論王陽明「致良知」說對當前台灣的啓示

黃俊傑

(中文提要)

本文之主旨在於分析當前台灣社會中之「自我肯定」或「自我中心」心態之問題，並論證王陽明(1472-1529)的「致良知」學說對台灣亂象之啓示。全文論述共分爲兩大部份：第一部份解析後戒嚴時代台灣之「自我中心」心態及其亂象。第一小節分析台灣亂象之種種表現；第二小節探討此種台灣現象之正面意義及其潛在危機。第二部份分析王陽明「致良知」說之內涵及其對當前台灣亂象的對治作用。第一小節析論「致良知」說的理論內涵；第二小節則說明「致良知」說在現實上之適用性。

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

WANG YANG-MING'S "*CHIH LIANG-CHIH*" AS A REMEDY FOR THE SELF-ASSERTIVENESS IN TAIWAN TODAY

by
Chun-chieh Huang
(English Abstract)

In this essay we first (in Section I) describe the emerging problem of Taiwan today, self-assertiveness, and then (in Section II) offer Wang Yang-ming's "*chih liang-chih*, 致良知" as its solution. Section I is divided into two subsections: A. the rise of self-assertiveness in Taiwan today, and B. its opportunities and dangers. Section II is also divided into two subsections: C. theoretical feasibility of Wang Yang-ming's "*chih liang-chih*", and D. its pragmatic practicability.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

WANG YANG-MING'S "*CHIH LIANG-CHIH*" AS A REMEDY FOR THE SELF-ASSERTIVENESS IN TAIWAN TODAY

Chun-chieh Huang

I. The Rise of Self-Assertiveness in Taiwan Today

A. The Facts of Its Development

The rise of self-assertiveness is a historic phenomenon in Taiwan today. The decisive lifting of the martial law in 1987 lifted the lid of a political, socioeconomic, and cultural pressure-cooker which had been tightly closed long since 1895 by two autocratic governments, the Japanese regime and the ROC. Now, self-assertiveness in Taiwan is seen everywhere, seething, exploding everywhere.

No less than 1,516 cases of social movements erupted between 1983 and 1987; during 1987 alone, 676 events of this sort have taken place.[1] It is fashionable nowadays to criticize public figures; not even the national leader is above criticism. One has to criticize public policies of the powers that be

[1]See Chu Yün-han, "Ts'ung Tsung-t'i She-hui Chieh-kou tih Pien-ch'ian K'an Tzu-lih Chiu-chi-hsing Chieh-t'ou Yün-tung tih Yung-hsien" (eruptions of self-help movements on the streets from the total perspective of social structure), Conference on Social Movements and Exercise of Public Power, 1989, Taipei.

to catch popular attention and get elected. The democratization trend permeates everywhere. Appointments from the upper level become fewer and fewer; everything must be decided by public voting, so much so that supposedly illegal "buying votes" in various forms is a common practice everywhere.

Previously, Taiwan used to serve as a launchpad of attack and return to Mainland China; Taiwan also used to serve as a supplier of cheap labor to international market. Today, Taiwan as a sovereign state and society confidently asserts itself as an equal against its correlative others. Just to glance at four social sectors in Taiwan i.e., (1) agricultural, (2) political, (3) industrial and commercial, and (4) education, is enough to convince us of this noteworthy eruption, much as bamboo shoots after the spring rain, of self-assertiveness in Taiwan.

1. Self-assertiveness in *Agriculture*: Farmers' movements at the grassroots are the most conspicuous expression of Taiwan self-assertiveness after the lifting of the martial law in July, 1987. Their significance can be fully appreciated against their historical background. Three historical factors etch forth the farmers' proud self-consciousness not to be pushed around by the vested interests groups.[2] The three historical factors are as follows.

First, the Japanese colonization policies (1895-1945) were manifested in their slogan, "Industrial Japan, Agricultural Taiwan" ; Taiwan was during those years fast turning capitalist; its arable lands were fast being centralized and owned by a handful of wealthy landlords. These historical

[2]See my research with Professor Cheng-hung Liao of farmers' value-orientation in our ***Chan-hou T'ai-wan Nung-min Chia-chih Ch'ü-hsiang tih Chuan-pien*** (changes in farmers' value-orientation in postwar Taiwan), Taipei: Lien-ching Ch'u-pan Kung-ssu, 1992, pp. 152-154. Also see my "Transformation of Farmers' Social Consciousness in Postwar Taiwan," in Stevan Harrell & Chun-chieh Huang, eds., ***Cultural Change in Postwar Taiwan***, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994, pp. 111-134.

臺灣大學歷史學系

factors conspire to tell us that Taiwan farmers and their agricultural enterprises were during those years ruthlessly exploited by Japanese imperialists, the capitalists, and the landlords.

Then, secondly, in the 1950s after World War II, the agricultural sector of Taiwan came to supply military needs, people's foods, then in the 1960s served as a launchpad for "Industrial takeoff, " and in the 1980s played the role of "fire brigade" for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Because of diplomacy, the government had to occasionally make " emergency purchases" of unnecessary agricultural produces from abroad.[3] Taiwan farmers were thus made to play diplomatic fire fighters.

Thirdly, we have a sad sequel to the above story of brave farmers and agrarian businesses who served as effective aids to the military men, industry development, and foreign diplomacy. Having accomplished their various missions for the nation, Taiwan farmers were left in the cold and neglected. All other sectors in Taiwan went on flourishing, claiming to be part of "Taiwan miracle." Farmers did not profit from this Taiwan "economic miracle." The roles above described were forced upon the farmers in servitude to other sectors of Taiwan society, at an exorbitant cost to agricultural autonomy and integrity. Their repressed resentment naturally exploded in many "farmers' movements" upon the lifting of the martial law in 1987.

The first and the last historical factors indicate an intimate relation between agriculture and politics. To begin with, all personnel and enterprises directly and indirectly related to agribusiness are beholden to political management which was in turn tied to industrial, economic and diplomatic situations at the time. Thus agriculture turned out to be an *instrument* in someone else's hand to solve someone else's problems.

[3] A large quantity of apples and oranges were imported from the USA to offset trade deficit between Taiwan and USA to appease US anger.

臺灣人文社會期刊資料庫

Moreover, agricultural people had to resort to political maneuvers to solve their own problem, especially the problem of serving as means to someone else's ends. "Unless the leader of farmers' movement is himself a political figure, farmers have no way of taking to the streets to redress their unfair situation and assert their rights," sighed a local leader of farmers' movement in Miao-li (苗栗) County .[4] Gradually Taiwan farmers came to *politically* shift themselves from the position of other-supporters to self-sustainers. Thus agriculture and politics became inseparable. We now come to consider the rise of political self-assertiveness in Taiwan.

