Comparison of Islamic, Traditional and Alternative Utility Theories

Sümeyye DEMİRSOY
International University of Sarajevo
Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mehmet CAN
International University of Sarajevo
Bosnia and Herzegovina
mcan@ius.edu.ba

Abstract: Decision making under uncertainty is always trying to be explained by utility theory. And utility theory's roots rely on moral philosophy. Moral philosophy is concerning concepts about good and bad, right and wrong, virtue, justice, etc. It can be say that utilitarianism, which is a field of moral philosophy, is more directly about utility theory. Throughout the human history, from Prophet Abraham to Greek philosophers; Socrates, Aristotle, Epicurus, to Islam scholars al Kindi, al-Farabi, al-Razi, Ibn-i Sina, Ibn-i Rushd, Ibn-i Haldun, all discussed about ethics and utility concept.

1. Introduction

Although utility is an economic term which measures the satisfaction or desirability in terms of the consumption of goods and services, its roots rely on moral philosophy which deals with the concepts about good and bad, right and wrong, virtue, justice, and happiness. On the other hand, concepts of good and bad, right and wrong, virtue, justice, and happiness was constituents of ethichs throughout history of humanity.

Human concepts like good and bad, right and wrong, virtue, justice, and happiness were the concern of human civilizations through millenniums. Historically the foundations of human ethics are laid by divine revaliations through prophets.

Muslims identify the prophets of Islam as those humans chosen by Allah to teach mankind. Humans may rely on revelation or tradition to identify prophets. Each prophet brought the same basic ideas of ethics. They brought the belief in a single God and in the avoidance of idolatry and sin.

Muslims regard Adam as the first prophet and Muhammad as the last. Islamic theology recognises as many as 124,000 prophets. The Qur'an identifies 25 prophets by name, starting with Adam and ending with Muhammad. Five of them, Rasuls, receive the highest reverence for their perseverance, Ibrahim (Abraham), Moosa (Moses), Dawud (David), Isa (Jesus), and Muhammad.

1.1 Prophet Ibrahim (Abraham)

Ibrahim was born in a house of idolaters, in the kingdom of Babylon. He announced to his people: O my people I turned my face towards Him Who created the heavens and the earth, and never shall I give partners to Allah. He has the power to make the stars rise and set.

1.2 Prophet Musa (Moses)

Musa the son of Imran, was born in Egypt in which at that time the kings were known as Fir'awns. First statement about working ethics in Torah is in Genesis part. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." (Torah, Genesis 3/19)

In Torah it is suggested to respect neighbour rights and to behave in good way to them: "When thou dost lend thy brother any thing, thou shalt not go into his house to fetch his pledge. Thou shalt stand abroad, and the man to whom thou dost lend shall bring out the pledge abroad unto thee. And if the man be poor, thou shalt not sleep with his pledge: In any case thou shalt deliver him the pledge again when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his

own raiment, and bless thee: and it shall be righteousness unto thee before the Lord thy God."(Torah, Deureronomy 24/10-13)

Another statement about poor is as following and in this statement Torah mentioning about living together with brothers: "And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee; then thou shalt relieve him: yea, though he be a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of him, or increase: but fear thy God; that thy brother may live with thee." (Torah, Levitucus 25/35-36)

"If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury. If thou at all take thy neighbor's raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it unto him by that the sun goeth down: For that is his covering only, it is his raiment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep? and it shall come to pass, when he crieth unto me, that I will hear; for I am gracious." (Torah, Exodus, 22/25-27)

"And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger: I am the LORD your God." (Torah, Levitucus 19/9-10)

"And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee; then thou shalt relieve him: yea, though he be a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee." (Torah, Levitucus 25/35)

1.3 Prophet Dawud (David)

Dawud (David) was not only an illustrious Prophet of the Israelites but he was also their king. The Holy Qur'an affirms: "And Allah gave him the kingdom! and wisdom and taught him of that which He willed." (2: 251). And it was said unto him: " 0' Dawud!To! We have set you as a vicegerent in the earth, therefore, judge aright between mankind and follow not desire." (38:26)
He lived in Bait-ul-Lahm which was situated at the distance of ten miles from Jerusalem. He prayed: "Our Lord! Pour out constancy on us and make our steps firm and help us against those who are disbelievers." (2:249)
Allah revealed the Zabur (Book of Psalms) to Prophet Dawud. It contains lessons for the guidance of his people.

