

後新儒家實踐哲學的一個側面——關於「外王—內聖」問題的一些回應

林安梧*

摘要

本論文旨在經由生命實存的為學歷程，回應近三十多年所爭執的「內聖—外王」，以及由「當代新儒學」跨到「後新儒學」的實踐哲學之論題。起先從兩副對聯及一篇短論，開啟對於當代中國思想史的諸多反思，指出「後五四時代」已然來臨。我們應該跨過「方法論的本質主義」的困境，代之以「方法論的約定主義」。正視「自然科學」與「人文學問」其因果性的異同，而正視現代化正朝複數的方式如實而多樣的發展著。我們早該揚棄徹底的反傳統主義，而正視「有人倫的人權，有自覺的自由，有民本的民主」的重要性。當然，我們仍得解開中國政治傳統的根本困結——「道的錯置」，讓「君、父、聖」三者能恰當歸位，並從而確立「天地親君師」所隱含的四個共同體。再者，回溯「內聖外王」的原初結構，並論述其轉化與變遷。最後，則回應「由外王而內聖」的意義何在，這正如同船山所說「無其器則無其道」；當然道器合一、兩端而一致，本體發生學的思維方式是值得重視的。邁入廿一世紀的現代化之後，新儒學之後我們應該跨出主體性哲學的限制，歸返豐富的生活世界，真存實感、啟動參贊，為人類文明的交談盡一份心力。

關鍵詞：儒學、本質主義、約定主義、道的錯置、本體發生學、共同體、兩端而一致

林安梧* 山東大學易學與中國古代哲學研究中心 (limaw2001@gmail.com)

*林安梧，漢族，台灣台中人，祖籍：福建漳州平和。山東大學易學與中國古代哲學研究中心特聘教授、儒學高等研究院合聘教授，台灣元亨書院院長，主要從事中國哲學、比較哲學研究。
基金專案：國家社會科學基金重大專案「近現代中國價值觀念史」(18ZDA020)的研究成果。

壹、問題緣起：從兩副對聯說起

業師牟宗三先生於一九九五年辭世，到今年已經廿八年了。這廿八年來，對我影響最大的仍然是牟先生，與我交談最多的仍然是牟先生。有人說牟先生已經過世了怎麼與你交談呢？我想那就是一種神交古人的方式吧！若要認真說來，那不只牟先生，交談最多的可應該是孔子、孟子、荀子、老子、莊子、釋迦牟尼、蘇格拉底、耶穌基督，乃至古往來今的諸多聖賢哲人。當然，有親切感，並且曾經親自受教，從生前到辭世之後，仍然參與著你的學術生活，最多最多的，那還是牟宗三先生。這是無可懷疑的。

我不是乖學生，我是喜歡發問的學生，我也喜歡我的學生發問，甚至喜歡他們與我爭辯。我相信爭辯有助於思想義理的澄清。我自從學以來，一直是這樣的，但我並不是不願意拳拳服膺，而是知道所有的思想都會走樣，所以要拳拳服膺的並不是文字，而是在文字之後，以及文字之上，文字之外的，有甚於文字，優先於文字的「存在」本身。老子講的好，「道可道，非常道」¹，那宇宙造化之源是可表白的，但一旦表白了，就不是原先的道。西方有所謂「吾愛吾師，吾更愛真理」的論法²，東土也有「當仁，不讓於師」的教言³。學生發揚老師的學說，中間免不了會有變化，甚至轉進，也會有批判，還有創造的可能，這都是很自然的事。在我來講，轉益多師，不只是古訓，更是天經地義的事情。我們說「聖人焉不學，聖人無常師」⁴，就連聖人都要如此認真學習，都要無常師，更何況是我們連賢者都夠不及，那更要努力學習，而且也要無常師。

我這些說法，其實是想鋪陳，目前我很多想法與我的老師牟宗三先生有著很大的差別，但這並不妨礙。我還是尊敬我的老師，家裡牆上掛著老師的像，寫著一副嵌名對聯

「宗師仲尼誠通天地，
三教判列道貫古今」。

這對聯寫的並不十分工整，主要能顯其義蘊就是了，要工整起來，又恐怕以辭害義。那就不划算了。這副對聯是牟先生過世時寫的其中一對。這一對是為佛光大學南

¹ 語出老子《道德經》第一章。

² 亞里士多德（Aristotle）這句話，吾愛吾師，吾更愛真理（Plato is dear to me, but dearer still is truth.），大家耳熟能詳，也引發不少討論，儘管有些異同，但總的來說，事說明了「追求真理」的優先性。

³ 出自《論語》〈衛靈公〉篇，這說的是「當著仁德，不必謙讓於老師」。這與「吾愛吾師，吾更愛真理」形成對比。他重視的是「仁愛的感通」（前者），後者則重視的是「真理的確定」。請參見林安梧《論語聖經譯解：慧命與心法》，2019，台北：台灣學生書局，頁428。

⁴ 出自《論語》〈子張〉篇「衛公孫朝問於子貢曰：『仲尼焉學？』子貢曰：『文武之道，未墜於地，在人。賢者識其大者，不賢者識其小者，莫不有文武之道焉。夫子焉不學？而亦何常師之有？』」，請參見林安梧[前揭書]，頁520-521。

華管理學院(南華大學)寫的。另一對是以我自己的身分寫的，這對聯是這樣的：

「夫子飄飄來魏晉風骨好為青白眼世俗人皆驚寵辱，
吾師悠悠去宋明義理能過生死關真儒者何畏陰陽。」(林安梧，2003b)⁵

顯然地，前一對聯是就「文化、思想、學術」的公共領域著墨者多，後一對聯是就「從師問學、生命風格」，比較起來是我自己的體會者多。就從這兩副對聯說起吧！

牟宗三先生的確是「宗師仲尼」是儒教（儒家）教化的學問傳承者、創建者，他秉承的學問根柢是「誠」，而這「誠」是通天接地的。牟先生仍然守著華夏「天地人」的老傳統，不過他更強調「人之為人」的主體性，把道德的主體性提到最為優位的地步。這主要是繼承著陸王心學以來的傳統，不過，他又受到西方近代以來啟蒙思想的影響，更加重了這主體性的理性成分，當然它更著重的是道德理性。他經由康德學的全面消化，揉合了西方哲學的傳統，以及中國哲學中儒道佛三教的智慧精華，成就了他自家的哲學思想。《現象與物自身》、《圓善論》⁶可以說是他的學問顛峰之作（金貞姬，2020）。他是把「誠通天地」這實踐的學問，講成了一整套學問，講得最為哲學，而且是與西方哲學可以相比擬的現代哲學家。

「三教判列」，牟先生不只是儒學的學者，他也深通道家、佛教，而且深度、高度，還可能在許多所謂道家、佛家學者之上的⁷。正因如此，他才可能展開宏偉的「判教」（分判教相）的活動。牟先生對儒道佛三教的分判，仍然是以儒家為本位的，這當然在所難免。但他已經早超越了宋明儒者的「闢佛老」的方式。老實說，宋明儒者闢佛老，多有過激的抵斥之言，對於佛老真有深入理解，又心平氣和，願意好好傾聽的，並不是沒有，但還真的不多。據實來說，從宋明諸儒，到王船山已經是一大進境，由王船山到熊十力，又是一大進境。由熊十力到牟宗三，又是一大進境，這一大進境，是更為超邁地，且較為客觀地，並且能用現代哲學的表述方式，以體系性的、較為全面地哲學的建構，展開其分判。

當然，這樣的學問，必然是要求「道貫古今」的，智慧不能自家限制了，不能只是在地的，而且要由在地通向全世界的。不是全球化（globalization），而且更是在地全球化（glocalization）。這些年來，還聽聞到說儒家所說的真理普世性不足，還有人問我看

⁵ 以上這兩副對聯，請參看林安梧〈迎接「後牟宗三時代」的來臨——《牟宗三先生全集》出版紀念〉，《鵝湖月刊》第28卷第11期，總第335期，[社論]，2003年5月。

⁶ 據《現象與物自身》全集本編校說明（金貞姬），《現象與物自身》1975年8月，由台灣學生書局出版。1985年《圓善論》由台灣學生書局出版，完成了牟先生的哲學系統。以上見《牟宗三先生全集》第21冊，也見於第32冊《牟宗三先生著作編年目錄》，頁39、52，2020年12月二版；台北：聯經出版公司。

⁷ 其實，當代新儒家的治學風格是融通統貫的，一方面深於中國哲學儒道佛三家思想，一方面也通過西方哲學，乃至印度哲學，這方面除了牟宗三先生以外，唐君毅先生更是如此。他們之作為哲學家，而不只是哲學的專業從業人員，這與當前的學術客觀研究，專業有餘而通識不足，是大相逕庭的。

法如何。我說，我們之所說當然是要朝向普世來說，但凡是人之所說便有限制，最好是好好地面對我們的限制，而且要相信，我們東方的儒道佛三教當然是朝向普世真理邁進的。儒道佛三教他們之所說是普遍的、是能遍及於天地人我萬物一切的（陳來，2005）⁸。不過，只要一落為文字便有他的限制。正因如此，這三教的經典從來就不宣稱「我就是真理、道路、生命」（林安梧，2020）⁹。「話語的論定」是有限的，唯有跨過話語的論定，回到存在本身，讓存在彰顯其自己，這樣才可能交光互網。

貳、從「迎接『後牟宗三時代』的來臨」說起

《牟宗三全集》總共三十三冊，2003年5月4日出版，在牟先生過世後八年出版，特別挑在五月四日，我想是很有意義的。牟先生是五四之子，卻是反對五四的，這反有幾層：反對的反，反省的反，回返的反，這三層都有。牟先生生長的年代，在北大就學的年代（1929-1933），已經是五四以後了，但中國從一九一九年以後，直到現在仍然身受這次運動的影響。用我的區分方式，有：五四、五四後、後五四，這三個階段。牟先生應該屬於從「五四」到「五四後」，我們則是「五四後」到「後五四」。牟先生並不同意五四的徹底反傳統主義，但無疑地，他的學問主要是回應五四的，他反對五四的徹底反傳統主義，但多少又被這徹底的反傳統主義襲擊到，而且要反對、反省，提出批判，而提出新的轉進方式，進而由此轉進而有了嶄新的創造（林安梧，2020）¹⁰。

前兩代的當代新儒家其實都是在這主要脈絡下進行其思考的。第一代的梁漱溟、馬一浮、熊十力是如此，第二代的唐君毅、牟宗三、徐復觀也是如此。第一代傳統成分多一些，第二代現代成分多一些些。第一代，熊十力、馬一浮的論述方式比較是傳統的表述方式，對西方的學術有些反思，但仍以傳統為主導。梁漱溟比較是建立在自己的生活世界，以及通向全世界文明的總思考，他主要是個實際運用、身體力行的思想家。對於民主、科學理解並不全面，但也不是全盤的接受。第二代唐君毅、牟宗三、徐復觀，因為四九之後轉到了香港與台灣，被稱為港台新儒家。

總的來說，唐、牟、徐，三位先生基本上全盤肯定民主、科學，這樣的現代化方式。他們的主要議題是回應「徹底的反傳統主義者」（totalistic anti-traditionalism）（林毓生，

⁸ 陳來曾有〈儒學的普遍性與地域性〉的討論（刊於《天津社會科學》，2005年第03期），這篇文章寫得小心翼翼，這正反應一百餘年來，我們一直在文化的次殖民地中長育著，這樣所造成的限制。其實廿一世紀應該是跨出這個限制的年代了。

⁹ 語出基督宗教《聖經》新約全書《約翰福音》14:6 CCB，原文為「耶穌說：『我就是道路、真理、生命，若不藉著我，沒有人能到父那裡。』」這與東方儒道佛三教的精神大異其趣，一神論的宗教為「信靠的宗教」，而東土儒道佛三教則為「覺性的宗教」，請參見林安梧〈克服「修昔底德陷阱」：關於學術殖民與本土化問題的一些反思——黃光國〈本土化學術的研究發表與展望〉讀後〉，台北：《本土諮商心理學學刊》，2020年，11卷4期，37-58頁。

¹⁰ 關於此，請參看林安梧〈從「五四後」到「後五四」：基於「存有三態論」思考中華文明在21世紀的角色〉，山東濟南《文史哲》，2020年第2期，頁93-102。

1979)¹¹，但他們與敵對的陣營有一點是一樣的，對於現代化的民主與科學，基本上是全盤接受的，都認為西方是先進的、進步的文明，華族應該努力的學習，要迎頭趕上。所不同的是，徹底的反傳統主義者認為要全盤西化，要迎進來德先生(民主)(democracy)、賽先生(科學)(science)，就得把傳統洗脫淨盡，徹底清除。當代新儒家，後來也稱之為新保守主義者，或文化的保守主義者，新傳統主義者，則以為中國傳統文化並不妨礙現代化，只不過要做一番轉化，由此轉化便能接納現代化，接榫現代化。所謂的「返本開新」，回到傳統的本質裡，在尋求這本質的轉化，讓他能與現代化接軌。他們認為傳統太過於強調內聖了，而忽略了外王，因此要「本內聖而開出新外王」(李明輝，2003；林安梧，2004)。¹²內聖學沒問題，只是外王學還趕不上。內聖學主要強調的是良知本心，由於太強調本心良知了，所以忽略了外王的發展，而新外王的發展是以知識為中心的。內聖學是以本心良知為中心的，新的外王學是以知識系統的為中心的，最大的議題是如何從本心良知轉出知識系統。他們花了許多功夫，終於肯定地說，是可以的開出的，只要經由「良知的自我坎陷」開出「知性主體」就可以與西方的現代化熔接在一起了，中國人就可以開出現代化了。

港台新儒家的學問之轉進與開出，主要就是針對這樣的議題而來，他們主張要由舊內聖，本此舊內聖而開出新外王，用學術的系統語彙來說，就是，由良知的自我坎陷，開出知性主體，由此知性主體而開出民主科學，民主科學就是現代化的內容。他們認為現代化的內容是普世的，西方先進國家是走在前面的，我們要迎頭趕上。他們對於現代化基本上是全盤接受的，偶或有些批評，但仍然是現代性的思維方式。新傳統主義的、徹底反傳統主義的，這兩方陣營看似敵對，但他們都全面肯定了西方現代化的基本內容，所不同的是對於中國傳統文化，一個認為應該保存，並且返本可以開新，可以轉化的創造；一個認為應該徹底揚棄，揚棄了才能真正迎進德先生、賽先生。

不過，他們一樣都採用了方法論上的本質主義，一個說中國文化傳統本質上並不妨礙現代化，另一個說中國文化傳統，其本質上是徹底妨礙現代化的。須知：依著本質主義的方法論來思考，極容易陷入片面性，兩者相較，徹底的反傳統主義的片面性則更為嚴重。因為，他們握有較大的勢頭，須知握有愈大勢頭的，愈會走向片面性、甚至專斷、專制，乃至極權。當代新儒學之作為新傳統主義者，最可貴的是對於這樣的徹底反傳統主義，提出另一個相對反的主張。但方法上，兩者則是同一個對立面的兩端。做個比喻，

¹¹ “totalistic anti-traditionalism”，也有翻譯成「全盤性反傳統主義」，請參見林毓生《中國意識的危機：五四時期激烈的反傳統主義》(The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness)，1979年出版後即引起多方討論，後來也有兩個不同譯本，後來在2020年有個較為完整的「重譯本」，由台北：聯經出版公司出版，譯者為郭亞珮、王遠義、楊芳燕、傅可暢、楊貞德、劉慧娟、劉唐芬，多半為林毓生的弟子，這部重譯本，林毓生也寫了新的中文版序，是更為可信的。

¹² 關於這方面的討論可以說是汗牛充棟了，有代表性的兩端是李明輝與林安梧，請參見李明輝〈由內聖向外王的轉折——現代新儒家的政治哲學〉，2003年9月，《中國文哲研究集刊》第23期，頁337-350，中央研究院中國文哲研究所。林安梧〈後新儒學的新思考：從「外王」到「內聖」——以「社會公義」論為核心的儒學可能〉，2004年8月，《鵝湖月刊》350期，頁16-25。

就像數學上所說的「A」與「非A」，取其絕對值，都是「A」。

參、解開「方法論的本質主義」的困境

從上個世紀九零年代初，我就一再呼籲，我們應該解開方法論的本質主義（methodological essentialism）的困境。我這呼籲並不意味著我忽略了事物本質的認取，而是強調我們不能陷溺成為一種偏至化、教條化、專制化的偏向。要留意到，我們去說這個世界，當然必須經由語言文字圖像來說，但這只是個定位系統，並不是存在本身。因此，任何有所說，都得回到存在自身去檢覈，這檢覈也不是固定的，它是在不斷的檢覈過程中，而趨近於適當而已。顯然地，這樣的方法論並不同於本質主義，他可以姑且稱之為「方法論上的約定主義」（methodological conventionalism）（林安梧，1996/2016）¹³。我們之定位，並不是恆定的，而是約定的，這樣的約定，為的是在展開存在的敘述與定位，必須要不斷地經過檢覈，在檢覈中能更趨近於事實，能取得大家所共識下的定位，不過共識又得不斷的經過循環往復的檢覈。絕對不能夠「一錘定音」，就此了得。即使必要時，一錘定音，那也只是一種權變法門，不能當真。也可能某個階段是真，但另一個階段他就不是那個樣子了。

