

Relativity of Ethics with Sociology in Perspective of Logical Positivism and Advaita Vedanta

Gurmukh Singh

Assistant Professor (Philosophy), Government Girls College, Pokaran, Rajasthan, India
Ph.D Scholar, Department of Philosophy, University of Rajasthan, India

Received: March 02, 2019

Accepted: April 10, 2019

ABSTRACT: : Ethics is a special kind of science, because it is concerned with the human being. Again human behaviour is related with all other sciences like sociology, logic, psychology etc. When human emotions and human experience comes, there all other sciences also come. So subject of ethics is so vast that it touches the boundaries of various branches of knowledge. Most of other Sciences like psychology, political science are concerned only with one particular aspect of human experience, but the morality or ethics scope is very wide. So it is famous that ethics is philosophy of human conduct and a philosophy related to all other branches of knowledge dealing with human nature. There are some sciences that have foundation of ethics and some sciences support the ethics or intermingled with ethics. As both the theories Logical Positivism and Advaita Vedanta believed that morality is relates with human emotions and somewhere indirectly related with human experience also. But there are some exceptions found in Logical Positivists theory. In this paper we will see which type of relation between sociology and ethics in perspective of Logical Positivism and Advaita Vedanta. And which theory defined clearly and logically.

Key Words: Vedas, Upanishads, Bhiksha, Varnashrama dharma, Sadarana dharma, Vaishyas, Higher cultured objects, Cultured objects

Now we will see what type of relation is there between ethics and other sciences according to Logical Positivism and Advaita Vedanta. Also compare them and try to conclude them, weather favourable or unfavourable in general science. According to Logical Positivism sociology is not moral science. Otto Neurath explained this:-

"If the "natural sciences" cannot be delimited from the "moral sciences," it is even less possible to make the distinction between the "philosophy of nature" and the "philosophy of the moral sciences". Even leaving aside the fact that the former term is unsuitable because, as mentioned above, it still contains the word "philosophy," by "philosophy of nature" one can only understand a sort of introduction to the whole work of unified science. For how should "nature" be distinguished from "non-nature"?"

One cannot even adduce the practical exigencies of everyday life or of the conduct of scientific investigations as justification for this dichotomy. Is the theory of human behaviour seriously to be opposed to that of the behaviour of all other objects? Is it seriously intended that the theory of human societies should be fitted into one discipline and the theory of animal societies into another? Are the natural sciences to deal with "cattle-breeding," "slavery" and "war-fare" among ants, and the moral sciences with these same institutions among men? If this is not meant, then the distinction is no sharper than that between different "scientific fields" in the older sense.

And quite understandably so, for then where would be the great cleavage concealed behind all this, the cleavage depending on the maintenance of the centuries-old theological habit of thought which divides up all existence into at least two departments, e.g., a "noble" and an ignoble"? The dualism of "natural sciences" and "moral sciences," and the dualism of "philosophy of nature" and "philosophy of culture" are, in the last analysis, residues of theology."¹

Otto Neurath explained that as social behaviourism, sociology is a part of unified science. Here Logical Positivism differentiates the Sociology and moral science. They put sociology under the umbrella of natural Sciences and philosophy of nature. Whereas give place moral science under philosophy of culture. When sociology goes on the areas of slavery, warfare etc. it touches human behaviour. Sociology forms laws regarding social structure and these laws obtained from reading and observing human behaviour. Again human behaviour is related with culture. Logical Positivism arouses question on human behaviour and its recognised law by making correlations between different human behaviour. According to Logical Positivism

¹A.J.Ayer, Logical Positivism (London: The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1959), 294.

type of laws accepts by group of humans, may not be accepts by another groups. So according to Logical Positivism relations between human behaviour and men's statement concerning the law, may be depend on the allowed interest rate or on standard of living of a period that reflects the prohibited usury. So the modes of behaviour which the moral judgements are passed as legal or ethical could be included in sociology or with in Sociology. But here Logical Positivism differentiates the disciplines from ethics. It means Logical Positivists includes human behaviour under the Sociology and also agree that human behaviour modes used to pass the moral judgements. But they denied of any relation between ethics and sociology. This shows contradiction in Logical Positivism theory about morality, sociology, human behaviourism and sociological correlations.

