of control and self-control of the person which realized themselves with the help of personal will and conscience. The fact of the existence of the so-called "pangs of conscience" bespeaks the acute realization and painful acceptance of the gap between personal moral beliefs and individual actions; between feelings and thoughts, on the one hand, and activity, on the other; between the words and deeds of the individual as a person and as a citizen.

Unfortunately, contemporary civilization emphasizes mainly the rational powers of man, ignoring his emotional side so that gradually one becomes immune to the joy of communication with other people. Social mobility, automation and computerization, the enormous use of mass media (TV, radio, films, video, press) hinder emotional sympathy between people so that we remain indifferent to the pain, sorrow, suffering, joy and exaltation of others. Many authors conclude with anxiety that development of mind and intellect are matched by the decrease and neglect in emotionality and sentimentality. Knowledge about good and evil, if not united with emotions, feelings and personal moral beliefs, cannot ensure moderation of mind, drives, desires, intentions and actions, and hence of spiritual good will and equilibrium.

Conscience

The word conscience derives etymologically from the Latin, conscientia meaning "privity of knowledge" or 'with knowledge'. It implies internal awareness of a moral standard in the mind concerning the quality of one's motive, as well as a consciousness of our own actions. Thus conscience may be first, a largely unexamined 'gut feeling' about what ought to be or should have been done. It is an aptitude, faculty, intuition or judgment of the intellect that distinguishes right from wrong. Religious views of conscience usually see it as linked to morality inherent in all humans, to a beneficent universe and/or to divinity. The diverse ritualistic, mythical, doctrinal, legal, institutional and material features of religion may not necessarily cohere with experiential, emotive or contemplative considerations about the origins and operation of conscience.
Secular view regard the capacity for conscience as probably genetically determined, with its probably learned or imprinted as a part of a culture.

Chinese concept of Ren indicates that conscience along with social etiquette and correct relationships assists humans to follow the Way (Tao) a mode of life reflecting the implicit human capacity for goodness and harmony. Buddha links conscience to a pure heart and a calm well directed mind. It is also associated with compassion for those who must endure cravings and suffering in the world until right conduct culminates in right mindfulness and right contemplation conscience manifests in unselfish love for all living beings which gradually intensifies and awakens the mind to a purer awareness.

The Islamic concept Taqwa refers to “right conduct” or “Piety” guarding oneself. God is the ultimate source of the believer’s Taqwa which is not simply the product of individual will what requires inspiration from God.

A Christian view of conscience might be, “God gave us our conscience so we would know when we brake His Law; the guilt we feel when we do something wrong tells us that we need to repent. Conscience is defined as the last practical judgment of reason which at the appropriate moment enjoins a person to do good and to avoid evil. It is an act of mind to direct personal action.

Conscience as Society forming instincts:

It is argued that people have instincts and drives which enable them to form societies. Charles Darwin considered that conscience evolved in man to resolve conflicts between competing natural impulses, some about self preservation but others about safety of a family or community. The claim of conscience to moral authority emerged from the “greater” duration of impression of social instincts in the struggle for survival. In such a view behavior destructive to a person’s society is bad.

Philosophical view of conscience:

It is not necessarily the product of a process of rational consideration of the moral features of a situation and can arise from parental, peer groups, religious, state or corporate indoctrination, which may or may not be presently consciously
acceptable to the person’s traditional conscience. It may be defined as the practical reason employed when applying moral convictions to a situation. Living life of peaceful conscience means to Spinoza that reason is used to generate adequate ideas where the mind increasingly sees the world and its conflicts, our desires and passions subspecies aeternitatis, that is without reference to time. Hegel’s philosophy of mind held that the absolute right of freedom of conscience facilitates human understanding of an all embracing unity, an absolute which was rational, real and true.

Joseph Butler argued that conscience is God given should always be obeyed, is intuitive and should be considered the “constitutional monarch” and “universal moral faculty”.

Kant claimed that two things filled his mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe “the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me, the latter begins from my invariable self, my personality, and exhibits me in a world of which has true infinity but which I recognize myself as existing in a universal and necessary connection”. The universal connection referred to here is Kant’s categorical imperative: act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.

Locke highlighted the problem of whether accepting a statement like ‘follow your conscience’ supports subjectivist or objectivist conception of conscience as a guide in concrete morality, or as a spontaneous revelation of eternal and immutable principles to the individual, “If conscience be the proof of innate principles, contraries may be innate principles, since some men with the same bent of conscience prosecute what others avoid”.

