

Department of Government Working Papers

(Pamphlet)

JA

8

B78

no.14

No. 14

THE DIFFERENCE AND COMPLEMENTARITY OF TWO TRADITIONS: A COMPARISON BETWEEN WESTERN AND CHINESE POLITICAL IDEAS

ZHENG CHUXUAN

Department of Government Working Papers

No. 14

**THE DIFFERENCE AND COMPLEMENTARITY OF TWO TRADITIONS:
A Comparison between Western and Chinese Political Ideas**

Zheng Chuxuan

ISBN 1-872166-36-9

£3.00

Available from the Editor, Keith Dowding,
Department of Government, Brunel University,
Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB8 3PH, England.

1991

Brunel 
THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST LONDON

WORKING PAPERS

1. Keith M. Dowding *Conceptual Analysis & Essential Contestability* (1990)
1-872166-20-2
2. Keith M. Dowding *Wants, Needs and Interests* (1990)
1-872166-25-3
3. Martin J. Smith *Post-Industrialism, Thatcherism and Policy Networks* (1990)
1-872166-30-10
4. Zheng Chuxuan *Gramsci: A Perspective From China* (1990)
1-872166-35-0
5. Anthony Glees *Britain and the European Community in 1990: The Reluctant European* (1990)
1-872166-45-8
6. Keith M. Dowding *Coercion and Liberty* (1990)
1-872166-50-4
7. Barbara Goodwin *Moral Responsibility in Pluralist Society* (1990)
1-872166-55-5
8. Sonia Mazey & Jeremy Richardson *British Interest Groups and the European Community: Changing Lobbying Styles* (1990)
1-872166-60-1
9. Martin J. Smith *From Policy Community to Issue Network: Salmonella in Eggs and the New Politics of Food* (1990)
1-872166-65-2
10. Keith M. Dowding *Ableness and Ability: Morriss on Power and Counteractuals* (1990)
1-872166-70-9
11. Dr. Anthony Glees *Portraying West Germany to the British Public: British High Policy Towards Germany on the Eve of Unification* (1990)
1-872166-80-6
12. Martin J. Smith *Changing Patterns of Consumer Group Action in Britain and the United States* (1990)
1-872166-85-7
13. Michael J. Hughes *The Myth of Central European Identity and the Move towards European Integration* (1991)
1-872166-21-0
14. Zheng Chuxuan *The Difference and Complementarity of two Traditions: A Comparison between Western and Chinese Political Ideas.* (1991)
1-872166-36-9
15. Michael Hughes *Russian Nationalism: Organisational Structures and Patronage Networks* (1991)
1-872166-41-5

ISBN: 1-872166-36-9

(Pamphlet)
JA
8
B78
no. 14

PART I INTRODUCTION

Western political ideas and Chinese political ideas actually have the same subjects, like "human nature", "sovereignty", "government" and so on, but, according to different historical backgrounds and social conditions, come to different conclusions on the subjects and thus form their own traditions, which have most heavily been influencing the general thought of the Western and Chinese people respectively, although some exceptions exist---in the Western world and in China, there are always some theorists who are deviators and critics of their home towns' traditions. In this sense, the tradition of Western political ideas is individualistic and liberal or democratic while that of Chinese political ideas is moralistic and centralist or despotic. This part will observe the collision of the two traditions and its consequence, and will explain the necessity and significance of the combination of them.

I The Collision of the Two Traditions and Its Consequence

Around 500 B.C., the development of human civilization produced Socrates, Plato and Aristotle in Greece, while producing Confucius in China. Since then, the two traditions of Western and Chinese political ideas had been developing respectively in their home towns, simply without any contact and collision between them until the 1860s, in when the Chinese bourgeois reformers began to introduce Western political ideas into China, attempting to reform the society with Western political ideas and systems.

After that, the collision of the two traditions happened from time to time, which can be divided into four major collisions.

The first major collision happened from the 1895 to 1898; it took the form of conflict between the Chinese bourgeois reformers and the "obstinates" and the "Westernized" who were in power. The bourgeois reformers favoured the Western theories of natural right and democracy, proposing to establish a constitutional monarchy in China, while the obstinates and the Westernized basically opposed Western political ideas and systems. The consequence of the struggle was that the bourgeois reformers were driven out of the country or were sentenced to death. This collision explains that the Western tradition of political ideas began to intrude into Chinese political ideas, sowing the seeds for the next major collision.

The second collision took place from the beginning of the 20th century to 1919, when it was reflected in the struggle between the Chinese bourgeois revolutionaries (headed by Sun Yat-sen and Gu Yanwu) and the feudal obstinates (headed by Yuan Shikai, Kang Youwen and Wang Naixuan). The bourgeois revolutionaries praised the Western ideas of democracy and freedom highly and in fact destroyed the monarchy and established a short lived bourgeois democratic republic in China (1.1912-3.1912). The feudal obstinates, on the other hand, strongly argued that "only monarchy can save China" and supported Yuan Shikai to restore the monarchy. The consequence of the struggle was that Yuan Shikai changed the bourgeois democratic republic into a short lived monarchy (83 days) and there followed a period of division between the warlords. In this collision, the Western tradition of political ideas experienced a victory and a heavy hit

that made some Chinese people with lofty ideas, who had previously followed the bourgeois revolutionaries before, reconsider the significance of Western political ideas and systems to China; this led to the third major collision.

The third major collision of the two traditions happened from May fourth period (around May Fourth Movement in 1919) to 1949, when it was reflected in some Chinese bourgeois scholars' and the Chinese democratic parties' persistence of Western political ideas and systems and the criticisms against them from various feudal scholars or feudal bureaucrats and warlords on one hand, and from the Chinese Marxists on the other.

The bourgeois scholars and democratic parties were headed by Hu Shi, Dai Jitao and the others. They persisted on Western democracy and freedom and tried to rebuild the bourgeois democratic republic; all of these were opposed in different ways by the feudal scholars or feudal bureaucrats and warlords headed by Liu Shipei, Gu Hongming and Jiang Jieshi respectively and the Chinese Marxists mainly including Li Dazhao, Chen Duxiu, Mao Tze-tung, Zhou Enlai and the others. The feudal scholars or feudal bureaucrats and warlords opposed them with the despotic doctrine of Confucianism while the Chinese Marxists opposed them with the theory of socialism which came from the Russian Bolshevik and coincided with the despotic tradition of Chinese political ideas. The consequence of this struggle was the establishment of socialist system and the prohibition of propagating Western political ideas in the country, but the tradition of Chinese political ideas still existed in the form of socialist theory. This collision

illustrated that it is not because China is naturally xenophobic that the Western tradition of political ideas could not be accepted by the Chinese people. The crucial point here is that to what extent the Western tradition is superior to the Chinese tradition and applies to the Chinese society.

The fourth major collision happened from 1978 to 1989, when it was reflected in the struggle between the Chinese socialists headed by Deng Xiaoping and a few intellectual elite. The socialists insisted on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tze-tung Thought, the leadership of the CCP, the socialist road and the dictatorship of the proletariat, which were criticized by the intellectual elite as feudalism and despotism. The intellectual elite mainly included Yan Jiaqi, Fang Lizhi, Liu Xiaopo and the others; they tried to introduce Western democracy and freedom, the Western multi-party system, the parliamentary system and so on into China. So they were criticized by the socialists as doing bourgeois liberalization and spreading spiritual pollution. When the struggle was in its upsurge, there emerged a large-scale student movement and it seemed that the country would fall into chaos. Therefore, the Chinese government was forced to use troops to stabilize the situation. Afterwards, some intellectual elite were criticized or sent to prison or were forced to go into exile. And inside China, political theory reverted to the socialist orthodoxy, and meanwhile Confucianism was brought back to life.

Summarizing the above four major collisions: although the Chinese tradition cannot avoid being impinged upon by the Western tradition, yet it shows a great vitality in its resistance to

this intrusion. On the other hand, the Western tradition displays a great tenacity in its intent to intrude into and replace the Chinese tradition, albeit it does not appear absolutely superior to the latter. In this sense, both the Western and Chinese traditions have their own rationality. So the collision of the two traditions would perhaps continue very long. But we should better end this sort of collision and try to organically combine the two traditions together, for the sake of the improvement of both the Western and Chinese political ideas and for the sake of the self-perfection of human society.

II The Necessity and Significance of the Combination of the Two Traditions

The necessity of the combination of the tradition of Western and Chinese political ideas is, first of all, decided by the development and perfection of the two traditions themselves.

