Reconstruction
of Values and Morality
in Global Times

Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXXIV

Edited by
Liu Yong & Zhang Zhixiang

Table of Contents

Introduction

LIU YONG & ZHANG ZHIXIANG

Ethics and values are core components in the development of cultural traditions and a nation's heritage. It is important to carry on and reconstruct these important components according to our changing times and circumstances. In the era of globalization, one indisputable and inevitable fact is that different cultures and civilizations must interact and learn from each other in order to enrich and to be enriched through mutual understanding. This includes mutual recognition and mutual knowledge of ethics and values.

This interaction requires open dialogue among scholars from different backgrounds and different countries. It explores how to build a common search and understanding based on mutual respect and consensus among different nations, cultures and peoples on the issue of ethics and values. Particularly, in the situation of today's growing global crises we need to think together about the meaning of ethics and values, and even construct a new ethics and new values based on common concerns for human destiny, mutual care, and respect for the entire human community. This demands overcoming cultural arrogance and superiority in order to search for new meanings and aspirations for the future. Only then, might we have a chance to solve the global crisis of ethics and values through multicultural dialogue.

The international academic conferences of "Reconstruction of Morality and Value Systems in the Time of Globalization" and "Value Conflict and Consensus in the Context of Cultural Diversity" were hosted by the Council for Research in Values and Philosophy and undertaken by Yangzhou University and Liaoning University from December 17 to 19, 2014. The delegates were from different countries of five continents, such as America, Canada, Holland, Portugal, Russia, Romania, Austria, China, India, Lebanon, and Uganda. They discussed the topic of "Reconstruction of Morality and Value Systems in the Time of Globalization" from five aspects, Globalization and Traditional Cultural Values, Cultural Traditional Values and Modernity, Cultural Values and Contemporary Society, Reconstruction of Morali-

ty and Value Systems in a Multicultural Context and the Comparative Study of Morality and Value Systems.

The aim of this conference was to clarify fundamental issues related to ethics and values in different cultures and circumstances, to study the main challenges facing the era of globalization, to learn the latest achievements of international academic research, to promote cultural exchanges and cooperation among scholars from different disciplines and to encourage young scholars to go deeper into these core issues in order to improve academic standards and capabilities.

Globalization and Traditional Cultural Values

Vincent Shen, professor of philosophy at the University of Toronto, analyzes traditional cultural values in the process of globalization from the angle of Confucian altruism, generosity and justice. Confucian "strangification" (waitui), in the sense of reaching out from oneself to other people (tui ji ji ren) and "he who practices shu knows how to strangify" (shu zhe shan tui) is a possible strategy for communication among different civilizations. In Chinese, the etymological meaning of this is the act of going outside of oneself to meet multiple others, or going beyond that with which one is familiar to strangeness, to many strangers. Three types of strangification are discussed here: linguistic, pragmatic and ontological. The virtues of being able to step out of one's self-enclosure and be generous to many others are the most essential in the process of globalization. In Confucianism, shu could be seen as such a basic virtue. With shu, one extends one's existence to even larger circles. It is the act of always going beyond oneself to many others: from self to family, from family to community, from community to the state, and from the state to all under heaven. In the global times, the original generosity implied by ren and shu should be seen as the *conditio sine qua non* of all reciprocal relationships. From ren, Confucius derived yi, rightness; from yi, Confucius derived li, the ritual or proprieties. In Confucian terms, the concept of distributional justice is based on the moral righteousness, which comes from ren. When the reciprocal relationships, developed from ren, are extended, by the strangification of shu, justice can be realized.

Xie Xiaojuan of Liaoning University, China, discusses the new features of cultural diversity and the building of value consensus. Cultural diversity is a basic form of existence of human civilization and the motivation for progress in human society. Contemporary cultural exchanges present new features along with the emergence of globalization and the Internet. Globalization has brought world cultures more closely together, both in exchanges and collisions. The internet makes all kinds of cultural transfers faster, achieving instant sharing of cultural products. Because of this, the impact of culture on all levels of society is more prominent, and beliefs, customs, morals and ideas are all affected thereby. Facing the coexistence of cultural diversity, conflict has intensified. Internal conflict is usually between different values and paths of development. Meanwhile, different countries are facing common tasks and problems so that the value consensus becomes more possible. Therefore, from a cultural perspective, we should break the thinking mode of binary opposition, construct equal dialogue and communication mechanisms, and adopt cultural exchange activities that build a value consensus so as to advance human civilization.

Edward Alam, professor at Notre Dame University in Lebanon, analyzes the challenges and opportunities from the angle of human desire and international global capitalism. Drawing upon both ancient and modern philosophical insights into human nature and desire, he argues that it is necessary to curb the tide of international global capitalism and its corresponding industries by means of structurally channeling human desire beginning with early childhood education and the family value towards what Aristotle would call the transcendentals of being and "the good life." This calls for deep philosophical reflection on the categories of imitation and desire which presuppose and are presupposed by the mystery of human freedom. Such reflection can help to re-build the structures which will allow this channeling to take place.

Yuan Jiuhong of Southeast University, China, discusses the idea of freedom as a socialist core value but with Chinese characteristics. He points out that freedom is advocated as a "universal value" in the world by western countries, though there is no such universal and absolute truth in the world. For the past 30 years, China has had

tremendous success in modernization, but it has not adopted the western political or value models. What China has advocated in the process of modernization is "socialist freedom," which comes from the critical inheritance and development of western freedom. Nonetheless, this is fundamentally different from the western freedom in its theoretical basis and response to such questions as "why should we advocate [for] freedom," "[for] what kind of freedom should we advocate" and "how should we realize this freedom."

Culture, Traditional Values, and Modernity

Tu Xiaofei of Appalachian State University makes a parallel study between Critical Buddhism and Continental Philosophy from the angle of Anti-Essentialism and Tathagatagarbha. One of his controversial claims is that the concept of Buddha Nature or Tathagatagarbha is often viewed as a cornerstone of East Asian Mahayana Buddhism, though some scholars disagree. From the angle of Continental Philosophy, Tu thinks that Critical Buddhism is just like European Anti-Essentialism. A world without essence is a world of dead objects. A motto like "have the courage to be God" is only an inflation of Self. To him, it is nothing less than "you act as though you headed a government of the world in exile instead of taking care of your house." It would be more honest rather to be yourself, a human being.

Alexandre Palma of the Catholic University of Portugal, points out that the Non-Inscription Phenomenon is a modern way of avoiding a reconstruction of values. Reflecting on the present situation of Portuguese society, philosopher José Gil diagnosed this Phenomenon which describes a way of being that does not seem to really value anything. People seem to live as if nothing really happens. If nothing really happens, then there is no responsibility and nothing influences life. Can one continue to like that nothing happened? Non-Inscrip-tion be-speaks a gap between what we think and feel and reality itself. This may not be an exclusively Portuguese social pathology, but a weakness in modern societies. Where this occurs, no true value reconstruction seems possible, because that would demand a cultural inscription of events.

Tang Huiling of Yangzhou University, China, writes of mutual recognition and modern state governance. In modern times people begin to understand and accept recognition as a concept which should be equal and mutual. Mutual recognition can help dispel the subject-object dualistic thought pattern, be conducive to social unity and stability, and contribute to constraining an increasingly powerful government; this is an important paradigm of modern governance. Based on this theory, modern state governance should strive to build a community of recognition, and establish modern political identity and democracy.

Kondrashin discusses the modern approach to morality and values in times of global change. He points out that our understanding of values and vices embody an action-interested attitude of humans to the world. Firstly, they allow the justification of standard moral requirements. Secondly, they serve as the normative form of the moral orientation of the person in the world, translating and implementing it in the form of specific and often "ready" regulators. Thirdly, our ideas about values contain an assessment of the phenomena of reality and human actions in terms of their moral significance. Wisdom and morals, reason and justice should be returned to humanity as new modern qualities and should become the spiritual foundation for both East and West and for humanity as a whole.

Cultural Values and the Contemporary Society

John Ozolins of Australian Catholic University explores business and moral responsibility in a globalised world. Corporations have become dominant institutions in the global economy. Their incomes, in the case of some of the largest corporations, exceed the GDP of many middle-sized countries. During the recent global financial crisis, some were labelled as "too big to fail," suggesting that even though some of them had engaged in dubious financial transactions, allowing them to fail would result in even greater financial disaster globally. In many countries they have acquired huge resources and through their economic power are in a very strong position to dictate public social policy to government. Because they employ, in some cases, many thousands of people, they have the power through the wages they pay

and the working conditions they provide, to affect not just the lives of their employees, but also the lives of their families. Ozolins argues that the stakeholders involved in corporations, including multi-national corporations, include not only shareholders, managers and employees, but also the wider community. This means that corporations have responsibilities to the wider community and governments have a duty to regulate their activities within their own jurisdictions, preventing corruption, ensuring a just wage and minimizing environmental damage. Given the global nature of many corporations, the international community too has responsibility for ensuring that corporations are good global citizens, who realize that the aim of business activity is not merely the pursuit of profits, but also to contribute to the well-being of all.

Chrysoula Gitsoulis of City University of New York discusses the construction of value on the basis of utility vs. rights. She distinguishes what are called "natural rights" from "legal rights," and "negative rights" from "positive rights." She attempts to show that it is best to think of the difference between utilitarianism and rights-based ethics not as a difference in kind, but as a difference in degree. This will make it apparent that the same problem posed above for the utilitarian can be posed for the rights-based theorist who maintains that rights should be respected because it is fitting to do so, and not because of the good consequences that will flow from doing so. She concludes by highlighting some of the advantages and shortcomings of the "right-based" discussion.

Edward Wamala of Makerere University, Uganda, provides metaphysical reflections on commercial knowledge production for markets. He reflects on the possibility of metaphysics in a social-cultural milieu dominated by markets. The phenomenon of Economic Liberalization and the emergence of markets as the dominant feature of social life is radically changing the dynamics and dialectics of intellectual inquiry in contemporary scholarship and, in turn, impacting the discourse in disciplines like metaphysics, ethics and philosophy generally. Knowledge in the liberalized market place has assumed an instrumentalist and immediate utilitarian value. If our essentialist question can give us an answer or a clue about what markets essentially are, that will be an important step in our examination of how

they should operate. Economists have tried to figure out perfect markets, but these efforts were not motivated by the metaphysical dispassionate and non-ideological demand to understand the essential nature of markets. In many cases what was conceived as perfect markets were so conceived because they met certain partisan characteristics. The need for now when we are fully buttressed in markets which are so intimately affecting our lives is to ask: what is or what should be the essential nature of markets and how are we supposed to operate them.

Fang Guangshun of Liaoning University discusses how to advance the integration between Marxism and traditional Chinese culture. He points out that the integration of Marxism and traditional Chinese culture originates from their identical inherent nature. We should understand Marxism as the soul of deep traditional Chinese culture, and thus, we may grasp the root of their integration.

Reconstruction of Morality and Value Systems in the Context of Multicultures

Xu Keqiang of Nanjing Normal University explores whether freedom (liberty) has always been the supreme universal value? He points out that freedom and liberty as a lofty value is a new idea imported from Western countries after the beginning of modern times in China. In general, Western culture, especially represented by the USA, considers freedom as the most important, supreme and universal value of humankind. For many years, the Western countries, especially the USA, have been doing their utmost to push forward the idea of the supremacy of freedom to the whole world. However, the result of this unilateral push of Western values to other cultures is not always positive. Different nations and cultures have different value priorities, due to their different historical and cultural backgrounds. For instance, in traditional Chinese culture, the value of "ping an," which means peace and safety, was obviously prior to the value of "freedom" or "liberty." Professor Xu tries to make a comparison between the value priority of freedom and the "ping an" value priority, with analysis of their different cultural impacts. He argues that values are neither absolute nor universal, but historical, situational and

dynamic. They should be based on the social reality and life require-ments of peoples and nations in a particular society and at a par-ticular stage of development rather than generated from some outside commandments. However, in the era of globalization, different and even sometimes contradictory human values may mutually com-plement and counterbalance each other.

Mihai Dan Chitoiu of Alexandru Ioan Cuza University, Romania, discusses the role of spirituality in understanding reality and shaping values. He points out that spiritual experience, as it developed in the Eastern Traditions (including not only Taoism, Confucianism or Moism, but also Eastern Christianity), gains its specificity because a certain path is required (specific requirements), but at the end of this path it is beyond the normal state of knowledge. Mystical experience is, somehow, closer to what is proper to the today's scientific experi-ment; both are ways for experiment. A follower of such a path needs to meet the requirements comparable to those of the scientific experi-ment's rules and criteria for verification. Yet the result of this spiritual quest is on another level, because it gives access to a reality beyond our common perception of time and space. Expressing the contents of this experience is extremely difficult, and the normal usage of words is inadequate. For any generation in history, expressing the specificity of this experience always brings novelty because of different cultural and social backgrounds, and is, thus, a different "field of experience." We can speak today about a 'global culture' because of new technolo-gical means that offer the same content all over the world, and this radical change brings a different approach to the spiritual experience as well as new ways to understand and express it. We are in a time when we can understand better the specificity of the spiritual path as well as its concrete nature known (by new scientific research), and the significance of spiritual practice for a more complex understanding of reality. At the same time the new spiritual experiences, in this actual context, can offer new solutions and new answers to the current social and cultural challenges.

Wang Xiaohong of Liaoning University considers comprehensive human development as the core value of Socialism. Marx thinks every human is free and that comprehensive quality in development and social relations is the ultimate goal of human development. There is a

historical process which cannot go on without social development and can only be realized in social community. Through the practical critique of unilateral development of the human in capitalist society, Marx pointed out that the core value of socialist society, which exceeds capitalist society, is the human comprehensive development which can be realized only in a socialist society.

Peter Jonkers of Tilburg University, Netherlands, discusses the reconstructing of values in times of radical pluralism. He points out that ever since Socrates philosophy has been defined as the "love of wisdom." By being so, it pursued the tradition of a close connection between philosophy and the life world. However, since the beginning of modernity, philosophy has redefined itself as (the love of) scientific knowledge, and considered wisdom as the supreme fruit of science. The result of this paradigm shift was that philosophy lost its link with the life world. Rorty and Marquard tried to re-connect philosophy with the life-world in a pragmatic way. Against the background of today's radical pluralism of life worlds, they abandoned, on a theoretical level, Socrates' ideal of a reasonable, philosophical scrutiny of the life-world, and, on a practical level, a welcoming (ethnocentric) conformism or traditionalism. Because these philosophical approaches to the life-world are not isolated, but reflect important trends in contemporary society, it goes without saying that they are unable to respond to the enormous challenges that confront humankind, especially on a global level. The overall conclusion is that philosophy, by re-connecting with the life-world through the idea of wisdom, can shed a new light on the ways in which the life-world can play a positive role in the public debate about the enormous challenges which confront contemporary pluralist societies.

Comparative Study of Morality and Value Systems

Selecta Mishra of the Indian Institute of Technology explores the relevance of love in the era of globalization, from a multicultural perspective. She points out that everyone has the right to be free and to live fully. To bring a love-ethic to every dimension of our lives, our society would need to embrace change. Changes are necessary if we are to bring love to the public sphere at the social and community level.

Individuals who choose to love can alter our view of a love-ethic by choosing to work with individuals we admire and respect, by committing to relationships which entail a global vision. Thus, we see our lives and our fates as intimately connected to everyone else on the planet. To bring about this cultural change, society needs the principle of a love-ethic.

Wang Yonggui and Chen Yanqiu of Nanjing Normal University analyze the relationship between the traditional culture of the rule of law and core socialist values. "Rule of Law" was included in core socialist values in the report of the Eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party. It has been enshrined in the pursuit of core socialist values as the socialist rule of law. Chinese traditional culture is the profound resource for core socialist values, and the construction of socialist law must also originate from traditional thought of rule of law in the country's rich heritage. Therefore, there is great significance in studying the concept of rule by law in Chinese traditional culture and exploring its association with core socialist values. This further implements the spirit of the fourth plenary session of the 18th CPC, and comprehensively promotes the process of the construction of the country under "the socialist rule of law."

Shi Jiaxian and Zhang Changwei of Liaoning University explore Lei Feng's spirit from the perspective of citizenship. Since Chairman Mao Zedong advised: "Follow the Examples of Comrade Lei Feng," articles on studying Lei Feng's spirit have kept emerging. Despite this, Lei Feng's spirit, as an external variable in this process, is always being questioned as to whether it is up-to-date. However, from the perspective of citizenship, citizens are regarded as carriers of Lei Feng's spirit, the interpretation of which reflects the basic principles and the required qualities of a socialist citizen. Therefore, under the conditions of socialist market economy, advocating Lei Feng's spirit echoes the inner needs for improving the quality of citizenship and calls for educating citizens and providing institutional guarantees.

In sum, this book is the fruit of the wisdom and contribution of the scholars who attended the two international academic conferences. Without this professional dedication, this book could not have been realized. Many scholars have provided behind the scene contributions to the successful completion of the volume. First, we are grateful to

Professor George F. McLean, the late President of the Council for Research in Values and Philosophy. For decades, he kept promoting dialogue and interaction among scholars from various cultures across the globe. Second, we would like to thank the moderators of the different sessions for their fine work to ensure the success of the conference. Third, we appreciate the support from Jiangsu Social Science Association, Liaoning Social Science Association, the Humanities and Social Sciences Department of Yangzhou University, the School of Marxism of Liaoning University, the School of Marxism of Yangzhou University and the Research Center for Democratic Politics of Contemporary China of Yangzhou University. Finally, we would like to thank the financial support given by the Academic Exchange Fund of Yangzhou University and the Publishing Fund of Yangzhou University.

Yangzhou University, Yangzhou, P.R. China

1.

Confucian Altruism, Generosity and Justice: A Response to Globalization

VINCENT SHEN

Globalization

I define globalization as: "An historical process of deterritorialization or cross-bordering, in which human desire, universalizability and ontological interconnectedness are realized on the planet as a whole, and concretized as a global free market, transnational political order and cultural 'glocalism'."

Let me explain my notions regarding desire, universalizability and ontological interconnectedness which are crucial to this definition. I use the term desire to describe the energy within each one of us that is directed towards many others (people and things) and ideas of an ever higher level of universalizability. This dynamism presupposes the interconnectedness of all things and persons on the ontological level, so that we direct ourselves always toward many others and in this dynamic process lies the significance and meaningfulness of our life. I make a distinction between universality and universalizability. I do not buy universality pure and simple in this concrete and historical world. For me, in the process of our temporal existence, we are looking for the ever higher and for universalizability. Globalization is a process of implementing the universalizable in the process of time.

Human Nature Looking for Higher Universalizability

Since globalization is a process that concerns the whole of human kind, it should have some foundation in the nature of human beings. Philosophically speaking, it should be based on the human desire that always looks beyond in its longing for higher universalizability. Globalization as a technological, economic and cultural process should be seen as the material implementation of this universalizing dynamism in human nature. For us humans, determined as we are by historicity, there can be no universality pure and simple but only a process of

universalization over time. This is to say that universality pure and simple is only an abstract ideal existing on an everreceding horizon. Real human history is a process of unceasingly going beyond and towards higher levels of universalization.

Anthropologically speaking, this may be traced back to the historical moment when a human being picked up the first chopping stone and came to use an instrument. In this way, human beings went beyond the determinism of physical nature and thereby established a free relationship with the material world. Since that moment, human beings entered into the process of hominization. *Homo faber*, was able to go beyond the determination of the material world by using tools, however, he was still dependent on the material world and therefore not yet totally human. When human beings were able to communicate with one another through language, a system of signs that concentrated human experience, and thereby revealed the intelligibility of things in communicating with one another, they started to exist on a new level of universalizability. Moreover, when human beings came to engage themselves in aesthetic and disinterested activities, such as playing, making sacrifices and embarking on creative/artistic endeavors, there emerged a higher level of freedom, even to the point where they lost themselves in things and in other people. While they may well have been tired after a hard day's labor, human beings could still find the energy to dance, play games and take part in ritual sacrificial activities. This illustrates the truth that human beings are more human in these free playful and creative activities.

Therefore, the stages of *homo loquutus* and *homo ludens* that followed were more human, more universalizable and therefore more humanized, and not merely hominized. Starting with humanization, the universalizable dynamism in human nature entered into the human historical process. This is probably why Eastern and Western philosophers in the Axial Age, a time of philosophical breakthrough between the 8th and the 2nd Centuries BCE, would understand reason as the most essential function of the human mind. In ancient Greek philosophy, the human being was defined as "*to on logon exon,*" later translated into Latin as "*animal rationale,*" the proper function of which was *theoria*, which in looking for the theoretically universalizable, produced knowledge for knowledge's own sake. In ancient China, the

concern was more with the impartial or the universal in human praxis, the practically universalizable. Theoretical or practical, there was a common interest in universalizability in both East and West.

The Need of Strangification/*waitui* 外推

Today's globalization brings with it the contrast with localization, and also the contrast of homogenization with diversification. This is a moment of human history when people of the world feel close to each other on the one hand, and also vulnerable and susceptible to conflicts on the other. At this critical historical moment it is time to be open toward others instead of keeping 'closed within ourselves. In response to the urgency of today's situation, characterized by conflicts resulting from the self-enclosure of different peoples within various disciplines, cultures, political and religious groups, etc., we human beings should be more concerned with one another and the possibility of mutual enrichment.

As a means to overcome antagonism via the construction of effective dialogue, I have proposed the strategy of "strangification," or *waitui* 外推 in Chinese, the etymological meaning of which is the act of going outside of oneself to meet multiple others, or going beyond that with which one is familiar to strangeness, to many strangers. This act presupposes the appropriation of language by which we learn to express our ideas or values in the language of others or a language that is understandable to others. In their turn, "strangification" and "language appropriation" presuppose an original generosity toward many others, without limiting oneself to the claim of reciprocity which is quite often presupposed in social relationships and ethical rules.

Three types of strangification will be discussed here. The first of these is linguistic strangification, by which we translate one discourse/value or cultural expression/religious belief into the discourse/value/cultural expression/religious belief of other scientific, cultural or religious communities. If it is still understandable after translation, then it has universalizable validity. Otherwise, its validity is limited to its own world and self-critical reflection must be undertaken with regard to the limits of one's own discourse/value or expression/belief.

The second type is pragmatic strangification. If one discourse/ value or expression/belief can be drawn out from its original social and pragmatic context and put into other social and pragmatic contexts and remain valid, this means that it is more universalizable and has a validity that is not limited to its own context of origin. If it becomes invalid after such recontextualization, then reflection or self-critique should be undertaken with regard to its limit.

The third type is ontological strangification. A discourse/value or expression/belief, when it is universalizable by a detour of experiencing Reality Itself, for example, a direct experience of other people, Nature, or even of the Ultimate Reality, would be very helpful for understanding other's different scientific micro-worlds (disciplines or research programs), cultural worlds, and religious worlds. This is very important for religious dialogue today, in the sense that instead of conceptual debates, it is better for one religion to understand another religion through the detour of one's experience of the Ultimate Reality, that, if indeed Ultimate, would allow one to have access to its various manifestations.

Today, the dialogue that is needed between different cultural traditions and religions should be understood, in this context, as a process of mutual strangification. Religious and/or philosophical dialogue should be conceived as based on a mutual act of *waitui* 外推 (strangification). In the dialogue between A and B, on the level of linguistic strangification, A should translate his propositions or ideas/ values/belief system into the language of B or a language understandable to B. Meanwhile, B should translate his propositions or ideas/ values/belief system into the language of A or a language understandable to A.

On the level of pragmatic *waitui* 外推 (strangification), A should draw his proposition(s), supposed truth(s)/cultural expression/value/ religious beliefs out from his own social, organizational context and put it into the social, organizational context of B. Meanwhile, B should draw his proposition(s), supposed truth(s)/cultural expression/value/ religious belief out from his own social, organizational context and put it into the social, organizational context of A.

On the level of ontological *waitui* 外推 (strangification), A should make efforts to enter into B's micro-world, cultural world or religious world through the detour of his/her experience of Reality Itself, such as a person, a social group, Nature, or the Ultimate Reality. Meanwhile, B should also make efforts to enter into A's micro-world, cultural world or religious world through the detour of his experience of Reality Itself.

This is to say that communication and dialogue with others will never be conducted from within one's self-enclosure. Such communication and dialogue can only begin when one steps outside of one's self-enclosure to meet the other, which I call "a process of mutual *waitui* 外推 (strangification)." I go outside of myself to you and you go outside of yourself to me, so as to form a dialogue leading to mutual enrichment. When we conduct mutual *waitui* 外推 (strangification), we make our own scientific/cultural/religious/life world understand-able to each other by translating our languages into the language of the other or a language that is understandable to the other, by putting it into the other's pragmatic context or by going through the detour of experiencing Reality Itself or the other's life-world. This process of mutual *waitui* 外推 (strangification) is to be conducted not only in everyday life, in scientific research, in cultural and religious life, but also in economic and political life, where different political parties, interest groups, governments and peoples etc. should commit themselves to a process of communication leading to mutual enrichment rather than conflict or war.

Waitui 外推 (strangification) and dialogue in the form of mutual *waitui* 外推 (strangification) are more fundamental than the communicative action understood by Habermas as argumentation. For me, Habermasian argumentation presupposes a previous effort of *waitui* 外推 (strangification) in expressing one's proposal(s) in the language of others or in a language understandable to others, without which there can be no real mutual understanding and no self-reflection in the process of argumentation. Habermas' four ideal claims for understandability, truth, sincerity and legitimacy simply cannot work in the real world. Without previous mutual *waitui* 外推 (strangification), I would think I'm sincere, but you would think I'm a hypocrite; I would think that I'm telling the truth, but you may consider that just absurd;

and, since a commonly acceptable norm does not exist yet, or that the law necessary for legitimacy is still an issue under debate, there is no accepted legitimacy so to speak.

Generosity to Many Others

In today's globalizing world, where we are confronting/encountering multicultural traditions both at the international and national level, we should practice strangification and dialogue as mu-tual strangification with many others. I replace the idea of "the Other" (l"autrui, l'alterité) of French postmodernists such as G. Deleuze, E. Levinas and J. Derrida with the concept of "many others." Since the term "the Other," implies an inherent opposition between Self and Other, and under the inspiration of the Confucian concept of five relationships, Daoist concepts of Myriads of Things (*wanwu* 萬物), and the Buddhist concept of all sentient beings (*zhongsheng* 眾生), I prefer to use the term "many others," which for me is the concrete ontological context in which we are born, grow up and develop. Life will be saner if we always keep in mind that we live among many others. The idea of "many others" is much more realistic and clear than Levinas's concept of "tiers parts," which means only the Other of the Other.

The original generosity implied by this first act of going outside of oneself should be seen as the condition *sine qua non* of all reciprocal relationships. Philosophically speaking, before we can establish any sort of reciprocity, emphasized for example in Marcel Mauss' *Essai sur le don* as the principle of human society, there must be a generous act of going outside of oneself to the other. If in the classical world and modern world, the golden rules were heavily emphasized and reciprocity was seen as the basic principle of socialbility, now in the postmodern world and the world of globalization, we need a principle that extends beyond that of reciprocity. The new ethical and social principles that we are looking for should base themselves on original generosity and strangification as the act of going outside of oneself to many others.

Confucian *ren* and *shu*

All social institutions and social processes, whatever their nature, should have existential and ethical meaningfulness for human beings. The same applies to the process of globalization, developed by communication technology and implemented on economic, political and cultural levels, which is now bringing humankind into more and more systematic networks. This situation of living in networks existentially exemplifies the ontology of dynamic relationship that Confucianism claimed long ago. The Confucian concept of *ren* denotes the internal relationships between human beings and all things existing in the universe (heaven and earth). By reason of *ren*, human beings can be affected by and respond to one another, and by the act of *shu*, they can extend to larger realms of existence beyond themselves, to others, to family, to social community, to the state, to all under heaven, now interpreted by the term globalization. The network of this dynamic relationship cannot be said to exist in the form of substance, neither can it be said not to exist, to be nothingness. It is always present, dynamically developing, not only on the ontological level but also on the ethical level.

Confucius tried to revitalize the institutionalized human relationship of his time (hierarchical institutions and codes of behavior), named *li*, by tracing back to its origin and basing it on *ren*, which signified the sensitive interconnectedness between one human being and another, between nature and heaven. *Ren* manifests human being's inner self and responsibility, in the original sense of his ability to respond, in and through his sincere moral awareness. Also, *ren* means the ontological interrelatedness giving support to all social and ethical life. Thus, under my interpretation, *ren* means ontological inner-connectedness, and therefore the responsiveness of human beings to many others, including beings that are not human. With *ren*, the human being has an inner dynamism that causes him to generously go outside of himself to many others without losing his own sense of self. That is why Confucius said that *ren* is not remote from or difficult for any human being; when an individual wills for *ren*, he will find it already there within himself. In saying this, Confucius laid a transcendental foundation to the interaction of human beings with nature,

society and heaven. In this philosophical context, responsibility was understood as the ability to respond to many others, rather than a burden that one must bear, or merely the assumed liability of an agent seen under the philosophy of subjectivity. It means that through seeing and responding to the goodness in many others, one can achieve one's selfhood.

The virtues of being able to step out of one's self-enclosure and be generous to many others are the most essential in the process of globalization. In Confucianism, *shu* could be seen as such a basic virtue. Although quite often translated as "altruism" (Chan: 44), or "putting oneself in the other's place" (Ames: 92), or even as "using oneself as a measure to gauge others"(Lau: 74), it is here best understood and interpreted in terms of strangification, in the sense that "he who practices *shu* knows how to strangify"(*shu zhe shan tui* 恕者善推) and "extend from oneself to other people"(*tui ji ji ren* 推己及人).

In the *Analects*, not much was said about *shu*, although it was said by Confucius himself to be the expression to act upon till the end of one's life.

> When Zigong asked, "Is there one expression that can be acted upon till the end of one's days?" The master replied, "There is shu 恕: do not impose on others what you yourself do not want." (*Analects* 15:24; Roger Ames:189)

Here *shu* was understood in the spirit of the negative golden rule, "do not impose on others what you yourself do not want." The same negative golden rule was repeated by Confucius when answering Zhonggong's question about *ren* (*Analects* 12:2, Roger Ames 153). From this repetition, and the fact that they have the same definition, we can see a very close relationship between *ren* and *shu*. On the other hand, a positive golden rule was given in answer to the question about the concept of humanity (*ren*), also addressed to Zigong; thus we read, "A man of humanity, wishing to establish his own character, also establishes the character of others, and wishing to be prominent himself, also helps others to be prominent."(*Analects*. 6: 28, Chan, p.31)

As we can see, both negative and positive golden rules are, in Confucian terms, based on a reciprocal relation between self and other. With *shu*, one extends one's existence to even larger circles. It is the act of going always beyond oneself to many others, from self to family, from family to community, from community to the state, and from the state to all under heaven. This is the act of "extending or strangifying from oneself to other people" (*tui ji ji ren* 推己及人). A Confucian existence is an ever-expanding life based on self-cultivation.

The Confucian way of life is extending one's humanity to larger and larger circles in the process of which one perfects one's self. Even if self-cultivation takes priority over many others in the order of moral perfection, strangification or *shu* is always necessary in the order of ethical and political implementation. As Mencius said, "Hence one who extends his bounty can bring peace to the Four Seas; one who does not cannot bring peace even to his own family. There is just one thing in which the ancients greatly surpassed others, and that is the way they extended what they did."(*Mencius* 1: 7, Lau: 57)

In Confucianism, the tension between self and others is normally to be solved by reference to the golden rules, both negative and positive, based ultimately on the principle of reciprocity. In this sense, we can say that in the Confucian world, in which human behaviors are necessarily regulated by *li*, even the act of going outside oneself to the other initiated by *shu*, and the original generosity it implies, have to be regulated by reciprocity.

The principle of reciprocity becomes a guiding principle of social and political philosophy in the *Great Learning*. There it is called the principle of measuring square (*Jiejuzhidao* 絜矩之道). There seems to be a positive version of the principle followed by a negative version. They are put in the context where the extension from "governing the state" (*zhiguo* 治國) to making peace within all under heaven (*ping-tianxia* 平天下) is explained. The positive version reads:

> What is meant by saying that the peace of the world depends on the order of the state is: When the ruler treats the elders with respect, then the people will be aroused towards filial piety. When the ruler treats the

> aged with respect, then the people will be aroused towards brotherly respect. When the ruler treats compassionately the young and the helpless, then the common people will not follow the opposite course. Therefore the ruler has a principle with which, as with a measuring square, he may regulate his conduct. (Chan: 92)

The major point here is the governance by *ren* (humanity): when the ruler governs his people by respect and humanity, his people will respond with peace and harmony. Positive reciprocity is here expressed in terms of filial piety, brotherly respect, submissiveness and compassion for the young and the helpless etc., initiated by the ruler. On the other hand, there is also the negative version of the measuring square:

> What a man dislikes in his superiors, let him not show it in dealing with his inferiors. What he dislikes in those in front of him, let him not show it in preceding those who are behind; what he dislikes in those behind him, let him not show it in following those in front of him; what he dislikes in those on the right, let him not apply it to those on the left; and what he dislikes in those on the left, let him not apply it to those on the right. This is the principle of the measuring square. (Chan: 92)

The reciprocity here is extended analogically from one side to the opposite side: from superior to inferior, from inferior to superior; from right to left, from left to right; from front to behind, from behind to front, and thereby forms a cubic relationship, not merely a square, of reciprocity, though always taken in a negative sense. Within this cubic structure of reciprocal relationship, more attention is paid to the horizontal; that is, from right to left, from left to right; from front to behind, from behind to front, than to the vertical relation between superior and inferior, which is mentioned only once. Nevertheless, the

concept of "extended reciprocity" plays a major role in this largest extension of human relations from the state to all under heaven.

Confucius' Generosity

In general, the virtue of generosity discussed here can be understood in two senses: as liberality or as magnanimity. When we look for the Confucian virtue of generosity in terms of liberality or generosity in the giving or sharing of one's material goods, we might first think of Zilu. When assisting Confucius with Yan Hui, asked by Confucius what he would like most to do, Zilu replied, "I would like to share my horses and carriages, my clothing and furs, with my friends, and if they damage them, to bear them no ill will."(*Analects* 5.26, Ames 102) This shows that Zilu possessed the virtue of liberality. Even if it concerns the sharing rather than the unconditional giving of his material goods, Zilu nevertheless expressed his nonpossessiveness and generous sharing with many others in the sense of friends. Zilu did not say "share with any other in general," but "share with my friends," all of whom were equal to one another and reciprocal in being good to one another. It seems that Zilu cherished friendship more than material goods. Friendship in which one shares one's own material goods is friendship in a strong sense. For Aristotle, friendship is also a kind of virtue. In this sense, Zilu could be said to have the virtue of generosity in the context of friendship in a strong sense.

Zilu's generosity in terms of liberality with his own material goods, even his ambition to govern well a state of a thousand chariots, were not highly evaluated by Confucius in comparison with the ambitions expressed by those others who were present. Confucius preferred, and praised, Gong Xihua's reply in the same dialogue:

> In the late spring, when the spring dress is ready, I would like to go with five or six grown-ups and six or seven young boys to bathe in the Yi River, enjoy the breeze on the Rain Dance Alter, and then return home singing. (*Analects*, 11.26)

Upon hearing this, Confucius heaved a sigh and said that he agreed with Gong Xihua. Here we can see that Confucius put emphasis on existential feeling and on the spirituality that comes from being close to the rhythm of nature. This shows the cosmic scope of Confucius' mind. Indeed, Confucius' mind was so great that his virtue of generosity was not limited to liberality, but much closer to what Aristotle termed "magnanimity." Confucius did not care much about material goods; his ambitions were spiritual, and much loftier than any desire for fortune or position. This is illustrated when he said: "To eat coarse food, drink plain water, and pillow oneself on a bent arm – there is pleasure to be found in these things. But wealth and position gained through inappropriate means – these are to me like floating clouds."(*Analects* 7:16, Ames 114) In his own words, his ambition is "to bring peace and contentment to the aged, to share relationship of trust and confidence with my friends, and to love and protect the young."(*Analects* 5:26, Ames 102) This indicates that what Confucius cares about most is the existential comfort of all people of all ages, which might stem from his desire to universalize the virtue of humanity.

We should point out here that Confucius also understood generosity in the sense of reciprocity. In answer to Zizhang's question about *ren*, he said: "One who can practice five things wherever he may be is a man of humanity...Earnestness, liberality, truthfulness, diligence, and generosity." As we can see, among these five virtues *kuan* (liberality) and *hui* (generosity) were related to the virtue of being generous, although all five are related to reciprocal virtues, as Confucius himself explained: "If one is earnest, one will not be treated with disrespect; If one is liberal, one will win the heart of all, If one is trustful, one will be trusted. If one is diligent, one will be successful. And if one is generous, one will be able to enjoy the service of others." (*Analects* 17:6, Chan 46-247) In terms of consequences Confucius points out that otherwise one would not be treated with disrespect, win the heart of all, be trusted, be successful, able to enjoy the service of others etc. This shows us that Confucius considered moral matters not only from an intentionalist but also from a consequentialist point of view. Liberality and generosity in the Confucian sense, as to the consequences they bring, still depend on reciprocity.

Confucian Justice as Righteousness

Confucius understood justice as rightness or righteousness, which can be traced back to the basic ontological make up of human beings – *ren*, and is realized in the institutionalized codes of behavior and social institutions called *li*. From *ren*, Confucius derived *yi*, rightness, which for him represented respect for multiple others and proper actions towards multiple others. Confucius did not say much about *yi*, though what he did say was essential to Confucianism: "A wise and good man makes rightness the substance of his being; he carries it out with ritual order. He speaks it with modesty. And he attains it with sincerity, such a man is really good and wise!"(*Analects*, 15:18) Notice here that *li* was that which a wise and good man used to carry out *yi*, which was the substance of his own being. For Confucius, rightness was also the criterion by which good men were distinguished from base guys (*Analects* 4:16). All moral norms, moral obligations, our consciousness of them, and even the virtue of always acting according to them, was based on rightness.

From *yi*, Confucius derived *li*, the ritual or proprieties which represented the ideal meaning of harmony with a sense of beauty, and the actual meaning of codes of behavior, social institutions and religious ceremonies. Youzi, a disciple of Confucius, once said: "The most valuable function of *li* is to achieve harmony. This is the beauty of the way of ancient kings, who followed it in all occasions, large or small."(*Analects* 1:12) It is in this sense that *li* can be understood as a general Confucian concept of cultural ideal, as harmony with a sense of beauty, or a graceful order leading to beauty and harmony. With it, human life in the past is worthy of remembrance, in the future worthy of expectation, and in the present full of meaningfulness.

There are two concurrent dynamic directions in a Confucian moral experience. One is the dynamic direction of manifestation, in which *ren* manifests into *yi*, and *yi* manifests into *li*. The other is the dynamic direction of grounding, in which we trace back and ground *li* in *yi*, and *yi* in *ren*. Confucian ethics constitutes a model of interactive movement between these two dynamic directions.

Thus, in Confucian terms, the concept of distributional justice is based on the moral righteousness that respects each and everyone,

and it is when people show disrespect that there is no justice in the distribution of resources. However, moral righteousness comes from *ren*, the ontological interconnectedness and the ability to respond, though *ren* itself should always be realized through moral righteousness, which in turn is realized by *li* (ritual).

Conclusion

From a philosophical point of view, the process of globalization can be seen as an historical process during which the transcendent and ever-universalizing aspect of human nature is realized. The dynamism that lies behind this realization is human intelligence and desire, their universalizability and perfectibility, developed since humankind was humanized by language and art, and self-consciously furthered through philosophical endeavor. In modern times, human beings have been searching for this resource in their own subjectivity and the rational construction of this world by conceptual representations. Entering into the process of globalization, we need a new ethics based on the original generosity to many others that is accomplished through unceasing strangification.

Without globalization, human universalizability to a higher level cannot come about. However, globalization itself should have respect for and be resourced by different cultural traditions. It should be an invitation, not an imposition. In this context, the Confucian concept of *shu* and its virtue of generosity may be a source of inspiration, even if there is some limit to their emphasis on reciprocity, in which case they are in need of self-critique and further support which would arise from the original spirit of generosity. If human beings are not ready for further strangification and greater generosity toward many others, they will not be ready, nor even worthy, to move on to real globalization, that is to say, in Confucian terms, to move on to all under heaven (*tianxia* 天下).

University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada/Taiwan

References

Ames. R. and Rosemont H. translators. 1998. *The Analects of Confucius, A Philosophical Translation*. New York; Ballantine Books.

Chan. W.T. 1963. *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lau. D.C., translator. 1970, *Mencius*, New York: Penguin Books.

Shen. Vincent. 2002. *Contrast, Strangification and Dialogue* (in Chinese), Taipei: Wunan.

Wang Fuzi, *Chuanshan Chuanshu* (Complete Works of Wang Fuzi), vol. 6. Chang Sha: Yue Lu Publishing House.

Zhu Xi. 1985. *Si Shu Ji Zhu* (Collected Commentaries of the *Four Books*). Chang Sha: Yuelu Publishing House.

Zhu Xi. *Zhuzi Wenji* (Collected Writings of Master Zhu), proofread by Chen Junming, Taipei: Defu Foundation, 2000. (Specifically Vol. 2. Chapter 13).

2.

On the New Features of Cultural Diversity and the Building of a Value Consensus

XIE XIAOJUAN

Cultural diversity is a diachronic existence, as well as a kind of synchronic existence across the boundaries of time and space. Highly dependent on the global economic and political influences of the times, the level of cultural exchange between different countries and nations is becoming more intensive and extensive. Thus, current cultural exchanges have reached an unprecedented level. Global cultural commodity trading activities, as influenced by modern transportation, also constitute a network of change and affect corresponding cultures. Because of the close relationship between the culture and the value of diversity, cultural exchanges will inevitably bring about value conflicts, while also forming the basis for a consensus of values.

The Existence of Cultural Diversity and Its New Forms of Exchange from the Perspective of Thinkers

Culture, as a kind of diversity, exists and the generation and spread of culture are unable to be formed in an isolated or enclosed space; culture faces other cultures and symbioses. Through the ages, the change of culture has had no exception whatsoever. Historians, cultural theorists, and anthropologists have argued this point.

The famous German historian Oswald Spengler (Oswald Spengler, 1880-1936) considered the initial advanced culture in human history to be 'primitive culture', that links tribes and peoples. He listed nine kinds of advanced cultures in the history of the world: Egyptian culture, Babylonian culture, Chinese culture, Indian culture, classical culture (i.e. the ancient Greek culture), Mexican culture, Arabic culture, (Modern) Western culture and Russian culture. These cultures must pass through the organism's birth, growth, maturity and decline of life processes, but each has a unique original symbol, religious idea, political system, economic life, worldview, artistic form, psychological characteristics, ethics, philosophy and science and so on. These

constitute a multicultural picture of world history. In *The Decline of the West*, Spengler reveals several primitive symbols of the main cultures in world history, a detailed description of the specific forms of these primitive symbols in their political, economic, social culture, religion, philosophy, science, art and other fields. In Spengler's view, although each major culture has its inherent original symbols and specific forms, the impact of foreign culture will result in some form of distortion and deformation of local culture.[1]

The British historian and philosopher of history Arnold Toynbee (Arnold Toynbee, 1889-1975) believed civilization to be dynamic and non-continuous in time and space, which has its origin, growth, decline and disintegration, as well as a tendency towards a new civilization. Civilizations, through contact, communication, and interaction, influence each other. He believed that in the 6,000 years of recorded human history, there have been 26 kinds of world civilization. They are the Western Christian civilization, Orthodox civilization (which can be divided into Byzantine civilization and Russia), Iranian civilization, Arabic civilization (which can be combined with the Iranian culture as Islamic civilization), Indian civilization, Far Eastern civilization (which can be divided into Chinese civilization, North Korea and Japanese civilization), ancient Greek civilization, Hittite civilization, Babylonian civilization, ancient Egyptian civilization, Andean civilization, ancient Mexican civilization, Yucatan civilization, Mayan civilization; and five stagnant civilizations, namely Polynesian, Eskimo, Nomadic, Spartan, and Ottoman. These civilizations have diverse, complex histories, linking and interacting with each other in time and space.[2]

Samuel Huntington (Samuel Phillips Huntington, 1927-2008) was a famous American political scientist. The view of his famous masterpiece The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order is summed up as "Clash of Civilizations." Huntington thinks that there are eight kinds of civilization affecting the current world situation: Western civilization, Confucian civilization, Japanese civilization and Islamic civilization, Indian civilization, the Slavic-Orthodox civilization, Latin American civilization and African civilizations. [3]

France's most distinguished historian Fernand Braudel (Fernand Braudel, 1902-1985) believed that people in different countries, re-

gions and ages, economic, social, technological, political, religious, cultural and other factors are different. Therefore, all civilizations are different. He discussed civilizations outside Europe, including the Islamic civilization, black African civilization, the Chinese civilization of far eastern civilizations, Indian civilization, Japanese civilization, and those are not addressed in the past, such as Indochina, Indonesia, the Philippines and north Korea's "Sea Far East" civilization, but also discusses Western Europe, Russia and the Soviet union's "another" Europe, Latin America, the United States, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand such English world civilization and other regions and countries. Braudel believes that the world civilization is the unity of identity and diversity. Identity refers to some general characteristics of each civilization, which learn from each other, communicate, absorb and infiltrate. Braudel at the same time attentions to the spread and communication of different civilizations absorbing and drawing lessons to improve their own civilization. Because "All the history of civilization is actually the history of continuing to learning from each other, although each civilization still retains their original characteristics."[4]

In addition, the German philosopher Karl Jasper (1883-1969) believed that both Western culture and Asian culture are parts of the history of the world. Because "From the beginning, the historic humanity is its diversity of historic...endless historical phenomenon to spread out, there are many nationalities, many cultures, each made up of a special historical facts infinitely diverse."[5]

In short, culture diversity is a kind of diachronic existence, also one kind of synchronic existence. In the long process of human history, different cultures learn and draw lessons from each other, the transfer, inheritance and even dying in the process, cultures present a variety of rich colors. This richness and diversity, on the one hand, comes from their own cultural characteristics, while, on the other hand they were traditionally controlled, by natural, social and other conditions. Cultural diversity is the motivation of the progress of history, but also an essential attribute of culture.

Currently, the symbiosis and exchange of cultural diversity presents a new kind of state.

First, the cultural diversity exchanges are more deep. At present, whether it is from the state or from a national perspective, the diversity of culture exchanges reaches an unprecedented level. Driven by globalization, national cultural exchanges and interaction are more frequent and deep. Take China as an example, the impact of foreign cultures is more distinct. From clothing to architecture, from diet to film and television, from the discourse system to the ways of thinking, from ideas to action, people in many ways reflect the absorption and acceptance of foreign culture. TV products, fast food culture, sports, fashion and so on present significant characteristics of Chinese and foreign exchange. The history of Chinese traditional culture is also facing modern transformation and the topic of the times is how to integrate modern culture. Other countries, without exception, are under siege among cultural diversity. Among them, the strong industrial capabilities helped the pervasive spread of western culture, and many countries on the one hand are busy defending their ethnic culture, while on the other hand they also learn from Western culture the development of the nation's culture.

Second, the computer, cybernetwork has become the main mode of transmission of cultural diversity. The network is the carrier of culture. The spread of transnational culture, because of the network, becomes more rapid and convenient. Or, the network itself is a kind of culture. Because of the existence of the network, results in culture "being all-inclusive and comprehensive.""The majority of cultural expression inclusive of digital and electronic production, distribution, and the exchange on the basis of an integrated communication system, will have significant consequences on the social form and processes."[6] The network has become a cross regional and cross-border communication system and has weakened the traditional culture monopoly, with its official ideology, traditional customs, and moral preaching based on traditional culture authority. At the same time, because the network leads to diversity and multi-mode communication systems, it leads to a variety of interests and values, with multidimensional social conflicts. Network on the one hand weakens the authority of the traditional culture, on the other hand it also shapes and strengthen the existence of comparative cultures, making the comparison of cultures more evident.

Third, regional conflicts caused by strong cultural invasion intensifies. Culture is neither good nor bad. Every culture of every nation is determined by history. However, the carrier of culture or the way of a cultural heritage has strong and weak points. Contemporary strong culture is not only manifested as a kind of cultural superiority, but also acts in a universal sense. In reality, a strong culture shapes the weak culture by cultural offensive or invasion. This leads to the rise of the weak culture as a national cultural conservatism. This leads some developing countries to seek the ruling political forces to demand legitimacy and shows a hostility to other cultures. It is not conducive to equal communication and mutual respect between cultures. This also leads to increasingly fierce competition between a number of countries at the level of international relations. A strong culture may show contempt and presume to judge other cultures, leading to more complicated cultural relations between countries. At present, the Islamic state's organization and rampant activities has become the root of world instability. This reflects that many differences between Christianity and Islam has become the main conflict in Europe, West Asia and North Africa and Southeast Asia. Among these, we need to see the modern western civilization as an institution of the Islamic state and regardless of nationality, original religion and other cultural traditions of the artificial division of spheres of influence in the Muslim countries, such as Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Palestine and other resulting in these countries continuing to dispute all year round. Currently, the United States, Europe, Russia, face the increasingly complex security and threats from the "Islamic State" organization. The Middle East, West Asia and North Africa has also become the world's unstable regions, associated with strong and tough cultural attitudes, military intervention and high handed policy.

The Value Conflict and Value Consensus against the Background of Cultural Diversity

Due to the interaction of cultural diversity, value conflicts are inevitable when seen against the background of cultural diversity. Values are often contained in the culture, in explicit or implicit forms. Value itself is a reflection of social existence. Under the background of

different stages of social and economic development and different systems, their value orientation must differ. The value orientations of humans is not necessarily contradictory and incommensurable, as humans consistently pursue the values of freedom, equality, democracy. Therefore, value conflicts are always accompanied by a value consensus; this is difference in search of similarity.

