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ABOUT WHAT IS DIALOGUE

Prof. Dr. Hans Küng has devoted himself to the project on “global ethic” under the slogan No World Peace without Religious Peace for more than a decade.¹ In his essay “A Global Ethic in World Politics: the Middle Way Between ’Real Politics’ and ‘Ideal Politics’,” he suggests: “A worldwide dialogue, a global dialogue, has already been set in motion that should lead to a consensus on shared values, standards, and basic attitudes, to a world ethic, a global ethic.”² I agree with him,³ as in “A Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities”, that “human aspirations for progress can only be realised by agreed values and standards applying to all people and institutions at all times.” While this statement is right, the question is always how we can attain such agreement in our increasingly pluralistic world. It is particularly difficult and important in case of religion, amidst the mounting tensions between different religious beliefs all over the world. For those who hold that we could have different fundamental faiths and that these differences could be reconcilable, the solution prescribed is often “dialogue and tolerance”.

We must agree that the peaceful coexistence of different faiths through dialogue, tolerant. Of course! “No dialogue, then death!” But the question is always how “dialogue” can pursue between two people. If we have denied that there is such a thing as ‘human nature’, and claim the contingency of the language and of conscience, and suggest there are no any common criterion and law, as western liberalism did,⁴ then what can be said for “dialogue”? In fact “dialogue” only means


² Ibid., 14.

³ Ibid., 14. Küng says: “And all over the world much about morals, laws, and customs that had been taken for granted for centuries, on the basis of religious authority, is no longer automatically accepted.”

⁴ Richard Rorty said: “I shall end this first chapter by going back to the claim, which has been central to what I have been saying, that the world does not provide us with any criterion of choice between alternative metaphors, that we can only compare languages or metaphors with one another, not with
that anyone says himself, “tolerance” only means that anyone doesn’t care anything except oneself in modern times.

For Kant, our agreed values and standards, if any, can stem from nowhere except our own reason. Dialogue and tolerance without principles may result in nothing more than yet another occasion for restatement, or even reinforcement of one’s own private beliefs or political claims. As Kant notes when he elucidates his idea of “cosmopolitan Intent” (weltbürgerlicher Absicht), “ethical community” and “eternal peace”: “in erecting a power and a kingdom for itself within the human species, in the form of a community according to the laws of virtue that proclaims the victory over evil and, under its dominion, assures the world of an eternal peace.” (Rel 6:124)

As Kant reveals that reason (Vernunft) prescribes laws a priori for the faculty of desire, i.e., “the will is nothing but practical reason.”, and pure practical reason includes a will which by all its maxims enacts universal law (durch alle seine Maximen allgemein gesetzgebenden Willens). (Gr 4:432) Therefore there is common desires and beliefs which are universally shared by everyone.

I agree with Kant that he said: “For the faculty of desire, as a higher faculty operating under the concept of freedom, only reason (in which alone this concept has a place) prescribes laws a priori.” (KU 5:178) “Here is only one human rational exists” (MS 6:207) “According to laws through which the freedom of each can coexist with that of the others.” (B373) Therefore we can say that “the greatest human freedom” rests upon originally legislative (gesetzgebenden) of reason. “The very existence of reason rests on this freedom [of critique]. For reason has no dictatorial authority; and its pronouncement [in people] is never more than the agreement of free citizens, each of whom must be able, without holding back, to utter his qualmsindeed, even his veto.”(A738/B766)

Moreover, the endless controversies of a merely dogmatic reason compel us finally to seek tranquillity in some critique of this reason itself and in a legislation based on this critique. It is as Hobbes maintains: the state of nature is a state of injustice and violence, and one must necessarily abandon it and subject oneself to the constraint of law; for such constraint alone limits our freedom so that it can coexist with the freedom of everyone else and precisely thereby with the common best interest. […] This much already lies in the original right of human reason. For human reason recognizes no other judge than universal human reason itself again, wherein everyone has his voice. And since all improvement of which our situation is capable must come from this universal human reason, such a right is sacred and must not be encroached upon. (A752/B780)

I believe “no dialogue, then death.” But there are more powerful reasons

something beyond language called ‘fact’.”(Richard Rorty, Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity, Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp.20)“[...] set aside the idea that both the self and reality have intrinsic natures, natures which are out there waiting to be known.” (Ibid.,11) Rorty is speaking for western liberalism.
for believing that the endless controversies will compel us finally to seek dialogue in a legislation based on critique of reason. Thereby I say: “no reason, then no dialogue.” No dialogue, then wars between civilizations and religions is unavoidable.

I believe Kant’s teaching: while the human race release from self-imposed immaturity, i.e., “everyone free to use his reason”, (KGS 8:41) “a lasting tranquil reign of reason over the understanding and the senses would have its beginning.” (B493) Then we shall set up “ethical community” to assures the world of an eternal peace”, (Rel 6:124) and “general happiness”. (A851/B879)

HOW IS PEACE BETWEEN THE RELIGIONS POSSIBLE

Prof. Küng stated clearly that he have to disagree with Huntington’s main conclusion of an unavoidable “clash of civilizations or religions.”5 Of course, if clash of civilizations or religions were given by nature, as Huntington claimed, then we must admit that war would be constant, endless in the future, even we can prejudge that a Third World War of civilizations which would “lead to the end of the human race”, 6 would be ultimate and unavoidable.

Although Fukuyama interpreted the end of the Cold War as the triumph of the West idea, but though he admitted that it was only victory of economic and political liberalism.7 He asked: “If we admit for the moment that the fascist and communist challenges to liberalism are dead, are there any other ideological competitors left?”8 As Fukuyama suggested, many western political theorists claim that the war in modern times will be wars of religion, of nationalism.

