

The Study of Relationship between Freedom and Morality

Xijun Wang

*Ideological and Political Theory Department, Changsha Vocational & Technical College,
Changsha, Hunan, 410217, China*

Keywords: Freedom, morality, good Inter-subject relationship, relationship

Abstract: Freedom has complex and diverse connotations. With factors that oppose and coexist with freedom as a reference, freedom can be divided according to four dimensions, namely, the dimension of restriction imposed by others, the dimension of restriction from individual capability and desire, the dimension of restriction from objective law and dimension of restriction from religious belief. A four-dimensional analysis of freedom is made with reference to constraints that oppose freedom. Based on politics, religion, individual utility and good inter-subject relationship, morality is divided into four systems. By analyzing the different connotations of freedom and morality and the nature of the reflected relationship, corresponding correlations and matching are made to infer and demonstrate the relationship between freedom and morality. The freedom of rational free people who get rid of constraints from traditional politics, religion and individual utility is the premise and law for the formation of free morality.

1. Introduction

Regarding freedom, Abraham Lincoln once said, "There has never been a precise definition of freedom in the world...We both claim to fight for freedom, but the same words used mean very different things" ^[1]. If someone considers that "morality" is not as diverse in meaning as "freedom", and its connotation is definite and uncontroversial, it will be the biggest misunderstanding. In fact, like "freedom", it also faces the reality that "the same words used mean very different things". For such two concepts with multiple connotations, we need clarify their relationship. The basic idea is to analyze the different connotations of the two, make corresponding correlations and matching, then infer and demonstrate the relationship in between.

2. The Four Dimensions of Freedom and the Four Systems of Morality

2.1. The Four Dimensions of Freedom

Freedom opposes and coexists with the factors that restrict it. If we take the "first-order freedom" ^[2] of "arbitrary willfulness" as the logical starting point, and take the factors that oppose and coexist with freedom as the reference basis, we can examine and analyze freedom from four dimensions, namely, the dimension of restriction imposed by others, the dimension of restriction from individual capability and desire, the dimension of restriction from objective law and dimension of restriction from religious belief. When it comes to freedom, although meaning is different, discussions of

numerous scholars basically focus on these four dimensions. For example, Friedrich August von Hayek discussed freedom purely from the dimension of constraints imposed by others. He even confines freedom to a smaller scope of discussion, that is, "away from arbitrary coercion of others as much as possible". According to him, freedom "specifically refers to a relationship between people', and only coercion of others will damage it" ^[3]. Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum put forward the "capability theory", discussing freedom from the dimension of individual capability. In the book "Research on Human Understanding", David Hume mainly discusses the relationship between freedom and inevitability, who tends to discuss freedom from the dimension of restriction from objective laws. In his article "You Give Me "Freedom", I Give You a World of "Virtue" - A "Dialogue" between "Philosophy" and "Religion", Ye Xiushan, a professor at Tsinghua University, discusses the value of freedom from the perspective of religious constraints. A thinker's emphasis on one dimension often does not mean that the discussion of freedom is purely from one dimension. That is, two or more dimensions may be involved. For example, the Russian thinker Nicola Aleksandrovich Berdyaev advocated the construction of "individual personality" to resist the enslavement of law, morality, and human relations, resist the enslavement of being ruled, and resist human beings' submission to the enslavement of nature. It can be seen that Nicola Aleksandrovich Berdyaev mainly discusses freedom from the dimension of restriction imposed by others and the dimension of restriction from objective law in nature. The establishment of individual personality is naturally related to individual capability (that is, the dimension of restriction from individual capability). Thus, the freedom discussed by Nicola Aleksandrovich Berdyaev relates to three of the four dimensions. In another example, Jean-Jacques Rousseau mainly discusses freedom from the perspective of political rule and obedience (the dimension of restriction imposed by others), but he also realizes that freedom is the most noble ability of man. It can be seen that Rousseau's discussion of freedom involves two of the four dimensions... Generally speaking, the freedom discussed by numerous scholars has respective emphasis, but does not go beyond the four dimensions outlined by the author.

