

Dialectical Ethics and Politics in Western Thought: Contemporary Vision

Tagreed Hanoon Ali, Mohamed Aziz Abdel-Hassan
University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq

If the policy in its simple definition is the methods of leadership of the human group and the methods of management of what is believed to be good and useful, morality is the set of values and ideals directed at human behavior towards what is also believed to be good and to avoid what is perceived as evil. Both of politics and morality are aimed at giving people a preconceived vision that makes their lives a goal and a meaning, and therefore converge on the call to build a certain pattern of principles and human relations and to defend them, but are accustomed to the character of the principles and relations that address the policy which is different qualitatively from those addressed by the ethics to the extent of the conflict in Mkavili, which overrides politics on morality in his book *Prince*, to show behavior, as if he openly denies all moral virtues when justifying the use of all means to achieve political ends! The relationship of morality in politics is in a constant renewal, depending on the evolution of political events and reflection on the ethics, so there must be a continuous research and writings are looking at all new in this relationship and in every age of the ages. It should be noted that the rules, priorities and the foundations of governance, law, and politics are the conscience of the priorities of building moral, and then for the ruling political that pays tribute to the Kingdom of politics on the ground and the soil and the rules of policy and uses if possible rules of ethics as a complementary help, but not essential why? Because the good political system must be based on the pillars of several of the most prominent: The first is people's power in decision-making; the second is equal rights in the exercise of that power. The truth is following the effect that the state rule is personal and moral relations among individuals and is governed by state law and not personal moral relations!

Keywords: dialectical ethics, western thought, contemporary vision

The importance of research is that the relationship of moral to politics is in a continuous renewal, depending on the evolution of political events and the reflection on moral, so there must be researches and writings ongoing looking at each new in this relationship and in every era of the ages; moral and politics are important subjects for individuals and countries. It is renewed in every age.

Problematic Search

The research deals with several problems, including the old problems of ethics, the impact on politics, and modern and contemporary issues. What is the impact of ethics on politics?

Tagreed Hanoon Ali, Ph.D., assistant professor, College of Political Science, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq; research field: political thought.

Corresponding author: Mohamed Aziz Abdel-Hassan, Ph.D., assistant professor, College of Political Science, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq; research field: international and strategic studies.

Search hypothesis based on this problem, we started from the hypothesis that: The relationship of moral to politics is an old phenomenon, but it is renewed and takes different forms over time.

Research Methodology

The research was based on a historical approach to trace the formation and development of the relationship between moral and politics in addition to the analytical approach to analyzing the intellectual foundations of moral and analyzing the vision of philosophers and thinkers of this relationship.

Structure of Research

The research has been divided into following sections, in addition to introduction and conclusion:

The first topic: the meaning of moral and its origins;

The second topic: resources of moral and its branches and roots;

The third topic: Aristotle's ethics;

The fourth topic: the future of the relationship between morality and politics.

The First Topic: The Meaning of Morality and Its Origins

The meaning of morality is the general recognition of the actions of the Islam and Muslims' principles in all, and falls on the terms in which do not feel the actor most often.

It also means searching for the principles, arranging and settling them, and showing all their truths, all their practical importance, and the duties that they have imposed upon the human being with all the consequences that result from them (Bartmelli, 1973).

Ethics are a general law and not a personal law that may be in a conscience stronger and clearer than in another conscience, but it exists in all pronouns to a degree of power and weakness, resulting in the law of ethics to give people a single dialect, although their hearts do not listen to the questioner.

The result is that the law of morality is not only a basis for the individual, but also a factor for the unity of the ties that connect the individual with his/her ideals, while the needs are closer to the people, the benefits go to decay, and even the family love itself, which helps to form the family that may not help to save (Froukh, 2014).

Morality is known to end the printing and the prison, and in general, the prison and the printing are as good and righteous as honor and courage, or not like Hamdin acceptance of humiliation, weakness, and cowardice (Fattah, 1990).

And morality is a normative, voluntary, and subjective character, or even a daily habit that is consciously and exclusively committed to man. Without the moral union, the human community would have been free. People may cooperate as some animal species, but they can never be perfect or distant from it, which arranges for themselves and remains for centuries. That man feels or happens to himself or other people also understand the law of morality.