Prof. Küng claims that peace among the religions is possible through dialogue between the religions. He said: “I discovered that all the great ethical and religious traditions of humanity have very much in common.”9 “The great traditions of humankind know very many much more concrete maxims,[...]”10 He indicates that

---

5 Cf. Hans Küng, “A Global Ethic in World Politics: the Middle Way Between ‘Real Politics’ and ‘Ideal Politics’”, p.10. He said: “Huntington's 'clash theory' takes no notice of the commonalities. Within the one Christianity he delimits the Eastern Orthodox civilization from the Western one, and the North American from the Latin American civilization. Everywhere he emphasizes the antagonisms of cultures without even thinking of basic commonalities, let alone commonalities, for example, between Christianity, Judaism, and Islam.” (Ibid., 9-10) “If such conflicts between civilizations and religions were really unavoidable, the future of humankind would look extremely gloomy. Not without reason, Huntington has been accused of deep pessimism and even irresponsible fatalism; [...]” (Ibid., 10)
6 Ibid., 10.
8 Ibid.
10 H. Küng, A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics, New York Oxford Oxford University Press 1998, 99. He says: “It could be that one will find some common ethical 'sayings' or instructions for human behaviour in quite different traditions. What I mean by this can be demonstrated relatively simply by means of that Golden Rule of humanity which we find in all the great religious and ethical tradition. Here are some of its formulations: - Confucius (c.551-489 BCE): 'What you yourself do not want, do not do to another person' (Analects 15.23). - Rabbi Hillel (60 BCE-10 CE): 'Do not do to others what you would not want them to do to you' (Shabbat 31a). - Jesus of Nazareth: 'Whatever you want people to do to you, do also to them' (Matt.7.12.; Luke 6.31). - Islam: 'None of you is a believer
Western and Eastern Christianity represent one and the same religions/ civilizations, different religions (like Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) “have numerous features of faith and even more of ethics in common.”11 While his thought is hardly opposite, the question is: why indeed wars of religions never stop in history of humankind.

There can be several kinds of fundamental trusts, therefore there are several kinds of faiths. In his book Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason, Kant said:

There is only one (true) religion; but there can be several kinds of faith. (Rel 6:107)

We can say, further, that in the various churches divided from one another because of the difference in their kinds of faith, one and the same true religion can nevertheless be met with. It is therefore more appropriate (as it in fact is more customary) to say: This human being is of this (Jewish, Mohammedan, Christian, Catholic, Lutheran) faith, than: He is of this or that religion. (Rel 6:108)

As Kant said, the ordinary human being will every time understand by “religion” his own ecclesiastical faith, “statutory ecclesiastical faith is all that they understand by the word.” (Rel 6:108) We may rightly say: indeed, clash of ecclesiastical faiths is inevitable. As Kant indicated that religious struggles had “so often shaken the world and spattered it with blood,” (Rel 6:108) Historical religion “have never been anything but squabbles over ecclesiastical faiths,” (Rel 6:108) ecclesiastical faiths carries the consciousness of its contingency, there can be several.(Rel 6:115) “So too each and every church entertains the proud pretension of becoming a universal one; as soon as it has propagated and acquires ascendancy, however, a principle of dissolution and schism into various sects makes its appearance.”(Rel 6:123)

A ecclesiastical faiths is only Historical faith.12 Historical faith is only contingent, statutory forms of faith are divers, despite as Prof. Küng claims that they have very much in common, and know very many much more concrete maxims,13 we all know that these common concrete maxims: “You shall not kill!” “You shall not steal!”“Deal honestly and fairly!” “You shall not lie!” “You shall not commit sexual immorality!” “Respect and love one another!” etc., but differences of faiths still split the world into bitter parties. As Kant described: In the West, the spiritual leader ruled over kings, and “incited them to foreign wars (the Crusades)”, “bloodthirsty hatred against their otherwise-minded conferees in one and the same so-called universal

as long as he does not wish his brother what he wishes himself (Forty Hadith of an-Nawawi, 13).[...]

11 Ibid.,11.
12 Kant said:“Historical faith (which is based upon revelation as experience) has only particular validity, namely for those in contact with the history on which the faith rests, and, like all cognition based on experience, carries with it the consciousness not that the object believed in must be so and not otherwise but only that it is so; hence it carries at the same time the consciousness of its contingency. This faith can therefore indeed suffice as an ecclesiastical faith (of which there can be several); [...])(Rel 6:115) “And, whether given to each individual secretly or publicly - that it may be propagated among human beings through tradition or scripture - this revelation would be a historical and not a purely rational faith.”(Rel 6:104)
Christianity”. (Rel 6:131) He indicates that this history of Christianity, when beheld in a single glance, like a painting, could indeed justify the outcry, *tantum religio potuit suadere malorum!*, 14 (Rel 6:131) Kant prejudge that “the root of this strife, which lies hidden in the fundamental principle of an ecclesiastical faith which rules despotically, and still occasions apprehension over the replaying of similar scenes: [...]” (Rel 6:131)

“Such evil deeds could religion prompt!” (Rel 6:131) I agree with Kant’s teaching, “only the pure faith of religion, based entirely on reason, can be recognized as necessary and hence as the one which exclusively marks out the true Church.” (Rel 6:115) Only through the basic principles of the one religion of reason, viz. Moral religion, viz. a free faith, we can establish tolerance among their adherents. (Rel 6:122) We must carry “a principle for continually coming closer to pure religious faith” (Rel 6:115) until finally we can dispense clash of historical faith.

