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ABSTRACT
Maybe the basic question of ethical philosophy is whether we create or discover the values? Are the ethical experiences the way to find the values that already exist in objective world? Or is it just making the values? In other word, are the ethical propositions, cognitive and declarative or un-cognitive and constructive? Do the “ethical truths” exist, so we my know them? The most basic and important questions in ethical philosophy, and the roots of differences in ethical schools, is return to how and what we answer to this basic question. The writer of this article wants to proof the discovering of ethical proposition and existence of values which independent from human being. If the human being exists or not, the values still exist, and the output of ethical thought is to discover them.
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INTRODUCTION
Nature of Ethical Propositions
In ethical philosophy, discussion about nature of ethical propositions is an important and basic discussion. Are ethical propositions of the type of actual and objective premises or of the type of credit ones? If it is a credit one, is it of absolute credible matters that merely depends on the credit of credible or it is of credits that owns genetic essence and actual abstraction origin? Totally, are ethical propositions of the type of declarative propositions or composition ones?

This issue in ethical philosophy owns focal and pivotal aspect. As far as other issues such as predication or relativity, the criterion of ethical value, being rational and logical of ethical propositions, depends on the theory that is applied in this issue.

Totally, human being's actions is natural, habitual or ethical. Ethical action is predicated to action that is admirable and anti ethical action is the one that is disapproved one. But the habitual and natural action can't be admired or disapproved. Human beings admire ethical actions. And actions such as benevolence, kindness, justice and honesty own contradistinctive value on view of human beings. The basic question is that how are these values? Are there any other identical ones for them in extrinsic world? Are they originated from actual objects that man has discovered and detected them or they are man's creatures and generated of people's thoughts, behaviors and decisions?

By what human criterions these values can be justified? There are two completely adverse and different views about this matter:
1) Some people believe that ethical scope, personal decision making scope. And every human being owns decision making right in ethical should and shouldn't. One self decides that whatever he should or shouldn't do. On the base of this matter, nobody is supposed to recommend other people what should do or what principles should admit in ethical.
2) The second view seeks correct answer in ethical questions and it doesn’t believe in decision making on the base of emotion, sentiment or other thing. In other words, it's not person that determines and creates values, but values exist and person should discover them not to create them.

These two views are counterviews. Because, basically there is no thing out of person's ethical opinions and decisions. So that it could determine their correctness or incorrectness. But on the second view person seeks the value that has already existed in the extrinsic world. So, on the first view man concocts and creates values by his decisions. Whereas on the second view, man finds and discovers them.

Philosophers who count ethical propositions as composition one, or they ascribe them as demand expression, that is result of Imperativism, or they count it as speaker's emotion expression that is result of Emotivism. Others such as M.R.Heer count ethical propositions as action pensionable.
It means that ethical propositions are the propositions that have been expressed to conduct human beings' actions. This view has expressed in title of "Imperativism."

Here, on the base of definition of realism, only we can spot the first type amongst realism views. The second and third types, naturally are realistic. Because the second and third types declare a reality and also they are approvable and refutable, they are denominated "cognitive". And because the third type propositions are not predicate, they are counted "non-cognitive".

And on the base of other view, the first annotation is counted objective and the second and third ones are counted as subjective and reliant on person.

The most important differences between these two propositions consist on informative predicate propositions, informative and refutable and discoverer ones. Namely, by this one phenomenon is discovered to us. Versus, the composition propositions don't cause knowledge and cognition, so they are not approvable and refutable, and they are apocryphal propositions that depend on fiction or reliability of person or group.

Certainly, we should notice that composition propositions consist on two types:
I) Either it is expressive of sentiments, desires and leanings of person or group.
II) Or it is symptomatic of objective and actual matters. In the other words, it is generated from extrinsic abstraction resource.

The differences that have been mentioned, are related to composition propositions of the first type, otherwise the composition propositions of the second type are predicate propositions and expressive of actual matters. Although it differs apparently.

Here the ethical propositions are either of the type of predicate propositions or composition one of the type of the second that any they describe actual and objective affairs. Ethical composition and should and shouldn't can merely be acceptable, total and absolute herein. And we can spot actual support and real criterion for it.

Because firstly it is not on the base of personal desire and willing and secondly it is effective to achieve goal and to gain real and final desire of ethical.

But if ethical propositions are of the type of the first type of composition and they are on the base of credible reliability, and they don't own actual and objective origin, hereon:
1- There should be a composition doer. Because every compositions needs a doer. If we count ethical propositions of the type of composition ones, they will need exist of composition doer. Then this question will form that who does dictate and necessitate these propositions? God? Intellect? man? Society?... Other question is that Why and on the base of what value criterion should we obey that commanding?

But if we count the ethical propositions of the type of predicate and expressive of reality, these questions never will form.