2. Self-assertiveness in *Politics*: Taiwan as a sovereign political unit is now self-assured, being on an equal footing with any other nations, especially in relation to Mainland China. How did it happen?

In July, 1994, the Executive Yüan of the ROC issued an "Explanation of the Relationships Across the Taiwan Strait" [5] to respond and refute PRC's claims in its White Paper, "The Taiwan Problem and the Unification of China" that was issued on August 31, 1993. The "Explanation" claims that ROC in Taiwan is now undergoing a "Quiet Revolution" both in politics and in economy, establishing itself as a wealthy, law-governing democratic society that honors the human dignity of every citizen. This is the first such society to appear in Chinese history. Then the "Explanation" bemoans the fact of two "split" governments on both sides of Taiwan Strait, appealing to the PRC to bravely recognize and acknowledge this fact, so as to improve on their domestic economy and political situation, and to develop a rational, peaceful, and mutually beneficial relation on an equal basis.

On December 10, 1993, representatives from PRC visited Taiwan. At

[4]This statement is quoted from my interview with that leader, April 24, 1988 (evening).

[5]The Executive Committee on Mainland China, Executive Yüan, "T'ai-hai Liang-an Kuan-hsi Shuo-ming Shu" (explanation of the relationship between Across the Taiwan Strait), 1994, pp. 10-11.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

the time, twenty-three organizations, including the Taiwanese Association of University Professors, jointly issued "Opinions Concerning the Relationship between Taiwan and China" which concluded by saying that the Taiwanese people have rights to determine the future of Taiwan and choose their own styles of life. Any regime that wishes for the support of the Taiwanese people must acknowledge this fact and form a common Community of Shared Destiny with Taiwan.

3. Self-assertiveness in *Industry and Commerce*: Industrial and commercial sectors in Taiwan have formed a common bond with their government to work together and establish right here in Taiwan the Asian-Pacific Operation Center. The Ministry of Finance announced, on November 9, 1994, to work to speed up liberalization and internationalization of all financial transactions, so as to establish in Taiwan the Asian-Pacific Finance Center within six years.[6] Only in this perspective of intensive self-respect in Taiwan can we understand the vigorous brisk international commercial intercourses currently taking place. The Ministry of Transportation reported that the Chiang Kai-shek International Airport has 226 daily takeoffs and landings of airplanes that transport 32,213 people and 2,026 tons of cargo.[7]

4. Self-assertiveness in *Education*: No longer is education regarded as means of securing jobs, an aid to development of industry, economy, and national defense. Education is now being regarded as a worthy end in itself, or more precisely, primarily for the sake of cultivating individuality and developing personal integrity. The work of the Council on Education Reform (in the Executive Yüan) (1994-96) and the continuing effort in educational reform can be taken as another indication of the reconstruction of autonomy in education.[8] The vibrant education in Taiwan has contributed

---

[6]***Chung-yang Jih-pao*** (Chung-yang daily newspaper), November 10, 1994, p. 2.
[7]***Tzu-lih Wan-pao*** (Tzu-lih evening newspaper), November 10, 1994, p. 5.
[8]See for details my "Reform of University General Education in Taiwan : Retrospect and

臺灣大學哲學系資料庫

much to the promotion of literacy level, as can be seen in the precipitous drops in illiteracy rate from 42.1% in 1952 to 5.8% in 1994 and the no less dramatic rise in high-school education from 8.8% in 1952 to 52.6% in 1994.[9] This rise was resulted from long years of promulgation of compulsory education since the academic year 1968-69.

All in all, we have surveyed four sectors as widely spread as we can choose from--agricultural, political, industrial-commercial, and educational--and have seen the same impressive phenomenon in postwar Taiwan: a rapid vigorous rise in self-assertiveness which is forward-looking and full of self-confidence.

B. Opportunities and Dangers

Having seen above a vigorous rise of self-assertiveness in postwar Taiwan, we must now note its dangers and opportunities. We must see to it that its dangers be obviated and its healthy symbiotic growth be facilitated.

First, we are aware of some opportunities implied in the rise of self-assertiveness. To grow up in self-dignity and become truly oneself is a worthy project of individual life, whether personal or communal. Assertion of self-identity is a unique historical event in Taiwan, a precious opportunity to grow up as Taiwan for the sake of Taiwan. And this is Taiwan's unique opportunity, the very first time in its history, after its domination by autocratic regimes continually one after another of various cultural backgrounds--Dutch (1624-1662), Koxinga (1661-1683), Manchu (1683-1895), Japan (1895-1945), ROC (1945-today).

Prospect," Unpublished Manuscript.

[9]See Council for Economic Planning and Development, ROC, ***Taiwan Statistical Data Book***, 1996, Table 2-4b, p. 11. For a recent discussion of this issue, see Feng-fu Tsao, "Postwar Literacy in Taiwan: A Critical Review in Sociolinguistic Perspective" in Chun-chieh Huang et. al. eds., ***Postwar Taiwan in Historical Perspective*** (College Park, MD.: University Press of Maryland, 1998), pp. 158-180.

臺灣大學歷史學系

Yet at the same time we can understand how rife with dangers this self-assertiveness can be in Taiwan. Given for the first time, self-identity excites people, transfixed by their new-won freedom. This results in preoccupation with oneself at the cost of others around oneself. And self-preoccupation all too easily leads to simple selfishness without considerateness, enjoyment of freedom without duties, responsibilities and obligations. Public decency and facilities are the first to be demaged, then follow ugly rancid pollutions (noise, chemical, prejudicial, ecological) and confusions (violence, inconveniences, disregard of social convention and sociable thoughtfulness).

In other words, Taiwan is now in a state of budding teenage assertiveness against domination by outsiders. Love of oneself is a stage in growth of personhood, saying No to everyone except to oneself. If unchecked and not guided by appealing ideals, this potent self-awareness can become as brutal and the worse for its unsuspected eruptions everyday everywhere. Self-assertion can grow out of hand in brutal callousness to others that results in mutual destruction; self-love destroys selves. This situation breeds Hobbes' world where life is solitary, poor, nasty, brutal and miserably short. Taiwan is now at the critical juncture in its history of growing into political and cultural autonomy. Dangers of self-destructive anarchy can be seen everywhere. Self-love must grow into "loving others as oneself" on pain of self-demise.

