

TRANSFORMATIVE MODES OF CHINESE COSMOPOLITANISM: A HISTORICAL COMPARISON

John Zijiang Ding*

Abstract: Chinese traditional thinkers attempt to examine cosmopolitanism through metaphysical, ethical, aesthetical, and utopian imagination. They transform the examination of cosmopolitanism from the geographical to ethical-political. The conceptualization of Chinese cosmopolitanism has had four dimensions: 1) the concept of the supernatural being and superhuman being through certain ontological and cosmological imagination; 2) the concept of the natural being through the geographical environment; 3) the concept of the human being through the centralized ruler ship to govern the entire society and all lands; and 4) the concept of the moral virtue, ethical value and utopian idea through self realization, self perfection, self purification and self transformation. This article will justify seven transformative modes of Chinese cosmopolitanism through a philosophical comparison.

COSMOPOLITANISM EXAMINES the relations among nations, groups, or individuals, and how they can be morally, culturally, economically and politically unified as a global community. Through the cosmopolitan approach, we 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, and universal values. If we should go back the ideal of universalism, we then face questions of cultural-linguistic translatability. Global justice, cosmopolitanism and universalism should be regarded as Three-in-One or Threefold Truth as they are inter-related, inter-acted, and inter-transformed. This article will examine the transformative modes of Chinese cosmopolitanism through a historical comparison.

I. A Brief Review of Western Cosmopolitanism

In a sense, Socrates' thought is based on universalism and cosmopolitanism. He considers himself a member of the cosmos, and his philosophical examinations are always extended to all human beings, rather than just certain people. According to Plato, the Sophist Hippias says: "Gentlemen present... I regard you all as kinsmen, familiars, and fellow-citizens — by nature and not by convention; for like is by nature akin to like, while convention, which is a tyrant over human beings, forces many things contrary to nature" (*Protagoras*, 337c7-d3). Stoicism advocates that all people are manifestations of the one universal value and should live in universal love and help each other in a brotherly manner. For instance, Diogenes claims, "I am not an

*Dr. JOHN ZIJANG DING, Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy Department, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. Email: zding@csupomona.edu.

Athenian or a Corinthian, but a citizen of the world” (Epictetus, *Discourses*, i. 9. 1) . From a theological view, Epictetus maintains: "Each human being is primarily a citizen of his own commonwealth; but he is also a member of the great city of gods and men, where of the city political is only a copy" (Ibid., ii. 5. 26). Stoic cosmopolitanism influenced Christianity and even modern political thoughts, as T. L. Pangle suggests that "...our historical situation conduces to a revival of the Stoic cosmopolitan vision, which is centered on the idea of a more or less radical transcendence of national allegiances and boundaries (Pangle, 1998, 235-262). Early Christianity supported an idea of cosmopolitanism, as St. Paul claimed that "there is no distinction between Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free" (Col. 3:11).

Since Socrates, many great Western thinkers have been more or less influenced by this moral and social ideal. It is important to highlight these themes of universal rights and mutual consensus because they illustrate crucial transitions from classical cosmopolitanism to modern cosmopolitanism. "As is widely recognized, Stoic and Thomist cosmopolitanism were sources of considerable inspiration for several key Enlightenment philosophers, such as Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), John Locke (1632-1704), F. M. A. Voltaire (1694-1809), and Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826)" (Brown, 2011).

I-1 Kant's Revolutionary Theory of Cosmopolitanism

Immanuel Kant launches a revolutionary way to justify cosmopolitanism. For him cosmopolitanism can be defined as being "the matrix within which all the original capacities of the human race may develop." He supports "cosmopolitan law," in which individuals have rights as "citizens of the earth" rather than as citizens of particular states. He argues:

Purposeless savagery held back the development of the capacities of our race; but finally, through the evil into which it plunged mankind, it forced our race to renounce this condition and to enter into a civic order in which those capacities could be developed. The same is done by the barbaric freedom of established states. Through wasting the powers of the commonwealths in armaments to be used against each other, through devastation brought on by war, and even more by the necessity of holding themselves in constant readiness for war, they stunt the full development of human nature. But because of the evils which thus arise, our race is forced to find, above the (in itself healthy) opposition of states which is a consequence of their freedom, a law of equilibrium and a united power to give it effect. Thus it is forced to institute a *cosmopolitan* [my italics] condition to secure the external safety of each state...The impact of any revolution on all states on our continent, so closely knit together through commerce, will be so obvious that the other states, driven by their own danger but without any legal basis, will offer themselves as arbiters, and thus they will prepare the way for a distant international government for which there is no precedent in world history. Although this government at present exists only as a rough outline, nevertheless in all the members there is rising a feeling which each has for the preservation of the whole. This gives hope finally that after many reformative revolutions, a universal

cosmopolitan condition, which Nature has as her ultimate purpose, will come into being as the womb wherein all the original capacities of the human race can develop (Kant, 1784).

Kant's examination of cosmopolitan right is widely regarded as the philosophical origin of modern cosmopolitanism. According to his deontological methodology, the rational idea that a peaceful international community of all human beings can be created is a principle of cosmopolitan rights which is an obligation on all nations to facilitate travel and trade and to unite for the purpose of creating universal laws to regulate their relations (Ibid., 1970, 172). For O. Höffe, Kant is systematically a cosmopolitan, "not only in the political, but also in the philosophical sense." Höffe argues that Kant accepts a more "moderate" universalism based on principles that can be applied in heterogeneous contexts and in diverse cultures and traditions (Höffe, 2006, 64-65). From a theoretical perspective, Kant resumes some of the most relevant aspects of holistic universalism, namely an understanding of rationality going beyond egoistic interests as well as the aim to establish a universal order.

I-2 Habermas' Revolutionary Theory of Cosmopolitanism

Jürgen Habermas, one of the most influential philosophers in the world, attempts to reconstruct Kant's cosmopolitanism for today's needs. For him, the social development has provided the new challenge to Kantian theory of cosmopolitan right and justice. Habermas has combined universalism, cosmopolitanism, and global justice for his whole theoretic framework, as A. Bogdandy and S. Dellavalle conclude: Habermas presents an innovative theoretical basis for a constitutionalist, universalist project of global order and provides elaborate reasons why a universalist project should be pursued. "His constitutionalist project does not amount to a celebration of international law as it stands; in that respect it is very different to many contributions on the constitutionalization of international law in legal scholarship. Rather, it sets out a far reaching transformative agenda that might serve as a regulative idea, informing transformative work of scholars, politicians and lawyers, depending on what is conceived to be feasible at the international level in our times" (Ibid., 29).

N. Walker examines the explicit linkage in the recent work of Habermas about cosmopolitanism and the constitutionalization of international law. For him, Habermas previous thinking on the constitutionalization of international law has tended either towards the utopianism of world government or the modest ambition of attaching the constitutional label to certain material developments in transnational regulation – in particular the human rights regimes and the institutional structure of the UN as developed through state agreement – Habermas looks for an intermediate solution. This will involve a modest range of institutions and functions at the global level, in particular around peace and human rights, but founded on a broader and more popular basis than state agreement. The potential and urgency of the Habermas proposal lies in its opposition less to the other constitutional visions and more to the alternative and increasingly tangible prospect of a lopsided international regime dominated by American perspectives. In Walker's regard, to try to situate Habermas in

the debate over “the development of a new cosmopolitan project for the international order” is already to court a significant ambiguity. On the basis of his corpus of academic work, Habermas is probably the most influential social theorist of his generation. There are few if any significant streams of thought in transnational sociology, international political theory, international relations and international legal theory which do not today invoke his work as a reference point, whether affirmatively or critically, and, of course, the same has long been true of the domestic state- or society-bound domains of these disciplines. “Jurgen Habermas is also a prominent global public intellectual of our times. His formidable intellectual reputation has given him a platform from which he may pronounce on a wide variety of matters of political moment and moral concern; where, to put it crudely, he is listened to and is capable of making a difference as much for whom he is as for the quality of his ideas and insights” (Walker, 2005, 1).

