2.1. Introductory: *Man's Relation with Ethics*

Looking at the development of ethics as a subject, we must go back to the days of human civilisation to find it in its infantile stage too, as development of human society is much owed and influenced by the guidance of it. In fact, we may be accrued to the fact that it is the sense and 'feeling' inculcated in human mind by the sense and knowledge of 'ethics' itself, that has helped it to achieve a steady ground for attaining maturity on its own for its over-all development of future prosperity and posterity too. However, when civilisation was in its infantile stage, ethics too did not develop further and existed in its crudest form only. It is over the centuries and millenniums that it also has achieved its fullest form with all its pitfalls and nuances developing at all directions of human psyche and touching all the peripheries of human mind. Even in modern time it has made its highest bid and has tried to presage all the human activities and lay restriction on intellectual fervour by decreeing on the 'moral standing' of some such issues.

However, not always Ethics has succeeded in decreeing the moral standard over all the issues that have of late hovered over the human society in general. The reason can be attributed to the fact that after all it is creation of human mind only and it is therefore viable to the change of both human psyche and time. Its
‘Internal viability’ that man has been exploiting time and on to adept it according to his own necessity, it is being his prerogative since in spite of being a ‘godsend’ messages to mankind, it is always susceptible to indemnity of human eccentricity man like to exercise over his own creations. Therefore for man, ethics, as a subject has reflected both stringency of views to ‘opportunism’ he has exercised when he deemed it necessary, and often for his own survival. We can witness the overall development of it, with reaching its pinnacle perhaps during the medieval period. However, the study of ‘Ethics’ only scrutinise and chronicle the true and actual ‘Applied Ethics’ in society only which has got its own crescendo of happenings and a course of evolving for itself.

Therefore, one of the most important features of the relationship between man and ethics is the ‘viability’ of ethics, as it has changed over the periods of time along with the change of views and values of human being. Invariably, its viability had much to do with the third component of society, that is nature. Although western philosophy, predominated by views of Christianity has never believe nature to be greater than human being—man being an independent creation of God, along with nature, nature always has dictated its terms in spite of its viability to human eccentricity. However, like in the eras preceding it, even the modern period gave away to the dubiousness of the contemporary ethical thinking; as in the ancient period, western philosophy was conditioned to the duality of cynics and cyrenaics to be called epicureans and stoics respectively in the following period. While cynics and stoics believed in appreciating nature and
natural ways followed in stringent manner, cyrenaics and epicureans believed more in the theme of happiness or pleasures in life and defined their reckoning of it accordingly. The same parallel views become apparent in modern period when utilitarian ethics has been contravened by the view of environmental ethics. While some great scholars like G.E. Moore or John Stuart Mill started endorsing the views of utilitarianism from the altruistic perspective of human welfare, scholars like Joseph Butler or Samuel Clark started portraying the environmental ethics as the forte of contemporary thinking, emphasizing the greatness of natural law and the importance of nature in human relationship with ethics. However, it was called ethical naturalism or ethics of nature only. In modern time it has been taken over by the applied form of it in the name of environmentalism, cosmocentrism or deep ecology or even as the environmental activism.

**Ethics and Ethical Disagreement**

There has been considerable controversy over whether 'Ethical Disagreement' should exist regarding 'different' moral feeling among different persons occurring to them in the 'same' situation of emotion. The modern philosopher G.E. Moore has put considerable importance to the issue by emphasizing on the basic duality of Ethics. According to him, "This fact, on which I have been insisting, that different men feel differently towards it at different times, is of course a mere common place." (Ethics, p.40) However, the duality of a concept, which is perceived differently by two different persons or groups expressing ambiguity towards the perception of the other one, may not, according to Moore, be different
in opinion in spite of being different in attitude. Therefore, to be actually differentiating from one another ethically means one has to be different from the other one both in attitude and in opinion.

2.2. 'Summum Bonum' Of Life: The Ultimate Goal of 'Goodness'

Each and everyone of us, having positive inclination of life, intend to do good things in our life—whether it is for ourselves, or for our families or even for people in general or for our society or country. However, although we believe in doing our deeds with a ‘good’ motive its periphery remains limited in most accounts. It is believed that the small accounts of ‘goodness’ in all of us together can create the ‘good’ of the world too.

‘Man is a social animal’ — the age old adage remains an eternal truth for mankind, although human society has witnessed tremendous social changes in the twentieth century. From pluralistic to ‘nuclear’ set up, society has come a long way in defining individuality in a person. However, in olden time or now, concern always remains embedded in human mind for the society he/she belongs to in particular and humanity in general. The reason to be found is very simple—like the drop of water creating an ocean, man too has created humanity and however small or big it may seems to be, he contributes to its development knowingly or unknowingly. Therefore, there always exists the seed of ‘goodwill’ for the society in human mind, which can either be called ‘philanthrophism’ or ‘altruism. According to John Dewey, the famous philosopher and one of the most well known scholar of twentieth century known for his views as a proponent of
utilitarianism. "A union of benevolent impulse and intelligent reflection is the interest most likely to result in conduct that is good. But in this union the role of thoughtful inquiry is quite as important as that of sympathetic affection." *1 Again he says, "In other words, there is a natural response to a particular situation, and one lacking in moral quality as far as it is wholly unreflective, not involving the idea of any end, good or bad .......but it has affected those who hold that benevolence is the sole motive which is morally justifiable."*2

However, like almost all other branches of human faculty, whether it is religion or philosophy, ethics too as a subject is mired in the problem of its inherent dualism. When some believe in man's ego-centric ideology, others vouch for ethos that should be based on 'goodwill' of the society in particular and humanity in general, i.e. altruism or 'philanthrophy' that bears the signatory mark of universality. Perhaps similar mark of bilineal pursuit can be witnessed in between Cynics and the Cyrenaics of the pre-Socrates era and the stoics and the epicureans of later period. Therefore, the 'good' of life defined by ethics always seems to suffer from the diabolic predicament of the notion of 'what 'good' we have been talking about and for whom is the 'good' and who should attain the ultimate benefit of it. However, quite a number of theories have been initiating since the inception of ethics over who should take precedence in achieving the 'good' of society: there are the ones who emphasize on Egocentrism i.e. love of self against the ones who are basically propagator of society getting precedence over 'self'. The 'cyrenaicism' vs cynicism, the 'epicureanism' vs. 'stoicism', 'hedonism'
vs. 'spiritualism' are the representations of the constant conflict of egocentrism versus altruism in the world. Ethicist James Seth believes 'there is at once revealed a seemingly chaotic variety of 'good', for which he comments-“what appears good to me is my good, what appears good to you is yours: there is apparently no moral criterion. Here, at any rate, we seem to be reduced to absolute subjectivity. Each man appears to be his own measure of Good, and no common measure seems possible. Yet the scientific thinker cannot, any more than the ordinary man, escape from the faith of absolute good......Variety of opinion as to what is what the Good is, is always confined within the limits of a perfect unanimity of conviction that there is an absolute Good.' Even it is found out that the Utilitarianism which give precedence of self over societal good on basis of deriving the most utility out of our surrounding, is not without the view of overall well-being of the society and believe it to be the ultimate attainment of individual Good .*3

However, it is a little bit difficult to arrive at the conclusion whether the 'good' an individual or the society strive to achieve is the 'end' in itself or only the 'means' for attaining the highest goal it aims for. However, the great philosopher John McKenzie believes that 'the term' good' used (perhaps even more frequently) to signify not something that is useful to a person but something which is righteous and useful at the same time and which is universally acceptable too. He also believes that the 'good' itself is a kind of 'end' for human kind which is aimed to be achieved by it, thereby being the ultimate 'good' or 'Summum Bonum'of life, representing height of spirituality, devotion and dedication for the betterment of society. Therefore, we may arrive at the
conclusion that ultimately it is the element of 'Universal Well-Being' or "Altruism" which overtakes the element of 'Ego-centrism' of the individual human being in particular and society in general. Human being will always strive to achieve the 'ultimate' good in spite of his inclination to do 'good' to himself i.e. being self centred or ego-centric. He says, "It should be carefully observed, however, that the term "Good" also used perhaps even more frequently) to signify not something 'which is a means to an end', but something which 'is itself taken as an end'. Thus the 'Summum Bonum', or supreme good, means the supreme end at which we aim. *4

2.3. The Nature, Comparative Study and History of Ethics

Ethics as a subject is not only part of the establishing of the 'guiding rules' of the society in the ancient time, it also forbears certain characteristics that set it apart from other subjects. We find that unlike some subjects, ethics does not discuss about its subject matter and make a judgment of it, as a subject of study and is attributed with various characteristics that sets it apart from other subject matters. For example, we may find that Ethics as a subject, unlike subject like philosophy does not analyse its content, but only dictates rules that are to be applied according to a situation. Nor does it discuss over issues or the subject matter of it, unlike it is done in case of subject matter such as education, political science or other science subjects.
As regards Ethics, we may note that:

(a) Ethics is not a subject of discussion but that of ‘Guidelines’. It is therefore called a ‘normative science. (b)The basis of the study of ethics is ‘morality’ or “rightful conduct’. However, it cannot be called as ‘art’ of conduct as it does not carry any instruction how to be of good ‘conduct’, but what is good conduct.

(c)Ethics primarily connects itself with the world ‘within’ only, i.e. the world of ‘emotion’ only which guides the basic human principle. It means its rationalization is based on the basic human feelings only, which sets it apart from most other subject matters.

(d) Ethics, as we came to know of it dictates rules and therefore it confines its studies to various diction that are similar to that of scientific studies where one needs to adhere certain fixed rules or postulates to arrive at conclusion.

Besides it, it also has other characteristics of ‘methods, ‘laws’, views etc. However, ethics calls certain subject matters of it as ‘problem’ as and when it fails to arrive at conclusion regarding them..

Ethics as a subject bears similarity with many other subjects in many respects- that is in way of its nature of being ‘normative, or idealistic in characteristic, or an applied subject matter having ‘bearing’ upon practical life, but not a practical science. However, in spite of the similarities, Ethics bears in characteristics that are distinct in nature and sets it apart from other subjects in term of integrity and quality. Because of its importance by nature of its objectivity
of the study and its influence over man's relationship with society attributes itself to be a superior podium for in annuity and further pursuing of spirituality.

(A)Ethics Vs. Psychology :- Ethics as a normative study of science is a 'state of mind' and relates to various 'mind related issues that connects it to the society. The relation of mind and society is more evident in Ethics than any other subject matter. Psychology, on the other hand is also connected to the mind as it is study intended to explore the various basically crevices and 'pitfalls' of mental activities only. The purpose of Psychology is basically not to establish the relation of mind with society but rather the influence of society on the mental setup of the individuals. Besides, it is entirely the inner world of mind that psychology explores rather than the outside one although the mind as the receptive sensory organ relates to the outside world only. Therefore, the difference of the two subjects lies not only in the variation of quest but also on the subject matters each relates individually. That is when ethics lays stresses on the relationship of the mind, with that of society, -psychology relates to the nuances and crevices of mind as a manifestation of the outside influence on it only. Again, being a normative science Ethics decrees directives on the righteousness or legitimacy on the subject matter. Whereas psychology is more descriptive in nature, detailing on the nook and corner of mental activities, although some section of it looks for the solution for mind related issues only. Thus, in spite of dealing with the same plane of mind by both the subject matters, each seems to have moved into different directions to relate to completely different subject matters only.
**Ethics vs. Logic.** While comparing ethics with logic, we find ethics as a subject bears in some semblance with logic also. However, the difference between the two subjects remains noteworthy. Both ethics and logic are normative subjects; both dictates its followers with certain criteria to be followed with for farther proceed of the study. However, there seems to be distinction in such proceeding between the two, when, the logical proceedings are scientific, based on certain given laws, are applied according to necessity. It is not so in case of ethics, although it dictates its norms there is no such hard bound rule, in spite of the subject matter is given. Its criteria are loosely bound and applied according to the necessity of situational subject matter. Logic doesn’t deal with any human feelings, only facts, whereas ethics is related to the emotion of the human being. When the themes of logic are practical situations to be related to, the themes and ideas of Ethics are abstract one.

