



**Morality:
Awareness of Being Human and Remaining
Human in the Post-pandemic Period**

Hüseyin Sariođlu

Prof. Hüseyin Sariođlu

Prof. Hüseyin Sariođlu graduated from Ankara University Faculty of Theology in 1986. He completed his PhD in İstanbul University in 1994. Taking the title of associate professorship in 1998, Dr. Sariođlu continues his academic studies, which started with research on the classical period of Islamic thought, by focusing on classical logic, knowledge theory, religion-philosophy-science relations and morality. He is also TÜBA member. Dr. Sariođlu has been working at İnönü University since March 2020. He teaches undergraduate, graduate and doctorate courses in the Department of Philosophy.

**Morality:
Awareness of Being Human and Remaining Human in the
Post-pandemic Period¹**

Hüseyin Sarıoğlu
Istanbul University
sarioglu[at]gmail.com

Abstract

Considering its historical counterparts, significant changes are expected to occur in all areas of human life during and after the Global COVID-19 Outbreak. However, as globe almost turns into a “quarantine zone” because of a pandemic emerging during an age that has nano technology, artificial intelligence, robotic production, digital sociability applications, the search for life in space and trans humanism; concern and uncertainty about the future has greatly increased. Some restrictions and practices in community life and relationships have been introduced to prevent the outbreak and reduce its effects. Due to the perception that these restrictions might be permanent and used as an excuse to digitalize social life, the concern and uncertainty are gradually being replaced by fear and chaos. Because of its consequences being far beyond of a health event, if the global epidemic becomes a turning point in terms of the flow of history and “nothing ever will be the same” as it’s widely foreseen, morality will also have its share of change. Under these circumstances, a “morality vision” should be put forward again, by considering the predictions, claims and expectations of the new normal period but fundamentally based on the reality of being “human”.

Keywords

human, meaning, value, morality, knowledge, faith, intention, action, digitalization, COVID-19

¹ This study is a translation and updated version of the paper previously published in the book titled “Küresel Salgının Anatomisi: İnsan ve Toplumun Geleceği” by TÜBA in June 2020.

Introduction

Taken together with the present scientific and technological development level, it is widely accepted that the COVID-19 Outbreak, which is experienced by the entire humanity and which we wish to overcome as soon as possible, is an unprecedented and unexampled issue in view of its massiveness and characteristics. This *global pandemic* spread almost all around the world from the east to the west and from the north to the south and implies us what “globalization” means as a phenomenon that marks the present era. In this respect, it is considered a turning point in human history and it is stated that “nothing would be the same” as a wish and/or a general statement.

When China declared that some unusual pneumonia cases observed in the city of Wuhan of Hubei Province having a population of 11 million on 31st December 2019, the number of the cases increased to an extent that it influenced hundreds of countries rapidly and reached millions of people. In the meantime, the number of the casualties reached hundreds of thousands (Şeker vd., 2020, Table 7). The daily life almost came to a standstill, the countries closed their borders, the transportation was minimised, the production and commercial activities were reduced to a minimum. The roads, streets, squares, market places and open areas became isolated; and people confined themselves in their houses. In fact, the coronavirus epidemic appeared as a health issue at the beginning, but the humanity faced with a “chaotic” state in its entirety as it influenced all areas of life from education to science, culture, arts, worshipping, agriculture, tourism, industry and commerce. This picture reminded the humanity that the developments emerged after “the health activities, which caused administrative and vital changes throughout the world history and which have global effects” were “shaped by the traumatic results faced by the nations among whom there existed no production even if they had funds.” As an instance, it impelled people to think over the relationship between the so-called *Black Death*, which occurred in 1300s and is considered to be the greatest

pandemic in Europe with respect to its consequences, and the decadence of feudalism in Europe (Şeker et al., 2020: 36).

As to the COVID-19 Global Outbreak -notwithstanding that the number of the casualties is less in virtue of the efficient measures-, it is the greatest and the first “global” scale pandemic in view of the countries it effected after the Spanish Flu that occurred 100 years ago. In fact, only this would suffice the entire humanity to be taken with fear and anxiety, and it caused also a “multiplier effect” on this fear and anxiety as it occurred during a period in which human beings have the greatest strength in view of scientific and technological experiences compared to before, they design an utterly different future by nanotechnology, the pharmaceutical production progressed with the collaboration of engineering and medicine, and the search for remedies for death through artificial intellect and transhumanism as well as finding habitats in space remain on the agenda.

Besides this subtler contradiction, various explanations are made with reference to the changes and transformations in social life caused by the previous epidemics and different claims are asserted. Moreover, the rapid spread of these explanations, opinions and claims by means of the information technologies, media and social media, which are considered to be the distinctive means of our age, brought about excessive increase in turmoil, social tension and disturbances. As it is expressed in Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi (Şeker, 2020: 42-43) report: It is witnessed that the scientists were accused of unethical working and sharing without prior authorization and permission by the governments and laboratories they work. // It was subject of debate to what extent China concealed the first case and how late it was in isolating it. And the discussions as such would maintain its vitality. It is claimed that COVID-19 infected people by a virus belonging to coronavirus family after being mutated naturally. Moreover, some people claim that COVID-19 was produced at a laboratory and caused an epidemic after getting out of control, and there exist some views implying that the virus spread all around the world deliberately by those who produced it. Some surveys and articles are shared assuming that those who went shopping at the Huanan Seafood Market in Wuhan were infected and the virus spread by means of the one who ate bat soup or it may have come from a certain species of snake. // Many groundless, unproven and unscientific claims occupy the minds of the people. It is also a fact that sharing through the social media that similar scenarios were treated in various science-fiction and artistic products (movies, novels) in the past or similar developments were predicted in some works of popular culture years ago contributed only to increase the anxiety and unease among the communities.