2.2. The Four Systems of Morality

What is morality? What kind of relationship does it study? Opinions vary. Based on numerous discourses on morality, it can be basically divided into four systems, namely, the traditional political ethics and moral system, the religious ethics and moral system, the ethics and moral system based on individual utility, and the ethics and moral system based on the value of good inter-subject relationship ^[4].

The moral norms of the traditional political ethics and moral system are determined by the ruling class according to the needs of its political rule through the form of "legislation by saints". However, politics is limited within a clear ruling area and historical period, which inevitably means that different ruling areas, the same region in different historical periods will form different morals. Seen from global scope and wider historical time domain, "morality" of the traditional political ethics and moral system is inevitably divided by the time and space of political rule into diverse types that are both intersecting and different.

The morality of the religious ethics and moral system is established by "gods". For example, Christianity advocates that "God is the maker of moral rules, and these rules are called statutes, institutions, commandments, instructions, etc., which are the laws of God or divine law." ^[5] Different religions have different "gods", different dogmas and rules, which of course inevitably means that different religions linked by faith have different morals. That is, the domain boundaries of religious ethics and moral system are divided by religious beliefs.

Traditional politics is often linked with religion, so the traditional political ethics and moral

system and the religious ethics and moral system are often blended together. Many scholars also tend to call relatively stable behaviors and customs gradually formed by the long-term influence of religion and politics as "morality". Even more, some "moralists" call the Chinese old custom of women's foot binding and the custom of girls' circumcision still popular in some parts of Asia and Africa as "morality". Does it seem awkward for those who praise moral beauty and advocate high morality without analysis?

The ethical and moral system based on individual utility takes individual pursuit of pleasure and benefits and avoidance of pain and harm as the ethical principle. Due to individual differences in the viewpoints on hardship and happiness, benefits and harms, the so-called morality based on the satisfaction of individual desires will inevitably lead to exceedingly strange moral outlook due to individuals' widely different judgments of "good" and "evil".

Judging from the above three ethical and moral systems, morality is different for different ruling regions, different religious belief groups, and even different individuals. That is, when people discuss morality, the substantive connotation of "morality" does not have the same logical identity.

This shows that, to make "morality" a generally recognized word with logical identity, the first thing to do is to construct a universally recognized common idea of "goodness" that can break through divisions of domain boundaries due to political rule, religious belief, and individual utility.

Ethics and morality based on good inter-subject relationship (see the author's papers "On Positive Value Morality", "On the Essence of Morality-Based on Positive Value Perspective", "On Four Ethical and Moral Systems", "Ethics Research Should Orient to Relational Nature and Public Domain") advocates that morality is a word for evaluating the inter-subject relationship (the relationship between people, the relationship between people and organizations, the relationship between organizations, and behavior irrelevant with others has nothing to do with morality), rather than the subject-object relationship, such as the relationship between people and things, and goodness defined in terms of desire satisfaction refers to the subject-object relationship. It takes not harming (bottom line) or benefiting (high demand) the interests of others as the evaluation scale. It takes "treating others as oneself" - treating others as a different self as the emotional basis, and the values of good inter-subject relationship - equality, freedom, justice, honesty, friendliness, conscientiousness, etc. as the basic principles. It is a moral system oriented to the normative system formulated with the value concept of good inter-subject relationship as the basic principle.

Hence, among the four types of ethical and moral systems, only moral system based on the good inter-subject relationship can break through the boundaries of race, politics, religion, and individual utility, thereby unifying the meaning of the word morality. That is, the substantive connotation of morality is consistent despite different races, different political regions, different religious beliefs and different individuals.