1.4 Buddha

The evidence of the early texts suggests that the Buddha was born in a community that was on the periphery, both geographically and culturally, of fifth century BCE northeast India. This community seems to have had two categories of people, masters and servants.
The Four Noble Truths of Budhism:

1.   Life as we know it ultimately is or leads to suffering/uneasiness (dukkha) in one way or another.
2.   Suffering is caused by craving. This is often expressed as a deluded clinging to a certain sense of existence, to selfhood, or to the things or phenomena that we consider the cause of happiness or unhappiness. Craving also has its negative aspect, i.e. one craves that a certain state of affairs not exist.
3.   Suffering ends when craving ends. This is achieved by eliminating delusion, thereby reaching a liberated state of Enlightenment (bodhi);
4.   Reaching this liberated state is achieved by following the path laid out by the Buddha.

2. The Greek Philosophers

For ancient Greek philosophers the question 'how should I live?' took a fundamentally prudential or self-regarding form. It amounted for them an inquiry searching how a man could secure his own happiness, fulfilment or perfection. Benevolence, altruism, philanthropy, a concern for happiness of others occupied a secondary position in their ethical recommendations. It is conceived as a condition of self-realisation of the individual. In general Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle in particular, found a place for restricted benevolence by emphasising the role of friendship in a fully satisfying life. Aristo somewhat made a disdainful liberality part of his conception of the ethically ideal or 'magnanimous' man.

It can be said that utilitarianism, which is a field of moral philosophy, is more directly about utility theory. Utilitarianism can be understood as a movement for legal, political and social reform that flourished in the nineteenth century. It can also be understood as the ideology of that movement. It is also a general ethical theory. As a theory of

ethics, it provides a criterion for distinguishing between the right and wrong action, an account of nature of the moral judgements that characterise action as right and wrong.

Utilitarianism can be expressed as the combination of two principles: (i) the consequentialist principle that the rightness, or wrongness of an action is determined by the goodness, or badness of the results that flow from it and (ii) the hedonist principle that the only thing that is good in itself is pleasure and the only thing bad in itself is pain. The doctrine can be expressed in the form of a single principle, the greatest happiness principle: the rigthness of an action is determined by its contribution to the happiness of everyone affected by it. (Quinton, 1973).

Greek moralists unreflectively assumed a consequentialist position in developing their more or less prudential life-styles. The only way in which they conceived it to be possible to justify a type of conduct was by reference to the results to which it gave rise (Quinton, 1973).

2.1   Socrates (BC 470-399)

Socrates' ethical intellectualism has an eudaemological character in which he asserted that the highest good for any human being is happiness. According to Socrates, people's true happiness is promoted by doing what is right. When people's true utility is served (tending own soul), people are achieving happiness. Happiness is evident from the long-term effect on the soul.

According to him, whatever action a man chooses is motivated by his desire for happiness. All the concepts like knowledge, virtue, and wisdom are the same and man chooses an action according to what he thinks will bring him the greatest happiness. Therefore the more a man knows, the greater his ability to reason out the correct choice and the greater his ability to choose those actions which truly bring happiness to him.

According to Socrates, to answer the question 'what is happiness', the first question should be asked to an individual by himself: If all his needs were completed, or he had enough power to do anything, would he really be happy? When individual observe and attract attention to him, even all these needs mentioned above are completed, he sees that he is not happy enough. On the contrary he sees that he witnessed many disappointments, only when he is in harmony with himself he will really be happy. People who are not in harmony with themselves never be happy properly.

Socrates believes that psychic harmony is the greatest good, and that the result of it is moral behavior. He also believes that if you have a healthy body and soul then you are in psychic harmony with yourself. In the ideal soul, the reasoning part and the feelings (desires for honour) rule over the appetitive part (desires for wealth, food, etc). A properly ordered soul experiences a sense of well-being or psychological health. Thus, psychological health is something distinct from psychological stability since it depends on psychic harmony.

According to Socrates, immoral behavior is a result of an unbalanced personality and leads people to irrational behavior. Psychic harmony is a psychological condition and makes someone moral and this harmony has no motivation. Moral behavior comes from people's own beliefs and desires. If one is bad or unjust in the social sense it is because of his sensuality, greed, or vanity. According to Socrates where there is psychic harmony, the motives for injustice in the social sense will be eliminated.

Socrates did not surpass the prejudice of Greek intellectualism in ethics. It is enough to know virtue in order to be virtuous. Everyone wishes to be happy and if someone does not attain happiness, it is because he does not know the way that leads to happiness. Consequently, so-called evil men are in reality only ignorant. Thus, vice is synonymous with ignorance, so knowledge of the good is synonymous with virtue. That is why Socrates, who intended to form a virtuous youth, restricted his teaching to the search for moral concepts.