While logical rules are introvertly used for various conclusion, there is only superficial imposition of the rules in ethics such as laws and methods and theories which are only fixed conditions without any supposition and contradiction. Thus ethics remains socio psychological in nature, Logic remains scientific in approach covering a long range of subject matter.

Thus, we have already come to learn that Ethics is study of ‘rightful’ conduct, the need is to focus on what is rightful conduct and the discussions on it. We have come to know that being a normative science of study, it imposes its moral criteria on various issues of discussion and bind the rule for them. However,
there are many subject matters that ethics seems to be, even since its early days, in ambiguity of assertions and had failed to arrive at a conclusion. Such subject matters are considered a 'problem' of ambiguity and therefore remains controversial among the scholars and ethicists in the world.

Besides, there are other subjects related to human mind and emotions and social issues and practices that ethics as a subject relates to. They can be categorized into the following divisions as its basic qualities:- Postulates, Standard Methods, Problems, Theories, Standards and Laws. 'Idea' and 'Authority' also can be measured as standard of assessment of ethical values. Basically, it is the various postulates of ethics around which other measures of ethical values develop as complex ideas of ethics grow.

Regarding various issues of Ethics, Dr. Mc. Kenzie opines in the following way, "... The treatment of this subject is necessarily to some extent historical. It is hardly possible, at the present state of development of ethical study, to lay down the various more or less incorrect opinions that have been current in the course of ethical speculation. Having considered these and formed our view as to the general nature of the doctrine that is to be taken as true, we are then able, finally, to consider the application of this doctrine to the treatment of the concrete facts of the moral life." Postulates are basic themes that ethics relate to and methods are certain systems of moral order confounded by rules of ethics over certain subject matters whereas the 'Law' of ethics expresses the rules that confound the issues of their limitations. The necessity of the issues to be contained within the limits of
Ethics is to perforce the fact that they are within the bound of the moral order of Ethics.

In the study of ethics we find various divisions to denote the various stratas of the notions of human contemplation, like the 'laws', 'problems' and 'standards' etc., there are many 'theories' of ethics too, to purport the idea of the 'right' kind of ethics. We may discuss the issues in the following manner:-

2.4. The Postulates

The basic themes related to human mind and emotion that ethics relates to, are feelings, volition and desire, will, motive and intention, freedom or liberty and right, duty and responsibility, the origin of conscience etc. Ethics has viewed the importance of each of the subjects separately.

(A) Feeling, Volition, Desire and Will 

Feeling, volition, desire, wish and will all various of human emotions and achieve certain stage of it in association with subconscious to cognitive states of acknowledgement. When we are talking about 'Desire', we must not confound it with a kind of appetite of an animal, as desire is associated with consciousness of a person. Besides, the 'feeling' of ethical consent is also associated with it. We may find out that while volition is reflective action, not having any cognitive effort in it, and which can be compared with that of feeling of appetite only, has in reality nothing to do even with feeling. Feeling, on the other hand, is the basic recognition of emotion and also its reflective expression, it is the intrinsic quality of it by which it identify and direct other associated feelings also.
Volition, is kind of automatic action on part of individual, which is carried out impulsively, rather than with any feeling. Desire, is a conscious acknowledgement of 'wish'. The most important element of it is the acknowledgement of 'good' in such a 'wish'. It is generally believed that a person consciously 'desire' for an object only if it is "good" for him. It does not seem to be very redeeming to believe a person consciously desire something after thinking it to be 'good' for himself. It should be explained in the following manner that when a person desire for something, it should serve him the purpose of an 'end' for himself. A comparative notes on other related 'feelings' may actualize the position of 'desire' in a person's life.

Desire and will, when to be compared in terms of each one's inclination of achieving its goal, we discover that the former suggests intense feeling for achieving its goal, in which it acts as means of will, although it may not suggests as the ultimate way to achieving it. In case of the latter, it means a kind of feeling, lasting for a longer period of time, rather than being intense, and therefore added with a sense of determination for the same. When the Will suggests the intention of achieving its end, the Desire simply expresses wish for the end and not necessarily expresses either an intention or any determination for the same.

(B) Motive, Inclination and Intention:- 'Motive' is one the basic agenda of human actions. When we talk of or insist on carrying on a particular act, we call it having certain 'motive' for such insistence and believe one having certain 'hidden' agenda,
i.e. reason for that. The fact that, one wants to achieve certain goal within a specific or stipulated period of time, one is induced with a force or reason for that. That particular reason is called the Motive.

However, it can neither be a moral reason or a qualified one, as it does not seem to be a 'cognitive' actions. While motive may indicate an end in view and itself as the means for the same, inclination only suggests a sense of feeling or will to achieve but not necessarily any presence of end or being itself a means. It iconise a static perception, whereas the former indicates a sense of mobility, which means action with volition, with an intention i.e. a strong will to perform which acts as the hidden agenda. On the other hand, 'Intention', which has close affinity with the meaning of 'motive' besides being difficult in identifying separately, can be defined in close heel with the former in terms of achieving its end, in spite of their mutual difference. When a person intends to do something, he means to do it again, with his eyes on the end of it. However, while carrying in 'Intention', to do a job, one keep one's eyes on achieving the end only and not necessarily to follow the particular way to achieve it. It is the means to achieve the goal or end, which count between the two genres. In 'Intention' one is not very 'particular' about the way to achieve the end and may or may not be 'induced' to achieve the end. Therefore, we may arrive at the conclusion that motive can be a part, or to be precise, complimentary to Intention but not be the whole of it. Or, we may say that it includes the 'direct' intention, it does not do so the indirect Intention.
© Behaviour, Character, Conduct and Habit: While a person is referred to, he or she is signified by the pattern of behaviour by which to relate or to conduct with the people of outside world. Behaviour is the expression of the inane qualities of a person which he or she carries inborn. The word 'good' or 'bad' is attached later to the type or pattern of the particular behaviour judged on basis of conventional 'standard' of morality. Usually, the particular pattern of behaviour or manner signifies a person, which is called his or her character. The outward expression of it or the applied form of character of a person can be called as the person's 'Conduct'. Again, habit is particular form of conduct a person carry in an inherent manner. Therefore, we may consider the behaviour, character, conduct and habit as different facets of different stages of human psyche of an individual.

When the different parameters of 'Conduct' or character are considered from ethical point of view, the question of 'Good' or 'bad' conduct comes up to be scrutinized for the standard of morality. While good behaviour suggests a person incurring etiquette that suits the moral standard of society, the opposite of it, i.e. bad manners or behaviour suggests the performer's inability to fulfill the moral code, defined for conducting such behaviour.

We find that different ethicists defining character, conduct and habit in their individual manner. According to Dr. Mc.Kenzie,- "we have seen that character means the complete universe or system constituted by acts of will of a particular kind. Character is, on the whole the most important element in life from the point of view of ethics, as we shall see more fully in the sequel."

According to
him, will is the underlying factor that dominates 'character', although it is confined within the parameters of space and time and a 'good' character needs the support of good acts of will to substantiate its qualities, he believed. Conduct, on the other hand, can be called rather an assortment of various activities, both physical ones as expression of individual morality and mental ones too, which in overall manner symbolizes the individualistic characteristics of a being which is directed to achieving certain end. Herbert Spencer not only defined such 'characteristics' of conduct, he even believed that even a mollusk can be defined in term of its conduct. However, his views can be challenged upon by the fact that while creatures such as mollusk or even higher kind of animal carry themselves around with certain amount of individualistic characteristics of their own moving towards an end at the same time, their acts lack self recognition and are more of expression of their instinctive behavioural pattern than having any purpose, motive, rationalization or therefore are acts of their own will.

Habit, on the other hand is complete different expression of character. While conduct can be called assimilation of various behavioural patterns of character, habit can be called as the expression of the characteristics of a person. It is the outward manifestation of the inane qualities of a human being, which shows not only the level of refinement of behaviour, but also the moral standard of an individual. Therefore it can be called, as in definition of Socrates and Aristotle that virtue is not only knowledge but also kind of habit. However, if habit is kind of reflection of the character a human being possesses, then it is a fact that such habits
can be improvised upon its former ways or patterns and thereby its moral qualities being boosted to achieve the expected podium. Thus, habit, unlike character, itself reflects certain qualities that are conditional to inane qualities of moral values of conduct and therefore is the ultimate expression of moral standard of an individual.

2.5. Standard of Ethics

(A) Happiness: Happiness is one of the primary postulates, which also can be called as the axis of western ethical thinking. It is an end, the means of achieving of which remained a matter of contemplation in western thinking. Followers of different standards of value perceived it different ways; for example, hedonists believe happiness can or should be achieved through sensible pleasures only. So was basically the views of the Cyrenaics in ancient Greece, the land or origin of ethics, although Socrates, the mentor of its thinking believed it can be attained through acquirement of knowledge and virtue only. At later stage, Epicureans believed in a pessimistic approach, that it can be achieved through the experience of pain, so as to understand the joy of pleasure, and therefore happiness. At the beginning of modern era, utilitarian, believed it could be attained through altruistic motives, that is, basically for the betterment and welfare of human kind. For them pursuing such happiness even by relegating our surrounding, that is, nature or its paraphernalia, that is the resources is not committing any misdeed or sin, and therefore are conceded of or approved by moral justice.
Duty, while looked at in relation to Happiness and Perfection, may have completely different perspective than in terms of its relation with such other postulates as responsibility and the right. According to Dr. McKenzie, “If we describe the two opposing theories of as those of Duty and Happiness, the term perfection may appropriately be used to characterize the middle theory, which to large extent, combines the other two.”

**Duty**

Duty is believed to be one of the primary postulates in Ethics. Duty as the standard and the theories evolving around it asserts it to be one of the primary obligation of an individual in society. In fact, in religio-philosophy of Hinduism emphasizes so much on ‘Duty’ that it seems to be indispensable and therefore inseparable from its ethical views. It is also the primary postulates of Indian ethics. However, It does not seems to have occupied such an important place in western philosophy, at least not more than as a postulate of the morality of ethics.

Human kind, are entrusted with certain responsibility, towards his own family members, to each in an individual manner as well as towards society in generals and certain members of it in particular form. The concept of duty, the rudimentary form of which can be found even among the other living beings such as animals, birds and even creatures like fish, spider etc.
Often mankind seems to have so much to learn from some of them regarding the performance of duty that philosopher like Plato considered a small living being of bird as the standard and ideal forbearer of virtue. However, before performing one's own duty, one needs to bring in certain considerations as rational basis for further more complex set of duties other than those carried out by animals, as man needs to substantiate his values to be based on certain rational criteria. Among such criteria, we find freedom, judgment etc. to be considered for as the basis of duty. However, such criteria or postulates are to be considered as the objects of respect (or respected as the primary criteria for consideration) for duty. The postulates to be respected as the basis for duty are reasonified for various considerations.

**Duty and Responsibility**

A man comes to the earth, duty bound, and he may bear in many responsibilities entrusted upon him. For example, when we say that it is our duty to take care of our children and educate them, we understand that we are taking the responsibility for fulfilling them, besides being bound to do it. From the example, we may derive the fact that man, as a social animal is bound with certain duties to other human beings if not all, but with those he is socially or situation wise connected with. On the other hand, man may have responsibility, to which he may be bound or not, although carrying responsibility may be part of fulfilling one's duty only. Responsibility may not always be binding situation wise but by socially only. Therefore, we may believe that carrying out responsibility is the
means for fulfilling one's duty. While duty is a reality, responsibility is a condition only. The former is long lasting, whereas the other is temporal and exist for a duration only. To perform duty, one must be having responsibly for taking charge of the situation, otherwise it would remain unfulfilled. Likewise, a man is ethically bound by duty to his family that born him, to the nation that feed him and the society that nurture him and to the children he gave birth to. A man is duty bound to them all due to the situational bond to them. But, being responsible always does not suggest to be duty bound. For example, the eldest boy of a group took responsibility to get them work throughout the day. Here, the boy is not duty bound but taken responsibility of the work to be done. Again, the ethical responsibility a person holds towards his society is not duty bound but conditional only.

