

林安梧對於「黃漢忠、許明珠、吳美瑤、李瑞全」四位教授評議之回覆

林安梧*

摘要

本文針對黃漢忠、許明珠、吳美瑤、李瑞全四位教授的評議進行了回應，主要討論了當代新儒家的實踐哲學、道德與政治的關係、中西文化的差異以及政權的合法性等問題。值得注意的是，關於牟宗三的「良知自我坎陷」說，由於其過於理想化，且重視的是詮釋上的理論次序，而忽略了社會實踐的真實歷程。作者主張應該從外王學習過程中調節內聖，並提出「方法論上的約定主義」以替代「方法論上的本質主義」。再者，他強調中國文化傳統並非本質上妨礙現代化，而是可以在適應現代社會需求的同時發揮其獨特價值。作者還討論了政權的合法性與民主制度的建立，認為道德與政治應該相輔相成，共同構建和諧社會。他最後提到，應該明確區分歷史的發生次序、實踐的學習秩序以及理論的邏輯次序，以促進現代化的有效發展。

關鍵詞：當代新儒家、實踐、良知自我坎陷、方法論、約定主義、本質主義、學習次序、現代化

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。

感謝「黃漢忠、許明珠、吳美瑤、李瑞全」四位教授的審閱與評議，茲擇要回覆如下：

壹、關於對黃漢忠教授的回應，如下

一、林安梧對「良知自我坎陷」說的批評是否恰當？當代新儒家是否全盤接受西方的民主與科學？

回答：牟宗三先生的「良知自我坎陷」說過於強調道德的自覺以及主體的轉折，而忽視了社會實踐與歷史情境的重要性。這種觀點在理論上十分曲折，但實踐上，過於理想化，未能充分考慮到人性的複雜性與社會環境的影響。因為，過分強調個體內在的道德自覺，可能會導致對外在社會條件的忽視，從而使道德實踐變得空洞無力。

明顯地，當代新儒家對於接受西方民主與科學，基本上反思是不足的。之所以不足，因為他們是處在花果飄零的年代，只能努力尋求靈根自植而已。它們要回答的是，中國文化是否妨礙現代化，還來不及思考更為繁複的現代化之後的問題，儘管有些觸及，仍只是隨緣說道。我認為：整個結構性的確需要去面對與處理，此其時矣。這必須涉及到總體的思考。擺脫「本內聖以開出新外王」的「內先而外後」的思考，才有新的可能。「內外本為一體」，而實踐的學習次序是「外先而內後」，理論的邏輯次序是「內先而外後」，這兩者是「兩端而一致」的。我提出「由外王而內聖」，這是一個矯治的提法，而總的來說，我主張「兩端而一致」。正如同《中庸》也說「合外內之道」也。

當然，在中國文化傳統的基礎上，有選擇地吸收西方文明的優點，強調中西文化的融合，並試圖在保持中國文化特色的同時，實現現代化，乃至對現代化之後的反思是必要的。西方民主與科學在推動社會進步的同時，也可能帶來文化同質化與價值觀的衝突。在借鑒西方經驗的同時，保持文化獨立性與自主性，並尋求一條適合中國國情的現代化道路，所謂創造性的轉化、創新性的發展是必要的，而且是可能的。

二、當代新儒家是否陷入「方法論上的本質主義」困境？中國文化傳統是否本質上妨礙現代化？

當代新儒家在某些方面確實存在「方法論上的本質主義」傾向，即過分強調文化本質與傳統價值，而忽略了具體歷史情境與社會變遷。相對來說，我提倡「方法論上的約定主義」，強調理論與實踐的開放性與多元性。過分堅持文化本質主義可能會導致對其他文化與價值觀的忽略或貶抑，從而限制了文化交流與創新。我們尊重文化多樣性的基礎上，尋求跨文化對話與合作，以實現人類社會的共同進步。當然，當代新儒家並不是封閉而保守的，但有著太強的本位意識，是妨礙更多交談對話的。

當然，中國文化傳統並非本質上妨礙現代化，而是可以在適應現代社會需求的同時，發揮其獨特價值。在尊重傳統的基礎上，進行創造性轉化與創新性發展。中國文化傳統中蘊含著豐富的智慧與價值，如儒家的人文關懷、道家的自然觀念與佛家的慈悲精神等，都可以為現代社會提供寶貴的啟示與借鑒。在保持文化傳承的同時，積極吸收現代文明的成果，以實現中國文化的現代化與世界化。值得注意的是，不必定性說中國文化是道德的，西方文化是知識的，而把問題推到：「如何從道德開出知識」，推到這論題上，去做過多的論述，是完全不必要的。因為像「中國傳統文化本質上是否能開出現代化」，這根本是徹底的反傳統主義者所擬的虛假問題。徹底的反傳統主義者，認為中國傳統文化本質上是妨礙現代化的，所以他認為應該徹底地拋除傳統文化。相對來說，當代新儒家則認為中國文化傳統本質上是道德的，問題點是如何從「道德」開出「知識」的問題。其實，這問法，一開始就錯了。這是時代的限制所造成的。

三、西方民主與科學是否存在根本缺陷？道德與政治在當代新儒學中應如何定位？

顯然地，西方民主與科學，在某些方面確實存在缺陷，例如可能導致極端個人主義與物質主義。在借鑒西方文明的同時，應保持批判性思維，並努力實現中西文化的互補與融合。西方民主與科學雖然在推動人類社會進步的過程中發揮了重要作用，但也存在著價值觀衝突與道德風險。尊重西方文明的同時，積極探索適合中國國情的民主與科學發展道路，以實現社會和諧與人類福祉。這其實是一個摸石子過河的、實踐的學習過程，但絕對不是道德太盛，而忽略了知識的問題。當然，不必去思考如何從道德開出知識，也就不會有如何從良知坎陷而開出知性主體的論法。

道德與政治應該相輔相成，共同構建和諧社會。道德是政治的基礎，而政治則是道德的實踐場域。我們應該強調道德與政治的緊密聯繫，並尋求二者之間的平衡。道德與政治的結合不僅有助於提升個體的道德素養，還能促進社會公共利益的實現。在尊重個體權利的同時，關注社會整體的福祉與發展，以實現道德與政治的和諧共生。記得：不是好的道德決定了好的政治，當然也不是好的政治決定了好的道德，他們是彼此互為影響、相互決定的。

四、如何理解中西文化在道德與知識習得上的差異？林安梧提出的「方法論上的約定主義」與當代新儒學有何不同？

中西文化在道德與知識習得上的差異主要體現在價值觀與方法論上。中國文化強調道德修養與人際和諧，而知識習得則側重於內省與體悟；西方文化則更重視個人權利與自由，以及客觀知識的積累與傳承。在尊重差異的基礎上，實現中西文化的交流與融合。

中西文化在道德與知識習得上的差異反映了不同的歷史背景與文化傳統。我們應保持文化特色的同時，積極探索跨文化對話與合作的可能性，以實現人類智慧的共享與增長。

「方法論上的約定主義」強調理論與實踐的開放性與多元性，主張在具體歷史情境與社會變遷中尋求最適切的解決方案。與當代新儒學相比，這種觀點更加注重實際問題的解決，而非過分強調文化本質與傳統價值。無疑地，「方法論上的約定主義」有助於打破學術界的封閉性與保守性，促進學術創新與社會進步。在尊重學術傳統的同時，關注社會現實的需求與挑戰，以實現學術研究與社會實踐的有機結合。值得注意的是：為免於方法論上的約定主義容易導生價值相對主義，乃至價值虛無主義，我們應該徹底地回到生活世界、重視歷史社會總體，回到事物自身。「回到事物自身」的現象學式的思考是必要的，而且應該從「存在的覺知」啟動。

五、如何看待政權的合法性與民主制度的建立？當代新儒學如何回應文化本質主義的批評？

當代新儒學應該在尊重傳統價值的基礎上，關注政權的合法性與民主制度的建立。通過道德與政治的結合，實現社會的和諧與穩定，並在此過程中逐步完善民主制度。政權的合法性不僅來自於憲法與法律的規定，還應該建立在道德與民意的基礎上。在尊重政治制度的前提下，關注公民的道德素養與政治參與，以實現政權的合法性與民主制度的完善。明顯地，宋明儒學所強調的心性之學，之作為道德修養與社會實踐的根本，他 不免仍然囿限在帝皇專制、父權高壓、男性中心的格局來啟動思考的。這與當今是很大不同的，民主憲政、男女平權、重視個體，這樣的外王學當然不會是以前的，這樣的內聖學也就與以前不同。所以不只是去思考：如何從內聖開出新外王，而是在新外王的學習過程裡，好好調節內聖。

我認為當代新儒學應該積極回應文化本質主義的批評，強調在尊重傳統的同時，關注具體歷史情境與社會變遷。在保持文化特色的基礎上，進行創造性轉化與創新性發展，以實現中國文化的現代化。文化本質主義的批評提醒我們，文化不是靜止不變的，而是隨著時間與環境的變化，不斷發展與演變。如同外王之學的變化一樣，內聖之學不是不變的，它們都是與時俱進的，在尊重文化傳承的同時，關注文化創新與變革的可能性，以實現中國文化的活力與創造力。