3. Analysis on the Nature of the Relationship between Freedom and Morality

If the four dimensions of freedom and the four systems of morality are matched one by one, there will be 16 matching pairs. It will be too mechanical and boring to discuss 16 pairs of matches one by one. The four dimensions of freedom are divided based on relationships, and the four morality systems are also divided based on relationships. To discuss the relationship between freedom and morality, the simplest way is to analyze the nature of the relationship. Since freedom and morality are both the feelings and evaluations of the subject (people), the relationship between the two must involve the subject's participation. Accordingly, there can only be two types of relationships, one is the inter-subject relationship, and the other is the subject-object relationship. Here, it is particularly worth mentioning that moral philosophy should orient to the relational nature of its research. That is, it should determine that the core relationship of its research is the inter-

subject relationship ^[6], while issues, events and fields irrelevant with the inter-subject relationship should be outside the field of moral philosophy research. Numerous ethical writings suggest that it seems to be true, but actually it is not. For example, questions such as how to prolong life and what is more nutritious eating habit should not be studied in ethics. However, many ethics works concern these issues. For another example, if we only study environmental issues, it falls in the category of specialized environmental science and ecology research. The so-called environmental ethics should fundamentally orient to inter-subject relationship behind the "environment". That is, the "necessity" and "justice" of environmental behaviors should be judged based on the gains and losses to others (or abstract species subjects—people, or even presumed future people) brought about by environmental protection or damage. The author advocates that the relationship that should be studied in moral philosophy should orient to inter-subject relationship (both direct and indirect). The author also believes that the relationship irrelevant with the subject has no ethical meaning, which is also the logical starting point of this paper.

3.1. Analysis on the Nature of the Relationships Involved in the Four Dimensions of Freedom

Among the four dimensions of freedom, the dimension of restriction imposed by others undoubtedly involves the inter-subject relationship, because the restrictor and the restricted are both subjects, namely, the relationship between people, between people and organizations, and between organizations. Regarding the dimension of restriction from individual capability and desire, "capability" and "desire" are invariably manifested through explicit behavior. There are undoubtedly two types of explicit behaviors, one is behavior that is irrelevant with others; the other is behavior that is relevant with others. Behaviors relevant with others can be classified into two types, behaviors harming others' interests or behaviors without lossless and benefits to others. The dimension of restriction from objective law means that the freedom of action to achieve practical purpose (different from the purpose of expressing ideas, emotions, desires, and creating myths simply through imaginative thinking and fiction) cannot violate objective law. Freedom in this dimension also involves two types of relationships. One is subject-object relationship in which the subject acts on the object world by acquiring the necessary materials for life, or understanding things, or exploring laws. The other involves inter-subject relationship concerning whether the dominant subject grasps the law realistically and acts according to the law in the act of achieving the practical purpose. Of course, this kind of behavior inevitably involves the gain and loss of others' interests. For example, research on nuclear physics belongs to the field of pure science - reflecting the subject-object relationship, while whether one uses nuclear physics results - to serve human beings or to harm others, and examines the actual or possible consequences - converts the nature into inter-subject relationship. Hence, how to use nuclear physics carries an ethical significance. The dimension of restriction from religious belief involves the relationship between "God and Man". Essentially, it studies the relationship between religious interest groups and believers, so it obviously also learns the inter-subject relationship.

Any behavior of free will of an individual has nothing to do with others. That is, it does not involve the freedom in inter-subject relationship and has no "moral" meaning. Such behavior can be drinking water when thirsty, and freely choosing when and where to eat. Behavior of free will of an individual that may damage or benefit the interests of others, that is, behavior directly or indirectly involved in the inter-subject relationship carries "moral" significance. Such behavior can be smoking in public places, and lifting up a fallen old man. In a word, irrelevance with inter-subject relationship means irrelevance with morality. Therefore, the freedom to discuss the relationship between freedom and morality only needs to be limited to the scope where the actual and possible consequences of freedom involve the gains and losses of the subject interests.

