A Critique of Morality as the Basis of Social Order

By

Victor Ogheneochuko Jeko, PhD
Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts, University of Benin
E-mail: victoroghene@yahoo.com Phone: +2348036107994
&

Chinedu, Nnabugwu Samuel PhD
Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Imo State University,
Email: powerfullchigmail.com, Phone: +2347035059631

Abstract

The problematic in this theoretical discourse is that the issue of morality as the basis of social order is an alluring idea which anchors on the need to curb the excesses of human nature but the excesses of human nature cannot be totally resolved because human nature is a thorny philosophical problem. The objective in this theoretical discourse is to undertake a kaleidoscopic viewpoint and periscope into the concept of morality as norms that invariably posit positive values and the idea of the public good. But there is no universal consensus as to what is morality, good or bad due to the jigsaw puzzle of human biological makings and the problem of determination. The evils of violence in society and the need for society to stick to critical dialogue is an essential issue for morality because dialogue expands the understanding of the world. Our conjecture is that the attainment of social order should be predicated on strict adherence to moral standards, norms or values and society is the custodian of morals and customs and in order to guarantee social order, there must be the prevalent existence of peace, love, happiness, equity and equality, equality of opportunity, bridging the gap between the 'have and the have-not'.

Keywords: Morality, Social Order, Society, Human Nature, Emotion

1.1 Introduction

The author of nature has determined us to be governed by a moral sense and to direct our actions in a proper direction. The link or the inextricable nexus between morality, human nature and social order has been a common theme since the time of St. Augustine, and, with the rise of modern empirical moral psychology, and it remains equally popular today. Evolutionary ethicists, ethnologists, developmental psychologists, social neuroscientists, and even some cultural anthropologists tend to unanimously agree that morality is part of the bio-program. Recently, researchers have begun to look for moral modules in the brain,

and they have been increasingly tempted to speculate about the moral acquisition device, and innate faculty for norms acquisition akin to celebrated language acquisition device promulgated by Chomsky. All these talks of moral modules and mechanisms may make some shudder, especially if they recall that engines emerged out of an effort to find the biological source of evil. The tendency to postulate an innate moral faculty is almost irresistible. For one thing it makes us appear nobler as species, and for another, it offers an explanation of the fact that people in every corner of the globe seem to have moral rules and principles. This paper, therefore discusses the concept of morality as the basis of social order. It examines the conceptual clarification of morality, the dynamic interplay between morality and human nature the functions of morality in human society.

1.2 Morality as the Basis of Social Order: The Global Ethical Project

Moral relativism is, in this respect, an optimistic doctrine, one that makes our great big world seem comfortably smaller what we may refer to as the Global Ethics Project. The connection between morality, human nature and social order reflects a discernible or avowed affinity. It unravels the problem of psychoanalysis and prediction in human behaviour and the crucial or existential imports of morality and social order in our global ethics. Morality, like all human capacities, depends on having particular biological predisposition. Morality is coined from the Latin word "mores", which simple means norms, rules, values, etiquettes, customs and regulations. It means what we ought to do and what we ought not to do. It is the philosophy of the Golden rule-do unto others what you want others to do unto you. It refers to the philosophy of ethical universalism or universal conscience. Morality has an irresistible utilitarian underpinning or undertone. It is geared toward public utility or public good or social order. It helps to curb the heinous excesses of men in society. Society is not just a free-rider-system. It connotes part-whole analysis. It connotes a holistic process. It is governed by laws and morals. It is the Coolean 'looking-glass-self'. The society is the Durkheimian custodian of norms, values, traditions, customs, rules and regulations. As such, morality is considerably more variable, that is, the moral realism connotes a system of social engineering or structural program. It might lead us to the use of our critical thinking faculty. It is the logic of rational reasoning so to speak. It is exciting to see cognitive scientists taking keen and unalloyed interest in morality, but that trend carries the risks of reification. My role is to argue on how we can come to care about the idea of the good. We should realize that the concept of morality foretells human social decency. Human beings are rational animals, though, they tend to exhibits animalistic behaviors or characters.