Lin I-hsiung（林義雄, 1941-）is a former provincial assemblyman and currently the chairman of Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) whose family were assassinated (save his wife and daughter) because of his fervent love of Taiwan. He has an apt description of Taiwanese people's value-orientation today: callous exploitation of natural environs, ruthless competition in total disregard of others, brutal racial prejudice, and exclusive worship of money

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

and power.[10]

We agree that the first three dangers (nature exploitation, competition, prejudice) are, as Lin pointed out, derived from the last, money-power-worship. But what is crucial is where all these four vices come from; we see that they all arise out of self-assertiveness expressed as egocentrism, self-preoccupation manifested as self-confinement. This is sheer parochialism in the midst of internationalization of Taiwan economy.

This parochialism, as it were, is well expressed in an egocentric vision of Taiwan as the "center of the world"; Taiwan-centrism is simple ethnocentrism if not pure tribalism. It was graphically formulated as early as in August 10, 1941, toward the end of Japanese occupation of Taiwan, when Wu Hsin-jung (吳新榮, 1906-1967), a well-known doctor in the historical city of Tainan (台南), bemused himself,[11]

"Sitting alone in my study, I gazed long at the map on the south wall. My thoughts now being clear, the idea of 'Taiwan Centrism' took its shape in me:

1. Being at the center of Southeast Asia, Taiwan can be called geographical holy land;
2. To the east of Taiwan is the world greatest ocean, the Pacific, to the west is the world largest continent, Asia;
3. Taiwan is cut through at its center by the Tropic of Cancer, to the north of which is the temperate zone, and to the south, the torrid tropics; . . ."

And on and on it went on like this for no less than ten reasons why

[10]Lin I-hsiung, "Tai-wan jen Chia-chih Kuan tih Ch'ung-chien" (reconstruction of value-orientation among the Taiwanese), ***T'ien Hsia (Commonwealth)***, December 1, 1994, pp. 104-106.

[11]Wu Hsin-jung, ***Wu Hsin-jung Jih-chi (Chan Ch'ien)*** (Wu Hsin-jung's diary [prewar days]), Taipei: Yüan-ching Ch'u-pan she, 1981, p. 112.

臺灣大學博碩士論文資料庫

Taiwan is the center of the world.[12] Today, this Taiwan-centrism in the world is being enthusiastically embraced and developed by young progressive intellectuals, fast becoming an essential part of the new culture of Taiwan for the twenty-first century. It is also a new major dynamics that is impacting Mainland China.[13]

In addition, Taiwan has many conflicting cultural values. In desperation, Taiwanese people have to pick and grasp ones which have most visible signs of safety, protection and respectability, namely, money and power. Confusing plurality of values explains how the worship of money and power (Lin's fourth mental trait of the Taiwanese) came about.

And the plurality of conflicting cultural values came, in turn, from Taiwan's unique history, a series of varied cultural and political dominations, namely, Dutch, Koxinga (Chinese), Manchu, Japanese, ROC (Chinese). The world history has of course seen many glorious liberations, e.g., the USA and India from the British Empire, Afro-Americans from the white USA, Filipinos from Spain, Indonesians from the Dutch, and so on. But rarely has a cultural community been liberated from a series of different governments of different cultural backgrounds, as Taiwan has.

Cultural value bespeaks basic value which comprehensively shapes our way of living. Plurality of basic cultural values indicates broken self-identity.[14] Taiwanese people are in need of a coherent value-center to live by

---

[12]We see that this sort of thought is perfectly legitimate *as long as* Wu added that other places are also the centers of the world for different reasons. Then he would have been on his way toward self-interested cosmopolitanism. Self-dignity is a treasure when "extended," shared, and universalized; it is devilish when only confined to oneself. This will be our contention following Wang Yang-ming in Section II.

[13]See, e.g., Chiang Nien-feng, "T'ai-wan jen yü Hsin Chung-kuo--ke Min-chin-tang tih I-koh Hsing-tang Cheh-hsüeh" (The Taiwanese and the new China--a philosophy of action dedicated to the Democratic Progressive Party), Taichung, printed and distributed by the author, 1988.

[14]We need one coherent value-system to live by to become ourselves. For our personal identity expresses itself in one coherent pattern of behavior and perception according to

臺灣大學哲學系期刊資料庫

and make sense of plurality of cultures with which they live. So, in desperation, they grabbed the most easily visible, the most immediately effective, values that are money and power. However, both of them are also the shallowest, the most brutal, the most unreliable, the most transient, and the most deceptive pseudo-values. To grab money and power is to grab ruthlessly chilly winds as one's shelter; one is sure to go empty, homeless, and broken at the core and heart of one's personhood.

And so, I agree with Lin that Taiwanese people today are filled with egocentric assertiveness expressed both in callous exploitation of others, be they natural environment or other ethnic groups, and in worship of money and power. Taiwan's exclusive self-interest stems from a lack of one coherent value-center to make sense of value pluralism at the basic level which is unique in the history of Taiwan.

This Section I argues that Taiwan has reached a teenage stage shouting "Me here!." This shout has quite easily turned "Me only!, " a turning inward into self-preoccupation which in turn resulted in a "Not you" attitude which is an exclusive egocentrism. A self-awakening is turned into an exclusivism. That is the problem.

My diagnosis of the ills and dangers of Taiwan points to necessary traits of their cure. Self-assertiveness must be turned into other-considerateness; value pluralism requires a coherent value-system to integrate and learn from. In next Section II I shall argue that within our very self-assertiveness we

---

our coherent value principle. Otherwise, we will be split into as many identities as the many value-systems we hold. We need one coherent value-system, usually expressed in a culture, to cohere and unify our many desirings, actings, perceiving, and thinkings into a personal unity, to which we refer all our desires, acts, perceptions, thoughts. And this personal unity we call personal integrity. That is why Taiwanese people need one coherent cultural value-system to be the "Taiwanese people." This does not of course minimize the importance of pluralistic society and world in which we live. In fact, the inescapable fact of the plurality of cultural values indispensable for our mutual enrichment and symbiosis, all the more bespeaks the need for a coherent value-center to coordinate and make sense of those different values.

have an innate knowledge that we feel good at seeing someone feeling good, and we are pained at seeing someone in pain. As the bottom of my heart of being that this "someone" is really myself and you and he and she and it and all myriad of things. This fellow-feeling and this kinship-perception, are ingrained in me. This is what Wang Yang-ming (王陽明, Shou-jen 守仁, 1472-1529) dubbed, somewhat surprisingly, as "innate knowledge (*liang-chih,* 良知)." He urged us to innately "extend" (*chih,* 致) it. Thus in this Section I we saw Taiwan's growth-problem of selfhood ; in the next Section II we will see a maturity-problem into the fellowship of beings at the center of myself. We have considered the first; now we go into the second.

