Global Ethics and Criticism of its Affirmative Approaches

Rasūl Amīr Qahrimānī[1*]; Sayyad Ḥamīd Riḍā Mīr ‘Aẓīmī[2]; Sayyida Mārīya Qurayshī[2]

1. PhD Student of Ethics, Faculty of Thought and Islamic Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
2. Assistant Professor of Ethics, Faculty of Thought and Islamic Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

Abstract
Global ethics is a branch of social ethics which finds the "ethical commonalities" among religions and creeds, and calls people for an understanding and recognizance of it. Realities and challenges of the contemporary world make the global ethics an inevitable necessity. Thus, the representatives of the world religions endorsed the declaration of global ethics in 1993. Ethical commonalities can be recognized through inductive and deductive ways. Inductive approach is related to the study of ethical schools of thought and creeds and also case study of ethical commonalities; because it is not biased in favor of any specific school, it is accepted more ubiquitously. However, it faces criticisms such as not being definite, not explicating the causal relations between ethical phenomena, and not providing a solution for ethical contradictions. Deductive approach is based on the theory of innate disposition, and identifies the public and widespread ethical virtues through innate requirements. Despite having an epistemological value and providing definite results, deductive approach lacks generalization. This is because ethical non-realists and also those who deny the innate disposition do not accept this approach. The global ethics needs to follow both of these approaches which complement each other.

1. Introduction

Exploring human temperament and behavior as well as explicating, explaining, justifying, and describing its soundness and falsehood have always been the concern of scientists of ethics. Many arguments have been propounded, over time, which are compiled in the science of ethics.

The specific features of the contemporary time that — due to the augmentation of communication industry — have developed the ethical interaction of people in the world and have provided a global village for the life of mankind is the reason for the increasing importance of ethical understanding. Nonetheless, if this understanding wished to be determined based on a complete and comprehensive school of ethics, it would be difficult and time-consuming because of the vast differences of humans in their foundations. Now the question arises that there is a more smooth way for the ethical understanding of the entire people. And how can this way be identified? The study at hand attempts, first, to explicate the quiddity of global ethics and its necessity regarding the challenges of the contemporary world and, second, to explain and criticize the ways of identifying global ethics through inductive and deductive approaches.

⁎ **Corresponding Author, Email:** r.amirghahremani@ut.ac.ir

2. The quiddity of global ethics

Global ethics is a branch of ethics that for a better understanding of which one should be familiar with the science of ethics and its subjects.

2.1. Definition and subject of ethics

Ethics is the science of the way of being and the way of living. Although the subject explored in this science, to some scientists, is the internal temperament which is realized as a permanent faculty in human soul (Ibn Miskawayh, 2005: 115; Ṭūsī, 1992: 14), it is more comprehensive than the internal temperament including the external behavior of the human (Miṣbāḥ Yazdī, 2012: 20-21; Muṭahharī, 1993 vol. 13: 714; Zhaks, 1983: 9). Basically from the entire ethical schools of thought, consequentialism and deontology focus their ethical arguments on the external behavior. On the contrary, virtue theoreticians pay attention to the internal temperament, demeanor, character, and motivations of an ethical agent (for more information, q.v. Frankena, 2004: 141).

The difference between these two views in ethics has caused the formation of two trends of personal ethics and social ethics. Namely, personal ethics concentrates first and foremost on the self-refinement, modification of temperament, and the permanent realization of ethical faculties. This is whereas the social ethics above all is related to the reformation of human's external behavior towards others. In personal ethics, some ethical attributes are recommended in interacting with others. This is because they lead to soul perfections, and not because they influence the redemption of the public and the regulation of social relations. For example, teachings like "generosity", bravery", and "justice" are of importance in the personal ethics because, through possessing these attributes, the soul of the human becomes sublime, even if one in a part of his or her life is not found in a situation which requires a, say, generous behavior. This is whereas the social ethics finds its meaning only in the receptacle of society and human interactions[1] (Fanā'ī, 2005: 52-59).