Furthermore, morality is quite fundamental for the public good and the general well being of all in society. Morality is fundamental as far as social order is concerned because no

society can progressively strive and develop so rapidly in an atmosphere of rancour, moral quandary, moral quicksand, social conflict, menacing drumbeat of killings, bombings as prevalent in Jos and other parts of Nigeria, in a state of dog eat dog society because such avalanche will make the society get caught in the grip of fear, turmoil, mistrust, the menacing of blood- letting and religious bigotry. Development can only strive in a society where by morality is adulated where there is the cognizance of the sacredness and respect for human life. In a situation where there is man's inhumanity to man, it will lead to the glaring balkanization of the Global Ethics Project. This is the clarion call for a return to morality and to philosophy of humanity because any attempt to dislodge or escape from philosophy is an attempt to escape from our humanity. Morality arises because humans are essentially social animals. The social nature of humans create the need for morality not from a god but from the nature of humans' self-responsibility and social interaction (Herrick, 2006, 21). This is the role the philosophy of morality or moral development has to play in ensuring the unalloyed freedom and ethics of the idea of the good in human society. Morality or the essence of morality has been thrown into a state of epistemological, social, ethical quandaries, drumbeating menace and intellectual crisis in this 21st century era. My main focus is in this theoretical discourse is to take a kaleidoscopic views and invariably periscope on the conceptual analysis of morality as the basis of social order. But in order to do justice to this conceptual analysis between morality and social order, the thorny philosophical problems of human nature, the socio-cultural conundrums of this present day and age cannot be isolated in this theoretical discourse. This intellectual discourse deserves a bird's eye view and a million dollar attention so lucidly and succinctly. The world is characterized by a spiritual unity of dialectical sequence and human society is governed by moral principles, law, and social order. The world in no small measure is a dynamic set of relations. We can call it the socio-ethico-epistemic-cultural-metaphysical relation of men in their immediate socio-political world. This all-inclusive system of dynamic relation is dialogical-it demands dispositions and responses. It is devoid of war or violence which is the annihilation of persons or race. Violence, for instance, arises through political inclinations. For Hoffman and Graham (2009), violence is a synonym for force (Hoffman and Graham, 2009:502). It demands responsibility and generosity. Responsibility, on the one hand, is deemed as a noble task and violence on the other hand can still be present even in the act of generosity or hospitality (Levinas). Many philosophers from Antiquity to the Medieval, Modern and Contemporary periods such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Aurelius, John Rawls, David Hume, Karl Marx, John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau and Thomas Hobbes have done a great deal of intellectual works on human nature, social order and morality. The million-dollar question is that why do things go wrong in society? This is the most prevalent human predicament in our world of anomic and amoral waters whereby the question of respect for human life

has been trivialized. Our humanity has also been balkanized and draconized. Our today's world has been bastardized by moral quandary and plethora of moral quicksand whereby using Hobbes's words man is wolf to his fellow man. This theoretical discourse attempts to address the question of man's inhumanity to man. The factors that can militate against morality as the basis of social order are war, violence, hatred, absence of love, peace, limited information, limited empathy and sympathy and limited resources. Human society scrabbles for limited resources where by the Darwinian survival of the fittest has been the order of the day.

The factors that can constitute social order is when there is the prevalent existence of strict adherence to societal norms, values, customs, traditions, the sacredness and respect for human life, rules and regulations and normative peace. To situate morality with social order human beings have to be unconditionally responsible because to be human is to be indispensably responsible; this marks the basis of morality. Social order and morality are like two sides of a dubious tossing coin. A misunderstanding should be avoided here; morality and religion though both are closely connected but they are not invariably the same thing. An Atheist for instance can be highly moral but not religiously inclined. Morality as the basis of social order is indeed the transmutation of ensuring an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence or tranquility devoid of rancor, commotion or conflict. Conflict refers to a clash of interests that can be tackled through violence, but only resolved through non-statist pressures. Conflicts of the latter kind are inevitable and arise from the fact that we are all different from one another (Hoffman and Graham, 2009:496). Hofmeyr believes that in the era of the 21st Century, we are experiencing intellectual crisis, ethical quandary and moral quicksand (Hofmeyr, 2005:3-4). Our society has been bedeviled with myriads of anomic and amoral waters. We no longer recognize the need to accord strong value to our humanity. Philosophy there plays a crucial role in this perspective whereby there will be a trans-valuation of theory to practice because Karl Marx believes that theories are fuelling points that if they are well natured and nurtured they can be converted into a material force or praxis. Morality as the basis of social order is not just a mawkish sermonization, theoretical acrobatic and liquorice all sorts of bucketful of opaque liquid but turning abstract ideas into some form of concrete human affairs. Morality reveals praxio-logical circumstance of ensuring perfect balance of human society whereby transparency, honesty of purpose, purity of intention and truth over falsehood reign supreme (Asouzu, 2004:1-2). Morality is therefore crucial for human society because it generates or guarantees human development, social improvements, happiness, peace, love, mutual co-operation, and dialogue. Dialogue expands the understanding of the world and social justice. It vitiates the prevalence of carnivorous insularisms, war and violence. The idea of morality as the basis of social order reflects or inextricably portrays