That the perception and/or the claim that some developments such as *digital world, digital global state, digital social life, humanity 2.0, singularity, transhumanism, etc.* (see. Canan ve Acungil, 2019; Yıldırım, 2019a-b ve 2020) are being used as a preparation phase towards popularizing in a global scale in line with the statement “it would never be the same” which is put into words for the “new

normal period” in addition to the social life confined with such speculations concerning the emergence and the spread of coronavirus intensify the obscurity about the future as well as the anxieties and fears thereof.

The COVID-19 Global Outbreak, which is experienced these days and goes beyond being a health problem, is itself a “human condition” just as expressing various claims, views, explanations and predictions. It is clear that there are responsibilities and tasks of various sorts and extents to be executed by the institutions, foundations and governments as it is the case with each human condition beginning with the emergence of this event to its spread globally, its perception and explanation, interpretation, taking precautions and their applications in addition to predict the new period and condition that would appear in the aftermath. However, it is evident that the main element that determine and direct the course of affairs is *the individual attitudes, manners and acts* as it is the case with each human condition. It is reasonable that fulfilling the responsibilities and tasks of the institutions, foundations and governments in “the new normal period”, which is inevitable for the humanity and the societies not only during the epidemic but also after it gain *meaning, value, function and legitimacy* within the framework of “legal” norms, principles and rules whereas the basis on which *the attitude, manner and act* performed by each *human being/individual* concerning all these matters are shaped is “morality”.

Morality from the Old Normal Period to the New Normal Period

As the history of the great outbreaks like coronavirus is examined, it is seen that these events led to comprehensive and efficient inquiries in almost all fields to the extent that they would influence the changes in the course of the history, and caused certain transformations concerning the ancient understandings, beliefs and traditions. As a matter of fact, it is known that after the Black Death that terrorised Europe in XIVth century, a new period, that’s to say, the Modernity is shaped by a change, which occurred as a result of the questioning the Medieval beliefs, thoughts, principles and values and replacing them with the new ones, and it is also known that the greatest share of this change was received by *morality*. Thus, Modernity, which succeeded in engulfing the societies living over other civilisations and became a “world civilisation”, emptied the past memories of the societies it influenced with the memory of the world it belonged by transforming the *notions* and *the values* as well as distracting their essential meaning and quiddity. In turn, this led the humanity to face many “contradictions”, “crisis”, “deadlock”, “war”, “chaos” and “obscurity”, and it led the crisis experienced by a culture to become ac crisis experienced by all cultures for the first time throughout the history. The problems stirred by the modernity in “hearing”, “thinking” and “acting” was expected to be solved by “the political philosophy” in the first quarter of XXth century. However, when this expectation inclined towards “the domain of morality” during the last quarter (Türer, 2009: 17), it became clear that it was the “moral crisis” that constituted the very basis of the problems and a search for solution began (see Sarioğlu, 2009).

Human and Morality (Akhlaq)

As these pursuits has not achieved sufficient results, the humanity is now experiencing a profound obscurity and anxiety concerning their fate after *COVID-19 Global Outbreak*. If the changes caused by similar events occurred during times, which are more local in view of this global pandemic and are incomparable to the present scientific and technological development, are taken into consideration, the changes that will shape “the new normal period” after the present situation would be expected to influence morality along with all other domains deeply.

The religious doctrines based on the theological/divine authority apart from the classical and traditional as well as the modern philosophical theories generally view morality as a “system od social values” structured by norms, principles, rules and its enforcement in the social domain based on the idea that the human being is a social-political being. If this approach is taken as a basis and if the humanity is supposed to cope with a “social life” illustrated by some unusual concepts such as “digitalisation”, “virtual environment”, “artificial intellect control”, “augmented reality”, “transhumanism”, “physical distance” and “individuality” during the new normal period following COVID-19 Global Outbreak and if “nothing would be the same”, then morality should be defined again.

Even during the “normal period” which began to be characterised “previous/old”, the individuals who prefer to appear through virtual/fake accounts on digital platforms know no bounds to express ideas, opinions and acts that is impossible to associate with their real identities. Under these circumstances, an obscurity and even a chaos expected to be brought forth by a “new normal period”, in which the social life and relations are predicted to be conveyed from physical social environment to the digital/virtual one, would affect morality deeply as it would affect all domains of life.

The main question(s) to be analysed here are as follows: how would the “ego”, “personality” and “identity” of the moral subject be formed during the new normal period in which the human relations/socialisation is conveyed from a physical setting where these take place as a face to face manner to a completely digital/virtual environment to a great extent as a requirement of “social distance” principle?; what would be the “enforcement” appropriate for the “result” emerged with the “norm” concerning the “act” which is an expression of it and how would it be applied? What would be the effects of physical/social distance principle and the digital social life, which are/will be internalized by means of the pandemic, and to what extent they would be realized? It is useful and even necessary to face and criticise everything pertaining to the past while seeking solutions for this and other questions with respect to understand and make sense of the present condition. However, considering the past as the only responsible for the present condition as it is the case in general and believing that it is possible to find solution by becoming distanced from it is useless and unnecessary at the same time. In this respect, it is necessary to deal with

the matter by a noncomplex/unsophisticated approach through “the human being” who is the subject of morality directly without disregarding the visions, theories and discussions concerning morality that has been imagined up to now and without dealing with the details.