**Conscience**:- The conception of Conscience holds important role in ethics. It is believed to be higher kind of psychological exercise that may be lacking in animal habit and tribal self of a person. The state of conscience in the mind of a man transcends his basic feeling and act as a superior conduct in terms of judgment, and rationalization. Regarding the origin of conscience as an ethical instrument, Clifford brings into context the tribal self and its influence on the common beings' selves. According to W.R. Sorley, "Conscience is supreme in man, and represent the divine purpose."*8
2.6. THE THEORIES OF ETHICS

There are many postulates in Ethics, upon which various theories regarding the moral values applied in different concern of Ethics are brought into consideration. In such manner, we get various theories such as that of duty, pleasure and perfection. While most of the theories of ethics, western or oriental revolve around duty and pleasure, emphasized by oriental and western philosophy respectively, the theory of perfection can be called as revolving between the two genres of theory.

However, we may find difference between the various ‘Views’ in relation to the theories of ethics as views only surmise opinions, whereas theories propound certain ideas which are based on proto typical characteristics derived from various events.

(A) Right and Obligation:– When we talk of the ‘Right’ of a person, we talk of the person ability to take over or possess of the particular object or matter in whatever manner it is deemed required to do so. Then again, in another context, when we talk of a person having ‘obligation’ to someone or an institution, whether a materialistic or abstract one, (such as the institutions of family, or marriage etc) we believe him or her to owe the person or institution something or has got certain duty to follow upon towards it, so that in certain way he or she has to make up for the owing or the particular duty. For example, when we say that ‘he has obligation towards his uncle’ we understand that he must be owing something for which he has to comply it with. Only, then he will attain freedom or
right over the old situation or any object. For example, we may understand from the earlier instance that he has obligation of duty towards his uncle, either because he owes his uncle financially for which he would have to make up the same way or by fulfilling and carrying out other task, or by fulfilling his obligations the same way, he may inherit his uncle's property i.e. get his right over it in the given way. From here, we may arrive at the finding that right and obligation can be complimentary to each other if not mutually supplementary for the same situation. One way, we can call them (right and obligation) the two sides of a coin, whether in regard to materialistic consideration or moral ones but not necessarily of the same coin, as by fulfilling obligation for owing someone something, a man may retract his freedom or right over it, i.e. moral right only, in which case, he may not gain any materialistic right, unless he did not owe and was 'obligated' to fulfill his duty only to gain the materialistic 'right' only.

However, the same condition is applicable when we are talking about the ethical right and obligation or to be precise, right and obligation of highest order. Besides the self related persons or issues, man has certain obligation towards the society in particular and humanity in general. Therefore, from ethical point of view, each individual should expense with certain amount of time for the society with beneficial works, to fulfill his obligation, whereas, he automatically owns moral right over, different issues of society for which he can dispense with beneficial ideas.
(B)Freedom and Liberty:- Freedom is one of the condition that the ethical state of
mind crave to achieve. According to Robert Owen, 'freedom of man is depended
upon his circumstances only and determined by it as well. It seems every person is
bound by numerous obligations including duties towards others in family and
society, therefore is left with little Freedom of his mind to allow himself to act upon
his own right. However, freedom does not merely suggest in being free of mind,
time and space. It shows the deliberation of one having his 'freedom', that is
when it is exercised, and that is when it is applies to one's preferences of
something over other things. We find that freedom can be of two notions,_{
External and Internal, and often when external notions are improved upon to
enhance its conditions, necessarily it does not assert the achievement of it
internally.

Again, there are other situations to assert that freedom, when unbound of any
internal restriction, i.e. obligations or directions, can act in any manner,- right
from animal subversity to impulsive actions. Therefore it is believed to be brought
into the context of ethical perspective to scrutinize 'freedom.' The act of
'necessity,' on the other hand, acts as the detrimental quality going against the
interest of it. Regarding both the acts, Dr. Mc.kenzie opines in the following
manner,_{"But there is no contradiction when we observe precisely what is the
nature of freedom and what is the nature of necessity that is demanded. The
necessity means simply the uniform activity of a given character. The freedom on
the other hand, means simply the absence of determination by anything outside
the character itself."*9 Therefore we may find that given freedom, there are various
stages of it, to indicate the state of mind by the exercising ‘character’. When some exercise lower kind of freedom, a person knowing the ‘liberty’ of it, may exercise the higher kind which means using it for better benefit and or for ethical reason for greater interest of human kind.

(C)Judgment, Crime and Punishment:- Although from analytical point of view, judgment and crime and punishment are two different genres of ethics, they are intrinsically connected as complementary to each other in relation to ethical values. Judgment, to be precise, ethical judgment must take into account various standards of values in ethics-such as ‘righteousness’, decisiveness, morality, welfare, duty and above all consciential propriety, etc. Crime, an ethical sin, and theoretically considered as pathological ethics, is considered as desecration of values and therefore antithesis of the good of society. Since society needs to maintain the values intact to maintain it’s good, hence the onus is with judgment to maintain the parity of it. Therefore crime is followed by punishment of its perpetrator, so as to maintain the ethical balance of the society.

2.7. THE LAWS OF ETHICS

The laws of Ethics can be called a kind of perspective, for the issues it relates to. Over certain issues and perspectives, Dr. Mc.Kenzie, the famous ethicist has defined and categorised the laws into the following subject matters:-

(A) Law of God:- the Law of God suggests that it is different from the diction of moral Authority, moral or otherwise. Such a diction is believed to be surmised
above the land and as words of God. However, on the rationalizing its moral authority, the most prominent instance of such a law can be exampled as where it is considered as 'Words of God'. But such a claim lacks justification, since if it is a sermon of moral authority by dint of the superior power for God, than it is a 'must' and not an 'aught'. Again, if God is to be considered as self righteous, there will have to be a law which is above the law of God so as to judge his 'actions'. However, such an imagined authority above that of God puts in dilemma with the finality of law of God and therefore it does not hold consistency as calling the Law of God as final law.

(B) Law of Nature:- In order to get over the problem of dilemma of the authority of God explained from the point of view of Law of God, it is next in the Law of Nature, which is attempted to be proven as the final authority of morality. The Law of Nature held a considerable importance in ethics of Greek philosophy, as the conception of nature took root as the most fundamental law on earth, therefore the ultimate one. Its importance was so impressive for the stoics that they considered living by the 'standard of nature only (vivre conventer nature). Even it took important role at the beginning of modern time, that is later part of seventeenth century and most of eighteenth, among the elite ethicists such as Samuel Clark or Butler to base their ethical conception on Law of Nature. Clark justified the inherent difference of logistic existence of ethics and nature as that of any two conception with their basic individuality but being rooted of the same law on earth, which is the final and ultimate one. "The differences, relations and proportion of things both natural and moral, in which all unprejudiced minds
thus naturally agree, are certain, unalterable, and real in the things in themselves.”

*10 Samuel Clark believed so. Besides, he said, “The reason of all men everywhere naturally and necessarily assents, as all men agree in their judgment concerning the whiteness of snow or the brightness of the Sun.” *11 Regarding the difference between the two he explains that the difference and relation of the two subject matters, their applications and non-application or fitness and unfitness of conditions are same as that of similarity and difference between two figures of geometry and arithmetic.

However, the inherent difference between the two also counts when we witness two contradictory qualities in Nature. For example, we find that nature’s fury may cause the devastation of its own creation whereas, on the other hand, the planetary system of it will continue with the eternal rule of its own. Both the qualities stem from the same rule of ‘fitness’ of things, but stand at the contradictory position of the criteria for the law of destruction to the law of creation at the same time, which is beyond the logical conclusion of any rule on earth, besides, being only partially at rhythm with ethics, and not in overall manner, in spite of their relationship and the differentiation.

Therefore, the self contradictory ‘logicality of existence of Nature’ had put into jeopardy the claim that the law of nature is the final and ultimate Law on Earth.

( C) *Law of Morality:* The Law of Nature being proven to be inadequate to explain its superiority to other laws, we may resort to The Law of Morality to scrutinize
its supposed ultimate position as the final Law on earth. The Law of Morality suggests that the moral sense which prevails on our mind prior to carrying out any activity over is 'righteous' ness or wrongfulness of it, is the ultimate law on earth. Ethicist Shaftesbury speaks so in the following passages regarding the conception of being virtuous which means being virtuoso at the same time, ... “To philosophise in a just signification is but to carry good breeding a step higher.”*12

That is we should carry our moral orders, not only for others but also for being of superior order of 'rational' kind, therefore for ourselves too. The theme to be surmised from such a rhetoric is that any rational person would abide by the law of morality i.e. the code of it he or she had learnt since his childhood, will be applied in all the spheres of his or her life. Dr. McKenzie the great ethicist explains that in the following way, ... “From this point of view it may be quite rightly be maintained that the moral law becomes a second nature, so that the choice of the right and avoidance of the wrong passes almost into a kind of instinct. From this point of view it may be quite rightly be maintained that moral sense is a kind of taste.”13

However, the question that comes over here is that as aesthetical point of view points out, when it comes to the question of taste it may vary from person to person, place to place and society to society. In fact, the criteria for 'ethical standard' vary like wise too. Therefore if according to the law of morality certain act be considered morally 'rightful' in one place or society, it may not be considered so in another place, therefore, the law projected as ultimate diction for man may not be held true elsewhere. Therefore it will lack the criteria of
universally being accepted as the ultimate law. Therefore, the duplicity of situation debar it from being called the final and ultimate law.

(D) Law of Reason: The law of Reason, basically propounded by Immanuel Kant, who established Intutionalism, is based on the idea that there are certain 'universal moral truths which can be deduced from certain rational facts, the same way we may deduct 'thought' from intelligence of our lives. According to Kant, the fact that there are causes for every action or situation created, (for example milk is always the cause of curd or yogurt, or two plus two will always make it four) and which are explainable to one, means that we have a rational insight into it and a kind of moral consciousness lying beneath the realization of the existence of such eternal truths. However, with such a dependence on moral consciousness along with the faith on the irreversibility of nature's way, we may not find too many difference of such a law of reasoning having not much of difference with the law of Nature.

The Law of Reason has, besides, born striking similarity with the law of Nature, according to the Stoics too. They believe that both are synonymous with each other, as they believed the law of Nature being itself a rational system as it seems to follow certain kind of reasons only.