According to Habermas, 1) a cosmopolitan order should be moral, civic, juridical, legitimate, political, plural, democratic, negotiating, institutional, international, transnational, and postnational; 2) the emergence of international public law is central to a just global political order; 3) a global political order is the continuation of the form of democracy based on human rights (Habermas, 1997, c7); 4) if a political community is based on the universal principles of a democratic constitution, “it still forms a collective identity, in the sense that it interprets and realizes these principles in light of its own history and in the context of its own particular form of life” (Ibid., 2001, 117); 5) without a common ethical basis, institutions beyond the state must look to a “less demanding basis of legitimacy in the organizational forms of an international negotiation system,” the deliberative processes of which will be accessible to various publics and to organizations in international civil society (Ibid., 109); and 6) regulatory political institutions at the global level could be effective only if they take on features of governance without government, even if human rights as juridical statuses must be constitutionalized in the international system (Ibid., 2006, 130-31).

I-3 Some Interpretations of Cosmopolitanism

For 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 grounds the law of nations in 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” (Bogdandy, 2009, 12-13).

The idea of a naturally sociable humankind as the basis of a universal order informs a universalism increasingly independent from the 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” (Ibid., 2009, 12-13). Benedict Anderson points out, “In an age when it is so common for progressive, cosmopolitan intellectuals (particularly in Europe) to insist on the near-pathological character of nationalism, its roots in fear and hatred of the Other, and its affinities with racism, it is useful to remind ourselves that nations inspire love, and often profoundly self-sacrificing love” (Anderson, 1998, 141). For David Gress, there are three great errors of the Grand Narrative’s understanding of the West: 1. The Grand Narrative incorrectly holds to a false dichotomy of abstract ideal of liberty versus messy and immoral history. 2. The Grand Narrative incorrectly upholds Universalism: that liberty and democracy are universally valid. 3. The Grand Narrative falls prey to an “Illusion of newness”: that liberty begins with the Enlightenment and the American and French revolutions (*Ibid.*, 1-2). With regard to David Held’s view, three key terms have defined his intellectual preoccupations: “democracy, globalization and cosmopolitanism. Each of these refers to a set of ideas as well social processes which have shaped, and continue to shape, our lives” (Held, 2010, ix).

From the above mentioned conceptual and theoretical frameworks, we may find that Western cosmopolitanism has been examined by applying the six transformative modes: 1. The natural-artificial, such as the Sophist Hippias; 2. The theological-secular, such as Epictetus and the Thomist; 3. The deontological-teleological, such as Kant; 4. The antinationalist-nationalist, such as Diogenes; 5. The institutional (or constitutionalist)-individual, such as Habermas; and 6. The philosophical-political, such as Kant and Habermas.

II. A General Examination of Traditional Chinese Cosmopolitanism

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.” Cosmopolitanism can be regarded as the defining feature of Chinese culture. Under extreme pressure from the West in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, China had no recourse other than to adopt nationalistic programs to extricate itself from a dire predicament. Nevertheless, “China’s natural inclination has always been towards cosmopolitanism. A cosmopolitan model does not separate state and society but instead makes a distinction between different roles and functions. Its aesthetic symmetry or beauty lies in its driving ethos: the harmonization of culture” (Bao, 2006, 144). There have been various anti-aggression wars in Chinese history. Patriotism (or nationalism) and cosmopolitanism are often presumed to be mutually exclusive, but Kant defends both. Perhaps Kant’s focus on one’s country is motivated by the idea that the appropriate subgroup smaller than humanity as a whole is the one that is *the largest* group that an individual can still feel personal devotion to. “But this idea is mistaken. Different groups whom one might wish to benefit may actually be larger than one’s country, depending on which group one is talking about and which country one lives... perhaps Kant’s argument might (wrongly) persuade someone in China, but it doesn’t work for Norwegians. In sum, Kant’s argument in the *Metaphysics of Morals Vigilantius* is insufficient to justify a duty to nationalist patriotism” (Kleingeld, 2003, 312-313).

In Chinese thought, *tianxia* 天下 has been a significant concept related to the metaphysical imagination, ethical identification, and also the political application. However, this term is very ambiguous, controversial, and debatable. Confucius’ and Mencius’ life purposes were to be “Correcting conscience, cultivating self, regulating the family, governing the state and pacifying the world” and “If you are unsuccessful, to moralize yourself; if you are successful, to moralize the whole world.” Traditional Chinese cosmopolitanism focused on a concept called “*tianxia*,” which literally means “all lands and countries under Heaven.” Accordingly, the transformation of Chinese cosmopolitanism (*tianxia*), from the meaning of geographic space in the time of “Five Emperors (*wu di* 五帝) and Three Dynasties (*san dai* 三代)” to the universal ethics based on human-heartedness (*ren*) in the time of the Qin and Han, witnesses a critical change in the making of the Chinese people. The importance of Chinese cosmopolitanism is seen in its role in the preservation of a unified Chinese territory and in the integration of the Chinese people. The concept of cosmopolitanism (*tianxia*) is very important in the historical experiences and intellectual development of the Chinese people, theoretically guiding their unification amid diversity. It also acts as a source of spiritual stimulation for the Chinese people in their individual cultivation. “Chinese cosmopolitanism testifies that the tradition of any culture may positively meet new challenges posed at any time, provided its diverse resources are fully tapped” (Chun, 2009).

The political ideal of *tianxia* has recently been revived in mainland China by such thinkers as Zhao Tingyang and Yan Xuetong. However, For D. Bell, the political implications of *tianxia* remain unclear. He questions “What sort of political practices and institutions can be derived by the ideal of *tianxia*? And how do these practices and institutions differ from those put forward by liberal defenders of global justice and Marxist defenders of global communism?” C. Chang and K. Chen’s assumption

is that *tianxia* has its own genealogical trajectory and cannot be instrumentally adopted for political imagination. J. Dai considers the perils and possibilities of adapting historical universalisms such as *tianxia*, and the extent to which historical universalisms can impart both substance and methods to undertake an understanding of a new universalism. For him, new conditions of globalization, however, have created more spaces and conditions for universalisms and cosmopolitanism than available in the past century. Indeed, cosmopolitanism, if not universalism, is well-nigh a necessary condition for sustainability.¹

As China is becoming an economic and political power, thinkers and writers are debating the theoretical implications of the traditional Chinese vision of world order. The notion of *tianxia* (all under heaven) embodies a worldwide public perspective rooted in Confucian moral and political thinking. This vision anchors a universal authority in the moral, ritualistic, and aesthetic framework of a secular high culture. Varied discourses indebted to *tianxia* have resurfaced in modern China in quest of moral and cultural ways of relating to and articulating an international society. These attempts to be part of the international community and to enter world history ran counter to the Western temperament steeped in the conflict of nation-states, in geopolitical rivalry, and in economic theory based on possessive individualism and imperialist expansion. These elements of capitalist modernity have fostered a divisive sense of mystified cultural difference and geographical inequality.²

In J. Levenson's regards, Confucian literati accepted cultural differences as the way of the world. Although they made a distinction between the civilized and barbarians, they were aware that "the barbarians are always with us." Confucian universalism cannot be construed as soft power or hegemony. It was "a criterion, a standpoint, not a point of departure." Chinese left home to travel and settle in other countries, Levenson wrote, but "not one had any Confucian pretensions to be bearing out a Word," as did Christian missionaries (Levenson, 1971, 24). According to P. Cheah, "Chinese mercantile culture and its Confucian basis are therefore to be regarded as modular or normatively cosmopolitan" (Cheah, 2000, 134). As ethical imperatives, philosophical tradition, or cultural politics that attempt to address the condition of the world today, "it is not surprising that a variety of perspectives and answers have been presented, yet contemporary discussions of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitics need a lot of translation in order to connect with both Chinese history and the contemporary context" (Shen, 2009, 16).