the ethicality of the universal human freedom. We are all born equal before the creator, we reflects the philosophy of live and lets live, it enunciates the philosophy of the golden rule, it unearths the need-Do not kill me but help me to live (Levinas, 1969:4). It guarantees the principle of justice, equality, freedom, equal opportunity for all and the voice of conscience. The adumbrations stated clearly quite encapsulates the philosophy of morality as the basis of societal order-this is the connotation of the Durkheimian tradition of society as the only custodian of customs, culture, norms, values, traditions, rules and regulations. It is akin to Jean Paul Sartre's view that man is a being for himself and a being for others. It is the Foucaultian-Levinasian tradition of self-other dichotomy-the government of the self and the government of the other. Another factors that serves as a sine-qua-non or litmus-test for morality as the basis of social order is the inter-subjective recognition of human equality and justice as virtue. Morality as the basis of social order is a Globalized Ethics Project. The 21st Century can be known as the "Century of Global Ethics (Iroegbu, 2005:27).

1.3 What is Morality?

Morality is the principle concerning right and wrong or good and bad in human behaviours. In our present contemporary world, standards of morality seem to be dropping. Morality is a subsystem of deliberation about what we ought to do. Morality is a functional term like tuner (Skorupski, 1998:564-576). Morality bases its judgment on the rational nature of man and his final destiny which makes his actions morally right or wrong (Echekwube, 2005:32). However, much in our life is governed by norms and values. The direction we face in the elevator, the way we walk, the way we talk, what we wear, the volume we speak in, the way we greet people, and pretty much everything else that we do in our waking hours are all geared towards morality. Not all of these norms count as morals. My concern here is with norms. This theoretical discourse does not attempt to distinguish moral norms from other norms, neither is it to distinguish individual morals from social morals, but my considered and settled opinion here, is that, morals sometimes are based on sentimental norms: they are underwritten by various sentiments. In particular, moral norms are solely grounded in the moral emotions of peoples. The British moralists claimed that moral norms are based on disapprobation. It simply means what society approves of and disapproves as good or evil, or as good or bad. An action is right if it is generally accepted by society. We would see approbations or unalloyed approval towards those who do it, and an action is wrong if, under idealized conditions, we feel disapprobation. Idealized conditions include things like full knowledge and freedom from being bias. The terms "approbation" and disapprobation are a bit antiquated, although, they can be judiciously treated as umbrella terms for two classes of moral emotions: emotions of moral praise, and emotions of moral blame. Emotions of praise include gratitude, esteem, approval and righteousness. Emotions of blame include other-directed-

emotions such as disapproval, anger, contempt, disgust, resentment, and indignation as well as self-directed emotions, such as self-guilt and blame.

