

Philosophy Of Ethics‘In The Perspective Of Islam And Contemporary Philosophical Ideas

Uzma Shahzadi¹ , Dr. HM Azhar Usama² , Dr.Asma Shahid³ , Dr. Hana Mahboob⁴ , Dr. Amina Saleem⁵

¹PhD.Scholar, Institute of Islamic Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

²Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, the University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
muhammad.azhar@ais.uol.edu.pk (Corresponding Author)

³Lecturer Islamic studies. Govt. associate college Shujabad.Multan, Punjab, Pakistan

⁴Lecturer, Govt. Associate college for women, 14 area near slaughter house, wahcantt. , Pakistan

⁵PhD.From Institute of Islamic Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Abstract

This article presents a comprehensive collection of the philosophy of ethics, the perspective of Islam and contemporary philosophical ideas as a research review and the result is a large collection of discussions on various aspects that have been on the planet since man. It exists and since it is mental, intellectual and physical actions exist, morality exists. Because morality is related to human actions, as long as man followed the instructions of God, his moral existence prevailed over his animal existence, a straight, clear and bright road of life was open before him and he walked on it. Kar continued towards his destination with peace and tranquility, but when he forgot that direction, the path of his life became crooked, peace and tranquility ended, confusion and confusion began to set in, and he forgot this. Where does he want to go and what is his destination? Now he was only a servant of his intuition, emotions, prayers, observations and intellect. Whereupon he started galloping away in guidance. His animal existence prevailed over his moral existence and he fell from the high position of humanity to the lowest cave of animality. The record of history shows that the Greeks first formulated the philosophy of morality based on mere reason and emotions. What All these theories will be explained in this paper.

Keywords: Phylosophy, Ethics, Islam, Modren Approach, Scriptures, Islamic Ideologies,

Introduction

What is the reality of human actions? What are their principles and laws? What are their causes? What is their purpose? From that time until today, philosophers have been discussing these questions, but have not been able to get a definite

and definite answer to these questions. It is not intended here to enter into the thorny forest of all these conflicting philosophies and present their details, but it is necessary to take a brief review as a sample, so that it is known that the philosophies compiled based on reason and

emotions are not human morals. The knots have been and will always be untangleable.

Moral philosophy formally begins with the Greeks, but even before that, its journey continued in one form or another, and continued even later. In hindsight, the later philosophy of ethics has not made any fundamental and important additions to it. . Even after centuries of contemplation by ancient and modern philosophers, the point remains where it was. , not a single question of moral philosophy could be solved, but the contradictions and contradictions of these questions which were answered with the passage of time increased and did not decrease.

A History of Moral Philosophy

The history of moral philosophy can be divided into the following four periods.

- **Before Socrates**

Although the name of Socrates is first in the list of compilers of moral philosophy, but this does not mean that moral ideas were completely absent before that. No philosophy and no art suddenly emerges in a systematic form. In the poetry of the 7th and 6th centuries B.C., we find such simple and uncoordinated sayings of wisdom, which were, based on the morality of human character, and in them the prominence of moral considerations. We see glimpses. Before Socrates, we find three philosophers whose moral teachings cannot be ignored: Phaistos Horus, Heraclitus and Demas Critos.

The reign of Phaetha Ghorus ends in 500 BC. Philosophers before Socrates were entangled in metaphysical problems. The main focus of Phaetha Ghorus was also the same, but in addition, he also presented ideas about human ethics. Nothing is known in detail about this philosopher because his history is shrouded in fiction, but trustworthiness. It is known that he had created an organization in whose rules and regulations ethics also had a special importance.

Courage, honesty with friends, moderation, obedience to law and government, insisting on daily accountability and other such morals are important elements of his education. The color of his teaching is not philosophical, it is unsound, there is only one thing in his moral advice, which can be called a philosophical element, which he has taken from his metaphysical philosophy and inserted here. Its philosophical element is a mathematical view of the universe. Just as he considers unity as the cause of uniformity and balance in the components, similarly he takes help from numbers to create balance in morals, that virtue and health are the name of balance and friendship is balanced equality. These balances combine to produce one or more numbers.

