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ABSTRACT

Hans Küng was concerned with the crises and problems in contemporary economy, therefore, he believes that today’s capitalist society needs a disciplinary value, and he has also expanded the political duty of national leaders from national responsibilities to global responsibilities. From this angle, he introduced the concepts of world society and world domestic politics (Küng, 1998:85-95), which stresses that the pursuit of national wealth and strength is of national responsibility, and this kind of practice is the same as shifting one’s trouble onto others from the perspectives of global responsibility, world society, and world domestic politics, making it very ill-advised. When considering the crises in capitalism from the perspectives of global responsibility, world society, and world domestic politics, it is important and necessary to mention world ethic (universal ethic) – the basis for common values in the world society.
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INTRODUCTION

In the “Future of Capitalism,” L. C. Thurow (1996) proposed his observation on the crisis in contemporary capitalist societies and concerns in the following four aspects: instability of global economy, fundamental religious doctrines and racial issues, the stand-off between democracy and market economy, and issues with capitalist values (Thurow, 1996: 43-278). Thurow is not the only one with such worries; Fukuyama (1993), who proposed that history had ended up as capitalism and democracy at the end of the Cold War, continued to contemplate on mankind’s dignity and sovereignty under capitalism and the drawbacks of capitalism itself. In his books such as “Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity” and “Our Post-human Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution,” Fukuyama gave an in-depth look at the drawbacks and challenges faced by capitalist societies (Fukuyama, 1993:3-12,287-340, and Fukuyama, 1996: 3-32,349-362, and Fukuyama, 2000: 3-127, 249-282, and Fukuyama, 2002: 105-180). What S. P. Huntington (1996) considered was the external variable – clash of civilization, that challenged capitalist societies. He examined its conflict with Western universalisms through aspects such as history, population growth of different civilizations, success and failure of modernization of civilizations, and renaissance of different religions (Huntington, 1996: 19-120, 183-206 ).

To address the above mentioned crisis, what Thurow proposes is that the capitalist value and ideology of seeking minimum cost and maximum profit should be adjusted in order to face the current challenges and crises(Thurow, 1996: 115). Fukuyama also believes that the development of capitalist societies is now facing serious difficulties, including the escalating crime rate, divorce rate, and illegitimate children, decline of social trust, and selfish investors, thus he has introduced the concept of social capitalism which he believes is capable of lowering the risks of a capitalist society ( Fukuyama, 2000: 143-248 ) . Huntington (1996) believes that besides avoiding conflicts among neighboring nations of different civilizations and different civilization groups within the same nation, the fundamental solution is to find what different civilizations have in common (Huntington, 1996: 266-322 ). Comparing the solutions proposed by Thurow, Fukuyama, and Huntington, we see that Thurow’s proposal is least specific as it only mentions adjustments in the capitalist value of seeking maximum profit, whereas Fukuyama’s social capitalism and Huntington’s proposal of seeking commonalities between different civilizations both imply universal ethic. One question that deserves our attention is whether Thurow’s proposal of adjusting problematic capitalist values would become effective after introducing the concept of universal ethic.
In terms of addressing the problems faced by post-capitalism, Thurow’s solution was to adjust capitalist values and ideology in order to deal with current challenges and crises (Thurow, 1996: 310-328) (Thurow, 1996: 310-328). G. Soros (1998) believes that today’s global capitalist societies are based on the faulty premise of traditional economics, and unlimited pursuit of profit and unregulated market will threaten the global capitalist structure and causing global crises. The solution to which is having universal beliefs that serve as the basis of the regulations and mechanisms needed by global mutual prosperity, and such beliefs can only be acquired through constant trial-and-error in an open society (Soros, 1998:1-4). Examining issues such as the escalating crime rate, divorce rate, and illegitimate children, decline of social trust, and selfish investors, Fukuyama (2000) believes that contemporary capitalism is forming a gigantic fault (Fukuyama, 2000:256-294, and Fukuyama, 1996:155-182). Since he believes that history has ended in the systems of democracy and capitalism, what Fukuyama (1996) cares about is the future existence of these two systems, thus the solution he proposed for the above-mentioned fault is to increase the social capital of a capitalist society in order to surpass the fault, and he also believes the most important social capital is trust. Social capital, according to Fukuyama, is basically the virtues in a society that facilitate economic development, and the fact that he treated “trust” as the most important social capital can be viewed as a re-interpretation of Weber’s “spirit of capitalism” (Fukuyama, 1996:204-211).