What counts as a moral norm, is that emotions must be tailored in a particular way approved by a particular society or political community. First and foremost, a moral norm does not count as moral simply in virtue of eliciting one of the aforementioned emotions in isolation. What makes a particular norm moral is because it is approved by the society (generality of people in human society) or what are the parameters in which particular norms can be termed to be moral. At a minimum, moral rules involve both the self-directed-emotions and other-directed-emotion. One might feel disgusted when one see one's friend cut his finger open intentionally but would one say this connotes moral act?, Or he feels a shame or guilty in doing it?. Secondly, our emotions must be directed at the third parties if they are to be grounded as moral norms. Moral concern arises when we are not directly involved. Thirdly, moral judgments are enforced by meta-emotion? If we do something wrong and don't feel guilty, we may be refer to as psychopaths and we will be angry at ourselves for our unethical conduct or behavior and for our lack of remorse and meta-emotions are necessary for moralizing. To have a moral attitude towards something, one must have a moral sentiment that disposes one to feel a self-directed emotion of blame for something, and an emotion of other directed blame when someone else does something wrong. The idea of morality as the normative basis of social order is geared towards human happiness. However, the mass of people have not been educated or empowered to the extent necessary to engage in the intelligent pursuit of their happiness or to sustain a true democracy (Carden, 124-125). First, psychologists have shown that moral judgments can be altered by eliciting emotions. Secondly, negative moral appraisals or emotional deficits result in moral blindness or moral quandary. Psychopaths suffer from a profound deficit in negative emotions, including moral emotions. There is an open question whether the things we are emotionally concerned with are really wrong, but it is not an open question whether emotionally condemnatory attitudes are moral-attitudes.

1.4 Morality and Human Nature

Morality reflects the tendency for an effective meaningful interaction. Dewey, for instance, regards morality to be aimed at an effective meaningful interaction and pedagogically useful for human society; it reflects the platform for an effective social structure. Dewey regards the contemporary power structure to be a result of the lack of meaningful interaction among the members of society (Carden, 2006, 124). Hobbes's moral thought or ethics is difficult to disentangle from his politics. On his view, what we ought to do depends greatly on the situation in which we find ourselves. Where political power and political authority are lacking (as in his famous natural condition of humankind), our

fundamental rights needs to be guided, our natural rights must be guided by whatever means we deem fit. Where political power and political authority exist and are geared towards the public good, our duty seems to be quite straight forward, that is, to obey those in power. But we can carefully separate his ethics (his moral thought) from his politics (his political thought). If we follow Hobbes properly we could see that his ethics or moral thought is concerned with human nature. Hobbes' political philosophy and ethical philosophy deal with what happens when human beings interact socially in their immediate existential-socio-political-world. In this connection, we as human beings, we are all needy and vulnerable. No one can live in complete or total isolation. What defines our humanity is the ethic of oneness, the spirit of identity and fraternity or sense of belonging to a particular political community. We are easily led astray in our attempts to know the world round us, our capacity to reason is as fragile as our capacity to know, it relies upon language and it is prone to error and undue influence when we act, we may do so selfishly or impulsively or in ignorance, on the basis of faulty reasoning or bad theology or others emotive speech. Normative reasons are required to justify normative conclusions-for the aim of philosophy, then, is not merely to document what is, but also to highlight what can be (Wisnewski, 88)?

Moreover, the critique of philosophy, thus, aims at emancipation and at the enrichment of our socio-political position (Wisnewski, 44). What is the political fate of this rather pathetic-sounding-creature that is of us? Unsurprisingly, Hobbes thinks total happiness can be expected of our living together-hence the need for social order. The best we can hope for is normatively peaceful life under an authoritarian sounding government. The worst, on Hobbes's account, is what he calls "the natural condition of mankind", a state of violence, insecurity, and constant threat; the natural condition of mankind where life becomes brutish, poor, short, nasty and solitary. Broadly and logically speaking, Hobbes argument is that the alternative to government is a situation no one could reasonably wish for and that any attempt to make government accountable to the people must be underscored, and so threatening is the situation of non-government that we must all wish to avoid. Our only reasonable option, therefore, is a sovereign authority that is totally accountable to its subjects. Hobbes' moral philosophy has an avowed affinity with his politics and social order. A political philosophy periscope from the Hobbesian tradition is invariably morally oriented. Let us make it clear that this conception of social contract is not going to be treated here.

