

Universal Ethical Dimensions of World Religions: The Case of Hans Küng

Dr. Said Aly Ebead , Dr. Nizar Smida, Dr. Lahcen Elouazani , Dr. Bassem Jemal,

¹Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy and Ethics, College of Social and Human Sciences, Mohamed Bin Zayed University for Humanities, Abu Dhabi 26262, UAE. E-mail: said.aly@mbzuh.ac.ae - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6049-6015>

²Assistant Professor, Department of Tolerance and Coexistence, College of Social and Human Sciences, Mohamed Bin Zayed University for Humanities, Abu Dhabi 26262, UAE. <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2960-9932>
nizar.smida@mbzuh.ac.ae

³Faculty Member, College of Islamic Studies, Mohamed Bin Zayed University for Humanities, Abu Dhabi 26262, UAE. E-mail: lahcen.elouazzani@mbzuh.ac.ae - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8504-3677>

⁴Professor, Department of Tolerance and Coexistence, College of Social and Human Sciences, Mohamed Bin Zayed University for Humanities, Abu Dhabi 26262, UAE. <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3677-4695>
bassem.jemal@mbzuh.ac.ae

HOW TO CITE:

Said Aly Ebead ,Nizar Smida,.
Lahcen Elouazani, Bassem Jemal,
(2026). Universal Ethical Dimensions
of World Religions: The Case of Hans
Küng.
International Journal of Special
Education, 41(23s), 1884 - 1901

ABSTRACT:

This study seeks to explore the formation of the human horizon in the philosophy of Hans Küng by tracing the intellectual transformations through which his project developed: from questioning religious faith and seeking to establish its reasonableness, to grounding trust in the human being and in reality, opening the self to the Other, and ultimately searching for a shared human ground upon which a global ethic might be founded. The study is guided by a central philosophical question: How did the human horizon take shape in Küng's philosophy, and how was he able to move from the particularity of religious belonging toward a universal ethical horizon without erasing plurality and difference? To address this question, the study adopts a critical-analytical approach, examining a selection of Küng's major texts and identifying the conceptual connections that give coherence to his philosophical project.

The study is organized around three main themes. The first examines Küng's transition from inherited faith to reasonable faith and the accompanying reconsideration of the relationship between faith, reason, and religious authority. The second explores the role of fundamental trust and the relationship with the Other in the formation of human consciousness. The third considers the transition from humanity to global ethic and the minimum set of shared values and standards upon which such an ethic is grounded. The study argues that Küng's intellectual development does not represent a rupture with religious faith; rather, it reveals a gradual widening of the horizon of questioning: from a faith seeking to establish its reasonableness, to a form of trust that opens the self to the Other, from there to the discovery of a shared human ground, and ultimately to a global ethic that does not abolish religious and cultural particularities but seeks,

within their plurality, a common ethical foundation.

The study concludes that human dignity, trust, and responsibility toward the Other constitute fundamental pillars of this human horizon. It further argues that universality, for Küng, does not entail the unification of beliefs or cultures; rather, it seeks to establish the possibility of a shared human life in a world increasingly marked by both difference and interconnectedness.

The study concludes with several key findings, notably:

- Hans Küng's intellectual development cannot be explained as a transition from religious faith to a separate humanistic stance, or a break with his Christian reference point; rather, it is a gradual expansion of the horizon of inquiry, in which he moved from criticizing inherited patterns of faith and religious authority to searching for a reasonable faith, capable of entering into dialogue with reason, humanity, and the world.

- The research showed that the other represents a foundational moment in the formation of human consciousness for Küng; the self is not complete in isolation but rather is formed in its relationship with the religiously and culturally different other. Therefore, Küng rejected prejudices and generalizations that reduce religions to the errors of some of their followers, and openness to the other became a prerequisite for moving from self-awareness to discovering the shared human experience.

- For Küng, ethical universality does not mean the abolition of religious and cultural particularities or their assimilation into a single human model; it is not a call for a new world religion or a unified culture but rather is based on the possibility of agreeing on a minimum set of shared values and ethical standards. Thus, pluralism does not become the antithesis of universality, but rather the arena within which its necessity is confirmed; for the need for ethical common ground arises from the very reality of difference.

Keywords: Hans Küng – Human Horizon – Global Ethic – Religions – the Other – Interreligious Dialogue – Human Dignity..

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the
terms and conditions
of the Creative Commons Attribution
(CC BY)
license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The project of the Swiss philosopher and theologian Hans Küng (1928 – 2021) has emerged as one of the most prominent contemporary philosophical projects that sought to re-establish the common humanity through the concept of “universal ethics,” based on a minimum of values and moral standards that can be met by world religions and different cultures, making them a basis for human coexistence, dialogue between civilizations, and building world peace.

This vision does not stem from a desire to create

a new world religion, or to transcend and exclude religions, but rather from a search for a human horizon in which common values converge, and where man, as a human being, becomes the focus of moral commitment, but rather from a belief in the possibility of a human moral consensus that makes human dignity, justice, freedom, and mutual respect common values that transcend the boundaries of religious and cultural difference. Hence, the search for ethics that transcend national and religious boundaries became an existential necessity, not an intellectual luxury, which prompted Hans Küng to build his philosophical project under a slogan that has

become one of the most famous slogans of contemporary ethical thought: “There is no peace among nations without peace among religions, no peace among religions without dialogue among them, and no dialogue among religions without mutual knowledge among them.”

Hans Küng’s project is distinguished by the fact that it does not stop at calling for dialogue between religions, but moves to a deeper level, which is the search for the common moral structure that preceded the emergence of the major religions, and then the religions reformulated and confirmed it within their doctrinal and legislative systems. Hence, for him, universal ethics become an expression of shared humanity before it is an expression of religious or civilizational affiliation, which makes it capable of addressing the believer and the non-believer, the religious and the secular, based on human values upon which the survival of man himself depends.

Based on this, this research seeks to answer a number of key questions, the most important of which are: What are the philosophical foundations upon which Hans Küng’s theory of universal ethics is based? Does this ethics stem from a purely religious reference, or from a human reference that transcends religions without being separate from them? How was Hans Küng able to reconcile the particularity of world religions with the call for a shared universal ethical system? And to what extent can this project contribute to confronting the crises of violence, extremism, and civilizational conflict in the contemporary world?

To answer these questions, the research adopted the critical analytical approach, while making use of the comparative approach whenever the nature of the subject required it, through analyzing Hans Küng’s original texts, linking them to their philosophical and theological context, then evaluating them in light of contemporary ethical problems, in order to demonstrate the philosophical value of the universal ethics project, and its theoretical and practical possibilities in building a more just and peaceful human future.