生命是在生長著的，是變動遷流的，在變動遷流中，我們用語言文字去描述定位，這只是方便我們的敘述與討論而已。在這敘述與討論過程中，讓我們能有更深一層的理解，有更適當的詮釋，也因此可以找尋到較為適當的實踐解方。正因如此，我們的學問必須要時時刻刻能返歸到存在本身，而所謂的返歸是不斷的交互過程，在交互過程中，更為適當的接近而已。這也就是說，我們必須「江山代有才人出」地，時刻去反思過去，去瞻望未來，隨時隨刻，必須做出更為深沉的回返到存在之所依憑。這樣的活動，是必須一代一代，一直做下去，「苟日新、日日新、又日新」¹⁴所說庶幾近之。我們論及《易經》，講「易有三易，簡易、變易，不易也」¹⁵，把這道理講的很是透徹（林安梧，1991）。

「方法論上的本質主義」的思考方式，陷入嚴重的困境，造成極端的專制、以及權力的集中所造成的嚴重的極權，在卡爾·波柏爾（Popper, 1945/2020）的論述裡指出這些都是

¹³ 反對方法論上的本質主義，大體說來是我在上個世紀八零年代在台大碩士班時，於林正弘教授的課堂上，經由卡爾·波柏爾（Karl Popper）的學習而來的，後來在威斯康辛大學做訪問學者時，與林毓生教授時相往來，深受教益，我在一九九四年寫成《儒學與中國傳統社會的哲學省察：以血緣性縱貫軸為核心的展開》一書（此書原來由台北：幼獅文化出版公司，於1996年出版；後來又增版，加了一半內容，更名為《血緣性縱貫軸：解開帝制、重建儒學》，由台北：台灣學生書局，於2016年出版），我可以被定位為是「方法論的本質主義」的反對者。基本上，我是反對教條主義的，特別是那些努力的反教條主義的教條主義者，是我最所警惕，最所揪心的。

¹⁴ 語出《禮記》〈大學〉。

¹⁵ 語出《易緯乾鑿度》：「易一名而含三義，所謂易也，變易也，不易也。」歷代哲學家裡，將天道論、人性論、實踐論，在這易有三義：簡易、變易、不易的思考範疇裡，發揮得最為詳盡的可以說是王船山。特別是他「兩端而一致」的思考，辯證地開啟了一套完整的人性史哲學，請參看林安梧《王船山人性史哲學之研究》，1991年再版，台北：東大圖書公司。

開放社會的敵人¹⁶。他對於邏輯實證論的檢證原則（the principle of verification，或譯為「證成原則」）提出了嚴厲的批評。在他的科學哲學的深層思考裡，提出了「證偽原則」（the principle of falsification，或譯為「否認原則」），來取代原先的檢證原則（林正弘，2007）¹⁷。這檢證原則是關聯到方法論上的本質主義的，而證偽原則則是關連到方法論上的約定主義的。我們可以說是方法論上的本質主義容易墮入封閉性的思考，方法論上的約定主義者則採取的是開放性的思考（林安梧，1997）¹⁸。當然，也會因為太過於開放，而流蕩無所歸。這兩端要都能照顧到，才是比較周全的。

其實，「本質」這個詞，在學問的討論上是不可避免的，但不能將他主張成不可變易的，將它視為永世不遷的，那就不行。名稱只是約定，但這名稱是要指向真實的，儘管這真實不是當下可以認取，但我們總要肯定的，當然這肯定仍然是約定意義下的肯定，不是果真就只是那唯一的被論定。華人自古以來就強調要「實事求是」，所說正是這道理。有實事焉，但人之所是，只是人之所求的是，並不是果真僅只是這樣的是。正因如此，帶有著開放性的思考，要求自己不斷的要檢覈，要日新又新、要精益求精。這樣的「是而非之」，又「非之而是」，不斷檢覈；而不掉入「我是彼非」，是其所是，非其所非，的自我困境裡（錢，2017）¹⁹。因為清楚到所說的「是」是你所「求」的「是」，不就是事實的「是」，因此要對這「是」不斷地提出檢覈，最後才使的那「事實」庶幾近之。

這問題想清楚了，我們就可以對於像胡適之提出的「大膽的假設，小心的求證」這樣的方法論口號，提出反思與批評（林正弘，1991）²⁰。你仔細的思考，這方法論口號是有嚴重缺失的。他的基本思考不出邏輯實證論的檢證原則，這是封閉性的思考。相對於此口號，你如果用的是「小心的假設，大膽的求證偽」，那就形成另一個對比，這樣的對比將有助於你突破原先的封閉性。我且用一則自己親身的經歷，讓這兩端的對比能顯得更清楚。約莫六、七歲時，家居鄉下，剛買了「收音機」，那時收音機不是電晶體的收音機，而是真空管的收音機。鄉下條件較差，買了收音機，那可不得了，整村子的人看這收音機可稀罕得很，可以說是望之如神物，大人更是不讓小孩去動他。父親更是三令五申，要我不能去動它，一動了它，便會遭受嚴重的懲罰。有趣的是，你愈是禁止，小

¹⁶ 《開放社會及其敵人》1945年出版後，旋即轟動西方學界，奠定了波柏爾（另譯為：波普）無論在左派或右派都屹立不搖的劃時代地位。值得注意的是，波柏爾也強調：開放社會的敵人，同樣會打著「開放」旗幟，而行專制之實。只有清晰分辨這種虛偽，肯定理性與自由，才能在政治、社會制度以及種種問題上，求得實際合理的根本解決，並創造出更理想的未來。該書由莊文瑞、李英明翻譯，2020年，台北：商周出版。

¹⁷ 請參見林正弘〈卡爾·波柏與當代科學哲學的蛻變〉，臺北市（1985.11），國立臺灣大學創校四十周年國際中國哲學研討會論文集，p.403-420，後收錄於2007年出版的書《伽利略·波柏·科學說明》。

¹⁸ 關於此，請參看林安梧《契約、自由與歷史性思維》第九章〈論歷史主義與歷史定論主義：波柏爾《歷史定論主義的窮困》之理解與詮釋〉一文，頁167-182，1997年再版，台北：黎明文化事業公司印行。

¹⁹ 早在《莊子》的〈齊物論〉於此又有深刻的洞見。請參見錢穆《莊子纂箋》，頁6-23，2017年六版七刷，台北：東大圖書公司。

²⁰ 請參見林正弘〈胡適的科學主義〉頁197-211，收在周策縱／唐德剛等《胡適與近代中國》，1991年，台北：時報文化。

孩愈是孽，就想去動。想去動，就會看大人怎麼打開電源的，記起來，準備適當時機時行動。我挑了一個父母都不在時，去動它。起先我扭了第一個鈕，那是管電源的。電源打開，奇怪，怎麼聲音不響，我急得扭動另外一個鈕，那扭驅動了指針，是選台的指針。扭著、扭著，指針到了 5、6 的地方，聲音居然響起來了。我於是「大膽的假設」開收音機的方法，是扭開了電源之後，要在扭動另外一個扭，那是選台的扭，扭到 5、6 的地方，聲音就會響了，這是完善的開機啟動方法。就這樣，我做了「大膽的假設」之後，我真是「小心的求證」，正因為我都仔細而小心翼翼的求證，果真每次開機都成功。又因為這樣的成功，讓我不疑有它的認定為開機就這樣動作的。

約莫過了一、兩年，我都偷偷地這樣去開啟這收音機，每次都屢試不爽，準確無誤。直到有一次，我正偷偷開啟這收音機的電源，聽到遠方傳來父親的呼喊聲，父親的威嚴一向令我驚駭，這呼喊頗為急切，我就愈發害怕，便立馬朝父親的呼喊聲衝過去。原來一群小雞小鴨跑進了剛播好秧苗的水田，會踩踏到秧苗，讓秧苗損傷，須得有人趕忙去把這群小雞小鴨趕上來。喊了我去，趕雞趕鴨，火速緊急，過一會兒工夫，雞鴨回圈子去了，我又趕回客廳，要完成還沒完成的收音機開機動作。趕了回來，見到收音機，它竟然已經響了起來；我整個人愣在那裏，被那情景驚住了。原來，以前我仔仔細細的開機動作，打開電源，扭動轉台指針到 5、6 之間，這樣的完美動作卻是有問題的。其實，只要打開電源，等一下子，後來知道，要讓它真空管熱了，才能傳導，便能發出聲音來。我說的故事，正是「大膽的假設，小心的求證」這方法論口號的可能嚴重錯誤。從這方法論的誤用，深入來看，就可以了解到台灣胡適之以降的一派史學其成就如何了（楊貞德，1994）²¹。

相對來說，我若是「小心的假設」，想說：這收音機的開機方式，有可能是這樣，打開電源，扭動轉台指針到 5、6 之間，但這只是暫時姑且的認定，它有可能不是這樣，我可以試試看，而且要打膽地想，有可能不是這樣。不只大膽地想，而且大膽嘗試，不照原先的假設，哈！可能就找到了別的開機方式，最後多方檢覈，找到了。原來，只需要把電源打開就可以了。這過程便是「小心的假設，大膽的求證偽」。「大膽的假設，小心的求證」，在方法論上的本質主義的驅策下，會走向封閉。相較說來，「小心的假設，大膽的求證偽」，在方法論上的約定主義的驅動下，才會去思考更多可能。也才能找到更適合的方式。「實事求是」是必要的。

肆、「自然科學的因果性」與「人文學問的因果性」

自然科學上的實事求是，並不同於人文學問的實事求是。前者，可以把人與情境的

²¹ 關於此，請參見楊貞德：〈胡適科學方法觀論析〉，1994 年，中央研究院《中國文哲研究集刊》，5 期，頁 129-154。

因素排除，而且可以反覆的驗證。後者，人與情境的因素，乃至其他涉及於人的、時間的、空間的，種種因素都會介入，而且這樣的介入與發展，無法反覆驗證。簡單的區分，前者是不涉及於人這個主體的，後者則涉及於人這個主體的。前者可以排出時空因素，後者是無法排除時空因素的。前者可以反覆驗證，後者不能反覆驗證。這樣便出現了兩種因果性，前者，姑且名之為「自然科學的因果性」；後者，姑且名之為「人文科學的因果性」(林安梧，2009)²²。前者，自然科學的因果性，我們說他是一種外延的因果性，可以稱之為「科學的驗證」，科學的驗證包括了經驗的驗證，以及理論的論證。後者，人文科學的因果性，則是內容的因果性，他的驗證是不能重複的，所謂「時不再來」便是，他不是共時性的，他是歷時性的，他不叫驗證，他只能叫證據。這證據用來做成的是「人文的詮釋」(humanistic interpretation)，而不是「科學的說明」(scientific explanation)。

人文的詮釋在歷時性下展開，由於他不能像自然科學一樣重複驗證，但人們還是習慣於一種因果性的把握，我們會說「後之視今，如今之視昔」²³。今之所受，是由前之所作而來；今之所作，當會有後之所受。這「作—受」的邏輯是很重要的。我們講到人文的詮釋，講到歷史的發展，都離不開這「作—受」的邏輯。關於「作—受」的邏輯，你又如何要展開這樣的行動呢？因為，後之視今，如今之視昔，以前所造成的，現在結果，這樣的「作—受」已經讓我有所警惕，有所借鏡，我從這裡得到了教訓，我總結了一些理解與詮釋，因此，在「作—受」的邏輯下，我思慮抉擇了在未來的「作—受」下，我將可能如何達到所確立的「終點」，由這「終點」啟動我現在該有的「起點」方向。總的來說，我們希望的是現在好好作，以後就會有好受的；若現在作不好，或不好好作，或是方向錯了，以後就沒得好受。再者，人文的學問與自然科學的學問，並不是截然分開的，人文學問必然涉及於自然科學，只是他是用人文的方式來涉及於自然科學的。

因為自然科學必須置放在人文的實踐歷程中展開，才会有發生巨大的人文影響。比如說，如何發展出核子電能，這可真是自然科學，但要不要發展核子電能，這要不要就是人文學問。有了核子電能，如何運作，要如何管理，這一樣是人文學問。要發展核子電能，有沒有些文化的特殊因素，會讓他發展得更快，或者更慢，甚至是反對他的發展，這當然也是人文的學問。人文學問簡單的說，涉及到生命的，活生生的，不可避免的；而自然科學簡單的說，是要把這些涉及，極力地撇清，或者用非生命的、攝質歸量的方式來處理。

這些問題作了適度的釐清，之後，我們可以進一步來想想，一個多世紀以來，清末民初，以至現在，這段近現代歷史的發展軌跡如何。尤其我們最常聽到的是中國傳統文化與現代化的論題：中國傳統文化果真妨礙現代化嗎？如果是妨礙了那該如何，如果不

²² 關於此，請參看林安梧《中國人文詮釋學》第一章〈人文學、社會科學與自然科學之異同〉，頁 1-38，2009 年，台北：台灣學生書局。

²³ 原文出自王羲之的《蘭亭集序》(西元 353 年)，原文「後之視今，亦猶今之視昔」，這話常被引用，它帶有深刻的歷史哲學的意味。

妨礙，那又該如何解釋，我們怎麼落後於西方的現代化呢？中國文化沒有發展出西方的現代化思維，是我們整個文化的必然結果嗎？是本質上就發展不出來的嗎？還是只是某些歷史因素造成的，排出了這些歷史因素，也就可以發展了。那又如何排除呢？是逐漸的演進呢？還是需要徹底的革命呢？這些問題，從十九世紀末，二十世紀初，就一直被提到檯面上來討論、爭議、辯論，甚至在政治實踐上大打出手，不顧天下蒼生、血流成河。跌跌撞撞，坎坎坷坷，終於度過了百餘年，進到二十一世紀了，時局儘管還詭譎萬分，但雲霧漸開，我們已經有機會重新來反思這一大段歷史了。這便涉及到幾個關鍵詞：中國文化、內聖、現代化、外王、本心、良知、知識、合理性。

顯然地，自然科學的因果性與人文學問的因果性，大相逕庭，最大的不同是人文學問必然涉及於人的「自由意志」的問題，這是自然科學所沒有的（林安梧，2009）²⁴。一涉及於自由意志，那許多參數便無法用計量的方式去算計出來。就因為人文學問無法像自然科學那樣的「攝質歸量」，儘管某些層面仍然可以「攝質歸量」，但終極處是無法這樣執行的。這問題講明了，我們就可以知道，一種科學主義式的思考，誤以為一切可以銷歸於量來處理，一切都可以很科學的來處理，這是不可能。科學這「賽先生」其實終極來說，是不可能「賽」過「先生」的，「先生」必定要「賽」過他的，畢竟「先生」才是真正的主人。民主這「德先生」，終其極來說，不能只是選舉、罷免就可了事的，並不是制約平衡（checks and balances），就可了事的（Montesquieu, 1748/1998）²⁵。因為如果沒有「德性」作為先行者，那制約平衡到頭來仍然只是權力的傾軋而已。看來，「德先生」果真還是要「德」「先生」。原來，政治是要講道德的。孔老夫子所說的「為政以德，譬如北辰，居其所而眾星共之」，「導之以政，齊之以刑，民免而無恥；導之以德，齊之以禮，有恥且格」（林安梧，2017）²⁶。《尚書》說的「正德、利用、厚生，惟和」，把正德放在最前頭仍然是千古常新的道理²⁷。

伍、如何實踐「有人倫的人權，有自覺的自由，有民本的民主」

這些道理講明了，就可以知道民國以來「徹底的反傳統主義者」，以及作為其對立面的「文化保守主義者」「新傳統主義者」，在那些地方出了嚴重差失了。一直爭議著，中國文化是否妨礙現代化，這根本是毫無意義的。但這論題居然到現在在人文社會科學裡，仍然起著陣陣漣漪，就知道一種錯誤的方法論上的本質主義的思維，這幽魂仍然在天空

²⁴ 請參見同註 22，林安梧前揭書，第一章第十一節，頁 16-18。

²⁵ 早在孟德斯鳩的《法意》（一譯作：論法的精神），就提出行政、立法、司法，三權分立的精神。這本書有多種翻譯，現在以張雁深翻譯的《論法的精神》最為通行，該書於 1998 年，由台北：商務印書館印行。

²⁶ 以上出自《論語》〈為政〉篇，請參見林安梧《論語聖經譯解：慧命與心法》，頁 19-21，2017 年，台北：台灣學生書局。

²⁷ 出自《尚書》〈大禹謨〉，原文為「禹曰：『於！帝念哉！德惟善政，政在養民。火、水、金、木、土、穀，惟修；正德、利用、厚生，惟和；九功惟敘，九敘惟歌。戒之用休，董之用威，勸之以九歌，俾勿壞。』」

中盤旋著、遊蕩著。老實說，從一百多年來的華人發展史，我們可以清楚地看到，追問：中國傳統文化是否妨礙現代化，這根本無意義。所幸的是，並不是所有的人都陷入這爭論之中；在這些爭論看似極端熱鬧的時候，一直有著一批人默默地在進行著全民族拯救的點滴工程，他們有著高卓的志向，有著寬廣的胸襟，有著長遠的眼光，也有著細緻的手路，一直在努力著。他們高舉著實業救國，高舉著興學校、育子弟、喚醒民智、振興民德，在花果飄零下，尋求靈根自植。實事求是，一直是華夏民族非常重要的一個傳統，我常說「孝、悌、慈」這三個字，是華夏民族永生的奧秘（林安梧，2021）²⁸。