1.5 Functions of Morality

By its function, morality is that set of convictions whose function is to promote human flourishing and to enable us live together on terms of naturally beneficial mutual

cooperation. Morality is a distinct sphere within the domain of normative thinking, about action, feeling and the whole domain of human autonomy. Man as a moral agent is an autonomous being. It reflects the Kantian conception of goodwill and autonomy. For Wisnewski (2007), Kant's use of the notion of autonomy, of course, is a problematic one. Kant's categorical imperative captures the condition for the possibility of objective moral demands. The primary condition is that of autonomy (Wisnewski, 44-45). Moral codes have social function, such as that of maintaining beneficial mutual cooperation. It does not seem as an a priori truth alone. The sentiment at the core of praise and blame is sometimes known to be a species of anger and indignation. Morality plays the important role of guiding people's behaviors. As medicine exists to cure the illness, likewise morality should have some function in curing the ills of human society. It is used as a guide to correct behavioral patterns or wrongs. The ultimate goal of both medicine and morality must be some positive conscious state of affairs, either a utilitarian one (public happiness) or a complex one of such state as experience of beauty, transcendent rapture, love and compassion, knowledge of some sort. When we face moral choices, we tend to need guidance, and if we do not have a conscience to listen to, then we can use a moral code instead. Moral code can also be communicated to others, in order to assist or control them. The function of moralityis the primary reason that morality exists in cultural norms whose violation commonly engenders the emotion of righteous indignation and the idea that the violator deserves punishment or at least correction to ensure social justice and to guarantee the public good. Human society aims at taking action in the interest of a peaceable global order (Habermas, 1997, 178) and the end of any society is the end of any normatively demanding political socialization (Habermas, 177). The primary function of moral standards (the primary reason they exist in cultures) is that they increase the synergistic benefits of public cooperation in groups by advocating unselfish behaviours. Moral behaviours are unselfish behaviours that increase, on average, the benefits of social cooperation within groups and between groups. Moral behaviour demands benefit of mutual cooperation and unselfish behaviour because seeking a benefit of pleasure produced by killing other members of a group could not qualify as a logically consistent benefit of human cooperation. The social nature of humans creates the need for morality. A key aspect of morality is the consequence of a person's actions or deliberates act or volitions. 'Unselfish' refers in the normal sense to the behaviours that are concerned with one's own self-aggrandizement, narcissistic behaviour, taking advantage of others, pleasure or well-being. Morality is a developing normative framework of adaptive and adoptive norms, the function of which it is to cultivate the well-being within sustainable contexts of shared human and non-human interests, with sustainability constituting the sufficient condition for cultivating human well-beings. Well-being in this context connotes

or rather consists in habit-forming maximally generous and attention of humans' states of affairs.

Morality, however, becomes abstract. Morality becomes abstracted into an inexplicable law of inscrutable origins that constrains our behaviour without regards to its own practical applications (the eulogizing or phrasing of Homer, Greek gods, a set of "well-meaning rules that don't work out in real life". It is this last picture or assertion that needs to be strongly refuted in order for a picture like a 100% proofs to be more widely acknowledged. The concept of morality is somehow tied up in doing well for others altruistically (or the perception thereof). If we accept that morality's purpose is, in an indirect manner (via shared domain or whatever, to promote the wellbeing for the self and others only as an indirect, unintentional, shared benefits), then how can we gain psychological fulfillment? We mean, if we reason that morality is done ultimately in self-interest, then why should it improve my self-perception as being a benevolent force? The normative basis of morality is to keep our immediate environment and society stable? There's a reason to cure and rationalize our psychological fulfillment. However, probably, self-interest so to speak can mar human conducts. One fundamental question we need to ask is that does rationalizing morality increases or decreases its effectiveness towards our psychological fulfillments or ends? We guess our hypothesis about morality's purpose is to fulfill psychological, emotive, instinctive needs, to enhance positive self-perception and the need to have concern for others-the unprecedented concern for others, radicalizing the idea of the public good and rationalizing morality perhaps brings about the idyllically framework for the purpose of the good? The function of medicine is not just to treat illness, but to also help people live long and healthy. Morality has more than one function. Of course, it is against ideals of morality if it does not cure society's moral ills. Some people most especially those at the religious circle think that morality serves a single purpose or function – the enforcement of the will of God and the absolute is unchanging. Morality goes beyond religion.

