

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION: SOME THOUGHTS ON STUDIES OF EAST-WEST THOUGHT

John Zijiang Ding

The theme of the inaugural issue of *Journal of East-West Thought* is “global justice, universalism, and cosmopolitanism.” Global justice examines *fairness* and *impartiality* as it applies to universal human rights, wealth distribution, resource allocation, economic equality, international relations, new colonization, and the legitimate cosmopolitan institutions throughout the world. Cosmopolitanism, one of the main approaches to global justice today, examines the ideal relationship between nations, groups or individual people of various nations, which can be morally, culturally, economically and politically unified as a single world-society or global community. Universalism examines the identification of an all-embracing truth of justice and value for all people. Through the cosmopolitan approach, we seek to verify and justify the relationship between global justice and universal justice, finally leading to the concept of universalism. Universalism may not be as implausible as some contemporary philosophers believe. The real world seems to call for universalism such as universal justice, universal values, and so on. If we should go back the ideal of universalism, we then face questions of cultural-linguistic translability which Toming Jun Liu's and Longxi Zhang's articles raise in this issue. Global justice, cosmopolitanism and universalism should be regarded as Three-in-One or Threefold Truth as they are inter-relatable, inter-actable, and inter-transformable.

According to A. Bogdandy and S. Dellavalle, universalism, cosmopolitanism, and global justice are related. For instance, the concept of *jus cogens* can be linked to the assumption of a universal community of communication. This encompasses the totality of actors involved in international relations, including states and individuals understood in a cosmopolitan way; as it sets the core requirements for legitimate public action worldwide. The idea of a global political community spells out this concept within the theory of international relations. Hugo Grotius placed the secular foundation of international law's universalism in an ontological postulation of human nature, which he saw determined by both a natural and a universal disposition of human beings to sociability. As Aristotle claimed, humans naturally tend to establish society, and this tendency extends globally. International law can be regarded as the common law of humankind containing the general rules of universal sociability. This interpretation of Western universalism bases the law of nations on a view of every human being's natural reasoning, regardless of his cultural or religious background. Certainly, universal sociability is less “thick” than its counterpart within the borders of single polities. Nevertheless, it is strong enough to bear the responsibility for a set of general minimal or “thin” norms guaranteeing the orderly and essentially peaceful interaction of peoples

and individuals beyond the borders of their countries. The idea of a naturally sociable humankind as the basis of a universal order informs a universalism increasingly independent from Christian tradition. “Notwithstanding its paramount significance in shaping the universalistic perspective of international law, this understanding of order also shows at least one unresolved shortfall. The founding assumption of the existence of a global community including all individuals and states and of common fundamental values is little substantiated within this strand of thinking.” (Universalism Renewed: Habermas’ Theory of International Order in Light of Competing Paradigms. *German Law Journal*. Vol. 10 No. 01. 12-13, 2009)

Universalism and cosmopolitanism are two of the highest moral ideals for almost all traditional Chinese thinkers. According to traditional Chinese spirituality, all social ideals, moral purposes, teleological or consequential virtues, and justified terms should be universal, applying to all people. Confucianism, Daoism, Moism, and Chinese Buddhism really concern the origins, causes, nature, relationships, functions, interactions, and transformation of the universe through a superhuman power or supernatural being such as *Tian* (Heaven), *Tianming* (Mandate of Heaven), *Dao* (Way of Ultimate Reality), and *Kong* (*Sunyata*--Great Nothingness or Emptiness). Almost all great Chinese thinkers have advocated certain universal moral rules to guide or govern social behavior and human affairs; these rules being Confucian *Ren* (Benevolence), Daoist *Ci* (Mercy), Moist *Jianai* (All-embracing Love) and Buddhist *Cibei* (Compassion). The most common moral purpose or thread among these thinkers is to apply a universal value which transforms all human individuals (or as many as possible) from an ordinary person into an ideal or holy person embodying a universal moral quality. Chinese philosophy and religion are very inclusive, interactive, tolerant, and transformable. They continuously strive to promote a harmony, unification, interaction, communication and correspondence between Man and Heaven (or Nature), including universal harmony in the perfect world which transcends racial, cultural, national, religious, and other boundaries. All humans may or shall be transformed into a member of the ‘ideal society’ through moral training, practice, and education by sages or saints. Like Socrates, the most leading traditional Chinese thinkers, advocated cosmopolitanism, and dreamt that all people, all races, and all human groups should become the members of a unified cosmopolitan community. This community comprising common moral values and ideals, based on the universal harmony of a great commonwealth or a ‘perfect society.’ Traditional Chinese ethics generally emphasized moral inclusivism and social egalitarianism, such as “all men are brothers within the four seas,” and “the whole world is one family.”