Thomas Hobbes noted that opinions formed on the basis of conscience with full and honest conviction, nevertheless should always be accepted with humility as potentially erroneous and not necessarily indicating absolute knowledge or truth.

Hannah Arendt pointed out: a bad conscience does not necessarily signify a bad character, infact only those who affirm a commitment to applying moral
standards will be troubled with remorse, guilt, or shame by a bad conscience and their need to regain integrity and wholeness of the self. She wrote that “conscience is the anticipation of the fellow who awaits you if and when you come home”. She believes that people who are unfamiliar with the process of silent critical reflection about what they say and do will not mind contradicting themselves by an immoral act or crime, since they can “count on its being forgotten the next moment”, bad people are not full of regrets. She held that conscience as we understand it in moral or legal matters, supposedly always present within us, just like consciousness “and this conscience is also supposed to tell us what to do and what to repent, before it became the human natural or Kant’s practical reason, it was the voice of God”.

John Ralston Saul expressed, the view in The Unconscious Civilization that in contemporary developed nations many people have acquiesced in turning over their sense of right and wrong, their critical conscience, to technical experts: willingly restricting their moral freedom of choice to limited consumer actions ruled by the ideology of the free market, while citizen participation in public affairs is limited to the isolated act of voting and private interest lobbying turns even elected representatives against the public interest.

Emmanuel Levinas viewed conscience as a revelatory encountering of resistance to over selfish powers, developing morality by calling into question our naive sense of freedom of will to use such powers arbitrarily, or with violence, this process being more severe more rigorously the goal of ourself was to obtain control. In other words, the welcoming of the other was the very essence of conscience properly conceived: it encouraged our ego to accept the fallibility of assuming things about other people, that selfish freedom of will “does not have the last word” and that realizing this as a transcendent purpose: “ I am not alone in conscience, I have an experience that is not commensurate with any a priori framework-a conceptless experience”.14

As Emmanuel Levinas has been considered the philosopher of otherness, here his work must be considered foundational. To review Levinas’s doctrine of otherness in detail is beyond present capacities and purposes. But it is important to note some topics that help to deal with the interdisciplinary network needed in
order to integrate the process of recognizing otherness into an experience of dialogue. The relationship with otherness which conditions the very possibility of representation and truth is identified by Levinas as an ethical topic. This relationship does not seek appropriation through representation, but is aware of the appeals form the other which makes demands on me. “One begins with the idea that duality must be transformed into unity, and that social relations must culminate in a communion. This is the last vestige of conception that identifies being with knowledge, that is, with the event through which the multiplicity of reality ends up referring to a single being and where, through the miracle of clarity, everything that encounters me exists as coming from me” (Levinas, 1989, p. 164)

For Levinas as for Gadamer, to a certain extent otherness and singularity are not present, but in the past: the other is different not only from me, but from things and from others. This consideration enable me to understand the double condition of the other as both ego and other in relation to me. The ethical orientation of Levinas’s otherness emerges here in all its dimensions: ".... A mode of being and saying where I am endlessly obligated to the Other, a multiplicity in being that refuses totalization and takes form instead as fraternity and discourse, an ethical relation which forever precedes and exceeds the egoism and the tyranny of ontology” (Levinas, 1989, p. 1). This complementarity dialogic mode turns identity (which is monologic of itself) into a conversational being, as Gadamer states: “It is characteristic of every true conversation that each opens himself to the other person, truly accepts his point of view as worthy of consideration and gets inside the other to such an extent that he understands not a particular individual, but what he says” (1975, p. 347).

These insights of Levinas enable us to go beyond the limitations inherent in Todorov’s three levels of the emergence of otherness, where tensions and ambivalences are the “natural” consequences of a linguistic and semiotic approach. Using such a framework, it should be possible to look at otherness not only as a sociological or semiotic object, but as a frontier or border at which it is possible to pass from one science to another. This is the sense of Serres’ claim (1980, p. 18): “The passage is narrow and rare . . . the path does not cross on
homogeneous and empty space. Usually the passage is closed . . . and if the passage is open it follows a path that is difficult to gauge."15

**Moral culture of the Person**

Morality is a visible indicator of human culture, a mirror of nature of the individuals and peoples. The morality is the universal measure of the spiritual and cultural perfection of humans as the supreme goal and absolute value. Morality is an aspect of human culture, the touch-stone not only of what and an individual is, but also of what one should be as a person and a citizen. The individual is a moral being whose social nature reveals itself through the notion of good and evil, virtue and vice. It is by knowing a person’s morals that one can best understand him.