3.2. Analysis on the Nature of the Relationships Involved in the Four Systems of Morality

Among the four systems of morality, the traditional political ethics and moral system involves the relationship between the ruler and the ruled (inter-subject relationship) in the political domination area. The religious ethics and moral system involves the relationship between the hierarch and the believers (inter-subject relationship) in the same belief system. The ethical and moral system of utilitarianism involves two types of relationships. In the first type, the pursuit of self-utility has nothing to do with others (for example, someone is intoxicated with light music in a small space not interfering with others). In the other type, the pursuit of self-utility damages or benefits others. These three types of ethical and moral systems are integrated into the meta-ethical theory by a set of "goodness" (value) requiring the object to meet the needs of the subject (see Wang Haiming's "Principles of Ethics" (third edition), Peking University Press, 2009, meta-ethical theory in the first part). This set of theories defines value (goodness) as the attribute of requiring the object to meet the needs of the subject, and only uses "value" to interpret the subject-object relationship, failing to separately list the inter-subject relationship as a research object of meta-ethics. Its essence is not to regard the ruled and believers as subjects, but as objects—objects governed and controlled by the dominant subject, and all means of maintaining the ruling or religious order are considered as "goodness". For example, Shang Yang's theory of "foolish people, weak people, tired people, humiliated people, and poor people" in order to maintain the emperor's rule is to regard "people" as the object to be dominated. As long as it facilitates the rule of the emperor, the people's ignorance, weakness, fatigue, humiliation and poverty are not evil, but are the "goodness" that emperors need to pursue instead. Hitler Nazism's genocide of Jews can also be called "goodness" - building concentration camps to kill Jews is a way to satisfy the needs of Nazism - the needs of the subject (Nazists) are met, so it is "good". This shows that if moral philosophy does not clearly distinguish between the inter-subject relationship and subject-object relationship, and does not regard people with ability to think and act as subjects, not only will the logic of the whole set of theories be confused, but also all evils will be recognized in the name of "moral goodness". The ethics and moral system based on good inter-subject relationship only discusses the relationship between the subjects, and refers to the behavior that does not harm or damage the interests of others as moral behavior or "goodness". Such "goodness" is "good relationship", which does not take satisfaction of the needs of a certain subject as the basis, but takes the interests and losses of others caused by the behavior as the evaluation basis. In this way, morality becomes the behavioral self-discipline according to which the actor must consider the consequences of the behavior on the interests and losses of others, so that one will not do whatever he wants to pursue individual needs.

4. Domain Morality and Liberty Morality as Opposed to Freedom

4.1. Domain Morality as Opposed to Freedom

In the traditional political ethics and moral system, religious ethics and moral system and the ethics and moral system based on individual utility, the relational nature of "morality" is defined as subject-object relationship. The so-called goodness means the object helps the subject meet the needs; the so-called evil means the object does not help the subject meet the needs. These three types of ethics and moral systems do not regard the other as the subject, but as the object, which means the freedom of the other cannot be the goal pursued by the dominant subject. Not only that, the freedom of the other often hinders or damages the dominant subject's pursuit of their own needs—especially needs of protecting the interests of the privileged class as opposed to the interests of the other. Therefore, the freedom of the other is not the goal pursued by the "morality" prescribed

by the dominant subject. Moreover, it is regarded as "evil" because it interferes and hinders the fulfillment of the dominant subject's needs. In the traditional political ethics and moral system and religious ethics and moral system, freedom is only the freedom of the privileged class. For example, in ancient Greece, freedom was the privilege of the nobility. Christianity also once claimed that freedom is the exclusive right of God ^[7], and believers have no freedom to think. Therefore, in the traditional political ethics and moral system and religious ethics and moral system, freedom and "morality" are fundamentally contradictory, and the domain morality advocated by them is incompatible with freedom.

For such "domain morality" fundamentally contradictory with freedom, we should reform it for the sake of freedom. That is, we should strive to limit the privileges of the traditional political ruling class, get rid of the bad control of religion, go beyond the shackles of individual utilitarianism, and reconstruct free and open moral theory. Since the Renaissance, the theoretical discourses of numerous thinkers and various movements for freedom have allowed the dynamic reconstruction of theoretical system of freedom and morality in the struggle and game with traditional politics and religion.

4.2. The Morality of Freedom

"Free morality" is naturally a morality free from traditional political and religious shackles, and also a morality that is incompatible with the utilitarian view of simply pursuing individual desires. That is, morality must be independent from politics, religion, and self-interest satisfaction, just as the so-called "God's to God, Caesar's to Caesar"—religion to religion, politics to politics, and morality to morality. Such morality cannot be determined and simplified as rules by rulers and religious leaders based on their own special interests, nor can it be guided by utilitarian's pursuit of their own happiness. Instead, it should be guided by the values of equality, freedom, justice, integrity, friendliness, and conscientiousness based on the good inter-subject relationship, so that it is possible to establish a system supported by these values, thereby guiding and regulating social behavior. In this way, free morality becomes a systematic and mechanical system of "values - institutional system-behavior based on good inter-subject relationship".