Whereas according to Advaita Vedanta the sociology and ethics are not differentiated. Where there is ethics found in Vedas, there is also sociology. Ethics and sociology are interrelated in Advaita Vedanta where one cannot differentiate ethics and sociology, when read the duties, volition, consciousness, springs of action, virtues etc. in Vedas and Upanishads. Because both ethics and sociology are merged between each other, so on separation both destroyed. We can describe it with one word social ethics or ethico-socio. In Vedas and Upanishads there is not any special branch of ethics or sociology. A lot is written on these two. In Advaita Vedanta the ethics is social ethics that is means for an end. And this end is knowledge of self or we can say that objective of social ethics of Vedas and Upanishads is ultimate knowledge of oneness of self. Now we see how ethics and sociology are found intermingled in Advaita Vedanta. Classification of the duties is one of the earliest attempts at a systematic treatment of objective of social ethics. So there is found two types of duties:-

1. Varnashrama Dharma - relative duties
2. Sadharana Dharma - common duties

Whereas varnashrama Dharma or relative duties, relate to one self's station in this empirical life, these are oneself specific duties. One self's station is determined by one's Varna or caste and by one's ashrama. Here caste is by work not by birth. This means that Varna depends on one's work in his empirical life. Like one uses agriculture as his profession and produce grains, with which whole society completes the need of hunger. Similarly vaishyas or businessman adopts business of transportation of goods. He buys goods and other items from one place, transport to another places and sell there. In both cases the person are obeying their relative duties and in this way helps the society. Again these relative duties have some boundaries, these are of ethical nature. For example person is selling food grains in drought area, there will be definitely black marketing of food grains. It may be that, the selling price is doubled or tripled. But there is hurdle of varnashrama dharma with sadharana dharma or common duties comes. This sadharana dharma is common duties of universal scope and validity and is the duties irrespective of one's age, caste, Creed, nation, region. These are duty of man as man and not as a member of a particular community or class or as being at a particular stage or period of life. The duty of common man includes:-

1. Steadfastness (Dhrti) not changing unexpectedly, staying same for long
2. Forgiveness (Ksama),
3. 3. Cleanliness (Saucha),
4. 4. Veracity (Satya)
5. Application (Dama), 6. Wisdom (Dhi), 7. Learning (Vidya), 8. Moral Earnestness
6. 9. Repression the sensibilities and sensuous appetites (indriya nigraha)
7. 10. Non appropriation (Caurya bhava)avoidance of theft
8. 11. Restraint of anger (Akrodha)
9. 12. Seeking the good of creatures (Bhutahitva)
10. 13. Refraining from injury to living beings (Ahimsa)
11. 14. Moral watchfulness (Apramada) unflinching performance of unconditional duties

Bhutahitva or seeking the good of creatures represents more inclusive and humanitarian and ideal of life in which the individual can achieve his moral end only by going beyond himself instead of remaining confined within the stone walls of independent neutrality. Again the moral earnestness and model watchfulness are two law of socio-ethical aspect of ethical training of the will. Moral watchfulness consists in cultivation of that alertness of moral consciousness which checks for a moral shortage through mere carelessness or inadvertence and the moral earnestness is the moral feeling and impulse that is inconsistent with levity or frivolousness of any sort. There is close connection between moral life and social life of human being and vice versa. So it looks impossible to deny relation between these two subjects. So it

seems that there are some blunders in theory of ethics, sociology, human behaviourism and sociological correlations of Logical Positivism.

It seems here that these list of duties have reference to the attainment of the individuals own perfection and there is practically no reorganization of social duties. But indirectly these activities and duties have intention of society also. As human being is a social animal. And effect of human being living in particular society is reflected in that society. A person follows these type of duty also directs him towards positively in social service. The second part of duties of varnashrama dharma (relative duties) includes four ashramas. The duties of these four ashramas show direct relation between ethical point of view and social point of view. Like duty of unmarried student is a serving and attending to his teacher, collecting fuel i.e. wood for their school in which other fellows and other colleague lived, collecting alms (bhiksha). The duties of married person living with his family as serving and entertaining of his guests, paying respect to elders, beget children by cohabitation with his wife and do all like study of children, earn and give them food and other necessities which was earlier given to him by his parents.