The foundations of Socratic system of ethics can be summarised as;

i.   a choice is rational if and only if it is a choice of what is best for the agent

ii.   something is good for an agent if and only if it is morally right.

The cornerstone of Socratic ethics is the self-interested concern for happiness, that is, one's own good. But this concern requires that we act in accordance with what is just and noble, that is the moral good. The identity of one's own good with the moral good is the basis for specific Socratic foundations. Socrates shows in the book Gorgias that one's own good coincides almost completely with the moral good, since the utility of nonmoral goods, for example, wealth, depends on the possession of moral excellence.

According to Socrates, the content of goodness/benevolence covers utility and pleasure. That is why some of the historians of ethics assume that Socrates is Epicurean, so he is utilitarian. However, pleasure, which Socrates implies, is not harmfull to intellect and soul. Here intellect has a role of being informative and determinant. Thus Socrates' pleasure is under control of intellect. And also Socrates' utility view is not individualistic, but public.

2.2   School of Cyrene – Aristippus (BC 435-366)

Cyrene school of philosophy is a kind of discipline of Socrates, founded in the 5th century by Aristippus. He was a hedonist and urging the pre-eminent claims of bodily pleasure as an end.

This philosopher explains his thought, which he starts with a question 'what is a happy life', by answering 'life, which has as much as possible pleasure and as little as possible suffering, is a happy life'. To make life happy, someone should include as much as possible pleasure and as little as possible suffering to his/her life. For to do this, he/she should decrease needs, so it will be adjusted to life with limited needs. So by doing with limited needs, it can be benefited from all pleasures of life.

Aristippus teaches us kind of a life art that should be lived wisely. And this art can be gained by giving up desires which make people slaves of themselves. Thus, school of Cyrene derived hedonism from Socrates' eudaimonism. Later on, school of Cyrene's this hedonism concept was accepted by Epicurus (Aster, 2005)

2.3   School of Cynicism – Antisthenes (BC 455-365)

Antisthenes, who outlined the themes of the school, is the first philosopher of school of cynicism. He had been a pupil of Socrates in the late 5th century BC. Antisthenes has severe discussions to Aristippus' pleasure assumption.

According to Antisthenes, people should look for real happiness in desire of freedom and liberty inside. People, who reach to real happiness, know how to stay insensitive and disregarding in relation to either pleasure or suffering. This staying indifferent in relation to pleasure or suffering brings freedom from inside.

2.4   Plato (BC 427-347)

Plato, founder of Academy in Athens, is a classical Greek philosopher. His mentor was Socrates and his student was Aristotle. According to Plato, nothing is fine without moderation, and the thing which is pleasant becomes as pleasant with this moderation. He also mentions about moderation in between organic pleasures and intellectual benevolence.

Unlike Aristotle's developed concept of happiness (will be mentioned below), Plato's happiness concept is more obscure. According to Plato, the Good is the source of intelligibility. He asserted that the highest goal in all of education is knowledge of the Good. According to him, human beings aim at the good, nobody voluntarily chooses evil.

Plato thinks that the masses are incapable of grasping the truth. He illustrated this in his the allegory of the cave where Plato suggests that the masses cannot see the truth directly but they are satisfied with an illusion of reality. According to Plato, the good is the source of intelligibility and happiness is the attainment of intelligibility. Thus, Plato describes his happiness concepts as the goal of life.

There is an important difference between Socratics and Plato. Both Aristippus and Antisthenes are individualists. For both of them, origin is individual. Both of them don't deal with super-individual fact as state, history, society. If people want to be really happy, they should be on their own, they should not depend on other people. In this point, Plato has disagreement with his other two schoolmates. According to Plato, people never be on their own but always live with other people. If we isolate an individual from the society he lives in, we exclude him from his own resources. Moreover, the institution called 'state' is like a human. What condition social entire is in, individual lives in the same condition. Thus to understand human being, it should be looked into the state which he lives. Therefore Plato rejects Socratics' (Aristippus and Antisthenes) thoughts. Although they seem like the followers of Socrates, Plato thinks that they are not thinking in similar perspective. According to Plato, contrary to Aristippus and Antisthenes' individualistic tendency, Socrates did not only show his skillfulness about living, but he also became the first example of moral principle which took socialization as a base (Aster, 2005).

2.5   Aristotle (BC 384-322)

Aristotle is a Greek philosopher who is student of Plato and teacher of Alexander the Great. His teaching about virtue and ethics is set forth in his Nicomachean Ethics.
Greek philosophy accepts that human life's main purpose is 'happiness'. However they differentiate from each other about 'what is happiness'. Aristotelian method is different from others because, according to him, each existence has

its own activity. Knowing specific activity of human shows us that what kind of an objective this human wants to reach. So it will be learned what is the 'real happiness'.