這樣子說來，誤以為政治就只是權力的制約平衡，以為能夠通過制度的設計，就可以使得政治免於專制極權，這想得太容易了。特別是到了廿一世紀已經快過了四分之一世紀的現在，我們發現到原先的民主政治的設計，在資本主義的催化下，已經成為高耗能而低產值的一種制度，已經成為有錢的人愈有錢、有勢的人愈有勢，權力名位這些浮於外表的東西成為文化的主流，這傾向隨著網絡的發達，讓這世界簡直是擾攘喧囂，而永無寧日，文化低落、人性頹靡，可以說是到了令人難以置信的地步。當一切都可以商品化，而極力地再經由消費的吹捧，慾望的高張，又將慾望商品化，也讓商品與慾望結成一不可解的牢結，就這樣人們在慾望橫流的商品潮中，自我追逐、自我迷失、自我放逐，往而不復，伊于胡底！

華夏傳統的「人倫」當然不同於近現代西方的「人權」，以前我們的人倫，講的是孝悌，而兩千多年來的孝悌又深深地裹在「君主專制、父權高壓、男性中心」的思考裡，因此我們誤認為「人倫」是專制的、是高壓的、是男性中心的、是父權主義的、是君權至上的，誤以為只要打擊了、打倒了人倫，就可以迎來人權。想想民國以來，有多少所謂啟蒙救亡的知識份子誤認為「孝道」就是「父權」，就是專制，以為打倒孝道，就可以解放了，就可以從父權、專制、極權裡，解放出來了。這想法，著實可笑。打倒了儒家所強調的孝悌人倫，結果是專制還是專制，而且還更專制；極權還是極權，而且更極權。好不容易，熬到今日，終於有個盼頭，這世界果真不是這樣的，原來有了「人倫」，才不會讓「人權」過頭，才能讓人權終有個歸依與念想，原來沒有孝悌人倫的人權會淪落為只是權利的爭奪而已（曾春海，1990）²⁹。

同樣的，如：以賽亞·伯林（Isaiah Berlin）之強調「消極的自由」與「積極的自由」的區別，他強調「消極的自由」在政治社會共同體的建置上是基本而不可或缺的，這樣的自由是不容許被省略的³⁰。相對來說，「積極自由」在政治上是危險的，因為它誘使統

²⁸ 在多次訪談裡，我提到這樣的觀點。最接近的一次是 2021 年 1 月 7 日《博鰲論壇》「新儒商與陽明心學：當代新儒學與新儒商的巔峰對話」，由博鰲儒商論壇理事長、中山大學黎紅雷教授，與臺灣清華大學通識教育中心原主任林安梧教授對話《新儒商與陽明心學》，請參見〈黎紅雷對話林安梧〉，博鰲儒商論壇發佈：2021-06-01。 <https://baike.baidu.com/tashuo/browse/content?id=625561342d44a54116010eed>。

²⁹ 請參見曾春海〈變遷社會中的人倫與人權〉，台北：《哲學與文化》17 卷 9 期（1990/09），頁 846-852

³⁰ 請參見 Berlin, Isaiah. 1969. *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 再者，許國賢〈三種自由觀再探〉，台北：東吳政治學報，30(2)，2012，頁 169-219。

治者「為了自身利益」而削弱人們的消極自由。這些論點使得研究者誤解華夏文化傳統儒道佛三教所說的自由是「積極的自由」，而這是會使得人之作為一個人參與於政治社會共同體的「消極的自由」受到限制，甚至為專制者所利用。當然，專制者、極權者之利用思想、操作思想，那是不在話下的，但果真儒道佛所強調的人的教養與自覺，這自覺就可以理解成所謂的積極的自由嗎？而這樣的積極的自由就會導致統治者的利用嗎？這都不無疑問。再說，如果好好讀清楚了孟子所說的「徒善不足以為政，徒法不能以自行」³¹，知道儒家所強調的「禮、樂、刑、政」³²，大概可以肯定的，有自覺的自由，應該會比沒有自覺的自由，還來得好，而且還來得重要。至於會不會因為太強調積極的自由，而被當權者利用，而使得連「消極性的自由」都被忽略了，那是另外的問題。換言之，不是你把儒道佛三教所說的「自覺」，你所以為的積極的自由，打了下去，就可以真正實現了你所以為的消極的自由。「自由」是要追求的，但若沒有自覺，那追求到的自由，有可能只是權力的鬥爭下的樣態而已，那是無法穩定而如實的生長的。

當然，「民本」並不同於「民主」，這是顯而易見的，華夏文明中的儒家政治思想，如孟子者，可以說是把民本思想發揮到了極致，但畢竟那還不是民主，不過，如果在這個世代，孟子把民本思想發揮於民主政治之中，可能這樣的民主會是一較為健康的民主（陳運星，2004）³³。很明顯地，以前專制政體可以利用民本思想，也可以依著民本思想，讓人民百姓免於水火，讓老百姓能安居樂業；同樣地，現在的民主政體也可以利用民本思想，當然也可以依著民本思想，讓老百姓真正能當家做主，能國泰民安。當然，在民主憲政時代，要利用民本思想，那比起專制時代可要難得些，但要積極的去運用民本，那可真是便利得多了。這也可看出，儒家原先所強調的「民本」，在民主時代，那可真是「長江出三峽」，從此可以江面寬闊，行船安穩。當然因為緩行從容，也可會鬧出泥沙淤塞的問題來。民本是為政的態度，而民主則是制度，有民本的態度，結合著民主的制度，這會是更好的。若是沒有民本，只強調民主，極可能墮入民粹的境域。誤認為儒家的民本是與專制政體緊密結合在一起的，所以把民本思想瓦解了，就可以把專制政體也瓦解了，這思想是極為荒謬的。

到了廿一世紀的現在，我們可以確然無疑地宣稱，不可摒棄人倫談人權，不可摒棄自覺談自由，不可摒棄民本談民主，而要努力地去實踐「有人倫的人權，有自覺的自由，有民本的民主」（林安梧，2018）³⁴。

³¹ 語出《孟子》〈離婁章句上〉，孟子曰：「今有仁心仁聞，而民不被其澤，不可法於後世者，不行先王之道也。故曰：徒善不足以為政，徒法不能以自行。」

³² 語出《禮記》〈樂記〉：「禮節民心，樂和民聲，政以行之，刑以防之，禮樂刑政，四達而不悖，則王道備矣！」

³³ 請參見陳運星〈從民本到民主：儒家政治文化的再生〉，台北：中山人文社會科學期刊，民 93 年 12 月，第十二卷第二期，頁 87-112。

³⁴ 我在多次的講座中提到這些理念，2018 年參加尼山世界文明論壇時，接受訪問也做了此論。人物林安梧：人人都能成為傳統文化傳播的使者（2018/12/25）來源：中國孔子基金會。網址：<https://read01.com/gg2nDyA.html>。

陸、解開「道的錯置」：讓「君、父、聖」三者恰當歸位

這些觀念釐清了，隨著世代的變遷，逐漸被時間澄清了。這時候，我們可能需要去回顧一下，上個世紀七零年代余英時先生提出了「反智論與中國政治傳統」（余英時，1976）³⁵，一時膾炙人口，不過當時就有胡秋原先生提出疑義，他在〈評余英時院士的「反智論與中國政治傳統」〉一文中，指出余先生所說的「反智論」由於誤解英文並作羅織³⁶。這篇文章刊出之後，余先生並沒有回應。我當時初生之犢不畏虎，大學四年級時，給戴璉璋先生的「中國哲學史」期末報告裡，寫了一篇《中國政治傳統中主智、超智與反智的糾結》，這篇文章先在台灣師大的《文風》發表，後來又增修了，刊載在《鵝湖》（林安梧，1979）³⁷。後來，也聽從了高友功先生的話，說余先生很喜歡後輩對他的思想有所批評，也寄給了他，但沒有得到余先生的回應。我想現在重新看胡秋原先生的文章，也重新反思了一下自己的論點，果真還是想說，余英時先生應該可以做個回應，當然余先生已經作古歸天了，無法回應。但是，歷史的發展卻給了回應，很明顯地，胡秋原先生的文章是有道理的。

我重新回想了一下，余先生「反智論與中國政治傳統」的論述，的確給我不少啟發，只是喜好哲學思考的我，認為余先生的論述說得太簡略，而且要說「反智論」的話，並不是說儒家主智論、道家反智論、法家反智論，儒學法家化，之後，也就漆黑一片了，都是「反智論」為主導了。當然，把道家理解成「反智論」，很難論證成功的。道家基本上是「超智」，他強調跨過理智，回到存在本身。道家由於強調「超智」而會有反智的可能導向。儒家雖主智，但仍然有超智一面，也因為如此，才會有反智的可能。當然，最重要的是由周朝的「宗法封建」跨到秦漢的「君主專制」，這是歷史飛躍的進步，卻也墮入了難以拔脫的深淵之中。

反智論是中國傳統政治的一個面向，但不是本質如此。秦漢帝制以下，儒家「聖王」的理想，轉而成了「王聖」的現實。儒家本來主張「聖者為王」，有德行、有智慧、有能力的聖者，應該成為政治社會共同體的統治者，這有點像柏拉圖的哲學王的意思。結果適巧相反，一旦登上了權力的高峰，作為政治社會共同體的最高統治者，就宣稱自己是有德行、有智慧、有能力的聖者了。「聖者當王」的「聖王」，現在異化、扭曲、倒反，

³⁵ 〈反智論與中國政治傳統——論儒、道、法三家政治思想的分野〉一文出自：余英時，《歷史與思想》（台北：聯經出版，1976）。

³⁶ 〈評余英時院士的「反智論與中國政治傳統」：論余先生所說的「反智論」由於誤解英文並作羅織〉此文原刊《中華雜誌》第17卷第191期（1979年6月），係《中華雜誌》發行人胡秋原先生以「編輯部」名義發表。

³⁷ 林安梧〈中國政治傳統中主智、超智與反智的糾結—環繞先秦儒道二家政治思想的試探與考察〉，台北：鵝湖月刊 51期（1979/09），頁2-11。此文後來收入林安梧《道的錯置：中國政治傳統的根本困結》附錄一，頁315-340，2003年8月，台北：台灣學生書局印行。

成了「我為王，我就是聖」，這樣的「王聖」。這我稱之為「道的錯置」(misplaced Dao)。我認為這是中國政治傳統的最大困結，我也為此寫了兩本書。一本是《道的錯置：中國政治傳統的根本困結》、另一本是《血緣性縱貫軸：解開帝制 重建儒學》(林安梧，2003c，2016)³⁸。

解開「道的錯置」才有可能真切地跨出兩千年專制的泥淖，我經由系統脈絡的總體結構分析闡釋，指出「君、父、聖」這三個核心性的概念必須深化理解與詮釋。在君主專制的兩千年傳統裡，「君」是做為政治社會共同體最高階位的頂點，「父」是做為家庭人倫共同體最高階位的頂點，「聖」是做為文化教養共同體最高階位的頂點。這三個共同體必須有其一定的獨立性，也必須有著恰當的關係，如若不然，將會有錯置的問題。兩千年的帝皇專制傳統一切以「君」為核心，把君說成了聖君，把君說成了君父。我們要將「君」，還其為「君」，在民主憲政、公民社會體系下，讓「君」真切的成為「公僕」，總統、總理，都只是個約定的名稱而已。他是接受人民的囑託而有著該盡的責任與義務，他們是有任期的，他們不是永世不遷的。「父」真切的成為父，父慈子孝，能夠把血緣人倫的共同體處理好，因而讓他成為良善的社會政治共同體的基石。「聖」真切的成為聖，道統延續，生生不息，能夠把文化教養共同體處理的日臻完善，日日新、又日新，讓文化綿延、永續流傳。

「君、父、聖」回歸於正位，這三個共同體，政治社會共同體、血緣人倫共同體、文化教養共同體，真切的受到了如實的重視，當然這一切都得回歸到天地自然的共同體。天地自然的共同體、血緣人倫的共同體、政治社會的共同體、文化教養的共同體，這便是我們常說的「天地親君師」五倫(林安梧，2022)³⁹。這四個共同體共同撫育著每一個人的「身心共同體」。把這些關聯起來，則是正心、修身、齊家、治國、平天下。正心之本在誠意，誠意之本在致知，致知之本在格物。這便是《大學》所說的「八目」。在這八條目前，還有五階次(定、靜、安、慮、得)，及三綱領(明明德，親民，止於至善)。其實，大學之教果真是學為大人之學也，是一部非常了不得的政治哲學，是「內聖外王」充實圓滿之教。

柒、「內聖外王」的原初結構及其轉化

既然「內聖外王」是充實圓滿之教，那為什麼我從上個世紀末，要刻意的提出「由外王而內聖」呢？這當然是針對著過度的強調「內聖」學，而要由內聖學開出外王學，

³⁸ 林安梧《道的錯置：中國政治思想的根本困結》，2003年8月，臺北：台灣學生書局。

林安梧《血緣性縱貫軸：解開帝制·重建儒學》，2016年1月，臺北：台灣學生書局。

³⁹ 這些年來，我提及儒學時多從「天地親君師」做「四個共同體」來加以闡釋。最近林安梧〈關於先秦儒學「人性論」的一些討論——以孟子和荀子為核心的展開〉，《齊魯學刊》2022年第1期，第五節「儒家重視的四個共同體——人性論不離「天地親君師」」。

這樣的思路而發的。

其實，把儒家誤解成只是內聖學，而不注重外王學，這根本是錯誤的。甚至有學者還說儒家之所論不及於「公共領域」，而只有涉及於「私自領域」。這真是天大的誤解。《禮記》〈禮運〉所說的「大道之行也，天下為公」，這不是很清楚嗎？當然，論者以為宋明理學有嚴重的內傾，這往內的傾向的確有些因子在，但並不是全然如此。較為嚴重的是，我們將這一大段的思想史都理解成往內傾的向度，這才是更大的問題。

須知：理解與詮釋的活動，與理解者、詮釋者其思想的視域、存在的境遇，有著密切的關聯。清末民初以來，由於中國的積弱不振，急於救亡的啟蒙者，一棒打翻船的，依據著方法論的本質主義思維方式，看到了中國國民性之一斑，以為魯迅筆下的阿 Q，便是中國人的本質樣貌，認為這種樣貌是因為思想之內傾而造成的，而往上一追，發現宋明理學深深的染上了佛教禪宗的色調，說這是陽儒陰釋，說佛法弱了中國，說宋明理學特別是心學一派，常常是「無事袖手談心性，臨危一死報君王」⁴⁰，說他們只強調「心法」，但卻一點「辦法」也沒有。這些論說評點，一再地被擴大，大家慢慢誤解中國文化整個來講是內傾的、早熟的，整個歷史是停滯的，兩三千年來如一日。其實，這些講法並不準確，但這擴大的說法，已經瀰天蓋地，無處不然。

這麼一來，儒學的知識被說成只是地方型的知識，沒達到普世真理的層次，儒學所說的都只是私領域，不及於公領域。依據這說法看來，儒學十足是上不了檯面的，儒學尚且如此，中國其他的小傳統，那更是迷信、落後、茫昧、荒謬。徹底的反傳統主義者認為既然如此，那整個傳統應該全面予以揚棄，中國文明才有新生之可能。其實，只要你翻閱儒家經典，不論四書或五經，或者廿五史，明顯的，以上種種對儒家文明的誤解，那是顯而易見的。但是一百多年來，幾乎所謂進步的啟蒙者，都誤將中國的積弱不振，專制茫昧，都甩鍋給儒家。我認為這便是在所謂的中國近現代的文化意識之危機，是中國人的存在危機，自己的身家性命，存在根基全然被撼動了的狀況下，恍恍然莫知所之的狀況下的錯誤理解（張灝，1978）⁴¹。

這樣的理解視域、存在境域蓋過了一切，這使得急於救亡的啟蒙者，誤以為只要引進了德先生、賽先生，一切就得救了。洋文化是足以救贖整個中國的。在極端的不自信底下，又加上了內憂外患，兵災戰禍，對日抗戰最後雖成了戰勝國，但中華神州卻已經遍地焦土、滿目瘡痍。緊接著國共內戰，一九四九之後，避居香港的當代新儒家們，不免感嘆花果飄零。在「手空空，無一物」的艱難困苦中，「路遙遙，無止境」，在「亂離中，流浪裏」，「餓我體膚勞我精」，儘管如此，「艱險我奮進，困乏我多情」，「千斤擔子兩肩挑，趁青春，結隊向前行」。錢賓四先生所寫的新亞校歌，可見當時之一斑。在這情

⁴⁰「無事袖手談心性，臨危一死報君王」語出顏習齋《存學編》，「宋、元來儒者卻習成婦女態，甚可羞。無事袖手談心性，臨危一死報君王，即為上品矣。豈若真學一復，戶有經濟，使乾坤中永享治安之澤乎！」