To Know the Human Being

In fact, morality can be considered as an issue concerning the process that begins with “*the curiosity of the individual to perceive and understand himself/herself and what is going on around him/her* and continues *along with individual and specific existence and a pursuit to make sense and experience the existence in all its entirety*. Thus, we can examine the issue of morality through two simple practices those can easily be experienced by everyone. (i) Firstly, if the free talks/conversations of a group of people is recorded and analysed in any occasion, it would be seen in the emergent scene that the topic of the conversation is “the human being” and the things told about him/her is “negative” to a great extent. (ii) Secondly, when someone is pointed at among the community after addressing him/her as “the human being” and is requested to tell a few words immediately, it would be seen that these would be “positive” thoughts and expressions are inversely correlated with the previous ones (I experienced this practice for long years with my students and with thousands of people of different educational backgrounds, careers and status belonging to various institutions as a kind of field study; it is observed that the results of these two practices are inversely correlated).

Why do they result in one condition as “positive” and in the other as “negative” although it is “the human being” that is spoken of in both cases? Different answers can be given on various grounds for this question, but this result can be interpreted as most people *are pleased with their own “human condition”* and expressed this with “positive” statements whereas they *are not pleased with “the human condition” of others* and stated this fact by “negative” expressions. Even this contradiction emerging from a simple observation points at the necessity of knowing the being called “human” closely. To know, understand and make sense of the human being means to determine his/her ontological state, nature, power, and the limits. As a matter of fact, it would not be an exaggeration to say that all efforts exerted on thought, belief and arts are directed to a final goal in the last analysis such as *to understand, tell and make sense of the human being* throughout the history.

In the course of life, if the legal norms along with the data based on religious and philosophical moral doctrines as well as scientific surveys those have emerged from the ancient times until today -not to speak of the statements made by each person based on basic observations and experiences- are taken into consideration, the “human reality” appears as follows: (i) a being weak from in one aspect who is need of others and is bound to live in a community; (ii) in another aspect, a being who is keen on autonomy and freedom, and who is not pleased with being subject to orientation but can stand for receiving orders for the sake of expectations; who can adapt for the changing circumstances and

perceive the phenomenon and facts from an ego-centric perspective; who wants to manage everything and makes use of almost everything for self-interests; who considers aims as means and means as aims as occasion requires; who can live love and hatred, hope and fear, joy and despair, etc. together; and who is a being encompassed with contradictions, (iii) and from another perspective, a being that can attain a superior and privileged position in the world of existence by its *intellect and will*. Under the light of these instances, it is possible to say that the human being consists of a three-dimensional structure, namely (i) “need”, (ii) “feeling”, (iii) “thinking”, and is encircled by a fourth dimension, which we can call (iv) “possibilities”. Thus, the lifeline of the human being consists of the search for *serenity, peace and felicity* by maintaining *conformity and integrity* within a “tensional” setting among these four dimensions. From this respect, the human being can be likened to, so to speak, “mercury”, a liquid which has the highest specific weight but is unmanageable and can be affected by the outer changes rapidly (these depictions made to illustrate the human structure should not be seen as positive or negative value-judgements but only as determinations. Besides, the human being owes this special and privileged status to this structure).

A crucial question arises in this context: how can the human being maintain serenity, peace and harmony as his/her most fundamental need and the final goal in his/her (i) inward (self, self-awareness, goodwill, self-reliance) and (ii) in social life (personality, we/history/culture/sense of belonging)? Different answers can be given to this question and generally the following elements are pronounced: religion, law, customs, tradition, morality, culture, education...

Each of these words stand for separate structure and institution, and they refer to norms/principles/rules as to how one should behave in accordance with a specific condition. If aforementioned aspect of the human being as “one who is keen on autonomy and freedom, and is not pleased with being imposed authority and orientation” is to be remembered, it becomes clear that the rules imposed unto him/her would mean being “confined” and “prevented”, that’s to say a status of liberty. In the meantime, if the structures and institutions associated with the other aspect the human being that “can stand for receiving orders for the sake of expectations” for a situation considered to be *meaningful* and *valued* taken together with the fact that they occupy a position that can *judge* “the human acts”, it would be seen that the common ground between them is “meaning” and “value”.

Then we face with two questions under these circumstances: firstly, is it meaningful, functional and necessary to consider morality reduced, joined or an outward set of norms/rules/principles although there exists norms/principles/the religion, law, customs, traditions that sets rules regarding how to behave in face of a certain situation?; and secondly, what do “meaning” and “value” stand for and how did they emerge?

The Meaning and the Value

The second question can be analysed through two examples those can easily be experienced by everyone assuming that it would serve as a ground for the evaluation of the first question. One of the examples is the letters, which symbolize the sounds come out of our larynx and which are used to externalize, express, convey and record our feelings and thoughts; and the other ones are the numbers we use to form numerals as we refer the quantity and amounts. When the letters are taken separately, they have no other meaning or function other than being symbol for each sound. When they are associated with other letters and become a unit of a whole (word/sentence), they not only gain functionality but also participate in forming a whole. The change of the status and the function of the letters those constitute a whole brings about a change or cease in meaning. The same is true for the numbers and it is not possible to say whether a number is small or big if it is taken separately. However, it is possible say whether they are bigger or smaller compared with another only if they are associated with the other numbers. When more than one number are joined and made a part/element of a new unit and whole, that whole gains a new value as well as a greater one. A change in its position and function leads to a change in view of its digit value as well as a change of the whole it belongs. These two examples indicate that in order to speak of “meaning” and “value”, at least two things should exist and there must be “relation”, “conformity”, “hierarchy” and “integrity” between them. The same thing can be observed through the notes and tunes that form melodies and through the colours and tones that form the pictures.

