

The Foundation of Moral Philosophy

by

Hamdoon A. Khan

Abstract

This paper aims to redefine the philosophy of morality and ethics through the lens of justice, positing justice as the primary determinant of moral and immoral actions. Traditional ethical frameworks such as deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics, although foundational, frequently fall short in grappling with the complexities and nuances of modern ethical dilemmas. A critical examination of these theories reveals their limitations and underscores the need for a more robust ethical framework. By positioning justice as the core principle, this paper argues that morality itself should be defined through the concept of justice, rather than integrating justice as an auxiliary component. This approach ensures that ethical principles are applied consistently and equitably, providing a universal standard for moral judgment. The analysis of classical ethical dilemmas, such as the Trolley Problem, illustrates the inherent conflicts within traditional theories and highlights the superiority of a justice-centered approach. The redefinition of morality through justice addresses the shortcomings of existing frameworks and offers a comprehensive solution to modern ethical challenges. This paper concludes that a justice-centric ethical philosophy not only aligns with contemporary societal values but also promotes a more just, empathetic, and sustainable world.

Keywords: Morality; Ethics; Moral Philosophy; Social Justice; Modern Ethical Dilemmas

Introduction

Morality and ethics have been central to philosophical inquiry for centuries, guiding human behavior and societal norms. Classical frameworks such as deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics have provided foundational insights into moral philosophy. Immanuel Kant's deontological ethics emphasizes duty and universal principles, while utilitarianism, developed by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, focuses on the consequences of actions to maximize overall happiness. Aristotle's virtue ethics, with its emphasis on character and flourishing, has also significantly influenced moral thought.

However, as human societies evolve, the shortcomings of traditional ethical theories become more evident. Deontological ethics can be rigid, utilitarianism sometimes justifies ethically dubious methods, and virtue ethics relies heavily on subjective interpretations. The emergence of modern ethical dilemmas, spanning from feminism, gender equality, artificial intelligence and digital privacy to environmental sustainability, underscores the urgent need to reassess and refine these moral frameworks.

This paper proposes that justice should be the lens through which morality is redefined. Rather than integrating justice as an additional component, this approach positions justice as the core

principle, ensuring that ethical decisions are made consistently and equitably. By critically analyzing traditional moral frameworks and contemporary ethical dilemmas, this paper aims to demonstrate the superiority of a justice-centered approach to morality, providing a robust foundation for ethical decision-making in the modern world.

Literature Review and the Necessity to Refine Morality

Morality, an intrinsic component of human experience, has been a focal point of philosophical inquiry across the ages. The quest to define moral behavior has led to the establishment of numerous ethical frameworks. However, as human societies evolve, there is an enduring need for the re-examination and refinement of these moral theories. This literature review delves into significant philosophical perspectives on morality, emphasizing the importance of evolving these frameworks to address contemporary ethical challenges.

Classical Foundations

Plato and Aristotle: Classical Greek philosophy serves as the bedrock of Western ethical thought. Plato, through seminal works like *The Republic*, asserted that morality is rooted in the realm of ideal Forms, with the Form of the Good representing the ultimate standard. This notion suggests that moral behavior is aligned with an abstract, unchanging ideal. Aristotle, in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, introduced the concept of virtue ethics, which focuses on the cultivation of moral character and the pursuit of eudaimonia, or flourishing. Aristotle's approach highlights the significance of intrinsic virtues and the alignment of human actions with higher moral ideals, framing ethics as a practice oriented towards the development of personal excellence and societal well-being (Aristotle, 2009).

Immanuel Kant: Immanuel Kant's deontological ethics, articulated in *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, propose that morality is grounded in duty and governed by the categorical imperative. This imperative commands actions that can be universally applied, emphasizing rationality and autonomy. Kant's framework asserts that moral actions are those performed out of a sense of duty rather than for their consequences. His philosophy has profoundly shaped modern moral thought, underscoring the importance of universal principles and the autonomy of moral agents (Kant, 1998).