Huntington (1996) believes that besides avoiding conflicts among neighboring nations of different civilizations and among different civilization groups within the same nation, the fundamental solution is to find what different civilizations have in common (Huntington, 1996:266-322.). J. Habermas (1975) believes that if a government was expected to intervene in the problematic capitalist market and re-distribute wealth at a time of depression or high unemployment rate, it would hinder the sense of legitimacy in capitalism that uses the market mechanism as the fairest basis for wealth distribution and result in a crisis with the legitimacy of capitalism. The legitimacy of governmental intervention is rooted in ideologies which are generated from a systematic distortion of communication in the existing structure; therefore, the solution to avoiding crisis of legitimacy is the rationalization of the behavior of communication. Through the application of Kommunikationsethik and Universalpragmatik, communication is rationalized, and individuals under capitalism can reach a consensus based on their agreed common interest in order to avoid the crisis of legitimacy in late capitalism (Habermas, 1975:33-94).

The focus of K. Popper (1996) on the theories of democratic politics and its actual practice is that he believes that democracy is not “ruled by the many” since it would often lead to social tyranny; his definition of democracy is a system that frees everyone from dictatorship, thus the only way to ensure democracy is the effective restraint on governmental power (Popper & Bosetti, 1996:65-80). From the argument of capitalism being unfair in nature since it focuses on competition and efficiency, Thurow also reminds us that it is in conflict with democracy which stresses that all men are created equal. However, Thurow’s solution was only a vague proposal of adjusting capitalist values accordingly (Thurow, 1996: 242-278).

D. Held (1996) reminds us that a nation-state’s sovereignty is seriously losing touch with reality in terms of international law, international organization, hegemonic nations and international security, national identification and globalization of culture, and world economy, and this is why it is facing the impact of globalization and problems with the legitimacy of democracy (Held, 1996:99-140). Therefore, in order to prevent a nation-state’s sovereignty from being severely restricted, Held proposed cosmopolitan democracy and emphasized that democratic politics have to be re-shaped in the local, national/regional, and global dimension. Therefore, citizenship and citizenship rights should be re-defined with cosmopolitan democratic law (Held, 1996:239-266).

The Seek of Universal Ethic by Capitalist Values

The above literatures indicate that when facing crises in contemporary capitalism, Thurow (1996) believes the answer is to adjust capitalist values, which means capitalism should adjust the basis for ethic judgment. Fukuyama points out the importance of universal ethic as a social capital and stresses that “trust” is the most important social capital in the capitalist society. Huntington’s proposal of seeking commonalities between different civilizations and avoiding cultural clash actually implies identifying common values, making it also a concept of universal ethic. The solution of seeking the regulations and basis for different groups to co-exist and mutually prosper was proposed by
Soros for solving global capitalist crises, and it is also a pursuit of common values or universal ethic. As a student of Popper’s, Soros believes such universal values can only be obtained via the method of trial and error.

Habermas believes that by using Kommunikationsethik and Universalpragmatik, common values that satisfy different people’s interest can be found. What Popper (1996) sought after is a system that frees all people from dictatorship, and no doubt such system could only be established based on common values that are accepted by all people in a capitalist society. In essence, cosmopolitan democracy proposed by Held is a universal value and is a specific example of the latter. Hans Küng was also concerned with the crises and problems in contemporary economy and believes that with the end of WWI in 1918, the world and civil society that was rooted in Europe – the basis of modern world, has stopped at a fault while the post-modern world is developing towards a catastrophe. This is why German’s national socialism, Japan’s militarism, communism, and socialism, American new capitalism, and Japanese capitalism that were introduced after WWII all have their limitations in terms of future development. Therefore, main thoughts and ideologies are facing crises, and a preventative ethics is needed that helps maintain the basis of social values during the paradigm change of going from modernism to post-modernism (Küng, 1991:5-20). Therefore, he believes that today’s capitalist society needs a disciplinary value, and he has also expanded the political duty of national leaders from national responsibilities to global responsibilities. From this angle, he introduced the concepts of world society and world domestic politics (Küng, 1998:85-95), which stresses that the pursuit of national wealth and strength is of national responsibility, and this kind of practice is the same as shifting one’s trouble onto others from the perspectives of global responsibility, world society, and world domestic politics, making it very ill-advised. When considering the crises in capitalism from the perspectives of global responsibility, world society, and world domestic politics, it is important and necessary to mention world ethic (universal ethic) – the basis for common values in the world society.

