From Applied Ethics to Moral Philosophy

Hamid Shafizadeh

Medical Ethics and History of Medicine of Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract

The usual way of creating an attitude and practical solution in ethics always begins with philosophy; that is, it first comes from theoretical philosophers and new attitudes based on ontology, semantics and logic, based on which types of soft or imperative ethics are formed and applied ethics show itself in its continuation. This is a prevalent and standard issue that governs our systems today, but the truth is that all of these theories have deficiencies that create problems and challenges for students or their users in the applied ethics scene. Many philosophers have tried to solve this problem in some way, for instance Ross has suggested the inspirational ethos or intuitionism, and he has established the method of acting on a moral act based on what is occurring to the mind. All of this proves that man and his relationships are so complex that the use of the characteristics of philosophical theories can no longer be able to answer the challenging and ambiguous issues of moral problems. Therefore, my suggestion is that the human beings, the users or the medical staff decide to solve two dilemmas of morality and follow them, regardless of these schools and theories, and thereby free their minds from shortcomings and limitations of the aforementioned philosophies.

Keywords: Applied Ethics, Moral Philosophy, Medical ethics

INTRODUCTION

In our era, there are various kinds of philosophical theories, based on which different styles of moral inference have been formed in the realm of action. These philosophical schools have to be taken very seriously, because many important global events, including the Renaissance, social and cultural movements, emergence of political schools, massacres and genocides, in recent centuries, have been formed on the basis of correct and right understanding of these philosophical schools, such as the Nazis who used to massacre European people, and that was nothing more than Darwin's philosophical school. [1] The theory of natural selection and the struggle for survival was the excuse that the Nazis used to kill some people and races in Europe.

Moral theories are, if not more than, at least as old as medical science itself. The most historic of them is the virtue-based ethics that Aristotle is its greatest scientist and agent. [2] With the advent of the Renaissance revolution in Europe and the rebellion of new philosophers against the old ones, new philosophers such as Kant come up who base their moral philosophy on the basis of Deontology. They are also followed by philosophers who create arguments and other methods for creating another moral philosophy, such as theories based on the consequentialism and Utilitarianism. [3] Then, a personality such as Ross, founds his moral theory based on fidelity, gratitude, reparation, non injury, harm-prevention, beneficence, self improvement, justice [4] and utility. Recently, two named philosophers, Beauchamp and Childerss, base their ethical principles on four pillars of autonomy, beneficence, non-harm, and justice, [5] which,

despite the defects and contradictions inherent in them, sits on today's world of thought thanks to the American empire of knowledge.

For decades, biology and medical ethics in the world have somehow undergone a renaissance, and institutions and hospitals are voluntarily or, in some cases involuntarily, to follow guidelines to advance their goals. Although our discussion is not on this issue, but there are evidence and figures showing that this tendency to professional ethics is not for the value of human dignity but rather for the advancement of commercial goals. In fact, bioethics and medical ethics are increasingly moving towards the ethics of commercial medicine and every year, they go under transformations which make their appearance and interior, look more similar.

Address for correspondence: Hamid Shafizadeh, Medical Ethics and History of Medicine of Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.
Email: Dr.shafizadeh3@gmail.com

Some argue that our inability to address the challenges and problems that we face in moral dilemmas is due to the lack of training and instruction of personnel involved with ethical cases. However, there are some indications that, despite increasing education and practicing medical personnel, they have not been able to solve this problem even in the clinical sate of the patient.

At this time, emphasis has been placed on ethical training and practice but the question is: What is the quality and quantity of education and its contents? We are not opposed to education and practice, but can a mentality full of various theories of medical ethics uses what has been memorized in moral dilemmas? Or is this information and these abundant methods, in the end, like information explosion and information overload, extinguish and destroy the real information which as a result causes puzzlement and dizziness? [6]

Although some people offer data fusion [7] and data mining to solve the problem, these materials by themselves, in some way, increase the information and cause this sequence to continue. This enormous volume of philosophical schools' methods is like a warehouse in which the needle of truth has been lost. The current trend ultimately leads to information anxiety in users. Aside from these issues, the problem of understanding philosophical concepts and the lack of transparency in philosophical content have caused ambiguities and different perceptions of philosophical schools. The evidence for this claim comes from many interpretations and exegesis that have been written for the books of philosophers throughout history. On the other hand, half of the philosophers' efforts to prove their philosophical claim go for rejecting the claims of previous philosophical theories. This situation has created a thought in the minds of some people that when philosophers do not accept the others and reject each other ruthlessly and callously and for sure this trend will be preceded by future philosophers; why should people listen to their esoteric and ambiguous words?