Free morality features relational intersubjectivity, generative nature of moral norms, openness of the public domain, the value supremacy of good inter-subject relationship, and the full responsibility of free subjects.

4.2.1. The Relational Intersubjectivity

That is, the nature of the relationship involved in morality is the inter-subject relationship rather than the subject-object relationship. In particular, it is unrecognizable if the dominant person regards the dominated as the object and alienates the inter-subject relationship into the subject-object relationship. That is to say, people are "an end in themselves", and no one or a violent group has the right to dominate others as a tool. ^[8]

4.2.2. The Generative Nature of Moral Norms

Moral norms are not determined by the dominant subject through "legislation by saints" or "legislation by God". Instead, it is naturally generated in the benign game of interaction and repetition between subjects when the subject "sees others as a different self", pursues self-interest and assumes responsibility based on the emotion and rationality of love and compassion. It is something with regularity. Being a law means that it is not artificially set, and can be recognized and described. For example, in a fully free market economy, the subject that pays attention to integrity and provides consumers with high-quality goods and services can naturally win

consumers' recognition and thus develop lasting vitality. A morally good subject can naturally be recognized, followed and imitated by others.

4.2.3. The Openness of the Public Domain

Traditional political morality and religious morality have strict territorial boundaries and are therefore communitarian, while liberal morality does not set territorial boundaries and is therefore cosmopolitan.

4.2.4. The Value Supremacy of Good Inter-subject Relationship

Norms inevitably create order, and the essence of free morality is not the normative system itself (some people regard the essence of morality as a normative system, which actually confuses the public), but something above the norm. The norm is only the appearance, and what is above the norm is the essence. For example, for things built above the traffic regulation system, the first priority is safety, followed by efficiency. Safety and efficiency are the essence of traffic rules. The entire normative system is formulated around the essence, and in turn, the implementation of the entire normative system highlights and focuses on the essence, forming a perfect state. The same is also true for the normative system of morality. In traditional political and religious ethics, the normative system values the utmost interests of the privileged, while free morality emphasizes equality, justice, integrity inclusiveness and other values based on good inter-subject relationship.

4.2.5. The Full Responsibility of Free Subjects

The premise of free morality is free subject. A free subject is not subject to the inducement, coercion and constraint of others, whose behavior is completely controlled by its own rationality. Because of this, a free subject must bear full responsibility for his own behavior. That is, if his behavior causes damage to the interests of others, he must assume full moral and legal responsibility. It is worth noting that the morality and law here are theoretically generated by "overlapping consensus" rather than imposed by the subjective consciousness of the dominant subject. Traditional politics and religion often lead to the enslavement of individuals' minds and spirits, making them lose their ego and rationality, and then subconsciously create "banality of evil". The mediocre are damnable, who are also enslaved victims worthy of sympathy.

5. How Is a Free Morality Possible?

The globalized market economy, shared culture, and democratic governance will inevitably disintegrate the "domain morality" constructed by traditional politics and religion, while the philosophy of intersubjectivity and public philosophy provide philosophical support for the construction of free morality based on good inter-subject relationship.

5.1. The Globalized Market Economy Will Inevitably Break Through the Domain Boundaries Set by Traditional Politics and Religion, which Is the Economic Foundation for the Formation of Free Morality

The most important reason for the long-term survival of traditional political morality and religious morality is that for a long period of time, human society itself is relatively closed and divided. Regional communities built by politics and religion nurture ethnic cultural customs and values with political cohesion. To maintain domination and religious order, rulers and religious groups establish certain distinctive regional, religious, and national behavioral norms through

political and religious myths. These behavioral norms are regional historical "morality" with profound political and religious color. Obviously, such morality is relatively closed and separated from each other.