II Wang Yang-ming's *"Chih Liang-Chih"*

We propose the culminating Neo-Confucian of all ages, Wang Yang-ming' scentralpassional thesis of *"chih liang-chih"* (致良知, extension of innate knowledge)[15] as a basic remedy to problems of Taiwan today. Immediately this proposal shall meet various challenges as to its relevance and feasibility. For instance, someone may propose the following three points of "irrelevance" of *chih liang-chih* to Taiwan today: (1) Wang's proposal concerns our innate moral judgment; today's sociopolitical problems concern the pursuit and distribution of secular values and profit.

[15]Professor Ōkada Takehiko holds that Wang represents the culmination of Neo-Confucianism. See his ***Ōyomei to Min-matsu no Jūgaku*** (Wang Yang-ming and Confucianism of later Ming), Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha, 1970, pp. 12, 18-19. Wang Yang-ming said, "My daily lectures concern only the notion of three letters, *chih liang-chih.*" See his "Yü Cheng-hsien nan shou-mo erh-chüan"("Two Letter to Cheng-Hsien" in ***Wang Yang-ming Ch'üan-chi*** (complete works of Wang Yang-ming) , Shanghai : Shang-hai ku-chi ch'u-pan-she, 1992, Vol. II, p. 990.

(2) Wang's vision is mystical[16], immediate, subjective[17], and transcendental, difficult to communicate to today's mentality with emphasis on conceptual objective knowledge. (3) We are politically concerned in Taiwan today with the negotiation among hostile powers and balance of conflicting claims, having nothing to do with Wang's moral normative doctrines.[18]

Four more difficulties can be added. (4) Did Wang himself proposed his thesis explicitly as a remedy to sociopolitical ills? Did he practiced it in his political activities himself? (5) Wang's situation during 1472-1529 is quite remote from ours in Taiwan today. Do these two situations share anything in common? (6) Many sages, religious people, and even revolutionaries in many periods of human history have proposed and tried many remedies. What is so distinctive about Wang's that deserves our attention? (7) Traditional China has had three isms, Confucian, Taoist, and Buddhist. Taiwan today has in addition democracy, Christianity, and folk

[16]Julia Ching (Ch'in,Chia-i 秦家懿), among other, has already indicated the "religious" import in Wang Yang-ming's thought. By "religious," Julia Ching means that Wang is "mystical." See Ch'in, Chia-i, ***Wang Yang-ming*** (Taipei: Tung-ta t'u-shu Kung-shih, 1987), p. 205.

[17]Wang Yang-ming was reported to have kept saying "that to learn is to learn to preserve the Principle of Nature, and that in order personally to realize this, it is merely necessary to have no selfish wishes in one's mind." See Wang Yang-ming, ***Ch'uan Hsi Lu,*** translated by Wing-tsit Chan, ***Instructions for Practical Living and Other Neo-Confucian Writings by Wang Yang-ming***, NY: Columbia University Press, 1963, #96, pp. 58-59 (Hereafter cited as Chan, ***Instruction***). Perhaps because of Wang's emphasis on the spontaneity of mind, Wang was criticized by late Ming thinkers such as Wang Fu-chih (王夫之, Ch'uan-shan 船山, 1619-1692) as being responsible for the moral anarchy and social chaos that led to the fall of the Ming dynasty. For a discussion of Wang Fu-chih's criticism, see Ian McMorran, "Late Ming Criticism of Wang Yang-ming." The case of Wang Fu-chih," ***Philosophy East and West*** vol.23, no.1 and 2 (Jan.-April, 1973), pp. 91-102.

[18]Cf. Tseng Ch'ün-hai, "Wang Yang-ming 'Chih Liang-chih' tsai Min-chu Cheng-chih Shih-chien shang t'e-neng tsao-yü tih K'un-nan" (possible difficulties in Wang's 'extension of innate knowledge' to be encountered in the praxis of democracy), ***Yang-ming Hsüeh Hsüeh-shu T'ao-lun Hui Lun-wen Chi*** (proceedings of conference on Yang-ming scholarship), edited by Kuo-lih Shih-fan Ta-hsüeh (National Taiwan Normal University), 1988, pp. 30-34.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

religions. They have all been tried and found not quite effective. Wang belongs to Confucianism. What does he have which assures us that his thesis is just the right and effective "medicine" for our sociopolitical ills today in Taiwan? As a corollary to this, Taiwan today bristles with a radical plurality of views, religions and isms. Why add one more ism?

The above seven queries and difficulties can be conveniently reduced to two questions: *How can* such a remote subjective notion as *chih liang-chih* be applicable to Taiwan today? and *Can* it apply? The first question concerns (C) theoretical feasibility and the second, (D) pragmatic practicability. These two questions are all concerned with "Problem of objectification of the subjectivity" as Lao Ssu-kuang aptly argues. [19]The rest of this essay is devoted to responding to if not answering both these questions in this order.

C. Theoretical Feasibility of *Chih Liang-Chih*

Our primary task here is to show how entirely different, in fact, opposed, Wang's thesis of *chih liang-chih* is to a mystical, subjective, world-transcending and -withdrawal type of ism (such as Buddhism in Wang's eyes) that some scholars take it to be. The best way to show that Wang's thesis is a radical world-revolutionizing yet quite spontaneous innate inevitable revolution is to consider the thesis in some details.

Wang Yang-ming's proposal of *chih liang-chih* has three terms, each deserving separate, then joint, consideration.

First, as to the term, *chih* 知, knowledge. Significantly, Wang proposed "knowledge" when he proposed a view on human nature; he considered human nature (*hsing* 性) or human mind (heart-mind, *hsin* 心) *in terms of* knowledge (*chih* 知). Nature is something ontological; mind or heart-mind is its function in general. Thus both "nature" and "heart-

[19]Lao Ssu-kuang (勞思光), ***Hsin-pien Chung-kuo cheh-hsüeh-shih*** (新編中國哲學史) (Taipei: San-min Shu-chü, 1983), III:A, pp. 505-528.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

mind" are notions that *stay within* a being called "human person." [20] No wonder, some scholars suspected of static ("stay") and mystifying subjectivism ("within") when Wang proposed a novel view on human subjectivity. In contrast, "knowledge" (*chih*) is an interactive, correlative performance; it is an *act* of relating a knowing subject to a known object, (a) a *projective* act from the knower toward the known. To put such projective performance between two beings at the (b) heart *hsin* 心 of human nature *hsing* 性 jolts our common sense; such a move belongs to a stroke of genius on Wang's part. What did he have in mind when he did so?

Putting together both points above, i.e., (a) our projective act (b) at the heart of human nature, we come to understand at least three of Wang's intentions.