We may find that there are some distinctions between Eastern and Western cosmopolitanism. In the final analyses, Chinese thinkers have adapted and applied the following seven transformative modes. For philosophical usage, "mode" can be defined as a special form, type, pattern, method, framework or paradigm of "a complex combination of ideas"; "transformative mode" can be concerned as a changeable, exchangeable, interactable and alienative mode. The transformative

¹Please see Tianxia Workshop, Stanford University:
<http://www.stanford.edu/dept/asianlang/cgi-bin/about/abstracts.php>.

²*Ibid.*, "What is Tianxia?"

modes or paradigm “emerged in response to individuals who have been pushed to the societal margins throughout history and who are finding a means to bring their voices into the world of research. Their voices, shared with scholars who work as their partners to support the increase of social justice and human rights, are reflected in the shift to transformative beliefs to guide researchers and evaluators” (Mertens, 2008, 3). Historically, the theoretical modes of Chinese cosmopolitanism have been transformed by following the social conditions and social progress.

III. Seven Transformative Modes of Chinese Cosmopolitanism

Generally speaking, universalism and cosmopolitanism are two of the highest moral ideals for traditional Chinese thinkers. In 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* 天 (Heaven), *Tianming* 天命 (Mandate of Heaven), *Dao* (Way of Ultimate Reality), and *Kong* 空 (*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* 仁 (Benevolence), Daoist *Ci* 慈 (Mercy), Moist *Jianai* 兼愛 (All-embracing Love) and Buddhist *Cibei* 慈悲 (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.

II-1 The Particular-Universal Mode

Hierocles made a circle model of identity: the first one around the self, next immediate family, extended family, local group, citizens, countrymen, humanity (Nussbaum, 1997, 1-25). As the final social units, the families can be regarded as a basic harmonious component of Chinese cosmopolitanism. K. Chan argues that these spatially dispersed families constitute strategic nodes and linkages of an ever-expanding transnational field with which a new of Chinese identity is emerging – that of the Chinese cosmopolitan (Chan, 2005, 116).

Confucius intended to balance moral particularism and moral universalism. For him, “love more people, the better.” He extended his thought of love from all personal relationships in a family to all social relationships in a country, and then extended to all relationships between countries. In the *Analects* of Confucius, one of the most important ideas is “All men of the whole world are brothers.” Confucius’ theory of justice consisted mainly of equity, fairness, impartiality, integrity, equality, legitimacy, moderation, righteousness, and so on. Justice was one of the basic categories and the highest ethical principle of human nature; it was the ultimate ideal of individuals, families, countries, and inter-State relations. Cosmopolitanism which was based on the universal love was one of Confucius’ final social purposes. He advocated “the

whole world and all countries as one community” and “universal harmony in the world,” but also emphasized national self-identification of Chinese culture. Confucius claims: “There is one which runs through all my teachings” (*Analects* 15: 2).

Laozi’s ethics is based on universalism. His Dao is the final key to all of human being, natural being, superhuman being, and supernatural being, including the entire society, whole environment, all things and heaven. For Laozi, as the female overcomes the male with tranquility, a country can win over a small or large country by placing itself below. The difficult can be handled while it is still easy. Great accomplishments begin with what is small. The wise always confront difficulties before they get too large. Handle them before they appear. Organize before there is confusion. Be as careful at the end as at the beginning, and there will be no failure. For Laozi, to practice justice is to demonstrate how the realization and transformation of Dao translates into fundamental rules controlling the society, nature, and universe. Like Laozi, Zhuangzi’s highest ideal was to construct a natural, inactive, unaggressive, unoppressive and non-exploitative society. This society was based on naturalism, egalitarianism, moral universalism, and primitive communism.

For Mozi,³ all-embracing love (*jianai* 兼愛) is a mutual love based on social equality without difference and discrimination, leads to a happy order and social harmony, and is beneficial to all social members. In order to overcome conflicts, crises and other troubles, the law of all-embracing love should be followed through the interchange of mutual benefit. People always return love and benefit, or hatred and trouble to each other. All-embracing love is advantageous and easily practiced. If the superiors or rulers encourage this love by rewards and praise, and deter those against it by punishment and fines, people would move toward it. All-embracing love is the way of the sage kings, the principle to secure peace for rulers and politicians, and also food and clothes for the myriad people. Man with all-embracing love can provide benefits or utilities to more people and even the whole society, and establish a higher, harmonious order for human life in the long run.

According to Zhu Xi, justice as a common reason was the first principle of Confucianism. A man must discern good and evil, right and wrong, justice and interests, and then transfer himself from an ordinary person to a sage by searching

³Mozi provides great contributions for philosophy, cosmology, physics, mathematics, engineering, and military strategy. Mozi’s main social ideas are: 1) *Jiaai* 兼愛 (All-embracing Love) and *Feigong* 非攻 (Anti-war): all people should love each other on an equal basis, and against any unjust wars and fighting between peoples and countries; 2) *Shaongtong* 尚同 (Unification) and *Shangxian* 尚賢 (Election): rulers and people must be unified together and electing sages as officials or rulers; 3) *Jieyong* 節用 (Thrifty) and *Jiezang* 節葬 (Simple Funeral): against monarchy and aristocracy’s extravagance, especially against the Confucian value of deluxe funeral; 4) *Tianzhi* 天志 (Heaven Will) and *Minggui* 明鬼 (Spiritual Power): rulers would be punished if they contravened the will of Heaven and spiritual powers such as gods; and 5) *Feiming* 非命 (Non-determinism) and *Feile* 非樂 (Anti-entertainment): people’s lives are determined by “force” not “fate,” and entertainment is the harm of the world and therefore must be prohibited.

justice as the code of conduct. Zhu developed Confucian cosmopolitanism and moral universalism. He pointed out that only saints who had great political wisdom could achieve “the world of great harmony.” For him, “the whole world as one community” was the application of “the great Dao” or “the great root” which was “the attribute of mandate of heaven.” He considered “fairness for all countries” the ideal social purpose, and emphasized “to clarify and justify the explicit morality to all the people and all countries,” and “to achieve the great world unity.”

In Wang Yangming’s thought, benevolence, justice, propriety, and wisdom are naturally manifested virtues. In educating the young, he recommended teaching filial piety, brotherly respect, loyalty, faithfulness, propriety, justice, integrity, and a sense of shame. Wang believed that “all things can be merged into an organic whole” as the form of the world is the ideal political order of human society. A man should love other people like he loves himself, and treat all people like he treats his own blood relatives in order to achieve a perfectly good social life. “All things in one” was the ideal social order which means “there is no barrier between you and me,” “all Chinese people are united as one,” and “all people in this world is one family.” Wang’s thought further deepens and developed Confucian cosmopolitanism for the needs of social changes. By following Confucius, the general worldview of Wang is *wanwuyiti* 萬物一體 (All in One or the Unity of All Beings). Wang supported a metaphysical universalism, and attempted to unify the human being, natural being, and supernatural or superhuman being as the Great One. He expressed his world view in the following words: The great man regards Heaven and Earth and the myriad things as one body. “He regards the world as family and the country as one person. As to those who make a cleavage between objects and distinguish between the self and others, they are small men. That the great man can regard Heaven, Earth, and the myriad things as one body is not because he deliberately wants to do so, but because it is natural to the humane nature of his mind that he does so. Forming one body with Heaven, Earth, and the myriad things is not only true of the great man” (Chan, 1963, 659).