2.2. Definition and subject of global ethics

Global ethics is one of the aspects of social ethics that, without considering the ideological dissimilarities, emphasizes the commitment of all humans to the commonalities of good behavior. The subject of the global ethics is also beyond the soul faculties, and is related to the behavior of humans. This ethical approach holds that the differences in worldviews do not necessarily lead to the differences in the entire ethical values. Rather, it states that the existence of some ethical commonalities can be proved, without considering the skin color, race, religion, denomination, nationality, and gender. Therefore, global ethics is some ethical study and attitude that, through its affirmative approaches, tries to determine, explicate, explain, recommend, and support the ethical commonalities.

In personal ethics contrary to global ethics, the incentive and intention of the agent is not a gauge for evaluating an act, but rather what matters first and foremost is the realization of an ethical act, without regarding the agentive goodness or obscenity. For example, if "trustiness" is done out of utilitarian incentives to achieve the trust of others, it is not an accepted act and

---

1. Personal ethics and social ethics have common values, but they follow various goals with those very common values. For example, telling lies is an obscene value both in the personal ethics and social ethics. However, it is bad in personal ethics because it challenges the salvation of a person, and it is bad in social ethics because it infringes the rights of others or destabilizes the trust of people to each other which is a necessary condition for social cooperation.

lacks the agentive beauty from the view of personal ethics. However in the global ethics which is an attitude of social ethics, the act of "trustiness" is favorable without concerning the incentive behind it; it makes no difference whether this behavior is done out of a thought to attain salvation or out of habit, obligation, or custom to attain fame and the like (Küng, 1997: 44-70; Id., 1998: 5-48; Küng & Karl-Josef, 1993: 103-107).

3. Necessity of global ethics

The idea of global ethics has arisen owing to social facts, challenges, and necessities of contemporary time. That is, after the emergence of industrial revolution[1] and the expansion of communication and transportation industries thereof, the geographical borders and the interaction distance overriding the behavior of societies and nations gradually decreased and the relations among people became more interwoven.

Based on the reported statistics, more than 75 percent of people have turned to communication in cyberspace[2] (Digital Trends, 2019). Development of communication means has not removed the tensions and immoralities in the social classes of religious and non-religious people from various denominations and sects, from the people of countries or even a city, making the contemporary world face deep, ethical crises. Martyr Muṭahharī says, "Today's civilization not only has not decreased the crimes[3], but also it has made them more and bigger" (Muṭahharī, 1993, vo. 1: 270).

Nonetheless, the attainment of a complete and impeccable understanding between people to determine an ethical, perfect and comprehensive school – which is based on a correct and logical foundation – is difficult or impossible. This is because:

First, some of the ethical challenges (like undue gender discrimination) are based on long-lasting habits, customs, ignorance, and prejudices and non-discursive dogmatism that are time-consuming and are in need of many persuasive tools to change.

Second, some cases of ethical abnormalities (like racial behaviors) are out of philosophical assumptions and various accepted worldviews. Thus, focus on behavior correction has less effect without taking care of those assumptions. Apart from this, logical agreement in the philosophical and worldview foundations is much more difficult than agreement in morals and behavior.

Third, some immoral behaviors (like violence and hawkishness) are provoked and promoted by political and non-political organizations and institutions through deformation of the facts for materialistic goals. It seems ethical persuasion and peaceful settlement with these centers of power is onerous and in need of many other preparations.

Now that there is no possibility for the attainment of a complete and logical understanding and also determination of an ethical, comprehensive and perfect school of thought, should one do nothing and be indifferent about many immoralities of the world? To answer this concern, global ethics holds that although determining a comprehensive ethical school is a challenging matter, one

---

1. Bases of industrial revolution were established in England from 1750 to 1830. In the light of the development of industrial and communication techniques and products, this revolution made a deep transformation in all its contemporary social contexts (in all the areas that were influenced by it) (Sa'īdī, 1972: 158, 167).
2. Based on the research done by "We are social" and "Hootsuit", from January 2018 then on, every day on average more than a million new users have been added to the users of Internet in a way that, in 2019, the number of Internet users reached 4 billion and 39 million (Digital Trends, 2019).
3. Although crime is a legal expression related to the violation of rules, it seems what Martyr Muṭahharī meant by this word is social immoralities.

can explore and expurgate the ethical commonalities between the schools of thoughts, religions, and creeds through using a minimalistic approach as well as overcome many ethical crises of the contemporary time through recommending those commonalities. Theoreticians of global ethics believe that if people, organizations, governments, and rulers succeed in moving within and being obliged to this very minimalistic approach, a great many problems in economic, political, and environmental realms would be solved and, thus, the health of the global, social system would be guaranteed (Declaration Toward a Global Ethic, n.d.).