最後，我想要說的是，在探討民主與科學的發展過程時，我們應當明確區分三個不同的次序：歷史的發生次序、實踐的學習秩序以及理論的邏輯次序。這三個次序在東亞地區的發展中尤為重要，因為它們不僅受到西方歷史發展的影響，還必須結合自身的實際情況進行適應和調整。

首先，歷史的發生次序指的是西方所謂已發達國家，在歷史進程中民主與科學發展的先後順序和路徑。這一順序是基於西方特定的歷史背景和文化環境形成的，而東亞國家在發展民主和科學時，並不一定需要完全遵循這一順序。其次，實踐的學習秩序強調的是每個國家或地區在實際操作中學習和適應民主與科學發展的過程。這一秩序需要根據本國的實際情況，如文化、經濟、社會結構等因素，來確定最適合自身發展的路徑和節奏。理論的邏輯次序則是從哲學或理論的角度出發，探討民主與科學發展的邏輯關係和內在聯繫。例如，「良知自我坎陷說」是一種哲學詮釋上的理論邏輯秩序，它關注的是良知在個體和社會發展中的作用和意義。

我們應當清晰地區分這三種次序，理解它們在民主與科學發展中的不同作用和影響。特別是在東亞地區，應當基於自身的實際情況，靈活運用和調整，重視實踐的學習次序，以促進現代化的有效發展，並且反思到現代化之後的種種論題。

貳、關於許明珠教授所提出的論題

一、儒者的自我期許與道德實踐

在民主社會中，儒者是否應該僅滿足於作為守法公民，還是需要堅持更高的道德標準和淑世情懷？儒者是否應該持續強調「存天理，去人欲」的氣魄，即使在現代社會的多元價值中？

回答：當然，儒者必須要有更高的自我期許與道德實踐，但必須以公民社會的公民意識之覺醒，及符合公民之法律及倫理作為起點。就我的經驗來說，常常看到許多以儒家自居的朋友，缺乏公民意識，常自認為自己是儒家代言人，而且是主導者，這便造成了嚴重的扭曲與異化，問題的嚴重性在於最基本的「公民」要先做好。進一步，當然要有君子之風、君子之德、君子之行。

「存天理、去人欲」其實說的是「存天理之公，去人欲之私」，但說久了，這話便有了問題，而被誤認為「飲食男女之欲」都是人欲，都得盡去。須知：「人欲淨盡，天理流行」這些太過強調的、道德嚴肅主義的提法，都是有問題的。其實，人欲淨盡，天理就不行了，恰當的說，只要能推擴出去，有普遍性、理想性、總體性，這就可以了。孟子回答齊宣王，寡人好色、寡人好貨，他便是把這好色、好貨，推而擴充之，說到「室無怨女，野無曠夫」、「貨暢其流，人人得利」，這便是了。孟子學經由宋明理學的詮釋，使他變得太過於道德心性化了，其實，孟子之學是充實而飽滿的，不可以概括為「存天理、去人欲，而是「理欲合一」論。孟子說「可欲之謂善，有諸己之謂信，充實之謂美，充實而有光輝之謂大，大而化之之謂聖，聖而不可知之之謂神」。這起點就在「可欲」，「可欲」說的是為共同體之所可，同時，為道體之所可，為天理之所可，為本心之所可。我

認為「存天理、去人欲」這語彙是有弊病的。有些時、有些人還說成「存天理、滅人欲」，那更會是錯解連連。王船山的「理欲合一」才是合理的。

公民儒者的社會參與：公民儒者應該積極參與；如婦女平權、環境保護、勞動權益等社會公共議題，一方面實現「利用」和「厚生」的理想，一方面也回到自家身心上，求其「正德」。儒者應該在社會正義和全體公民福祉的推動中扮演更積極的角色。

二、主觀境界形態的道德論述

在現代社會中，儒學的主觀境界形態的道德實踐是否仍然具有重要性，不應因外王事業的挑戰而被忽視？內聖學是否仍然是儒學的核心，即使在追求民主與科學的現代化過程中，也應持續被重視和實踐？

回答：應該不是主觀的境界型態的道德實踐，而是做為一個讀書人應有的堅持。這是夫子所說的「志於道、據於德、依於仁、游於藝」的「志於道」。是曾子所說的「士不可不弘毅，任重而道遠，仁以為己任，不亦重乎；死而後已，不亦遠乎！」這是孟子所說的「萬物皆備於我矣，反身而誠，樂莫大焉，強恕而行，求仁莫近焉！」，這是實理實事，不適合說是主觀境界型態。即如道家也不適合用此語彙，這語彙常被誤解，而且太過主觀、太過境界，而忽略了真切的、務實的。記得多年前，我曾有一篇文章寫到這些論題，是對主觀境界型態批評的。在《鵝湖》我曾發表多篇文章，就兩篇短論是典型的，一是：〈走向實感的批判之路〉（卜問天，1987）¹²⁰，一是〈孔子與阿Q：一個精神病理史的反省〉（林安梧，1997）¹²¹。

「批判是一種瓦解，批判是一種重構，批判是一種瓦解與重構的辯證歷程。批判是具體的，批判是實感的，批判是一種具體而實感的創造歷程。

作為一種具有瓦解力的批判性儒學正說明他不會自我封限在爛泥之中，終而腐蝕自毀；他不會躲入象牙塔中，思想走階梯，臨風興歎世衰道微。瓦解力的批判性儒學具有一種內在的自我辯證，面向不合理的制度結構發出挑戰的呼聲。自我辯證與挑戰呼聲融匯為道德的鍛鍊。道德的鍛鍊是具體的、是實感的，他指向瓦解、批判及重構、創造。批判不是隔靴搔癢，也不是吳儂軟語，批判不是來自外在的權威，更不是內在的自慰。批判是切指要害，拳打丹田；批判是直語相向，真誠無間；批判是良知的驅策，更是架構的覺醒。良知的驅策必走向架構的覺醒，這樣才叫批判。

良知若未走向架構的覺醒，徒作自我主體的調整，這極易墮入境界的假相。境界的假相造成自我圓足、自我欺矇。自我圓足於爛泥之中，終而腐蝕自毀；自我欺矇於萬物一體之中，實則隨波逐流。

¹²⁰ 卜問天（1987）。〈走向實感的批判之路〉，《鵝湖月刊》，（146），頁1。

¹²¹ 林安梧（1997）。〈孔子與阿Q：一個精神病理史的理解與詮釋〉，《鵝湖月刊》，（262），頁56-57。

道必然開展為器物結構，道必然開展為言說理論。良知必得通過器物結構與言說理論才能參贊乎道，惟有這樣的參贊才是具體的實感的參贊；除此之外，若企求良知直接沒入「道」的實體，這是一種抽象而空泛的玄想，這是境界假相與自我矇騙。

傳統中的儒學容或為帝王家做了不少事，但除了這種帝制式的儒學（Imperial Confucianism），歷史上尚有生活化的儒學（Lively Confucianism），還有批判性的儒學（Critical Confucianism）。生活化的儒學旨在喚醒良知本體，融入一生活世界之中以成己成物。批判性的儒學旨在面對不合理的制度結構，提出建議、修正，乃至瓦解與重構。生活化儒學與批判性儒學是保住儒學生機的在野勢力，亦是抑止帝制式儒學惡化的唯一藥方。

如今帝制式儒學已頹廢乏力，逐漸解構，但鴉片戰爭以來的民族自卑及千餘年來的帝制醬缸卻使得儒學仍然喪失其生活性及批判性，思之！寧不令人憂心如焚呢？惟有走向實感的批判之路，重新挖掘儒學的底蘊，喚醒當下的存在切感，留心「鄉土的文化」，面對結構更革才能廣拓「文化的鄉土」，如此儒學才可能具有瓦解性的批判力，亦才可能展開生化活化的重建。」

另外一篇，引述一部分，如下：

「……將孔子與阿Q對舉起來，一方面說其為兩端，而另一方面則說此兩端乃是一連續的歷程所糾結而成之物。就精神病理史而言，原先儒學所強調的道德實踐是要走向社會實踐的，而魯迅筆下的阿Q卻是徹徹底底的失魂落寞，而落到用「精神勝利法」來自我蒙欺。