According to Aristotle, happiness (eudaimonia) is an activity of the soul in accordance with virtue and it is the highest of all goods. Happiness is the first principle and cause of all goods and it is a self-sufficient activity always chosen for itself. Unlike other virtues, happiness is the only thing chosen only for itself and not for the sake of other things. Aristotle believes that amusement is not self sufficient like happiness and he distinguished between the life of amusement and the happy life.

Aristotle proposes two possible paths to happiness as a life of virtuous activity and a life of theoria and asks which of the two is the best. The former path defines happiness as a practical vitue and in need of external goods. And the latter path theoria is contemplation of eternal truths for an entire lifetime which is the highest activity of reason. Aristotle chooses theoria. Becuase the life of practical virtue achieves happiness in a lesser sense because of the necessity of material goods in this life and the life of the theoria limits the need for material goods and perfect happiness (eudaimonia) is enjoyed by the Gods.

According to Aristotle, human being is rational as his nature. If a rational man behaves rationally and moderate, he will be behaved parallelly to his nature. 'Thinking' and 'knowing' are human's highest activities. But what can be ratio/intellect's activity in practical life? Each of the virtues is a state of being that naturally seeks its mean. All virtues are in between of two extremes, virtues are means of the two extremes. This mean is not mathematical but it is a border which can be found by ratio/intellect. The virtuous habit of action is always an intermediate state between the opposed vices of excess and deficiency. For example; with respect to the enjoyment of pleasures, temperance (sophrosúnê) is a mean between the excess of intemperance and the deficiency of insensibility. Greek thought always searches for harmony and moderation, dislikes extremes. Aristotle is an opposer to all kind of extremes, too. Thus, Aristotle is against the thoughts that reject possessions like Cynics. Aristotle emphasizes on possessions' relative values. By using them moderately, they can bring even sense and value. One another thought of Aristotle is not to ignore desires and urges totally, they should not be ignored totally, but to keep them down by ratio.

According to Aristotle, there is no direct connection between good/benevolence and pleasure. These three points should be taken into account: First pleasure is not main principle for a moral life, second pleasure occurs as a result of an action which targets virtue. And third virtue is in the action which results in pleasure.

2.6   Epicurus (BC 341-271)

Two more schools joined to the list of schools of philosophy in about BC 300s. One is school of Stoa and the other one is Epicureanism that took its name from the founder Epicurus. These two schools have contradictory opinions about life and knowledge.

As it is mentioned in former parts of this work, school of Cynicism and Cyrene have contradictory opinions about ethics, too. According to Cynics, it is important to exert perfect dominance on desires. After Cynics, we see some similar thoughts are repeated by Stoa. It is virtuous to exert dominance on excitements, desires because virtue gives us staying apathetic to life and death. School of Cyrene perceives life's real purpose as catching pleasure and escaping from pain. Kind of a dissidence, like between Cynics and Cyrenes, later on was seen in between Stoa and Epicureanism.

These two schools, Stoa and Epicureanism, sustained their existence by keeping alive dispute among them. However at the same time they have some similar or common opinions. The first point they agree is that human being is subject of philosophy. First they draw portraits of 'superman'. However all these 'superman' concepts were interpreted differently. For Stoa school, superman is man who beats demands and desires, knows to disregard to both life and death. They show apathy (lack of interest or concern) as a purpose to human. On the other hand Epicureanism finds its purpose on ataraxie (freedom from worry). However it can be noticed that there is no big difference between ataraxie and apathy.

According to Stoa school, first principle is people's need to understand that they are organs of the unity called world. Second principle is people's need to know their own stand in the world and so to adopt themselves to destiny which is chosen for themselves. However Epicurus thinks that world processes with respect to blind and spontaneous necessity. If people's destiny is determined by coincidences which can not be seen before, then they can have interest in products which are their own will-power. Thus, people will stay disregard in respect to life and death and by behaving rationally they will know how to distinguish things which give happiness.

Epicurus adopted the principle to attain pleasure and to escape from pain in ethics. But human should do this wisely. He should avoid from intense pleasures which bring pain at last. Human should not interest in anything more than its necessity because extremes cause to pain. People should know to keep away from temporary and

specious values such as fine and glory. Temporary values always direct people to more, and this more never ends, that is why people always stay in unrest. Thus, people should be interested in "moral pleasures" which won't cause to dissatisfaction. According to Epicurus, for to be happy, it is necessary to live moderate, to tend pleasures which are moral, and to behave in accordance with all these.