The basic purpose of Chinese Buddhism⁴ is to save people from suffering life and *samsara*, to help them share enlightenment, and to purify those whose minds have been lost in false views arising from hatred. Buddha enthusiastically advocated a universal and equal love for everyone, and did not approve of special love for particular things. For him, “Those who love nothing in the world are rich in joy and free from pain.” The following verses are from the beautiful and ancient Buddhist poem of the way of Righteousness (*Dhammapada*): Never in this world is hate, appeased by hatred; it is only appeased by love — this is an eternal law. Only by love, the way of Righteousness is convinced, will hatred cease. In another Buddhist literature — “Middle collection” (*Majjhima-hikaya*), we read the following: If someone curses you, you must repress all resentment, and make

⁴There have been significant interpenetration and interaction between Confucianism, Daoism and Chinese Buddhism in Chinese history. Sakyamani (Buddha), founder of Buddhism, created a new religion by criticizing Hinduism. In his criticism, he emphasized religious equality and universal love. For him, human life is *dukkha* (suffering, unhappiness, or dissatisfaction). “*Dukkha*” has two causes — ignorance and desire. The ordinary people are bound by three fetters: passion, hatred, and stupidity; therefore we need wisdom and love (or compassion) to break these fetters.

the firm determination that “my mind shall not be disturbed, no angry word shall escape my lips, I shall remain kind and friendly, with loving thoughts and no secret spite.” If you are then attacked with fists, with stones, with sticks, with swords, you must still repress all resentment and preserve a loving mind with no secret spite.

Accordingly, individual love is no good for Buddhist purposes, because it means a limitation of freedom from everyday life. To a real Buddhist, his or her inner perfection, purification, self-realization, and finally salvation, are guided by the principle of love. There are six or more basic virtues which the bodhisattva (by the Mahayana School) practices in perfection during his career; one of these is “love”. For Buddhists, “the joy of right love — the love of the good” and “love for Buddha-truth” are two important principles. There have been some debates about consistency among “emotional love” and “self-concentration,” “self-purification,” or “self-liberation.” Overall, “love,” “compassion,” “sympathy,” “mercy,” or “Benevolence” are significant in the full framework of Buddhism as the “right kinds of love.” For Buddha, the love his disciples should cultivate for all humankind should be universal in character. As a result, this universal love is different from the love of one individual for another, which is a very emotional, prejudicial, narrowed or illusive one among human beings. Unlike universal love, individual love — “unreal love” — actually could cause suffering and unhappiness in the life of human beings. For this reason, real love must be the outcome of an infinite withdrawal from ordinary life. In general, two Basic Schools — the *Mahayana* and the *Theravada (Hinayana)*, have different emphases on “love”. The *Mahayana* school stresses universal love to save more people from suffering, but the Theravada School emphasizes self-love in order to purify oneself and attain personal enlightenment.

In a sense, non-universal love, as unreal love, is one of ten fetters and twelve *Nidanas* (the linked chain of causes and effects) by which beings are bound to the wheel of existence. Clearly, this kind of love should be avoided and given up. In many Buddhist literatures, the “unreal love” has the same meaning as “lust”, “thirst”, “avidity”, and “desire”, in a very negative sense. It is interpreted as “coveting, and defiling attachment”; it is also defined as a love like that toward wife and children, and a pure love like that toward one’s teachers and elders. This kind love is “the illusion, falseness or unreality of desire,” or “the root of desire, which produces the passions.” A “loving heart” of an ordinary person is in fact “a mind dominated by desire”; finally, he is drowned in the river or ocean of desire, or is born in the fire of desire, or put in the prison of desire, and from the seed of desire, with its harvest of pain, would get the fruit of desire and attachment — suffering. For instance, one of so-called eight sufferings is the suffering of being separated from those whom one loves.

“Unreal love” is just like poison which harms devotion to Buddha. In everyday life, the Karma of love which follows desire forces human beings into the bondage of rebirth and mortality by love of life. When dying, the illusion of attachment fertilizes the seed of future *Karma*, producing the fruit of further suffering. Therefore, “unreal love” could be a cocoon of desire spun about beings as a silkworm spins a cocoon about itself, or a wheel of desire which turns men into the paths of transmigration. In some Buddhist stories, there is the demon of love or desire, as a personified evil power, who controls the motives, intentions, and behaviors of human being. Logically, the transition from

everyday life to an enlightened life is the transition from non-universal love to universal love; in other words, only universal love according to the *Bodhisattvas* (Savior in Mahayana School) can help human beings achieve enlightenment.

Noteworthy, even the Bodhisattvas themselves can achieve nirvana only through universal love. According to some Buddhist legends, universal love comes from the merciful light and the over-spreading cloud of Buddha's compassion. It means with compassion, all things succeed. Buddha asked Bodhisattva to use universal love or mercy as water to nourish life. Buddha had a former incarnation — king of merciful virtue or power (*Maitribala-rajā*) — during which, as all his people had embraced the vegetarian life, Yaksas (wild demonic beings who are hostages of people) had no animal food and were suffering. The king fed five of them his own blood. One of the most important *Bodhisattvas-Avalokiteshvara*, as the power of the Buddha, appears — as his helper and embodies one of the two fundamental aspects of Buddhahood — great compassion or universal love (*mahakaruna*). He helps all beings who turn to him in times of extreme danger through his limitless compassion and love. In legend, *Avalokiteshvara* also protects from natural disasters and grants blessings to children. Interestingly enough, when Buddhism was disseminated to China and Japan, *Avalokiteshvara* became a female figure, the Goddess of Mercy with the Chinese name *Guan-Yin* 觀音 and the Japanese name *Kannon*; perhaps because a mother's love is boundless and unconditional. Indeed, in far Eastern Asian, the Goddess of Mercy, just like the universal mother, is almost a household word to everybody, as an incarnation and embodiment of universal love.

Chinese cosmopolitanism gives rise to a form of ethical liberalism with the Chinese style, sustaining Chinese people in their social lives and cultivating their individual achievements. Chinese cosmopolitanism not only reflects the geographical and ethical experiences of Chinese people that originated in their “Families (*jia* 家)” at the stage of patriarchal society, but also symbolizes the Chinese people in their acknowledging of the wider “geographic world” and developing universal values over more than two-thousand years. During the current age of globalization we should aim at mutual communication and benefit between human-heartedness (*ren* 仁) combined with rites (*li* 禮), as exhibited in Chinese cosmopolitanism, and universal human rights as exhibited in world pacifism. The universalistic claims of Chinese imperial culture constantly bumped up against, and adapted to, “alternative views of the world order, which it tended to cover with the rhetoric of universalism: this was its defensive strategy” (Duara, 1993, 3).