原先孔子所開啟的儒學強調的是一「道德的社會實踐意識」，但顯然地世代並未真從宗法封建與帝皇專制中解放出來；因而在此兩面向的糾葛下，道德的社會實踐意識無法暢達的發展，遂滑轉為一「道德的自我修養意識」。原先之轉為一道德的自我修養意識，為的是要歸返生命自身，而再度開啟社會實踐意識，傳統之要求由內聖通向外王，所指殆此。問題是：內聖通不出去為外王，反折回來，又使得那道德的自我修養意識再異化為一「道德自我的境界之追求」。此時之道德轉而為一境界型態之物，而不再是實理實事。原先的道德精神境界的追求所為的是自我的治療與康復，俾其能開啟道德的自我修養之可能；但在世衰道微的情況之下，即如道德精神境界亦成為一虛假而短暫的境界。這再度往下異化便成為一「自我的矯飾」與「自我的休閒」，明說其理由，實則為虛，終而墮入一自我蒙欺，萬劫不復的魔業之中。魂魄既喪，遊走無方，來去無所，這失魂症的病人也只能以「道德的精神勝利法」自我蒙欺罷了。

如上所說，「孔子」與「阿Q」兩者可以關聯成一個井然有序的系譜。由「道德的社會實踐意識」滑轉而為「道德的自我修養意識」，再滑轉為「道德自我的境界追求」，而後再異化為「道德的自我矯飾」與「道德的自我休閒」，終而墮到以「道德的精神勝利法」

而轉為一「道德自我的蒙欺」。我們之所以將「孔子」與「阿Q」做這個精神病理史的關聯性理解，並不是要去說當代中國族群之為阿Q為可接受的，而是要藉由這樣的理解與詮釋達到一治療的作用，進而得以瓦解這個奇怪的綜體，讓中國文化及在此中長養的中國子民有一重生的可能。」

我想許明珠教授看了我所引用這兩段話，也就能了然明白了。若對比李瑞全教授的文字，就可以更了解，沾惹在我們華夏民族的業力習氣，要解開帝制、父權是何等艱難。

參、關於吳美瑤教授的論題之回應

吳美瑤教授就我所提出的論題，轉而探討了新儒家實踐哲學與諮商心理學在人格發展議題上的交會。這樣的回應方式，間接而轉到了他自己的論題上去。這便與我另外的著作《中國宗教與意義治療》是可以相提並論的。她還對比了東西方哲學與心理學，指出東西方哲學如何回應社會變遷。最主要是聚焦於諮商心理學與新儒家實踐哲學對「自我覺察」的重視。

明顯地，這是由我所提出的「外王—內聖」的論題，轉回原先「內聖—外王」，然後轉成「新儒家實踐哲學與諮商心理學在人格發展議題上的交會」。這樣的轉進甚好，但並沒有針對我所提出的論題。我的針對點在於牟宗三先生所提出的「良知的自我坎陷」已開出知性主體，涵攝民主科學，這是在他詮釋的意義下的「理論的邏輯次序」，這不同於「歷史的發生次序」，也不是「實踐的學習次序」。這在前面，我回應的論題裡，已經表述清楚了，不必再贅述。

另外，她還強調品德教育的重要性：指出從牟宗三先生的論點與西方品德教育研究，強調品德對科學知識學習的助益。還有，人倫互動與社會平等：探討儒家的人倫關係與阿德勒心理學中的社會平等觀，強調以人格尊嚴平等為基礎的民主社會。

還有，強調從個體自我覺察開始，實現人的完整發展與建設合理社會的共同目標。提出新儒家與諮商心理學結合的可能性，特別是正念冥想在心理治療中的應用。對林教授與牟宗三先生的觀點進行比較，提出結合諮商心理學研究，深化道德心轉化為認知心的內在心理歷程的探討。這裡在在可以看到吳美瑤教授的用心良苦，而這落在品德教育及諮商心理學以及人格發展等議題上，應該都是可以開展的。

至於，有關「方法論上的本質主義」、「良知的自我坎陷」等論題，我在前面回應黃漢忠、許明珠兩位教授，已經提到，就不再重複了。

肆、關於李瑞全教授所提出的論題

一、關於「外王內聖」「內聖外王」的論題

「外王內聖」還是「內聖外王」，爭議頗多。為此，鵝湖月刊與中國哲學研究中心，特別於二〇二二年九月三日，安排了一場「林安梧 VS 李瑞全」的公開論辯。後來，我在隔年寫了一篇較長的回應文章〈「外王內聖」還是「內聖外王」辯論之後——敬答周群振、李瑞全兩位學長〉（林安梧，2023）¹²²，這篇文章回應了這次辯論，並且酬答早在二〇〇五年即提出異議的周群振學長。由於宋明以來的新儒學太強調「內聖」，而導致內傾、內捲，進而往境界型態的圓教系統邁進，因而生出了許多問題。面對現代化，我們須得釐清「實踐的學習次序」不同於「歷史的發生秩序」、「理論的邏輯秩序」，如此一來，就能了解「由外王而內聖」這思路提出的重要性，進而洞見「中國文化傳統是否妨礙現代化」原是一虛假問題。最後，指出跨過方法論的本質主義的謬誤，進而指出「良知的自我坎陷」的困境，解開「道的錯置」，開啟現代化之後的後新儒學之可能。這篇文章，所敘述應該有助於讀者，解其疑惑。

二、關於「牟宗三之後、後牟宗三」的問題

李瑞全教授有這樣的論斷，他說：

1.「林安梧教授總喜歡自稱自己是進到所謂「後五四」、以「後牟宗三」的口號自稱，但實質上如何的「後五四」、「後牟宗三」卻完全莫名其妙。」

2.「林教授如此云云，便以為可蓋括牟先生的哲學體系之基本要義，又可進而妄稱自己進入了「後牟宗三時代」，超越了牟先生的成就，實是自欺欺人之言。」

3.「林教授的由「外王開內聖」的主張與其自認為批判了和超越了牟宗三先生的「兩層存有論」而來的「後新儒學」的「哲學」有直接的關係，在此需要先剖釋其主張和根本的錯解和不解當代新儒學之義理，特別是牟先生的哲學體系的要點和哲學上的貢獻，以見其由「外王開內聖」之說之謬。」

回答：關於「五四」與「後五四」等等，我有一篇完整的文章，名為：〈從「五四後」到「後五四」——基於「存有三態論」思考中華文明在二十一世紀的角色〉（林安梧，2020）¹²³，敬請參看。又「五四」、「後五四」是目前很清楚的分劃，李教授不可能不知，當然，他故意妄稱不知，那也就罷了。

另外，「牟宗三時代」與「後牟宗三時代」，我有一本專著《牟宗三前後：當代新儒家哲學思想史論》（林安梧，2011）¹²⁴，李教授應該可以看看。牟先生是我尊敬的導師，我發揚他的學問，採取的是創造性的轉化與創新性的發展，並無不可，但我之努力，仍有許多要用功的地方，豈敢妄稱超越吾師。在我任何文字所及，絕無此說法，可能李教

122 該文，林安梧（2023）。「外王內聖」還是「內聖外王」辯論之後——敬答周群振、李瑞全兩位學長，*鵝湖月刊*，（578），頁 17-25。

123 請參看，林安梧（2020）。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*，（2），頁 93-102。

124 請參看，林安梧（2011）。*牟宗三前後：當代新儒家哲學思想史論*，學生書局，頁 434。

授自己糊塗了，夢囈中之語也。

關於「後牟宗三時代」，可以參看我在 2003 年寫的〈迎接「後牟宗三時代」的來臨——《牟宗三先生全集》出版紀感〉這段文字（林安梧，2003）¹²⁵：

「牟先生甦活了中國哲學的慧命，他深入闡述了儒道佛三教哲學，並獨立譯述了康德（I. Kant）三大批判；更難能可貴的是，牟先生將康德三大批判銷融於中國傳統儒道佛之中，經由體系性的建構，成就了規模宏偉的「兩層存有論」。近一百年來的中國哲學發展，無疑的，這是一最為重要的里程碑。

牟先生跨過了「逆格義」的限制，經由「譯述」、「銷融」、「重鑄」的過程，讓中國古代典籍的話語、現代的學術話語、當前的生活話語，和合融通，鑄成偉辭，他生產了鮮活的哲學語彙，開啟了活生生的覺知與思考。

面對廿世紀初以來，中國民族的存在意義危機，牟先生隨順著熊十力先生「體用哲學」所開顯的「乾元性海」，經由一「形而上的保存」，進一步以智識化的理論構造，穩立了道德主體；並冀求「以德開智」，經由「良知的自我坎陷」以開出知性主體，並以此融攝民主與科學。

當然，牟先生將康德哲學之「窮智以見德」經由儒道佛三教的銷融，轉而為「尊德以攝智」。他看似承繼康德「超越的分解」以穩立知識體系，但卻直契陸王，上接孔孟，穩立道德之自我，再下開知識界。這樣的「下開」即是「良知的自我坎陷」之轉出，這是一「辯證的轉折」而開，這卻是近於費希特（J.G. Fichte），而遙遙指向黑格爾（G.W.F. Hegel）。只不過，康德哲學強調的超越分解，使得牟先生做了一形而上的追溯，而有了一形而上的安宅。居於此安宅中，牟先生以一「詭譎的辯證」達到一「圓教」與「圓善」的境界。