On one hand, the Chinese tradition has shown its shortcomings and needs to absorb some elements from Western political ideas. This is explained by the collisions of the two traditions mentioned above; it can also be proved by some Chinese theorists, like Mo Tzu, Li Zhi, Bi Fucheng and He Qi, who upheld the positions of individualism and utilitarianism, reacting against the Chinese tradition, but ended up with the Western tradition.

On the other hand, the individualist and liberal tradition of Western political ideas has gone to its extreme (e. g. in Sartre's and Freud's theories), unable to deal with the unrest and turbulence caused by the inflation of individual greed and the degeneration of morality; it can improve itself by absorbing

something from the Chinese tradition. This can be explained by some Western thinkers, like Burke, T. H. Green and F. D. Roosevelt, whose theories are deviations from the Western tradition and the criticisms of it, but coincide with the Chinese tradition.

Furthermore, the combination of the two traditions is necessitated by the self perfection of human society. The history of human society is a history of developing and perfecting. This has now become a course of eliminating estrangements and conflicts, moving towards mutual complementarity and unity between different nations and countries in the political, economic and cultural areas, in which political ideas, as a constituent part of human society, will play a very important role. The traditions of Western and Chinese political ideas are the two major traditions of political ideas in the world, their combination will undoubtedly promote the mutual complementarity and unity between Western and Eastern nations and countries in the political, economic and cultural areas, so as to ameliorate human society as a whole.

The significance of the combination is basically contained in the necessity of the combination. When the combination of the two traditions is really realized, human society will soon enter a new age in which people all over the world live harmoniously, peacefully and friendly, and share the common and far more developed and perfect material and intellectual civilizations. If my paper can cast a brick to attract jade (a Chinese idiom which means to offer a few commonplace remarks by way of introduction so that others may come up with valuable opinions), making more people to join in contributing to the combination, my purpose

will be realized.

PART II HUMAN NATURE

What is human nature? This is a question almost every Western and Chinese political theorist must answer first. But they answer it differently according to how they solve the relationship between man's natural nature and man's social nature, whether consciously or unconsciously.

III Attributing Man to Animal

Many Western political theorists attribute man to animal and tend to consider man's natural nature as human nature.

The Epicureans of ancient Greece, according to their straightforward materialism, maintained that as far as the world at large is concerned, nature simply means physics, the atom out of which all things are made; as far as human being are concerned, nature means self-interest, that is, all men are essentially selfish and seek only their own good. Therefore, there are no intrinsic moral virtues and justice except self-happiness. Morality and justice are identical with expedience. States are formed merely for the sake of obtaining security, especially against the depredations of the other men.¹

Machiavelli's views were formed in Italy's age of "bastards and adventurers" of the 1520s when the country was divided by the tyrants and was despoiled by the other countries. Successive internal dissensions and external wars occurred, violence and cunning strategies prevailed. Machiavelli advanced the theory of "masterless man", arguing that human nature is essentially

selfish, men are born aggressive and acquisitive, they aim to keep what they have and acquire more, and that states and laws are formed solely to protect each individual against the aggression of other individuals.²

Hobbes started from a perspective of mechanical materialism and, first of all, held that man has an instinct for self-preservation, that is, a desire to prevent his riches, position, power and so on from depredation by others. But "because he cannot assure the power and means to live well, which he hath at present, without the acquisition of more",³ he is driven to take for himself what the others want and embroils himself with other men. Then, man has reason, Hobbes said, which expresses itself in rational self-preservation. According to Hobbes, reason teaches men to create the states, laws and so on which define their desires in a rational state, so as to make them all live peacefully. Therefore, there are two principles in human nature, Hobbes said, desire, and reason. But obviously, the second is caused by or is a derivation of the first. So, man's nature is selfish in the final analysis. Society is merely an "artificial" body, a collective term denoting the fact that human beings find it individually advantageous to exchange goods and services. The so-called "general public good" is only a figment of the imagination; there are only individuals who desire to live and to enjoy protection for their livelihood.

Bentham, by reference to his utilitarianism and hedonistic psychology, suggested that human tends to seek pleasure and fear pain. He said, "Nature has placed mankind under the government of

two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne".⁴ Every political and legal institution or system is formed on the basis of and examined by reference to human nature; they are all devised for the sake of reducing man's pain and increasing his pleasure. This, Bentham supposed, is "the greatest happiness principle" which is applicable at all times and in all places.

Freud, in his theory of psycho-analysis, attempted to pursue the eternal elements contained in human nature; but he actually retreated to the position held by some traditional Western theorists like Locke and Bentham that man is born tending towards pleasure and avoiding pain. According to Freud, the most basic element contained in human nature is the sexual instinct, the satisfaction of which is ultimately pursued by everybody. Freud called it the "pleasure principle". But, because of social circumstances, man cannot satisfy his sexual instinct everywhere and every time, that is, his desire for sexual pleasure is very often opposed by the force of circumstance. At this time, the ego's instinct of self-preservation appears to reconcile the conflicts between the two, and then the distillation of sexual instinct occurs, that is, man's energy, arising from his sexual instinct, is directed towards something else, e. g. study and work. Freud described this process as the passage from the pleasure principle to the reality principle, which is the necessary condition for the development of human civilization. Nevertheless, this

transformation does not change the dominance of the sexual instinct in human nature, because not only all man's energy arise from sexual instinct; nevertheless, all man's activities tend to the satisfaction of sexual instinct in the last analysis. That is why Freud said that "the reality principle does not abandon the intention of ultimately obtaining pleasure, but it nevertheless demands and carries into effect the postponement of satisfaction, the abandonment of a number of possibilities of gaining satisfaction and the temporary toleration of unpleasure as a step on the long indirect road to pleasure".⁵

Sartre, one of the main theorists of existentialism in the 20th. century, did not agree with the theistic view that man's nature is given by the God, nor with the theories of the philosophers of natural law, like Hobbes and Locke, who imposed abstract and universal human nature on each individual. Sartre described them as absolutist theories that let nature antecede existence. What is human nature according to Sartre? Sartre actually answered the question indirectly by explaining the principle "existence antecedes nature". In Sartre's view, man, first and foremost, exists, comes on the scene and does everything he likes, and then explains himself. Man is what he imagines himself to be and what he is willing to become. In a word, man is made by himself. Sartre thought that he had, through the above explanation, answered the question, but in fact he had not, because what Sartre was talking about is what sort of person a man will become, e. g. engineer or professor. Theoretically, Sartre's view on human nature should be found in his explanation of man's existence. Sartre, departing

from the principle "existence antecedes nature", deduced: man's existence means that man is absolutely free; man's existence cannot be separated from freedom; man's nature is contained in his freedom. What does freedom mean? Its departing point is nihilism, that is, man only exists, comes on the scene and does everything he likes, without any knowledge of himself and the world around him.⁷ It is evident that Sartra, in the final analysis, attributed human nature to a nothingness which cannot be understood. Therefore, although we cannot say that Sartre took man's natural nature as human nature, we can say that he considered something far more mysterious or naturalized as human nature.

IV The Complete Socialization of Man

Contrary to Western political thinkers, most Chinese political thinkers completely socialize man and prefer to explain human nature through clarifying man's social nature.

Confucius (Kung Fu-tzu, c.551-479BC), the eponymous creator of Confucianism, said that "human nature is similar between individuals while human behaviour is different from one individual to another". What does "human nature is similar" mean? Confucius explained it through clarifying his concepts of "etiquette" and "benevolence". "Etiquette" is a sort of social pattern and essentially means division, that is, the division of positions and functions between prince and courtier, the upper and the lower, father and son, the elder and the younger and so on. Everyone should behave properly according to his position in the society. The doctrine of "benevolence" was advanced to

perfect the division of etiquette. It is essential for the sake of peace between people and mainly means "loyalty, pardon and loving other men". If everybody can be loyal to, pardon and love each other, there will be peace between them, so that etiquette will be maintained. Confucius was very confident of the existence of etiquette in society and the people's realization of benevolence, because, according to his views, human nature tends to be virtuous and everybody can arrive at benevolence through studying and receiving education. This is why he said that "human nature is similar". If most people cannot arrive at benevolence, etiquette will not remain; and then, both men's and society's existences will not subsist in their true senses, let alone human nature.