The boundaries of man's voluntary actions, which include morality, can include good and bad. They are so wide and varied that we can observe their effects at all levels (Zaki & Badruddin, 1999).

That the moral and voluntary act on the individual and collective level in terms of composition in a manner that cannot talk about the separation of morality and moral action without reference to what is immoral and everywhere can trace the ethics of good and not good face in the various acts that are intentionally issued by the individual or group (Froukh, 2014).

The concept of reward and punishment is the existence of the life of the others, relying on the practicalities of the mind because they are sincere results necessary for honest introductions. In these results, the heavenly religions and the philosophers expounded that there is no contradiction between them through their compatibility with the human instinct. The mind sees good and understands it, and the science shows to man that the law of ethics carrying good is always no matter how it stops in the way of obstacles, because of which we lose the human things. The work of good is obedience, which is not limited and not coupled with grumble and surrender, but with the stability and strength (Hamdi, 1985).

In relation to the relationship of morality to politics, it can be said that there is the impossibility of separating politics from morality, because of the universality of morality and its relationship to the already emanating from the individual and the community. It is often said that morality in its positive face, in the words of thinkers and philosophers, is consistent, clear, and well-connected to the truth. Although it is a voluntary and optional action, because of the requirements, proportionality, and evolution, it is sometimes based on lies, deception, hypocrisy, flattery, and demagoguery.

The difference between the exposed and the hidden actually affects morality, destroys the values and the legendary position, and causes the permissibility, especially at the general level (Adeeb, 1959).

The Second Topic: Resources of Moral and Its Branches and Roots

The heritage of philosophical moral in Greece has taken on a purely abstract character in Greek philosophy.

The science of moral was born in Greece by Socrates, who brought philosophy from heaven to earth.

After nature and post-nature being the best-selling research in philosophical thinking, the study of humanitarian issues, after the mind took over the crisis of human life, has been the hand of religion. Socrates understood that ethics are essentially characterized by religious traditions, and so was the doctrine of Socrates.

The first attempt is to free mental morality (Al Mousawi, 1953), that is, know yourself, because Socrates gave knowledge a central place in his philosophy, especially ethics, but he devoted most of his attention to the knowledge, in which man originates in the manner of generation from his mind and is intended to spread virtues in society.

The Greek ethic is based on the wisdom of knowing the old morality based on the wisdom of self-interest. Ethics include the meaning of freedom at this historical stage. Greece formulated freedom and individual liberty in moral form, but morality in this context had a specific meaning in Greece. It is a way of living and dealing visually with others. It translates creation into the manner of dress, behavior, speech, and calm that one responds to all events.

And this creation is a concrete response to the meaning of freedom, which means Maitm Greek is the exercise of freedom resulting in a direct link between freedom and creation. In other words, freedom as a daily practice of a close relationship is necessary with restraint, self-interest, and care (Karam, 1936).

The moral principle involves relations with others; on the grounds that creation requires attention to others and that the free man (the creator) is the one who knows how to care for others. Through his leadership as best as his wife, children, family, and home, self-interest has become a condition for governance in the city and for the rule of the group or to take up public positions, such as the judiciary or the friendly relations that enjoy an important place in ancient Greece, as well as in the study and education, which requires listen to the teacher lesson.

Hence, the Greek moral thought is based on the recognition of the need for the leader, the counselor, the friend, the teacher, or the person who tells the truth. These forms of relations are seen as evidence of the relation of self-interest through attention to the other. Socrates is a typical example of the philosopher who cared for himself, through his discussions and discussions with others and his constant call for them to be self-interested (Abdelkader, 1970).

The relationship of self-interest as a moral symbol of Greece and its relationship with others to self-interest and to others in the subject of authority are clearly evident.

If the Greek moral thought was determined in exchange for slavery, he saw that the greatest danger was the transgressions of power, where the law was broken, and the capitulation to desires, lusts, and desires. Greek moral and political thought was largely stopped in the image of a tyrant who exploited his power, wealth, and influences to seize his whims. And desires therefore do not hesitate to injustice assault on others and impose his authority unfair; this tyrant actually appears to be a slave to his loonies and whims and loses control of himself, due to the lack of self-interest. In this sense, self-interest means power of self, so that self-interest turns into a key base and the first condition of the rule.