Epicurus established his school in Athens in 306 BC. In the surviving writings of Epicurus, there is little of direct relevance to the connection between utility and justice. However, virtue including justice, was not intended to limit pleasure. According to Bailey (Bailey 1928) Epicureanism is 'a system of uncompromising egoistic hedonism'. Scarre (Scarre 1994) put it, 'just as the Epicurean community practiced economic self-sufficiency within the walls of its garden, the Epicurean man cultivates an inner self-sufficiency, a contentment in his own physical and mental states and a suppression of unnecessary desires'. The only perfect pleasure was a condition of ataraxie where one lives quietly in bodily health and with little physical and psychological distress. (Rosen, 2003).

Although none of the pleasure is bad, some (involving less pain) are purer than others. Epicurus made connection between pleasure and health, pain and disease. All pleasures were good in the sense that health was good, even though some pleasures were mixed. If health was good, with disease of body or soul it becomes greatest evil.

In Epicureanism the greatest pleasure was defined by the removal of all pain, and hence the Epicurean lived quietly and peacefully in the real or metaphorical Garden (Rosen, 2003). The important virtue for Epicurus was prudence, and a considerable emphasis was placed on the egoistic pleasures connected with friendship. On the other hand, little attention was given to social values and instincts.

When it comes to 'justice' in Epicurus' system, it can be said that 'justice' means achieving security from the attacks of other people. Epicurus' state on a conception of justice is that; a pledge of mutual advantage to restain men from harming one another and save them from being harmed (Epicurus,1926). At another point, Epicurus wrote about justice in terms of being of advantage in the requirements of men's dealings with one another (Epicurus, 1926). Epicurus used here a Greek phrase, 'sumpherei en tais chreiais', for 'advantage in the requirements'. Rosen claims that Greek noun, 'chreia', also possessed a range of meanings and might be translated as 'need', 'use' or 'utility'.

For all societies in which to make compacts not to harm one another is not possible, nothing was either just or unjust. Although justice was applied potentially to all requiring, where contracts for one should not harm others, such a justice might be applied differently in different societies and under different circumstances. Where a law, which was previously considered, just, had no longer had usefulness or secured advantage, there was no longer just (Epicurus, 1926). According to Alberti (Alberti 1995) 'justice is the realization of utility by means of a contract'. The emphasis on utility allows for the separation of law from justice by rejecting the view found in Plato and Aristotle, that all law is just. And emphasis on utility leads to a notion of justice which is different from nomos (legal justice) and physis (natural justice) (Rosen, 2003).

Justice was an invention of the wise for their own good. Epicurus summed up matters with brutal directness and claimed that the laws exist for the sake of the wise, not that they may not do wrong, but that they may not suffer it (Bailey,1928). Law and justice were matters of convenience which the wise person devised and approved. Epicurus had no reason to make justice a positive part of the human condition except enabling people to obtain 'peace of soul' (DeWitt, 1954). "It represented a painful burden, and in its application as punishment justice could be extremely painful. All that could recommend it was its utility to the wise. Other members of society might have less invested in justice, as they were not cultivating their gardens as were Epicureans, and might well gain less from rules concerning not harming others. However, so long as they accepted the compact, they would be assisting themselves, as well as not harming the wise in society."(Rosen, 2003).

3. Medieval Times Islam Philosophers

In the seventh century, translation movements from Greek to Arabic language started and in the time of Caliph al-Mansur this movements reached its peak. The study of Islamic ethics began to take shape in the third century of Islam's emerge, with the influences from Greek ethics including Stoicism, Platonism and Aristotelianism. Al-Kindi, the first philosopher of Islam, influenced by Socrates and Diogenes the Cynic as seen in his ethical writings. Other influences can be seen in the work of Platonists such as Abu Bakr al-Razi or Neoplatonists such as al-Farabi, Aristotelian influences can be seen in the works of al-Farabi, Ibn Sina and Ibn Rushd.

3.1 Al-Kindi (d.873)

Abu Yusuf Ya'qub ibn Ishaq al-Kindi (d.873) was the first philosopher of Islam and also the first author on philosophical ethics. In Baghdad, al-Kindi was involved in the scientific movement of the translation of Greek texts into Arabic. His starting point was Greek philosophy and he is reported by the classical bibliographers that he has a number of ethical treatises reflecting an interest in Socratic and Cynic thought.