Furthermore, 'game theory' has been used to analyze the function of morality. A good example is Edna Ullmann Margalitz's theory of the "Emergence of Norms" in which she argues that "moral norms enable agents to cooperate and coordinate their actions in situations where the pursuit of self-interest presents itself (Margalitz, 1977, 51-52). The'game theory' context is equivalent to many everyday interactions governed by morality. The function of morality binds individual together and it is to present the features of ethical rationality. Morality coincides with mutually advantageous normative outcomes. Morality here is normative, a source of guidance. Morality is introduced as something outside of individual rational action and choices. Morality is interpreted as the

normative outcomes of a bargaining spirit. David Gauthier believes that rational agents will comply with the terms of the bargain (Gauthier, 1967, 460-475). Morality at least as it is traditionally conceived often requires us to sacrifice our selfish interests or aims for the purpose of the highest good of the highest numbers or the principle of the supreme good (the principle of the summum bonum).

1.6 Social Order: The Dogmas of Social Morality

The world is governed by cosmic order so also human society is governed by the principle of morality and social order. Social is a concept used in sociology, history, psychology, political science and other social sciences. It refers to a set of linked social structures, social institutions, social groups and social practices which conserve, maintain and enforce "normal" ways of relating and behaving. It is the ground-norm of social morality. The word social, means a quality of interaction that involves the ways of seeing, thinking, acting, and responding to others that are shaped by two factors: (1) forces outside the individuals or (2) the presence of other people who notice what is going on (Ferrante, 2003, 21.). A "social order" is a relatively stable system of institutions, patterns of social interactions and customs, capable of continually reproducing at least those normative conditions essential for its own continual existence. The concept refers to all those facts of society which remains relatively constant over time. These conditions could include property, exchange and power relations, but also cultural norms, communication relations and ideological systems of values. Social order as discussed in this paper primarily refers to these structures and order in society; it connotes proper social arrangement and social conduct. The word 'order' means an arrangement, a controlled state, it connotes instructions, goods, it posits the arrangement of social class, it means to organize-to put things in proper perspectives or form. It is the opposite of disorder or violence or anarchism. This entry reveals the function of art to bring order out of chaos or confusion. Order means stability in the possession of things; security against violence and a trust in others that promises will be kept (Hoffman and Graham, 499). The issue of social order is crucial to human existence and how and why it is that social order exists at all?; it is historically associated or central to the field of sociology. Hobbes is recognized as the first to clearly formulate the theory, problem and answers which he conceives as the notion of social contract.

The principle of the sacredness of the human life (of the understanding and managing of life based upon the intrinsic truth of universal prioritizing unity), the existing mode of the "objectification of reality" has not at all been rightly lost. Human centeredness has become the acceptable convention of "Universal Mind". Human "knowing" is now devoted to an analytical reductionism of the process of reducing everything to the individual human

being. The idea of social order is borne out of the context of human nature. Human nature is the concept that there is a set of inherent distinguishing characteristics, including ways of thinking, feeling and acting that humans tend to have. The question of what causes these distinguishing characteristics of humanity and fixed human nature is "nature versus nurture" which has important implications in ethics, politics and theology because they are seen as providing standards or norms that humans can use by judging how to live. The complex implications of such are dealt within art. The branches of science associated with the study of human nature include sociology, sociobiology, and psychology, particularly evolutionary psychology and developmental psychology: understanding of human nature is understood with plethora of difficulties, such understandings of human existence imply proper and critical rational knowledge. The individual cannot exist independently without socio-ethical relation. The existence of an insatiable human nature is a subject of historical, political, social, and moral debates. Yet a profoundly destructive (materialistic, analytical and anti-sacred) human issue is a philosophical enterprise which is also operative and relevant at the same time. The state as it were creates political and social order. The state must find other means for creating order such as law, justice, equality, order, punishment, rewards. Public institution or corporate authority must proffer current political corrections of the state. To maintain order in the state, political and social realism is the fundamental function and the force whereby political and social order is developed and maintained. The state is an institution that claims a monopoly of legitimate force for a particular territory. This claim makes it contradictory and paradoxical (Hoffman and Graham, 501). Nonetheless, another key factor concerning social order is the principle of extensiveness. This states the moral norms and the more important the moral norms are to a society, the better these moral norms tie and hold together the social group as a whole.