Hans Küng’s philosophies are rooted in the concept of “every human being must be treated humanely,” from which he proposed the theory of world ethic (global ethic). Hans Küng expanded Huntington’s proposal of seeking inter-civilization commonalities and Walzer’s idea of fundamental ethic standards to the principle of world ethic that seeks a common ethic basis between different religions and cultures and four necessary standards, and it seems that he tried to understand the principle of world ethic and four necessary standards as a contract of world society. This is because Hans Küng strove for seeking common beliefs among different religions and cultures. For example, he stressed that the Confucian belief of “do unto others as you would have them do unto you” can be found in traditional oriental and Western ethics that seem different at a glance (Küng, 1998:80-85, 105-111, and Chen, 2000:158-159), and this kind of concept allows us to discover common ethics when facing ethic diversity. In other words, Hans Küng tried to determine common values in different cultures in order to show that the set of regulations are social contracts agreed by everyone in the world.

On the other hand, although ethic principles such as righteousness, respect, mercy, and honest are ancient and fundamental values (Küng, 1998:253-254), Hans Küng has not only proposed that democratic politics or ethics in market economy in today’s capitalist world are urgent and necessary but also returned these values back to the fundamental spirit of “every human being must be treated humanely.” More importantly, Hans Küng has successfully found commonalities among different oriental and Western religions, cultures, and ethics. For example, he has detected the Confucian belief of “do unto others as you would have them do unto you” in many religious doctrines around the world (Küng, 1998:87-89, and Küng & Kuschel, 1993: 157-169). World ethic principles that are established based on this principle not only avoid the problem of not being able to define the source of corporate ethic regulation but also solve the predicament of diverse ethics using the universal ethic.

As discussed above, the core proposal of seeking common ethic basis in different religions and cultures in Hans Küng’s world ethic helps us reach a path with fewer controversies in the diverse and often opposing international corporate ethics. Hans Küng (1998) once described the common ethics among different religions with the “golden rule” on humanity (Küng, 1998:95-104, and Küng & Kuschel, 1993: 157-169):

Confucius: “Do onto others as you would have them do onto you.” —The Analects of Confucius (Yanyuan 12; Wei-ling-gong 15)

Rabbi Hillel: “What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbor.” —(Shabbat 31a)
Jesus Christ: “As you would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.” — (Mathew 7:12; Luke 6:31)

Islam: ‘None of you is a believer as long as he does not wish his brother what he wishes himself’ — (Forty Hadith of an Nawawi, 31)

Jainism: “A man should wander about treating all creatures as he himself would be treated.” — (Sutarkritanga I, 11.33)

Buddhism: “A state which is not pleasant or enjoyable for me will also not be so for him.” — (Samyutta Nikaya V, 353.35 – 342.2)

Hinduism: ‘One should not behave towards others in a way which is unpleasant for oneself: that is the essence of morality.’ - (Mahabharata XIII, 114, 8)

In Hans Küng’s world ethic, the most fundamental spirit is “humanity” as he proposes that each and every person should be treated humanely. Using the above “golden rule,” Hans Küng also explains that such “humane golden rule” can be found in all great religions and ethics. Starting from the “golden rule,” Hans Küng attempts to establish a consensus on ethics. The “Declaration of World Ethic” drafted by Hans Küng in the 1993 World Conference on Religion is a specific example of his philosophy (Küng & Kuschel, 1993: 157-169).

Universal Ethic and Mankind’s Common Values

Hans Küng’s principle of world ethic is basically the pursuit of minimum common values of mankind and fundamental attitude. Hans Küng has stated that instead of a complete consensus on ethics, what he was seeking is a minimum level of consensus on ethics. In this regard, Hans Küng was deeply influenced by Michael Walzer who divided ethics into “Thin Ethics” and “Thick Ethics.” In “Thin Ethics,” the so-called “core ethics” includes mankind’s fundamental right to live, the right to be treated equally, and the right to be free of physical or psychological tortures(Küng, 1998:88-101). In fact, this concept of “core ethic” is quite similar to the “core” of human rights (the most inviolable human dignity) stated in the German Constitution (Lin, 2004:161).