From, the same point of view, we discover that the sense of reason which encourage a man to carry out his duties and do all the deed he consider to be righteous, so it does give him a sense of refraining himself from all the deeds that seems 'not righteous' too. However, such acts are decided upon by the fact that
their 'righteousness is decided upon by the its outcome of 'good' or 'evil' only. The great ethicist Immanuel Kant believed that a person would not carry out a wrongful deed because it is inconsistent with his idea of 'what is good.' According to him, the moral law cannot dictate us the righteousness of a task. While "there is nothing good, but the goodwill only." Since again the law of morality cannot tell us more than a way that is comfortable to law only. As according to McKenzie, we find Kant believing in the fact that each act must be 'self consistent', which will assert, as according to his 'categorical imperative' that, "act only on that maxim(or principal) which thou canst at the same time will to become universal law."*14 Drawing an example of 'broken promise', he said that it cannot be a universal formula, because people will have to first make promises and only then to be broken. First, 'brokenness' is conditional to making promises, and only then it would be reconsidered to be 'broken'. Therefore, it lacks in universality as it is conditional to another situation. And 'wrong doing' cannot have any universal application and therefore, also be self consistence. By giving the example he, asserts of his view that moral imperative, which he deem to be categorical, cannot be derived from 'the consideration of any end outside of the will of the individual.' He believed, since every external end is empirical, i.e. based on sense perception, so it will result into hypothetical imperative only. Since again, seeking a particular end means acting in a particular way, which means a kind of 'bound', while performing the absolute Imperative of duty, there cannot be any end attached to it as it is not to look for a good or pleasurable end but goodwill only.
However, Kant's view is not beyond the criticism, not primarily for its 'default' but for the stringent view it carries towards moral perceptions that a 'righteous' person may ask for. For, according to him, not any conduct can be based on 'feelings', but only to be guided by moral reason. Such a postulate i.e. reason is a kind of moral principle which is not based on any feeling or emotion. However, in practical reality, a person's conduct may not be separable from feelings or emotions. Defending such a view, Sir T. Brown, by giving an example expresses that when a person give alms, it is not to appease him but to comply the will of God. However, in stark contrast to it, a philanthropist does carry many more 'beneficial' works out of 'love' rather than by the pure sense of duty to ones that he has any obligation to do so. Secondly, another of his stringent views are expressed through the fact that he 'permits of no exceptions to his moral imperatives' as according to Dr. McKenzie-"Kant is thus led to give us the content of the categorical imperative this formula- 'act only on that maxim or principle which thou canst at the same time will to become a universal law.'15. When Kant has put his Imperative in a way of a kind of 'commandment', in reality a person does not follow any such dictum to decide upon the 'morality' of an issue, but rather depend on his own sense of 'righteousness' only. Besides, not every 'righteous' occasion is reflection of 'eternal truth', but may occur as 'exception' to the rule also. For example, the heroic deeds are exceptions only, not common acts carried out in day to day life by everybody. Again, when a person do great activities for his country, (for example we may put forward the instance of Mahatma Gandhi who in an act of exceptional courage) put his non violent
battle against the British to liberate his motherland), he or she does it out of the conviction that no one else can carry it out. Therefore, it certainly cannot be a generalized case of Moral imperative of reason.

However, when the Law of Reason propounded by Kant seems to be too harsh to follow in practical life, other 'law's are considered too 'lax' to be considered as the final and the ultimate necessity as the law on earth. When we cannot hope that every 'exceptional' rule, has to be applied by 'everyone if a similar situation is arrived at, there is no explanation to the fact that the 'act' that is carried out consciously has been done so under the notion of any 'rational plea'.

(E) Law of Conscience:-When law of moral sense was strongly opposed by Joseph Butler who believed it to be inadequate as the ultimate law of account because of the fact that morality may have different standard at different places and therefore lack in universal application. According to him, that man has got many instincts to act accordingly in the world and the fact that he has to control and drive them in righteous way to gain his goal, so that the instincts which are subordinate to Self love become benevolent to others. However, he further adds that there are certain principle which is superior to such feelings and which presents itself as reflective concern for the law of righteousness. Butler believes it is conscience addiction which is impersonal in attitude and guides us through our deeds in righteous perspective. He said, "Thus that principle, by which we survey, and either approve or disapprove our own heart, temper, and actions, is not only to be considered as what is in its turn to have some influence; which may
be said of every passion, of the lowest appetites." However, this particular law overshadows our mind with two contradictions the first being as it is explained that it is a simplistic and inexplicable law that lay down the guidelines in our lives. The other is that is a kind of 'intelligible authority' which guide us by its rational reflections. However, to find a proper definition to his 'Conscience' a close look at his philosophy indicates that the first kind can be called as Intuitionalism, whereas the other can be called as the Law of Reason.

(F) Law of Tribe:- The Law of Tribe can be called as one of the earliest laws based on primitive notion of 'moral authority'. The law of Tribe believes in one supreme authority of society, who dictates the acts to be done and make judgment on the result of such acts. However, such a law cannot be considered the final one, not to speak of being the ultimate one, as besides being conditional to the fact that any individual can be fallible in his her judgment, not to speak of only as the supreme authority, but also because of the fact that what kind of 'criteria,' being applied for judgment of acts. Thus, the Law of Tribe falls short of expectation far more due to its fallibility besides being inconsequential in respect of universality.

2.8.HISTORY OF ETHICS: (Western)

The developmental stages of 'Ethics can be divided into three major periods of time, namely_

(1) Ancient period,(2) Medieval period and (3) Modern period.
1. **ETHICS : ANCIENT PERIOD**

Along with development of various civilisations in the world in ancient time, Ethics as a subject also developed along with them to attain its zenith during the period of post medieval era, when European civilization academically achieved its peak. Ethics as a part of philosophy also developed in many other countries such as India, China, Persia etc. However, it is the Greek, i.e. the ancient period of European Ethics when it seems to achieve its fullest development and set the trend of western thinking of its moral values to be followed in the later period. The study of ethics in Greek period started with its appreciation of nature, as many of the scholars believed following the path of nature would restrain them from committing or indulging in excessiveness and would keep them within the bounds of 'morality'. But soon they discovered the limitations of learning through 'nature' and started exploring other avenues of philosophy for acquiring knowledge of the world beyond and within the mind. However, it is only ethics that Greek civilization started with its quest for knowledge and Greek philosophy will remain synonymous with ethics as its beginning. Some of the great Greek philosophers who are considered not only greatest by Greek standard but also the ones of world Philosophy, started their quest of knowledge by experimenting with Ethics only. Their views on Ethics set the rules for its studies for the subsequent periods of history of human civilization. The great 'Trio' of Greek philosophy are namely Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. However, Greek history is replete with the contribution of many other great philosophers such as Democritus, Heraclitus, Aristophanes etc. The former two are
considered the harbingers of Stoic and Epicurean Ethics of Greek philosophy. The follower of Socrates were known in Greek philosophy as the Sophist only. Some other well known scholars belonging to Greek philosophers are Aristipus, Hibbius, Aristophanes etc.

**The Early Greek Ethics**

The early Greek philosophy started with, as mentioned earlier, with the study of Ethics only. At the beginning of it, the followers of ethics abode by stringent regulations that encouraged them to respect the ways of nature, which was believed to be the ultimate goal for them. However, over a period of time, such views took change of importance and was replaced in later period by 'quest for knowledge' i.e. Metaphysics. Some of the great Greek scholars preceding the time of Socrates are as follows:-

Heraclitus (circa 530 B.C. - 470 B.C.) started with his ethical view on stringent moral values and subsequently he was known to be the originator of 'Stoic' ethics. He was followed by Democritus (circa 460 B.C. - 370 B.C.) who on the other hand propounded the value of 'pleasure' as the root of all virtues and thereby establishing the 'Epicurean' values of Greek philosophy. Such views on their part signified them as 'weeping' and the 'laughing' philosophers. Their approach to ethics, which is considered as 'basic' to have influenced the views of many scholars of later period of history of ethics has been identified as a major contention of discussion and a 'problem' of Ethics among the scholars of philosophy for all-time to come.
Heraclitus believed that 'the great aim of moral life is to secure the victory for the 'bright and the 'dry' by which he tried to signify 'his fundamental moral principle to be 'fire' and considered the necessity to 'keep the soul dry', by which perhaps he tried to signify the necessity of keeping one's self in restrain and live in 'pure' form, that is only to live in nature's ways and not indulge in excesses of any material gain. He viewed that postulates were diabolically opposite to the basic Epicurean postulate of 'pleasure'. However, there was no effort on developing his views on ethics into any system at that time.

THE 'SOPHIST'

The prominent sophists who were believed to precede Socrates and established a certain ethical trend that also speculated upon the political situation were the stalwarts of Greek philosophy- Parmenides and Pythagoras. By the period of time they professed the kind of ethics, it was the practice to 'live' and 'think' philosophy to quench their thirst for knowledge. However, The Sophists, who were named after the Greek word Sophia, meaning knowledge, had taken the cudgel of bringing into the fore of a civilisation the 'problem of ethics', which was still in its puerile stage of development. The basic intention of the 'sophists, who were considered the teachers of the society, was to educate the young Athenians in proper mould of thinking ability or mental set-up so as to prepare them to be 'able' citizens.

Plato, the great Greek Philosopher, not only chronicled his own philosophical views but also wrote down the philosophical ideas and views of
other preceding or contemporary philosophers along with the narrations of their philosophical conversations. In fact, it is from his writings only that the world came to know about the great philosophy of his teacher and mentor Socrates. He wrote in details the views expressed and conversations carried on with his disciples and followers by Plato himself which were the treasures for coming generation realizing the in depth knowledge of great sophist. However, Plato often were so engrossed in details that it had been difficult for readers to comprehend which were Socrates views and which were his own. There were other authors too, who wrote on Socrates. However, it was more of satirical version of Socrates' Stringent views on life as a sophist, rather than any appreciation of his works and prime progenitor of such works were another rival philosopher Aristiphanes who joked over his works caricaturing his image to be that of a fool.

From Plato's various works only, one come to know of the views of the sophists. From his book 'Protagoras', we come to know Protagoras' ethical and philosophical views, so as that of Gorgias too.

The Sophists were a term for the 'expert' in any conceivable field of knowledge or skill whether of literature or arts. Their name 'Sophist', derived from the word 'Sophia' meaning expert skill, generally meant 'Wisdom'. In Plato's writing, we come to know of Protagoras' view in the following way—"If (a pupil) come comes to me, he will learn... prudence both about his private affairs and affairs of the city."*17
As mentioned earlier, the sophists believed in preparing common youth of Athens into able citizens, giving priority to education and knowledge besides being ethically aware of their duties towards family and the nation. In the process, sophist like Protagoras believed they i.e. the students needed to acquire a fair amount of rhetoric, so that they learnt of debate and argumentation to counter their opposites as well as assert their own position in society. Such qualities, Protagoras believed, were ways to the success of being good politician and debator.

However, the Sophists were not always met with adulation but rather with consternation from the people of Athens, for the following reasons: common people believed them to be not only illusionist and trickster, but also their promises for their youths as hypothetical and hoax, bordering on false and hollow intellectualism. The govt. of Athens believing their ethics to be anti establishment i.e. against the traditional systems that were running it, and last of all were despised by the philosophers themselves, believing the Sophists to be scholars for hire, a kind of contempt that was saved by for the common people by the aristocrats. But most of all, what antagonized them of the sophists was their penchant for 'Rhetoric', which was very redundant in context of being pragmatic and finding solution to practical problems. Even more was for the reason that the tenet they put forward to for the 'stronger argument as opposite to the weaker version of their opponents might be used by the wrong doers as for their own defense. Therefore, the idea, of 'Dissoi Logoi' that is 'counter Argument' has caused counter argument for themselves too dependable.
While Protagoras is considered the most prominent sophist, Gorgias is considered the most 'stylist' of them all. According to him, nothing exists; If anything exists at all, it is not knowable and thirdly, if it is knowable at all, then it cannot be communicated upon. Considered skeptical in their approach, it personifies the 'counter argument' of Protagoras only, besides, parodying the words of Eleatic philosophers like Zeno and Permenides. However, apart from their teutological verbosity and rhetorics, their words were considered not so seriously but rather ambiguously, which is expressed in the words of analyzer of Greek Philosophy Christopher Rowe, "This is clearly intended as a parody of the of the arguments of the eleatic philosophers Parmenides and Zeno; but it is at the same time also a quite serious demonstration of the principle enunciated by Protagoras, that for every argument, there exists a counter argument." *18

**SOCRATES**

The most prominent and earliest Philosopher of Greece, Socrates was admired for his association with the Sophist as much it derived criticism for his support for it. However, unlike the other sophists, he was not a teacher of rhetoric like others, but considered himself a student of moral science only. It is in fact Socrates only, who established the ethics and introduced 'ethical values' to not only western civilization, but also influenced the proceeding generations till today. It is said that, initially he tried to follow nature and natural ways till he discovered it to be inadequate for finding knowledge the way he wanted and could not quell his thirst for the same. Therefore, he quested for the answers of his philosophical
questions in 'Ethics' and ethical values and he thought he established also the basis for his metaphysical pursuit. His very views on ethics has given way to the most prominent divisions of philosophy, as the Cynics followed his sense of independence and freedom, whereas, the Cyrenaics admired and followed his tact and skill in 'making the most out of his surroundings'. Later they were known as Stoics and Epicureans in Greek philosophy of history.