For Kant, our agreed values and standards, if any, can stem from nowhere except our own reason. Dialogue and tolerance without principles may result in nothing more than yet another occasion for restatement, or even reinforcement of one’s own private beliefs or political claims. Indeed there are several kinds of fundamental trusts, but it is need to have a common trust, which is “the final end”. the final end bases on reason, therefore, it is similar for everybody. For Kant, “namely, of the exact harmony of happiness with morality”, (KpV 5:125) “that is, the idea of a highest good in the world”, “it meets our natural need.” 15 (Rel 6:5) Everyone “would also will the very existence of such a world”, and “the highest good possible through us be actualized”.

We all hope that peace between the religions and civilizations will possible in the future, therefore as Kant pronounces clearly that all historical faiths, including the historical Christian religion, should be transformed to the only one genuine and pure religion in the end, which is based entirely on reason. Of course as “A Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities” asserts that “human aspirations for progress can only be realised by agreed values and standards applying to all people and institutions at all times.” But I still want to say that only “a minimum of common values, standards, and basic attitudes,” in short, “a global ethic” is not enough. For fulfilling an eternal peace in the world, it is need to “a true enlightenment (an order of law originating in moral freedom).” (Rel 6:122) Through true enlightenment introduce “a pure religious faith, over which there can be no dissension of opinions,” (Rel 6:131) “i. e. to win over to the new faith”, thereof take back the diversity of statutory forms of faith, which “has wrecked the human race, and still tears it apart.” (Rel 6:131)

We must have an enlightenment in the 21th century. What Is Enlightenment? For Kant’s view, true enlightenment is: everyone “not being not being passive with his reason but always being legislative for himself”, “the person who would only be adequate to his essential end and does not demand to know that which is beyond his

---

15 Kant said: “This idea is not (practically considered) an empty one; for it meets our natural need, which would otherwise be a hindrance to moral resolve, to think for all our doings and nondoisings taken as a whole some sort of ultimate end which reason can justify.” (Rel 6:5)
understanding,[…].” (KU 5:294) In his essay “What Is Enlightenment?”, Kant says: “Yet nothing but freedom is required for this enlightenment. And indeed it is the most harmless sort of freedom that may be properly called freedom, namely: to make public use of one’s reason in all matters.” (KGS 8:36) also:

Enlightenment is the human being’s emancipation from its self-incurred immaturity. 1 Immaturity is the inability to make use of one’s intellect without the direction of another. This immaturity is self-incurred when its cause does not lie in a lack of intellect, but rather in a lack of resolve and courage to make use of one’s intellect without the direction of another. “Sapere aude! Have the courage to make use of your own intellect!” is hence the motto of enlightenment. (KGS 8:35)

Of course it is very difficult.16 “Reason is the ability of a creature to extend the rules and ends of the use of all of its powers far beyond its natural instincts”, (KGS 8:18-19) therefore it must “requires experimentation, practice, and instruction in order to advance gradually from one stage of insight to the next”, “it requires a perhaps incalculable number of generations, of which each passes its enlightenment on to the next.” (KGS 8:19) Reason as the natural predisposition, its use is “to be developed in full only in the species, but not in the individual,” and it is necessary to develop fully in accordance with its purpose. (KGS 8:18)

Kant indicate that there is only one and the same true religion which is purely moral and rational faith, and “pure moral legislation” (viz. Reason legislation) “is not only the unavoidable condition of all true religion in general but also that which actually constitutes such religion,[…].” (Rel 6:104) Therefore we can say that each individual can recognize his religion through his own reason. (Rel 6:104) Any sort of “historical faith will finally pass over”, “into pure religious faith.” (Rel 6:117) As Kant claim that “under an autonomous principle which is one and the same for all human beings and for all times,” (Rel 6:124) in erecting a community “according to the laws of virtue”, “proclaims the victory over evil” and “assures the world of an eternal peace.” (Rel 6:124)

**THE ETHICAL COMMUNITY AND PERPETUAL PEACE**

I agree with Kant: “Just as the juridical state of nature”, the ethical state of nature “is a state of war of every human being”,17 (Rel 6:96) “and this is a condition of war”, “this condition is a continual violation of the rights of all others”. (Rel 6:97) For,

---

16 Kant said:“One readily sees that while enlightenment is easy in thesi, in hypothesi it is a difficult matter that can only be accomplished slowly:[…].” (KU 5:294)

17 Kant said:“Hobbes's statement, status hominum naturalis est helium omnium in omnes, has no other fault apart from this: it should say, est status belli... etc. For, even though one may not concede that actual hostilities are the rule between human beings who do not stand under external and public laws, their condition (status juridicus), i. e. the relationship in and through which they are capable of rights (of their acquisition and maintenance) is nonetheless one in which each of them wants to be himself the judge of what is his right vis-a-vis others, without however either having any security from others with respect to this right or offering them any: and this is a condition of war, wherein every man must be constantly armed against everybody else. Hobbes's second statement, exequum esse e statu naturali, [...].” (Rel 6:97)
everyone has “the presumption of being the judge in one's own affairs”, and “in theirs save one's own faculty of desire of choice [Willkün].” (Rel 6:97)

As Kant indicate: “even with the good will of each individual”, “every morally well-disposed human being” is nevertheless in this perilous state. (Rel 6:93) The causes that “draw him into this danger come from the human beings to whom he stands in relation or association”. 18 (Rel 6:93) In modern times “political community”, as Kant said: “still in the ethical state of nature, and have the right to remain in it”. (Rel 6:95) In the ethical state of nature they “will mutually corrupt each other's moral disposition and make one another evil”. (Rel 6:94) “however much the individual human being might do to escape from the dominion of this evil, he would still be held in incessant danger of relapsing into it.” (Rel 6:94) Kant’s claim is right: so is the ethical state of nature a public feuding between the principles of virtue and a state of inner immorality which the natural human being ought to endeavor to leave behind as soon as possible. (Rel 6:97)