Mencius (Meng Tzu, c.372-289BC), a very famous Confucian, developed Confucius' idea of benevolence and maintained that human nature is virtuous. Mencius gave the example that if a man suddenly sees a boy falling into a well, he will unvoluntarily go to save him. Then Mencius argued that "It is not for the sake of showing off among his village men and friends that he does so", his deed just comes from his "heart which cannot tolerate misfortune falling on others".⁸ Therefore, human nature is virtuous. Meanwhile, Mencius agreed that the desires of the senses also belong to human nature. But he argued that the desires of senses are "little human nature" while virtue is "big human nature"; the former must obey the latter.

Gao Tzu, Mencius' contemporary, is another ancient Chinese thinker. Although claiming that human nature has nothing to do

with virtue, he commended Confucius' benevolence so strongly as to argue that benevolence is intrinsic in each man's heart. That is, everybody is born with love, filiality and loyalty. Love means loving other men. Filiality means that the son and younger brother respect and obey the father and elder brother, while the father and elder brother show concern for the son and younger brother. Loyalty means being loyal to everybody and exerting oneself for them. It is obvious that Gao Tzu, through elucidating Confucius' benevolence, unconsciously shared Mencius' view that human nature is virtuous.

Kang Youwei(1858-1927), as an influential Chinese bourgeois reformer of the period in which the old and feudal Chinese society was being replaced by a new age, still praised highly the doctrine of Confucianism that human nature is virtuous and even took it as an important ground for the realization of the "great world republic". He held that everyone has a "heart which cannot tolerate misfortune falling on others"(Mencius' words). He called that heart as a virtuous heart, so human nature is virtuous. The virtuous heart is the origin of everything. Human evolution and civilization, human benevolence and love all come from this. Kang Youwei argued further: Men have vicious hearts too, which come from striving for fame and gain. We can help people to give up their vicious hearts through reforms and education, and then everybody will come to his nature(the virtuous heart), and the great world republic will be realized.⁹

Mao Tze-Tung, as a contemporary Chinese Marxist, characterized as class nature the axiom of Marx that "human nature is the totality of all social relations". According to Mao Tze-Tung, in the

society of civilization, men are divided into different classes (e. g. landlord class and peasant class), every class has its own human nature. For example, a landlord class element is born loving other landlords and a peasant is born loving other peasants. There is no so-called "universal human nature". This is why Mao Tse-Tung said: "There is no love and hate without reasons in the world. As for the so-called 'human love', there has never been this universal love since man entered class society. In the past, all ruling classes were keen to propose this love, many 'sages' and 'worthies' were also keen to propose this love, but nobody has realized it, because it cannot be realized in class society".¹⁰ It is obvious here that Mao Tse-Tung did not agree with the Confucian view on human nature. But the point is that, compared with the Confucian view, Mao Tse-Tung's concept of human nature is more socialized.

V Human Nature Should Be the Totality of All Natural and Social Relations

So far, the basic difference between Western views and Chinese views concerning human nature is evident: many Western political thinkers emphasize man's animal attributes and consider man's natural nature as human nature while most Chinese political thinkers completely socialize man and take man's social nature as human nature. Which view is correct? I do not think it is such a simple question. If human nature simply means man's natural nature, how can man distinguish himself from animals? If human nature is equal to man's social nature, what is the similarity between man

and animals? That is to say, man, as he developed from animals, is similar to animals and yet is basically different from animals because he lives in human society. So human nature must at the same time contain natural attributes and social attributes. If this reasoning is correct, a better way to study human nature is by organically combining the Western and Chinese views together.

By organically combining the Western and Chinese views together, human nature can be seen as the totality of all natural and social relations. It then includes two essential characteristics: animal instincts and social consciousness.

Animal instincts include the need for food, sexual desires, being acquisitive of property, pursuing absolute freedom etc., that is, the Epicureans' "self-interest", Machiavelli's "aggressive and acquisitive", Hobbes' "self-preservation", Bentham's "tending to pleasure and avoiding pain", Freud's "sexual instinct" and so on.

Social consciousness includes gregariousness, being altruistic, self-control etc., that is, Confucius' "virtuousness", "love", "filiality" and "loyalty", Mencius' "heart which cannot tolerate misfortune falling on others", Mao Tze-Tung's "class love" and so on.

These two characteristics determine all human activities; in other words, all human activities, from sexual attacks to sexual controls, from war to peace, can be explained essentially from man's animal instincts and social consciousness.

Nevertheless, the functions of the two characteristics, natural and social, are not fixed, but changeable according to different environments, nations, cultures, educations and so on.

In general, the lower the material living standard is, the more important function the animal instincts perform, and vice versa; the more moralized the culture is, the more important function the social consciousness performs, and vice versa.

PART III THE INDIVIDUAL

What is the individual? Determined by their different views on human nature, Western and Chinese thinkers approach the subject from different perspectives and have different concepts of the individual.

VI The Individual as A Natural and Solitary Man

In Western political thought, the individual is mainly considered as a natural and solitary man.

W. W. Tarn said: "Man as a political animal, a fraction of the polis or self-governing city state, had ended with Aristotle; with Alexander begins man as an individual".¹¹ This division is right in the perspective of time, but not correct theoretically. In theory, man as an individual began with the Epicureans. Of course, the Epicureans did not define the concept of individual specifically, but presented a clear idea of the individual in their theory of the origin and development of human institutions.

According to the Epicureans, man has no impulsion other than the restless pursuit of his individual happiness. At the beginning, he lived a roving and solitary life, seeking shelter in caves and struggling to maintain himself against wild beasts.¹² It is undubitable that this sort of roving and solitary man is the man

in the state of nature basically undistinguished from animals, but the Epicureans already considered him as the original individual, and, deductively, in their view, naturalness, solitariness and roving constitute the attributes of individual.

Hobbes, as a theorist of clear-cut individualism, developed the Epicurean idea of individual; he clearly thought of the solitary man in the state of nature as an individual and, on the basis of this, established his whole political philosophy. According to Hobbes, in the state of nature, man, like other animals, behaved according to the general principle that the living body is programmed instinctively to preserve or heighten its vitality. Each individual is acted on only by considerations that touch his own security or power, and other individuals are of consequence to him except as they affect this. Later, man entered the social state but the state institution is only an outside power holding individuals precariously together. Except when there is a tangible superior to whom men render obedience and who can, if necessary, enforce obedience, there are only individual human beings, since each is still actuated by his private interests.¹³

Although the logical structure and the complexity of Locke's political philosophy is very different to that of Hobbes', and some of his concrete conclusions are even quite opposite to those of Hobbes', Locke's idea of individual is very similar to Hobbes'. In Locke's political philosophy, the foundation of the whole system is the individual and his rights of life, liberty, property etc. What is the individual? According to Locke, the individual in the state of nature is a man with a purely private life and his own

interests. The individual's rights of life and liberty originate of course in the state of nature. As for the right of property, Locke explains as the following: the basis of the right of property is labour. The individual labours and extends, so to speak, his personality into the objects produced. By expending his internal energy upon them, he makes them a part of himself. As a result of this, his right of property arises. It is obvious that the production of individual's right of property is also a matter which happened in the state of nature.¹⁴

Sartre's view on the individual is outstandingly reflected in his elucidation of man's existence. Since Sartre attributed man's existence to nothingness, and nothingness means that man only exists, comes on to the scene, but without any knowledge of himself and the world around him, Sartre, first of all, took man as an individual and then isolated him from everything in the world. So the individual is absolutely free. He can decide and do everything at will. In Sartre's words, "man at the very beginning is a project of consciousness, not a moss, a dust and a flower; nothing antecedes this project". Man "is in the state of absolute solitariness, he undertakes every responsibility himself". In order to live, "he must refuse and say 'no' whenever and wherever".¹⁵ Therefore, if we cannot say that Sartre's individual is a man in the state of nature described by Hobbes and Locke, but we can say that his individual is a far more naturalized man.

Marcuse, one of the main contemporary Western Marxists, held that Marx's theory of class struggle and ideology is not correct because it approaches the problem of man only from the angle of society. In his own words: "Marxism's emphasis on the development

of political ideology indicates that it does not pay so much attention to find the basis of liberation in the individual, that is, it does not concern itself with each individual and the world experienced by them most directly and impressively, it does not pursue the basis of social relations in everybody's perceptibility and instinctive needs".¹⁶ Therefore, Marcuse claimed to improve Marxism by conjoining it with Freudianism and devoted himself to understanding the individual from personal perception and instinctive needs. But he actually ended up with and developed Freudianism. That is Marcuse absorbed Freud's conception of "the pleasure principle" and understood the individual as a man mainly characterized by sexual admiration. He even proposed to destroy any form of sexual prohibition identifying the complete release of sexual instincts with the liberation of mankind, and maintaining that only if the individual has got absolute sexual freedom, could he become really happy.