4. Background of global ethics

In recent decades in the West, some attempts have been done and solutions have been sought to search and determine the ethical commonalities and build the structure of global ethics. As to this matter, the most important attempt has been done by the Christian theologian, Hans Küng, at the beginning of the last decade of 20th century.

The idea of "global ethics" does no seek to provide a specific, ethical school of thought next to other ethical schools. The goal of propounding this theory is to promote social ethics on a global scale in order to realize the peace and move away from immoralities. For this, a center, "The Global Ethic Institute", was established in Tübingen under the management of Hans Küng in 1991.

In April 28, 1989, the executive manager of "Parliament of the World's Religions" asked Hans Küng to procure a statement about the "ethical commonalities" for this council. After writing the first draft by Hans Küng and his students and revising and correcting it for several times, a meeting was held from August 28 to September 4, 1993, to commemorate the "centennial year of the conference of world's religions in 1893" with the attendance of representatives from 120 religions in Chicago. In this meeting, the foregoing draft was endorsed and signed under the title of "Declaration Toward a Global Ethic" (n.d.) by the representatives of world religions. Within this draft, various ethical teachings have been recommended to people for the realization of peace and serenity.

After this, Leonard Swidler, professor of the religions faculty of Temple University, wrote another draft for global ethics and presented it to public for exploring and criticizing; so far, many corrections have been done to this draft. The pivotal view of Swidler is the emphasis on the "Golden Rule" to the effect that "Treat others as we would like to be treated" (Swidler, 2004).

5. Affirmative approaches of global ethics

Global ethics in the realm of affirmation is based on ethical commonalities between ethical schools of thought and creeds. However, the affirmative aspect of ethical commonalities and their recognition is sensibly possible through two approaches:

5.1. Inductive approach

Induction is one of the ways of argument in which one moves from part to whole and from experimental data to theory. It is based on this principle that one can discover the rules overriding a phenomenon through observing and thinking precisely about the recurrent patterns.[1] Induction is realized through two types:

---

1. The definition of induction provided in the text is based on the definitions of Muslim scientists. In the West, induction means "every type of non-deductive argument". With this definition, induction is more inclusive than the common and shared induction (Harman, 2000: 201).

a) Complete induction in which everything is explored as a whole and a general conclusion is obtained like studying the ethical behaviors of all schools of thought, religions, creeds, habits, and customs and then figuring out common, ethical behaviors and attitudes among people.

b) Incomplete induction in which some of things are explored as a whole, but a general conclusion is derived like some of the common, ethical behaviors among some of the tribes or creeds which are deemed as global, ethical commonalities (Muẓaffar, 2003: 309-315).

Inductive approach in global ethics is based on studying and exploring ethical teachings of school of thought and then determining and including ethical commonalities. This approach has been taken on by some thinkers such as Hans Küng. Due to his interest and concern, Küng has dedicated his studies to some religions and creeds like Islam, Judaism, Chinese creeds, Buddhism, and Hinduism and has figured out ethical commonalities among these religions and schools. In writing the draft of global ethics' statement, Küng has used the opinions of some scholars in the University of Tübingen including *Heinrich von Stietencron*, the specialist of Hinduism, *Josef van Ess*, Islamic scholar and theoretician, and Karlheinz, the specialist of Chinese creeds. The existence of ethical commonalities has led him to conclude that all humans can oblige themselves to observe the principles of ethical commonalties for the realization of peace (Küng, 1998: 44-52).

Inductive approach has been present among some of the Muslim ethical thinkers, like the necessity of referring to praiseworthy opinions and accepted premises[1] in determining the general propositions of ethics.