Not without reason, we demand that “a union which has for its end the prevention of this evil and the promotion of the good in the human being” (Rel 6:94) should be set up. This union is “an association of human beings merely under the laws of virtue”, through “morally legislative reason”, setting up” a society in accordance with, and for the sake of, the laws of virtue”, “as rallying point for all those who love the good”. (Rel 6:94) This union can be called an ethical community, (Rel 6:94) i. e. a kingdom of virtue (of the good principle). (Rel 6:95) In this union human beings “are united under laws without being coerced, i. e. under laws of virtue alone.” (Rel 6:95)

According to the tradition of Confucius’s philosophy, ethical community, is a society, wherein an association of human beings under the principle of “ren”19 and “yi”20 Mencius said, “Ministers will serve their sovereign, cherishing the principles of ‘ren’ and ‘yi’, sons will serve their fathers, and younger brothers will serve their elder brothers, in the same way - and so, sovereign and minister, father and son, elder brother and younger, abandoning the thought of profit, will cherish the principles of ‘ren’ and ‘yi’, and carry on all their intercourse upon them.”21 (Mencius. Gaozi II) In Kant's

---

18 Kant said: “Envy, addiction to power, avarice, and the malignant inclinations associated with these, assail his nature, which on its own is undemanding, as soon as he is among human beings.” (Rel 6:97)

19 Translate “ren”(仁) into English “benevolence” generally, but “benevolence” cannot adequately express the meaning of “ren”.

20 Translate “yi”(義) into English “righteousness” generally, but we must indicate that the meaning of “yi”(義) is more originally and plentifully than “righteousness”. Many words of the Confucian philosophy don’t translate well, therefore I will transliterate these Chinese words into phonetic symbols in my essay.

21 Also Mencius went to see king Hui of Liang. The king said, “Venerable sir, since you have not counted it far to come here, a distance of a thousand li, may I presume that you are provided with counsels to profit my kingdom?” Mencius replied, ‘Why must your Majesty use that word ‘profit’? What I am provided with, are counsels to ‘ren’ and ‘yi’, and these are my only topics. ‘If your Majesty say, ‘What is to be done to profit my kingdom?’ the great officers will say, ‘What is to be done to profit our families?’ and the superior officers and the common people will say, ‘What is to be done to profit our persons?’” Superiors and inferiors will try to snatch this profit the one from the other, and the kingdom will be
words, “[…]to regard it [a universal doctrine of Prudence] as a theory of maxims according to which one selects the most effective means to attain ends to one’s own advantage, that is, to deny that morality exists at all.” (KGS 8:370)

As Kant indicated that human beings “shall not partake in any happiness or perfection other than that which they attain free of instinct and by means of their own reason” (KGS 8:19). If we abandon the faculty of reason and the freedom of will, i.e. give up “those natural predispositions aimed at the use of its reason”, then “human beings, who are otherwise so enamored of unrestrained freedom”, “inflict on each other, whose natural inclinations make them unable to live together in a state of wild freedom for very long.” (KGS 8:19) Therefore everyone must begin to found “a manner of thinking”, “through continual enlightenment”, “to transform the primitive natural predisposition for moral discernment into definite practical principles and, in this way, to ultimately transform an agreement to society that initially had been pathologically coerced into a moral whole.” (KGS 8:21)

A moral whole, i.e., aethical community, according to the tradition of Confucius’s philosophy, namely a society which is Great Unity and Harmony (datong: 大同). Of course, we all know: human beings are not only as a moral species, but also as a natural species. As Kant indicated: “since culture, according to true principles of the education as both human being and citizen, perhaps has not even really begun, much less been completed”, therefore all true afflictions arise which weigh on human life, and all vices that dishonor it. (KGS 8:116-117) I believe Kant is right, he indicated “the ultimate aim of the moral destiny of the human race” (KGS 8:118), i.e.: “culture must progress such that the capacities of humankind as a moral species properly develop toward its destiny so that the latter no longer conflict with the former as a natural species.” (KGS 8:116) As Kant indicated that we have no reason to “excuse that human nature is incapable of good in the way that the idea of reason dictates it, and the only effect that they have is to make progress impossible and to perpetuate the violation of right”22 (KGS 8:373)

As Kant indicate: “Everything in nature works in accordance with laws”, only we human being has the faculty to act in accordance with the representation of laws, i.e., in accordance with principles, or a will.” (Gr 4: 412) This fact express clearly we are as already existing free beings,(Rel 6:142) namely we can according to the laws are moral beings, who are determined to citizenship in an ethical community, “not in virtue of their creation, but because of a purely moral necessitation, only possible according to the laws of freedom.” (Rel 6:142-143)

endangered. In the kingdom of ten thousand chariots, the murderer of his sovereign shall be the chief of a family of a thousand chariots. In the kingdom of a thousand chariots, the murderer of his prince shall be the chief of a family of a hundred chariots. To have a thousand in ten thousand, and a hundred in a thousand, cannot be said not to be a large allotment, but if righteousness be put last, and profit be put first, they will not be satisfied without snatching all. […]” (Mencius. Liang Hui Wang I)

