The Origins Of Moral Principles

Posted on October 23, 2019

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/the-origins-of-moral-principles/

Introduction

Moral principles are the fundamental societal norms that are universally accepted by the society.

Ethics are also called moral principles. Moral philosophy discusses what is morally wrong and what is right or what is right and what is wrong. The terms morality and ethics are closely related. Moral and ethical values play an essential role in our daily lives. Ethics is considered a branch of philosophy, but it has links with other areas of study, such as biology, history, sociology, anthropology, theology, and politics. However, ethics remain distinct from these disciplines of study.

Origin Of Morality

There are different views about the source. Some scholars argue that morality is divine, some scholars say that morality is linked with human civilization, and some of the thoughts say that morality is closely linked with the institution (Cushman and Fiery, 2008).

There is an ancient history of the origin of ethics and morality. The history of morality starts from the Babylonian column, showing the first time presenting the code of moral principles in 1750 BCE (Cushman and Fiery, 2008). The oldest record of ethics and morality can be traced back to Babylonia.

There are four basic fundamental moral principles of ethics:

The principle of Respect for autonomy

The word autonomy is derived from a Latin word used for self-rule. It is the fundamental norm that we give respect to another person in society; it is the dignity of humanity. It is considered harmful to interfere in the decision-making process of others who are adults and are competent to make a decision.

The principle of beneficence

It is our social responsibility, and it is moral and ethical values that we behave in a friendly and our actions are good for society. The first and foremost importance is that we cannot hurt the community

through our actions. Moral principles for the well-being of the nation.

The principle of no maleficence

First of all, it is stated that we have no right to hurt others; no one is hurt if, in the case where the situation is uncontrolled, we try to minimize the harm through actions. Don't increase the risk of harm. Always try to reduce them. It is not right that you waste the resources that are used for your well-being.

The moral principle of justice

It is our moral obligation that we give every individual the right that he deserves. It is our moral obligation to treat people equally and unfairly in our public life. We work for the benefit of society and give benefits without any discrimination.

The Moral Principles Of Cultures

The moral principles of cultures differ from culture to culture. In one culture, the act of a human being is considered bad, but there may be that action cannot be considered bad. In other societies, there are some universal cultural moral principles that are considered wrong in all cultures. Rubbery is considered bad in all cultural values. The cultural values norm that it is the moral obligation of every individual to follow this moral obligation. Cultural norms and obligations for the goodness of society it is the moral duty that we follow those norms and principles.

The Moral Principle Of Religion

There is a very close relationship between morality and religion. There are some moral principles that set the foundation for faith regarding the personal behavior of the individual to determine what is right and what is wrong. All religions have some basic moral principles, either Islam, Judaism, Christianity, Hinduism, or Sikhism (Lovejoy and Arthur, 2017). These ethical principles are interpreted by various sources such as the holy books, the Quran, or the Bible, as well as in oral form and the speaking of the holy prophets and their religious leaders. Most of these principles are based on equality and freedom of thought.

Morality and religion are not synonyms; there is a relationship between these two, but morality does not depend upon belief (Lovejoy and Arthur, 2017). Conceptually, the principles of morality and the religious value system are two different ways action guidelines.

Kant And Hume On Morality

There is a very close relationship between David Hume (1711 to 1776) and Immanuel Kant (1724 to 1804). These two are the most critical contributions to modern philosophy. Hume and Kant have two different conceptions of morality. These different conceptions of morality help us to explain the two different approaches regarding moral philosophy (Guyer and Paul, 2014). The most important difference between Immanuel Kant is that duty, obligation, and law are the core of morality, while on the other hand, David Hume does not like this.

Immanuel Kant's concept of morality Bernard Williams calls "the moral system," which defines the domain of morality as an inescapable and unconditional form of obligation. Immanuel believes that the question highly dominates our moral concerns about what duties and responsibilities are imposed on us by the law that commands our moral necessities (Guyer and Paul, 2014). Like other philosophers of the eighteenth century, they also believe that our moral values are closely linked with the question of how to be virtuous in the course of life, but that scholars define morality as the basic fundamental concepts of duty, obligation, and law.

On the other hand, in contrast to Immanuel Kant, David Hume also considers morality, but they are not more focused on this. They are less central than Kant. David argues that personal merit lies in the heart of morality (Guyer and Paul, 2014). Our moral concerns are more dominated by which motives are a virtue, and we respond to the question by looking at fellow humans. David Hume puts more emphasis on the role or response of society in morality rather than the law.