However, Socrates, throughout his lifetime remained an ethicist of great calibre. It is only ethics in which he finds the answers for his quarries. As we have mentioned earlier, he tried to follow the rule of nature at the early stage of his philosophical life, but being unable to find his answers, he followed the Ethics for finding his answer in moral values.

All his works are being known through the write up of Plato. Right from 'Analogy' and 'Protagoras' to Charmenides and Lyches and Plato has narrated his rendezvous with Socrates. However, even his disciple Aristotle believed that since Socrates put more of Ethical questions rather than answers, the conversation put in the mouth of him in the discourses narrated by Plato, were answered actually not by Socrates but by Plato himself only.

Even, another philosopher belonging to the next generation, Xenophanes who also narrated the discourses of Socrates, did so without giving the answers to his quarries too. However, whatever were the answers, the questions which were put forward by Socrates, were themselves not only revolutionary, but also happened to be the basis of Ethics set forth by himself for the posterity to come in the following time.
Socrates seems to have followed certain ‘tenet’s of ethical values, which can be named as his ‘Doctrines’ also. The primary Goal or end for his ethical wisdom was to earn Knowledge and he sought to establish it as the primary ‘virtue’ for mankind. In ‘Protagoras’, Plato tells how Socrates emphasised upon all the mortal beings in achieving such a ‘virtue’ which would lead them in life to be not only able beings but also to further their quest for spiritual knowledge. For establishing the ethical truth, he took help of, according to Aristotle, of two philosophical postulates _the first is inductive’ logoi’ i.e. arguments which were based on examples, whereas the other was ‘Universal Definition’ ( from Metaphysics1078 b 27-9). However, later, soon he mentioned that he never ‘separated’ the identity of ‘universals’ and they were instances from Plato’s early works only. He mentioned that Socrates called the ‘universals’ as ‘ideas of things as they are’. They also do not figure in some of Plato’s other works such as the Charmenides, Laches and Lysis. However, the conversation that were narrated did not arrive at any conclusion regarding the nature of Temperance, or Piety, or Courage, or ‘whatever could be the subject of the argument’. By his own admission, Socrates did not know the answers of them either. Even in the works of, Xenophanes, as mentioned earlier, the answer to the quarries were not found to be expressed by Socrates. According to him, to achieve ‘virtue,’ one must not only be ‘virtuous’ but also make knowledge a condition to achieve it. Christopher Rowe, the ethical critic retorts in the following way: ‘only when they(the people) recognised that they did not possess the requisite knowledge of virtue would they be started looking for it”. *19
Another quest on part of Socrates was for searching the soul which he called as ‘Suche’. One can realize one’s soul or ‘suche’ only by virtue of ‘virtue’, the eternal ethical quality that purify and make noble of soul.

Plato, in his work Apology has written in details on the paradoxes Socrates used to express his views with. The way ‘Virtue is Knowledge’ is a paradox, and not a definition, so we come to know of other paradoxes of Socrates as well. For example, ‘man can never do any wrongful deed knowingly’ is another paradox, which he emphasized on to express that a person who follows the path of righteousness would not commit any wrong doing intentionally. By such a paradox here, Socrates wanted to assert that knowing the illness of ‘wrongfulness’, a ‘rightful person’ always prefers the path of ‘rightful’ act to follow his ‘rightful’ thinking. The same paradox is put otherwise, that ‘no man can do wrong willingly’ suggesting, that if a person is to act wrongfully or viciously, then he may commit it out of ignorance, rather than out of knowledge or conscious manner. To emphasize the paradox, he expressed the words ‘Hekon’ and ‘Akon’, meaning intentionally and unintentionally respectively. Since according to him, no one can commit ‘wrong’ intentionally or willfully, and anyone by any such reason may commit it, it must be a ‘bad’ or ‘wrong’ condition of the ‘soul’ or ‘suche’. When vice is a wrong or bad condition of it, ‘virtue is a healthy or righteous condition of it. However, he treated the definition of soul or suche in rather as a conscious state of mind than as a mute identity. For him, virtue should be a mental condition for a person rather than committing virtuous acts.
Some of the modern scholars of philosophy believe that Plato's Republic and Aristotle's Ethics are the two greatest works of philosophy. In the book Republic, Plato has written in details on the various ethical postulates he believed in, including the manifold application of 'Virtue'. Like Socrates, he too believed in qualities of virtue, but interpreted it somewhat in different manner from Socrates. In 'Gorgias', which can be called a book entirely as of ethical themes, contains no metaphysical or political ideas, which were ample in evidence in either 'Stateman' or 'Law' or in 'Republic'. It is also a book based primarily on the ideas mostly of Plato's, unlike in Republic or Protagoras where Socrates' views play the dominant role than his own. Besides, in Republic we find that to emphasize certain view point of Socrates such as the Central Ideas, which lacks in the original ones, Plato is driven to the two other important fields—politics and metaphysics which we find being manifested in the earlier mentioned works Statesman, Law and Republic respectively. However, in Gorgias, which as we have mentioned earlier, we find him entirely dealing not only with ethics, but also expressing his own point of views only.

In Gorgias, Plato starts his dialogue with Callicle, and earlier with one Polus, with whom he discusses about 'whether Injustice, rather than Justice is the root of Happiness. Through the character Polus, and his conversation we come to know that 'he' believed to be committing injustice is worst than suffering it, as well, not being punished is worse than actually punished. From the chapter (474 c-d) we come to know while one can derive pleasure from the notion of 'finesse' of an
act or situation, one becomes afraid of being 'shameful' because it can be harmful or painful for the perpetrator, and one who does cause injustice, such a person acts in a shameful manner only. In the following content of the context of we find Polus trying to justify committing injustice as it is adventurous. However, ultimately it was arrived at the conclusion that committing an act both shameful and advantageous can be 'ipso facto' disadvantageous for the person. However, what we find a conversational felony is that 'goodness' is being equated with 'fineness' and therefore if it can be compared with 'pleasure' or joy as the latter is the 'cause' of it.

In the book 'Republic', we find Plato trying to define Justice as 'DikoiSuna', which is equivalent to being 'justice oriented'. In the book, it has been discussed in the context of running the state in rightful and proper manner and that of such other aspects as education, jurisprudence etc. Regarding the state it had been said that if it has to be good then it must possess the cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, self control and justice. While the self succeeds in controlling pleasures and desire, then he or she becomes master of himself or herself. Plato puts in the mouth of Socrates that 'It is education by dint of which a person succeed in attaining self control of desire and pleasure'. Then only it will lead to the path of Justice. Then again, it is both physical and mental training of education - first physical training and then that of music and poetry that will lead a person in his path of education. When Dikoisuna or justice is attained because of it, Plato maintains, 'If it (Dikoisuna) is the condition of wisdom,
courage and self control, then perhaps we should interpret it just as goodness in general, than disposition from which 'all' right behaviour flows."*20

Regarding The soul, he says that it possesses three parts in all,- Reason (to Logisticon), the Spirited Part (to Thumoeides) and the Appetitive part(to Epithumetikon). According to him, it is clash of the above mentioned parts of the soul, the three that leads to 'injustice'. The three parts are also the indicatives of the states of the soul in order. The role of the higher part is to rule, whereas the second part is to be subjected to the first part i.e. reason. If one is properly educated, then one would roost over the lowest part i.e. Appetitive, Plato believed. In 444 d-e Socrates is made to say by Plato -that, 'virtue will be a kind of health and beauty and well being of the soul, and vice is a kind of disease and ugliness and weakness." *21 At the end of the argument, we can arrive at the assertion that Justice and Virtue 'represent the natural state of the soul.'

In 'stateman' and 'Law', we find primarily the definitions of various political and jurisprudence related postulates; however, we may not miss the traces of ethics in it. In Stateman, we read about the Kronos the divine life, Which is perfect and flawless, and where individual can pursue knowledge. On the other hand, the world that rotates opposite of it, is the world of fate and innate desire of mankind, that is man controlled and chaotic. Plato also talks about 'weaving together' both the worlds.

Towards the end of the book 'Law', we find Plato talking about misdeed and punishment, the latter as more of a reforming criteria than as retributionary to one's misdeeds. It is based on the paradox of Socrates, which suggests that 'all
vices of man are voluntary.' According to him, the misdeeds cause outcome of 'injustice' kind, and they are primarily the factors of anger, pleasure or ignorance. However, we find believing ignorance to be one reason of committing misdeeds or vices also indirectly justify the position of the paradox in saying that all vices are committed involuntarily by the committer.

ARISTOTLE

Aristotle, being a resident of Plato's academy, by dint of being his disciple or follower, we find that in spite of maintaining his individuality of views in large difference with that of Plato, his ethic is basically an extension of further corroboration of Platonic ideas only. However, his book 'Ethics' is not only considered as one of the greatest work on ethical philosophy, it also distinctly diversified the trends of two of the most important ethical conceptions in the world, i.e. that of knowledge and sensibility. Knowledge in one way of expressing and discussing of virtues, whereas, sensibilities deals with various nuances of the emotions of desires and pleasure and to some extent 'happiness.' Aristotle's writings too bear in distinct characteristics to signify his own method of delivering the theme of his own discourses.

While talking of Aristotle's distinct ways, we find him at very beginning of his writing disagreeing with what we can call as Socratesism :- He refuses to give any vaunt to the 'idea' of 'Forms of the Good', because he believed that 'good' is an ambiguous term and 'is not a common element that can answer to a single form'(1096 b 25-6). In his second point, he mentions that all the sciences
or subject matters aim at or seek the particular 'good' to happen and not earn the
knowledge of 'good' and then apply it.

Regarding the complexity of ethics, which Plato realized towards the
end of his written work, and as mentioned earlier, Aristotle has made it a central
theme in his writing, so that the grasp over it becomes easier for those following
his ethics. In 1094 b 11ff. he says, "it will be enough if our discussion has as much
clarity as its subject matter allows; for we must not look for the same degree of
precision in everything we say, any more than we do in all the products of arts.
Fine and just actions, which political science investigates, admits of much variety
and fluctuation, so that it seems that they exist only by convention, and not by
nature. Good things too give rise to the same kind of fluctuation, because they
bring harm to many people; for some have died because of wealth, others because
of their courage. So, since we are talking about things of these kind, and
beginning from these kind of basis, we must be content to indicate the truth
roughly and in outline (also in 1098 a 26 ff, 1103b 34 ff)"22

Aristotle has detailed on the 'nature' of happiness too. For enhancing
the importance of it, he had projected 'Ergon' i.e. work or work ethics suggesting
what a person does, and what amount of the element of rationality it carries along
with it. Because doing barely some amount of works may not suggest that it
bears 'goodness' or 'righteousness' but it needs to be asserted by proper scrutiny.
However, the conception of Ergon does not merely means rationalizing the act
itself, but act in a proper manner too.
However, like Socrates and Plato, Aristotle also importunated upon the 'virtue' as a quality of human beings. But Aristotle's virtue is unlike Socrates' 'virtue of Knowledge' or Plato's 'virtue of Justice'. He emphasizes so much on it that it can be separated and distinguished of the 'quality' of virtues into two distinct identities. Since the virtue Aristotle emphasizes upon is 'virtue' that encourages 'goodness' in a person, or basically the one who embodies 'Goodness', or 'Spoudoi'. He says, "the good for man is activity of soul in accordance with 'virtue'; and if there is more virtues than one, in accordance with the best and most perfect". Then again comes the question of 'Happiness'. Does 'goodness' and happiness can go along; or to be precise can a 'good man' always be happy; or on the other hand, if a 'happy person can always be good.