Humans are only moral beings endowed with mind and reason, with consciousness and self-consciousness, with personality, freewill and conscience. Man’s intimate world, consciousness and conduct function in term of not only of ability but also of beauty and good. Morality is the most notable feature of human nature and culture, it leads to infinite perfection—but could lead also to fanaticism and superstition. Man is moral being not only potentially but actually as well. At the same time, human properties of mind speech, work, creativity, aesthetic attitudes, desires, will, temperament and conscience undergo historically determined changes which differ in their cultural meaning.

As an organic part of human culture morality is an active and universal socio-cultural phenomenon. As a culture it consists mainly in the active attitudes of human beings towards world, both natural and social. A human virtue is a specific moral and psychic ability to create good in the form of certain good deeds. In the same way vices are not mere feelings or thoughts, but cause evil deeds. Man deals only with those moral values which are in his activity or behaviour and make them part of his culture. Thus, the construction of the world of moral values and phenomena is a real historical process based on the dialectics of objectifying and de-objectifying moral consciousness and behavior as essential elements in the human simulation of the world.

Moral culture creates man for it reflects the moral principles and values of human society and community. Moral culture of personality on the one hand and moral culture of society leads to question of social dynamics of moral values, their
cultivation in the consciousness and behaviour of people as well as of each person. The challenge of time is not only of a political, economic and spiritual renovation but moral renovation of personality in society. Enlightenment French materialists considered man outstanding because of his intellectual and moral abilities. According to them mind, genius and virtue all are the result of human upbringing and the influence of surroundings. In his system of nature P. Holback writes that our moral ideas are more real than theology, but are not innate, but are based on experience as the only adequate indicator of what is virtuous, honest and dishonest and deserving respect. Moral culture presupposes not only a certain knowledge and good education, but also emotional richness of personality. For rational and moral creatures true culture lies in the harmony between heart and mind, feelings, thoughts, intentions, ideas and beliefs, words and deeds.

Moral Responsibility

When a person performs or fails to perform a morally significant action, praise and blame are perhaps the most obvious forms the reaction might take. To regard such persons worthy of one of these reactions is to ascribe moral responsibility to them on the basis of what they have done or left undone. Persons are thought to be qualitatively different from other known living individuals. Many have held that one distinct feature of persons is their status as morally responsible agents, a status resting on a special kind of control that only they can exercise. Theory of moral responsibility would elucidate the following:-

1. Concept of moral responsibility.
2. The criteria for being a moral agent (only beings possessing the general capacity to evaluate reasons for acting can be moral agents).
3. The conditions under which the concept of moral responsibility is applied is those conditions under which moral agent is responsible for a particular something.
4. Possible objects of responsibility ascriptions e.g. actions, omissions, consequences, character traits etc.

Aristotle seems to have been the first to construct explicitly a theory of moral responsibility. He begins with a brief statement of the concept of moral responsibility, that it is sometimes appropriate to respond to an agent with praise
or blame on the basis of her action and far dispositional traits of character. Only a certain kind of agent qualifies as a moral agent who possesses capacity for decision. For him decision is a particular level of desire resulting from deliberation, one that expresses the agent’s conception of what is good. Regarding conditions under which it is appropriate to hold a moral agent blameworthy or praiseworthy for some particular action, is that if and only if the actions and/or disposition is voluntary. Voluntary actions or trait has two distinctive features. First there is a control condition, the action or trait must have its origin in the agent. That is it must be up to the agent whether to perform that action or possess the trait, it cannot be compelled externally. Secondly the agent must be aware of what it is she is doing or bringing about. There are two interpretations of conception of moral responsibility:

1. **Merit based view:** Praise or blame would be appropriate reaction towards the agent if and only if she merits such a reaction.

2. **Consequentialist view:** According to this praise or blame would be appropriate if and only if a reaction of this sort would likely lead to desired change in the agent and/or her behaviour. Causal determinism is the view that something that happens or exists is caused by sufficient antecedent conditions, making it impossible for anything to happen or be other than it does or is. According to it, one’s deliberate choice and actions will often be necessary link in the causal chain that brings something about. In other words even though our deliberations, choices and actions are themselves determined like everything else, it is still the case that the occurrence of or existence of yet other things depends upon our deliberating, choosing and acting in certain way. On the ramification of casual determinism for moral responsibility there can be

   1. One who maintains that if casual determinism is true then there is nothing for which one can be morally responsible. These are called incompatibles.