The so-called value conflicts "in the process of globalization, not only lead to a fierce value conflict with the developed capitalist countries, due to the conflict of system, beliefs and interests, between socialist and capitalist values, but also form various value conflicts with other developing countries because of geographical, differences of national conditions and the pursuit of their special interests, including different levels of value goals, orientations, standards, means and so on."[7] In short, value conflicts come from the practical activities of mankind society. The value conflicts are of such kind that is reflected in both within a country due to different living circumstances and interests, but also with other countries and ethnic globally because of different beliefs, ways of thinking, and choices of paths. Value conflicts of traditional values and modern value, advanced values and backward values, mainstream values and non-mainstream values can hardly be avoided. This includes the value conflict on the same horizontal space and time, also including the longitudinal timeliness conflict of traditional, modern and postmodern.

On the international level, value conflicts mainly stem from the following aspects and fields: one of which is the different choices in the path of national development. Some countries chose the road of socialist development while others chose the road of capitalism. The conflict between the two lies in the different development paths, ideas and directions. The second is due to the choice of different core values. Some countries are dominated by patriotism and collectivism as a whole, with equality as the primary value; others are dominated by individualism and individual rights, with freedom and rights as the most important values. The third is the choice of different traditional ethics. Some countries choose traditional ethics, paying more attention to the role of the authority and tradition; others choose a modern ethics, with freedom of choice and the market contracts as the main ethics. Fourth, some countries advocate dedication and devotion,

others the maintenance of individual rights with attention to the realization of personal value goals and interests. From a macro perspective, a cultural exchange must be accompanied with value conflicts, which is the motivation of cultural development and progress.

The so-called value consensus refers to "the particular social community in the process of social production, through social intercourse practiced in order to reach a relatively consistent common understanding and view of a concept of value in social life."[8] Value consensus should be established on the basis of a certain minimum value identity, to standardize and restrain people's behavior, in order to resolve the disputes brought by value conflicts, so as to promote the progress and development of the world." In the era of pluralistic values conflicts, people need to reach a minimal value consensus, that is to maximize the promotion of different subjects through understanding interactive activities to reach an agreement on the basic view of value (mainly with reference to the public value), or to reach an agreement on the basic views and attitudes of value, thus promoting to the development of society."[9]

Between different cultures, it may not be possible to reach consensus on values? What is the basis of value consensus? From the perspective of global problems, the common life of people is more realistic. Each country needs to take cooperative actions not only on economic interdependence, solutions to global problems, the fight against terrorism and so on. For example, the fight against corruption also needs to achieve global governance. Currently, many international institutions for the global fight against corruption have been set up, as well as many international regional anti-corruption cooperation. Many countries through concluding and fulfilling bilateral extradition treaties, criminal judicial assistance treaties, asset-sharing agreements, have established anti-corruption modes of cooperation mechanisms between the countries so as to lay the realistic foundation for value consensus.

From the perspective of national interests, the interests of the value subject and the consistency of the requirements form the basis of a subjective value consensus. The relationship between the United States and China is an example. Both have enormous common interests which not only shows the huge economic interests and inter-

dependence brought by extensive cooperation in the economic field, but even the influence on international affairs brought by mutual trust in the political field and so on.

From the view of the values themselves, differences of value can be the basis of value consensus. That is to say: no difference no consensus. The characteristics of the value itself determines such a unity of diversity and unity. Therefore, neither can use the value of diversity to go against the value of unity, also cannot use the value of unity to remove value diversity. Consensus comes from the difference, which is the basis on which consensus is established. In a people's pursuit, consensus is also a kind of value.

From the view of the core content of value conflicts, different social systems, values and beliefs are the core of value conflicts. However, different social systems, or religious differences may not mean an inability to establish value consensus. From the perspective of social systems, the socialist and capitalist systems have in reality of the longterm coexistence and also an objective trend of development. The two kinds of systems themselves are facing a historical mission of developing productivity; both need to deal with inflation, unemployment, economic fluctuation, contradiction between equity and efficiency, and also need to deal with political governance, fight against corruption, improve the efficiency of government and so on. Therefore, the coexistence of two kinds of social systems and learning from each other is a long and necessary process. The process of globalization has deepened this interdependence. Different religious systems have different beliefs, but different beliefs also have inner common characteristics. In the pursuit of human beauty, Buddhism, Islam and Christianity all have their special contributions.

The Exploration and Efforts of Constructing Value Consensus

The construction of value consensus is the basis and premise of the construction of international peace, but also a basic guarantee for the orderly development of human society. Therefore, the construction of value consensus needs to be an object of unremitting effort. The formation of value consensus is not only limited to the value consensus of the domestic level, but from the perspective of international

cultural exchange, the search for value consensus through and cross-cultural communication, interaction and mutual benefit seems to be more important.

First, from the perspective of the way of thinking, we should change the binary opposition way of thinking to tolerance, neutralization, rationality and pragmaticism. For a long time, some countries cannot be harmonious in this way of thinking, but uncompromising to opposite ways of thinking. In longterm social development, people look upon the nations that choose a different road to its own country with an attitude of hostility and suspicion. Some people treat the relationship with other civilizations in an extreme nationalist mood with rigid conservative thinking. Some scholars and politicians of the capitalist countries, still hold such an attitude towards China. The "China Threat Theory" is always heard. Many countries look with tinted glasses at the development of China, making things difficult for China or shame China, with a cold war way of thinking. This cannot promote in-depth dialogue. Therefore, in order to achieve world peace and development, to achieve common prosperity and progress, all countries must fully respect and understand the national historical traditions and cultures of other nations, respect and understand these different roads of social development and social values of different countries from the historical perspective and search for global civilized symbiosis and the common interests of mankind, seek a minimum consensus, and break the ingrained opposite mode of thinking, and with a tolerant neutralization, rational and pragmatic thinking, realize a win-win game.

Second, from a communication dialogue mechanism, we must constantly improve the communication dialogue mechanisms based on sovereign equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Communication and dialogue between different civilizations is the symbol of modern civilization, the sign which differs from the violence and force of barbarism. Communication and dialogue between contemporary countries should be based on mutual equality and respect. No country can intervene the internal affairs of other countries, even cannot threat to use force, or trying to transplant ideas, systems and concepts, and no trying to use one concept or system to control the world. Globalization does not mean Westerniza-

tion, and Westernization does not mean Americanization. American culture cannot cover the cultural needs and value pursuits of all countries. Dominique Moisi, the special advisor of the French International Institute wrote in his article that western countries should not attempt to use the arrogant way to impose their own values upon others. Asians are always reluctant to accept the idea of universal values because "our democracy looks fragile." However, communication and dialogue is necessary at the same time, because common value is an objective need in the era of globalization. Dominique Moisi said, "the globalized, interdependent and transparent world may look chaotic, even confusing, but the existence of a set of common values, which make up of human rights and the rule of law, is obviously more necessary than ever before." He added, "although we have different interests, we must unite together through some common, global values."[10] Value consensus is the minimum to establish a basis for harmony in diversity, while consensus does not mean avoiding differences and denying differences.

Third, from the perspective of cultural exchange, we should reach a value consensus through cultural exchange and cultural identity. Value is rooted in culture. To expand cultural exchanges, increase cultural awareness, improving cultural identity is the foundation of constructing value identity. From the perspective of Chinese culture, this is a peaceful way to spread and promote Chinese culture so that other countries recognize and respect the development approach and core values of China, as well as its mainstream ideology, to get the western audience to know and be familiar with Chinese development strategy and the ruling ideas of Chinese culture, as well China's efforts to promote world and regional peace. It is necessary to find the right and acceptable ways for other countries if China culture wishes to go out. At present, Chinese culture international development strategy has made remarkable achievements. "Since the establishment of the world's first Confucius institute in 2004, in just 10 years, 123 countries and regions have established 465 Confucius institutes and 713 Confucius classrooms in the world, with over 850,000 registered students. The number of people coming to learn Chinese around the world has reached 100 million. United States, Britain, France, Japan, Korea and other 43 countries have brought Chinese teaching into their national

education system. Confucius institutes have become a bright way to show China and fully deserve to become the most wonderful cultural product that Chinese exports. By 2013, our country had signed agreements on cultural cooperation with numerous governments and nearly 800 implementation plans of annual cultural exchange with 149 countries and regions. There are also different cultural exchange forms with thousands of international cultural organizations. In France, Korea, Egypt and other countries, there are Chinese cultural centers which concentrate on holding, e.g., 'the Sino French Culture Year', the American Cultural Festival', 'the African Cultural Festival on Chinese Culture' and a series of large-scale international cultural activities, promoting cultural exchanges between China and foreign countries.''[11] However, there are many problems which need to be solved in order for Chinese outreach strategy, represented by the Confucius institute and Confucius classrooms, to be really effective. This includes how to avoid being "misread as cultural colonialism," how to better to respect the audience's way of thinking, how to follow the laws of cultural life of foreign countries, how to display the cultural style of contemporary China, and how to show Chinese socialist core values through cultural activities and cultural products. All the above are long-term and arduous tasks. Therefore, cultural out-reach needs to construct its own core strategic value.

In the process, we must absorb the good components of each civilization with a modest and tolerant attitude. At the same time, China must work together with other civilized nations to fight against extreme cultural conservatism, religious extremism, cultural hegemonism, and all kinds of forces threatening to destroy peace in the world. Only then, will we really promote civilization and the advancement of the world.

School of Marxism, Liaoning University, Shenyang, P.R. China

References

Oswald Spengler. *The Decline of the West*, translated by Zhang Lanping, Shaanxi Normal University press, 2008 edition.

Arnold Toynbee. *A Study of History*, translated by Liu Beicheng, Guo Xiaoling, Shanghai Century Publishing Group, 2005 edition, pp. 53-53.

Samuel Huntington. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, translated by Zhou Qi et al, xinhua publishing house, 1998 edition, p. 39.

Fernand Braudel. *Grammmaire des Civilisations*, translated by Chang Feng, Xiao Tang, Guangxi Normal University Press, 2003 edition, p. 28.

Karl Jasper. *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*, translated by Wei Chuxiong, Yu Xintian, Huaxia press 1989 edition, p. 284.

Manuel Castells. *The Rise of the Network Society*, translated by Xia zhujiu, Social Sciences Academic Press, 2003 edition, pp. 464-465.

Li Yong-sheng. *The Value Collision and Value Integration under Pluralism*, Social Sciences in Ningxia, 2006(4).

Wang Yu-ping. *The Value of the Consensus and Its Contemporary Significance*, Truth Seeking, 2012(5).

Liu Huaig-uang, Ji Wenjun. *The Value Consensus in a Pluralistic Era*, Journal of Shanxi Normal University (Social Science Edition), 2012(3).

Dominique Mois. *The World Must Find Common Value*, Reference News, November 19, 2014.

Zhao E-nuo. *Chinese Culture "From walking out to waking in,"* People's Daily.

http://theory.people.com.cn/n/2014/1009/c40531-25794510.html.

3.

Human Desire and International Global Capitalism: Challenges and Opportunities

EDWARD J. ALAM

Drawing upon both ancient and modern philosophical insights into human nature and human desire, this paper argues the need to curb the wild tide of international global capitalism and its corresponding industries (weapons industry, pornography industry, auto industry, education industry, medical industry) precisely by *structurally* channeling human desire via early childhood education in the family towards what Aristotle called the transcendentals of being, and what Zhang Zai[1] referred to as "the good life." In this regard, deep philosophical reflection on the categories of *imitation* and *desire* and their respective relations, both of which presuppose and are presupposed by the mystery of human freedom, can help to rebuild the structures which will allow this channeling to take place.

I apologize from the outset for not being able to probe the categories of *imitation* and *desire* in the light of Chinese philosophy; I am still a mere student when it comes to Chinese thought. My one reference to Zhang Zai draws a parallel between his conviction that one of the goals of "thinking" is to lay the foundation for building "the good life," and that of Aristotle who has a similar conviction. For both thinkers, this "good life" cannot be limited to simply *my own* good life, but must necessarily be translated into the good life of the community, given the radically social nature of what it means to be human. This is not an insignificant point especially given the ultimate goal of this paper, which is to curb and critique what I have called the wild tide of international global capitalism, since individualistic[2] consumerism is

---

[1] An 11th century neo-Confucian Chinese philosopher interested in the relation between thinking, cosmology, and living a good life.

[2] In showing disdain for "individualism" I am not thereby applauding all forms of communitarianism, communism, or socialism. "Individualism" as a phenomenon of modern "western" civilization does point in my view to something genuinely good and can, at one level, be spoken about as an authentic development of the spiritual nature of the human being. For more

one of the anthropological pillars upon which this international movement is based. To really get to the heart of this quintessentially modern philosophical anthropology, the one foundational concept that cries out for critical examination most is the notion of *freedom*. There is, of course, already a plethora of deep philosophical analyses of this concept in the history of both eastern and western philosophy, but my particular angle shall be to approach the notion of freedom as a great mystery, which only partially comes to light when we critically reflect upon the relation between two other great mysteries: human desire and human imitation. I draw here upon the work of René Girard, a contemporary cultural anthropologist, philosopher, literary critic, and exegete who has been thinking and writing about these themes for over five decades. Girard has focused attention on the categories of imitation and desire in the context of his general philosophical anthropology while theorizing about the role of violence in the mystery of human origins. Though many before him have thought and wrote seriously about these themes, they take on new significance in the hands of Girard, as he suggests that something profoundly intense and extremely significant happened millions of years ago to the pre-human creature on the threshold of becoming human.

This pre-human creature, according to Girard, *lost* something precisely in order to *gain* access to something else. What was lost was *part* of its animal instinct; what it gained was an access to *desire*.[3] Once this potential was activated, and only then, did this pre-human creature become human. In addition to losing some of its instincts, the retained instincts are also somewhat diminished to make *space* as it were for this radically new and inexplicable and properly human and even spiritual power called *desire*. What makes this new power so unique and curious is precisely that it has no essential or ultimate goal; human desire, unlike mere instinct, is without an obvious and fixed object. Girard draws this insight out of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* and then justifies the move by developing another insight from Aristotle's

---

on this, see Vladimir Solovyov's remarkable book, *The Meaning of Love* (Lindisfarne Books: Great Barrington, 1985).

[3]See René Girard's *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning,* tr. James G. Williams (New York: Orbis Books, 2001), 15.

Poetics concerning the centrality of *imitation* for the human animal. Girard is on solid ground here because it may very well be, in fact, that Aristotle's most important insight regarding how man differs from the other animals comes not in his biological works,[4] nor even in his *De Anima*, but in his *Poetics* for there we read:

> It is clear that the general origin of poetry was due to two causes, each of them part of human nature. Imitation is natural to man from childhood, one of his advantages over the lower animals being this, that he is the most *imitative* creature in the world, and learns at first by imitation. And it is also natural for all to delight in works of imitation.[5]

Girard then claims that since human desire has no object per se, human beings must *borrow* their desires from others; these others are calls role models. The term he coins here is "mimesis" or "mimetic desire" – a *desire* that emerges through the *imitation* of the desires of others.[6] As a cultural anthropologist, Girard is most interested in how what he calls the "mimetic nature of human desire" is the cause of violence, and how violence operates in the very genesis of human culture. I shall not explore this latter in any detail, but as it does provide what I take to be a very important insight into the nature of human freedom in the context of the relation between imitation and desire, I would like at least to point out the following: Girard claims that when the desire to be like our role model becomes so intense that we desire to not only have what the model has, but even to be what the model is, then we become rivals of our role models. Now the energy of this rivalry phenomenon on the individual level is compounded on the societal level and can lead any given society, if not constrained, to all

---

[4] Depending on how you classify them, and there is still some disagreement, Aristotle's biological works constitute about a third of all the writings that have come down to us.

[5] Aristotle, Poetics 1448b:4-9 (my emphasis in italics)

[6] For a precise summary of Girard's thought see the Foreword by James G. Williams in *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*.

out competition and eventually violent chaos. The constraint usually comes by way of religious taboos and cultural activities that regulate the competitive energy through ritual and controlled sport and games. This had led many to conclude that Girard considers mimetic desire to be an intrinsically negative or even evil power that inevitably leads to violence, but a careful reading of his work shows this not to be the case. He clearly states, in fact, that:

> Even if the Mimetic Nature of human desire is responsible for most of the violent acts that distress us, we should not conclude that mimetic desire is bad in itself. If our desires were not mimetic, they would be forever fixed on predetermined objects; they would be a particular form of instinct. Human beings could no more change their desire than cows their appetite for grass. Without mimetic desire there would be neither freedom nor humanity. Mimetic desire is intrinsically good.[7]

There is not sufficient time to show how Girard's account of freedom in the twentieth century fits into the enormously vast and complicated story of how the concept of freedom developed in the nineteenth century, but there does seem to be a line of development from, or at least commensurability with, two great philosophers of freedom in that era, namely, Frederick Schelling and Karl Marx. I shall address a few aspects of both Schelling's and Marx's philosophy momentarily. All three provide insights into the modern notion of freedom that go a long way in constructively criticizing those tendencies to absolutize freedom by tearing it away from rich philosophical anthropologies grounded in, and guided by, the Aristotelian transcendentals of being. Without such qualifications, the modern meaning of freedom is reduced to mere individualistic liberties and *rights* and thus becomes the life/death force in that wild tide of international global capitalism which threatens seriously to disrupt not only the ecosystem and the economy, but to destroy the human being itself.

---

[7] René Girard, *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*, 15.

In his book, *Philosophical Investigations into the Essence of Human Freedom*, Schelling introduces two different ways of being: (*ground* – the principle of contraction) and (*existence* – the principle of expansion); these principles can be found everywhere in nature and capture the ways in which things "are" in the world. The balance in nature emerges when these two "opposing"[8] principles maintain their proper relation. That is, when *ground* (or contraction) remains the "condition for" *existence* (or expansion) then the whole remains balanced and harmonious, but when *ground* becomes that *for which* the whole is conditioned, disorder (or evil) emerges. In some ways perhaps this echoes Zhang Zai's point about the work of the philosopher in harmonizing the spirit of heaven with that of earth. At any rate, this order in nature for Schelling is rooted in what we may call a divine and eternal struggle/tension between ground and existence, contraction and expansion, inwardness and out-wardness, hiding and revelation. Human beings, too, as part of nature, tend to exist or to move towards non-existence within this struggle. At the divine level, the struggle always remains in the proper balanced tension, but at the human level, the outcome of the struggle is far from secure: evil or disorder often emerge because the contracting principle seeks to dominate the principle of expansion. In spite of Schopenhauer's scathing critique of Schelling, claiming, as he does, that Schelling is simply aping Kant while pretending to be original, I suggest that, on the contrary, Schelling goes much deeper than, and even reveals the inherent weaknesses in Kant. Schelling does this by identifying evil with a distortion of the *relation* between *ground* and *existence* whereby *ground* (or inwardness) becomes the perversely self-conscious, *rational* will of the *individual* no longer in real relation to anything but itself. In this, it is possible to read Schelling as criticizing a particular form of Kantian rationalism. In any case, if Schopenhauer's criticisms of Schelling are not accurate, there is still room for criticism of Schelling in that he never really tells us why the proper relation is maintained at the divine level and not at the level of nature and for human beings. In this, although his account of freedom is weightier than virtually any other

---

[8] Not so much in terms of contradictory opposition but in terms of contrary opposition, though even this distinction does not fully capture the nature of the relation between the two principles here.

philosophical account in the nineteenth century, it is by no means the final word.[9]

When we turn to Marx, we also find a philosophical account of freedom that goes far beyond freedom as mere *democratic* freedom. Marx steadily criticized such superficial accounts of freedom and was exceedingly uncomfortable with the overly polite and domesticated notions of freedom that seemed much too controlled in Anglo-Saxon constitutional democracy; he yearned for an indivisible, complete, and extreme freedom that would result in an unprecedented and radical independence for each and every individual. For Marx, genuine freedom had to be indivisible and thus it could not really exist unless it existed for all. In a particularly compelling expression of this, he writes,

> [f]reedom is so much the *essence* of man that even its opponents realize it…No man fights freedom; he fights at most the freedom of others. Every kind of freedom has therefore always existed, only at one time as a special privilege, another time as a universal right.[10]

---

[9]Schelling's work has always reminded me of certain trends in the mystical traditions of the Abrahamic religions. In particular, the Lurianic School of Kabbala with its emphasis on the teaching of *tsimtsum* (divine withdrawal) wherein God (in order to create out of nothing) becomes absent to himself in a kind of contraction so that "the void" or "nothingness" can come into existence, sounds a lot like Schelling's *ground/existence* distinction since this void (in the Lurianic School) then becomes the "place" where freedom originates. In Christian mysticism, too, one finds echoes of this in both the ancient and modern periods. One contemporary Christian mystic, Fernando Rielo, writes in terms strikingly close to what we find in the Lurianic School and is certainly commensurate with what Schelling proposes. And who could ever forget that incredibly pregnant statement by Nicolas Berdyaev in his famous work, *The Destiny of Man*, when he wrote, "Freedom is not determined by God; it is part of the nothing out of which God created the world" (London, 1937, p.33).

[10] Quoted in R. Dunayevskaya's *Marxism and Freedom* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1958) 19. I am tempted to claim here that Marx, like Freud, may have been much more influenced by his own Jewish religious tradition than

It was precisely the promise of a radical, all-encompassing realization of individual freedom that made the ideas of Marx so attractive in the nineteenth century, and my hunch is that this promise is still behind much of the attraction, if any, that his thought may still hold today. The really crucial insight and turning point with respect to freedom in Marx's thought was this: he sincerely believed that the fight for freedom was being fought on the wrong front. The battle for the *rights* of individual citizens vis-à-vis the state was simply the wrong war to be waging, he argued. For there the limited freedom one wins, if one wins at all, is restricted and fleeting. The fight for freedom must be fought on another more crucial and universal front: nothing less than the struggle to change the very *structures* of the world, and one of the first structures that had to be overcome was the industrialist/ capitalist structure that alienated human beings from their very own selves by turning them into commodities.

In a recent rereading of Marx's four *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, I was struck by how convincing and inspiring his arguments still are today. His existentialist humanism[11] rooted in a profound appreciation for, and celebration of, the dignity of man seems to be rooted in a view of the human being very close to that of the Jewish religion of his ancestors, and certainly commensurate with both Aristotle and the philosophical anthropology of someone like Zhang Zai. His critique of democracy, moreover, is more relevant now than it ever was, as many philosophers who are re-thinking Marx today claim. Even the highest authorities in long-established religious traditions, such as the German philosopher and theologian, who went on to become Pope Benedict, have contributed to this new appreciation for Marx's thought. In a particularly powerful passage of an historical treatment of the concept of freedom, Ratzinger states:

---

is usually supposed. His praise of freedom at this ontological level echoes (at one significant level) what one finds on freedom in the kabalistic tradition. Check this and the unvocity of being, mystery and a virtue centered ethics. See Cessario.

[11] See Erich Fromm's work here.

The Marxist critique of democracy cannot simply be brushed aside: how *free* are elections? To what extent is the outcome manipulated by advertising, that is, by capital, by a few men who dominate public opinion? Is there not a new oligarchy who determine what is modern and progressive, what an enlightened man has to think? The cruelty of this oligarchy, its power to perform public executions, is notorious enough. Anyone who might get in its way is a foe of *freedom*, because, after all, he is interfering with the free expression of opinion. And how are decisions arrived at in representative bodies? Who could still believe that the welfare of the community as a whole truly guides the decision-making process? Who could doubt the power of special interests, whose dirty hands are exposed with increasing frequency? And in general, is the system of majority and minority really a system of freedom? And are not interest groups of every kind appreciably stronger than the proper organ of political representation, the parliament? In this tangled power play, the problem of ungovernability arises ever more menacingly: the will of individuals to prevail over one another blocks the freedom of the whole.[12]

In any event, I am not trying to claim that there is a clear line of development from Schelling to Girard through Marx nor am I trying to turn Girard into a Marxist; I am just highlighting what I take to be commensurate insights into the essence of freedom found in some of the most important western thinkers in the last two centuries. It is the case, however, that Lucien Goldmann, the most influential Marxist critic in France in the decades after World War II, praised Girard's early work in Literary Criticism for doing the very thing that Marx's whole life was devoted to, namely, criticizing materialistic consumerism in order to praise the dignity and unique value of individual life and freedom.

---

[12] Ratzinger, *Communio* 23 (Spring 1996), 24.

In conclusion, I return to my opening statements wherein I suggested that one fundamental way of stemming the influence of unbridled capitalism and its corresponding industries was to *structurally* channel human desire via early childhood education in the family towards what is good and true and beautiful, giving priority to human relationships based on the virtues. I assumed much here, namely that unbridled capitalism was something dangerous for the world and something to be critiqued and curbed. I named its corresponding industries without evidence or qualification. I assumed that there is a right and wrong way of living and of being human. I used the definite article to qualify the term *virtues*, assuming that they are knowable and definable and more or less recognized across cultures in each and every era. I assumed at least this much, too, with respect to the transcendentals of being. Clearly, I cannot demonstrate the truth of all these assumptions here, and acknowledge that some may not even be provable, but I have tried to provide some philosophical evidence for my claim concerning the importance of teaching our children what to desire, by drawing upon the thought of philosophers whom I consider to be genuine lovers of wisdom and seekers of truth.

Notre Dame University-Louaize, Lebanon

4.

Freedom in the Core Values of Contemporary China

Yuan Jiuhong

At the Eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, "freedom" was listed as the basic content of the socialist core values and was advocated and emphasized. Some people could not understand or even misunderstood it, viewing it as recognition of the western freedom being accepted by the Communist Party of China. Actually, that is not the case. The freedom pursued by contemporary Communist Party of China and the Chinese people is by no means western freedom. They are fundamentally different in their theoretical basis, basic principles and main ideas. This article is to clarify freedom in the core values of socialism with Chinese characteristics.

Theoretical Basis of Freedom

There are three reasons why contemporary China advocates freedom among its core values.

First, the pursuit of freedom is the fundamental value of Marxism. The guidance of Marxism is the basic theoretical ground for contemporary China to establish its core values. Marxism is, in general, the scientific study of the proletariat and the liberation of humanity. In short, it is "the science of people's liberation"[1]. The essence and goal of human emancipation is to achieve freedom and comprehensive development of all human beings. It is stated clearly in *The Manifesto of the Communist Party,* coauthored by Marx and Engels, that "a new association will take the place of the old society where there were social classes and class antagonisms. In this association, the free devel-

---

[1] Gao Fang, *New Theory of Marxism and Socialism* (Heilongjiang People's Publishing House, 2007), p. 65.

opment of each individual is the condition of that of all"[2]. In his later years (1884), Engels, in response to the question "what is the core idea of scientific socialism" posed by the Italian *Cánepa*, once again affirmed that the above statements in *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* were the most suitable answers concerning freedom. Indeed, the words of wisdom that "the free development of each individual is the condition of that of all" has expressed the ideal of human freedom, and is, indeed, a profound understanding in the human being's exploration of freedom. Its profoundity and incisiveness, applicable to all times and all countries, is noetworthy. It also constitutes the soul and core of the scientific socialist core values constructed by classical Marxist writers. It signifies that realizing people's free and all-round development is the most essential characteristic of a communist society, whose promotion is the most essential requirement of socialism.

Second, Freedom is an indispensable requirement of socialism with Chinese characteristics in order to realize its real justice system which is the basic guiding ideology of the reform and development of contemporary China. It is the latest scientific achievement of the 'sinicization' of Marxism. Socialism with Chinese characteristics faithfully adheres to Marxism's core ideal value of people's free and all-round development, which it localizes in China to be a "people-oriented" concept of scientific development. This concept always puts the fundamental interests of the broad masses of the people as the starting and ending point of all theories and practices. The Eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China clearly put "promotion of people's all-round development" as the basic requirement to be adhered to the development of socialism with Chinese characteristics. Promoting people's all-round development needs not only to ensure that people have rights in speech, thought and other basic freedoms without interference, but also to provide the resources, opportunities and conditions for the free development of people. Actually, all the various reforms, in politics, economy, culture and other fields put forward by both the Eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China in 2012 and the Third Plenary Session of the

---

[2] *Selected Works of Marx and Engels* (People's Publishing House, 1995), Volume 1, p. 294.

Eighteenth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in 2013, aim to expand people's freedom, to enable all people to have more rights, more opportunities and better social conditions for the realization of the dream of their own beautiful life. For example, according to the requirements of the goals of deepening the reform of the household registration system put forward by the Third Plenary Session of the Eighteenth Central Committee, the State Council introduced "On Further Promoting the Reform of Household Registration System" on July 30th 2014. This document stipulated clearly that there would be no restriction in household registration policy in towns and small cities, and that in mega cities there should be the implementation of the credits system in household registration, with no other application conditions but half a year's residence. It also eliminated the distinction between the agricultural and non-agricultural household registration. Instead, all people in our country would be registered uniformly as Chinese residents. This is not only a case of deepening the reform comprehensively, of safeguarding and expanding the freedom, but also the essence of the reform and development of China and its socialist "road" in the past 30 years. The essence is to mobilize all of the positive factors to liberate and develop productivity in order to guarantee the expansion of people's freedom in pursuit of happiness.

Third, freedom is the primary principle of value in establishing a well-ordered society which conforms to the public opinion. The most fundamental reason why contemporary Chinese Communist Party and the socialist practices with Chinese characteristics should actively advocate freedom lies in the fact that freedom is the common desire and the unshakable value pursuit of all Chinese people. Freedom is the basic need of human nature. The Chinese nation and the Chinese people have loved and admired freedom since ancient times. Though during the past over 5000-year history of Chinese civilization, there was rampant "tyranny" from inside and aggressive bullying from outside, the Chinese people have never stopped yearning or the untiring pursuit of freedom. Especially since modern times, the Chinese nation and the great Chinese people have composed a splendid chapter of the struggle for the freedom and independence of the People's Republic of China. The founding of the new China, especially the

establishment of the socialist system has provided the fundamental guarantee for the Chinese people in political, economic, and ideological freedom. The freedom gained by the Chinese people is actually unprecedented in Chinese history, and the extent of this freedom is unachievable in modern capitalist countries. Since the new era of the reform and development, and because of the creation and development of the socialist road with Chinese characteristics, the freedom of Chinese people and that of society have been full of vigor and are continuous development.

It is the common aspiration and the universal appeal of all people to have greater freedom. The Chinese Communist Party of China promotes freedom in its practice and advocates freedom in its values in compliance with the demands of the people. This is not surprising. On the contrary, if what the Chinese Communist Party of China did is not in accordance with the public opinion, or has not attached great importance to public opinion, or failed to expand and promote freedom, such a country would ultimately lose the foundation of its legitimacy and the effectiveness of its governance, and would perish. This is also seen from the perspective of the general law of social development. In modern and contemporary times, any party or country which departures from the important principle of freedom would not only suffer the destruction of the party and the country, but would never achieve the basic goal of a well-ordered society.

A "Well-ordered society" is a society in which there is good order, or is simply a "good society." What this is is the focus of many contemporary political thinkers. There is much debate and great difference on this but than "overlapping consensus" is that a "good society" must fully respect and guarantee people's freedom and is well-ordered. "American economist Knight said: "The ultimate level of civilization achieved depends on the public recognition of the level of freedom in the constitution, and will not suffer a collapse of order."[3] Rawls defined the well-ordered society as one, "which not only aims to promote its members' interests, but is also effectively regulated by public justice." In such a society, (1) everyone accepts and knows that

---

[3] Quoted from Wang Dingding, *Lectures on New Political Economy* (Shiji Wenjing/Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2013), p. 269.

other people accept the same principle of justice; (2) the basic social institutions generally satisfies, and are generally known to satisfy these principles. Under this condition, though people may demand more from each other, they have to acknowledge one decisive point of view in common. If the fondness of their own interests makes people wary of each other, their sense of justice in common makes it possible for a strong cooperation. Among individuals with different targets, the common view of freedom establishes ties of friendship among citizens, and the common desire of justice restricts the pursuit of other targets. This fair view of justice constitutes the basic charter of a well-ordered human association.[4] What Rawls tried to express is that a "well-ordered society" is one which sets fairness and justice as the "basic charter," according to which each and every individual can enjoy equal freedom.

Amartya Kumar Sen, the "economist of the poor" from India and Nobel laureate in economics, said more clearly: "it is significant for a well-ordered society that all people enjoy individual freedom." His statements can be interpreted as containing two different parts, namely, (1) the value of individual freedom: this is so significant that in a well-ordered society it should be guaranteed that "each and every" individual can enjoy it; (2) the enjoyment of equal freedom: so that if one individual is provided with a freedom, all people should enjoy it. The combination of these two points stipulates that individual freedom should be available to all people on a shared basis[5]. In *The Idea of Justice*, he emphasizes again that "freedom is significant for at least two reasons. First, greater freedom enables us to have more opportunities to realize our goals and to achieve what we value. For instance, it boosts our ability to live in accordance with our own will. This is the ability to realize what we value. Second, we can focus our attention on the process of choice. For example, we do not want to be constrained in a certain state because of the restrictions imposed by other people."[6]

---

[4] Rawls, *Theory of Justice* (China Social Sciences Press, 2009), p. 4.

[5] Amartya Kumar Sen, *Development as Freedom*, translated by Ren Ze, Yu Zhen (China Renmin University Press, 2009), p. 236.

[6] Amartya Kumar Sen, *Ideas of Justice*, translated by Wang Lei, Li Hang (China Renmin University Press, 2012), p. 21.

The goal of the Communist Party of China is to establish a "good society" which embodies fairness and justice and in which every individual can "realize his or her dreams." The construction of such a "well-ordered society" would also need to follow the general construction rules of contemporary society, to act in accordance with the progress of society and the historical trends of the times, and to consciously implement "freedom" as the primary value principle of social construction. The Eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China ushered in the socialist core values cultivated and practiced following the "three things to advocate," where freedom is put at the first place as the value requirement at the social level. It is also a conclusion drawn from the scientific recognition of the general rules of the social construction. As a matter of fact, among the value principles of social construction, compared with equality, the rule of law and justice, freedom should be the primary choice.

Comparing freedom and equality, we can say that without freedom, equality is impossible. Equality can be enjoyed when people are free and independent. If there is no guarantee in basic freedoms such as personal freedom or freedom of speech, how can there be equality? Throughout history, we find that the reason why socialism is full of particular charm and attraction is mainly because it cares about equality. We have to understand that this equality should be established on the basis of "free men."

Comparing freedom with the rule of law, we know that the latter is to protect and promote people's basic freedoms. Otherwise, it is an "evil law" rather than a good law. An important goal of construction of rule by law in contemporary China is to ensure that the rights of the broad masses', like economic freedom, political freedom, freedom of expression and freedom of press, are effectively respected and protected, lest they suffer from unlawful interference and harassment from external power or individual behavior.

Concerning the relationship between freedom and justice, the latter itself is a comprehensive concept of value in that it contains values such as freedom and equality. Modern and contemporary political philosophy put forward various concepts of justice. These concepts of justice differ in the establishment of the principle of fairness, with alternatives between the principle of freedom and that of

equality. Some insist that the primary principle of justice is freedom, while others stress that the principle of justice is equality. Whatever be argued there is this consensus: there is no justice without the protection and the promotion of people's basic freedoms. As far as we are concerned, the primary principle of social justice is that every individual enjoys the freedom of equality.

From what is discussed above, it is apparent that the establishment and development of a well-ordered society constructed in line with the public opinion cannot do without values like freedom, equality, democracy, rules of law, and justice, among which freedom is a prerequisite for all and is in the basic and primary position. Therefore, the value requirements of the socialist core values with Chinese characteristics at the social level, generally speaking, demand that freedom should govern values such as equality, the rule of law and democracy. Only in this way, can the establishment of a "well-ordered society" at the primary stage of socialism have a stable basis and be able of develop continuously.

Basic Connotation of Freedom as the Contemporary Chinese Social Core Value

Freedom means ability and behavior in its most general sense. It refers to people, who can choose their own life, express their own thoughts, and realize their own desire independently in the social life. The socialist freedom, to advocate and promote in contemporary Chinese society, is the new form of human pursuit.

The essence of socialist freedom in contemporary China can be understood from three aspects:

First, it pursues real freedom and unites purpose and regularity. Freedom is the activity of people's impendent consciousness; it includes understanding and transforming of the objective world and is a unity of truth, goodness and beauty. Those are the basic rules on the nature of freedom by the Marxist. Engels tells us: "Freedom is not to be rid of the rules of nature to be independent, but to understand these

rules, so they can make the rules of nature systematically for a certain purpose."[7]

Second, the reality of freedom is the unity of rights, obligation and responsibility. In modern society, freedom always bestows rights and the security that people have in certain social relations systems according to their wills. Freedom is not abstract and absolute is determined by the specific social economic base. This is the essence of the Marxism. Marx said: "the rights can never exceed the social economic structure for the social cultural development is restricted by the social economic structure."[8]

Third, the ideal freedom is the high unity of individual and social freedom. The freedom advocated in socialist values with Chinese characters refers to the ideal society with the perfect unity of spiritual freedom and action, individual freedom and social freedom. These freedoms are for the development of everyone as the condition or basic principle of all free development. In this free association, everyone can have full freedom and development not at the expense of other's free development as they mutually complement each other. Individual freedom and social freedom become more highly unified day by day as the basic rules of social values of Chinese characters have different connotations in different areas and levels. This reflects economic freedom and politician freedom, moral freedom, expression freedom, etc.

First, is the pursuit of economic freedom. The economic freedom in capitalism refers to the thorough privatization, marketization and globalization of social economic life. The essence is the personal possession of property and free exchange. Withing this difference that the freedom advocated by the socialist can only be socialization as combined producers, exchanging material between them, put in their joint control, rather than letting it become a blind power to rule themselves. This material exchange is under the most worthy of being and the most suitable condition by the minimum consumption. How-

---

[7] *Selected Works of Marx and Engels* (People's Publishing House, 1995), Vol. 3, p. 455.

[8] *Complete Works of Marx and Engels* (People's Publishing House, 2001), Vol. 25, p. 19.

ever this field is always an inevitable kingdom. At the other side of the inevitable kingdom, as the purpose of the human ability to take place, the true freedom kingdom has began."[9] Of course, this is the ideal state of communism. In the primary stage of socialism in contemporary China, economic freedom refers to the liberation and development of the productive forces unceasingly, giving full play to the source of all wealth and to the decisive role of the market in resource allocation. Here the role of the government is to protect the lawful rights and interests of workers, to reflect independent labor, to eliminate exploitation and achieve common prosperity.

Second is the political freedom of the socialist. This is relative to political dissent from the perspective of bondage, slavery and authoritarian power. It embodies the autonomy and the independence of the citizens in social political life. The essence of freedom is the independent, self-reliance and self-determination of the main body. In the field of politics, the socialist freedom means citizen's recognition and the automatic right of the citizen to participate equally in national political life according to their own will. Lenin said:"Political freedom is the freedom of people dealing with national and state affairs."[10] "The fight for political freedom is secured by law to ensure that all citizens participate directly in country's management, ensuring that all citizens enjoy freedom, discuss their own affairs, and affect the rights of state affairs through a variety of groups and newspapers."[11] That the people are masters is the core content of socialist political freedom. The exercise of state power and the management of state affairs is also the true realization of political freedom.

Third is socialist moral freedom. This refers to the ability of people to choose conscious socially active norms, translate them into the inner moral belief and to adjust the relationship between themselves and society. Moral freedom relates to every one, as to the kind of life we want. It focuses on what kind of life is a good life. According to Marxism, the idea of the good life and its practice are up to everyone,

---

[9] *Complete Works of Marx and Engels* (People's Publishing House, 1974), Vol. 25, p. 926.

[10] *Complete Works of Lenin* (People's Publishing House, 1986), Vol. 7, p. 114.

[11] *Complete Works of Lenin* (People's Publishing House, 1984), Vol. 2, p. 90.

and are not imposed externally. The good ideal concept of life, if imposed on people, would be to enslave them. Socialist moral freedom emphasizes moral autonomy, stressing that everyone has to shoulder the responsibility of moral choice. In Chinese, this means to be non-violent by yourself, and emphasizes the unity of freedom and responsibility or obligation. Though you have moral freedom, you are not free to act unscrupulously because in social life, order is indispensable.The important foundation for a well-ordered society is the common moral bottom line which one is not free to break.

Fourth is socialist press freedom and freedom of expression. Socialism advocates the periodicity and relativity of press freedom and think that the world does not have absolute press freedom, that is nonpartisan, transcending classes and supranational. Western press freedom advocates an independent media, and argues that so-called neutral justice is the most deceptive. Socialist press freedom always adheres to the unity of the universal party spirit, adheres to the authenticity of news and the correct guidance, insist on the unity of the rule of law and freedom. Press freedom and freedom of expression also have a bottom line: one cannot break the law, commit fraud, counterfeit news or spread rumors as internet freedom. Internet rumors do not mean freedom of speech. Not only is this not freedom, but it also should be punished severely.

The Difference Between Values of Freedom Advocated by Contemporary China and Western Countries

The contemporary Chinese value of freedom has its theoretical source and guiding ideology in Marxist scientific thought. This pursues a kind of socialist values which is not without source, but is directly inherited from the western values of critical freedom in modern times. Engels pointed out: "Modern socialism, in terms of its contents, first is the result of class antagonism between the propertied and those without property in modern society, between capitalists and wage-workers as well as the prevailing anarchy in production of these two aspects. However, in terms of its theoretical form, it initially manifested as various principles of the great French Enlightenment scholars of the 18th century raised further, allegedly through more

thorough development." [12] This means means that there is fundamental difference in meaning between the freedom advocated by socialist core values and the concept of western capitalism. This difference is embodied in four aspects:

The first is seen from the ideological basis and value orientation. Western values of freedom is built on the basis of the abstract theory of human nature, is an idealism, based on an unscientific foundation. This is a value-oriented individualism, which advocates that individuals have unfettered rights which are always higher than the community, which is but tools to achieve self-value. Socialist values emphasize that freedom is built on the basis of historical materialism, taking collectivism as the basic value orientation, emphasizing that the freedom must be collective. As Marx pointed out: "Only in the community can the individual get an all-round development of their talents, that is, only in the community may one have personal freedom." Collectivism advocates that "each person is on their own and gets their freedom jointly." Individual freedom and collective freedom are promoted mutually and develop simultaneously in society.

The second is seen from this content and features. Western values of freedom generally will be divided into negative freedom and positive freedom, while highlighting "negative freedom," which emphasizes individual rights of freedom without interference. In fact, all negative freedom is not free. Freedom guaranteed by the socialist democratic system includes not only negative freedom, but also positive freedom, that everyone has for self-development, self-realization of the rights and opportunities of freedom.[13] Socialism freedom has obvious superiority, as the most extensive and comprehensive. In addition, the instrumental characteristics of capitalist freedom contrasts strongly with socialist freedom. Western freedom concept proposed in the 17th and 18th centuries' mainly anti-feudal autocracy and religious theocracy. After mid-19th century, the main target is the country's power and excessive government intervention, and thus is strongly instrumental. In general, Western freedom is the realization

---

[12] *Collected Works of Marx and Engels* (People's Publishing House, 2009), Vol. 3, p. 523.

[13] *Ebid*.

of one's own interests by contrast socialist freedom has people's free all-round development as its core content. Freedom is not only instrumental, but the ultimate purpose of man and the development of human society and nature, is the complete liberation of humankind.

The third is seen from the point of view of substance and function. Values are generated for a particular economic basis, whether on the level of social system or of ideology, it reflects that economic basis of society is to serve the interests of the class.

Capitalist's values of freedom are established on the basis of capitalist private ownership, which in the final analysis is for the benefit of the capital and its spokesman, and thus is a tool for the benefit of the system; in the final analysis this so-called freedom is the freedom of capital. Socialist values of freedom are established on public ownership, the essence of which is for the people's interests and to achieve the common interests of the people. More simply, one of its fundamental values is to serve the people, which is different from the kind of values which serve the capital: the roles are very different.

The fourth is seen from the way of implementation. Although Western values of freedom also emphasize the realization of human freedom and has its conditions, namely that it be carried out under the rule of law, this "conditional" aspect of the capitalist system, which has the rule of law, also reflects the interests of the bourgeoisie to implement and maintain the so-called "constitutional" capitalist system. The socialist values of freedom advocated by China emphasize freedom with socio-economic conditions, in which the fundamental condition of the freedom of human liberation, is the establishment of the socialist system, the road of socialist rule of law. From the historical process of development of human society, the socialist society is supposed to be much higher than the freedom of capitalist society. Thus, the establishment and improvement of the socialist system actually achieves the freedom for people to provide a broad space with more comprehensive conditions.

Of course, today China is still at the primary stages of socialism, the development of social freedom and individual freedom is affected by factors such as the realistic level of productivity and development, history of the political economy, and other factors. There are still many

unsatisfactory places that are distant from the ideal of Marx's "free kingdom." However, the Chinese people never lose confidence, and under the correct leadership of the communist party, the Chinese people will redouble their efforts, and actively practice socialist values of freedom. These values constantly promote society and people's all-round free development, and thus, expand the socialist free order.

School of Marxism, Southeast University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China

5.

Anti-Essentialism and *Tathagatagarbha:* A Parallel between "Critical Buddhism" and Continental Philosophy

Tu Xiaofei

The so-called "Critical Buddhism" is represented by the works of two Japanese Buddhist scholars at Komazawa University, Hakamaya Noriaki and Matsumoto Shiro, and has created a special interest in Buddhist studies circles since the 1990's. One of their controversial claims is that the concept of Buddha Nature or *Tathagatagarbha*, often viewed as a cornerstone of East Asian Mahayana Buddhism, is "not Buddhist." Various scholars in North American have responded, either positively or critically, to their bold thesis. (Hubbard and Swanson, 1997; Shields, 2001) In this paper, I intend to shed new light on this ongoing discussion by drawing on a seemingly unlikely source from European Continental Philosophy. I argue that Hakamaya's and Matsumoto's aggressive attack on *Tathagatagarbha* is to be considered part of a wider anti-essentialism trend that has been in vogue for some time in both the Western and Asian academia. Scholars opposing "essentialism" believe that the latter, a time honored but misguided theory, demands that an entity or subject have specified values or characteristics (essence) in order to be defined as such. In contrast, the same scholars deny that an entity or subject must have an "essence" or "nature." In Wittgenstein's metaphor, there is no single fiber that runs through a rope (Wittgenstein, 2009). Along a similar line, the two aforementioned Japanese scholars question the validity of the *Tathagatagarbha* doctrine, namely each sentient being invariably contains the intrinsic potency for becoming a Buddha, which according to their view is at odds with the fundamental Buddhist doctrine of dependent origination (Hakamaya, 1989; Matsumoto, 1989).

The army of anti-essentialism crusaders in the West includes, for example, Jean Paul Sartre (1993) who proclaims that existence precedes essence and Karl Marx who denied the existence of an ahistorical human nature that transcends economic conditions and class interests.

My topic in this paper, however, is the German Jewish philosopher Frank Rosenzweig (1886-1929) because his arguments against German Idealism strikingly resonate with that of Critical Buddhism.

A small but important work by Rosenzweig is titled *Understanding the Sick and the Healthy – A View of World, Man, and God*, which prefigures Rosenzweig's magnum opus *The Star of Redemption*. World, man, and God are the most important topics for Judaism and philosophy in general. Yet there are right ways and wrong ways to understand and represent them. Rosenzweig claims to offer "new thinking" regarding these questions. For him, the new thinking or correct way to think, is nothing but common sense. The term "common sense" could be misleading in that one might think that this is something commonplace, something which is not complex enough to solve sophisticated problems. According to Rosenzweig, however, "common sense" is ordinary good sense or sound practical judgment. The word's meaning is expressed clearer in German: *gesunder Menschenverstand*, which literally means "healthy human understanding." Rosenzweig urges people to go back to common sense because he finds that in his time philosophy has become sick. It was urgent for a genuine philosopher to introduce a healthy way of thinking to rescue philosophy (1999).

The reason for Rosenzweig's defining his contemporary philosophy as sick was the prevalence of German idealism, which reached its summit in Emmanuel Kant and G.W.F. Hegel. In German Idealism, pure thought is assumed to be the "essence" of all beings and taken as the sole and highest reality. This tradition, which finds its root in Descartes, assumes that a thinking subject, *cogito*, is the only sound foundation of any philosophical contemplation in contrast to a suspicious outside world or an unprovable Divine. Hence, man is contracted in this philosophy to a rational spirit; but on the other hand, this rational spirit is inflated to include the whole cosmos. It is in this rational spirit that the outside world and even God find the justification of his existence.

Rosenzweig considers this rational spirit an illusion. To him, evading real life and trying to find some "essence" under the surface of life is a kind of abnormal human behavior which he calls "sick reason." He finds its symptoms to be a paralysis of healthy, normal

thinking, and hence the loss of ability to act as do healthy, normal people. Rosenzweig gives an example in which one wants to buy a slab of butter. It is the most trivial thing in everyday life and could be handled even by a child. As a man with sick reason does it, he gets into trouble. Instead of going to a shop, paying and taking home the piece of butter which he likes, he has to contemplate "philosophically" before taking any action, because he is a philosopher. He has to figure out when this slab of butter, which certainly was, part of the chunk before it is cut, began to be? Did it come into being when it was cut, or earlier? Did it become a slab ideally in our philosopher's mind when the idea of buying it comes to him? Besides, how is it even possible for him to want a slab of butter? Problems like these would harass our philosopher so much that he would at last find himself not able to buy the slab of butter at all. Things like this happen in other cases to our philosopher so that he becomes paralyzed. "His hand will not grasp – they await some justification to act. His legs refuse to move – how can they be sure the ground is solid? His eyes refuse to see – what proof is there that everything is not a dream? And for his ears, they refuse to hear – to whom should they listen? His mouth is closed in silence; talk in empty space is of little use" (1999, p. 31). The question needs to be asked: why the philosopher gets sick in mind while the majority of mankind is sensible?