The epoch of every Clytus ends in 470 BC. Here too we find the morals that later philosophers have benefited from. For example, he advises people to stick firmly to the path of wisdom which is common to all human beings. "1

On the one hand, he says this, and on the other hand, he believes that everything found in the world is based on justice and the injustice we see in it is only relative to human understanding. That is, man thinks it is injustice, but in reality it is not injustice but justice. Every Kalitos might have said this stupid thing to comfort the oppressed, but he did not realize that he was providing an argument for the oppressors to act cruelly.

The era of Dimas Qaritus ends in 300 BC. Among his ideas that have come down to us, there are some disjointed and contradictory things about ethics. He is perhaps the first philosopher who clearly claimed that the highest and real good for man is the pursuit of pleasure and happiness. Philosophy was providing a basis for moral imprisonment. On the one hand, he says that doing evil is not only evil, but the desire to do evil is also evil, and on the other hand, he says that being a victim of oppression is worse than being oppressed, that is, being oppressed.

Being cruel is worse than being cruel.

Apart from these three philosophers, another group of philosophers, 'Sophists', passed before Socrates, but the teaching these people gave about human character was so general that it cannot be given philosophical importance. Since these people were a little before Socrates. Therefore, this audacious point has been well targeted by Chen's criticisms and has been proved to be completely wrong on his test. If the education of this Jamaat is called Gorkha Dhanda, then it is not in vain. There is no doubt that his efforts in reducing sati on ancient superstitions are commendable, but those who taught these ethics were not familiar with the true meaning of them. That is why the research-minded people began to think of him as playing with words and called him a fraud. Henry Hooke (d. 1864), a former professor of ethics at Cambridge University, writes apologetically on behalf of these people:

"There is no reason to suppose that these people used deliberate deception in doing so."

Because his condition was exactly the same as that of our newspapermen as political advisers.

It is obvious that the value and status of a journalist as a politician is something special

It is not based on political wisdom and wisdom, but it is the result of autobiography and essay writing.²

- **In the era of Socrates**

470 to 399 BC is the era of Socrates. This philosopher was the first person in Greece to be deeply interested in the study of human character. He strongly disliked the physical and metaphysical investigations in which his contemporaries and advanced philosophers were entangled. There were two reasons for this hatred: firstly, that he was not satisfied with the results of their theories and secondly, that for him the

revelation of the secrets of the physical universe was beyond human possibility. He expresses this impression about the paradoxical and conflicting views of philosophy

"Their example is like a few madmen arguing with each other."³

Those who have spent some time studying these debates can only use the similitude of the debates of philosophers in the investigation of the mysteries of the physical universe and metaphysical problems. Socrates' intellect had reached the point that he declared the revelation of the secret of the creation of the universe beyond the possibility of man and he also found the fact that man should investigate and investigate his character and correct his morals. should worry about doing but unfortunately he could not get the guidance of real knowledge. He turned away from the research of physical and metaphysical problems and wanted to research the human character and focused his intellect on the solution of this problem, but actually because this problem is also connected with the metaphysical problem, therefore his intellect could not find any correct solution. By reading the history of his philosophy of ethics which is before us, it is clearly felt that he has made only severe criticisms on his environment and the moral ideas and beliefs spread in it and all his discussions and cross-examinations have only proved this. What he did was to shake people's beliefs, but he could not put any clear positive thing in front of them. The negative side of his moral philosophy is so prominent that the positive side is not only suppressed, but also obscured and muddled. . It is for this reason that after him his own disciples adopted completely opposite views in regard to morality. The other student, on the contrary, considers pleasure as evil and declares poverty, toil and disgrace as good and good. Controversy, contradiction and conflict of ideas are present here as they were in philosophy of theology. I wish Socrates had also

cherished the fact that the problem of human morality is not a matter of intellect alone. What is good and good for him, so he should not do bad things. He declares knowledge as the best good for man and then he declares the knowledge of good as the most important knowledge, but he does not answer the question of what is the source of this knowledge and who is that good. defines and interprets, rather, when people asked him about it, he avoided the answer, although a fundamental question is what is the standard and measure of calling an optional action good or bad. Is? and what is the highest and highest good that man should seek, the philosophy of any philosopher does not give a satisfactory answer also, it is not understood by Socrates that "the mere knowledge of good and evil is sufficient to adopt it or to avoid it."⁴