If each of us speak of the meaning and the value of something, it is certain that we consider that very thing as an element of “relation”, “conformity”, “hierarchy” and “integrity” associated with us. In other words, no one is expected to consider anything *meaningful* and *valuable* unless he/she sees it as a *need* or considers it to be *associated/related with* him/her. The individual makes this by the help of “thinking ability”, that’s to say, “the intellect” which makes one a human being. By the intellect, one is able to establish relation with himself/herself, to realise the existence of one’s own and attain “the self-awareness”. Within the consciousness of three-dimensional space and time, which is gained by the power of intellection, he/she would enjoy the privilege of *understanding/making sense* and *narrating* the existence, phenomenon and facts both by associating with oneself and with each other.

On the other hand, everything in the world of existence were created and formed in a *system of relations* that appeals to the ability of thinking in human being; each human being is born into this system of relations and becomes a part of it. The individual has enough capacity to enlarge and affect shaping the functionality, content and quality of this system by means of the relations he/she will establish. Each relation maintains “rights” and authority” for each party whether it is formed by them intentionally or unintentionally; moreover, it imposes “tasks” and “responsibilities” and attributes them a new “meaning” and “value” at the same time. When the individual conceives this fact, he/

she would realise the meaning and value of himself/herself as well as of those around him/her. The individual would see that he/she maintained everything he/she possesses in the name of *meaning* and *value* or anything he/she appealed while illustrating “his/her own self” by means of others through the relations he/she participated; thus, he/she gains not only meaning and value but also he/she lets others whom he/she is related gain meaning and value. It is with this *consciousness* that the individual would conceive *the goal, meaning and value of the individual, existence and life* in time and space as well as with the dimensions beyond them. It could be said that despite the conflicts and tensions in “need”, “feeling”, “thought” and “possibilities”, the starting point of the path that leads to *serenity, peace and felicity*, which he/she desires in his/her life as well as in the social life consisting of the people of the same structure, is to have a *being consisting of meaning and value* or intellect. In that case, where is morality situated on this path?

Morality: The Effort of the Individual to Realise Himself/Herself by the Consciousness of Being-Human and Remaining-Human

At this point, we have to turn back again and start our way with the fact that the human being is *weak*, that's to say, a *being in need*. It is a well-known fact that human is a thinking and social being by definition and has various needs that can be classified under two main groups: bio-physiological and psycho-sociological. It is also known that (i) each act/action/behaviour actualised by the human being deliberately is tended for fulfilling a *need/maintaining* something. (ii) during this tendency, the human being determines *options* for meeting the needs (iii) and *chooses/prefers* one of them that he/she finds *worthy* of realising for various reasons. (iv) *The act* he/she does in this direction (v) brings forth a *result*. It is possible to say this process, which occurs in five stages, has in fact three elements: *the act, its before and after*. We can also call them as “intention” → “act” → “result”.

It would be useful to see if it tends towards religion, law, customs, traditions which set norms/principles/rules concerning what to do in which situations or towards “intention” → “act” → “result” elements of morality which are considered to be in the same category. We know that *result* for law (even only the *negative result*); *intention, act and result* for religion; *act and result* for customs; -if it is considered as a system of norms and rules- *act and result* for morality denote priority and importance. When this is taken into consideration, we can offer an insight for the following question by means of the table below: “Why is there a need for morality in the event that it is seen similar although others already exist?”

Bearing in mind the three-dimensional structure of the human being, it is clear that all three columns of intention, act and result can perform (+) positive/good/right/beautiful or (-) negative/bad/wrong/ugly acts; however, all three levels cannot be expected to be completely (+) or (-) for a normal

and sane human being in his/her acts. Besides, all norms and rules aim to decrease the human acts corresponding to line eight as much as possible and increase the acts corresponding to the first line as much as possible. When it comes to the human being, the existence of acts corresponding to the other lines as emerging from the mentioned four dimensions is quite natural, even inevitable. Considering all these matters, let us assume that the result lines are (+) or (-) and the empty lines in the “total value” column are filled by ourselves/one who performed the act.

	Intention	Act	Result	Total Value
1	+	+	+	+
2	+	+	-	
3	+	-	+	
4	+	-	-	
5	-	+	+	
6	-	+	-	
7	-	-	+	
8	-	-	-	-

When the cells able are filled completely, it would be seen that the “total value” column and the “intention” column match exactly. This indicates that when the individual “value”s his/her own acts, he/she primarily pays attention to “intention”. To this respect, it can be asserted that it is much more functional, meaningful and appropriate to think *morality is essentially moulded and shaped in intention and externalised in act and result*, and thus is appropriate to be considered as an *awareness which is individual, subjective and inward* rather than an *outward* system of norms/principles/rules presented to the individual.

Intention derives from an Arabic word that has connotations such as “to tend, to show solemnity and determinedness”. It is the most fundamental element that determines the manner and the behaviour as well as the act and the attitude displayed by the human being in face of an issue, situation, phenomenon and event. That many elements affect shaping the intention from the genetical/hereditary features to the culture, background, social environment, physiology and physiognomy, the geography he/she lives and natural environment, economic opportunities and future expectations, the negative experiences and the happy moments, the customs of the society he/she belongs and the religion he/she believes, the worldview and the political ideology, the educational background, career and occupation is a n undeniable fact. considering all these, it is possible to say that it is the *individual* himself/herself who decides to assume an appropriate attitude, manner and act in accordance with the phenomenon, event, issue and situation (need) deliberately under the influence of some of them and despite some of them. That’s to say, the *individual* and *subjective* aspect of morality have stronger influence *vis a vis* religion, law and customs each of which is a system of values aiming to guide and lead the way.