Rosenzweig finds the root cause of sick reason to be the wonder of life. Life always ends with its opposite – death, which shocks man. Life becomes numb in the face of death – and dies. Human beings wonder at this cruel fact of their own existence. Rosenzweig concedes that wonder is the nature of man. While healthy souls pause to wonder and then continue drifting along the unceasing river of life, letting their wonder be cured in the stream, a philosopher is so petrified in his wonder about the enigma of life and death that he refuses to go back to life again. This refusal to return to life is a syndrome of "sick reason." A philosopher does not want to go further unless the immediate answer to this problem is given to him.

Thus, the philosopher appeals to pure reflection. Wonder is perpetuated in the motionless mirror of his meditation: the subject. That is why our philosopher, as we have seen, is reduced to a pure thinking spirit. The desperate craving to grasp something solid, unchangeable,

and eternal drives the philosopher to ask the question: "what actually is?" The answer is, for him, certain: essence. This "essence" is the opposite of the feeble, changeable, and transient "non-essence." No matter what this essence is, it is surely something totally different from real life which is thought of as "appearance," "phenomenon," etc. If that is true, then the threat of death could also be eliminated as only "appearance," and not a real threat.

The problem is, according to Rosenzweig, this answer is an answer to a question which has been put forward wrongly, an unnatural question. Common sense tells us that a thing receives a character of its own only within the flow of life. A thing is itself just because it is in a particular time, place, and sequence of things. The "what actually is" question has no meaning since it has no relation to life. This wrong question arises from the impatience of the philosopher as unwilling to accept the process of life and the passing of the numbing wonder has brought. Impatience brings excessive wonder. The result of this wonder-mania just makes things worse, because by refusing life he is dead already before the due date of his course of life. The philosopher steps outside of life. If life means dying, he prefers not to live. He chooses death in life. He escaped from the inevitability of death into the paralysis of artificial death.

Then what are we to do with our sick philosopher? A simple reverse of his attitude may not result in a healthy view, but in philistinism – "the natural concomitant of advancing age." Philistinism does not worry about essence or other things behind life, it just keeps floating unreflectively on the surface of it. Yet, because of man's inquiring nature, it is not totally ignorant to the fact that there are things to be wondered. Philistinism suffers from a sense of guilt. It is influenced in its self-evaluation by standards it rejects in practice but acknowledges in theory. It knows that it fails to do something it cannot avoid. If the outcome of our cure is going back to philistinism, it may be better for the sick not to be cured. At least, sick reason has a good faith and is able to be loyal to it; on the contrary, philistinism has not even the capacity to think. As a result, a self-cure by means of time produces not true health but its mockery. Neither does Rosenzweig like the Nietzschean answer to this question that "if we are to enjoy our life, we ourselves must give it significance." A motto like "have the

courage to be God" is only an inflation of Self. To him, it is nothing less than "you act as though you headed a government of the world in exile instead of taking care of your house." The honest way is rather to be yourself, a human being.

The real cure lies in real life in this world. What is world? To Rosenzweig, world is the place we live, not an epistemological object, a thing to be "viewed." Taking the example of the butter again. One wants to buy a stab of butter, what makes him decide? Rosenzweig thinks that it is the previous experience of eating butter. What is there connecting the butter eaten before and the butter one wants to buy? Is it butter in itself, or butter in essence? To Rosenzweig, the only relation between the two is the word "butter," nothing more. Is that too simple an answer, an answer not philosophical enough? It really is "only the name." Name is something binding our experience together and making life continuous; "name represents permanence; it is the only tangible thing giving continuity to man's existence."

According to Rosenzweig, name makes it possible for man to be man. It is language that assures him there is something outside him, because language itself is not a part of man, yet is so deeply involved in human life. This stress on name's holy nature could find its parallel in Jewish mysticism – Kabbahlah's theory of name. In Kabbahlah, the world is said to be created through ten numbers and twenty two Hebrew letters which are the actual names of God. God weighted these letters and numbers, exchanged them and combined them, formed out of them the soul. In Merkabah mysticism, the secret names of God were used as passwords in the mystics' journey to god's throne (Merkaba). The great medieval Jewish thinker Nahmanides even claims that the whole Torah is a series of God's name, and at the same time, the whole Torah is one single great name of God. (Scholem, 1995)

Without resorting to any form of essence, spirit, or soul that hide under the tangible world, here is Rosenzweig's answer to life. There is time to work, there is time to rest; there is day, and there is night; there is life itself, and there is death. There is no remedy for death; not even health. A healthy man, however, has the strength to continue to the grave. In health, even death comes at the "proper" time. Health is on good terms with death.

Having examined Rosenzweig's critique of the so-called sick reason, one is left wondering whether "sickness" is indeed what defines being human. Art, academic work, and many other human work and activities, are all efforts to search for something permanent and "essential." Rosenzweig is right in stating the root of philosophical sickness is the incurability of death. However, it could be argued that man is by definition a "sick" animal and an incorrigible essentialist, as shown by generations of thinkers and scholars both in the West and Asia. Did not Joachim Wach call our attention to the *sui generis* religious experience, and Nishitani Keiji highlight the universal existential concerns that are embedded in every human being, to mention just two examples?

Rosenzweig says that his is a Jewish book. Nahum Glatzer believes that Rosenzweig's "Jewishness" is the insistence on the concrete situation and rejection of abstraction. (1998) Rosenzweig dislikes the idealist philosophers who are obsessed with the essence-search and their arrogant belief that to be misunderstood by common sense is the privilege, even the duty of philosophy. This criticism calls to mind other Jewish anti-metaphysics thinkers in his time. Wittgenstein uses the concept of "family resemblance" to be rid of the stubborn "essence" in his contemporary philosophy. His famous words "do not think, but see" is in accord with Rosenzweig's "Life *is* not, it simply occurs." Yet another Jewish philosopher Martin Buber is also a rabid anti-essentialist. In Nonald Moore's words, Buber opposes "any other worldliness, in his insistence on finding in the present whatever beauty and redemption there may be, and his refusal to pin his hopes on any beyond." (Rosenzweig, p18)

To make cases for his famous I-thou relation, which is alleged to be an authentic relation between human beings where every human is taken as an end, Buber referred to some primitive linguistic phenomena. He mentioned that for the expression "far away," the Zulu language instead had a word to the effect that "there where someone cries out: 'O, mother, I am lost;'" and the Fuegian counterpart was "they stare at one another, each waiting for the other to volunteer to do what both wish, but are not able to." Buber thought that these primitive ways of speech gave evidence that their "life is built up within a narrow circle of acts highly charged with presentness." In the

same manner he offered examples of how primitive people greeted one another. According to Buber, the Kaffir way of greeting was to say "I see you!" When it seemed not "primitive" enough to him, Buber gave us another one: Indian-Americans in similar circumstance would say "Smell me!" While it may stretch credulity to embrace such anthropologically unsound data, we certainly see Buber's fondness of concreteness over the abstract. Perhaps not surprisingly, Buber is not a big fan of Buddhism. In his verdict, Buddhism proposes that the world and God be absorbed into the human mind. He concluded that this worldview of "absorption" was not in accordance with the I-thou relation because Buddhism disregarded real beings. Absorption wishes to preserve only the 'pure', the real, the lasting, and to cast away everything else. The doctrine of absorption demands and promises refuge in the one thinking Essence, refuge in pure subject. Buber rejected this supposed Buddhist view by saying that a subject deprived of its object is deprived of its reality. He condemned Buddhism as a kind of profound perversion and the "peaks of its language." Against this Buddhist essentialism, Buber said that "the sense of being is but simply the total status of the world as world, just as the sense of Self is but simply the total status of the *I* as *I*." (Buber 1955)

Although there is no evidence of direct knowledge of Rosenzweig by Critical Buddhist scholars, we sense a clear intellectual affinity between the larger intellectual trend when we consider the similarity between Rosenzweig's complaints about German Idealism and Critical Buddhism's grievances against Mahayana Buddhism. As Rosenzweig picks bones with the an "Egoistic," disembodied Consciousness as the essence of the world in German Idealism, Critical Buddhism is trying to destroy the "un-Buddhist" transcendent Buddha Nature as the essence of dharma realms in East Asian Buddhist traditions. Viewed in the light of Western intellectual history, anti-essentialism could be seen as the *revenge of the Old Testament*, that is, the resurgence of Hebrew elements against Greek elements (e.g. the Platonic Idealism) in the Judeo-Christian traditions. Fueling the anti-essence trend is the worldview recommended by a popularized version of modern science, which asserts that the world and humans are nothing but the sum total of physical objects and their natural functions. If my hypothesis has any merit, one is compelled to ask

whether such a cultural specific proposition shaped by complex Western religious and philosophical problematics could be transplanted to Asian contexts without further questioning. Moreover, one needs to question whether the fashionable anti-essentialism is philosophically defendable and ethically desirable.

Critical Buddhism detracts the *Tathagatagarbha* doctrine because it believes that *Tathagatagarbha* is incompatible with the *Pratityasamutpada* doctrine of early Buddhism. That is, a concept of "Buddha Nature" may be confused with *Atman* in Hinduism which the Buddha disputed. Hakamaya and Matsumoto attempt to support this claim by seeking the "original teachings" of the Buddha in Indian texts. However, the textual evidence may not be in their favor, as Jikido Takasaki and others have pointed out. (Takasaki, 2000) The shaky textual studies of Hakamaya and Matsumoto that attempt to detect late (especially Taoist) additions to East Asian Buddhism remind us of Motoori Norinaga's textual study of *Kojiki* that intended to exclude "harmful" Chinese influences from Japanese thought. Textual studies are not intrinsically disinterested and value free. Critical Buddhist scholars do not even pretend to be objective. To be sure, since the Buddha did not use a voice record when he turned the dharma wheel, it is fair to say that it is impossible for us to know his "original" teachings. The "authentic" Buddhism can only exist in the lives and practice of generations of Buddhist practitioners rather than in the dubious interpretation of a few fragmented Pali texts by eccentric scholars. As Takeuchi Yoshinori puts it, the validity of Buddhism that transcends time and space is not unchanged doctrine that holds true for all people in all places and times. Religious reflection is not a cumulative science in which one generation can build on the foundations of its predecessors, but rather a conversion that needs to be repeated fundamentally again and again. There is always need for new solutions to the serious questions that trouble the human spirit in various spiritual environments. They answer to questions never before experienced, but which had ripened from their own religious existence in the here and now as the true questions of their age and their world. (Takeuchi, 1999) By all accounts, Critical Buddhism's claim to authentic Buddhism is subjective and sectarian at best. In alleging to possess the knowledge and authority to dictate what is "true" Buddhism, it appears to be stun-

ningly out of touch with mainstream academic practice and ironically "essentialist." To Hakamaya and Matsumoto as Buddhologists, we have to concur with Norman Brown in saying: Fools with tools are still fools.

Philosophically, Critical Buddhism's position is equally unwarranted. Over-emphasis on "no self" suggests the mistaken view that is dubbed "vicious emptiness" in traditional Buddhism. Indeed, the concept of "no self" is by no means unique to Buddhism, as Critical Buddhism claims, but a common concept shared by early Buddhism and other Hindu traditions such as Jainism. Like Rosenzweig, Critical Buddhism believes that an essence that is inaccessible to language is anathema. In this regard, Critical Buddhism is especially harsh in their criticism of the Zen *koan* method which they regard as a form of obscurantism. A world in which everything is clearly laid out, everything is understood, and the rest is ignored is a world that misses depth and becomes two-dimensional. Matsumoto accuses *Tathagatagarbha* thought of being divorced from time and history and being a philosophy of death. That is, Mahayana Buddhists are scared by the prospect of death and hence driven to seeking an undying essence in existence. However, we might wonder why all religious traditions are concerned with similar "essentialist" questions. Is it not human nature to be concerned about their own beginning and final destiny? Borrowing Fredrick Jameson's terminology, life without existential concerns would be a life in euphoria, a pathological mental state that is marked by a lack of anxiety and any sense of alienation, but that at the same time is marked by a lack of focus and a retarded mind. Critical Buddhism believes that only an exclusive no-self belief could serve as the foundation of altruistic desires. An altruism without depth and spiritual ground is bound to be superficial and to miss the point.

A person missing "essentialist" concerns is, as Rosenzweig put it, a philistine. A world without essence, again as Rosenzweig himself realizes, is a world of dead objects. "It is a world which has no reality beyond appearance, which is made up of multilateral reflections of appearance, appearance irradiated by appearance and the source itself of more appearance, reflecting nothing but appearance."

To be fair, anti-essentialism is not without merit. It serves as an antidote to an overdose of philosophical speculation and aimless

spiritual roaming, and draws our attention back to this world. When guarded as an infallible doctrine, it is seriously flawed because it is one sided. Is an "essenceless" world or philosophy desirable? I want to conclude by quoting William Blake with a change of a few words:

> And twofold always
>
> May the Buddha us keep
>
> From single vision,
>
> And Newton's sleep.

Appalachian State University, USA

References

Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

Glatzer, Nahum N. *Franz Rosenzweig: His Life and Thought*. Hackett, 1998.

Hubbard, Jamie and Jan Swanson. *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm Over Critical Buddhism.* University of Hawaii Press, 1997.

Hakayama Noriaki. (袴谷憲昭) 本覚思想批判. 大蔵出版, 1989.

Matsumoto Shiro. (松本史朗) 緑起と空: 如来蔵思想批判. 大蔵出版, 1989.

Rosenzweig, Franz. *Understanding the Sick and the Healthy: A View of World, Man, and God.* Harvard University Press, 1999.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. Washington Square Press, 1993.

Shields, James Mark. *Critical Buddhism*. Ashgate, 2011.

Scholem, Gershom. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. Schocken, 1995.

Takasaki Jikido. "The Tathagatagarbha Theory Recosidered." In *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 2000, 27/1-2.

Takeuchi Yoshinori. *Buddhist Spirituality: Later China, Korea, Japan, and the Modern World.* The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

6.

The "Non-Inscription" Phenomenon:
A Modern Way of Avoiding a
Reconstruction of Values

Alexandre Palma

Every society has to find its own way of reconstruction, its own values and morals. In a global age, this challenge becomes even more complex, because the scale of values is built not only in dialogue with one's own tradition and past, but also in dialogue with cultures which have different traditions and different past experiences.

In this study I want to bring something of my own cultural and national background. I will be presenting and dialoging with contemporary Portuguese philosopher José Gil (born in 1939), most likely unknown to most. For several years now, he has been analyzing the present stage of Portuguese society and diagnosing in it what he called the "non-inscription" phenomenon. Although this notion was created to describe a particular reality, such as contemporary Portuguese society, it can be useful also to understand some cultural trends in other Western societies and perhaps even to understand very different cultures and societies, such as, for example, the Chinese. As a matter of fact, in a marginal note (but a quite suggestive one), José Gil relates the Portuguese behavior with the Chinese. Quoting a French diplomat, who had served her country for many years in China and latter in Portugal, he describes the Portuguese as the "Chinese of the West."[1] I, too, am a "Chinese of the West"!

In short, first of all, I will explain what José Gil means when he speaks of non-inscription, the causes of such phenomenon and, subsequently, their effects. Finally, I will try to show how such social and cultural reality risks blocking the possibility of an effective reconstruction of values and morality. Such analysis, although deeply

---

[1] Both, Chinese and Portuguese, seem to approach issues in a diagonal way, circling around them before approaching them in a clearer and direct way. Cf. J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje. O medo de existir* (Lisboa: Relógio d'Água, 2012[13]), 66.

rooted in the Portuguese reality, can also shed some light on other cultures and societies and, above all, on the present theme: Reconstruction of Values and Morality in Global Times.

What Is Non-inscription?

"Non-inscription" describes a troubled social attitude. In a way, it can be seen as a "social disease" that diminishes the vital force of a particular society;[2] or as a psychological problem of a society. It occurs when nothing is truly registered in the social conscience of a certain people or of a certain community. Obviously, several things happen daily in the life of a people. When none of those things is taken seriously, nothing is registered, that is, nothing is "inscribed."

In this sense, inscription (as a positive dynamic) "implies action, statement, decision," because to inscribe is "to produce reality."[3] "Inscription," declares José Gil, "makes the present, a present of meaning […] that gives a sense to the individual existence or to the collective life of a people.[4] Inscription occurs when "life events acquire the meaning of decisive experiences."[5]

Non-inscription is present when a society becomes unable to transform normal facts into meaningful events or trivial realities into proper experiences. In such a paradigm, social happenings never authentically become events. This can always happen at an individual level. What José Gil calls our attention to, is the fact that it can also happen at a social and cultural level. A society can also act in such a way, refusing the hard confrontation with life's reality, being unconsciously blind to it, and unwilling to engage with it.

It is precisely in this sense that José Gil speaks about non-inscription as a social "non-action and as a social non-event":[6]

---

[2] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 73.

[3] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 17.

[4] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 44.

[5] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 73

[6] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 74-75.

- "non-action" because that particular society seems to decide not to act, that is, not to register and transform life facts into relevant events;

- "non-event" precisely because everything that happens is never really rooted in the culture and conscience.

That is why non-inscription is forgetting the present.[7] In this peculiar state of social lethargy, nothing is truly important. The social focus never rests on anything, but it transits endlessly in a way that nothing becomes an authentic social event; nothing is engraved in its memory or conscience. So, what is "non-inscription"? A diffuse social dynamic where a people or a community no longer assume life facts in order to transform them into meaningful cultural and social events. On the contrary, "nothing is really important, nothing is irredeemable, nothing is inscribed."[8]

José Gil gives several examples where he sees this phenomenon in the Portuguese society. Indeed, examples can be helpful to understand what we are speaking about. I imagine that such examples would not be of great help to us here, since they require certain knowledge of Portugal and its recent history. So, let me give you an example that has nothing to do with Portugal, but with another country and with a historical episode most likely known to us all. This example is also suggested by our author, José Gil. According to him, we can see "non-inscription" in the way Germans, in the post-World War II period, dealt with their memories and with their deeds. In fact, – and I quote – "Germans denied to inscribe, in their existence as in their history, the Third Reich and Nazism, reducing them, for decades, in their History schoolbooks to an episode described in ten or twenty lines."[9] For decades, the German people seemed to deal with the War experience and with its specific responsibility in it not by recognizing it nor by denying it, but simply by ignoring it or, at least, by trying to do so. This is non-inscription. The fact was there, but, for some time, German society as a whole resisted transforming it into a significant social and national experience. This is a good example of what "non-inscription,"

---

[7] Cf. J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 18.

[8] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 17.

[9] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 15.

in reality, is and it might help us ask if this phenomenon is also present (or not) in other cultures and societies, in other countries and historical periods.

What Are the Causes of Non-Inscription?

In José Gil's analysis, the causes of the non-inscription phenomenon have a lot to do with Portuguese history, mainly in the Twentieth Century. I will not be elaborating on this topic, because it would distract us from our main theme. I must recognize that some of the causes I will be suggesting have a lot to do with the Portuguese reality. My hope is that some elements of this particular reality can illumine the understanding of other cultures and societies, mainly of those in which a similar "non-inscription" can also be recognized.

What is at the origin of the non-inscription phenomenon? Three elements might help us answer this question (let me be clear: I do not pretend to be exhaustive in the analyses of its causes):

Fear

Fear is at the core of non-inscription. In other terms, non-inscription is a way (normally an unconscious way) of dealing with fear and of sublimating it. There can be several motives for a society to be afraid: there can be economic reasons (fear of losing a certain economic status; of facing a period of deprivation); there can be socio-political reasons (due to internal social and political dynamics); there can be geo-political reasons (having to do with the present and past relations with societies and countries close and far away); there can be regional reasons (perhaps a certain tension and rivalry among neighboring communities); there can also be historical and cultural reasons (related with past memories and traumas), and so on. Beside all that, it can also be a diffused fear, or as José Gil puts it, "a fear with no object."[10] This is, I think, in our present post-modern and post-indus-

---

[10] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 68.

trial societies (mainly in West), a very present form of social fear: a diffuse sensation that does not necessary have a concrete object.

Faced with fear, a society can follow this path of "non-inscription," that is, it can refuse to face that fear and its circumstances, preferring instead to simulate that such reality simply is not there, simply does not exist. "Non-inscription" is a kind of a state of illusion that arises as a way to deal with something that brings social discomfort. To block reality can be just an effort to block fear.

The situation becomes even more complex, when we consider that normally the fear at the origin of this social attitude is, in almost every case, not truly perceived or admitted as such. That means the fear that causes "non-inscription" is, in itself, normally not inscribed.

Lethargy

Non-inscription can also be the result of a passive society. Previously, I have already used the expression social lethargy to describe what "non-inscription" is. A certain social apathy, fatigue, even a certain social laziness, can produce this form of evasion because the positive act of inscribing demands an engagement with reality, with its challenges and demands. Instead, in "non-inscription" there is a "deficit of vital force."[11] Refusing to act in such a way can have this consequence: the refusal to produce reality is what José Gil means when he talks about "non-inscription."

There is a natural connection between fear and this social lethargy. As our author puts it, fear "softens the bodies, absorbs its energies, and creates a void in the spirits."[12] Non-inscription occurs in societies that seem to have lost their energy or a goal strong enough to mobilize it as a whole. Historical facts can help us understand why there are some societies less dynamic than others as their past can explain such a lack of social stamina and energy. There are also other facts that feed this lethargy. The absence of a clear social and/or national goal can generate this lethargy. A mobilizing common project is also necessary for a dynamic and lively society. Coming from Europe, I think about

---

[11] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 72.
[12] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 73.

aged societies as another factor that can increase this collective lethargy. Normally younger societies tend to be more dynamic (even if, in some cases, this is not so). There is a demographic crisis in Europe, partially solved by immigration, but particularly present in Southern Europe.[13] There are similar demographic dynamics in other parts of the World which can also cause or increase this kind of social lethargy at the base of "non-inscription," and with real social, economic and cultural consequences.

Permanent Mental Transit

A certain social hyperactivity (a psychological pathology) is also at the origin of "non-inscription." A permanent transit between issues and events, that does not allow any of them to penetrate the memory or the conscience of a people, causes this evasion from reality. Modern societies are particularly exposed to this flaw. The abundance of information, (for example several 24 hour news channels, even in small countries; the internet; etc.) might produce this paradoxical effect. In principle, as information and knowledge become more available to all, due to its excess and to the very short period of time particular information stays alive in the public sphere, society gradually becomes insensitive to what is really happening. This insensitivity is "non-inscription," a permanent mental transit to no-where,[14] in which the social attention never rests on anything, produces (almost inevitably) the illusion of authentically facing and engaging reality, though on the contrary, this lack of concentration means only a superficial interaction. This is, at its core, "non-inscription": nothing – no issue nor event – penetrates the mind and memory of a society. All things are too transitory to be inquired about or registered in depth. The society itself loses the capacity of reflecting about itself, because it also becomes much too transitory. In different terms, one can say (with José Gil) that "non-inscription" appears where not enough space is given to analy-

---

[13] Some data on this issue (from 2012): in the 28 EU countries, on average, a women had 1,58 children (in Portugal 1.28 – lowest number of the 28); a women has the first child at 30.1 years (cf. www.pordata.pt).

[14] Cf. J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 47.

ses and where the synthesis is precipitated, that is, where the synthesis is almost assumed as the first and only step in the path of knowledge.[15]

The Effects of "Non-Inscription"?

Having identified some of the causes of non-inscription, I want to point out some of its effects. On this subject, there is a certain circular relation between causes and effects. To be more explicit, that means that fear, lethargy or permanent mental transit can also be seen as effects of "non-inscription"; or at least they are somehow present in the effects.

As effects on the non-inscription phenomenon, we can consider:

Lack of Social Sense

Where "non-inscription" is present, it becomes much more difficult to find a common sense of social life. The space for greater common projects becomes gradually smaller so that societies become increasingly less able to undertake coherent and mobilizing projects as Ancient Greeks like Aristotle would put it, a final cause is necessary also at a social and cultural level. Where this is lacking, social dynamics risk becomes chaotic, with individuals going different ways. This lack of common sense is inevitable because not assuming or inscribing reality is to refuse to produce reality or transform reality or refuse to take it in our own hands. This dismissal can only produce a lack of the sense of reality for no sense can arise when one evades reality. What is lacking is the clear perception of the goal we want to achieve which gives meaning to our efforts and brings people together. Instead, "non-inscription" leaves space only for small and particular goals and, consequently, for a diminished notion of social common sense. José Gil describes it as an "imprisonment of sense" and he explains: when "sense does not go beyond the small circle of existence" then "the sense we extract from experience is also small."[16] This situation applies the old (and well known) saying of the ancient Latin philoso-

---

[15] Cf. J. Gil, *Portugal, hoje*, 50.

[16] J. Gil, *Portugal, hoje*, 47.

pher Seneca: "*If one does not know to which port one is sailing, no wind is favorable.*"[17] It might be added that each sailor goes his own particular way. To José Gil, this seems true, not only at a personal level, but also at a social or cultural level.

Illusion of Freedom

Non-inscription gives the appearance of being free when perhaps that is not quite so. One of its effects can be an illusion of freedom. By evading and avoiding reality, a society that has walked this path finishes living in a simulation of reality. It might have the impression of being free, inside the fictional world it has created, but it is not. Actually, this escape from reality is a way of dealing with the challenges and demands of being free, not by affirming it nor by denying it (both postures, even if opposite ones, are forms of assuming or inscribing freedom), but by overlooking it. By providing a psychologically comfortable place in that fictional world, "non-inscription" can produce a false notion and a false experience of freedom. José Gil describes it this way (and I quote): "To circulate among small things, to invest in them and then disinvest, to connect and then disconnect gives the illusion of movement, of freedom, of a diverse and rich desire. It gives the illusion of continuous movement that brings an inscription of all present single events in a unified time but this movement is really illusory."[18]

Corrosion of Communication

Mexican poet Octavio Paz once said that a civilization begins its decline when it ruins its own grammar, its own language. And language also suffers with "non-inscription," because "language is an essential condition of inscription."[19] To speak is already to inscribe and not to speak is a way of denying existence. Also at a social level, language allows for a certain subject to exist in the public sphere. That

---

[17] Seneca, *Letters*, LXXI, 3: "*quia non habent quo derigantur; ignoranti quem portum petat nullus suus ventus est.*"

[18] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 46.

[19] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 49.

is why, a society that avoids reality by non-allowing it to affect its own conscience and memory normally is exposed to a corrosion of its capacity to communicate. Their citizens, normally, "do not know how to speak to each other: how to dialogue, discuss or talk,"[20] which has immediate impact on the possibility of restructuring values and morality. Being able to speak about reality is the first and necessary step of assuming and transforming what happens into meaningful social experiences and events.

This corrosion can be perceived from the Portuguese perspective and perhaps are not entirely transposable to other social and cultural environments. We constantly change the subjects of our conversation, not letting them play an effective role in social life. This inability to listen to others deeply disturbs public discussion, making it harder for a society or group of societies to find a "common tone." That is a shared level of communication that makes possible true public debate. Where this "common tone" of discussion is lacking due to a corrosion of the capacity to communicate), can we really reach any social, cultural or intercultural value consensus, and assume the common task of reconstructing our scale of values?

Decay of Social Attention

Distraction is one last possible consequence of the "non-inscription" phenomenon. A certain social and cultural alienation is among its foreseeable effects. This can be seen as a natural consequence of the social lethargy just noted. It is also a consequence of the corrupted ability to communicate, because when there is lack a tool so decisive in interpreting reality as language, then the ability to see and understand what is happening is seriously diminished. In this sense, "inattention" (the opposite of attention), lack of concentration, social negligence, cultural dispersion are all effects of "non-inscription."

---

[20] J. GIL, *Portugal, hoje*, 49.

Non-Inscription and Reconstruction of Values and Morality

Thus, I have described the so-called non-inscription phenomenon. It is now the time to ask in what way such reflection helps us think about a "reconstruction of values and morality for global times."

I will start with two brief considerations:

1. Although this notion was developed within the Portuguese reality and in order critically to interpret it, non-inscription, as a social dynamic, can be perceived in other societies and/or in other periods of time (past, present but also future). In this sense, such analysis has not only a hermeneutic value (as it interprets the present status of a particular social reality), but also a prospective interest allowing one to foresee eventual future dynamics. This means that where some of the mentioned causes are perceivable, then it is possible that something like "non-inscription" might develop in the future as a possibility but not an inevitability.

2. Furthermore, there is no one version of this phenomenon. On the contrary, I think it is not hard to observe the same social pattern with different historical, social and cultural causes and with different consequences. Those different versions of "non-inscription" have in common the alienation from reality by refusing to inscribe or register what occurs in memory and conscience and a consequent social and cultural lethargy. The causes and the effects of that can change according to specificities of different cultures and societies.

Finally, what does all this mean to the Reconstruction of Values and Morality?

Putting it in negative terms, I would say that where there is non-inscription no effective reconstruction of values and morality is truly possible. It is in this sense that I speak about "non-inscription" as a "modern way of avoiding a reconstruction of values."

At first, this would seem a good social mechanism to block social confrontation, especially when this can assume a violent form. Social appeasement would be reached not by a positive adherence to a mobilizing social project, but by the dismissal of assuming any social pro-

ject at all; it would be reached not by assuming reality, but by evading it; not by facing social and cultural challenges, but by unconsciously avoiding them. In non-inscription, one positive aspect seems to be the absence of conflict; the negative one, is the alienation that lies at its base. Each particular society should think and consider if this is a price worth paying for this social appeasement.

On the other hand, value consensus seems also impossible, because consensus demands a positive commitment and a constructive attitude towards reality and the rest of the society (or towards other societies and cultures). In this sense, consensus seems too much for a resistant society to inscribe reality in its mind and memory. Therefore, non-inscription seems unable to fulfill what a true moral consensus requires, making it (in practical terms) impossible to reach, because the absence of social disagreement is not equivalent to the presence of social consensus.

Putting this in more positive terms, I would say that this analysis of the non-inscription phenomenon helps understand how important it is for a society (or for a group of different societies) to find a common purpose and to develop the social conditions that allow and promote its pursuit. Without these two, it seems hard to reach any substantive social consensus around morality whereas finding a common purpose is already to reach a form of consensus. That is an effective way to deal with the inevitable conflicts within a society or between different societies, since it is a form of assuming conflict (a form of inscribing it) and, at the same time, of directing its energies in a constructive sense. There is a sort of social fragmentation in "non-inscription," because its deceptive view of reality tends to isolate social groups and individuals in their own perspectives. The opposite movement (that of inscripion), on the contrary, seems to have the power of really bringing people together (and not just seeming to do so), even if they come together around very different views about reality (which, with Paul Ricoeur, could be called a conflict of interpretations).[21] Inscription, that is, registering in the social mind and memory what happens and transforming it into meaningful common experiences, seems a way to

---

[21] P. Ricoeur, *Le conflict des interpretations. Essais d'herméneutique* (Èd. du Seuil, Paris: 1969).

build true and solid social, cultural and intercultural consensus. True value and moral consensus does not come from the evasion of reality, but by its social inscription.

In order for this to be possible, it also seems of vital importance to create and promote the conditions for a lively society. If there can be no true value reconstruction without inscription, there also can be no true reconstruction in a numbed society. Social lethargy is the psycho-social basis for non-inscription, whereas only its opposite, that is, only a dynamic and an awaken society can act in such a way that the reconstruction of values and morality truly be attained.

Portuguese Catholic University, Lisbon, Portugal

7.
Mutual Recognition and Modern State Governance

TANG HUILING

The Origin of "Recognition"

Recognition means equal recognition between individuals, individual and community, community and community. It emphasizes self-recognition and self-affirmation of all kinds of individuals and communities on the basis of equal treatment. [1](P3)

Beginning from modern times recognition as a concept was popularized and accepted. In ancient Greece, individual and society were an integrated unity, in which the individual could not realize his own worth outside the social community; in the Christian natural law of the middle ages, the individual was basically regarded as existing to form a community, and people should be attached to the community in order to realize their inner nature. The ethical order was constructed on this basis. That is to say, the individual subject did not take shape until the middle ages. Since the Renaissance and the Enlightment, the individual's pursuit of self-worth, self-meaning and freedom have become the main theme of modern culture.

It was Hegel, the German Classical philosopher, who began the normative research on "recognition." Hegel pointed out that the relationship between the owner and the slave was not true recognition. The owner had independent consciousness and its essence was an existence acting-on-itself, which was accepted by some and rejected by others; while the slave had a dependent consciousness and its essence was living for others or existing for other. In fact, the owner was accepted by an existence he himself did not recognize, and mutual recognition was the way to satisfy desire. The "mutual recognition" was a reciprocal dialectical relationship between "self" and "others," in which "self" can only become "self" by being recognized by others. It cannot be formed in its own abstract self-relations: without exceeding the "self," it cannot generate the meaning of "self" and recognize

the "self"; only by the other person, can anybody become his "self." In other words, true recognition should treat the slave as he treated himself; the slave should treat himself as he treated the owner. True recognition should be equal recognition of each other.

Charles Taylor expounded on "recognitory politics." Faced with multicultural times, Taylor put forward a new theoretical frame for "recognitory politics" on the basis of the relationship between identification and recognition by using Hegel's theory of the "fight for the recognition." Taylor, first of all, investigated the origin of mutual recognition, and on such a basis proposed two models of mutual recognition: politics of equal dignity and politics of difference, and then after comparative analysis, pointed out that the required mutual recognition in present times requires tolerance on the basis of a "politics of difference," in which the uniqueness of both individual and group are accepted. His basic thinking was that identification and recognition are different: "identification" was a person's understanding of who he is and his human essence, while the key issue of "recognition" lies in the fact that a person's self-identification was, to a large extent, constituted by others' recognition. Namely, a person's identification took shape in dialogical relationship with others. Therefore, whether or not a person can get others' recognition in relationships would be very influential due to the influence of recognition upon identification. Whether or not a person can get others' recognition can affect his practical self-identification, and thus the individual needed the recognition of the society. Due to the importance of this, both rejected and twisted recognition can cause the group who did not get recognition or got, rather, a twisted recognition, to fight for their true recognition.

In the 20th century, the most important response to Hegel's recognition theory was Habermas' identification theory, in which the core is communication and dialogue. On the basis of Hegel's theory, Habermas published a series of important works, reinterpreted Hegel's recognition theory, and had a broad impact on Western academics. In his view the construction of modern self-identity must be implemented in a conversation with other persons, which depends on the others' recognition. Habermas made a big step forward regarding

Hegel, and formed modern identity research that provided a new way to solve the identity crisis of modern society.

In short, since "mutual recognition" theory was put forward, there are continuing responses and further studies both theoretical and practical which are more meaningful in modern society. Therefore, legitimate mutual recognition is not only a psychological need of people but also becomes a political requirement. Thereupon, "recognitory politics" established on mutual recognition is a pressing need for modern state governance.

Mutual Recognition: The Important Paradigm of Modern State Governance

In fact, no matter whether in pre-modern society or in modern society, there has always been a call for recognition. However, the two societies differ. Pre-modern society emphasizes the individual's recognition by the political community; it overturned the old political power to establish the new one by a series of social mobilizations and ideological education, even by force; gradually it sought for people's recognition on the validity of its political rule; while in modern society, with the development of democracy, people are not only aware of their own recognition by the political community but feel that they should also get the recognition and respect from the community. On such a basis, the recognition between individuals and community become the important paradigm of modern state governance.

The establishment of this paradigm has meaning for modern state governance. First of all, it contributes to dispelling the subject-object dualistic thinking pattern. Since the Enlightenment, people continue to advocate the subject and they believe that the subjective rational ability can not only liberate people from the domination of nature, but also help them control the natural and social life. Under the influence of this idea the relationship between the subject and the world is monopolistic. With the development of democracy the limitations of such subject-object dualistic thought patterns become increasingly prominent and has gradually been criticized and rejected. Because people of modern states object to all oppressive power, the paradigm of social activities can only be built up on the mutual recognition

rather on the isolated subjectivity, from which derive the subject-object dualistic relationship of ruling and being ruled. [2]181

Next, the establishment of this paradigm makes for social unity and stability. The process of mutual recognition is the one in which individuals recognize, respect and tolerate each other as individuals and community. Now that modern state is in the pluralistic society, it should reinforce the alliance of the dialogue and communication, so as to enhance people's rally, and create "more tolerant community." [3](P141)If the social members are all independent and incompatible, the whole community will become a mess and it will be very difficult for governance. The establishment of the paradigm of mutual recognition is not only the trend of the times but also can reduce and stop all forms of violence and destruction and promote a non-violent social public life. It also questions the purely individualistic values. In addition it has provided a reasonable explanation for the democratic values of modern society.

Finally, the establishment of the paradigm is conducive to checking growing government power. The paradigm of mutual recognition especially lays emphasis on recognizing and respecting individuals and strives to construct an integrated structure, in which people can discuss public affairs freely and critically. As for government, under the constraint of the paradigm, it cannot do anything recklessly and it should fully respect the will and the rights of people, establishing a benign interaction with its members, which is conducive to constraining the modern states from cross the border in its governance.

Modern State Governance under Mutual Recognition

Modern state governance should first of all strive to construct a community of recognition according to the guidelines of the paradigm of mutual recognition. Compared with pre-modern times, modern society has made great progress in material life, political aspirations, relationships and values. The moral community in the traditional sense can no longer meet the needs of the community, but the recognition community which can accommodate differences and recognize and respect minorities can adapt to the diversity of modern society.

After the World War II, there emerged conflicts between the groups with different identifications, including national, aboriginal, racial, religious, gender, and homosexual groups. When these groups resort to the public authority for their rights, they begin to put national laws and policies under continual pressure. In the worst scenario, this could become a political disaster and pose a threat to the political system. To avoid the related fights and conflicts, the modern state should strive to construct a community of recognition, in which civil rights and obligations are guaranteed their realization, and non-mainstream groups are protected from being marginalized or rejected but are assimilated in the common politics, culture and contract.

Secondly, modern state governance should strike up modern political identification on the basis of recognition. Political recognition of identity is significant for the stability and development of a society. The logical starting point of political identity is the extent to which the political community can meet individual. The satisfaction of the individual in society comes not only from the physical aspect, but also from mental or psychological aspects, in which the most important point is whether an individual was recognized by the community. In other words, the degree of satisfying "the desire of being recognized" of the social members directly influences the construction of the political identification of the modern society. Meanwhile, the establishment of political identity depends on the nature of the dialogical relationship between persons. So modern state governance should be established on this dialogical relationship. If a society cannot offer recognition to different groups and individuals, oppression is unavoidable.

Objectively speaking, China is currently still in a transition phase from pre-modern to modern society, with recognition, sound rational systems and inclusive dialogue still on the way. Only when the citizens get the right to express themselves freely and equally and their livelihood is improved, can a reliable modern political identity be established.

Thirdly, modern state governance should be established in modern democracy on the basis of recognition. Democracy is the cornerstone of modern society, but real democracy is inseparable from political recognition. There are deep demands for being recognized in

everyone's heart, which is inherent to human existence. Equal recognition is inevitable for every democratic society. (Where there is recognition, there is true democracy; where there is not recognition, dictatorship is inevitable.) Modern democracy on the basis of recognition means a much more far-ranging and equal democracy. It requires equal treatment for every citizen, respect for their rights and recognition of their legal status. It can be said that without recognition democracy is out of the question, and even becomes a dead letter. In the modern state, a social community might include a variable number of different communities. If the community can give them full recognition, this can not only put an end to the monopolistic existence, avoid the struggles and conflicts, but also promote harmony, progress and the development of the entire community.

Meanwhile, recognition is not just a majority agreement by a democratic process, but the one of legal status of opponents, and this latter is far more significant because the degree of civilization in a democratic society depends largely on the attitude and approaches with which a society treats its opponents. By providing an effective channel for legitimate opposition, political conflict, caused due to poor expression, can be avoided. This makes the relationship between the ruling party and the opposition no longer one of incompatibility and hostility and promotes the development of a genuine political civilization.

References

Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth, *Redistribution or Admit – A Political Philosophy Dialogue*, Shanghai: People's Publishing House of Shanghai, 2009.

Axel Honneth, *Struggle for Recognition*, Shanghai: People's Publishing House of Shanghai, 2005.

Richard Rorty, *Truth andPprogress*, Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 2003.

A Modern Approach to Morality and Values in Times of Global Change

IGOR I. KONDRASHIN

Most philosophical analyses and studies of human development show that the situation on the Earth, both in the East and in the West, is gradually deteriorating with every passing year, both – socially and environmentally, especially now, in the 21st century, it is becoming even more dangerous. In fact humanity, as mostly ignorant and partitioned, is on the edge of "nuclear winter," or self-destruction, which can end life on earth forever at any moment.

Since long ago huge efforts undertaken by organizations and individuals, engaged in "sustainable development" problems, are still ineffective. The unsatisfactory results of such activity testify that the direction taken by those efforts are not correct.

Despite the activism of numerous organizations, declaring serious concern over the adverse course of events on our planet and trying to carry out actions aimed at ensuring a stable existence for mankind everywhere, there is chaos threatening at any moment to escalate into a global catastrophe.

It is obvious now that the last century was a new, peculiar stage of human civilization's evolution. At the same time it is almost universally accepted that at this stage of the planet's civil development, a number of new threats to its continued existence have appeared. Among them the following ones could be considered as the most serious:

1. Anthropogene poisoning of the environment – the atmosphere, water, deforestation and pollution (including chemical and radiational) of the planet's surface increasing with growth of population and volume of production and consumption.

2. Resource depletion (combustibles and other resources).

3. Aggravation of military conflicts (the 20th century saw two World wars). Conflicts are caused by territorial disputes, religious, ideological, ethnic or social differences, ambitions of national or ideological leaders. In the future, military conflicts may be further exacerbated fueled by the shortage of natural resources, territory and environmental problems.

4. Development and accumulation of weapons of mass destructtion (WMD) that are capable of killing billions of people and may lead to the extinction of the human race.

5. Continued research work aimed at further development of nuclear (and, obviously, chemical and biological) weapons and creation of new WMDs based on nanotechnology, biotechnology, robotechnics and other areas of scientific breakthroughs. Development of weapon delivery systems and militarization of space is also going on.

6. Repeated cases and further threats of global economic crises, unprecedented in scale that would reduce human civilization to chaos with unpredictable consequences.

At the same time, it becomes clear that natural disasters are also a big danger for humanity:

Space – the fall of large asteroids, outbreaks of harmful radiation – the sun and distant stars, geophysics, planetary phenomena – volcanic eruptions, climate changes and fluctuations in the level of the oceans, earthquakes, tsunamis, etc.

Based on results of numerous research on problematic events, experts often name the middle of the 21st century as potential date of such global cataclysms. Television and filmmakers compete with one another showing apocalyptic scenarios for the human race. Most of the above mentioned threats have appeared (or become exacerbated) during the last 100 years, i.e. during the period, which is fundamentally different from all previous phases of development of our civilization. Technological breakthroughs have led to the appearance of global means of communication, new types of weapons and means of influencing public mind-set and attitudes. Wars have become much more destructive and claim large death tolls. The two world wars of the 20th century claimed 26 million and 55 million human lives

respectively. Most of the planet's areas suitable for life have been developed and populated; human activities are causing significant changes to the environment. Over the last 100 years the world population has grown from 1.5 billion to 7.1 billion. Displacement (destruction) of many species of living creatures and plants continues. Natural studies have brought us closer to the understanding of the place of human civilization in the Universe and in its many-billion long years of development. These dramatic changes in the life of human civilization appear to have little effect on the main traits of our consciousness, style and manner of group and individual behavior as well as the instincts that have formed over the long period of evolution – often dangerous at the present stage of development.

As things stand today, society is almost unable to cope with the numerous emerging contradictions, and the main question to ask is whether we will manage to overcome the growing threats and continue to move along our forward path. It is obvious that without a fundamental change in the way of life, in approaches to conflict resolution and in the planet's resources management humankind will be very likely to become degraded or even extinct.

Apart from such 'traditional' sciences as history, political science, global studies, etc., a new science has appeared to deal with a forward-looking lens into the future of human civilization. It is 'synergetics' – the science of describing complex systems and the laws governing their existence. According to synergetics, the epoch of evolutionary, upward development, may be followed by a phase of instability, bifurcation, i.e. a state where the system becomes unable to continue living by its former laws and slides into a state of chaos with unknown consequences.

Meanwhile, our understanding of the values and vices, embodying the action-interested attitude of man to the world, first, allows one to justify standard moral requirements. Second, they serve as the normative form of moral orientation of man in the world, translating and implementing it in the form of specific and often "ready" regulators. Third, in our ideas about values at the same time there is an assessment of the phenomena of reality and human actions in terms of their moral significance.

Wisdom and morals, reason and justice should be returned to humanity in a new modern quality; they should become the Spiritual Foundations for both – East & West, for humanity as a whole! Let us hope that after short time there would not be any more separated East and West thinking on the Earth, but a united unified Global citizenship with a single modern Global mentality, morals, values and responsibilities.

We would not say that humanity did not realize all those dangers. There is plenty of organizations and activism aimed at peaceful and stable development. In recent decades we could see the appearance of a number of organizations engaged in the analysis of our life and seeking solutions that could ensure a stable, long-term existence for the Humankind. Regular summits of the world's mightiest countries (originally, G7, later – G8 and G20) focus on the crucial and most challenging issues of the global level management. For more than 50 years government and business representatives regularly come together at the World Economic Forum in Davos. There are several more regularly held Economic Forums at the regional level, and also many religious forums. Considerable attention at such meetings is given to problems of interrelations between communities and the preservation of peace both regionally and on the planetary level.

The biggest and most authoritative organization dealing with global management is the United National Organization which was established in 1945. Most meaningful events staged under the UN auspices in the recent several decades have been three world forums – the Sustainable Development Forum in Rio-de-Janeiro in 1992, "Rio+10" forum held in Johannesburg in 2002 and "Rio +20 " – in 2012 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. All these forums were attended by the leaders of over 100 countries and many thousands of participants. The spirit of these conferences is best expressed in the words of the former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan: "…responsibility for our planet, whose bounty is the very basis for human well-being and progress. And most of all, responsibility for the future – for our children, and their children."

The Rio-de-Janeiro conference of 1992 was followed by the adoption of the document called "The 21st Century Agenda," which outlined measures to counteract the dangers noted above. Similar

proposals are present in the Millennium Declaration which was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2000. "We have approached a decisive turning point in history…New and various threats have taken shape. We have to take another look at the mechanism of international relations: whether or not it is up to these new challenges? And what changes should be introduced if it is not?" – former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan said. The Russian Academician Nikita Moiseyev made the following assessment of those conferences. "[The forums in Rio] has failed to rise to a sufficiently high level. We ought to reach the level of society where people think and act together." The Rio forums inspired many countries only into the adoption of their own programs of combating the dangers facing humanity, but it seems that after some time since then even those slight efforts and plans have mostly faded away.

Thus, plenty of manifestos, appeals, declarations, events, etc. have been adopted until now, but fears about the future of humanity are only increasing and becoming more realistic and huge. The present-day situation in the world community shows no signs of positive development toward resolving the problems described above, and there are no serious and purposeful efforts currently underway to counteract these problems.

Let us look now at the obvious measures that need to be taken to raise our efficacy to preserve human civilization. These are contained in various forms in numerous appeals and declarations.

1. Consciousness: Transformation of the consciousness and mindset of the people, changing the historically formed behavioral patterns that are no longer acceptable in the modern world. Large scale (embracing vast majority of the population) activities of upbringing, propaganda and education (including civic education) directed at cultivating decent culture of behavior, tolerance, peacefulness and equality, to eliminate aggression and ignorance, national and religious hatred and to limit the excessive consumption.

2. Disarmament: Gradual disarmament and disbandment of national armies. Only international security forces should be preserved. Termination of development and production of conventional wea-

pons and weapons of mass destruction. International control of scientific research.

3. Technology: Development of humanitarian technologies ensuring transformation of mind-set and behavioral patterns in line with the consciousness project as well as technologies that would help enhance quality of life and environmental protection. Establish an industrial base in outer space.

4. Economy: Development of the economies through the introduction of innovative technologies, training of personnel, financial aid and fostering regimes based on social justice and stability. Elimination (dramatic reduction, for starters) of the gap in the quality of life.

5. Geopolitics: Association (Federation) of the planet's states globally, elimination of borders and armies. In the long term creation (through a unified system of education of citizens of the Earth) as a single global community, or – political and social globalization.

It is easy to see that there is no or practically very little work actually being performed in the modern world along these directions despite the numerous programs and declarations calling for radical measures for the preservation of the human civilization put forth by various organizations and forums and works of leading experts in the field. The actions taken in the right direction by a few teams and individuals are by far insufficient for achieving problems solution on any large scale.

Analyses of this impasse juncture provides the following possible causes of these failures:

1. Incompetence and ignorance of the authorities, lack of specific knowledge, neglect of expert opinions. Unwillingness (or inability) to take an active path toward resolving the problems facing humanity on the global level.

2. Failure to understand and acknowledge the high probability of the dangers facing humanity. Hopes that these threats will take a long time to develop.

3. Wrong priorities in the allocation of funds and efforts. It is necessary to allocate less to the seemingly important transitory tasks in favor of the solution programs of global problems (analysis indicates that there are sources for funding efforts directed at resolving the globally important problems).

4. Big gaps between a relatively small part of humanity of extremely rich and prosperous individuals with excessive consumption, and the great bulk of mankind lagging behind – the poor, prematurely dying from starvation, lack of medical care, education and other necessities for life.

5. Inadequacy of the upbringing and mentality of the vast majority of the world population to the needs of durable and conflict-free existence.

6. Lack of coordinated efforts and consolidated plans for the activities of numerous organizations and individuals. Lack of proper activism and resources.

If no changes for the better, from the present situation, are achieved in the near future, the following scenarios will be the most likely:

1. Limited catastrophes – small wars or military conflicts involving the use of WMD producing a strong psychological shock that would hold mankind back from massive confrontation for some time but with a danger of developing into a world catastrophe.

2. A global war or catastrophe caused by natural or antropogenic factors reducing human population to a few separated groups of people struggling to survive and restore our population (civilization). The greater chance is that such a catastrophe would end with a self-destruction of the whole of Humanity and of Life on this earth.