Utilitarianism: Utilitarianism, developed by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, is a consequentialist theory that evaluates the moral worth of actions based on their outcomes, particularly the maximization of overall happiness. Bentham's principle of utility and Mill's refinement, which considers qualitative differences in pleasures, provide a pragmatic approach to morality. This framework advocates for the greatest good for the greatest number, challenging the emphasis on duty and intrinsic virtues by focusing on the results of actions (Bentham, 2007; Mill, 2001).

Contemporary Developments

Revival of Virtue Ethics: Alasdair MacIntyre, in *After Virtue*, critiques the fragmentation of modern moral philosophy and advocates for a revival of Aristotelian virtue ethics. MacIntyre emphasizes the role of community and historical context in shaping moral virtues, arguing that morality is deeply intertwined with social practices and narratives. This perspective suggests that ethical understanding cannot be isolated from the cultural and historical milieu in which it is situated (MacIntyre, 2007).

Moral Relativism and Objectivism: The tension between moral relativism and objectivism remains a pivotal debate in contemporary ethics. Relativists, such as Gilbert Harman, argue that moral truths are contingent upon cultural and individual perspectives. In contrast, objectivists like David Enoch contend that objective moral facts exist independently of subjective viewpoints. This ongoing discourse highlights the challenges in reconciling cultural diversity with universal moral standards (Harman, 1975; Enoch, 2011).

Care Ethics: Feminist critiques, particularly those by Carol Gilligan and Nel Noddings, have introduced care ethics, which emphasize the moral significance of relationships, empathy, and care. This approach challenges the dominant paradigms of justice and duty by advocating for a context-sensitive and relational understanding of morality. Care ethics foregrounds the importance of interpersonal connections and the ethical implications of nurturing and caregiving (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984).

Moral Psychology: Advancements in moral psychology, spearheaded by scholars like Jonathan Haidt, explore the interplay between emotions, intuitions, and social factors in shaping moral judgments. This interdisciplinary field bridges philosophical ethics and empirical science, offering insights into the cognitive and emotional processes that underlie moral decision-making. The integration of psychological findings with ethical theory enriches our understanding of how moral behavior is influenced by innate and societal factors (Haidt, 2012).

The Necessity to Refine Morality: The multiplicity of moral theories reflects the inherent complexity of human moral experience. However, the pressing need to refine our understanding of morality arises not merely from global interconnectedness, technological advancements, or environmental challenges, but from the realization that existing philosophical explanations of morality and ethics are often incomplete and can lead to significant dilemmas. Traditional ethical theories, while foundational, frequently fail to provide comprehensive guidance for the nuanced and multifaceted ethical issues we face today.

Incomplete Philosophical Frameworks

Gaps in Traditional Ethical Theories: Traditional ethical frameworks, such as deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics, each offer valuable insights but also exhibit critical limitations. Deontological ethics, for instance, emphasizes duty and adherence to universal principles but often lacks the flexibility to address context-specific ethical nuances. Utilitarianism, with its focus on the greatest good for the greatest number, can overlook individual rights and justify morally questionable means to achieve desirable ends. Virtue ethics, while promoting moral character and flourishing, can be criticized for its reliance on subjective interpretations of virtue and the good life.

Ethical Dilemmas and Modern Challenges: The inadequacies of these traditional theories become particularly evident when confronted with contemporary ethical dilemmas. The rise of artificial intelligence and digital technology presents scenarios that traditional theories did not anticipate, such as ethical considerations in algorithmic decision-making and data privacy. Similarly, issues of environmental sustainability and climate change challenge anthropocentric moral frameworks and demand a broader, more inclusive ethical approach.

Misleading Conceptions and Moral Dilemmas: Furthermore, the existing moral theories can be misleading, fostering ethical dilemmas rather than resolving them. For example, the rigid application of deontological principles can lead to conflicts where moral duties appear irreconcilable. Utilitarian approaches may result in moral paralysis or justify actions that are intuitively wrong, creating moral quandaries. The virtue ethics emphasis on character development can sometimes obscure the importance of addressing systemic injustices and institutional failures.