First, putting subject-object correlation *inside* subjectivity shows us that (i) this "knowledge" (*chih*) is as *unitive-intuitive-active* as "felt awareness," not separative as in scientific experiment where the investigator oversees the investigated object, and yet that (ii) this felt awareness is that of *someone else's* state of being. I feel someone else's pain exactly as I feel my own; that is the sort of participatory knowledge, the knowledge-in-me-about-another, that Wang has in mind and keeps harping on. Let us quote some of his sayings on this point:[21]

> *"Man is the mind of the universe. At bottom Heaven and Earth and all things are my body. Is there any suffering or bitterness of the great masses that is not disease or pain in my own body? Those who are not aware of the disease and pain in their own body are*

[20] Cf. Ōkada Takehiko (岡田武彦), ***Ōyomei to Min-matsu no Jū gaku*** (王陽明と明末の儒學), Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha, 1970, pp. 18-19.

[21] Chan, ***Instructions*** #179-180, pp. 166, 168, #183, cf. 171.

臺灣大學歷史期刊資料庫

people without the sense of right and wrong. The sense of right and wrong is knowledge possessed by men without deliberation and ability possessed by them without their having acquired it by learning. It is what we call innate knowledge. This knowledge is inherent in the human mind whether that of the sage or of the stupid person, for it is the same for the whole world and for all ages.

Thanks to divine guidance I happen to entertain certain views on innate knoeledge, believing that only through it can order be brought to the world. Therefore whenever I think of people's degeneration and difficulties I feel pitiful and have a pain in my heart. . . ."

夫人者，天地之心。天地萬物本吾一體者也。生民之困苦荼毒。孰非疾痛之切於吾身者乎？不知吾身之疾痛，無是非之心者也。是非之心，不慮而知，不學而能。所謂良知也。良知之在人心，無間於聖愚。天下古今之所同也。

僕誠賴天之靈，偶有見於良知之學。以爲必有此而後天下可得而治。是以每念斯民之陷溺，則爲之戚然痛心。. . .

Secondly, since this knowledge-about-another is deep *within* me, it is untaught, unreflective, namely, innate, ingrained in my nature. This conclusion inescapably follows from the above point. Thus this my felt participatory knowledge within me is a *liang-chih*, my innate knowledge. My felt sensitivity *toward* an objective situation of someone else is at the core, the heart (*hsin*), of my being; it is part of my nature, it is "innate." This is the point Wang was never tired of stressing, so much so that he was accused of subjectivism.

Now, thirdly, to put, within the deepest realm of subjectivity, this essentially projective notion of "knowledge" from the knowing subject to the known object, amounts to building the projective, outgoing dynamism right inside subjectivity. This outgoing nisus is the act of "extension" (*chih* 致) inherent, an essential ingredient, in this "innate knowledge"

臺灣大學哲學系

(*liang-chih*). Such an extension manifests itself in thinking as acting, the unity of knowledge and action (to feel pain even of others is itself to act on it to save them), and in acting out such interpersonal resonance in sociopolitical management of the world.[22] First, Wang's graphic description of the unity of innate knowledge and spontaneous action comes to mind:[23]

> *"In the case of fathers, sons, and brothers, because of love one will surely feel an ache in his head and a pain in his heart, run desperately until he has lost his breath, and crawl to save them. He even ignores the danger of drowning himself. How much more will he ignore being ridiculed as insane!"*
> 若夫在父子兄弟之愛者，則固未有不痛心疾首，狂奔盡氣，匍匐而拯之。彼將陷溺之禍有不顧，而況於病狂喪心之譏乎？

And then, to extend such unity of knowledge and action shall result in a sociopolitical management of the world. We can do so because all of us, without exception, are born with this innate knowledge. This knowledge and its extension is therefore the basis of *true* democracy. What is noteworthy is that all this sociopolitical act is inevitable and spontaneous; we cannot help it because we feel our communal pain at the core-heart of our beings. Wang said movingly,[24]

> *"If gentlemen of the world merely devote their effort to extending their innate knowledge they will naturally share with all a universal sense of right and wrong, share their likes and dislikes, regard other*

[22]In the history of Confucianism, what is distinct in Wang is that Wang carried out the implication of praxis in Wang's thesis of "*chih hsing ho i*" (unity of knowledge and action 知行合一), and carried out this view in successful political-military campaigns.
[23]Chan tr., *Instruction*, #181, p. 169.
[24]Chan tr., *Instruction*, #179, p. 167, cf. p. 171.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

people as their own persons, regard the people of other countries as their own family, and look upon Heaven, Earth, and all things as one body. When this is done, even if we wanted the world to be without order, it would not be possible. When the ancients felt that the good seemed to come from themselves when they saw others do good, when they felt that they had fallen into evil when they saw others do evil, when they regarded other people's hunger as their own, and when they felt that if one person's condition was not well adjusted it was as if they had pushed him into a ditch, they did not purposely do so in order to seek people's belief in them. They merely devoted their effort to extending their innate knowledge and sought to satisfy themselves."

世之君子，惟務致其良知，則自能公是非，同好惡，視人猶己，視國猶家，而以天地萬物爲一體。求天下無治，不可得矣。古之人所以能見善不啻若己出，見惡不啻若己入，視民之飢溺，猶己之飢溺，而一夫不獲，若己推而納諸溝中者，夫故爲是而以蘄天下之信己也。務致其良知，求自慊而已矣。

To stop this unstoppable monistic and pragmatic dynamism is to fall into a *dualistic* egoism of "me" against "you." They feel separated, become one-sided, intent only on their own benefit, oppose and injure others with crafty lies in petty wrangling and rivalry; we *feel* pity and pain for them.[25] We begin the task of extending our shared innate knowledge. This is to "save the world."

What does all this amount to? When one feels kind to the other, one is of a kind to that other; kindness is a kinship-feeling (*ch'in* 親). "Feeling" here means felt participation, the ultimate of knowledge which is a distanced, surveying, and cognitive participation; feeling is an experienced knowledge

[25]Chan tr., *Instruction*, p. 168.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

that lies at the heart of creation of personal reciprocity. "*Ch'in min* 親民" is to "*ch'in*" people, to "kin" people, to become people's kins; it is the ultimate of governance which results spontaneously and inevitably from Wang's innate knowledge loving and deferring our kinsfolks. Mencius positively stated it when he said,[26]

> *"What a man to do without having to learn it is what he can truly (*liang-neng*) do; what he knows without having to reflect on it is what he truly knows (*liang-chih*). There are no children who do not know loving their parents, and none of them when they grow up will not know respecting their elder brothers. . . . .What is left to be done is simply the extension of these to the whole Empire."*
> 人之所不學而能者，其良能也；所不慮而知者，其良知也。孩提之童無不知愛其親者，及其長也，無不知敬其兄也。親親，仁也；敬長，義也；無他，達之天下也。

And Mencius negatively brought out the same point in that famous heartfelt unbearable sensitivity toward someone's pain (*pu jen* 不忍, 1A7) and danger (*ts'e yin* 惻隱, 2A6). Wang Yang-ming claims that this heartfeltness points to its innateness (*liang* 良), this sensitivity indicates knowledge (*chih* 知), both of which together constitute *liang-chih* 良知, our ingrained knowledge of kinship one to another throughout the universe. Homo-cosmic continuum (*t'ien jen ho i* 天人合一) makes up our innate heartfelt awareness (*liang-chih*) that urges us to become homologous, become home one to another. Such cosmic-cognitive sentiment is innate in us (*liang-chih*), normatively urging us to bring it about (*chih liang-chih*), claims Wang. We may say that "ought" implies "can"; being

[26]D. C. Lau's translation. D. C. Lau, *Mencius*, II:A, 15, Volume Two, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1979, 1984, p. 269.