⁴¹ 張灝在〈新儒家與當代中國的思想危機〉一文（林鎮國翻譯），有著深切的反思，請參見台北：鵝湖月刊 35 期（1978/05），頁 2-13。

境下，要尋求「靈根自植」何等不容易。

強調「靈根自植」的優先性，上個世紀是確然必要的。不只靈根自植，而且這靈根必須植於天壤之間，必須要有雨露之滋潤，日月光華之輝耀，才得生長。要救亡圖存、要啟明民智、育養民德，都必須得從這靈根自植做起。正如同錢穆所說的，「山巖巖，海深深，地博厚，天高明，人之尊，心之靈。廣大出胸襟，悠久見生成。」⁴²「十萬里，上下四方，俯仰錦繡。五千載今來古往，一片光明，十萬萬神明子孫，東海西海南海北海有聖人。珍重，珍重，這是我新亞精神。」⁴²錢穆、唐君毅、牟宗三、張丕介、徐復觀，等經營的新亞精神，真切的起了「靈根自植」的工作成果。

我以為「天地，山海，人心」這正是中國文化三才者，天地人的傳統，是「天高明、地博厚，人悠久」的傳統⁴³。這是「內聖外王交與參贊而成」的傳統。這傳統早在《莊子》〈天下〉篇，已經暢發其義理（錢穆，2017）⁴⁴。我以為儒道本為同源，後來雖各有所別的發展，但畢竟兩者是同源而互補的（林安梧，2003a）⁴⁵。這內聖外王的結構，是充足而飽滿的。

由於整個近現代中國陷入嚴重的存在意義危機之中，花果飄零，信心的確立是最嚴重的問題。當代新儒學面對著震天嘎響的徹底反傳統主義者的喧囂，他們極力地從宋明儒學的心性本體中，找尋到了儒學的魂魄，努力地重新確立起這民族精神的象徵，思有以「靈根自植」也。當代新儒家由於太強調靈根自植，這「靈根」經由哲學的深度詮釋，它成了形而上的本體，這樣的哲學深度詮釋工作，我名之為「形而上的保存」。既為「形而上的保存」當然也就必要有「形而下的開啟」（林安梧，1995）⁴⁶，本內聖以開出新外王，也就這樣成了一個必然要啟動的實踐力量。

「形而上保存」的是「道德」，而「形而下開啟」的是「知識」，如何以「德」開「智」，如何由「道德」開出「知識」，成了最重要的問題。就這樣如何「本內聖開出新外王」，轉手而為如何由道德開出知識，因此「良知的自我坎陷，以開出知性主體，開出民主科學」，這樣的理論也就應運而生了。牟宗三先生也就在這思考裡，融通三教、會通中西，而締構了他兩層存有論的系統。也在這系統下，提出了「良知的自我坎陷」這膾炙人口的理論（林安梧，1999）⁴⁷，以作為「本內聖以開出新外王」，以完成由形而上的保存到形而下的開啟的歷程。

⁴² 以上所引為錢賓四先生為《新亞校歌》所作歌詞，大約作於1949年，由黃友棣譜曲。

⁴³ 「三才者，天地人」語出《三字經》，而《禮記》〈中庸〉第廿六章「博厚，所以載物也；高明，所以覆物也；悠久，所以成物也。博厚配地，高明配天，悠久無疆。如此者，不見而章，不動而變，無為而成。」

⁴⁴ 請參見錢穆《莊子纂箋》〈天下〉篇，頁274-285。

⁴⁵ 請參見林安梧〈「道」「德」釋義：儒道同源互補的義理闡述—以《老子道德經》「道生之、德蓄之」暨《論語》「志於道、據於德」為核心的展開〉，台北：《鵝湖月刊》334期（2003/04），23-29。

⁴⁶ 請參見林安梧〈無盡的哀思：悼念牟宗三先生兼論「形而上的保存與實踐之開啟」〉，台北：中國文哲研究通訊 5卷2期（1995/06），178-180。

⁴⁷ 請參見林安梧〈解開「道的錯置」——兼及於「良知的自我坎陷」的一些思考〉，《孔子研究季刊》總第53期，1999年第一季，頁14-26，中國孔子基金會主辦，齊魯書社，山東濟南。

捌、提出「由外王而內聖」的意義何在？船山所說「無其器則無其道」的啟發

「形而上保存」的是「道德」，而「形而下開啟」的是「知識」，以「德」開「智」，由「道德」開出「知識」，這樣說著說著，我們開始有一種理解，誤認為我們以前所「強」的是「道德」，所「弱」的是「知識」。更且重要的是，這「道德」可是萬世不遷的形而上的本體，他是確然無疑的。問題出在於我們太道德了，太形而上了，我們整個心都被道德包住了，都被包在形而上之體裡，因此知識才會落後，才會忽略了知識系統，我們現在就是要努力地從這形而上的道體所裹住的道德，重新開啟知識系統。

問題果真就在這裡，我們果真是太道德、太形而上嗎？我們必須要「坎陷」一下，才能不要太道德，而讓「知識」有喘息的機會，而開啟知識系統嗎？我們不要那麼地形而上，而要落實接地氣而開啟形而下嗎？太道德當然不好，因為太道德一定變成了假的，所以要趕快轉出來才好。太形而上會變得太掛空，那也不好，所以要快些落實為形而下；這樣才好。這呼籲是很有道理的，但問題是怎樣叫做「太道德」、「太形而上」，又他又是如何造成的呢？是甚麼因素讓那道德變得太道德，那形而上變得太形而上。這其中有的是難以解開的魅惑，問題是在這魅惑如何解開。呼籲應該解開是對的，而誤認為是「太道德」、「太形而上」造成了，這恐怕就有問題了。

「內聖—外王」，內修外行，本來應該充實而飽滿，然而何以轉為內傾，太過強調內修，而甚至以內聖作為主要的實踐向度，這必須回溯整個歷史發展的起伏升降的問題，而不是把中國歷史的發展，特別是儒學的發展定位為以內聖為主，而外王本是由此內聖發展出來的、衍生出來的產物。當前，錯誤的認為儒學是以內聖為主的，甚至說儒學只是涉及於「私領域」的，而未能及於「公領域」，儒學只配作為「地方知識」的，雖然彼此有所不同，但都是被看小了，看內傾了。這其實是在一封閉心態下，被對比出來的，是處在嚴重的意識危機下，被對比出來的。這是在文化的次殖民地，被意識形態化後對比出來的。呼籲由私領域轉進到公領域，由地方知識轉進到普世知識，這當然不會有人反對，同樣的要求能由德轉智，由內聖開出外王，這當然也是正確的。問題是怎麼開出？

如果我們沒有對整個歷史的浮沉升降，好自理解，只是誤認為我們以前是一片漆黑，現在要把漆黑去掉，迎來光明。或者誤認為我們以前是一片光明，只是光明的灼人眼睛，難以看清楚，恐怕要遮蔭一下，坎陷一下才能開啟真正的清楚分別。這些呼籲，必須落實，而所謂的落實，是實事求是地去理解，我們之所以會往內傾，而忽略了外在結構，這與我們兩千年來的父權高壓、君主專制、男權中心，是有密切關係的。就是這三者所構成的「血緣性縱貫軸」再加上科舉制度、八股取士，教條化、刻板化了人的培育與構成。這麼一來，就使得這「血緣性縱貫軸」固結成難以解開的專制集權結構。正是這樣

的結構，讓我們的道德成為太道德了，讓我們的人性成為太人性了，讓我們的內聖成為太內聖了。這一「太」就走向了「封閉」。

我們若只理解為「太道德」了，「太形而上」了，我們當該從此坎陷開出「知識」系統，開啟「形而下」，這便忽略了真切的歷史事實，而只將我們思想成的形而上的真實，誤認為它就果真是乾坤萬有之基，希望能由此乾坤萬有之基開啟一切。其實，這樣的說法只是某種詮釋下的哲學構造，並不是真正的歷史事實。在這樣的哲學構造系統下呼籲著到如何開啟形而下，儘管也給出一個真正進程，良知的自我坎陷以開出知性主體，由此知性主體而開啟對列之局，開啟新的外王學。這其實只是詮釋學意義下的哲學上的理論邏輯次序，它並不是歷史的發生次序，也不是實踐的學習次序（林安梧，1994）⁴⁸。

我在許多地方曾經論述到了這三種次序的異同，就我們東亞的現代化來說，不是原生地的現代化，而是被衍生出來的現代化。我們可能做的不是照原來原生地的現代化那般歷史的發生次序，重來一遍；因為這並不切實際。我們也不是經由哲學理論構造的釐清，就可以依循著在詮釋學意義下的理論邏輯次序，而去推導出實踐的學習次序。當然，同樣的，這也不切實際。還有值得注意的是，「內修—外行」、「內聖—外王」，彼此相互影響，兩端而一致，內在修為的內聖之學並不是永世不遷的，隨著世代的變遷，有著不同的外王結構、組織制度，以及生活場域，也就會有不同的內聖學。特別是在解開了帝制、父權、男權以後的世代，這是民主憲政、公民社會，在這樣的生活世界、歷史社會總體之下，所陶鑄出來的內聖之學也自然會有不同。

用王船山的話來說，「道器合一」，而且特別重視「無其器則無其道」，具體的、實存的、生活世界優先於形而上的普遍的、抽象的原理原則。船山又說當器未形著之前，形而上隱然未現之則，早已經是存在的。就本體論來說，「道」為優先，就發生學來說，「器」為優先。船山主張這兩面都值得重視，我以此為「本體的發生學」（ontogenetic method）方式來稱謂它（林安梧，1987）⁴⁹。「道」與「器」兩者，互藏以為宅，交發以為用，「形而上者謂之道，形而下者謂之器」，「道」是「器」的形而上之「家鄉」，而「器」是「道」具體落實的「安宅」（林安梧，2009，2012a，2012b）⁵⁰。

為何我在「本內聖以開新外王」之說以外，一定要說出個「外王—內聖」，為的是在船山學式的「本體發生學」的思考下，特別要強調新外王的學習過程裡，重新調節內聖，

⁴⁸ 關於此三種不同次序的釐清，最早在林安梧〈「當代新儒學」及其相關問題之理解與反省（上）〉，台北：鵝湖月刊，223期（1994/01），10-20。後來此文收入林安梧《儒學革命論：後新儒家的問題向度》，第一章，頁3-28，1998年，台北：台灣學生書局。

⁴⁹ 一方面肯定形器的首出性，並從而就此形器而溯源說道之存在這樣的方法，我們姑且名之為「存有發生學的方法」（ontogenetic method）請參見林安梧《王船山人性史哲學研究》第三章，頁69，1987，台北：東大圖書公司。現在我將此更譯為「本體發生學的方法」。

⁵⁰ 船山學的「兩端而一致」，處處可見，後來我將它運用於「中國人文詮釋學」的建構中，請參見林安梧《中國人文詮釋學》第四章〈語言：存有之道落實於人間世的居宅〉，第五章〈道（存有）：語言調適而上遂的本源〉，2009年學生書局出版。又請參見林安梧《王船山「經典詮釋學」衍申的一些思考—兼論「本體」與「方法」的辯證（上、下）》，2012年5、6月《鵝湖》，443-444期，頁22-28以及頁17-22。

主張內聖也當有新內聖。這是王船山所說的「無其器則無其道」的提法。當然內聖外王兩者「互藏以為宅，交發以為用」。其實，內聖與外王兩者是交與參贊為一體的，兩者是互為體用的。

玖、結語：學問傳承，綿綿若存，生生不息

中國文化傳統能否現代化，這本不應該是問題，做出來就是了。做出來就能，做不出來，不認真做，那就不可能。它不是本質上可以不可以，而是人的實踐上有否做得出來。再說，現代化只是人類的歷史發展的一個階段，它在不同地域、不同的傳統、不同的族群有就會有不同的可能表現。現代化不就等同於西方化，現代化不是單數，而是複數，它是多元的、差異的、各有區別的，因地域、人種、文化、傳統，而會有其不同。雖不同，而又可以匯通起來理解。

「內聖、外王」「內修、外行」，本為一體。中國政治傳統中，何以偏向「內聖」，特別是宋明儒學以來以內聖為重，這偏向「內聖」；並不完全忽略「外王」，更不是沒有外王學。當代新儒家在花果飄零下，尋求靈根自植，主張「本內聖」而開「新外王」有其苦心孤詣，也有其思維的基本限制。我們應該正視這個限制，並尋求轉進與創造的嶄新可能。

我們應該跨出主體性哲學的限制，歸返到豐富的生活世界中尋求一真存實感的啟動處，參贊處。屏棄方法論上的本質主義，而代之以方法論上的約定主義。「天命之謂性」的道德不能只是先驗的，須知：命日降、性日生日成，未成可成，已成可革；道德是發展的，是變動的，是人文化成的。

我記起從一九九四年二月，我提出「後新儒學論綱」以來，後來又提出了「外王—內聖」的說法，引發了許多師友同道的討論。甚至，也引來了「背叛師門」的謠言，「路遙知馬力，日久見人心」，我秉持著學術的良知，「吾愛吾師，吾更愛真理」，「當仁，不讓於師」，我只是繼續我的馬力，努力地往前邁進。我這篇文章，可以用來回應這些年來對我殷殷督促的師友同道。

在哲學系統上，我建構了「存有三態論」（林安梧，1993；程志華，2011；張旭愷，2012）⁵¹；基於儒道佛三教，我進一步開發其意義治療學的思維。在政治哲學裡，我對「道的錯置」提出了批判，進而指出應該由「血緣性縱貫軸」轉折邁進到「人際性互動

⁵¹ 「存有三態論」是從熊十力的《新唯識論》所隱含的「體用論」所轉化出來的，首發於林安梧《存有、意識與實踐：熊十力體用論之詮釋與重建》第五章〈存有的根源的開顯〉，第二節「論存有的三態」，後來我繼續擴大這思考，廣泛的寫了不少文章。河北大學程志華教授於《哲學動態》2011年第6期發表《由「一心開二門」到「存有三態論」：儒學之一個新的發展向度》，討論了林安梧所提出的「存有三態論」。另外，河北大學哲學系張旭愷，於2012年6月，提出其碩士論文《林安梧存有三態論思想之研究》（程志華教授指導）。「存有三態論」可以說是繼續著牟宗三先生「兩層存有論」之後的理論新發展。

軸」，如此才可能解開帝制、重建儒學（楊生照，2006a，2006b，2006c）⁵²。在方法論上我主張要揚棄本質主義（或唯實論），代之以「約定主義（或者唯名論）。在中國人文詮釋學上，我提出了「道、意、象、構、言」的五階結構。主張經典的詮釋不離生活世界，不離心性體認、不離天地人我萬物所歸趨的道，道是存在本源。再者，我發現在中國哲學傳統裡，我們主張的存在的連續觀，這不同於西方哲學是已存在的斷裂觀為主導，「存在與價值的和合性」優先於「思維與存在的一致性」的原理。

四十年餘來的努力，我的發展以及所做成的哲學，與我的老師牟宗三先生有許多差異。當代新儒學是立基於陽明學的，顯然地，我是立基於船山學的。陽明、船山雖有不同，但都歸本於孔子。回眸凝視書房牆上牟先生照相，「宗師仲尼誠通天地，三教判列道貫古今」的對聯，不免俯首長嘆：感恩先生的教導，感恩老師讓我有充分的思維天地，我可以在哲學天地間起舞弄劍，從先生所教給我的招式，在努力研習中有了些轉化、有了些發展。當然，要創造性的轉化與創新性的發展，那還得更努力。學問傳承，綿綿若存，生生不息。

— 癸卯之夏（2023）陽曆 6 月 26 日 完稿於台中元亨書院

參考文獻

- 王弼等（2016）。**老子四種**。國立臺灣大學出版中心。
- 朱熹（2012）。**四書章句集注**。中華書局。
- 牟宗三（1975）。**現象與物自身**。台灣學生書局。
- 牟宗三（1985）。**圓善論**。台灣學生書局。
- 牟宗三（2020）。**牟宗三先生全集**。聯經出版公司。
- 余英時（1976）。**歷史與思想**。聯經出版公司。
- 李明輝（2003）。由「內聖」向「外王」的轉折—現代新儒家的政治哲學。**中國文哲研究集刊**，23，337-350
- 阮元（校刊）（2013）。**十三經注疏**。藝文印書館印行。
- 林正弘（1991）。胡適的科學主義。載於周策縱、唐德剛（主編），**胡適與近代中國**。時報文化。
- 林正弘（2007）。卡爾·波柏與當代科學哲學的蛻變。載於林正弘，**伽利略·波柏·科學說明**（二版）（39-66 頁）。東大出版社。
- 林安梧（1991）。**王船山人性史哲學之研究**。東大圖書公司。

⁵² 請參見楊生照〈從「血緣性縱貫軸」到「道的錯置」(上、中、下): 林安梧「後新儒學」的切入點〉, 台北: 鵝湖月刊 370、371、372 期 (2006 年 4、5、6 月)。此文後來修訂刊登於《後新儒家與現代之後: 林安梧教授回甲誌慶學術論文集》, 頁 1-36, 2017 年, 廖崇斐主編, 台北: 台灣學生書局、元亨書院聯合發行。