Five themed articles concerning Global Justice, Cosmopolitanism and Universalism appear in this first issue. Jürgen Habermas, one of the most influential philosophers in the world, attempts to reconstruct a future non-state constitutionalized world society. For him, globalized domestic politics must be involved in an interaction between national

and cosmopolitan citizens, national and regional governments, institutionalized transnational networks, supranational players, and a democratically legitimated world organization. This amalgamation would form a central negotiation system with core competencies in the prevention of international conflicts and also the formalization of basic human rights. A new supranational world organization emerges as more potent and based on more inclusive democratic legitimacy processes than the current United Nations. Habermas advocates Kant's view of the cosmopolitan constitution in order to develop the constitutionalization of international law. The growth of international organizations can be a response to social-political control and regulation. We should understand the functional differentiation of world society. The innovations in international law between civilizations are characterized by one or more of the great world religions, and equal to cross-cultural understanding and interpretation needs. Habermas discusses the following three basic subjects: 1) the three-level global system and Nagle's Problem; 2) individuals and states as subjects of a World Constitution; and 3) legitimacy requirements and learning processes. By following H. Brunkhorst's theory, he attempts to distinguish the important differences between a supranational level and a transnational level in the political system of a world society. For him, the political constitution and the joint membership of an association of free and equal citizens can reach out across national borders. The lowest level of the political system of world society would be compared to the idea of states. The citizens of this world follow universal standards, which would obey the peace and human rights policy of the United Nations, since it's world domestic policy was negotiated among global players. Citizens' requirements for the behavior of their governments and negotiators in these international arenas is based not only primarily on global standards of justice, but also takes into account the conduct of national and regional interests. This conflict would take place in the minds of the same citizens that need notions of legitimacy, and unfold in the cosmopolitan framework of the international community. The political responsibility of national or regional governments towards their own citizens can be institutionalized, only if the universal justice of the world's political constitution can be recognized. Only a world state would establish the world order from the will of its citizens. We must consider two legitimate ways to accomplish this: 1) coming from the citizens of the world from an existing state to the international community for peace and human rights policies of the world organization; 2) coming from the citizens of a related nation-state to the transnational negotiation system, which is part of the international community on issues of global governance. Habermas continues to discuss "individuals and states as subjects of a World Constitution." This world organization specializes in the basic regulatory function of securing peace and protecting human rights, and integrating the international community of states and citizens, as well as unifying the global legal order.

The fundamental issues of transnational justice reside within institutionally and constitutionally fixed premises. It requires the

inclusion of all people in a cosmopolitan order and provides everyone with political and civil rights, and also the "fair value" of these rights guaranteed. It also means the respective local context is required in order to take the same formal rights effectively. On this basis, a fair value is determined to be a mutually acceptable boundary between national and cosmopolitan solidarity. These obligations of the states, in turn, are derived from the duties which the citizens of beneficiary countries (as global citizens) give to citizens in disadvantaged states. These civil-social actors should promote transparency by presenting their discussions and decisions globally. This in turn gives the citizens of the world an opportunity to make informed decisions, as well as express their own unique opinions and points of view. The overarching duty abiding in a "universalistic morality of justice" - that of refraining from crimes against humanity and wars of aggression (which seem rooted in all cultures and correspond to 'their' legal requirements) - is to justify the basis of the institutions of the world organization making decisions internally. On a transnational level a different kind of need for legitimation arises. The global players among the world's domestic political arrangements negotiate to keep from the perspective of traditional foreign policy. In this ideal world War becomes impossible as a means of conflict resolution, since the normative framework of the Constitution binds the cosmopolitan formation of compromise between unequal partners attempting to avoid certain directives.

Xunwu Chen's paper examines views of Habermas and others on global justice and argues the most reasonable way to develop, administrate, and enforce global laws of justice - or build a cosmopolitan order of justice is through a two-track politics of global democracy. Sharing Habermas's call for multi-faceted, multi-level institutional reconstructions in global politics, Chen's paper calls for a two-track global democracy on two fronts: (1) a two-track democracy consisting of formal and informal politics and (2) a two-track democracy which assembles a global legal architecture and makes a nation-state government complimentary - thereby enabling conditions of global justice.