This means that if you know what it means to be a citizen of the city and a master of your home, the things that should be taken care of and things that must be left, and if you know finally that it must be, you should not be afraid of death, then it cannot exceed your authority and exceed others¹.

Nevertheless, it is possible to point out an important methodological question, namely, that we cannot say the Greek man who cares for himself had to take care of others first, and this subject was not only put forward, but also it is not necessary to give priority to attention to the other before self-interest. Given that the relationship with the self is formerly and primarily existential, it is true that the subject of self-interest has turned in the abuser into a process of self-denial and a break with public affairs; but in ancient Greece, self-interest was not at all opposed to attention to others (Plato, n.d.)².

Say frankly or say the truth, the ancient Greeks and Romans did not limit their morality to self-interest, but they had political ethics. At the head of this morality, frankness, or truth, means "saying everything", "frank words", and "freedom of speech", it is a virtue of moral virtues and a recipe of distinct qualities. Honesty and courage are in exchange for the hypocrite, the liar, and cowardice. The first moral duty is a certain way, since there are those who know how to use frankness and who does not know this, especially if it concerns the person concerned to guide others and help them format and compose themselves and we find it when they are Greeks, Romans, Silesian, Marc Aurelos, Abiktas, and others.

We found Plato's discussion of the tyrant (Donis) after the student (Dion, one of the students of Plato) about how to change Dion after joining the School of Plato where the good nature of what was in his uncle's palace, he tried to tell the right to his tyrant uncle to be considered in addition to Plato's dialogue with him, through a tripartite dialogue among Plato, Donis tyrant, and young man. Dion was the subject of virtue, especially the virtues of courage and justice, where Plato said that the life of the fair and happy life of the oppressor both, did not tolerate the tyrant, because he considered it directed against him; and to express his anger and displeasure on Plato, this is the question: What would you do in Sicily?

Plato's answer was to find a good man. Plato's answer was no more than anger to the tyrant who decided

¹ *Plato: The republic*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from <https://www.iep.utm.edu/republic>.

² *PLSC 114 (lecture 4), Philosophers and kings: Plato, republic, I-II*. Retrieved from <https://oyc.yale.edu/political-science/plsc-114/lecture-4>.

to expel him, but his student (Dion) remained frank with his tyrant uncle and did not hesitate to insist and say the truth with courage in saying the truth.

This incident shows the frankness of Plato, who presented his view of virtue, especially the duty of justice and the relationship between justice and happiness. This is a question in his lesson or in front of the tyrant, as this incident shows the continuation of Plato's student in telling the truth before the tyrant, even when the tyrant decided to punish his teacher and therefore did not hesitate to clarify and address it as it is true.

This means that openness or truth is an endless task, and respect for it is a duty that no authority can economize on, unless slavery is imposed.

It should be noted that he began to say the right of the tyrant to establish the political ethic or the relationship of political science to morality, and then the concept of freedom considered the part of the moral system in Greece to confirm the relationship of politics to ethics after freedom from the pillars of political science³.

Moral in Greece is a way of life or a way of living, as it is directed at a limited number of individuals, and does not require everyone to comply with a single scheme of behavior, that is, it belongs to a select group of free individuals. However, this morality has been extended and expanded in the Roman period, although everyone was not forced to follow them, so it was optional option (Carugati, Ober, & Weingast, 2015).

Moral is also known as freedom; self-interest is an exercise of freedom.

Moral is only a conscious exercise of freedom. Freedom is also regarded as the existential condition of morality, but morality is the conscious form of freedom as we connect to a result which is associated with morality and freedom⁴.

Morality, reason, philosophy, and ethics by going back to Plato, it is argued that morality is responsible for the attainment of justice, through the individual being the basis of society, which follows the conditions of nature, and to prove this, Plato seen in the community sees it as a phenomenon arising from the multiplicity of individual needs and inability to eliminate alone.

This society may be innocent of the ultimate goal of being societies, as in this individual society, it may build on this end and all these two types (nature and morality) as its own moral.

According to Plato, society in its natural state gives a picture of spontaneous life governed by God, where there is neither state nor government; where life has no safety and stability, because living organisms that live according to nature have not had any kind of conflict, and therefore the regime under this life without limits; and where the land gave them the many fruits of the tree without planting, and men did not take women and have children, but their atmosphere was very moderate so they lived naked in the open taking a living of soft suppression.