DISCUSSION:

In the past, as societies have not grown and interwoven like today and different attitudes towards various scientific and philosophical issues have not been shaped in the society. The emergence of new technologies , the advancement of science in various branches and in particular the emergence of mass media, including the press, radio and television, and recently, Internet networks, have aggravated pluralism in all aspects of human life despite the initial impression. Although it was initially thought that the advancement of human science would make human beings more intimate to each other, evidence suggests that humans today vary considerably from each other in ideas and thoughts. Perhaps today, many people are similar in dress, fashion appearance, eating, and the shape of the home and office and also similar disciplines with the same references are thought in the various universities around the globe. All of these developments have come into existence thanks to the to the advancement of science and

technology, but all the people know that although the appearances of human life has become similar, their inner desires have fallen apart and humans have become distant and alienated. The spread of poverty, class divisions, family disruption, the spread of divorce and the dramatic rise in human trafficking and abortion, all of which are the prelude to the disintegration of society, are the symptoms of this disease whose virus has been made of science and technology. [8]

The science of today is not as white as paper and can be criticized and revised. Is education technology an exception to this rule? Does technology destroy the internal structure of the human body? It's a question that more than anything else will show how far human beings are apart and alien.

In fact, the point here is that the human mind is able to understand and fathom things on the basis of its own self-evident things. Therefore, perhaps the best way to solve the equations and riddles of medical ethics is to use an empty mind which is devoid of any philosophical theory. We can solve all conflicts and moral dilemmas in our minds and in ourselves, and then, if philosophers are interested, they can proceed on philosophizing about our own kind and method by field reviewing of solving of this moral challenge in the field of action. We believe that movement, unlike the standard and common method does not start from philosophy to soft ethics and we suggest that bottom-up method be used. That is, we should let our minds to decide and make decisions about all of these instructions which are sometimes on the contrary to each other and then philosophers, in case of being interested, can make philosophy and philosophical principles about it by reviewing the solved cases. Our philosophical theories in this method will be more comprehensive and complete because we get to reality from intellectual philosophies.

This concept differs from the subject of case-replete and situational ethics because in the latter human beings somehow create an intellectual equation and solves it based on his/her knowledge about ethical philosophy and overriding conditions but it should be noted that, in all of these situations, we are all also in the vein of our own former intellectual network, which is accustomed to pursuing a certain school of thought. It may seem like what Kant says about ethical decision making. Kant says that man must make his own ethical decision for every form of coercion and mental belief, therefore the question is whether the philosophical schools formed in our minds have conquered our minds in some way and we cannot decide beyond our own mental background, and we are, in other words, captives of these thoughts and schools, and always decide on the form and atmosphere of these schools. This fact is a very narrow place that distinguishes the moral judgment in different individuals. No one is really free in his/her inside. It involves all human beings, and there is no exception. Perhaps an important objection that can be made to Kant's autonomic principle is the same. Of course, it's clear that no mind can be

devoid of belief, and when someone says I do not think about anything, s/he actually thinks about not thinking. Therefore, we must practice our minds to use what is initially inspired to us before these concepts and moral theories and solve that ethical challenge.

In fact, morality is of the same kind of understanding good and bad, and the human being is capable of understanding goodness and badness in its essence, and it is not necessary for him/her to learn the beauty or being good or bad because as s/he understands beauty and ugliness in his/her essence s/he also fathoms the principles of good and bad ethics and should only learn how to use and interweave them in order to get a solution.

Children, who have not yet been involved in social education and schools, behave in the same way and approach unity is evident in their behavior. All of them show roughly the same behavior facing somebody's frown, gift or encouragement.

However, if we go to college and frown on all the students, each one of them will respond differently: one will laugh at us, one will ridicule us and another will show ignorance. And this is also true in gift receiving, because the mature people are captive of by their own doctrines and internal schools, but the children act according to their own nature and instinct. It could be ephemerally pointed out here that most of the modern world's educations have somehow caused plurality of thoughts and beliefs, and ultimately human separation.

Looking inside creates a kind of unified approach in human beings.

