Right, Wrong, Logic and Mentality

Sanad Aburass[1,a,*]

[1]*Department of Computer Science, Maharishi International University, Fairfield, Iowa, USA*
a. saburass@miu.edu
*corresponding author

Abstract: This paper explores the nuanced relationship between right, wrong, logic, and mentality in ethical decision-making. It argues that ethical judgments are deeply subjective and context-dependent, influenced by individual and collective experiences, cultures, and cognitive frameworks. The paper introduces the metaphor of mentality as the fabric of the mind and logic as Lego pieces, illustrating how cognitive flexibility and logical structure interact to shape our moral understanding. While advocating for a fluid and adaptable approach to morality, the paper asserts the absoluteness of wrongs when actions cause significant harm. The "Twelve Gates of Wrong" framework is proposed to systematically evaluate ethical decisions, emphasizing harm avoidance. This model integrates traditional ethical theories—virtue ethics, deontology, and consequentialism—while addressing the complexities of modern moral dilemmas. By balancing cognitive flexibility with logical integrity, the paper offers a comprehensive roadmap for ethical reflection and decision-making, urging a principled and empathetic approach to minimize harm and foster societal well-being.

Keywords: Right, Wrong, Logic, Mentality

1.   Introduction

In moral philosophy, the distinction between right and wrong has been a persistent subject of debate[1][2]. This paper delves into this discourse, emphasizing the subjective and relative nature of ethical judgments compared to the potential absoluteness of moral wrongs, especially when harm to others is involved. Central to this exploration is the question: How do humans, with their varied mentalities and logical capacities, navigate ethical decisions? The inquiry into what constitutes right action is as old as philosophy itself and remains relevant to today's moral dilemmas [3][4] Traditional approaches often sought universal principles to guide ethical behavior. However, this paper suggests a more fluid understanding of morality, where the determination of right is deeply embedded in human experience, culture, and cognition[5]. It is within this framework that the interplay between logic and mentality is examined, not as mere faculties of reason and emotion but as mechanisms through which ethical values are constructed, challenged, and lived. Logic provides tools for coherent thought and argumentation, structuring our understanding of the world consistently and rationally. Yet, applying logic to ethical questions introduces complexity that cannot be resolved through reasoning alone. Our mentality, shaped by experiences, beliefs, emotions, and knowledge, profoundly influences our perception of logical principles and their application to ethical dilemmas. This interplay suggests that our judgments of right are deeply subjective, colored by our worldview[6].

The paper argues that the relativity of rightness is not a call to moral relativism but an acknowledgment of the diverse contexts in which moral judgments are made[7]. Ethical decisions are made at the intersection of individual and collective values, historical contexts, and societal norms. What is considered right in one context might differ in another, reflecting the multifaceted nature of human morality. This perspective urges us to consider the logical consistency of our actions and their emotional and social resonance[7][8].

Despite embracing subjectivity and relativity, the paper distinguishes actions that cause harm. Here, the concept of wrong becomes absolute. Actions that inflict irreversible or profound harm on others are posited as universally wrong. This principle serves as a moral anchor, delineating a boundary within which the fluidity of right must be navigated. It underscores the responsibility in ethical decision-making to weigh actions against personal and cultural values and their potential to cause harm.

This nuanced understanding of right and wrong requires self-reflection and critical thinking. It challenges us to interrogate our biases, consider the broader impacts of our actions, and cultivate a principled and empathetic moral sensibility. By framing right and wrong within the contexts of logic and mentality, the paper offers a roadmap for navigating modern ethical complexities. It calls for a reflective, inclusive moral discourse grounded in minimizing harm, advocating for a vision of ethics that is both deeply human and rigorously thoughtful.

2. What is The Right Thing to Do?

The relationship between mentality and logic is crucial in understanding human cognition, impacting reasoning, decision-making, and adaptation[1][2]. This paper uses a metaphor describing mentality as the fabric of the mind and logic as Lego pieces. This analogy helps conceptualize the dynamics between our mental predispositions and logical structures[3][4].