臺灣人文學術期刊資料庫

normatively urged to do something assumes that we are capable of doing that something, for otherwise there is no point in urging. Mencius drove home to us this principle when he urged King Hsüan of Ch'i (齊宣王, r. 371-289 B.C.) to practice governance in line with the pain he felt at the heart of being about the ox in mortal jitters (1A7). Wang Yang-ming would say that the inescapability of "ought" is based on the "already-is." We must become or do it because we cannot help it; it is there within us and everywhere around. And the "it" here is the ubiquitous *liang-chih*. The innateness of connectedness of all (*t'ien jen ho i*), and to make an accomplishment of this matter inescapable, is inherently known in our heart of hearts. We are burnt inside, or rather, born, with this awareness as we are with our capability to know. That is what *liang-chih* means. Mencius graphically brought out this inevitable inescapability in the famous stories on *pu jen jen chih hsin* (不忍人之心, unbearable sensitivity, 1A7) and *ts'e yin chih hsin* (惻隱之心 visceral compassion, 2A6).

Significantly, what distinguishes Wang Yang-ming from Buddhistic sentiment is this. This existential difference in experiential respectful knowledge distinguishes Wang Yang-ming the Neo-Confucian from Buddhism which all too easily collapse everything with everything else. In short, Wang's cognitive innateness (*liang* 良) entails regardful knowledge (*chih* 知) of personal integrity and individuality of others.

Wang's cognitive, existential, and cosmic identification is a co-resonance with all beings, as he graphically stated as he began ***Ta Hsüeh Wen*** (大學問, Queries on the ***Great Learning***), saying, [27]

> *'The great man regards Heaven, Earth, and the myriad things as one body. He regards the world as one family and the country as*

[27]Wing-tsit Chan, translated with notes, ***Instructions for Practical Living and Other Neo-Confucian Writings by Wang Yang-ming***, NY: Columbia University Press, 1963, p. 272.

臺灣人文社會線期刊資料庫

one person. . . . not because he deliberately wants to do so, but because it is natural to the humane nature of his mind . . . Therefore when he sees a child about to fall into a well, he cannot help a feeling of alarm and commiseration. This shows that his humanity forms one body with the child. . . . Again, when he observes the pitiful cries and frightened appearance of birds and animals about to be slaughtered, he cannot help feeling an 'inability to bear' their suffering. This shows that his humanity forms one body with birds and animals. . . . [W]hen he sees plants broken and destroyed, he cannot help a feeling of pity. This shows his humanity forms one body with plants. . . .[E]ven when he sees tiles and stones shattered and crushed, he cannot help a feeling of regret. This shows that his humanity forms one body with tiles and stones. This means that even the mind of the small man necessarily has the humanity that forms one body with all. Such a mind is rooted in his Heaven-endowed nature, and is naturally intelligent, clear, and not beclouded."

大人者，以天地萬物爲一體者也，其視天下猶一家，中國猶一人焉，…非意之也，其心之仁本若是。…是故見孺子之入井而必有怵惕惻隱之心焉，是其仁之與孺子而爲一體也。…見鳥獸之哀鳴觳觫而必有不忍之心焉，是其仁之與鳥獸而爲一體也。…見草木之摧折而必有憫恤之心焉，是其仁之與草木而爲一體也。…見瓦石之毀壞而必有顧惜之心焉，是其仁之與瓦石而爲一體也。是其一體之仁也，雖小人之心，亦必有之，是乃根於天命之性而自然靈昭不昧者也。

"Forming one body with all" in this context must not mean melting oneself with all into one undifferentiated whole; it must mean being identified in co-resonance with the situation of a particular being, then with another particular being, until each human person identifies oneself with all

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

beings. What makes a man "great" is his great accommodation to all beings, becoming resonatingly one, being identified, with all beings, forming with them one body and one family. What is important to note is that this co-resonating identification with beings assumes distinctive integrities of beings. To be identified with the other requires not being identical with that other.

Cognition is cognitive assimilation, becoming similar to the known, and such assimilation is a dissimulation that assumes dissimilarities. To know is a unitive project of the knower toward the known, and assumes that the knower is not the known; compassion obtains only between two *distinct* beings. The so called "family resemblance" in knowing bespeaks family difference among all existents, for knowing has no limit to know. Wang's *liang-chih* bespeaks a virulent trust in inherent individuality and personal integrity, which, on this base of confident self-respect, expands itself to other-respect, and co-responds, co-resonates, with all beings as occasions arise. How? Wang stressed that we must follow our innate sincere pro-attitude toward the good (expanding on Mencius' insight that no children do not *know* loving their parents and respecting their elders), to guide and shape what our intention tends and stays , i.e., our daily comportment.

Not only is this sensitive co-resonance resolutely opposed to hermetically sealed (*fen ke*, 分隔) self-withdrawing privatistic egoism (*ssu hsin* 私心, *ssu yü*, 私慾) but positively presupposes a regardful recognition of the distinctive and distinct integrity of each existent thus responded to.[28] Wang's such robust co-responsive innate knowledge is a much stronger version of individualism than the declaration, "every man is created equal," that is at the base of Western democracy. This point of felt individual integrity at the base of *chih liang-chih* makes *chih liang-chih* an

[28]This paragraph is a summary of Wang Yang-ming's celebrated essay, "*Ta Hsüeh Wen*" (Queries on the Great Learning).

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

appropriate appealing remedy to the selfish version of individualism today in Taiwan.