From the above examination, we may discover that a very significant dilemma in the traditional Chinese culture is “negative individualism vs. positive universalism.” With regard to this point, the performance of so-called individualism may be contrasted with the overall performance of positive universalism. In Chinese tradition the individual was not central, and no conception of individual rights existed in the sense known in the United States. The individual's participation in society was not voluntary, and the legitimacy of government did not depend on his consent or the consent of all people. Individuals were not equal, and society was not egalitarian but hierarchical (Henkin, 1986, 26-27). The conception of individual rights is commonly contrasted with non-Western conceptions of the collective good to show not only that

the Western conception of rights is culturally peculiar to the West but also that “it is morally inferior in privileging individual self-interest over the common good” (Tao, 1990). Chinese philosophy still assigned a great role to individuals; “this was a political individualism of a very different kind from that which the term calls to mind in the modern West” (Nathan, 1986, 138). Confucianism “regarded individuals as roots, and communities as leaves — individuals as foundations and communities as roots” (Hsieh, 1968, 280). For D. Bodde, “Confucian individualism” means that the individual must develop his creative potential so that he can fulfill “that particular role which is his within the social nexus” (Bodde, 1966, 66). There has been a serious dilemma between the traditional Chinese social ideas based on universalism and the actual social practice based on particularism. Universalism vs. Particularism defines the general social rules, ethical guidance and moral application.⁵ Normally, universalism can be regarded as by following the good and right values for everybody, everything and any situation; but particularism emphasizes only certain concrete relationships and circumstances for individual people and special situations. “China is a particularistic culture where people look at relationships and circumstances in a specific situation to decide what is right. For the Chinese, the legal contract communicates a starting point for an agreement. As circumstances change so too should the terms of the agreement. For the Chinese, the situation and the particular individuals involved are what define relationship.”⁶

Tang Yijie, a contemporary Chinese philosopher, interrogates classical Confucian texts to read Chinese history and culture. From a series of dialectical exchanges in the Confucian texts, he invokes the idea of “harmony/integration in difference or *he'erbutong*. By integration Confucius did not mean B totally obliterating A, or vice versa; rather, he referred to A and B finding a point of confluence during their interactions, resulting in change that was mutually beneficial” (Chan, 2005, 6).

II-2 The Ontological-Ethical Mode

According to Dale Snauwaert, cosmopolitans assert the existence of a duty of moral consideration to all human beings on the basis of a presupposed shared humanity and a concomitant universal duty of moral consideration. The duty of moral consideration in turn requires nations and peoples to conduct their relations with each other in accordance with ethical principles that properly instantiate the intrinsic value and dignity of a shared humanity. In turn, a cosmopolitan ethic is grounded in particular ontological presuppositions that necessitate the inner transformation of the moral agent. This understanding of what is cosmopolitan is explicated in Gandhi's nonviolent philosophy. “This inner transformation, in turn, shapes the imperatives of an education consistent with a cosmopolitan ethic; an education for cosmopolitanism

⁵Universalism vs. Particularism is a concept forwarded by Fons Trompenaars.

⁶Trompenaars, Fons. <http://www.via-web.de/universalism-versus-particularism/>.

should reclaim the relationship between the search for true and the good and the internal self-transformation of the student” (Snauwaert, 2009).

Chinese philosophy and religion are 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 members 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”.

Generally speaking, Chinese traditional thinkers address the transformation from the speculative and abstract “conceptualization” to the practical and applicable “moralization”, as Confucius said: “The whole world is one community when the great Way prevails (大道之行也，天下為公)”⁷; and also As Zhuangzi said: “With the heaven and the earth as the criterion, to bringing all things, to realize the harmonious world, and to bring happiness to the people (以天地為准則，養育萬物，調和天下，恩澤百姓).”⁸ Accordingly, the transition from the geographic experience before the Qin to the cultural transformation of human-heartedness and rites witnessed the change of the Chinese cosmopolitan space from the emperors’ managerial spheres (*jitianxia* 家天下) to the ethical imperatives of all Chinese people (*gongtianxia* 公天下). “In the sense of agglomeration, the Chinese people committed themselves more to a system of ethical values rather than merely to a geographic or territorial identity at this juncture. They came to appreciate universal ethical values exposed in *gong tian xia* rather than the geographic experience implied in *jia tian xia*” (Chun, 2009, 25). Mencius applies a quotation from *Shujing* 書經 (*The Classic of History*):

Heaven populated the earth below,
Made the people a lord
And made him their teacher
That he might assist God in loving them.
“In the four quarters, neither the innocent nor the guilty escape my eyes,
Who in the Empire dare be above himself?”⁹

Kang Youwei¹⁰ advocated that “*Yuan* 元” (Ultimate Reality or Originality) is the final root of all things.” In his Book of Great Harmony (Commonality), he emphasized:

⁷ 《禮記•禮運第九•大同篇》

⁸ 《莊子天下篇》

⁹ In *Mencius*, translated by D.C. Lau, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1970, Book 1, Part B, 3.

“The vast *Q* 氣 (vitality) of *Yuan* forms Heaven and Earth.” From his “Ontological *Yuan*,” he pointed out that “*Ren*” (Benevolence) is a demonstration or performance of “*Yuan*” in the human affairs. For him, Dao of Confucius was deduced from *Yuan*, appeared as *Ren* (Benevolence) and *Zhi* 智 (Wisdom), and then developed all things. Consequently, “*Ren*” can be considered “the sea of all changes,” and “the roots and sources of all things.” He believed that the fundamental driving force of human evolution is “*Ren*.” Kang’s highest social idea is his utopianism. “Great Harmony” has been a traditional Chinese social idea through the entire history of China. Kang had absorbed nutrients of advanced thinking from all times and different sources, and braced his own views.

II-3 The Inward-Outward Mode

The cosmopolitan perspective calls for a reclamation of the ontological perspective of Gandhi and Ancient Western philosophy. If we are to be capable of responding to the inherent value and dignity of all human beings, we must undergo an internal self-transformation (Snauwaert, 2009).

Confucianism emphasizes the transformation from the internal “self” or “mind” to the whole external “world” or “universe”, as Mencius said: “refine his personal virtue when in poverty, and help save the world when in success (窮則獨善其身，達則兼善天下).”¹¹ For Confucius, self cultivation involved not only educating oneself, but also picking up on the good traits in others and imitating them. Few indeed are those who are naturally filial towards their parents and dutiful towards their elder brothers but are fond of opposing their superiors; and it never happens that those who do not like opposing their superiors are fond of creating civil disorder. “The gentleman concerns himself with the root; and if the root is firmly planted, the Way grows. Filial piety and fraternal duty — surely they are the roots of humaneness.” (*Analects* 1:2) “Great indeed was Yao as a ruler! Sublime indeed was he! It is only Heaven that may be deemed great, but only Yao modeled himself upon it. So boundless was he that the people were without the ability to put a name to him. Sublime was he in the works which he achieved and glorious in the accomplishments which he possessed” (*Analects* 8:19).

The Great Learning (*daxue*大學) claims: “If human-heartedness is advocated by the emperor’s family, then the whole country may prosper through the principle of human-heartedness.... The Emperors Yao and Shun governed all under the heaven by the principle of human-heartedness and all people volunteered to be their subjects.” According to Confucius, “To subdue oneself and turn to propriety (rites) is perfect virtue (human-heartedness). If a man can subdue himself and turn to propriety, everyone under heaven would praise him as a man of perfect virtue” (*Analects* 12:1);

¹⁰Kang Youwei (1858–1927) was a faithful follower of Confucius and Confucianism, and was committed to transform Confucianism into the state religion of modern China. He also was the main leader of the Hundred Days' Reform in 1898. He served as the first president of the Chinese National Confucian Association.

