ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

The Examination of the Relationship between Law and Morality from a Legal Philosophy Perspective: A Return to the Interpretation of Law as Intergrity

Mocheng Sun

Law School, China University of Political Science and Law, Beijing, 100088, China

Abstract

The relationship between law and morality is one of the core issues in the philosophy of law. Dworkin's proposition of the integrity of law provides us with a unique perspective. In Dworkin's view, law is not only a single system composed of rules, but also a holistic system full of value judgments and moral considerations. He proposed that "law is not only a collection of facts, but also the embodiment of moral requirements", which broke through the traditional legal positivism and closely linked the application of law with moral standards. Dworkin advocated that the law should be interpreted in conjunction with moral concepts in specific cases, especially when the legal rules are incomplete and there is ambiguity, judges must make judgments based on moral principles such as justice and fairness. This view emphasizes the moral component of legal decisions, arguing that the law is not merely to resolve disputes by mechanically applying rules, but to "interpret" the law so that it is consistent with the moral values of society. However, Dworkin's holistic proposition is not that law is entirely determined by morality, but that moral values should play an important role in the process of legal interpretation. He believes that legal rules and moral norms complement each other, and that moral requirements and legal rules in the legal system are not opposed to each other, but are unified through an interpretative practice. In this way, Dworkin provides a bridge to understanding the relationship between law and morality, highlighting the close integration of reason and ethics in the rule of law. The significance of this proposition is to remind us that the legitimacy of law not only depends on formal compliance, but also depends on deep moral judgment, and the perfection of the rule of law needs to find a balance between morality and law.

Keywords

Philosophy of law; Law; Morality; Law as intergrity.

1. The Formation of The Issue

In the process of promoting the "modernization of national governance" in China, it is necessary to build a harmonious and orderly bureau based on the rule of law and supported by the rule of virtue. The realization of this order depends not only on the rigid norms of law but also on the flexible guidance of morality. Morality is the cornerstone and must not be ignored at any time." Since the founding of the People's Republic of China, especially after the reform and opening up, remarkable achievements have been made in the construction of the rule of law in China. The socialist legal system with Chinese characteristics has been gradually improved, and citizens' legal awareness and belief in the law have gradually increased. However, the construction of the rule of law still faces many challenges, such as the waste of judicial resources caused by the phenomenon of excessive litigation, the limitation of the efficiency of the rule of law, the crisis of trust caused by moral decline, and the difficulty of unifying the situation, reason and law. The root causes of these phenomena mostly point to the loss of moral order,

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

because "the rule of law is not omnipotent, and the rule of law alone is not enough to govern the country." "Law is written morality, and morality is the law of the heart." Both law and morality have the function of regulating social behavior and maintaining social order. In the governance of the country and society, we must attach importance to the rule of law and the rule of virtue at the same time, and attach importance to the normative role of law and the educational role of morality, so that law and morality complement each other and rule of law and rule of virtue complement each other." Thus, the core problem of the construction of the rule of law in our country lies in correctly dealing with the relationship between law and morality. The realization of the rule of law is impossible in a society without moral belief. In the process of moving towards a society ruled by law, any country must rely on the soft resources of morality to make up for the inflexible deficiency of law. Therefore, in order to realize the modernization of the rule of law, we must face up to the internal relationship between law and morality, and attach equal importance to the two. Only in this way can we promote social harmony and justice to be manifested, and make national governance move to a higher level.

In any legal system, the relationship between morality and law is always the core issue that cannot be avoided. Although legal ideas and institutions often reflect moral values, they do not coincide completely. As they say, being good and doing good is not necessarily the same as obeying the law, and if the law is exactly the same as morality, it is confusing. The relationship between law and morality is more like two intersecting circles. In the overlapping part, law and moral values are in harmony; However, in non-overlapping areas, illegal conduct may not be unethical, and unethical conduct may not constitute illegal conduct. The degree of crossover determines the acceptance and legitimacy of the law in the society. The more overlap, the more recognized and respected the law will be by the members of the society. However, when the connection between law and morality is gradually alienated, the authority and binding force of law will be weakened. As the German sociologist Reimer Gronemeier put it, "When people act morally, they no longer tremble." It is no longer new for jurists to break the law, nor is it surprising that medical personnel abuse the human body for their own purposes. When people face God's punishment or violation of divine law without fear, all things are possible." It can be seen that the relationship between morality and law is an important topic in the construction of contemporary rule of law.