According to expert estimates, the probability of a global cataclysm in this century is as high as 30-65%, therefore, there is no time to lose to start working on counter-measures. In view of the above, it is necessary to prepare and discuss specific programs aimed at resolving the main problem of our time – the problem of the presservation of human civilization. Moreover, not only discuss endlessly, but to act

so as to involve more and more people showing real practical global activism.

It is well known that East and West for ages have always been as two separate parts of the human world of the Earth's habitants – Humanity. This division can be traced since ancient times – long ago B.C. Thus, going back into the great history of humanity we can find out that about 3 thousand years ago in the Western part of the planet two great cultural traditions were cultivated in Ancient Greece.

At the same time as Ancient Greece, on the Eastern side of the world we have Confucius (551-479 BC.), who according to Chinese tradition was a thinker, political figure, educator, and founder of the *Ru* School of Chinese thought. His teachings, preserved in the *Lunyu* or *Analects*, form the foundation of much of subsequent Chinese speculation on the education and comportment of the ideal man, how such an individual should live his life and interact with others, and the forms of society and government in which he should participate. Fung Yu-lan, one of the great 20th century authorities on the history of Chinese thought, compares Confucius' influence in Chinese history with that of Socrates in the West.

A hallmark of Confucius' thought is his emphasis on education and study. He disparages those who have faith in natural understanding or intuition and argues that the only real understanding of a subject comes from long and careful study. For Confucius study, means finding a good teacher and imitating his words and deeds. A good teacher is someone older who is familiar with the ways of the past and the practices of the ancients. (See *Lunyu* 7.22) While he sometimes warns against excessive reflection and meditation, Confucius' position appears to be a middle course between studying and reflecting on what one has learned. "He who learns but does not think is lost. He who thinks but does not learn is in great danger." (*Lunyu* 2.15) Confucius, himself, is credited by the tradition with having taught altogether three thousand students, though only seventy are said to have truly mastered the arts he cherished. Confucius was willing to teach anyone, whatever their social standing, as long as they were eager and tireless. He taught his students morality, proper speech, government, and the refined arts. Confucius' pedagogical methods are striking. He never discourses at length on a subject.

Instead he poses questions, cites passages from the classics, or uses apt analogies, and waits for his students to arrive at the right answers.

Confucius' goal is to create gentlemen who carry themselves with grace, speak correctly, and demonstrate integrity in all things. His strong dislike of the sycophantic "petty men," whose clever talk and pretentious manner win them an audience, is reflected in numerous *Lunyu* passages. Confucius finds himself in an age in which values are out of joint. Actions and behavior no longer correspond to the labels originally attached to them. "Rulers do not rule and subjects do not serve," he observes. (*Lunyu* 12.11; cf. also 13.3) This means that words and titles no longer mean what they once did. Moral education is important to Confucius because it is the means by which one can rectify this situation and restore meaning to language and values to society. He believes that the most important lessons for obtaining such a moral education are to be found in the canonical *Book of Songs*, because many of its poems are both beautiful and good. Thus, Confucius places the text first in his curriculum and frequently quotes and explains its lines of verse. For this reason, the *Lunyu* is also an important source for Confucius' understanding of the role poetry and art more generally play in the moral education of gentlemen as well as in the reformation of society. Recent archaeological discoveries in China of previously lost ancient manuscripts reveal other aspects of Confucius's reverence for the *Book of Songs* and its importance in moral education. These manuscripts show that Confucius had found in the canonical text valuable lessons on how to cultivate moral qualities in oneself as well as how to comport oneself humanely and responsibly in public.

The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle connected the term dialectic with the meaning development. The development of potentiality to actuality is one of the most important aspects of Aristotle's dialectical philosophy. It was intended to solve the difficulties which earlier thinkers had raised with reference to the beginnings of existence and the relations of the one and many. The actual vs. potential state of things is explained in terms of the causes which act on things.

Another innovation of Aristotle was combining the dialectic with morality in his Ethics. He believed, that happiness cannot be found in any abstract or ideal notion, but it must be something practical and

human. It must then be found in the work and life which is unique to humans. This is neither the vegetative life we share with plants nor the sensitive existence which we share with animals. It follows therefore that true happiness lies in the active life of a rational being or in a perfect realization and working out of the true soul and self, continued throughout a lifetime.

Justice, as one of the main aspects of morality, is used both in a general and in a special sense. In its general sense it is equivalent to the observance of law. As such it is the same thing as virtue, differing only insofar as virtue exercises the disposition simply in the abstract, and justice applies it in dealings with people. Particular justice displays itself in two forms. First, distributive justice hands out honors and rewards according to the merits of the recipients. Second, corrective justice takes no account of the position of the parties concerned, but simply secures equality between the two by taking away from the advantage of the one and adding it to the other who is disadvantaged.

Strictly speaking, distributive and corrective justice are more than mere retaliation and reciprocity. However, in concrete situations of civil life, retaliation and reciprocity is an adequate formula since such circumstances involve money, depending on a relation between producer and consumer. Since absolute justice is abstract in nature, in the real world it must be supplemented with equity, which corrects and modifies the laws of justice where it falls short. Thus, morality requires a standard which will not only regulate the inadequacies of absolute justice but be also an idea of moral progress.

This idea of morality is given by the faculty of moral insight. The truly good person is at the same time a person of perfect insight, and a person of perfect insight is also perfectly good. Our idea of the ultimate end of moral action is developed through habitual experience, and this gradually frames itself on the basis of particular perceptions. It is the job of reason to apprehend and organize these particular perceptions. However, moral action is never the result of a mere act of understanding, nor is it the result of a simple desire which views objects merely as things which produce pain or pleasure. We start with a rational conception of what is advantageous, but this conception is in itself powerless without the natural impulse which will give it strength. The will or purpose implied by morality is thus either reason

stimulated to act by desire, or desire guided and controlled by under-standing.

These factors then motivate willful action. Freedom of the will is a factor with both virtuous choices and vicious choices. Actions are involuntary only when another person forces our action, or if we are ignorant of important details in actions. Actions are voluntary when the originating cause of action (either virtuous or vicious) lies in ourselves.

Moral weakness of the will results in someone doing what is wrong, knowing that it is not right, and yet follows his desire against reason. For Aristotle, this condition is not a myth, as Socrates sup-posed it to be. The problem is a matter of conflicting moral principles. Moral action may be represented as a syllogism in which a general principle of morality forms the first (i.e. major) premise, while the particular application is the second (i.e. minor) premise. The con-clusion, though, which is arrived at through speculation, is not always carried out in practice. The moral syllogism is not simply a matter of logic, but involves psychological drives and desires. Desires can lead to a minor premise being applied to one rather than another of two major premises existing in the agent's mind. Animals, on the other hand, cannot be called weak willed or incontinent since such a conflict of principles is not possible with them.

Friendship is an indispensable aid in framing the higher moral life; if not itself a virtue, it is at least associated with virtue, and it proves itself to be of service in almost all conditions of our existence. Such results are to be derived not from the worldly friendships of utility or pleasure, but only from those which are founded on virtue. The true friend is in fact a second self, and the true moral value of friendship lies in the fact that the friend presents to us a mirror of good actions, and so intensifies our consciousness and appreciation of life.

On the top of the meanings of the term dialectic Aristotle placed its connection with politics. Aristotle does not regard politics as a science separate from ethics, but as its completion, and almost verifi-cation. The moral ideal in political administration is only a different aspect of that which also applies to individual happiness. Humans are by nature social beings, and the possession of rational speech (logos) in itself leads us to social union. The state is a development from the

family through the village community, an offshoot of the family. Formed originally for the satisfaction of natural wants, it exists afterwards for moral ends and for the promotion of the higher life. The state in fact is no mere local union for the prevention of wrong doing, and the convenience of exchange. It is no mere institution for the protection of goods and property, but a genuine moral organization for advancing the development of humans!

The family, which is chronologically prior to the *state*, involves a series of relations between husband and wife, parent and child, master and slave. Aristotle regards the slave as a piece of live property having no existence except in relation to his master. Slavery is a natural institution because there is a ruling and a subject class among people related to each other as soul to body; however, we must distinguish between those who are slaves by nature, and those who have become slaves merely by war and conquest. Household management involves the acquisition of riches, but must be distinguished from money-making for its own sake. Wealth is everything whose value can be measured by money; but it is the use rather than the possession of commodities which constitutes riches.

Which is the best state is a question that cannot be directly answered. Different races are suited for different forms of government, and the question for the politician is not so much what is abstractly the best state, but what is the best state under existing circumstances. Generally, however, the best state will enable anyone to act in the best, and live in the happiest, manner. To serve this end the ideal state should be neither too great nor too small, but simply self-sufficient. It should occupy a favorable position towards land and sea and consist of citizens gifted with the spirit of the northern nations, and the intelligence of the Asiatic nations. It should further take particular care to exclude from government all those engaged in trade and commerce; "the best state will not make the "working man" a citizen; it should provide support religious worship; it should secure morality through the educational influences of law and early training." Law, for Aristotle, is the outward expression of the moral ideal without the bias of human feeling. It is thus no mere agreement or convention, but a moral force coextensive with all virtue. Since it is universal in its

character, it requires modification and adaptation to particular circumstances through equity.

Education should be guided by legislation to make it correspond with the results of psychological analysis, and follow the gradual development of the bodily and mental faculties. During their earliest years children should be carefully protected from all injurious associations, and be introduced to such amusements as will prepare them for the serious duties of life. Their literary education should begin in their seventh year, and continue to their twenty-first year. This period is divided into two courses of training, one from age seven to puberty, and the other from puberty to age twenty-one. Such education should not be left to private enterprise, but should be undertaken by the state.

There are four main branches of education: reading and writing, gymnastics, music, and painting. They should not be studied to achieve a specific aim, but in the liberal spirit which creates true freemen. Thus, for example, gymnastics should not be pursued by itself exclusively, or it will result in a harsh savage type of character. Painting must not be studied merely to prevent people from being cheated in pictures, but to make them attend to physical beauty. Music must not be studied merely for amusement, but for the moral influence which it exerts on the feelings. Indeed, all true education is, as Plato saw, a training of our sympathies so that we may love and hate in a right manner.

Aristotle did his best to teach the developed ideas of philosophy to young people-students at his philosophical schools. The most famous pupil, who was educated by Aristotle during five years, was 13 year old Alexander, who later became Alexander the Great.

Those were the main achievements that the dialectic gained with Aristotle's assistance. Later, under the leadership of Chrysippus, the ancient Stoics developed a well-known school of formal logic, which they called the dialectic. The term dialectic was also used by them to refer to a variety of intellectual activities, including grammatical theory. The tradition of equating dialectics and logic with a broad range of applications became the norm into the Middle Ages.

Thus, the dialectic came to be known as one of the three original liberal arts or trivium (the other members are rhetoric and grammar)

in Western culture. In ancient and medieval times rhetoric and dialectic (or logic) were both understood to aim at being persuasive (through dialogue). While the rhetoric focused on the art of speaking, the dialectic dealt with the logical skills of analysis, the examination of theses and antitheses, and the use of syllogisms.

The end of Ancient Greek born tradition as Dialectic was similar to the first Ancient tradition end – the Olympics games which were officially prohibited by the Roman emperor Theodosius I in 393 AD.

In Medieval Europe, dialectics (or logic) was an integral part of the educational Curriculum broadly defined as a Classical education. In ancient and medieval times both rhetoric and dialectic were understood to aim at being persuasive (through dialogue).

A more modern use of the dialectic was introduced by Kant's critique of traditional dogmatism in the nineteenth to mid-twentieth century. Later it was given entirely new meaning by the German idealists, particularly Hegel; then transformed again into dialectical materialism by Karl Marx.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Since Plato, and through all its metamorphoses and varied terminological uses, the dialectic had essentially been a means for handling an eternal truth that was assumed as given by the laws of logic. In the medieval period, the authority of revelation was added as a further irrefutable point of reference.

With the advent of Kant's philosophy, this would dramatically change. Since, for Kant, it was not possible for humans to reach any certain theoretical knowledge about the ultimate nature of things, much less about those issues that are not objects of the senses (God, freedom, and eternal life), the dialectic came to take on a negative connotation. In Kant's system, the ancient dialectic is called the "logic of illusion," because it is seen as intellectual play with propositions whose validity thinkers had no way of verifying.

In the "Transcendental Dialectic," an important section of his *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant makes use of so-called Antinomies, which are four sets of opposing propositions on issues such as the existence of God. Thereby, Kant intends to show that both contending propositions, the thesis as well as the antithesis, can be proved right, though they are mutually exclusive, thereby exposing the futility of a rea-

soning involving propositions that are beyond the grasp of human intellect. The thesis and antithesis thus are not followed by a synthesis that would conclude a dialectical movement. Rather, they are followed by the realization that such movement is impossible, or at least that it cannot possibly lead to valid conclusions.

In any case, the dialectic is neither fiction nor mysticism, but a science of the forms of our thinking insofar as it is not limited to the daily problems of life but attempts to arrive at an understanding of more complicated and drawnout processes. The dialectic and formal logic bear a relationship similar to that between higher and lower mathematics.

Dialectical thinking is related to vulgar thinking in the same way that a motion picture is related to a still photograph. The motion picture does not outlaw the still photograph but combines a series of them according to the laws of motion. Dialectics does not deny the syllogism, but teaches us to combine syllogisms in such a way as to bring our understanding closer to the eternally changing reality.

We call our dialectic, materialist, since its roots are neither in heaven nor in the depths of our 'free will', but in objective reality, in nature. Consciousness grew out of the unconscious, psychology out of physiology, the organic world out of the inorganic, the solar system out of nebulae. On all the rungs of this ladder of development, the qualitative changes are combined with quantitative ones and all together with space and time. Our thought, including dialectical thought, is only one of the forms of the expression of changing matter. There is place within this system for neither God, nor Devil, nor immortal soul, nor eternal norms of laws and morals. The dialectic of thinking, having grown out of the dialectic of nature, possesses consequently a thoroughly materialist character.

Darwinism, which explained the evolution of species through qualitative transformations, was the highest triumph of the *dialectic* in the whole field of organic matter. Another great triumph was the discovery of the table of atomic weights of chemical elements and further quantitative transformation of one element into another, but with different qualitative characteristics.

With these transformations (species, elements, etc.) is closely linked the question of classification, which was equally important in the natural as in the social sciences. Linnaeus' system (18th century), utilising as its starting point the immutability of species, was limited to the description and classification of plants according to their external characteristics. The infantile period of botany is analogous to the infantile period of logic, since the forms of our thought develop like everything that lives. Only decisive repudiation of the idea of fixed species, the study of the history of the evolution of plants and their anatomy, prepared the basis for really scientific classification.

The concept of dialectics was given new life by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (following Fichte), whose dialectically dynamic model of nature and of history made it, as it were, a fundamental aspect of the nature of reality (instead of regarding the contradictions into which dialectics leads as a sign of the sterility of the dialectical method, as Immanuel Kant tended to do in his *Critique of Pure Reason*). According to Hegel, "dialectic" is the method by which human history unfolds; that is to say, history progresses as a dialectical process.

In the mid-19th century, the concept of "dialectic" was appropriated by Karl Marx (see, for example, *Das Kapital*, published in 1867) and Friedrich Engels (with his book "Dialectics of nature") and retooled in a non-idealist manner, becoming a crucial notion in their philosophy of Dialectical materialism. This concept has played a prominent role on the world stage and in world history.

Marx, who in distinction from Darwin considered himself as a conscious dialectician, brought big confusion into dialectical ideas and the dialectical method. He completely ignored the Plato-Aristotle-Hegel's dialectical classification of human societies (states) based on wisdom and reason, and offered a new basis for the classification of states – the productive forces. After that the structure of the relations between states became to be considered on the grounds of ownership, which constituted the anatomy of society. This way Marxism substituted the pure scientific state classification and relationship in societies for the vulgar descriptive classification of societies and states, which even till now is still in use in some universities under the name – a materialistic dialectical classification. Where Plato-Aristotle-

Hegel's true dialectical reason based classification of human societies (states) is completely forgotten and not used.

Dialectical logic expresses the laws of motion in contemporary scientific thought. The struggle against materialist dialectics on the contrary expresses a distant past, and…a spark of hope for an afterlife. In contemporary polemics, "dialectics" may also refer to an understanding of how we can or should perceive the world (epistemology); an assertion that the nature of the world outside one's perception is interconnected, contradictory, and dynamic (ontology); or it can refer to a method of presentation of ideas and conclusions (discourse).

In a dialectic process describing the interaction and resolution between multiple paradigms or ideologies, one putative solution establishes primacy over the others. The goal of a dialectic process is to merge point and counterpoint (thesis and antithesis) into a compromise or other state of agreement via conflict and tension "(a synthesis) that evolves from the opposition between thesis and antithesis." (Eisenstein, "The Dramaturgy of Film Form," 23). Examples of dialectic process can be found in Plato's *Republic*.

In a dialogical process, various approaches coexist and are comparatively existential and relativistic in their interaction. Here, each ideology can hold more salience in particular circumstances. Changes can be made within these ideologies if a strategy does not have the desired effect. These two distinctions are observed in studies of personal, group and national identity. For example, studies of the "dialogical self" is a psychological concept which describes the mind's ability to imagine the different positions of participants in an internal dialogue, in close connection with external dialogue. The "dialogical self" is the central concept in the Dialogical Self Theory (DST), as created and developed by the Dutch psychologist Hubert Hermans since the 1990s.

Many philosophers have offered critiques of dialectic, and it can even be said that hostility or receptivity to dialectics is one of the things that divides twentieth-century Anglo-American philosophy from the so-called "continental" tradition, a divide that only a few contemporary philosophers have ventured to bridge.

It is generally thought that dialectics has become central to "Continental" philosophy, while it plays no part in "Anglo-American" philosophy. In other words, on the continent of Europe, dialectics has entered intellectual culture (or at least its counter-culture) as what might be called a legitimate part of thought and philosophy, whereas in America and Britain, the *dialectic* plays no discernible part in the intellectual culture, which instead tends toward positivism. A prime example of the European tradition is "*Critique of Dialectical Reason*," which is very different from the works of Popper, whose philosophy was for a time highly influential in the UK where he resided. Sartre states: "Existentialism, like Marxism, addresses itself to experience in order to discover there concrete syntheses; it can conceive of these syntheses only within a moving, dialectical totalisation which is nothing else but history or – from the strictly cultural point of view which we have adopted here – "philosophy-becoming-the world."

Karl Popper has attacked the dialectic repeatedly. In 1937 he wrote and delivered a paper entitled "What Is Dialectic?" in which he attacked the dialectical method for its willingness "to put up with contradictions." Popper concluded the essay with these words: "The whole development of dialectic should be a warning against the dangers inherent in philosophical system-building. It should remind us that philosophy should not be made a basis for any sort of scientific system and that philosophers should be much more modest in their claims. One task, which they can fulfill quite usefully, is the study of the critical methods of science" (*Ibid.*, p. 335).

In chapter 12 of volume 2 of *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (1944; 5th rev. ed., 1966) Popper unleashed a famous attack on Hegelian dialectics, in which he held Hegel's thought (unjustly, in the view of some philosophers, such as Walter Kaufmann,) as being to some degree responsible for facilitating the rise of fascism in Europe by encouraging and justifying irrationalism. In section 17 of his 1961 "addenda" to *The Open Society*, entitled "Facts, Standards, and Truth: A Further Criticism of Relativism," Popper refused to moderate his criticism of the Hegelian dialectic, arguing that it "played a major role in the downfall of the liberal movement in Germany,…by contributing to historicism and to an identification of might and right, encouraged totalitarian modes of thought…[and] undermined and eventually

lowered the traditional standards of intellectual responsibility and honesty" (*The Open Society and Its Enemies*, 5th rev. ed., vol. 2 [Princeton University Press, 1966], p. 395).

However, the most realistic approach in understanding of modern meaning of the term-homonym dialectic should be considered reasonings of the German philosopher Frederick Engels (1820-1895), in his book "Dialectics of Nature" in 1883 where he tried to discover the essence of the Fundamental Laws of *Dialectics*. In this book, Engels argues that Dialectics, or so-called objective dialectics, prevails throughout nature, and what can be called subjective dialectics, or dialectical thinking, is only the reflection of the motion through opposites which asserts itself everywhere in nature, and which by the continual conflict of the opposites and their final passage into each other, or into higher forms, determines the life of nature including man as its integral part.

Engels could not finish his book as he died in 1895. 100 years later a new book – dialectics of matter – Systemic approach to fundamentals of philosophy appeared. In this book, the ideas of dialectics have been further developed, thus proving that it is impossible to stop its positive development, or progress. This objective law of being is the main proof of the meaning and essence of the dialectics itself.

Thus, human cognition, which is based on the scientific philosophy, now has reached a point where our ideas regarding the way of material objectivity, which until now was grounded on two global categories – space and time, ceased being sufficient and requires a more expanded approach, taking into account all the latest achievements in this field of knowledge, but first of all its connection with the motion of matter along the ordinate of the third global category – quality. In order to create the full and complete picture of the formation and evolution of the material world it is necessary to observe the motion of material forming in three equivalent philosophical categories: in space – time – quality.

The joining of all stages of the evolutionary development of Matter – from the lowest forms of its existence till the most developed ones – into the three-dimensional continuum (space – time – quality) forms a kind of the new ontological model, reflecting the unified, lasting, integral picture of the World, allowing one to trace the historic

process of the development of matter from early to late, from small to big, from simple to complex. This model is the only way to explain the causal condition of the process of evolution of lower forms into higher ones as well as the objective regularity of this process giving reasonable explanations of the meaning of Life.

However, the broad use of this knowledge would be possible not only after the philosophical elite masters it for themselves, but when also a considerable part of the world society learns it. In the current conditions of an unstable world it is very important that ordinary people study main philosophical values and ideas. The more the better because only the scientific philosophy is in a position to increase according to Immanuel Kant "the thinking society" and its spreading will help the protection and evolution of human civilization.

In any case the humanity with both its parts, Western and Eastern, has now many common questions to discuss and vital problems to solve in order to survive. Until recently, this was not done properly. Maybe it was one of the reasons that on September 26, 2012 the United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon launched the Global Initiative: "Education First." This Initiative has for the first time made education a priority; its aim is to generate a renewed push to achieve the internationally-agreed education goals set for 2015 and get the world back on track to meeting its educational commitments. According to Ban Ki-moon education is about more than literacy and numeracy, it is also about citizenry.

To implement the idea, the Secretary-General turned to UNESCO to play a lead role in shaping this Initiative and taking it forward. UNESCO from its side put among the Strategic Objectives of its "Medium-Term Strategy for 2014-2021" such priorities in Education as: putting every child into school, improving the quality of civil learning, and fostering global citizenship. Meanwhile, the need of civil education and the training of world citizens were raised by WPF yet in 2010 at its 1st Dialectical Symposium and since 2011 WPF has initiated the Global learning program of lifelong civil education and action for all inhabitants: "Earth-XXI Citizenship": http://wpfunesco.org/eng/wcitiz.htm.

In the frames of this project there were established and began to work:

1) The WPF Socratic Philosophical School: http://wpf-unesco. org/eng/socr-sch/socr-sch.htm for educating and certification of individuals as Earth-XXI Citizens for global citizenship.

2) The WPF (Tuition-Free Online) University: http://wpf-unesco. org/eng/univ/indexu.htm for worldwide lifelong distant civil education for all.

3) The WPF Aristotelian Philosophical Academy: http://wpf-unes co.org/eng/aris-ac.htm for educating & certification of Earth Citizens as Earth-XXI Aristocrats for global leadership.

The principal goal of this entire self-supporting program is to transform a mostly fragmented and uneducated Earth population into a united, well educated, enlightened and integrated, wise and self-governed Earth-XXI global Civilization, whose growth rate can be easily traced at any time by everyone – (http://wpf-unesco.org/id.htm)

At the same time, it is obvious that the program's goal can be considered to have been reached only when the East, the West and the rising Islamic thinking combine in a single modern Global mentality based on ideas of transuniversalism (the appropriate combination of neohumanism & transhumanism).

Only then will the "Global Development Goals of Humanity in the 21st century," proclaimed by the UN, help to find a way out of the evolutionary impasse in which humanity now finds itself.

World Philosophical Forum, Moscow, Russia

9.

Metaphysical Reflection in the Age of Commercial Knowledge Production for Markets

EDWARD WAMALA

Introduction

This paper reflects on the possibility of metaphysics in a socio-cultural milieu dominated by markets. When metaphysical reflection first emerged, it was engaged in by lone thinkers who, cast in a bewildering universe they barely understood, wondered what that universe was. The different cosmological answers they gave were the many different ways they conceptualized that universe. Bertrand Russell in His *History of Western Philosophy* writing about these early philosophers, the Milesians, has perceptively noted that they were important not so much for what they achieved but for what they attempted to do. The questions they asked were good questions and their rigor inspired subsequent investigations.

Since ancient times, humans have reflected on matters that bewildered them, and has within the boundaries of their abilities, offered explanations that calmed anxieties. What is noteworthy about that endeavor is that it was engaged in precisely when man felt lost, confused or bewildered, or when extant explanations were deemed inadequate.

Philosophical speculation satisfied intellectual curiosity, anxiety and fears; whether in the field of cosmology, ontology, or ethics, individual philosophers formed the basis of traditional philosophical thought as subsequent generations of inquirers built on predecessors' contributions which they integrated into their own theories as they transcended to further horizons. Humans reflected on nature and the universe because they wanted to understand and to live a satisfying life.

Economic Liberalization, Markets and new forms of Knowledge Generation

The phenomenon of Economic Liberalization and the emergence of markets as the dominant feature of social life is radically changing the dynamics and dialects of intellectual inquiry in contemporary scholarship and in turn impacting on discourses in disciplines like metaphysics, ethics and philosophy generally. What is changing is not simply the dialects of inquiry; even the subject matter of that inquiry is changing.

Gibbons et al (1994) and several other scholars have in the recent past drawn attention to the emergence of a new mode of knowledge, mode 2 knowledge type, where knowledge developed, imperiled by the necessity of the market and industry is being negotiated in what has been called the triple helix of the state, university and industry. The product that comes out in this nexus is knowledge in the context of application. To this end, knowledge is knowledge if stakeholders in the state (public policy formulators), industry and lastly university declare it so. Knowledge is knowledge if it can solve immediate market or social policy or development problems! Knowledge in the liberalized market place has assumed an instrumentalist and immediate utilitarian value.

In this context the lone thinker who contemplated or reflected about a problem, advanced hypothesis or advanced theory is an endangered species. Knowledge generation is now the preserve of research teams comprising experts from the different parts of the helix. To fit in mode 2 knowledge generation, universities and policy designers are recommending sweeping measure to bring in curriculum and deploy delivery methods that will meet industry, market and social needs/demands. To that end, invariably curriculum must now have (among other things) a component of social research where researchers will have to interface with communities to find out their problems, then dissemination seminars where results of research are shared with potential users of the acquired knowledge. It is a proposed to have internships where learners try out their theoretical knowledge to solve problems in industry, markets or the social set up. Academic dons are not spared in this brave new world; they are required to show

numbers of patents they have gotten from their research and innovative creations if they are to advance their carrears in university services.

The Problem

Metaphysics with its metaphysical character i.e., being beyond the physics has, as one of its major characteristics remoteness from the ordinary phenomenon of sense or immediate awareness and application. Yet, being part of the market, it is expected to show the same responsiveness to market demands as biochemistry or engineering disciplines. The imperatives of the market demand that either the discipline responds like other disciplines do or it is finished. The demand for accountability and relevance from tax payers and other actors in the market is that all academic disciplines in universities (especially public universities) account by showing how they help solve social, economic, health, environmental or technical problems. Academic discourse is for all purposes subsumed into an instrumentalist rationality – metaphysics is not spared in this regard.

Ethics, another major branch of Philosophy has responded superbly to the demands of the market, and Ethicists are now well entrenched in the market economy, specializing as they do in applied fields like integrity training for organizations, dismantling traditional codes of conduct and building codes of ethics for organizations. They are busy developing Ethics tools usable to measure levels of ethical behavior of organizations, companies, or even states. Such instruments, like accountability maps, score cards, etc. Only a small part of a growing arsenal of tools ethicists have or are developing as a response to market demand.

Ethics has also found room as part of the growing discipline of human rights. Although initially human rights had taken on a legalistic stance, in more contemporary times, ethics has been rehabilitated as the foundational discipline of human rights. The concept of the dignity and sanctity of the human person although fundamentally rooted in Christian theology, has by Immanuel Kant in his *Metaphysic of Morals* been recast it the Ethical perspective of human rights has taken on.

It is worth noting here that the ethics which is so skillfully woven into a tool for ethics and firmly integrated into the market is founded on metaphysics. Kant rejected the ethics which was designed to meet the greatest happiness of the greatest number in other words, an ethics which was empirically grounded. His argument was that an act could bring about the greatest happiness for the greatest number when it was ethically wrong.

> Now an action done from duty must wholly exclude the influence of inclination, and with it every object of the will, so that nothing remains which can determine the will except objectively the low and subjectively pure respect for this practical low and consequently the maxim that should follow the law even to the thwarting of all my inclinations.

Kant develops his ethical positions not grounding them on empirical preferences, but according to the pure dictates of reason. It is noteworthy that the subsequent application of his ethics never goes back to reflect on the metaphysical foundations on which he buttressed it.

The Nature of Contemporary Markets: Disavowal of Reflection on Metaphysical Grounding

Disavowal of reflection as a philosophical problem was first highlighted by Edmund Husserl in his phenomenological reflections. He traced the disavowal of reflection to the positivist trend of thought which limited or confined the knowable to what is empirically verifiable. I argue in this paper that the emergence of unregulated markets as we find in sub-Saharan Africa is leading to a disavowal of reflection on metaphysics in a new sense. The operations and demands of markets makes metaphysical reflection a non-possibility.

To appreciate this point, we recall the nature and operations of markets in the ancient world. When markets first emerged in ancient

civilizations, they were not a separate sphere of activity like we have them today, they were not disembedded.

Robert Ekulund has perceptively captured the nature and operations of market in the ancient world thus:

> Historically there was a time when the economic sector of society did not present itself as an independent sphere of action described by separate legal institutions such as private enterprise and the wage system. As compared to the disembedded "economy of the nineteenth century, the embedded economy of the ancient world was indistinguishable from the political and governments system. To be sure trade and money were common place but the production and distribution of goods were not subsumed under a self–regulating system of price making markets. In the ideal version of Greek exchange, no gain was involved; goods had known prices that were fixed beforehand by custom and tradition.

Contemporary markets, drawing on Adam Smith's psychological insights concerning human nature, which he describes as inherently self-interested (and selfish), have rationalized into a natural identity of interests, what would ordinarily be reprehensible behavior. According to Adam Smith, "as we struggle in our personal pursuits we intend only our own self-interest. Unwittingly however, that behaviour which starts as self-interest translates into the public good." "By directing industry in such a manner that its products may be of greatest value, he intends only his own gain and in this he is as in so many other cases led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was not part of his intention" There is a sense in which our selfish behavior translates into a positive good and it is this behavior which contemporary markets have picked up on.

To this end, markets have extolled the "values " of ruthlessness in economic behavior and practices, cutthroat competition in all aspects of life, ruthless marketing strategies, efficiency, and speed, where the catchphrase now is zero time between action and reaction.

In market economic as they operate today, the focus is an increase on volumes of products and sales, it is on successful companies and the market share they hold. The dream wish of any worthwhile busmen manager or enterprise is to appear in the 100 leading companies or entrepreneurs on the Forbes list!

Although it may be unfair to liken unregulated markets to the Hobbesian state of nature increasingly the way markets operate especially in Africa is becoming akin to that. In a culture where the emphasis is on zero time between action and reaction (the demand of efficiency) philosophical and specifically metaphysical reflection is edged out. In a cultural ethos, where the mightier swallow the weaker, both the strong and brave on the one hand and the weak and vulnerable on the other are reduced to playing a zero sum game! The net effect is the death of philosophical reflection.

The Case of Metaphysical Reflection

Metaphysics resurges precisely when we are challenged in our thoughts, practices, values etc. If it was not for sophists' elevation of relativism to an almost respectable school of thought, Plato's theory of forms would not have seen the light of day. If it had not been for the utilitarian empirical grounding of morality in the greatest happiness for the greatest number possibly the Kantian grounding of morality in pure reason would not have emerged. David J. Rosner in his paper *Conservatism and Chaos: Martin Hedeggar and the Decline of the West*, shows that Heideggar's metaphysical reflections related to the social economic decline he experienced in Germany at his time. In his own words he says,

> Martin Heideggar was one of the most important thinkers of this time, ad his thought can be read in part as attempting to return Germany to the groundedness of tradition and the primordiality of the earth. The sudden pace of change in Germany helps us understand Heideggar's attempt to hold fast to what was being swept away by urbanization and mechanization.

Heidegger's search for a metaphysical stand point is understandable. Given the fleeting character of reality as he saw, it was a justified philosophical instinct to look for some firm grounding which would endure when the whirl wind finally calmed down. As we have noted above, markets have tended to work in a way which limits or severely constrains metaphysical reflection. They limit this in at least two ways: first, the very act of operating in markets where we referred to zero time between action and reaction does not allow the kind of reflection on fundamental issues,

Second, metaphysical reflection is not likely to lead to development of usable market commodities or intellectual property rights! The world with its emphasis on commodities for sale requires that we have a definite commodity for exchange, from whatever activity we undertake. The catch in all this is that (and here we paraphrase what Habermas said about technology and morality) namely, that even a civilization which is committed to science is not exempted from confronting ethical questions. Similarly, even a civilization that is fully committed to markets cannot or is not excused from confronting problems of a metaphysical nature. We may look away from metaphysical problems, we may shelve them to the periphery, but whatever we do they will remain and somehow will have to be confronted.

The way to go about this task is to borrow from Heidegger and ask an essentialist question, namely what is the essence of markets, framing our question in Heideggerian language: what is the essence of Technology?

If our essentialist question can give us an answer or a clue about what markets essentially are, that will be an important step in our examination of how they should operate. Economists have tried to figure out perfect markets, but these efforts were not motivated by the metaphysically dispassionate and non-ideological demand to understand the essential nature of markets, and in many cases what was conceived as perfect markets were so conceived because they met certain partisan characteristics. The need now when we are fully buttressed in markets that are so intimately affecting our lives is to ask: what is or what should be the essential nature of markets and how are we supposed to operate in relation to them.

Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

10.

Advancing the Integration between Marxism and the "Excellent" Traditional Chinese Culture

FANG GUANGSHUN

The integration of Marxism and excellent traditional Chinese culture originates from their inherently identical nature. Correct paths should be chosen to advance their integration and to bolster the *sinification* of Marxism. Being aware of their identical inherent nature, we should uphold the dominant position of Marxism and the leadership position of the CPC, view Marxism as the soul and most excellent core of traditional Chinese culture. This core exposes root and reinforces our confidence in socialism with Chinese characteristics.

The Identical Nature of Marxism and Traditional Chinese Culture Determines Their Integration

Traditional Chinese culture possesses multiple distinctive natures. Firstly, the Chinese culture holds and emphasizes such core values as ceaseless self-improvement, harmony, fraternity and universal unity. These are the spiritual elements underlying the ceaseless Chinese culture, which are advancing with the times and constantly demonstrating its continuity and stability. Secondly, Chinese culture displays a highly inclusive feature. Through its thousands of years' history, it has embraced and accommodated various foreign cultures with its charm and inclusiveness, softening and integrating them as its important components, instead of being subjugated to the aggressive ones among them. Foreign cultures, as soon as they stepped onto the Chinese territory, adapted themselves in a natural manner to the local culture, accepted the Chinese core values, and eventually integrated into and enriched the Chinese culture. Thirdly, Chinese culture possesses an efficient self-correcting mechanism. Throughout history, much of its contents have transmuted positively and thus flourished

with the development of production, economic and social changes and through the efforts of the intellectuals. Such natures enable the Chinese culture to search for new forces that can help to transform and improve it in this colorful world and continuously thrive, even under circumstances of deluges and storms.

Being scientific, purposeful, open and value-oriented, Marxism evolves into the only theory among the numerous schools of thoughts and theories that is suitable to integrate with the Chinese culture, codevelop it into a progressive culture and furnish scientific world outlooks and methodology for the Chinese culture. These intrinsic characteristics are not present in other thoughts and theories; nor in traditional Chinese thought. By reviewing the differences between Marxism and the Chinese culture, we can assume that it is not true that the Chinese culture chooses Marxism; rather it is that the Chinese people that choose Marxism due to its scientific method, i.e. the core factor that determines the integration between Marxism and the Chinese culture lies in the scientific nature of Marxism.

The dominance of CPC plays a decisive role. At the turn of the 20th century, the whole Chinese society was pursuing what could rescue the nation and its people and striving for the conjunction of Chinese culture with western cultures. What makes Marxism stand out and be accepted by the Chinese people? What is special to the CPC is that it determined Marxism as it guiding theory at the outset; it established its own organization according to the founding party rules of Marxism and Leninism at the outset; it firmly established such guidelines as associating theories with practices, and standing firmly on the ground of approaching and solving the practical issues in the Chinese society. The sinification of Marxism could not be possible without the perseverance, development and creativity of the CPC.

Advancing the Integration between Marxism and Excellent Traditional Culture Is an Important Task of the Era

Economic globalization and developments in science and technology bring about profound transitions to the whole world. China is being ushered into a new historical transformation period facing new issues and problems that have emerged in the Chinese society in the

process of reform, opening-up and modernization. China is in the phase of reselecting its morals, beliefs, thoughts and ideals, and so is the Chinese culture. At this significant moment of reselection, it is essential to the future of China that people make the right and rational decisions among their multiple choices. This requires that the CPC to persist in the right political direction, preventing people from going adrift and preventing motley thoughts and tides.

We must treat rationally the most influential ideologies and cultures in the contemporary Chinese society, one being the excellent traditional Chinese culture with its rich historical legacy and social foundation, the other being the theoretical system of Marxism, Leninism and socialism with Chinese characteristics. Dogmatism will transpose if we take no regard to the current developments and status quo in China, or stick to the views and comments of the classic authors; seclusion and ossification is inevitable if we take no regard to global changes and historical lessons, and only cling to the traditional culture and its taboos. Advancing the integration of the two is a task that the CPC is bound to fulfill.

The scientific system of Marxism and excellent traditional Chinese culture serve as two bottom lines for the cultural selection in contemporary China. First, we should uphold unswervingly Marxism as our guiding principle. Marxism is the scientific theory that integrates both science and values; abandoning Marxism, we will sink into darkness and chaos, the Chinese people will lose its theoretical support and the cause we are fighting for under the leadership of the CPC will be destined to lose. Second, we should hold on to the profound foundation of excellent traditional Chinese culture and uphold and develop Marxism on the ground of excellent traditional Chinese culture. Through thousands of years' development, the Chinese culture has fostered its complete ideological and cultural system, formed its distinctive paths to inherit, develop and live, and shaped the intrinsic thinking and character of the Chinese people. Innovation and development of the Chinese culture cannot be possible if alienated from the soil of Chinese culture.

Advancing the Integration with Traditional Chinese Culture under the Guidance of Marxism

Marxism is the soul of the integration of Marxism and traditional Chinese culture. The historical destiny of the traditional Chinese culture is not determined by the traditional culture itself, but by whether traditional culture can be transformed and remodeled by applying Marxism. Reviewing the history of Chinese culture, we can discover its two deadly problems. First, integration with Marxism, which is based on socialized production, cannot be realized if the traditional Chinese culture does not undergo basic transformation, for the social and material foundation for Chinese traditional culture is a natural economy and closed society. Second, the Chinese culture possesses two traditions instead of one: the excellent traditions and the cultural dross. In terms of integration, only the excellent portion of the traditional Chinese culture is to be taken into account. Meanwhile, some of the excellent traditions may fade away with the elapse of time and change of the society. The traditional Chinese culture will not be rejuvenated without forsaking its dross.

We should prevent and oppose two tendencies in the integration of Marxism with excellent traditional Chinese culture. The first is to be vigilant and prevent sticking to the traditional culture without discriminating the bad from the good. The vigor and vitality of excellent traditional Chinese culture in the contemporary China consists in the guidance of Marxism. Only after the founding of the CPC, has Marxism been accepted as the guiding ideology and the revolutionary transformation of traditional culture; consequently, the new culture is formed with Marxism as the guide, traditional Chinese culture as the foundation and socialism as the objective. The second tendency is to prevent opposing and denying Marxism under the pretense of development or of ossifying Marxism into a dogma with the pretense of upholding it. Flaunting the banner of Marxism under the excuse of sticking to the classics has occurred multiple times within the party, bringing huge losses to the revolution. This marks important lessons for advancing the integration of Marxism and excellent traditional Chinese culture.

Confidence is necessary in integrating Marxism with the deepest core traditional Chinese culture. The first is confidence from the nation. With confidence in the excellent traditional Chinese culture, we can consciously root the integration process in the soil of traditional Chinese culture and make scientific Marxism flourish in the soil of Chinese culture. The second is confidence in theories. The theoretical system of socialism, with Chinese characteristics, is the newest development of Marxism in contemporary China. Upholding socialism with Chinese characteristic is upholding Marxism in the truest sense. The third is confidence in culture whose core is confidence in values. Values are at the center of the culture; the types of values determine the types of causes. We firmly believe that Marxism is science, the fundamental objective of the CPC is to serve the people wholeheartedly, and that the ultimate ideals of communism are destined to be realized. Sticking to such core values, we will be able to lead Chinese culture from its ancient brilliance to contemporary glory, integrate incisive and profound Marxism with the long-standing and dignified Chinese culture. This integration will bring Marxism to a new stage.

School of Marxism, Liaoning University, Shenyang, Liaoning, P.R. China

11.

Is Freedom (Liberty) Always the Supreme Universal Value?

Xu Keqian

Freedom as the Top Value: An Imported Idea from the West

In modern China, there is a very popular and well known poem:
Life is indeed valuable,
Love's price is even higher.
But if for the sake of freedom,
The two can all be thrown away![1]

Of course, this was not an original Chinese poem, its original author is said to be the Hungarian poet Petőfi Sándor (1823-1849). When it was first imported to China, the thought and idea embodied in it were totally exotic to Chinese people, albeit its Chinese translation is basically conformed to the forms and rules of a traditional Chinese four-line five-character short poem, which greatly promoted its spread in China. Nevertheless, the primary cause of the popularity and spreading of this poem is the novel and fresh idea represented in it. It is a value which is quite different from that of traditional Chinese culture. In the ancient Chinese value system, whether Confucianism, Taoism or Buddhism, the value of life is obviously higher than that of "love"[2] and "freedom." While this poem tells us that we should value "love" more than "life," and "freedom" more than anything else. As a result, the poem has played an important role in China's modern revolution. Thousands of youth have been inspired to break through

---

[1] This English version here is literally translated from the Chinese version by myself.

[2] In the Chinese version of this poem, the word for "love" here is "爱情," which is specially referring to sexual love between a man and a woman. It is distinguishable from other general love, such as Confucian "仁爱" (benevolence or kindheartedness) or Mohist "兼爱" (universal love), etc.

the restrictions of their families and traditional social customs to boldly pursue their romantic free love. Innumerable revolutionaries, including earlier communists, have been encouraged to bravely devote themselves in the struggle against the "feudalist autocracy," "capitalist oppression" and "imperialist invasion," fighting for "freedom" and "liberty"[3] for the country, for the nation, for the people, as well as for themselves. "Give me liberty, or give me death!" said Patrick Henry. This demagogic and blood boiling slogan has mobilized thousands of enthusiastic people, especially young people, to pick up weapons in all kinds of riots, protests and wars. Many have dedicated their lives in these terms.

During the long period of Chinese revolution and modernization which happened in the past century and more, the objects, goals and connotations of revolution or reform have been continually changing. However, the idea of considering "freedom" as the highest value has gradually become an important part of Chinese modern ideology. Especially in the post-Mao period the value of freedom and liberty has been increasingly emphasized along with the rapid development of a free-market economy. The focus now is concentrated more on individual liberty and civil rights, rather than on the freedom of the nation or the independency of the country. Some intellectuals truly identified themselves with the Western individualist and liberal tradition, putting the value of "liberty" and "freedom" of individuals as the top consideration in their scheme and agenda for social reform; they have been called the Chinese liberals constituting one of the most important portions on the map of contemporary Chinese political power. Many in the masses also embrace the value of "liberty" and "freedom" without knowing its complicated connotations and long history, but simply understand it as permitting individuals to do whatever they want without any restriction.

---

[3] While "liberty" and "freedom" in English are basically synonymous, they do have some semantic and syntactic differences. In the modern Chinese there is an equivalent for both English "liberty" and "freedom," that is "*ziyou* 自由." In this paper, I use "liberty" and "freedom" simultaneously or alternatively according to the syntactic contexts, basically with the same semantic meaning equal to that of "*ziyou* 自由."

The ideology of liberty and freedom, as the highest value, has been greatly enhanced by the impact from the great role model of our era, the United States of America. Since the beginning of the reform and opening in 1980s, more and more Chinese people have had opportunity to visit the USA. Almost all of them have to pay a pilgrimage to the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, experiencing a very vivid and impressive baptism of the American value, which obviously put "freedom" and "liberty" as a top priority. On the other hand, the freedom advocating American culture has also been brought to China by Americans who come to China. Among them are politicians, teachers, scholars, missionaries, businessman, artists, etc. American presidents and other political leaders who take every chance to promote the American value of freedom whenever they are invited to give a speech at China's top universities. The supreme value of freedom is immersed in many products of American culture, such as Hollywood movies, English teaching text books, VOA broadcast, pop music, research works, etc.

Promoting Liberty and Freedom as the Top Value and Its Results

Actually, the American value of freedom has impact everywhere throughout the world. The USA has the image of the major representative of the so-called "free world" and is proudly called by the American people themselves "the home of the brave and the land of the free." To many people around the world, the biggest selling point of the USA, beyond its prosperous economy, advanced science, technology, education and military power, etc., is its advocacy of the value of liberty and freedom and the USA has been doing its utmost to promote the values of freedom all over the world. Support for freedom overseas has been America's official policy at least since Truman, who set it as one of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States.[4] The American government and politicians always try to legitimize their diplomatic policy and actions, including many military actions in other countries, under the name of freedom, either

---

[4] Mike Gonzalez. Another freedom group abandoned by U.S., http://edition.cnn.com/2014/10/01/opinion/gonzalez-white-house-freedom/index.html, October 1, 2014.

for the freedom of American people, or for the freedom of the people in the countries involved. For instance, the Iraqi war lunched by George W. Bush's administration in 2003 was named by him: "Operation Iraqi Freedom."

It is understandable that liberty and freedom is a supreme American value. The admiration of liberty and freedom can be traced back to American people's Western cultural heritage in the long history of European culture. It is recounted in the *Bible* (*Book of Exodus*) that Moses, the most important prophet of Judaism and Christianity, led the Israelites out of Egypt, leaving slavery behind and walking towards freedom under the guidance of Yahweh. This can be considered as a religious root for the value of liberty in the Western culture. The value of liberty especially individual rights and freedom become much more popular in the Age of Enlightenment, where the liberal philosophy provided the value foundation for a series of political and economic revolution in the Western world. There are also some cultural particularities in American people putting freedom at the top of their value priority. That was born from the searching and struggle for liberty. The first batch of its European ancestors came to this land in order to get rid of religious oppression and to pursue freedom. Establishing the United States was to slip the leash of the political and economic restrictions of their British suzerain. As colonists and pioneers in the "new world," they must have a spirit of bravery, freedom, and courage in the taking risk in order to settle down in this virgin land and open their new life. The strong aspiration for freedom is also a counterforce to slavery. Since the most brutal slavery system existed in American till near modern times, the fresh memory and strong hatred of this ugly unhuman system always reminds the American people of the preciousness of freedom, thus making it matural for the value of freedom and liberty to be emphasized in this country.

Many people attribute the great achievements of America in science, economy and politics to the tradition of liberalism, neglecting some other important, and perhaps even more crucial factors which have caused the unusual and inimitable achievement of America. As a result, liberty and freedom has been worshiped as the highest value in the USA and the whole Western world. To some people, it seems logical that if people in other parts of the world can accept the idea of

liberty as the highest value, as well as accepting the relevant Western systems based on this value, they will also be able to achieve the same success as the Western countries. Unfortunately, this is not the reality. The practices of liberalism and the liberal democracy in many of the undeveloped countries are not as successful as expected.

The connotation of the concept of "liberty" or "freedom" is very rich and complicated, with many different and sometimes contradictory understandings. However, in modern times, it has been more and more narrowed and limited in the social, political and economic realms. Pursuing "liberty" and "freedom" only means struggling and contending for the material "interests" or political "rights" that are supposed innately to belong to every individual: going to squares to participate in demonstrations, rallying in the streets to protest against the government, or even taking up weapons to fight the government, or with other groups. Aroused by the spirit of individual freedom, no one wants to suffer losses, no one is willing to make any compromise when one's own "interests" or "rights" are involved. Human relationships in society are strained, frictions and conflicts are intensified, the people's living space is no longer at peace and secured.

Actually, in many cases, the fighting or "revolution" for liberty and freedom encouraged by Western countries only causes disorder and chaos in those places, triggering more riots and conflicts among various groups. It leads to splitting and confrontation in those societies, causes the deterioration of the social development and the living environment. The current situations in Iraq, Libya and some other countries are recent examples. Probably motivated by good will, and under the name of liberty, the United States and other Western countries sent armies to Iraq and Libya and overthrew the regime of Sadam Hussain and Moammar Gadhafi, liberating the people from the rule of those dictators. However, afterwards, people there have been living in endless chaos and conflicts. It is very ironic that Christopher Stevens, former US ambassador to Libya and an active warrior for freedom who supported the Libyan people in their struggle to get free from the rule of Gadhafi, was finally killed during a riot by someone among those Libyans who were freed by the revolution. Now in Iraq and Syria, the US has to fight with ISIS, which is also the enemy of Bashar al-Assad of Syria, while Bashar's government was the one

US wanted to undermine for a long time by supporting its rebellious forces.