5. 2. Deductive approach

On behalf of exploring the ethical commonalities case by case, deductive approach emphasizes the existence of a comprehensive, general yardstick within the human innateness, based upon which it determines, explicates, and recommends general ethical behaviors among people. This approach – which is justifiable based on the views of scholars of innate disposition ethics – holds that innate disposition is a widespread phenomenon among all humans. In the realms of affirmation and perception, if the ethical commonalties related to the innate disposition can be identified, then the ethical commonalties of humans can also be identified, which they can be introduced as the teachings of global ethics.

Innate disposition is one of the important subjects of anthropology that its ethical results can be used in global ethics. Also in Islamic knowledge, this theory has received great attention and, as Martyr Muṭahharī says, it is "of the most important subjects of Islamic knowledge" (Muṭahharī, 1993, vol. 2: 63). Based on the theory of innate disposition, the essence of human has two aspects of vision and attitude that God has deposited them within him at the time of his creation. Accordingly, the human is capable of perceiving ethical principles and recognizing the goodness and obscenity bases. Moreover, his essence is inclined toward benevolence and is evasive about badness.

---

1. Avicenna sees all the ethical rules and cases as specifically accepted premises. To him, although these rules are accepted by everybody, none of them are directly attained through cognitive faculties. Also, they cannot be ascertained without social education and training (Avicenna, 2002: 127). Among Muslim thinkers, Muḥaqqiq Iṣfahānī also has the same view (Iṣfahānī, 1995: 42-43, 311-314).

Human innate disposition has five features: 1) generality[1]; 2) inalterability[2]; 3) innateness; 4) hierarchy; and 5) selectivity of the action based on its requirements (Muṭahharī, 1993, vol. 2: 489-491).

The aforesaid features can pave the way for the realization of global ethics based on the innate aspects; namely, when the innate disposition contains "generality", then all humans (who are drawn to ethical goodness and hateful to ethical badness) can cooperate around innate requirements. Also in ethical policy making, one can rely on this common element. Moreover, the aspect of "inalterability" is an additional reason for it. This is because there is this certain feeling that innate attitude is secure in all favorable and unfavorable ethical conditions and one can be aided by its graces, though the perceptive and attitudinal aspects of innate disposition dwindle in unfavorable conditions. The "non-acquired" feature of innate disposition offers the trainers of "global ethics" this capital so that they can use the ethical bounties without bearing the consequences. The equivocality and gradation of innate disposition suggests the possibility of ethical rise or decline of the human. The aspect of "being conscious and voluntary" also is related to the subject of ethics because basically ethics and ethical training is possible when the recommended behavior is voluntary and conscious.

The deductive approach of global ethics based on the innate disposition theory is possible with the consideration of the following points:

1. In the analogy formed, innate disposition should be placed as the middle term.
2. In provision of the analogy's minor premise, ethical behaviors consistent with the innate disposition should be identified.
3. The formed analogy should be based on priory demonstration. That is, contrary to the posteriori demonstration in which one argues the cause through the effect, in priory demonstration one should argue the effect through the cause (Sulaymānī Amīrī, 2010: 99). In other words, in posteriori demonstration, the middle term is just the cause for the realization of the belief in demonstration's conclusion, but in priory demonstration the middle term – in addition to being the cause of the belief in the conclusion – is the real cause of the conclusion (Muẓaffar, 2003: 309-315).

If we wanted to express the deductive form of this view with an example based on the first form of demonstration (which is one of the important forms as to the four forms of demonstration), it would be as follows:

Compassion toward other people (as an ethical teaching) is a requirement of human's innate disposition.

Every ethical behavior which is a requirement of human's innate disposition is global (because all humans have been created based on that).

Conclusion: showing compassion toward other humans is of global ethics.

It can be seen in this analogy that human innate disposition is the middle term of the demonstration. In addition to causing belief in the conclusion, it is the cause of the conclusion in the world of reality. That is, this innate disposition causes the realization of global ethics.

Both the inductive and deductive approaches have positive and negative points as to proving the commonalities of global ethics, which would be discussed in the following:

---

1. When innate disposition is mentioned in noble Qur'ān, the expression "the pattern on which He has made mankind" (Qur'ān 30:30) is used which means that God has bestowed upon all humans the innate disposition.
2. In the verse of innate disposition, noble Qur'ān emphasizes its inalterability, saying, "no change (let there be) in the work (wrought) by God" (Qur'ān 30:30).