2. The definition of law: Law is justice

The definition of law or what law is has always been the core issue of legal philosophy, because law is not only the embodiment of social order, but also the condensation of human reason and morality. The definition of law, like a multi-prism, reflects the light of truth in different thoughts, and is a comprehensive expression of reason, justice and order. When discussing "the definition of law", we need to go beyond the formal logic of appearance and think about the source of the legitimacy of law and its internal relationship with ethics and justice. As Cicero said, "Law comes from nature." [1] Natural law is the joint crystallization of reason and wisdom, it provides the scale of the distinction between legal and illegal, beyond the limitations of written law, is a measure "for all times", existed before the formation of the state. [1] Cicero further states that "we can distinguish between good and bad laws only by natural standards." We follow nature and distinguish not only between legal and illegal, but also between the noble and the ugly." [3] Natural law is not only the basis of legitimacy, but also the cornerstone of moral evaluation.

This view of natural law as the core not only occupies an important position in Cicero's thought, but also has been deeply explained in Augustine's philosophy of law. Augustine said, "All human laws, as long as they are derived from natural law, are rational." If a human law is contrary to the law of nature, it is no longer legal." [4] This argument reveals two essential attributes that

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

law must possess: reason and justice. When law loses the support of natural law, as Augustine said, "Without justice, what is the state, except a multitude of robbers?" [5] This incisive statement reveals the inseparable link between law and justice: without the support of justice, law loses its due meaning and the legitimacy of the state is out of the question. This view of natural law finally points to the ultimate source of legal legitimacy. As Augustine put it, "A realistic legal order must have a foundation, and this foundation cannot be the law itself, to which the label of law can be affixed simply because the organs of the State have formulated it." This basis must be something else: here it is the ultimate source of truth, the will of God." Therefore, law is not only a kind of institutional existence, but also a norm that embodies the ultimate value. Only in the framework of natural law and ultimate truth can law obtain the real legitimacy and authority.

The discussion of classical natural law theory and analytic positive law theory shows two completely different modes of legal thinking. Hobbes regarded natural law as the embodiment of justice, truth, goodness and beauty. He insisted that there must be an impartial judge when a dispute arises, and that no one should act as a judge in his own dispute. [6] This view emphasizes the impartiality and objectivity of the law, aiming to eliminate bias arising from selfish interests and maintain social order. Locke, on the other hand, summarized natural law as "no one may infringe upon the life, health, liberty, or property of another." [7] Emphasize the inviolability of individual rights. "The obligations imposed by the law of nature do not disappear from society, but are in many cases more clearly expressed and enforced by the law of man with clear punishments." [8] It can be seen that natural law not only provides the basis of ethical norms for human society, but also is clearly reflected in law through the combination with human law and has practical effect. At the same time, Locke pointed out that natural law, as "the eternal norm of all men, legislators, and others" [9], not only restricts the actions of legislators, but also requires that all laws conform to "natural law, that is, the will of God" [10], otherwise they lose their legitimacy and legitimacy. This thought places natural law above human law and emphasizes its permanence and universality.

On the other hand, the theory of analytic positive law distinguishes between law and morality from the form and effect of law. Austin argues that "law is command", and he clearly states that "any positive law, or law in the strict sense of the word, is made by the sovereign individual or by a sovereign body of men for individuals or members of an independent political society." [11] This view emphasizes that the source of law is the command of the sovereign, and that the existence of law is not conditional on its morality. Unlike Austin, Hart challenged the command theory of law, arguing that law is not simply a command, but a combination of rules, including rules of duty and rules of right. Hart pointed out that if the broad definition of law is adopted, the law that violates social morality, that is, the evil law, can be included in the scope of legal research, so as to better analyze the social response to the evil law and its characteristics. He warned that simply excluding unethical laws from the law would not only lead to theoretical confusion, but could also overlook the impact of bad laws on society in reality. [12] By expanding the scope of law, the positive law theory not only focuses on the practical operation of law, but also tries to understand the complex relationship between law and morality from the perspective of rules, so as to provide a broader vision for legal research.