Such chaos and disorder would seem to indicate that the consequences of encouraging liberty and freedom might not always be positive. In a practical and historical perspective, putting the value of liberty as the top priority is not always a good idea.

Different Cultures Have Different Value Priorities, "*Ping An*" Is the Top Value in Traditional Chinese Culture

Values are one of the very important spiritual elements which compose a cultural tradition. As human beings, people all over the world do share some common values. Liberty, freedom, democracy, equality, etc., are definitely among those universal values shared by people of different cultures and nations. However, no matter the particular culture, society, or even person, different values always exist simultaneously. There must be an order of priority among them, which depends on the specific stage of development and the particular historical situation that nation or society happens to have. Values and value priorities reflect the objective social reality and life requirement of particular peoples and nations; they are not generated from some outside commandment. Different values and value priority may in turn influence on individual behaviors, human relations, social organizations, economic and political systems, etc.

Of course, liberty and freedom is a dream for everyone, so it can be considered as a kind of universal value. This does not mean that in all cultures liberty and freedom are always the highest values. Different cultures may have different top values, in other word, people in different societies or in different cultural backgrounds may have different ideas on what is the most valuable thing which deserve their greatest effort to pursue, defend and maintain. This most valuable thing represents the highest value of that culture, which may also be called the core value of that culture. To pursue or to realize the core value usually constitutes the fundamental motive in this type of culture. In other words, many cultural phenomenon and collective behavior in this culture can be explained explicitly or implicitly with the motive of pursuing and maintaining its core value.

As we have discussed above, "freedom" can be considered as the core value of American culture, but it is not necessarily a core value in other cultures. Here I would like to take traditional Chinese culture as a comparative example. By "traditional Chinese culture" here I mean the culture of the majority Han Chinese people before modern times, of which Confucianism, Taoism and Chinese Buddhism are the mainstream ideologies. As with any other such macro-comparisons, it may be a bit too simplified and overlook some historical details.

In modern Chinese, the equivalent word of English word "free," "freedom" or "liberty" is the same word "*zi you* 自由," which first appeared no earlier than the Eastern Han Dynasty. It had not been a frequently used word with important cultural or philosophic significance until modern times. Surely there might be some other words or expressions in ancient Chinese philosophic texts which have similar meanings as "freedom" or "liberty," but none of them were important enough to be selected as the key word to represent a value of the culture. This does not mean that ancient Chinese people did not have any concept or spirit of "freedom," or they never thought "freedom" to be a value worth pursuing, but only that compare to other more important values, "freedom" was not a priority and cannot be considered as the core value in ancient China.

Then what can be identified as the core value of ancient Chinese culture? If we were to use one Chinese word to represent the core value in traditional Chinese culture, this should be "*ping an* 平安," which roughly means peace and safety, with some related words such as "*tai ping* 太平"(peace and tranquility), "*he ping* 和平"(harmony and peace), "*an ding* 安定"(stability), "*an quan* 安全"(security), etc. Pursuing and maintaining a state of "*Ping an*" which includes the peace and tranquility of individual in mind and body, the safety and security of people's life, harmony and concord of family and society, prosperity and stability of the country and the world is the core value of Chinese culture. In other words, Chinese culture in general inclines to put "*ping an*" at the summit of their values. This core value is a driving factor of the logic of action in Chinese culture, which explain many phenomena in the collective behavior in Chinese society. This contrasts with American culture, which takes "freedom" as its core value. This does not mean that American culture values only "free-

dom" and never peace and safety at all, or the Chinese culture values only "*ping an*" and never values "freedom." It means only that, in the comparative relation between the two different values, especially when the two are in conflict with each other in a particular situation, and when taking account of both is impossible, then people in different cultures may prefer or be inclined to put a certain value differently as the top of priority. This different preference in value priority may affect many aspects in a culture such as individual action, collective consciousness and political strategy of government, etc.

The Historical and Cultural Background of "*Ping An*" Values

As mentioned earlier, the American priority for "freedom," as a value, has a profound historical and religious-philosophic origin. Similarly, the Chinese "*ping an*," as a priority value, also has a deep root in its long and rich historical and cultural background.

Contrast with the fact that the majority of Americans were originated from early colonists and immigrants who came to the fresh land from other continents, Chinese people are native residents in their homeland where their ancestors have been living for countless generations. The Chinese way of life connected with intensive agriculture has nurtured their passion for the homeland and an unwillingness to leave. Instead of confronting with undeveloped Indians, traditional Chinese people usually live among their fellow-countrymen who can almost be considered their own sisters, brothers or close relatives. As a result, there is little free space left here for brave and free adventurers to compete. For traditional Chinese people, this land cannot be a virgin land for "the free and the brave," rather, it is "my father's and mother's country," and all the lands under the heaven are the territory nominally belongs to the emperor. On the other hand, in the thousand years of Chinese history, there has never been a system of slavery like that which once existed in America; no groups of people have ever been enslaved as had African Americans. Consequently, there is no need to emphasize the importance of the value of freedom to so exaggerated a degree. It is a civilized and polite realm where everyone must obey to the emperor's law and regulations. There were hierarchical social strata, but they were dynamic and movable. There were

some kinds of mechanism such as the imperial examination system providing a possibility for those talented and hardworking young men from the bottom of the society to ascend to the ruling elite class. The relatively stable social orders, systems and customs are the accumulation of thousand years of history. Though they might be not absolutely reasonable and perfect from the perspective of some outsiders, but they have been functioned here for generations, and are generally accepted by most people, and help in maintaining the overall peace and harmony of society. The general peace and stability of the country, harmony with neighbors, normal social order and security have become the common will and the highest value of the majority of people.

The making of the Chinese nation is a long and complicated story, and it is difficult to date exactly when this nation was formed. The unification of the Qin Dynasty (221B.C.E.-207 B.C.E.) and the rise of the Han Dynasties (202 B.C.E.-220A.D.) can be counted as an early milestone. Afterwards, the Chinese nation seems to have experienced repeated cycles of "unification after prolonged division and division after prolonged unification." However, no matter the unification of the Qin and Han dynasties after the turmoil and splitting of the Spring-Autumn and the Warring State periods, or the reunification and prosperity of the Sui (581A.D.-619A.D.) and the Tang (618A.D.-907A.D.) Dynasties after the splitting of "Three Kingdoms" and the turmoil and division of the period of "Northern and Southern Dynasties" till the "five barbarian invasion and the sixteen states," all indicate that the general foundation of the national identity of the Chinese nation has been the unification and stability after war and turbulence. Even during the Yuan and Qing Dynasties, when China was ruled by the alien ethnic groups of Mongolians and Manchurians, the Chinese society also maintained a basically peaceful order and stability for centuries. The Mongolian rulers had ruled a part of northern China for more than a century before they subjugated the Southern Song Dynasty. Afterwards, they continued their ruling of whole China for another 98 years. The Manchurian rule of China extended for 267 years. After entering central China, these pastoral nomadic ethnic groups were gradually assimilated by the culture of Chinese agricultural civilization, and accepted the value priority of

peace and stability. If a general peace and stability of society is maintained, people belonging to different ethnic groups can coexist peacefully without severe conflicts. To the majority of ordinary Chinese people, the significance of the ethnic origin and background of their emperors seems much less important than the general peace and harmony of society.

In the Chinese Confucian and Taoist classics, we can hardly find any appeals for individual liberty in terms of personal economic interests, political rights, etc. The only ideas relevant to the spirit of individual freedom are the individual's inner freedom based on personal integrity and free will, such as Zhuang Zi's spiritual "care free wandering" and "going alone with the spirit of the Heaven and the Earth," or Confucian "learning for oneself," "practicing *ren* depends on oneself," and "making one's own person perfect," etc.[5] To most of the traditional Chinese intellectuals, the most important freedom is a spiritual state of being together with the *Dao* and feeling at ease in one's own heart. It is a state without a feeling of shame, since after examining oneself one is confident of having not done anything wrong under the Heaven and before others. To the majority of commoners, freedom is a comfortable state expressed in a Chinese common saying: "I will never be frightened when hearing a midnight door knocking since I have not done anything wrong to others." In general, freedom, in the context of traditional Chinese culture, is mainly an internal peaceful and comfortable mental status of a person whatever be the outside situations. It is truly free because it does not rely on any concrete or tangible "rights" and "properties" in the material world. The modern (Western) concept of freedom or liberty in sociological, political and economic senses is seldom found in ancient China, to say nothing of it becoming a top value in the culture.

---

[5] For the Confucian and Daoist tradition of individualism and liberalism in Ancient China, one can reference works such as W.M. Theodore de Bary, *Liberalist Tradition of China* (中国的自由传统), Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1983; Erica Fox Brindley, Individualism in Early China: Human Agency and self in Thought and Politics, Honolulu: University of Hawai Press, 2010.etc.

By contrast, "*ping an*," whether in terms of the peace and safety of the individual's life, peace and harmony of families or communities, or peace, security and good order of a country, is the supreme value of Chinese culture. Confucius thinks that a state "should worry not about under-population but about uneven distribution, not about poverty but about instability. For where there is even distribution there is no such thing as poverty, where there is harmony there is no such thing as under-population, and where there is stability there is no such thing as revolution."[6] For individuals, the most valuable thing is a peaceful and healthy life without suffering disasters and calamity, rather than fighting for "liberty" and struggling for "freedom." For the society and the country, the ultimate idea is "unification under Heaven," "the peace and tranquil of the whole world" without war and fighting. The goal is to build a society in which everyone is an equal member of a harmonious community in which "doors are not bolted at night, and on the street no one would pick up things dropped by others."

From a Confucian view, "there is no blessing so long lasting as being without misfortune,"[7] or in other words, the most durable happiness is never being involved in any trouble. The most valuable utilization of Confucian rites is to increasing harmony among people of different social status. As one of Confucius disciples said: "Of the things brought by the rites, harmony is the most valuable."[8] The ultimate goal of Confucian philosophy, as expressed in the first chapter of *Zhong Yong* (*The Doctrine of the Mean*), is to "let the state of equilibrium and harmony exist in perfection, and a happy order will prevail throughout heaven and earth, and all things will be nourished and flourish."[9] In order to reach this goal, Confucianism educates individuals to cultivate their own moral personality and to exercise self-discipline, in order to stabilize others, stabilize the society, and realize the peace and order of the world under Heaven.

---

[6] *Analects* 16:1, Lau, 1983, 160-161.

[7] Knoblock, 1994, 136.

[8] *Analects* 1:12, lau, 1983, 7-8.

[9] Legge, 1991, vol.1, 385.

Taoism advocates virtue without contention (*bu zheng zhi de* 不争
之德).[10] According to Lao Zi, people should always be content with
what they already have, and never be wanting to get more;[11] a govern-
ment should be clean and tranquil, and govern by "doing nothing"
(*wu wei* 无为), thus to let every people live and work in peace, and en-
joy a secured and prosperous life. In the later Taoist religion, healthy
life, longevity and even becoming immortals are the top values. It
would be ridiculous to call a Taoist monk to sacrifice his life in fighting
for something called "liberty." To ordinary Chinese people, the har-
mony and prosperity of their families, lasting extension of happiness
among endless descendants is what is most valued.

All of these demonstrate that emphasizing and pursuing of "*ping
an*" is the top value in traditional Chinese culture. Therefore, we can
say that pursuing "*ping an*," namely, peace and security, is the leading
motive in traditional Chinese culture.

Comparison of the Impact of the Value Priority of "Freedom" and "*Ping An*"

Comparing the "freedom" value priority represented by modern
American culture, and the "*ping an*" value priority represented by
traditional Chinese culture, is not to make another value judgment
between the two value priorities. Rather it is to point out that the
different value priorities may have different influences and conse-
quences in each culture, which I would like to elaborate here.

In general, the cultural spirit which takes "freedom" as the top
value, or a system prioritizing the value of individual freedom, rela-
tively likes contending and encourages competition. People tend to
have a positive view on conflicts. They are comparatively arrogant
and aggressive, more offensive and assertive, more inclined to outside
expansion, more likely to use military power to settle disputes, easier
to trigger events of violence. The domestic control in this kind of so-
ciety is comparatively loose, people are easier to devoice, regulations
and disciplines are comparatively less enhanced in education, stu-

---

[10] *Laozi*, Ch. 22, 66, 68, Waley, 1999, 45,135,139.

[11] *Laozi*, Ch. 44, Waley, 1999, 95.

dents are given more space for self-choice and free development. This society is more open and free, people are more likely to express themselves frankly and directly. In terms of ways of thinking, people are more stubborn in their own ideas, more self-confident, and more easily take an extreme stance, etc.

In contrast, the cultural spirit which takes "*ping an*" as the top value, or a system prioritizing the value of social peace and stability, usually has a negative view of conflicts. Contending with others is not encouraged. It only encourages a kind of unremitting self-improvement or competing with oneself rather than with others. It emphasizes the importance of harmony and solidarity. It is inclined to avoid head-on confrontation and conflicts. It has a tendency to reject the use of military power. It emphasizes self-introspection and self-discipline, admiring a sort of introverted, modest and humble personality. It emphasizes regulations and established rules, and leaves little space for children's free creation. There are more visible or invisible regularities and rules in social communication. People care more about courtesy and etiquette, and express their ideas more euphemistically in order to protect the "faces" of both self and others. Their way of thinking is comparatively flexible, moderate, tolerant and inclusive. They are apt to accept different ideas and adapt to new situations. They do not like going to extremes.

Of course, by this comparison, I am not indicating that "*ping an*" or peace and security is not at all a value in American culture which takes "freedom" as the top value. It only means that in that culture, people are not likely to accept peace and security without "freedom." One typical example is that although so many cases of gun shooting at schools have happened, the mainstream Americans still do not want to give up the freedom of civic gun ownership. Compared to traditional Chinese people, Americans are more likely to take the risk of their lives to try some very dangerous games (such as an 80 years old lady's jumping from an airplane with a parachute, etc.) to pursue stimulation and get a sense of freedom. In this society, peace and security is only a guarantee for individual freedom. When a conflict happened between the demand of public security and individual freedom itself, or in order to maintain the general peace and security of society, the freedom of individuals has to be restricted, there will be

immediately a strong response and resistance from the people, protesting any possible reduction of individual liberty and freedom.

On the other hand, although Chinese culture puts "*ping an*" at the top priority of it values, "freedom" is still among other values in Chinese culture. In other words, traditional Chinese people do not want "freedom" at all, but they would be reluctant to accept a kind of unsecured "freedom" without a sense of safety. Chinese people in general are less likely to take the risk of their life to fight for individual freedom. In traditional Chinese culture, liberty or freedom can only be attained under the big roof of peace and stability. A suitable degree of individual freedom will be considered as meaningful and valuable only when it is helpful in promoting the general harmony, stability and welfare of the society. If a self-declared "liberty" or "freedom" has a tendency to lead to an action which may undermine the big roof of peace and stability, it will be denounced and restricted.

Actually we can say that both "freedom" and "ping an" are universal values. The difference lies only in that which one should be the top priority, especially when sometimes there is a conflict between the two happens. It is just due to this nuance in value priority, that various differences appear in the social norms and individual behaviors in these two cultures.

In a society which takes "freedom" as its ultimate value, people care more about establishing their own individual independent status in social reality, and want to assert and confirm his own properties, rights and responsibilities; people pay more attention to the individual's personal attributes, but less to family backgrounds and social relations. People usually protest to the government doing too much and thus interfering with freedom. While in a society where "*ping an*" is a top value, people care more about their social affiliation and their positions in a well-organized, sometimes hierarchic, network of social order. They are eager to secure a sense of belonging for themselves. In social communication they pay more attention to other people's family background and social connections. They usually complain that their government is being irresponsible for certain things and doing little about it, earning their peaceful life and security unprotected.

In a society which emphasizes the priority of the value of "liberty" and "freedom," people usually tolerate and even admire those extraordinary or eccentric behaviors of individuals, thus encouraging novel and original innovations. While in society which emphasizes on the priority of "*ping an*," people are more vigilant about any unusual deviating conduct of individuals, considering not merely as personal behavior, but as a kind of public event which may become a threat to the general security.

A nation dominated by the ideology of the supremacy of "freedom," on the one hand provides a relatively loose and relaxed environment for its internal members, neglecting self-control; on the other hand, it often seems to enter into the affairs of others and freely comments and criticizes other countries, sometimes even interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries. In contrast, a nation which considers "*ping an*" as the most important thing usually uses a more restricted self-control concerning the behavior of its internal members. At the same time, it more likely makes concessions and compromises when handling its external relations with other countries, in order to avoid trouble, to reduce friction, and to reach reconciliation. It does not want to be involved in other peoples' affairs or concerns.

Values of Different Cultures Might Be Mutually Complementary

By making the above comparison between the "freedom" as a value priority represented by American culture and the "*ping an*" as a value priority represented by traditional Chinese culture, I do not want to judge which is better. Rather, my contention is that both "freedom" and "*ping an*" are indispensable human values. What I do want to point out is that putting a value such as "freedom" or "liberty" as the top value above anything else may be only a cultural peculiarity rather than a universal rule. It happened in a particular historical and cultural background, and it should be justified according to the particular times and social contexts.

In today's China, it is questionable that "*ping an*" is still a top value in the ideology of the majority contemporary Chinese people, especially the young. In a sense we can say that, modern Chinese history has witnessed a process of conflict between the "freedom" ori-

ented Western culture and the "*ping an*" oriented traditional Chinese culture, and that traditional Chinese values has been severely challenged by the Western values in many aspects. More and more Chinese have adopted the Western value and spirit of "liberty" and "freedom." Many contemporary Chinese youths are more independent, risk-taking, innovative and aggressive. They share less in values with their ancient ancestors than with their contemporary American peers.

In general, modern China has benefitted from adopting the Western value of liberty and freedom, as well as some other values such as individual rights, democracy, scientific rationality, etc., in its process of modernization. However, the exceedingly liberal and extreme individualism also has caused new trouble for Chinese society, breaking the peacefulness and stability of the traditional Chinese social structure and cultural order.

Actually, to human beings, both "freedom" and "*ping an*" are important values, and probably we should not emphasize one value at the expense of the other. Neither a freedom without the guardian of peace and security, nor a "*ping an*" without freedom can be considered as ideal. The difficult point is that, sometimes under a particular situation these two values conflicting with each other and consideration cannot be given fully to both values simultaneously. This dilemma is very common in human society. For instance, after the "9/11" terror attack, in order to insure the general peace and security of the society, America had no choice but to implement more restrictions on individual freedoms (including more strict security checking, surveillance of individuals, etc.). The American people have to tolerate and even legitimate the torturing of prisoners (terrorist suspects) in Guantanamo and some other places in the world, by US military agencies,[12] which obviously contradicts the basic value of individual freedom and liberty. Similarly, during the difficult historical transition from the traditional Chinese society to a modern society, Chinese people and government frequently faces the challenge of how to unceasingly increase individual freedom and yet avoid an uncontrollable situation leading to social disorder and turmoil. When there is a substantial con-

---

[12] Steven Lukes, "Liberal Democratic Torture," *British Journal of Political Science*, 36(2005):1-16.

flict between the two, which value should be put at the top priority position? How to find the balanced and appropriate "*zhong*"[13] point between the value of "freedom" and the value of "*ping an*"? This is a very important problem not only to China, but also to the contemporary and future world.

From a "Zhongtaological" view,[14] the American "freedom" priority value and the traditional Chinese "*ping an*" priority value can complement each other, and mutually rectify each other's possible deviation to the extremes. For instance, in today's world, partly due to excessive emphasis upon the value of "freedom," conflicts, frictions and even wars between groups of people with different interests, different religious beliefs and cultural backgrounds rise one after another. Therefore, advocating and emphasizing the value of "*ping an*" or peace and stability, may help to balance the ill effect caused by the overflow of the spirit of extreme liberalism, to relax some international tensions, to maintain world peace and promote the establishment of harmonious human society. Of course, on the other hand, we may also use the value of "freedom" to rectify or remedy those defects and maladies in a society where the value of "*ping an*" is exaggerated, such as the defects of over restriction of individual freedom, deterioration of human rights, loss of the spirit of adventure and lack of courage in innovation.

In such cases, values are not absolute universal truths. They are "*zhongs*" that happened in history and time. Their correctness and appropriateness is temporal, historical and dynamic. It is negotiable and adjustable in particular situations. This is what in Confucian terms as "timely *zhong*" (时中). Any particular value, even widely accepted, has its pros and cons, advantages and disadvantages. Conflicting extreme values may not necessarily be opponents; they may be mutually reliable *Ying* and *Yang* elements, and can mutually supplement with

---

[13] "*zhong*," the Chinese character"中," is a very important philosophic concept in Confucian philosophy, for detailed discussion of the meaning of "*zhong*," see Xu (2012).

[14] Xu Keqian. (2013), "Zhongdaology: A Confucian Way of Philosophical Thinking and Moral Life." Paper presented at the 23rd World Congress of Philosophy (WCP 2013) Athens, Greece, August 4–10, 2013.

each other. According to Confucian "Zhongtaological" way of thinking, the right thing to do is to suspend the two extremes and find the balance at the "*zhong*" point based on the coincidence of personal consciousness and the objective practice in particular situations.

Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, P.R. China

References

Brindley, Erica Fox, *Individualism in Early China: Human Agency and self in Thought and Politics*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010.

De Bary, WM Theodore, *Liberalist Tradition of China* (中国的自由传统), Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1983.

Gonzalez, Mike. Another freedom group abandoned by U.S., http://edtion.cnn.com/2014/10/01/opinion/gonzalez-white-house-freedom/index.html, October 1, 2014.

Knoblock, John, trans. *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*, Vol.2 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).

Lau, D.C., trans. *Confucius: The Analects* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1983).

Lau, D.C., trans. *Mencius* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2003).

Lukes, Steven, "Liberal Democratic Torture," *British Journal of Political Science*, 36(2005):1-16.

Legge, James, trans. *The Chinese Classics* (Taipei: SMC, 1991).

Waley, Arthur, trans. *Laozi* (Changsha: Hunan People's Publishing House, 1991).

Xu, Keqian. A Synthetic Comprehension of the Way of Zhong in Early Confucian Philosophy. *Frontier of Philosophy in China*, 7(3) (2012): 422-438.

Xu, Keqian. Zhongdaology: A Confucian Way of Philosophical Thinking, 2013.

12.

Spirituality's Role in Understanding Reality and Shaping Values

Dan Chițoiu

Globalized Culture and the Need for Spirituality

Today the setting of a "globalized culture" becomes gradually more manifest, something made possible by new ways of communication. Obviously there are not only positive effects of this new evolution, but negative ones also, especially the pressure put on traditional cultures. In this case, globalization implies a standardization of means and values of communication, but mostly of its content. We have to question if there are consequences on human experience at the anthropological level, if we encounter today significant changes in the way we experience ourselves, the other, and the world. There are enough reasons for the answer to be, certainly, yes. A recent phenomenon that can be discovered especially on social media, is the increased occurrence of messages or conversations on spiritual/religious topics. This should be connected with the need of identity felt by today's younger generation, a need related with the development of a personal experience connected with something more than everyday life. Yet, the reference to spirituality is made following a subjective need, so there is little interest in understanding what is the real specificity of a spiritual tradition and practice, rather, just some affirmations fitting with this personal quest. I connect this need of assuming personal experiences which exceed the usual with the quest for radical and authentic novelty, for attaining something really different and personal. This kind of quest is different in shape and content from those made before because of the impact of recent science and new technologies. Here is also a kind of danger. If we agree that the quest for a spiritual path is more present today compared with what happened before in the modern times, and that this pursuit is different compared with the past, the practice may not lead to the desired goal, due to lack of any landmarks (as offered by a spiritual/religious tradition).

This is confirmed by today's unclear meaning of spirituality: the use of the term today becomes rather vague and, on the other hand, the spiritual practices are so diverse that it is improper to use the term in every case because today the term is used more and more for practices not related with traditional religions. Among the younger generation there is an explicit tendency to search a spiritual path that does not track any religious practice; it is a quest for a private spiritual activity that does not follow the rules and the requirements of traditional religious practices. This tendency is more or less worldwide at present. This spiritual search is often risky because of inadequate means and inadequate goals. It is risky because it can affect not only the reasoning but also the health of the practitioner. To give a support to this last statement, I propose in what follows a discussion on the value of tradition when speaking about spiritual practices. By "tradition" I understand here that corpus of rules and requirements that where established through the experiences gained over many generations, a corpus under the name of religion. It is not here just the specificity of a religious goal, but at the same time the deployment of an anthropological profile. It is a description of human capabilities and possibilities in conducting spiritual experiences: a horizon of possibilities and limitations. The limitations where understood as a way to channel experiences, to empower the human capacities in attaining spiritual goals, and to prevent failure or harm. We can speak about a type of rigor implying verifiability (guidance) and precision requirements (prescriptions orienting mind and body). It is interesting to clarify how this rigor has been set in different cultural areas. We can find several descriptions and uses of rigor in the practice of traditional spirituality, a fact that proves that this kind of precision is not unique, as we can find it in science, yet this does not mean that it has less precision. It is useful to clarify the influence of a certain cultural horizon in shaping a particular spiritual practice and vice versa.

Cultural Horizon and Spiritual Tradition

When discussing the specificity of a spiritual practice in the horizon of tradition, we have to avoid any approach unaware of the specificity of a certain cultural area. A cultural model directly or indirectly

influences the shapes taken by a human experience in a certain religious horizon and the way science is done. For the Western world, what we call "Modernity" had as its main mark the privilege given to a human capacity, specifically to the *rational capacity*. This option is visible in the founding of the modern concept of science. The type of science initiated by Galileo Galilei, which was to dominate scientific perception has as its founding act the reduction of the sensitive and living qualities of the discredited bodies as appearance and illusion and their replacement with mathematic knowledge of their abstract forms and relations. These could be known only through mathematics, meaning that the most authentic sense of reason must be bound to this way of knowledge. Galilei's paradigm was considered for a very long time the only valid foundation for scientific research, as well as for the valid explanation in science. The modern philosophical approach inherited the influence of this vision of reality, so that Galilei's doctrine proves to be one of the key sources of modernity. At the end of the 19th century, Wilhelm Dilthey insisted on the distinction between two ways of investigation, proper to the "natural" sciences and to the "spiritual" ones. If *explanation* is characteristic of the natural sciences, *understanding* is specific to the spiritual sciences. The object of the spiritual sciences is the "living" and the only way to understand this is the "reliving." Later Martin Heidegger wrote a study on the modern view of technique, in which he describes the incorrectness of the technical attitude towards nature, in so far as it regards an insistent delivery request addressed to nature.[1] Enlightenment rationalism held that there can exist but one perspective of truth. Therefore, according to its own definition of what is veridical and real, it judged and classified the entire cultural production of mankind. The recent evolutions in science entailed a serious crisis in explanation (especially in quantum physics, but also in cosmology or the life sciences), the value of nonscientific approaches, like religion or philosophy, opening a much broader discussion about validity in scientific explanation. One aspect of this major change was a broader understanding of what

---

[1] Martin Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology," *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings from "Being and Time" (1927) to "The Task of Thinking" (1964)*, ed. David Farrell Krell (Harper: San Francisco, 2008), 315.

iss meant by "exactness," and "precision," as important classical criteria in science for experimental validation.

The Need of Rigor

There is required the analysis of a broader meaning of precision and its signification for the different description of experiment as a form of *tryout* (understood as a fundamental human experiential act). The involvement of mathematics in physics modified the understanding of the world, eliminated the sensible or concrete, in favor of only the characteristics considered essential to an object, those characteristics are describable mathematically. The reality described by the classical physics is independent, that is: the measurements do not interfere with the phenomena (the meaning given to objectivity). This became the central thesis of any kind of modern science. Certain levels of reality, specifically the quantum levels, cannot be subjected to the classical explanation given by the science founded by logical formalism, so that there arose the need to resort to alternative explanatory models. In the 1930's there appeared a serious breech in the paradigm of the physical realism and nowadays the quantum theory refutes the perspective of the classical physics, mainly because the new discoveries revealed that particles no longer play the role of constitutive material of the universe: our senses do not reveal the real constituent of the universe. There appear dramatic differences from the classical vision of the world. There is now required a different vision, as well as the need to renounce to objectivist language.

The reaction to the danger came from the interference of some cultural constructions, which often took the shape of ideology and misled the spiritual exercise and also the scientific investigation from their true purpose. This brought out a consciousness which modernity did not possess until recently. This is an horizon with an unprecedented possibility which does not necessarily guarantee a productive dialog between the Eastern way of understanding the spiritual experience and scientific investigation. We may easily have the impression of a forced proximity between two dimensions of the human experience that aim at different reality levels. Recent mutations in understanding the nature of reality have made it possible to accept the vali-

dity of spiritual experience and the value of the discourse of spiritual tradition as specific ways of investigating the inner levels of reality. The crucial question is whether these alternative ways of evaluation can somehow meet the current need for rigor, and precision. We can argue that it is important to prove that the spirituality discourse provides rigor in the description of reality, that in this case there is also a certain understanding of precision and exactness, which is totally functional at a practical level as well. Science and spirituality are, on their specific paths, somehow similar ways for approaching what we call *reality*? The mystic's experience and the scientist's experiment are both ways of tryout? Is the mystic's experience, somehow, closer to what is proper to scientific experiment?

Spiritual Experience as Experiment?

The Romanian philosopher and theologian André Scrima considers that the spiritual experience is the manifestation and the sign of a possibility, of a fundamental aspect of the human condition, namely, the human being as a being of experience.[2] Experience is what comes out of tryout, *knowledge by tryout*. Experience, understood as tryout, represents the central aspect of any spirituality. At the same time experience, in its valence of experiment, is the essential component of science: one cannot speak about science as long as there is not an experimental frame, without unfolding some experiments. Precisely in this double reference to tryout there exists an area of a real rapprochement between the one who performs a spiritual experience and the scientist. They both put the reality to tryout, in one way or another. In fact, this rapprochement is more difficult and represents a commonplace, due to the reasons mentioned above which from one point of view, maybe subsumed to language difficulties. This is why, those who reached the intuition of the common ground that this *tryout* of reality takes place in full acceptance of what we call reality, including *ultimate reality* were those who could understand the limitations that human language introduces inevitably in a certain historical period.

---

[2] André Scrima, *Experiența spirituală și limbajele ei (The Spiritual Experience and its Languages)* (București: Humanitas, 2008), 198-199.

They were exceptional people because they did not fall in the traps of a more or less specialized language that a historical moment may impose: for they were able to understand the authentic ways in which such a complex reality may be experienced and passed over the imaginary and the ideology of their time.

I will invoke a situation of overcoming a language context and of the way in which reality was understood in a certain period, which can illustrate what I want to argue. This situation belongs to the spiritual experience that is proper to the Christian East that belongs to Symeon the New Theologian, a Byzantine author from the turn of the first millennium. I think here we can find a sample of the role of experience as tryout in the mystical writings. Symeon was indeed exceptional because he put this experiential self-tryout in a poetical expression. The way Symeon spoke about God and man's experience of God can be fully called a-typical if we relate his writings to the discursive canons from the beginning of the second millennium. Symeon wanted to transmit to his contemporaries that they too could reach in their times something what they considered possible only in the time of the Fathers. This was a sudden transforming experience that does not come as a result of one's expectation, and whose result is a deep inner change.[3] What characterizes Symeon's experience is an exceptional "exposure" to an unexpected experience, a sudden discover of a deep and very powerful reality. If we are to follow Scrima, that experience was means knowledge by tryout. Indeed, for Symeon the type of tryout was a double one, because in addition to the tryout from the extraordinary presence of a totally different Reality from daily experience there was also a tryout of himself. This consisted in the need to leave aside everything that could represent an inner obstacle to exposing oneself to this experience. As a matter of fact, Simeon's experience as knowledge by tryout was not really new for the Eastern Tradition. What he really succeed in doing in his writings was to warn about the difference between an authentic experiential life and a misleading one.

---

[3] Louis Bouyer, "Byzantine Spirituality," *A History of Christian Spirituality*, Vol. II, ed. Louis Bouyer (NY: The Seabury Press, 1968), 568.

The experimentalism is decisive, the truth criterion being provided by the "appeal to experience." The hesychasm, the Eastern-Christian spiritual practice is different from other spiritual practices, at least in the Christian area, by the fact that it emphasizes the experience in the shape of the experiment. That is, it is supposed to be a method of verifiability, and validation and hence of interest in ultimate reality or, in the hesychast language for uncreated energies.

We can find an evident analogy between science and *hesychasm* regarding some discussions about the nature of ultimate reality. In the experiential or mystical tryout (a tryout in the front of an unexpectedly revealed reality, as well as a self-tryout as a result of this tremensdous experience), one of the most difficult tasks was finding a proper expression for this radical experience. The same difficulties appeared once with the discoveries made in quantum physics at the beginning of the last century.[4] The modern science began to have a similar question: how to find a proper language to express reality at the quantum level, or at the Universe's enormous scale? The physics of the 20th century was rather under an explanation crisis. This explanatory crisis meant a conflict of the explanatory models that intended to be complete and truthful. In imposing an epistemological model there prevailed rather a pragmatic need that proves that the researchers' experience in investigating the microphysical reality is complex and bewildering, and only some rather contextual needs imposed the use of a certain language. There is a gain when it comes to communicating among researchers, but at the same time a loss because the investigated reality is more complex than a formalization or an epistemological model. The risk is that an explanatory model will limit the way the research can understand and investigate reality. The fact is that the period invoked above meant a new opening to an unanticipated reality which proved a challenge to formalism and the epistemological model at stake.

---

[4] Bernard D'Espagnat, *On Physics and Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 2006, 14.

Conclusion

Today, more than ever, there is a need to move beyond the knowledge fragmentation caused by a discipline approach, and to integrate the information coming from different research perspectives. Without including the spiritual experience as a radical form of tryout between these perspectives, undoubtedly we will not be able to have a proper understanding of reality. The achieving of such a goal implies a difficult task: to find a language common to the scientific experiment and to the spiritual experience. Past history proves how serious is this challenge or provocation, but the study of this history can give us the clues to finding the right approach. The spiritual experience has its specificity in bringing new kinds of solutions to today's problems and crises, which is reason for an increased interest in this regard. The Eastern spiritual traditions, Chinese, Indian or Eastern Christian offer a very rich and complex inheritance that certainly can be used in developing of a more complex understanding of reality. On the other hand, the practice of spirituality, when done with rules and criteria provided by a spiritual tradition, can offer a genuine novelty and new perspectives on today's global challenges. This happens because the spiritual practice is a way of discovering something not hitherto revealed. This fact can be explained if we take into account that every human being has its own particularities, and its proper way to pursue a spiritual path. It is very important to stress that the history of spiritual practices is not a repetitive one: every historical epoch brings something different and new. If philosophy is today understood as being not only a theoretical and speculative enterprise, but rather connected with a way of practical experience, with a way of life, spiritual practice is certainly part of it. This makes obvious that an integrated and integral perspective in research is necessary, and this not only regarding scientific practice, but also one concerned with understanding the human, and thus the debate about values and the role of culture in a globalized world.

Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iaşi, Iasi, Romania

13.

Human Comprehensive Development is the Core Value of Socialism

WANG XIAOHONG

Every Human's Free and Comprehensive Development is the Ultimate Value, the Goal of Human Development

Historical materialism told us that the human is the subject of society, is being of social existence. Social development is the result of human activity. All material wealth, goods and material existence are the products of human activity, and the results of human natural power. Social development is rooted in the human's development, quality and capacity. Marx clearly pointed out that in the future new society, "every human's comprehensive and free development is the basic rule" and "every human's free development is the condition of all human's free development." American Socialist Inkeles also admitted in his *Exploring Individual Modernity* "human's modernity is a necessary element of a country's modernity. They are not the by-products after modernity but the prerequisite of a modern system and the economy's long term development and success." To understand Marx's theory about human's comprehensive development we need to pay attention to these aspects:

First, human's comprehensive development mainly means the individual capacity's comprehensive development and improvement. Marx in his *Critique of Political Economy (1857-1858 manuscript)* said "Comprehensive developed individual – their social relations as themselves' common relations" comprehensive developed individual – their social relationship as their common relations, also follow themselves' common control – not the result of nature, but history. To make this individuality possible, capacity's development need reach a high degree. This is just based on the production with value exchanges as prerequisite, so this kind of production can produce the universality and comprehensiveness of individual relation and capacity at the time produce the common alienation between self and

others." Here can be understood as personal ability and talents. Generally speaking, the more one person know and able to do and can handle complex and detailed things, then can be regarded as an able man or woman. Surely, human's comprehensive development is a dream. In real, we are far away from that now. Furthermore, as the refinement of social division of labor and professionalization of human ability obey the requirement of comprehensive development and will be overcome sooner or later.

Second, human development is a historical process. In different historical periods, the level and standard of comprehensive is different. Today's comprehensive development may not be comprehensive at tomorrow. How should we view human's comprehensive development? Marx viewed this issue from the meaning of history. The comprehensive development Marx said more strengthen on overcoming the social relations' limit on human, i.e. overcome the old type division of labor out extra mandatory's limit on human. The old division is not start from human's nature, it's spontaneous but not self-willingly. Therefore, human activity become an alienated power for themselves and this kind of power control human. Human activity was fixed and every human's development was limited in specific area. "He is a hunter, fisher or herdsman or judger. As long as he does not want to lose consumption goods he should always be such kind of man." The division of labor here is an old type combined with private ownership, through labor alienation it lead human alienation directly. Marx thought as long as the existence of old type division of labor, human unilateral development cannot avoid. Only in communist society, human can spread their talents in largest degree as their interests and willing but not forced, then reached comprehensive development.

Third, human comprehensive development is a moving process. Since the comprehensiveness is an ideal goal, and its realization is the accumulation of the social process, i.e. the realization from unilateral development to future comprehensive development, needs social progress's drive. Every significant development and progress all are kinds of development and liberation for human, are the stairs for future comprehensive development and ultimate liberation. Though since the disassembling of primitive society human met many kinds of misfortune and disaster, without these things, there will be no social

progress and human's development and liberation. Marx once said, since the initiation of civilization, production was built on the antagonism of level, rank, and classes, at last built on the opposite between accumulated labor and direct labor. Without opposite, there will be no progress. This is a rule that civilization followed until today." For human, "every progress in culture is forwarding to freedom." Therefore, we cannot underestimate the positive role that past society once played in human development, although this kind of role is limited and contradictory.

All in all, from Marx's viewpoint, the nature of comprehensive development of the human is the comprehensive reliance on their nature, i.e. "humans rely in a comprehensive way, that is, in general, humans build on their nature." Practice (based on labor) is way of human existence. Through practice humans identify their existence and verify their nature and got various kinds of material and social relations. Practice is the basic way that humans reached their nature comprehensively. In this meaning, human comprehensive development is a historical process that in labor, humans occupy their nature.

Every Human Comprehensive Development Can only Become True in Social Community

The sociality of humanity means human development cannot go on without social development. On one side, human's development was decided by society's development. During human's existence and development, all human will live on the material condition like productivity and productive relations created by last generation. These conditions regulate human's nature and limit human's development. Human's development is all fit for the level of productivity and social relations. On the other side, human's development decided society's development. Human are the subject of society and the subjective power driving social development. Through practices, human develop themselves' power ceaselessly, transforming nature and society, creating new productivity and social relations, changing the material condition of life. Because of continuous development of capacity, it is possible that society can alter its form and gain progress and development. Human is both the reason of social development and the result

of social development; both the "writer" of history and the "player" of history. The consistence of human development and social development is achieved in the conflict movement which manifest in three forms of social development that Marx proposed, i.e. Human society's development pass from early natural economy to commodity economy and communist (product economy). In this historical process, human developed from original rich human – dependent on nature through extremely unilateral development – independent development based on materials to free individuality – free development. This is a gradually moving process which the previous process is the basis of the later one. Although in a certain period, the prosperity of social civilization was not accompanied by highly richness of individuals but wasted individual development, however, just through squeeze on individual life formed highly developed productivity, prosperous social communications, science and culture. That is to say, during the abstraction of human individual, the comprehensiveness and universality can be get, the condition of every human's comprehensive development in advanced society will be created. This kind of human development definitely is not accidental but necessary.

The conflicts involved in human development and social development show that real human comprehensive development is a process through human activity and realized in social relations. Humanity is a social existence and always exists in a certain social relations. Therefore, human's development must rely on social development through the occupancy on various social relations. The comprehensiveness Marx said is not imagined or assumed one, but of real relations and idea relations. The realization of individual ability and promotion cannot leave its social relations. Surely, the comprehensiveness of social relations is not a natural thing but history. In the final analysis it's the product of productivity's development. Marx said, in the production process "what appeared as its subject is individual, merely in correlation. They both reproduce this kind of relation and produce this kind of relation. This is a nonstop moving process of themselves. In this process, they upgrade the fortune world they created and also upgrade themselves." However, to what degree the individual creates social life and social relations was decided by

the social not themselves. Real human comprehensive development is always achieved gradually in social comprehensive development.

Socialist Core Value Shows the Value Appeal of Every Human's Comprehensive Development

Socialist core value is the manifestation of every human's comprehensive development value appeal. Every human's comprehensive development is the core of socialist values.

First, promoting and realizing human's comprehensive development is the value goal of socialism. Marx thought, it is communist society (socialist is just initial phase) that will replace capitalist society, while value of communist society (socialist society) is to realize human's comprehensive development. As early as his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscript of 1844* Marx pointed that "Communism is private property that is human alienation's positive sublation, realizing true occupancy on human nature through human and for human; therefore, it's human involution to themselves and society. This involution is comprehensive, spontaneous and preserve all fortune left by past development. This kind of communism as a complete communism equals to humanitarianism, while as for accomplished humanitarianism equals to naturalism." The understanding of Marx on human's nature also has the feature of Heidegger but it pointed out the aim of communist is to liberate human, let human have real meaning and eliminate the alienation of human in labor, production, self and social relations. In Marx's view, the elimination of private ownership, old type of social division on labor and class antagonism is the leap of human society from necessity kingdom to free kingdom, is the necessity to realize human's comprehensive and free development. Later, he described the future society in a more clear way: "the social form regard every human's comprehensive and free development as the basic principle," "what replaces the capitalist society which has classes and antagonism will be such kind of union where every human free development is the condition of all human's free development." The future social productive development is to satisfy "human need developed by society," "through social production, not only can guarantee all social members material life better and better,

but also can guarantee their full and free application of their physical power and wisdom." Future social development is to meet "human need developed socially," "through social production, not only can guarantee all social members abundant and daily better material life, but also can guarantee their physical power and wisdom's free and comprehensive application." Future social productive development need to be based on human comprehensive development, making efforts to "foster all nature of social human, and regard him as human has most various nature and relations. Therefore, will be human has need as wide as possible – produced as social production as comprehensive and complete as possible." At the time driving social production's ahead promoting human comprehensive development and progress. Promoting and realizing every human's comprehensive development is the value goal of future Socialism.

Second, the setting of every human's comprehensive development as the value goal of socialist society is based on the living situation in capitalist society and the critique of capitalist society. Marx's conclusion after his observation on the living situation of capitalist society is: alienation. Marx found what capitalist society liberated is productivity but not human. "The productivity created by capitalism within 100 years are larger than all productivities created in last centuries." "Proliferation of material world is in proportion to the devaluation of human world," the success that capital get did not liberate human in real sense, but lead human in deep alienation. The benefit pursuing nature of capital established on capitalism which enslave worker and deprive surplus value, was dehumanization and against humanity. "On one hand is the accumulation of fortune but on the other hand, that is the class who regard their products as capital to produce is the accumulation of poverty, labor torture, slaved, ignorance, rudeness and moral degradation." is the manifestation that capitalism destroy and degrade human. In such cases, through the critique on various kinds of disasters brought by capitalism to the proletariat and human, Marx thought the value of future society should lie on: the elimination of alienation, every human's free and comprehensive development, the liberation of proletariat and even the whole human.

Third, human's comprehensive development shows the natural difference between socialist values and capitalist values, and also that is where the surpassing of socialist to capitalist lies. Core value is an important standard to distinguish socialism and Capitalism and other differences of these two ism can be extended from the difference of core value. The core value of Capitalism centered around capital and strengthening economic, political and cultural development for capital's free flow. Capital's nature is, thus, chasing benefits to break all limits. Therefore, Capitalism regards 'free and equal' as core value to be pursued. Centered around capital, all value concepts like freedom, equality, universal love and human rights which mean human progress are used for capitalist's freedom and equality. Moreover, these advanced value concepts are not shown in capitalist social reality. This means that human alienation is the definite result of capital's free development. However, the core values of socialism are society oriented, strengthening economic, political and cultural development and serve for every human's free and comprehensive development. Moreover, regarding enhancing human quality, developing human ability and promoting human happiness is the final goal and practice of Socialism. Therefore, Socialism viewed as social harmony, human happiness and human free and comprehensive development is the ultimate goal to pursue. Society and capital are the watershed between Socialism and Capitalism where free and comprehensive development are manifested.

References

Gao Guoxi: Marx Free and Comprehensive Development and Socialist Core Value, Academic Journal of Zhongzho, 2007(6).

Yu Wujin: On Human Comprehensive Development, Exploration and Discussion, 2002(8).

Feng Ziyi: How to Understand Human Comprehensive Development, Social Sciences of Beijing, 2002(4).

Li Daxing: On Changes of Marx Theory of Human Comprehensive Development, Philosophical Researches, 2006(6).

Huang Bin: Human Comprehensive Development and the Construction of Socialist Core Value, Socialism Studies, 2006(5).

14.

Reconstructing Values in Times of Radical Pluralism

PETER JONKERS

Introduction

One of the most important challenges of contemporary ethics is the wide-spread conviction, particularly in the Western world, that traditional values are nothing but contingent social constructions. Since the sixties of the last century, the processes of individualization, and, more recently, globalization have led to a 'detraditionalisation' of the value landscape in the Western world. A growing number of people 'construct' their own, individual values by taking various elements from heterogeneous value traditions and reassembling them into new, highly personal constructs. Concrete examples of this new eclecticism are New Age esotericism, and the steep decline of the appeal of many traditional value driven organizations in civil society, such as churches, trade unions, and political parties. Consequently, people consider the legitimacy of the truth claims of established value traditions as completely void or at least as limited in time and place to the group of their respective adherents.

Paradoxically, in spite of the wide-spread conviction that all substantial values are but contingent social constructs, this does not prevent people from being deeply attached to some of them, especially those belonging to their own life-world. One of the most prominent examples of such an attitude is populism, which favours an un-reflective, emotional sympathy for all kinds of popular values in a community of like-minded people. However, from a broader perspective, it is obvious that this emotional and unreflective stance is very worrying, especially in these times of globalization and, hence of radical value pluralism. Therefore, I fully agree with the organizers of this conference that it is timely to argue in favour of a reconstruction of values. However, when such a reconstruction would result in affirming that values are, indeed, social constructs, such an attempt would fall short

of expectations, since it would imply that value traditions would be entitled to withdraw in their own purview, thus blocking the opportunity of interaction, mutual understanding, and enrichment. Hence, what I want to examine in this paper is whether it makes sense to reintroduce the notion of 'truth' when it comes to discussing values, and how this notion has to be defined in order to be fruitful in such a discussion.

In order to discuss the relation between the proclaimed contingency of values and the claim to truth, I will examine values and value traditions from an existential point of view. This means that I will treat them not so much as a set of propositions about do's and don'ts, but as concretizations of the idea of human dignity, and as realized in particular ways of life. Values obviously include all kinds of contingent, i.e. historical and cultural, elements, but they also involve strong personal commitments, which reach far beyond their proclaimed contingency. For example, when educating our children we try to give them the values to which we are strongly attached. Hence, we feel very frustrated if our children ignore them, because we are convinced that living by these values will make their life good and fruitful. Is our deep existential commitment to some substantial values a sufficient reason for saying that they are also true? When using words like a good and fruitful life, do we refer to values that only count for us or also for others, and, eventually may be valuable as such?

In order to examine the question whether there is a relation between substantial values and truth, I will start with presenting a philosophical analysis of the popular idea that values are noting but social constructs. In the following section, I will then query this view by arguing that, even if one accepts that values comprise many contingent elements, this does not mean at all that it would not make sense to ask for the truth of these values. This insight leads to the idea of existential truth, which I will discuss in the final section.

Values as Contingent Social Constructions

The American philosopher Richard Rorty offers an unsettling analysis of why values are widely being perceived as contingent and how to deal with this in a pragmatic way. He shows that philosophy's

quest for truth, including the truth of values, has obviously led to nothing; its hope that the objective truth of values could be founded on the so-called natural law, stating that values reflect a natural order, has proven to be in vain. Instead, all values and the narratives underpinning them are but contingent 'final vocabularies'; their truth can only be demonstrated with circular arguments whose strength does not reach beyond the persons or communities using this vocabulary. In other words, the plausibility of values, let alone their truth, does not reach beyond the confines of a specific culture, which is, by definition, local. Consequently, through lack of a common, neutral meta-vocabulary, people are unable to weigh the truth claims of different value traditions against each other: values, which are essential for Western people, may rather be insignificant for people from other cultures, and vice versa. This explains why a discussion between people of different value traditions ends so often in mis-understanding or in a hostile silence instead of interaction and mutual enrichment. In sum, according to Rorty, we should drop the notion of objective truth altogether, especially when it comes to reconstructing values in global times, and replace it with that of an unforced agreement in a local community. This does not mean that Rorty opts for a kind of relativism, according to which every value would be as good as any other or that 'true' would be an equivocal term. It does imply "the ethnocentric view that there is nothing to be said about either truth or rationality apart from descriptions of the familiar procedures of justification which a given society – *ours* – uses in one or another area of inquiry."[1]

In our global times, the almost daily confrontation with very diverging value traditions often causes people to take an attitude of irony with regard to all these 'final vocabularies': ironists are "never quite able to take themselves seriously because always aware that the terms in which they describe themselves are subject to change, always aware of the contingency and fragility of their final vocabularies, and

---

[1] Richard Rorty, "Science as Solidarity," John S. Nelson, Allan Megill, Donald N. McCloskey (eds.), *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences: Language and Arguments in Scholarship and Public Affairs* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), 42.

thus of their selves." [2] They put this into practice by continually redescribing themselves, society, and the world in ever new ways, by constantly recreating themselves without referring to any normative eternal examples, like God, reason, truth, natural law, etc. Consequently, the ironist dismisses any reasonable discussion between different value traditions as a waste of time.