Mentality is a malleable fabric, shaped by experiences, emotions, and knowledge. Its texture—soft and adaptable or rigid and resistant—affects how we integrate new logical ideas into our cognitive framework. Factors like neuroplasticity, emotional resilience, and life experiences influence this texture, impacting our ability to assimilate logical constructs and adapt to new insights. The paper also examines cognitive flexibility and rigidity. An overly pliable mental fabric may lead to incoherent beliefs, while excessive rigidity can hinder innovation and progress. Thus, a balanced mental fabric is essential for integrating new ideas without losing coherence, crucial for individual growth, societal cohesion, and fostering innovation. Cognitive flexibility, the ability to switch between concepts and think about multiple ideas simultaneously, is vital for mental health and well-being[9]. It helps navigate modern life's complexities, enhancing problem-solving, creativity, and coping with change[10]. Logical structure in cognitive processes is key to understanding and navigating the world. Piaget's theory highlights the transition to abstract and logical thinking as critical for cognitive development[11], enabling reasoning and critical thinking across scenarios[12]. The interplay between cognitive flexibility and logical structure is evident in learning and adaptation. A balanced cognitive framework integrates new ideas while maintaining coherence. Neuroplasticity shows our brains can form new connections throughout life, supporting continuous integration of information and logical structures[13]. This balance of flexibility and integrity is vital.

Balancing cognitive flexibility with logical structure has profound societal implications. In a changing world, societies benefit from individuals who adapt to new challenges while grounded in logical thinking. This balance fosters innovation, resilience, and social cohesion, driving societal progress[14].

The metaphor of mentality as fabric and logic as Lego pieces illustrates cognitive flexibility and logical structure's role in personal and societal growth. The literature underscores the necessity of a balanced cognitive framework, where flexibility and structure coexist, fostering resilience, creativity,

and cohesion. Balancing new ideas with a coherent logical structure is essential for personal fulfillment and societal progress.

2.1.   Mentality, Logic, and Their Interrelation: A Fabric and Lego Exploration

The relationship between mentality and logic can be understood through the analogy of fabric and Lego pieces. This analogy provides insight into how individuals perceive, integrate, and utilize logical ideas by conceptualizing mentality as the mind's fabric and logic as building blocks.

2.2.   Mentality: The Fabric of the Mind

Mentality, in this framework, is the foundational fabric of the mind, continuously shaped by experiences, emotions, and knowledge. It includes subconscious predispositions, biases, and pre-reflective understanding. Factors like neuroplasticity, emotional resilience, and life experiences determine whether the fabric is rigid or malleable. A young mind's fabric is softer and more adaptable, making it easier to integrate new logical ideas. As one ages, the fabric can become more rigid, complicating the assimilation of new concepts[15].

The mental fabric has properties that influence our ideas and belief systems, affecting how we perceive and integrate logic. Similar mentalities can either attract or repel each other, fostering understanding or leading to conflict. Conversely, contrasting mentalities can either complement or create discord. The most critical property of this mental fabric is its degree of softness or rigidity. A softer, malleable mentality is conducive to assimilating diverse logical structures, fostering a rich, nuanced belief system. In contrast, a rigid mentality limits this integration, leading to a more constricted viewpoint. Understanding these properties and their effects on human cognition and interaction highlights the complex interplay between individual mentalities and their collective impact on social dynamics and relationships.

2.3.   Logic: The Lego Pieces

Logic, likened to Lego pieces, illustrates how we process and adapt to new logical ideas. Each logical idea is a Lego block that must fit into the existing cognitive structure, a complex construct shaped by previous experiences, knowledge, and the texture of our mental fabric.

Integrating new logical ideas involves several key steps:

1. Examining the Existing Structure: Understanding the current cognitive framework by recognizing and analyzing pre-existing beliefs and logical constructs.

2. Identifying the Appropriate Location: Determining how the new idea aligns with or contradicts current beliefs and knowledge, requiring critical thinking to maintain the coherence and integrity of the overall structure.

3. Adapting the Structure: This challenging part involves reconfiguring parts of the existing structure to accommodate new ideas, which may mean revising beliefs, expanding knowledge, or discarding outdated concepts. The texture of the mental fabric—whether soft and flexible or rigid and resistant—greatly influences the ease of this adaptation.

This metaphorical framework underscores the importance of balancing cognitive flexibility with structural integrity, facilitating personal growth and societal cohesion. It highlights how mentality and logic interact dynamically, shaping our cognitive and social landscapes.

The metaphor of mental fabric highlights the importance of cognitive flexibility. A soft, adaptable fabric allows for easier modification and incorporation of new ideas, which is crucial for learning, problem-solving, and creativity. This flexibility enables individuals to assimilate new information and perspectives readily. Conversely, a rigid mental fabric, stemming from entrenched beliefs or

resistance to change, can hinder this process. Such rigidity may lead to cognitive dissonance, rejection of new ideas, or an inability to adapt, ultimately stifling growth and innovation.

