

الملخص باللغة الانجليزية

This research sheds light on the moralism of Kimberley Brownley's civil disobedience both theoretically and practically, after the disobedience caused widespread controversy because of the difference between the positions of philosophers and law scholars on the moral and legitimate nature of the theory. In practice, there is no world without disobedience

The problem of research is to resolve the tragic and ethical conflict between duties, the obligation to obey the law, respect and duty to obey the conscience and loyalty to it, and which we owe loyalty to? , Which represents the supreme duty?

Therefore, there is a moral paradox of the great content: How to become civil disobedience is civil disobedience or citizens of the law morally justified ?, although we have a moral duty to abide by the law and obey it? . If civil disobedience is morally justified, why does the law punish civil disobedience practitioners with excessive and unfair punishments and are seen as criminals and committed to criminality. ?

The most important results of the research:

- Brownie's civil disobedience is permissible and ethically permissible if it is ideal and communicative and stems from the collective conscience.
- Civil disobedience is more moral than individual conscientious objection, after Brownley raised the collective conscience of the individual.
- The law may err because it is not sacred, and may be applied by politicians in the wrong way, so the authority of internal moral conscience is higher than the authority of external law, so we must give our loyalty to the truth and not to the law that may be unjust.
- There are alternative moral solutions to avoid disobedience: avoiding injustice, seeking a just non-class society, and politicians and rulers becoming moral men in the first place, and their policies becoming ethical.