2. The Anthropological Roots of Global Ethics.

The emergence of universal ethics was not born of a single philosophical era, nor of a shared human experience emerging from the womb of world religions. Rather, its anthropological and historical roots extend to a cosmic history that predates the formation of religions and civilizations. Hans Küng (1928–2021) bases this on the idea that, compared to the course of the universe, humanity was a latecomer. According to current astronomical estimates, the universe has existed for approximately 13.7 billion years, since the Big Bang (13). During this cosmic evolution, *Homo sapiens* appeared only about two hundred thousand years ago, in warm Africa with its tropical and subtropical climate, rich in wildlife. I have never found it difficult to accept that man - in his evolution - shares much with his relatives among the higher primates: from the number of chromosomes, to the structure of the teeth, the development of the brain, all the way to social behavior and some of the earliest beginnings of self-awareness” (8).

Küng was particularly interested in what distinguishes humans from animals. First, humans are distinguished by their upright gait, a posture that has become a symbol of morality in our time. Then comes self-awareness, which has also become a moral concept, as a prerequisite for the emergence of complex, synthetic language. Only humans are endowed with language, and only they possess the capacity for strategic and abstract thought, for self-reflection, and for managing their emotional states: love and hate, hope and fear, convictions and desires. All these characteristics have formed the foundation upon which higher human culture is built, and above all, human or universal morality (8).

Hans Küng explains the concept of religion in ancient times, noting that scholars agree that Paleolithic humans, those hunter-gatherers who lived hundreds of thousands of years ago, possessed some form of religion or religious sentiment. However, the major problem lies in the extreme scarcity and obscurity of the

"documents" that have reached us from those times, such as scattered bones, stone tools, pigments, grave relics, and cave paintings. These remains—despite their importance—do not allow us to paint an accurate picture of prehistoric human life, nor of the nature of their beliefs or rituals. Religion at that stage remains shrouded in a thick fog, through which we can only glimpse vague indications of a symbolic and spiritual world that existed in the lives of early humans, but whose details remain hidden from us (2). This text serves as clear evidence from Hans Küng that universal ethics predates world religions and even the idea of belief in a transcendent deity. Moral standards, not religion, are the touchstone of human relations.

As for "culture," Hans Küng says, "This question often confronts me in my life, because the first inhabitants truly did not develop writing, science, or complex technology. However, cultural anthropologists have shown me that their ways of thinking are characterized by logic and consistency, and even by a clear passion for organizing things and building human relationships. There is also no doubt that these first inhabitants possessed a basic morality that helped them—and still helps them—to build their lives and ensure their survival, and which is still the basis of human coexistence today. This has helped me understand a fundamental principle in human development. From the very beginnings of humanity, and with the emergence of basic needs, orientations of human behavior imposed themselves, such as certain customs and traditions—that is, moral standards, rules, systems, and guidelines. All of these have been tested over thousands of years, and they had to—so to speak—make their way through the successive generations' (8). The idea that science, in the true sense, or culture does not exist now is not proof of the non-existence of universal humanity. Humanity comes first, including ethical standards, rules, and universal guidelines. This implies a "synonymy" between universal ethics and the idea of humanity from an anthropological perspective up to this point.

Hans Küng argues that the values and norms in

early tribal cultures—and even today—were unwritten customs, not formulated as theoretical rules. They were passed down through generations via the morality of the family, clan, and tribe, taking the form of stories, proverbs, analogies, and customs. It was no coincidence that similar norms emerged in different parts of the world, all of which focused on the most important aspects of life. Foremost among these was the preservation of life, or the sanctity of human life—that is, the prohibition of killing—except in exceptional circumstances such as resolving conflicts or punishing violence. Therefore, it was not surprising that Albert Schweitzer (1875–1965) made the "sanctity of life" the cornerstone of his ethical philosophy. From the outset, these primitive, universal morals were also concerned with protecting private property, preserving dignity, and regulating relations between the sexes. These four perspectives of primitive morality became particularly important to me when I sought to identify the shared human values held by different cultures (8).

Küng argues that "long periods of training and testing took place before these practical standards gained widespread acceptance among cultures. After the hunter-gatherer stage—whose population likely numbered only a few million—a more advanced stage of cultural development began. With the spread of agriculture around ten thousand years ago, the population increased significantly, and at the same time, cultures differentiated, which ultimately paved the way for the emergence of major civilizations and religions. At that stage, ethical standards were no longer mere customs but were formulated as clear rules and written down. In some cultures, these rules were placed under the will of God, as in the example of the Ten Commandments in the Hebrew Bible, that is, under the authority of the one God' (8). This text necessarily leads us to the existence of universal standards prior to the emergence of major civilizations, not to mention the idea of world religions. The existence of subsequent civilizations and religions led to the codification of ethical standards, which became a fundamental structure for universal human

commonality.

3. World Religions and the Foundation of a Common Human Ethic.

Hans Küng sought to find an immediate remedy for current problems, and he began to pursue this through interreligious dialogue. Thus, the main goal, as he says, is: "I do not pin my hope on the unity of religions or on any form of religious syncretism, but rather on ecumenical peace among the world's religions. This means peaceful coexistence, growing rapprochement, and creative pro-existence among religions, in a shared quest for a greater truth and for the mystery of the one true God, which will not be fully revealed until the end of time. This is what I believe. Is this merely an empty utopia? No, it is a realistic vision, and its realization has already begun from the popular roots of the major religions, roots which are often characterized by a cosmopolitan orientation that surpasses that of nation-states and their policies" (2). Despite the inability to pinpoint the "first religion," one undeniable fact remains: throughout human history, no society has ever been found without religious influence. Religion—in its various forms—has always been present, whether in rituals, symbols, myths, or collective practices (8). This leads to the recognition of the existence of religions, while the idea of activating universal commonalities through religions is subsequent to the existence of humankind itself.

Good and evil are intertwined within humanity itself. Humans are neither angels nor demons. It is rightly said, "If humans were demons, no government could exist; if they were angels, there would be no need for government at all. But humans are complex and ambiguous beings, occupying an intermediate position between reason and irrationality, between good and evil. They are a mixture of selfishness and virtue, capable of using power for good or ill, in matters both small and large, in their private lives as well as in politics"(7). Therefore, the existence of religions was a universal necessity, to restore dignity to humanity and to the shared values

between individuals.

Religion cannot be bypassed or ignored in any serious attempt to achieve peace and social justice among the peoples of the earth. Religion has not disappeared, as predicted by Karl Marx (1818-1883), Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), Nietzsche (1844-1900), or other Enlightenment thinkers who viewed it as a temporary crutch that humanity would discard once scientific knowledge advanced. However, reality shows that religion remains a spiritual and moral center for the lives of billions of people. If we consider only the two major religions, Christianity and Islam, more than two billion people in the world today guide their lives, with varying degrees of commitment and awareness, based on the meaning they find in Christ or in the Quran(12).

The reason for the immense effectiveness of religions lies in their ability to address both the heart and the mind—the entirety of human existence in lived experience. This allows them to profoundly influence how people make moral and life decisions, whether for good or evil. Therefore, any program for world peace that ignores the fundamental influence of religion on the lives of those called upon to contribute to this peace will have missed the opportunity to integrate the necessary spiritual energy to legitimize the shift in consciousness required to achieve true peace(12).