- 林安梧 (1994)。「當代新儒學」及其相關問題之理解與反省 (上)。**鵝湖月刊**，**223**，10-20。
- 林安梧 (1995)。無盡的哀思：悼念牟宗三先生兼論「形而上的保存與實踐之開啟」。**中國文哲研究通訊**，**5** (2)，178-180。
- 林安梧 (1996)。**儒學與中國傳統社會的哲學省察：以血緣性縱貫軸為核心的展開**。幼獅文化出版公司。
- 林安梧 (1997)。**契約、自由與歷史性思維**。黎明文化。
- 林安梧 (1998)。**儒學革命論：後新儒家的問題向度**。台灣學生書局。
- 林安梧 (1999)。解開「道的錯置」—兼及于「良知的自我坎陷」的一些思考。**孔子研究季刊**，**53**，14-26。
- 林安梧 (2003a)。「道」「德」釋義：儒道同源互補的義理闡述—以《老子道德經》「道生之、德蓄之」暨《論語》「志於道、據於德」為核心的展開。**鵝湖月刊**，**334**，23-29。
- 林安梧 (2003b)。迎接「後牟宗三時代」的來臨—《牟宗三先生全集》出版紀感。**鵝湖月刊**，**335**，0-1。
- 林安梧 (2003c)。**道的錯置：中國政治思想的根本困結**。台灣學生書局。
- 林安梧 (2004)。後新儒學的新思考：從「外王」到「內聖」—以「社會公義」論為核心的儒學可能。**鵝湖月刊**，**350**，35-54。
- 林安梧 (2009)。**中國人文詮釋學**。台灣學生書局。
- 林安梧 (2012a)。王船山「經典詮釋學」衍申的一些思考—兼論「本體」與「方法」的辯證 (上)。**鵝湖月刊**，**443**，22-28。
- 林安梧 (2012b)。王船山「經典詮釋學」衍申的一些思考—兼論「本體」與「方法」的辯證 (下)。**鵝湖月刊**，**444**，17-22。
- 林安梧 (2016)。**血緣性縱貫軸：解開帝制·重建儒學**。台灣學生書局。
- 林安梧 (2019)。**論語聖經譯解：慧命與心法**。台灣學生書局。
- 林安梧 (2020a)。克服「修昔底德陷阱」：關於學術殖民與本土化問題的一些反思——黃光國〈本土化學術的研究發表與展望〉讀後。**本土諮商心理學學刊**，**11** (4)，37-58。
- 林安梧 (2020b)。從「五四後」到「後五四」：基於「存有三態論」思考中華文明在 21 世紀的角色。**文史哲**，**377**，93-102。
- 林安梧 (2022)。**關於先秦儒學「人性論」的一些討論——以孟子和荀子為核心的展開**。**齊魯學刊**，**286**，5-29。
- 林毓生 (2020)。**中國意識的危機：五四時期激烈的反傳統主義**。聯經出版公司。
- 金貞姬 (2020)。**《現象與物自身》全集本編校說明**，見《牟宗三先生全集》第 21 冊，

胡秋原 (1979)。評余英時院士的「反智論與中國政治傳統」：論余先生所說的「反智論」由於誤解英文並作羅織。中華雜誌，17 (191)。

張旭愷 (2012)。林安梧存有三態論思想之研究〔未出版碩士論文〕。河北大學。

張灝 (1978)。新儒家與當代中國的思想危機 (林鎮國譯)，鵝湖月刊，35，2-13。

許國賢 (2012)。三種自由觀再探。東吳政治學報，13 (2)，169-219。

陳來 (2005)。儒學的普遍性與地域性。天津社會科學，3，4-10。

陳運星 (2004)。從民本到民主：儒家政治文化的再生。中山人文社會科學期刊，12 (2)，87-111。

曾春海 (1990)。變遷社會中的人倫與人權。哲學與文化，17 (9)，846-852。

程志華 (2011)。由「一心開二門」到「存有三態論：儒學之一個新的發展向度。哲學動態，6。

楊生照 (2006a)。從「血緣性縱貫軸」到「道的錯置」(上)：林安梧「後新儒學」的切入點，鵝湖月刊，370，60-64。

楊生照 (2006b)。從「血緣性縱貫軸」到「道的錯置」(中)：林安梧「後新儒學」的切入點，鵝湖月刊，371，49-58。

楊生照 (2006c)。從「血緣性縱貫軸」到「道的錯置」(下)：林安梧「後新儒學」的切入點，鵝湖月刊，372，57-63。

楊貞德 (1994)。胡適科學方法觀論析。中國文哲研究集刊，5，129-154。

廖崇斐 (主編) (2017)。後新儒家與現代之後：林安梧教授回甲誌慶學術論文集，台灣學生書局、元亨書院聯合發行。

鄭玄 (注) (1981)。禮記。學海。

錢穆 (2017)。莊子纂箋 (六版七刷)。東大圖書公司。

Montesquieu. (1998). 論法的精神 (張雁深譯)。商務印書館。(原著出版於 1748 年)

Popper, K. (2020). 開放社會及其敵人 (莊文瑞、李英明譯)。商周出版。(原著出版於 1945 年)

A Side View of Post Contemporary Neo-Confucianism Practical Philosophy: Some Responses to the Issue of “Outer Kingliness and Inner Sagehood”

An-Wu Lin*

Abstract

This paper aims to address the contentious issue of "Inner Sagehood and Outer Kingliness" over the past three decades and the transition from "Contemporary Neo-Confucianism" to "Post Contemporary Neo-Confucianism" in practical philosophy, through the process of life's practical learning. It begins with two couplets and a short essay, initiating reflections on the history of contemporary Chinese thought, indicating that the "Post-May Fourth Era" has arrived. We should transcend the predicament of "methodological essentialism" and replace it with "methodological conventionalism." Acknowledging the similarities and differences in causality between "natural science" and "humanities," we must recognize that modernization is developing in plural forms and diversely. It is high time we abandoned radical anti-traditionalism and acknowledged the importance of "human rights grounded in ethics, self-aware freedom, and people-oriented democracy." Certainly, we must untangle the fundamental knot of China's political tradition—the "Misplacement of the Dao," allowing "the ruler, the father, and the sage" to appropriately take their places and thereby establish the four communities implied by "Heaven, Earth, Ruler, and Teacher." Furthermore, tracing back to the original structure of "Inner Sagehood and Outer Kingliness," and discussing its transformation and changes. Finally, it responds to the significance of "from Outer Kingliness to Inner Sagehood," which is akin to what Wang Fuzhi said, "Without its vessel, there is no its Way." Of course, the unity of Way and vessel, the consistency of both ends, and the ontogenetic way of thinking are worthy of attention. Entering the 21st century's modernization, after Neo-Confucianism, we should transcend the limitations of subjective philosophy, return to the rich lifeworld, truly exist and feel, initiate participation and contribution, and contribute to the dialogue of human civilization.

Keywords: Confucianism, Essentialism, Conventionalism, Misplacement of the Dao, Ontogenetic, Community, Consistency of Both Ends

An-Wu Lin* I Ching and Ancient Chinese Philosophy Research Center/ Institute for
Advanced Confucian Studies/ Yuanheng Academy
(limaw2001@gmail.com)

I. The Origin of the Problem: Starting from Two Couplets

My teacher, Mr. Mou Zongsan, passed away in 1995, so it has been twenty-eight years this year. In the past 28 years, Mr. Mou Zongsan has had the most significant influence on me, and the one I talk to the most is still Mr. Mou Zongsan. Some people say that Mr. Mou has passed away. How can he talk to you? That is a way of "interacting with the ancients at a spiritual level"! From the perspective of this kind of conversation, it is not only Mr. Mou who has the most conversations with Confucius, Mencius, Xunzi, Laozi, Zhuangzi, Sakyamuni, Socrates, Jesus Christ, and even many sages and philosophers throughout the ages. Of course, Mr. Mou Zongsan is most affectionate to me and has personally taught me. From his lifetime to his death, the person who still influences my academic life the most is Mr. Mou Zongsan. There is no doubt about this.

I am not a quiet and well-behaved student. I am a student who likes to ask questions. I also want my students to ask questions and even like them to argue with me. I believe that debate helps clarify ideas and principles. I've always been like this since I started studying, but it's not that I don't want to keep it in mind but I know that all thoughts will go out of shape, so it's not the words that need to be kept in mind, but what's behind the words, on top of the words, and between the words. There is something external, more than words, and priority over the "existence" of words itself. Lao Tzu said it well, "Dao that can be described is not universal and eternal Dao." The source of the creation of the universe can be expressed, but once it is expressed, it is no longer the original Dao. In the West, there is a saying, "I love my teacher, and I love the truth even more." In the East, there is also a teaching that "in the face of benevolence, there is no need to be humble to the teacher." When students carry forward the teacher's teachings, there will inevitably be changes, transitions, criticism, and the possibility of creation. This is all natural. For me, asking for help from many teachers is not just an ancient rule but also a matter of course. It is said, "There is no sage who has stopped learning, and there is no specific teacher for the sage." Even the sages must study so seriously and learn from multiple teachers. What's more, we can't even reach the level of the sage. We must study hard, and not just from a single teacher.

These remarks are actually to clarify that many of my current ideas are very different from those of my teacher, Mr. Mou Zongsan, but this does not prevent me from respecting my teacher. There is a portrait of my teacher on the wall at home, with a couplet of words nested with Mr. Mou Zongsan's name " Inherited from Confucius, his sincerity reaches heaven and earth. His comments of the three religions can be traced back to ancient times and the

present."

The rhetorical technique of this couplet is not very neat. It is mainly used to express its meaning. If it were to be tidy, I would be afraid of harming the meaning of words. That's not a good deal. This couplet is one of the couplets I wrote when Mr. Mou passed away. This pair was written for Fo Guang University Nanhua School of Management (Nanhua University). Another couplet, written in my capacity, goes like this:

"The Master came here wandering with the character of the Wei and Jin Dynasties to make comments. Ordinary people were shocked, flattered, and humiliated when they heard about it.

My master has been away for a long time. The principles of Song and Ming Dynasties can pass the test of time. How can true Confucians fear yin and yang?"
(Lin, 2003b)

Obviously, the former couplet is about "culture, thought, and academics" in the public domain, and the latter couplet is about "learning from teachers and lifestyle." In comparison, more have written about my own experience. Let's start with these two couplets!

Mr. Mou Zongsan is indeed "inherited from Confucius" and is the cultural inheritor and founder of Confucianism (Confucianism). The foundation of the knowledge he inherits is "sincerity," and this "sincerity" is universal. Mr. Mou still adheres to the old Chinese tradition of "heaven, earth and man", but he emphasizes the subjectivity of "human beings" and elevates the subjectivity of morality to the highest priority. This is mainly a tradition inherited from Lu Jiuyuan and Wang Yangming's theory of mind. However, he was also influenced by Western Enlightenment thought in modern times and emphasized the rational component of subjectivity more. Of course, it focused more on moral rationality. After a comprehensive digestion of Kantian studies, he combined the tradition of Western philosophy with the wisdom essence of Confucianism, Daoism and Buddhism in Chinese philosophy, and achieved his own philosophical thought. (Transcendental Distinction between Appearances and Things-in-themselves) and (A Treatise on the Perfect Good) can be said to be the pinnacle of his knowledge (Jin, 2020). He taught the practical understanding of "sincerity to connect the world" into a whole set of expertise. He was the most philosophical and modern philosopher comparable to Western philosophy.

In "Identification and Classification of the Three Religions," Mr. Mou is not only a scholar of Confucianism but also profoundly familiar with Daoism and Buddhism, and his depth and height may be higher than many so-called Daoist and Buddhist scholars. Because of this, he

launched the magnificent activity of "discriminating religions" (distinguishing religions and teachings). Mr. Mou's classification of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism is still based on Confucianism, which is inevitable. However, he has already surpassed the "Buddha and Lao" method of Confucianism in the Song and Ming dynasties. The Confucian scholars of the Song and Ming dynasties often made extreme remarks against Buddha and Elders. It is not that there are not many who understand Buddha and Elders deeply, are calm-minded, and are willing to listen well, but there are not many. From the scholars of the Song and Ming dynasties to Wang Chuanshan, it was already a big step, and from Wang Chuanshan to Xiong Shili was another big step. From Xiong Shili to Mou Zongsan, there is another big step forward. This significant step is more advanced and objective and can be expressed systematically and comprehensively using modern philosophical methods. Construct and unfold its identification and classification.

Of course, this knowledge must require "the Dao reaches through the past and present." Wisdom cannot be limited to oneself. It cannot be limited to the local area but must lead from the local area to the whole world. It's not globalization but glocalization. Over the years, I have heard people say that the truth taught by Confucianism is not universal enough, and some people have asked me what I think. I said that what we say is meant to be universal, but what people say has limitations. It is best to face our limitations well, and we must believe that our Eastern Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism are moving toward universal truth. What the three teachings of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism say is universal and can pervade heaven, earth, people, me, and all living things (Chen, 2005). However, once it is turned into words, it has its limitations. Because of this, the classics of these three religions have never claimed that "I am the truth, the way, and the life" (Lin, 2020). "The conclusion of discourse" is limited. Only by transcending the conclusion of discourse, returning to existence itself, and letting existence reveal itself can communication and connection be possible.

II. Let's Start with "Welcoming the Advent of the 'Post Mou Zongsan Era'"

"The Complete Works of Mou Zongsan" has thirty-three volumes and was published on May fourth, 2003. It was published eight years after Mr. Mou's death. I think it is significant to choose May fourth specifically. Mr. Mou was the son of the May Fourth Movement, but he opposed it. There are several levels of opposition: opposition, reflection, and return. These three levels are present. The era when Mr. Mou grew up and studied at Peking University (1929-1933) was already after the May Fourth Movement, but China has been affected by this Movement from 1919 until now. In my way of distinguishing, there are three stages: May Fourth, May Fourth-After, and Post-May Fourth. Mr. Mou should belong to the group from "May Fourth" to

"May Fourth-After," while we are from "May Fourth-After" to "Post-May Fourth." Mr. Mou disagreed with the thorough anti-traditionalism of the May Fourth Movement, but undoubtedly, his knowledge was mainly in response to the May Fourth Movement. He opposed the thorough anti-traditionalism of the May Fourth Movement but was more or less attacked by this thorough anti-traditionalism. Moreover, we must oppose, reflect, criticize, and propose new ways of transformation and create new creations from this transformation (Lin, 2020)

The first two generations of Contemporary Neo-Confucianism all think within this main context. This was true for Liang Shuming, Ma Yifu, and Xiong Shili of the first generation, as well as for Tang Junyi, Mou Zongsan, and Xu Fuguan of the second generation. The first generation has more traditional ingredients, while the second generation has more modern ingredients. Xiong Shili and Ma Yifu's discussion methods were relatively traditional in the first generation. They had some reflections on Western academics, but they were still dominated by tradition. Liang Shuming was more based on his own life world and general thinking leading to the world's civilization. He was mainly a practical and practical thinker. His understanding of democracy and science is incomplete, but he has not entirely accepted them. The second generation of Tang Junyi, Mou Zongsan, and Xu Fuguan are called Hong Kong and Taiwan New Confucians because they moved to Hong Kong and Taiwan after the 1949 Movement.

Generally speaking, Tang, Mou, and Xu basically fully affirmed democracy, science, and this modern approach. Their main issue is to respond to "totalistic anti-traditionalism" (Lin, 1979), but they have one thing in common with the hostile camp. They basically accept modern democracy and science. They all believed that the West was an advanced and progressive civilization and that the Chinese should study hard and catch up. The difference is that thorough anti-traditionalists believe that to fully westernize and welcome Mr. De (democracy) and Mr. Sai (science), tradition must be washed away and ultimately eliminated. Contemporary Neo-Confucianism, later known as neo-conservatives, cultural conservatism, and neo-traditionalism, believes that traditional Chinese culture does not hinder modernization but only requires some transformation, and through transformation, it can be accepted modernization, then connected to modernization.

The so-called "returning to the roots and creating new things" refers to returning to the essence of tradition and seeking to transform this essence so that it can integrate with modernization. They believe that the tradition places too much emphasis on the inner sagehood and neglects the outer kingliness, so they want to "create new outer kingliness based on the inner sagehood" (Li, 2003; Lin, 2004). There is no problem with the inner sagehood studies, but the outer kingliness studies cannot catch up. The inner sagehood mainly emphasizes the

conscience and the original heart. Because it emphasizes the original heart and conscience, it ignores the development of the outer kingliness. The development of the new outer kingliness is centered on knowledge. The inner sagehood is centered on the original heart and conscience, while the new outer kingliness is centered on the knowledge system. The biggest issue is transferring the knowledge system from the original heart and conscience. They put a lot of effort into it and finally said with certainty that it could be prescribed. As long as the "intellectual subject" is developed through the "Self-Entrapment of Conscience," it can be integrated with Western modernization, and the Chinese can take into modernization.

The transformation and development of New Confucianism in Hong Kong and Taiwan is mainly aimed at such issues. They advocate that the old inner sagehood should be used to create a new outer king based on the old inner sagehood. To use a systematic academic vocabulary, from the Self-Entrapment of Conscience, the intellectual subject emerges, and from this intellectual subject comes democratic science, which is the content of modernization. They believe that the content of modernization is universal, that advanced Western countries are ahead, and that we must catch up. They fully accept modernization and occasionally criticize it, but it is still a modern way of thinking. The two camps, the neo-traditionalist and the thoroughly anti-traditionalist seem to be hostile, but they both fully affirm the primary content of Western modernization. The difference is that in traditional Chinese culture, one believes it should be preserved and returned to its roots to create a new one, a creation that can be transformed; one thinks it should be completely abandoned. Only by abandoning can we genuinely welcome Mr. De and Mr. Sai.