Social law theory is based on the integrity and interaction of human society, and emphasizes the regulating function of law in social relations. Leon Duguit was critical of the doctrine of individualism. He believed that "man cannot live in isolation, but can only survive in society." Therefore, the concept of social man is the only possible starting point for legal theory. Based on this view, he further states: "Its actions have no validity or legal value except in order to achieve this purpose." At the heart of Leon Duguit's theory lies the concept of public service, which, he argues, "is what the government is obligated to do." This concept covers "any activity that must be regulated and controlled by the Government because it is inseparable from the

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

achievement and promotion of social solidarity" and is characterized by the fact that "it cannot be guaranteed except through government intervention". Therefore, in Leon Duguit's theoretical framework, "law is first of all a law regulating public service", thus establishing public service as the cornerstone of law. Complementing the idea of public service of Leon Duguit, Pound emphasizes the social function and practical significance of law in the context of sociological jurisprudence. He pointed out that sociological law is based on a pragmatic approach, focuses on the actual operation of law, and regards law as a social system that combines experience and reason, with the ultimate goal of serving social needs and protecting social interests. Pound argued that the form of legal rule is only a means to an end, not an end in itself.

Law may draw strength from the deep of history and become a natural continuation of tradition and national spirit; Or it manifests its utility in social changes and becomes a predictor of real behavior and judgment results. German jurist Savini proposed that law is the product of a nation's history, tradition and culture, and the concrete embodiment of national spirit. He believes that the development of law is not the result of human coercion, but a natural and gradual historical process. In Savigny's opinion, legislation plays a dual role in the formation of civil law: on the one hand, it complements and assists the improvement of positive law; On the other hand, it promotes the natural development of law. At the same time, he argued that "as long as the law is in a dynamic state of progress, there is no need for a code," a view that demonstrates his admiration for customary law as a natural continuation of the national spirit. However, this defense of customary law was seen at the time as an endorsement of the privileges of the feudal aristocracy, and was therefore criticized by Marx. In his Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Marx pointed out: "There is a school of thought which justifies today's vile acts by yesterday's vile acts, and there is a school which declares as rebellion every cry of the serfs against the whip - as long as the whip is old, ancestral, historical." According to Marx, historical jurisprudence is essentially a defense of the established order of power, thus ignoring the necessity of social change.

The realistic legal theory focuses on the actual operation of law and emphasizes that the essence of law lies in its prediction function to social behavior. Holmes proposed that the essence of law should be observed from the "villain's perspective", that is, concerned with the actual consequences of the law on the violator. "If you really want to know what the law is, you have to look at the law like a bad person," he pointed out. This perspective highlights the predictive role of law in behavioral regulation. Accordingly, John Chipman Gray further argued that the words of the legislature were mere words whose meanings were ultimately given practical effect by interpretation by the courts. Law, he argued, consists of two parts: the making of law and the making of law by judges. In fact, "all laws are made by judges." As Mr Holder put it: "Whoever has the absolute authority to interpret any law, written or spoken, is the true legislator, not the person who first drafted or told it." Realistic jurisprudence emphasizes the subjective initiative and authority in the judicial process, and holds that the meaning of law is not fixed, but a dynamic product given by judges in practice. This theory re-examines the operation mode of law from a practical perspective and provides a new methodological framework for understanding the role of law in society.

The essence and definition of law have always been the focus of debate in various schools of law. Although there are different opinions, the diversified interpretation of law often comes from the subjective perspective and value judgment of the authors. Dworkin argues that the traditional theory of legal rules neglects irregular legal norms, which include principles and policies. Principles centered on fairness, justice, or morality, such as "no one shall profit from his own fault" is a legal principle. [13] In Empire of Law, Dworkin elaborates on this view through the Elmer case, arguing that the law respects this moral principle everywhere, and that Elmer therefore lost his inheritance. "Legal empires are defined by attitudes, not by territory,

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

power, or process," Dworkin emphasizes. [14] "Attitude" here refers to a unified understanding of and respect for principles and rules in legal interpretation. Similarly, the Japanese jurist Hozumi Nobushige has discussed the complexity of the definition of law, noting that "in England, the word 'law' still has a specific and precise meaning when the law is enforced in the courts." However, when taken out of the context of the court, the meaning tends to be confused." He further criticized that many authors use the term "law" repeatedly in their texts, as if indulging in fantasy and trying to build a false sense of trust through the accumulation of terms, which reveals the instability and ambiguity of the definition of law in different situations. Dworkin's and Hoi's views reflect the complexity of law in interpretation and application, as well as its internal tension between rules and principles, context and practice.