   2. Those who hold that a person can be morally responsible for something even if both who she is and what she does is causally determined are called compatibles.
How one interprets the concept of moral responsibility strongly influences one's overall account of moral responsibility. For those who accept the merit based conception of moral responsibility have tended to be incompatibles. Those accepting the consequentialist conception of moral responsibility have traditionally contended that determinism possess no threat to moral responsibility. A distinction has been made between responsibility understood as attributability and responsibility as accountability. The central idea in judging whether an agent is responsible in the sense of attributability, is whether the action discloses something about the nature of the agent's self. To regard an agent as praiseworthy or blameworthy in the attributability sense of responsibility is simply to believe that the credit or fault belongs to the agent. An agent is praiseworthy or blameworthy, in the sense of accountability, if one is justified in holding her responsible. Some have argued that while a compatibility sense of freedom is necessary her attributability, genuine accountability would require that agent be capable of exercising libertarian freedom. There has been a resurgence of interest in metaphysical treatment of freedom and moral responsibility in recent year.

Moral truths and social change

There are some types of conduct such as killing human beings which are morally wrong whatever the social condition. The morality of the group consists simply of the moral convictions of the overwhelming majority of its members. The individual does not derive his knowledge of what is wrong and right simply by consulting the morality of the group as he does derive is knowledge of what is legal or illegal by simply consulting law of the group. On the contrary the morality of the group is true only if the moralities of its members are.

Morality and Existence of Society

If human beings lived in small biologically necessary but relatively impermanent groups consisting of one man, one woman and their dependent children, if they had no language, if they had no fund of knowledge and practical skills to pass on, if they did not inculcate in the young certain uniform rules of behaviour than we would say that these people lived outside society. To live in society is to live among men who have common ways of life which they pass on to
their children. Societies are artificial ways of life, ways of life which go beyond the instinctive or natural and sometimes counter to it.

Hobbes argues that in the State of nature, men will act either on impulse or in accordance with self interest. Then there will be perpetual conflict between them because of scarcity of resources. It is therefore in everyone’s interest to secure for himself a great share of them as possible, to hoard them for future emergencies, to defend them against possible attacks, to engage in preventive action against others who might become a menace. In such a state of nature there is therefore a perpetual war of everyone against everyone. However only existence of societies, that is artificial, common, generally acknowledged and generally followed ways of life can satisfy all the conditions for the application of moral percepts. Only when there are societies is it correct to say any action that is morally right or wrong, that one ought to do what is right and refrain from doing what is wrong. To live in a state of nature is to live outside society. It is to live in conditions in which there are no common ways of life and there are no reliable expectations about other people’s behaviour. In such a state reason will be the enemy of cooperation and mutual trust. If everyone follows self interest it can lead to a state of affairs which is desirable from no one’s point of view. It is on the contrary desirable that everybody should follow rules overriding self interest. In other words it is desirable to bring about a state of affairs in which all obey the rule of morality. Moralities are system of principle whose acceptance by everyone as over ruling the dictates of self interest is in the interest of everyone, application of this system of rules is in accordance with reason only in social conditions, that is when there are well established ways of behaviour. Such a system of rules has the support of reason only when people live in societies. Outside society people have no reason for following such rules that is for being moral. In other words outside society the very distinction between right and wrong vanishes.

Knowledge of Right or Wrong Outside Society

Our knowledge of right and wrong depends upon our ability to work out in deliberation. Doing so in turn pre-supposes our ability to survey the facts with a view to determining which of them are moral pros and cons and our ability to weigh them against each other. But this ability requires training, that it pre-
supposes a level of sophistication of which an individual cannot be capable unless he has been helped by the experience of generations. In following reason one is not following nature as one is when following impulses, inclinations, instincts. Following impulses and instincts is doing what comes naturally, what one would do naturally, that is without thinking or deliberating. We are not always prompted by nature to do what is right and to shun what is wrong. Being moral cannot construe following nature, and then animals would be moral. Existence of society is a good thing is beyond all reasonable doubt. Human beings outside society can live only the most primitive animal-like lives. Without education, without language, without a cultural heritage to draw on, without the division of labour, without skills, without an ordered and settled way of life, existence is a continuous struggle against nature. An important contribution which the existence of society makes to the life that is worth living is the provision of established pattern of behaviour giving every one confidence and security. It provides institutions and definite rules for the realization of the most fundamental human needs and desires. It makes arrangements about mating, rearing of children, about the way individual members of the society may use their talents to earn a living. Such arrangements give rise to specific injunctions and prohibitions which will be common knowledge among the members of the group. Social institutions introduce great many differentiation among people. They create social position and social status attaching special privileges and duties. There are special rights and duties arising out of the various patterns of life which a society allows. Society arranges for division of labour allotting different task to different groups. All the social arrangements vary from one society to another. The patterns of life may involve social injustice, some impose too many burdens other grant to many privileges. Society has to prohibit those courses of action which, because of the particular nature of social frame work would be harmful if everyone or even if only a few people entered on them. So the people may suffer harm as a result of a single individual’s conduct or as the result of a large number engaging in that sort of conduct, society is entitled to prohibit such conduct.