This image in the patent reflects the image of society at the beginning of its composition, as the state is created for the individual inability of independence and to meet the needs of himself, meet with others in one stable state, and exchange things with each other, whether one of them takes or gives.

He knows that this is due to his personal interest, and none of them asks for his natural needs, which are the most important of food, shelter, and clothing. Each one of them is doing the work that suits his readiness to keep his mental strength in this work, so that his production is more generous and better.

³ *Ancient political philosophy*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ancient-political/>.

⁴ *An introduction to Ancient Greek political thought*. Retrieved from <http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/political-science/an-introduction-to-ancient-greek-political-thought/40139>.

All in this primitive society, they live a simple life, in which they depend on their work and spend their lives with good ethics and away from the vices of morality, because the human soul has been rid of them. Peace and equality prevail in society. Nature preserves their morality and satisfies their needs. A model of morality and virtue has no place in it for competition and enmity. Such a society does not exist forever, but Plato presents it through myth and fiction to show the positive relationship between justice and moral behavior.

He did not mean an innate justice based on a lack of knowledge, but rather what is meant by justice.

And this community, even if it does not remain on this case, life is based on the basis of reason and purpose⁵.

Therefore, he criticizes this life for its lack of the basic purpose for which man is found. Plato offers a solution to the problem of the age he lives in, surpassing the mythical primitive society, in which morality is built on new foundations based on the division of existence and then the city (Greece) into three sections. The individual needs the group not to abandon himself and for the purpose of reaching this goal to integrate with others, it needs to order and unite efforts, and here, the state is established. On the other hand, the psychological forces infiltrate the state.

Rulers (philosophers), soldiers (guards), and workers (producers), each member of the society belongs to one of these classes, according to that one of the parts of the soul overcomes the other two parts. It is the victory of the mind which belongs to the layer of rulers, overcomes the emotion belonging to the layer of soldiers, and overcomes the desire to belong to the working class⁶.

The moral of Plato is the human soul and the matters of wisdom and reason. The person is distinguished by the mind and by the Platonic section of virtue, which is the basis of morality, like the division of the human soul into three sections: intolerance, irritability, and nervousness.

Nervousness and irritability are virtues mediated by passion and nervousness.

The divisions of the city into layers are social justice, social justice virtue, and virtue morality.

Moral, as it means when Plato in the divisions of the city is social justice classes that will raise children on the basis, and is wisdom and knowledge which is the virtue and creativity of the city at the same time.

This education, as Plato sees it, is to guide young people to know the correct laws, because these laws have an effective effect on the formation of the citizen's ethics and then the formation of the ethics of the whole society.

Therefore, the education system should be compulsory and under the supervision of the state in order to achieve the educational objective that creating a good citizen who depends on the validity of what he gets from the knowledge and knowledge qualify for the balance of emotional subject to the power of his mind and force that controls the other powers of the human being. He was also a virtuous citizen fit to spread justice among the people of a society whose virtues are steadily increasing because of its association with the principles of functional specialization among its members⁷.

⁵ *History of political thoughts. The Greeks by RPC—Slideshare*. Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net/zaizai27/history-of-political-thoughts-the-greeks-by-rp>.

⁶ *Greek literature in contemporary political theory and thought*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/...001.../oxfordhb-9780199935390-e-40>.

⁷ *A critical history of Greek philosophy by W. T. Stace*. Retrieved from <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/33411/33411-h/33411-h.htm>.

The Third Topic: Aristotle's Ethics

Aristotle conceives of ethical theory as a field distinct from the theoretical sciences. Its methodology must match its subject matter—good action—and must respect the fact that in this field many generalizations hold only for the most part. We study ethics in order to improve our lives, and therefore its principal concern is the nature of human well-being. Aristotle follows Socrates and Plato in taking the virtues to be central to a well-lived life. Like Plato, he regards the ethical virtues (justice, courage, temperance, and so on) as complex rational, emotional, and social skills. But he rejects Plato's idea that to be completely virtuous, one must acquire, through training in the sciences, mathematics, and philosophy, an understanding of what goodness is. What we need, in order to live well, is a proper appreciation of the way in which such goods as friendship, pleasure, virtue, honor, and wealth fit together as a whole. In order to apply that general understanding of particular cases, we must acquire, through proper upbringing and habits, the ability to see, on each occasion, which course of action is best supported by reasons. Therefore, practical wisdom, as he conceives it, cannot be acquired solely by learning general rules⁸.

