REPORT BETWEEN SOCIAL ETHICS AND PERSONAL MORALS IN OUR DAYS

Rita Loloçi
University "Aleksander Moisiu", Durres Albania, AAB College College ,ritaloloci@gmail.com
Orneda Gega Hoxha
University "Aleksander Moisiu" Durres, Albania, ornedagega@gmail.com

Abstract: In this study, we will try to explain the correlation that exists between social ethics and personal ethics. Today's challenges of human society in the field of ethics, morality and consciousness are not the same in different eras and in nations or groups of states. All three of these domains move more slowly than other processes, but are indispensable in everyday life. State authority in constantly way strive to create legal rules, but their non-compliance with ethic, principles of morality and conscience create major problems in contemporary development. Rapid contemporary developments, especially those in the field of technology and science have brought other concepts to social and personal ethics, but the necessity of their presence always adapting to other conditions has been felt. Today's man seeks to understand it more in the form of ethics and social education. For example: nudity, morality principles to this phenomenon have changed from generation to generation, once considered shame and today as something private. The reality of the moral and conceptual problems that human and society have had over law, the rights and ethics have changed, concepts have been overthrown, and the way how people have been judged for different situations has evolved. Individual's education in the traditional societies have been very important issue in his/ her life. That was a lifelong learning process instead. Education's main purpose was to help the individual during his/her life so that he/she was not only responsible and aware of the environment, but to prepare the individual to fit into real life. In the actual society there are different points of views as far as the moral and civilizing education bonds are concerned. A mutual environment asks for mutual values, but on the other hand it is assumed the need to understand, accept and support even the values which may be different from the individual ones. In other words, the civil education has to treat moral as a separate issue, even though there are different opinions like: moral is a personal choice, moral is given by God, moral is a social agreement, etc. What we should emphasize is the fact that dealing with similar points of view is as important as debating against the opposite ones. It would be very positive if this could be achieved for a common understanding. But does everyone understand what moral, social and personal ethic is? Another question adds to this one: How is the problem of moral going to be treated? And is it necessary to set tasks or duties on moral as well? What features must moral education have in a view of the evolution of society as whole in terms of   a new worldview? Today humanity is on the rise and is heading towards great organisation, but one must keep in mind that within this uniformity there is also diversity to be respected. The new worldview must be open to new progress and thinking not only from the content but also from the form.
Keywords: Moral, education, principles, low, rigths, public

INTRODUCTION
Ethics (derived from the Greek word ethos, "character", "conduct", "habit") is a branch of philosophy that studies objective and rational phenomena which determine human behaviour reflected in an approach that is able to distinguish what is good, right and moral as opposed to what is bad and immoral.
Social ethics is assumed to comprise a set of rules guiding human activity in coexistence with other people based on certain moral values recognised as indispensable by most people. For this to work, one should refrain personal ego by renouncing some personal habits.
Given that persons share their activity in a community of other people, it is necessary that they align their own rules to those of the community that intend to live with. In this context, we refer to civic education as an important part of personal education. In traditional societies, one's upbringing and education were considered as lifelong processes. The main goal of education was to assist people to better understand social coexistence rules in order to become aware of the challenges underlying this process.
Such education was not limited to some learning benchmarks, but comprised all artistic and social activities and influenced in shaping one's personality. It was a perpetual procedure which, but involved all spiritual, mental, psychological and natural prospects - hence, it was a radical transformation and integration procedure. In his work "The Republic", Plato claims that "good education gets their souls illuminated and our citizens will be able to easily

see through these issues and matters"[27]. Upbringing and education shaped by excellence benchmarks breeds good people who are better than their predecessors. According to Plato, State watchdogs must be vigilant to prevent education from becoming corrupt, i.e. that state laws are not violated.

Exactly, this issue is open to various interpretations either among individuals or among cultural and religious traditions. "An education that seeks to brew educated citizens must be always tolerant of other cultures, because each culture has a different moral code"[28]. There is no objective standard that can be used to judge whether a society's code is better than another's and that the moral code of a society determines what is right within that society[29]. Common understanding is a kind of agreement on upholding certain values, such as acknowledging that some ways of conduct are wrong and some not. Actually, this is common interpretation of what morality stands for in itself, so that common people or politicians – when they address morality in their speeches, at least, they are clear and do comprehend what they are referring to.

Anyhow, does everyone understand what morality is? How is the issue of morality addressed in a social co-existence? Is it necessary to address duties associated with the morality?

METHODOLOGY

This study applies the method of reviewing and interpreting literature. The latter was selected with a focus on those authors who contributed to the interpretation of present morality issues. The two most important pieces of literature in this study are "Systems Theory" by Niklas Luhmann and "Man for himself: An inquiry into the psychology of ethics" by Erich Fromm. In addition, the study makes a comparative approach on how ethics has been conceptualized at different times. The explanatory and comparative analysis plays a pivotal role in the interpretation of the ethical, moral and legal phenomena and situations in the functioning of a society.