Dewey Observes

A child is born into an already existing family with habits and beliefs already formed not indeed rigid beyond re-adaptation but with their own order. He
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goes to school which have their established methods and aims. He gradually assumes membership of business, civic and political organizations, with their own settled way and purposes. Only in participating in already fashioned system of conduct does he apprehend his own powers, appreciates their work and realize their possibilities and achieve for himself a controlled orderly body of physical and mental habits.

Dewey shows how the inner quest “know thyself” makes sense only in social context. Apart from social medium the individual would never “know himself” he would never become acquainted with his on needs and capacities. He would have the life of a brute animal, satisfying as best he could his most urgent appetites of hunger, thirst and sex.16

Morality and Religion

Within the wide range of moral traditions, religious moral traditions co-exist with contemporary secular moral frameworks. Monotheistic religions such as Judaism, Christianity and Islam define right and wrong by the laws and rules set forth by their respective scriptures Polytheistic religious traditions tend to be less absolute. In Buddhism the intention of the individual and the circumstances should be counted for to determine if an action is right or wrong.17 In Hinduism “practically right and wrong are decided according to categories of social rank, kinship, stages of life. For modern westerns who have been raised on ideals of universality and egalitarianism, this relativity of values and obligations is the aspect of Hinduism most difficult to understand.18

Religion provides different ways of dealing with moral dilemmas. In monotheistic tradition certain acts are viewed in more absolute terms such as abortion or divorce. Religion is not always positively associated with morality. From the beginning of the human civilization religion and morality have been closely intertwined. Morality and religion have been inseparable until very recently and that our moral vocabulary is still deeply infused with religion.

David Hume stated that “the greatest crimes have been found in many instance, to be compatible with superstition piety and devotion. Hence, it is justly regarded as unsafe to draw any inference in favour of a man’s morals, from the fervor or strictness of his religious exercises even though he himself believes them
Religious morals can diverge from commonly held contemporary moral positions such as mass murders, mass atrocities and slavery. Simon Blackburn states that "apologist for Hinduism defend its involvement with caste system and apologist for Islam defend its harsh penal code or its attitude to women and infidels". Christians explain that Jewish laws in the Bible show the evolution of moral standard towards protecting the vulnerable, imposing a death penalty on those pursuing slavery and treating slaves as persons not property. Some religious communities see the divine as providing codified morality through revelation. Such codes may be called laws as in the Law of Moses, or a community morality may be defined through commentary on the texts of revelation as in Islamic Law. Throughout most of human history religion has provided both vision and regulation for an ideal life, morality is often confused with religious percepts. Many legal codes are merely built on foundation of religious and/or cultural codes; often they are one and the same. Examples of moral code include the Golden Rule (Ethic of reciprocity), the five percepts and noble Eight fold path of Buddhism, the ten commandants of Judaism and Christianity, the Quran of Islam.

Language and Morality

Our capacity for language is innate, but the diversity of languages all over the world came as a result of cultural revolution. A body is not born with the ability to learn a certain language but with the capacity to learn language. Rationality and language play an important role in the evolution of morality. Humans are always trying to pass judgments over their own action and the action of others. We rationalize what we do, trying to understand the meaning of our actions, why we do the things we do, and the way we do them. The way we can achieve this level of morality is by language. We need rationality to pass judgments over actions, but to let the other know how we feel or what we think language is needed. Social interactions are needed to achieve this level. One of the roots of morality may be social interaction. Language is at the roots of social interaction. If we pass language to other generations, we also pass morality through our judgment and we teach them through language. In Judaism they understand that God was the one who gave humanity the ability to communicate verbally and it is the same God who is in control of every language. The beginning
of religious reflection and the origin of language are deeply related. Language, rationality, moral system, social interaction and religiosity same to be blended. Language is important for understanding humanity and how it molds a variety of aspects of what it means to be human. Language must be a key factor in the survival of our species and for development of society and culture. The recursion refers to the computational mechanism that provides the capacity to generate an infinite range of expression from the finite set of elements. Recursion may be the only characteristics that distinguishes human language from non-human communication system. For human recursion may enable us to express our moral ideas about an infinite number of situations, objects and relations. Creative recursive language makes human morality creature of recursion. Linguistic recursion perpetually enables, extends and enhances the range and number of real and even imaginary scenarios we can moralize about. Language stands as a primary means to access the mental states of others. Naming insight also extends and expands human ability to moralize because we can name stuff, we can moralize about. Language also helps make abstraction and this highlights the unique feature of human language called displacement. Displacement is defined as the ability whereby language can be used to refer to contexts removed from the immediate situation of the speaker. Linguistic displacement enables us to moralize about the past and the future. It also enables us moralize about hypothetical and unreal. Language also enhances our knowledge, beliefs and values, virtues and vices, myths, social relations, skills etc.