「超越的分解」為的是一「形而上的追溯」，進而凸顯由古代經典所喚起的「存在覺知」，就在這存在的覺知的召喚下，讓這難以跨越的鴻溝有了一「詭譎的辯證」之銷融與連結。當然，所謂的「圓教」與「圓善」就是在這詭譎的辯證銷融下完成的。牟先生雖然一再的強調辯證的開展的重要，但他做的卻是辯證的銷融，經由銷融而尋得一形而上的安宅，一純智所思的安宅。

他做了「現象」與「物自身」的超越區分，以「一心開二門」的方式，成就了「執」與「無執」的「兩層存有論」。他雖然一再的強調兩層存有論並不是截然區隔，而是融會通貫；但他卻居於無執的存有論所成的純智所思的安宅，指點人間善惡，規範那執的存有論。他亦贊同天台宗所說之「一念無明法性心」，欣賞其「即九法界而成佛」這種「不斷斷」的精神；但由於時代精神的限制，牟先生仍只能經由一「詭譎的辯證」而達到一

¹²⁵ 請參見，林安梧（2003）。〈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），頁 0-1。

銷融性的和合同一，做成一形而上的圓善。我們要說這樣的圓善並不就是牟宗三哲學的完成，而是預示著一個嶄新的轉折、迴返、批判與發展。

我們當該將牟先生在形而上的居宅中，「結穴成丹」的「圓善」再度入於「乾元性海」，即用顯體，承體達用，讓他入於歷史社會總體的生活世界之中，深耕易耨，發榮滋長，以一本體發生學的思考，正視「理論是實踐的理論，實踐是理論的實踐」，「兩端而一致」的辯證開啟，重開儒學的社會實踐之門。

「轉折」，不再只停留於「主體式的轉折」，而應通解而化之，由「主體性」轉折為「意向性」，再由「意向性」開啟活生生的「實存性」。

「迴返」，不再只停留於「銷融式的迴返」，而應調適而上遂，入於「存有的根源」，進而「存有的彰顯」，再進一步轉出一「存有的執定」。

「承繼」，不再只停留於「哲學史式的論述」，而應如理而下貫，一方面上遂於文化道統，另一方面做一理論性的創造。

「批判」，不再只停留於「超越的分解」，而應辯證的落實，入於「生活世界」所成的歷史社會總體，「即勢成理，以理導勢」，成就一社會的批判，進而開啟一儒學的革命。

「發展」，不再只停留於「古典的詮釋」，而應展開哲學的交談，面對現代的生活話語，經由一活生的存在覺知，重構一嶄新的學術話語，參與於全人類文明的交談與建構。」

台灣地區九二一的大地震、美國九一一雙子星大樓的崩落、美國對伊拉克的反恐戰爭，世紀之交的後現代，人們隨著天地間的顫抖而恐懼，隨著文明的異化而驚疑。這幾個星期來，台灣、香港與大陸正為非典型急性肺炎 SARS 的肆虐痛苦，存在在掙扎中、生命在考驗中，我深切的覺知到朱夫子所說的「堅難！」

牟先生竟已逝世八年，但我仍記起一九九五年為先生所作的輓聯：

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

牟先生面對苦痛與危難的「高狂俊逸」（蔡仁厚先生對牟先生的稱語）令人低迴！夜深矣！深矣！天明亦已近矣！近矣！

抬頭望見我書房上的牟先生造像，有一段文字寫著：

吾師牟宗三先生，畢其生，拓落自然，一無所罣，惟吾華民族文化為終身勳力之目標。彼嘗言：惟有大感受而後有大問題，有大問題而後有大悲心，有大悲心而後有大智慧；如斯始能成就哲學志業也。

壬戌之秋安梧謹誌

先生造像旁邊鑲著一副嵌名對聯，聯曰：

宗師仲尼誠通天地，

三教判列道貫古今

夜深矣！遠矣！天明亦已近矣！近矣！禱之於天地神祇，謹此虔誠，謹此虔誠！

癸未春暮五月五日晨三時於元亨齋

知者知之，不知者不知，這是平常事。只是可惜的是，我呼籲的思想之轉折，已經超過三十年，呼籲「迎接後牟宗三時代之來臨」，也超過二十年，努力示警，我們不能再拿當代新儒家第一代、第二代的問題意識，當成我們這時代的問題意識，我們必須「接著講」，不能「照著講」，我們該「薪未盡，火先傳」，接了棒，繼續努力往前邁進。這幾十年來，居然同門師友，對我多所鼓勵者有之，然若李瑞全教授，如此不解，妄議者有之、顛倒是非者有之，甚至語多涉及人身攻擊，想想歷史上諸多學派的生長，大概也免不了如此景況，面對這些，也只能付諸一笑而已。

這些年來，我最喜歡的兩個字：「從容」，這詞語雖平常，但實大有來頭，它出自老子《道德經》「孔德之容，惟道是從」。因為「惟道是從」，因此「孔德之容」也，有道是依，自爾「從容」了，真真如此也。我願意努力的「伏首甘為孺子牛」，但已不必「橫眉冷對千夫指」；因為這世界是有情分的、有義氣的、有公道的，我想到「天清月朗，與物為春」，便滿心歡喜。我也期待我的學長李瑞全教授，不必如此操急，須知：「知常容，容乃公，公乃全」，從容度日，這世界是有公斷的。善哉！且「喫茶去」！

—甲辰年，2024年6月28日，寫於台北元亨書院

參考文獻

- 卜問天（1987）。走向實感的批判之路。*鵝湖月刊*，146，1。
- 林安梧（1997）。孔子與阿Q：一個精神病理史的理解與詮釋。*鵝湖月刊*，262，56-57。
- 林安梧（2003）。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（2011）。*牟宗三前後：當代新儒家哲學思想史論*。學生書局。
- 林安梧（2020）。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*，2，93-102。
- 林安梧（2023）。「外王內聖」還是「內聖外王」辯論之後——敬答周群振、李瑞全兩位學長。*鵝湖月刊*，578，17-25。

A Response to the Reviews by Professors Hon-Chung Wong, Ming-Chu Hsu, Mei-Yao Wu, and Shui-Chuen Lee by An-Wu Lin

An-Wu Lin*

Abstract

This article responds to the reviews by Professors Hon-Chung Wong, Ming-Chu Hsu, Mei-Yao Wu, and Shui-Chuen Lee, focusing on issues such as the practical philosophy of Contemporary Neo-Confucianism, the relationship between morality and politics, the differences between Chinese and Western cultures, and the legitimacy of political power. Notably, regarding Mou Zongsan's theory of "Self-Entrapment of Conscience," it is critiqued for being overly idealistic and for emphasizing interpretative theoretical order while neglecting the true process of social practice. The author advocates for adjusting the inner sagehood through the learning process of the outer kingliness and proposes "methodological conventionalism" as a replacement for "methodological essentialism." Furthermore, he emphasizes that the traditional Chinese culture does not inherently hinder modernization but can exert its unique value while adapting to the needs of modern society. The author also discusses the establishment of political legitimacy and democratic systems, arguing that morality and politics should complement each other in building a harmonious society. He concludes by stating that it is essential to clearly distinguish the historical order of occurrence, the learning order of practice, and the logical order of theory to promote the effective development of modernization.

Keywords: Contemporary Neo-Confucianism, Practice, Self-Entrapment of Conscience, Methodology, Conventionalism, Essentialism, Learning Order, Modernization

An-Wu Lin*

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

Thanks to the four professors " Hon-Chung Wong, Ming-Chu Hsu, Mei-Yao Wu, and Rui-Quan Li " for their review and comments, I would like to reply as follows:

I. Regarding the response to Professor Hon-Chung Wong

1. Is An-Wu Lin's Critique on the "Self-Entrapment of Conscience" Theory Appropriate? Does Contemporary Neo-Confucianism Fully Embrace Western Democracy and Science?

Response: Mr. Mou Zongsan's theory of "Self-Entrapment of Conscience" places excessive emphasis on moral self-awareness and the transformation of the individual, while neglecting the importance of social practice and historical context. Although this perspective is theoretically sophisticated, it tends to be overly idealistic in practice and does not adequately account for the complexities of human nature and the impact of the social environment. By prioritizing an individual's internal moral awareness, there is a risk of overlooking external social conditions, which can render moral practice superficial and ineffective.

Contemporary Neo-Confucianism have not adequately reflected on their acceptance of Western democracy and science. This shortcoming arises from their existence in an era where the fruits of culture have fallen and scattered, compelling them to strive for a replanting of their spiritual roots. Their primary concern is whether Chinese culture impedes modernization, leaving little room to contemplate more complex post-modernization issues. Although some have touched upon these topics, their discussions remain incidental and incomplete. I believe it is time to confront and address this structural challenge comprehensively. This requires a holistic approach that transcends the notion of the "inner sagehood before the outer kingliness," which prioritizes the internal over the external. The new possibility lies in recognizing that "the internal and external are inherently one," where the sequence of practical learning should prioritize the external before the internal, while the logical order of theory is internal before the external—two ends that ultimately converge. I propose a corrective approach of "from outer kingliness to inner sagehood," emphasizing the "unity of both ends." As stated in *The Doctrine of the Mean*, it is essential to "harmonize the way of the internal and external."