MORAL CONSCIENCE AS A SOURCE OF PERSONAL ETHICS AND AUTHORITARIAN CONSCIENCE AS A SIGNIFICANCE OF SOCIAL ETHICS

We normally force[30] ourselves to act properly in line with our conscience; however, it is not always easy to assess if our action in certain situation is proper or not. We often face ethical issues (and it makes us judge our actions as positive or negative) and ethical dilemmas (when found between two choices and unable to determine which path to follow). This entails the need to shape moral conscience with adequate certainty,[31] so that it can show us the path to take in many crossroads we come across.

At present, conscience is one of the most relevant topics to self-reflection of people. Formation of such conscience is labelled by Fromm as "humanistic conscience" [32] which is a reaction of our personality in our proper or improper functioning, together with the entirety of skills that constitute our human and intellectual existence - our inner recognition. Humanistic conscience is not only the expression of our true selves, but it simultaneously contains the essence of our moral experiences.

AUTHORITARIAN CONSCIENCE

In a social setting, what rules ones must know and adhere to? According to From, authoritarian conscience[33] exists in such cases. Fromm asserts that "authoritarian conscience is the introjected voice of an external authority figure, parents, state or any other figure". As far as the individuals' conduct and actions are not guided by the internal rules of morality, such conduct is driven and regulated by fear of punishment and the hope for reward, always dependent on the presence of these authorities. In the architecture of conscience, people either consciously or unconsciously accept these authorities such as the church, the state and the public opinion as moral and ethical legislators; therefore, people adhere to their laws and sanctions and internalize them. Consequently, the laws and sanctions of the external authority, i.e. the State institutions in this case, become part of oneself; so, instead of feeling responsible to something outside oneself, people feel responsible for something internal, for their own conscience which,

---

[27]Plato, (1999), "The Republic", Phoenix Publications, Tirana, pg. 147.

[28] Rachels, J &S, (2007, The Elements of Moral Philosophy", Dita Publications, Tirana, pg. 36.

[29] ibid.

[30] Freud's authoritarian conscience brewed by reward and sanction factors.

[31] Rachels, J &. (2007), "The Elements of Moral Philosophy", Dita Publications, Tirana, pg. 30.

[32] Fromm, E. (2003), "Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics", Fhoenix Publications, Tirana, pg. 132.

[33] Fromm, E. (2003), "Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics", Fhoenix Publications, Tirana, pg. 138.

according to Fromm, is only a preliminary stage in the development of "conscience"[34]. In seeking to distinguish between the humanistic and authoritarian conscience, we may single out that:

- Humanistic conscience gradually becomes part of person's integrity, while authoritarian conscience is targeted towards people's obedience, their duty or social adjustment.
- The goal of humanistic conscience is productiveness and, therefore, one's happiness. On the other hand, the pursuit of authoritarian conscience leads to submission, depersonalization, loss of integrity, and so on.

Actually, all rules, traditions, and conducts have undergone a vertiginous evolution, so, it is not easy to have a clear and firm conscience for the choices we must make. Such a fact leads to the need for shaping moral conscience with adequate certainty, in order to show us the path to follow among the many crossroads of life. Given that the authority of family, State, law, and public opinion plays an important role in shaping the conscience, it is the duty of these institutions to understand and recognize their orders and perform the "role of authority" towards man and society. The more equitable the institutions' orders, the greater chances there are to form a good moral conscience. Good authoritarian conscience produces a feeling of well-being, obedience and security, whereas a conscience created out of fear and reward produces insecurity.

Since personal morality is moulded through conscience, i.e. acceptance by human reason, it is important that authoritarian rules are created in a way that is accepted by human rationality. People find it easier to comply with rules if they first accept them. Today, all scholars of ethical thinking reach a common conclusion: the judgment and determination of conscience construe the most important moment of human conduct. But at this point, a question arises: Do legal and moral norms subsequently lose their significance, being that the independent determination of conscience is so important?

To answer these questions, we refer to Kant who emphasizes that "where legal order lacks a substrate of prevailing moral conscience of a population, even law is called into question"[35]. If the legal system itself has a stable legal and political balance, then there is no need to discuss on having a public inner conviction. But the latter hardly works, as Kelsen states, "Positivist legal science, free of politics, sociology or psychology, is only successful in periods of social balance. But, when public order is missing, we should revert to the theory of natural law"[36].

If legal norms are not accepted by citizens' moral conscience, then legal order will feel like an external coercion restricting the free development of personality. From this point of view, many people will tend to violate legal norms without any feeling of guilt.

