

Can Moral Rules save the World?

Feb., 22, 2016

Kenzo Fujisue

1. Introduction

I am a Member of National Parliament in Japan and always feel the limits of scope of moral rules. I think that the scope of moral rules should spread from individual to societies and nations, finally to the world, but the max limited scope of moral rules is nations at present.

I would desire to achieve the ideal goal of **“all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want”** and **“We, the Japanese people, pledge our national honor to accomplish these high ideals and purposes with all our resources.”** written in the preface of Japanese Constitution and make the world happier.

In order to achieve my goal, I would think about following two points from a point of view of moral philosophy,

1. Peace free from want; how can we help people suffering from hunger, disease and no education in other countries?
2. Peace free from fear; how can we stop killing each other in wars?

2. Moral Rules for the World

In this context, I would very simply consider the "Moral Rule for the World" using the knowledge of moral philosophy theories studied in the lessons.

1) Contractism

The original position of contractism is based on “the veil of ignorance.” People behind the veil of ignorance do not know their class, social status, income, talents, level of intelligence, or their conception of the good and people advance their interests in establishing conditions that enable them to effectively pursue their final ends and fundamental interests. If the veil of ignorance can hide “even their countries,” people will select providing the freedom and fairness to people of all over the world equally.

2) Virtue ethics

Aristotle thinks that the pursuit of one's own happiness, properly understood, requires ethically virtuous activity and will therefore be of great value not only to one's friends but to “the larger political community” and Aristotle's statement in the Politics that the political community is prior to the individual citizen. If the largest political community can be the world, Aristotle’s moral rule will cover the world.

3) Deontology

Kant defines "A Kingdom of Ends" in the third Formulation as "a systematic union of different rational beings under common laws." Kant seems to too much concentrate on rational beings and there are not completely all rational beings in the real world. Therefore, I guess that Kant establish the plan of the world peace depending not on moral theory but on a peace program written in the Perpetual Peace.

4) **Utilitarianism**

According to utilitarianism, we could think the greatest happiness of the greatest number "of the world" and may make a moral rule for the world finally.

3. Consideration 'Moral Generalism and Moral Particularism'

I think that moral generalism can establish moral rules for the world because generalism assumes that there can be moral principles in spite of moral rules of any individual countries. Moral particularism has the view that there are no moral principles because that moral thought does not consist in the application of moral principles to cases, and that the morally perfect person should not be conceived as the person of principle.

In my opinion, from a viewpoint of moral rules of the world, contractism, virtue ethics and utilitarianism can be defined as moral generalism and deontology of Kant can be defined as moral particularism. In the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, deontology is classified into moral generalism but I do not think that deontology can establish moral principles (rules) for the world in my opinion.

4. Conclusion

I think it is possible to establish some moral rules for the world, using moral theories such as the original position of the world people, political community of the world and the greatest happiness of the world, by deepening the existing moral philosophy.