Understanding and applying this analogy has profound implications for personal development, education, and societal progress. It underscores the need for an open-minded and adaptable cognitive framework that welcomes new ideas and critically evaluates and integrates them into a coherent, evolving structure. This balanced cognitive development allows innovation and tradition to coexist, leading to a nuanced understanding of the world. The logic and Lego analogy conceptualizes human cognition's complexity and the ongoing process of learning and adaptation. It encourages mindfulness of our mental fabric's texture and striving for a balance that promotes both flexibility and structural integrity, enabling the building of a rich, expansive, and coherent cognitive landscape.

2.4. The Interrelation of Mentality and Logic

The texture of the mental fabric (mentality) directly influences the adaptability of the cognitive architecture to new logical ideas. A soft fabric enhances cognitive flexibility, facilitating the easy integration of new ideas and fostering innovative thinking. Conversely, a rigid fabric leads to cognitive resistance, making the mind less receptive to new information, especially if it contradicts established beliefs. The metaphor vividly illustrates the dynamic interplay between our cognitive predispositions and our ability to engage with new ideas. Maintaining a soft, adaptable fabric of mentality is crucial for fostering a mind that is open, curious, and willing to expand its horizons, essential for personal growth and navigating the complexities of an ever-changing world.

2.5. The Implications of Imbalance in Mental Fabric: Navigating Between Rigidity and Flexibility

The comparison of mentality to the fabric of a mind, with ideas as Lego pieces, offers a profound understanding of cognitive flexibility and rigidity. An imbalance—being too soft or too rigid—carries significant implications for individuals and society.

Too Soft: Creativity Without Boundaries

A mentality that is too soft represents extreme openness to new ideas, potentially lacking a coherent structure of beliefs, principles, or values. While fostering creativity and innovation, it can also lead to a lack of direction or purpose. Individuals may struggle to commit to specific goals or values, making decision-making and identity formation precarious. Societally, this could lead to a lack of shared values, resulting in fragmentation and instability. Creativity drives societal progress, but shared beliefs and principles are crucial for unity and purpose.

Too Rigid: Principle over Progress

Conversely, a mentality that is too rigid adheres firmly to established beliefs and values, often resisting new ideas or perspectives. This rigidity fosters a strong sense of identity and purpose but decreases creativity, innovation, and empathy towards differing beliefs. Societally, this can lead to stagnation, as resistance to new ideas hampers progress and adaptation to change. Moreover, such rigidity can fuel divisiveness, undermining mutual understanding and cooperation.

In summary, determining the right thing to do involves identifying the logical action that fits seamlessly into one's cognitive construct, shaped by the flexibility of the mentality. This approach highlights the necessity of balancing cognitive flexibility with logical coherence. By ensuring that actions align well within this adaptable cognitive framework, individuals can make ethical decisions that are both rational and contextually appropriate. This balance promotes not only personal growth and adaptability but also societal cohesion and progress, as individuals are better equipped to navigate the complexities of modern ethical dilemmas. Thus, the integration of flexible mentality and logical action forms the cornerstone of ethical decision-making.

3.   What is The Wrong Thing to Do?

Ethics encompasses various theories offering distinct perspectives on morally right or wrong actions. Foundational frameworks include virtue ethics, deontological ethics, and consequentialism[7][8]. Virtue ethics focuses on character and virtues, advocating for moral virtues as the basis for ethical behavior[5][12]. Deontological ethics emphasizes adherence to moral norms and duties, asserting actions are right if they follow moral laws, irrespective of outcomes[7]. Consequentialism, particularly utilitarianism, evaluates morality based on outcomes, arguing the rightness of actions depends on their consequences[6].

"The Twelve Gates of Wrong" is a novel ethical theory bridging gaps between these frameworks, proposing a harm-avoidance-centered approach. It offers a structured methodology for evaluating the morality of actions through a multi-dimensional lens prioritizing minimizing harm. This theory aligns with the principle that ethical decision-making should consider harm and benefit, drawing on normative ethics to create a balanced, pragmatic framework[16].

The Twelve Gates of Wrong innovatively evaluates ethics by considering direct consequences, broader implications of inaction, individual ethical responsibilities, and societal contexts. It emphasizes proactive engagement in ethical behavior and a holistic assessment of potential harms and benefits [5].