Social order reflects social groups and social networks. In every society people belong to groups, such as businesses, families, churches, athletic groups or neighbor-hood. The structural framework of these social groups mirrors that of the whole society. There are social networks and ties between groups as well as each of these groups create social order. Some people belong to more than one group, which sometimes causes conflict. It is necessary to have social ties between groups to strengthen the society as a whole and to promote the pride of each group. It is best for a group to have stronger social ties within a group so that social norms and values are reinforced. Status group can be based on a person's characteristics such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, occupation, physical attractiveness, gender and education. They are defined as a subculture – having a rather specific status – within the stratification system, that is, societies tend to create a hierarchy of status groups, enjoying high ranking and some low. Social order is circumscribed within the perspective of value and normative system. Values constitute

individual values, which pertains to something that we think as moral worth and then there are social values. Moreover, social values are needs and desires modified according to ethical principles or according to the group we associate with. Norms on the other hand, tell us what people ought to do in a given acceptable general situation. Norms are certain values acceptable to the generality of people. It is a situation or a pattern of behaviour that is usual or expected. It is the standards of behaviour that are typical of or accepted within a particular group or normative society. We have both social and cultural norms.

A society as a whole determines norms, and they are passed down from generation to generation. Sometimes, the need for power and authority stem from lack of social justice and the problems of social norms. In order to ensure effective social justice and social norms the need for the use of the control of power and authority is to guarantee social order in society. Social order is aimed at reducing social tensions and to ensure or to guarantee the public good and social cohesion. Tension can arise, therefore, between social classes when norms, laws and rules are put in place that do not conform to the values of these social classes. Social tension arises when the laws, regulations, norms and rules are meant at the detriment of the less privilege in society. These rules, regulations and laws are required to preclude the breakdown of the social order, which is part of the framework of our world (Otakpor, 2005:162). Order does not necessarily need to be controlled by the government. The ambivalence of human interests can make human society unpredictable and individuals pursuing selfish interest can make social systems unpredictable. When individuals pursue their own preferences society disintegrates and segregates. The Schellian tradition believes that when all individuals pursue their own preferences, the outcome is segregation rather than integration or social cohesion. The unregulated interactions of rational selfish individual interests produce an unwanted or unwarranted outcome. The jigsaw puzzle in attaining social order is when there are anti-social behaviours, lack of conformity to society's traditions, norms and values. Deviance is invariably the opposite of conformity to society's regulations. Order results from a large number of independent decisions to transfer individual rights and liberties to a coercive state. Moreover, social order guarantees the security of persons and their properties as well as its establishment of normative mechanisms to resolve disputes. The ultimate source of social order is residing not in external controls but in accordance to specific values and norms that individuals somehow have managed to internalize.

1.7 Why Do Things Go Wrong in Society?: The Human Predicament

The fundamental reason why things go wrong in human society and which seems to be the human predicament is because between the two boundaries of life and death, life appears to be meaningless to some people while life seems to be meaningful to some

people. People lie and cheat and swindle, and bring despair to others. For most people, life generally makes sense, but always, somehow, there is the experience of gross unfairness, the accident, the bereavement, the illness, unemployment of teeming youths like in Nigeria, old age, deception, a cunning fraud, and there is that meaninglessness that causes a cry out from deep down inside us "it not fair". The major cause of why things go wrong in society is the prevalence of individual or mass tragedies, the problem of human disorder. But the disorder is not just of the individual tragedy.