Of course, rooted in the foundation of Chinese cultural tradition, it is essential to selectively absorb the strengths of Western civilization, emphasizing a fusion of Chinese and Western cultures. This approach involves striving for modernization while preserving the unique characteristics of Chinese culture and reflecting on the post-modernization period.

While Western democracy and science propel social progress, they may also result in cultural homogenization and value conflicts. Therefore, while drawing on Western experiences, it is crucial to maintain cultural independence and autonomy, seeking a path of modernization that aligns with China's specific conditions—a path of creative transformation and innovative development that is both necessary and feasible.

2. Do Contemporary Neo-Confucianism Encounter the Challenge of "Methodological Essentialism"? Does the Chinese Cultural Tradition Inherently Impede Modernization?

In some respects, Contemporary Neo-Confucianism exhibit a tendency toward "methodological essentialism," which excessively emphasizes cultural essence and traditional values while neglecting specific historical contexts and social changes. In contrast, I advocate for "methodological conventionalism," which prioritizes openness and pluralism in both theory and practice. An overreliance on cultural essentialism can lead to the disregard or devaluation of other cultures and values, thereby limiting opportunities for cultural exchange and innovation. By respecting cultural diversity, we should strive for intercultural dialogue and collaboration to foster the anticipated progress of human society. Although Contemporary Neo-Confucianism are not entirely closed-minded or conservative, their strong sense of cultural centralism impedes broader dialogues.

Indeed, the Chinese cultural tradition does not inherently obstruct modernization; rather, it can play a unique role by adapting to the needs of modern society through creative transformation and innovative development. The Chinese cultural tradition is rich in wisdom and values—such as Confucian humanism, Daoist naturalism, and Buddhist compassion—which can provide valuable insights and lessons for contemporary society. While preserving cultural heritage, we should actively embrace the achievements of modern civilization to facilitate the modernization and globalization of Chinese culture. It is important to note that there is no need to rigidly categorize Chinese culture as moral and Western culture as intellectual, nor to overemphasize the issue of "how to derive knowledge from morality." Such discussions are unnecessary. The question of "whether Chinese traditional culture is inherently capable of leading to modernization" is a misleading one posed by staunch anti-traditionalists, who argue that Chinese traditional culture fundamentally hinders modernization and should therefore be entirely discarded. In contrast, Contemporary Neo-Confucianism assert that the Chinese cultural tradition is inherently moral and emphasizes the issue of deriving "knowledge"

from "morality." This framing is flawed from the outset, shaped by the limitations of the prevailing context.

3. Are There Fundamental Flaws in Western Democracy and Science? How Should Morality and Politics Be Positioned within Contemporary Neo-Confucianism?

Western democracy and science possess certain flaws that may lead to extreme individualism and materialism. While drawing from Western civilization, it is crucial to maintain a critical mindset and strive for the complementarity and integration of both Chinese and Western cultures. Although Western democracy and science have significantly contributed to the advancement of human society, they also present value conflicts and moral risks. It is essential to respect Western civilization while actively seeking a path for democratic and scientific development that aligns with China's national conditions, as this is vital for achieving social harmony and enhancing human well-being. This process resembles practical learning, akin to crossing a river by feeling the stones, rather than overly emphasizing morality at the expense of knowledge. Indeed, there is no need to contemplate how to derive knowledge from morality, which undermines the notion of deriving an intellectual subject from the "Self-Entrapment of Conscience."

Morality and politics should complement one another to foster a harmonious society. Morality serves as the foundation of politics, while politics provides a platform for the application of moral principles. It is essential to emphasize the close relationship between morality and politics and to strive for a balanced integration of the two. This synergy enhances individual moral development and promotes the realization of the common good within society. While it is important to respect individual rights, attention must also be given to the overall welfare and development of society to achieve a harmonious coexistence of morality and politics. It is crucial to remember that good morality does not automatically lead to good politics, nor does effective politics guarantee moral integrity; rather, they influence and shape each other in a reciprocal manner.

4. How Can We Understand the Differences Between Chinese and Western Cultures in Terms of Moral Values and Knowledge Acquisition? How Does An-Wu Lin's "Methodological Conventionalism" Differ from Contemporary Neo-Confucianism?

The differences between Chinese and Western cultures regarding moral values and knowledge acquisition are primarily evident in their respective values and methodologies. Chinese culture emphasizes moral cultivation and interpersonal harmony, with knowledge acquisition centered on introspection and insight. In contrast, Western culture places a greater emphasis on individual rights and freedoms, as well as the accumulation and transmission of objective knowledge. Recognizing these differences is essential for the exchange and integration of Chinese and Western cultures. These distinctions reflect each culture's unique historical backgrounds and traditions. While preserving cultural characteristics, we should actively explore opportunities for intercultural dialogue and cooperation to foster the sharing and growth of human wisdom.

"Methodological Conventionalism" emphasizes openness and diversity in both theory and practice, advocating for the pursuit of the most suitable solutions within specific historical contexts and social changes. In contrast to Contemporary Neo-Confucianism, this perspective prioritizes addressing practical problems over an excessive focus on cultural essence and traditional values. Undoubtedly, "Methodological Conventionalism" contributes to breaking the closed and conservative nature of academia, fostering both academic innovation and social progress. While it respects academic traditions, it also addresses the needs and challenges of social reality, aiming for an organic integration of academic research and social practice. To prevent methodological conventionalism from devolving into value relativism or even nihilism, we must fundamentally return to the lifeworld, emphasizing historical and social totality, and engage with the things themselves. A phenomenological approach that "returns to the things themselves" is essential, beginning with an "awareness of existence."

5. How Can We Assess the Legitimacy of Regimes and the Establishment of Democratic Systems? How Does Contemporary Neo-Confucianism Address Criticisms of Cultural Essentialism?

Contemporary Neo-Confucianism should prioritize the legitimacy of political regimes and the establishment of democratic systems while honoring traditional values. By integrating morality with politics, it seeks to achieve social harmony and stability, gradually refining democratic institutions in the process. The legitimacy of a regime is not solely derived from constitutional and legal provisions; it must also be rooted in moral principles and public opinion. While acknowledging various political systems, it is essential to focus on the moral cultivation of citizens and their political participation to enhance both the legitimacy of the regime and the

development of democratic institutions. Neo-Confucianism during the Song-Ming period emphasizes the traditional school of mind and moral reason, as the foundation for moral cultivation and social practice was historically constrained by the framework of imperial autocracy, patriarchal oppression, and male dominance. This contrasts sharply with contemporary values, where democratic constitutionalism, gender equality, and individual rights are prominent. Therefore, the concept of "Outer Kingliness Learning" today differs significantly from its historical context, as does "Inner Sagehood Learning." It is not merely a matter of deriving a new "Outer Kingliness" from the "Inner Sagehood," but rather about how to appropriately adjust the "Inner Sagehood" in the process of learning about a new "Outer Kingliness."

I believe that Contemporary Neo-Confucianism should actively address the criticisms of cultural essentialism by emphasizing respect for tradition while also considering specific historical contexts and social changes. While maintaining cultural characteristics, it should engage in creative transformation and innovative development to modernize Chinese culture. The critique of cultural essentialism serves as a reminder that culture is not static; it continuously develops and evolves in response to time and environmental changes. Just as "Outer Kingliness Learning" evolves, "Inner Sagehood Learning" is not immutable. Both must adapt to the times. While honoring cultural heritage, there should be a strong emphasis on the potential for cultural innovation and transformation to sustain the vitality and creativity of Chinese culture.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that when exploring the development of democracy and science, it is essential to clearly distinguish between three distinct orders: the historical order of occurrence, the practical order of learning, and the theoretical order of logic. These three orders are fundamental to the development of East Asia, as they are not only influenced by the historical evolution of the West but must also be adapted and adjusted to fit their unique circumstances.

First, the historical order of occurrence refers to the sequence and trajectory of democratic and scientific development in developed Western countries. This order is rooted in the specific historical contexts and cultural environments of the West. In contrast, East Asian countries, in their pursuit of democracy and science, do not necessarily need to adhere strictly to this order. Second, the practical order of learning emphasizes the processes through which each country or region learns and adapts to the development of democracy and science in practice. This order should be determined based on the specific conditions of each country, including its culture, economy, and social structure, to establish the most suitable path and pace for its development.

The theoretical order of logic, on the other hand, examines the logical relationships and intrinsic connections in the development of democracy and science from a philosophical or theoretical perspective. For instance, "Mr. Mou Zongsan's theory of 'Self-Entrapment of Conscience'" exemplifies a theoretical order of logic in philosophical interpretation, focusing on the role and significance of conscience in both individual and social development.