What is the nature of law? On the basis of Marxist jurisprudence, Jurisprudence (5th Edition), edited by Professor Zhang Wenxian, gives a systematic definition of "law" : "Law is a system of norms of conduct formulated or recognized by the state and implemented by the state's compulsory force. Its essence lies in that it takes the will of the people as the core, reflects the rights and obligations of the people determined by the material conditions of life in a given society, and aims to identify, protect and develop social relations that meet the interests of the people, maintain social order, and achieve the goal of promoting the well-being of the people and social progress." [15] This definition highlights the central position of the will of the people in the law and conforms to the basic attributes of China as a socialist state under the people's democratic dictatorship. The main function of law is to safeguard the vital interests of the people, regulate social behavior, and ensure the stability and sustainable development of social order. However, law cannot contain all moral content, and the mandatory and normative nature of law predestined its scope of application to be limited. Therefore, in addition to law, it is necessary to pay attention to the cultivation of morality and virtue, and make up for the external limitations of law through the internal constraints of morality, so as to build a closed-loop system of social order with both internal and external maintenance, so that law and morality complement each other and jointly promote the benign operation and development of society.

3. The Definition of Morality: Morality Is to Be Good

The understanding of morality in the East and the West, though in different forms, points to the importance of individual choice and self-discipline in the core. Aristotle believed that virtue is a habit of correct choice formed through continuous practice of action, and that virtue and evil are determined by the voluntary decision of the individual. "Virtue depends on us, and wickedness depends on us, for what we have the power to do, we also have the power not to do." He further pointed out that "choice is the most inherent characteristic of virtue, and it is a better judge of character than action." [16] This view reduces the core of morality to the individual's ability to choose, emphasizing that virtue is practical wisdom learned through voluntary action. Thomas Aquinas argues that in ethics, "choice" is not only the essential element that constitutes moral behavior, but also gives a decisive status to moral practice. From the perspective of transcendental rationality of idealism, Kant proposed that "the self-discipline of the will is the only principle on which all moral laws are based" [17], providing a metaphysical philosophical basis for moral choice. In traditional Chinese thought, Confucian scholars also attach importance to the practical value of moral choice. Confucius put forward the idea of "thinking of righteousness", "it is not possible to obtain it without etiquette", and stressed that people should put justice first when facing interests, and take etiquette as the limit of behavior to achieve self-regulation. He further pointed out, "Human beings without benevolence, what kind of etiquette? What joy is there if people are not kind?" He believes that benevolence is the foundation of moral behavior, and formal rites and music are meaningless without the support of benevolence and justice. Mencius said, "Life is also what I want,

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

righteousness is also what I want; The statement "neither of them can be obtained at the same time," reveals the supreme principle of moral choice, emphasizing that in the face of the conflict between life and justice, justice should be chosen without hesitation. He also put forward "compassion is the end of benevolence", pointing out that the root of morality lies in the natural feelings of the human heart, and the practice of advocating benevolence should take this as the starting point. Xunzi, starting from the relationship between human nature and desire, believes that "the heart can be in the middle of the reason, then the desire is much, and the injury is in the treatment." The heart can be irrational, then want to be few, Xi stop in chaos? Therefore, chaos lies in what the heart can do, and death lies in what the heart wants." He proposed that the root of chaos lies in the guidance and restraint of rationality on desire, and further explained that the establishment of moral order depends on inner choice and norms.

As for the definition of morality, there is no lack of profound theoretical support. In general, morality is generally summarized into three main theoretical perspectives: altruistic morality, egoistic morality (including subjective egoism and objective egoism) and utilitarian morality. These three viewpoints explain the multi-dimensional balance between individual interests and public interests with their own unique logic construction and value demands.

In moral theory, we need to rationally criticize or deny two viewpoints: emotionalism and cultural relativism. Emotionalism reduces moral judgments to "expressions of preferences, attitudes, or feelings" about individuals, but does not effectively explain why certain feelings or attitudes should be approved. McIntyre criticizes emotionalism as either silent in the face of specific moral issues or trapped in a cycle of "equating emotional approval with moral approval." James Rachel rejects this view from the point of view of rational argument, arguing that "people have not only feelings, but also reason" [18], and therefore emotions do not constitute a sufficient basis for moral judgment. Steven Loupoel further argues that emotionalism has no practical relevance in moral arguments because it is, at its core, an attempt to make others accept one's own emotional views, rather than the pursuit of objective truth. Cultural relativism, on the other hand, holds that different societies have their own moral codes and that standards vary from culture to culture, denying the existence of objective standards of merit and inferiority. Ancient Greek Sophists had long advocated this idea, advocating the abandonment of absolute moral standards and following local customs. However, while cultural relativism calls for tolerance and respect, it cannot deny certain basic universal moral principles, such as don't kill, don't steal, and don't lie. As Cicero said, "What nation does not value politeness, kindness, sincerity, and gratitude?" What nation does not despise and hate the arrogant, the wicked, the cruel, the ungrateful?" It can be seen that no matter how diverse the culture, some moral norms in human society always have a value that cannot be ignored in terms of universality and objectivity.