Based on the above, the direct question emerges: Why should one be a Christian? Why not simply be a human being, a truly human being? Why, in addition to being human, should we be Christians? Is there more to being a Christian than being a human being? Is it a superstructure? Or an infrastructure? And what exactly does it mean to be a Christian? And what does it mean to be a Christian today?

These questions raised by Hans Küng are not intended to defend Christianity, but rather to establish a "humanistic universality." He states: "Christians should know what they want, just as non-Christians should know what Christians want. When the question is posed, 'What does Marxism want?' a Marxist can offer a clear and coherent answer, even if it is no longer universally

accepted: it wants world revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the nationalization of the means of production, the new human being, and a classless society"(1). But what does Christianity want?

The answer Christians often give is vague, emotional, and general; Christianity, they say, wants love, justice, meaning in life, and for people to be good, do good, commit to it, and achieve humanity. But don't non-Christians want these things too?

The question of what Christianity wants, and what Christianity itself is, has become more pressing than ever. Today, others not only say something different, but often say the same thing. Non-Christians also support love, justice, meaning in life, commitment to good, doing good, and humanity. In fact, in practice, they often go further than Christians in this regard (1).

From the above, it can be said that the common human is the building block on which universal ethics are built. Thus, the idea of "post-religions," that is, human universality or universal ethics, which all religions believed in, is synonymous with it in meaning, but not a substitute for it. All religions share the fact that they do not only aim to provide an interpretation of existence, but also to provide a practical way, a way out of the misery and suffering of existence, towards a kind of salvation (7). As Küng says, humanity today wants above all else to be human—not a superhuman, nor an inferior one; it wants to be fully human in a world that is human to the fullest extent possible. Is it not remarkable how humanity has managed to seize control of the world, how it has dared to leap into outer space, just as it previously dared to delve into the depths of its own psyche? And is it not also remarkable that, as a result, it has brought under its control much—indeed, almost everything—that was previously attributed to God, to superhuman, transcendent, and spiritual forces, and that it has truly reached maturity?(1) Therefore, human universalism in the post-religious horizon does not seek to negate or transcend religion, but rather to redirect humanity toward the essence of its humanity, where universal ethics becomes a

unifying horizon that liberates values from exclusionary manipulation and restores them to their authentic human meaning.

For Cong, the idea of interfaith dialogue is the first and essential step towards a future that believes in humanity as such. He realized that world peace is contingent upon establishing peace among the world's religions(9). He states, "With the support of many people, after the great conflict with Rome in 1979-1980, I was able to formulate my ideas on interfaith dialogue and a common ethic based on fundamental trust, the foundation for which I had previously laid out. After dialogue with scholars from Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Chinese religions, and secular ideologies, I deepened, formulated, and shaped these ideas. Thus, finally, in 1990, after a decade of conflict with Rome, I was able to present the project of a universal or cosmic ethic"(8). Democracy will not endure unless there is an alliance based on mutual respect between believers and non-believers, church members and laypeople, and religious figures and their opponents(4).

After this dialogue with scholars from the Hindu, Buddhist, Chinese, Muslim, and Christian traditions, I found a fundamental empirical consensus: there are four ethical imperatives not only found in the Ten Commandments of the Hebrew Bible, but also affirmed in the New Testament and the Qur'an. We also find them in the teachings of Patanjali, the founder of Yoga, in Buddhist law, and in the Chinese tradition: "Do not kill, do not steal, do not lie, and do not abuse sex." The beginnings of history have shown me that this agreement is not coincidental. Throughout the planet, at a very early existential stage, humans were concerned with protecting their lives, property, dignity, and sexual relationships. These primitive ethics lie at the heart of universal morality (8). Therefore, it cannot be said that the dialogue of world religions is a secondary cultural option, but rather it is the main condition for the possibility of activating universal ethics. The dialogue has resulted in a primary ethical consensus that transcends religions and cultures, which is represented in

primary human commands to protect life, human dignity, property, and human relations, which constitute the essence of the common human and the basis of universal ethics.

But what is the precise function of such universal ethics as advocated by Hans Küng?

Küng offers his answer by saying: "I can only reiterate here that universal ethics is not a new ideology, nor an intellectual superstructure, nor does it seek to abolish or render useless the ethics of different religions and philosophies. Hence, it is not a replacement for the Torah, the Sermon on the Mount, the Qur'an, the Bhagavad Gita, the teachings of Buddha, or the sayings of Confucius. A single universal ethics does not mean a single world culture, let alone a single world religion. In a positive sense, it can be said that universal ethics—or the ethics of the world—is nothing more than the necessary minimum of shared human values, general standards, and basic attitudes. Or, to put it more precisely: universal ethics is a basic agreement on binding values, irrefutable standards, and essential moral attitudes, recognized by all religions, despite their doctrinal differences, and in whose establishment and contribution non-believers can also participate"(4).

My hopeful vision of achieving universal ethics emerges when a growing number of people realize that the three prophetic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—form an interconnected, river-like system with a Semitic, Middle Eastern source, in which all acknowledge one God, the God of Abraham, the God who creates and sustains this world, a future-oriented historical path, and a fundamental ethics based on primal humanity, namely the Ten Commandments. What I advocate is not a utopian world of religions, but a vision of religions living together in peace without abandoning their essence (6).

On this point, Hans Küng argues that when comparing church leaders and secular authority in Christian history, Islam, in many respects, demonstrated a higher degree of tolerance. The dhimmi status system allowed Christian and Jewish minorities to live tolerable lives, with

protection for life and property, even though their rights remained quite limited, even in the tolerant Moorish Andalusia. The Islamic empire, at various stages, demonstrated tolerance and hospitality. Indeed, Christian minorities and dissidents later preferred living under Islamic rule to the persecution they faced at the hands of other Christians in the Byzantine or Habsburg empires. In general, it can be said that Islam's record of religious tolerance was better than that of Christianity itself(6). This last point necessarily leads us to examine the universal conception in Islamic law, which makes it the duty of every person to contribute to fulfilling the needs of others. This leads me to pose a bolder and more significant question: What prevents the United Nations... From adopting an Islamic standard - as a model - that can also benefit non-Muslims? Here the true horizon of a universal ethical philosophy is revealed, one that does not exclude religious traditions, but rather invests its ethical energy in the service of common human dignity (8).