Chinese democracy, including that in Taiwan today, should base itself on the *chih liang-chih* version of individuality, not on a compromise of adversarial egoism as Hobbes proposed. For egoism is a self-centered version of individualism basically opposed to Wang's other-sensitive version of individualism of *liang-chih*. The latter individualism treasures individual subjectivity (*liang-chih*) that leads out to (*chih liang-chih*) the cosmic family of universal symbiosis. Self-seeking egoism that bends back on itself shrinks into oneself, pulverizing the universe into chaotic mess of conflicts, a poor, solitary, brutish and nasty world of Hobbes. Hobbes' "solution" of giving up a part of individual sovereignty to communal control in exchange for individual safety merely plasters over the infesting mortal sore underneath. Adversarial egoism always lurks under to break out of the plaster of communal control. Hobbes was intent on reducing the risks of hostile "conflict," which yet is just a manifestation or a symptom of the root trouble, "egoism," an inner-directed narcissistic individualism. It must be turned around outward in sensitivity to *others'* pain; it is not pleasant to watch pain, even the risk of pain, of the innocent, whoever it is. Wang tells us that this true individualism that treasures every individuality should be extended (*chih*) because such knowledge is ingrained in all of us (*liang-chih*).[29] We note that in our explication of Wang's thesis of *chih liang-chih* we have inevitably touched on its vibrant impact on actuality. This is by the nature of the case. Wang proposed his thesis for this very purpose to

[29] $\overline{\text{O}}$ kada Takehiko (岡田武彥) has a conclusion similar to mine in ***Juky$\bar{o}$ Seisin to Gendai*** (儒教精神と現代, the spirit of Confucianism and modernity), Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha, 1994, pp. 185-187. However, $\overline{\text{O}}$ kada's rationale has an illicit (a) connection among rationality, analysis, opposition, and egoism in (b) illicit contrast to (c) illicit connection among will-and-emotion, unity (*zen-ichi*, 全一), and subjectivity. Our rationale stated above may be firmer, more apt and natural than his.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

"save the world." It is time for us now to deal with this theme.

D. Pragmatic Practicability of *Chih Liang-Chih*

1. Let us begin with two major points pertaining to the "difficulties" of the application of Wang Yang-ming's theory in modern age, namely, Wang's thesis of *chih liang-chih* is (a) too mystical, subjective, moralistic, and transcendental to be (b) relevant to today's sociopolitical situation of brutally calculative adjustment among hostile powers and prudential balance of conflicting claims.

(a) First of all, the above description of Wang has hopefully shown that nothing is farther than the truth. Wang's thesis is a monistic homo-cosmic dynamism that is deeply rooted in our respective innate knowledge to resonatingly extend to the limits of the entire universe.

The so-called "difficulties" well manifest and reflect our current dualistic mentality. The word "innate" at once evokes an image of something subjective which is synonymous with elusive if not illusory, as *opposed* to something objective, a buzz word for something trustworthy, practical, verifiable and scientific. The word "innate" also evokes something mystical that *transcends* things mundane and tangible. And "opposed" and "transcends" bespeak dualism: the subjective is opposed to the objective, the mystical transcends the mundane. Since the contemporary mind prefers if not worships the objective-mundane in contrast to the subject-mystical, we live in the objective down-to-earth world, with which Wang's "innate knowledge" is out of touch. Hence, the "difficulty" with Wang's proposal.

Wang's *chih liang-chih* was proposed precisely to break us away from this mistaken dualistic mentality. Wang's is a dynamics of all-comprehending monism. It is the monistic dynamism of *chih* (extension) inherent within the *liang-chih* that gives it the homo-cosmic momentum.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

The dynamic morphology of *chih* (extension) goes on two levels, i. e., my "oneness" of knowledge and action, and myself forming "one body" with Heaven, Earth, and myriad of things (*yü ti'en-ti wan-wu wei i-t'i* 與天地萬物爲一體).

First, unity of knowledge and action follows directly from the nature of one's inherent knowledge (*liang-chih*) as Wang understands it. Usually when we know something we mean we know that something is the case; we the knower possess the knowledge which is something different if not separate from us the knower. But Wang's "knowledge" is our knowing *loving* our parents and respecting our elders since our childhood, and our immediate *liking* of the good (loving parents, respecting elders). Neither knowing-loving nor knowing-liking is "knowing something"; it is instead akin to intimate awareness, as in being aware of pain and pleasure. Such an awareness is intimate (innermost) and immediate (unreflective); it is inherent and innate in us. We now understand that in this intimate inherent context of innate knowledge, to know *is* to act on it, that is, to know loving *is* to love, in the same sense as to know pain *is* to be in pain and scream. This is what Wang means by oneness of knowledge and action; this active, ethical and pragmatic monism clearly has nothing to do with mystical subjectivism that many contemporary scholars visualized.

From this understanding of unity of knowledge and action follows immediately the one-body-ness with myriad things and the universe. For if knowing is knowing-loving, which is a co-resonance of sensitive mutuality with others, knowing-acting is already interactive with other beings. And since knowing has no limit, acting out of sensitive mutuality has no limit, hence I innately act out to form one body with all beings in the universe and with the universe itself.

The "cash value" as it were of this pragmatic universal monism is quite clear; such knowledge-act synonymy and me-everything oneness pays us an immediate dividends of managing the world (*ching shih*, 經世),

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

putting the world in sociopolitical order. As innate knowledge has an immediate impact on action that immediately forms one body with all beings, so innate knowledge has an immediate extension in political governance and socioeconomic management. This is well expressed by Lu Chiu-yüan(陸九淵, Hsiang-shan 象山, 1139-1193), Wang's distinguished precursor, when he said that "even when Confucians reach to where there is neither sound nor smell, neither place nor form, they always give priority to putting the world in order." [30] Wang's "innate knowledge" (*liang-chih*), deeply embedded in our subjectivity, inevitably and immediately "expands" (*chih*) to sociopolitical governance. World governance is solidly firmed up by one's innate knowledge that is action of personal mutuality; world governance draws out and fulfills the innate universal nisus of the self, enriching personal subjectivity symbiotically. Thus Wang's *chih liang-chih* is both subjective and other-directed, both ingrained and cosmic. This explanation renders otiose "difficulty" of Wang's irrelevance to the world today.

(b) Our second response to the charge of Wang's irrelevance immediately follows from the above. The basic model in our present-day sociopolitical maneuvers in Taiwan is a picture of random, lonesome, and hermetically sealed "dots" (not even monads which at least mirror one another) randomly pushing and pulling one other around with short-sighted plans. This model produces mere stopgap paste-overs of problems, and in the final analysis, ad hoc evasions of a total collapse; the model can never produce stable, lasting and fundamental solutions. Nothing is more urgently relevant to such desperate situation of today than Wang's radical

[30]From Lu's first letter to Wang Shun-po. Lu Chiu-yüan, ***Lu Chiu-yüan Chi***, Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1980, p. 17. Translation of Wing-tsit Chan in ***A Sourcebook in Chinese Philosophy***, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963, p. 576, adapted in Conrad Shirokauer and Robert P. Hymes eds., *Ordering The World : Approaches to State and Society in Sung China* (Berkeley : University of California Press, 1993) ,p. 1.

thesis, *chih liang-chih*, that is neither an absolute religion nor a sociopolitical ideology. Wang's is not a fad but a fundamental proposal to fulfill what Karl Marx dreamed but failed, "to change the world."