6. Criticism of affirmative approaches of global ethics

6.1. Criticism of inductive approach

To criticize the inductive approach of global ethics, the following can be stated:

Although some like Francis Bacon and John Stuart Mill were among those who believed in the authenticity of this logic and deemed it an appropriate way for offering general rules (Chalmers, 2010: 45-50), in fact both the complete and incomplete inductions lack the proper applicability in sciences. Although complete induction leads to certainty, its attainment is not typically possible because many persons would be realized in the future or some persons existed in far past and now they are perished. As to ethical commonalties, for example, some ethical behaviors have not had the possibility of realization due to environmental conditions and thus have been disregarded in inductive approach. On the other hand, incomplete induction does not lead to certainty, because all persons have not been examined and the cause of the judgment has not yet been attained so that one can prove the judgment in respect of the other details (Muẓaffar, 2003: 309-315).

In studying and examining the ethical commonalities, one should not overlook the diversity and span of ethical teachings among people. This span is so widespread that it is very difficult to achieve a general conclusion out of a mere incomplete induction of ethical commonalities, and introduce a certain behavior as an ethical commonality. As to this subject, Hans Küng and the like can be criticized to the effect that there are innumerable ethical schools of thought that have not been studied or cared by them; moreover, basically there is a possibility of the existence of some creeds and habits among humans other than what has been deemed as the ethical commonality. Therefore, drawing a general conclusion out of an incomplete induction is speculative and lacks the logical certain limit.

Inductive approach is more used to describe the phenomena, but it cannot explicate the causal relations between the phenomena. Also in the induction of ethical commonalities, because one cannot attain the criterion and the cause of attributing the judgment to the ethical subject, there is the possibility of the inevitable impact of theoretical preconceptions on the realized perception of one's observations (Chalmers, 2010: 45-50). Therefore in counting the ethical commonalities through induction, it is possible to mix etiquette with ethics due to the interference of improper preconceptions. For example, by seeing that most people of the world wear shoes in public, we may conclude in our induction that this behavior is an instance of ethical commonality, whereas this act is indeed an etiquette and not ethics.

Based on the second criticism (i.e. not explicating the causal relations between phenomena), of the other failings of inductive approach in determining ethical commonalities is the lack of proving a stance in practical relativism. That is, in counting ethical commonalties one may conclude that some creeds, say, burn the corpse of dead people to revere the dead (which is an ethical act), while in other creeds this behavior is considered wrong and they bury their dead people in the ground to revere them. Now, what should be done if a general teaching in global ethics is going to be recommended? It may be said that these are the forms of ethical behavior about which every tribe can be recommended to act according to its own preferred way. However, this question here arises: if a dead person is a point of controversy for these two groups (namely, some believe in burning and some in burying), what should be done?

In addition to the mentioned failings, some of the positive aspects of inductive approach in studying global ethics should not be unnoticed. This is because if the ethical commonalities are counted and determined through the case study of the ethical schools of thought and

teachings, then these commonalties are dismissed from having biases of religion, creed and the like. Accordingly, improper oppositions won't have the possibility to interfere with this approach and thus, generality of the global ethics would be more feasible, regardless of the contradictory cases. Also in the inductive approach, one can perceive the generality of these common ethical teachings (without having criticism, opinions, or challenges about the philosophical and affirmative foundations), and undue biases would, hence, pack off.

Inductive approach becomes necessary when there is not enough information about a phenomenon and the researcher wants to provide necessary, underlying knowledge for it. Thus, the researcher is unable to provide a solution in contradictory ethical conditions. For instance, what should be done if, in certain conditions, honesty (as a good ethical behavior) causes an oppressor to catch an innocent person and then kill him (as an obscene act), but lying (as an obscene act) causes him to run away from the oppressor? With no doubt, as to this instance, inductive study of ethics cannot, per se, offer a global yardstick for determining the preferred behavior, and the global ethics would fail this situation.