We must clearly distinguish between these three orders and understand their distinct roles and influences in the development of democracy and science. Particularly in East Asia, it is essential to apply and adjust these concepts flexibly based on local realities. This approach emphasizes the practical order of learning to promote effective modernization while also reflecting on the various issues that arise in the aftermath of modernization.

II. On the Topic Proposed by Professor Ming-Chu Hsu

1. The Self-Expectations and Moral Practices of a Confucian

Should a Confucian in a democratic society be satisfied with merely being a law-abiding citizen, or should they strive to uphold higher moral standards and a sense of global responsibility? Should Confucians continue to emphasize the doctrine of "making the course of nature existent and the desire of human extinct," even in a modern society with diverse values?

Response: Certainly, Confucians should hold themselves to higher self-expectations and engage in rigorous moral practices; however, this must begin with an awakening of civic consciousness and a commitment to the laws and ethics of civil society. In my experience, I often observe many individuals who identify as Confucians lacking civic awareness, mistakenly viewing themselves as spokespersons or even leaders of Confucianism. This leads to significant distortions and alienations. The gravity of the issue lies in the necessity of first excelling as a "citizen." From that foundation, one can aspire to embody the virtues, morals, and conduct of a person of noble character.

"Making the course of nature existent and the desire of human extinct" signifies the importance of preserving the universality of natural principles while eliminating the selfishness inherent in human desires. However, this expression has been repeated so frequently that it has led to misunderstandings, suggesting that all desires for food, drink, and romantic relationships are human desires that must be eradicated. It is crucial to recognize that overly rigid and morally austere interpretations, such as "when human desires are completely eradicated, natural principles prevail," are problematic. If human desires were entirely eliminated, the viability of

natural principles would be compromised. A more accurate perspective is that expanding desires in a manner that embodies universality, ideality, and totality is sufficient. When Mencius responded to King Xuan of Qi, who acknowledged his fondness for beauty and wealth, Mencius expanded on this fondness by suggesting, "there be no unmarried women in chambers or men left in the fields," "goods flow smoothly so that everyone benefits." This serves as a compelling example of the concept.

I believe that the phrase "making the course of nature existent and the desire of human extinct" has its flaws. Some interpret it as "preserving the universality of natural principles while annihilating human desires," which can lead to further misunderstandings. Wang Chuanshan's concept of the "unity of principle and desire" offers a more reasonable perspective.

Civic Confucian Participation in Society: Civic Confucians should actively engage in public social issues such as gender equality, environmental protection, and labor rights. This engagement not only embodies the ideals of "utilization" and "enhancing people's welfare," but also encourages self-reflection to pursue "rectifying virtue." Confucians ought to adopt a more proactive role in advocating for social justice and the well-being of all citizens.

2. On the Subjective State of Moral Discourse

Does the subjective state of moral practice in Confucianism still hold importance in modern society, and should it not be disregarded despite the challenges posed by "outer kingliness learning"? Is "inner sagehood learning" still the essence of Confucianism, and should it continue to be emphasized and practiced even as we pursue the modernization of democracy and science?

Response: It is not about the subjective state of moral practice; rather, it emphasizes the perseverance that an intellectual should embody. This notion aligns with Confucius' principle: "Set your heart on the way; act in accordance with virtue; hold fast to goodness; enjoy the arts." It is fundamentally about aspiring to the Dao. Similarly, Zengzi meant by saying, "officer may not be without breadth of mind and vigorous endurance. His burden is heavy and his course is long. Perfect virtue is the burden which he considers it is his to sustain - is it not heavy? Only with death does his course stop - is it not long?". It is what Mencius also echoed this sentiment when he remarked, "All things are already complete in us. There is no greater delight than to be conscious of sincerity on self-examination. If one acts with a vigorous effort at the law of reciprocity, when he seeks for the realization of perfect virtue, nothing can be closer than his

approximation to it." These are genuine principles and truths; they do not conform to what we might label a "subjective state."

Even within Daoism, the use of such a term is inappropriate, as it is often misunderstood and overly subjective. This perspective places excessive emphasis on a "state" while neglecting the concrete and pragmatic aspects of the philosophy. I recall writing an article on this topic many years ago, critiquing the concept of a "subjective state" in moral discourse. In *Legein Monthly*, I have published several articles, two of which are particularly relevant: "On the Path to Critical Realization" (Bu, 1987, p. 146) and "Confucius and Ah Q: An Understanding and Interpretation from a Psychological History Perspective" (Lin, 1997, p. 262).

"Critique is a form of dismantling, a process of reconstruction, and a dialectical journey that encompasses both deconstruction and reconstruction. It is concrete and palpable; critique represents a tangible and vivid process of creation.

As a method of Critical Confucianism, it demonstrates a refusal to remain mired in stagnation, ultimately leading to its own corrosion and destruction. It will not retreat into an ivory tower, where thought ascends incrementally, lamenting the decline of the world and the erosion of the way. Critical Confucianism embodies an inherent self-dialectic, a voice that challenges unjust institutional structures. The fusion of self-dialectic and the imperative to challenge manifests as a form of moral cultivation. This moral cultivation is both concrete and vivid, aimed at dismantling, critiquing, reconstructing, and creating. Critique is neither a mere scratching of an itch from outside the boot nor a gentle whisper of the Wu Nong dialect. It does not originate from external authority, nor is it a form of internal self-gratification. Instead, critique targets the core, striking directly at the essence; it conveys truth without reservation, with sincerity and openness. It is driven by conscience and an awakening of structures. This driving force of conscience inevitably leads to structural awakening—only then can it be deemed true critique.

If conscience does not facilitate a structural awakening but merely modifies the self, it can easily devolve into a deceptive semblance of spiritual attainment. This illusion fosters a false sense of self-completion and self-deception. Such self-completion, rooted in superficiality, ultimately leads to deterioration and self-destruction. In truth, self-deception, when viewed through the lens of the unity of all things, is simply a passive drifting along the current.

Dao inevitably manifests in the structures of artifacts and evolves into discursive theories. Conscience must engage with these structures and theories to meaningfully partake in the Dao; only such participation is concrete and tangible. Conversely, if one attempts to immerse conscience directly into the essence of the Dao, it results in abstract and empty speculation—a

deceptive illusion of spiritual attainment and self-deception.

While traditional Confucianism has indeed served the imperial family in many ways, there have been other forms throughout history beyond Imperial Confucianism, such as Lively Confucianism and Critical Confucianism. Lively Confucianism aims to awaken the essence of conscience and integrate it into everyday life, facilitating self-cultivation and the cultivation of external affairs. In contrast, Critical Confucianism confronts unjust institutional structures, offering suggestions, corrections, and even advocating for dismantling and reconstruction. Both Lively Confucianism and Critical Confucianism represent the lifeblood of Confucianism in opposition to Imperial Confucianism; they also serve as essential remedies to prevent the deterioration of Imperial Confucianism.

Today, Imperial Confucianism has weakened and undergone deconstruction. However, the national inferiority complex stemming from the Opium Wars, along with over a thousand years of imperial cultural development, has led to a significant decline in both the vitality and critical spirit of Confucianism. Reflect upon this! Is it not profoundly concerning? Only by pursuing a tangible path of critique, rediscovering the profound depths of Confucianism, awakening the existential immediacy of the present, being mindful of 'local culture,' and confronting structural reform can we expand 'the cultural homeland.' Only then can Confucianism harness the critical power necessary for dismantling outdated structures and embark on a revitalizing reconstruction."

In another article, a section is quoted as follows:

"... juxtaposing Confucius with Ah Q, these figures are positioned as two extremes; however, it is also suggested that these extremes are intertwined as part of a continuous process. In the history of psychopathology, the moral practices emphasized by original Confucianism were intended to lead to social practice. In contrast, Ah Q, as depicted by Lu Xun, is utterly dejected and resorts to the 'spiritual victory method' to deceive himself.

Confucianism, as initiated by Confucius, initially emphasized a 'moral social practice consciousness,' but clearly, generations have not fully liberated themselves from the constraints of patriarchal feudalism and imperial autocracy. Consequently, caught in the interplay of these two influences, the moral social practice consciousness struggled to develop cohesively and eventually regressed into a 'moral self-cultivation consciousness.' The initial shift towards a moral self-cultivation consciousness sought to reconnect with life itself and revive the awareness of social practice. The traditional call for moving from inner sagehood to outer kingliness underscores this intention. The challenge lies in the fact that the inner sagehood does not extend into the outer kingship; instead, it retracts, leading the moral self-cultivation

consciousness to further devolve into a 'pursuit of moral self-transcendence.' At this juncture, morality transforms into a spiritual pursuit rather than a concrete reality. The pursuit of the moral and spiritual realm initially served as a means for self-healing and recovery, opening up the possibility for moral self-cultivation. However, during times of societal decline, even the moral and spiritual realm can devolve into a false and transient state. This further deteriorates into 'self-decoration' and 'self-leisure,' where the justifications become hollow, ultimately leading to self-deception and an irreversible descent into demonic affliction. With the soul lost and wandering aimlessly, such an individual suffering from spiritual malaise can only resort to the 'moral spiritual victory method' as a means of self-deception.