The Imperative for Reanalysis

Critical Examination of Moral Foundations: To address these challenges, a critical reanalysis of our moral foundations is essential. This involves questioning the assumptions underlying traditional ethical theories and exploring their limitations in contemporary contexts. By examining the philosophical underpinnings and identifying the gaps, we can develop more robust and applicable moral frameworks.

Towards a Holistic Moral Framework: The evolution of moral thought from ancient virtue ethics to contemporary debates underscores the dynamic nature of morality. As we navigate the complexities of the 21st century, there is an imperative to refine our understanding of morality to address new ethical challenges and promote a more just, empathetic, and sustainable world. By integrating classical theories with modern developments, we can develop a holistic moral framework that resonates with the realities of our time and guides us toward ethical living in a globalized era.

The exploration of morality through various philosophical lenses underscores the complexity and dynamism of ethical thought. Classical theories provide foundational insights, while

contemporary developments highlight the necessity for adaptive and context-aware approaches. The continuous interplay between historical traditions and modern challenges ensures that the study of morality remains a vibrant and evolving field, essential for addressing the ethical dimensions of contemporary human existence.

The Purpose and Origin of Morality: A Critical Examination

Why should I speak the truth? Why must I be trustworthy? Why shouldn't I cause harm to others? Why should I refrain from robbing others? These fundamental questions probe the very essence of morality and its role in human existence. What is morality, and why is it significant? Is morality a necessity for me as a human being, or is it a construct imposed for the benefit of a select few?

If we, as human beings, came into existence merely as another phase of evolution, it prompts an inquiry into the origins of morality and ethics. How did these concepts emerge within the evolutionary framework? The development of moral and ethical constructs could be perceived as evolutionary strategies to facilitate social cohesion and cooperation, thereby enhancing group survival. However, this evolutionary perspective also invites deeper scrutiny into the essence of morality. Is it merely a pragmatic adaptation, or does it possess a more profound, perhaps intrinsic, significance?

As we live within societies, the necessity of being morally and ethically responsible becomes apparent, ostensibly to ensure the common good. Yet, this introduces complex questions: What is deemed moral, and what is deemed immoral? Morality, which varies significantly across different cultures, reflects the societal norms and values unique to each community. An action considered moral in one society may be viewed as immoral in another, challenging the universality of moral principles. This cultural variability raises critical questions about the authority to define morality. Who determines what is good and bad, and on what basis are these determinations made?

The authority to define morality has historically been vested in philosophers, religious leaders, and lawmakers, whose judgments are often shaped by the cultural, temporal, and societal contexts in which they operate. This leads to an intricate interplay between moral authority and power dynamics, suggesting that moral codes might serve the interests of those in power as much as they serve the common good. If each society can independently decide what is good and bad, it implies that morality is subjective rather than objective. This subjectivity can lead to ethical pluralism, where different moral standards coexist, often leading to conflicts and moral dilemmas.

Furthermore, the concept of acting for the common good introduces the tension between individual and collective interests. Ethical behavior often demands individuals to consider the welfare of others, sometimes at personal cost. This raises the critical issue of whether actions

that benefit the community can always align with individual interests. The pursuit of moral and ethical righteousness may necessitate personal sacrifices for the benefit of the collective, highlighting the inherent tension between self-interest and communal responsibility

If harming others is considered an immoral behavior, what ethical considerations come into play when someone is faced with an immediate threat, such as being bullied or physically attacked on the street? This scenario raises profound questions about the morality of self-defense and whether he can engage in actions typically deemed immoral, such as causing harm, in the context of protecting himself from harm imposed by another.

Traditional moral frameworks often emphasize that certain actions, like harming others, are inherently wrong. However, this perspective can be overly simplistic when applied to complex, real-life situations where moral absolutes may conflict with the imperative to protect himself. Moral absolutism posits that ethical rules apply universally and without exception. Yet, in the face of aggression, adhering strictly to the principle of non-harm could lead to unjust outcomes, such as the victim enduring further harm without recourse.