Yet, another question may arise at this point: is there an individual basis in human being that can function as a basis for morality the individuality of which is dominant as he/she is open to all kinds of effects and instant changes like quicksilver with his/her three-dimensional dynamic structure? In order to understand this, we have to scrutinize “the human nature/structure” from a different perspective again. On the other hand, the prerequisite for religion, law and customs as systems of norms and rules, which set norms and rules for deciding the appropriate human acts depending on the circumstances to function expectedly and develop a moral theory in accordance with them, is to accept that the human being has a nature or disposition that enables him/her to behave in conformity with them.

I think, Plato’s theory of *four virtues* based on the *balance* and *conformity* of the three basic capacity belonging to the human nature/soul – a theory adopted and repeated by many Muslim scholars as well- continues to be relevant and functional even today. According to this, each human being has potency of *intellect* (aql) peculiar to his/her species as well as the potencies of *carnal desires* (shahwah) peculiar to similar species and *anger* (ghadab)- based on the individual/specific situation, phenomenon and event/context he/she inclines, various names and all inclinations may transform into these two. When these are balanced/in conformity with the situation one faces, respectively wisdom (hikmah), temperance (iffah) and courage (shajaah) come into being. And if these three are balanced, then justice(adalah) comes out, which serves a basis for morality. All other virtues to be enlisted under these consist of different levels and combinations of these four virtues emerged as they face with specific situations, phenomenon, and events.

From Intention to the Action

How is it possible to pass from intention formed within the inner world of the human being to the act occurred in the outer world? In order to understand this, we have to analyse the “intention-act process” that is completed by “result” meaning to emerge from a need and to meet that need on the basis framed by these four dimensions which we express as “needs”, “feelings” and “possibilities”. It is possible to illustrate the main stations of this process by appealing to the classical literature as follows: it prompts the *mind* (1) for preference and to find the best (ihtiyâr) (2) by looking for ways/options (knowledge) (3) to meet the need through desire or anger prompted by inner perception/feeling/awareness (hiss) (4) that appears (a) as a result of the occurrence of any absence/poverty/lack/ danger and of the thing(s) that may eliminate them (b) after a need, depending on the phenomenon, event, matter and situation, for the bio-physiological or physico-sociological structure. This is followed by finding the option being preferred (5) and the will to put this into action (iradah), the determination to realise it (azim) and the determination to reach the desired result (qasd), and (6) the *act* comes into being (7) and the *result* appears.

The main points to be analysed in this process, whose stages or elements are dealt briefly, are the elements (4) and (5) that begin soon after finding out something good if it is to be realised for meeting the need among the options (knowledge) and preferring it until the realisation of the act, and the *intention* is shaped at this stage. It must be clarified here where is the option that makes something *preferable, desired and applicable* vis a vis other and whether it is with the one who prefers it or with the preferred. We can try to understand this through an example that is in conformity with the existing global health problem. Let us think that someone, who has enough experience and knowledge just as a person specialized directly on a disease or a health problem and knows that giving up an act linked directly with a disease would be necessary/good/right/useful but continues to do it; for example, let's think that an oncology expert smokes cigarette after he/she gives a conference on his/her field of study. We see similar contradictions far and wide every time. Under the light of mentioned facts, which deficiency, inconformity and unbalance results in a contradiction as such in this matter? If this expert had not been knowledgeable, courageous, temperate and balanced, that's to say if the expert had not possessed the four virtues and been a person having a strong will in general, it would have been impossible to reach at his/her position. Then, why did he/she *prefer* the *unnecessary/bad/wrong/harmful option* instead of the option he/she knew to be necessary/good/right/useful as an act? We often face with situations towards which we have difficulties in deciding and be in dilemma. What we see, in fact, is that there is no agreement of *intellect and heart* or *knowledge and feeling* on one the options, and each insists on a different option. In cases where this *hesitation and instability* do not reach a consensus, the intention does not emerge. Either there exists no act or the result cannot be *ensured*, and *suspicion* occurs at the end. The *intellect* determines, justifies and sorts (knowledge) the option in the process where the intention is formed, and it is the *heart* that *desires/likes/approves* among the options or assumes an attitude (feeling) such as *reject/dislike/disapprove* in view of the options. In this context, when the relation between intellect/knowledge and heart/feeling results in agreement, harmony and concord, *the integrity of knowledge-feeling* is realised and the belief emerges. Here there exists a *belief* about which there is trust vis a vis suspicion concerning its necessity/goodness/trueness/usefulness rather than an option/knowledge which is known to be necessary/good/right/useful. It is possible to say it is right/true belief that emerges when the intellect/knowledge is decisive during the process from knowledge to the belief whereas it is the wrong belief/void that emerges in the cases where the heart is decisive. So, the human being does not try to realise any option/knowledge as an act which he/she does not believe to be safe/trustable/secure, that's to say necessary/good/right/useful/valid. Thus, in order to do an *act*, the intention should be formed with all of its elements, and for the intention to be formed, the knowledge should be transformed into belief (cf. Güngör, 2008: 11-69; Mehdiyev, 2019: 83-103; Özakpınar, 2014). This process whose stages are given briefly occurs immediately in repeated similar situations whereas it grows slow in complicated situations. And this shows that it is a situation of awareness/consciousness in which all elements and dimensions are ensured. It is here where morality

develops as something that gives value and meaning to the act. We can state under the light of mentioned facts that

Morality is a state of individual awareness that has a social aspect.