VII The Individual Submerged In Social Relations

Many Chinese theorists present a purely socialized concept of the individual, submerging the individual in social relations.

Confucius's view on the individual is also reflected in his elucidation of the concept "etiquette". According to Confucius, etiquette is the highest standard which can judge whether an individual behaves well or not. This is why Confucius said: "Do not look at it if it is not etiquette; do not listen to it if it is not etiquette ; do not talk about it if it is not etiquette and do not do it if it is not etiquette".¹⁷ The essence of etiquette is division, that is, the division of position between prince and

courtier, the upper and the lower and so on. Each individual should behave properly according to his position in society. This is what Confucius meant in his two famous axioms: "A gentleman does not think above his position" (gentleman here actually denotes each individual) and "Do not talk about politics if you are not in the right position".¹⁸ Therefore, in Confucius's view, the individual does not exist in the true sense, he is actually submerged in social relations. A typical example is the following: Confucius, in his exposition of etiquette, talked a lot of "filial obedience", the main idea of which is the blind obedience of a son to his father. That is to say, the father has absolute power over his son; the son is just an attachment to his father, losing all his individual characteristics.¹⁹

Hsun Tzu's view on the individual is reflected in his conception that "people are grouped by clear divisions". Hsun Tzu emphasized man's social nature and said that "man cannot live without groups" and that "a solitary life without mutual help will make you poor".²⁰ But how should we group people? Hsun Tzu's answer is to divide the people into different strata, because "division means righteousness; division with righteousness means peace; peace means unity; unity means strength; strength means strong and strong means overcoming".²¹ Hsun Tzu's division includes the division of labour, property distribution, the division of the noble and the humble and so on, all of which, according to Hsun Tzu, constitute the precondition of human life. Each individual is tied closely to all these relations from the very beginning; the so-called individual dignity, value, right etc. are actually decided by the society as an entity.

Jiang Jieshi, as one of the leaders of the Koumindang, took Confucianism as his precept and fused the individual in the state as a social organism. Jiang Jieshi said: "The state is an organic collective organization which transcends everything. All its organs constitute a very tight organism, of which every subject is a cell".²² In order to consolidate and develop this organism of state, each individual must be absolutely responsible for it. Each individual's responsibility for the state is reflected in his responsibility for others, e. g. his family and his friends. That is, each individual should be loyal, filial, benevolent, believable and peaceful to the others. If each individual undertakes well his responsibility to others, the state will be developing and prosperous.²³ In one word, Jiang Jieshi took each individual as a subject of the state and a cell of a organism, who has responsibility to the others, but without any right or freedom of his own.

Mao Tzu-Tung, as one of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, claimed to be an anti-Confucian, but his view on the individual, developed from Marx's axiom that "Only if the proletarian liberated all people in the world, could it liberate itself", actually coincides with the Confucian tradition. Mao Tzu-Tung criticized the egoistic or individualistic viewpoints which started from the individual, while himself taking the "others", the people as a whole, the country and the whole world as the departing point for thinking and action. Mao Tzu-Tung taught the members of the CCP that a Communist party member never seeks individual interests; what he strives for is the interests of

the whole class, the whole nation and the whole of mankind. Mao Tzu-Tung addressed the revolutionary army ranks, saying that our ranks are the people's ranks which work in the people's interests with heart and soul. Mao Tzu-Tung told the Chinese people that in all places and at all times, they should not put the individual first, but should put the collective and the country first; that is, the individual obey the collective and the collective should obey the country. In his two famous works "Serve the People" and "In Memory of Norman Bethune", Mao Tzu-Tung even recommended "serve the people" and "work in the interests of others but not for the individual himself" as precepts for everyone.

VIII The Individual Should Be A Social Animal

It is common sense that the individual denotes man in political thought, and it is also common sense that man lives in society and necessarily has various relationships with others. So, the Western theorists' individual as a natural and solitary man does not exist in fact. On the other side, taking the individual as a natural and solitary man in theory will produce evil results in practice, that is, it will encourage some people to seek self-interest and absolute freedom regardless the interests of others and of society. In the Western world, rapes, robberies, murders etc. are frequent, the crime rate is very high; these facts must have some relation to the theory.

Determined by his human nature, each individual necessarily has personal rights and desires about food, sex, property, freedom etc., and some means which can satisfy these rights and desires.

Herein lies the origin of individual value, dignity and right in Western thought. This implies there is no individual value, dignity and right if the individual is submerged in social relations. So, the Chinese tradition of political ideas on this question does not coincide with humanitarianism. On the other side, it entails the loss of initiative as the society's motive force if everyone is obedient to the society. This helps to explain why China has developed very slowly over thousands of years.

It is evident that the Western and Chinese traditions, on the question of individual, theoretically go to the two extremes respectively and both, in practice, are not good for the future development of human society. Then what is the individual? The correct answer can be produced by organically combining the Western and Chinese views together.

As a result of this combination, the individual should be seen as a social animal who is distinguished from both the individual as a natural and solitary man and the individual submerged in social relations. He should have some basic rights originating from animal instincts and, at the same time, should undertake some basic obligations determined by various social relations.

Individual rights and obligations are actually the two sides of the same thing and have a balancing relationship between them. For instance, an individual has the right to work in his own interests, but meanwhile he has the obligation not to sabotage the interests of the others; he has the right to satisfy his sexual desire, and at the same time he has the obligation not to rape someone or has the obligation not to sabotage the others'

happiness.

The basic rights and obligations are not fixed but changeable. Generally speaking, the more developed the country is, the more the sum total of basic rights and obligations is, and vice versa. The rate of growth of this sum total must be controlled according to the standards which can make sure that society as a whole is not sabotaged and, at the same time, let the society have its motive force.

Therefore, if each individual can keep a balance between his rights and obligations, and the society can properly control the rate of growth of the sum total of the individual basic rights and obligations, human society will become more and more developed and perfect.

PART IV DEMOCRACY AND DESPOTISM

Democracy and despotism, as the central subject of political thought, are the common subject of Western and Chinese political ideas. Nevertheless, the Western views and Chinese views on this subject are very different.

IX Democracy as End and Means

Democracy or despotism? Western political ideas mainly advocate democracy.

Althusius, a Dutch thinker of the 17th. century, can be said to be the first thinker who clarified the theory of democracy very explicitly in the Western world. Althusius developed the theory of the state on the basis of his views on the "contract of association". According to his views, the state is one of a

series of associations. It arises through the association of provinces or local communities; and, as compared with the others, the state holds sovereign power. In theory, sovereignty resides in the people as a corporate body and belongs to them; consequently, it is never alienated and never passes into the possession of a ruling class or family. In reality, sovereignty is always bestowed upon the administrative officials through the law of the state for the interests of the people as a whole. But if the administrative officials break the law and abuse their power for their own interests, the power must be given back to the people.²⁴

Milton, a well-known English political commentator of in the 17th. century, argued for "popular sovereignty" and the "natural birthright". In his view, men are born free and set up government for the sake of mutual defence. The magistrate's power is derived from the people for the public good. So, the right to protect the common good against a tyrant must always reside in the people. In his words, "the power of kings and magistrates is nothing else, but what is only derivative, transferred and committed to them in trust from the people, to the common good of them all, in whom the power yet remains fundamentally, and cannot be taken from them, without a violation of their natural birthright".²⁵

Rousseau, the eighteenth century French political theorist, is a famous democratic theorist in the Western world, whose view of popular sovereignty is undoubtedly very clear. Rousseau deemed, in his Social Contract, that government, as a product of the social contract agreed by everybody, has no vested rights,

but is merely the committee which acts for the interests of the people. People, as the corporate body of the social contract, are the only holders of sovereignty, while government is merely an agent having powers delegated from the people. Furthermore, in order to realize popular sovereignty completely, Rousseau strongly argued for a political system of direct democracy in which the citizens can actually be present at any meeting concerning their common interests, and he opposed all forms of representative government, which may easily allow the magistrates to abuse the powers given to them by the people. Nevertheless, if abuse of powers and violation of the social contract occur, the people can withdraw or modify the powers.