Philosophical traditions, including those of natural law and legal theory, generally recognize the right to self-defense. This principle asserts that individuals are justified in using reasonable force to protect themselves from imminent harm. In this context, the act of self-defense, even if it results in causing harm to the aggressor, is not considered immoral but rather a necessary and proportionate response to an unjust threat. This perspective aligns with the ethical doctrine of double effect, which holds that an action leading to harm is permissible if the harm is not the intended outcome but a side effect of pursuing a morally significant goal, such as personal safety. Therefore, can someone be deemed to act immorally and cause harm in such a situation merely because they were compelled into it by force?

If speaking the truth is considered a moral behavior, can this moral principle always serve my best interests if I practice it unwaveringly? For instance, if I am a soldier and I am captured by the enemy, should I disclose my country's war tactics if asked, or should I lie to protect those tactics? If I am expected to tell the truth, this so-called moral behavior could be detrimental not only to myself but also to my nation. Conversely, if I lie, does this mean I should only adhere to moral principles when they are advantageous to me? Is morality intended solely for personal benefit, and if so, does that not make immorality potentially more beneficial than being moral?

Consider a scenario where I prioritize my own interests above all else, exploiting the vulnerable to further my agenda. I employ every conceivable means to amass wealth, even if it entails appropriating resources rightfully belonging to others. Through cunning and manipulation, I ascend to a position of power where I wield influence over the selection of national leaders, the direction of political parties, and the decisions they enact. I orchestrate a system where all serve my interests without even being aware of my role. In this scenario, I enjoy unparalleled luxury and comfort, reaping the rewards of my actions without regard for moral considerations.

In this imagined reality, I indulge in a life of opulence and privilege, insulated from the consequences of my actions by the shield of power and anonymity. Material wealth, political control, and personal gratification become the hallmarks of my existence, all achieved through the ruthless pursuit of self-interest. In such a world, morality holds no sway over my decisions, as I prioritize personal gain above all else.

It's glaringly evident that adhering to moral behavior will not always yield favorable outcomes for individuals. The demand for morality and ethics in our actions often seems illusory when confronted with the reality that such behaviors may not consistently benefit us as individuals. Despite this, there remains a glimmer of hope that if every individual upholds moral principles, it could potentially contribute to the well-being of mankind in the long run. This hope serves as a driving force for many to continue striving for moral conduct, even in the face of personal disadvantages.

Consider a hypothetical scenario where speaking the truth is universally mandated. In such a world, imagine encountering a situation where an intruder enters your home at night, perpetrates violence against you and your family, and demands information about valuables. In this scenario, you comply with the mandate of truthfulness, divulging the whereabouts of your possessions. However, despite your adherence to truthfulness, you and your family still suffer physical harm and loss. Subsequently, upon reporting the incident to the authorities, the perpetrators are apprehended, tried, and punished. While justice is served, the fundamental reality remains unchanged - your family endured harm despite your commitment to truthfulness. This illustrates that even if truthfulness were universally practiced, it alone cannot guarantee the overall well-being of mankind.

Conversely, cheating is commonly denounced as an immoral act. Imagine a world where cheating is universally eradicated. However, the question arises: would the absence of cheating alone suffice to ensure the well-being of mankind? The answer is unequivocally no. Despite the elimination of cheating, myriad other harmful actions and circumstances could still prevail, posing significant threats to individual and collective welfare. Thus, while eliminating cheating may contribute positively to societal norms and integrity, it alone is insufficient to safeguard the well-being of mankind comprehensively.

Some might argue that, in order to ensure the common good of mankind, every moral behavior should be upheld, and all immoral acts should be avoided by everyone on this earth. In that case, it will not bring any new findings to the table, but it will keep us in the same dilemma forever, bringing us to the exact point where we are today. Moreover, when we want to mandate all moral behaviors and prohibit all immoral ones, this very action raises a fundamental question: is taking away someone's choice and forcing them to do something moral? It cannot be. So, do we need the presence of immorality in order to ensure morality? Furthermore, adhering to Occam's razor principle, if something can be explained in one step, explaining it in two steps is misleading and redundant. This will only bring more complications in the attempt to explain it.