In al-Kindi's writings, the personalities of Socrates and Diogenes the Cynic are united and both emerge as ideal instances of virtue and asceticism (Fakhry, 1998). Moreover, the Stoic idea of apatheia (freedom from passion) and the indifference to the vicissitudes of fortune are set out in fluent terms. According to al-Kindi, the antidote of pain is to consider that pain results either from our actions of from doing the actions of others. In the former case, it is individual's duty to avoid from doing which is the cause of pain. In the latter case, averting the pain is either in our power or it is not. If it is in our power then we certainly ought to avert it, if it is not, we should not suffer at the prospect of injury with the hope that it might somehow be turned away. The suggestion, to avoid material possessions as temporary acquisitions, reflects the influences of the Stoic philosophers.

3.2   Abu Bakr al-Razi (d. 925)

Another philosopher Abu Bakr al-Razi (d. 925), who is influenced by Plato, refers to Plato as 'the master of the philosophers and their leader' and to Socrates as 'the ascetic and spritual' sage in his book al-Tibb al-Ruhani (The Spiritual Physic).

A Socratic-Platonic theme which takes place in al-Razi's writings is the foolishness of the hedonistic life which turns man into a slave. People's many of pleasures are temporary and unattainable and people are attacked by anxiety or pain. But according to al-Razi, true philosopher will not succumb to pain, because philosopher understands that nothing is permanent in this world. And that whatever cannot be turned away should be ignored, since it is the product of passion and not of reason. al-Razi says in his book al-Falsafiya that: 'For reason summons us only to what is susceptible of bringing about profit sooner or later; grief does not bring any advantage... That is why the perfectly rational man will only follow the summons of reason ... and will never follow the summons of passion or allow himself to be led by it or get close to it.

Like Socrates and Plato, al-Razi believes that the soul, leaving the body, will return to its original residence in the intelligible world, after passing through an endless cycle of purifications. Death is a logical consequence of our being human and essential part of the definition of man. However, al-Razi adds another argument which derives from Epicurus that death is the deprivation of sensation and with his death man will be stripped of the sensations of pleasure and pain. Thus this is a better condition than living in pain. That is why 'according to the judgment of reason the condition of death is better than the condition of life' (Rasa'il al-Razi al-Falsafiya).

3.3   Al-Farabi (d. 951)

Abu Nasr al-Farabi (d. 951) was known as the "second master" (muallim-i sani) amongst his peers, Aristotle being the first (muallim-i evvel). Al-Farabi was the first systematic writer on philosophical questions in Islam. He also contributed to ethical discussions and wrote a commentary on some parts of the Nicomachean Ethics which is translated into Arabic by Ishaq bin Hunayn.

Al-Farabi follows Aristotle in ethics like dividing the virtues into moral and intellectual (Fakhry, 1998). According to him, moral virtues are perfections of the lustful part of the soul whereas perfections of the intellectual part are practical reasoning, good judgement, wisdom and sound understanding. Al-Farabi also follows Aristotle's arguments about justice which consists in the equitable distribution of 'common goods' in the city or in the state. Every member of city or state is entitled to share this 'common goods' such as security, wealth, dignity, public office, etc.

Al-Farabi deflects from Aristotle and other Greek phlosophers believing in the life hereafter in Qor'anic way. Accoring to al-Farabi, nations and citizens of cities attain happiness, worldly in here and supreme in the life hereafter, when four human needs are met. These are; theoretical virtues, deliberative virtues, moral virtues and practical arts. Worldly happiness is necessary for the attainment of supreme happiness in the hereafter. According to him, happiness is the absolute good and achieving happiness is the purpose of life. Whenever the soul of the person reaches perfection, then happiness is achieved. According to al-Farabi, if individual's desire for happiness is weak and he/she has other purposes in his/her life, then the result will be evil.

Theoretical virtues, the first one of the four themes mentioned above, consist of the sciences. The purpose is to have understanding of all the beings on these sciences. Deliberative virtues are voluntary intelligibles that vary across time and place such as events occuring accidentally or willingly, such as disasters or war. An individual cannot possess deliberative virtue without possessing moral virtue. A person has to have virtuous moral character who wishes the good for himself/herself or for others. And according to al-Farabi, theoretical virtues, deliberative virtues, moral virtues and practical arts are all inseparable.

The his famous work al-Madina al-Fadila (virtuous city), in which people cooperate and help each other for the purpose of attaining happiness, al-Farabi reflects again his devotion to Islamic utility perception. To him, on the other hand, non-virtuous city is the city whose people do not know happiness. Al-Farabi discussed these two cities' souls of the citizens and he believed that the souls of the citizens of the virtuous city are immortal. However, the souls of the citizens of the ignorant city are mortal and their destiny is to suffer. As a result, al-Farabi believed that political association should be directed towards the attainment of happiness.