2- Requirement of two independent comprehension existence: If we don't count ethical propositions expressive of actual affairs and existents and we don't spot extrinsic origin, but we imagine them as only composition propositions to expressive commitments, then we construct such a barrier between existents and commitments that each needs specific comprehension of it self. In other words, we should be eligible to two comprehension strengths:

One visionary intellect that apperceives existents and inexistsents and the other one, applicative intellect that cognizes should and shouldn't. Whereas we own only one comprehension strength. But because the cognition belongings (concepts) are different, so we can divide intellect in two classes of theoretical and applicative intellect. Not we have two independent intellect really. But we own two intellect applications. Here, if we count ethical propositions, predicate or composition one owning extrinsic abstraction origin that are generated from actual and abstract concepts, this condition isn't necessary.

3- Lack of ethical criterion to ethical propositions: If ethical propositions can't be affirmed by reasoning and logic, we can't assess ethical school and ideologies or we can't indagate their correctness or incorrectness.

Rational expression of ethical propositions, is possible merely when between values and shoulds in one side and existents and realities in other side, logical relation is appointed: it means ethical propositions should be either of the type of predicate one composition one originated from actuality.

But if they are of the type of absolute reliabilities and compositions, there is no logical relation between them, but no intellectual reason can affirm them.

4- Relativity of ethical propositions: if ethical propositions are absolute composition ones, they are sequent of personal willing or social customs and they don't own any origin in extrinsic realities. So, with change of personal willing or their social tendencies, their ethical assessment will change, too.

Maybe behavior that is admirable today, it will be objectionable in future with social evolutions and changes. The inverse of this case is correct and behavior that was treated a bad act, in special social conditions, with alteration in that conditions, it maybe treated admirable. This is the same problem of relativism that is pensionable of ethical pluralism and lack of intellectual single criterion to distinct correctness or incorrectness of ethical ideologies. But if ethical propositions of the type of predicate or composition ones, are expressive of actuality,
they will be total and absolute notsequent of person or group's willing.

Are ethical values real?
Is ethical a real matter? Does it own natural reality or not? Some philosophic thoughts such as existentialism, Marxism, pragmatism and positivism, believe that ethical is not a substantial subject. Because ethical science is a cognition that is gained by the effect of environment and education in human being's mentalities and sprites. And they don't express actual context. So ethical values are various as result of several nations, ages and places.
In as much as a nation count something good and other people and other nation count it evil. This difference implies that reality doesn't exist in ethical affairs. So each of these philosophies and ideologies with all of their differences, they are accordant in this principle that ethical values don't have stable actuality.
The answer is that the real object existence has two varieties:
1-Of the type of first rational, namely objective and extrinsic existence and independent in essence such as water, earth, sky…
2-Of the type of second philosophic rational that is originated and dependent on extrinsic matters.

Ethical values are of the type of the second ones. So these are extrinsic matters which are described by ethical values. Because these values are reliant on these matters really and practically. So when we say: Honesty is good and leasing bad, commitment fulfillment is obligatory and abjuration is taboo, it means that goodness is in honesty and evil is hidden in leasing and commitment fulfillment obligatory and abjuration prohibition is dependent in commitment and abjuration actions. Just such as science depends in scientist and ignorance depends in self blinded, and parsimony depends in curmudgeon and generosity is related to openhanded.

Ethical Realism or Value Discovery
Ethical realism consists in ethical questions owning human being free answers that they should be found, not construct and concoct them. Ethical opinions are true when they are coincident to ethical realities. It means that ethical opinions correctness and faulty is independent to people, and their thoughts and emotions, and they are on the base of actualities. Thus ethical specifications don't imply our thought specifications, but they are related to actual affairs that are independent in us, that they are the same ethical realities.
But this thought that we concoct and excogitate our ethical values, can't reflect the affairs that are independent in us. And it means ethical non-realism.
On the basis of this matter, ethical thoughts won't be ethical beliefs. Because believing means coincidence to actuality and to spot something true and this matter is meaningless without approval and rebuttal. And if values are man made, there won't be approval and rebuttal anymore. So we won't have ethical beliefs.

Whether or no, ethical realism believes in ethical realities existence and sequently adjectives such as good, bad, right, false, virtue and vitiocity exist in extrinsic world and independent in human beings.
"Ethical realism" if accounts approval of some ethical propositions incontestable leastwise, we can entitle it "ethical recognition" too. "Ethical beliefs and propositions are knowledge expressive, or they can at least be informative. Certainly there are some ethical realities in the world that we can't get knowledge about them." Ethical recognition is a theory that notifies.

What does mean reality? Does it mean being a part of real network and not imaginary and autistic one, existing in time and place that science proves it? Do these essences with these adjectives in the world? If they do, how are they? Are those adjectives total and general? Namely are they capable to come off meantime in several people at the same time? What is the relation between ethical adjectives and non-ethical adjectives? If ethical adjectives are described on the base of non-ethical adjectives, how we can realize? Then ethical realism has been discarded. If we profess that there is a logical relation between those adjectives, this question will form that how is the nature of this logical relation? The major reason of ethical realism is intellect basis. We sometimes realize that something, an act, a person is ethically god or bad, it is right or wrong. We treat ethical sentences as faise or hones ones, we have disagreements about them and we argue about them or we sometimes try to live according them.