2. Let us now consider our proposed difficulties which can be reduced to three main points: that Wang's thesis is so remote and ancient, that many have been proposed, tried and failed, and that we already have too many isms in Taiwan today.

Our responses are four in number: First, such a stance as this, expressed in those three points, is suicidal. Santayana's polite quip, "Those who refuse to learn from history are condemned to repeat it," means a muffled but awesome warning. "Repeating" here means to be stuck in the old gutter of the decrepit past, a horrendously suicidal irony because the refusal originates in a desire to pull out of the past to push ahead.

Secondly, we must realize that *all* our solutions and new visions, without exception, came of learning from history. To learn from history in this case is to inherit Wang's proposal by adapting and adjusting it to today. Only at our own peril can we put his thesis out of court just because he is historical.

Thirdly, therefore we cannot say that since a past thesis has been tried and was not too successful, we can bypass it. Instead we should say that since it was tried then, we should try it again in a *new* way, learning from the past experience, as long as we deem it *worthwhile*. The question is not whether a past proposal is to be adopted for today's problems, but which one deserves to be, and how. Wang has a proposal full of virulent extroverted individualism that respects everyone, both myself and all others. This version of individualism radically differs from timid, hostile, and self-sealed egoism parading under the name of "individualism" and its no less timid ad hoc compromise by short-lived calculative management. In contrast, various flexible sociopolitical policies can be designed on the basis of Wang's proposal firmly ingrained in the heart of *each* individual and, at the

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫

same time, expands all over ecologically among *all* beings.

Finally, practicability of the above point is made plausible by four phenomena in Wang's days that parallel ours. According to Professor Ōkada Takehiko（岡田武彦, 1908-）, Wang's days saw a rise of emphases on individuality and naturalism that rejected shackles of social ritual-convention and institution; this parallels today's cult of individual freedom against oppressive sociality. Besides, Wang's period was that of anti-feudalism and pro-progress; its parallel to today is unmistakable. Moreover, pluralism of views and religions was rampant, so much so that various efforts at syncretistic unification were manifested; Taiwan today also bustles with pluralism of alternative ideological proposals and commercial-industrial enterprises for social ills. Wang's thesis, with its respect for inherent individuality, would be a powerful initiative to "promote private sectors" so much insisted upon today. Finally, there were an explosion of publications of moralistic tracts (*shan shu*, 善書) urging people to behave, paralleling the booming publishing businesses in Taiwan today, contributing much to promotion of popular culture (*shomin bunka*, *shu-min wen-hua*, 庶民文化).[31] The point is clear. Wang proposed his thesis to target precisely such an ethos of his times; his times parallel ours. Wang's proposal is appropriate for our days.

Now, having said all this above, we see that two key factors remain: *Why* we should adopt Wang's thesis of *chih liang-chih*, and *how* we can adapt it to our Taiwan today.

First, as to *why* we should adopt Wang's proposal. We see five reasons. First, Wang's *chih liang-chih* exhibits the extraordinary quality of rooting itself at the innate core and heart of our being (*liang-chih*), on the one hand, and exploding with the nisus to expand (*chih liang-chih*) itself

[31] Ōkada Takehiko, ***Ō yomei to Min-matsu no Jū gaku*** (Wang Yang-ming and Confucianism in later Ming), Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha, 1970, pp. 17, 23, 25-26.

臺灣人文與社會學術期刊資料庫

throughout the universe, on the other. Wang's thesis is extraordinary in its comprehensiveness; it is subjective-objective, individual-social, philosophical-pragmatic, ethical-sociopolitical, personal-legal, and personal-cosmic. Second, Wang's times parallel today's Taiwan in no less than four aspects, bespeaking the relevance of his thesis to us today. Third, Wang's proposal is that of individualism at its best, inherently expanding to communalism. In the Fourth place, Wang's thesis is democracy at its best, democracy not as a timid compromise among adversarial egoisms, but as an enhancement of individual self-interests *inclusive* of other-sensitivity. Finally, thus Wang's thesis is profoundly appropriate as a launchpad for enhancement of pluralism, a matrix for the co-thriving and cross-fertilization of many alternative ideals and ideologies.

Now, as to *how* we can adapt Wang's thesis of *chih liang-chih* to Taiwan today. We see today two views of ourselves that seem to undermine Wang's thesis of the innateness of our personal knowledge. Freud claims that our Superego, equivalent to Wang's inherent propensity toward the good, is societal in origin, social injunction internalized. Echoing Freud, the deconstructionists claim that all our views and theses are radically sociopolitical, reflecting and floating with the vicissitudes of the times. Both Freud and deconstructionists seem to assume as Kao Tzu (告子) and Locke did that our human nature is a blank slate or a *tabula rasa.*

We can claim that these two parties merely ride on coattails of the ethos of shrinking subjectivity, beleaguered egoism, and mathematical objectifying methodology of "sciences" much in vogue today;[32] their view of socialized ego is the result, not the cause of modern trend of thought.

[32]Professor Ōkada Takehiko blames today's tendency of egoistic, utilitarian and adversarial individualism on the objectifying methodology of sciences, and lamented that today's youth seldom read Wang Yang-ming. See his ***Jukyō Seisin to Gendai***, Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha, 1994, pp. 185-188. There is a grain of truth in this his slightly extreme view.

臺灣大學學術期刊電子資料庫

Therefore, it is all the more necessary for us to heed the radically different thesis Wang has to offer. But all this still remains an interesting *claim* awaiting careful demonstration not only on paper but also in praxis.

Or else, we can turn the table around and enlist Freud and deconstructionists to our aid to solve our own problem, of why that supposedly inevitable, unstoppable universal expansion of co-resonating sensitivity to others often stops at the family level, if our innate other-directed nisus advances at all. We can learn from Freud and deconstructionists on the pervasively permeating sociality at the core of our being and thinking, and see to it that we start at both ends in two opposing directions, from the individual to the social, as Wang did, and from the social to the individual, as Freud and deconstructionists do. This would be another demonstration of Wang's feasibility and practicability.

And the above twofold demonstration, negative and positive ones in relation to Freud and deconstructionists, shall inevitably adapt and adjust Wang's original thesis to fit and benefit our situation in Taiwan today. It is thus that this essay calls on us to adopt Wang's *chih liang-chih*, and calls us to creatively adapt it to the situation in contemporary Taiwan.

臺灣大學學術期刊資料庫