- **After Socrates**

Socrates planted the seed of moral philosophy, Plato is its bud and Aristotle is its fruit. Just as these two philosophers are the most prominent in the philosophy of physics and metaphysics, they are also the most prominent in the philosophy of ethics. The philosophy that Socrates started, Plato and Aristotle made it a comprehensive and comprehensive art, but it is obvious that as the seed is, so are the fruits and flowers, as is the origin, so are its branches. There is no unified idea, but contradictions are also found here. All these philosophers admit that the perfection of man is to adopt good and abandon evil, but none of them is the reality of good and evil. could not reach, because all of them trusted only the guidance of reason and intuition and they could not get higher and higher guidance than reason and intuition. It is clear from the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle that the relationship between moral issues In fact, it is also connected with metaphysical problems, so until a definite answer to these problems is found, the problems of ethics cannot be properly solved. It is an important place. These three philosophers declare the

happiness of a human being as the real good, but how can this happiness be achieved? Upon reaching here, their car stops and from here, many different paths go in opposite directions. What is the reality of human actions? It is not known what are their determined principles and laws? How can we achieve this goal with faith? There are dozens of theories about each of these questions, and more often than not, each theory contradicts the other. Which never ends. It is not that Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are deniers of God, each of them acknowledges God. It is said about Socrates that he was convinced of the only God. He used to say that there are supernatural beings higher than man, but the real divinity belongs to a single God who is absolute goodness, absolute knowledge, perfect reason and justice and the Lord of the worlds. Since the philosophers could not be guided by divine revelation, they could not be fully aware of God's attributes, and they could not be sure of a day of reckoning after life. When they arrived, God remained as a necessary cause and that's it. The points they made, without needing God's guidance, were nothing but mental exercises and intellectual debates. do not have . These philosophical debates do not create the light of faith in any heart, but if there is any faith, they replace it with the darkness of doubt and hesitation.

When Christianity entered Greece and Rome, it fought this philosophy for a few days, but it itself had become a collection of illusions and myths, so instead of defeating this philosophy, it defeated itself and Aristotle's philosophy of Christianity. The second element has become. When a voice was raised in Europe against Christianity mixed with the guidance of God, the fabricated jurisprudence of Leviticus, the delusions of monks and the philosophy of Aristotle, every part of this mixed religion was rejected and the whole collection was thrown away by the people. gave Although Luther opposed only the religious components of

Christianity, it was only twenty years after his death that Aristotle's philosophy was also included. The young people felt that Christianity had made philosophy a slave to religion. By binding philosophy to religious practices, it imprisoned its rational activism, and thus people were put into double prisons: one of the Church and the other of Aristotle. Thus, twenty years after Luther, the young Rambus successfully presented this claim to the University of Paris:

"Everything that Aristotle has taught is wrong".⁵

He declares with all his might that the crisis of the world cannot end unless the entire edifice of the present civilization is demolished and it is built on religious and moral foundations. He writes:

"The problem in the current crisis is not whose civilization should be preserved and whose should be destroyed, but the real problem is to rebuild a new civilization."