It is necessary to mention that although the affirmative approach of Hans Küng in examining ethical commonalities has been based on induction, the possibility of deduction of ethical commonalties can also be understood from some of his ideas. For example, he emphasizes this point that "Every human being must be treated humanely" (Küng, 1997: 4). Revising this view and determining "humane treatment" as the middle term of the argument can be related to the deductive aspect of global ethics, though a systemic study has not been done by Küng about this view and induction is the dominant aspect of his ethical approach. Also, the view of Swidler that sets the Golden rule as the pivot of global ethics provides the possibility of deduction of this theory.

6.2. Criticism of deductive approach

As the deductive approach has more importance in logical limit than the other ways of reasoning, it has also more priority in the discussion of global ethics. However, the use of it as one of the affirmative approaches of global ethics faces some criticisms and challenges, which will be discussed here:

Of the challenges of deductive approach based on innate disposition theory is the provision of analogy's minor premise. That is, instances of ethical behaviors (required by the innate disposition) from an affirmative aspect should be identified in the minor premise of this analogy so that, finally through using the analogy's major premise, these behaviors could be introduced as the teachings of global ethics. But this is just the beginning because identification of some ethical behaviors consistent with the innate requirements is not clear to everybody, with disagreements about them. For example, what is the appropriate ethical behavior in an encounter with an arrogant person? Should we show modesty to such a person? Should we be indifferent toward him? Or should we retaliate? This is one of the instances of ethical challenges that although the human innate disposition requires one of these behaviors with regard to affirmation and reality realm, identification of innate disposition requirements is not an easy task in the realm of ascertainment and perception. The most important reason for this difficulty is the lack of consensus. If the behavior consistent with the innate disposition were easy to understand, then there would be no disagreement in determining the ethical behavior. Also in some cases, the behavior consistent with the innate disposition may be identified and even agreed globally, but there may be disagreement in determining its conceptual width or its narrowness or in determining the limit of its applicability. For example, if it is concluded that in the previous example conceitedness

before an arrogant person is a behavior consistent with the innate disposition, then this arises that to what extent confrontational conceitedness is acceptable. Therefore with this objection, generalization of global ethics faces a challenge.

It is worthy to note that to some Muslim thinkers, ethical cases are self-evident and are of the type of intuitive cognition or a priori data (Fayyāḍ Lāhījī, 1985: 60-62; Ḥā'irī Yazdī, 2005: 126-129; Ḥillī, 1982: 84; Jawādī Āmulī, 2008: 57; Nawbakht, 1984: 104; Sabziwārī, 1993: 322; Ṣadr, 1987: 544; Sayyid Murtaḍā, 1990: 287). Some may think that self-evidence of ethical cases, per se, leads to the comprehensive and general perception of ethical cases and the realization of global ethics. However to criticize this idea, it should be said that self-evidence of ethical cases (whether to regard them from the type of intuitive cognition, a priori data, or cases with the stipulated attribute) is related to the ethical generalities and principles like the goodness of justice, obscenity of oppression, goodness of trustiness, obscenity of lying, and so on. Nonetheless, determining the instances of these moralities and matching the titles with the subjects (particularly in ethical contradictions[1]) is a difficult and indefinite matter.

Although the scientific discussion between the scientists for determining the ethical behavior consistent with the innate disposition, determining its limits of concept and applicability, and also providing a logical solution for the ethical contradictions is feasible, the attainment of a general theory would be difficult regarding the differences of foundations and the distinction of discourses. Some thinkers consider the divine revelation as the last say for the differences of view, and hold that because senses, intelligence, and experience are unable to perceive all the dimensions of salvation and suffering ways as well as the recognition of causal relations between human acts and their otherworldly consequences, referring to the divine message and Prophets' aid can compensate for the deficiencies of intelligence (Miṣbāḥ Yazdī, 2014: 110-112). It seems although this view as to the relation between the intelligence and revelation has a firm limit in epistemology[2], it has no use in global ethics whose goal is creating the unity of discourse in the ethical common teachings among the people of the world. Regarding the otherworldly consequences of the human's behavior and also believing the rightfulness of revelation (regardless of some of the deviations in the interpretation of revelation among some religions) is not something agreed by all the people and, thus, cannot have the last say in determining the behavior of global ethics. In global ethics, it is necessary to seek that series of ethical teachings which is generally accepted by all the worldviews and epistemologies.