However, they both adopted methodological essentialism. One said that Chinese cultural tradition does not essentially hinder modernization, and the other said that Chinese cultural tradition essentially ultimately hinders modernization. Note: It is easy to fall into one-sidedness when thinking based on essentialist methodology. Compared with the two, the one-sidedness of thorough anti-traditionalism is even more severe because they have more incredible momentum. It should be noted that the greater the momentum, the more one-sided, even arbitrary, autocratic, and even totalitarian. As a neo-traditionalist, the most valuable thing about Contemporary Neo-Confucianism is that it puts forward another opposing proposition to such thorough anti-traditionalism. However, methodologically, the two are opposite ends of the same spectrum. To make an analogy, just like "A" and "not A" in mathematics, taking their absolute values, they are both "A".

III. Participate in and Solve the Dilemma of "Methodological Essentialism"

Since the early 1990s, I have repeatedly called for us to resolve the dilemma of methodological essentialism. My appeal does not mean that I have ignored the recognition of the essence of things. Still, it emphasizes that we cannot indulge in a biased, dogmatic, and authoritarian tendency. It should be noted that when we talk about this world, we must speak through language, words, and images, but this is just a positioning system, not the existence itself. Therefore, anything you say must be reviewed by the existence itself. This review is not fixed. It is in the process of constant review and tends to be appropriate. This methodology differs from essentialism and can be called "methodological conventionalism" (Lin, 1996/2016). Our positioning is not constant but is agreed upon. To unfold the narrative and positioning of existence, such an agreement must be constantly reviewed. During the review, we can get closer to the facts and obtain the positioning based on everyone's consensus, but the consensus must be continuously reviewed repeatedly. There is no "final word," and that's it. Even if a final decision is made when necessary, it is only a contingency method and cannot be taken seriously. It may be confirmed at a particular stage, but not like that at another stage.

Life is growing, changing, and flowing. In the changing and flowing, we use language to describe the position. This is to facilitate our narrative and discussion. In the process of narration and discussion, we can have a deeper understanding and a more appropriate interpretation, and therefore, we can find a more suitable practical solution. Because of this, our knowledge must return to existence itself at all times, and the so-called return is a continuous interactive process. In the interactive process, it is just a more appropriate approach. This means that we must always reflect on the past, look forward to the future, and make a more profound return to the basis of existence at any time. This kind of activity must be carried out from generation to generation. "New every day, new every day, and new again every day" is very close to what I said. When we talk about the "Book of Changes," we say, "The Book of Changes has three types of changes: simplicity, changeability, and non-changeability." This truth is explained very thoroughly (Lin, 1991). The way of thinking of "methodological essentialism" has fallen into a severe dilemma, resulting in extreme autocracy and serious totalitarianism caused by the concentration of power.

Karl Popper (1945/2020) pointed out these in his discussion, saying they are all enemies of an open society. He severely criticized the principle of verification (the principle of verification, or translated as "justification principle") of logical positivism. In his deep thinking on the philosophy of science, he proposed the "principle of falsification" (the principle of falsification or translated as "the principle of negative proof") to replace the original verification principle (Lin, 2007). This principle of verification is related to methodological essentialism,

while the principle of falsification is related to methodological conventionalism. We can say that methodological essentialists tend to fall into closed thinking, while methodological conventionalists adopt open thinking (Lin, 1997). Of course, you will also wander around because you are too open. It is more comprehensive if both ends are taken care of.

In fact, the word "essence" is inevitable in academic discussions, but it cannot be advocated as immutable or eternal. That would not work. The name is just an agreement, but this name points to the reality. Although this reality cannot be recognized now, we must constantly affirm it. Of course, this affirmation is still affirmation in the sense of agreement. It is not just the only one that is judged. The Chinese have emphasized the need to "seek truth from facts" since ancient times, and this is precisely what they say. There are facts, but people are only what they want, not what they are. Because of this, with open thinking, you must constantly review, renew, and strive for excellence every day. This kind of "question the right" and "affirm the questioned" continually checks and does not fall into the self-predicament of "I am, and the other is not," what is what it is and what is not what it is (Qian, 2017). Because you know clearly that the "yes" you are "seeking" is not the "yes" of the fact, so you have to check this "yes constantly" and finally get closer to the "fact" reality.

Once we have thought this issue through clearly, we can reflect and criticize the methodological slogan of "bold assumptions, careful verification" put forward by Hu Shizhi (Lin, 1991). If you think about it carefully, there are severe flaws in this methodology slogan. His essential thinking cannot lead to the verification principle of logical positivism, which is closed thinking. Compared with this slogan, if you use "careful assumptions and bold falsifications", then another contrast will be formed. Such a contrast will help you break through the original closedness. Let me use my experience to make the comparison between the two ends clearer. When I was about six or seven, I lived in the countryside and bought a "radio." At that time, the radio was not a transistor radio but a vacuum tube radio. The conditions in the countryside are poor, so buying a radio is a big deal. People in the whole village see this radio as a rare thing. It can be said that they look up to it like a sacred object, and the adults don't let their children touch it. My father gave me repeated orders not to touch it. If I did, I would be severely punished.

Interestingly, the more you forbid it, the more naughty the child becomes and wants to move. If you're going to move, you will watch how the adults turn on the power, remember it, and prepare to act when the time is right. I picked one to touch when my parents were away. First, I turned the first button, which was the power button. When the power was turned on, it was strange that there was no sound. I was so anxious that I twisted another button, which drove

the pointer, which was the pointer for channel selection. After twisting and twisting, the pointer reached the 5 or 6 position, and the sound sounded. So I made a "bold assumption" that the way to turn on the radio is to turn on the power and then twist another twist, which is the twist to select the station. When you twist it to 5 or 6, the sound will sound. This is the Perfect startup method. In this way, after I made a "bold hypothesis", I really "carefully verified". I verified it carefully, and it was successful every time I turned it on. And because of such success, I do not doubt that it behaves like this when turned on.

After about a year or two, I secretly turned on the radio in this way, and it worked every time without fail. Until one time, I was secretly turning on the power of the radio and heard my father's shouting from the distance. My father's majesty always frightened me. Rush over. It turns out that a group of chickens and ducks ran into the paddy field where the seedlings had just been sown. They would trample the seedlings and damage them. Someone had to rush to catch these chickens and ducks. He called me to chase the chickens and ducks, and it was urgent. After a while, the chickens and ducks went back to the circle, and I rushed back to the living room to complete the unfinished operation of turning on the radio. When I came back, I saw the radio and it was already ringing. I was stunned and shocked by the scene. It turns out that in the past, I carefully turned on the computer, turned on the power, and twisted the turntable pointer to between 5 and 6. However, there was something wrong with such a perfect action. In fact, I just need to turn on the power and wait for a while. Later I found out that the vacuum tube needs to be heated so that it can conduct conduction and make sound. The story I am telling is exactly the possible serious error of the methodology slogan "Bold assumptions, careful verification". From the misuse of this methodology, if we take a closer look, we can understand the achievements of the Taiwanese historiography since Hu Shizhi (Yang, 1994).

Relatively speaking, if I am making a "cautious assumption," I would like to say: The way to turn on this radio may be like this: turn on the power, twist the turntable pointer to between 5 and 6, but this is only a temporary assumption, it has It may not be the case, I can give it a try, and be brave enough to think that it may not be the case. Not only do I think boldly, but I also try boldly and do not follow the original assumptions. Ha! Maybe I found another way to boot, and finally, I checked with many parties and found it. It turns out that all you need to do is turn on the power. This process is "carefully assuming and boldly seeking falsification." "Bold assumptions, careful verification," driven by methodological essentialism, will lead to closure. In comparison, "careful assumptions and bold falsifications" are driven by methodological conventionalism, which encourages us to consider more possibilities. Only then can we find a more suitable way. Seeking truth from facts is

IV "The Causality of Natural Sciences" and "The Causality of Humanities Knowledge"

Seeking truth from facts in natural science differs from seeking truth from facts in humanities knowledge. The former can eliminate human and situational factors and can be verified repeatedly. In the latter, human and situational factors, and even other factors involving people, time, and space, will intervene, and such intervention and development cannot be verified repeatedly. To make a simple distinction, the former does not involve the human subject, while the latter involves the human subject. The former can exclude time and space factors, but the latter cannot exclude time and space factors. The former can be verified repeatedly, while the latter cannot. In this way, two kinds of causality emerge. The former is tentatively called "the causality of natural science"; the latter is tentatively called "the causality of humanities knowledge" (Lin, 2009). The former, the causality of natural science, is an extended causality, which can be called "scientific verification." Scientific verification includes empirical verification and theoretical demonstration. The causality of human sciences is the causality of content, and its verification cannot be repeated. The so-called "time will never come again" means that it is not synchronic, it is diachronic, and it is not called verification, he could only call for evidence. This evidence is used for a "humanistic interpretation" rather than a "scientific explanation."

Humanistic interpretation unfolds diachronically. Since it cannot be repeatedly verified like natural science, people are still accustomed to a causal grasp. We will say, "Look at the present in the future, and look at the past in the present." What you receive now comes from what you did before; what you do now will result in what you will receive later. This logic of "doing-receiving" is very important. When we talk about humanistic interpretation and historical development, we cannot do without this logic of "making and receiving." Regarding the logic of "doing-receiving," how can you carry out such an action? Because the present is viewed in the future, and the past is viewed now. What was caused in the past will be the result now. This kind of "doing and receiving" has made me wary and used as a reference. I have learned lessons from this and summarized some understandings and interpretations. Therefore, under the logic of "doing-feeling", I considered and decided how I might reach the established "end" under the future "action-feeling". From this "end," I started my present life—the proper "starting point" direction. Generally speaking, we hope that if we do well now, we will have better outcomes in the future; if we do not do well now, or if we do not do it well or in the

wrong direction, we will not have good outcomes. Furthermore, the knowledge of the humanities and the knowledge of the natural sciences are not entirely separate. The humanities knowledge must involve the natural sciences, but it involves the natural sciences in a humanistic way.

Because natural science must be placed in the practical process of the humanities to develop, it will have a vast humanistic impact. For example, how to develop nuclear electric energy is a natural science, but whether to develop nuclear electric energy or not is humanistic knowledge. With nuclear power, how to operate and manage it is also humanities knowledge. To develop nuclear power, are there any particularly cultural factors that will make it develop faster, slower, or even oppose its development? This is, of course, also a matter of humanities. To put it simply, the knowledge of the humanities involves life-like things, living and inevitable, while the natural sciences, to put it simply, try to keep these references away or use non-life, qualitative, or quantitative methods to deal with them.

After these issues have been adequately clarified, we can further think about the development trajectory of this period of modern history for more than a century, from the late Qing Dynasty to the early Republic of China and even now. Particularly, we often hear the topic of Chinese traditional culture and modernization: Does Chinese traditional culture hinder modernization? If it is a hindrance, what should we do? If not, how can we explain why we lag behind Western modernization? Is it the inevitable result of our entire culture that Chinese culture has not developed Western modern thinking? Is it essentially impossible to develop? Or is it just caused by certain historical factors? If these historical factors are eliminated, development can be achieved. So, how do we rule it out? Is it a gradual evolution? Or is a complete revolution needed? Since the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, these issues have been brought to the table for discussion, controversy, debate, and even violent fights in political practice, regardless of the lives of the people in the world and the bloodshed. After over a hundred years of stumbling and ups and downs, we have finally entered the 21st century. Although the current situation is still bizarre, the clouds are gradually opening, and we have the opportunity to reflect on this large period of history again. This involves several keywords: Chinese culture, inner sagehood, modernization, outer kingliness, original heart, conscience, knowledge, and rationality.

Obviously, the causality of natural science is very different from the causality of humanistic knowledge. The most significant difference is that humanistic knowledge must involve the issue of human "free will," which is not found in natural science (Lin, 2009). Many parameters cannot be calculated quantitatively when it comes to free will. Just because

humanistic knowledge cannot "take qualitative or quantitative methods to deal with," like the natural sciences, although it is still possible to "take qualitative or quantitative methods to deal with" at some levels, it cannot be implemented this way at all levels. Once this question is clarified, we can see that scientific thinking mistakenly believes that everything can be reduced to quantity and that everything can be handled scientifically. This is impossible. Science Mr. Sai (science), in the end, it is impossible to "win" against "people." "People" must "win" against science. After all, "people" are the real masters. Mr. De (democracy), in the final analysis, cannot just be elections and removals, and it cannot just be checks and balances too (Montesquieu, 1748/1998). Because if there is no "virtue" as the prerequisite, the restriction and balance will still be just a struggle for power in the end. It seems that Mr. De (democracy) still wants to prioritize "Virtue." It turns out that politics is about Virtue. Confucius said, "For government, use Virtue, like the North Star, which resides in its place and is surrounded by stars." "Use management to guide the people, use punishment to demand the people, and the people want to escape punishment without shame; use Virtue to Guide the people and demand them with etiquette. The people have a sense of shame and character" (Lin, 2017). "Shangshu" says, "Virtue, utilization, welfare, and harmony," putting Virtue in the most critical position is still a time-honored truth.

V. How to Practice "Human Rights with Ethics, Freedom with Conscious, and Democracy with People-Oriented "

Once these principles are explained clearly, we can see that the "thorough anti-traditionalists" since the founding of the Republic of China, as well as the "cultural conservatives" and "neo-traditionalists" who are their opposites, have made severe mistakes in those areas. There has been controversy over whether Chinese culture hinders modernization, which is entirely meaningless. However, the fact that this topic is still causing ripples in the humanities and social sciences shows that the ghost of wrong methodological essentialist thinking is still hovering and wandering in the sky. To be honest, from the history of Chinese development over a hundred years, we can see that it is meaningless to ask whether Chinese traditional culture hinders modernization. Fortunately, not everyone is caught up in this controversy; even when these debates seem to be extremely lively, a group of people have been silently carrying out projects to save the entire nation. They have lofty ambitions, and He has a broad mind, a long-term vision, and a meticulous approach and has been working hard. They aim to save the country through industry, building schools, educating children, awakening

people's wisdom, and revitalizing people's morality. They seek to plant their spiritual roots under the scattered flowers and fruits. Seeking truth from facts has always been a critical tradition of the Chinese nation. I often say that the three words "filial piety, brotherhood, and kindness" are the secret to the eternal life of the Chinese nation (Lin, 2021).

In this way, it is too easy to mistakenly believe that politics is just the restriction and balance of power and that politics can be protected from autocratic totalitarianism through system design. Especially now that we are almost a quarter of a century into the 21st century, we have discovered that the original design of democratic politics, catalyzed by capitalism, has become a system with high energy consumption and low output value. Rich people get richer, and powerful people become more powerful. Superficial things such as power and status have become the mainstream of culture. With the development of the Internet, this tendency has made the world noisy and noisy with no peace, the culture is low and humanity is decadent, it can be said that it has reached an unbelievable level. When everything can be commercialized, and through the promotion of consumption and the exaggeration of desire, desire is commodified, and commodities and desires form an indestructible knot. In this way, people are in the commodity tide of desire, self-chasing, self-lost, self-exile, never to return, unable to stop!

The traditional Chinese "human ethics" are different from the modern Western "human rights." In the past, our human ethics talked about filial piety and brotherhood, and the filial piety and brotherhood for more than two thousand years were deeply wrapped up in "monarchy, patriarchal oppression, and male-centered." we mistakenly believe that "human ethics" is authoritarian, oppressive, male-centered, patriarchal, and monarchical. We mistakenly believe that as long as we attack and overthrow human ethics, human rights can be ushered in. Think about how many so-called enlightenment and national salvation intellectuals since the founding of the Republic of China mistakenly believe that "filial piety" means "patriarchy" and autocracy. They think that by overthrowing filial piety, they can be liberated from patriarchy, authoritarianism, and totalitarianism. This idea is really ridiculous. Overthrowing the filial piety ethics emphasized by Confucianism, the result is still autocracy and more authoritarian; totalitarianism is still totalitarian and more totalitarian. After a lot of hard work, I finally have hope today. The world is not like this. It turns out that with "human ethics," "human rights" will not be allowed to go too far, and only then can human rights finally have a refuge and consideration. It turns out that human rights without the ethics of filial piety will be reduced to just a struggle for rights (Zeng, 1990).