Generally, it can be said that al-Farabi was greatly influenced by both Aristotle and Plato in his philosophy and his concept of happiness particularly. On the other hand, his thought was framed by Islam. He selected portions from each of these three different influences to form a complete description of happiness. So his concept of happiness is a product of his understanding of Greek philosophy and Islam. With his concept of happiness, he combines Plato's concept of the good, Aristotle's concept of eudaimonia (happiness) and Islamic concept of Jihad Al nafs (struggle of the soul).

Plato and Aristotle's concepts were given above. On the other hand, the Islamic concept of Jihad Al nafs means the struggle of the soul. According to Islam, God created man to achieve bliss (happiness) in the next life through a clearly defined struggle in this life called Jihad. By the Quranic definition, "And whosoever strives (jahada), strives (yujahidu) only for himself. Surely Allah is self sufficient, above need of His creatures." (Quran 29:6). The person who struggles with turning his inner self into a new way of living that understands the true reality where material is only a small portion.

3.4 Ibn Sina (Avicenna) (d. 980)

Ibn Sina (Avicenna) (d. 980) is one of the foremost philosophers in the Medieval Hellenistic Islamic tradition and one of the most important practitioners of philosophy. He exercised a strong influence over the other Islamic philosophers and medieval Europe as well. Al-Farabi's successor Ibn Sina is the author of a very short tract on ethics and he follows closely the Platonic model in psychology.

Ibn Sina speaks about the laws which are needed to be laid down as the moral habits (akhlaq) and traits (adat) which lead to justice. He divides the soul into different parts like rational, irascible, and concupiscent which correspond to the virtues of wisdom, courage and temperance respectively. Finally justice is the 'summation' of all these three. According to Ibn Sina, enforcement of justice within the state (with the existence of caliph) is necessary as the sovereign of the world and God's vicegerent on earth. The virtues of temperance, courage, and wisdom are for the well-being of human beings in this world. They can be followed adequately without theoretical wisdom. Ibn Sina presents theoretical wisdom as being so important that one can attain happiness only by acquiring it as well as these three virtues, all of which add up to justice. Ibn Sina distinguishes himself from Farabi by insisting on the possibility of acquiring temperance, courage, and practical wisdom-or justice-without possessing theoretical wisdom. In other words, unlike Farabi, Ibn Sina does not perceive all the virtues to be intellectual or to be grounded in sound intellectual understanding.

Make separation between the practical virtue and the theoretical virtue does not fully account for Ibn Sina's moral teaching. From what appears in his treatises that moral habits are directed to the liberation of the soul from the body. Thus they serve the ultimate goal of theoretical virtue, that is the soul achieving a free perception of God and the divine intelligences. It is not clear, however, how the moral habits lead to justice. The only explanation that comes to mind is that insofar as some human beings center their thoughts and activities on other worldly concerns. Ibn Sina differs here from al-Farabi too since he starts with the basic human needs and ascends from them to the larger issue of law- giving and providing for justice. On the other hand, Al-Farabi begins by thinking about ultimate human happiness. Ultimate human happiness is about the highest ends of human beings rather than their humblest beginnings or it is about their noble concerns rather than about their basic needs.

3.5   Ibn Rushd (Averroes) (d. 1198)

Ibn Rushd (Averroes) (d. 1198) is regarded as one of the important Islamic philosophers. He set out to integrate Aristotelian philosophy with the Islamic thought in the twelfth-century of Islamic Spain. He produced commentaries on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics and also Plato's Republic which is relevant to his ethical theory as well.

According to Ibn Rushd, the principal virtues correspond to the perfection of the three parts of the soul are the rational, the irascible, and the concupiscent. Then he describes justice along Platonic lines as the 'harmony' of the three corresponding virtues of wisdom, courage and temperance. As Aristotle stated in the Nicomachean Ethics, it has two subdivisions which are common or universal, corresponding to 'perfect virtue', and particular. However, Ibn Rushd does not identify happiness with the contemplative life, but rather with conjunction (ittisal) to the active intellect, which the Muslim Neoplatonists had regarded as man's ultimate goal.

In Muslim thought, everything they need to know about moral behaviour is encapsulated in Islam. However, Ibn Rushd argued that a distinction should be drawn between moral notions and divine commands and here he follows an Aristotelian approach (Leaman). According to Ibn Rushd, the answer of question "what is the purpose of a human being?" is that; one of the ultimate aims is to be happy and to avoid actions which lead to unhappiness. Moral virtue leads to happiness. If people do what they should do in accordance with their nature, people will be able to achieve happiness. This happiness may be interpreted as a mixture of social and religious activities or as an entirely intellectual ideal. However, neither religion nor philosophy would approve of entirely intellectual ideal as the ultimate aim for the majority of the community. It is possible for someone that he/she would try to live apart from the community with concentrating entirely on intellectual pursuits, but this way of living is inferior to a life in which there is a concentration upon intellectual thought but combined with integration within the practices of a particular society.