Aristotle, then, gave importance to morality no less than the interest of his Professor Plato, where he made his theory in politics linked to morality closely, and this is clear manifestation of the community and the relationship of people among them, as well as Aristotle foundations and the foundations of happy civil life.

And we see this detailed in his book *Ethics*, which laid down the moral foundations upon the happiness of man.

The book of politics came to lay the groundwork for this happiness. A delegation linked Aristotle between morality and the state as a political institution constitutes a moral life.

Ethics are the law of the state, so that the right, good and honesty, virtue, and happiness are moral meanings; it is one of the important priorities of the state, as it seeks to achieve good and happiness⁹.

Aristotle believes that the science of ethics is seen in the actions of man as a human being.

Aristotle is known as a "rational animal". The animal was his sex and thought of his qualitative action. Therefore, thinking is what distinguishes man from all other beings and distinguishes him from them.

The study of ethics in Aristotle aims to improve life, which is the focus of good work, and the interest of ethics is focused on the knowledge of the essence of happiness, as human life revolves around the four virtues: justice, courage, wisdom, and moderation.

The happiness and happy life of Brai Aristotle is linked to our correct perception of the interrelationship between good things, such as friendliness, pleasure, virtue, respect, and wealth, as a cohesive group that can be won through proper education, hard work, and a simple knowledge of these good things.

Aristotle says: "Practical wisdom cannot be achieved through familiarity with its general rules, but with hard work and the acquisition of the necessary psychological, emotional and social skills".

Aristotle mentions three characteristics in the search for the highest degrees of goodness, and links them to morality, which is good itself and is not desirable because of the rest of the virtues desirable.

Aristotle believes that the quality of inference leads to the quality of life and the happiness of the human

⁸ *Ancient Greek philosophy*. Retrieved from https://catalogue.pearsoned.ca/assets/hip/us/hip_us.../0205783864.pdf.

⁹ *Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle*. (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Kitchener: Batoche Books. Retrieved from <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/aristotle/Ethics.pdf>.

being is entrusted with the spirit of inference. This type is the best of all, of life that is characterized by virtue and excellence (Bowin, 2017)¹⁰.

The Fourth Topic: The Future of the Relationship Between Morality and Politics

What is the relation between moral reasons and reasons of “political necessity”? Does the authority of morality extend across political decision-making? Or are there “reasons of state”, which somehow either stand outside the reach of morality or override it, justifying actions that are morally wrong?

Machiavelli’s answer to these questions was clear enough. He set it out, together with his main reason for it, in a famous passage:

The gulf between how one should live and how one does live is so wide that a man who neglects what is actually done for what should be done learns the way to self-destruction rather than self-preservation. The fact is that a man who wants to act virtuously in every way necessarily comes to grief among many who are not virtuous.

Machiavelli’s own brand of “political realism” is one which allows moral assessment and does properly apply to political agents, but is overridden by reasons of political necessity. A politician’s actions may be morally wrong—contrary to virtue, contrary to “what should be done”—and yet justified. His view differs, therefore, from the view in political theory that moral assessment simply fails to apply to political action. In what follows, the authors shall maintain that such views are typically both overstated—“political action” covers a broad enough range of cases that a “realist” treatment of all of them does not stand a chance of being correct—and ultimately confused. Indeed, in this translation, Machiavelli’s view wears its confusion on its face if one’s action is really “what should be done” (Cullity, 2007).

In contemporary politics, most politicians are often concerned about practicality because they seem to be driven by their interest in being elected and reelected. To be more specific, politicians are very focused on short-term survival rather than a long-term purpose for their constituency or country. Public politics is a game played among professional politicians, and to succeed in the game, one must use the tools integral to politics. Complete forthrightness is a sign of vulnerability and naivete, neither of which will earn a politician respect among his/her opponents, and the opponents will use every advantage against the honest politician.

Politics is a business born not only of idealism but also of pragmatism insofar as in order to be effective, a politician must gain and hold onto political power. In the authors’ observation, some degree of pandering to the electorate and to those who might lend financial support for reelection efforts is necessary to maintain that position. Modern politics is replete with candidates who refused to pander, thereby mining their own chance to exercise effective leadership¹¹.