A free mind and open eyes have also brought this philosopher to the extent that reason can reach. But the guidance that is needed beyond that, alas, these philosophers do not accept it and want to set the destination beyond the intellect under the guidance of the intellect, which results in zero. It can be seen that there are very few of them who deny God, but there is hardly anyone among them who does not deny the revelation sent by God and the law he revealed. I wish these philosophers would stop this kind of open stupidity. They could not understand that God, who created this universe, has also revealed a law for human beings. If these people had paid attention to the moral philosophy of the Qur'an and its philosophy of life, they would have wandered in illusions and mirages all their lives. For Albert and others like him who advocate moral renaissance, the easy way out is to recognize the fact that it can only be achieved through the moral philosophy of the Qur'an and based on that. A new civilization can be born which is the best and highest ideal of humanity.

Ethical theories

After a brief review of the history of moral philosophy, it seems appropriate to take a look at the ideas presented in different periods regarding moral standards in order to find out how moral philosophy has progressed so far. I did not have to go through any kind of vicissitudes. What were the ideas which were presented by different people as the standard of morality?

The fact is that this question is of great importance in the science of creativity that what is the standard of truth and falsehood, good and evil, goodness and badness, good and evil. That is, what is the standard on which to judge whether an action is good or bad? If you look carefully, the entire science of ethics depends on the correct answer to this question, but as important as this question is, the answer is confusing. Philosophers of all ages tried to define good and evil by answering this question and in every age it was assumed that they had solved this problem, but later people questioned their opinion and told that his talk was not very interesting and many aspects of the issue remained unresolved. Therefore, despite being discussed from the time before Christ to the modern era, the fundamental question of determining good and bad remains with the philosophers. What has been said so far in this regard has confused the issue rather than solving it.

Regarding the standards of ethics that have been presented from time to time, the idiom of "words speak volumes" can be applied. The reason is that everyone looked at this issue from their own perspective. For the sake of ease of understanding, these different views and ideas can be seen by keeping them in four schools.

The first group is in favor of determining the nature of moral character in the light of principles and laws, above the requirements of environment, time and place. Compared to this, there is another school of thought which is in favor of

seeing ethics in terms of results instead of principles and laws. The philosophers Cyrenaics of Greece and Hedonists of the modern era represent this school of thought. These two views can be combined in a third school of thought. This group is convinced of seeing morality in terms of evolution. According to him, virtue is a conscious act. There are wide possibilities for its growth, flourishing and flourishing. It cannot be restricted to a few limited and specific forms. Thought In Greece, we find an example of this school of thought in the ideas of Plato and Aristotle. While in modern times, Spencer (d. 1903), Green and Allama Iqbal (d. 1938) seem to support this point of view. The fourth school of thought is that of those thinkers who are in favor of discussing ethics in the light of values. According to them, the real goodness is only born from wisdom and prudence and understanding. This gives us the knowledge of the values of life which are the source of balance and harmony. Among the Greeks, Socrates and the ideas of Professor Moore, Mackenzie and other thinkers in the modern era are examples of this school of thought.

And a few years after that, a group of thinkers arose in Italy one after the other, who announced that the dawn of modern physics had dawned, and it was not long before that the dawn of modern moral philosophy had dawned. What did this morning bring?

- **4. After the Renaissance of Europe**

This dawn brought with it an ideology of pure materialism which destroyed spirituality even if it remained. With this dawn arose a black storm of egoism which scattered religion and morals all over Europe. . In the morning light there was an armed army of immorality, sexual anarchy and religious atheism, which forced humanity to drink the cup of poison and now man was a complete beast. He did not accept anything other than animal needs and needs, wishes and

supplications and psychological inclinations and tendencies. The entire system of individual and collective life was built only on materialism and self-interest and all sciences and arts were compiled keeping this view of life in front. It was not a morning for humanity, but a terrible black night, the dawn of which has not yet dawned. Since good and evil, immorality and piety are both inherent in human nature, so even in this dark era, some people in Europe and America have expressed their disgust with this situation, but so far no such successful movement has arisen there. That changes the way people think. It is obvious that the current situation cannot be changed by some people who preach morals just academically. They have not added anything to the philosophy of ethics. Therefore, Western intellectuals are very angry with their current Western civilization. How sad are they? In this regard, the views of an authentic creative philosopher are worth noting. Albert Schweitzer writes:

“Moral ideas, on which civilization depends, wander around the world like the destitute and the homeless. No such theory of the universe could be developed so far which could provide a solid foundation for these moral ideas, that is the reason why instead of a powerful and awakened spirit of honest principles running in the world, unrelated and superficial ideas are moving around the world. are being pushed here and there and the world has become a haven for useless and harmful actions. Alas, we are traveling darkly in the age of darkness.”⁶

What a good depiction of the godless western civilization! This Western philosopher has deeply studied his civilization and has come to the conclusion that the world's troubles are not economic but the real troubles are moral. He is a strong supporter of moral renaissance. writes:

"Among all the forces that constitute reality and reality, morality is the first and the highest."⁷

He declares with all his might that the crisis of the world cannot end unless the entire edifice of the present civilization is demolished and it is built on religious and moral foundations. He writes:

"The problem in the current crisis is not whose civilization should be preserved and whose should be destroyed, but the real problem is to rebuild a new civilization."⁸

A free mind and open eyes have also brought this philosopher to the extent that reason can reach, but the guidance that is needed beyond that, alas, these philosophers do not accept it and want to set the destination beyond the intellect under the guidance of the intellect, which results in zero. It can be seen that there are very few of them who deny God, but there is hardly anyone among them who does not deny the revelation sent by God and the law he revealed. I wish these philosophers would stop this kind of open stupidity. They could not understand that God, who created this universe, has also revealed a law for human beings. If these people had paid attention to the moral philosophy of the Qur'an and its philosophy of life, they would have wandered in illusions and mirages all their lives. For Albert and others like him who advocate moral renaissance, the easy way out is to recognize the fact that it can only be achieved through the moral philosophy of the Qur'an and based on that. A new civilization can be born which is the best and highest ideal of humanity.

Ethical theories

After a brief review of the history of moral philosophy, it seems appropriate to take a look at the ideas presented in different periods regarding moral standards in order to find out how moral philosophy has progressed so far. I did not have to go through any kind of vicissitudes. What were the ideas which were presented by different people as the standard of morality?

The fact is that this question is of great importance in the science of creativity that what is the standard of truth and falsehood, good and evil, goodness and badness, good and evil. That is, what is the standard on which to judge whether an action is good or bad? If you look carefully, the entire science of ethics depends on the correct answer to this question, but as important as this question is, the answer is confusing. Philosophers of all ages tried to define good and evil by answering this question and in every age it was assumed that they had solved this problem, but later people questioned their opinion. Told that his talk was not very interesting and many aspects of the issue remained unresolved. Therefore, despite being discussed from the time before Christ to the modern era, the fundamental question of determining good and bad remains with the philosophers. What has been said so far in this regard has confused the issue rather than solving it.

Regarding the standards of ethics that have been presented from time to time, the idiom of "words speak volumes" can be applied. The reason is that everyone looked at this issue from their own perspective. For the sake of ease of understanding, these different views and ideas can be seen by keeping them in four schools.

The first group is in favor of determining the nature of moral character in the light of principles and laws, above the requirements of environment, time and place. Compared to this, there is another school of thought which is in favor of seeing ethics in terms of results instead of principles and laws. The philosophers Cyrenaics of Greece and Hedonists of the modern era represent this school of thought. These two views can be combined in a third school of thought. This group is convinced of seeing morality in terms of evolution. According to him, virtue is a conscious act. There are wide possibilities for its growth, flourishing and flourishing. It cannot be restricted to a few limited and specific forms. Thought in

Greece, we find an example of this school of thought in the ideas of Plato and Aristotle. While in modern times, Spencer (d. 1903), Green and Allama Iqbal (d. 1938) seem to support this point of view. The fourth school of thought is that of those thinkers who are in favor of discussing ethics in the light of values. According to them, the real goodness is only born from wisdom and prudence and understanding. This gives us the knowledge of the values of life which are the source of balance and harmony. Among the Greeks, Socrates and the ideas of Professor Moore, Mackenzie and other thinkers in the modern era are examples of this school of thought.⁹