In the 20th century, the democratic tradition of Western political ideas is inherited and developed by the Democratic Socialists and the European Communists in the Western world. That is, the Democratic Socialists and the European Communists, in theory, developed the traditional theory of political democracy to encompass political, economic and social democracy.

The Democratic Socialists maintain: "Socialism can only be completed through democracy and democracy can only be fully realized through socialism". Democracy here includes political, economic and social democracy. Political democracy is the condition for the realization of economic and social democracy. It means that, "in a democratic country, all political powers must accept supervision by the popular masses". "Economic democracy is, on the basis of getting more and more prosperous to enlarge the individual freedom in economy, social insurance and so on". Therefore, to the socialist parties,

"the most important thing is not who controls the production materials, but how the people live in the society". As for social democracy, the Democratic Socialists point out:

"The guiding principle of capitalism is self-interest, while that of socialism is to satisfy human needs", giving everyone the right of work, rest, welfare and so on.²⁶

The European Communists do not entirely agree with the classic Marxists' view on democracy and hold that it is not right that there is no relationship between democracy and socialism; on the contrary, there is an internal and unitary relationship between them. Democracy belongs neither to the bourgeoisie, nor to the proletariat, it is the product of human civilization and is still the direction in which every nation and country in the world is developing. Therefore, the Spanish Communist Party says that its aim is "to gain and establish democracy again in Spain"; the Italian Communist Party proposes to "develop democracy in Italy, so as to realize the broadest democratic coalition between all political forces"; the French Communist Party holds that "socialism must develop democracy and freedom".²⁷ To the European Communists, the main idea of democracy is "the general election, protecting and extending the basic right of freedom of the popular masses", which are expressed in the three sorts of freedom, that is, economic, social and political freedom. Economic freedom means letting the working people join in economic decision-making. Social democracy means "making every labourer enjoy his achievement of hard work". Political democracy denotes "letting all citizens have the

rights of election, decision, supervision and control".²⁸

X Despotism and Its "Democracy"

In general, Chinese political ideas are traditionally despotic, and legalism, one of the chief schools of the ancient Chinese political ideas, developed the despotic theory to its most extreme extent according to its conception of history.

Most legalists maintained that the evolution of mankind is a long process, in which the position of the prince was developed for the sake of popular interests. Shen Dao(-c. 339BC), one of the early legalists, said that "no order exists if there is not a nobility in the world".²⁹ In his view, mankind, at its very beginning, was in great chaos because there were no fixed behaviour patterns, so "the prince" was later called into being, to teach people how to behave properly and to bring orders into the world.

Guang Tzu(-c. 645BC), the earliest legalist, held that, at the beginning of human society, "there were no differences between prince and courtiers", so "violence prevailed everywhere". In the strife, "the sage used the popular strength to punish violent men and stop riots, doing good to the people and developing morality among them. Therefore, the people followed the sage". This sage was, simply, the earliest prince.³⁰

Han Fei(c. 280-223BC), whose view is the comprehensive expression of legalist thought, deemed that mankind lived simply in Nature at its beginning. Later, because the development of population was faster than that of the natural means of life and the means of production, contradiction and strife over living

space occurred, breaking the natural balance of primitive life. Eventually, because of the need to establish a balance between man and nature on one hand and a balance between men themselves on the other, the prince, as the sign of power, was called into being.

Summarizing the above, according to the legalists' conception of history, the prince saved the people from the terrible state of strife and violence and brought them peace and harmony; therefore, he was necessarily the protector and master of the people, while the people should naturally obey the prince. This is undoubtedly a doctrine of complete despotism.

Although traditional Chinese political ideas are generally despotic, there are still to be found in them many views which stress the role of the people in politics.

According to Mencius, politics resides in winning people over; losing people's allegiance necessarily means failure. He said, "violating the people means killing oneself and destroying the state, or risking one's own life and weakening the state". "Jie and Zhou lost the world because they lost the people; losing the people means losing one's own heart".

Hsun Tzu(-c. 210BC) was another famous Confucian, whose views on the role of people is very similar to those of Mencius. He said, "as the ruler of state, if the prince can get the popular strength, the state will be rich; if the people are willing to risk their lives for him, the state will become strong; if the people praise him, the state must be prosperous. If he can get all these, he will gain the world; if he loses all these, he

will lose the world".³²

Guang Tzu advocated despotism and severe legal enforcement. But when speaking of the basis of legal enforcement, he also devoted much attention to the predilection of the people. He said, "why does law work well? Because it encourages what people like and forbids what people hate".³³ "Good law comes from people's desire, so that it can work well...Good law punishes what people hate, so as to stop social evil".³⁴ According to his views, if a law is set up against the people's will and desire, or outruns the people's ability to receive it, it will naturally have a contrary effect, forcing the people to break the law. Because of these views stressing the people's role in politics, some researchers argue that there are in fact some democratic elements in traditional Chinese political ideas. But this is not the case, because it is obvious that Chinese political thinkers, such as the thinkers mentioned above, stressed the people's role when they were exploring how to protect the prince's ruling position and vested interests. In other words, their point of departure is the prince, but not the people; stressing the people's role is merely for the sake of the prince's power. So their views actually tend to be despotic.

In modern China, the tradition of despotism still existed in or affected the theories of the Chinese bourgeois reformers and revolutionaries.

Zheng Guanying (1842-1922), an influential Chinese bourgeois reformer, positively recommended the Western parliamentary system, but what he preferred is the so-called despotic-democratic system, that is, constitutional monarchy. He held that in

monarchy, political power inclines towards the prince while democracy lays too much stress on the people's right; but "in a despotic-democratic system there is a balance between the prince and the people", so it is the best government. Zheng Guanying, on one hand, emphasized that the prince must follow the people's will. On the other, he strongly argued that "it is Heaven who produces the people and establishes the prince", believing that the supremacy of prince is naturally born and unshakable. In his view, the people's opinions are transferred by the parliament to the prince; the people's right is expressed by the prince; the parliament's decisions are just for the prince's consideration of exercising. Therefore, the parliament is just a advisory body of the prince.³⁵

Jiang Jieshi was a very famous Chinese bourgeois revolutionary and naturally opposed Communism. But he, in the 1930s, criticized liberalism and, in the meantime, extolled the virtues of fascism, which shares many viewpoints with traditional Chinese thought. According to Jiang Jieshi, there were three political theories in the world at that time: Communist theory, liberal theory and fascist theory. Communist theory did not apply to China with its undeveloped state of industry and its original morality. Liberal theory did not apply to China either, because it "shouts of freedom" and "proposes parliamentary debate", "letting questions and difficulties grow among the popular masses" and making it difficult to unite all parts of the country. It is only fascism which can ensure the most effective governing power and make the country united.³⁶ Furthermore, Jiang Jieshi suggested combining

the practice of fascism and the development of Chinese original culture together, so as to ensure "the absolute belief of all the Chinese people in the revolutionary leader and organizations and their absolute support to them".³⁷

XI Democracy Should Be Based on Human Rights

The despotic tradition of Chinese political ideas becomes more obvious when it is compared with the Western democratic theories where democracy is both the end and means at the same time. Given this, if there are some elements in Chinese political ideas which must be given up, the theory of despotism should be the first one; in other words, it should be basically replaced by the Western theory of democracy.

This does not mean that the Western theory of democracy is absolutely sound, because that theory is always based upon the ideas of "natural rights" or "birthrights", which makes unverifiable reference to nature and easily goes to the other extreme, even denying a reasonable degree of centralism and state power. That is to say, democracy cannot be based on natural rights or birthrights; it should be based on another concept. This concept is that of human rights.

Compared with "natural rights" or "birthrights", human rights is certainly a concept with a social dimension, which refers to basic individual rights and has a mutual relationship with basic individual obligations. And basic individual obligations always mean observing duties and are related to a reasonable degree of centralism and state power. So, it can prevent some people from going to the extremes of individualism

if democracy is based on human rights.

Consequently, democracy, in the sense of "people's sovereignty", does not exclude a reasonable degree of centralism and state power; in fact, it includes a reasonable degree of centralism and state power, which in practice exist everywhere and are accepted by most people, but are neglected by the democratic tradition of Western political ideas. For this reason, the Chinese theory of despotism, e. g. Shen Dao's "a nobility in the world", Zheng Guanying's "despotic-democratic system", perhaps contains some useful elements which could ameliorate the Western theory of democracy.