If there is no designated body to hold me accountable for my moral behaviors, and these so-called morals do not always bring me benefits, why should I care about them? Or wait, have we truly understood what morality is before we even attempt to logically criticize it? Are truthfulness, honesty, gratitude, tolerance, respect, and kindness genuinely moral behaviors, or have we merely been told that they are? If they indeed are moral behaviors, and they do not benefit me consistently, especially because not everyone adheres to them, why should I bother following them while the vast majority do not? Adhering to these so-called morals might hinder me from living an emphatically good life, as opposed to forcing myself to comply with them.

However, before we discard moral responsibilities and label them as illusory promises of a good life, let's take a step back and consider whether all moral responsibilities carry the same weight. Is speaking the truth as important as helping others? Are there hierarchies in the significance of moral behaviors? Can some behaviors be less effective in ensuring the well-being of mankind than others? Since we are human, can the sense of humanity and empathy be the highest form of morality? Let's apply this to the suggested test. Imagine that everyone in the world inherently possessed humanity and empathy towards others. Could this ensure the overall well-being of mankind? Could someone cheat you while upholding humanity and empathy? Could they bully you, kill someone, or rob others? No. So, humanity is the greatest moral obligation that can ensure the overall well-being of mankind when upheld by everyone. If everyone embraced these virtues, many immoral acts would be naturally eliminated, fostering a more harmonious society.

Before reaching that conclusion, let's pause and examine the Trolley Problem, an imaginary scenario introduced by Philippa Foot to assess the practical effectiveness of humanity. Picture this: a runaway trolley hurtles towards five oblivious children playing on the tracks. You stand beside a lever capable of diverting the trolley onto a different track. However, there's a single deaf child on this alternate track, facing the opposite direction. You're confronted with a dilemma: pull the lever, sacrificing the one child to save the five, or refrain from acting, leading to the deaths of the five children. Driven by sympathy, you opt to pull the lever, sparing the five but condemning the one. Regardless of your choice, someone will perish. What's the moral course: being held accountable for the death of one child or commended for safeguarding five lives? In this situation, humanity falls short in ensuring our well-being.

This problem illustrates a critical challenge in moral philosophy: the conflict between utilitarianism, which advocates for the greatest good for the greatest number, and deontological ethics, which emphasizes the importance of adhering to moral rules regardless of the outcome. By highlighting this tension, the Trolley Problem reveals that relying solely on humanity and empathy to guide our moral decisions can be problematic, as these virtues do not always provide clear answers in complex ethical dilemmas. Thus, while humanity and empathy are crucial components of morality, they must be complemented by other ethical principles to effectively navigate the complexities of real-world situations.

When we notice all the above situations, where the so-called moral behaviors failed to ensure the common good, so closely, it becomes clearer to us that in all those situations one specific

element was compromised, which is justice. There is no meaning for humanity and sympathy in the absence of justice. Justice, therefore, takes precedence over all other behaviors known to us as moral. Without justice, the foundation of moral actions collapses, rendering virtues like humanity and empathy ineffective. Thus, ensuring justice is paramount to achieving the common good and maintaining the integrity of our moral framework.

Let's now put justice under the same layers of critical analysis to determine if it truly can ensure the well-being of mankind. Hypothetically accepting that justice is at the top level of morality, how would it address Philippa Foot's thought experiment, in which even humanity failed?

You cannot be questioned and held responsible for something that was not caused by you. Therefore, when you stand beside the lever and see the trolley heading towards the track where five children are playing, you did not ask them to play there. You can try to save them by any means possible, but you will not be morally accountable for their deaths because you did not pull the lever. However, if you decide to pull it, you are actively choosing to kill an innocent child, and you will be responsible for that action. Therefore, morally, you should not pull the lever, even though the result will be the death of five children. Furthermore, even if we imagine that those children are tied immovably to the track by someone else, you still cannot pull the lever to protect those kids by killing one. Although those children were tied there unjustly, that act was not caused by you. Pulling the lever would introduce a new injustice, one caused solely by you. An injustice cannot be justified by committing another injustice.