The four representative schools of thought described in the above lines are not final and definitive, nor are they meant to be representative of all ethical theories.

can be declared. However, many ideas and concepts can be understood under them. Apart from this, from another point of view, the division of moral theories can be done in such a way that some theories emphasize the superiority of intellect and consciousness and some recognize the superiority of emotions and feelings. A point of view between these two extremes is that the reality of both intellect and emotion in the human personality should be taken into consideration and our standard of conduct should be characterized by consistency. In this regard, we find the first example of moral theory in the ideas of Hume and Kant. Another point of view is interpreted as hedonism. Hobbes, Mill and Bentham etc. are its pioneers. While the glimpses of the third concept can be seen in Aristotle, Hegel (1831), Mayur and Mackenzie etc. In these three forms duty, pleasure and perfection are given priority respectively. Another way of dividing ethical theories can be that some theories place too much emphasis on right, etc., that is, to see only how well an action is bound by rules and regulations. While some theories emphasize the

importance of good, according to them, it is not enough that the action should be done in accordance with the laws, but it is also necessary to be correct in terms of the end. The first view is exemplified in Stoicism and Kant, who are strong advocates of duty, while the second view is represented by the emphasis on utility and pleasure.

It is impossible to review in detail all the ideas that have been presented regarding the determination of moral standards. However, some of the most important and prominent ideas are being briefly described and their analysis is being done, from which it will be known that where the human thought has stumbled in determining the standard of conduct and where it is merely due to reason. How did the efforts to solve this most important problem on the part fail? The second advantage will be that later when the real and true quality is presented, it will be easy to understand and recognize its value. And the difference between human wisdom and compassionate wisdom will be clearly shown.

- **Theory of pleasure**

A group of moral thinkers believe that the purpose of human life is the pursuit of pleasure. Therefore, the actions that help in attaining pleasure are called good, and those that obstruct the path of achieving this goal are called evil.

The result of this theory is that:

"The main motive of every action is always to get maximum pleasure from it as a whole"¹⁰

Those who believe in this point of view are called Lashadites. Its foundations in philosophy are familiar to us

Appears in the school of Epicureanism. While in the present era, its prominent pioneers are Bentham (1748-1832), John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) and Sujok (1838).

Aristotle's theory of hedonism is the motivation. According to him, the purpose of life is to achieve happiness or pleasure. Who are called pleasure and pleasure, which are their two types? The proponents of this theory do not agree on the answers to these questions. Different thinkers have presented it in different ways. First we can divide the theory of hedonism into two different schools of thought, psychological and moral hedonism. Proponents of psychological hedonism were the Cyrenes and Epicureans among the Greeks, and in modern times Spinoza (1677), Hobbes, Bentham (1832) and to some extent Mill. According to them, man is a mere compulsion and he is naturally a seeker of pleasure and a hater of pain. Therefore, the goal of all his struggle is the pursuit of pleasure and instinctively he is compelled to do so.¹¹

Proponents of moral hedonism are Mill and Sujok. According to this theory, a person can choose pain. He is free in this regard, but he is morally bound to choose only pleasure and avoid pain. In other words, our actions may have different motives, but we should choose only the motive of pleasure among them and abandon the other motives.¹²

In addition to psychological and moral hedonism, hedonism can also be divided into the schools of thought of indifference and indifference. Bentham was the supporter of Anai hedonism, who believed that the pleasure of the agent is responsible for making an action good or bad, while the supporter of Ikhwanism was Mill, who believed that only through experience can we find out what gives us pleasure and what is the source of pain? However, not only the pleasure or pain of the doer, but of all human beings, it is not only the quantity of pleasure but also the condition. He cares about the excess of pleasure as well as the highest pleasure. Although he is a fraternalist, but like Benitham, he also keeps his theory based on selfish pleasure.

Despite the above sub-differences, the hedonists agree that the purpose of life is to achieve pleasure and expansion.