Altruism is a moral concept that takes the interests of others as its core and ignores or even sacrifices its own interests. It occupies an important position in many cultural and religious traditions. The Christian doctrine clearly advocates that "seek not one's own good, but the good of others", and regards altruism as the basis of faith and behavior. This kind of spirit has also been fully reflected in our Confucian tradition, and the core of Confucian ethics "benevolence" contains the idea of altruism. Zhu Xi once said: "Impartiality and selflessness is benevolence." This expression clearly links "benevolence" closely with altruism. The mainstream moral values of our country also always emphasize the spirit of altruism, advocate the moral cultivation of "selflessness" and "selflessness", and regard the sacrifice of the ego to fulfill the ego as the embodiment of ideal personality. However, although altruistic morality is noble in theory, it faces many challenges in practice. First, the morality of altruism often fails to conform to the general laws of human nature. Altruistic morality requires the complete neglect of the self, and this transcendent requirement makes it difficult to popularize and cannot become a code of conduct followed by most people. In addition, altruistic ethics may ignore the principle of

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

fairness. The unconditional pursuit of others' interests may lead to the unfair distribution of resources and even lead to the chaos of social order. For example, in some groups, if one side overemphasizes selfless dedication, while the other side is accustomed to taking, in the long run, it will exacerbate inequality within the group and destroy social harmony.

Objective egoism holds that everyone should focus on pursuing their own interests as a core principle of ethical behavior. According to the American philosopher Eine Rand, human life is the highest standard of value, and the existence of each living entity is its own end, rather than a tool for the benefit of others or a means to achieve other goals. Therefore, individuals should live for themselves, neither sacrificing themselves for the benefit of others, nor depriving others of their benefits because of self-centeredness. Eine Rand further pointed out that "survival for oneself" means the pursuit of individual happiness as the supreme goal of human morality, which is the highest affirmation of the essence of life in the ethical sense. The moral concept of subjective egoism, that is, psychological egoism, faces many criticisms. James Rachel points out that the argument of subjective egoism has inherent flaws: people often act out of their own desires, but some choices are not simply because they "want to do", but because they conform to their own perceived necessity; However, if we only pursue personal interests while ignoring the needs and well-being of others, we will destroy the balance of social interests, make public order difficult to maintain, and eventually fall into the crisis of disintegration and chaos.

The utilitarian moral theory has profoundly reshaped people's moral thinking mode. Bentham proposed that the moral standard of good and evil does not originate from the will of God or abstract norms, but is based on the happiness view of pleasure and pain, and its core evaluation standard is the principle of utility. According to this principle, any action should be evaluated on the basis of whether it is "bound to increase or decrease the propensity of the person concerned to happiness, that is, to promote or hinder it". From the viewpoint that moral judgment should be based on sufficient reasons, Professor James Rachel put forward his own concept of moral bottom line. He believed that any moral judgment should be based on sufficient reason, which not only needs to provide sufficient reasons to justify it, but also must take into account the interests of all those affected by the action equally. Based on this, Rachel's concept of bottom-line morality can be summed up as "morality is at least a tool for guiding behavior with reason". In other words, morality requires that people do what is best justified, while paying equal attention to the interests of everyone whose actions may affect them. He further states that responsible moral actors have the following characteristics: They have a fair interest in the interests of everyone affected by their actions, examine facts and reflect on their meaning, accept rules of conduct only after deep consideration and confirmation of their reasonability, are willing to listen to the voice of reason, even if it may challenge their original convictions, and ultimately guide their actions with thoughtful conclusions. Although Rachel's theory did not give a clear definition of "morality", by emphasizing reason and fairness, he provided a set of rigorous rational tools for thinking and judging moral issues. This thought also echoed utilitarianism's emphasis on happiness and interests, and provided a new direction for the study of modern ethics.

What is morality? This question has troubled philosophical thinking since ancient times, but in tracing the origin of morality, we will find that Aristotle's argument is particularly accurate, and his thought, like the torch of reason, understands the true meaning of morality. "All technology, all research, all practice and choice, aim at some good." So it is well said that all things are good." [19] In his view, the good is the highest goal and end of all actions and practices, and is a universal and supreme being. Aristotle further elaborated on the internal connection between good and happiness, and he believed that the highest good is the perfect realization of virtue, and happiness is the activity of this perfect virtue in practice, because happiness is not a static state, but is manifested in continuous realization. Thus, good is not only a source of happiness, but also a source of pleasure, while evil, in contrast, is the source of pain and unhappiness.