The highly globalized market economy makes it easy for us to freely allocate and exchange production factors and commodities across political and religious domain boundaries. The cross-regional flow of production factors and commodities is bound to impact the original order and moral norms formed by traditional politics and religion through long-term historical accumulation, thus reconstructing generally recognized new order and new moral code that breaks through the traditional domain boundaries and adapts to economic globalization. It can be said that it is the globalization of the market economy that breaks through the barriers of traditional politics and religion, and therefore provides the economic foundation for freely reconstructing morality by breaking away from the shackles of traditional politics and religion.

5.2. The Shared Culture of Globalization Will Inevitably Break Through the Domain Boundaries Set by Traditional Politics and Religion, which Is the Cultural Foundation for the Formation of Free Morality

Culture is defined in a broad sense as the sum of all the achievements of material civilization and spiritual civilization created by human beings. Any material form of civilization achievement is the carrier of spiritual culture. The cross-regional flow of free market elements and commodities, and the frequent exchange of personnel and information will inevitably lead to cross-domain influence of culture. Global economic exchange and interaction and global cultural integration and mutual learning are bound to go hand in hand without separation. While sharing the fruits of economic development brought about by globalization, human beings are also sharing the fruits of cultural innovation. Mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, geography, logic, philosophy, architecture, information technology. Such disciplines have become universal disciplines in school education around the world. People use the mutual translation and analysis of languages to overcome communication barriers formed by languages and texts of different ethnic groups in historical accumulation. Global natural science Olympiad competitions, various global cultural and sports activities, etc. are frequently carried out... The sharing of human culture has already comprehensively impacted the domain boundaries constructed by traditional politics and religion. Therefore, the conservative tendency to rely on the traditional basic political and religious thinking in attempt to build a solidified "domain morality" is already outdated. The extensive cross-domain communication and influence of culture will inevitably impact the closed and rigid traditional political and religious culture, and the moral values and normative systems will inevitably break away from the shackles of traditional politics and religion and get reconstructed. Therefore, how to construct a universally applicable moral theory that breaks through the domain boundary has become an important topic for thinkers and politicians to reflect and learn.

5.3. Global Democratic Governance Will Inevitably Break Through the Domain Boundaries Set by Traditional Politics and Religion, Which Is an Inevitable Trend in the Formation of Free Morality

Under the background of economic globalization, diversified market players actively participate in economic activities. In particular, a large number of multinational companies conduct globalization transactions, resulting in overlapping and interpenetration of interests between countries, regions and market players, and then forming communities with a shared future for stakeholders. In this way, international organization aimed to balance interests and national exchange platforms come into being. The intricate game of interests will inevitably lead to the

democratization of international politics and the birth of rules, norms, international charters and laws adapted to global economic governance. In addition, global issues such as energy, resources, environment, population, food, health, security, and human rights also demand global governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations to find solutions through joint discussion. Obviously, no “domain morality” constructed by traditional politics and religion can adapt to such open, multilateral, and democratized international political requirement, which will inevitably lead to the disintegration of “domain morality” and the reconstruction of new moral code guided by the values of mutual respect, equality, fairness, integrity, and tolerance based on the good inter-subject relationship.

5.4. The Rise of Intersubjectivity Philosophy and Public Philosophy Provides Philosophical Support for the Construction of Values and Normative Systems of Free Morality

The rise of Western philosophy of subjectivity in the early modern period plays a positive role in combating the ideological control of medieval feudal religions and promoting ideological emancipation. However, modern capitalism and colonialism brought various disasters of inequality, prejudice, and killings. As the social context changes, in order to reduce or eliminate the practical problems and theoretical logical flaws in the philosophy of subjectivity, the philosophy of intersubjectivity quietly emerged. Scholars such as Edmund Gustav Albrecht Husserl, Martin Heidegger initiated elucidation. Jürgen Habermas used intersubjectivity as the premise of his theory of communicative rationality and discourse. Then, Slavoj Žižek regarded the dualization of self-consciousness as the basis of intersubjectivity. Philosophy of "intersubjectivity" is deemed as the highest achievement of "subjective" epistemological philosophy, which is valued by more and more researchers. "It is through intersubjectivity that we can build a shared world that enables our communication. With intersubjectivity, individuals can communicate freely with each other, find their own identity through free communication with themselves, and achieve socialization without coercion." [9]