In Hans Küng's philosophy, universal ethics transcends the limits of individual behavior, becoming a universal standard for judging religious and cultural phenomena, thus preventing the reduction of values to deviant practices or the generalization of condemnation to entire religious or moral systems. Therefore, the ethical recommendation advocated by Cong in his philosophy was that Christianity and Islam together should never be condemned because of the moral lapses of some of its followers. If I, as a Christian, refuse to have my faith judged by the actions of the Crusades or the Inquisition, I must be even more careful not to judge the faith of others by the actions of a few terrorists who might commit them in the name of that faith. Thus, if it is wrong to condemn a particular doctrine or system of values because of the actions or statements of some of its adherents, it is equally wrong to generalize a moral judgment to an entire religion or spiritual tradition based on the deviant behaviors of individuals or groups that do not reflect the essence of that religion or its authentic moral message (6). Ultimately, the justification of moral values lies in God alone,

and this transcends mere critical comparison between moral systems. The different, and it alone allows us to realize the basis on which that inviolable value, that inviolable dignity, and that indispensable freedom of man are based, things which a free society must presuppose if it does not want to descend either into the nihilism of absolute chaos or turn into a coercive totalitarianism (3). Therefore, K  ng's vision and goal become clear: to establish universal ethical standards that are not based on any particular religion and do not exclude non-religious people, but rather target humanity as a human being in a complex, pluralistic world.

4. Interreligious Dialogue and the Grounding of Global Ethics in Hans K  ng's Philosophy.

Hans K  ng is fully convinced of his humanitarian stance on the necessity of establishing universal ethics through dialogue between world religions, because he believes that we live in a world and time in which humanity is threatened by what Samuel P. Huntington (1927-2008) called the "Clash of Civilizations," especially between Islamic or Confucian civilization on the one hand, and Western civilization on the other. However, the danger we face today is not primarily the outbreak of a new world war, but rather an endless series of potential conflicts: between two countries, or within a single country, in a particular city, or even on a single street or within a school (4). Thus, the world's survival is threatened by escalating military violence, famine, the extinction of animal species, global economic disasters, the degradation of rainforests, and increasing global warming. These disasters are also accompanied—in K  ng's view—by a global moral crisis, as many people no longer know a reliable basis for making universal moral decisions; consequently, they face personal and social nihilism in every aspect of human existence (9).

These global challenges – if we do not find a solution to them – will inevitably lead to conflict and a clash of civilizations. However, K  ng believes that the real threat does not lie

– as some think – in this difference between Western and Eastern civilizations, but in something deeper and more dangerous; it lies in the absence of mutual understanding, and in the world's inability to establish a common universal moral ground that allows for effective coexistence between cultural and religious pluralisms (4).

According to K  ng, the mechanism for addressing these challenges—despite all the problems—does not abandon hope. Peace between religions, he says, is not only possible but necessary. His vision is: "There can be no peace between nations without peace between religions (8), and no peace between religions without interreligious dialogue." Likewise, "There can be no interreligious dialogue without an examination of the foundations of religions"(6). Peace, like truth, requires a willingness to engage in sincere and continuous dialogue, because truth brings minds closer together and reveals what unites those who were previously in conflict (10). There is no inherent contradiction between truth and peace, as some uninformed sociologists believe. Any religion can maintain its claim to truth, provided it respects the truth of others, is tolerant in its practice, and is prepared to work with them to awaken and mobilize humanity's moral energies (4). This principle, in Hans K  ng's philosophy, represents common ground, through which shared solutions among people can be reached instead of conflict. Therefore, universal ethics is essential because it unites humanity on common ground, entirely separate from religious and ethnic affiliations.

Based on the above, Hans K  ng observes: "Many will object, saying: Are there not profound doctrinal differences and serious obstacles between the different religions that make interreligious dialogue a naive illusion? I say to them: Yes, this is true. We live in a world and a time in which better relations between religions are hindered by various forms of dogmatism, a dogmatism which we find not only in the Roman Catholic Church, but in all churches and religions, and even in modern ideologies. My

answer to this challenge is: There will be no new world order without a new global ethic; that is, a universal or planetary ethic, despite all doctrinal differences" (4).

Hans Kung did not deny the idea of the existence of conflict between humans. He believes in the existence of conflict, but this conflict has a universal cure. The transition from modernity to post-modernism is not a smooth transition, but rather a seismic and confusing transformation, because it represents a profound disturbance in the cultural and moral structure of the world (9). One of the most prominent manifestations of the post-modern crisis is the absence of a moral compass through which rapid cultural changes can be directed, so that they do not end in devastating, catastrophic effects in the long term (13). He summarizes this idea with a series of illustrative points that highlight the contradictions inherent in contemporary human experience:

- Science exists, but wisdom is absent, leaving no deterrent to prevent the misuse of scientific research. Why, then, isn't the creation of "artificial human matter" being considered in Japan?
- Technology is available, but the spiritual energy needed to mitigate the risks of highly efficient, high-tech development is lacking. Why are India and Pakistan developing atomic bombs instead of combating mass poverty?
- Industry is booming, but environmental awareness is absent, leaving no one to curb the rapidly expanding economy. Why, then, are hundreds of square kilometers of Amazon rainforest being cleared?
- Democracy exists, but the morality needed to counter the greedy interests of individuals and groups in power is nonexistent. How, then, can we confront the drug cartels in Colombia, the scandals of the Congress Party in India, the corruption of the Liberal Nationalist Party in Japan, or the Mobutu regime in Zaire?

Commenting on these paradoxes, Kung says that, although some of the examples given are

relatively old, it is easy to replace them with newer examples of corruption and misuse of technology, which keeps the problem alive and perhaps even more acute (13).

Kung also highlighted the dangers of this crisis, stating: "We are undoubtedly living through a difficult but crucial period in reshaping international relations between the West and Islam, as well as between the three Abrahamic religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The choices are clear: either competition and conflict between religions, a clash of civilizations, and wars between nations; or dialogue between civilizations and peace between religions, as an indispensable prelude to peace between nations. If we are facing a deadly threat to all of humanity, is it not our duty to dismantle the barriers of hatred, revenge, and hostility, to work on demolishing the walls of prejudice brick by brick, and to build bridges of dialogue, including bridges extending to Islam? I am not calling for ignoring or sweeping differences under the rug, nor for a superficial, conciliatory approach to religions. What I am calling for is an honest approach, a serious pursuit of understanding, based on mutual self-awareness, objectivity, fairness, and a precise knowledge of what divides us and what unites us." "One moment" (6).

This awareness of the ethical dilemmas of postmodernism is what leads Kung to formulate his central thesis on the urgent need for a universal ethics. He argues that the contemporary world faces unforeseen threats stemming from scientific and technological innovation, and these threats necessitate a proactive global ethical framework. Ethics, he contends, should act as a prophylactic safeguard against crises, and leading ethicists today are beginning to agree that we need preventive ethics (13).

Hans Kung moves from diagnosing the clash of civilizations and the dangers of technology in the postmodern era to emphasizing that establishing universal ethics through interfaith dialogue is a necessary condition for transforming conflict into coexistence and building peace between nations based on mutual

respect for truth and shared humanity. Hans Küng stands contemplating the sincerity of his goal: "Is this endeavor naive, as the pessimists and cynics in the circles of politics, economics, science, and the media claim? Yes: quite the opposite; dialogue between religions and civilizations is the only realistic alternative, if we are not prepared to give up completely on the hope of a better world order. I am convinced that the United States itself will, in the not-too-distant future, find its way out of the obsession with war, just as it emerged in the 1950s from McCarthy hysteria, and will rediscover itself and its long-standing democratic traditions. After the clear failure of the strategy of unilateral hegemony, the aggressive war policy in Afghanistan and Iraq, the unilateral bias in the Palestinian issue, and the resulting global loss of moral credibility, dialogue between cultures and religions has become more urgent than ever" (6).