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

Therefore, good and evil have become the most common and intuitive criteria for people to judge morality. Aristotle also deeply recognized that people's moral level is significantly differentiated by nature and nurture. He pointed out that there is a clear distinction between the elite and the masses in their capacity for good, and that many people cannot improve their character or moral standards through theoretical learning or moral education. Faced with this situation, Aristotle proposed that legislators should assume the responsibility of coercion and guide people to a high moral life through legal means. Here, law is not only an external coercive tool, but also a normative practice path, providing behavioral guidance for groups that cannot improve their morality through education, so as to achieve a broader social moral order. This view not only highlights Aristotle's realistic consideration of moral practice, but also demonstrates his deep understanding of the relationship between law and ethics.

4. Return to Ronald Dworkin's "Law as intergrity" theory

Ronald Dworkin, with his“Law as intergrity” , the so-called "legal view of morality", deeply reveals the internal connection between law and morality, and maintains that law is the extension and embodiment of morality. In his critique of Hart's rule theory, he explicitly stated: "I want to launch a general attack on legal positivism, and when a target is needed, I use Hart's view as a target." [20] This statement represents a fundamental challenge to Dworkin's core view of legal positivism, which holds that law is not only a collection of rules, but also a complete system of norms containing moral principles. He takes the moral principle that "no one shall profit from his own wrongful conduct" as an example, and regards it as a "principle" in law, which complements the rules and forms the basis for the operation of law. In Riggs v. Palmer, the court relied on this principle when it ruled that Palmer was disinherited by murder, establishing a model of practice in which legal principles prevail over narrow rules. The court's judgment in this case indicated that legal interpretation should follow the basic principles of the common law, that is, it should not profit from evil acts, nor claim rights based on unjust acts, which fully embodies the profound integration of rights and justice, and policy considerations serve the realization of collective goals. [21] For this reason, Dworkin further argues in Hedgehog Justice that "law is actually fused with morality: lawyers and judges are functioning political philosophers in a democracy." [22] Through this argument, Dworkin elevates the interpretation of law to the practice of moral evaluation, emphasizing that judges and lawyers, as interpreters of law, must have both legal and moral perspectives in order to achieve justice and coherence of law.

Ronald Dworkin argued that political rights are a product of history and morality. In civil society, the rights granted to individuals depend not only on the provisions of the law, but also on the justice and morality embodied in the political practice of the society. [23] "The proposition of rights assumes that the right to win a lawsuit is a genuine political right, although clearly different from a political right like the right that all citizens should be treated equally", and further advances the important proposition that "judicial decisions are political decisions". This shows that Dworkin's theory of rights does not separate law from politics, but emphasizes the political and moral connotation of judicial activities. In Dworkin's theoretical framework, "law" is not only composed of rules, but a complex system jointly constructed by multiple elements such as standards, policies, rules and principles. Dworkin argues that how these elements are connected depends on the political values of a particular society, and that a judge's judgment on the weight of these elements in his ruling ultimately depends on his personal political philosophy. He further defines law as an extension of political morality, a view that is systematically elaborated in Hedgehog Justice [24]. In the book, Dworkin proposes a new view of law, one that no longer sees law as a system of rules that may conflict with morality, but rather as a part of morality. He uses the metaphor of the "tree structure" to show that law, as a

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

branch of political morality, derives from broader personal morality, which in turn is subordinate to a general philosophical inquiry into what it means to live well. [25] This structural perspective reveals the hierarchical relationship between law and morality, indicating that law is not only a formal normative system, but also an embodiment of social moral values. The judge should connect individual rights, political justice and social morality through the examination of political philosophy in the interpretation of law, so as to make the operation of law conform to the goal of higher justice.