Beginning in the 1990s, Japanese academia quietly launched a systematic study of "public philosophy". Under the initiation, advocacy and promotion of Kim Tea-Chang, Sasaki Takeshi, et al., the "Common Research Society of Public Philosophy" (later renamed "Public Philosophy Kyoto Forum") was established in Kyoto, gathering a large number of scholars for discussion and interaction and achieving fruitful results. Based on Habermas's philosophy of intersubjectivity, public philosophy takes the Stoic school's "world compatriots" and Kant's "world citizens" as its ideals, and advocates thinking, judging, acting, and taking responsibility from the standpoint of world citizens. Based on the ternary related thinking of mutual restraint - mutual harmony - mutual generation between "public", "private" and "common", it seeks "common happiness" through "mutual media", "interaction", and grasps the mutual linkage between oneself, others and the world to promote "private publicity - public and private creation - happiness co-creation" [10].

Philosophy of intersubjectivity and public philosophy are not communitarian but cosmopolitan, not closed but open, not constructed on the basis of a certain “domain culture” and “domain morality”, but reconstructed without setting of domain boundaries. Therefore, the philosophy of intersubjectivity and public philosophy provide solid philosophical support for the construction of values and normative systems of free morality.

6. Conclusion

Kant believes that "the heteronomy of the will is the source of all false moral principles." "Freedom is the ratio essendi of the moral laws." Engels also said, "If you don't talk about the so-called free will, human responsibility, the relationship between necessity and freedom, etc., you

can't discuss the issues of morality and law well."... The morality in Kant and Engels' idea is naturally not closed domain morality mandated by traditional politics and religion, because domain morality itself is improper coercion opposite to freedom. The morality of freedom means the morality of a rational and free person who breaks away from the constraints of traditional politics, religion and individual utility. It is a morality naturally generated between the subjects amid the benign game of natural emotion, behavior interaction and repetition. It is a morality open in the public domain that guides values of good inter-subject relationship. It is a morality that reflects inevitability and demonstrates strict universality. In this sense, freedom is the premise of morality, and freedom generates morality. It carries important practical significance and profound historical significance to conduct research and practice on moral philosophy advocating cross-domain universalism with cosmopolitan feelings.

References

- [1] Abraham Lincoln, *The Writings of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. A. B. Lapsley [New York, 1906], VIII, 121.
- [2] Shaoping Gan, *An Ethical Examination of "Escape from Freedom". Morality and Civilization*, 2019, No. 4, pp.11.
- [3] Friedrich August von Hayek, *Freedom Charter*, translated by Yang Yusheng et al., Beijing, China Social Sciences Press, 2017-11, pp.30.
- [4] Xijun Wang, Bengang Zhao, *On Four Ethical and Moral Systems*, *Frontiers*, No. 11, 2014, pp. 68-69.
- [5] Yanzhang Zeng: "The Moral Effect behind the Construction of the Social Good Law System", *"Seeker"*, No. 10, 2010. pp. 119-121.
- [6] Xijun Wang. *Ethics Research Should Orient to Relational Nature and Public Domain*. *Journal of Hunan Administration Institute*, No. 9, 2017, pp. 110-112.
- [7] Xiaoying Liu, Feng Liu. *On the Development of Freedom and Equality Concepts before the French Revolution*. *Study & Exploration*, 1999 (4), pp. 74-77.
- [8] Immanuel Kant. *An Anthology of Criticism of Historical Reason*. translated by He Zhaowu. Beijing: Commercial Press, 1997, pp. 60-67.
- [9] Jiaming Chen. *Fifteen Lectures on Modernity and Postmodernity*. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2006.
- [10] Sasaki Takeshi, Kim Tea-Chang, editor-in-chief, translated by Bian Chongdao, Wang Qing, and Diao Liu, *Prospects of Public Philosophy in the 21st Century*, Beijing, People's Publishing House, June 2009, pp. 9