If only justice can pass our test, what makes justice different from other moral behaviors? What is the relationship between justice and other moral behaviors? Let's validate those moral behaviors with justice. When you talk to someone, you have two options: you can either be honest and tell the truth, or you can lie. It is unjust to mislead someone with false information or to alter the facts; therefore, speaking the truth is moral. Taking someone else's belongings is unjust; hence, robbery and stealing are immoral. Supporting your community and working for its betterment is just; thus, being loyal to your nation is moral.

Justice serves as the foundation upon which other moral behaviors are built. It provides a standard for evaluating the ethical implications of our actions, ensuring that they contribute to the common good and uphold the rights of individuals. By aligning other moral behaviors with justice, we can determine their validity and ethical standing. Therefore, when we validate moral behaviors through the lens of justice, we ensure that they contribute positively to the well-being of individuals and society as a whole.

Hence, justice is not a moral behavior but a fundamental element of existence. Existence itself loses its meaning without justice. In other words, truth is not inherently good simply because it is truth, and robbery is not inherently bad simply because it is robbery. Justice serves as the guideline to determine whether an act is good or bad, moral or immoral. Truth is good when it aligns with the principles of justice, but it becomes immoral when it contradicts justice. Similarly, robbery can be seen as moral if it adheres to the guidelines of justice. For instance,

lying to your enemies during war is not only permitted but considered a moral act, whereas telling them the truth would be immoral.

Standing for your country in times of difficulty is an act of morality. Conversely, opposing your country when it engages in unjust actions is also a moral behavior. This is exemplified by Muhammad Ali, who refused to fight in the Vietnam War despite being compelled by his government, and by Daniel Ellsberg, who exposed the true nature of the war. Modern examples include Julian Assange, Edward Snowden, and Glenn Greenwald, who have taken stands against injustices, revealing important truths in the pursuit of justice.

Now it brings us to an obvious question: what is justice? Various philosophical schools offer different explanations of justice, and perhaps each individual has their own interpretation. These explanations might contradict each other. If we cannot define what justice is, modifying the philosophy of morality will be futile.

In short, justice is about everyone getting what they deserve and ensuring the overall well-being of mankind. But how can we determine which actions promote mankind's well-being and which do not? This is especially challenging in our modern world, where rapid changes and new ideologies constantly reshape our understanding of life. The true nature of many things remains unclear, making it difficult to ascertain what truly serves the common good.

Determining if something is just is not overly complicated. If justice is indeed a fundamental aspect of existence, as this paper claims, it implies that justice existed prior to human existence. Thus, human actions cannot alter the inherent nature of what is just and what is unjust, no matter how hard we try. Since justice aims to ensure the overall well-being of mankind, we can evaluate the positive impact of an action by assuming that everyone in the world engages in it. If an action has a negative impact on our well-being when universally practiced, it is unjust. Moreover, if an action is just, it should be feasible for everyone to practice it at any point, regardless of previous attempts to alter its nature.

Let's make this concept clearer by illustrating it with real-world examples. In everyday life, if everyone were to speak the truth, we can imagine how positively it would impact the overall well-being of mankind. Therefore, we can say that speaking the truth in day-to-day conversations is just. On the other hand, if everyone in the world were to only speak lies in our daily lives, trust and rapport between individuals would vanish, which would ultimately destroy the social structure, and humans are inherently social beings. Therefore, lying in typical conversations is unjust.

Since lying in this context is unjust and, conversely, speaking the truth is just, those who lie in their daily lives should be able to stop lying immediately and start speaking the truth without needing to set the stage for that. This is because justice is immutable by human actions. If truth in this context were justice, it should be feasible for everyone. Imagine if the entire world considered lying to be good and practiced it, but upon experiencing the negative outcomes, decided to stop lying and start speaking the truth in their daily lives. Could they do so? Yes, they

could make this change instantly without any need to alter the world fundamentally. Therefore, speaking the truth in daily life is a moral behavior, and lying is immoral.

Based on this explanation of justice, let's analyze it within the context of some modern issues to determine if justice, as defined, can resolve those problems. For instance, some argue that eating non-vegetarian food is immoral. If this claim were true, we should be able to imagine that those who eat non-vegetarian food could stop immediately and transition to the moral way of eating, which is vegetarianism, as they claim.