¹¹《孟子·盡心上》

“Is virtue indeed far off? I crave for virtue, and Lo! Virtue is at hand...The man of perfect virtue is one who, desiring to sustain himself, sustains others, and desiring to develop himself, develops others. To be able to draw from oneself as a parallel for the treatment of others, that may be called the way to practice virtue” (*Analects* 7:30) .

Laozi, the founder of Daoism, recommends frugality to be prepared from the start and in order to build up inner power. In a sense, *Dao De Jing* 道德經 can be concerned as a guidance for self-cultivation, as Laozi said:

And so the wise person:
Embraces the One Thing,
and becomes the Shepherd of the World.
He does not show off, so he shines
He does not promote himself, so he becomes famous
He does not boast of himself, so he gets the credit
He does not glorify himself, so he becomes leader.
He just does not contend
And so no one can contend with him (*Dao De Jing* 4:22).

Wang Yangming systematically examined *Liangzhi* which is derived from Mencius' idea, “The ability possessed by men without having been acquired by learning is innate ability, and the knowledge possessed by them without deliberation is *Liangzhi*” (*Mencius* 7A.15). Moral actions are relevant to the endeavor of self-cultivation, *Liangzhi* relates to substance that is indispensable to the endeavor of self-cultivation, there is no distinction between the external and the internal. Virtues produce an identical self to guide various actions responding to various situations. *Liangzhi*良知 demonstrates itself in different moral actions in accordance with diversified social relationships and situations. The relationship between innate moral consciousness and moral actions is therefore in a form of one controlling many. Innate moral consciousness constitutes the authentic self. While principles of Heaven are external and alien, innate moral consciousness as virtues represents mostly self-demands of a moral agent. When a moral agent follows innate moral consciousness, he is acting at his own free will. Considering acting in accordance with innate moral consciousness is a process of the realization of self-satisfaction. A perfect action lies in the unity of the obtainment of propriety and the realization of self-satisfaction. The significance of emotions to innate moral consciousness embraces reason, emotions, and will at the same time. For Wang, a moral action springs from nature with the presence of emotions which are rooted in innate moral consciousness.

II-4 The Egalitarian-Distributive Mode

Confucius emphasized distributive justice. According to him, “Do not have to worry about poverty, just worry about inequality of wealth; do not have to worry about a small population, just worried about instability in the country.” Like Confucius, Mencius considered cosmopolitanism the highest ideal. He believes that “when the way of virtue and justice prevail, the whole world is one community.” One of his

most important thoughts was “the people should have their private property forever,” otherwise “The Great Harmony World” could not be achieved.

Sun Yat-sen's¹² “Three People's Principles” have affinity with Abraham Lincoln's “government of the people, by the people, and for the people.” He attempted to apply those principles to transform the old China and to develop certain “socialist ideas.” His purpose was to bring people's livelihoods up to average wealth, and let all people have equal status in seeking their happiness. Sun combined nationalism and cosmopolitanism as a unit of two opposites, and neither can be neglected. He emphasized international pacifism, international egalitarianism, “universal love and universal harmony in the world,” and “the whole world and all countries as one community.”

Mao Tse-tung's¹³ ideas of justice were too idealistic, utopian, and even too radical, however, sometimes too pragmatic, so it caused the Chinese society both positive and negative effects. Mao's “taking class struggle as the guiding principle” and “Continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat” make the escalating political movement, eventually led to the “Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution,” and finally caused the Chinese society a serious crisis and catastrophe. Mao's childhood was educated and enlightened in the Chinese classics. His youth was inspired by the reformist thoughts of Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao, and then by the Communist influence through reading Marxist works. This is a fundamental reason why he always connected socialism and Communism logically with the Confucian idea of great harmony. In his article *On People's Democratic Dictatorship*, Mao says: “Kang Youwei wrote the *Book of Great Harmony*, but he did not and could not find the way to attain the great harmony.” In a sense, Mao was more cosmopolitan and modernistic than classic Marxism. His thought of global justice was based on his “Three World Theory.” For him, the United States and the Soviet Union were the first world; Western Europe, Australia, Canada, and Japan were the second world; Asia (except Japan), Africa, and Latin America were the third world. The first world was relatively rich, the second World was not too rich, but much richer than the third world. China belonged to the third world. Because of political and economic reasons, China could not be with the richest and the richer, but only with the poorer countries. Just because of the conflicts and contradictions between those three worlds, there would be poverty, hatred, suffering, turmoil, unfairness, dissatisfaction, inequality, global injustice, international exploitation, and people's revolutions; and just because of imperialism in this world (Russia is also known as social-imperialism) would cause wars, even world wars. Mao supports the third world people for peace, national independence, liberation struggles, and provided the economic assistance for the construction of the developing countries. Generally, Mao advocates egalitarianism, moral relativism, Utopianism, anti-colonialism, anti-capitalism, anti-imperialism, and anti-hegemony. In order to achieve the Chinese-style of socialism, he combines

¹²Sun Yat-sen (1866~1925) was the first president and founding father of “Nationalist China”.

¹³Mao Tse-tung (1893~1976) was the leader of the Chinese Communist Revolution.

realistic nationalism and utopian cosmopolitanism for his theoretic framework of Global justice.

Sun Yat-sen's and Mao Tse-tung's ideas were formalized right before or after May Fourth Movement. If we say that the West used the Chinese tradition as a counter-discourse to Enlightenment ideology, in a characteristics incorporation of non-Western material for Eurocentric purposes, this recognition or endorsement meant to the neo-traditionalists that the Chinese tradition as such could harmoniously coexist with modernity, and that they could be Chinese and Western at the same time. "This conscious desire to be both is perhaps a more egalitarian form of cosmopolitanism than the exclusively Westernized vision of May Fourth intellectual who conflated cosmopolitanism with Occidentalism" (Shi, 2001, 174).

II-5 The Rational-Mystical Mode

According to C. Bender, metaphysical practitioners' past lives provide a window into the understandings of the past that help to shape their identities and perspectives. "...we can understand their role as shaping a mystical cosmopolitanism" (Bender, 2010, 153). For Christianity, the ideal of cosmopolitanism has been based on mysticism. Relatively speaking, Eastern rationalism is more intuitive, mystic, and practical. For Confucius, justice is a rational basis for establishing a perfect social order. He who learns but does not think, is lost! He who thinks but does not learn is in great danger.... What the superior man seeks is in himself; what the small man seeks is in others.... He who conquers himself is the mightiest warrior (Lunyu 2.15).

Most traditional Chinese philosophers have focused their attention on the roles of the "heart-mind". Confucian scholars positively stress intuitive mentality or mental intuition, as Mencius maintains, "the function of the eyes and ears is not thinking, for they are only blocked by objects." "The function of the mind is thinking. Think and then you gain, otherwise you gain nothing." Accordingly, the moral practice involves intuition, which is different from intelligence, which is the outcome of education. Intuition can lead us to absolute knowledge and truth. Truth is the realization of our own being, and gives outside things an existence. The moral sense is the realization of our being, and intelligence is the realization of outside things. They are both powers of our being and combine the inner or subjective and outer or objective application of the power of mind.

Neo-Confucianism, the idealist movement of the Song and Ming dynasties, really emphasize the "nature of the mind." This philosophy can be divided into *Xinxue* 心學 — the School of Heart-Mind or Intuition, founded by Cheng Hao (1032-1085), in which the most leading thinker was Wang Yangming, and *Lixue* 理學 — the School of Reason-Principle, in which the most leading thinker was Zu Xi (Chu His, 1130-1200). Both of them advocate that the world consists of *Li* 理 — the realm of Reason-Principle and *qi* (*chi*) 氣 — the realm of Physical Force. Reason-Principle guides and controls physical force, and the latter demonstrates the former; the final root of Reason-Principle is Ultimate Reality, which derives from Heaven. The School of Reason-Principle maintains that to find the Reason-Principle of any physical process is to seek the Reason-Principle that is inherent in all physical and spiritual processes.