In his work "The Concept of Law" [37], Hart explains that a legal system or rule is not required to have moral content, but it might be that a constitutional rule may be introduced in a legal system to include the moral requirement that is necessary or adequate to ensure legal validity in that system. To make this clear, we refer to the case of the Canadian Constitution[38] which foresees that moral reasons are crucial to the validity of laws. So, moral rules assume a very important bearing in this society, because morality is imposed as a condition for the existence of a basic document of law such as the Constitution.

The difference between legal and moral norms lies in the fact that while the former are shaped and exist to regulate the relationships in the actions among various entities, the latter guide relationships that exists between the action and the entity that performs it. The question arises: Does one believe oneself or not?[39] Does one act in accordance with his/her conscience or not?

A very interesting interpretation comes from Kant's philosophy which probes into the relationship between the tutelage and human judgement. The state of the tutelage, according to Kant, is one's inability to make use of our judgement without guidance by another. In fact, it is man himself responsible for this tutelage state where the cause lies in the inadequate courage to serve oneself in the absence of external care, rather than in one's inadequate judgement. Know to dare! This is the courage to serve yourself for the sake of your true judgement![40]

But what happens when there is a whole public instead of a single person; does the state of "enlightenment" work again? By rational action, the public can get rid of the tutelage, Kant claims. For this to happen, he proposes a

---

[34] Ibid.

[35] Kant, I. (2004), "Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals", Dritan Publications, Tirana, pg. 132.

[36] Ikonomi, L. (2006), "Philosophy of Right", Express Publications, Tirana, pg. 68.

[37] Ikonomi, L. (2006), "Philosophy of Right", Express Publications, Tirana, pg. 63.

[38] Hart, H.L.A. (1961 dhe second edition 1994), "The Concept of Law", Oxford: Clarendon Press, ph. 205.

[39] Fromm, E. (2003), "Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics; Fhoenix Publications, Tiranë, f .135-185.

[40] Kant, I.(2005), "Critical Philosophy", Dritan Publications, Tirana, pg.108.

revolution against personal despotism by putting an end to oppression driven by the desire for profit and ruling others. However, the public must not allow that their revolution replaces[41] the tutelages with new coercions.

We often hear of the "freedom of conscience[42]" as one of the basic criteria for human freedom, which outweighs other rules whose purpose is to restrict human behaviour. Freedom of conscience means applying public reason to all issues. But what really happens? Anywhere we hear: Don't reason! The Tax Officer[43] tells you not to reason, but to pay! And so on. Certain concrete choices that one makes are determined by the principles and inner truth one has – which stems from his/her experiences or other instances, as well as from processing the situation, its circumstances and the expected implications of his/her actions.

SOCIAL COEXISTENCE

Any ethics or moral system expects to be binding on everybody, but no specific moral system can obtain universal acceptance. So, invoking fundamental moral principles no longer suffices to legitimate the social system and its legal order. For this purpose, an effective persuasive force on all citizens would be necessary. At first glance, fundamental rights or human freedoms seem to fulfil such role in democratic societies. Though, on one hand, these fundamental rights hardly constitute the foundations of any constitutions; in contrast, constitutions originate from laws that protect individuals from the power of the State. On the other hand, there is no comprehensive consensus on the meaning of these fundamental rights.

Seeing that social coexistence continues to work regardless of such deep conflicts in values, it seems logical to conclude that integration of the social system does not occur because of morality. Luhmann is right in observing a gradual demoralization in terms of society's expectations of individuals. Instead of a personal morality, the important thing today is that individuals behave in consistence with the functionality of social subsystems where their activity occasionally takes place. Everything else is left to the free judgement of persons in deciding what to do. The proper functioning of social subsystems requires some degree of personal credibility which must stem from the personal integrity of individuals.

The findings of a "demoralization" of social life are not valid if we consider the tendency to express private and public judgements on the behaviour of others. Moral judgments refer to the question of how people should behave in social life. However different the opinions on this issue might be, we are always resort or are directed towards coexistence with others. The needs of such common living naturally invoke interest in having rules that outline our actions, so that social life can thrive. Thus, people must never lack the reason to express moral judgments, especially if they refer to the actions of others.

An extreme form of such judgments is moral blaming, a phenomenon that will never disappear from human social life, because it guarantees to the one who judges - unlike others - the pleasure of feeling in synergy with the needs of a truly human co-existence. But, to accomplish such a goal, it is not enough just to express judgment against others. It is, of course, harder to judge our own behaviour based on moral standards, because special circumstances or needs become so constricting that they often constitute an obvious excuse to concede to ourselves, i.e. an exception from the general norms.

The analysis of Luhmann's assumption that the organization of contemporary western society is "demoralized" led the following result: people's social co-existence retains a reference to moral motivation in the citizen's behaviour, and moral criteria interfere with the legitimacy of social order.