One of the other challenges of deductive approach in global ethics based on the innate disposition theory is the declining view of some thinkers regarding the very existence of innate disposition and its faculties. For example, to John Locke (1632-1704), human tablet basically is like a white piece of paper or an empty room. At the beginning, the human lacks the perceptive products like imaginations and ideas; in other words, in the mind, there is basically no innate principle (Locke, 1970: 7, 13, 30, 37). It seems the view of Locke is based on this point that the human is equipped only with perceptive ability; however, perceptive data and also its quality is not something which is embedded in the human innate disposition (Ibid: 107-108).

---

1. The example can be a situation wherein honesty causes the death of tens of innocent people. Here as the act is honesty it is good, but as it causes the death of the innocent it is obscene.
2. Revelation has the greatest cognitive value among all the cognitions.

Therefore, regardless of the existence of reasons for the criticism of Locke's views, the realization of global ethics based on the innate disposition-based deductive theory misses the feature of generality, and with the view of John Locke and the like, the middle term of the argument cannot be procured.

Of the criticisms against the deductive approach of global ethics based on the innate disposition theory is its incompatibility with the view of ethical non-realists.[1] This is because accepting an ethical reality (regardless of the divine command, emotion, or convention) is of the postulates of global ethics with a deductive-innate approach. However, ethical non-realists do not see a reality for ethical realities. That is, based on the deductive innate approach, intellectual explication of ethical rules is possible only when there is a logical relation between the values and concrete facts; such a relation is fixed regardless of various tastes and desires. However, non-realists have propensity toward the relativity of ethical propositions. They deem all the ethical rules equal, no matter how much they are contradictory and opposed. Basically, they have denied the capability of their being true and false (Rachels, 1997: 428-433). Therefore, regardless of the criticisms against the non-realistic view, generality of global ethics with a deductive approach would face challenges.

Beside the criticisms against the deductive approach of global ethics based on the innate disposition theory, the positive aspects of this approach in comparison with the inductive approach should not be overlooked. These positive aspects of deductive approach can be stated in three axes:

Epistemological value

Although the generality of inductive approach is more convenient, it is of not much value regarding the epistemological limit because its produce is speculative. However, the deductive approach possesses certainty of conclusion because it is based on logical analogy.

Less practical expense

Contrary to the inductive approach in which much effort and practical expense is needed for seeking the ethical commonalities between various schools of thought and creeds in order to attain the required result, it is not necessary to study the creeds and ethical schools of thought and to search their moralities practically case by case in deductive approach. If the premises of the analogy are arranged in deductive approach, general innate behavior can be identified and be introduced as the global ethics, even if no study is done as to the extant creeds.

Identification of causal relations

Because the inductive approach is useful for describing the phenomena, it cannot explicate the causal relations among the phenomena. Nonetheless, the deductive approach is related to mentioning the criterion and the cause of attributing the judgment to the ethical subject.

---

1. Ethical non-realism does not necessarily mean the denial of human innate disposition and, thus, there is no contradiction between the second and the third criticisms. This is because reasonably it is possible for one to be non-realist in the realm of ethics and, at the same time, to believe in the human innate disposition. However, his perception of innate disposition can be merely focused on some of the mathematical (rather than ethical) innate perceptions of the human.

Conclusion

Global ethics in the conditions of contemporary world is a necessary and inevitable matter, which is based on ethical commonalities. Exploring the ethical commonalties to procure the products of global ethics is possible through the inductive and deductive approaches (based on the innate disposition theory). Each of these approaches has its own positive and negative features and none of them can be unnoticed because both approaches are useful in their proper setting, facilitating the attainment of the goals of global ethics. To achieve its goals, it seems global ethics should follow both approaches next to each other and at the same time. Inductive approach has a more mass value, while deductive approach has a more elite value. It can be said that the weakness of each of these approaches is compensated by the strength of the other approach and that these two approaches are complement to each other.

References

- *The noble Qur'ān*

Avicenna, Ḥ. (2002), *Al-Ishārāt wa al-tanbīhāt*. Edited by M. Zāriʿī, Qom, Būstān Kitāb.

Chalmers, A. F. (2010) *What is this thing called science? An assessment of the nature and status of science and its methods.* Translated by S. Zībākalam. Tehran, SAMT.