Aristotle has rationalized his viewpoints in his book X of Ethics in details. He mentions in the book that the happiest man is the one engaged in scientific contemplation; that is the man who is active 'in accordance with' a different kind of virtue, or excellence, the 'intellectual virtue' of wisdom. He had also explained (in the last chapter of the book I and at the beginning of the book II) the reasons of discussing it, the first being it will help into the inquiring about 'happiness'. Regarding, the Happiness, we find out that Aristotle expresses it the same way he expresses about 'Form of Good'. The way Platonists believed 'Form' to be the cause of 'goodness', Aristotle too believed 'Happiness' to be the 'first principle' and cause of goodness. As for the distinguishing of virtues, they are being mentioned as the 'virtues' of the 'Appetitive' part of the soul. Which can be seen either as
irrational or as rational (irrational because it opposes reason; rational, because it can obey it.)

The relation of 'Happiness' and 'Virtue', as seen by Aristotle has been divided into two categories. First, the Nicomachean ethics - whereas the other is called the Eudaemonism.

**Nicomachean Ethics** of Aristotle:- In the Nichomaecian doctrine of ethics, Aristotle has emphasized upon the role of virtue as the supreme good for mankind. Appropriate and just actions, compounded courageous performances justify the role of such virtues. The argument he purported on behalf of 'Virtue' puts forward the doctrine that 'for ethical virtue is about pleasures and pains; for it is because of pleasure that we perform vicious actions and because of pain that we abstain from fine ones.'

Therefore, since childhood a person should be groomed and taught to derive pleasure and pain in right perspective (1104 b8-13). Again Aristotle defines the objects of choice and objects of avoidance. While 'the fine', 'the beneficial' and the 'pleasant' are the object of choice whereas 'the shameful', 'the harmful' and 'the painful' are the objects of avoidance.

The general definition of ethical virtue as given by Aristotle goes in the following manner:—"virtue then, is a disposition concerned with choice, lying in a mean, that is a mean in relation to us, one determined by reason, and in the way the man of practical wisdom determine it."*24. The 'Phronimos' is the same as the 'Spoudois', the good man found in the writing of Socrates. It is believed to be
the practical wisdom for virtue in the full sense, as we discover in book IV, that is which has to be possessed or acquired. Another argument of Aristotle is that the definition of 'vicious' person, as according to Plato-Socrates, who is diabolically opposed to the virtuous one, can not choose his 'end' as he is the committer of 'wrongful deeds. "If then the end is wished for, and the means to the end are chose and deliberated about, actions concerned with means will be according to choice and voluntary.

Then comes Aristotle's 'Intellectual Virtues'. According to him, it serves the necessity for superior ideology, as we need to find a 'right reason' for choosing the practical wisdom. The theoretical part, as defined by him is grasping the truth, whereas, the action, believed to be the calculative part, should be cooperated upon by 'desire'. The theoretical part is called Sophia.

In another section of definition of Virtue, Aristotle says that the five states of virtue of the soul are:- Productive Skill(techne), Deductive Knowledge(episteme), Phronesis(practical Wisdom),Sophia (grasping of Truth) and Nous( Intuition).Nous and Sophia are the states of same mental faculty whereas, Phronesis and Techne belong to the same category of states of soul.

In the last chapters of book VI, Aristotle discusses about the relationship of ethical virtue versus phronesis, in which he says about the latter as no person can be virtuous without phronesis or practical wisdom, nor can he be 'practically wise' without ethical Virtue. Regarding relationship of Sophia versus Phronesis he says in here that Sophia (which he perhaps is equalizing
with present day version of Conscience) is superior to phronesis, although it has
more utility for mankind. Thus Sophia has more 'contemplation' value which
precedes the necessity of moral activity as one needs to be directed by it to
perform such moral activity.

**Eudemian Ethics or Eudaemonism:** Aristotle defines the conception of Pleasure
and Akrasia, meaning lack of control, in the book of Eudaemonism. Eudaemonism is what is happiness is all about, in plain terms of pleasure. He
deigned the idea of classifying and considering it as a movement or process.
According to him, it is attributed with certain qualities of totality and therefore
cannot be considered as a kind of movement only. The conditions of pleasure are
not it will remain an activity as long as things would be perceived as it is; again, pleasure is desirable; as long as it remain a proper kind of activity. However,
according to him, pleasure that is derived from wrong action is not the 'righteous
pleasure'. And is like that of animals'. He suggests in book VII (1153 b31-2) as
'people do not pursue pleasure, they think they pursue desire or the one they
would say they were pursuing, but the same one; for everything by nature has
an element of div continent' and therefore his reason might clash with desire and
than be overcome with it.

Akrasia on the other hand is the conception in which he details the condition of
being overcome with desire or pleasure; An 'Akriti' or weak minded person fails
to control the reason by it. According to him, it can be quelled by the presence of
knowledge in the being of the person. Thus the pleasure of Aristotle, as defined
by him, is pleasure that counts above the pleasure of common human desire, but of superior integrity.

**Stoics and Epicureans**

They were the later version of the cynics and cyrenics respectively. However epicureans were believed to be more of pessimistic in view regarding concept of pleasure than their predecessors, as they believed pain takes precedence over pleasure in life.

**ETHICS OF MEDIEVAL ERA**

Regarding the ethical evolution during the era of medieval times, little can be said as there had been little change over conventional beliefs already set during the ancient period of Greek civilization. Whatever development of ethics occurred, it happened so as part of the religious tenets and espoused by primarily the apostles of 'church' lineage. Even in India, we come to know little of any newer kind of ethics being introduced to the conventional religion or trends of philosophy.

The Medieval Philosophy, on the other hand can be divided into two sections,- The Patristic Period and The Scholastic Period respectively. Although both the periods indicates their heavy dependency on the Plato and Aristotelian definition of Ethics, still it can not be denied of individualistic interpretation upon it. The medieval period of Ethics, also depended upon its definition defined by contemporary Christianity, did not lack in individuality either in its
historical perspective or evolutionary or development point of view. The medieval period was more conservative in outlook and influenced by the views of the likes of Thomas Aquinas, but could not do away with the legacy of Plato or Aristotle.

ETHICS OF MODERN ERA

Around the time of industrialization taking root in western world, medieval ethics has given ways to modern conceptions being introduced at the behest of primarily those supporting and exemplifying the exigency of pleasure in ethical role in day to day life of common man. However, it was also the time of neo-realisation in the philosophical front, and as a repercussion of it, we find many ethicists trying to re establish the classical morality in a rejuvenated way. There were many enthusiasts such as Butler or Samuel Clark trying to bring in the Nature’s role in ethics, as did the Stoics in ancient Greek days, so that people could not be reprehensive towards it, increasingly being materialistic oriented and oblivious of laxity of ethics in such new found activities. But, like the Epicureans in the same old Greek times, there were whole band of neophytes who were appreciative of not only the new found materialistic adventures, but also tried to vault it by justifying its materialistic morality. A new kind of ethics emerged, which can be called as a refined version of Hedonism that existed since ancient times, making ‘pleasure’ or ‘desire’ its primary theme. Such a trend of ethics is being called as Utilitarianism, which emphasizes upon exploiting and utilizing best on our surrounding for the best benefit of mankind, trying to base
on the idea of altruism. However, it barely succeed in its ulterior motive of human welfare, as the resources it asks for utilization is not only begotten at the cost of our surrounding but also is exhaustive, for which no such beneficial activities would be carried for long.

However, there were considerable number of ethicists born of that period, who could foresee the possible deviation of the lineage of ethics during such a trying times of history and therefore tried to put it on a strong foothold of rationality, so that prior to any such deviation, one can introspect the reasonability of such activities, and come back to old value of morality.

Therefore, among the new found promoters of 'natural ethics' were known philosophers such as John Locke, Samuel Clark etc., whereas Descartes, Immanuel Kant etc were promoters of reason as the basis of ethics. There were the even more explorers of the new found moral values, and such neo ethicists came to be known as 'Utilitarianists'. Towards the middle of the modern period of ethics, covering a period of over two centuries, they dominated the scene of modern philosophy personified by likes of G. E. Moore, John Stuart Mill, John Dewey etc.

The modern period of Ethics, which was dominated by newly inducted or defined conceptions, can be divided into the following categories, the Rationalism which is followed by the Intuitionism, and then the Utilitarianism. They dominated the ethical scene of modern period till were overshadowed by
the consecutively inducted conceptions of Evolutionism and then German Idealism.

**Intuitionalism:** Intuitionalism tried to reestablish the conventional moralities performed in our day to day life, into some asserted notions, so that they become part and parcel of our life, rather than being certain optional viability, utilized only in accordance to the necessity of life.

Institutionalism speaks for making such trifle activities of life as duty performing, as it believes 'righteousness' or 'wrongfulness' has its own intrinsic qualities. Dr. Mc. Kenzie describes it in the following word:- "(it) is may be described as a theory that actions are right or wrong according to their own intrinsic nature, and not in virtue of any ends outside themselves which they tend to realize."*25 (p.148-manuel of ethics). Thus, we find that there are considerable number of characters that the conception of Intuitionism personifies and that they can be found in the nook and the corners of history. By simpler definition it means to say that there exists the sense of judgment over our sense of conscience, which is beyond the retribution of any other authority or appeal and acts as a kind of perception only. However, the perception of conscience is not that of an individual's conscience, but the overall nature of it which epitomizes in every individuals. A person not acting in accordance with his conscience, cannot be described as a 'righteous' person and can be compared with any lower being that acts without any conscience approved motivation. However, the greatest irony of manhood is that he may commit misdeed even
when he acts consciously, due to certain intrinsic flaw in human nature. Often man uses his conscience based on wrongful perception too. Therefore, many scholars believe that there must be existing a kind of intrinsic sense of moral value dictating the 'righteousness' and 'wrongfulness' of every act a person performs. However, how latent or emancipated it is, depends upon individual to individual. Again, some scholars find 'common sense' to be accountable for such moral truths. However, some others bring out the question of 'intellectual truth' which puts into question the viability the common sense and the truth depending upon it. According to Sidgwick, common moral sense need not be a 'binding faculty,' laying down principles for our guidance which are not capable of any further analysis or justification' and therefore need not be the tool of justification. However, moral principles can command such rational justification and explanation,, so that 'we can distinguish what (I) is permanent and reliable in the decision of conscience from (II) what is varitable and not trustworthy.

The well known ethicist Dr. Mc. Kenzie believed that both the renown Philosophers- Clarke and Kant did not base their conception of rationality on Intutionalism because of the its basic idea of conscience being based on 'perception' only. According to Kant, there is even more an authority over conscience to direct it on the 'right' path., and that is 'reason'. He had detailed the principle of reason in his Formalism.
In Formalism, Kant had tried to establish that there used to be certain pattern and behaviour that is being called the principle in this context, whether 'righteous' or 'wrongful' ways. Therefore, human being in general tend to sense or feel similar way in a situation, when he or she in a gathering or alone, without being dictated by any other individual. He also established the conception of Categorical Imperatives to suggest the division of different feeling that ensue the different reflective actions out from them. However, not everyone agree with Kant, as in certain situation, as for 'stealing', we cannot think that everyone feels the same way as the stealer, therefore we can say that there used to be uniformity of situations only and unlike Kant believed, an individual acts in 'unique way' i.e. in an individualistic manner, that suggests that he or she, although there used to be universal and uniform pattern of moral conception, he or she is not subjected to behaving in uniform or universal manner of conduct.