However, according to Rorty, the ironist is a pathological figure, since he is constantly in doubt as to whether he has been raised in the 'wrong' language-game, and inclined to give up his vocabulary in favour of another. Because all vocabularies are equally contingent, there is no end to this search, so that the ironist never finds peace in any of them. Consequently, he runs the risk of not belonging to anything anymore, of completely loosing his identity. He can only avoid this risk by devoting himself to the vocabulary with which he is familiar. Consequently, he simply declares that there are limits to what he can take seriously. In sum, we are fully entitled to be *emotionally* attached to a specific value tradition, although *reasonably* we know that it is completely contingent.

In my view, Rorty's analysis is exemplary for what is happening in many Western countries with regard to values and their truth claims. He explains why people are afraid of losing the values to which they are attached, especially when confronted with a plurality of alternatives, all of which seem equally attractive, but also equally contingent. In order to deal with the unsettling consequences of this radical value pluralism, they unreflectively affirm the values with which they are most familiar, not so much on reasonable, but on emotional grounds.

In an article entitled "Apologia of the Coincidental," the German philosopher Odo Marquard offers a similar analysis of the current radical value pluralism in the Western world. Like Rorty, he shows that substantiating the truth claims of value traditions on the basis of natural law, as well as trying to reach consensus over them in a pluralist context have failed in the face of human finiteness. This has led to a widespread suspicion with regard to the truth claims of all values,

---

[2] R. Rorty, *Contingency, Irony, Solidarity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 73f.

and to the conviction that all values can be transvaluated (Nietzsche). "Everything that cannot (by a consensus, resulting from a non-oppressive discourse) be demonstrated as being absolutely good, could for that reason be evil (including all the orientations at our disposal for acting). Therefore it should be treated as if it were really evil, until it is (by absolute discourse) consensually justified as something good. As long as this is not the case, all acting that is guided by conventions has to be suspended and even treated as suspicious."[3]

A concrete example of this strategy are the endless discussions among youth about the basic principles of a new, just society during the sixties and seventies of the last century. In their eagerness to set up a new, non-oppressive society, they started by rejecting all conventions and value traditions, because they were not rationally justified and were oppressive. They were convinced that, through a consensus resulting from non-oppressive discourse, they could lay the foundations of a new society that could meet the criteria of rational justification. Meanwhile, they expected that the affluent society they were actually living in would enable them to refrain from real life as long as their discussions about the ins and outs of the new, rational society had not yet reached the desired general consensus. In fact, this methodic suspicion of conventional values results in a kind of philosophy which refuses what is given, what has been handed down through the ages, i.e. value traditions, because of their contingency. It eventually comes down to a refusal of every value tradition as long as it is not rationally justified: as long as a particular, contingent way of life has not proven itself rationally justified, the best option is to refrain from living at all. Of course, this conclusion is absurd, since it is in fact a ban on starting to live before life has come to an end.

Marquard's critique of the modern idea that it would be possible to reach reasonable consensus over conflicting values in a pluralist society comes down to the idea that this approach makes use of an abstract idea of rationality and human society: it presupposes that humans are intellects, freely floating in a neutral space, and that new

---

[3] O. Marquard, "Apologie des Zufälligen. Philosophische Überlegungen zum Menschen," in idem, *Zukunft braucht Herkunft. Philosophische Essays* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2003), 151 f.

value traditions can be developed from scratch, accepting only what has passed the test of rational foundation or justification. In doing so, it abstracts from the fact that human rationality is always embodied in concrete lives.

Thus, we seem to find ourselves in a deadlock with regard to answering the question of how to reconstruct values in global times. The ideal of modern philosophy, aiming at a complete rational justification of the truth of these values through natural law or consensus, has proven unattainable. Human life is simply too short to wait for conclusive answers which remove all doubt concerning the truth of our value orientations. The pursuit of this ideal of complete rational justification and truth leads to a philosophy of life after death, thus leaving the vital questions of life before death unanswered.[4] What we really need is a philosophical reflection on life before death. Only with the help of this type of reflection may we be able to understand *why* certain values should be reconstructed, whereas others have rightfully become obsolete.

Marquard's position is similar to Rorty's also as regards the solution of this deadlock: although traditions are contingent, we simply cannot live without them. Marquard is able to explain far better than Rorty why the ironist's practice of hopping from one vocabulary to another makes him insane. He calls traditions expressions of fate-contingency, and distinguishes them clearly from arbitrary-contingency. Arbitrary-contingency can be described as something that could have been otherwise, and can be changed by us (e.g. the contingent choice between cheese or ham as sandwich filling). Rorty's ironic 'tradition-hopper' is a clear example of this arbitrary-contingency; he thinks he can arbitrarily redescribe his own life and the world he is living in. Fate-contingency, on the other hand, is something that could have been otherwise, but cannot be changed by us (e.g. the fact that we were born in a certain time and place, that we speak our native language). In fact, fate-contingency prevails in determining our lives, since it confronts us with the strength of natural and historical particulars.[5] From this perspective, the self-important presumptuousness

---

[4] O. Marquard, "Apologie des Zufälligen," 153.

[5] O. Marquard, "Apologie des Zufälligen," 157 f.

with which we make our plans or take decisions often makes us look ridiculous. Most value traditions, like all other kinds of final vocabularies, obviously belong to fate-contingency, since they determine us far more than we determine them. We humans are much more our own fate-contingencies than our own choices.[6] In sum, in Marquard's view, although value traditions are contingent, this is no reason for not being attached to them; on the contrary, life would be impossible without them.

The Paradox of Substantial Attachments to Contingent Traditions

In the previous section, I have shown that various contemporary philosophers explicitly recognize the importance of value traditions, either because there is a limit to the value traditions that we can take seriously (Rorty), or because they are simply part of our human condition (Marquard). This explicitly proclaimed attachment to values does not prevent them from being contingent. This contingency concerns both the personal, historical, and cultural backgrounds of our attachment to these value traditions, as well as their content. According to these authors, our substantial attachment to a way of life have no implication as to its truth. It is only determined by psychological and cultural factors, and thus basically a matter of time and place. This implies that, if it makes sense at all to claim its truth, this claim does not reach any further than the people who are already committed to this or that (religious) way of life, and, thus, convinced of its truth. However important it is for the already converted to clarify and meditate these truths, there is no generally accepted concept of rationality or a neutral meta-vocabulary which could serve as a kind of judicial authority (to use a famous expression of Kant's) for weighing the truth claims of diverging values. Thus, humans seem to be substantially committed to a given tradition, to which they belong only contingently, and which, as such, is also contingent. This result leaves still unanswered, the leading question of this paper, namely how to reconstruct values in times of radical pluralism, especially when this

---

[6] O. Marquard, "Apologie des Zufälligen," 160.

reconstruction aims at more than just affirming that value traditions are social constructions.

After having analyzed some underlying problems with regard to the reconstruction of values in times of radical pluralism, the remainder of this paper, will try to give a positive answer to this question. Admittedly, we often experience that many of our substantial attachments concern contingent matters. Most of our daily habits, from the kind of food we prefer to our morning or evening rituals, belong to this category. We usually perform them unconsciously, and we only realize the substantial character of our attachment to them when we have to forego them for some time. This is one of the reasons why people are usually glad to return home from their holidays abroad. The contingent content of some of our substantial attachments becomes even clearer when we look at our attachment to our native language. As the word 'native' already indicates, it is the language we are most familiar with in the sense that it enables us to express and share our deepest thoughts and emotions. We experience the substantial character of this attachment most clearly when we are abroad and want to communicate with others on a deeper level than sharing the usual 'airport information'. In such situations, we always feel somewhat hampered, because we often cannot find the right words to express our thoughts and feelings, or understand the exact meaning and connotetion of the words of our conversation partners. Immigrants and people belonging to a linguistic minority are also painfully aware of this handicap in everyday life, and of the social and economic discrimination resulting therefrom. On the other hand, however, our native language is something contingent, since it depends upon the contingency of the language of our parents; it is a mother tongue. In sum, a native language is characteristic of what Marquard calls fate-contingency: although it is completely contingent, our native language determines our symbolic access to the world and to other people, whereas we cannot determine it. Nobody can choose his or her native language.

When reflecting upon our substantial attachments, most people realize that many of them concern all kinds of contingent matters. Therefore, nobody seriously wants to lay claim to their truth. Although we are attached to our native language in a substantial way, this does not mean at all that it is more 'true' or superior in comparison

to other languages. On the contrary, all attempts to upgrade our substantial attachment in such a way lead to oppressing those who have other substantial attachments. Heidegger's conviction that German is, after ancient Greek, the best language to speak about philosophical issues, shows the problematic character of his attachment to his native language, especially if one looks at his political positions during the Nazi period. Moreover, it is an insult to all non-German philosophers. The same can be said about the ancient Greeks, who underscored their pretension to 'linguistic superiority' by calling foreigners barbarians, thereby disqualifying the language of these foreigners as jabber. These examples clearly show how essential it is to realize that the objects of many of our substantial attachments are contingent, and have to remain so. It prevents us from imposing them on others, since this would imply an illegitimate violation of their personal or cultural integrity. Especially in global times, being aware of the contingency of many of our attachment is crucial for being able to live together peacefully.

The question is whether this reasoning holds true for our attachment to all substantial values and value traditions. Are they as contingent as our daily habits and native language, implying that it makes no sense to speak about their truth? Are people, in expressing the truth of the values to which they are attached, simply expressing their private feelings or those of the community, to which they happen to belong, or are they, by contrast, saying that these values are really true? If so, are they justified to impose their values on other people, or would they then become guilty of oppression and tyranny? As we know, history is full of tragic examples of imposing specific values on other people, especially during the times of colonization.

Although nobody can seriously want to return to the cultural colonialism of the previous centuries, the issue of value contingency versus truth is still, or perhaps again, very relevant because of the important shifts in contemporary society. The crucial question in this respect is: Is an individual able to perform the 'mental acrobatics' necessary for being substantially committed in the private domain to certain values, while, at the same time, recognizing their sheer contingency in the public domain?

In order to clarify this crucial point, note this concrete example of conflicting values in global times. Insofar as being a European citizen stands for the substantial attachment to a value tradition, which comes down to respecting the inviolability of the physical and spiritual integrity of the person, or, more generally speaking, the dignity of the human person.[7] Again, both the origins and the content of this value tradition and our commitment to it contain many contingent aspects. When confronted with people who reject this value or even attack it, many Europeans experience that not only is their attachment to them substantial, but that their basic content is also true, and hence deserves to be defended publicly. They do not experience the substantial content of their European values as just one of the many final vocabularies, but as an interpretation of what it truly means to be human and what a just society should be. Although history shows that the origin of this value tradition was contingent, and although it needs constant refinement and adaptation in a globalised world, it is nevertheless an expression of how the relations between persons as well as between states and their citizens should truly be.

In contexts of private and public values, we use words like 'true' and 'universal' in order to express something essential, something that is not just true for the individual who expresses it or for a small group of like-minded people. In order to make this concrete, we communicate our substantial commitments with others in the public domain, asking others to recognize them as an expression of something essential. In other words, we ask them to recognize the values that underpin these commitments as truthful orientations for our lives. This striving for recognition does not mean that others have to adopt our values for the orientation of their lives. This would be a denial of the inevitable dissemination of people's lives, and consequently of the real divergence of our substantial commitments as they are embodied in the contingency of our concrete existence as finite human beings. It is an illusion to expect that this real divergence of substantial commitments can eventually be superseded by a peaceful dialogue between all value traditions or by waiting for their eschatological fusion. On

---

[7] See Hans Joas, *Die Sakralität der Person* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2012).

the contrary, the striving for recognition of the truth of diverging value traditions often appears as a painful confrontation of irreconcilable practices. Nevertheless, the process of striving for recognition shows that there is something essential at stake: others ask us to recognize that their substantial commitment to their value tradition is an attempt to express something essential and of equal value to our own substantial commitments, although we may not share their commitments and they may even fill us with repulsion. The process of recognition can only take place against the background of conflicting substantial values, because only then can all partners in this process become aware of the fact that there is something essential at stake. Therefore, we feel deeply frustrated when others do not want to take these meanings seriously, and reduce them to contingent, private opinions whose acceptance does not rest upon their substance, but merely upon their private character, and on their not causing too much of a fuss.

What matters here is not so much the actual process of recognition and its social and political implications, but the fact that, while striving for recognition, we reach out towards something essential, towards an existential truth which transcends our subjective, contingent self. In the end, we do not want to be left alone with our contingent convictions and practices, nor are we prepared to leave others alone with theirs. We humans are too finite to be left alone with our own finitude, too dependent on the recognition of our substantial meanings by others to seriously consider ourselves as the only creators of truth and value in a meaningless world. This implies that the above mentioned 'mental acrobatics' that is required to be a full member of the (post) modern circus of life-styles, bidding for the public's favour, falls short of expectations. We cannot live with the idea that all our private substantial attachments, without which life would be impossible, are, in the public domain, completely contingent.

Value Reasoning

What does the foregoing tell us about the truth of values? As said, answering this question is a necessary condition for engaging in a process of value reconstruction in global times. First of all, it has

become clear that the kind of truth that value traditions claim, differs from the truth claims of the sciences and theoretical philosophy. Rather, in order to discover the truth of values, philosophy has to start from the lives of people who live by these values, and accept that value traditions are expressions of practical wisdom and have to be examined accordingly. That is why I prefer the term 'existential' to 'theoretical truth' in the context of values and other expressions of practical wisdom. In other words, what is needed for a reconstruction of values is in the first place a hermeneutics of specific value traditions.

A concrete example of this hermeneutics is cultural value reasoning. This approach stems from the tradition of interreligious dialogue, which, under the name of 'scriptural reasoning', is aimed at interpreting religious convictions and practices.[8] First of all, all participants engaged in cultural value reasoning have to acknowledge the sacred character of the others' values to them (without having to acknowledge their authority for oneself). They have as well to recognize that they do not exclusively 'own' the values of their cultural tradition, which means that they are not the only experts on its final meaning.[9] By taking this approach, cultural value reasoning aims at stimulating a self-reflective attitude among the people who participate in such a dialogue, without requiring them to give up the sacred character of their values to them.

Cultural value reasoning starts with recognizing that value traditions result from long chains of reasoning about the good life. Value reasoning prevents these values from being reduced to contingent social constructions. In order to show whether the truth claims of these value traditions are justified they have to be made public, so that they can be understood by people from other traditions. Value reasoning fulfils this task by bringing together the views of the good life, their

---

[8] For an analysis of scriptural reasoning and references to other literature about this issue see: "Peter Jonkers, From Rational Doctrine to Christian Wisdom," Staf Hellemans and Peter Jonkers (eds.), *A Catholic Minority Church in a World of Seekers* (Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2015).

[9] Ford, *Christian Wisdom,* pp. 279f. See also Adams, *Habermas and Theology,* p. 243.

interpretation by philosophical reasoning, and 'public issue' questions. In other words, value reasoning stimulates that cultural traditions become self-reflective: in particular, its members have to acknowledge the *sacredness* of the others' values to them, but without having to acknowledge their *authority* for oneself. When people enter the hermeneutical circle of the public debate and, by doing so, become self-reflective, they learn to accept the idea that the values of others express a kind wisdom that can be interpreted philosophically, and, hence, offers food for thought to all participants in the public debate, even though they may not share or even reject these values. Hence, this philosophical interpretation of the wisdom that is embedded in value traditions creates a shared field for people from different cultures. Given the heterogeneous character of value traditions, value reasoning is polyphonic, which implies that it is not aimed at reaching consensus. It even less can be reduced to an authoritarian monologue of one value system, distorting all the others.

The above shows that value reasoning mediates between divergent value traditions. It realizes this aim by making deep value reasonings public so that others may learn to understand them and discover why particular trains of reasoning are *reasonings*, and not just particular assumptions, contingent social constructions, and why they are attractive or problematic.[10] In other words, value reasoning stimulates value traditions to become self-reflective, so that they can situate themselves against a broader cultural background, and can be recognized by people who do not belong to this specific tradition, but without requiring them to accept any claim for *exclusive* recognition.

Hence, value reasoning is able to understand the values that are foundational for a culture in their own right. It is aimed at establishing a self-reflective, hermeneutical field that is shared by various value traditions. This shared field is the result of the common need for existential orientation, to which all value traditions are trying to respond. In this context, it is also important to note that the shared field, at which value reasoning aims by making the reasonings of different value systems public, is not identical with striving after consensus.

---

[10] Adams, *Habermas and Theology,* p. 242; see also Ford, *Christian Wisdom,* p. 281.

Rather, the best result that can be reached is friendship, that is, the recognition of the sacred nature of each other's values and a shared desire to study them.

How, then, can value reasoning realize the recognition of the sacred character of fundamental values, while avoiding that this recognition becomes exclusive? The answer is that it only coordinates discussions between members of different value traditions without requiring a commitment to a specific culture and a specific interpretation of human rights, which often turns out to be a Western, individualist one. Participants engage in value reasoning only as members of a particular value tradition. By so doing, they also recognize that their specific value system does not completely exhaust the very idea of human dignity, which underlies each value system. Because this recognition counts for all specific value systems, none of them can claim to have a monopoly. Moreover, value reasoning prepares a *shared* playing field, which means that the members of value traditions accept the claim that the other belongs there too, without stating further conditions as to the nature of their reasonings. This explains why value reasoning is aimed at friendship, resulting from respectfully studying religious traditions, rather than at consensus on specific issues. A final reason why value reasoning may offer a solution to the problem of value conflicts in a context of radical cultural diversity is that it does not make a strong contrast between argumentation and narrative. Because value reasoning brings together the interpretation of values, the practices of philosophical and theological reasoning, and 'public issue' questions, there is argumentation at every stage. This is so because, again, value reasoning is an expression of practical wisdom, and is practiced in a shared, not in a neutral, space. In other words, through its origin in wisdom, value reasoning manifests a broader kind of reasonableness than modern, procedural reason, and is therefore able to include both argumentation and narration.

Tilburg University, The Netherlands

15.

The Relevance of Love in the Era of Globalization: A Multicultural Perspective

SELECTA MISHRA

> Darkness cannot drive out darkness: only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate: only love can do that.
> – Martin Luther King Jr., *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches*

Hooks cites Martin Luther King Jr.'s proclamation "I have decided to Love" (1994a: 247). She argues that the civil rights movement was successful because it was moved by Martin Luther King Jr. who called for love. Hooks suggests that any progressive movement becomes successful when it compels the masses to do so by compelling the hearts and souls through the promise and proclamation of love. Even in small communities, when its members organize their lives around love ethics, every aspect of daily life can be affirming for everyone. In a similar manner, Kentucky poet Wendell Berry (1995) writes in his work, about the positive values that exist in rural communities that embrace the ethics of communalism and the sharing of resources. He encourages learning from the lives of folks who live in communities governed by a spirit of love and communalism.

Multiculturalism

Multicultural society is a society of difference. When we talk of multiculturalism the main concern becomes the difference, people with different cultures. This difference is not the negative meaning of life. It does not threaten; in fact, it has an enriching meaning. It enriches the life of people by bringing different cultures together. The question of whether a society should be culturally plural or multicultural is not really an issue: modern societies for the most part are simply multicultural. The issue is the challenges the society now faces in these multicultural worlds. The varied cultures of society leading

to cultural diversity or multiculturalism have brought many conflicts or wars among cultures. This battle between cultures is no longer a simple battle; this cultural war has moved on to global war. It is part of the shape of the world politics of a new millennium. There is still a society where, for example, the three richest people are equal to 600 million of the poorest. Now the culture wars are not only matters of racism or soap operas but, rather, ethnic cleansing. There is a political corelative between individual and universal known as nation-state. The hyphen here has a great role here for it signifies the relation between culture and politics. Nations are always required to take shape by state as these bring the unity of being reconciled under a single sovereign. Since the sovereign is the product of reason itself, the local is thus raised to universal. Some movements have now become more international than national. Moreover, nation is gradually getting a more global status. Culture is playing a more ambitious role on the world political stage. Cultures are now becoming the basis of the nation-state. If we speak culturally, belonging to one nation rather than the other has become so important that people are quite often prepared to kill or die over these questions (Eagleton, 2000). Various public institutions, public agencies fail to recognize and respect the particular cultural identity of its disadvantaged minorities. Only now are multicultural societies facing these identity crises. The concern with cultural recognition and rights perniciously diverts attention away from genuine cases of social injustice concerning inequalities of opportunity. In this context, Berry (2001) argues that multiculturalists often end up hurting people most in need assistance (Berry, 2001). The proposition that all groups are free to pursue their cultural objectives on the same terms remains ill founded. Another concern of multi-culturalism is accommodation of minorities. Now in most societies its practices endanger the interest of minority groups. As Susan Moller Okin observed whereas 'the special rights that women claim do not give more powerful women the right to control less powerful women …cultural group rights often (in not-so obvious ways) reinforce existing hierarchies' (Okin, 1999: 131). It is very difficult to find a multicultural society which is not going through this controversy of identities: recognition, justice, citizenship and group differentiated rights of cultural disadvantaged minorities. Many challenges are now

faced by our multicultural societies which give the study of multi-culturalism a new dimension. Is it possible to handle these challenges without conflicts or wars? In this paper I will explore how to look at the challenges through the lens of love.

Multiculturalism is closely associated with "identity politics," "the politics of difference" and "the politics of recognition," all of which share a commitment to revaluing disrespected identities and changing dominant patterns of representation and communication that marginalize certain groups (Gutmann, 2003; Taylor, 1992; Young 1990). Multiculturalism is also a matter of economic interests and political disadvantages that people suffer as a result of their minority status. The debate about multiculturalism is a debate in which certain differences (culture, ethnicity, faith) have come to be regarded as important and others (such as class, say, or generational), which used to be perceived as important in the past, have come to be seen as relative.

The traditional model of citizenship as common-rights was deeply connected to ideas of national integration. That is now under attack. Many groups like blacks, women, indigenous peoples, ethnic and religious minorities, gays and lesbians feels marginalized not because of their socio-economic status but because of their socio-cultural identity, the 'difference'. They argue that the common rights of citizenship cannot be accommodated to the needs of other groups.

Henry Louis Gates, echoing W. E. B. Du Bois, observed in 1992 that "the problem of the twenty-first century will be the problem of differences — the matter of multiculturalism" (see Powell, 2003). Analysis of the term reveals many of its characteristics and factors—it stands for both positive and negative versions of accommodation, recognition, cultural (and in some case moral). The term multi-culturalism congregates many interrelated themes. It accentuates the need to have a stable identity, underlines the contributions of different cultural communities. It emphasizes the importance of cultural belonging and legitimizes the craving to maintain difference. Multi-culturalism is about the proper terms of relationship between different cultural communities. The norms governing their respective claims, cannot be derived from one culture alone but, through toleration, an equal dialogue between different cultures and the principle of justice.

Love

In this manuscript an attempt is made to look at the multicultural society through the lens of love. I chose the lens of love for three reasons. First, love is something which is without dominance. Equality prevails where love prevails. According to Irigary, love is a positive attempt towards otherness, towards difference. All great social movements for freedom and justice in all societies are based on love. She further argued that collective development of any nation, city or neighborhood is rooted in the values of love. Second, everyone is free, to live fully and well. We get this freedom when we live our life based on a love ethics. To bring this love ethics into our life, society needs to be changed. Important and radical changes are necessary if love is to become social and not individualistic. When violence becomes the accepted norm love is the only principle of change which can be started first from our own community. There is no longer a need of dying for nation or organizing great massacres or any national revolution, but preparing for the future generations because they are also our loved ones. Instead of involving in any violent activity where the future generations are also bound to pay for it, we should be involved in such activity that will help our future generation. What we prepare now will affect our future generation (Erich Fromm, 1956). Third, a multicultural society cannot be stable and last long without developing a common sense of belonging among its citizens. The sense of belonging cannot be ethnic and based on shared cultural, ethnic and other characteristics, for a multicultural society is too diverse for that, but must be political and based on a shared commitment to the political community. Its members do not directly belong to each other as in an ethnic group but through their mediating membership of a shared community, and they are committed to each other because they are all in their own different ways committed to a common historical community. They do and should matter to each other because they are bonded together by ties of common historical community. They do and should matter to each other because they are bonded together by the ties of common interest and attachment....The commitment to the political community involves commitment to its con-

tinuing existence and well-being, and implies that one cares enough for it not to harm its interest.

Relevance of Love in a Multicultural Society

Have we reached a stage now where we do not have to decide whether that multicultural society is good or bad? Whether we can work for a multicultural society? We are already multicultural. Currently, scholars have started discussion on integration. This becomes very crucial when we talk about multiculturalism.

A multicultural society passes through many crises and conflicts. When conflicts have become a part of our life the only option left for us which is opposite to conflict is love. Love here sticks the nation together. Love allows for integrity and care which enhance our lives. Even if we get into any conflict we think only of the present situation and the others whom we think are different. Are we not suppose to think about our future generations? These are our near ones. The conflict we are involved in at present has its impact on their future. Can we see our future generation suffer? The after effect of our violence can chose anyone in future. Love can be a substitute for violence. Love gives a sense of respect towards others. Love is the only substitute for violence. The crises of multiculturalism are clearly difficult to eradicate but we can work on some new ideas like the ethics of love which stands for care, respect and integrity.

Understanding Love

As a society we are embarrassed by love. We treat it as if it were an obscenity. We reluctantly admit to it. Even saying the word makes us stumble and blush...Love is the most important thing in our lives, a passion for which we would fight or die, and yet we're reluctant to linger over its names. Without a supply of vocabulary, we cannot even talk or think about it directly (Diane Ackerman, 1994). If our society had to have a common understanding of the meaning of love then the act of love would not be so mystifying. The dictionary definition of love emphasizes romantic love, defining love first and foremost as "profoundly tender, passionate affection for another person when

based on sexual attraction." Of course there are many others writers who have written without the context of sex. However, deep affection does not really adequately describe love's meaning (Bell Hooks). According to Diane Ackerman "Love is the greatest intangible." Everyone admits that love is wonderful and necessary, yet no one agrees on what it is.

There are a great variety of phenomena called 'love', many ancient words are translated by this one word, and with various, often incompatible philosophical definitions. Whichever is the more exact sense of the word one has in mind, conceiving it properly requires accounting for a rich constellation of other closely related phenomena, some of which may also go by the same name (Globalization Love: on the Nature and Scope of love as a form of recognition, Heikki Ikaheimo, 2010).

Love is described differently by dfferent researchers. For example, love as described by Aristotle (see David Konstan, 2008) and Ahmed (2004) is not the same love as individual sentiments and feelings towards others. For Aristotle love is not a sentiment or feelings, but a settled intension. Aristotle however says nothing about feelings but looks exclusively at intention, which moreover has as its object the well-being of other. This love as intention introduces the biggest problem of multiculturalism, that is, otherness, the problem of minorities. Sara Ahmed (2004) has described how love becomes a way of bonding with others in relation to an ideal, which takes shape as an effect of such bonding. She examines how love moves us towards something in the very delineation of the object of love, and how the direction is sustained through the failure of love to be returned. She brings two things to the discourse of love: what we are doing when we do something in the name of love? How it is assumed to be better to do something if it is done in the name of love? Thinking through how love works in places where it has been seen more benevolent, such as in the discourse of multiculturalism. Ahmed tries to see how multicultural love works to expand love to include others. Lucy Fur has taken this discussion of love into a totally new direction: love for future generations. He considered all the future generations to be our loved ones. Hence, he proposes that we should perform our activities keeping in mind the love for our future generation. The love discussed

by Aristotle, Sara Ahmed and Lucy Fur will help me to discuss the concept of love in a multicultural context. It has been described in a different way which can address many of our multicultural challenges. In the following section the concept of love is discussed.

In any multicultural society there is a serious gap between what people claim to hold as values but in reality do not follow: a gap between the theory and practice to connect thought and action, realizing these values and putting them into practice in a real multicultural society. This may be due to the fear of the dominant class of losing the importance of their own culture. Though the majority groups show their love towards otherness, in practice they fail to do so because they are scared of radical change. They think that the changes in society may bring change in their dominant culture. This is a serious issue in any multicultural society, and the fear is responsible for building the gap and holding the dominant structure. In its true sense, love does not possess fear, but gives us the freedom of opportunity to lead a full life, it gives the freedom of choice. When one chooses to love s/he chooses to move against fear – against alienation and separation (Hooks, 2000: 93). Love is the choice to connect to others, to find ourselves in others. Hooks in his book talks about *Love Ethics*. According to him "A love ethics presupposes that everyone has the right to be free, to live fully and well. To bring a love ethic to every dimension of our lives, our society would need to embrace change." In a multicultural society it is the time to think beyond domination and focused on recognition. Multicultural society should show more concern about politics of domination, more care and more special rights for oppressed groups. Hooks draws on the concept of Ethics of Love to argue that this is possible. He (2000) argues that the ability to acknowledge blind spots can emerge only as we expand our concerns about politics of domination and our capacity to care about the oppresssion and exploitation of others: a love ethic makes such expansion possible. Further he associates the testimony of love, with the practice of freedom: "The moment we choose to love we begin to move against domination, against oppression. The moment we choose to love we begin to move towards freedom, to act in ways that liberate ourselves and others. The action is the testimony of love as the practice

of freedom (1994a, 250). As been discussed earlier we should try to live by the principles of a love ethics.

To live our lives based on the principles of a love ethic (showing care, respect, knowledge, integrity, and the will to cooperate), we have to be courageous. Learning how to face fears is one way we embrace love. Our fear may go away, but it will not stand in the way. Those of us who have already chosen to embrace a love ethic, allowing it to govern and inform how we think and act, know that when we let our light shine, we draw to us and are drawn towards other bearers of light. To live a life which is based on love ethics where care, respect, freedom, integrity all have a role to play we need to be free of fear and accommodative. Fear may not go away in whole manner but it should not stand in the way of accommodation or acceptance. Oliver (2001) has supported relations with others do not have to be hostile alien encounters. Instead, they can be love adventures, the advent of something new. Difference does not have to be threatening; it can be exciting, the source of the meaning of life. In the thrilling adventure of love, the unknown and incomprehensible excite rather than threaten. Falling in love, otherness, is the greatest joy; and vulnerability in the face of the other is a sweet surrender, a gift rather than a sacrifice.

Irigary (1985) emphasizes the importance of love through the lenses of the dominant and the oppressed groups. According to her, love is something which is without domination. For love there is no dominant group and oppressed group: equality prevails where love prevails. Love is a positive attempt towards otherness, towards difference. All great social movements for freedom and justice in all societies are based on love. Collective development of any nation, city or neighborhood is rooted in the values of love. If all public policy was created in the name of love, we would not have to worry about an oppressed group, their accommodation or their identity. She proposes that love outside of domination as a nonhierarchical love between two and emphasizes *the between*, which both connects and separates the lovers. This negative limit, which is not a negative, sets up the boundaries necessary to imagine a non-totalizing love across difference. She imagines a love that does not fix a beloved as an object, a love that does not reduce one to the other; rather according to her love is a dynamic movement towards another. She suggests that by recon-

ceiving love we can transform ethical, social and political relations. This makes sense in a multicultural society which is characterized by difference. Love has the potential to make this difference an enriched experience for people by bringing different cultures together. Falling in love with otherness brings happiness and the greatest joy in life. Love gives the power to be together and enjoy the richness of life. Difference is not a curse; it is a gift to enjoy life with others with the ethics of love. In the present study, I have followed Irigary (1985) by arguing that love can bring transformation in any multicultural society. A non-hierarchical love between the dominant and the oppressed group can change the vision of the dominant culture group towards the oppressed and give them necessary freedom. Similarly, the oppressed cultural group must learn to identify themselves with the established cultural group.

The term politics of love in multicultural nations is not a private issue and can be better understood by the Greek term *'Philia'* used by Aristotle in his concept of love and friendship. Philia is an ancient Greek term used by Aristotle in his *Nicomachean Ethics* to express friendship. Philia is often translated as brotherly love. It is one of the four ancient Greek words for love (Philia, Storge, Agape and Eros). According to Aristotle "friendship has three species, corresponding to three objects of love" (In *Dialouge with Humanity*, 2011, *The Nicomachean Ethics* section, para. 1156a7). This first type of friendship is friendship based on utility. In this situation, people, usually the elder or the prime, become friends just because they can utilize each other's power to gain what they desire, e.g., money and support. The second type of friendship occurs among those who pursue pleasure for themselves, for instance, youth. Apparently, these two species of friendship can hardly last for a long period because if their friend is no longer useful or pleasant to them, "the cause of their being a friend is removed" (1156a: 23). Unlike the first two types, the last type of friendship, complete friendship, however, is enduring. It is "the friendship of good people similar in virtue" (115b7). In this case, good people become friends not because of utility or pleasure, but because of this virtue. Since this pursuit of virtue is mutual and a friend is considered "another oneself" (117097), "they wish goods to each other for the sake of each other" (1156b9-10).

Aristotle used the term Philia to explain the reciprocal affection between friends, but occasionally uses it in simple sense of love, irrespective of mutuality.

Aristotle has made two points very clear from the definition of "Love." First it is unequivocally and empathetically altruistic: One wishes and acts to realize good things for the other's sake, in accordance with what the other conceives of as good–reciprocally as in the case of friendship. In the Rhetoric, Aristotle affirms that Philios must share the pleasure and pain of the other on account of the other and for no other reason. This is because if the other has what is good, we ourselves will be pleased at this realization of our wish; otherwise not (1381a3-7). Love is considered as a feeling. According to Hatfield and Rapson (2000), "Companionate Love...combines feelings of deep attachment, commitment, and intimacy." The emphasis is feeling together with a notion of attachment and closeness. Aristotle however says nothing about feelings but looks exclusively to intension in which the objective is the well-being of the other. Here Aristotle's conception of love is different from the modern conception of love. The second edition of Webster's New International Dictionary (1959), for example, defines "love" as "a feeling of strong personal attachment and "ardent affection."

Love and friendship in Aristotle's term is summarized not as required obligations or based on kinship but as an altruistic desire which, when reciprocated, results in state of affairs that Aristotle and Greek in general, called Philia (David Konstan, 2008). Basically Aristotle is not trying to define love rather is identifying the reasons why one should love: that we share the same idea of good and bad with others disposes us to wish good things for their sakes. His way of explaining love is what is good or bad for one group must be good and bad for the other. Those who hate one group or being hated are the same for the other also. The same thing will appear as good and bad for both the parties. Aristotle has also given importance to justness and moderation. According to him a group of people those who believe in justness would not want to in an advantageous position by unfair means and at the same time they wish good things for others also. He believes that most people are inclined towards those who are

agreeable or not quarrelsome and they admire those or expect to be admired by them.

The majority community as well as the minorities such as immigrants and ethnic minorities are obliged to do something so that one should not blame others for the failure of integration. Multiculturalism assumes a two-way process of integration. This two-way process of integration can be successful when the two groups allow cohesion along with integration. A multicultural society cannot be stable without developing a common sense of belonging. This is possible if a thing becomes the same for both the parties. The majority may not have any attachment towards different others, but only intension for the betterment of the minority. Multicultural accommodation works simultaneously on two levels: creating new forms of belonging to citizenship and country, and helping sustain origins and diaspora. Integration is not possible without a small hyphen which worked in a big level. This 'hyphened' is such identities as Jewish-American or British-Muslim or in India the Hindu-Muslim. This hyphen is small but it works on a big level. For any stable multi-cultural society we can considered this small hyphen as equality among the majority and the minority. Taylor (1992) argues that when we talk about equality in the context of race and ethnicity, we are appealing to two different albeit related concepts: equal dignity and equal respect. Equal dignity appeals to people's humanity or to some specific members in a relatively uniform way. Hence, when we talk of this hyphened identity and equality; it can be possible when things appear to be same for the majority as well as for the minority. If the majority aspires to be admired by the minority then they have to admire minority as well. If a thing is good for the majority the same has to be good for the minority. The policies have to be made in such a way that it is good for both. This is the kind of love intension talked by Aristotle. The majority and minority even if emotionally not attached to each other, though living in a plural diverse society has to develop love as intension, i.e., a positive intension towards difference, towards otherness for a stable multicultural society. According to Aristotle, love is where justness is part of life. Equal dignity and equal respect mean admiring the qualities of each other.

Fromm (1956) believed that love for self and for others is conjunctive. Genuine love according to Fromm is an expression of productiveness and implies "care, respect, responsibility and knowledge." It is not an 'effect' in the sense of being affected by somebody, but an active striving for growth and happiness of the loved person, rooted in one's own capacity to love. He further believed that selfish persons are not only incapable of loving others, but also are incapable of loving themselves.

Fromm believes that love is an art like any other art. The learning process involves first the mastery of theory and then the mastery of practice. According to him, if one wants to learn the art of medicine then s/he needs to know the human body and about various diseases. When the theoretical knowledge blends with one's practice it can be mastery in medicine. One more thing is also important here: when one learns the art it must be a matter of ultimate concern and it must be more important than anything else. Similarly, any theory of love must begin with a theory of man, of human existence. Man – of all ages and cultures – is always confronted with one question how to overcome separateness and how to achieve union, how to transcend one's own individual life and find atonement. The question is the same for all: for primitive man living in caves, for nomadic man taking care of his flocks, for a peasant in Egypt, the Phenoenician trader, the Roman soldier, the medieval monk, the Japanese samurai, the modern clerk and factory hand. The question is the same, for it springs from the same ground: the human situation, the conditions of human existence. However, the answers may vary. The question can be answered by animal worship, by human sacrifice or military conquest, by indulgence in luxury, by ascetic renunciation, by obsession with work, by artistic creation, by the love of God, and by the Love of Man. It is easy to love when the others are our own people. In a multicultural society the position of others are not loved ones. They are strangers, marginalized people and the minorities. Is it that easy to love strangers? Multicultural citizens need to learn the art of love. Love is not a kind of sentiment which anyone can develop. It needs maturity; it needs a certain personality. It is an attitude towards the other. You need courage and to be disciplined in order to love others.

According to Fromm (1956), love cannot be attainted without the capacity to love others. Man is gifted with the ability to reason and is aware of the past and the future. The majority which takes the responsibility of development of society and holds the power for same should develop the art of love for others, taking the future into consideration. The future of any multicultural society does not depend on the development of only those who are accepted. The contemporary politics in many movements demands recognition. This demand for recognition is given urgency by believed links between recognition and identity. Absence of recognition or misrecognition of the identity of others may damage and generate in them low self-esteem. They undergo real damage when the society around them mirrors this back to them. According to Fromm (1956) "The awareness of human separation, without reunion by love – is the source of shame. It is at the same time the source of guilt and anxiety." Man's greatest fear is to be separated from the group. If he is within the group, eats the same, wears the same and speaks the same language he feels safe. He is scared there is difference. The non-conformity from the group makes him scared and this fear is dangerous for the society. This separation from the group because of the differences brings another concept into consideration: equality. Equality can bring development in the condition of the different group. The two values are never same, and if we rank them it brings conflict. For instead of ranking them the focus should be on giving equal respect and celebrating the differences. Smith (2011) echoes similar feelings when he argues that the focus should be on celebrating differences and reciprocity of justice.

Modernity gave the universal model of everything; for instance, the model of state economy and society on the basis of rationality. The idea of sovereign nation-state in the context of plural societies, based on the constructed universal national identity, is the root cause of much trouble. The way the modern sovereign nation-state tried to construct the common national identity created the congenial environment for a politics of identities. Through the process of nation building they tried to construct national identity, which led to assimilation rather than accommodation of diverse socio-cultural identities into the mainstream politics. The project of nation building in particular

has been perennially dominated by the inherited psyche of identity expressed in the dynamics of religion, ethnicity, and minority.

Celebrating difference in real sense is giving freedom to each group whether minority or majority to have their own identity. Asking them to assimilate in other groups takes away their own identity. They lose their cultural identity. As culture plays the utmost role in human life every group is bound by their cultural identity. If that is expected to merge in some other culture or not been recognized then conflict between groups, community, society becomes the way of life. This particular way of life never brings sustainability of a group, a community or a nation. Multiculturalism is not to subvert one's own identity and lose oneself in the chaos of multiple cultures. In fact it becomes the current ideology to freely express ones culture and core values. This suggests that recognition or the accommodation of cultural, national, religious or ethnic difference, is connected to a rich sense of equality. Recall that on the liberal neutralist view, we treat someone equally when we respect and protect their basic rights. Behind this idea is an appeal to the relation between equality and treating people similarly. When we respect others we develop the sense of recognition and equality. To develop this sense of recognition and equality our community first needs to be inclusive.

Community is and must be inclusive. The great enemy of community is exclusivity. Groups that exclude others because they are poor or doubters or divorced or sinners or of some different race or nationality are not communities; they are cliques actually defensive bastions against community (Peck, 1987). In a multicultural society the fear of exclusiveness among others gives a great pain. The separation from the group is the great fear of marginalized group in any multicultural society. Not being recognized as same as the main group and not being given their identity as the main stream is always a pain for the minority. This is exactly the pain of marginalization. This fear and pain which go hand in hand may not go away completely but the principles of love (care, respect, knowledge) can embrace the situation. According to Fromm, those of us who have already chosen to embrace a love ethic, allowing it to govern and inform how to think and act, know that when we let our light shine, we draw to us and are drawn to other bearers of light. We are not alone.

Community is integrative. It includes people of different sexes, ages, religions, cultures, viewpoints, life styles, and stages of development by integrating them into a whole that is greater or better than the sum of its parts. Integration is not a melting process; it does not result in a bland average. Rather, it has been compared to the creation of a salad in which the identity is preserved. Community does not solve the problem of pluralism by obliterating diversity. Instead it seeks out diversity, welcomes other points of view, embraces opposites and desires to see the other side of every issue. How is this integration possible which gives the different their identity?

To live our life on the principles of love which is showing care, respect and knowledge about others and the will to cooperate. Love grows at the social level to develop or bring change in society. Love at individual level is mere attachment toward another at the individual level it establishes love towards one's own people. When the love is towards different others it tries to bring change. This shift of love from private life to public is now marked in society. This shift of love from individual to group, from private life to public, from home to society works as a vision. The vision is to give good life to all including different others. The revolution in private life has brought a revolution in love that is concerned about future generations and weaker sections of the society. People are now aware of the problem the world is facing. These are in collective life where revolution is possible because of the revolution of love. This revolution of love has affected the public sphere in collective life.

Fromm argued that if we want a society to be changed, then love has to work at the social level and not only at an individual level. Love as an individualistic phenomena is what lovers say to each other, "I love you." However, love relates one to others. If one loves only a particular person that is not love, but rather attachment. If one loves others then how can s/he hate others? If one loves someone, that means s/he can love others. People believe that we can love only loved ones. According to Fromm (1956) if one truly loves one person s/he loves all persons, s/he loves the world, s/he loves life. According to Fromm, if one can say to someone else, "I love you," s/he must be able to say, "I love in you everybody, I love through you the world, I love

in you also myself." Extended to the social level, this love can bring many development and changes in human society.

For a stable multicultural society love needs to be seen as a social phenomenon and not as individualistic. At the end of the Art of Loving, Fromm affirms that "important and radical changes are necessary, if love is to become a social and not highly individualistic, marginal phenomenon. In this book he says that love is not a sentiment which can be easily indulged in by anyone, regardless of his maturity. Love is bound to fail unless one tries actively to develop her/ his total personality. To achieve a productive orientation; the satisfaction in individual love cannot be attained without the capacity to love one's neighbor, without true humility, courage and discipline. If love works on the social level, it turns into vision, which in turn becomes reflection towards otherness.

Love is a vision which is not only about inner emotion. It is a reflection towards otherness. It gives freedom to otherness and sees otherness in a new dimension. It nourishes relationship across difference. This vision opens a new path to look at the world, beyond differences and positive accommodations. The eye with love gives a new vision, a reflection for otherness and recognition. Love vision is a reconstruction of anything in a positive sense. If we think of a multicultural society it is a positive recognition that must not demand domination or assimilation. Here others are rather a multitude of different people depending on each other.

Parekh (1999) argued that a multicultural society cannot be stable and last long without developing a common sense of belonging among its citizens. The sense of belonging must be political and based on a shared commitment to the political community. Its members do not directly belong to each other as in an ethnic group but through their mediating membership in a shared community they are committed to each other because they are all in their own different ways committed to a common historical community and are bonded together by ties of common historical community. They do and should matter to each other because they are bonded together by the ties of common interest and attachment. The commitment to the political community involves commitment to its continuing existence and well-being, and implies that one cares enough for it not to harm its

interests and undermine its integrity. It is a matter of degree and could take such forms as concern for its well-being, deep attachment, affection, and intense love (Parekh 1999:4).

A multicultural society is a society of difference, where otherness plays an important role. Who are these others? They can be immigrants, asylums, any minority groups. When we talk of the concept of love in context of multicultural society it is love for the difference, love for the others, and love for the marginalized. Oliver's (2001) attempts to define a sense of connection with others rely on the ethics of love. He preferred love in place of hate where he mentioned "Love is an ethics of differences that thrives on the adventure of otherness. This means that love is an ethical and social responsibility to open personal and public spaces in which otherness and difference can be articulated" (Oliver, 2001: 20).

Here, the question is can we discuss love as pure positive feelings towards otherness? It might be difficult to answer the question. Examples prove that in many cases of multicultural crisis love has not worked as an emotion. The race riots that took place in Northwest England in 2001 were understood to be a result of a failure to integrate, or 'segregation'. The Love for the nation is the love for the differences. Here nation becomes the object of love and in return may expect love in the form of learning the national language and cooperating with others. The failure of love for difference has urged the idea of thinking of "Love, In the name of love." Love for difference is not because the others are the object of love but the nation is the object of love. As we love our own country, to maintain the stability of own country, in the name of own country love the difference. This approach to understand accommodating differences is called the politics of love. Love as responsibility, respect with knowledge which can be lead to recognition and identity in any multicultural society.

There are some basic components of love like care, responsibility, respect and knowledge which are mutually interdependent. Care and concern are part of responsibility only. Responsibility is always considered to be something bestowed upon someone from outside. It is a kind of response to other person's need. It is a purely a voluntary act. Responsibility in its true sense is response towards others. It is not the response towards only loved one's or oneself. Responsibility as an

element of love is response towards others in equal respect as towards one's own. Love along with responsibility acts as a response to the needs of others. In the absence of love, responsibility may come down to domination. In most cases when responsibility is only towards one's own people it deteriorates into domination and possessiveness. According to Fromm (1956), responsibility could easily deteriorate into domination and possessiveness were it not for a third component of love, respect. Respect means the concern that the other person grows and unfolds as he is. Respect for others means respect for other cultures. Respect thus implies the absence of exploitation. Culture defines the self and constitutes one's personal identity. Indeed, identity is itself unattainable without signifiers of distinction, for these alone can fulfill the condition of relevance, which is constitutive of identity. Respect for others therefore, include respect for other cultures. Even a liberal-democratic state might be justified in intervening to protect or maintain the integrity of endangered cultures and form of life.

A further defense of the protection of minority cultures emerges from the liberal theory that diverse cultures provide individuals with real alternatives in the form of different ways of life from among which they can effectively choose (Bhargava 2002; Mahajan and Sheth 1999; Taylor 1994). The knowledge of some particular cultures brings respect towards them. A diverse form of life develops knowledge about other cultures. If proper knowledge can be exchanged in this diverse society then minority cultures can have their respect and choose to lead their life in their own way.

Hence respect towards something cannot be based on absence of knowledge. Without knowledge of someone, respect for same is not possible. Even in this situation care and responsibility becomes blind if they are not guided by knowledge. Knowledge has many layers. Respect for a person is not possible without having any knowledge about that person (Fromm, 1956). Knowledge requires interaction. When we interact with others then the possibility of gathering knowledge is possible. Respect is created, when we are aware of someone. Knowledge as an aspect of love does not stay at the periphery but penetrates to the core. Knowledge as an element of love goes to the depth of someone where care and concern does not remain on a

superficial level with the establishment of blind care and concern. Hence knowledge as love understands others in their true sense. Union with others is one of the paths to know others. Love shows the path to knowing others, which means they are truly recognized. Thus true recognition gives them their identity without leaving the main stream. Without having the knowledge of others means, as Erich Fromm mentioned in his book *The Art of Loving* that the other's path to knowing "the secret" is love. Love is active penetration of the other person, in which my desire to know is stilled by union.

In the act of fusion I know you; I know myself; I know everybody; yet I "know" nothing. He also added love is the only knowledge, which in the act of union answers my quest. In the act of loving, of giving myself, in the act of penetrating the other person, I find and discover myself; I discover us both. The only way of full knowledge lies in the act of love which transcends thought and words. It is the daring plunge into the experience of union. Love brings respect towards others by interaction and knowledge creation; Whereas when we are united together but without knowledge, the act of love or relationship may turn into domination and exploitation.

On the other hand, respect comes when we are free and independent. When we are free from dominance, respect comes as a part of love. If there is exploitation and dominance then freedom is absent. Freedom gives a sense of respect and love towards others. Respect is not possible without freedom for it is clear that respect is possible only if one has achieved independence; that is, if I can stand and walk without needing crutches, without having to dominate and exploit anyone else (Fromm, 1956).