**Morality and Culture**

Culture may be seen in a wide sense to describe all aspects characteristics of particular form of human life or in a narrow sense to denote only the system of values implicit in it. Understanding culture in the wide sense is one of historical, anthropological and sociological studies. The study of culture in a narrow sense is province of humanities, where aim is to interpret and transmit to future generation the system of values in terms of which participants in a form of life find meaning and purpose. Culture may be thought of as a causal agent that affects the evolutionary process by uniquely human means. It permits the self-conscious evaluation of human possibilities in the light of a system of values that affect prevailing ideas about what human life ought to be. Culture is thus the
indispensable device for increasing human control over the direction in which we can seek changes. The basic human contacts with nature are our cognitive acts as the starting points for further acts based on the knowledge of contacts with nature. Man has no personal human contact with the world of nature apart from acts of cognition. A specific form of intellectualization of nature occurs through cognitive contact. The reality in which man is submerged both constitutes the object of human endeavour guided by intellectual cognition and as subjected to changes due to this conscious endeavours. The intellectualization of nature on a scale possible for man is culture in its fundamental meaning.

Persons and virtues

If the set of values is not to remain merely a set of preferences it is necessary to complement them by the development of concrete abilities to act morally. The progressive development of this ability to act through a series of levels might be called one's vertical transcendence and will focus on the development of virtues. It becomes crucial to be able to know and to choose actions which are truly conducive to the realization and fulfillment of persons in community. It is important to note that moral development cannot be reduced to the achievement of new level of ability to solve moral dilemmas. The ability to judge rightly in moral matters remains one of the essential features of moral growth. Actions which are judged truly to be morally good are experienced also as what one ought to do. When these are exercised repeatedly in the process of life patterns of actions develop habits in the sense of being repeated, they are the mode of activity with which we are familiar. For this reason in the unity of mind and body, one's set of virtues has been considered to be the basic indicator of what one's life as whole will add up to. In the field of moral education such growth is referred to as the development of competencies called 'virtues'. These abilities consist of part of dynamism within the persons, but they must be protected and promoted by the physical and social realities outside of man. Purpose of moral education should be to assist in the development of these abilities, competencies or virtues.

Values reflect the general themes of culture and heritage. These are shaped and refined through personal and free search to realize the good in one self and in
world. Hence one’s values reflect both the present circumstances, one’s on free response to these circumstances and the unique specification of virtues. Moral development as a process of personal maturity consists in harmonizing one’s personal patterns of virtues with one’s personal set of values. The moral development of the person as one’s search for self fulfillment is no less a search for that dynamic harmony both within and without which is called peace.

Moral Culture and Guilty Intellectuals

When an ordinary person faces the problem of guilt, it usually means a condition, which results from violating or overstepping rules and moral norms. (philosophy and ethics try to ground it theoretically) In this respect, guilt is a moral relation of a person towards other persons or towards society as a whole. It is usually overcome mainly through some “good” redeeming deed and actively stepping back into the ‘normal circle’. In some religions as for instance in Catholicism, this redeeming activity is performed through the sacrament of confession. In society, different sanctions regulate the redeeming deeds on the part of the guilty; judicial (sentences, penalties etc.), moral (censures, reproaches etc.) and individual (conscience, remorse etc.)

The concept of responsibility, linked to the above-mentioned understanding of guilt, specifies a person’s relation to society as regards specific moral requirements. These are crystallized in a set pattern of moral behaviour, which is usually sanctioned by tradition, moral codes, training, education and even the language that he/she speaks. That is why the problem of responsibility is usually situated in its practical dimension, which reduces the problem to how much a person realizes his/her moral duties; how strictly he/she fulfills them; and how adequate, from this point of view, are his/her activities. Hence responsibility is always quite concrete and pertaining to the individual. Guilt differs from responsibility in that, though graded, it also may be collective.