Successful political leadership involves serving the society with its best interests as the leader’s overriding concern. Many leaders, such as Stalin and Hitler, whom most people would agree were egregious violators of public morality. Ultimately, such leaders forfeit their leadership as a result of the immoral means by which they obtain or wield their power. Or consider less egregious examples, such as President Nixon, whose contempt for the very legal system that afforded him his leadership led to his forfeiture of that leadership. It seems to the

¹⁰ *The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. (F. H. Peters, Trans.). Retrieved from https://www.stmarys-ca.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/files/Nicomachean_Ethics_0.pdf.

¹¹ *What is the relationship between morality and politics?* Quora. Retrieved from <https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-relationship-between-morality-and-politics>.

authors that the short-term amoral or immoral public behavior might serve a political leader's interest in preserving power; yet the long-term such behavior invariably results in that leader's downfall (Filis, 2012).

The line of demarcation between political science and ethics is quite distinct.

Though both political science and ethics aim at the noble and righteous life of man, yet the former is primarily concerned with the political governance of man, whereas the latter refers to man's conduct and morality; that is, whereas political science deals with political order, ethics deal with moral order. Ethics also judge man's conduct and in the last resort touch on what the conduct ought to be. Political science has nothing to do with it. The laws of the state prescribe only the way of life and are concerned with the external actions of man. Moral laws prescribe absolute standards of right and wrong, justice, and injustice, but the laws of the state follow the standard of expediency. What a law prohibits may not be an immoral act. Finally, political science is concerned with man as a citizen. Ethics are concerned with man as a man and, as such, it is prior to political science (Cullity, 2007).

Conclusions

Since morality and politics have been controversial since the oldest of the siege and since the state of the city and even before that, morality is a human instinct. God has created human beings but it first emerged in the Greek city state, which was confirmed by Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. It is first virtue of the individual, society, and state, especially in their well-known works: *Ethics of Socrates*, *The Utopian City of Plato*, and *Ethics and Politics of Aristotle*.

Ethics were closely linked to politics when it was associated with virtue and wisdom as a condition for the political ruler of the city state, which relied on justice and the application of the law according to the Greek vision that ruled (equal to the equals).

Only free and continued morality is associated with politics up to the modern era, in which there is the emergence of movements of religious reform and European renaissance.

Liberalism as a doctrine has its main pillars.

First: Secularism is "separation of religion and state": From the pillars of liberalism as secularism, liberalism is secular in its attitude towards religion.

The term "secularism" is an Arabic translation of the term Secularism, which is a formula for the word Secular, and means Latin or the world. The Latin origin of the term secularism benefits the meaning of what is secular vs. religious. The Arabic origin of Arabic translation negates such a link.

The first is of the Latin origin (Secular), while the second origin is science.

As for the term, secularism is its dissolution which separates religion from its "representative in religious authority" and the state from "its representative in political power". And if the above talk related to the common—common meaning of the term secular and its original significance, the term later acquired special connotations—multiple ones, including that secularism is the separation of religion from politics, "political power", not the "state".

Second: Christian secularism "with a religious basis": Originally secular was part of the Christian religion, based on the words of Christ (peace be upon him).

"Give what Caesar has to Caesar and God to God" (Matthew 17: 21).

Here we can talk about one form of secularism, Christian secularism, which is secular and has a religious basis because it is one of the principles of Christianity.

Secularism has become a particular ideological stream, which emerged at a certain stage in the history of Europe, which turned its revolution against the intervention of the Church in power. It ended with the establishment of an integrated system of life, and the liberal system in which secularism is one of its pillars, and is the result of cultural, psychological, historical, and cultural factors that prevailed in Europe for about seven centuries.

Here we can talk about another form of secularism: liberal secularism, which is one of the four pillars of the liberal system “in addition to capitalism, individualism and capitalism”. It is secular, natural, non-religious, based on the idea of “natural law”, whose content (that the interests of the society as a whole will be realized through the pursuit of each individual’s interest)—on which the lyrical approach is based—becomes religious activity so limited to individuals and says that the human body must be subject to political power, but the spirit of freedom of absolute freedom, is based on the freedom of belief absolute and unrestricted, and is free to choose any Christian belief: “Christian or other”, or no religious atheism or doubt.