Human beings living in a multicultural world are expected to have the knowledge of different sets of others to whom different attributions must be made and of different contexts in which different cultures they are expected to be operative. They are also expected to interact with others who are acknowledged as members of that society though with different cultures. Inter-cultural contacts make at least some people competent in some aspects of a micro-culture, as well as macro-cultures in a multicultural society. Baumann and Vertovec (2011) in their book *Multiculturalism: Critical Concepts in Sociology* conceptualize culture in a multicultural world in a few points (1) culture

as a phenomena, arises out of learning, in the context of interaction, the expectations people attribute to others; which is akin to Mead's (1934) concept of the "generalized other."(2) the specific micro or macro-cultures that individuals attribute to specific sets of others as ones that are appropriately operative in social institutions; (3) the range of variance in what the individual members of an interaction network or group attribute to the membership of the network or group as the group's culture; (4) the number of such interaction networks or groups in a social unit under consideration, the degree to which they overlap in membership or come together in large networks or groups; and (5) the total range of knowledge of and competence in, various micro-cultures and macro-cultures that is possessed by the members of a given social unit, whether or not they appropriately interact within that unit, and that compose what can be called the "cultural pool" or "reservoir" of the membership of that unit (Goodenough, 1971).

The above discussion of a multicultural world by Baumann basically focused on groups, group culture, interaction and the total range of knowledge of micro-cultures. It is very clear that members of the cultural pool, where cultures are different need to have a thorough understanding of others and of others cultures. Inter cultural interacttion among members of cultural pool is possible through acts of love. Here, love acts not as a blind love, but as respect. To respect a person is not possible without knowing him. Similarl, without knowing about others, the culture of others at a core level, respect towards others will be difficult for members of any multicultural society. The increasing political presence of refugees and immigrants in post-war Europe has generated considerable debate about the nature of multicultural society. Globalization has marked a dissolving of differences, trying to show the sameness among them as well as cultural humanization but many multicultural societies are undermined by having less knowledge of nations and nation-states.

The dominant culture of the west is now shaping global politics, whereas the world is multicultural in composition and complexion. The dominance of the west could lead to the emergence of a mono-culture, which threatens the existence of diverse cultures around the globe, leading to a growing awareness of one's own national cultural

identity and the need to reassert and preserve local identities. The domination of western cultural identity in global politics has already resulted in a struggle against the hegemony of the west. That hegemony under the leadership the United States of America is being challenged by other identities at the global level. Sometimes, it might be the Islamic identity, other times it might be the Sinitic identity or Japanese identity or Hindu identity depending upon the time and space. Globalization is also playing a significant role in the construction and deconstruction of identities. Many times this identity construction and deconstruction ends up in cultural conflicts. These cultural conflicts can come to end if they get enough exposure to different cultures. Due to increased communication amongst and within nations, the fragmentation of broad national identities and a formation of new local identities are taking place. Improved communication therefore can facilitate the dissemination of national identity centered on the state as well as have the opposite effect of solidifying particularistic identity based around a cultural peculiarity of a specific group. Knowledge of other culture or increased exposure to another culture helps lessen any cultural conflicts or any identity crisis.

Where the society has claimed to be at the age of cultural, economic, and social integration. Globalization does not contribute to cultural, social and economic integration of people in societies through equitable access to fruits of development variable. Hence, the demand for the recognition of cultural, racial, and ethnic differences has taken central place in any multicultural society. This can be seen through love as care, responsibility, respect and knowledge which are mutually interdependent.

Pluralistic society on the one hand has been said to encourage plural forms of living, adding richness to life. On the other hand, this has been claimed as "misleading because it concentrates attention upon differences in race and custom and upon group conflict while at the same time directing attention away from the processes making for unity and integration in the society" (Smith, 1958). Emphasis on plurality may also encourage people to look on societies with minority problems as if they did not have coherent social systems that are strictly comparable to the societies that do not have minority problems"(Morris, 1957:125). The difficulty is the attempt to cover all

these differences. Every multicultural society has pluralistic aspects in terms of different values and attitudes. The increasing tendency for the elimination of differences is closely related to the concept of equality, which is now mostly marked in any modern society. Equality means the differences between people must be respected. Equality as a condition for the development of individuality was also the meaning of the concept in the philosophy of the Western Enlightenment. Most clearly formulated by Kant, it meant that no man must be the means for the ends of another man. That all men are equal in as much as they are ends, and only ends, and never means to each other. These are the ideas of equality brought by the Enlightenment. By following these ideas, socialist thinkers of various schools defined equality as abolition of exploitation, of the use of man by man, regardless of whether this were cruel or "humane" (Fromm, 1956).

Covering all these different values and attitudes specifically of the minorities is a bigger problem. The pain of minority not getting the same treatment as the majority in respect to their culture and customs gives rise to conflicts. These conflicts can be converted into love when we start respecting others. Respect for others is not possible without knowing or understanding about the others or other cultures. Hence, this is possible only through knowledge sharing among groups like the majority and the minority. Interaction among majority and minority at the core level can make this possible. It is difficult to respect others without knowing about them. Knowledge sharing helps the majority and minority to respect the culture of each other. Freedom here will play an important role. When the other culture gets respect they get all the freedom instead of domination to practice their own culture in their own way. This is the act of love.

Before I go to the discussion of love at a broader level, such as state and nation, it will help to look at the community level. We need each other, so we live in a community with each other. All know that peacemaking should be the first priority of community. In the present context, it is difficult to say how an American should interact with a Russian or any other different cultures when we do not know how to communicate with our own neighbors. Like "charity begins at home," peacemaking should start from a small level; from the neighborhood, and extend to the society.

A group of people cannot make a community just by staying together. The seeds of community reside in humanity. It needs to be cut and polished properly to become a real community It is just like a gem. Gem gets it beauty after its cut and polished. The best way to describe its beauty is to describe its facets. Similarly, to describe community means to describe all its facets for each facet holds the beauty of the whole. Each facet of the community is interlinked. Ignoring one facet brings down the beauty of the community. Exclusivity is not a characteristic of community, but it is great enemy. Community must be inclusive which is possible through appreciation of differences. According to Peck (1998), in any community, instead of being ignored, denied, hidden, or changed, human differences should be celebrated as gifts. Marriage is of course a small, long-term community of two members. Yet in short-term communities of even fifty or sixty individuals, while the timing and depth are almost opposite, I found the dynamics to be the same. The transformation of attitudes towards each other that allowed Lily and me to transcend our differences took twenty years. This same transcendence can routinely occur within a community-building group over the course of eight hours. In each case alienation is transformed into appreciation and reconciliation. In each case the transcendence has a good deal to do with love. (The different drum)

Love and Otherness (Love at National Level)

Sara Ahmed tried to put the concept love in a different way for our pluralistic society. Sara Ahmed, in her book, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, argues that love becomes a way of bonding with others in relation to an ideal, which takes shape as an effect on such bonding. She said that we could ask: what are we doing when we do something in the name of love? Why is it assumed to be better to do the same thing if it is done out of love. Her argument about the role of love in shaping collectives seems rather banal or even obvious; love is a sticky emotion which sticks people together, for example a fraternity or patriotism. The argument is more complex when love works in a place where it has been seen as benevolence, such as in the discourse of multiculturalism. In multicultural discourse something might be done

in the name of love or out of love? What happens when love is extended towards others who are recognized as different? I will analyze how multiculturalism becomes imperative to love difference and how this extension of love to construct a national ideal that others can fail. Multiculturalism especially since September 11 has been viewed as a security threat: those who have come into a nation 'could be' terrorists. The nation program hence becomes: how can one identify the nation as open. Here Love plays a crucial role. The love for country plays a role. Out of love for country one avoids violence, and conflicts with immigrants are accommodated in the name of love. For example, in Britain the new conditions require that migrants 'must learn to be British', that is migrants must identify themselves as British by taking 'the nation' as their object of love. At the same time the British policy is accommodating them positively. Here the argument is that British, out of love for their country, to maintain peace in the country, and accommodate new immigrants in the name of love. Out of love for the country we love the differences in the name of love, which helps to stick the nation together. So Love becomes crucial to the promise of cohesion within multiculturalism: it is required to keep the nation together.

Love becomes crucial to stick others together in multiculturalism. It becomes more crucial in the event of a failure of the nation to deliver on its promise of the good life. To give back the failure of the nation love works to increase the investment in the nation. One keeps loving without recognizing whether this love will give any return. In multiculturalism even this can be thought in the context of future generations. One can think of national love as a form of waiting and investment. (Sara Ahmed, 2004). If love functions as the promise of return, then the extension of investment through the failure of return works to maintain the ideal through its deferral into the future. National love places its hope in the next generation.

This discussion could be brought into the discourse of multicultural nations. To be a nation is difficult without nationalism? This is a difficult issue among those who are considered to be others for the country (e.g. immigrants, ethnic groups, marginalized groups, any minority group). If the nation fails to give them a good life. How to retain their nationalism in the particular nation in which they now live.

Is it possible in any manner? Love could act as an investment for future generations. If their love for the country is sustained despite the failure of the nation to give a return to future generations. Because the national love also requires an explanation of the failure. Without the investment of love by others, the nation would be without nationalism, which is difficult for the sustainability of any nation. For this sustainability of the love investment, a nation has to reciprocate. Hence love works to expand love to include others in the form of recognizing them and giving them their identity.

Though the UK is considered to be an open, diverse, and multicultural nation, it is experiencing the discontent of the English hegemony over the Scottish, Welsh and Irish. The immigrants are also experiencing anxiety on the issues of the lack of integration and national loyalty in the UK. 9/11 has been viewed as a great security threat to multiculturalism which now is joined to security threats. The question becomes how a nation can deal with these threats and what can be done so that the strangers identify with the nation. This threat has made all those who come to a nation probable terrorists. As a result, one way to deal with this is more surveillance over the strangers. On the other hand, multicultural states are also putting new conditions to meet the new crises. They want the migrants to assimilate into thee British community. They want this even at home as well. They want Muslim women to learn English so as to pass it on to the next generation. The migrants in order to identify with the British have to learn to be British, taking the British as the object of their love. New immigrants are now required to pass English exams and formally affirm allegiance to the crown. The Home Secretary believes it is crucial that newcomers to the UK embrace its language, ethos and values' (Hughes and Riddell, 2002: 1). At the same time they are asking to do this without losing their identity and developing a hybridity sociality (Ahmed, 2004). In Europe, the idea of multiculturalism soon met the discussions about whether the liberal-democratic state could effectively integrate other peoples, in particular Muslims. In France, for instance, the model of *Laicite* strongly discouraged the emergence of religion or ethnicity in politics. The issues which modern France has contended with, headscarves, turbans, the wearing of religious symbols, covering of the face, and so on, bring out its con-

sistently different struggle with the manifestations of minority identities (Jaffrelot 2004)

Identity is associated with the language, class, ethnicity and many other aspects of a particular social group. Identity may not be so important for a dominant group, but is important for a minority group (a minority's language, class, race, ethnicity etc.). It is a great demand from the migrants to love a nation on certain conditions in a hope to get the love in return from the nation in future.

However, cohesion becomes difficult in multiculturalism when the minority has to sacrifice on their identity. Hence, love has to plays a double role in a multicultural nation. The majority group, out of love for their own country and to protect it from others put some conditional love on others. Out of love for the nation, it tries to accommodate others. With a certain conditional love, they try to make the inclusion easier. Others in the name of love for the country which has welcomed them and accommodated them, follows them in hope to get back the love. Can a Nation possible without nationalism? Can multicultural nations be build up these loves. i.e., out of love and in the name of love? We have already entered a renewed period of nationalism and ethnic conflicts in the post-cold war. Nation and nationalism are no longer confined to only simple political bodies and ideology, but open to cultural phenomena. They are multi-dimentional and encompass languages, sentiments and symbolisms. These nationalisms give them their identity. When the others get their identity they own the nation. The nation becomes an object of love in the case of minorities and the crucial love is replaced.

However, citizenship goes along with national identity. Perhaps it is possible to disconnect citizenship from national identity. It is possible to invest our civic loyalties and sense of belonging to some principles of human right-based political order, what Habermas (1992) called 'Constitutional Patriotism'. This is the belief of recent contemporary thought in multicultural nations such as Western Europe and Canada. Situational patriotism is not going to hold the people together at the time of crises. More constitutional rights or special rights to minorities may give a sense of belonging to the country where they live. A sense of belonging to one's country is necessary to make a successful multicultural society. An inclusive national identity

is respectful; it builds upon the identities that people value and does not trample upon them (Modood, 2007).

One's love for the country make one open to the inclusion of others which play a valuable and even essential role in establishing a decent society or country. This is called as the politics of love. Here love is not at an individual level but at a society level.

In the today's context, most societies are multicultural. The question is not whether a society should be multicultural or not? How to accommodate the minorities, the immigrants, the marginalized members of the society. They can be accommodated in the name of love for the country. When the love becomes difficult for the others we can develop it positively for peacemaking in the community. Cultural conflicts over the differences are not the solution of any multicultural society and it will never come to and.

Love for the country is what patriotic feeling is. Patriotism is a form of love. It is the feeling of love feelings for one's own nation. Love here is not a kind of commitment, it is different from individual nations and for maintaining peace within and outside the country. This is because the nations are also interconnected with each other. Whatever happens to one country definitely affects the other. Though our focus is at the national level, we cannot forget the state, city, community as they are also equally involved in the love of patriotic feelings. When a tension arises between the immigrants and the mainstream, is it possible for the host country to just ask them to leave the country. This is not that easy also. Here we need to develop love towards otherness. Though it is not always possible, it can be developed as the patriotic love. In a multicultural society love becomes crucial when it comes to accommodate any minority or immigrants. When the US goes back to think of 9/11 where does the emotion love stands. On one hand all Muslims in US cannot be connected with terrorist attack and for that to leave US. On the other hand it was an issue accommodating the Muslim immigrants. In this case political emotion can play a role which takes the nation-state as their focus and involves commitments to its deference and flourishing. As Mazzini (YEAR) says, public love includes love of the nation.

Our life has become self-centered where hatred, greed, and egos play a major role. The question becomes, when it has become difficult

for people to love and accommodate their own people, how can we talk of accommodating people who are others in their life. Here I would like to take the example of India. India is multicultural within the country. The Indian perspective of multiculturalism can be defined as a demographic reality which can acknowledge the vast ethno-religious, ethno-racial and ethno-linguist diversity of the country.

People migrate from one state to other for study, work and livelihood; but politics is playing a major role in India. For example, in the year (YEAR), Shiv Sena, a political party in Maharastra has officially tried to stop people from Bihar origin from migrating into Maharastra. The constitution of India provides the citizens the right to travel to any part of the country and engage in employment; and people from Bihar are Indians first and then are the Biharis. In spite of the constitutional rights, if preventing people from migrating and settling in a region other than this native place is the case how can one talk of global justice and global peace. There is a need for strong emotion directed at global peace. Mazzini says that our lives are immersed in greed and self-interest, so we need a strong emotion directed at the general welfare to inspire us to support the common good in ways that involve sacrifice.

Luc Ferry

In his book, *On Love: A Philosophy for the 21st Century* (2013), Luc Ferry a French political philosopher proclaims "the revolution of love and the re-enchantment of the world. His writings attempt to show the rise of a new era where the "live principles of the meaning of life" successfully emerged since Thomas Aquinas. This is cosmological "principles of meaning" apparent in the odyssey of like: to live well you had to journey from chaos towards reconciliation with the cosmos. The second is the theological principle: holding sway from Christ death until the renaissance. This found harmony in obeying God's law. Then came the revolution of subjectivity whether married or not, whether of the same or different sex which has not been taken seriously. There is a shift in marriage to convenience. This has affected other areas of life: not only public but political life as well. In this "first humanism": a man was in some way "saved" when he laid his own

brick in the edifice of human progress." The fourth is the deconstructionist principle, which admitted life's federal undertow, urged freedom and intensity, liberation and even irrationality.

Now as per Ferry (2013): we are at the brink of an enlightened humanism. He formed the fifth principle: the autonomy of life. For him this means that we are no longer ready to die for an abstraction such as God, country or revolution. Family love is no longer confined to the private sphere. This shift in marriage in family as a revolution of love has extended love from the local to the global sphere.

There is no doubt that the love is an old phenomenon, as old as humanity and many philosophers from Plato to Luther have discussed it. The modern families have moved this discussion from the private to the political sphere. Love has gone beyond being the sole legitimate basis for couples and families, beyond marriage, and has become the rule in all-loving unions.

Here the politics of love will be a clearer way to explain the new dimension of an old phenomena. Both moral and political activity can be reflected in terms of love. Though love is an old phenomena it can adopt a new formulation. Ferry (2013) Love is not about sympathy and care but has adopted a new formulation of what Kant called the categorical imperative. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) argued that moral requirements are based on a standard of rationality he identified as a "Categorical Imperative" (CI). It is the presence of this self-governing reason in each person that Kant thought is offered as decisive grounds for viewing each as possessed of equal worth and deserving of equal respect.

Kant's Moral Philosophy shows there is a new categorical imperative: "Act in such a way that you can desire to see the decisions you take being applied also to the people you love most."

This is what is called a politics of love. This formula of a new imperative is like: act in such a way that maximum of your act can be applied to your loved ones. If we really started acting in the same way the way we behave towards others on foreigners, differences will change. The mode of behavior to be universalized then becomes the law of love. (First published Mon Feb 23, 2004; substantive revision Sun Apr 6, 2008)

This politics is all about merging the gap between the private and the collective. It helps to develop a bond between private and collective. If a set-up is to be a principle for others first I should see whether this could be applied to my own loved ones. If applied what would be the result? This is not established as a universal law but to see them applied to the people you love the most.

There is no longer a need of dying for nation or organizing great massacres or any national revolution but preparing for the future generations because they are also our loved ones. Instead of involving in any violent activity where future generations are also bound to pay for it. This should involve activity that will help our future generations. What we prepare now will affect our future generation. We should act in a way which can give a positive result to our future generations. All this can happen in the name of love.

There is a great question mark in this name of love? As a form of love this can be successful if in return the others of any multicultural society get back their love. Violence is not the solution for any group. To stop all multicultural crises it would be difficult to find a solution but we can work on some ideas to meet the need. Hence, violence can be replaced by "In the name of love" which can take care of future generation, whereas people involved in violence think only of the present situation. Sometimes violence not only affects the present, carries the bitterness into the future generation of which our loved ones are also going to be a part. So as per furry we need to be careful about. The future generation includes our loved ones. To look at a future generation and future multicultural society one needs Kant's categorical imperative which may give some sort of integration among differences.

The most important and common factor in multiculturalism is citizenship which goes along with national identity. Even if it is not advisable to demand a very strong multicultural or minority identity or weak common national identities. Strong multicultural identities are good in that they are diverse and reactionary, but at the same time they need a framework of vibrant, dynamic national narratives and also ceremonies and rituals which give a feel of national identity.

In multicultural language we say this is basically the new way to analyze the 'majority' and 'minority' relation, to analyze the power in this multicultural hierarchical system and the lens through which various power games could be seen. Hence, this will make it easier for the dominant group to make a fair decision for the dominated group. When the analysis is done, keeping in mind both 'we' and 'they', the chances for fair decisions increase.

Indian Context

India as leading the South Asian nations is not free from the politics of identity but it has successfully constructed an overall national identity. For example despite its ethnic diversity, there is a sense of unity and unity in diversity. The national identity of India is the most contested terrain in its politics. The homogenization of Indian national Identity during the last over fifty years has resulted in Indian Identity politics. The Universal Indian national Identity could neither properly accommodate nor uproot the primordial identities. These identities retained their organic roots in the social fabric of Indian society. The so-called national identity is at the center, whereas the other cultural identities are at the periphery of public domain.

India offers a unique example of a peaceful interactions of multiple identities. Often described as a river, constantly refreshed by fresh streams, Indian civilization reveals a remarkable propensity to respect and absorb traditions and rituals across religions and cultures. The quest for truth through the conciliation of diverse viewpoints has ever been intrinsic to Hindu thought. The *Rigveda* thus pronounced "Ekah va idam vi babhuv sarvam" (That which is one has multiplied unto all) and Ekam Sad Vipra bahudha vadanti (The truth is one, the sages express it variously) and further 'Aa no bhadrah Krtavo yantu Vishvatah' (May noble and auspicious thoughts come to us from all over the Universe). Such a dialogical tradition and non-dualistic ethos creates a natural space for cultural pluralism and diversities. Unsurprisingly India has long been a preferred destination for various religious and cultural communities from afar. In recent times too we could readily discover several lived instances of cultural pluralism and syncretism

Indian society and community are multicultural within it. In a community also different languages and castes reside. Bengalis in India are very rich in their culture and are proud of that. They are infamous in dividing the world into two clear halves – Bengalis and non-Bengalis. When it comes to their biggest festival *Durga Puja* they are famous for assimilating the non-Bengalis. Durga puja in Kolkota a glimpse of madness that grips the city for five days. People of all communities join hands with Bengalis to celebrate the festival in Kolkota in a grand show of unity where the desire for the triumph of good over evils transcends everything else. There are many families from other states of the country living in this metro city and thousands who were the third or fourth generation residing in Kolkota. The puja also has become an integral part of their life also. This four days puja is not confined to religious rituals but rather encompasses all without discrimination. Almost everybody celebrates the festival, resonating the love and passion that are synonymous with the city. There are many South-Indian families whose food habits are totally different from eastern India. For decades they celebrate durga puja where Bengalis help them to prepare the Bengali bhog. Their kitchens also remain close for all five days of the festival and their families take part in the 'adda' sessions at the pondal. It is not confined to different states or regions in India but has extended to different religions as well. The Muslims of Kolkota are also associated with the durga puja committee for years. Several ministers and councilors belonging to different communities join hands together with Hindus to celebrate durga puja, and some are even members of a puja committe. Gulzar Zia (Muslim) Kolkota Corporation Councilor Ward no 60 says in an interview I think Muslim should be a part of Durga puja celebrations. My responsibility doubles at this (Durga puja) time (*The Hindustan Times*, Wednesday 24 September 2014). Here the love ethics of care, respect and integrity plays a vital role. No one who has embraced the ethics of love has not become joyous and fulfilled.

A love ethic presupposes that everyone has the right to be free, to live fully and well. In order to bring a love ethic to every dimension of our lives, our society would need to embrace change. This is necessary if we are to bring this love into the public, societal, and community levels. Individuals who choose to love can alter our ways

according to a primacy of a love ethic. We do this by choosing to work with individuals we admire and respect, by committing to give our all to a relationship by embracing a global vision wherein we see our lives and our fate as intimately connected to those of everyone else on the planet (Erich Fromm, *The Art of Living, Harper Perennial Modern Classics*, p. 15. Anv edition (November 21, 2006). To bring this cultural change to society there is need for the principles of a love ethics.

Indian Institute of Management Indore, Indore, India

Relationship between the Rule of Law in Traditional Culture and Core Socialist Values

WANG YONGGUI & CHEN YANQIU

The general target that comprehensively advances rule of law and builds a country under "the socialist rule of law" that was put forward in the fourth plenary session of the 18th CPC, has opened a new journey to socialist rule of law and governance. In core socialist values, the "rule of law" became an important pursuit on a social level along with "freedom," "equality" and "justice." Meanwhile, General Secretary Xi Jinping stressed that to cultivate and carry forward the core socialist values these must be based on the "excellent Chinese traditional culture." As a result, probing into the inherent relationship between the traditional culture of the rule of law and the rule of law in core socialist values helps to promote and practice core socialist values today.

The rule of law is the basis of the meaning of core socialist values. The core socialist values in the Report to the Eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party, "call for prosperity, democracy, civility, harmony, advocate freedom, equality, justice, rule of laws, and promote patriotism, dedication, integrity, friendship." They respectively generalize the values, goals, orientation and principles to the national level. "Rule of law" has been an important part of core socialist values because of its long history in our country. The development of "rule of law" during more than 30 years shows that it has been integrated into our nation's governance as a basic national policy, whether in theory or practice. General Secretary Xi Jinping points out that we will carry out legal promotion and education, in the socialist spirit of rule of law in the society to guide all people to abide by the law and rely on the law to solve the problem, forming a good atmosphere for abiding by the law." In other words, the rule of law should become a way of life and the common belief recognized in society. The "Rule of

law" as the value orientation of the socialist core, is not only the basic content of core socialist values, but also an important way to practice these.

Chinese traditional culture is broad, profound and perennial, accumulating the most profound spiritual pursuit of the Chinese nation. General Secretary Xi Jinping pointed out, "To cultivate and carry forward the core socialist values must be based on Chinese excellent traditional culture. Core values have their own roots, so abandoning traditions and losing roots are equal to cutting one's own spiritual lifeline." In other words, Chinese excellent traditional culture is the profound resource of core socialist values, and probing the rule of law in Chinese traditional culture is the important path to understand the ideas of rule of law of core socialist values. "Rule of law" has its tradition since ancient times in our country. Although in the long course of historical development, the footsteps of the rule of law often encountered obstructions. Its pursuit as well as its realm was not as good as today, but it still provides an inexhaustible source for our current socialist construction whereas the traditional source of rule of law accumulated its powerful vitality.

"Rule of law" of core values is the inheritance and development of the rule of law in traditional culture. We can still see the influence of the rule of law in Chinese traditional culture when we go back to "the rule of law" of core socialist values. Indeed, we need to exclude the dross in order to inherit the essence of the traditional ideas of rule of law in our country because of historical limitations. It is in the process of inheriting and surpassing, the rule of law of core socialist values that has evolved and been carried forward.

First, from the perspective of the status of the rule of law, this has its different positions in different eras. Basically, the rule of law exists as a tool rather than an institutional spirit in our traditional society. As proposed by Guan Zhong, "the law is the norm of behavior in society." This expresses the idea of legal instrumentalism. Nowadays, the law also serves politics. It maintains the construction of the national regime and the stabilization of economic social order through the force of law. It manages the state by law's punishment, management and inspiration and also plays an increasingly important role in achieving the China Dream and building socialism with Chinese

characteristics. These all reflect that socialist rule of law inherited legal instrumentalism in Chinese traditional culture. In addition, there is a concept that "no litigation is virtue" in the ancient society. The position of rule of law in ancient people's hearts is not high. Mediation or compromise for relationship is the first choice when people resolve their differences, which to some extent reduces the conflict of social contradiction. The idea that "peace is most precious" conforms to the construction of a harmonious society in China which aims to mediate contradictions among the people, as well as "harmony," the value principle of the core socialist values.

However, legal instrumentalism in our traditional culture, as well as the concept that "no litigation is virtue," created the phenomenon of obligation standard in ancient China in the aspect of the rule of law. For example, ancient people had a weak individual rights consciousness in that they are absolutely subject to laws. They are unwilling or unable to use the weapon of law to safeguard their rights and interests. They are in a completely passive position in the law. From this perspective, the right standard of "people-oriented" improves and surpasses the traditional legal instrumentalism. People are no longer in passive obedience to the rule of law, instead, they use laws to protect their rights and interests and to monitor government agencies and officials as subjects and forces of the rule of law. In addition, the rule of law exists as a system relying on spiritual beliefs in the larger sense today. The reason is that "legal authority is derived from the people's inner support and sincere faith." At the same time, we must vigorously carry forward the core socialist values in order to take carry forward the socialist spirit of rule of law, to make people establish a legal conviction and consciously safeguard the authority of the law. In Chinese traditional culture, people were oppressed and subject to the rule of law by external force.

Second, from the perspective of law's content, there is much valuable experience about this in the traditional culture of the rule of law. We should learn from it that the rule of law in core socialist values has inherited these ideas. For example, the legal reform thought that changing laws with ages fits the requirement stressed in the fourth plenary session, mainly that the law's content should be changed with era's development, and it meets the spirit of "advance with the times"

advocated in China; the trend of simplified legal provisions continue in current China. This required improving the legislation quality in the third plenary session of the 18th CPC, which shows that the requirements of scientific legislation are increasingly high and strict. In the Tang Dynasty, it was also required to simplify legal provisions and make these more easily implemented; the concept: "Good law is the premise of good governance" which was emphasized in the third plenary session of the 18th CPC, the requires improving legislative quality, and the ideas of increasing law's timeliness, effectiveness and pertinence, conform to Huang Zongxi's opinions that there are "good laws" and "bad laws," and that only if "good laws" are used to manage the country, can the laws be effective.

However, there is still some negative content which exists in the traditional culture of the rule of law. With the idea of "heavy prison and light people," law was seen as a means to enslave people under a feudal system. However, under the socialist legal system with Chinese characteristics, the Constitution of the Republic, which was produced by the democratic process, embodies the will of the party and the people, and safeguards the people's interests as the starting and ending point. This has changed "light people" to "heavy people." In addition, although legalism advocated legal reform, the inheritance is mainstream in our tradition of the rule of law. For examples, the Yin Dynasty inherited the Xia Dynasty, the Zhou Dynasty inherited the Yin Dynasty, and follow the standard of the Tang Dynasty in the late period of feudal society. That is, there is inertia legal content of Chinese traditional culture which emphasized that ancestors cannot be changed. Since the founding of new China, especially during the almost one year from the third plenary session of the 18th CPC to the fourth plenary session, our reform of rule of law has been carried out in an order but accelerated. This reflects that socialist rule of law in our country does not follow the ancient dogma, but adapts to the socio-economic development requirements and the characteristics of innovation.

Third, from the perspective of the effectiveness of law, there are many ideas which reflect law's equality in Chinese traditional culture of the rule of law. Legalism is the first to suggest that everyone should obey the laws equally. Guan Zhong called "whether monarch or the

poor all obey the law "the great order"; Shang Yang's "a criminal" and "a reward" ideas; Han Fei believed that "the law does not avoid the minister and the reward does not leave the common people," which shows the idea of equal law enforcement and obedience. These ideas had been recognized and respected in recent Confucianism. The concept of "expostulation does not avoid bigwigs" in the Tang dynasty is a good example. Huang Zongxi put forward equal ideas of legislation from his civil rights theory to establish "the law of the world," which challenges the idea of "divine right of kings." This idea of equality in the modern idea of the rule of law in China has been a good inheritance. We should adhere to several principles in order to complete the general objective that is a comprehensive advance of the rule of law. One of the principles is "all men are equal before the law." Equality is seen as an important attribute of socialist law, and is pursued by core socialist values at the social level like the rule of law, which will be approved and obeyed by everyone.

However, this "equality" is limited in Chinese traditional thought on the rule of law, for they have the same basis in feudalism. In ancient society, the Monarch was not subject to any restrictions. He could execute power despite his preferences and entirely override the law. While "etiquette" is highly regarded by Confucianism, it established a rigid caste system where the monarch at the top elite has exclusive privileges which are beyond the law. In other words, in a society of absolute monarchy, the law is designed to help the King control his country better. The sovereign is the law and royalty is the highest code of conduct. Nowadays, China is a people's democratic dictatorship and socialist country. Any organization or individual must respect the authority of the law and act within the framework of the constitutional law. No person or organization can hold privileges beyond the law. To that end, our government constantly perfects the mechanism of supervision and put power into a cage that especially increase as the constraints and standards on executive power. The legal regulations for the restriction and supervision of power doubtless goes beyond traditional society under the imperial rule of law in China, reflecting the real equality in the socialist concept of the rule of law in China.

Finally, from the perspective of rule by law and rule of virtue, on the one hand, the law is an important tool for governing the country, as the legalism praises "method as the only rule of law." They thought "rule of law" is the most appropriate way of governing. Because "rule of law" not only consists with the essence of human nature which is "draw on the advantages and avoid disadvantages," but also provides specific standards. The main means of reward and punishment make it easier to implement "rule of law" compared with a "rule of virtue." Now, we identify the rule of law as the party's strategy of ruling the country. We also identify governing by law as the party's basic method of governance. This rule of law becomes an important part of the core socialist values. On the other hand, morality has educative effects on people's social behavior. Confucius had two famous saying about "rule of virtue." One is "governing by morals, like the North Star as... total" and the other is a "people are shameless with government and punishment, while people have shame and conscientious with virtue and manners." In the context of rule of law, rule of virtue has been put on a new level in national governance. We should vigorously carry forward the core socialist values to show the moral enlightenment, and to internalize the unified value goal and standard into citizen's unified pursuits and beliefs.

This is different from legalism's "rule of law" and Confucian's "value virtue and ignore law. Our party has put forward the combination of rule by law and rule by virtue. General Secretary Xi Jinping pointed out that, "the law is a codified morality, and morality is the inner law." This shows the relationship between law and morality. The rule of law and rule of virtue have different status and play their own role in governance. It needs to promote the rule of law, to build a culture of law, and to develop a spirit of law to make the authority of law believed; while the effectiveness of rule by virtue relies on norms and constraints of the rule of law to strengthen the role of ethics. The rule of law is also an important part of core socialist values, whereby it can effectively support moral construction. We must combine "rule of law" and "rule of virtue." "The management of the nation and of society requires both law and moral. We must both insist on rule of law and rule of virtue." We should strengthen both to make them become a dense and indispensable whole. "Law and moral

perfectly complement each other, and the rule of law and rule by virtue are a perfect match."

In short, advancing the rule of law must have its "cultural foundation" in order for the spirit of rule by law of core socialist values to be believed. The thought of law in Chinese traditional culture which has thousands of years of history is the best root. Faced with the development of times and society, our traditional culture should be rooted in a new basis of substance and value in order to radiate new vitality. We believe that socialist legal construction will make even greater progress in the process of innovation where Chinese traditional thought on rule by law integrates and inherits the rule of law in core socialist values.

Research Center of Socialist Ideology, School of Marxism & School of Public Administration, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, P.R. China

Lei Feng's "Spirit" from the Perspective of Citizenship

SHI JIAXIAN & ZHANG CHANGWEI

Lei Feng's spirit refers to the advanced thoughts, moral ethics, and noble qualities that are generalized from the words and deeds of Lei Feng.[1] Once formed, this spirit of Lei Feng represents a shared way of living for a group of people rather than individual behaviors. Nevertheless, when thinking about Lei Feng's spirit, people tend to take a macro-perspective and to view it from a political angle, which neglects the subjectivity of citizens and drives the spirit away from the masses. This leads to the gradual fading away of the spirit and makes "learning from Lei Feng" only a form. The saying "Uncle Lei Feng comes in March and leaves in April" can be regarded as evidence. However, from the perspective of citizenship, Lei Feng's spirit, instead of merely being an external variable, actually reveals the basic principle, the required quality and the inner needs for being a qualified citizen in a socialist society.

The Contents and Nature of Lei Feng's Spirit

The Lei Feng's spirit that has taken shape during Lei Feng's short lifetime properly illustrated how to become a qualified citizen in a socialist society.

The Ccontents of Lei Feng's Spirit

1. Dedication. Lei Feng worked hard in all the jobs that he had undertaken. He was awarded as the model worker when working as a correspondent for the town government, as an excellent tractor driver when driving tractors on the farm, as the advanced soldier in

---

[1] Ma Zhenqing, *A Course in Lei Feng's Spirit* (Shenyang: Liaoning University Press, 2007), 20.

the army; excellent party member after joining the party and the model head of the squad after he became one.[2] He worked with "a passion resembling the heat in summer," and fully devoted himself to every job in which he had ever engaged.

2. Willing to learn. Though Lei Feng only finished primary school, he would always make time to study hard whatever job he was doing. "Make time to read: get up earlier and go to bed late, utilize the time before and after each meal, take advantage of the time during marching, walking and meeting, and study for a longer time in the weekends and holidays." "The time for studying is always there, and it depends on us to make that time."[3] Integrity. Lei Feng is a doer instead of a talker. He did what he said and "walked the walk." He did not merely talk about his affection and loyalty to the Party, his country and the people, but also practiced them in the daily matters while he enjoyed, which shows his integrity vividly.

3. Spirit of service. The core and backbone of Lei Feng's spirit is to serve the people whole-heartedly. "Man's life is finite, while to serve the people is an infinite process. I would like to devote to this infinite process of serving the people my finite life…"[4]

4. Teamwork. The Spirit of teamwork is a highlight of Lei Feng's spirit." "Thanks to the Party's education, I understand that an advanced individual is always alone while a group of advanced individuals can gain greater achievement, just like one flower cannot make a beautiful spring."[5] The strength of each individual is limited. Only when we unify with other comrades and integrate into the community can we gain infinite strength. "Strength comes from unification, while wisdom comes from labor."[6]

5. Altruism. Altruism, also known as the "fool's spirit "of Lei Feng, is an important component of Lei Feng's spirit. When Lei Feng donated his savings to the victims of the disasters, he was regarded as

---

[2] Kang Fengyun and Zhang Ronglin, "On the Lei Feng's Spirit and the Construction of Socialist Core Value System," *Socialism Studies* (4.2012), 32.

[3] Lei Feng, *Complete Works of Lei Feng* (Beijing: Chinese Press, 2003), 37, 41.

[4] *Ibid.*, 53.

[5] *Ibid.*, 7.

[6] *Ibid.*, 16.

a "fool." However, according to himself, Lei Feng "wanted to be someone that does good to the people and the country, and he is willing to do so even if such behaviors are regarded as 'foolish'." "I will always remember that it is much happier to give more and ask for less."[7]

6. Frugality. Born in the old times, Lei Feng knew well about the difficulties of life and therefore cherished the hard-earned good life. He was diligent and thrifty, and used the money he saved to help others and the country's construction. In his diary, Lei Feng wrote that "I shall remember: in terms of work, I shall follow the examples of the most active comrades; in terms of life, I shall follow the examples of the most thrifty ones."[8]

The Nature of Lei Feng's Spirit

1. The vehicle of Lei Feng's spirit is the citizen. "For any economic order and behavior to achieve long-term development, the relevant cultural values and ethics are required, as are citizens equipped with these values and ethics."[9] It is the same with socialism. If there are no citizens with the values and ethics that suit its development, socialism cannot achieve its long-term development. In this case, the rich connotations of Lei Feng's spirit (i.e. affection for the Party, the country and the people, serving the people) represent socialist values and ethics.

2. Lei Feng's spirit embodies the responsibilities and virtues of citizens. Virtue refers to "an outstanding ability to work and an eagerness for achievements."[10] Socialism is superior in both materialistic and spiritual aspects. Hence, it is necessary for the successors of socialism to shoulder more responsibilities and virtues in order to create more labor productivity. Admittedly, the cultivation of such respon-

---

[7] Lei Feng, *Complete Works of Lei Feng,* 17, 50

[8] *Ibid.*, 16.

[9] Wang Xiaoxi and Li Zhixiang, "Civic Ethics Building and the Building of Socialist Market Economy," *Nanjing Social Sciences* (4.2004), 328.

[10] Otfried Höffe, *Economic Citizen, Citizen, Citizens of the World*, translated by Shen Guoqin et al. (Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2010), 2.

sibilities and virtues requires a process, yet Lei Feng's spirit can be used here as a reference and role model from which people can learn.

3. Lei Feng's spirit also functions as the lubricant for harmonious interpersonal relationships. According to the American scholar Carl Cohen, "if the opponent parties uncompromisingly maintain their own positions rather than that of the society that they are in, the society is doomed to be destroyed."[11] Whereas the various noble qualities of Lei Feng, like kindness and being helpful, actively guide people to abide by the basic principles and to pursue a higher moral goal, they also direct people to behave and choose rationally, which, in turn, reduces interpersonal frictions and becomes the catalyst for the harmonious society and interpersonal relationships.

4. On the one hand, Lei Feng's spirit, regarded as the materialization of socialist core values, is guided by Marxism, Leninism and Mao Zedong's thought. Its position is based on affection for the Party, the country and the people. It considers serving the people wholeheartedly as the value of life and puts dedication as the basic principle, reflecting and representing the socialist core values.[12] On the other hand, socialist core values are the sublimation of Lei Feng's spirit in terms of depth, width and extent.

Lei Feng's Spirit Is Indispensable for the Socialist Market Economy

The essence of the spirit of Lei Feng makes it still vital and indispensable for citizens in the socialist market economy.

1. The spirit of Lei Feng is the moral standard for the inner needs of citizenship. The spirit of Lei Feng is not only embodied in a positive professional attitude and work ethic, but also in the harmonious relationship between individuals as well as between individual and society; it provides inner guidelines for citizen conduct, maintaining a correct view towards their own legitimate interests while safe-guard-

---

[11] Carl Cohen, *On Rule by the People*, translated by Nie Chongxin and Zhu Xiuxian (Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1988), 185.

[12] Kang Fengyun and Zhang Ronglin, "On the Lei Feng's Spirit and the Construction of Socialist Core Value System," *Ibid.*

ing the legitimate interests of others and the society. Meanwhile, raising the level of civic virtue should be synchronized with raising standards of living, and only by closely combining these two can material progress make sense. Translating economic progress into social and political progress requires a wider basis of values and further improvement in the ethics of citizens. The spirit of Lei Feng is definitely in line with this requirement.

2. The spirit of Lei Feng is an inevitable requirement of the socialist market economy. Market economy is popular economy, in which everyone plays a different role during their participation in the process, and this requires that everyone behave in accordance with the accepted social norms so as to promote harmonious relationships, reduce the costs of friction and social transaction, improve productivity and promote economic growth. Meanwhile, with the rapid deepening of division of labor under the socialist market economy, every citizen has become a part of the whole and cannot exist in complete independence, which requires them to have the spirit of teamwork. Enhanced degrees of specialization are accompanied by increased requirements for all aspects of the people's employment. This intensifies competition among employees and calls for a stronger professionalism and dedication of all the citizens. In addition, as integrity is the core of social and moral order in market economy, it is necessary that the construction of social and moral order should be based on this core, i.e. integrity. Thus, the integrity contained in the spirit of Lei Feng should become the core for building the contemporary moral order of China's socialist market economy.[13]

3. The ever-changing approaches in the current knowledge economy era calls for a stronger learning ability on the past of citizens. In China, the proportion of tertiary sector has exceeded the secondary sector, "the increased proportion of the service sector indicates that the economy is increasingly relying on the knowledge factors, such as inputs of knowledge, science and technology, education and information, which have become the major drive for economic growth and the

---

[13] Liu Wei et al., "Ten Connotations of Lei Feng's Spirit for the Current Era," *Party Building*, (3.2013), 19.

main source of employment growth."[14] With the rapid development of productivity, the world is entering into the era of knowledge economy. Knowledge is not only playing a more important role in economic growth, but also being updated rapidly. Citizens are required to maintain a continuous learning ability, lifelong learning and the spirit of learning so that they can adapt to the rapidly updated knowledge and technology, rather than be left behind and fail to keep pace with the times.

4. Lei Feng's spirit is in accord with the needs of China's economic development. The fundamental purpose of our releasing and developing the productive forces and the economy is in the interests of the people and to meet the people's growing material and cultural needs. To achieve this purpose, we ultimately need the spirit of serving the people. Meanwhile, China is still in the early stages of socialism, with underdeveloped productivity and relatively lower output levels, and still has a long way to go. Development needs accumulated investment, which is based on the commitment of its citizens to hard work and thrift. The capital thus generated can be invested in improving our productivity and increase people's income from properties, while extravagance will harm the health and sustainable development of the economy.

To conclude, based on responsibility, honesty, hard work, thrift, teamwork and altruism, the spirit of Lei Feng is the essential quality for citizens. Carrying forward the spirit of Lei Feng is the inner need to improve the quality of citizens, and is fundamental to the success of our socialist cause.

Effective Ways to Promote the Spirit of Lei Feng

At present, due to the impact from the market economy's negative effects, the impact of foreign ideas and the neglect of personality education, some people believe that Lei Feng's spirit is "obsolete" or "useless." Hence, today, it is more urgent to carry forward the spirit

---

[14] Hu Angang et al., *2030 China: towards Common Prosperity* (Beijing: China Renmin University Press, 2011), 32.

of Lei Feng from the perspective of citizens, and to make it the code of conduct within every citizen.

1. Deepening the understanding of Lei Feng's spirit, especially deepening the understanding of the relationship between self-interest and altruism: some people think that Lei Feng's spirit lacks the safeguard as for one's own interests and becomes obsolete under the socialist market economy. This is a misunderstanding. Although Lei Feng "treats individualism like wind sweeping the falling leaves," the sweeping is not intended as sweeping away. The leaves do not disappear, and they are just not spreading everywhere like before. All humans pursue self-interests, but "despite how selfish one seems to be in other's eyes, there is always some instincts, in her/his nature, to care about others and share empathy with the happiness of others, even though she/he will receive nothing except a slight feeling of happiness from the well-being of others."[15] This shows that we also have altruistic instincts. The only difference lies in the proportions of selfishness and altruism. In China, we do not deny self-interest, but since China is a socialist country, we have the same fundamental interests, and its citizens have more altruism.

2. Strengthening civic education: education is an important way to improve civic quality, and school education provides the knowledge reserves necessary for the formation of civil qualities. There are rich valuable resources in traditional Chinese culture. Civic education should utilize the relevant resources in the outstanding traditional culture to enhance the citizens' sense of identity. Meanwhile, the publicity of models and examples will have profound influence on citizens as the power of example is infinite. Examples in our daily life, in particular, will have strong resonance among citizens and such practical education makes it easier for citizens to follow these models.

3. Utilizing the functions of social organizations, and social organizations' roles to improve the citizen's ethical quality and promote the spirit of Lei Feng cannot be underestimated. They can help citizens get out of their narrow self-serving perspectives and attend to the interests of others so that they will pay attention to their demeanor

---

[15] Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, translated by Wang Xiuli (Beijing: Beijing Institute of Technology Press, 2009), 3.

and improve their sense of responsibility. Through transferring the rights and empowerment, government can transfer public services and affairs to social organizations so as to reduce the burden on the government and provide a practical platform for citizens to improve their ethical qualities.

4. Establishing and improving related systems, employing them as hard constraints. "Bad guys cannot run amok under good systems, while good people cannot make full play of their virtues under bad systems, or may even go into reverse."[16] A good system is fundamental for the citizens to carry on the spirit of Lei Feng. The improvement of the quality of citizens and good citizen ethics also calls for the guarantee of a strong legal system. Therefore, we need to improve legislation and the legal system, establish definitive and institutionalized social norms, which will reward virtue and punish evil.

Liaoning University, Shenyang, P.R. China

---

[16] Deng Xiaoping, *Works of Deng Xiaoping* (Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1994), Volume II, 333.

Index

The Council for Research
in Values and Philosophy

Purpose

Today there is urgent need to attend to the nature and dignity of the person, to the quality of human life, to the purpose and goal of the physical transformation of our environment, and to the relation of all this to the development of social and political life. This, in turn, requires philosophic clarification of the base upon which freedom is exercised, that is, of the values which provide stability and guidance to one's decisions.

Such studies must be able to reach deeply into one's culture and that of other parts of the world as mutually reinforcing and enriching in order to uncover the roots of the dignity of persons and of their societies. They must be able to identify the conceptual forms in terms of which modern industrial and technological developments are structured and how these impact upon human self-understanding. Above all, they must be able to bring these elements together in the creative understanding essential for setting our goals and determining our modes of interaction. In the present complex global circumstances this is a condition for growing together with trust and justice, honest dedication and mutual concern.

The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy (RVP) unites scholars who share these concerns and are interested in the application thereto of existing capabilities in the field of philosophy and other disciplines. Its work is to identify areas in which study is needed, the intellectual resources which can be brought to bear thereupon, and the means for publication and interchange of the work from the various regions of the world. In bringing these together its goal is scientific discovery and publication which contributes to the present promotion of humankind.

In sum, our times present both the need and the opportunity for deeper and ever more progressive understanding of the person and of the foundations of social life. The development of such understanding is the goal of the RVP.

Projects

A set of related research efforts is currently in process:

1. Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change: Philosophical Foundations for Social Life. Focused, mutually coordinated research teams in university centers prepare volumes as part of an integrated philosophic search for self-understanding differentiated by culture and civilization. These evolve more adequate understandings of the person in society and look to the cultural heritage of each for the resources to respond to the challenges of its own specific contemporary transformation.

2. Seminars on Culture and Contemporary Issues. This series of 10 week cross-cultural and interdisciplinary seminars is coordinated by the RVP in Washington.

3. Joint-Colloquia with Institutes of Philosophy of the National Academies of Science, university philosophy departments, and societies. Underway since 1976 in Eastern Europe and, since 1987, in China, these concern the person in contemporary society.

4. Foundations of Moral Education and Character Development. A study in values and education which unites philosophers, psychologists, social scientists and scholars in education in the elaboration of ways of enriching the moral content of education and character development. This work has been underway since 1980.

The personnel for these projects consists of established scholars willing to contribute their time and research as part of their professional commitment to life in contemporary society. For resources to implement this work the Council, as 501 C3 a non-profit organization incorporated in the District of Columbia, looks to various private foundations, public programs and enterprises.

Publications on Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change

Series I. Culture and Values
Series II. African Philosophical Studies
Series IIA. Islamic Philosophical Studies
Series III. Asian Philosophical Studies
Series IV. Western European Philosophical Studies
Series IVA. Central and Eastern European Philosophical Studies
Series V. Latin American Philosophical Studies
Series VI. Foundations of Moral Education
Series VII. Seminars: Culture and Values
Series VIII. Christian Philosophical Studies

****

Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change

Series I. Culture and Values

I.1 *Research on Culture and Values: Intersection of Universities, Churches and Nations*. George F. McLean, ed. ISBN 0819173533 (paper).
I.2 *The Knowledge of Values: A Methodological Introduction to the Study of Values*. A. Lopez Quintas, ed. ISBN 081917419x (paper).
I.3 *Reading Philosophy for the XXIst Century*. George F. McLean, ed. ISBN 0819174157 (paper).

I.4 *Relations between Cultures*. John A. Kromkowski, ed. ISBN 1565180089 (paper).

I.5 *Urbanization and Values*. John A. Kromkowski, ed. ISBN 1565180100 (paper).

I.6 *The Place of the Person in Social Life*. Paul Peachey and John A. Kromkowski, eds. ISBN 1565180127 (paper).

I.7 *Abrahamic Faiths, Ethnicity and Ethnic Conflicts*. Paul Peachey, George F. McLean and John A. Kromkowski, eds. ISBN 1565181042 (paper).

I.8 *Ancient Western Philosophy: The Hellenic Emergence*. George F. McLean and Patrick J. Aspell, eds. ISBN 156518100X (paper).

I.9 *Medieval Western Philosophy: The European Emergence*. Patrick J. Aspell, ed. ISBN 1565180941 (paper).

I.10 *The Ethical Implications of Unity and the Divine in Nicholas of Cusa*. David L. De Leonardis. ISBN 1565181123 (paper).

I.11 *Ethics at the Crossroads: 1. Normative Ethics and Objective Reason*. George F. McLean, ed. ISBN 1565180224 (paper).