Utilitarianism

Towards the beginning of nineteenth century and at the middle path of modern era of Ethics, we find a new brand of neophyte of modern philosophy exploring and pursuing newer avenue of thinking, often mixing and reinterpreting the old moral values with those of modern conception. However, as any student of ethical values are aware of, Ethics too as a subject has been suffering from a kind of duality that puts it very conception of morality into a kind of dilemma. Since he beginning of the study of morality i.e. Ethics, we find it suffering from the duality, in one way, to follow moral value in stringent
manner, and on the other hand, accommodate the necessity of pleasure and desire into its fold, and allow it to be a part of moral value system in practice. However, such a 'lax' view creates consternation in the mind of those vouchsafing for following stringent moral values, calling the others as 'hedonist i.e. one going for pleasure and therefore lacking in proper value. We find the two trends as back as in the days of the followers or Socrates, who were segregated on the two themes as the group of 'Stoic' and the other being 'Epicurean'. Time and on the conflict of the two versions which aimed for 'Happiness' in their individual manner continued over the long period of centuries, till it was time for modern period of philosophy that has become overwhelmed with neo realization of various new conceptions. With the introduction of industrialization, general population was overcome with materialistic inventions. The primary target of such scientific endeavour was to appease the common masses with materialistic comfort, therefore the commonly defined version of happiness, as well as to continue such effort with financial benefit derived from the consummation by common masses. While the mass consumption allowed them to benefit themselves, it also helped the mass to be benefited immensely and enjoy materialistic happiness. In the west, it also helped the poorer section of people to be relieved of many of their grievances of day to day life; such as getting power supply, regular water flow, or even regulated market economy to take part of. Such mass utilization of commodities has inspired a section of intellects, always on the brink of finding a universal theme of 'happiness' of materialistic kind, that to be accommodated into the
purview of contemporary ethics, who have found a podium for encouraging and bringing into the fore their forte. Many such ethicists have tried to find a 'system' or 'principle' in the 'mass happiness' and discovered a theory that can incline on the principle of Altruism. On the other hand, we can also explain them as the ones, who wanted to interpret the theory of personal happiness as based on a universal principle, as they felt nothing counted more than the common pleasure of the mass population. According to them, the other necessities, that of intellectual pursuit and other succours of life should follow only later. The followers of the philosophy with an ethical interpretation justifying the universality of materialistic happiness by utilizing the best benefit has been termed as Utilitarian and the philosophy they established at the beginning of the modern era has been named as Utilitarianism. G. E. Moore has been one of the greatest propounders of the lineage of ethics. John Dewey, John Stuart Mill, Henry Sidgwick etc are also great followers of such a philosophy, which emphasizes the best of utility that benefit the mankind.

However, utilitarianism is defined differently by different philosophers who identify it with different approaches of life. Therefore Hedonism itself can be said to be important from environmental point of view, as it is believed to be a concept initiating not only materialism into western philosophy, but also as vastly responsible for inducing the concept of industrialization in the west. It has professed the need of human welfare in the name of Altruism, meaning love and concern for universal good. Perhaps, the definition of Utilitarianism be best described in the words of W.R. Sorley, "The formula of utilitarianism
cannot be expressed as the conclusion of a syllogism or of an inductive inference. It seems rather to have been arrived at by the production or the recognition of a sympathetic or ‘altruistic’ sentiment, which was made to yield a general principle for the guidance of conduct.”

According to author Geoffrey Scarre (book-Utilitarianism), utilitarian can be divided into four groups in accordance with their approach and view towards their ideology. They are namely Welfarist, Consequentialist, Aggregative, Maximising and Universalist. Bentham and J.S.Mill, who were followers of Aristotelian views are considered welfarist by the definition.

**Hedonism**

Hedonism is also a part of western philosophy, which is inducted into its fold since the days of Greek philosophy, much to the consternation of the ethical fraternity. Although, like many of the western lineages of philosophical thinking it’s basic theme is ‘pleasure’, its end being the same, it is the means which puts its ethical content in question. Hedonism does not believe in God and in their atheistic approach in life, have emphasized only on pleasure of life sans spirituality, since they do not believe in adverse outcome of having pleasure, since according to them, unlike believed by ethicists for moral values, pleasure is not a sin and having pleasure during the span of life does nor result into any ill effect or disregard any code of conduct.

In western philosophy, Hedonism has taken shape of an ideology in the early days of Ethics in Greek civilization, when it was founded by Aristippus,
elaborating on the views of Socrates, emancipated as Cyrenaics and considered pessimistic of views in life. He reciprocated the views of Socrates that the ‘true wisdom of life lies in foresight or insight into the significance of our actions, in an accurate calculation of their results, pleasurable or painful, in the distant as well as the immediate future’, the pleasure therefore being the sole motif or only good of life. However, unlike Socrates, he did not conjure the idea of ‘pleasure of soul’ but that of earthly or materialistic ones only. According to James Seth, “Cyrenaicism' could hardly be the creed of the modern Christian world. For us its counsels would be the counsels of despair rather than of hope.” 27. However, Cyrenaics took the form of Epicureanism in the later development of Ethics in Greek philosophy and which was to certain extent influenced by the views of Stoicism, the evoluted form of Cynicism, the parallel but agnostic of the views of cyrenaicism. Epicureaus, who was the founder of it, believed pleasure to be the primary ‘good’ of life. But he also believed that prudence precedes pleasure and conforms to the criteria of good. According to him, “Of all this, the beginning, and the greatest good, is prudence. Wherefore, prudence is more of a precious thing even than philosophy. From it grow all other virtues, for it teaches that we cannot lead a life of pleasure which is not also a life of prudence, honour and justice which is not also a life of pleasure. For the virtues have grown with a pleasant life, and a pleasant life is inseparable from them. (referred from Letters of Epicurus, in Wallace’s ‘Epicureanism pp.129-131) 28

However, modern day Hedonism is not ascribed with the notion of pessimism but rather by Optimism, as is evident in the explanatory work of
Sidgwick and some other scholars. According to Seth, "Ancient Hedonism, whether of cyrainics or of epicurean type, was apt to be pessimistic; modern hedonism is, in the whole, optimistic."*29

**Utilitarianism vs. Hedonism**

The comparison between Utilitarianism of modern period and hedonism, prevalent since ancient time comes into the context of 'pleasure' the primary tenet of both kind of ethics.

However, as we can notice, utilitarianism has a different perspective regarding the application of 'pleasure' in our life as in Hedonism. When 'pleasure' is considered the 'end' by the Hedonists, pleasure is more or less considered a means to achieve the 'good' of life by the utilitarian. Here the pleasure becomes a standard which brings into question from what it would be derived from. While utilitarianism has espoused the view that pleasure can be an instrument, that is, a means in deriving the 'good' of 'Altruism, that is benefit from a universal cause whereas for Hedonist pleasure itself is the 'good' and it has to be derived from any mundane day to day activities. While with Utilitarianism, the moral standard is quest for universal 'good', there is no moral standard so far for Hedonism for which it is considered as a conception with a degraded moral standard, which has no value-enhanced perception.

*Environmental ethics*: Parallel to the Utilitarianism, there was usurpation of 'naturalistic values which were defined in terms of ethics. When welfare of human had been the primary tenet of Utilitarianism, environmental ethics first
came to be acknowledged as part of naturalism only. Since the middle of seventeenth century, when naturalism came to be acknowledged as a scientific approach, as there was subjective analysis of nature's predominance on man's life, there was a revival of naturalism in western philosophy after the early Greek period only. However, only later it came be known as ethical naturalism as ethics came to be defined by it and even later in twentieth century as environmental ethics. Although environment and ethics are two different genres, here ethics is related to it as man as a species is part and parcel of the environment i.e. 'nature' and more so, man has been related to it in an intent manner, whether as manipulator or a worshipper of it.

The importance of environmental ethics is growing day by day as interference with the environment has put mankind into questioning of the contemporary values in present day ethics. On the other hand, many philosophers believe it to be the panache of the deteriorated values in modern time and also as rescuer from the ethical pitfall. Referring to the need of environmental ethics in our life, Lynton Caldwell expresses in the following way, "An ethics adequate to man's responsibility for his environment need not inculcate reverence for creation, but at peril of disaster, it must be based upon profound and genuine respect."*30

As in the oriental philosophy, ethics has been part and parcel of Western philosophy since the days of its inception. However, western ethics has always been inductive in characteristics and therefore has perpetually been going through
the process of change in an evolutionary manner, although it has been more static in nature during the medieval period. Another quality of western philosophy is it is experimental in nature, as a result of which it has often taken turn which later came to be 'undesirable' by many philosophers. Besides, its experimentation has allowed it to induct too many new conceptions to be added to its context, which has acted hazardous for its ethos. 'Utilitarianism' is one such conception that has been experimented and allowed to deviate from conventional ethical views. Such a conception of ethics has allowed mankind to accommodate the perception of 'pleasure' in form of luxury in the name of well being of mankind. It espouses the idea that every other things on earth can be utilized for man as he is the pivotal character on the earth. However, such a view has come under detailed scrutiny and most of the modern philosophers are highly criticizing and eschewing such a view as basically deviating western values to be economy or market oriented besides being the 'ultimate' responsible for the deterioration of environment for espousing 'egocentric' view and encouraging exploitation of nature.

2.9. ETHICS: INDIAN

Ethics is so much an integral part of not only Indian Philosophy and religion, that it is part of the people's psyche also. In Indian literature, it is mentioned as Naitik Sastra only. Almost all the major religious books and philosophical lineage of Hinduism are basically based on the intrinsic vales of Ethics. Only the question is what kind of perspective of views are laid with emphasis by individual scriptures of it and therefore, which of the aspects of life it
has touched upon. Almost all the books of Hindu religion lay emphasis upon 'Duty' as the iconic emblem of their rules and thereby have set the precedence of its contents or rules and regulations. We find that while 'Gita', considered the primary religious book of Hinduism is the sermon for ethical values to be practiced upon by individuals to improvise their inane abilities so that the relation with the almighty can be established, other books such as Manu’s Samhita relates to an individual’s ethical relation with the society which, with righteous result affected, may lead to one’s sublime exit from the metaphorical world to the ethereal one. Besides, the above mentioned scriptures, there are other religious scriptures which too have focused on some other angles of life. Scriptures such as Upanishad, Puranas and Even Sutrakars can be called a bundle of such ethical value-related concern of Hinduism. As is described by author Pratap Chandra,- “With the beginning of Upanisadic Era, a sea of change took place in the values of a section of society reported in these (the religious) text.”*31 However, the Vedas, which preceded Upanishad or Purana, cannot be called entirely ethical in nature, but more of a bunch of directives of tasks that would ascertain an individual of the sanctimoniousness of his mind and actions. They are more philosophical in nature that would explore the world of its inane realities and rather quest the metaphysical truth than invade the relation of man versus society of its mundane matters, although they are not void of the mention of society or its doable activities. However, they make more effort to direct an individual on how to achieve the eternal state of mind i.e. God, than bring to the book the 'righteousness' or 'wrongfulness' of one’s activities n day to day life.
The Dictates of Gita: The Moral Directives

The approach of Gita in attaining immortality is an ethical one. However, rather than establishing it through the activities in society a man carries through as part of his obligation to the family or the society, Gita has directed and advised on the purification of mind to such a state of it which would help him in achieving or relating himself with the greatest soul that is God, in where one can achieve the sublimity of one's soul. However, one must be ensconced in some ethical 'feats' to achieve such a stature of one's own personality. With the directives shown in the holy scripture one can attain such a feat.

Believed to have been written by great Poet Vyasa, It is consisted of ten thousand verses that are originally comprised in the great Epic of 'Mahabharata'. The words of Gita are said through the mouth of Lord Krishna who dictated Arjuna the warring Prince on the legitimacy or wrongdoing of actions of life and how ultimately it results in one's 'the here' or 'the other' lives. Therefore, although it speaks of ethical values, it is spoken in terms of 'other reality' or metaphysical terms only, not only as social solution of issues.

In Gita, Lord Krisna has given directives to individual on how to restrain oneself, of many temptations that come in form of Maya. One has to practice Yoga and be a Karma Yogi, i.e. keep doing one's duty in a relentless manner and,
must keep his or her unconditional faith in him, i.e. God and should not look for beneficial results as aftermath of it.

Here, in Gita we discover that Ethics is a plane, or rather be called a means to, achieve the ultimate reality, and not an 'end' by itself. Therefore, it is not barely a sermon of dictation of ethical valued but a means of achieving the ultimate plane of life too. Therefore, we cannot call it a merely ethical or religious scripture, but as a philosophical notion too.