Ronald Dworkin's Law as Integrity theory emphasizes that law should be seen as a coherent, integrated system, even though it may not be a seamless web, and "the plaintiff has a right to ask 'Judge Hercules' to see the law as a seamless web." [26] This theory requires judges to apply consistent principles when dealing with cases, so that all people have equal status based on the same standards. Dworkin believes that legal integrity is not only the political ideal of legal practice, but also the source of justice. [27] Judges who recognize wholeness need to construct the best interpretation of political structure and legal doctrine through coherent interpretation of social rights and obligations [28] in order to resolve difficult cases. [29] This interpretation aims at the unity of political fairness, practical justice, and procedural due process, and seeks to show the correct relationship between these values. For this reason, Dworkin argues that "law is an interpretive concept" and that "judges decide what law is by interpreting the practice of other judges." The holistic legal view closely combines jurisprudence with judicial adjudication, which not only gives legal practice a higher coherence, but also provides it with more adequate justification. [30] In Dworkin's view, judges should view law as a system of integration with moral values, and demonstrate broad vision and creative thinking by exploring the fundamental principles of law. [31] When the plaintiff's basic moral rights were established, Judge Hercules transformed them into institutional rights and provided concrete relief basis for them. This basic moral right is actually what Dworkin called "background right", that is, the right that society legitimates political judgment in abstract sense. Institutional rights, on the other hand, are justified by specific political systems. [32] In Dworkin's holistic legal theory, when judges pursue coherence and integrity, they can always find the only correct answer in difficult cases. As Morrison puts it: "A correct legal answer is one that upholds and protects the rights expressed or implied in the fundamental values of the legal system." Therefore, the concept of "only positive solution" is the inevitable result of the integrity theory of law.

In his philosophy of law, Ronald Dworkin tried to unify the relationship between law and morality through the theory of legal integrity. "We should pursue a theory that embraces not only the value of equality, but also the core political values of democracy, freedom, and civil society, and that shows its inherent logic and persuasiveness in a rational and just framework," he argues. In Justice in the Robe, he criticizes the traditional theory of the separation of law from morality, suggesting that "we may not regard law as separate from morality, but as a component of morality." Dworkin further explores the relationship between law and morality, noting that the traditional view views the two as separate normative systems: law as specific rules applicable to a particular community, while morality is universal and applicable to all. However, the fatal flaw in this view, he criticizes, is that when law and morality are regarded as completely separate, no neutral position can be found to reconcile them. He pointed out through the "tree" theory that personal morality is a branch of ethics, political morality is derived from personal morality, and law is an extension of political morality, and this structure unifies values that are usually regarded as independent. [33] Dworkin's "tree-like" theory further deepens the unity of law and morality. He distinguished two types of rights: legislative rights and legal rights, [34] and incorporated legal rights into the framework of political morality. [35] This perspective not only challenges traditional legal views, but also raises profound questions about the effectiveness of law in extreme situations. Citing Nazi laws, for example, he noted that "the appalling Nazi laws did not create even plausible or demonstrable

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

rights and duties" and that the Nazi government lacked legitimacy so completely that "it would be more morally accurate to say that these decrees were not decrees at all." The judges asked to enforce these decrees face not moral questions but prudential ones. From this, Dworkin concludes that law and morality are in fact one. He tried to put an end to the separation of law and morality through the holistic theory of law, and reflected on the nature of law as a branch of morality from the perspectives of political philosophy, moral philosophy and legal philosophy, emphasizing that legal practice must reflect the holistic moral concern.

5. Conclusion

The relationship between law and morality has been the focus of legal philosophy since ancient times, and Dworkin's proposition of legal integrity provides a new theoretical framework for this issue. In Dworkin's view, law is not only a formalized system of rules, but also an organic whole containing moral judgments. In legal practice, rules and morality do not exist in isolation, but interweave with each other in specific judicial operations. Dworkin argued that judges should not rely only on static laws when applying the law, but should place the law in the moral and justice background of the society for comprehensive interpretation and judgment. This view highlights the "wholeness" of legal interpretation, that is, within the framework of rules, the requirements of morality and social justice must be taken into account. For the construction of the rule of law in our country, Dworkin's theory has far-reaching enlightenment. Although the current legal system of our country is gradually improving, how to balance legal provisions and moral requirements in judicial practice is still a problem to be solved urgently. Faced with the ambiguity of legal texts and the complexity of social reality, if judges judge only by rules, they are easy to fall into formalism and neglect social justice and humanistic care. Dworkin's holistic proposition of law reminds us that the relationship between law and morality should be regarded as a dynamic and mutually reinforcing process. The application of law is not only the execution of laws, but also the response to morality and justice. Therefore, Dworkin's theory provides a profound reflection on the construction of the rule of law in our country, emphasizing the "interpretation" and "morality" of the law, and pushing the connotation of the rule of law from simple normative governance to the direction of humanistic care. In the context of globalization and modernization, the rule of law should not only be a form, but also a platform to realize social justice and moral ideals

References

[1] Cicero, On the Republic on the Law, translated by Wang Huansheng, China University of Political Science and Law Press, 1997, pp. 197.