Validity and efficiency of such criteria is manifested, for example, in the case of human rights and conception on democracy. In both cases, the necessity for ethical orientation and reflection remains unaltered. Inconsistency in moral evaluations and judgments proves that it is precisely the individual's moral motivation that needs reflection capable of providing some orientation. The duty of ethics is outlined in these terms, in the current situation.

On the other hand, the concept of lifestyle does not simply refer to the context of action in the individual behaviour. Reindorf has fairly emphasized the fact that the individual is "connected" to others "by life in a community and society" and the awareness of this reality holds "an essential element of the ethical phenomenon".

So, ethics is not concerned about human action *per se,* but rather about the action driven by human lifestyle in the context of community life. This corresponds to the origin of ethics and customs, in the spirit of a community from which both legal right and ethics derive from. This is the root of a constant co-existence between a subjective and objective element in the notion of ethics: the unity of individual lifestyle and life adjustment in its community dimension. However, when faced with the practice of customs, the concept of lifestyle remains formal. It still says

---

[41] ibid , pg. 110.

[42] Nietzsche, F. (2003), "Beyond Good and Evil", Plejada Publications, Tirana, pg. 220.

[43] Ibid.

nothing accurate about the content of community living rules. Good or fair lifestyle cannot be deduced from the notion of lifestyle. From this notion, we can deduct only a prerequisite of social life, i.e. life in the society of individuals who are find themselves involved in the concept of lifestyle, and yet it remains in a formal level: the need for mutual recognition in the process of social communication. This formal notion of recognition says nothing more than what people should mutually recognize.

CONCLUSIONS

The dimension of civic education in social coexistence seeking to form world citizens would include:

Enhancement of citizens' knowledge of the law and political systems, democratic standpoints and participatory skills, and exercise their responsibilities in all public life levels.

Knowing social dimension competences where the values of cooperation and solidarity bear primary importance.

Competency-based involvement of citizens in economic dimensions related to labour organization and distribution of material goods.

Cultural dimension which itself represents historical competency, recognition of common and diverse heritage.

All the above-mentioned competencies play an important role in establishing a community of citizens who take responsibility and serve as the basis of public debate[44]. Such civil and moral ideas exist and are used in public discourse[45], including educational talks provided in the way of norms. Such moral ideas do not significantly differ from what people do in their daily life and somehow morality performs also the function of the law.

LITERATURE

Brown J. L. D. (2019), "Additive Value and the Shape of a Life", Ethics, vol 130, international journal ,Publisher Chicago Press,

Fromm, E. (2003), "Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics", Fhoenix Publications, Tirana

Gray. M, (2010), " Moral Sources and Emergent Ethical Theories in Social Work", The British Journal of Social Work, Vol. 40, No. 6, Publisher: Oxford University Press,

Hanlon Rubio. J (2011), " Moral Cooperation with Evil and Social Ethics" Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics, Vol. 31, No. 1, Publisher: Philosophy Documentation Center,

Hart, H.L.A. (1961 dhe second edition 1994), "The Concept of Law", Oxford: Clarendon Press,

Ikonomi, L. (2006), "Philosophy of Right", Express Publications, Tirana,

Journal of Moral Education, (2019),Taylor & Francis on line,

Journal of Global Ethics, vol 15, No.2 (2019), Taylor & Francis on line,

Junren. W and Xin. Y (2009) ,"Ethics and Ethicists in the Modern Context", Frontiers of Philosophy in China, Vol. 4, No. 2, Publisher: Brill,

Kant, I. (2004), "Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals", Dritan Publications, Tirana,

Lango. J .W. (2014) ," Moral theory" Book:The Ethics of Armed Conflict, Publisher Edinburgh University Press.

Mitchell,L. A. (2015) ,"Integrity and Virtue: The Forming of Good Character", Sage Journal ,

Nietzsche, F. (2003), "Beyond Good and Evil", Plejada Publications, Tirana,

Pike.A, (2016), " Morality and Religion 1", Helga&Secret Publications, Tirana.

Press .E , (2018), "Moral Courage: A Sociological Perspective", Society , Volume 55 , Publisher Springer US,

Rachels, J &S, (2007), The Elements of Moral Philosophy", Dita Publications, Tirana,

Racher .F E. (2007), The Evolution of Ethics for Community Practice Journal of Community Health Nursing, Vol. 24, No. 1, Publisher Taylor & Francis Ltd,

Tolle. E, (2014", "The pawer of the present", Pema Publications, Tirana,

---

[44] Audiger, Francois. (2000), Referred to the project "Education for democratic citizenship" Strasbourg, Council of Europe.

[45] Or, othewrise in the theory of Thomas Hobbes contract "Morality, a set of rules that rational people accept provided that others accept them too", Dita Publications, Tirana, pg. 80.