Immanuel Kant draws a dark line between nonmoral and moral phenomena. Morality, the nature of its demand, and its normative standard distinguish norms from non-moral. On the other hand, David's line between morality and non-morality is quite blurred, and they cannot be sharply identified (Guyer and Paul, 2014). David assimilates moral judgment about beauty and deformity.

Another essential difference between these two scholars is related to the first one. Immanuel Kant's morality is profoundly different from non-morality, not only by the specialty form of obligation but also by the evaluation. Morality is unique and distinguished. The most important moral concern is to protect our status between moral and non-moral. Immanuel believes that the moral domain is the only way that separates us from the machine (Kleingeld and Pauline, 2018). They work better than humans, but due to a lack of morality, Protecting morality is one of our chief concerns. If we cannot preserve this status of morality, it is very dishonored for us.

Immanuel Kant and David Hume, both philosophers, believe that morality has its bases and cannot be discussed according to philosophical thoughts. When both Hume and Kant addressed the foundation of morality, they agreed on two points. First, both scholars agree that the basis or foundation of morality does not exist in religion, and secondly, both agree that virtue cannot be found in a mindset of independence. Without these two points, they disagree with each other (Guyer and Paul, 2014). David Hume argues that the morality foundation is located like a human being, primarily in our

emotional response toward other humans. In contrast, with David, Immanuel argues that morality is situated on the foundation of the rational nature of human beings. Kant further argues that the moral basis lies in the autonomy of the rational will.

These different concepts of morality and their bases give rise to two different approaches to moral philosophy.

The David Hume

David Hume's approach to morality is an empirical approach that is based on experimental and naturalistic approaches. David's moral philosophy is the higher part of the experimental explanation of human nature. David's approach to moral philosophy reflects the philosophy of mind that is based on empiricism. David treats ethics with politics, history, psychology, and aesthetics; he studied as a moral science. David Hume puts more emphasis on and is interested in explaining morality as a natural phenomenon. Discuss the moral aspect as a physical world where there is a causal explanation of things. According to this point of view there, everything has an empirical answer and investigation. David Hume compares animals and humans to establish moral grounds. There are some features of mind that are common between humans and animals.

The Immanuel Kant

Compare David Hume with Immanuel Kant, as compared to David Kant, more emphasis on the prior investigation of morality investigation. Kant closely links morality with the nature of human beings (Kleingeld and Pauline, 2018). However, as compared to David Kant, more emphasis on morality is based on the supreme moral principles, which can only be discovered through a philosophical approach. Immanuel Kant's morality commands are unconditional (Guyer and Paul, 2014). He rejects David Hume's empirical approach. Kant argues that through a practical approach, you tell us what people can do, but this approach cannot tell us what ought to be.

The Relation Between Religion And Morality

Immanuel Kant and David Hume's majority of works were found to be the element of religion in morality. They differ from each other, but they have some things in common. Especially the question regarding the role of religion in morality or the relation between morality and religion. Above all the differences, both scholars agreed on the point of religion in morality. Both the scholar secular advocate of moral philosophy (Lovejoy and Arthur, 2017). Both David and Kant distinguish morality and religion. He argues that these two are separate from each other.

David Hume's concept regarding morality argues that GOD has nothing to do with the foundation of morality, and religion and morality are two different things.

Immanuel Kant argues that the foundation of morality is nothing with religion and that morality is independent and does not depend on religion.

Conclusion

Ethics and moral principles have an essential role in our lives. The origin of these moral principles and ethics is not clear. Some school of thoughts argues that the origin of moral principles are linked with culture, some argue that the origin of these moral principles are divine origin or link with religion. Moral principles have a very close relationship with the society. The origin of moral principles is not crystal clear. David and Kant fully reject the relation between religion and moral values; both philosopher argues that there is no relation between these two, one of the scholar argued that morality based on the human nature is the heart of the morality, while Kant argues that law and obligation are the centers of morality. The history of moral principles traces back to Babylonian civilization.

Work Cited

Cushman, Fiery Andrews. *The origins of moral principles*. Harvard University, 2008.

Guyer, Paul. *Kant*. Routledge, 2014.

Kleingeld, Pauline. “The Principle of Autonomy in Kant’s Moral Theory: Its Rise and Fall.” (2018).

Lovejoy, Arthur. *The great chain of being: A study of the history of an idea*. Routledge, 2017.

Copyright © 2026 Academic Master.