“Thick Ethics” refers to the ethic codes that are naturally enriched in different cultures and permeate into all possible concepts and attitudes regarding history, culture, religion, and politics due to changes in time and space (Lin, 2004:90-95). Regarding Walzer’s ideas, Hans Küng (1998) believes that from the perspective of “Thin Ethics,” ethics based on global consensus can be made possible and meet the common expectations among different races, cultures, and religions, making it more of a “pure ethics” that is inviolable. On the other hand, “Thick Ethics” that is rich in cultural differences contains many unique cultural traditions and factors – even political and educational differences, making it impractical to ask different races, religions, and cultures to have common ethical practices (Lin, 2004:97-98). Therefore, Hans Küng’s world ethic and Walzer’s “Thin Ethics” both imply universalism. Hans Küng believes this kind of concept provides a minimum possible basis for mankind’s common life and behaviors in the face of political, social, or religious differences (Lin, 2004:99-101).

Confucius once said:

“Let his words be sincere and truthful, and his actions honorable and careful; such conduct may be practiced among the rude tribes of the South or the North. If his words be not sincere and truthful, and his actions not honorable and careful, will he, with such conduct, be appreciated, even in his neighborhood? When he is standing, let him see those two things, as it were, fronting him. When he is in a carriage, let him see them attached to the yoke. Then may he subsequently carry them into practice.” (Chapter 15 of Wei-ling-gong, the Analects of Confucius)

From this passage, it seems Confucius’ “sincerity, truthfulness, honor, and care” are what Hans Küng believes to be the minimum possible basis for mankind’s common life and behaviors – or “Thin Ethics” according to Walzer. This is why Hans Küng has spent many years understanding and compiling different religions and cultures in order to determine their commonalities. He completed “Christianity and World Religion” in 1985 and “Christianity and Chinese Religions” in 1989, based on which he later proposed the principle of world ethic. (Küng, 1989:134-151, and Küng, 1985:194-208)

From the concept of “One Principle – Multiple Implementations” by Confucians in the Sung Dynasty, S. Liu (2001) observed Hans Küng’s proposal of “world ethic” and believed that Hans Küng’s four principles of world ethic
Multiple (stern folk active to examine the value of Glolocalism and its relationship with mentation is known as the “paradox of positive and cial class and bloodline (One Principle tery, theft, bearing false witness against the neighbor, and coveting the neighbor’ wife, servants, live stocks and other things) (New Testament (Scotus), Exodus, 20:13-18, and Smith, 1991:287-288). However, Liu (2001) believes the “One Principle” that Hans Küng’s world ethic tries to achieve is not achievable by Western culture.

However, K. H. Pohl (2002) believes that the root of Western universalism is Christianity, and certain traditions of the latter have been transformed into a set of common values that are preserved in the cross-cultural domain – whether it be liberalism, Marxism, capitalism, democracy, or human rights. This is especially true with human rights as the root and legitimacy of human dignity and sacredness and from Christian traditions. This is why Pohl (2002) has made the following conclusions: 1. Although today’s Christian concepts are less distinct after being secularized, they are still the basis of Western societies, thus it is still fair to refer to them as post-Christian values. 2. Western world has successfully made Christian values popular through colonialism and imperialism through science and military technologies, and such process is achieved through the pursuit of new discoveries. 3. In terms of the goal of universalism in Western folk religion, the passion and absolutism of the early missionary have never ceased (Pohl, 2002:88-103, and Pfaff, 1988:25-33). St. Paulus in Corinthians 1 mentions “the greatest of these is love” and “love never fails” (New Testament (Scotus), Corinthians 1, 12:31 ~ 13:8), making love also a form of “One Principle” from the perspective of Christianity.

“One Principle - Multiple Implementations” was an innovative answer Cheng Yi gave Yang regarding the question of “Xi Ming.” Yang was asking Cheng Yi regarding “loving all people and things” in the book of Xi Ming and Mo Zi’s “universal love,” and Cheng Yi used Xi Ming’s “One Principle - Multiple Implementations” and Mo Zi’s “the inseparable two” to explain that the Confucian love differs according to social class and bloodline (Chen & Chen, 1982:12). Based on this perspective, Zhu Xi later developed the concept of “one principle is divided into multiple implementations” as the diagram of Ba-gua has one origin that develops into a vast scale of diversity. Tai-chi is the “one principle,” its Yin and Yang, four phase, eight diagrams, and 64 hexagrams are the “multiple implementations.” Thus “one principle is divided into multiple implementations” and “one moon shines upon tens of thousands of rivers” (Liu, 1995:413-427).