Hans Küng's objective view of religions is evident in his philosophy regarding Islam. He demonstrated his objectivity in the following text: "With regard to Islam, Christians and non-Christians alike should ask themselves serious questions such as: Why do 1.2 billion people adhere to this religion, and why is the number constantly increasing, found in the central regions of the globe, from the Atlantic coasts of Africa to the islands of Indonesia, and from the steppes of Central Asia to Mozambique? Furthermore, why is Islam the second largest religion in the world after Christianity, and why do its followers sometimes hope to surpass it in number one day? And why is it perceived—in the consciousness of its adherents—not only as the newest religion, but also as the oldest, the universal religion?"(6). Thus, the only realistic option for breaking the cycles of violence, restoring mutual trust, and establishing a more just and peaceful world order is one based on the mutual recognition of human dignity and shared morality.

And the questions posed by "Küng" do not stop. He continues to ask: "How was Islam - more than any other religion - able to bring together within one framework such diverse peoples; from nomadic Berbers and

Arabs in the Middle East, to Africans in the West and East, and from Turks, Bosnians, and Albanians to Persians, Pakistanis, Indians, Chinese, and Malays, that is, peoples belonging to disparate cultures and living in most countries of the world, yet sharing a single religious affiliation? So, where does the source of strength and appeal in the Islamic religion lie? What are its sources, values, and symbols? What is its message, its essence, and its structural components? What constitutes Islamic life, Islamic politics, culture, and art? And what are its weaknesses and shortcomings?" What are the critical self-questions that Muslims must ask themselves? I pose these questions, integrated with my vision, with one goal in mind: to help humanity engage in a shared dialogue during this crucial transitional phase toward a new relationship between civilizations, religions, and nations. I write this so that Christians, Muslims, and secular individuals alike—politicians, economists, and cultural producers alike: teachers, religious figures, and students—can better understand the global situation and respond to it more responsibly. This cannot be achieved without a deep understanding of world religions (6). Thus, Cong's self-criticism of religion contributed to affirming and embodying the essential spirit of reform within the Catholic Church, a spirit expressed by the Second Vatican Council, which posits that the Church is on a perpetual path of reform, according to the well-known theological maxim: "The Church is always in need of reform"(14).

Hans Küng argues that in recent decades, despite tremendous advances in medicine and pharmacy, as well as space travel and the internet, humanity's path has not become any easier. In every corner of the world, many people are now asking: Under what fundamental conditions can we—human beings—continue to live on a habitable planet? And can we shape our individual and social lives in a more humane way?

To answer these questions, we find Hans Küng taking the problems outside the framework of the Church, that is, those that affect society. In Rome and Geneva, in Canterbury and Moscow,

and Salt Lake City, it was possible – at least theoretically – to adopt the following humanitarian program: the development of the human being as a whole, and all human beings; the protection of human rights and religious freedom; the struggle to eliminate forms of economic, social and racial injustice; the promotion of international understanding; the reduction of armaments; the restoration and maintenance of peace; the fight against illiteracy, hunger, alcoholism, prostitution and drug trafficking; the provision of medical assistance, health services and other social services; and relief for the victims of natural disasters, such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, hurricanes and floods(1).

Küng emphasized the above when he said: “Whether it is Islam, Judaism, or Christianity, the more a religion is legalized and binds its followers to a narrow network of commands and prohibitions, the more resistant it is to the recognition of basic rights; those rights that all human beings possess as human beings, regardless of any religious or political affiliation, and which aim to protect human freedom; not only from the attacks of other individuals, but also from the tyranny of institutions; whether it be a state, a religion, or a hierarchical authority of any kind”(6).

In Hans Küng’s philosophy, universal ethics transcends the limits of individual behavior, becoming a universal standard for judging religious and cultural phenomena, thus preventing the reduction of values to deviant practices or the generalization of condemnation to entire religious or moral systems. Therefore, the ethical recommendation that Kung advocated in his philosophy was that Christianity and Islam together should never condemn a religion or moral system because of the moral lapses committed by some of its followers. If I, as a Christian, do not accept that my faith be judged by the actions of the Crusades or the Inquisition, then I must be even more careful not to judge the faith of others by the actions that a few terrorists might commit in the name of that faith. Thus, if it is wrong to condemn a particular doctrine or

system of values because of the actions or statements of some of its adherents, it is equally wrong to generalize a moral judgment to an entire religion or spiritual tradition based on the deviant behaviors of individuals or groups that do not express the essence of that religion or its authentic moral message(6). The ultimate justification for moral values in God alone is what transcends the mere critical comparison between different moral systems, and it alone allows us to realize the basis upon which that inviolable value, that inviolable dignity, and that indispensable freedom of man are based, things which a free society must presuppose if it does not want to descend either into the nihilism of absolute chaos, or turn into a coercive totalitarianism (3).

In discussing interfaith dialogue, Küng poses his philosophically thorny question: Can human rights be founded on an Islamic basis?

The answer to the thorny question – as stated by Küng – lies in his saying: “In my estimation, Human Rights can undoubtedly be established within the Islamic heritage, and in particular in the Holy Qur’an itself, since belief in the One God, who is not only the God of Muslims, but of all mankind, represents the deepest Islamic basis for the idea of human rights. In the Bible, man is created in the image of God, an expression which the Qur’an sees as a kind of exaggeration in likening man to God. The Qur’an affirms human dignity in a different way, as it places humans in the position of vicegerency on earth as representatives, agents, and deputies of God in the world. At the same time, man remains a servant of God, and this attribute is not seen as a humiliation, but rather an honor, as indicated by the prevalence of the name “servant of God” in Islamic culture” (6). Based on the foregoing, establishing human rights on an Islamic foundation is not only possible, but also finds its deep roots in the Quranic conception of human dignity and stewardship of the earth, where rights are founded on a universal moral responsibility that makes man God’s representative in preserving life, justice, and freedom.

5. Human Dignity as a Criterion for Global Ethics in Hans Küng's Philosophy

Hans Küng argues for the value of "humanity" or "humanum"—that is, human dignity—as the primary standard of universal morality. According to Küng, anything that promotes and protects human dignity is genuine, good, and valuable. Conversely, anything that suppresses dignity or diminishes human value is false, bad, and worthless. Therefore, Küng viewed "humanum" as a general and universal ethical standard applicable to all religions and ideologies (9).