However, it would be impossible to satisfy the food needs of the entire world population solely with plant-based foods on a daily basis unless we significantly modify our agriculture and supply chains. This indicates that the world cannot become vegetarian instantly. Therefore, based on our definition of justice, being a non-vegetarian is not inherently immoral.

Let's now move into more sensitive issues. Imagine if the entire world became exclusively gay and lesbian. The impact on the overall well-being of mankind would be drastic, as natural reproduction would cease, leading to the extinction of humanity within a few generations. Since the choice of being gay or lesbian brings about such catastrophic consequences for the very existence of mankind, being gay and lesbian is immoral.

And when we consider transgenderism, which involves men acquiring the rights of women and women attaining the rights of men, it entails receiving things that someone does not deserve, which contradicts the very definition of justice. Therefore, put simply, LGBTQ individuals are a group who engage in and encourage others to participate in such immoral behavior. Governments should work to help these individuals by providing mental healthcare services to address their misconceptions, rather than encouraging immoral behaviors. Supporting unjust actions is itself an injustice. On the other hand, standing for justice, fighting against injustice, and helping others to act justly are considered just actions.

The philosophy of morality and justice, as discussed in this paper, illuminates a path that is both logically coherent and profoundly beneficial for the well-being of mankind. When understood through this lens, it provides clarity and guidance in navigating ethical complexities, ensuring that actions align with principles that enhance human flourishing and societal harmony.

Furthermore, justice in this context necessitates the existence of a realm where the ultimate form of justice can manifest. Those who uphold moral behavior should receive their due rewards, irrespective of the challenges they faced while fulfilling their moral responsibilities. Conversely, those who perpetrate injustice must face appropriate consequences for their actions. It is evident that such ultimate justice cannot be fully realized in our earthly realm. Therefore, there must exist a realm beyond this life where justice can be administered in its purest form. Since this transcendent realm lies beyond our mortal existence, it logically follows that it must manifest after death. The entity responsible for ensuring that everyone will experience the ultimate form of justice in that place will be the God Almighty. He will be the

source of justice itself, and justice per se. Thus, justice serves as a foundational principle that extends beyond human existence.

Conclusion

In the pursuit of redefining morality and ethics, it becomes evident that existing frameworks, while foundational, are often insufficient in addressing the complexities of contemporary ethical dilemmas. The analysis of classical theories, such as deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics, reveals their limitations in providing comprehensive moral guidance. These traditional approaches frequently fail to account for context-specific nuances and the dynamic nature of modern ethical challenges.

Upon critical examination, it is clear that justice should not merely be integrated into morality; rather, morality itself should be defined through the lens of justice. Justice, as the ultimate arbiter, ensures the fair distribution of benefits and burdens within society, thus providing the most robust foundation for moral actions. Without justice, morality loses its essence and significance. Justice serves as the bedrock upon which moral principles stand, providing the essential framework to determine what is right and wrong, fair and unfair. It ensures that ethical behavior is not just a matter of personal preference or societal norms, but is grounded in principles of justice.

In aggregate, redefining morality and ethics through the lens of justice addresses the shortcomings of traditional theories and offers a more comprehensive approach to contemporary ethical challenges. By placing justice at the core of moral philosophy, we can ensure that ethical principles are not only fair and equitable but also the only solution to the complexities of modern society. This redefinition promotes a more just, empathetic, and sustainable world, guiding us toward ethical living in a globalized era.

References

- Aristotle. (2009). *Nicomachean ethics* (M. Ostwald, Trans.). Bobbs-Merrill.
- Bentham, J. (2007). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Dover Publications.
- Enoch, D. (2011). *Taking morality seriously: A defense of robust realism*. Oxford University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Harvard University Press.
- Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. Vintage Books.
- Harman, G. (1975). *Moral relativism defended*. *The Philosophical Review*, 84(1), 3-22.

- Kant, I. (1998). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (3rd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mill, J. S. (2001). *Utilitarianism* (R. Crisp, Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. University of California Press.
- Plato. (1941). *The republic* (B. Jowett, Trans.). Oxford University Press.