We can use Wei Wou’s “Glolocalism” to look at the meaning of “Multiple Implementations” and see how it is different from Western cultures and values. The word “Glolocalism” suggests it is a value and ideology that reconciles the opposing globalization and anti-globalization (localism) philosophies. Its fundamental spirit focuses on the integration of cultures and philosophies which also retain their own qualities, making it similar to the concept of “Multiple Implementations” mentioned by Cheng Yi and Zhu Xi. Wei Wou has mentioned that we not only should learn history for today’s sake but should also learn about Western thinking for China’s sake and even give what we learned new interpretations based on how the times and circumstances have changed. The concept of Glolocalism means to takes root in our homeland but join our local culture with world values (Wei, Li, and Chang, 2002:1, 61-87).

Oriental and Western cultures interpret and address the root of a conflict differently. In the following we use the oriental perspective to examine the value of Glolocalism and its relationship with “One Principle - Multiple Implementations.” C. Lin (2000) has proposed the concept of “glocal,” which is “global” + “local” = “glocal.” This concept is a paradox of two opposing concepts: the world being a global village (global) and the world being consisted of local groups (local). While “global” and “local” are two conflicts, they actually complement each other rather than replacing each other – at least not entirely. This kind of complementation is known as the “paradox of positive and negative” (Lin et., al, 2000 :126-128) and is based on Hegel’s Dialectics.

Glolocalism proposed by Wei Wou (2002) borrows the “Doctrine of Mean” and uses the concept of “polarization comes with integration” in the “Book of Changes” to interpret Yin and Yang. The philosophy of “Yin and Yang is generated at each other’s end” (Wei, 2002:85) is different from Hegel’s Dialectics. In the following we examine the oriental philosophies in Glolocalism through the concepts in the “Book of Changes,” Yin and Yang, and the “Doctrine of Mean.” The changes of divinatory symbols in the “Book of Changes” suggest the meaning of “Multiple Implementations” in Glolocalism. For example, among the complicated divinatory symbols, the 64 “Zong” symbols
Meaning the intertwining of Yin and Yang, “Tsuo symbols” teach us that even when we are on the same ground and have the same goal, we see things differently because we approach a question from different angles. The complicated changes of symbols are the same as intertwining, meaning each complicated interaction generates a new symbol. Same as “Zong symbols,” “Fu symbols” also mean repetition and refer to mutual interactions. The 64 symbols can be developed into countless changes that interact with each other (Nan, 2001:32-36). Therefore, when applying the changes of the Tsuo, Zong, Fu, Za symbols on Glolocalism and Multiple Implementations, we see the opposing “globalism” and “localism” and “One Principle” having different implementations operate according to “Zong symbols.” From the perspective of “Tsuo symbols,” although sometimes globalism and localism stand on the same ground and have same goals, they see things differently from different angles, thus oppositions are inevitable. Looking at Glolocalism from the “Fu” and “Za” symbols, we see that globalism and localism constantly interact with each other in different regions and countries and produce new outcomes and changes, which is the same as “One Principle - Multiple Implementations.” Therefore Wei Wou’s “Glolocalism” is rich in the spirit of “consistence tolerating difference” and “integration and diversification” (Wei, Li, and Chang, 2002:2, 70). As for the question of how to seek the balance between the four types of symbol changes, globalism, and localism, the answer lies in the Doctrine of Mean, Yin and Yang, Cheng Yi’s “One Principle - Multiple Implementations,” and Zhu Xi’s “one moon shines on tens of thousands of rivers.” This kind of thinking is similar to the teaching of “What Heaven confers is called ‘nature.’ Accordance with this nature is called the Way. Cultivating the Way is called ‘education’” in the first chapter of the Doctrines of the Mean as well as Zhu Xi’s “One Principle” (Hsieh, et. al, 1986:22).

CONCLUSION

From the above discussions we see that “Glolocalism” is a set of values that represent the reconciliation between the opposing globalism and localism. The Book of Changes, one of the most important ancient texts, focuses very much on the reconciliation of oppositions and conflicts. Xi-zhuán in the Book of Changes states: “Yin and Yang are the way. Those who inherit the way are the righteous people. Those who carry out the way are honest. The benevolent look at the way and say it is of benevolence, and the wise look at the way and say it is educational.” Though Yin and Yang are opposite from each other, what harmonizes them is not unification but balancing. Enlightenment comes when Yin and Yang are balanced and reconciled (Nan, 2000:111).