As previously stated, 'Confucius' and 'Ah Q' can be connected within a coherent genealogy. Beginning with 'moral social practice consciousness,' the progression moves into 'moral self-cultivation consciousness,' which further evolves into the 'pursuit of moral self-transcendence.' This trajectory then diverges into 'moral self-decoration' and 'moral self-leisure,' ultimately culminating in 'moral self-deception' through the 'moral spiritual victory method.' Our objective in establishing a psycho-pathological connection between 'Confucius' and 'Ah Q' is not to legitimize the Ah Q mentality among contemporary Chinese individuals as acceptable. Instead, we aim to foster a therapeutic effect through this understanding and interpretation, thereby deconstructing this peculiar synthesis and providing the potential for renewal within Chinese culture and the individuals shaped by it."

Professor Ming-Chu Hsu will fully understand the implications of the passages I have cited. By comparing them with the works of Professor Shui-Chuen Lee, it becomes evident how challenging it is to untangle the karmic tendencies that have persisted within the Chinese nation, particularly in the effort to liberate itself from imperial and patriarchal constraints.

III. Response to Professor Mei-Yao Wu's Topic

Professor Mei-Yao Wu, in response to my proposed topic, shifted her focus to the intersection of Neo-Confucian practical philosophy and counseling psychology concerning personality development. This approach indirectly aligned with my other work, Chinese Religion and Meaning Therapy. She also drew comparisons between Eastern and Western philosophies and psychologies, emphasizing how both respond to social changes. A primary focus of her discussion was the importance of "self-awareness" in both counseling psychology and Neo-Confucian practical philosophy.

This represents a shift from my proposed topic of "Outer Kingliness to Inner Sagehood," back to the original "Inner Sagehood to Outer Kingliness," and subsequently transitions into "the intersection of Contemporary Neo-Confucianism practical philosophy and counseling psychology concerning personality development." While this progression is commendable, it does not directly address my proposed topic. My focus is on Mr. Mou Zongsan's concept of the "Self-Entrapment of Conscience," which has evolved into an intellectual subject encompassing democracy and science. This concept relates to the "theoretical order of logic" as interpreted by him, which differs from the "historical order of occurrence" and the "practical order of learning." I have clearly articulated this in my previous response to the topic, and further elaboration is unnecessary.

Additionally, she emphasized the significance of moral education, highlighting that Mr. Mou Zongsan's perspectives, along with Western research on moral education, underscore the advantages of integrating morality into the acquisition of scientific knowledge. Furthermore, she examined human interactions and social equality, delving into Confucian concepts of human relationships and Adlerian psychology's interpretations of social equality, while emphasizing the importance of a democratic society founded on the principle of personal dignity for all.

Moreover, she emphasized the importance of beginning with individual self-awareness to achieve comprehensive human development and to establish a rational society with shared goals. She proposed the potential integration of Contemporary Neo-Confucianism with counseling psychology, particularly through the application of mindfulness meditation in psychotherapy. She compared the perspectives of Professor Lin and Mr. Mou Zongsan, suggesting a collaborative approach in counseling psychology research to deepen the understanding of the internal psychological processes that facilitate the transformation of the moral mind into the cognitive mind. Here, we can genuinely appreciate Professor Mei-Yao Wu's insightful considerations, as they encompass moral education, counseling psychology, and personality development—areas that hold great promise for further exploration.

As for topics such as "methodological essentialism" and "Self-Entrapment of Conscience," I have already addressed these in my previous responses to Professors Hon-Chung Wong and Ming-Chu Hsu, so I will not reiterate them here.

IV. On the Topic Proposed by Professor Shui-Chuen Lee

1. On the Topic of "Outer Kingliness to Inner Sagehood" vs. "Inner Sagehood to Outer Kingliness"

The debate over "Outer Kingliness to Internal Sagehoodhood" versus "Internal Sagehoodhood to Outer Kingliness" has been contentious. In response, Erh-Chih Monthly and the Center for Chinese Philosophy Research organized a public debate titled "An-Wu Lin vs. Shui-Chuen Lee" on September 3, 2022. Subsequently, I authored a more extensive response titled "After the Debate on 'Outer Kingliness to Inner Sagehood' or 'Inner Sagehood to Outer Kingliness'—A Respectful Response to Senior Scholars Zhou Qunzhen and Lee, Shui-chuen" (Lin, 2023, p. 578). This article addresses the debate and responds to Senior Scholar Zhou Qunzhen, who raised objections as early as 2005. Since the Song and Ming dynasties, Contemporary Neo-Confucianism has placed excessive emphasis on the "inner sagehood," leading to introversion and entanglement, ultimately advancing toward a realm-focused, ideal teaching system that has generated numerous issues. In the face of modernization, it is crucial to clarify that the "practical order of learning" differs from the "historical order of occurrence" and the "theoretical order of logic." This understanding underscores the importance of the "outer kingliness to inner sagehood" approach and reveals that the question "Does the Chinese cultural tradition hinder modernization?" is fundamentally a false dilemma. Finally, the article addresses the fallacy of methodological essentialism, elucidates the predicament of the "Self-Entrapment of Conscience," corrects the "misplacement of the Way," and opens the possibility for a post-Contemporary Neo-Confucianism. This article aims to assist readers in resolving their doubts.

2. On the Issue of "After Mou Zongsan and Post-Mou Zongsan"

Professor Shui-Chuen Lee has made the following statements:

- (1) "Professor An-Wu Lin often refers to himself as part of the so-called 'Post-May Fourth' and uses the slogan 'Post-Mou Zongsan.' However, the true meanings of 'Post-May Fourth' and 'Post-Mou Zongsan' remain entirely unclear.
- (2) "Professor Lin asserts that by making this statement, he can encapsulate the fundamental essence of Mr. Mou's philosophical system. He arrogantly claims to have entered the 'Post-Mou Zongsan era' and to have surpassed Mr. Mou's achievements. This is, in fact, a manifestation of self-deception."
- (3) "Professor Lin's advocacy of 'outer kingliness leading to inner sagehood,' which he asserts critiques and surpasses Mr. Mou Zongsan's 'two-level ontology,' is closely tied to his so-called 'post-Contemporary Neo-Confucianism.' It is essential to analyze his claims and address his fundamental misunderstandings, or lack of comprehension, of Contemporary Neo-Confucianism principles. This includes a thorough examination

of the key aspects of Mr. Mou's philosophical system and his contributions, in order to expose the fallacies inherent in Lin's 'outer kingliness leading to inner sagehood' theory."

Response: Regarding "May Fourth" and "Post-May Fourth," I have a comprehensive article titled "From 'Post-May Fourth' to 'Post-May Fourth'—Considering the Role of Chinese Civilization in the 21st Century Based on the 'Theory of the Three States of Existence'" (Lin, 2020, p. 2). Please refer to it for further details. The distinctions between "May Fourth" and "Post-May Fourth" are currently well-defined, and it is unlikely that Professor Li is unaware of them. However, if he chooses to feign ignorance, then that is his prerogative.

Additionally, regarding the "Mou Zongsan era" and the "Post-Mou Zongsan era," I have authored a dedicated monograph titled "Before and After Mou Zongsan: A Historical Discussion on Contemporary New Confucian Philosophy" (Lin, 2011), which I invite Professor Li to review. Mr. Mou was a respected mentor of mine, and in advancing his scholarship, I have pursued a path of creative transformation and innovative development. However, I acknowledge that my efforts are incomplete, and I do not claim to have surpassed my teacher. In all my writings, I make no such assertion, and Professor Li may be mistaken, speaking from a state of confusion.

For a deeper understanding of the "Post-Mou Zongsan Era," please refer to my article titled "Welcoming the Arrival of the Post-Mou Zongsan Era—A Reflection on the Publication of 'The Complete Works of Mou Zongsan'" (Lin, 2003, p. 335):

"Mr. Mou Zongsan revitalized the wisdom of Chinese philosophy. He conducted an in-depth exploration of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism, and independently translated I. Kant's three Critiques. Most notably, Mr. Mou integrated I. Kant's three Critiques with traditional Confucian, Daoist, and Buddhist teachings, systematically constructing the comprehensive 'two-level ontology.' Over the past century of Chinese philosophical development, this achievement undoubtedly represents a significant milestone.

Mr. Mou transcended the limitations of 'reverse hermeneutics' and, through the processes of 'translation,' 'fusion,' and 'reconstruction,' harmonized and interconnected the discourses of ancient Chinese texts, modern academic discourse, and contemporary life, thereby creating a profound philosophical lexicon that ignites vibrant awareness and thought.