22 Kant said: “In this human nature is also brought into consideration, which, since respect for right and duty are still animate in it, I cannot or do not want to regard as so sunken in evil that moral practical reason cannot, after many unsuccessful attempts, ultimately triumph over evil and show it to be worthy of love.” (KGS 8:313)
Kant state clearly: “The physical and, at the same time, the moral predisposition in us”, (Rel 6:121) the latter serve “to make all the more profound the union of minds with the good (which never leaves the thoughts of human beings after these have once cast their eyes upon it).” (Rel 6:122) “Thus freedom - a property which is made manifest to the human being through the determination of his will” [Willkür] by the unconditional moral law”, “since cognition of it can be communicated to everyone.” (Rel 6:138) It is fact that “the human being is called to a good life conduct through the moral law; that, through an indelible respect for this law which lies in him”, (Rel 6:144) “reason, heart, and conscience all teach this and drive us to it”. (Rel 6:145)

The mere fact that human beings have “the faculty of reason and the freedom of will based on this faculty”, is a clear express: “they were intended neither to be led by instinct, nor to be supplied and instructed with innate knowledge; they were intended to produce everything themselves.” (KGS 8:19) For Kant, our will as intelligences, in other words, as our proper self, (Gr 4:461) For Confucius (551-479B.C.) that is: “ren is the characteristic element of humanity”. (仁者人也) (The Maintaining Perfect Balance, ch.20) this statement interpreted “ren” as essence of human being, thereof to claim what is human being, and to indicate the inner nature and most important quality of human being. Thereafter Mencius (about 385-304B.C.) indicated that “ren is the characteristic element of humanity. As embodied in man's conduct, it is called the path of duty.” (仁者，人也。合而言之，道也。) (Mengzi - Jin Xin II) Also he said:“ren is man's mind, and is man's path. How lamentable is it to neglect the path and not pursue it, to lose this mind and not know to seek it again!” (Mengzi - Gaozi I) Ren is man's mind, here, “mind”never is mental, for Mengzi it is called “ben xin” (本心), which is a transcendential faculty, and inner nature of mind of human being. The Neo-Confucianist, Zhang Zai (張載), also said:“Righteousness, propriety, wisdom, and faithfulness are all [expressions of] ren.”

We would indicate that Confucius continued the wisdom of ancient Chinese civilization and originated the tradition of Chinese philosophy which highlights the civilization of Reason. In fact, according to the tradition of Confucius’s philosophy, the original mind (ren) has been no longer simply the source of some concrete virtue or in the empirical limits, but the ultimate reality originating all virtues and all things. Like the higher faculty of desire, viz.pure practical Reason (viz.freedom of will [Freiheit des Willens]), in Kant’s philosophy, which includes a will which by all its maxims enacts universal law. As the Neo-Confucianist, Wang Yangming (王陽明) stated “xin ji li” (心即理), he said, “The transcendental mind is supreme principle.” According to the tradition of Confucius’s philosophy, the universal law is originated from everyone’s transcendent mind, and everyone should act on this law. Just as Kant said, “Act from pure duty [aus reiner Pflicht zu handeln]).” (Gr 4:406)

24 For Kant, Reason prescribes laws a priori for the faculty of desire, i.e., “the will is nothing but practical reason.” About an overview of all faculty of mind and their higher faculty in their systematic unity, Cf. KU 5:198.
The “li” (理) namely the supreme principle of morality includes both the universality of the legislation of human reason and absolute necessity of the supreme principle. Confucius said: “Wishing to be established himself, seeks also to establish others; wishing to be enlarged himself, he seeks also to enlarge others.” (The Analects - Yan Yuan) This quotation can be said the expression of the highest moral principle, which expression is also called the moral golden rule.

The transcendental mind (ben xin), which is similar to “the freedom of the will”[Freiheit des Willens]. It also includes a “sensus communis”[Gemeinsinn], which makes our feeling “universally communicable”. (KU 5:295) We are able to say that “ben xin” (the freedom of the will) can be regarded as a creative faculty, making a man a moral being, as well as making the world a moral world (as a system of final causes). The tradition of Confucius and Kant’s philosophy both include a Moral philosophy, which is built on the principle of freedom which is the highest principle generated by the freedom of the will and it is also the ultimate root of the development of the individuals, as well as the whole universe.

It would seem merely quaint to query why we are moral. Human being is moral, namely, “their existence according to laws which are independent of every empirical condition and, therefore, belong to the autonomy of pure reason.” (KpV 5:43) Please attention! Don’t confuse in distinguishing the ethics and morality. Morality never be

25 As Kant said: “If one adds that unless one wants to dispute whether the concept of morality has any truth and relation to any possible object, one could not deny that its law is of such an extensive significance that it would have to be valid not merely for human beings but for all rational beings in general, and not merely under contingent conditions and with exceptions, but with absolute necessity, then it is clear that no experience could give occasion for inferring even the possibility of such apodictic laws. For with what right could we bring into unlimited respect, as a universal precept for the universe, that which is perhaps valid only under the contingent conditions of humanity, and how should laws for the determination of our will be taken as laws for the determination of the will of a rational being in general, and only as such also for our will, if they were merely empirical and did not take their origin fully a priori from pure but practical reason?” (Gr 4:408)

26 Kant said: “Now, a system of nature, in the most general sense, is the existence of things under laws. The sensible nature of rational beings in general is their existence under laws empirically conditioned, which, from the point of view of reason, is heteronomy. The supersensible nature of the same beings, on the other hand, is their existence according to laws which are independent of every empirical condition and, therefore, belong to the autonomy of pure reason.” (KpV 5:43)