Virtue ethics, inspired by Aristotle, posits moral virtues are central to achieving eudaimonia, or flourishing. It focuses on developing character traits for a morally good life, emphasizing practical wisdom (phronesis) for navigating ethical dilemmas. Aligning emotions with rational decision-making is crucial, enriching the Twelve Gates of Wrong by highlighting individual character and wisdom in assessing potential harms[8][17][18][19].

Deontological ethics contrasts by prioritizing adherence to moral norms over action consequences. It asserts certain actions are inherently right or wrong, regardless of outcomes, emphasizing conformity to moral norms. Agent-centered theories suggest moral obligations and permissions are tied to the agent's perspective, highlighting personal moral decision-making. The Twelve Gates of Wrong intersects with deontological ethics by focusing on harm avoidance as a moral norm, blending considerations of outcome with deontological commitments[7][20][21][22].

Normative ethics provides a broad framework for evaluating how actions contribute to the good, encompassing utilitarianism, virtue ethics, and deontological ethics. It aims to justify moral principles governing right and wrong behavior. The Twelve Gates of Wrong contributes by offering a structured approach to determining moral permissibility based on harm avoidance, engaging with normative ethical debates on good and ethical decision-making criteria [23][24][25].

The Twelve Gates of Wrong adds a unique voice to ethics by proposing a systematic method for evaluating morality through harm avoidance. Examining this theory alongside contemporary ethical frameworks offers practical guidance in ethical decision-making, emphasizing harm avoidance, promoting well-being, and preventing harm, making it a valuable contribution to moral philosophy.

3.1.   The Twelve Gates of Wrong

The Twelve Gates of Wrong offers a comprehensive framework for ethical decision-making, focusing on harm avoidance to determine the moral permissibility of actions. Unlike traditional frameworks that seek the 'right' action, it emphasizes avoiding wrong actions through systematic evaluation, recognizing the subjective nature of moral rightness.

The theory delineates twelve evaluative gates, each serving as a checkpoint to assess potential harms associated with an action, considering immediate and future impacts on physical and mental health and societal well-being. It aims to identify 'non-wrong' actions, acknowledging the complexity and relativity of ethical decision-making across different cultures, times, and contexts.

3.1.1. Expanding the Framework's Depth

Gate-Specific Considerations:

Gates 1 & 2: Personal Immediate Harm (Physical & Mental): These gates emphasize personal agency and autonomy, assessing immediate physical and psychological harm, including stress, anxiety, or trauma, and the potential for future risky behaviors.

Gates 3 & 4: Others' Immediate Harm (Physical & Mental): These gates consider harm to others, incorporating empathy and social responsibility. They evaluate the potential for actions to contribute to a culture of violence or neglect, beyond direct harm.

Gates 5 & 6: Societal Immediate Harm (Physical & Mental): These gates analyze collective impacts on social structures, public resources, and communal health, urging individuals to consider their role in collective behaviors and the widespread consequences of isolated actions.

Future-Oriented Analysis:

Gates 7 & 8: Future Personal Harm (Physical & Mental): These gates require a forward-thinking perspective, considering cumulative effects of current actions on future health and well-being, emphasizing sustainable living practices.

Gates 9 & 10: Future Harm to Others (Physical & Mental): These gates highlight the ethical responsibility to future generations, considering the long-term impact of our actions and the moral imperative to leave a positive or non-harmful legacy.

Gates 11 & 12: Future Societal Harm (Physical & Mental): These gates evaluate the sustainability of actions, requiring a broad perspective on the consequences of today's actions on future societal structures, environmental health, and global well-being.

3.2. Societal Harm and Collective Action: Understanding the Broader Impact

The Twelve Gates of Wrong framework evaluates an action's potential to harm society, considering the cumulative impact when actions are performed on a large scale. While a single act might seem inconsequential, similar actions by many can lead to significant societal harm, both physically and mentally.

A critical principle in this framework is the scale and collective impact of actions. The ethical weight of an action increases with its potential to become widespread. Actions that, if replicated by many, lead to detrimental outcomes for societal health, safety, or harmony are subject to ethical scrutiny. This principle recognizes our interconnectedness and the ripple effects of our actions within a social fabric.

To operationalize this principle, the framework suggests imagining the consequences if an action were widely adopted. This involves evaluating:

- Physical Harm to Society: Examining actions that could lead to public health crises, environmental degradation, or strain on shared resources.

- Mental Harm to Society: Considering actions that could contribute to societal stress, anxiety, or discord on a large scale, recognizing the importance of societal psychological well-being.