The Logical Positivism explain that the sociological correlation have so many aspects. Like not all events equally resistant to being employed in such predictions. Given certain conditions, from the mode of the production of historical period one can often roughly infer the next phases in the development of mode of production and the form of social organisation. Then one can try to make further prediction of human behaviour and similar matters with the help of such predictions with some success. Experience shows that, on the other hand, the reversed procedure meets failure. The predictions of production cannot be derived from prediction of human behaviour alone. However, whether we focus on production methods, human behaviour, building construction or music, we are always confronted with events that can be described physically. According to Logical Positivists many age old social Institutions can only be properly accounted for if their distant past is known, while others can, so to speak, conceived at any with the appropriate stimuli. There is a certain sense in which the presence of cannons acts as an in centric to react to armed turrets. A person wearing dress coat on a day, do not represent a reaction to singing and they would only be newly devised with difficulty. But it is understandable to us that a man dressed in a long skirted coat at same time in the past becomes the inventor of that dress coat, when his coat's skirts flapped with riding. Here we see two different examples that show coherence between established customs. According to Logical Positivism person makes predictions based on the type of coherence information available to him. Again one must have knowledge that there may be any possibility to make correlation of interrelation or the attachment of certain segment or part from other, so that there should not be any loss. Hence in this way Logical Positivism denied that individuals or particulars possibility of prediction, that effects the essence of social behaviourism. They arouse question on individuals or particulars possibility of prediction that affects the essence of social behaviourism. This is explained by Otto Neurath as:-

"It is a wholly physicalistic question to what extent the existence of specially conditioned individuals, deviating from the norm, assures the stability of the state structure. The related question of the degree to which such significant individuals are replaceable must be treated separately. The queen bee assumes a special position in the hive, but when a queen bee gets lost, there is the possibility that a new one will emerge. There are always, so to speak, latent queens. How is this in the case of human society?"

*The extent to which predictions about social complexes can be made without taking into consideration the fate of certain particularly prominent individuals is entirely a concrete sociological question. It is possible to maintain, with good reason, that the creation of bourgeois Europe, once the machine system had imparted to the modern capitalistic transformation its characteristic hue, was predictable at the end of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, one could hardly have predicted Napoleon's Russian campaign and the burning of Moscow. But it would, perhaps, be valid to say that if Napoleon had defeated Russia, the transformation of the social Order would have proceeded in the same way as it did in fact proceed. Even a victorious Napoleon would have had to countenance the old feudalism of Central Europe to a certain degree and for a certain time just as, on another occasion, he re-established the Catholic Church."*²

According to Logical Positivism sociology tracks down correlations used further for predictions. Every other science also does this job. But logical positivist denies that sociology cannot track down correlations of individuals or particulars that used further for predictions. And in ethics, it is found that individual or particular have their different prediction. So Sociology and ethics are differentiated by methods of human behaviours, morality and sociological correlations. They gave example of unpredictable

² A.J.Ayer, Logical Positivism (London: The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1959), 303.

movement of individual leaf of paper the wind. According to Logical Positivism, not any part of essence of developed science to be capable, for predicting every individual event. Again question arise on Logical Positivism, that laws of Sciences made by universalisation and it is not possible to check every event, so large number of practices done behalf of that norms made. In the same way laws of sociology formed on human behaviour, the same method of universalisation. Like an apple always drops down on land, when freely leaves in space. It may be that due to different conditions, like on moon, this law becomes failed. Similarly in ethics laws formed on basis of universalisation and this universalisation formed by number of observations of human behaviour and its acts. There may be some exceptions, for example a child living in gang of robber's bad habits of lie, steel and snitch, and that was due to different conditions. This is well explained in Vedas and Upanishads.