The actual embodiment of the principle of secularism reflected the political reality on religious and social ethics.

In contemporary times, after the end of the First and Second World Wars and the retreat of the Marxist tide, liberal ethics became the basic principles of the world in politics and morality, often pragmatic, capitalist, tactical, not dependent on one form, and no stability. In response, as criticism and reaction, the criticisms of liberal morality emerged to show a new movement calling for a return to morality—the so-called neo-liberalism or collective liberalism—a stark return to morality, justice, and values.

In contrast to liberalism, the “community” that elevates the group to the level of intrinsic value and makes it the basis of society has, in this context, benefited from the search for stability and heat attributed to the community—which have become less available in liberal societies—belonging to them and who serve as the physical and moral guardian of the individual.

It should be noted that the trend of the community grew up in thought and application after the rapid development of individuality and in conflict with it. Since John Rawls’s “The Theory of Justice”, a reference to contemporary liberalism, a number of critical texts have emerged to accuse him of neglecting the societal truth and the need for individuals to feel part of a group and to condemn its “Abstr Actism”. This criticism coincided with contemporary liberalism and with the growth of multi-source human representations and expressions, such as movements of migrants demanding respect for their rites and cultures or movements of national minorities, up to women’s movements and others. Among these, it seems that the common denominator is to ask to look at each of them and deal with them from the state and others as representatives of a distinct group.

References

- A beautiful syllabus of the philosophical dictionary. Part I.* (1982). Beirut: Lebanese Book House.
- Abdelkader, A. (1970). *Evolution of political thought (Ancient Greeks)*. Cairo: Nahdet Al-Sharq Library.
- Adeeb, T. (1959). *Plato man of the state*. Beirut: Mansour Dar Msoir for Printing and Publishing.
- Al Mousawi, M. Y. (1953). *History of the Ahlouk*. Cairo: Arabic Book House.
- Bartmelli, S. (1973). *From the introduction to the book of ethics of Aristotle*. Lutfi Sayyid.
- Bowin, J. (2017). *Aristotle’s virtue ethics*. Retrieved from <https://people.ucsc.edu/~jbowin/virtue.pdf>
- Carugati, F., Ober, J., & Weingast, B. R. (2015). *Development and political theory in classical Athens*. Retrieved from <https://web.stanford.edu/group/mcnollgast/cgi-bin/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Carugati-Ober-Weingast.-Political-theory-of-development-150608a.pdf>
- Cullity, G. (2007). *The moral, the personal and the political*. Retrieved from <https://www.adelaide.edu.au/directory/garrett.cullity?dsn=directory.file>

- De Boer, T. J. (1987). *History of philosophy in Islam*. Transcribed to Arabic and commented by Mohamed Abdel Hadi Abu Reda. Algeria: El-Tunisia Publishing National Company for Publishing and Distribution.
- Fattah, I. A. (1990). *Philosophy of ethics*. Cairo: Publishing and Distribution Dar Al-Thaqafa.
- Filis, M. (2012). *The inner connection between politics and morality: Historical and analytical explorations*. Retrieved from <https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/bitstream/handle/10871/8067/FilisM.pdf>
- Froukh, E. (2014). *Criticism of power from an ethical perspective series of civilizations studies*. Beirut: Mohamed Hussein Al-Wasiti and Abdul Razzaq Al-Jabri.
- Hamdi, A. A. (1985). *Ethics and its relationship between status and religion*. Beirut: Dar Al-Alam.
- Karam, J. (1936). *History of Greek philosophy*. Cairo: Printing Press and Translation Committee.
- Krison, A. (1979). *The moral problem and philosophers* (A. H. Mahmoud and A. B. Zekri, Trans.). House of the People in Cairo.
- Moza, A. R. (2008). *The moral values between Islamic and Western thinkers in the era of globalization*. World Publishing House and Distribution.
- Plato. (n.d.). *The republic*. (B. Jowett, Trans.). Retrieved from <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1497/1497-h/1497-h.htm>
- Youssef, M. M. (1953). *History of ethics*. Egypt: Publishing House Book.
- Zaki, M., & Badruddin, M. A. (1999). *Philosophical problems*. Alexandria: Dar Al-Ma'Aref.