This approach emphasizes foresight and responsibility in ethical decision-making, urging individuals to consider the broader implications of their actions in a social context.

The concept of societal harm underscores the ethical principle of collective responsibility. Individuals, through their actions, shape societal norms and outcomes. Evaluating actions through their potential large-scale impacts prompts a more conscientious and responsible societal role. This perspective shifts ethics from an individual-centric view to a collective understanding, where societal well-being is a shared responsibility. It challenges us to consider the indirect and potential consequences of our actions on society.

Incorporating societal harm evaluation into ethical decision-making broadens moral discourse to include collective well-being. It reminds us that our actions impact a larger social ecosystem, contributing to or detracting from the common good. Through this lens, the Twelve Gates of Wrong framework offers a comprehensive approach to ethics, encouraging actions that uphold society's integrity and health.

3.3. The Ethical Weight of Non-Action

The Twelve Gates of Wrong framework primarily evaluates the potential harm of actions, but it also crucially considers the ethical implications of inaction. Recognizing that non-action can result in adverse consequences for individuals, others, or society is vital for comprehensive ethical decision-making. This section explores the nuanced understanding of inaction within this framework, emphasizing that harm avoidance sometimes necessitates action.

Non-action, or the deliberate choice not to act, carries significant ethical weight within harm avoidance. The Twelve Gates of Wrong posits that if an action is necessary to prevent harm, choosing not to act is ethically scrutinized. This perspective broadens the focus from actions alone to include the implications of inaction, advocating for a more comprehensive ethical evaluation.

3.3.1. Scenarios of Ethical Non-Action

- Preventative Inaction: Failing to act in situations where intervention could prevent harm is ethically problematic. For example, not intervening to prevent an injury or failing to alert others to danger can be equivalent to causing harm directly.

- Opportunity Costs of Inaction: Non-action can result in missed opportunities to promote well-being or prevent greater harm. This examines the consequences of failing to act when such action could have positively impacted individuals, others, or society.

- Systemic Inaction: On a societal level, systemic inaction—such as failing to address social injustices, environmental degradation, or public health crises—highlights collective responsibility. The framework recognizes the cumulative impact of widespread non-action on societal health and harmony.

3.4. Evaluating Non-Action Through the Twelve Gates

To integrate the evaluation of non-action, the Twelve Gates of Wrong framework requires a shift in perspective, considering the absence of action alongside direct outcomes. Each gate serves as a tool for evaluating both actions and inactions, guiding ethical decision-making that accounts for the full spectrum of potential harm. This comprehensive approach ensures that the ethical implications of failing to act are thoroughly considered, promoting a more informed and responsible ethical practice.

3.5. Balancing Benefits and Harms: Navigating Ethical Dilemmas

Ethical deliberations within the Twelve Gates of Wrong often involve balancing potential benefits and harms. This section explores the complexity of weighing these factors, guiding individuals through decisions that may carry some harm but also offer significant benefits. While the framework primarily focuses on harm avoidance, it acknowledges the reality of ethical dilemmas where benefits and harms must be carefully balanced.

When actions or inactions yield both benefits and harms, individuals must evaluate whether the benefits outweigh the harms. This ethical calculus involves a multifaceted analysis, considering the magnitude, probability, and scope of both benefits and harms. The Twelve Gates of Wrong advocates

for a principled approach to this evaluation, emphasizing meticulous assessment of broader implications.

3.5.1. Principles Guiding the Evaluation

- Comprehensive Impact Assessment: Evaluate benefits and harms holistically, considering immediate and long-term impacts on individuals, others, and society. This assessment must go beyond surface-level analysis to understand the deeper implications.

- Irreversibility of Harm: Special consideration should be given to irreversible harm. When potential harm could lead to irreversible damage, the threshold for justifying the action rises, requiring stronger evidence of substantial benefits.

- Ethical Thresholds and Societal Norms: Weigh benefits against harms while considering ethical thresholds and societal norms. Some harms may be unacceptable regardless of the benefits, particularly when they contravene fundamental ethical principles or societal values.

- Responsibility and Accountability: Proceeding with an action that carries potential harm, even when benefits are anticipated, entails high responsibility. Individuals must be prepared to take accountability for the consequences, acknowledging the ethical weight of their choices.