We are reminded of Freud when he speaks of guilt. According to him, there are two feelings of fear that constitute the sense of guilt: on the one hand, “fear of authority” and on the other, “fear of the super ego”. While the former regards an external factor whose love one would hate to lose (hence the renunciation of interests), the latter is truly fatal in nature. There is no escape from
the interiorized external authority represented by the super ego. Instinctual renunciation is never enough, "for the will persists and cannot be concealed from the super ego". The outcome is tragic, because one is doomed always to be haunted by one's unsatisfied wishes. To put it in Freud's own words, "A threatened external unhappiness- loss of love and punishment on the part of the external authority- has been exchanged for a permanent internal unhappiness, for the tension of the sense of guilt." This is more characteristic and pertinent among Indian intellectuals as the case with others. The reason that we can advance for such a view is that it is the cultural characteristics as interiorized by them provide a kind of permanent tension for them. Most of our intellectuals, as represented in the Institutions of higher learning, have identified themselves strongly and peculiarly, with their 'culture'. Thus, their fear of the super ego is more acute and pathetic and also their sense of guilt. Therefore, one should not take them very seriously nor regard their prophecies as 'the salt of the earth'.

One can agree from this point of view that there is both shame and glory for our modern Indian intellectuals for they were covertly responsible for maintaining social and political regimes, which generated 'philistine injustice to a class of people who were fondly called 'untouchables'. What deeply involved Indian intellectuals are their lack of attitude and insensitivity to comprehend themselves as spokesmen of social interests, social programmes and the like. They feel at home not with realities but with the ideals in the name of Svadharma and Mahayoga. In that sense, most of our intellectuals belong neither to the times, not to their nation: In fact, they do not belong at all. As Karl Jaspers has labeled, the intellectual is suffering from a metaphysical guilt because he is constantly living a frontier life, as he knows that it is tragic to live on the borderline. In a word, it is high time for the Indian intellectuals to think that the first and primordial sin is hubris, the supreme self-importance that caused Satan to think himself equal to God. The post-independence intellectuals in this country should repent for the crimes in which they have participated directly or indirectly and even unawares. I think this is the only way to let the different voices of the caste, class victims and women win their right to cry out. To accept this radically pluralist ethic of post-modernity is the highest responsibility of the post-independence intellectuals of today. Thus, let us hope that an authentic philosophical problem with regard to the
comprehension and articulation of the relation between morality and human affairs can be a serious issue for the Indian intellectuals. Because, they have not ‘wasted’ their time for articulating the possibility and necessity of speaking meaningfully of a social, cultural or generic consciousness at the corresponding levels. Whatever the possibility of an answer by the intellectuals, it is necessary to point out the consequences and the implications, which are directed to the life of individuals in community, their realities and possibilities. They are not simply theoretical or matters of preference or of pre-established interests of certain groups or certain caste considerations. The point is to make life ever more possible at exemplary levels with criteria and standards of quality, that is, with universally desirable values. By implication, they should correct conditions of excessive authoritarianism or weakness on the part of the state or of the superior babus and the inherited injustice in the economic and social and cultural order in this country. Hence, a progressive humanization of life in the third millennium will mobilize the freedom/equality of the marginalized groups and women in this country, which can pervade, transform and inspire all phases of social and cultural life.

Science and Morality

Science provides knowledge of the physical world and living things. Scientific knowledge about astronomy living beings, and genetics has greatly changed the belief and value system. Knowledge about diseases, environmental pollution, sanitation, nutrition can lead to moral values grounded in scientific knowledge rather than relying on hearsay, tradition or ignorance.

These are times when following long standing moral tradition may turn out to be immoral. History is full of moral codes that have upheld sexual inequalities, prohibition of interracial inter-religious marriages, hard physical punishment for children, human slavery and an ethic that supports the view that rich deserves to be rich and poor deserve to be poor. As Society moves on, every few years new moral imperatives are added to the changing social ethic of the day. At the same time some of the old moral imperatives fall out of favour and are removed. Self correcting nature of scientific knowledge has greatly contributed to the change in moral code and moral flexibility by providing continuous direction for change. The principles of objectivity in science and disinterested pursuit of truth have led
to changes in position on gender, education, physical and mental abilities and to apply moral principles equally.