Declaration Toward A Global Ethic. (n.d.), https://www.global-ethic.org/

Digital Trends (2019), *Every single stat you need to know about the internet.* https://thenextweb.com

Fanā'ī, A. (2005), *Religion gauged by the scale of ethics.* Tehran, Ṣirāṭ Cultural Insitute.

Fayyāḍ Lāhījī, M. (1985), *Belief capital.* Edited by Ṣ. Lārījānī, Tehran, Al-Zahrā'.

Frankena, W. K. (2004) *Ethics*. Translated by H. Ṣādiqī, Qom, Ṭāhā Publications.

Ḥā'irī Yazdī, M. (2005), *practical Reason meta-ethics*. Tehran, Iranian Research Institute of Philosophy.

Harman, G. (2000), *Induction: Enumerative and hypothetical*, A Companion to Epistemology. Oxford, Blackwell.

Ḥillī, J. (1982), *Nahj al-Ḥaqq wa kashf al-ṣadq*. Edited by A. A. Ḥasanī Urmawī, Beirut, Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī.

Ibn Miskawayh, A. (2005), *Tahdhīb al-akhlāq wa ta thīr al-aʿrāq*. Qom, Ṭalīʿa al-ūr.

Iṣfahānī, M. (1995), *Nihāya al-darāya fī sharḥ al-Kifāya*. Edited by R. Qulīzāda, Qom, Sayyid al-Shuhadā.

Jawādī Āmulī, A. (2008), *Studies in religion*. Edited by M. R. Muṣṭafāpūr, Qom, Isrā'.

Küng, H. (1997), *Yes to a global ethic: Voices from religion and politics*, Continuum International Publishing Group.

Id. (1998), *A global ethic for a global politics and global economics.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Küng & K. Karl-Josef (1993), *A global ethic.* New York, Continuum.

Locke, J. (1970) *An essay concerning human understanding.* Summarized by S. P. Pattison, translated by R. Zāda Shafaq. Tehran, Dehkhudā.

Miṣbāḥ Yazdī, M. (2012), *Philosophy of ethics.* Edited by A. Ḥ. Sharīfī, Qom, Imam Khomeini Education and Research Institute.

Id. (2014), *Knowing the path and the guide*. Qom, Imam Khomeini Education and Research Institute.

Muṭahharī, M. (1993*), The collection of the works of master Muṭahharī (vol. 1: Divine justice).* Qom, Ṣadrā.

Id. (1993), *The collection of the works of master Muṭahharī (vol. 2: Human and faith).* Qom, Ṣadrā.

Id. (1993), *The collection of the works of master Muṭahharī (vol. 13: A critic on Marxism).* Qom, Ṣadrā.

Muẓaffar, M. (2003), *Al-Manṭiq*. Qom, Dār al-ʿIlm.

Nawbakht, A. (1984), *Al-Yāqūt*. Qom, Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī.

Rachels, J. (1997), *Subjectivism*. A companion to epistemology. Oxford, Blackwell

Sabziwārī, M. (1993), *Sharḥ al-Asmā' al-Ḥusnā*. Edited by N. Ḥabībī, Tehran, University of Tehran.

Ṣadr, M. (1987), *Manāḥith al-uṣūl*. Edited by K. Ḥusaynī Ḥā'irī, Qom, Maktab al-Iʿlām al-Islāmī.

Saʿīdī, A. (1972), "Industrial Revolution and the geographical face of the world." *New Literary Studies*, 29, 155-177.

Sayyid Murtaḍā (1990), *Al-Dhakhīra fī ʿilm al-kalām*. Edited by A. Ḥusaynī, Qom, Al-Nashr al-Islamī.

Sulaymānī Amīrī, A. (2010), *Advanced logic*. Qom, Al-Mustafa International University Centre for Publications and Translations.

Swidler, L. (2004), *Toward a universal declaration of a global ethic*. http://www.jsri.ro

Ṭūsī, Kh. (1992), *Akhlāq Nāṣirī*. Tehran, Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya.

Zhaks (1983), *Moral philosophy*. Translated by A. Pūr Ḥusaynī, Tehran, Amīr Kabīr.