Similarly, for example, Isaiah Berlin emphasized the difference between "negative freedom" and "positive freedom." He noted that "negative freedom" is essential and

indispensable in establishing a political and social community. Indispensable, such freedom cannot be omitted (Berlin, 1969; Xu, 2012). Relatively speaking, "positive freedom" is politically dangerous because it induces rulers to weaken people's negative freedom "for their benefit." These arguments have led researchers to misunderstand that freedom in the Chinese cultural tradition of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism is "positive freedom," which will limit the "negative freedom" of a person's participation in the political and social community and is even used by dictators. Of course, it is not trivial for autocrats and totalitarians to use their thoughts and manipulate their thoughts, but indeed, Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism emphasize human cultivation and self-consciousness. This self-consciousness can be understood as the so-called positive freedom? And will such positive freedom lead to exploitation by rulers? There is no doubt about this. Besides, if you read clearly what Mencius said: "Benevolence alone is not enough to govern a country, and governance alone cannot implement benevolent government." Knowing the "ritual, music, punishment, and management" emphasized by Confucianism, it is probably certain that freedom with self-consciousness should be better than freedom without self-consciousness and is also more important. As for whether the emphasis on positive freedom will be exploited by those in power and even "negative freedom" will be ignored, that is another question. In other words, you don't have to eliminate what Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism call "self-conscious," which you think of as positive freedom, to realize what you think of as negative freedom honestly.

"Freedom" must be pursued, but without self-consciousness, the freedom pursued maybe just a form of power struggle, and it cannot grow stably and truthfully.

Of course, "people-oriented" is not different from "democracy." This is obvious. Confucian political thought in Chinese civilization, such as Mencius, can be said to have taken people-oriented thought to the extreme, but after all, it is not democracy. However, if Mencius applied people-oriented ideas to democratic politics in this era, perhaps such a democracy would be a healthier democracy (Chen, 2004). Obviously, in the past, the autocratic regime could use people-oriented thinking, and it could also rely on people-oriented thinking to save the people from disaster and enable the people to live and work in peace and contentment; similarly, the current democratic government can also use people-oriented thinking. Of course, we can also rely on people-oriented thinking to allow ordinary people to truly take charge of their affairs and ensure peace and prosperity for the country and the people. Of course, in the era of democratic constitutionalism, it is more challenging to use people-oriented thinking than in the era of autocracy. Still, it is much more convenient to use people-oriented thinking actively. It can also be seen that the "people-oriented" initially emphasized by Confucianism in the

democratic era was "the Yangtze River emerges from the Three Gorges." From then on, the river surface can be vast, and ships can sail safely. Of course, because of the slow and leisurely pace, there may also be problems with siltation. People-oriented is a political attitude, and democracy is a system. It will be better to have a people-oriented attitude and a democratic system. If there is no people-oriented approach and only democracy is emphasized, it will likely fall into the realm of populism. Mistakenly believe that Confucian people-oriented is closely integrated with authoritarian government. Therefore, if people-oriented thinking is disintegrated, the authoritarian government can also be disintegrated. This idea is highly absurd.

Now, in the 21st century, we can declare with certainty that we must not abandon human ethics when talking about human rights, we must not abandon self-consciousness when talking about freedom, and we must not abandon people-oriented talking about democracy. Instead, we must work hard to practice "human rights with human ethics and have freedom of self-consciousness, people-oriented democracy" (Lin, 2018).

VI. Solve the "Misplacement of Dao": Let the Three "Kings, Fathers and Sages" Return to Their Proper Places

These concepts were clarified and gradually clarified over time with the changes of generations. At this time, we may need to review that in the 1970s, Mr. Yu Yingshi proposed "Anti-Intellectualism and Chinese Political Tradition" (Yu, 1976), which was very popular for a while. However, at that time, Mr. Hu Qiuyuan raised doubts. In the article "Comment on Academician Yu Yingshi's "Anti-intellectualism and Chinese Political Tradition," it was pointed out that Mr. Yu's "anti-intellectualism" was due to a misunderstanding of English and was garbled. After this article was published, Mr. Yu did not respond. I was a newborn calf who was not afraid of tigers. As a fourth-year college student, I wrote an article on "The Tangle of Intellect, Super-Intellect and Anti-Intellect in Chinese Political Tradition" for Mr. Dai Lianzhang's "History of Chinese Philosophy" final report. The article was first published in "Wenfeng" of the National Taiwan Normal University and later revised and published in "Legein Monthly" (Lin, 1979). Later, I also listened to Mr. Gao Yougong's words, saying that Mr. Yu liked the criticism of his thoughts by younger generations and sent it to him, but received no response from Mr. Yu. I have re-read Mr. Hu Qiuyuan's article and am rethinking my arguments. I still want to say that Mr. Yu Yingshi should be able to respond. Of course, Mr. Yu has passed away and cannot respond. However, the development of history has given a response. Mr. Hu Qiuyuan's article is reasonable.

I thought about it again and found that Mr. Yu's discussion on "Anti-Intellectualism and Chinese Political Tradition" greatly inspired me. However, as someone who likes philosophical thinking, I thought Mr. Yu's discussion was too brief. And to say "anti-intellectualism", this does not mean Confucianism is anti-intellectualism, Daoism is anti-intellectualism, Legalism is anti-intellectualism, or Confucianism is legalistic. After that, it was pitch black, it's all "anti-intellectualism" that dominates. Of course, it is difficult to demonstrate that Daoism is understood as "anti-intellectualism." Daoism is basically "super wisdom". He emphasizes transcending reason and returning to existence itself. Because Daoism emphasizes "super-intelligence", it may lead to anti-intellectualism. Although Confucianism advocates wisdom, it still has a super-intellectual side, and because of this, it is possible to be anti-intellectual. Of course, the most important thing is the transition from the "patriarchal feudalism" of the Zhou Dynasty to the "monarchy" of the Qin and Han Dynasties. This is a historical leap forward, but it has also fallen into an abyss that is difficult to escape.

Anti-intellectualism is an aspect of traditional Chinese politics, but it is not its essence. After the Qin and Han emperors, the Confucian ideal of "sage as king" became the reality of "king as sage." Confucianism initially advocated the principle of "the sage as king." An individual with virtue, wisdom, and ability should become the ruler of the political and social community, akin to Plato's philosophy king. However, the historical result was precisely the opposite. Once they reach the peak of power, as the political and social community's supreme ruler, those in authority would declare themselves virtuous, wise, and capable sages. The "holy king" whose "sages are kings" has now become alienated, distorted, and reversed, and has become a "king is sage" like "I am the king, I am the sage." This I call "misplaced Dao". I think this is the biggest obstacle in China's political tradition, and I have written two books about it. One is "The Misplacement of Dao: The Fundamental Knot of Chinese Political Tradition," and the other is "The Longitudinal Axis of Bloodline: Unraveling the Imperial System and Reconstructing Confucianism" (Lin, 2003, 2016).

Only by solving the "misplacement of Dao" can we truly break out of the dilemma of two thousand years of autocracy. Through the analysis and explanation of the system's overall structure, I pointed out that the three core concepts of "king, father, and sage" must be deeply understood and interpreted. In the two-thousand-year tradition of monarchy, "king" is the highest level of the political and social community, "father" is the highest level of the family and human ethics community, and "sage" is the highest level of the cultural and educational community. The vertex of the bit. These three communities must have certain independence and appropriate relationships. Otherwise, there will be problems of misplacement. The two-

thousand-year-old tradition of imperial autocracy centers on "king," referring to you as a holy king and your father as a king. We must restore the concept of "ruler" to its authentic meaning. Under the democratic constitutional government and civil society system, the "king" should genuinely embody the role of a "public servant." Titles such as president or prime minister are merely conventional designations in this context. He accepts the entrustment of the people and has the responsibilities and obligations he should fulfill. They have a term of office, and they are not eternal. "Father" truly becomes a father; a father is kind, and his son is filial, and he can handle the community of blood and human relations well, thus making him the cornerstone of an excellent social and political community. The "sage" truly becomes a sage, and the Daoism continues and is endless. It can improve the cultural and educational community, renew it daily, and allow the culture to continue and spread forever.

"King, Father, and Sage" have returned to their proper positions. These three communities, the political and social community, the blood and human community, and the cultural and educational community, have been truly valued. Of course, these must return to the natural community of heaven, earth, and nature. The natural community of heaven and earth, the community of blood and human relations, the community of politics and society, and the community of culture and education are what we often call the five ethics of "heaven, earth, parent, king, and teacher" (Lin, 2022). These four communities jointly nurture each person's "body and mind community." When related, it means rectifying the mind, cultivating oneself, regulating the family, managing the state, and bringing peace to the world. The foundation of a correct mind is sincerity, the foundation of sincerity is knowledge, and the foundation of knowledge is an investigation of things. This is the "eight virtues" mentioned in "The Great Learning". In addition to these eight points, there are five levels (sedation, tranquility, tranquility, consideration, and attainment) and three principles (explicit virtue, kindness to the people, and the pursuit of perfection). The teachings of "The Great Learning" are really for adults. It is a very remarkable political philosophy, and it is the teaching of enrichment and perfection of "the Inner Sagehood and the Outer Kingliness".

VII. The Original Structure and Transformation of "Inner Sagehood and Outer Kingliness"

Since "Inner Sagehood and Outer Kingliness" is a teaching of enrichment and perfection, why did I deliberately propose "from Outer Kingliness to Inner Sagehood" at the end of the last century? This is, of course, directed at the over-emphasis on the "Inner Sagehood" study and

the need to develop the outer kingliness study from the inner sagehood study.

In fact, it is fundamentally wrong to misunderstand Confucianism as only the inner sagehood study and not pay attention to the outer kingliness study. Some scholars even say Confucianism does not address the "public sphere" but only the "private sphere." This is a huge misunderstanding. Isn't it obvious what the Book of Rites "Liyun" says, "The journey of the great road, the world is for the common good"? Of course, commentators believe Confucianism was severely introverted in the Song and Ming Dynasties. This inward tendency is somewhat present, but it is not entirely the case. What is more serious is that we understand this significant period of intellectual history as an inward direction. This is a bigger problem.

Note: The activities of understanding and interpretation are closely related to the understander and interpreter's intellectual horizon and existential situation. Since the end of the Qing Dynasty and the beginning of the Republic of China, due to China's weakness, the enlightened people eager to save the nation could overturn the boat with one stick. Based on the methodological essentialist way of thinking, they saw the Chinese national character and believed that Lu Xun's Ah Q was the Chinese character. I think this appearance is caused by introversion in thinking about the essential appearance of Chinese people. When I looked up, I found that the Confucianism of the Song and Ming Dynasties was deeply tainted with the tone of Zen Buddhism, saying that this was Yang Confucianism and Yin Buddhism. It is said that Buddhism has weakened China. It is noted that Neo-Confucianism in the Song and Ming Dynasties, especially the school of mind, often "sit back and talk about the nature of mind when there is nothing to do, and die to repay the king when in danger." It is said that they only emphasize the "mind method," but there is no "method" at all. These arguments and comments have been expanded repeatedly, and people gradually misunderstand that Chinese culture as a whole is introverted and precocious and that the entire history is stagnant, as it has been for two or three thousand years. These statements are not accurate, but this expanded statement is everywhere.

In this way, Confucian knowledge is said to be only local knowledge and has not reached the level of universal truth. What Confucianism talks about is only in the private domain and is inferior to the public domain. According to this statement, Confucianism cannot be put on the stage. If Confucianism is like this, other small traditions in China are even more superstitious, backward, ignorant, and absurd. Thorough anti-traditionalists believe that if this is the case, then the entire tradition should be abandoned entirely so that Chinese civilization can be reborn. As long as you read the Confucian classics, whether it is the Four Books, the Five Classics, or the Twenty-Five Histories, it is evident that all the above misunderstandings about Confucian

civilization are apparent. However, for more than a hundred years, almost all the so-called progressive enlighteners have mistakenly blamed Confucianism for China's weakness, authoritarianism, and ignorance. I think this is the misunderstanding of Chinese culture in the so-called crisis of cultural consciousness in modern China, the existential crisis of the Chinese people, when the foundation of their wealth and life has been completely shaken and suddenly don't know what to do. (Zhang, 1978).

This understanding of the horizon and realm of existence overshadows everything else, making the enlightened people who are eager to save the nation mistakenly think that everything will be saved as long as they introduce Mr. De and Mr. Sai. Foreign culture is enough to redeem China. Under the extreme lack of self-confidence, there were internal and external troubles, military disasters, and wars. Although the Anti-Japanese War finally became a victorious country, the land of China was already scorched and devastated. Immediately after the civil war between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party and after 1949, contemporary New Confucianists who took refuge in Hong Kong could not help but lament that the flowers and fruits had disappeared. In the hardships of "empty hands and nothing," "the road is long and endless," in "the chaos and wandering," "my body and skin are hungry, and my spirit is exhausted," despite this, "I press forward despite hardships and dangers." "I am passionate," "Two shoulders carry a heavy burden, take advantage of youth, and move forward in a team." The New Asia school song by Mr. Qian Binsi can be seen then. In this situation, seeking "self-plantation of spiritual roots" is not easy.

Emphasizing the priority of "self-plantation of spiritual roots" was necessary in the last century. Not only do spiritual roots self-root, but they must be planted between the sky and the earth. They must be moistened by rain and dew and illuminated by the brilliance of the sun and moon before they can grow. To save the nation and survive, to enlighten the people's wisdom and cultivate their morality, we must start from the self-plantation of this spiritual root. Just as Qian Mu said, "The mountains are rocky, the sea is deep, the earth is vast, the sky is high, the people are noble, and the soul is the soul. A broad mind comes from a long time." "A hundred thousand miles, up and down, in all directions, overlooking the beauty. There has been a bright future for five thousand years, and there are hundreds of thousands of descendants of gods. There are sages in the East China Sea, the West China Sea, the South China Sea, and the North China Sea. Cherish it and cherish it. This is my Xinya spirit." Qian Mu, Tang Junyi, Mou Zongsan, Zhang Pijie, Xu Fuguan, etc. The New Asia spirit has genuinely produced the results of the work of "self-plantation of spiritual roots."

I think that "heaven and earth, mountains and seas, and people's hearts" are exactly the

three talents of Chinese culture. The tradition of heaven, earth and people is the tradition of "the sky is bright, the earth is rich, and the people are long-lasting". This is the tradition of "the Inner Sagehood and the Outer Kingliness interacting and influencing each other to give birth to each other". This tradition has already developed its meaning as early as in the "World" chapter of "Zhuangzi" (Qian, 2017). I think that Confucianism and Daoism originally had the same origin, and although they developed differently later, after all, they have the same origin and are complementary (Lin, 2003a). This structure of inner sagehood and the outer kingliness is sufficient and full.

As the entire modern China is in a serious crisis of existential meaning, with flowers and fruits scattered (talented people scattered everywhere), the establishment of confidence is the most serious problem. Contemporary Neo-Confucianism is facing the loud clamor of radical anti-traditionalists. They try their best to find the soul of Confucianism from the mind-nature essence of Confucianism in the Song and Ming dynasties, work hard to re-establish this symbol of the national spirit and hope to "self-plant the spiritual roots". Contemporary Neo-Confucianism places too much emphasis on the self-plantation of spiritual roots. This "spiritual root" becomes a metaphysical ontology through in-depth philosophical interpretation. I call this in-depth philosophical interpretation work "metaphysical preservation." For "metaphysical preservation", of course there is also a need for "metaphysical enlightenment" (Lin, 1995). The inner sagehood can create a new outer king, and thus it has become a practical force that must be activated.

What is "metaphysically preserved" is "morality", and what is "metaphysically opened up" is "knowledge." How to use "morality" to open up "wisdom" and how to open up "knowledge" from "morality" have become the most important issues. In this way, "the inner sage creates a new outer king", and how to create knowledge from morality, so "Self-Entrapment of Conscience, to create the intellectual subject, and create democratic science", this kind of theory was born. It was in this thinking that Mr. Mou Zongsan integrated the three religions, the Chinese and the Western, and constructed his two-level ontological system. Under this system, the popular theory of "Self-Entrapment of Conscience" was put forward (Lin, 1999), as "the inner sagehood can create a new outer king" to complete the process from metaphysical preservation to metaphysical opening. course.

VIII. What Is the Significance of Proposing "from the Outer Kingliness to the Inner Sagehood"? Inspiration from What Wang Chuanshan Said: "Without Tools, There Is No Way."

What is "metaphysically preserved" is "morality," and what is "physically opened up" is "knowledge." "Wisdom" is opened up with "virtue," and "knowledge" is opened up from "morality." With this saying, we begin to have a sense of understanding, mistakenly believing that what we were "strong" was "morality" and that what we were "weak" was "knowledge" in the past. More importantly, this "morality" is an eternal metaphysical entity, which is no doubt. The problem is that we are too moral and too esoteric. Our whole hearts are wrapped up in morality and a metaphysical body. Therefore, our knowledge lags, and we ignore the knowledge system. We must work hard now. The knowledge system can be re-opened from the morality wrapped in this metaphysical Dao.

The problem lies here: are we really too moral and metaphysical? Do we need to "get stuck" so that we can not be too moral and give "knowledge" a chance to breathe and open up the knowledge system? Instead of being so top-notch, should we implement down-to-earth principles and open up the bottom-up? Of course, it is not good to be too moral because being too moral will turn it into fake, so it is best to change it as soon as possible. If it is too metaphysical, it will become too empty, which is not good, so it is better to implement it into the physical as soon as possible; this is the best. This appeal is very reasonable, but the problem is why it is called "too moral" and "too metaphysical" and how it causes the problem. What factors make the moral too moral and the metaphysical become too metaphysical? Some of these are charms that are difficult to unlock. The question is how to unlock these charms. It is right to call for detachment, but it may be a problem to mistakenly believe that it is "too moral" or "too metaphysical."