27 See Lectures on Ethics, (translated by Louis Infield, Peter Smith, 1978, p.73.) Kant indicated that the general ethics has no vocabulary to express the moral nature, and thus it has caused the confusion in distinguishing the ethics and morality in the tradition of Western ethics. (Ethik 85) He said, “The German word, Sitten, like the Latin mores, means only manners (Manieren) and customs (Lebensart).” (MS 6:216) We know that Hegel advocated the virtue of custom. His critique in Kant’s moral philosophy is used to be the basis for replacing the morality (Moralität) which Kant had interpreted, together with the social ethos (Sittlichkeit). According to Hegel’s, the freedom of the will (Freiheit des Willens) is only an idea, which is Jenseits, as a postulate only, also being subjective and therefore lacking of objective reality; the moral law is just an empty form; the morality (Moralität) is empty and nothing. Hegel’s critique of Kant’s moral philosophy is his radical rejection of the doctrine of the freedom of the will (Freiheit des Willens). Hegel and his fellows do not admit that everyone’s reason (Vernunft) is the capacity of being legislative universally. Their entire line of criticism is misguided, since it has advocated a misunderstanding in the comprehension of Kant’s position. Kant indicated that the moral law must be the universal form, but the critic misinterpreted that he had advocated, “The individual action must be formal.” As a result, Kant’s moral theory is misread as “an empty formalism”. In addition, Kant indicated that moral law is the law of our intelligible existence (das Gesetz unserer intelligibelen Existenz), but the critic misunderstood that the moral law is only a logical form, and concluded that Kant’s Moral theory is nothing. Obviously, the problem caused is simply due to Hegel
the virtue of custom or social model, never be character - cultivation. What is morality? Morality contains nothing but legislation of human reason, i.e., one is subject only to law, which man makes by himself, yet are universal. Kant said, “All morality is derived from the conformity of our actions to the laws of reason.”28 (Ethik 22) Confucius also said, “I could follow desire of my mind [which it is in accord with the true goodness], without transgressing moral principle.” (The Analects - Wei Zheng) Namely, morality is the pure practical faculty of reason in us, “that is, a power to determine their causality by the conception of rules; and, therefore, so far as they are capable of acting according to principles, and consequently also according to practical a priori principles.” (KpV 5:32)

Of course we have to admit that “Human nature seems nowhere less worthy of love than in relations among entire peoples”, “the will to subjugate one another or diminish what belongs to the other is always there”, (KGS 8:312) as Kant has already pointed out, “for an enduring general peace by means of the so called balance of powers” is a mere fantasy.29 (KGS 8:312) In his essay “Toward Perpetual Peace”, Kant pointed out correctly: “The state of nature (status naturalis) is not a state of peace among human beings who live next to one another but a state of war, that is, if not always an outbreak of hostilities, then at least the constant threat of such hostilities.” (KGS 8:348-349) Also said: “Peoples, as states, can be judged as individual human beings who, when in the state of nature (that is, when they are independent from external laws), bring harm to each other already through their proximity to one another, and each of whom, [...].”(KGS8:354)

Nowadays, the key-note of ideology doesn’t allow talking about Reason and Morality. But I will ask how we get rid of the state of war in modern times, except “let everyone be free to make use of his own reason in all matters of conscience.” (KGS 8:40) Indeed “we are cultivated to a great extent by the arts and the sciences”, so that we are civilized to much trouble. “The human being is nevertheless in this perilous state through his own fault”. (Rel 6:93) Today we have set up a “juridico-civil”, but juridico-civil is “still in the ethical state of nature”, (Rel 6:95) namely “a condition of war, wherein every man must be constantly armed against everybody else.”(Rel 6:97) Hence we must apply as much force as we can muster in order to extricate ourselves from it. But how? Kant put forward his answer completely in his essay “Toward Perpetual Peace”. I will talk about some of main-points here.30

1. In “first definitive article of perpetual peace”, Kant proposed “the civil constitution of every state shall be republican”. (KGS 8:349) He said that besides “its

and his fellows who still hold on an implausible assertion. According to their assertion, the particular interest of an agent and the individual’s desires are the most important out of all.(See Hegel, Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte, S.34.)

28 Lectures on Ethics, p.12. ( » [...] da alle Moralität aus der Übereinstimmung unserer Handlungen mit den Gesetzen der Vernunft abgeleitet wird.«)
29 Kant said: “For an enduring general peace by means of the so called balance of powers in Europe is, like Swift’s house, which was built so perfectly by a master builder according to all the laws of equilibrium that it immediately collapsed when a sparrow landed on it, is a mere fantasy.” (KGS 8:312)
30 I must postpone the further explanation and discussion for another occasion, because my essay may not be too long.
having sprung from the pure source of the concept of right”, the republican constitution also offers the prospect of “perpetual peace”.(KGS 8:351) Because “in such a constitution the agreement of the citizens is required to decide whether or not one ought to wage war, then nothing is more natural than that they would consider very carefully whether to enter into such a terrible game.[...].”(KGS 8:351) By contrast, “in one which is not republican, declaring war is the easiest thing in the World”.(KGS 8:351)

2. In “second definitive article of perpetual peace”, Kant proposed “pacific federation (foedus pacificum)”, he said: “This federation would be distinct from a peace treaty (pactum pacis) in that it seeks to end not merely one war, as does the latter, but rather to end all wars forever.” (KGS8:356) A special sort of federation aims at “its securing and maintaining the freedom of a state for itself and also the freedom of other confederated states without these states thereby being required”, “to subject themselves to public laws and coercion under such laws.”(KGS8:356) Kant call “a pacific federation”, it “should gradually encompass all states and thereby lead to perpetual peace”,(KGS8:356) namely, lead to “the positive idea of a world republic”. (KGS8:356)