Morality is the awareness and success to create the values, principles and rules of the community one belongs as one's own values, principles and rules.

Morality is the awareness and capacity to apply the general values, principles and rules adopted by the individual to the specific situations, phenomenon, and events.

Morality is an effort to realise oneself through one's awareness of being human and remaining human

Apart from religion, law and customs, which value the human acts outwardly, it is clear, meaningful and functional that morality is seen a *specific awareness* that gives meaning and value inwardly to the human acts whose individual aspect is dominant, and we can now examine its relation with religion and law.

Morality and Religion

When the close relation with *individuality, subjectivity and liberty* of the human being is taken into consideration, it would be seen once again that *believing and belief* have an undeniable and unignorable importance for morality. If a need for *interpretation* and a dimension of *meaning and value* appears in any matter or event, it means believing and belief are engaged indeed. In this respect, the basis of the reality between morality, which gives *meaning and value inwardly*, and the religion and law, which *determine value and meaning outwardly*, is the *human capacity to interpret and believe*. It can be said without further analysis and justification that in order to speak of the possibility and basis of goal and functioning for law and religion, the individual should have a minimum capacity to interpret and believe so that morality, in its primacy and the most fundamental form, may become manifest. In this respect, we can pay attention to the guiding contributions exerted by religion and law in promoting morality and preventing and illustrate the religion and law as “morality outwardly” and morality as “religion/law inwardly”.

It is not possible to expect for a human being to have an ability to interpret and believe in the concrete, transcendental and supreme realities if his/her *capacity of interpreting and believing have not developed*. As a matter of fact, it is possible to state that the basis of religion, which is a system of beliefs and values, for a human being morality and the relation between them occurs through *interpreting and believing*. We see that *believing*, in which the individual and subjective aspects prevail, appears in difficulty but in a stronger manner in view its object, and thus it is the religion in which believing is learnt and experienced in the most effective manner; so other dimensions of the relation between morality and religion become apparent.

One of these dimensions appear in the context of the need and search for *ontological safety*. In this vein, although the human being has capacity to interpret and assess the beings, phenomenon and events in the physical world in which he/she lives and is a part of it by means of the powers of intellect and will, he/she does not have enough competence to evaluate the world of existence in its entirety and his/her place, goal, meaning and value thereof (Frankl, 2020: 133). However, in cases where the existential goal and the meaning of life are not clarified, morality as the awareness and effort of realising oneself would not maintain its sustainability and effectiveness. The human being would understand even this fact by means of his/her awareness to make use of this capacity, that is morality, and appeal to the religion that offers to meet this need; at the end, the human being would need to *understand and evaluate* it. That's why the individual is required to reach at a certain biological and psychological competence level for the religious duties. Moreover, that's why the imaginations formed on a social basis in view of the existential goal and the meaning of the life since the ancient times are the products of the religious and philosophical traditions. It is a well-known fact that especially the revealed religions placed the human being on a certain meaningful and privileged status and imposed him/her tasks in accordance with this status. In this era, it is clear that science and technology added a glamorous dimension to his/her relation with the natural world in which the human being is a special and important part. Although science and technology caused important transformations in human life, they did not maintain any expansion in view of the search for meaning and the existence of the human being (Kutluer, 2009: 140, 151). Seen from this perspective, it may be expected that the digital new period would make this issue more complicated and multidimensional as well as deeper. For, the meaning and the goal of life, which is defined in the answer given to the question "why does it exist?", cannot be expounded through the data from the science and technology, which pursues the question "how". This being the case, it is quite natural to consider morality in close relation with religion as morality is a state of awareness based entirely on *meaning, value and belief* with respect to its existence, function and operation. As a matter of fact, it becomes more important or even inevitable to sustain it in new normal period.

Another dimension of morality with the religion appears in the context of one's contradicted inclinations towards authority. As one may recall, it was stated before that human is a being, which is weak and has needs; he/she is keen on autonomy and liberty but is not fond of submission to authority and being directed. However, he/she can stand for receiving orders for the sake of expectations in case of necessity. It is inevitable for human being to be open to the outer supports and orientations as much as possible to form a harmonious and integrated self and personality, that is morality in all circumstances of individual and social life. In this respect, it is known that an idea of authority orients people knowingly or unknowingly in all stages and domains of life. However, it is natural that the orienting influence of authorities, which are at the same ontological level with a person, remains limited and is not inclusive so as to encircle the life entirely. Despite this fact, there appear some inclinations

and attempts in view of the nature of the human being combined with need, contradiction and weakness to *absolutize the limited authority* by not only the *affecting/orienting* but also the need for being affected/oriented; and the history of humanity is full of examples as such. On the other hand, as a result of the aspect that is not fond of authority and being oriented, there are inclinations and attempts to reject the authority completely. As well as the *authoritarian and despotic* attempts and the formation emanating from the human nature, the *anarchist and nihilist* objections have not been for the benefit of the human being. At his point, the authority that the morality as an effort and awareness to realise oneself can rely on/be nurtured/tend is God Who is the owner of a religion that has capacity to address the human nature and Who is the Highest Authority ontologically (cf. Kutluer, 2009: 151).