Ethics is closely linked with sociology. It is intended to study group of people or communities. This science has been moving recently. Its scope is so wide and its problems are so uncertain that setting its borders is very difficult. Very often, political science and economics problems overlap sociology problems. However, it can be said that sociology study social institutions, rites, customs and other social relations and traditions in particular. These views are mostly historical and naturalistic. There is no doubt that ethics as a normative science is different from sociology, similar despite different points of view. We will find that the oldest standards of conduct are customs, manners and traditional social rules. History bears witness to the subsequent growth of the development of moral conduct. Therefore, it is necessary to know the foundation of the social Ethics of human beings write from the very dawn of human civilization before setting ethical standards for the entire human race. In other words, no ethical theory can be considered final until a detailed study of social Institutions is carried out using sociology. From this point of view, ethics is largely dependent on sociology and vice versa. Ethics and sociology are so closely related that the social logical aspects of morality are an important part of its study in almost every detailed book on ethics. As sociology has an almost exclusively outlook; whereas the empirical point of view is individualistic, it have a general principles, because the ideals it proposes are applicable to individual people who form part of society. Sociology is concerned with social customs and manners, but it is not an appreciative science in the sense that judgements are right or incorrect and good or bad. Sociology is not a normative science and is descriptive naturalistic in essence. The beliefs propounded and subjected to grievance in ethics are the means of implementing the life of and each every character. If we analyse this cause of ethics, we will arrive at the belief that men or women morality in the end leads to social morality. The moral vital meant for the character is certainly stimulated by means of social well being.

Whereas at some places in Logical Positivism, gestures found regarding integration of sociology have with the ethics. Like when Rudolf Carnap explains "The Higher Cultural Objects" in the "The Logical Structure of The World". These special sciences are psychology, ethics etc.

*"Sociological groups or organizations are, among others, the most important higher cultural objects. Such a structure (for example, a tribe, a family, a club, a state, etc.) must be constructed as a relation extension, not as a class, since the order of the members within the sociological group belongs to the character of the group. That it is not permissible to construct these groups as classes follows from the possibility that the members of two different groups are identical. The other sociological groups must be constructed in a way which is similar to that which we indicated for the state. In this and other ways, we can then construct generally all higher cultural objects on the basis of the primary cultural objects and occasionally also on the basis of objects of other previously constructed types. Thus, we can construct, either as primary or as derived objects, the cultural objects of all cultural fields; hence, the entities, properties, relations, events, states, etc., of technology, of economics, of law, of politics, of language, of art, of science, of religion, etc. Finally, the division into, and the characterization of, the individual fields can be carried out through further constructions."*³

Here Carnap tried to explain that the higher cultured objects are constructed on the basis of the primary culture objects. Further Carnap also accept that in this case, investigations of special sciences will be used. Principal trouble of ethics is in fact in social trouble. Ethics lays down responsibilities for each and every character and also propounds rights corresponding to these obligations. These rights and obligations represent the relation of person and Society and duty of each person. When we study the ethics and try to attempt ethics in this life, we faces the same problems of sociology like of reward and punishment, of suicide, of capital punishment, of marriage etc. So for this study of sociology have a great importance for ethics and no one can deny separateness between sociology and ethics.

³ Rudolf Carnap, The Logical Structure of the World (California: The Regents of the University of California,1967),232

REFERENCES

1. Schilpp, P. Arthur. The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap. Open Court Publishing Company, LaSalle, Illinois, 1963.
2. Ayer, A.J. Logical Positivism. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1959.
3. Ayer, A.J. Language, Truth and Logic. Dover Publications, New York, 2014.
4. Singh, N.K. and Mishra, A.P. Advaita Philosophy. Global Vision Publishing House, New Delhi, 2011.
5. Chatterjee, Satischandra. The Nyaya Theory of Knowledge. University of Calcutta, Calcutta, 1950.
6. Mahadevan, T.M.P. The Philosophy of Advaita. Ganesh & Company Private Ltd., Madras, 1957.
7. Carnap, Rudolf. The Logical Structure of the World. The Regents of the University of California, California, USA, 1967.