"Inner Sagehood and Outer Kingliness," internal cultivation and external practice should be complete and total, but why did it turn introverted, place too much emphasis on internal cultivation, and even use inner sagehood as the leading practical dimension? This requires looking back at the ups and downs of the entire historical development rather than positioning the development of Chinese history, especially the development of Confucianism, as focusing on the inner sagehood, and the outer kingliness was initially developed and derived from the inner sagehood."

At present, it is mistakenly believed that Confucianism is mainly based on inner sagehood. It is even said that Confucianism only involves the "private domain" and fails to reach the "public domain." Confucianism is only worthy of being regarded as "local knowledge." Although these opinions are different, Confucianism is underestimated and thought to be

introverted. This is a view of comparison by a closed mentality and under a severe crisis of consciousness. This is viewed by ideologicalization under the sub-colonial culture. Of course, no one will object to the call to move from the private sphere to the public sphere, from local knowledge to universal knowledge. The same request can be made to move from virtue to wisdom and from the inner sagehood to the outer kingliness. This is, of course, also correct. The question is how to make it happen.

If we don't understand the ups and downs of history, we mistakenly believe that we were in darkness before and that we need to remove the darkness and usher in the light. Or we mistakenly believe that we were once bright, but the brightness burned our eyes and made it difficult to see clearly. I am afraid that we need to be shaded and sunk to open up the real clear distinction. These calls must be implemented; the so-called implementation means understanding it realistically. The reason why we turn inward and ignore the external structure is. This is closely related to our two thousand years of high-pressure patriarchy, autocratic monarchy, and male-centeredness. It is the "vertical axis of kinship" composed of these three, coupled with the imperial examination system and the eight-legged essay to select scholars, which dogmatized and stereotyped the cultivation and formation of talents. This "vertical axis of kinship" is consolidated into an authoritarian and centralized structure that is difficult to unravel. This structure has led to an overemphasis: our morality too moralistic, our humanity overly humanistic, and our inner sagehood too internatlized. This "too much" leads to a state of "closure."

If we only understand it as "too moral" and "too metaphysical," we should start from the "knowledge" system and open up the "not metaphysical," which will ignore the actual historical facts. However, we only think of metaphysical reality and mistakenly believe that it is the foundation of everything in the universe, hoping that this foundation can open up everything. Such a statement is just a philosophical construct, a particular interpretation, not an actual historical fact. Under the philosophical structure system, we call for metaphysical opening. Although it also gives a natural process, the Self-Entrapment of Conscience opens up the intellectual subject. This intellectual subject opens the situation of opposition, and a new external kingship is opened. This statement is just a philosophical, theoretical, logical order in the hermeneutic sense. It is not the historical order of occurrence nor the practical learning order (Lin, 1994).

I have discussed the similarities and differences between these three orders in many places. As far as our modernization in East Asia is concerned, it is not the modernization of the original place but the modernization derived from it. We may not repeat the historical modernization

sequence in the original place of origin because this is unrealistic. Nor can we deduce the practical learning order by clarifying the theoretical structure of philosophy and following the theoretical logical order in the hermeneutic sense. Of course, again, this is unrealistic. It is also worth noting that "internal cultivation - external practice" and "Inner Sagehood and Outer Kingliness" influence each other, and the two ends are consistent. The inner sage's study of inner cultivation is not eternal and will change with the passage of generations. With changes, there will be different outer king structures, organizational systems, and living fields, and there will also be different inner sagehood studies. Especially in the generation after the separation of monarchy, patriarchy, and male dominance, this is a democratic constitutional government and a civil society. In this life world and historical society, the inner sagehood studies cultivated will naturally be different.

In Wang Chuanshan's words, "the material unity of Dao," and particular emphasis on "without its material, there is no Dao," the concrete, existing, living world takes precedence over metaphysical universal, abstract principles. Wang Chuanshan also said that before the material was formed, the principle of metaphysical hiddenness and unrevealing already existed. In terms of ontology, "Dao" is the priority, and in terms of genetics, "material" is the priority. Wang Chuanshan advocates that both aspects deserve attention, and I call it the "ontogenetic method" (Lin, 1987). "Dao" and "material" are hidden in each other as a house and intertwined for use. "The metaphysical one is called the Dao, and the physical thing is called the material." "Dao" is the metaphysical "hometown" of "material," and "Material" is the concrete implementation of "Dao" (Lin, 2009, 2012a, 2012b).

Why do I say "Outer Kingliness and Inner Sagehood" in addition to "the original inner sage creates a new outer king"? This is because, under the thinking of Wang Chuanshan's "ontogenesis," it is essential to It emphasizes the re-adjustment of the inner sagehood in the learning process of the new outer kingliness and advocates that the inner sagehood should also have a new inner sage. This is what Wang Chuanshan said: "Without material, there is no Dao." Of course, the inner sagehood and the outer kingliness "hide each other as a home and hand each other around for use." In fact, Inner Sagehood and Outer Kingliness are communicating and cooperating as one body and complementary to each other.

IX. Conclusion: The Inheritance of Knowledge Is as Long and Lasting as Ever.

Whether China's cultural traditions can be modernized should not be a question. It just needs to be done. If you can do it, you can do it. If you can't do it, it will be impossible if you

don't do it seriously. It's not about whether it's possible but whether people can do it. Furthermore, modernization is only a stage in humanity's historical development. It may manifest differently in different regions, traditions, and ethnic groups. Modernization is not the same as Westernization. Modernization is not a singular number but a plural number. It is plural, differentiated, and will vary depending on region, race, culture, and tradition. Although they are different, they can be understood together.

"Inner Sagehood, Outer Kingliness," "Inner Cultivation, and Outer Practice" are essentially one. Why is there a preference for "Inner Sagehood" in the Chinese political tradition? Especially since Confucianism in the Song and Ming dynasties has prioritized the inner sagehood, this bias toward the "Inner Sagehood" does not entirely ignore "Outer Kingliness," nor does it mean that there is no study of outer kingliness. Contemporary Neo-Confucianism seeks to establish its spiritual roots amidst the falling flowers and fruits. It advocates the "original Inner Sagehood" and the creation of the "new Outer Kingliness." This is due to its painstaking efforts and the fundamental limitations of its thinking. We should face this limitation and seek new possibilities for transformation and creation.

We should step beyond the limitations of subjective philosophy and return to the rich world of life to seek the starting point and intersection of a sense of reality. Abandon methodological essentialism and replace it with methodological conventionalism. The morality of "Destiny is nature" cannot be just a priori. It should be noted that after the birth of a life, personality is slowly formed day by day. What is not formed can be formed, and what has been formed can be changed. Morality is developing and changing. It is formed by human culture.

In February 1994, I proposed the "Outline of Post Neo-Confucianism" and later put forward the concept of "Outer kingliness and Inner Sagehood," which triggered discussions among many teachers, friends, and colleagues. It even led to rumors of "betraying the teacher." "A journey can tell a horse's power, and time can tell a person's heart." I uphold my academic conscience, "I love my teacher, and I love the truth even more." "Leave it to the teacher." I just continued my momentum and moved forward hard. This article can be used to respond to my mentors and friends who have urged me over the years.

Regarding the philosophical system, I constructed the "Three States of Existence Theory" (Cheng, 2011; Lin, 1993; Zhang, 2012); based on the three teachings of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism, I further developed its logotherapy thinking. In political philosophy, I criticized the "misplacement of Dao." Further, I pointed out that we should move from the "bloodline vertical axis" to the "interpersonal interaction axis" so that it is possible to unravel the imperial system and rebuild Confucianism (Yang, 2006). In terms of methodology, I advocate

abandoning essentialism (or realism) and replacing it with "conventionalism (or nominalism). In terms of Chinese humanistic hermeneutics. I propose "Dao, intention, imagination, structure, and sentence" fifth-order structure. It is advocated that the interpretation of classics should not be separated from the world of life, the understanding of mind, and the Dao to which heaven, earth, people, me, and all things go. Dao is the origin of existence. Furthermore, I found that in the Chinese philosophical tradition, we advocate a continuous view of existence, which is different from Western philosophy, which is dominated by the existing view of rupture. "The harmony of existence and value" takes precedence over "the consistency of thinking and existence" principle.

Over the past forty years of hard work, my development and philosophy are very different from those of my teacher, Mr. Mou Zongsan. Contemporary Neo-Confucianism is based on Wang Yangming's studies. Obviously, I am based on Wang Chuanshan's studies. Although Wang Yangming and Wang Chuanshan are different, they both owe their roots to Confucius. Looking back at Mr. Mou Zongsan's photo on the study wall, "Inherited from Confucius, his sincerity reaches heaven and earth. His comments of the three religions can be traced back to ancient times and the present." I can't help but bow my head and sigh: I am grateful to Mr. Mou Zongsan for his teaching. I want to thank Mr. Mou Zongsan for giving me a sufficient world of thinking. I can dance and wield swords in the world of philosophy. From the moves taught to me by Mr. Mou Zongsan, I am studying hard. There have been some transformations and developments. Of course, if we want creative transformation and innovative development, we must work harder. The inheritance of knowledge is as long as it lasts and will never end.

— The Summer of Guimao (2023) June 26th in the Gregorian calendar, completed at Yuanheng Academy, Taichung

Reference

- Berlin, I. (1969). *Four essays on liberty*. Oxford University Press.
- Chen, L. (2005). Universality and regionality of Confucianism. *Tianjin Social Sciences*, 3, 4-10. (in Chinese)
- Chen, Y. S. (2004). From humanism to democracy: A study of the renovation of political culture of Confucianism. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(2), 87-111. (in Chinese)
- Cheng, Z. H. (2011). From "One mind opening two doors" to "The three stages of existence": A new development dimension of Confucianism." *Philosophical Trends*, 6. (in Chinese)

- Hsu, K. H. (2012). Three conceptions of liberty revisited. *Soochow Journal of Political Science*, 13(2), 169-219. (in Chinese)
- Hu, Q. Y. (1979). Review of Yu Yingshi's "Anti-intellectualism and Chinese political tradition": On Mr. Yu's misunderstanding of English and fabrication of "anti-intellectualism." *Chinese Magazine*, 17 (191). (in Chinese)
- Jin, Z. J. (2020). Editorial notes on the complete collection of "phenomenon and Thing-in-Itself," In *The Complete Works of Mou Zongsan, Vol. 21*(2nd ed.). Linking Publishing Company. (in Chinese)
- Li, M. H. (2003). The transition from "Inner Sage" to "Outer King" : Political philosophy of modern Neo-Confucianism. *Bulletin of the Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy*, 23, 337-350. (in Chinese)
- Liao, C. F. (Ed.) (2017). *Post-Neo-Confucianism and the postmodern: A festschrift for professor An-Wu Lin on his 60th birthday*. Taiwan Student Bookstore & Yuanheng Academy. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (1991). *A study on Wang Chuanshan's philosophical thought of human nature*. The Grand East Book Co. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (1994). Understanding and reflection on 'Contemporary Neo-Confucianism' and related issues (Part 1). *Legein Monthly*, 223, 10-20. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (1995). Endless sorrow: Mourning Mou Zongsan and discussing preservation of metaphysics and opening of practice. *China Journal of Literary and Philosophical Research*, 5(2), 178-180. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (1996). *Philosophical examination of Confucianism and traditional Chinese society: A development centered on the bloodline vertical axis*. Youth Cultural Enterprise Co. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (1997). *Contract, freedom, and historical thinking*. Li Ming Cultural Enterprise Co. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (1998). *The revolution of Confucianism: The problem dimension of Post-Neo-Confucianism*. Taiwan Student Bookstore. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (1999). Untangling the misplacement of the Dao: Some thoughts on the "Self-Obstruction of Conscience." *Confucius Quarterly*, 53, 14-26. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2003a). Interpretation of "Dao" and "De": A theoretical exposition of the common origin and complementary nature of Confucianism and Daoism: Centered on "Dao Sheng Zhi, De Xu Zhi" in the Laozi and "Zhi Yu Dao, Ju Yu De" in the Analects." *Legein Monthly*, 334, 23-29. (in Chinese)

- Lin, A. W. (2003b). Welcoming the Post-Mou Zongsan Era: A reflection on the publication of the complete works of Mou Zongsan. *Legein Monthly*, 335, 0-1. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2003c). *The misplacement of the Dao: The fundamental dilemma of Chinese political thought*. Taiwan Student Bookstore. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2004). New thoughts on Post-Neo-Confucianism: From "Outer Kingliness" to "Inner Sagehood" – The possible development of Confucianism centered on "social Justice." *Legein Monthly*, 350, 35-54. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2009). *Chinese humanistic hermeneutics*. Taiwan Student Bookstore. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2012a). Some thoughts on Wang Chuanshan's "Classical Hermeneutics": Also on the dialectic of "substance" and "method" (Part 1). *Legein Monthly*, 443, 22-28. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2012b). Some thoughts on Wang Chuanshan's "Classical Hermeneutics": Also on the dialectic of "substance" and "method" (Part 2). *Legein Monthly*, 444, 17-22. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2016). *Bloodline vertical axis: Untangling imperial system, reconstructing Confucianism*. Taiwan Student Bookstore. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2019). *The Analects: Interpretation and commentary on the holy scriptures and mind methods*. Taiwan Student Bookstore. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2020a). Overcoming the Thucydides Trap: Reflecting on academic colonization and academic indigenization in Kwang-Kuo Hwang's "Indigenized social Sciences academic research publications and prospects". *Journal of Indigenous Counseling Psychology*, 11(4), 37-58. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2020). From "Post-May Fourth" to "Post-May Fourth": Considering the role of Chinese civilization in the 21st Century based on the "Three Stages of Existence" theory. *Journal of Chinese Humanities*, 377, 93-102. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2022). Some discussions on the "Theory of human nature in Pre-Qin Confucianism: A development centered on Mencius and Xunzi." *Qilu Journal*, 286, 5-29. (in Chinese)
- Lin, Y. S. (2020). *The crisis of Chinese consciousness: The radical anti-traditionalism during the May Fourth period*. Linking Publishing Company. (in Chinese)
- Lin, Z. H. (1991). "Hu Shi's scientificism." In C. Z. Zhou & D. G. Tang (Eds.), *Hu Shi and modern China*. China Times Publishing Co. (in Chinese)

- Lin, Z. H. (2007). Karl Popper and the transformation of contemporary philosophy of science." In Z. H. Lin & G. Popper (Eds.), *Scientific explanation* (2nd ed.), pp. 39-66. Tung Ta Publishers. (in Chinese)
- Montesquieu (1998). *The spirit of the laws* (Trans. Y. S. Zhang). The Commercial Press. (Original work published in 1748) (in Chinese)
- Mou Zongsan (1975). *Phenomenon and thing-in-Itself*. Taiwan Student Bookstore. (in Chinese)
- Mou Zongsan (1985). *The Theory of Perfect Goodness*. Taiwan Student Bookstore. (in Chinese)
- Mou Zongsan (2020). *Complete works of Mou Zongsan*. Linking Publishing Company. (in Chinese)
- Popper, K. (2020). *The open society and its enemies* (Trans. W. R. Zhuang & Y. M. Li). Business Weekly Publications. (Original work published in 1945) (in Chinese)
- Qian Mu. (2017). *Commentary on Zhuangzi* (6th ed., 7th printing). The Grand East Book. (in Chinese)
- Ruan, Y. (Ed.) (2013). *Thirteen Classics with commentaries*. Yiwen Publishing House. (in Chinese)
- Tseng, C. H. (1990). Human relationships and human rights in a changing society. *Universitas: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture*, 17(9), 846-852. (in Chinese)
- Wang Bi et al. (2016). *Four kinds of Lao Tse*. National Taiwan University Press. (in Chinese)
- Yang, C. T. (1994). On Hu Shih's view of scientific method." *Bulletin of the Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy*, 5, 129-154. (in Chinese)
- Yang, S. Z. (2006a). From "bloodline vertical axis" to "misplacement of the Dao" (Part 1): The entry point of An-Wu Lin's "Post-Contemporary Neo-Confucianism. " *Legein Monthly*, 370, 60-64. (in Chinese)
- Yang, S. Z. (2006b). From "bloodline vertical axis" to "misplacement of the Dao" (Part 2): The entry point of An-Wu Lin's "Post- Contemporary Neo-Confucianism. " *Legein Monthly*, 371, 49-58. (in Chinese)
- Yang, S. Z. (2006c). From "bloodline vertical axis" to "misplacement of the Dao" (Part 3): The entry point of An-Wu Lin's "Post- Contemporary Neo-Confucianism. " *Legein Monthly*, 372, 57-63. (in Chinese)
- Yu Yingshi (1976). *History and thought*. Linking Publishing Company. (in Chinese)
- Zhang, H. (1978). Neo-Confucianism and the ideological crisis of contemporary China (Trans. Lin Zhenguó). *Legein Monthly*, 35, 2-13. (in Chinese)

- Zhang, X. K. (2012). *A study on An-Wu Lin's thought of the three stages of existence*
[Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Hebei University. (in Chinese)
- Zheng, X. (annot.) (1981). *The Book of Rites*. Xuehai. (in Chinese)
- Zhu, X. (2012). *The Four Books with commentaries and subcommentaries*. Zhonghua Book
Company. (in Chinese)