Küng demonstrates the idea of binding humanism by saying: "Despite all the enormous differences, humanist ethics and the ethics of world religions meet precisely at the point of primary humanism. Confucius, Gautama Buddha, Moses, Jesus of Nazareth, and also—to whom Muslims attach paramount importance—the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, are all, each in his own way, included under the name of humanists. As for me personally, it seemed clear to me from my six years as a student at the state humanist grammar school in Lucerne that I understand myself simultaneously as a Christian and a humanist, and I laid the foundations for this, and explained it from all angles, in my book *On Being a Christian*, published in 1974" (8).

How can humans created by God be so evil? How many times have I been asked this question, especially after crimes or scandals that defy comprehension, and it is a question one can also ask oneself in certain situations.

Hans Küng offers his answer to this thorny problem in the construction of universal ethics, stating that "the simplest answer is that man - coming from the animal world - had to learn to control his impulses with reason: the impulses of food, sex, and survival. These are impulses similar to the instinctive behavior of animals, but in the case of man they relate to his relationship with other human beings. Even today, every human being from childhood needs not only to develop basic trust, but also to learn to control, shape,

refine, and elevate his impulses to a spiritual level, including those impulses influenced by the deepest spiritual calls. Young people cannot shape their lives in a truly human way except through this path, which is a lifelong journey that does not always succeed, but rather involves setbacks and mistakes for every individual"(8).

Hans Küng argues that "if good is what enables a person to be truly human, then evil is what violates humanity, harms it, and prevents its realization. Evil, in particular, is what reduces a person to an inhuman level, causing them to behave in a wicked, animalistic way, like a beast, or in a savage manner." In contrast, over thousands of years, the criteria for humanity have evolved, and we find them in all the great traditions of humankind, among both religious peoples and philosophers. What, then, unites Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), Henry Dunant (1828–1910), Rosa Luxemburg (1871–1919), Thomas Mann (1875–1955), Albert Schweitzer, and Hannah Arendt (1975–1975)? 1906), Martin Luther King (1929-1968), Nelson Mandela (1918-2013), and the man who supported the "Universal Ethics" project from its inception more than anyone else, the great musician Yehudi Menuhin (1916-1999)? They were all defenders of humanity, of true humanity, and the "Universal Ethics" Foundation presents them as such in its traveling exhibition, in image and word" (6).

Christianity, as seen by Küng , is not averse to inhuman punishments, as evidenced by what is called the Christian Middle Ages. In those times, people were flogged, tortured, mutilated, crucified, and beheaded, all in the name of God and His word. Free thinkers, heretics, apostates, and especially women accused of witchcraft, lived under the threat of the stake. In principle, Christians were no better off than Muslims in this historical period. However, all of this occurred in the Middle Ages and the early modern period. In the Enlightenment, under secular and Christian influences, European countries were liberated from this pattern of justice practiced by the state and the church. These social transformations were accompanied by a shift in the sense of

justice, as physical integrity was recognized as an essential expression of human dignity, even in criminal law, to the extent that Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that: "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment" (6).

Hans Küng argues that Jesus' message stood in stark contrast to the elitist, exclusionary ideology of the so-called "sons of light." He contends that discrimination among people is not a human matter, but a purely divine one; only God can penetrate hearts and judge their contents. Jesus did not call for revenge against the people of the world, nor did he condemn the people of darkness. He did not promise a kingdom reserved for a perfect elite, but rather a kingdom founded on boundless goodness and unconditional grace, addressing his message specifically to the abandoned and the distressed (1). Thus, when compared to the somber doctrine of the Qumran community and the stern call to repentance issued by John the Baptist, his message appears as one brimming with joy and imbued with an exceptional human spirit. It is difficult to ascertain whether Jesus himself actually used the term "Gospel," but what he conveyed was not a threatening message, but rather, in its broader sense, a message of joy. This message was directed specifically to those who do not belong to a particular elite, and they know it (1).

Hans Küng argues that ethical principles concerning illness and treatment can be established, principles that are defensible even without invoking God, but which become more firmly rooted, clear, and universal when understood within the framework of faith. These principles are not directed solely at the patient, but at humanity in general—at the sick and the healthy, and at physicians above all others. They are human obligations imposed upon us in a special way when we consider God as presented to us by the Jewish and Christian traditions. If, according to the Christian understanding of God, He desires to be a partner to humanity, then human dignity is no longer a mere incidental ethical presumption or an empty political slogan,

but rather, in the process of its scientific development and objective embodiment, becomes a firmly established truth rooted in God Himself—a truth that no human being can relinquish or lose. Humanity means respecting the inherent value of every human being as a person, a value in and of itself, not dependent on their social position, competence, usefulness, or productivity. Humanity is not—as extremists on both the right and the left imagine—a sign of weakness, but rather... Man's Great Task for Man; whether a person is healthy or sick, strong or weak, young or old, woman or man, all of them - as God's creatures and partners - possess an inalienable dignity that must be respected, especially in times of illness (2). Humanity is most clearly realized in dealing with the Sick Person, who must never be reduced, in the context of medical care, to a subject for research, experimentation, or treatment, but must always be taken seriously as a Subject and an Articulate Partner in the healing process; a partner who, through this recognition, contributes to the Humanization of Medicine through the humanization of man (2).

"Jesus" was concerned with man - humanity or man as he is man - that is, he was concerned with the "Humanization of man", not only with his mental life, but also with his material needs and worldly affairs, and his speech was directed to everyone, not only to the strong, the young, or the healthy, but also to the weak, the elderly, the sick, and those with disabilities. In this sense, Jesus' actions explain his words, and his words explain his actions (.). This was clearly evident, as his insistence on receiving the "sick" and "possessed" was unusual, although in itself tolerable. In that historical context, the sick were considered responsible for their suffering, illness was seen as punishment for "sin," the "possessed" were attributed to demonic powers, as were the "lepers." These people already bore the sign of death and were thus considered outside the community of the living, whether the reason was due to fate, sin, or the prevailing prejudices of the era. The result is the same, which is that they were all "social outcasts," and yet "Jesus" took an essentially positive attitude

toward them, rejecting in principle any causal relationship between “sin” and “disease,” as well as between “disease” and “social ostracism” (1).

Hans Küng argues that human dignity extends beyond the patient or their relationship with the doctor. He believes that Jesus also believed in applying “humanity” to women, who were not socially valued at the time and were expected to avoid public interaction with men. They held a prominent position in his circle, as contemporary Jewish sources are replete with hostility towards women. Women were viewed as “inferior to men in every way,” and men were advised not to speak much, even with their wives, let alone other women. Women lived as far removed from the public sphere as possible, and in the Temple, they had only a designated area. Regarding the obligation of prayer, they were placed on the same level as slaves (1). Thus, Jesus broke with the prevailing custom of avoiding women, showing no disdain for them. On the contrary, he appeared remarkably at ease in their presence. Women accompanied him and his disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem, and personal affection for them was natural to him. They were present at his death and participated in his burial. Furthermore, the weak legal and social status of women in the society of that era witnessed a significant improvement through the prohibition of divorce, which had previously been possible solely at the husband's discretion (1).