[2] Cicero, On the Republic on the Law, translated by Wang Huansheng, China University of Political Science and Law Press, 1997, p. 190.

[3] Cicero, On the Republic on the Law, translated by Wang Huansheng, China University of Political Science and Law Press, 1997, pp. 201-202.

[4] Alexander Passerin d`Entreves, Natural Law: An Introduction to Legal Philosophy, translated by Li Rizhang et al., New Star Press, 2008, p. 47.

[5] Wayne Morris, Jurisprudence: From Ancient Greece to Postmodernism, trans. Li Guilin et al., Wuhan University Press, 2003, p. 67.

[6] Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, translated by Li Sifu and Li Tingbi, The Commercial Press 1985, pp. 98-120.

[7] Locke, A Treatise on Government (Part 2), translated by Ye Qifang and Qu Jurong, The Commercial Press, 1964, p. 6.

ISSN: 2637-6067 DOI: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202503_8(3).0022

[8] Locke, A Treatise on Government (Part 2), translated by Ye Qifang and Qu Jurong, The Commercial Press 1964, p. 84.

[9] Locke, A Treatise on Government (Part 2), translated by Ye Qifang and Qu Jurong, The Commercial Press, 1964, p. 84.

[10] Locke, A Treatise on Government (Part 2), translated by Ye Qifang and Qu Jurong, The Commercial Press, 1964, p. 84.

[11] Austin, Lecture Notes on Jurisprudence (Photocopy), China Social Sciences Press, 1999, p. 177.

[12] See Hart, The Concept of Law, translated by Zhang Wenxian, Zheng Chengliang et al. Encyclopedia of China Publishing House, 1996, pp. 204-205.

[13] See Ronald Dworkin, The Empire of Law, translated by Li Changqing, Encyclopedia of China Publishing House, 1996, pp. 14-19.

[14] Ronald Dworkin, Law's Emipire,Harvard University Press,1986,p.413.

[15] Zhang Wenxian, Ed. Jurisprudence (5th Ed.), Higher Education Press, 2018,p. 83.

[16] Aristotle, Nicomacho Ethics, China Social Sciences Press, 1990, p. 45.

[17] Kant, Critique of Practical Reason, The Commercial Press, 1996, p. 33.

[18] James Rachels, Elements of moral philosophy, translated by Yang Zongyuan, China Renmin University Press, 2009, p. 47.

[19] Aristotle et al. Nicomachean Ethics, trans. Miao Litian, China Social Sciences Press, 1999, p. 1.

[20] Ronald Dworkin, Taking Rights Seriously, translated by Xin Chunying and Wu Yuzhang, Encyclopedia of China Publishing House, 1998, p. 40.

[21] Ronald Dworkin, Taking Rights Seriously, translated by Xin Chunying and Wu Yuzhang, Encyclopedia of China Publishing House, 1998, p. 126.

[22] Ronald Dworkin,Jurisprudence for Hedgehogs,Harvard University Press, 2011,

[23] Ronald Dworkin, Taking Rights Seriously, translated by Xin Chunying and Wu Yuzhang, Encyclopedia of China Publishing House, 1998, p. 122.

[24] Ronald Dworkin, Jurisprudence for Hedgehogs,Harvard University Press,2011.

[25] Ronald Dworkin, Jurisprudence for Hedgehogs,Harvard University Press,2011,p.5.

[26] Ronald Dworkin, Taking Rights Seriously, Harvard University Press,1977,p.116-117.

[27] See Ronald Dworkin, Law’s Empire, Harvard University Press,1986, p.184.

[28] See Ronald Dworkin,Law's Empire, Harvard University Press,1986,p.218.

[29] See Ronald Dworkin,Law's Empire, Harvard University Press,1986,p.255.

[30] See Ronald Dworkin,Law's Empire, Harvard University Press,1986,p.410-411.

[31] See Ronald Dworkin,Law's Empire, Harvard University Press,1986,p.220.

[32] See Ronald Dworkin, Taking Rights Seriously,Harvard University Press,1977,p.93.

[33] See Ronal Dworkin, Jurisprudence for Hedgehogs,Harvard University Press,2011,p.405.

[34] See Ronal Dworkin, Jurisprudence for Hedgehogs,Harvard University Press,2011,p.410.

[35] See Ronal Dworkin, Jurisprudence for Hedgehogs,Harvard University Press,2011,p.406.