3. In “third definitive article of perpetual peace”, Kant proposed “cosmopolitan right”. (KGS8:357) He said: “As in the previous articles, we are concerned here with right, not with philanthropy.”(KGS8:357) He indicated that “the right of common possession of the surface of the earth”, “and originally no one has more of a right to be at a given place on earth than anyone else.”(KGS8:358) “The rights of humankind must be held sacred, whatever it may cost those in power.”(KGS8:380) Kant stated clearly that the concept of right “is the sole possible basis for perpetual peace.” (KGS8:380)

4. About the transcendental concept of public right. Kant stressed “publicity” of public right (KGS8:381)

About “publicity”, he said:”Any legal claim must be capable of publicity.” (KGS8:381) He indicated the transcendental formula of public right: “All actions that affect the rights of other human beings, the maxims of which are incompatible with publicity, are unjust.”(KGS8:381) He also proposed transcendental and affirmative principle of public right: “All maxims that require publicity (in order that they not miss their aim) are in agreement with both politics and right.”(KGS 8:386) I agreed with Kant’s teaching, those maxims through “publicity” can attain their end, “then they must also conform to the general end of the public (happiness)”, and “these maxims must also be in harmony with the right of the public”, “for it is in public right

31 Kant said: “Because the head of state is not a fellow citizen, but rather the owner of the state, and hence forfeits nothing of his feasts, hunts, summer residences, court festivals, and such things due to the war. The head of state can decide to wage war for insignificant reasons as a kind of game for amusement and can, for the sake of decency, indifferently leave its justification up to his diplomatic corps, which always stands ready for such tasks.”(KGS8:351)

32 Kant said: “And while a peace treaty achieves an end to the present war, it does not achieve an end to the state of war (always allowing a pretext to be found for a new war).”(KGS8:355)
alone that the ends of everyone can be unified.” (KGS:386)

5. It is the most important that Kant stated clearly that reason “makes peace an immediate duty. (KGS:356) He said: “From the throne of the highest moral legislative authority, reason looks down on and condemns war as a means of pursuing one’s rights, […]” (KGS:356) We claim that “There shall be no war among us”, “that is, to establish a supreme legislative” which originates reason (Vernunft), “executive, and judicial authority” over ourselves that will settle our disputes in a peaceful manner.” (KGS:356) By contrast, today many states says that “There shall be no war between myself and other states”, but they “acknowledge no superior legislative authority”. In modern times the inclination to throw over one’s reason leads one’s “wild (lawless) freedom”. As Kant indicated that the lawless condition “contains only war”, in this condition, “international right as a right to war”, which “not according to universally valid external laws that restrict the freedom of every individual”. (KGS:357) Kant said that “just that people who are so disposed annihilate each other and thereby find perpetual peace in the vast grave”33 that covers all the horrors of violence together with their perpetrators.” (KGS:357)

What is the essence with regard to perpetual peace? In Kant’s words, it regards the end that our own reason makes into a duty for human beings. (KGS:365) We desire perpetual peace, not merely as a physical good, but rather also as a condition that arises from the recognition of duty.” (KGS 8:377) It is a “moral task”, but it is not a “technical task”. (KGS 8:377)

Kant said: “Seek first the kingdom of pure practical reason and its justice, and your end (the blessing of perpetual peace) will come to you of itself.” (KGS:378) He indicated a basic principle of moral politics: “A people ought to unite itself into a state in accordance with the ideas of freedom and equality as the sole concepts of right, and this principle is not based on prudence, but rather on duty. “(KGS:378) We all know, in modern times a large number of politicians and philosophers argue against Kant, “by speaking of the natural mechanism of a mass of people who enter into society with each other”, they rely take care the physical predisposition, but not admitted the moral predisposition in us. Therefore they merely permit talking about the contingency, all are as much a contingency, “as are the orchids and the anthropoids”34, but don’t admit any inevitability. And they merely recognize individual particularity, and denied the universality of human nature, also is not acknowledged moral law, namely the common principle for each and every one is effective.

33 Kant said: “We can leave open the question whether this satirical caption to the picture of a graveyard, which was painted on the sign of a Dutch innkeeper, applies to human beings in general, or specifically to the heads of state, who can never get enough of war, or even just to philosophers who dream the sweet dream of perpetual peace.” (KGS:343)

34 Cf. Richard Rorty, Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity, Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 16. Richard Rorty, a neo-pragmatist, who calls himself a “liberal ironist”, (ibid., pp.xv.) He said: “I use ‘ironist’ to name the sort of person who faces up to the contingency of his or her own most central beliefs and desires, […]” (ibid.) Rorty is an agent of “a rich twentieth-century democratic society”. He is speaking for all of ideologies of postmetaphysical culture.
Richard Rorty said: “To see one's language, one's conscience, one's morality, and one's highest hopes as contingent products, as literalizations of what once were accidentally produced metaphors, is to adopt a self-identity which suits one for citizenship in such an ideally liberal state. That is why the ideal citizen of such an ideal state would be someone who thinks of the founders and the preservers of her society as such poets, rather than as people who had discovered or who clearly envisioned the truth about the world or about Humanity.”

He also said: “Freud thus helps us take seriously the possibility that there is no central faculty, no central self, called ‘reason’ […].” He claimed that “notions of truth, rationality, and moral obligation” had become “an impediment to the preservation and progress of democratic societies”.