I.12 *Ethics at the Crossroads: 2. Personalist Ethics and Human Subjectivity*. George F. McLean, ed. ISBN 1565180240 (paper).

I.13 *The Emancipative Theory of Jürgen Habermas and Metaphysics*. Robert Badillo. ISBN 1565180429 (paper).

I.14 *The Deficient Cause of Moral Evil According to Thomas Aquinas*. Edward Cook. ISBN 1565180704 (paper).

I.15 *Human Love: Its Meaning and Scope, a Phenomenology of Gift and Encounter*. Alfonso Lopez Quintas. ISBN 1565180747 (paper).

I.16 *Civil Society and Social Reconstruction*. George F. McLean, ed. ISBN 1565180860 (paper).

I.17 *Ways to God, Personal and Social at the Turn of Millennia: The Iqbal Lecture, Lahore*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181239 (paper).

I.18 *The Role of the Sublime in Kant's Moral Metaphysics*. John R. Goodreau. ISBN 1565181247 (paper).

I.19 *Philosophical Challenges and Opportunities of Globalization*. Oliva Blanchette, Tomonobu Imamichi and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565181298 (paper).

I.20 *Faith, Reason and Philosophy: Lectures at The al-Azhar, Qom, Tehran, Lahore and Beijing; Appendix: The Encyclical Letter: Fides et Ratio*. George F. McLean. ISBN 156518130 (paper).

I.21 *Religion and the Relation between Civilizations: Lectures on Cooperation between Islamic and Christian Cultures in a Global Horizon*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181522 (paper).

I.22 *Freedom, Cultural Traditions and Progress: Philosophy in Civil Society and Nation Building, Tashkent Lectures, 1999*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181514 (paper).

I.23 *Ecology of Knowledge*. Jerzy A. Wojciechowski. ISBN 1565181581 (paper).

I.24 *God and the Challenge of Evil: A Critical Examination of Some Serious Objections to the Good and Omnipotent God*. John L. Yardan. ISBN 1565181603 (paper).

I.25 *Reason, Rationality and Reasonableness, Vietnamese Philosophical Studies, I*. Tran Van Doan. ISBN 1565181662 (paper).

I.26 *The Culture of Citizenship: Inventing Postmodern Civic Culture*. Thomas Bridges. ISBN 1565181689 (paper).

I.27 *The Historicity of Understanding and the Problem of Relativism in Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Osman Bilen. ISBN 156518 1670 (paper).

I.28 *Speaking of God*. Carlo Huber. ISBN 1565181697 (paper).

I.29 *Persons, Peoples and Cultures in a Global Age: Metaphysical Bases for Peace between Civilizations*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181875 (paper).

I.30 *Hermeneutics, Tradition and Contemporary Change: Lectures in Chennai/Madras, India*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181883 (paper).

I.31 *Husserl and Stein*. Richard Feist and William Sweet, eds. ISBN 156518 1948 (paper).

I.32 *Paul Hanly Furfey's Quest for a Good Society*. Bronislaw Misztal, Francesco Villa, and Eric Sean Williams, eds. ISBN 1565182278 (paper).

I.33 *Three Theories of Society*. Paul Hanly Furfey. ISBN 9781565182288 (paper).

I.34 *Building Peace in Civil Society: An Autobiographical Report from a Believers' Church*. Paul Peachey. ISBN 9781565182325 (paper).

I.35 *Karol Wojtyla's Philosophical Legacy*. Agnes B. Curry, Nancy Mardas and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 9781565182479 (paper).

I.36 *Kantian Imperatives and Phenomenology's Original Forces*. Randolph C. Wheeler. ISBN 9781565182547 (paper).

I.37 *Beyond Modernity: The Recovery of Person and Community in Global Times: Lectures in China and Vietnam*. George F. McLean. ISBN 9781 565182578 (paper)

I.38 *Religion and Culture*. George F. McLean. ISBN 9781565182561 (paper).

I.39 *The Dialogue of Cultural Traditions: Global Perspective*. William Sweet, George F. McLean, Tomonobu Imamichi, Safak Ural, O. Faruk Akyol, eds. ISBN 9781565182585 (paper).

I.40 *Unity and Harmony, Love and Compassion in Global Times*. George F. McLean. ISBN 9781565182592 (paper).

I.41 *Intercultural Dialogue and Human Rights*. Luigi Bonanate, Roberto Papini and William Sweet, eds. ISBN 9781565182714 (paper).

I.42 *Philosophy Emerging from Culture*. William Sweet, George F. McLean, Oliva Blanchette, Wonbin Park, eds. ISBN 9781565182851 (paper).

I.43 *Whence Intelligibility?* Louis Perron, ed. ISBN 9781565182905 (paper).

I.44 *What Is Intercultural Philosophy?* William Sweet, ed. ISBN 9781 565182912 (paper).

I.45 *Romero's Legacy 2: Faith in the City: Poverty, Politics, and Peace-building*. Foreword by Robert T. McDermott. Pilar Hogan Closkey, Kevin Moran and John P. Hogan, eds. ISBN 9781565182981 (paper).

I.46 *Cultural Clash and Religion*. William Sweet, ed. ISBN 9781565183100 (paper).

Series II. African Philosophical Studies

II.1 *Person and Community: Ghanaian Philosophical Studies: I*. Kwasi Wiredu and Kwame Gyekye, eds. ISBN 1565180046 (paper).

II.2 *The Foundations of Social Life: Ugandan Philosophical Studies: I*. A.T. Dalfovo, ed. ISBN 1565180062 (paper).

II.3 *Identity and Change in Nigeria: Nigerian Philosophical Studies, I*. Theophilus Okere, ed. ISBN 1565180682 (paper).

II.4 *Social Reconstruction in Africa: Ugandan Philosophical Studies, II*. E. Wamala, A.R. Byaruhanga, A.T. Dalfovo, J.K. Kigongo, S.A. Mwana-hewa and G. Tusabe, eds. ISBN 1565181182 (paper).

II.5 *Ghana: Changing Values/Changing Technologies: Ghanaian Philosophical Studies, II*. Helen Lauer, ed. ISBN 1565181441 (paper).

II.6 *Sameness and Difference: Problems and Potentials in South African Civil Society: South African Philosophical Studies, I*. James R. Cochrane and Bastienne Klein, eds. ISBN 1565181557 (paper).

II.7 *Protest and Engagement: Philosophy after Apartheid at an Historically Black South African University: South African Philosophical Studies, II*. Patrick Giddy, ed. ISBN 1565181638 (paper).

II.8 *Ethics, Human Rights and Development in Africa: Ugandan Philosophical Studies, III*. A.T. Dalfovo, J.K. Kigongo, J. Kisekka, G. Tusabe, E. Wamala, R. Munyonyo, A.B. Rukooko, A.B.T. Byaruhangaakiiki, and M. Mawa, eds. ISBN 1565181727 (paper).

II.9 *Beyond Cultures: Perceiving a Common Humanity: Ghanaian Philosophical Studies, III*. Kwame Gyekye. ISBN 156518193X (paper).

II.10 *Social and Religious Concerns of East Africa: A Wajibu Anthology: Kenyan Philosophical Studies, I*. Gerald J. Wanjohi and G. Wakuraya Wanjohi, eds. ISBN 1565182219 (paper).

II.11 *The Idea of an African University: The Nigerian Experience: Nigerian Philosophical Studies, II*. Joseph Kenny, ed. ISBN 9781565182301 (paper).

II.12 *The Struggles after the Struggle: Zimbabwean Philosophical Studies, I*. David Kaulemu, ed. ISBN 9781565182318 (paper).

II.13 *Indigenous and Modern Environmental Ethics: A Study of the Indigenous Oromo Environmental Ethic and Modern Issues of Environment and Development: Ethiopian Philosophical Studies, I*. Workineh Kelbessa. ISBN 9781565182530 (paper).

II.14 *African Philosophy and the Future of Africa: South African Philosophical Studies, III*. Gerard Walmsley, ed. ISMB 9781565182707 (paper).

II.15 *Philosophy in Ethiopia: African Philosophy Today, I: Ethiopian Philo-sophical Studies, II*. Bekele Gutema and Charles C. Verharen, eds. ISBN 9781565182790 (paper).

II.16 *The Idea of a Nigerian University: A Revisit: Nigerian Philosophical Studies, III*. Olatunji Oyeshile and Joseph Kenny, eds. ISBN 978156518 2776 (paper).

II.17 *Philosophy in African Traditions and Cultures: Zimbabwe Philosophi-cal Studies, II*. Fainos Mangena, Tarisayi Andrea Chimuka, Francis Mabiri, eds. ISBN 9781565182998 (paper).

II.18 *Universalism, Relativism, and Intercultural Philosophy: Nigerian Philosophical Studies IV*. Joseph C. Achike Agbakoba and Anthony C. Ajah, eds. ISBN 9781565183162 (paper).

II.19 *An African Path to a Global Future*. Rianna Oelofsen and Kola Abimbola, eds. ISBN 9781565183230 (paper).

II.20 *Odera Oruka in the Twenty-first Century: Kenyan Philosophical Stu-dies, II*. Reginald M.J. Oduor, Oriare Nyarwath and Francis E.A. Owakah, eds. ISBN 9781565183247 (paper).

II.21 *Perspectives in Social Contract Theory*. Edwin E. Etieyibo, ed. ISBN 9781565183315 (paper).

Series IIA. Islamic Philosophical Studies

IIA.1 *Islam and the Political Order*. Muhammad Saïd al-Ashmawy. ISBN 156518047X (paper).

IIA.2 *Al-Ghazali Deliverance from Error and Mystical Union with the Almighty: Al-munqidh Min al-Dadāl*. Critical Arabic edition and English translation by Muhammad Abulaylah and Nurshif Abdul-Rahim Rifat; Introduction and notes by George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181530 (Ara-bic-English edition, paper), ISBN 1565180828 (Arabic edition, paper), ISBN 156518081X (English edition, paper).

IIA.3 *Philosophy in Pakistan*. Naeem Ahmad, ed. ISBN 1565181085 (paper).

IIA.4 *The Authenticity of the Text in Hermeneutics*. Seyed Musa Dibadj. ISBN 1565181174 (paper).

IIA.5 *Interpretation and the Problem of the Intention of the Author: H.-G. Gadamer vs E.D. Hirsch*. Burhanettin Tatar. ISBN 156518121 (paper).

IIA.6 *Ways to God, Personal and Social at the Turn of Millennia: The Iqbal Lectures, Lahore*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181239 (paper).

IIA.7 *Faith, Reason and Philosophy: Lectures at Al-Azhar University, Qom, Tehran, Lahore and Beijing; Appendix: The Encyclical Letter: Fides et Ratio*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181301 (paper).

IIA.8 *Islamic and Christian Cultures: Conflict or Dialogue: Bulgarian Philosophical Studies, III*. Plament Makariev, ed. ISBN 156518162X (paper).

IIA.9 *Values of Islamic Culture and the Experience of History, Russian Philosophical Studies, I*. Nur Kirabaev, Yuriy Pochta, eds. ISBN 1565181336 (paper).

IIA.10 *Christian-Islamic Preambles of Faith*. Joseph Kenny. ISBN 156518 1387 (paper).

IIA.11 *The Historicity of Understanding and the Problem of Relativism in Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Osman Bilen. ISBN 156518 1670 (paper).

IIA.12 *Religion and the Relation between Civilizations: Lectures on Cooperation between Islamic and Christian Cultures in a Global Horizon*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181522 (paper).

IIA.13 *Modern Western Christian Theological Understandings of Muslims since the Second Vatican Council*. Mahmut Aydin. ISBN 1565181719 (paper).

IIA.14 *Philosophy of the Muslim World; Authors and Principal Themes*. Joseph Kenny. ISBN 1565181794 (paper).

IIA.15 *Islam and Its Quest for Peace: Jihad, Justice and Education*. Mustafa Köylü. ISBN 1565181808 (paper).

IIA.16 *Islamic Thought on the Existence of God: Contributions and Contrasts with Contemporary Western Philosophy of Religion*. Cafer S. Yaran. ISBN 1565181921 (paper).

IIA.17 *Hermeneutics, Faith, and Relations between Cultures: Lectures in Qom, Iran*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181913 (paper).

IIA.18 *Change and Essence: Dialectical Relations between Change and Continuity in the Turkish Intellectual Tradition*. Sinasi Gunduz and Cafer S. Yaran, eds. ISBN 1565182227 (paper).

IIA.19 *Understanding Other Religions: Al-Biruni and Gadamer's "Fusion of Horizons."* Kemal Ataman. ISBN 9781565182523 (paper).

Series III. Asian Philosophical Studies

III.1 *Man and Nature: Chinese Philosophical Studies, I*. Tang Yijie and Li Zhen, eds. ISBN 0819174130 (paper).

III.2 *Chinese Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development: Chinese Philosophical Studies, II*. Tran van Doan, ed. ISBN 1565180321 (paper).

III.3 *Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, Christianity and Chinese Culture: Chinese Philosophical Studies, III*. 2nd edition. Tang Yijie. ISBN 9781 565183193 (paper).

III.4 *Morality, Metaphysics and Chinese Culture: Metaphysics, Culture and Morality, I*. Vincent Shen and Tran van Doan, eds. ISBN 1565180275 (paper).

III.5 *Tradition, Harmony and Transcendence*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565180313 (paper).

III.6 *Psychology, Phenomenology and Chinese Philosophy: Chinese Philosophical Studies, VI*. Vincent Shen, Richard Knowles and Tran Van Doan, eds. ISBN 1565180453 (paper).

III.7 *Values in Philippine Culture and Education: Philippine Philosophical Studies, I*. Manuel B. Dy, Jr., ed. ISBN 1565180412 (paper).

III.7A *The Human Person and Society: Chinese Philosophical Studies, VIIA*. Zhu Dasheng, Jin Xiping and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565180887.

III.8 *The Filipino Mind: Philippine Philosophical Studies II*. Leonardo N. Mercado. ISBN 156518064X (paper).

III.9 *Philosophy of Science and Education: Chinese Philosophical Studies IX*. Vincent Shen and Tran Van Doan, eds. ISBN 1565180763 (paper).

III.10 *Chinese Cultural Traditions and Modernization: Chinese Philosophical Studies, X*. Wang Miaoyang, Yu Xuanmeng and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565180682 (paper).

III.11 *The Humanization of Technology and Chinese Culture: Chinese Philosophical Studies XI*. Tomonobu Imamichi, Wang Miaoyang and Liu Fangtong, eds. ISBN 1565181166 (paper).

III.12 *Beyond Modernization: Chinese Roots of Global Awareness: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XII*. Wang Miaoyang, Yu Xuanmeng and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565180909 (paper).

III.13 *Philosophy and Modernization in China: Chinese Philosophical Studies XIII*. Liu Fangtong, Huang Songjie and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565180666 (paper).

III.14 *Economic Ethics and Chinese Culture: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XIV*. Yu Xuanmeng, Lu Xiaohe, Liu Fangtong, Zhang Rulun and Georges Enderle, eds. ISBN 1565180925 (paper).

III.15 *Civil Society in a Chinese Context: Chinese Philosophical Studies XV*. Wang Miaoyang, Yu Xuanmeng and Manuel B. Dy, eds. ISBN 156518 0844 (paper).

III.16 *The Bases of Values in a Time of Change: Chinese and Western: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XVI*. Kirti Bunchua, Liu Fangtong, Yu Xuanmeng, Yu Wujin, eds. ISBN l56518114X (paper).

III.17 *Dialogue between Christian Philosophy and Chinese Culture: Philosophical Perspectives for the Third Millennium: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XVII*. Paschal Ting, Marian Kao and Bernard Li, eds. ISBN 1565181735 (paper).

III.18 *The Poverty of Ideological Education: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XVIII*. Tran Van Doan. ISBN 1565181646 (paper).

III.19 *God and the Discovery of Man: Classical and Contemporary Approaches: Lectures in Wuhan, China*. George F. McLean. ISBN 156518 1891 (paper).

III.20 *Cultural Impact on International Relations: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XX*. Yu Xintian, ed. ISBN 156518176X (paper).

III.21 *Cultural Factors in International Relations: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXI*. Yu Xintian, ed. ISBN 1565182049 (paper).

III.22 *Wisdom in China and the West: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXII*. Vincent Shen and Willard Oxtoby. ISBN 1565182057 (paper)

III.23 *China's Contemporary Philosophical Journey: Western Philosophy and Marxism: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXIII*. Liu Fangtong. ISBN 1565182065 (paper).

III.24 *Shanghai: Its Urbanization and Culture: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXIV*. Yu Xuanmeng and He Xirong, eds. ISBN 1565182073 (paper).

III.25 *Dialogue of Philosophies, Religions and Civilizations in the Era of Globalization: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXV*. Zhao Dunhua, ed. ISBN 9781565182431 (paper).

III.26 *Rethinking Marx: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXVI*. Zou Shipeng and Yang Xuegong, eds. ISBN 9781565182448 (paper).

III.27 *Confucian Ethics in Retrospect and Prospect: Chinese Philosophical Studies XXVII*. Vincent Shen and Kwong-loi Shun, eds. ISBN 978156518 2455 (paper).

III.28 *Cultural Tradition and Social Progress, Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXVIII*. He Xirong, Yu Xuanmeng, Yu Xintian, Yu Wujing, Yang Junyi, eds. ISBN 9781565182660 (paper).

III.29 *Spiritual Foundations and Chinese Culture: A Philosophical Approach: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXIX*. Anthony J. Carroll and Katia Lenehan, eds. ISBN 9781565182974 (paper).

III.30 *Diversity in Unity: Harmony in a Global Age: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXX*. He Xirong and Yu Xuanmeng, eds. ISBN 978156518 3070 (paper).

III.31 *Chinese Spirituality and Christian Communities: A Kenotic Perspective: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXXI*. Vincent Shen, ed. ISBN 978156518 3070 (paper).

III.32 *Care of Self and Meaning of Life: Asian and Christian Reflections: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXXII*. William Sweet and Cristal Huang, ed. ISBN 9781565183131 (paper).

III.33 *Philosophy and the Life-World: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXXIII*. He Xirong, Peter Jonkers and Shi Yongzhe, eds. ISBN 9781 565183216. (paper).

III.34 *Reconstruction of Values and Morality in Global Times: Chinese Philosophical Studies, XXXIV*. Liu Yong and Zhang Zhixiang, eds. ISBN 9781565183278. (paper).

III.35 *Traditional Values and Virtues in Contemporary Social Life: Chinese Philosophical Studies XXXV*. Gong Qun, ed. ISBN 978156518. (paper).

IIIB.1 *Authentic Human Destiny: The Paths of Shankara and Heidegger: Indian Philosophical Studies, I*. Vensus A. George. ISBN 1565181190 (paper).

IIIB.2 *The Experience of Being as Goal of Human Existence: The Heideggerian Approach: Indian Philosophical Studies, II*. Vensus A. George. ISBN 156518145X (paper).

IIIB.3 *Religious Dialogue as Hermeneutics: Bede Griffiths's Advaitic Approach: Indian Philosophical Studies, II*I. Kuruvilla Pandikattu. ISBN 1565181395 (paper).

IIIB.4 *Self-Realization [Brahmaanubhava]: The Advaitic Perspective of Shankara: Indian Philosophical Studies, IV*. Vensus A. George. ISBN 1565181549 (paper).

IIIB.5 *Gandhi: The Meaning of Mahatma for the Millennium: Indian Philosophical Studies, V*. Kuruvilla Pandikattu, ed. ISBN 1565181565 (paper).

IIIB.6 *Civil Society in Indian Cultures: Indian Philosophical Studies, VI*. Asha Mukherjee, Sabujkali Sen (Mitra) and K. Bagchi, eds. ISBN 1565181573 (paper).

IIIB.7 *Hermeneutics, Tradition and Contemporary Change: Lectures in Chennai/Madras, India*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181883 (paper).

IIIB.8 *Plenitude and Participation: The Life of God in Man: Lectures in Chennai/Madras, India*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181999 (paper).

IIIB.9 *Sufism and Bhakti, a Comparative Study: Indian Philosophical Studies, VII*. Md. Sirajul Islam. ISBN 1565181980 (paper).

IIIB.10 *Reasons for Hope: Its Nature, Role and Future: Indian Philosophical Studies, VIII*. Kuruvilla Pandikattu, ed. ISBN 156518 2162 (paper).

IIIB.11 *Lifeworlds and Ethics: Studies in Several Keys: Indian Philosophical Studies, IX*. Margaret Chatterjee. ISBN 9781565182332 (paper).

IIIB.12 *Paths to the Divine: Ancient and Indian: Indian Philosophical Studies, X*. Vensus A. George. ISBN 9781565182486 (paper).

IIIB.13 *Faith and Reason Today: Fides et Ratio in a Post-Modern Era: Indian Philosophical Studies, XIII*. Varghese Manimala, ed. IBSN 9781 565182554 (paper).

IIIB.14 *Identity, Creativity and Modernization: Perspectives on Indian Cultural Tradition: Indian Philosophical Studies, XIV*. Sebastian Velassery and Vensus A. George, eds. ISBN 9781565182783 (paper).

IIIB.15 *Elusive Transcendence: An Exploration of the Human Condition Based on Paul Ricoeur: Indian Philosophical Studies, XV*. Kuruvilla Pandikattu. ISBN 9781565182950 (paper).

IIIB.16 *Being Human in Multicultural Traditions: Indian Philosophical Studies, XVI*. K. Remi Rajani and Vensus A. George, eds. ISBN 978156518 3285 (paper).

IIIC.1 *Spiritual Values and Social Progress: Uzbekistan Philosophical Studies, I*. Said Shermukhamedov and Victoriya Levinskaya, eds. ISBN 1565181433 (paper).

IIIC.2 *Kazakhstan: Cultural Inheritance and Social Transformation: Kazakh Philosophical Studies, I*. Abdumalik Nysanbayev. ISBN 1565182022 (paper).

IIIC.3 *Social Memory and Contemporaneity: Kyrgyz Philosophical Studies, I*. Gulnara A. Bakieva. ISBN 9781565182349 (paper).

IIID.1 *Reason, Rationality and Reasonableness: Vietnamese Philosophical Studies, I*. Tran Van Doan. ISBN 1565181662 (paper).

IIID.2 *Hermeneutics for a Global Age: Lectures in Shanghai and Hanoi*. George F. McLean. ISBN 1565181905 (paper).

IIID.3 *Cultural Traditions and Contemporary Challenges in Southeast Asia*. Warayuth Sriwarakuel, Manuel B. Dy, J. Haryatmoko, Nguyen Trong Chuan, and Chhay Yiheang, eds. ISBN 1565182138 (paper).

IIID.4 *Filipino Cultural Traits: Claro R. Ceniza Lectures*. Rolando M. Gripaldo, ed. ISBN 1565182251 (paper).

IIID.5 *The History of Buddhism in Vietnam*. Chief editor: Nguyen Tai Thu; Authors: Dinh Minh Chi, Ly Kim Hoa, Ha thuc Minh, Ha Van Tan, Nguyen Tai Thu. ISBN 1565180984 (paper).

IIID.6 *Relations between Religions and Cultures in Southeast Asia*. Gadis Arivia and Donny Gahral Adian, eds. ISBN 9781565182509 (paper).

IIID.7 *Rethinking the Role of Philosophy in the Global Age*. William Sweet and Pham Van Duc, eds. ISBN 9781565182646 (paper).

IIID.8 *Practical Issues and Social Philosophy in Vietnam Today*. Pham Van Duc. ISBN 9781565183346 (paper).

Series IV. Western European Philosophical Studies

IV.1 *Italy in Transition: The Long Road from the First to the Second Republic: The Edmund D. Pellegrino Lectures*. Paolo Janni, ed. ISBN 156518 1204 (paper).

IV.2 *Italy and the European Monetary Union: The Edmund D. Pellegrino Lectures*. Paolo Janni, ed. ISBN 156518128X (paper).

IV.3 *Italy at the Millennium: Economy, Politics, Literature and Journalism: The Edmund D. Pellegrino Lectures*. Paolo Janni, ed. ISBN 1565181581 (paper).

IV.4 *Speaking of God*. Carlo Huber. ISBN 1565181697 (paper).

IV.5 *The Essence of Italian Culture and the Challenge of a Global Age*. Paulo Janni and George F. McLean, eds. ISBB 1565181778 (paper).

IV.6 *Italic Identity in Pluralistic Contexts: Toward the Development of Intercultural Competencies*. Piero Bassetti and Paolo Janni, eds. ISBN 156518 1441 (paper).

IV.7 *Phenomenon of Affectivity: Phenomenological-Anthropological Perspectives*. Ghislaine Florival. ISBN 9781565182899 (paper).

IV.8 *Towards a Kenotic Vision of Authority in the Catholic Church*. Anthony J. Carroll, Marthe Kerkwijk, Michael Kirwan, James Sweeney, eds. ISNB 9781565182936 (paper).

IV.9 *A Catholic Minority Church in a World of Seekers*. Staf Hellemans and Peter Jonkers, eds. ISBN 9781565183018 (paper).

IV.10 *French Catholics and Their Church: Pluralism and Deregulation*. Nicolas de Bremond d'Ars and Yann Raison du Cleuziou, eds. ISBN 9781565183087 (paper).

IV.11 *Philosophy and Crisis: Responding to Challenges to Ways of Life in the Contemporary World* (2 Volumes). Golfo Maggini, Vasiliki P. Solomou-Papanikolaou, Helen Karabatzaki and Konstantinos D. Koskeridis, eds. ISBN 9781565183292 (paper).

IV.12 *Re-Learning to be Human in Global Times: Challenges and Opportunities from the Perspectives of Contemporary Philosophy and Religion*. Brigitte Buchhammer, ed. ISBN 9781565183339 (paper).

Series IVA. Central and Eastern European Philosophical Studies

IVA.1 *The Philosophy of Person: Solidarity and Cultural Creativity: Polish Philosophical Studies, I*. A. Tischner, J.M. Zycinski, eds. ISBN 156518 0496 (paper).

IVA.2 *Private and Public Social Inventions in Modern Societies: Polish Philosophical Studies, II*. L. Dyczewski, P. Peachey, J.A. Kromkowski, eds. ISBN. 1565180518 (paper).

IVA.3 *Traditions and Present Problems of Czech Political Culture: Czecho-slovak Philosophical Studies, I*. M. Bednár and M. Vejraka, eds. ISBN 1565180577 (paper).

IVA.4 *Czech Philosophy in the XXth Century: Czech Philosophical Studies, II*. Lubomír Nový and Jirí Gabriel, eds. ISBN 1565180291 (paper).

IVA.5 *Language, Values and the Slovak Nation: Slovak Philosophical Studies, I*. Tibor Pichler and Jana Gašparíková, eds. ISBN 1565180372 (paper).

IVA.6 *Morality and Public Life in a Time of Change: Bulgarian Philosophical Studies, I*. V. Prodanov and A. Davidov, eds. ISBN 1565180550 (paper).

IVA.7 *Knowledge and Morality: Georgian Philosophical Studies, I*. N.V. Chavchavadze, G. Nodia and P. Peachey, eds. ISBN 1565180534 (paper).

IVA.8 *Personal Freedom and National Resurgence: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies, I*. Bronius Kuzmickas and Aleksandr Dobrynin, eds. ISBN 1565180399 (paper).

IVA.9 *National, Cultural and Ethnic Identities: Harmony beyond Conflict: Czech Philosophical Studies, III*. Jaroslav Hroch, David Hollan, George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565181131 (paper).

IVA.10 *Models of Identities in Postcommunist Societies: Yugoslav Philosophical Studies, I*. Zagorka Golubovic and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565181211 (paper).

IVA.11 *Interests and Values: The Spirit of Venture in a Time of Change: Slovak Philosophical Studies, II*. Tibor Pichler and Jana Gasparikova, eds. ISBN 1565181255 (paper).

IVA.12 *Creating Democratic Societies: Values and Norms: Bulgarian Philosophical Studies, II*. Plamen Makariev, Andrew M. Blasko and Asen Davidov, eds. ISBN 156518131X (paper).

IVA.13 *Values of Islamic Culture and the Experience of History: Russian Philosophical Studies, I*. Nur Kirabaev and Yuriy Pochta, eds. ISBN 1565181336 (paper).

IVA.14 *Values and Education in Romania Today: Romanian Philosophical Studies, I*. Marin Calin and Magdalena Dumitrana, eds. ISBN 156518 1344 (paper).

IVA.15 *Between Words and Reality, Studies on the Politics of Recognition and the Changes of Regime in Contemporary Romania: Romanian Philosophical Studies, II*. Victor Neumann. ISBN 1565181611 (paper).

IVA.16 *Culture and Freedom: Romanian Philosophical Studies, III*. Marin Aiftinca, ed. ISBN 1565181360 (paper).

IVA.17 *Lithuanian Philosophy: Persons and Ideas: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies, II*. Jurate Baranova, ed. ISBN 1565181379 (paper).

IVA.18 *Human Dignity: Values and Justice: Czech Philosophical Studies, IV*. Miloslav Bednar, ed. ISBN 1565181409 (paper).

IVA.19 *Values in the Polish Cultural Tradition: Polish Philosophical Studies, III*. Leon Dyczewski, ed. ISBN 1565181425 (paper).

IVA.20 *Liberalization and Transformation of Morality in Post-communist Countries: Polish Philosophical Studies, IV*. Tadeusz Buksinski. ISBN 1565181786 (paper).

IVA.21 *Islamic and Christian Cultures: Conflict or Dialogue: Bulgarian Philosophical Studies, III*. Plament Makariev, ed. ISBN 156518162X (paper).

IVA.22 *Moral, Legal and Political Values in Romanian Culture: Romanian Philosophical Studies, IV*. Mihaela Czobor-Lupp and J. Stefan Lupp, eds. ISBN 1565181700 (paper).

IVA.23 *Social Philosophy: Paradigm of Contemporary Thinking: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies, III*. Jurate Morkuniene. ISBN 1565182030 (paper).

IVA.24 *Romania: Cultural Identity and Education for Civil Society: Romanian Philosophical Studies, V*. Magdalena Dumitrana, ed. ISBN 156518 209X (paper).

IVA.25 *Polish Axiology: the 20th Century and Beyond: Polish Philosophical Studies, V*. Stanislaw Jedynak, ed. ISBN 1565181417 (paper).

IVA.26 *Contemporary Philosophical Discourse in Lithuania: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies, IV*. Jurate Baranova, ed. ISBN 1565182154 (paper).

IVA.27 *Eastern Europe and the Challenges of Globalization: Polish Philosophical Studies, VI*. Tadeusz Buksinski and Dariusz Dobrzanski, eds. ISBN 1565182189 (paper).

IVA.28 *Church, State, and Society in Eastern Europe: Hungarian Philosophical Studies, I*. Miklós Tomka. ISBN 156518226X (paper).

IVA.29 *Politics, Ethics, and the Challenges to Democracy in 'New Independent States': Georgian Philosophical Studies, II*. Tinatin Bochorishvili, William Sweet and Daniel Ahern, eds. ISBN 9781565182240 (paper).

IVA.30 *Comparative Ethics in a Global Age: Russian Philosophical Studies II*. Marietta T. Stepanyants, ed. ISBN 9781565182356 (paper).

IVA.31 *Lithuanian Identity and Values: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies, V*. Aida Savicka, ed. ISBN 9781565182367 (paper).

IVA.32 *The Challenge of Our Hope: Christian Faith in Dialogue: Polish Philosophical Studies, VII*. Waclaw Hryniewicz. ISBN 9781565182370 (paper).

IVA.33 *Diversity and Dialogue: Culture and Values in the Age of Globalization*. Andrew Blasko and Plamen Makariev, eds. ISBN 9781565182387 (paper).

IVA.34 *Civil Society, Pluralism and Universalism: Polish Philosophical Studies, VIII*. Eugeniusz Gorski. ISBN 9781565182417 (paper).

IVA.35 *Romanian Philosophical Culture, Globalization, and Education: Romanian Philosophical Studies VI*. Stefan Popenici and Alin Tat, eds. ISBN 9781565182424 (paper).

IVA.36 *Political Transformation and Changing Identities in Central and Eastern Europe: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies, VI*. Andrew Blasko and Diana Janušauskienė, eds. ISBN 9781565182462 (paper).

IVA.37 *Truth and Morality: The Role of Truth in Public Life: Romanian Philosophical Studies, VII*. Wilhelm Dancă, ed. ISBN 9781565182493 (paper).

IVA.38 *Globalization and Culture: Outlines of Contemporary Social Cognition: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies, VII*. Jurate Morkuniene, ed. ISBN 9781565182516 (paper).

IVA.39 *Knowledge and Belief in the Dialogue of Cultures, Russian Philosophical Studies, III*. Marietta Stepanyants, ed. ISBN 9781565182622 (paper).

IVA.40 *God and Post-Modern Thought: Philosophical Issues in the Contemporary Critique of Modernity, Polish Philosophical Studies, IX*. Józef Życiński. ISBN 9781565182677 (paper).

IVA.41 *Dialogue among Civilizations, Russian Philosophical Studies, IV*. Nur Kirabaev and Yuriy Pochta, eds. ISBN 9781565182653 (paper).

IVA.42 *The Idea of Solidarity: Philosophical and Social Contexts, Polish Philosophical Studies, X*. Dariusz Dobrzanski, ed. ISBN 9781565182961 (paper).

IVA.43 *God's Spirit in the World: Ecumenical and Cultural Essays, Polish Philosophical Studies, XI*. Waclaw Hryniewicz. ISBN 9781565182738 (paper).

IVA.44 *Philosophical Theology and the Christian Tradition: Russian and Western Perspectives, Russian Philosophical Studies, V*. David Bradshaw, ed. ISBN 9781565182752 (paper).

IVA.45 *Ethics and the Challenge of Secularism: Russian Philosophical Studies, VI*. David Bradshaw, ed. ISBN 9781565182806 (paper).

IVA.46 *Philosophy and Spirituality across Cultures and Civilizations: Russian Philosophical Studies, VII*. Nur Kirabaev, Yuriy Pochta and Ruzana Pskhu, eds. ISBN 9781565182820 (paper).

IVA.47 *Values of the Human Person: Contemporary Challenges: Romanian Philosophical Studies, VIII*. Mihaela Pop, ed. ISBN 9781565182844 (paper).

IVA.48 *Faith and Secularization: A Romanian Narrative: Romanian Philosophical Studies, IX*. Wilhelm Dancă, ed. ISBN 9781565182929 (paper).

IVA.49 *The Spirit: The Cry of the World: Polish Philosophical Studies, XII*. Waclaw Hryniewicz. ISBN 9781565182943 (paper).

IVA.50 *Philosophy and Science in Cultures: East and West: Russian Philosophical Studies, VIII*. Marietta T. Stepanyants, ed. ISBN 978156518 2967 (paper).

IVA.51 *A Czech Perspective on Faith in a Secular Age: Czech Philosophical Studies V*. Tomáš Halík and Pavel Hošek, eds. ISBN 9781565183001 (paper).

IVA.52 *Dilemmas of the Catholic Church in Poland: Polish Philosophical Studies, XIII*. Tadeusz Buksinski, ed. ISBN 9781565183025 (paper).

IVA.53 *Secularization and Development of Religion in Modern Society: Polish Philosophical Studies, XIV*. Leon Dyczewski, ed. ISBN 9781 565183032 (paper).

IVA.54 *Seekers or Dwellers: The Social Character of Religion in Hungary: Hungarian Philosophical Studies, II*. Zsuzsanna Bögre, ed. ISBN 9781 565183063 (paper).

IVA.55 *Eurasian Frontier: Interrelation of Eurasian Cultures in a Global Age: Russian Philosophical Studies, IX*. Irina Boldonova and Vensus A. George, eds. ISBN 9781565183186 (paper).

IVA.56 *Religion, the Sacred and Hospitality: Romanian Philosophical Studies, X*. Wilhelm Dancă, ed. ISBN 9781565183254 (paper).

IVA.57 *Identity and Globalization: Ethical Implications: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies, VIII*. Dalia Stanciene, Irena Darginaviciene and Susan Robbins, eds. ISBN 9781565183261 (paper).

Series V. Latin American Philosophical Studies

V.1 *The Social Context and Values: Perspectives of the Americas*. O. Pegoraro, ed. ISBN 081917355X (paper).

V.2 *Culture, Human Rights and Peace in Central America*. Raul Molina and Timothy Ready, eds. ISBN 0819173576 (paper).

V.3 *Aymara Christianity: Inculturation or Culturization?* Luis Jolicoeur. ISBN 1565181042 (paper).

V.4 *Love as the Foundation of Moral Education and Character Development*. Luis Ugalde, Nicolas Barros and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565180801 (paper).

V.5 *Human Rights, Solidarity and Subsidiarity: Essays towards a Social Ontology*. Carlos E.A. Maldonado. ISBN 1565181107 (paper).

V.6 *A New World: A Perspective from Ibero America*. H. Daniel Dei, ed. ISBN 9781565182639 (paper).

Series VI. Foundations of Moral Education

VI.1 *Philosophical Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development: Act and Agent*. George F. McLean and F. Ellrod, eds. ISBN 1565180011 (paper).

VI.2 *Psychological Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development: An Integrated Theory of Moral Development*. Richard Knowles, ed. ISBN 156518002X (paper).

VI.3 *Character Development in Schools and Beyond*. Kevin Ryan and Thomas Lickona, eds. ISBN 1565180593 (paper).

VI.4 *The Social Context and Values: Perspectives of the Americas*. O. Pegoraro, ed. ISBN 081917355X (paper).

VI.5 *Chinese Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development*. Tran van Doan, ed. ISBN 1565180321 (paper).

VI.6 *Love as the Foundation of Moral Education and Character Development*. Luis Ugalde, Nicolas Barros and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565180801 (paper).

Series VII. Seminars on Culture and Values

VII.1 *The Social Context and Values: Perspectives of the Americas*. O. Pegoraro, ed. ISBN 081917355X (paper).

VII.2 *Culture, Human Rights and Peace in Central America*. Raul Molina and Timothy Ready, eds. ISBN 0819173576 (paper).

VII.3 *Relations between Cultures*. John A. Kromkowski, ed. ISBN 156518 0089 (paper).

VII.4 *Moral Imagination and Character Development: The Imagination* (Volume I). George F. McLean and John A. Kromkowski, eds. ISBN 1565181743 (paper).

VII.5 *Moral Imagination and Character Development: Moral Imagination in Personal Formation and Character Development* (Volume II). George F. McLean and Richard Knowles, eds. ISBN 1565181816 (paper).

VII.6 *Moral Imagination and Character Development*: *Imagination in Religion and Social Life* (Volume III). George F. McLean and John K. White, eds. ISBN 1565181824 (paper).

VII.7 *Hermeneutics and Inculturation*. George F. McLean, Antonio Gallo and Robert Magliola, eds. ISBN 1565181840 (paper).

VII.8 *Culture, Evangelization, and Dialogue*. Antonio Gallo and Robert Magliola, eds. ISBN 1565181832 (paper).

VII.9 *The Place of the Person in Social Life*. Paul Peachey and John A. Kromkowski, eds. ISBN 1565180127 (paper); 1565180135 (cloth).

VII.10 *Urbanization and Values*. John A. Kromkowski, ed. ISBN 156518 0100 (paper); 1565180119 (cloth).

VII.11 *Freedom and Choice in a Democracy*, Volume I: Meanings of Freedom. Robert Magliola and John Farrelly, eds. ISBN 1565181867 (paper).

VII.12 *Freedom and Choice in a Democracy, Volume II: The Difficult Passage to Freedom*. Robert Magliola and Richard Khuri, eds. ISBN 1565181859 (paper).

VII.13 *Cultural Identity, Pluralism and Globalization* (2 volumes). John P. Hogan, ed. ISBN 1565182170 (paper).

VII.14 *Democracy: In the Throes of Liberalism and Totalitarianism*. George F. McLean, Robert Magliola and William Fox, eds. ISBN 1565181956 (paper).

VII.15 *Democracy and Values in Global Times: With Nigeria as a Case Study*. George F. McLean, Robert Magliola and Joseph Abah, eds. ISBN 1565181956 (paper).

VII.16 *Civil Society and Social Reconstruction*. George F. McLean, ed. ISBN 1565180860 (paper).

VII.17 *Civil Society: Who Belongs?* William A. Barbieri, Robert Magliola and Rosemary Winslow, eds. ISBN 1565181972 (paper).

VII.18 *The Humanization of Social Life: Theory and Challenges*. Christopher Wheatley, Robert P. Badillo, Rose B. Calabretta and Robert Magliola, eds. ISBN 1565182006 (paper).

VII.19 *The Humanization of Social Life: Cultural Resources and Historical Responses*. Ronald S. Calinger, Robert P. Badillo, Rose B. Calabretta, Robert Magliola, eds. ISBN 1565182006 (paper).

VII.20 *Religion, Morality and Communication between Peoples: Religion in Public Life*, Volume I. George F. McLean, John A. Kromkowski and Robert Magliola, eds. ISBN 1565182103 (paper).

VII.21 *Religion and Political Structures from Fundamentalism to Public Service: Religion in Public Life*, Volume II. John T. Ford, Robert A. Destro and Charles R. Dechert, eds. ISBN 1565182111 (paper).

VII.22 *Civil Society as Democratic Practice*. Antonio F. Perez, Semou Pathé Gueye, Yang Fenggang, eds. ISBN 1565182146 (paper).

VII.23 *Ecumenism and Nostra Aetate in the 21st Century*. George F. McLean and John P. Hogan, eds. ISBN 1565182197 (paper).

VII.24 *Multiple Paths to God: Nostra Aetate: 40 Years Later*. John P. Hogan and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565182200 (paper).

VII.25 *Globalization and Identity*. Andrew Blasko, Taras Dobko, Pham Van Duc and George Pattery, eds. ISBN 1565182200 (paper).

VII.26 *Communication across Cultures: The Hermeneutics of Cultures and Religions in a Global Age*. Chibueze C. Udeani, Veerachart Nimanong, Zou Shipeng and Mustafa Malik, eds. ISBN: 9781565182400 (paper).

VII.27 *Symbols, Cultures and Identities in a Time of Global Interaction*. Paata Chkheidze, Hoang Thi Tho and Yaroslav Pasko, eds. ISBN 9781 565182608 (paper).

VII.28 *Restorying the 'Polis': Civil Society as Narrative Reconstruction*. Yuriy Pochta, Gan Chunsong and David Kaulemu, eds. ISNB 9781 565183124 (paper).

VII.29 *History and Cultural Identity: Retrieving the Past, Shaping the Future*. John P. Hogan, ed. ISBN 9781565182684 (paper).

VII.30 *Human Nature: Stable and/or Changing?* John P. Hogan, ed. ISBN 9781565182431 (paper).

VII.31 *Reasoning in Faith: Cultural Foundations for Civil Society and Globalization*. Octave Kamwiziku Wozol, Sebastian Velassery and Jurate Baranova, eds. ISBN 9781565182868 (paper).

VII.32 *Building Community in a Mobile/Global Age: Migration and Hospitality*. John P. Hogan, Vensus A. George and Corazon T. Toralba, eds. ISBN 9781565182875 (paper).

VII.33 *The Role of Religions in the Public-Sphere: The Post-Secular Model of Jürgen Habermas and Beyond*. Plamen Makariev and Vensus A. George, eds. ISBN 9781565183049 (paper).

VII.34 *Diversity and Unity*. George F. McLean, Godé Iwele and Angelli F. Tugado, eds. ISBN 9781565183117 (paper).

VII.35 *The Secular and the Sacred: Complementary and/or Conflictual?* John P. Hogan and Sayed Hassan Hussaini (Akhlaq), eds. ISBN 9781 565183209 (paper).

VII.36 *Justice and Responsibility: Cultural and Philosophical Foundations*. João J. Vila-Chã, and John P. Hogan, eds. ISBN 9781565183308 (paper).

Series VIII. Christian Philosophical Studies

VIII.1 *Church and People: Disjunctions in a Secular Age, Christian Philosophical Studies, I*. Charles Taylor, José Casanova and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN9781565182745 (paper).

VIII.2 *God's Spirit in the World: Ecumenical and Cultural Essays, Christian Philosophical Studies, II*. Waclaw Hryniewicz. ISBN 9781565182738 (paper).

VIII.3 *Philosophical Theology and the Christian Tradition: Russian and Western Perspectives, Christian Philosophical Studies, III*. David Bradshaw, ed. ISBN 9781565182752 (paper).

VIII.4 *Ethics and the Challenge of Secularism: Christian Philosophical Studies, IV*. David Bradshaw, ed. ISBN 9781565182806 (paper).

VIII.5 *Freedom for Faith: Theological Hermeneutics of Discovery based on George F. McLean's Philosophy of Culture: Christian Philosophical Studies, V*. John M. Staak. ISBN 9781565182837 (paper).

VIII.6 *Humanity on the Threshold: Religious Perspective on Transhumanism: Christian Philosophical Studies, VI*. John C. Haughey and Ilia Delio, eds. ISBN 9781565182882 (paper).

VIII.7 *Faith and Secularization: A Romanian Narrative: Christian Philosophical Studies, VII*. Wilhelm Dancă, ed. ISBN 9781565182929 (paper).

VIII.8 *Towards a Kenotic Vision of Authority in the Catholic Church: Christian Philosophical Studies, VIII*. Anthony J. Carroll, Marthe Kerkwijk, Michael Kirwan and James Sweeney, eds. ISBN 9781565182936 (paper).

VIII.9 *The Spirit: The Cry of the World: Christian Philosophical Studies, IX*. Waclaw Hryniewicz. ISBN 9781565182943 (paper).

VIII.10 *A Czech Perspective on Faith in a Secular Age: Christian Philosophical Studies, X*. Tomáš Halík and Pavel Hošek, eds. ISBN 978156518 3001 (paper).

VIII.11 *A Catholic Minority Church in a World of Seekers: Christian Philosophical Studies, XI*. Staf Hellemans and Peter Jonkers, eds. ISBN 9781 565183018 (paper).

VIII.12 *Dilemmas of the Catholic Church in Poland: Christian Philosophical Studies, XII*. Tadeusz Buksinski, ed. ISBN 9781565183025 (paper).

VIII.13 *Secularization and Development of Religion in Modern Society: Christian Philosophical Studies, XIII*. Leon Dyczewski, ed. ISBN 9781 565183032 (paper).

VIII.14 *Plural Spiritualities: North American Experience: Christian Philosophical Studies, XIV*. Robert J. Schreiter, ed. ISBN 9781565183056 (paper).

VIII.15 *Seekers or Dwellers: The Social Character of Religion in Hungary: Christian Philosophical Studies, XV*. Zsuzsanna Bögre, ed. ISBN 9781 565183063 (paper).

VIII.16 *French Catholics and Their Church: Pluralism and Deregulation: Christian Philosophical Studies, XVI*. Nicolas de Bremond d'Ars and Yann Raison du Cleuziou, eds. ISBN 9781565183087 (paper).

VIII.17 *Chinese Spirituality and Christian Communities: A Kenotic Perspective: Christian Philosophical Studies, XVII*. Vincent Shen, ed. ISBN 9781565183070 (paper).

VIII.18 *Care of Self and Meaning of Life: Asian and Christian Reflections: Christian Philosophical Studies, XVIII*. William Sweet and Cristal Huang, ed. ISBN 9781565183131 (paper).

VIII.19 *Religion and Culture in the Process of Global Change: Portuguese Perspectives: Christian Philosophical Studies, XIX*. José Tolentino Mendonça, Alfredo Teixeira and Alexandre Palma, eds. ISBN 978156518 3148 (paper).

VIII.20 *Seekers and Dwellers: Plurality and Wholeness in a Time of Secularity: Christian Philosophical Studies, XX*. Philip J. Rossi, ed. ISBN 9781 565183155, (paper).

VIII.21 *Renewing the Church in a Secular Age: Holistic Dialogue and Kenotic Vision: Christian Philosophical Studies, XXI*. Charles Taylor, José Casanova, George F. McLean and João J. Vila-Chã, eds. ISBN 9781 565183179 (paper).

VIII.22 *Narrating Secularisms: Being Between Identities in a Secularized World: Christian Philosophical Studies, XXII*. William Desmond and Dennis Vanden Auweele, eds. ISBN 9781565183223 (paper).

VIII.23 *Envisioning Futures for the Catholic Church: Christian Philosophical Studies, XXIII*. Staf Hellemans and Peter Jonkers, eds. ISBN 9781 565183353 (paper).

The International Society for Metaphysics

ISM.1 *Person and Nature*. George F. McLean and Hugo Meynell, eds. ISBN 0819170267 (paper); 0819170259 (cloth).

ISM.2 *Person and Society*. George F. McLean and Hugo Meynell, eds. ISBN 0819169250 (paper); 0819169242 (cloth).

ISM.3 *Person and God*. George F. McLean and Hugo Meynell, eds. ISBN 0819169382 (paper); 0819169374 (cloth).

ISM.4 *The Nature of Metaphysical Knowledge*. George F. McLean and Hugo Meynell, eds. ISBN 0819169277 (paper); 0819169269 (cloth).

ISM.5 *Philosophical Challenges and Opportunities of Globalization*. Oliva Blanchette, Tomonobu Imamichi and George F. McLean, eds. ISBN 1565181298 (paper).

ISM.6 *The Dialogue of Cultural Traditions: Global Perspective*. William Sweet, George F. McLean, Tomonobu Imamichi, Safak Ural, O. Faruk Akyol, eds. ISBN 9781565182585 (paper).

ISM.7 *Philosophy Emerging from Culture*. William Sweet, George F. McLean, Oliva Blanchette, Wonbin Park, eds. ISBN 9781565182851 (paper).

The series is published by: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, Gibbons Hall B20, 620 Michigan Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. 20064; Telephone: 202/319-6089; Email: cua-rvp@cua.edu; website: www.crvp.org. All titles are available in paper except as noted.

The series is distributed by: The Council for Research on Values and Philosophy – OST, 285 Oblate Drive, San Antonio, T.X., 78216; Telephone: (210)341-1366 x205; Email: mmartin@ost.edu.