Of the reasoning that has presented against realism, is visibility reasoning. "when we witness a murder, we don't see vitiocity in it, and we can't get this vitiocity by any principle of intellectual principles reasoning what we witness."Heum says.
The answer to the aforementioned reasoning is that this view is on the basis of ignorance this matter that ethical adjectives are adjectives of adjectives in exact words. So they are not recognizable by the way that other adjectives are recognizable. For example we don't observe red color when we see special spectrum of red color. Certainly we know the color completely or we accustom the color by little notice at least. And we don't doubt color and redness are two disconnected affairs. Because otherwise we will count color and green and blue … the same.
Other reasoning is that ethical adjective don't own nay positions in "scientific imaginary" of the world. Specially the essence of ethical adjectives are non-physical and it is discordant to physics that counts all creatures physical. So ethical adjectives don't
place in span of physics science and they can't enter in causality relations.
But we should say that most of creatures such as God and... are not physical creatures and we can't deny them. And nobody has affirmed that reality of something needs causality or expressive role. Additionally, it is not obvious that ethical adjectives don't have this role.
The third reasoning make us focus on ethical difference existences, specially among cultures. There are three famous replies to this reasoning:
First, the expanse and depth of this differences are assessed out of ethical philosophy span –namely by anthropologists- sufficiently.
Secondly, maybe these dissidences are the affect of people's ignorance about ethical realities, not lack of their existences. The differences are mainly in ethical details. Such as dissidences that are introduced in sexual behavior. We have little knowledge about these details especially their non-ethical adjectives. There are some dissidences in economical policy and efficient education, too. But are these dissidences counted as a proof to disaffirm realism in economy and children psychology?
Thirdly, most of these differences are the effect of misapperhension. Because the applied contexts, whether be correct or be incorrect, are immensely ambiguous and complicated. And they are the effect of ethical imfancy or the effect of self interests. For example, reach and poor people may be dissident in fair wealth distribution.
The fourth reasoning is that the relation between ethical realities and motivation and thereupon behavior, is an ambiguous one and maybe there is not such relation mainly. The famous reply to this reasoning is presented sufficiently out of ethical philosophy span. Therefore this opinion can be assessed in psychology. Because this reasoning deals with motivation theory. (Unless the problem is that whether to approve ethical realities logically does own suitable motives or not? Something that ethical reality doesn't have any necessity to express it, and it mustn't express it. But psychology hasn't developed so much that it presents a reply and if we imagine that neurology will introduce a suitable reply, we have been quixotics. Naturalism and intuitionism theories are counted of cognitionism theories. Because naturalists spot ethical propositions as a type of cognition that can be ascertainable or revocable. So, ethical concepts are definable by referring to natural and empirical concepts. And therefore, ethical sentences are testable. As respects the intuitionists, they claim by intuition we can affirm correctness or incorrectness of ethical propositions.
Although, on the base of intuitionism some of ethical adjectives are axiomatic, simple, intuitive an indefinable. So these two theories are cognitists because they approve objective existence of values and count ethical propositions as predicate and ascertainable and revocable ones.

Differences between ethical realism and non-realism
Totally differences between two views of ethical reality and non-realism or non-cognitism are as the below abstractly:
1-Realists believe in ethical reality existence. As mankind can be informed it. But non-realists or non-cognitist disclaim the independent ethical reality existence.
2-Realists, count ethical views as a type of belief and cognition about condition of world existence. Meanwhile non-realists spot ethical views as human being's treatment about real matters.
3-Realists believe that moral values exist and humankind can discover them, but non-realists deny independent existence of moral values and they spot humankind the value creator.

Conclusion
Ethical propositions are whether of the type of predicate propositions or of the type of composition ones owning extrinsic origin. So they are not of the type of absolute composition ones and absolute reliable affairs that depend on credible's validity and its willing.
Ethical propositions are not of the type of real and extrinsic affairs, and in the other word, substantiated concepts. But they should be generated from extrinsic realities and they should have real and genetic origin.
Although ethical is reliable science and its propositions are of the reliable matters, but we should notice that its not of the type of absolute reliable matters that is referred to credible.
Ethical reliability means: there is no identical one to ethics in extrinsic world, namely there is nothing such as honesty, lie, justice and tyranny and ... that we can refer them and we say something is good, another is evil; But their origin of validity abstraction exists in extrinsic world.
As empirical sciences are on the base of real matters, ethical propositions are on the base of reality not willing and therefore they are discursive. Absolute valid affairs are variative and relative. But reliabilities that own extrinsic abstraction origin are constant and absolute.
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