Historicism, irrationalism, relativism, pragmatist, neo-pragmatist, aestheticism, all of which had their foundations in modernity. They all denied that there is such a thing as ‘human nature’, and suggest there are no any common criterion and law. They defense of “negative liberty”, and call “freedom as the recognition of contingency”. Therefore they opposed to “freedom of will”, which for Kant freedom of will (Freiheit des Willens) is a property which is made be regarded as a creative faculty, which rests upon originally legislative (gesetzgebenden) of reason. Through this faculty, “the freedom of each can coexist with that of the others.” (B373) And the end of each as final trust, that is final end (Zndzweck) can share with others.

If we do not follow the teachings of Confucius and Kant, and the human race do not progress further from the current stage of civilization and pay higher regard to our moral vocation (moralisiert), “one cannot say ahead of time whether the discord that is so natural to our species will in the end prepare a hell of ills for us in however civilized a condition, in that nature will perhaps annihilate again, through barbaric devastations, this condition and all the previous steps of culture.” (KGS 8:25) In fact, as Kant cautions us, if we assume that the nature is purpose in its parts but purposeless as a whole, then we cannot extricate ourselves from the rule of blind chance. (see KGS 8:25) Nowadays, the world is full of threats such as nuclear weapons, terrorism, environmental pollution, and so on.

In today we have all kinds of “peace treaties”, but they actually are mere cease-fires. People favoring lawless freedom over freedom which Roots from reason, as Kant said: “cling to their lawless freedom, preferring to fight continually amongst one another rather.” (KGS 8:354) We can indicate that modern civilization is based on

---

35 Ibid., pp.61.
36 Ibid., pp.33.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid., pp.46. Rorty said: “Figures like Nietzsche, William James, Freud, Proust, and Wittgenstein illustrate what I have call ‘freedom as the recognition of contingency’.” He also said: “In Bedin's words, we need to give up ‘the conviction that all the positive values in which men have believed must, in the end, be compatible, and perhaps even entail each other’.” (ibid., pp.45.)
39 As Prof. Küng said: “But let us think also of everyday life, of the ever more frequent and unprecedented scandals involving leading politicians, bankers, businessmen, trade unionists in our industrialized nations, involving also the media and even the International Olympic Committee. Let us finally also think of the egocentricity, consumerism, violence, and xenophobia of so many people.”(Hans Kung, “A Global Ethic in World Politics: the Middle Way Between ‘Real Politics’ and ‘Ideal Politics’”, pp.14)
natural law, therefore still in the state of nature (status naturalis), so still in a state of war. (KGS 8:348-349) As Kant indicated if there is no freedom and no moral law based upon it, and everything that happens or could happen is a mere mechanism of nature (KGS 8:372), then we don’t guarantee a state of peace.

We must indicate that modern civilization is like Cyclops, “because it lacks one eye, the eye of true philosophy”(Anthro 7:227), namely an eye which rests upon originally legislative of reason. All people around the world together to get rid of the state of nature (state of war), through an enlightenment in the 21st century. Namely through Revival of Confucian and Return to Kant, set up the Enlightenment from Reason.

The state of peace must be established. (KGS 8:349) Kant suggested: “ a powerful and enlightened people can constitute itself as a republic (which according to its nature necessarily tends toward perpetual peace), then this republic provides a focus point for other states, so that they might join this federative union and thereby secure the condition of peace among states in accordance with the idea of international right and gradually extend this union further and further through several such associations.”(KGS 8:356)

Huntington in his essay “The Clash of Civilizations?” demand for the West “to develop a more profound understanding of the basic religious and philosophical assumptions underlying the other civilizations and the ways in which people in those civilizations see their interest.” Prof. Küng said: “In my opinion Huntington certainly exaggerates when he suggests in his later statement that the great civilizations have to be considered as the dominant paradigm for the political controversies of the new world epoch, which has replaced the Cold War paradigm and the First-Second-Third World scheme.” Of course we know if the Western civilization is still in the state of nature, Huntington’s suggestion is certainly exaggerated statement. But we still expect some powerful nations (i.e., Europe and America, or China) will transform the modern civilization into the civilization which rests upon reason through continual enlightenment, then, “a pacific federation” is able to set up, in however distant a future.

many believe that our world is drawing near to its end. I have to admit frankly that I do not have the slightest idea about it, but I know that, as Kant enlightens us with his philosophy, our existence and future must be determined by ourselves. I agree with Prof. Küng said:

Together we can move mountains!

2016.05.06

---

42 Ibid**, pp.18.
Note on sources and key to abbreviations and translations


**A/B**: *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (KGS 3, 4).

**Gr**: *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* (KGS 4).

**KpV**: *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (KGS 5).

**KU**: *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (KGS 5).
*The Critique of Judgement*, translated by James Creed Meredith, Litt.D. (T.C.D)

**MS**: *Die Metaphysik der Sitten* (KGS 6).

**Rel**: *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft* (KGS 6).

**Ethik**: *Eine Vorlesung über Ethik*, Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1990.

Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht, 1784 (KGS8:17-31).


Muthmaßlicher Anfang der Menschengeschichte, 1786 (KGS 8:109-123).
Speculative Beginning of Human History, Perpetual Peace and Other Essays, p.49-60.

Über den Gemeinspruch: Das mag in der Theorie richtig sein, taugt aber nicht für die Praxis, 1793 (KGS 8:275-313).
On the Proverb: That May be True in Theory, But Is of No Practical Use, Perpetual Peace and Other Essays, p.61-92.

Zum ewigen Frieden- Ein Philosophischer Entwurf, 1795 (KGS 8:343-386).
To Perpetual Peace A Philosophical Sketch, Perpetual Peace and Other Essays, p.107-143.