The School of Heart-Mind advocates that Heart-Mind can be completely integrated and can also reflect perfectly in itself the Reason-Principle of the universe. Since Heart-Mind is totally identical with the Universal Heart-Mind or the Ultimate Reason-Principle, our task should be to examine the nature of Heart-Mind.

Some Chinese doctrines of mind such as Lu Xiangshan's and Wang Yangming's are similar with Descartes' "I think therefore I am." Lu Xiangshan's school was called *Xinxue* 心學 (Philosophy of the Mind). He believed that there was a universal order. People who obey this order are rewarded while those who disobey are punished by Heaven. The sage emperors recognized this order in all natural phenomena, and enlightened their *xin* 心 (heart-mind). The heart-mind of man is therefore equal to the universal order and is a reflection of the natural patterns. The heart-mind of the sage is naturally equivalent to a mean man. If Heaven is order and man only wishes, they cannot be equal. While Zhu Xi stressed that spirit or mind was an objective reality, a composition of universal order, breath, or matter, Lu Xiangshan saw the spirit as dependent of sensual perception. Lu Xiangshan said: "The universe is my mind, my mind is the universe." He asserts "the mind is reason," and claims that *Tianli* 天理 (Heaven Reason), *Renli* 人理 (Human Reason), and *Wuli* 物理 (Natural Reason) exist only in the mind. For him, mind is the unique existence.

Generally speaking, the school of heart-mind treats the actual heart-mind as *li* (reason) and is therefore inherently good. The *xin* (heart-mind) designs reason into the world using a process of classifying and categorizing. As a result, one's phenomenal world can be regarded as a function of the mind. Later, there were heated debates between the disciples of Zhu Xi and that of Lu Xiangshan, but the former had lost its strength and was overtopped by the great Ming philosopher Wang Yangming, a dominate representative of the Philosophy of the Mind.

For Mencius, so-called conscience was originally a form of transcendently moral concept, which was a means to sympathize with people, to shame evil, to politely refuse interests, and to distinguish right from wrong. Wang Yangming developed this idea both ontologically and epistemologically, and thought that Man's conscience is a "Reason of Heaven." He reduced *a priori* moral conscience to "Reason of Heaven" which represents essence of the world and also becomes the primitive morality in Man's Mind. Furthermore, he considered conscience the only criterion to judge good from bad, and right from wrong. Therefore, "conscience" exists, as *a priori* entity or reality, in Man's Mind. Man will produce the right moral behaviors according to his internal conscience without the need to search any external sources. For him, the significance of emotions to innate moral consciousness embraces reason, emotions, and will at the same time. *Liangzhi* 天志 is guided by "*Tianli* 天理 (Heavenly Reason or Principles)" and "*Tianze* 天則 (Heavenly Laws or Rules), and is finally determined by "*Tianming* 天命 (Heavenly Will or Mandate). Like many other philosophers, Wang Yangming really emphasized the function of "knowing" and "cognitive power," the relations between "knowing subjects" and "known objects," and the interactions between "reason" and experience" for the transformation of self.

On the whole, there are certain distinctions between Daoist mysticism and Confucian mysticism. The former pays attention to intuition, emotion, feeling, direct or immediate knowledge, or knowledge without a medium. The latter stresses educational learning, moral judgments, and linguistic and semantic studies.

Laozi taught his disciples through the following interpretation: “Dao could be told is not really constant Dao.” “More mystical than the most mystical, the gate of all mysteries” (*Dao De Jing*, Chapter 1). Alan Chan has summarized six different modern views on Laozi and his *Dao De Jing* as follows: 1) *Dao De Jing* reflects a deep mythological consciousness at its core; 2) *Dao De Jing* gives voice to a profound mysticism; 3) *Dao De Jing* combines the mystical and mythological approaches; 4) *Dao De Jing* gives a metaphysical account of reality and insight into Daoist self-cultivation and government; but fundamentally it is not a work of mysticism; 5) *Dao De Jing* offers essentially a philosophy of life; and 6) *Dao De Jing* is above all concerned with realizing peace and sociopolitical order. Daoist mysticism is focused on nature and the natural order of things, namely, “let nature take its own course.” This view is against the traditional Western image: to praise miracles that violate the laws of nature. Daoist mysticism is often expressed through riddle stories. For example, Zhuangzi tells us a very famous riddle: “I dreamed I was a butterfly, flitting around in the sky; then I awoke. Now I wonder: Am I a man who dreamt of being a butterfly, or am I a butterfly dreaming that I am a man?” (*Zhuangzi: Qiwulun* 齊物論). Another famous story is: Zhuangzi and Huizi had strolled on to the bridge over the Hao, when the former observed, “See how the small fish is darting about! That is the happiness of the fish.” “You not being a fish yourself,” said Huizi, “how can you know the happiness of the fish?” “And you not being I,” retorted Zhuangzi, “how can you know that I do not know?” “If I, not being you, cannot know what you know,” urged Huizi, “it follows that you, not being a fish, cannot know the happiness of the fish.” “Let us go back to your original question,” said Zhuangzi. “You asked me how I knew the happiness of the fish. Your very question shows that you knew that I knew. I knew it (from my own feelings) on this bridge” (*Zhuangzi: Qiushui* 秋水). Those stories show that Daoism emphasizes immediate and intuitive knowledge rather than longtime learning that Confucius advocated.

II-6 The Pacifist-Inactive Mode

Generally speaking, Confucius was not supportive of war, because his highest social ideal was the world's peace and harmony. However, although he opposed violence, but supported just war, and advocated a "cautious war" and "civilized war." Mencius firmly opposed any unjust wars.

Governing society by a natural way of “actionless action (*Wuwei*無為)” is the core of Laozi’s thought. According to Laozi, if government is relaxed, then common people are happy; however if it is strict, then they are anxious. When those authorities responsible for justice become unjust, what seems good becomes evil. Only maternal leadership can be long lasting. Controlling a large country is like cooking a small fish; the leader must be careful not to overdo it. Politically, any ideal states should be governed by justice, and the world should be mastered by non-intervention. For

Laozi, "States are governed by justice. Wars are waged by violations. The world is mastered by nonintervention. How do I know this? By this: The more restrictions there are, the poorer the people. The more sharp weapons, the more trouble in the state. The more clever cunning, the more contrivances. The more rules and regulations, the more thieves and robbers. Therefore the wise say, 'Do not interfere, and people transform themselves. Love peace, and people do what is right.'"¹⁴

Mozi was the only one who considered justice the highest ethical standard. For him, all things and needs such as wealth, power, position, reputation, relationships, and so on must be established on the basis of justice. He was the earliest pacifist and cosmopolitan in Chinese history. One of his social ideas is *Fei Gong* (Anti-war): all people should love each other on an equal basis, and against any unjust wars and fighting between peoples and countries.