For centuries, religions—including Islam—focused solely on obligations: duty to God, to the ruler, to employers, or to parents. Modern philosophy, the Enlightenment, and the American and French Revolutions, however, shifted the focus to the inherent rights of human beings. Today, it is essential to recognize that human dignity encompasses both rights and responsibilities (6). Therefore, in this case, human rights are not a project of domination, but a Universal Ethical Project, provided that they are understood and practiced within a living balance between freedom and responsibility, and between right and duty.

6. The Golden Rule as a Criterion

for Global Ethics in Hans Küng's Philosophy

If humanity is the first standard of universal ethics, then the second standard is the Golden Rule, which is “reciprocity.” Hans Küng stated this, saying: “The fundamental requirement of humanity is most precisely defined by the ancient Golden Rule, the principle of reciprocity. This is a well-known rule that I have known since my youth: Do not do to others what you would not want done to you. However, its essential and universal importance for human society only became clear to me in the context of thinking about a universal ethics. This rule appeared five hundred years before Christ with Confucius in China: ‘What you would not want done to yourself, do not do to others.’ It then appeared in similar forms in all the major religions and ethical traditions of humanity, and it took on a ‘secular’ form with Immanuel Kant in his formulation of the moral imperative, which states: ‘Act in such a way that you treat humanity, in your own person and in the person of every other, always as an end and not merely as a means’”(8). This rule in itself represents the “moral dimension of the global political system,” and on this basis, fundamental values are derived from it, such as: respect for life, freedom, justice, mutual respect, willingness to help, and integrity, knowing that all these universal values are derived in one way or another from this rule, which is consistent with religious teachings across the world (4).

Küng argues: “This golden rule based on reciprocity represents the second fundamental principle of a common human morality. I have said on every occasion to representatives of politics, economics, culture, and sports that this golden rule should exist not only between individuals, but also between social and ethnic groups, and between nations and religions. However, a question is often asked of me: how can these fundamental principles of human morality—that is, universal morality—be expressed in the form of concrete standards?”(8).

From these two criteria—the criterion of humanity and the criterion of the Golden Rule—

Kung derived four fundamental ethical obligations that form the core of universal ethics. Every individual and every institution bears this fourfold responsibility:

1. Commitment to a culture of non-violence and respect for all forms of life: This means respecting life according to the time-honored principle, "Do not kill," "Do not torture," "Do not mutilate," "Do not violate." Consequently, it entails rejecting all forms of violence, respecting the life of humans, animals, and plants, and seeking peaceful solutions to conflicts.
2. Commitment to a culture of solidarity and a just economic order: Act justly and equitably, according to the time-honored principle, "Do not steal," "Do not exploit," "Do not bribe," "Do not corrupt".
3. Commitment to a culture of tolerance and honest living: Speak and act truthfully, in accordance with the time-honored guidance: "Do not lie," "Do not deceive," "Do not falsify," "Do not manipulate." This also means respecting cultural and religious diversity and resisting bigotry and extremism.
4. Commitment to a culture of equal rights and partnership between men and women: Respect and love one another, in accordance with the ancient principle: "Do not commit adultery, do not abuse sex," "Do not betray," "Do not insult," "Do not humiliate" (8). In principle, the Quran grants women and men equal status, stating: "And they (women) have rights similar to those (of men) over them in kindness, and men have a degree (of advantage) over them." This text affirms equality in rights and duties, while acknowledging historical forms of functional differentiation (6).

Hans Küng concludes from his analysis of universal ethical standards that the Principle of Humanity—the most fundamental and inherent principle of global ethics, namely, the inherent dignity of every individual—is clearly present in the core pronouncements of the Holy Quran. God has chosen humankind above all other creatures, making them His vicegerents on Earth. The Golden Rule, in its reciprocal form, is

conveyed in the Sunnah through the Prophet's saying: "None of you truly believes until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself." All of this clearly represents the common heritage of the three Abrahamic religions, a heritage that, if properly invoked and acted upon, could overcome many of the bitter conflicts that have characterized the past and propel us toward a shared ethical and humanistic horizon (6).

In Hans Küng's philosophy, universal ethics transcends the limits of individual behavior, becoming a universal standard for judging religious and cultural phenomena, thus preventing the reduction of values to deviant practices or the generalization of condemnation to entire religious or moral systems. Therefore, the ethical recommendation that Kung advocated in his philosophy was that Christianity and Islam together should never condemn a religion or moral system because of the moral lapses committed by some of its followers. If I, as a Christian, do not accept that my faith be judged by the actions of the Crusades or the Inquisition, then I must be even more careful not to judge the faith of others by the actions that a few terrorists might commit in the name of that faith. Thus, if it is wrong to condemn a particular doctrine or system of values because of the actions or statements of some of its adherents, it is equally wrong to generalize a moral judgment to an entire religion or spiritual tradition based on the deviant behaviors of individuals or groups that do not express the essence of that religion or its authentic moral message.

The above proves that the golden rule, coupled with the principle of humanity, transforms universal ethics from a mere theoretical claim into a system of practical normative obligations, shared by religions and cultures, capable of guiding individuals and institutions towards justice, tolerance, and achievable human equality. In short, it is a call to establish the "humanization of man," that is, the true essence of humanity.

7. Human Responsibility within the Horizon of Global Ethics.

The dialectical relationship between human

rights and shared human responsibility, within the framework of Hans Küng's universal ethics, is a necessary ethical response to the challenges of scientific and technological globalization. Human rights only acquire their full meaning when coupled with a universal sense of responsibility towards humanity, nature, and the shared future of humankind. International documents issued in the 1990s not only recognized human rights but also explicitly stipulated human responsibilities (4). Therefore, globalization requires universal ethics, and global politics and the global economy require "global ethics" (5). Today, as Küng says, we are living through a deep and far-reaching crisis of values. Since the youth and student revolutions of the late 1960s, there are no longer any institutions or authorities that are guardians of values that are not in crisis or subject to a radical challenge (4).

Hans Küng argues that "unprecedented technological progress has not eliminated the question of humanity's ethical progress—as was expected—but has brought it back to the forefront with urgency. Given the increasing problems ranging from gene technology to atomic energy, we are increasingly experiencing that man is capable of dealing with almost everything except himself. This is why a growing number of people are asking: Where does ethical orientation come from? How can it be established? More precisely, in the midst of this enormous multitude of choices in the present-day pluralism, how does one find and maintain one's way in life?" (8). Based on the above, Küng asserts that Islam inherently possesses a great potential for peace, and this potential must be activated in light of recent experiences, especially after the events of September 11. However, promises alone are not enough; what is required is not only a new reading of the texts, nor a new education for peace, but also the practical implementation of peace on the ground(6).