Care and concern for others and compassion are at the very core of every good moral system. Science offers many examples for the care and concern for improvement of the human condition especially physical health. Medical knowledge has greatly improved the human condition by treating diseases promoting healthy life style thus promoting human well being and freedom. Scientific knowledge leads to inclusiveness e.g. printing Press, information technology, computers and internet. Science provides immense opportunities for inclusive development and growth of the human person and society. Proactive good moral systems tell us in advance how to proceed. Passive moral system waits until things turned out badly for society. Then they condemn action of the past when it is too late. Scientific knowledge tells us that the harm we do to our environment will have bad effects for society in the future. Medical knowledge tells us that smoking will be injurious to health in the future. Science is one of the best means by which moral system can be proactive. It helps us to enhance our ability to be more proactive in our moral decisions at the same time as we become more-able to think clearly and act wisely to solve problems which in the past were often mistakenly thought to be problems imposed upon us by the random acts of nature rather than as a result of human action or inaction. Moral systems use a wide variety of motivation. They range from fear will, shame, ridicule, punishment, shunning and isolation. Rewards, approvals, acceptance, gratitude are positive motivators. Science in addition to positive rewards satisfies both our curiosity and our search for truth and meaning and an awareness of our universe and our place within it.

**Person and Values**

At birth, person though a subject and independent is not perfect, self-sufficient. Persons evaluate themselves and their circumstances, become conscious of their needs and possibilities. Persons are essentially active, dynamic and even in a sense creative. There are two foundations of personal freedom. First, one’s mind our intellect is oriented to truth itself. Second, a person’s will is not limited by any particular good but is oriented to goodness itself. This relation to goodness
emerges in and as the personal histories of persons and peoples. We depend upon our parents for physical life well being and love which suffuses their actions towards us. The person in the context of society and culture appreciates and values the good of an action, chooses it over its alternatives and eventually may bring it to actualization. The term value expresses the good especially as related to a will which actually acknowledges it as a good and responds to it as desirable. Thus different individual or groups at different periods may have a distinct set of values. By giving shape to the culture, values constitute the prime pattern and gradation of goods which person born into that heritage experience from their earliest years. In these terms they interpret and shape the development of their relations with other persons and groups. Young persons look out at the world through cultural lenses which were found by their family. And which reflect the pattern of choices made by their community through its long history. Like a pair of glasses values do not create the objects what they do reveal and focus attention upon certain goods and pattern of goods. Thus values become the basic orientating facts for one’s affective and emotional life. Over time they encourage certain patterns of action which in turn, reinforce the patterns of values. Through this process we constitute our universe of moral concern in terms of which we struggle to achieve, mourn our failing and celebrate our successes. “The new stress on the individual emerges in contrast to the prior state of affairs where interpersonal relations were duties and reflected one’s place in society. In contrast, for liberalism rights pertain to a person independently of society and prior to one’s participation therein. Relations to others are secondary and society is reduced to a fabric of individual interests woven according to patterns of similarity and dissimilarity, convergence and contrast, in the form of explicit contracts or traditional usage”.

By Way of a Conclusion

This chapter is intended to base upon a thesis that political, social and economic transformation of any given society will not yield to the desired results, if there is no simultaneous progress in the moral transformation of a society. Even after 65 years of independence, we are increasingly becoming clear that the post-independence intellectuals seem doomed to be in the “service” of their masters, be it a politician, or corporate houses and religious establishments and relatively
committed to their uncommitted 'class interests'. Accordingly, the present chapter
is overtly intends to throw some light on the following theses.

1. The moral fabric of Indian societies cannot be discussed and understood
devoid of the intellectuals of post-independence India. The moral force is a
motivating force for solidarity and associational values that entice citizens
to achieve social goals together. It gives people to an ideal to strive for and
a sense of belonging. But in the post independence India, the humanizing
aspect of our society has not been enthused by the intellectuals due to the
'associational' character with their political bosses. Accordingly, the
importance of public morality has never been accorded and debated as an
issue in the universities and institutions of higher learning. In fact, the idea
of public morality is a basic value that any society nourishes and fulfills in
its search for goodness and truth and thereby to live a dignified life and if
necessary to suffer for this cause.

2. A central element in the debate on morality and moral culture, in the Indian
context, is the desire to return to the concept of equality and social justice.
A civic culture is supposed to provide resources for motivating persons in
order to develop their capacities proper to such citizenship. Now the
question is: Can the existing normative doctrines, unquestioningly
practiced in India, provide the liberal political ideas of freedom and
equality devoid of their casteist, gender and metaphysical trappings? This
may be an utopian ideal. But the intellectuals have been coping Plato and
his Republic as a classical example of placing philosophers (read as
intellectuals) at the top of his utopian social pyramid wherein the utopia
turns into a terror as the intellectuals had always something to do with
power.
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