PART V SUPREMACY---LAW OR MAN

As a result of their different views on the political system, Western and Chinese political ideas on the form which rule takes are also very different.

XII The Rule of Law

In relation to the theory of democracy, Western political ideas mainly propose the rule of law.

Aristotle, as the ancestor of Western political thought, was also the first person in the Western world who clearly advanced the idea of the rule of law. Aristotle elucidated his views while devoting himself on the subject of "ideal state" and through his criticism of Plato's position which made government by law and government by a philosopher exclusive alternatives. In his Politics, Aristotle maintained that an ideal state should be

the state in which supremacy resides in law but not in any individual person whatsoever. This is because the rule of law is neither a makeshift device nor an unfortunate necessity, but is in fact the indispensable condition of a civilized life.

Aristotle furthered his argument by claiming that law, as agreed by everybody, means reason and equality, unaffected by personal desire and passion. No man's rule, even that of the wisest ruler, can attain this impartiality, and so the supremacy of law is unquestionable. Furthermore, even the magistrate's authority is given by law. Otherwise, it is neither reasonable nor moral. And if this happens, it must be the characteristic of a degenerate state and not the ideal state.³⁸

The tradition of the rule of law, first expressed clearly by Aristotle, existed in the Western world of the late ancient times and the Middle Ages, and was propounded especially in the theory of the Roman Lawyers from the 2nd. to the 3rd, century and in the theory of the lawyers of the Middle Ages. Both of them advocated the view that the authority of the ruler is derived from the law agreed by the people, so the ruler, like the people, must obey the law. Nevertheless, the expression of this tradition in the "Defence of Liberty against Tyrants", a famous work published in France in the Religious Wars Period(1562-1598) of the Western world, is more outstanding, because the work was written with the serious intent of criticizing the abuses of power by tyrants. According to the Defence, the king must be subject to the law; he depends on the law, not the law on him. "The law is reason and wisdom itself, free from all perturbation, not subject to be moved with choler, ambition, hate, or acceptances of persons".³⁹

On the other hand, law comes from the people, and not from the king. Therefore, the law cannot be changed without the people's consent. The king cannot dispose of the lives and property of the people unless he is permitted to do so by the law. The king is accountable under the law for his every act.

With the historical movement towards the replacement of monarchical government by republican government in the Western world in the 17th. century, the traditional idea of the rule of law was developed in the theory of republicanism, especially in the Oceana of Harrington, a well-known republican of that time. Harrington, according to his underlying conviction that the form of government is determined by its social and economic forces, held that England's development into a republic was both certain and natural, and the distinguishing mark of the republic was that it would be "an empire of laws and not of men". Only under the empire of law, can the people gain freedom; only a constitutional government can give adequate scope for true statesmanship and the public spirit; only a constitutional government corresponds to popular interests. The empire of men, on the other hand, is related to the personal arbitrariness of tyranny, giving freedom to only a few people and corresponding to their private interests.⁴⁰

The Western tradition of the supremacy of law is also reflected in Hegel's theory of constitutional monarchy in the 19th. century. In Hegel's constitutional monarchy, the state is an embodiment of reason and law is "rational". The state's power is absolute but it is not arbitrary; it must always exercise its

powers under the forms of law. Therefore, Hegel's constitutional monarchy is still a state in which the rule of law prevails. Furthermore, Hegel emphasized the supremacy of law by comparing his constitutional monarchy with despotism. According to Hegel, the essence of despotism is lawlessness, and the essence of a free and constitutional monarchy is that it excludes lawlessness and produces security. In Hegel's own words: "Despotism means any state of affairs where law has disappeared and where the particular will as such, whether of a monarch or a mob, counts as law or rather takes the place of law". But it is precisely the fact that everything in the constitutional state is fixed and secure which is the bulwark against caprice and dogmatic opinion".⁴¹ The monarch, however, according to Hegel, has no great power and such power as he has ought, in a well regulated monarchy, to follow from his legal position as head of the state. That is, "in a well-organized monarchy, the objective aspect belongs to law alone; the monarch's part is merely to set to the law the subjective 'I will'".⁴²

XIII The Rule of Man

In relation to the theory of despotism, Chinese political ideas traditionally argue for the rule of man; these arguments were mainly expressed in Confucianism and legalism, the two chief schools of political theory in China's feudal period (c. 476BC-1840)

There is hardly any mention of the rule of law in Confucianism, according to which, by contrast with the Western view, the prince is a sage, who incarnates the law of development

of the natural world and human society, and therefore has the natural supremacy in the world. This is why Confucius agreed that "a state can flourish with one word" and "a state can collapse with one word" (the "word" here certainly means the prince's word).⁴³

Mencius considered himself as a loyal disciple of Confucius and advocated the rule of man while opposing the rule of law. Before the "Warring States" period, all of China was a society ruled by the "rule of man". In Mencius' day, the landlord class had overthrown the slave-holder class and established its power successively in every vassal state. In order to acquire and consolidate its ruling position, the landlord class had to break down the prevailing conceptions and institutions. This was reflected, at the level of political ideas, as the legalists' conception of "governing according to the changed situation", as opposed to "following the old". Mencius was critical of the legalists' conception and argued for "following the ex-princes". In Mencius' view, the ex-princes, Yao, Shun, Yu and the others, were all sages, and their way of ruling, like compasses and melody, should be taken as the eternal way of ruling and as the eternal behaviour pattern. He said, "compasses denote the perfect sphere while the sage is the greatest model of men. To be a prince or to be a courier, follow Yao and Shun. If you do not follow Yao and Shun, no real prince exists. Governing the people without following Yao and Shun means robbing the people in fact".⁴⁴ So far, Mencius's argument for the rule of man and his objection to the rule of law is very clear.

Tung Chung-shu (c. 179-104BC), a very influential Confucian of the Han Dynasty, developed Confucianism's idea of the sage; he equated the prince with the sage and maintained that the prince, connecting Heaven, the earth and man, is the pivot which regulates the relationship between man and nature, and has the natural supremacy in the world. In his own words, referring to Chinese calligraphy, "The ancient letter-creator made three crossed lines with a vertical line in the middle become the prince. The three crossed lines mean Heaven, the earth and man respectively, with the middle vertical line connecting all of them. Who connects the three? It cannot be anybody but the prince".⁴⁵ Therefore, the duty to obey the prince is determined by Heaven, the earth and man. This is why Tung Chung-shu also said that "a body has the heart as its essential organ while a state is based upon the prince".⁴⁶

One of the main themes of legalism is the rule of law and the duty to judge everything according to law. Some legalists also made it clear that the prince ought to obey the law. Guang Tzu said that "a craftsman can make compasses, but he cannot draw a circle without compasses. The sage can make law, but he cannot govern a state without laws".⁴⁷ Shang Yang (?-c. 338BC) stated, "Laws and orders are followed by both prince and courtiers".⁴⁸ Han Fei said, "as sagacious prince and loyal courtiers, they cannot forget law any time while leading the state".⁴⁹ Nevertheless, in fact, the above legalists did not deny that laws are made by princes. This theory therefore apparently contains elements of the "rule of man" too. Furthermore, many legalists made it very clear that laws are made by the prince and are tools

of the prince. Guang Tzu said that "some men make laws, some follow laws and some obey laws. The prince makes laws, the courtiers follow laws and the subjects obey laws".⁵⁰ Han Fei said that "the tool of the prince is either law or art".⁵¹ Therefore, legalism came down on the side of the rule of man in the final analysis.

The Chinese tradition of the rule of man was also expressed by Yang Du, a scholar of the Northern Warlords (1912-1927). Yang Du, aiming at the constitutional republic presented by Sun Zhongshan and the other bourgeois revolutionaries, on one hand, he commended constitutional government as effective, and on the other hand, maintained that "the Chinese people's consciousness of law and democracy cannot match that of the French and American people", so, a constitutional republic cannot be established in China as in France and America. In China, "only if the president is replaced by a prince and the the position of the head of state is rendered unchangeable by the others, can the situation be stabilized". This is the basic characteristic of the state and it is what Mencius meant by "attributing everything to one". Yang Du continued his argument by saying that "we cannot save the country and we cannot establish a constitutional government unless we have a monarchy".⁵² That is to say, China must, first of all, have a prince with absolute power, and then, under the rule of the prince, establish a constitutional government. The position and power of the prince are not decided by the constitution, but on the contrary, the prince's will can effect the establishing of the constitution. The tradition of

the rule of man is very clear here.