4. Conclusion

This paper underscores the intricate interplay between logic, mentality, and ethical decision-making, proposing a novel framework, the "Twelve Gates of Wrong," to navigate moral complexities. By likening mentality to a fabric and logic to Lego pieces, it highlights the importance of balancing cognitive flexibility with structural integrity. The paper emphasizes that while ethical judgments are subjective and context-dependent, actions causing significant harm are universally wrong. It integrates insights from virtue ethics, deontology, and consequentialism, advocating for a harm-avoidance-centered approach to morality. This perspective encourages reflective and principled ethical decision-making, urging individuals to critically evaluate their biases, consider broader impacts, and prioritize minimizing harm. Ultimately, the paper calls for a nuanced, empathetic moral discourse that embraces the fluidity of human experience while upholding fundamental ethical principles, fostering both personal growth and societal cohesion in an ever-evolving world.

References

[1] C. D. Brown, "Fundamental mentality in a physical world," Synthese, vol. 199, no. 1–2, pp. 2841–2860, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11229-020-02914-7.

[2] V. Pishchik, "Features of the mentality of generations X, Y, Z," E3S Web of Conferences, vol. 210, p. 20007, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202021020007.

[3] P. N. Johnson-Laird, S. S. Khemlani, and G. P. Goodwin, "Logic, probability, and human reasoning," Trends Cogn Sci, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 201–214, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2015.02.006.

[4] J. St. B. T. Evans, "Logic and human reasoning: An assessment of the deduction paradigm.," Psychol Bull, vol. 128, no. 6, pp. 978–996, 2002, doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.978.

[5] F. M. Kamm, The moral target: Aiming at right conduct in war and other conflicts. Oxford University Press, 2012.

[6] W. Sinnott-Armstrong, "Consequentialism," 2003.

[7] L. Alexander and M. Moore, "Deontological ethics," 2007.

[8] M. Slote, "Virtue ethics," in The Routledge companion to ethics, Routledge, 2010, pp. 478–489.

[9] J. CAÑAS, J. QUESADA, A. ANTOLÍ, and I. FAJARDO, "Cognitive flexibility and adaptability to environmental changes in dynamic complex problem-solving tasks," Ergonomics, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 482–501, Apr. 2003, doi: 10.1080/0014013031000061640.

[10] D. P. O'Brien, "Human reasoning includes a mental logic," Behavioral and Brain Sciences, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 96–97, Feb. 2009, doi: 10.1017/S0140525X09000429.

[11] B. Inhelder and J. Piaget, The growth of logical thinking from childhood to adolescence: An essay on the construction of formal operational structures, vol. 22. Psychology Press, 1958.

[12] S. Aburass, "Consciousness and Greed: A Mathematical Model of Human Greed and Its Behavioral Implications," Communications in Humanities Research, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 112–116, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.54254/2753-7064/11/20231394.

[13] B. Draganski et al., "Temporal and Spatial Dynamics of Brain Structure Changes during Extensive Learning," Journal of Neuroscience, vol. 26, no. 23, pp. 6314–6317, Jun. 2006, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4628-05.2006.

[14] B. Uzzi, S. Mukherjee, M. Stringer, and B. Jones, "Atypical Combinations and Scientific Impact," Science (1979), vol. 342, no. 6157, pp. 468–472, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.1126/science.1240474.

[15] Y. Zahidjan, "CHANGES IN SOCIETY'S POLITICAL MENTALITY," American Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences, vol. 18, pp. 62–67, 2023.

[16] V. Tiberius, "Well-being: Psychological research for philosophers," Philos Compass, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 493–505, 2006.

[17] J. Page, Peace education: Exploring ethical and philosophical foundations. IAP, 2008.

[18] S. Banks and A. Gallagher, Ethics in professional life: Virtues for health and social care. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2008.

[19] L. Floridi, The ethics of information. Oxford University Press, USA, 2013.

[20] J. Mandal, D. K. Ponnambath, and S. C. Parija, "Utilitarian and deontological ethics in medicine," Trop Parasitol, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 5, 2016.

[21] K. Kitto and S. Knight, "Practical ethics for building learning analytics," British Journal of Educational Technology, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 2855–2870, 2019.

[22] F. Lieder, M. Prentice, and E. R. Corwin-Renner, "An interdisciplinary synthesis of research on understanding and promoting well-doing," Soc Personal Psychol Compass, vol. 16, no. 9, p. e12704, 2022.

[23] S. Kagan, Normative ethics. Routledge, 2018.

[24] I. Manners, "The normative ethics of the European Union," Int Aff, pp. 45–60, 2008.

[25] H. J. McCloskey, Meta-ethics and normative ethics. Springer, 2013.