A glance at the theory of pleasure reveals its superficiality, literalism and hollowness. The element of happiness can be associated with the fulfillment of various goals in life, but to say that happiness or pleasure is the goal of life and all other goals are the means to achieve it cannot be called correct in any sense. This theory brings man down from humanity to the level of animality. The reality is that pleasure is a substance that has no substance, life is not limited to desires, feelings, desires and instincts. Therefore, it is wrong in principle to limit life only to the satisfaction of these things. Apart from pleasure, there are many things in life which are dearer to man than pleasure and should be. For example, it is not permissible to forget all these values such as honesty, beauty, fulfillment of duty, freedom, justice, knowledge and literature, civilization and culture and make them subordinate to pleasure. Our goal in life is not only the purification of desires and getting pleasure through them, but the fulfillment of self, in which intelligence has a great part. Leaving desires without love is not the purpose of life, but the death of the real life. Moreover, sacrifice and There are qualities like beneficence and benevolence etc. which help a society to flourish and move forward. There is no room for such attributes within the theory of hedonism. Rather, this theory teaches selfishness. If this theory is accepted as the standard of morality, humanity will remain stagnant and the society will suffer stagnation and indifference and finally face death.

- **Theory of utility**

Another theory in ethics is utilitarianism, which says that the work that causes maximum benefit or profit is good and that which does not gain benefit or profit is evil. Utility value will be

obtained from In other words, actions must be judged in terms of their consequences. An action is neither good nor evil in itself. The one whose results are beneficial is called good and the one whose results are not beneficial is called evil. From this point of view, the same action can be declared good at one time and evil at another time, because the results of an action depend on the external conditions under which that action takes place. Then the question arises, whose benefit? Proponents of this theory respond that:

"The action is good in which the maximum benefit of the maximum number of people is established." ¹³

In view of these specifications, the theory of utility is an expanded form of the theory of pleasure, that's why many people have described both of them under the same title. If there is any difference between the two, it is that in the theory of hedonism, an individual was meant to achieve pleasure for himself, while in the theory of utility, the aim is to achieve pleasure for as many people as possible. It is only the pursuit of pleasure, but in the theory of utility, it has been given a collective form by considering the human being as a Madani al-Tabb. In this regard, the author of Ethics for Unbelievers, Amber Blanc White, writes:

An action should be called good or bad according to its results, for example, charitable hospitals are profit-making institutions. Although hospitals are a temporary means of achieving the goal (because the goal should be that the health of the nation is such that no one gets sick), so donating to these hospitals is a good deed. It should not be about why I donate" ¹⁴

However, the real question is hidden in why the answer has been avoided. A man is told that we should help the poor. If he is told that this is a moral duty or a requirement of humanity, then he will say, "Who has imposed this duty on me?" Who is called humanity that requires this? So the

holders of this theory do not have any answer. Then if it is said to him that the purpose of life is to achieve pleasure and doing so gives pleasure. So he can answer that I do not get any pleasure from helping others and spending my money for them, but it causes pain, so this action is not good for me, so this theory fails.

In view of the objections to the theory of utility, Rashdal (1924) modified this theory a little and formulated another theory which he refers to as ideal utilitarianism. According to this theory, the purpose of life is not the pursuit of pleasure, but the pursuit of an ideal ideal. The name of this ideal motto is Khair. This motto is the common goal of all mankind. Therefore, good refers to actions that make it possible for all humanity to achieve this ideal. ¹⁵

When this basic question comes up, what is the ideal ideal that is in front of the human race in common and for the achievement of which the name of the struggle is good deeds, then in the answer to it, it is nothing but "of the human race". "Welfare" which he used a vague term and could not say anything definitively. More and more he has added morality with pleasure. Although the main debate was that what is called morality? For details, his book The Theory of Good and Evil: Vol-1 can be seen.