Another dimension of morality in its relation with the religion is apparent in the efforts of the human being as he/she tries to sustain morality, which is the *effort of realising oneself through being human and remaining human* vis a vis the tensions and problems those emerge at any moment in the inner contradictions and social relations, vital and effective during lifetime. Whether based on being virtuous for the sake of being virtuous and the responsibility of duty/task or on longing for felicity and existential quest for peace, the *intention* can serve as a reasonable and competent instinct/motivation for the individual to fulfil virtuous acts as the manifestation of morality; however, everyone knows that the human being is insufficient to prefer and do morally necessary/good/right in all circumstances due to the familiar nature. For, the human being, by nature, renounces a preferable and achievable option turns to another one with the hope of attaining *better/meaningful and valuable*. But it is possible to face with ungratefulness, not to speak of the deserved and expected reward in conformity with the renunciation. On the other hand, the individual faces with the unvirtuous deeds as manifestations of bad/unwanted morality which are not usually punished, and even gains totally opposite outcomes. The *belief and will* of the individual, who cannot associate such states with *existential quest/longing for safety* and the *virtue/principle of justice* as the manifestation of good/beautiful morality to realise the virtuous acts, would be damaged. If that is the case, morality needs the support of the religion and adheres the eternal life beyond death, which is one of the three essential principle of the religion. What gives the individual *the power to react and endure (patience, perseverance)* in preferring and realising thee virtuous acts in all circumstances as the manifestation of good/beautiful morality are *the principles of faith and religious sentiments* which he/she adopted and relied on. To the extent that he/she believes God rewards even if one commits for His sake, he/she continues renunciation and self-sacrifice for the virtuous acts as manifestation of good/beautiful morality; for, expectation from Eternal Might and will as well as the benefit from Him is incomparable to that of others.

New Normal Period and Morality

The “new normal period” following the COVID-19 Global Outbreak in the context of our main topic can be evaluated in two dimensions: firstly, as an immediate health problem/event that emerges/can emerge from this outbreak, and secondly as a situation desired to be globalized through this outbreak.

First of all, it is natural even inevitable that the outbreak may affect and change the usual needs, perceptions, feelings and thoughts, acts and relations as the outbreak process itself is difficult and problematic process that threatens human life and health. Moreover, the emergent unusual new situation as well as its effects that would continue and perhaps become permanent aftermath is also natural. What is expected and needed for a human being within this framework is to understand and try to interpret the normal situation, and to participate in social solidarity on all levels in this matter. As it is known and experienced, the outbreak process influenced particularly health and all parts of human life directly or indirectly. There were people who lost one of their relatives or a beloved one; everyone from those who were treated to the ones who were quarantined, work actively in the healthcare field, the elders who were restricted due to high risks compared to the others, who had chronic diseases to the children, immigrants, the disabled, who cannot work actively or even those who lost their jobs one way or another. However, this global outbreak resulted in both *positive* and *negative* outcomes as any situation, phenomenon or event in the world of existents of which he/she is a part. For example, it is stated that this process maintained some possibilities to be rediscovered which, in normal circumstances, are considered unnecessary and have to be ignored and delayed. For this reason, this outbreak process and its aftermath can be considered a very fruitful opportunity in view of morality, which is the individual’s awareness to be human and remain human apart from a system of habits/customs/predispositions or norms/principles/rules. Understanding and interpreting the outbreak process as such find their reflections on the processes of various institutions, foundations and administrations in fulfilling their tasks and responsibilities as well as reaching positive results for compensating the negative effects of global outbreak with all their relations by the effectiveness of the individual’s awareness to be human and remain human, that is morality. For, the responsibilities of institutions and foundations have to be fulfilled through individuals and for individuals; that’s to say, everything begins and ends with the individual.

Digital Future and Morality

Secondly, it is known that some predictions and projections -some of which appeared as conspiracy theory- have been made stating that such a process would be experienced, then a digital world order would effective since COVID-19 Global Outbreak or even years before. It seems difficult to anticipate to which extent these would happen and what would humanity face in “new normal period”. However, we know at least that a great deal of the developments based on digitaliz/ation was made a part and parcel of human life before the outbreak whereas some of it became a part of it to a certain

extend actively. It is clear that legitimacy of this active situation is maintained and caused to spread globally, be it naturally or in a laboratory, through the global outbreak following the spread of so-called COVID-19 virus.

The first question that comes to mind is as follows: it is not possible to state the possibilities as well as the dangers and the threats brought about by this legitimized situation are conceived by people in a global scale properly and conveyed to a capacity to defend themselves and make use of it. on the other hand, it is also known that the possibilities and opportunities maintained by information technologies and the digitalization in all fields from the genetical researches to communication are transformed into threats and dangers by “opportunism” and the safety is not maintained properly as well. This being the case, what sort of dimension and deepness would the *obscurity, chaos and distrust*, which occur in all parts of individual and social life, gain after the mentioned situation become *legitimized/justified* by means of new means and by being globally spread?

Although it is not easy to estimate this, it is possible to say considering that it began with “the human reality” and “industry 1.0”, that’s to say the revolution of steam machines, and reached to the stage of “industry 2.0” electronic machines, “industry 3.0” computerized machines and the digital production phase until “industry 4.0” robots, and finally “industry 5.0” is on the agenda in which artificial intellect would cooperate with working robots and participate in production, it can be said that even the claims and scenarios seen as conspiracy theories would become true. All these developments and future predictions reveal the obscurity concerning the all fields of individual and social life as well as the future of the individuals, societies and countries in digital future, towards which the humanity approach step by step from the daily life to the relations, family, city, work life, entertainment, social environment, natural environment, laws, beliefs and religions, education and science, culture and arts.