1.8 Evaluation

We must take into our critical thinking the mass tragedies that multiply the sense of meaninglessness. Another issue of human predicament is the issue of natural disaster such as earthquakes and one might ask why do God allows certain natural disasters to happen. Why did six million Jews slaughtered by the Nazi terrorists. And there is the frustration and the importance of the human will. We must conduct a remarkable dialogue within ourselves and find ways of dousing our inner tension. The 'I' battling against myself and the 'I' battling against the other and the other battling against me tend to create a social tension. Furthermore, on these occasion when we attempt to confront the human condition, we eventually encounter what the Macquarriean tradition identifies as the 'polarities of existence' – these polarities reflect the social tension of our human predicaments and human existence, the conflicting parameters within which, somehow, our potential must be realized. There is also the polarity of responsibility and the impotence of certain forces. The prevalent existence of the social gap between the rich and the poor coupled with limited resources, limited information. Lack of empathy could lead to human or social disorder and implications of undue exploitation of the masses by the few in society. This will resort to violence or social disorder. First and foremost, we recognize that we live in a world of regularities. Without these regularities life would be impossible. Our society is replete and fraught with plethora dangers. What God has done is to leave us with a moral choice and of moral codes or regularity, of laws which may be discovered and used with confidence. Society collapses on the ground that we become prisoners of our conscience. Society is a large complex of human relationship; a system of interaction (Ferrante, 21-22). Moral judgments have cognitive content (Wisnewski, 2007:120). The sort of analytical strategy in morality is the political relevance of an ethics of discourse (Wisnewski, 114). Moral answers retain the rationally motivating force of insights (Wisnewski, 109). Society can only wither in the chill blasts of the gates of power and authority whose savagery and oppressive measures far outstripped those who are less privilege –Rawls theory of justice comes to the foreground in this normative dimension of addressing social ills. In ethics, the claim that there are no objective moral truths, for all moral judgments are said to be relative to the knowing subject and equally correct

(Lawhead, 2002, 577-578). Morality as the basis of social order becomes an ethical imperative andconditio-sine-qua-non of a stable society and the spring board for human development. Society as a whole is characterize by a diminished democratic learning processes (Habermas, 1997:156). Morality is a system of beliefs that emphasizes the rightness or wrongness of an activity or process (Hoffman and Graham, 499). Moral standards are fundamental to the socio-political development of human society. Furthermore, morality emphasizes the rightness or wrongness of our deliberate actions and choices.

1.9 Concluding Remarks

Morality as the basis of social order is the defining features of social life, individuals are usually assumed to be instrumentally rational in that they are seeking to maximize the satisfaction of their preferences and individual rational choices give uniformities in human behaviours. Broadly speaking, the power of rationality in man accounts for mutual interest of coordination. Morality as the basis of social order can make our existence meaningful. Morality begets meaningful being, cohesive states and mutually cooperative human existence. First and foremost, the polarity of possibility of the individual existence and his sense of belonging to a political community is of crucial importance to moral philosophy. Man's life is filled with discontinuities, unpredictability and uncertainties. There is the polarity of rationality and irrationality. We pride ourselves as being rational yet, some humans often behave irrationally.

Works Cited

Asouzu, Innocent., (2004): *Effective Leadership and the Ambivalence of Human Interests: Nigerian Paradox of Complementary Perspective,* Calabar: Calabar University Press.

Carden Stephen., (2006): Virtue Ethics: Dewey and Maclntyre, London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Gauthier., David., (1967): 'Morality and Advantage', *Philosophical Review, (76):*Pp. 460-475.

Habermas., Jurgen., (1997): A Berlin Republic: Writings on Germany, trans. Steven Rendall, with an Introduction by Peter Uwe Hohendahl, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Herrick, Jim., (2006):*Humanism: An introduction,* Ibadan: Gadfly Publisher.

Hoffman John and Graham Paul., (2009): Introduction to Political Theory, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Hofmeyr, Benda., (2005): *Ethics and Aesthetics of Foucault and Levinas,* (Dorrrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher. .

Iroegbu P.O and A.O. Echekwube (eds.), in *Kpim of Morality: Ethics, General, Special and Professional,* (Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books Limited.

Lawhead., F. William., (2002): The Voyage of Discovery: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy, USA: Wadsworth Group.

Levinas., Emmanuel.,(1969): Otherwise than Being., Martinique.

Margalitz., U., Edna, (1977): *The Emergence of Norms*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skorupski., John., (1998): Morality in Edward Craig(ed.), *Rutledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* London: Rutledge Books Limited.

Wisnewski., Jeremy., (2007): Wittgenstein and Ethical Inquiry: A Defense of Ethics as Clarification, London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.