Mao Tzu-Tung, as the great leader of the Chinese Communist Party, certainly did not agree with the rule of man and did propose the rule of law. But he emphasized first the rule of the party and then the rule of law. So, the rule of the party not only makes it difficult to practise the rule of law, but also, theoretically and in practice, coincides with the Chinese tradition of the rule of man. According to Mao Tzu-Tung, in socialist China, law is the expression of the will of the proletariat and the broad masses of people, and its establishment and practice must be sponsored and supervised by them. But the CCP is the sole representative of the Chinese proletariat and the broad masses of people and its will is naturally the will of the latter; therefore, the establishment and practice of law must proceed under the leadership of the CCP. And inside the CCP, the head of the party committee plays the leading and deciding role. As a result of this, it frequently happened in socialist China that the establishment and practice of law was affected by some head of the party committee, and that the rule of man took the place of the rule of law from time to time.

XIV The Superiority of the Rule of Law

The sharp contrast between Western political ideas and Chinese political ideas in the question is very clear: the former basically advocated the rule of law while the latter traditionally tended towards the rule of man. Without doubt, the rule of law is more advanced, because it is related to human rights, popular sovereignty and democracy; the idea of the rule of man is

less progressive since it is always seen in relation to divine right and despotism, unless there are in fact "real sages" in the world.

At the present time, in China, there are almost no thinkers who openly advocate the rule of man. But in fact, the traditional idea of the rule of man is trying every way to express itself in indirect forms, for example, in Mao Tzu-Tung's "the rule of the party" etc. The more important point is that the traditional idea of the rule of man had, before modern times, become part of a culture which still affects the thinking and behaviour of most Chinese people everywhere in our own time. This is concretely reflected in the fact that the Chinese people's consciousness of law is very low. To give an illustration, during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, because of the will of a few Chinese leading personalities, all police stations, procuratorial organs and courts were destroyed, leading the whole country into the state of absolute lawlessness, in which many innocent people (including quite a lot of top officials) were sent to prison and tortured to death, but the Chinese people, as a whole, was "dumb as a wooden chicken" and let these things happen unchecked, without demands to deal with these crimes and killings by legal means.

So, there are many obstacles to realizing the rule of law in Chinese culture, as compared with realizing it in the Western world. For this reason, if there are some Western political ideas which could be of use for the Chinese people, the idea of the rule of law will be the first one. That is to say, if the Chinese people can come to accept the Western idea of the rule of law, it

will be very significant in helping them to destroy the residue of the idea of the rule of man and to realize the real rule of law in China.

For these reasons, I believe that the Western idea of the rule of law will be accepted by the Chinese people and will help them a lot while the Chinese tradition of the rule of man will be destroyed gradually, since as compared with the rule of man, the rule of law is superior.

PART VI POLITICS AND MORALITY

In the history of Western political ideas and Chinese political ideas, there are some thinkers who openly denied the relation between politics and morality. Italy's Machiavelli and China's Han Fei, for instance, maintained that politics has no relationship to morality. But most of the Western and Chinese political theorists advocated or acquiesced in the close relationship between politics and morality in different ways.

XV Morality Is Included by Law

Relating the whole question to their idea of the rule of law, Western thinkers mainly explained the relationship between politics and morality by clarifying the reason and justice contained in laws. That is to say, the relationship between politics and morality is mainly reflected in the relationship between morality and law where reason and justice are the basic elements of morality; a state in which the rule of law dominates is therefore a moral entity. According to Aristotle's Politics, the chief purpose of a state is ethical, because it

ought to be an association of men living together to achieve the best possible life. In order to realize this purpose, the state must be a state in which the rule of law prevails. This is because that law is always something agreed on and accepted by everyone, so the rule of law is consistent with the dignity of the subjects and is rule in the public and general interest. In other words, the ethical purpose of a state must be ensured by the rule of law, since law, determined by its nature, is ethical from the very beginning. Therefore, the ethical purpose of the state dominates and completely subsumes its political or legal nature.⁵³

Helvetius held, according to his utilitarian system of thought, that what any man judges to be good is what he supposes to conduce to his interests, and similarly what any nation sets up as moral is what it believes to conduce to the general interest. As a result of this, a man may act so as to harm the general interest for the sake of his own interests. So, morality becomes the problem of the legislator. He must above all spread the knowledge by which men can see how the general interest includes their own, so as to make one consonant with the other. The legislator must then establish laws by which virtue is rewarded and vice is punished, so as to make men virtuous. This is why Helvetius said, "good laws are the only means of making men virtuous, the whole art of legislation consists in forcing men, by the sentiment of self-love, to be always just to others. To make such laws it is necessary to know the human heart, and first of all to know that men, though concerned about themselves and indifferent to others, are born

neither good nor bad but are capable of being the one or the other according as a common interest unites or divides them".⁵⁴

Rousseau maintained that mere likeness of kind does not make men into a society. Only a psychological or spiritual bond---"the reciprocal sensibility and internal correspondence of all the parts"---analogous to the vital principle of a living organism makes men into a society. Society thus becomes a corporate self which has "a general will". The general will of the corporate self sets the moral standards which are valid for its members. Therefore, Rousseau argued, rather similarly to Aristotle, that society is an "association" not an "aggregation, a moral and collective personality". In his own words, "the body politic, therefore, is also a moral being possessed of a will; and this general will, which tends always to the preservation and welfare of the whole and every part, and is the source of the laws, constitutes for the members of the state, in their relations to one another and to it, the rule of what is just or unjust".⁵⁵

The post-behavioralist school since the 1970s, reacting against traditional behaviouralism, disagreed with the attempts at value-free, no-moral research of the latter tradition. Iston, a post-behaviouralist, pointed out that people cannot do value-free political researches; every proposition put forward by the researcher must be imbued with moral preconceptions. When we described a fact, our proposition comes from some moral purpose which leads us to observe the fact. Political scholars should be more concerned with the concept of "value" and with questions of justice, freedom, equality etc. On the basis of these criticisms and this knowledge, the post-behaviouralists reintroduce value

and morality into their political resarches, or, in other words, they relate politics to morality again. Therefore, they devote themselves to the research of the political theory of standards and end up with the traditional view on the relation between politics and morality created by Aritotle. That is to say that they, according to the concepts of justice, freedom, equality etc, try to establish the laws and rules concerned with individual rights and obligations and the proper standards of political conduct, and they believe that, by doing so, they have introduced morality into political research and have related politics with morality.⁵⁶

XVI The Moralization of Politics

By contrast to Western thinkers, Chinese political theories above all moralize politics, making an equation between the two. This was outstandingly reflected in Confucius' explanation of how to engage in politics.

According to Confucius' view, there are three basic things to be done in engaging in political activity. First of all, there is the need to give moral inspiration. Confucius held that if the prince is strict with regard to his own morality and sets an example with his own conduct, the people will be infected by his example and follow him. Thus, governing a state will become easy. This is why he said that "there will be no killings if I govern a state. My virtue will make the people virtuous. The prince's morality means wind while the subjects' means grass; grass is necessarily prostrated

by the wind".⁵⁷ He said again that "if the prince behaves himself well, he can govern the state without decrees; if the prince behaves himself badly, he cannot govern the state at all even with decrees".⁵⁸ Secondly, Confucius maintained that the prince and the courtiers cannot interact with each other on the basis of power. On the contrary, the relationship between them is the relationship of morality. That is to say, "the prince uses the courtiers with etiquette while the courtiers serve the prince with loyalty".⁵⁹ Thirdly, Confucius held that the prince must give the people ethical education, making them behave morally. In his own words, the prince should "straighten the people with etiquette", so as to control the world. Once, one of his disciples asked him why he did not engage in politics, Confucius answered that he was engaging in politics while spreading filiality.⁶⁰

Facts very often proved that it is not practical to equate politics with morality. Therefore, many traditional Chinese thinkers later suggested, from different perspectives, that a political system should contain legal punishment, but morality was always put in the first place while legal punishment was relegated to the second place. Confucius said, "If you govern a state with political means and straighten the people with legal punishment, the people will not commit crimes without shame; if you govern a state with morality and straighten the people with etiquette, the people will not commit crimes with shame".⁶¹ It is evident here that morality is placed above legal punishment in Confucius' views.