Williams L. McBride shows "regression in history," and asks a thought-provoking question: "where are we now? " This question came to him as he re-read Habermas' old essay which treats Marx's ideas as being much more akin to Darwinian evolution than Marx himself thought it was. Habermas makes the case against the idea of strong historical inevitability. Historical development is not necessarily unilinear, and moreover it is not guaranteed to be uninterrupted. "Globalization" has been all the rage, but we are experiencing a "great global economic and general crisis," and "we" apparently do not understand historical processes very well. Capitalism constitutes "a truly deep regression in history, " one from which many thought humanity could be extricated in the past century; but which has ultimately begun to take on the appearance of historical inevitability and to be defended as inevitable. This is where we are now.

Tomming Jun Liu explores “trans-civilizational translations” in translational activities, broadening the field of translation studies to include considerations of philosophical, historical, cross-cultural and postcolonial implications. Underlining this study is his concern with problems which arise from a Western universalism overriding a cosmopolitan vision of the world. This point of view exacerbates the differences and problems which occur when translating works from a non-Western civilization such as the Chinese. His investigation, informed by theories of literature, translation, cultural studies, psychoanalysis and philosophy, focuses on a specific case: how Wang Wei’s “*Lu Zhai*” is variously translated, as well as what problematics and assumptions lie behind them. Liu concludes with a speculative comparison of “*Lu Zhai*” with Heidegger’s metaphor *Lichtung* as an example of a secret correspondence between the Western and Chinese civilizations. He affirms the Derridean view that the Babelian confusion of many tongues has a divine purpose. Translation studies in the postcolonial era raise questions about cosmopolitanism and universalism. A Western translator, in order to enter into Chinese civilization, cannot have the mind of only the Western world. He must also possess a cosmopolitan mind/view of the whole world along with an awareness of its complex and intricate range of divergences.

John Zijiang Ding develops a comparison of Wang Yangming’s and Schleiermacher’s “theories of self-transformation,” and examines their moral and metaphysical universalism. Wang’s thought deepens and extends Confucian universalism and cosmopolitanism for social change. The cosmological and universalistic tendencies of his theory unify the human being, the natural being, and the supernatural or superhuman being as “the Great One.” Schleiermacher’s thought is also based on universalism and cosmopolitanism. He regards humanity as a whole in all its diversity, thereby providing a moral basis for developing successful intercultural connections. He stresses a doctrine of universal salvation and election as representing a “reformed” universalism. His argument is modern in its appeal, and is one element in the increasing popularity of universalism since his day.

This inaugural issue also includes three outstanding scholars’ articles on Methodology and Meta-methodology of East-West Studies. Chung-ying Cheng develops a new analysis of the power of political leadership in Confucian perspective. Robert C. Neville promotes a new research project for comparative study and appreciation of ultimate realities through the sciences and humanities. Longxi Zhang attempts to find a successful path to overcome the challenge of East-Western comparative studies. Furthermore, this volume also includes articles from Jiyuan Yu and JeeLoo Liu, both of which are devoted to explore “A New Vision of Chinese Metaphysics and Cosmology.” This “New Vision” is very reconstructive and forward looking.

Journal of East-West Thought is intended to be a new forum for the development and advancement of diverse and divergent thoughts. Thus, I will close my introduction with this remark. In his co-authored book *The Grand Design*, Stephen Hawking, the most renowned physicist in

the world today, proclaims that philosophy is dead. For him, what was once the realm of philosophy, is now the task of science. Philosophy is dead because it has not kept up with developments in modern science, physics in particular. Scientists have become the torchbearers in our quest for knowledge. Is philosophy- Western and Eastern - really dead? For this question, philosophers have divided into three factions: optimists, pessimists and eclectics. Today philosophy may be facing a serious crisis, but not "death." Even Hawking could feel there remain certain parts of philosophy which are not entirely dead such as ethics, esthetics, social-political philosophy and so on. According to Daoism, crises could be transformed to opportunities. No matter how their debate proceeds, philosophers should accept crisis as a challenge and seek new directions and more effective approaches for promoting the reconstruction and reformalization of philosophy. A Chinese proverb says: "one would fight to live when confronted with danger of death." Through a self-transformation and self-realization philosophy may overcome these crises and establish "new life." The term "philosophy" literally means "to love wisdom." How can people stop the "love of wisdom"? All human civilizational spirituality should be guided by three basic powers: philosophy, theology and science. These "three" cannot be replaced, and each performs its own specific role and function. Yet all of them can be interrelated, interacted, and even intertransformed. Philosophy could be "sickened," "damaged," or "wounded," but it cannot be dead. If all of mankind could exist forever, then philosophy could always be with them forever as well. Just for this reason, *Journal of East-West Thought* will be with the sages and thinkers who seek truth, wisdom and justice forever. We are launching this first issue in December 2011. This season might be significant, as Shelley's poem says: "If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?"