Küng asserts that science, despite its immense capacity for technological advancement, cannot provide humanity with values, while religion

remains capable of establishing an effective ethical value system. Therefore, religious ethics can address many of humanity's problems by guiding individuals toward moral purification, the attainment of the highest good, and opening new horizons for human perfection. Religion also offers reassurance and peace to scientifically advanced societies that simultaneously suffer from existential anxiety. According to this view, religion did not come merely to explain the universe, but to improve moral conduct in human life and guide humanity toward goodness and happiness (13). We can no longer receive ready-made ethical solutions from heaven, nor from a fundamentalist reading of the Bible, to address the many unavoidable decisions in contemporary individual and political life, as moral theologians did at the beginning of the modern era, for example, regarding the permissibility of interest. Furthermore, it is no longer possible—as was the case in the 20th century—to derive solutions from a supposedly fixed and unchanging "human nature," that is, from natural law, in matters of contraception or artificial fertilization. Rather, we must repeatedly seek new and varied solutions on earth for all complex problems and conflicts and often work to develop them through interaction among multiple specialists(8).

What I advocate—as Küng put it—is a realistic ethic in human thought and action: an ethic in which standards interact with the situation, so that standards illuminate the situation, and the situation itself contributes to shaping those standards. I advocate an ethic in which precise scientific knowledge is blended with moral responsibility, where medicine—for example—is based on a combination of objective neutrality, personal commitment, and respect for the patient's dignity. Medicine today faces tasks that extend beyond a single generation: whether in scientific research with therapeutic aims or in basic studies that explore human nature. In all of this, scientific principles must remain consistent with ethical responsibility (2). Therefore, ethics is neither a mere theory nor a mere tactic, and neither law nor situation alone should be the decisive factor. Standards without situations are

empty, and situations without standards blind us. Ethical standards should illuminate the situation, and the situation should contribute to shaping the standards. In other words, what is good and ethical is not good and right in the abstract, but rather what is concretely good and right for this person or that group; that is, what is appropriate. A moral demand only becomes concrete in its specific situation, but in a particular situation, the demand may become unconditional. Hence, every situation is characterized by two factors: one absolute, and the other subject to comparison and evaluation; that is, a universal normative constant linked to a specific variable that depends on the situation itself (3).

Based on the foregoing, Küng believes that universal ethical principles cannot be applied to the actions of states in their abstract, universal form. However, the assertion that this application must be filtered through the concrete conditions of time and place does not render the question of the existence of universal ethical principles governing state action superfluous; on the contrary, it makes it more pressing. This is because cooperation between different peoples and cultures would be easier, and existing conflicts less intense and more manageable, if all peoples and groups saw themselves bound by "common ethical obligations." Therefore, it was essential to search for a common core of values and ethical principles(4).

Resolving the economic and political crises in our world today requires everything stipulated by law. However, laws alone are insufficient because the political will to combat greed, fraud, corruption, and self-enrichment often remains weak, not because laws are absent, but because they are not underpinned by moral will. Laws without ethics cannot endure, and no legal text can be effectively implemented without a moral consciousness grounded in fundamental ethical standards. Just as economic crises are man-made, so too must humanity bear a moral responsibility to build an institutional framework suitable for the economy (7).

In conclusion, Hans Küng, the theologian, affirms that the need for a minimum moral

consensus is no longer a theoretical option, but a historical necessity imposed by the unity of human destiny and the complexity of the contemporary world. Universal ethics, in its realistic form interacting with the context, represents the only framework capable of guiding human action between the stability of values and the change of facts.

8. Search Results:

From the preceding discussion, we can extract the following key findings concerning moral education in John Dewey's philosophy:

1. **Inseparability of Moral Education from Dewey's Broader Ethical Philosophy** It is impossible to understand Dewey's conception of moral education independently of his ethical philosophy in particular. Nor can one interpret his ethics apart from his instrumentalist philosophy and results-oriented approach, as all of his ideas were born from and shaped by this framework.
2. **Moral Education as Life Itself**, In Dewey's view, moral education is essentially life itself and represents the genuine growth of any society aspiring to progress. Hence, education assumes the role of social guidance that educators must provide to younger generations.
3. **Collaboration between Family and School**, Collaboration between parents (the family) and the school-based educational system is vital for nurturing and advancing the concept of moral education. School is only one facet of the educational process, and it cannot replace the role of the family. Rather, family involvement precedes and supports formal schooling.
4. **Linking Schooling to the Productive Environment**, There must be a connection between school-based education and the productive environment, as well as the broader societal needs. Education should be designed to meet the requirements of society so that its outcomes serve both the community and its surrounding environment.
5. **Consideration of the Child's Interests and Psychology**, Children cannot be creative if

they are subject to constant psychological or societal pressure. Thus, moral education relies on the principle of freedom, allowing children the opportunity to gather facts and draw conclusions independently.

6. **Integral Role of Experience and Logical Thinking**, Moral education cannot be interpreted in isolation from the concept of experience, and the role experience plays in establishing an ethical community. Likewise, logical thinking must not be divorced from the development of moral education.

References:

Primary Sources: Works by Hans Küng

1. Küng, H. (1976). *On being a Christian* (E. Quinn, Trans.). Doubleday.
2. Küng, H. (1984). *Eternal life? Life after death as a medical, philosophical, and theological problem* (E. Quinn, Trans.). Doubleday.
3. Küng, H. (1991). *Does God exist? An answer for today* (E. Quinn, Trans.). SCM Press.
4. Küng, H. (1998). *A global ethic for global politics and economics* (J. Bowden, Trans.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195122282.001.0001>
5. Küng, H. (2005). *Why I am still a Christian*. Continuum.
6. Küng, H. (2007). *Islam: Past, present and future* (J. Bowden, Trans.). Oneworld Publications.
7. Küng, H. (2010). *The global economic crisis requires a global ethic*. In BBVA (Ed.), *Values and ethics for the 21st century*.
8. Küng, H. (2010). *What I believe* (J. Bowden, Trans.). Bloomsbury.

Secondary Sources

9. Brewer, K. (2001). *The ethics of Jerusalem and the morals of Athens: Assessing Hans Küng's theological ethics*. *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 56(1).
10. Hughes, J. J. (1980). *Hans Küng and the Magisterium*. *Theological Studies*, 41(2), 368–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056398004100205>
11. Macallan, B. C. (2022). *The Küng is dead, long live the Küng: The value of Hans Küng's theology*. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 78(4), a7632. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v78i4.7632>
12. Morgan, R. H. (2011). *Peace among religions: Hans Küng's analysis of Christian and Muslim paradigms of social justice in search of a global ethic*. *Journal of Academic Perspectives*.
13. Rezania Shirazi, H. (2022). *Analyzing the viewpoint of compatibility and alignment as one of the main approaches in the relationship between science and religion (Case study: Hans Küng)*. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Pure Life*, 9(30).
14. Riyanto, W. F., & Galle', P. T. (2023). *The dialogical theology of Hans Küng: Clash between the Catholic mission and Islamic Da'wah in Indonesia*. *Acta Theologica*, 43(2), 30–53. <https://doi.org/10.38140/at.v43i2.6866>