In the past, as societies have not grown and interwoven like today and different attitudes towards various scientific and philosophical issues have not been shaped in the society. The emergence of new technologies , the advancement of science in various branches and in particular the emergence of mass media, including the press, radio and television, and recently, Internet networks, have aggravated pluralism in all aspects of human life despite the initial impression. [9, 10] Although it was initially thought that the advancement of human science would make human beings more intimate to each other, evidence suggests that humans today vary considerably from each other in ideas and thoughts. Perhaps today, many people are similar in dress, fashion appearance, eating, and the shape of the home and office and also similar disciplines with the same references are thought in the various universities around the globe. [11] All of these developments have come into existence thanks to the to the advancement of science and technology, but all the people know that although the appearances of human life has become similar, their inner desires have fallen apart and humans have become distant and alienated. The spread of poverty, class divisions, family disruption, the spread of divorce and the dramatic rise in human trafficking and abortion, all of which are the prelude to the disintegration of society, are the symptoms of this disease whose virus has been made of science and technology. [12]

Does technology destroy the internal structure of the human body? It's a question that more than anything else will show how far human beings are apart and alien. In fact, it is not necessary to mention repeatedly that since human nature and psyche are structurally similar, and all human beings know self-evident beings in their nature and have an existential unity with each other and nature, the use of empty, transparent and clean minds somehow causes approach unity in mental inferences and creates a solidarity between humans, and especially between the patient and the doctor, because the human psyche has a language that everyone understands and is very interested in.

Man finds original knowledge in his own being

In the outside world there are a number of concepts that are authentic, absolute, eternal and innate, including the understanding of mathematical rules, good and bad understanding, beauty and ugliness, and ethical principles. There are also sciences and information that are relative, temporary and contractual, such as these One-way or two-way streets, civil contracts, and a kind of attitude to science and society. The first group is sciences which we discover in ourselves and should only be mentioned and reminded for human beings and there is no need for external education. In contrast, there are sciences which are contractual and should be achieved by training and exercising externally and by creating their appropriate preconditions.

We understand the meaning of 1 and 2 spontaneously and then combine these concepts with the abilities we have in our being. Understanding the meanings of 1 and 2 is not related to education, and it does not depend on external perception. If these concepts were not in human being, no human was able to learn the most superficial and simplest issues. Our subject is that man does not create original knowledge, but rather discovers it. All true truths are somehow in our being and by recalling; we find and not create them in ourselves. Based on this hypothesis and thinking, the solution to the challenges of medical ethics can be discovered in human being. The solution to all moral problems is in our being and we must discover them in our being and not create or produce them. Man, in the true sense, is not capable of creating and producing knowledge, but is capable of discovering the knowledge and intellectual concepts in his own being. Subsequently, by combining and subtracting this knowledge, s/he will find a variety of its applications in the environment. Another thing that human beings need to learn is to become familiar with the cultures, beliefs, and rules of society, because what can restrain a person and limit him in decision making is the legal and cultural issues that society has with it. This is a matter for all ethical schools and all methods of solving moral dilemmas, because in all situations, we live in an environment that has its own culture and foundations.

CONCLUSION:

The last point is that although ethical theories in medicine have had their own certain history and sometimes they have been able to move and advance the problems of morality, it

has not, at the end, been able to cope with anxiety, stress, and awesome challenges before the medical staff. History, statistics, and figures show that we need to make fundamental and non-formal changes to our educational strategy. Educational technology, like other technologies, can be criticized and evaluated, and we should not be so mesmerized by this technology that the margin becomes more important than the core. Therefore, we suggest that humans pay attention to ethical solutions beyond all philosophical schools. Perhaps with this method, we will achieve a greater degree of efficiency accompanied with high quality and we do not need to learn a lot of philosophical schools anymore.

REFERENCES

1. Bergman J. Darwinism and the Nazi race Holocaust. Journal of Creation. 1999;13(2):101-11.
2. Harman G. Moral philosophy meets social psychology: Virtue ethics and the fundamental attribution error. In Proceedings of the Aristotelian society 1999 Jan 1 (pp. 315-331). Aristotelian Society.
3. Alexander, Larry, and Michael Moore. "Deontological ethics." (2007).
4. Thornton T. Judgement and the role of the metaphysics of values in medical ethics. Journal of medical ethics. 2006 Jun 1;32(6):365-70.
5. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Principles of biomedical ethics. Oxford University Press, USA; 2001.
6. Awden D, Robinson L. The dark side of information: overload, anxiety and other paradoxes and pathologies. Journal of information science. 2009 Apr;35(2):180-91.
7. Novak D, Mihelj M, Munih M. A survey of methods for data fusion and system adaptation using autonomic nervous system responses in physiological computing. Interacting with computers. 2012 May 1;24(3):154-72.
8. Acemoglu D. Technology and inequality. Technology and Inequality. 2003.
9. Wrinch D. The relations of science and philosophy. Philosophy. 1927 Apr;2(6):153-66.
10. Davis A. New media and fat democracy: the paradox of online participation1. New media & society. 2010 Aug;12(5):745-61.
11. KAMAT, Prashant V. Research ethics. In: A paper presented at the Symposium on Scientific Publishing, ACS National Meeting, Atlanta, GA. 2006.
12. FLEXNER, Abraham. The usefulness of useless knowledge. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 1955, 2.3: 241-246.