Ibn Rushd, inspite of working within an Islamic context, does not identify happiness and misery with some aspect of the afterlife since he was unable to accept the traditional view of the afterlife. Here Oliver Leaman, who has many works about Ibn Rushd, claims that without religious imagery, ordinary believers may find it difficult to understand that our moral actions affect not only ourselves but the happiness of the whole community, not just at a particular time or in a particular place but as a species. With our bad behaviours, we damage our own chances of human flourishing, and this damage affects our personal opportunities for achieving happiness and maturing as people. It is also resulting to the weakening of society. According to Leaman, while it is possibly true that the misery of evil-doing may not follow us personally after our death, it may well follow the community. The notion of an afterlife points to the wider terms of reference in which moral action has life.

3.6   Ibn Khaldun

Another philosopher Ibn Khaldun, who lived in 14th century, centred his economic ideas generally around the ideas of justice, hardwork, cooperation, moderation and fairness. He emphasises Al-adl (justice) as the bedrock of the economy, and lack of justice leads to the breakdown of the state. Some of his writings may appear as secular. For instance; "Civilisation and its well-being as well as business prosperity depends on production and people's efforts in all directions in their own interest and profit" (Muqaddimah, Volume 2). However, Ibn Khaldun insisted that man must avoid from evils, must improve himself, and must give preference to matters of the next world against this world (Muqaddimah, Volume 1).

According to Ibn Khaldun, extravagance and luxurious living lead to the destruction of the state. "Sedentary people are much concerned with all kinds of pleasure. They are accustomed to luxury and success in worldly occupations and indulgence in worldly desires. Therefore, their souls are adored with all kinds blameworthy and evil qualities"(Muqaddimah, Volume 1, 225).

Another issue Ibn Khaldun emphasises is cooperation. He says that "the power of the individual human being is not sufficient for him to obtain the food he needs through cooperation, the needs of a number of persons, many times greater than their own number can be satisfied" (Muqaddimah, Volume 1, 69) (Ibn Haldun, 1977).

Above the economic philosophy of Ibn Khaldun was mentioned shortly, but, his Muqaddimah covers a large number of other areas about economy like money, value, market, population, growth, international trade, etc. When dealing with micro or macro economic issues, he demonstrated perfect competence in generating theories. In his work, Ibn Khaldun synthesises the ideas learnt from the Qur'an and Sunnah, and from other sources which were converted into powerful theories.

4. Conclusion

Human concepts like good and bad, right and wrong, virtue, justice, and happiness were the concern of human civilizations through millenniums. Historically the foundations of human ethics are laid by divine revaliations through prophets. Then Greek phlosophers and Muslim scholars contributed to the theory till the begining of the modern times.

With the begining of the 20th century industrial society began to transform into information society and risk and uncertainty became prior and diagnostic feature of human behaviour. And now with these changes new structure of society is multi-dimensional, more complicated and uncertain. While this theory became accepted and is using in economics, criticism voices started to become louder. Critics to economics' deductive, abstractive and pure rationalist method focused especially on uncertainty and risk that propelled from that analysis. Among them only one was seem as an strong alternative to expected utility theory: Prospect theory which was found by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky in (Kahneman and Tversky 1979). They dealt with utility concept from the cognitive point of view, Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky's studies were the earliest studies of human decision-making by cognitive psychologists. Development of the theory through modern times may be the subject of another work.

References

Alberti, A., (1995). The Epicurean Theory of Law and Justice, in A. Laks and M. Schofield (eds) Justice and Generosity, Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, C. (1928). The Greek Atomists and Epicurus, Oxford: Clarendon Pres.

DeWitt, N.,W., (1954). Epicurus and his Philosophy, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Epicurus, (1926). Epicurus, the Extant Remains, trans. C. Bailey, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ibn Haldun, (1977). Mukaddime, Ankara: Onur Yayinlari.

Ibn Khaldun, (1967). An Introduction to History: The Muqaddimah, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kahneman, D., Tversky A., (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291.

Quinton, A., (1973). Utilitarian Ethics, London: Open Court

Rosen, F. (2003). Classical Utilitarianism from Hume to Mill, New York: Routledge

Scarre, G. (1994). Epicurus as Forerunner of Utilitarianism, Utilitas, 6:219-31.