When the landscape desired to be illustrated concerning the digitalized new normal period is evaluated as a whole, it becomes clear that the obscurity, in fact, is related to “the future of the human being”, that’s to say his/her “remaining human”. This issue will manifest itself in two dimensions, namely biological physical value and psychological spiritual existence. In this case, does it mean that the human being transform himself/herself into an artificial being at a point in which the organ production in laboratories for “body modification” by developed technologies as well as making “the modified (!) body” communicate with the digital information sources directly reached at its peak? In a situation in which the individual is made open to all sorts of immediate intervention, control, orientation and direction by being transformed into an artificial human like a robot, is there any need to think what sort of changes and to what extent would be in other fields of human life? Isn’t it a fact that he discourse stating that the possibilities presented by digital technologies and artificial intellect would maintain human being comfort and welfare as well as the claim that it would usurp all production, craft and occupation of the human being in all aspects

of life through so-called “aesthetic subject” would stimulate chaos and traumas on individual and social basis? Isn’t it true that the information, which will be followed and oriented from one or two centres after being effective globally, be used to attack and eliminate everything from the “standardizing” language to the culture, beliefs, values, way of life, consumption habits, worldviews and human relations? On one hand, isn’t it true that provocations, which would destroy the local/national integrity, would be organized in guise of so-called democracy, freedom, universal values, etc. along with this and other similar operations? Is it possible to estimate to which direction the human relations in such a world would be transformed? Is it possible to expect a sound a real social life for the individuals who look for satisfaction with virtual relations in virtual environments and even addicted to this quest? Is it possible to say that the family, street, village, city, country, language, culture, law, society, nation and humanity in a world are safe/secured where the individual experiences a loss of will and initiative during the struggle of being human and remaining human? It is possible or even necessary to form long lists those include these questions. For, the *question* is the manifestation of awareness and the awareness is the manifestation of a need to *question, understand and interpret* which is the first step and the light for hope on the path.

When the estimations, claims and predictions asserted after analysis are taken into consideration, it is stated that the new normal period whose essence will be formed by global digitalization would bring forth the intensification of individuality and the expansion of social groups in virtual environment while they become minimized in real life in accordance with the physical distance principle. When the concepts and projects of *artificial intellect, humanity 2.0 and individuality* are added to the existing issue, it can be said that the course of events would evolve into such a direction to cut the human being off the ontological basis and destroy/scatter/transform his/her existential structure, and the main danger is great and it is for the primordial nature of the human being. Moreover, as there can be no situation, phenomenon and event which are absolutely good or bad, absolutely beneficial or harmful in the world of exists of which the human being is a part as stated above, the precautions for the danger against the human nature is to be found also within the source of that very danger.

If the issue is analysed with respect to the sayings “when people fall down, they get up thereof” and “be equipped with the same weapons of the enemy, it is clear that the ground unto which one falls and the weapon to be used are the globalisation desired to be globalized based on the justification and legitimacy, which are tried to be maintained through COVID-19 Global Outbreak whereas the individual who is expected to fall down is one/the individual desired to be isolated from the physical social and natural environment by means of being withdrawn to the virtual environments. In this case, the counter-struggle should be fulfilled again by the individual himself/herself and over the digital possibilities. For the individual to conceive, understand, interpret these and ensure his/her security would be possible only through being equipped by *the*

awareness of being human and remaining human grounded on reasonability and sincerity, that is by morality itself, and keep them always vivid and effective.

References

- Burns, D. (2018). *İyi Hissetmek*. Çev. Ed. H. Alp Karaosmanoğlu. İstanbul: Psikonet Yayınları.
- Canan, S., & Acungil, M. (2019). *Dijital Gelecekte İnsan Kalmak*. İstanbul: Tuti Kitap.
- Frankl, V. E. (2020). *İnsanın Anlam Arayışı*. Çev. Selçuk Budak. İstanbul: Okyanus Yayınları.
- Güngör, E. (2008). *Ahlâk Psikolojisi ve Sosyal Ahlâk*. Ötüken Neşriyat.
- Kutluer, İ. (2009). Yeni Bir Ahlâkî Bilgelige Doğru: İslâm Ahlâkının Nazarî Boyutları Üzerine Bazı Mülâhazalar. *Çağımızın Ahlâk Bunalımı ve Çözüm Arayışları* (pp. 137-178). İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat.
- Mehdiyev, N. (2019). *Bir Bilme Teorisi*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Özakupmar, Y., (2014). *İnsan İnanan Bir Varlık*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- Sarioğlu, H. (2009). *Çağımızın Ahlâk Bunalımı ve Çözüm Arayışları*. İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat.
- Şeker, M., Özer, A., Tosun, Z., Korkut, C. & Doğrul, M. (2020). *COVID-19 Küresel Salgın Değerlendirme Raporu*. Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, TÜBA Raporları No: 34: <http://www.tuba.gov.tr/files/images/2020/kovidraporu/T%C3%9CBA%20COVID-19%20Raporu%206.%20G%C3%BCncelleme.pdf> (10.06.2020)
- Türer, C. (2009). Ahlâk Bunalımının Nedenleri. *Çağımızın Ahlâk Bunalımı ve Çözüm Arayışları* (pp. 15-32). Ensar Neşriyat. İstanbul.
- Yıldırım, H., (2019a, 2019b, 2020). *Yapay Zekâ ve İnsan Kalabilmek 1-3*.
<https://www.healthworldnews.net/yapay-zeka-ve-insan-kalabilmek-bolum-1>
<https://www.healthworldnews.net/yapay-zeka-ve-insan-kalabilmek-bolum-2>
<https://www.healthworldnews.net/yapay-zeka-ve-insan-kalabilmek-3-ve-son-bolumu/> (30.05.2020).