Tung Chung-shu, developing and advancing the above ideas, combined astronomical symbols, human affairs and subjective

imagination together and argued that politics first means morality and secondly legal punishment. According to his Spring-August Heavy Dew, Heaven contains feminine and masculine. "Feminine is warp-wool while masculine is makeshift", so morality means warp and legal punishment is makeshift. Furthermore, he held that Heaven divides into four seasons: spring, summer, autumn and winter. Summer represents life and means morality; winter represents death and means legal punishment. On one hand, summer and winter cannot replace each other, thus, morality and legal punishment cannot replace each other either. On the other hand, Heaven arranges for summer to come first and winter second; it is the same in human affairs, morality is the basic element and legal punishment is just a redress for morality.

The Confucians' moralization of politics was inherited and developed by Jiang Jieshi in the contemporary China. In his famous work "The Principles of Politics", Jiang Jieshi held that "politics bases itself on man and means the relationship between men"; the standard of the relationship between men is "benevolence" which "is equal to humanity or human nature". "Politics should proceed from the fact that each individual is completely responsible for his family, the society and the country". That is, between father and son, elder brother and younger brother, and between friends, everyone should be loyal, filial, benevolent, believable and peaceful. "The way of governing lies in from the inside to the outside and from close relationships to distant relationships, that is, "relationship makes people benevolent", "manage the family and then govern the country".

In a word, according to Jiang Jieshi, "the motive power of all politics is sincereness".⁶²

Mao Tzu-Tung, unlike Jiang Jieshi, based politics on class, but he unconsciously ended up with the Confucian tradition of moralizing politics. Mao Tzu-Tung quite agreed with Lenin on the definition that "politics denotes one class' struggle against the other" and furthered the point in question as follows: In contemporary China, politics means the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the socialist road and the capitalist road, between the interests of the majority and the interests of the minority. The proletariat persists on the socialist road which coincides with the interests of the majority, so its struggle is just, its politics are just. The bourgeoisie, on the other hand, persists on the capitalist road which coincides with the interests of the minority, so, its struggle and politics are unjust. Here, Mao Tze-Tung divided politics into the just or the unjust according whether it coincides with the interests of the majority or not, his moralization of politics is very obvious. Furthermore, Mao Tze-Tung, when choosing the successors of the proletarian revolutionary cause, emphasized first the political standard which is actually moral standard, that is, it stresses on whether a person is willing to work in the interests of the majority or not. This is what was meant by the popular axiom "preferring the red without special skill to an expert who is not red" in the political circle of socialist China.

XVII The Politics of Morality

It is evident that Western political thinkers recognized the close relationship between politics and morality merely in a formal sense, because morality is actually included in and replaced by law; without law, the saying that "the body politic is a moral being" and its like would become empty maxims. By contrast, Chinese political theorists moralize politics, equating politics with morality, or, in politics, putting morality in the first place and legal punishment in the second at most. Comparing their views, which one is better founded? It is actually not an easy question to answer.

Aristotle's view that a state ought to be an association of men living together to achieve the best life can be accepted by most Western and Chinese political thinkers. But in order to realize this purpose, even today, legal punishment must be first used to prevent the public interest being exploited by criminals. Here, the end and the means are logically unitary but contradictory in practice in the sense that the end is a moral one while legal punishment is a coercive, rather than a moral force. But there is no other choice available, because material poverty and moral and spiritual inadequacy always lead some men to harm others for their own selfish interest. This is why some people say that "constitutional rule is an unfortunate necessity" and this is the starting point from which the Western view on the relationship between politics and morality gets its realistic significance.

Nevertheless, it often happens in human life that an unfortunate necessity is related to imperfection. The moral

purpose of a society must be realized through the legal means of punishment; this is necessitated by material poverty and moral and spiritual inadequacy. Similarly, a man, in order to be healthy, must accept a painful medical treatment or a surgical operation, since he is very ill or has got a tumour, because he had defective genes or suffered from a poor diet. If the man has a healthy genes and a good diet etc, he is necessarily healthy, and he will not undergo unbearable painful medical treatment or major surgery. In a similar way, with the development of material and spiritual civilisation, the conscious and moral elements in human life should grow and increase while immoral behaviour and violence will decrease in the society, so as to gradually realize the unity between the society's end and its means both logically and in fact, and to accelerate the society's amelioration. In this sense, the Chinese moralization of politics has a more far-reaching significance for historical development, although it is less realistic than the Western perspective in the contemporary human society.

By the time the unity between society's end and its means is realized both logically and actually, politics will become the politics of morality.

Notes:

1. Sabine "A History of Political Theory", pp. 132-135
2. Ibid., pp. 342-344
3. Hobbes' "Leviathan", Ch. 11
4. Bentham "Introduction to the Principles of Moral and Legislation", Ch. 1, Sect. 1

5. Freud "Beyond the Pleasure Principle", p. 4
6. Sartre "Existentialism Is A Humanitarianism"
7. Sartre "An Answer to Garmou"
8. "Mencius . Gongsunchou"
9. Kang Youwei "An Analysis to Mencius'", Book I; Kang Youwei "An Annotation to the 'Analects', Book VI
10. "The Selected Works of Mao Tze-Tung", p. 827
11. W. W. Tarn "Hellenistic Civilization"(1952), p. 79
12. The Fifth Book of Lucretius' Poem "De Rerum Natura"
13. Sabine "A History of Political Theory", pp. 427-433, pp. 438-439
14. Sabine "A History of Political Theory", p. 487
15. Sartre "Existentialism Is A Humanitarianism" and "An Answer to Garmou"
16. Marcuse "Nature and Revolution"
17. "Analects . Yan Yuan"
18. "Analects . Charter"
19. "A Reflection on Traditional Chinese Political Thought", pp. 74-75
20. "Hsun Tzu . Constitution of Prince" and "Hsun Tzu . Making A Country Rich"
21. "Hsun Tzu . Constitution of Prince"
22. Jiang Jieshi "Chinese Soul"
23. Jiang Jieshi "The Reason of Politics"
24. Sabine "A History of Political Theory", pp. 416-420
25. "Works", ed. by Patterson, Vol. 5, p. 108
26. "Selections from the Important Documentants of the Social

- Democratic Parties", p. 15; "Selections from the Important Documents of the Socialist Parties, p. 187, p. 6
27. "Origins of European Communism", p. 210
 28. "Origins of European communism", p. 58
 29. "Shen Tzu . Power and Morality"
 30. Guang Tzu . Prince and Courtiers"
 31. "Mencius . Liloushang"
 32. "Hsun Tzu . Overlord"
 33. "Guang Tzu . Good Law"
 34. "Guang Tzu . Power"
 35. Zheng Guangying "Parliament"; Zheng Guangying's "Dangerous Words in A Prosperous World", Book 1
 36. "Minutes of the People's Congress"
 37. "A Brief Narration of the Reviviscence Society"; "Literature and History Materials", Book 11
 38. Sabine "A History of Political Theory", pp. 92-98
 39. "A Defence of Liberty against Tyrants", Edited by H. J. Laski, p. 145, London, 1924
 40. Sabine "A History of Political Theory", pp. 501-504
 41. Hegel "Philosophy of Right", Section 278, Note; Section"70, Addition
 42. Hegel "Philosophy of Right", Section 280, Addition
 43. The "Analects . Zhilu"
 44. "Mencius . Liloushang"
 45. Tung Chung-shu "Spring-August Heavy Dew . Prince Way Connecting Three"
 46. Tung Chung-shu "Spring-August Heavy Dew . Connecting State Body"

47. "Guang Tzu . Seven Courtiers and Seven Princes"
48. "Shang Yang Book . Careful with Law"
49. "Han Fei Tzu . Tricks in Leading"
50. "Guang Tzu . Responsible for Law"
51. "Han Fei Tzu . Difficulty Three"
52. Yang Du "On Saving the Country by Monarchy and A
Constitutional Government "
53. Sabine "A History of Political Thought", pp. 94-100
54. Helvetius "De l'esprit, II, 24; Vol. I, pp. 394 ff.
55. "Vanghan", Vol. I, pp. 241 f. ; Trans. by G. D. H. Cde, p.
253
56. "Trends of Contemporary Western Political Thought", p.
208 and pp. 234-235
57. The "Analects . Yan Yuan"
58. The "Analects . Zhi Lu"
59. The "Analects . Ba Yi"
60. The "Analects . Governing"
61. Ibid.
62. Jiang Jieshi "Principles of Politics"