The Upanishads

The Upanisads are another set of scripture for Hindu Philosophy and religion, which relate to both the world of spirituality and the morality, trying to quest the answers for the metaphysical quarries. The search for 'Eternal Reality' or the personification of God called 'Brahmam' can be attained by jettisoning oneself from the platform of ethical achievements only and which can be achieved by improving upon their soul of the ignorance they may suffer from, and be purified by their acquired knowledge. For attaining such knowledge they must again, carry out certain actions that must be 'duty' bound to those occasions the scriptures have asked them too. The failure to realize their duty and perform respectable Godly qualities may not allow them their soul to be one with the Brahmam and achieve eternity or Nirvana, and recur in repeated lives on earth due to 'Karma' or non achievement of ethical and moral supremacy such a platform demands for. So the directives of Upanishads suggest that a person
must do his duties on earth so as to succeed of eternity after leaving the body on earth by the soul like a cloak so that they can embrace and be one with eternity. Regarding the spiritualistic views in Upanishad, author N.K. Devaraja had expressed in the following way, "In the hymns of Rig Veda, we do not find any marked expression of the spirit of detachment towards earthly values. That spirit makes its first conspicuous appearance in our literature in the Upanisads."*32

The Puranas

There are about eighteen Puranas, ranging over a fairy long period of writing them down, which are rather mythical in nature than spiritual. They are usually compilation of various stories, each of them enacting the saga of events, portraying right and wrong doings of its progenitors. They also enacted various mythological events to personify the almighty or emphasise certain ethical values, so that common masses can follow them without hesitation or for the reason that being with less or without formal education, they could follow their conscience in judging a situation.

Manu's Samhita

One of the most enduring book of human civilization and representative of basic Hindu Ethics in form of a scripture for the same religion, Manu's Samhita bears in all the ethical directives a book of religion should bear upon its followers. It connotes in details the rites and rituals besides rules and regulations and the
tenets of ethical orders, so that the follower may perform them, again to achieve Nirvana. The primary tenets of Manu’s Samhita are:

Asramadharma, The Four Stages of Family Duties: The Hindu religion, as we have mentioned earlier, emphasises upon the primary duty of an individual firstly towards his kins and then lays the emphasis upon with the follow up for the society. Fulfillment of one’s duty by performing which on the earth, one paves his way to attain one’s Nirvana or sublimity with the eternity or the God Supreme. The four stages of duty towards the family can be describe in the following way (a) Brahmacharya i.e. till the age of twenty five years, when a person at his youth would be a celibate and stay at his teacher i.e. Guru’s residence and earn knowledge. (b) Garhasthya: at the second stage of next twenty five years, i.e. till the age of around fifty, a person should get married, do familial duty, along with it performing his other duties towards parents and the society too. By doing so he will be not only discharging his ‘debt’ towards his ancestors but will be doing so towards God by performing Yagna. (c) Banaprastha: The next twenty five years till the age of seventy five, one should leave aside the family and duties and must take solace in the forest to do penance for any wrong doing knowingly or unknowingly. (d) Sanyasa: At the last part of his life, one must completely give away his mundane possessions to the upcoming generation and live on meager meal and necessities, thus restraining oneself from temptations and excesses of life till the rest of his or her life.

Cast System or Varna: The caste system of Hindu religion can be attributed as signatory of a person’s duty towards his society. We find that at the beginning of
Hindu society, different groups of people, depending upon their authenticity of their identity, i.e. whether one was pure blooded Aryan race or admixed with other races or even belonged completely to other races considered inferior to the others, were put into a certain order, by which they were introduced with certain specific work which were not only deemed fit to them but suitable for the society as well. Usually, the one with the higher level of intelligence were entrusted with the job of 'priesthood' i.e. Brahmin, whereas, some others were the warriors i.e. the Khatriyas. Next in the order are the Vasyas i.e. the one doing commerce.

Therefore, we may come to the conclusion that in the Samhita we find that the primary tenet of it is the duty of individual towards it and serve it according to one's own ability. However, the initial division, which was applicable at the beginning as work division as per one's own ability, had become permanent features of Hindu religion. Consequently, the work ethics has not only become specific to each group, the subsequent generations has started inheriting the individual profession of the father and also has pass on to their coming generation. Thus, the work division also had created the permanent order of superiority to inferiority specifications of the groups and the additional privileges some of such groups owned. Thus, the caste system has created as much conveniences to the society as much it has encouraged dubious ethics for the religion.
Karmavada of Indian Philosophy:

One of the oldest religion in the world Hinduism propagates karmavada and spirituality and after life, Varnasrama etc. Originating from the views of not one person unlike in most other religion, but of assorted sages belonging to different era of time, Hinduism is inherent with stringent ethical value and influence of nature. Except for Manus' Samhita, a treatise on ethical diction of Hindu society, other scriptures inspired ethical values through the narration of mythological stories.

It has been one of the most enduring features of Indian philosophy in which characteristic of its ethics has emphasized not only on what manner to carry out duty, but also the outcome of performance or as a matter of fact non performance of it. It is called Karmavada and rather than being any ethical diction, it is more of an interpretation or narration of goodness of performed duty. As ethical interpretations can be derived from an assorted number of books such as MadBhagawat Gita, Purana, Upanisad etc. and also Manu's Samhita, one of the common ethical view of the scriptures is the Karmavada, which is significant for the inherited merit of performed duty in next of life.

According to views of Hinduism, it is an unprecipitated principle guided by God who defines and judges the merits and demerits of individuals on basis of his performed duties. According to it, There is an order of several stratas of life on earth, and one fails to perform one's duty in an disinterested manner, then the birth recurs repeatedly on it, till one succeeds in fulfilling duties righteously and then attain Nirvana. according to author S. K. Ghosh, "The law of Karma is this
general moral law which governs not only the life and destiny of all individual beings, but even the order and harmony of physical world."*33 According to the theory, man needs to perform disinterested duty which will liberate him from the cudgel of recurring lives of on earth. It is also believed not to be spiritual in content.

Both in Jainism and Buddhism and also some other Hindu lineages such as Sankhya and Mimamsa, however, it is believed that the law is autonomous, independent of God and functions on its own.

However, the law of Karma faces criticism inspite of its profound influence on Hinduism and other related religions. According to author S.K. Ghosh, "Man is not a mere product of nature; his life is something more than karma. If the law is all in all, than there is no real freedom possible........The infinite in men helps him to transcend the limitations of finite. The essence of spirit is freedom. By its exercise man can check and control his natural impulses. That is why his life is something more than a machine or mechanical laws."*34 (pp.3-4) but, when man’s freedom is acknowledged and as long as the law does not become a mechanical process, then in accordance with the theory, man can become not only the defining factor of his future but his destiny as well.

**Carvaka**

The Carvaka philosophy of Indian thinking can be compared with the Cyranics of Greek period or epicureans of later times. It is known as Hedonism in western philosophy. In both the philosophies, pleasure of life has been more emphasized
more than other ethical notions such as duty or morality and held ahead of the altruism in western thinking or Karmavada, i.e. theory of ‘repercussion’ of action in Indian philosophy or oriental in general. While most of the philosophical lineages of India profess ‘spiritualism’ on ethical basis Materialism exists in Hinduism in form of Carvaka and ‘Nastik’vada. Carvaka, the philosophy of pleasure and parallel to the Hedonism of west, does not believe in God and can be called atheistic in their supposition of God. However it believes in the ‘matter’ as the core or origin of the world and perception as the basis of all empirical knowledge and thereby asserts its precedence of western philosophy in modern period when it started emphasizing on knowledge of perception rather than being based on idea of preconceived notions. Since it does not believe in Karmavada, i.e. the theory of merit and effect of a deed done by a human, therefore it does not believe in after life or Nirvana, i.e. freedom from recurring of life on earth. However, not all propounders of Carvaka philosophy believed in indulgence in pleasure only and without restrain and Vatsayana was one of them. Author R.S. Dasgupta said about Indian Hedonism in the following manner, "In conformity with the (above) metaphysical theories that justify the contention that death of the body means death of the so called soul too or that nothing survives bodily death, the only ethical ideal that naturally gets response from human hearts is Hedonism."**35

**Buddhism:** From ethical point of view, Buddhism as a religion commands highest esteem, as it is one of the foremost promoter of peace, amity and non violence in
the world. In fact, Buddha is not only synonymous with such tenets, but also symbolizes them as necessity against the tumultuous and disruptive forces on earth. To maintain the peace and amity on the earth, Buddha has emulated certain path, fold and ways to be maintained and which are usually eightfold in terms to conditions and ways of each of its postulates.

_Buddhism_, as a religious belief, has emphasized more on moral value by performing activities in day to day life than attaining it through messages of God. In fact, it can also be included among the handful religions in the world which can be called either as the most ‘Ethic’ based one, as it is also an ‘Agnostic’ one, that is not a ‘God centric’ one, since it does not profess about God. Regarding the beliefs of Buddhism, R.s. Dasgupta the author says in following manner, “Tired of intellectual casuistries and the gymnastics of metaphysicians, who deny one another’s ontological standpoints both in respect and processes of results, leaving the unsophisticated mass of general people in the maze of bewilderment, unable to ascertain which way to go and which way to adopt, Buddha the embodiment of love for the living beings, chalk out a line of action, bereft of philosophical speculations, that shall lead to the cessation of all miseries, nay of the life itself, for life is the seed of all miseries.”*35. The founder of the religion, Lord Buddha after much penance in his life has arrived at certain ethical tenants that he believed would give guidance to people to live a life with proper expression of honest, moral and sincere values.
Among the various religions of the world, Buddhism is important from ethical point of view, as it has dictated certain rules called 'paths' to follow to achieve the ultimate reality of life. Unlike Hinduism, Buddhism does not believe in the greatest soul to achieve or to emerge with to attain Nirvana, but to attain it through the ethical paths only. In it, nirvana is not the means but the 'end' itself. There are various paths for various conditions of life.

Buddhism, as a philosophy is more ethically oriented than it is commensurated with the concept of theism, unlike most other major religion in the world. In fact in Buddhism, achieving Nirvana, the highest goal of life, that is freedom from life and rebirth, is but achieving the ethical pinnacle only and its followers should tread the moral paths shown by its founder and saint Lord Buddha only.

**Gandhism**

One of the most modern day ethics can be called the philosophy of Mohandas Karam Chand Gandhi of India who retrieved the independence of his own country from the colonial rule of the British regime. To be precise, with the help of his ethical values being applied to great extent in his political views, not only did he recovered the freedom of his country, he set a whole new trend of thinking that has opened up in front of the habitants of the whole world. Gandhi himself did not name his philosophy but its synonymy with his way of life has inspired the common people as well as the intellectuals of the world to believe and call his ideas after him only. The most significant part of his philosophy is the tenet
Gandhi, belonging to the modern period of the twentieth century, did not hesitate in exploring old values in remixing for utilizing for modern time, by applying which in an undefinable situation not witnessed in the recourse of history of the country, and skillfully succeeded in bringing into the lives of common man what can be called as spirituality and opportunity to practise it in a 'free' atmosphere attained through his perseverance and neo emancipated conceptions of morality.

Gandhism, which is a byproduct of modern conceptions born out of the coalesce of ancient ethical themes of most other religions and their applications manifested through his own works and thoughts, has not only redeemed the world with the success of its postulates long believed to be irrelevant in modern day context, but has also proven the retrieval of our old values as being the saviour of mankind in both the near and distant future. Gandhi believed, like in Buddhism and ancient Hinduism in the path of 'Non violence' or ahimsa, which encourages both individuals and communities to exercise restrain or prohibiting opting of any destructive means while facing provocation or danger. He believed rather for usage of non violent means which would neither incur any physical harm to individual or to any collective groups of people, or to cause any mental difference while looking for justice. However, we found out Gandhism to be too intrinsic a value system to be defined and then put into effect in a haphazard manner or in an indiscriminately, as his 'non
violent' methods might be taken advantage of by the agencies against whom it might be used. It speaks for skillful application against such agencies.

At the end we can surmise that Gandhism, with its non violent ethical policies, can be the best weapon in the resurrection process of the environment.
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