II-7 The Realist-Utopian Mode

Confucius attempted to find a balance between realism and utopianism. Chinese legalism is regarded as the "realist." Han Feizi was not an exception, but he had his "ideal country." His "Utopia" was a perfect society of "rule by law" without any bullying, hatred, conflicts, aggressions, and death threats. Although Confucius' moral universalism and cosmopolitanism such as "Great Harmony Society" were more noble and beautiful, Han's legalist ideas were more realistic and practicable for the actual social life. Kang Youwei attempted to combine Confucian universalism with modern Western ideas. "In Kang's utopian imagination, we may discern something of a real alternative to the aggressive power game and realistic notions underlying international relations."¹⁵ Vincent Shen summarizes Confucian reflection upon the theory of reality in the following propositions: 1. There is universal relatedness and co-naturality between human beings, nature and Heaven which serve as the ontological foundation for the understandability of *Wirklichkeit*, for human construction of knowledge about reality, and also for translation and communication. 2. Reality itself is understandable through sympathetic understanding based upon the interconnectedness of human beings with other beings, by which there is a tacit understandable content liable to be expressed through language. 3. Since there might be better as well as worse constructions of the life-world, depending on whether the construction is participative or dominative, life-world should not be identified with *Umwelt* (which is identified with *Wirklichkeit* by constructive realism). 4. Life-world is to be considered partially as a human construction, and partially as emerging spontaneously from the dynamism of reality itself. 5. It could be suggested that the theory of two types of reality be modified into a theory of three levels of reality: reality itself, constructed reality and life-world (Shen, 1994, 1994).

¹⁴Laozi, *Dao De Jing* 8 tr. Sanderson Beck and Ken Tsang, 57.

¹⁵Please see B. Wang's "Kang Youwei's Vision of International Ethics in Interstate Conflict," Tianxia Workshop, Stanford University:
<http://www.stanford.edu/dept/asianlang/cgi-bin/about/abstracts.php>.

Conclusion

Philosophically, Chinese traditional thinkers attempt to combine universalism with cosmopolitanism through metaphysical, ethical, aesthetical, and utopian imagination. Continuously, they transform the examination of cosmopolitanism from the geographical to ethical-political. The conceptualization of Chinese cosmopolitanism has had four dimensions: First, it is the concept of the supernatural being and superhuman being through certain ontological and cosmological imagination. Second, it is the concept of the natural being through the geographical environment. Third, it is the concept of the human being through the centralized rulership to govern the entire society and all lands, such as “All lands in Six Directions come within emperor’s territory, west being in the great desert, east being in the east China Sea, south being in Bei Hu, north being in Da Xia. All the people under the heaven have been tamed as the Emperor Qin’s subjects.”¹⁶ Fourth, it is the concept of the moral virtue, ethical value and utopian idea through self realization, self perfection, self purification and self transformation. Last, it is the concept of the cultural and civilizational superiority through contrasting to the perceived inferiority of Chinese minority cultures in her distant four border areas. One phrase in *The Classic of Poetry* is highly praised by Chinese thinkers: “Although Zhou is an old empire, yet her new mission is to revolutionize the world.” Here the “old empire” might be the core Chinese geographic space and the ‘new mission’ might indicate the ethical importance of Chinese culture (Chun, 2009, 25).

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1998. *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso.
- Bao, Er. 2006. *China's Neo-Traditional Rights of the Child*, The Blue Mountains Legal Research Centre, 144.
- Bender, Courtney. 2010. *The New Metaphysicals: Spirituality and the American Religious Imagination*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bodde, Derk. 1966. *China's Cultural Tradition: What and Whither?* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bogdandy, Armin von, and Dellavalle, Sergio. 2009. “Universalism Renewed: Habermas’ Theory of International Order in Light of Competing Paradigms,” *German Law Journal*. Vol. 10 No. 01.
- Brown, Garrett Wallace, Held, David. 2011. *The Cosmopolitanism Reader*, Polity Press.
- Cheah, Pheng. 2006. *Inhuman Conditions: On Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights*, Harvard University Press.
- Cheah, Pheng. 2000. “Chinese Cosmopolitanism in Two Senses and Postcolonial National Memory,” Vinay Dharwardker, ed. *Cosmopolitan Geographies: New Locations in Literature and Culture*, Routledge.
- Chan, Kwok B. 2005. *Chinese identities, ethnicity and cosmopolitanism*, Routledge.
- Chan, Wing-tsit. 1963. *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*, Princeton: Princeton University.

¹⁶ “Records of Emperor Qin,” Sima Qian, *Records of the Historian*, quoted by Chun, 2009, 22.

- Chun, Shan. 2009. "On Chinese Cosmopolitanism" (Tian Xia), *Culture Mandala: The Bulletin of the Centre for East-West Cultural and Economic Studies*, Vol. 8.
- Duara, Prasenjit. 1993. "De-Constructing the Chinese Nation," *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs*. No. 30 (Jul., 1993), pp. 1-26
- Ellwood, Robert S. Jr. 1980. *Mysticism and Religion*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gress, David. 1998. *From Plato to NATO: The Idea of the West and its Opponents*, The Free Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1997. "Kant's Idea of Perpetual Peace, with the Benefit of Two Hundred Years' Hindsight," in *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, ed. James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, 113-53, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- . 1998. *Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*, C. Cronin and P. DeGreiff (eds), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 2001. *The Postnational Constellation*, M. Pensky (trans., ed.), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 2006. *The Divided West*, C. Cronin (trans.), Cambridge: Polity.
- Held, David. 2010. *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities*, Polity Press.
- Henkin, L. 1986. "The Human Rights Idea in Contemporary China: A Comparative Perspective," *Human Rights in Contemporary China*, by R. R. Edwards, L. Henkin, A. J. Nathan, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Höffe, Otfried. 2006. *Kant's Cosmopolitan Theory of Law and Peace*, Alexandra Newton (trans.), Cambridge University Press.
- Hsieh, Yu-Wei. 1968. "The Status of the Individual in Chinese Ethics," in C. A. Moore, ed., *The Status of the Individual in East and West*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1968, p. 280.
- Kant, I. 1784. *Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View*, translation by Lewis White Beck. From Immanuel Kant "On History," The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1963.
- . 1970. *Metaphysics of Morals*. In *Kant's Political Writings* (pp. 131-175), Cambridge: University Press.
- Kleingeld, Pauline. 2003. "Kant's Cosmopolitan Patriotism," *Kant-Studien* 94 (3).
- Levenson, Joseph. 1971. *Revolution and Cosmopolitanism*, Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 24.
- Martin, Rex. 1985. *Rawls and Rights*, University Press of Kansas.
- Mertens, Donna M. 2008. *Transformative Research and Evaluation*, Guilford Press.
- Nathan, A. J. 1986. "Sources of Chinese Rights Thinking," *Human Rights in Contemporary China*, Columbia University Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1997. "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism," in *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Volume 5, Nr 1, pp. 1-25.
- Pangle, Thomas L. 1998. "Socratic Cosmopolitanism: Cicero's Critique and Transformation of the Stoic Ideal," in *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique*. Volume: 31, Issue: 2, 235-262.
- Shen, Shuang. 2009. *Cosmopolitan Publics: Anglophone Print Culture in Semi-Colonial Shanghai*. Rutgers University Press.
- Shen, Vincent. 1994. *Confucianism, Taoism and Constructive Realism*. WUV-Universitätsverlag, Ch. VIII.
- Shi, Shumei. 2001. *The Lure of the Modern: Writing Modernism in Semicolonial China, 1917-1937*, University of California Press.
- Snauwaert, Dale. 2009. "The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity," *Current Issues In Comparative Education*, Volume 12, Issue 1.

- Tao, Julia. 1990. "The Chinese Moral Ethos and the Concept of individual Rights, *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, vol. 7.
- Walker, Neil. 2005. *Making a World of Difference? Habermas, Cosmopolitanism and the Constitutionalization of International Law*, EUI Working Paper. Printed in Italy. European University Institute.