On a deeper level, how should the “Multiple Implementations” be diversified yet remain a part of the “One Principle” while satisfying different situations? The Book of Changes also provides some clues in this regard. The argument of Yin and Yang in the Book of Changes is not the same as Einstein’s Theory of Relativity nor Hegel’s Dialectics. The Western philosophy of unifying conflicts is a negative thought while the Chinese philosophy of reconciling oppositions is from a positive angle. The Chinese believe diversification comes with integration, and such balance exists in the principle of Yin and Yang as either is generated at the end of each other. This principle does not talk about its nature but how it can be applied; among all phases in the universe, the applications are generated by two opposing forces (Nan, 2000:119), and when we use this perspective to look at “Multiple Implementations,” it talks about the unique reconciliation between the “One Principle” and different cultural settings. Therefore, the “reconciliation” stressed by Glolocalism is about the Yin and Yang caused by the diversification that is inevitable at the presence of integration rather than Hegel’s dialectics. Wei Wou’s thinking is based on the Doctrine of the Mean and Yin/Yang, whereas Hegel focused on a system in which a static unification of conflicts. What Wei Wou’s focuses on has integration and diversification, and the balance is Yin and Yang that have dynamic yet balanced interactions. From this perspective, “integration” is the result of “Multiple Implementations.”

In terms of methodological differences, Hans Küng took an approach different from others. In the above discussions, Habermas believes mankind can reach a consensus through reason based on agreed common interests and even develop a set of ethics that everyone agrees upon. Therefore through Habermas’ so-called Kommunikationsethik and Universalpragmatik, communication can be rationalized in order to reach Hans Küng’s so-called minimum possible
basis for mankind’s common life and behaviors (Küng, 1998:105). What is worth noticing is that under the logic of Habermas’ deductive method, universal ethic only need to be based on humanity instead of religions or morals.

In his Theory of Justice, John Rawls attempted to come up with a set of applicable ethics from his general principles of justice and fairness. Similarly, this does not have to be based on religions or morality but only humanity. Naturally, whether it is Habermas’ prozedurale Gerechtigkeitstheorie or Rawls’ “content of contract” that people agree on based on the general principle of fairness and humanity (Lin, 2002:204) are achieved via deduction. Even Popper or Held who treated democracy as the extremely important “ethical value” developed their ideas via deduction. Lin Li used Rawls’ “thin theory of the good” and “full theory of the good” to determine the moral obligations that mankind is willing to bear and give ethical values their basis (Lin, 2004: 461-495), and this was also achieved via deductive reasoning. This is why it is very rare that Hans Küng used induction to establish his ethics.

However, Lin Li has also re-examined the efforts on ethical principles by Rawls, Kant, Habermas, and W. D. Ross (Lin, 2004:462–464). For example, he believes Rawls’ “thin theory of the good” is still based on mankind’s selfishness (Lin, 2004:466). Lin Li (2004) said:

“The ‘thin theory of the good’ shows us that the justice system was originated from mankind’s choice (compromise) for addressing selfishness; however, once we live under the system, we enjoy the good life it provides and come to truly love and identify its values. What is more important is its ‘spreading.’ When such system is implemented in a society and is supported by the people, it will be wanted and learned by other societies, it will be identified by more and more people (Lin, 2004:487).”

Mengzi’s theory of “sympathy exists in all men” states that our inborn sympathy is spread out in a society as kindheartedness and turns the society into a righteous one, where mankind would believe it is better to give than to receive and treat the “compromise” as a moral obligation that one is willing to bear (Lin, 2004:491), and this is the beginning of Hans Küng’s establishment of world ethic. Hans Küng’s four ethic principles are based on the humane spirits of “do not do to others what you do not want to be done to you” and “do onto others as you would have them do onto you” (Küng & Kuschel, 1993:234). From the “thin theory of the good” that is about mankind’s selfish and inevitable compromise, Lin Li believes the “spreading effect” due to the social atmosphere would improve the public’s moral and affect, thus he interpreted the “full theory of the good” as the manifestation of “respecting humanity as a form of moral obligation.” At a deeper level, Hans Küng is seeking the feasibility of a universal Theology in Religion. He believes the true humanity is the premise of a true religion, and a true religion is the completeness of true humanity. Therefore, as long as these two premises are met, religions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Christianity, and Catholic have met the above requirements. In this sense, “religion” is concealed, and what is left is the truth that these religions have trouble describing in words (Küng & Kuschel, 1993:234). As a result, although Hans Küng has used induction to complete the principle of “world ethic,” the origin is also the humanity that is expressed by the good side of mankind’s “limited altruism” (Hart, 1997:192). This is congruent with the “full theory of the good” proposed by Lin Li.
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