In response to the existential crisis faced by the Chinese nation since the early 20th century, Mr. Mou, building upon the 'Qiányuán Xinghai' articulated by Mr. Xiong Shili's 'philosophy of substance and function,' further established the moral subject through a process of

‘metaphysical preservation,’ with the aim of ‘enlightening wisdom through virtue.’ He advanced the intellectual subject by integrating the ‘Self-Entrapment of Conscience’ and incorporating democracy and science into this framework.

Naturally, Mr. Mou transformed I. Kant’s philosophy of virtue through the limits of intellect by integrating Confucian, Daoist, and Buddhist teachings into the concept of virtue to encompass intellect. Although he appeared to adhere to I. Kant’s ‘transcendental decomposition’ to stabilize the system of knowledge, he directly connected with the teachings of Lu Xiangshan and Wang Yangming, ultimately returning to the foundational ideas of Confucius and Mencius. This approach firmly established the moral self, which subsequently opened the realm of knowledge. This transformation of ‘Self-Entrapment of Conscience, closely aligns with J. G. Fichte and indirectly points to G. W. F. Hegel. However, I. Kant’s emphasis on transcendental decomposition led Mr. Mou to a metaphysical retrospection, forming a metaphysical abode. Within this abode, Mr. Mou attained a state of ‘perfect teaching’ and ‘perfect goodness’ through a subtle dialectic.

The purpose of ‘transcendental decomposition’ was ‘metaphysical retrospection,’ further underscores the ‘existential awareness’ evoked by ancient classics. Under the summons of this existential awareness, the insurmountable chasm is bridged through ‘a subtle dialectic’ of fusion and connection. Therefore, this nuanced dialectical fusion culminates in what is referred to as the so-called ‘perfect teaching’ and ‘perfect goodness.’ Although Mr. Mou repeatedly emphasized the importance of dialectical development, he ultimately achieved a dialectical fusion through which he sought a metaphysical abode—a pure intellectual dwelling.

He established a transcendental distinction between ‘phenomena’ and ‘things-in-themselves,’ employing the metaphor of ‘one mind opening two doors’ to achieve a ‘two-level ontology’ of ‘attachment’ and ‘non-attachment.’ Although he emphasized that this two-level ontology is not a strict separation but rather a harmonious integration, he remained rooted in the metaphysical ontology of non-attachment, which guided human judgment regarding good and evil and regulated the ontology of attachment. He also endorsed the Tiantai school’s concept of the ‘mind of fundamental nature manifesting in a single thought of ignorance,’ appreciating its spirit of ‘realizing Buddhahood through the integration of the nine realms.’ However, due to the limitations of the prevailing spirit of his era, Mr. Mou had to attain a fused unity through a ‘subtle dialectic,’ thereby creating a metaphysical notion of perfect goodness.

We must recognize that this concept of perfect goodness is not the culmination of Mou Zongsan’s philosophy; rather, it serves as a prelude to a new direction—a return, critique, and development. We should reintegrate Mr. Mou’s notion of ‘perfect goodness,’ which was

conceived in his metaphysical realm, back into the 'Qíányuán Xinghai.' This reintegration embodies the essence of perfect goodness and extends it into practical functionality, allowing it to reenter the holistic living world of historical society, where it can cultivate and nurture growth profoundly. From a genetic phenomenological perspective, we must confront the reality that 'theory is the theory of practice, and practice is the practice of theory.' This understanding opens the dialectic of 'two ends but one unity,' thereby reopening the gateway to the social practice of Confucianism."

- (1) "Turning" should no longer be confined to the "subjective turn but should be redefined as the "intentionality turn," which then opens up to a dynamic exploration of "existentialism."
- (2) "Returning" should no longer be confined to a "fusing return" but should be adapted to align with the "roots of being," then the "manifestation of being," and further develop into a "determination of being."
- (3) "Inheriting" should no longer be viewed merely as a "philosophical, historical discourse," but should be a logical continuation. On one hand, it should progress towards the cultural orthodox tradition, while on the other hand, it should foster theoretical innovations.
- (4) "Critique" should not be confined to "transcendental decomposition," but should be dialectically integrated into the "lifeworld" shaped by historical and social totality. This approach aims to achieve "situations shaped by principles and principles guiding situations," thereby facilitating a societal critique and ultimately initiating a Confucian revolution.
- (5) "Development" should not be confined to a "classical interpretation," but should evolve into a philosophical dialogue that engages with contemporary discourse. Through a dynamic existential awareness, it ought to reconstruct a new academic discourse, actively participating in the dialogue and construction of human civilization.

As the turn of the century unfolds in the postmodern era, people tremble in fear at the tremors of the earth and sky. They are bewildered by the alienation of civilization, marked by events such as the 921 earthquakes in Taiwan, the collapse of the Twin Towers in the United States on September 11, and the U.S. war on terror in Iraq. In recent weeks, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and mainland China have been grappling with the devastating effects of SARS, struggling to survive as life is put to the test. I deeply resonate with Zhu Xi's statement: "Perseverance is hard!"

It has been eight years since Mr. Mou passed away, but I still remember the elegiac couplet I wrote for him in 1995:

"The Master, drifting with the elegance and integrity of the Wei and Jin, favored by the world yet shocked the common folk; My Teacher, who embraced the principles of the Song and Ming, transcended the barriers of life and death—what would a true Confucian have to fear from the cycles of yin and yang?"

Mr. Mou's "lofty and spirited resilience in the face of suffering and adversity" (phrase coined by Mr. Cai Renhou to describe him)—leaves one in awe. The night is profound, so profound! However, dawn is approaching, so close!

Looking up, I see the image of Mr. Mou in my study, accompanied by a passage inscribed below:

"My teacher, Mr. Mou Zongsan, devoted his entire life to the unrestrained and natural pursuit of knowledge, with no attachments other than his dedication to the culture of the Chinese people. He once stated, 'Only through significant experiences can one encounter profound challenges; only through these challenges can one cultivate great compassion; only with great compassion can one attain profound wisdom; thus, one can achieve the aspirations of philosophy.' Respectfully inscribed by Anwu in the autumn of the year Renxu."

Next to the image of Mr. Mou is a couplet that incorporates his name:

"Mou, the great master, sincerely connects heaven and earth. The three teachings are distinctly arranged, with the Way weaving through both past and present."

The night is profound and distant, yet dawn approaches—so close! I pray to the deities of heaven and earth with the utmost sincerity and reverence. At the break of dawn on May 5, at 3:00 a.m., during the late spring of the Guisi year, I find myself at Yuanheng Studio.

It is a common occurrence for some to understand while others do not. What is regrettable is that I have been advocating for a philosophical shift for over thirty years and promoting the idea of "embracing the arrival of the post-Mou Zongsan era" for more than twenty years. I have earnestly warned that we can no longer regard the concerns of the first and second generations of Contemporary Neo-Confucianism as relevant to our current era. We must "speak forward" rather than merely "speak as it was." We should "carry the fire before the embers burn out," pass the baton, and continue to advance our efforts. Over the past few decades, I have been

greatly encouraged by fellow disciples and friends. However, there are also individuals, such as Professor Shui-Chuen Lee, who, through misunderstanding, make reckless criticisms, distort the truth, and even resort to personal attacks. Reflecting on the development of various historical schools of thought, such situations may be unavoidable. In response to these challenges, one can only smile.

In recent years, my favorite phrase has been "composure." Although it may seem typical, it has profound origins, deriving from Laozi's *Dao De Jing*: "The grandest forms of active force From Dao come, their only source." Because it "follows only the Way," there exists "the form of supreme virtue," and with the Way as a guide, composure naturally ensues. Indeed, this is the case. I am willing to strive and "bow my head, willing to be an ox for the children," but there is no longer a need to "frown in defiance of a thousand fingers pointing." For this world is one of affection, righteousness, and justice. When I reflect on the phrase, "The sky is clear, and the moon is bright, in harmony with all things like spring," I feel immense joy. I also hope that my senior, Professor Shui-Chuen Lee, need not be so anxious; remember: "Knowing constancy leads to acceptance, acceptance to impartiality, impartiality to wholeness." If we live our days in calm composure, this world will reach a fair judgment. Well said! Now, let us "enjoy a cup of tea!"

—Written on June 28, 2024, at Yuanheng Academy in Taipei, during the year of Jiachen.

References

- Bu Wenti. (1987). "On the path to critical realization," *Legein Monthly*, 146, 1. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (1997). "Confucius and Ah Q: An understanding and interpretation from a psychological history perspective," *Legein Monthly*, 262, 56-57. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2003). "Welcoming the arrival of 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. (2011). *Before and after Mou Zongsan: A historical discussion on Contemporary Neo-Confucian philosophy*. Student Bookstore. (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 'Theory of the Three States of Existence,'" *Journal of Chinese Humanities*, 2, 93-102. (in Chinese)
- Lin, A. W. (2023). "After the debate on 'Outer Kingliness to Inner Sagehood' or 'Inner Sagehood

to Outer Kingliness'—A respectful response to senior scholars Qun-Zhen Zhou and Shui-Chuen Lee," *Legein Monthly*, 578, 17-25. (in Chinese)