After what has been briefly written in the above line about the theory of utility, there is no need for any further comment on it. However, it is appropriate to say at this place that the theory of pleasure and the theory of utility are two sides of the same picture, which define the pursuit of pleasure as the center and axis of all activities of life and limit man to a narrow circle of selfishness. With the difference that the theory of hedonism brings the concept of good and evil to personal ends, while the theory of hedonism

Utility extends it to the realm of collectivity.

- **Theory of Relativity:**

One of the ideas presented regarding the criteria of good and evil in the science of ethics is the theory of addition. According to this theory, moral values do not have a permanent personal status, but they are related to specific environment and circumstances, so the values of one culture can be different from another. The values of one such era may be different from another era. According to this theory, there are no moral principles that are absolutely correct and can be applied equally to individuals and groups in all countries, as according to the theory of extrapolation:

- (i) Different countries and societies may have different moral values.
- (ii) There is no moral principle or yardstick that can be used to judge the values of one society as superior to those of another.
- (iii) There is no universal truth in the matter of moral values which is equally useful to all people of all times.
- (iv) A certain moral attitude of a society shows what is right in that society. If the moral code of that society declares an action right, then at least to the extent of that society that action will be considered right.

Our daily observation is enough to disprove the theory of relativity. There are several moral

principles and values that must be followed if a society is to survive and survive. For example, all the countries and societies of the world agree on the wrongdoing of acts like murder, theft, robbery, bribery and defamation, then what can prevent them from being considered as permanent values.

Apart from this, this theory is also unacceptable due to the fact that many people living in the world have their own moral point of view in different matters, but in any matter, despite the difference of opinion, there will be some truth and then it will be referred to. How can conflicting opinions be accepted equally? There are countless examples in history that great, intelligent and intelligent people were convinced of a particular philosophy or point of view. In later times that philosophy was proved to be completely wrong. So how can a building of a grand matter like ethics be built on such a loose foundation? The fundamental importance of morals in the rise and fall of individuals and nations requires that there are some permanent and unchanging values in it that are beyond the changes of time and place. Yes, there may be some values that can change under the influence of circumstances, but this change will also be in the light of those basic values and not independent of them. But this theory cannot be adopted at all.

References

- ¹ Qadri, Syed Ahmad Urooj, Maulana, The Moral Philosophy of the Qur'an, Central School of Islamic Publishers, New Delhi, 2014, p. 27
- ² Maulana, The Moral Philosophy of the Qur'an, Central School of Islamic Publishers, New Delhi, 2014, p. 25
- ³ Maulana, The Moral Philosophy of the Qur'an, Central School of Islamic Publishers, New Delhi, 2014, p. 28

⁴ Moral Philosophy of the Qur'an, p. 29

⁵ Maulana, The Moral Philosophy of the Qur'an, Central School of Islamic Publishers, New Delhi, 2014, p. 31

⁶ Maulana, The Moral Philosophy of the Qur'an, Central School of Islamic Publishers, New Delhi, 2014, p.32-33

⁷ Maulana, The Moral Philosophy of the Qur'an, Central School of Islamic Publishers, New Delhi, 2014p. 34

⁸ Maulana, The Moral Philosophy of the Qur'an, Central School of Islamic Publishers, New Delhi, 2014p.33

⁹ Shidai, Professor Yusuf, Study of Ethics, Aziz Publishers, Lahore 2004, pp. 73-75.

¹⁰ Parvez, What Man Thought, Tolo Islam Trust, Lahore, 2002, p. 146

¹¹ Shidai, Professor Yusuf, Study of Ethics, Aziz Publishers, Lahore 2004, p. 95

¹² Shidai, Professor Yusuf, Study of Ethics, Aziz Publishers, Lahore 2004, p. 96

¹³ Parvez, What Man Thought, Tolo-e- Islam Trust, Lahore, 2002, p. 148

¹⁴ Parvez, What Man Thought, Tolo-e- Islam Trust, Lahore, 2002, p. 148

¹⁵ Parvez, What Man Thought, Tolo-e- Islam Trust, Lahore, 2002,p. 149