

**Proceedings of the Fifth Conference on
“One Hundred Year Reflection of the New
Culture Movement: ‘Personhood: Concept
and Freedom.’”**

Anne S. Chao^{*}

The “Personhood: Concept and Freedom” (人：觀念與自由) conference was organized by the Philosophy Department of Peking University and chaired by Professor Zhou Cheng (周程). It took place on Sep. 19 - 20, 2015 in Beijing. This is the fifth and culminating conference to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the New Culture Movement. (The other conferences were held on the campuses of Anhui University, Fudan University, Zhejiang University, and National Taiwan University respectively). Fifty-four scholars from Taiwan, mainland China, Hong Kong, Japan, Germany, and the United States were invited to participate at this conference. Recognizing the tremendous influence of the New Culture Movement on the philosophical outlook of the subsequent generations, the organizers convened the conferences to explore the New Culture Movement’s legacy and its role in transforming Chinese society to the

* Anne S. Chao is Lecturer of the Department of History at Rice University.

present day. The theme of this meeting is fourfold: 1. Peking University and the New Culture Movement: The formation of modern scholarship and education system. 2. The self-affirmation and freedom of the Chinese person. 3. The transformation of Chinese philosophy: its concerns, concepts and methodology. 4. New Culture Movement: the present and the future.

Prof. Zhou opened the conference by welcoming everyone. He said that while the New Culture Movement was launched by two Anhui provincials, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, but it could not have taken off without a coterie of like minded intellectuals from Zhejiang province, such as Cai Yuanpei. Prof. 韓水法 of Peking University elaborated on the progression of the meetings. He said that it is not clear how the New Culture ideals fared in this past one hundred years. This is the first time for a conference to use the New Culture Movement as theme. In the past, the theme was centered around the May Fourth Movement. The first of this series of five conferences took place at Anhui University in 2014. Prof. 黃德寬 of Anhui University said that if it had been thirty years ago, this conference could not have taken place. He emphasized that this is a cross-disciplinary and cross-straits conference. He believed that the issues discussed in the New Culture Movement are still relevant today. As the problems of the New Culture Movement are still not solved presently, Prof. Huang wondered, and what would happen one hundred years from now? Prof. 苑舉正 of National Taiwan University pointed out that although Hu Shi and Fu Sinian individually are celebrated in Taiwan, but that is not the case with the New Culture Movement. However, historians in Taiwan do research on the New Culture Movement, but not from the perspective of philosophy. Prof. 盛曉明 of Zhejiang University explained that the theme of the conference in Zhejiang was focused on science (科

學) and democracy (民主). He pointed out that the movement grew to a larger phenomenon in Beijing from its origin in Shanghai, was then hijacked by the save-the-nation (救亡) movement, and continued in Taiwan.

The first panel opened the conference, and after lunch the conference divided into two simultaneously occurring tracks. Prof. 何懷宏 of Peking University, in his paper, “學以成人，約以成人——對新文化運動人的觀念的一個反省,” argued that the essence of the New Culture Movement was to create a new system by which a person should live. This system included a religious aspect, as well as aspiration and lifestyle of the new person (新人). The new person was to pursue absolute freedom, and as a result, could not stray from politics. This effort echoed the creation of the “complete person” (成人) in the Confucian tradition, but the modern pursuit no longer held a singular meaning as in the past. In the Confucian world, heaven’s way was linked to man and society, while moral aspirations, cultural pursuit, even political power and economic welfare were all configured as one. Today the modern person could choose only one path, and thus the “complete person” embodied a different meaning. However, we can aspire to a common spirituality by searching of the meaning of the “complete person.”

The New Culture intellectuals used the ideas of Social Darwinism to reject tradition and to embrace new (and mostly Western) ideas. Prof. 王遠義 of National Taiwan University, in his paper “嚴復思想的特質：天演與自由” critiqued Benjamin Schwartz’s interpretation of the relationship between individual freedom and the common good in the latter’s book, *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West*. Schwartz had argued that due to Yan’s concern with the strength of the nation, he was willing to subsume individual freedom for the greater welfare of the country.

Wang disagreed and pointed out that Yan considered individual freedom as the highest pursuit of society, but that personal freedom could only be achieved when a nation has become strong. The way to achieve national strength was to develop three aspects: the morality of the people (民德), the wisdom of the people (民智), and the strength of the people (民力). He believed that China was not ready for a republican system, and that constitutional monarchy was the best system to improve the quality of the people. It was only after this process could individual freedom be realized. Prof. Wang pointed out that individual freedom was the goal of creating a strong and wealthy nation, and it was not to be subsumed to the welfare of the nation, as Benjamin Schwartz indicated.

In “中國如何成爲專制國家的？——從孟德斯鳩談起，” Prof. 白彤東 from Fudan University traced the path by which China became associated with the concept of despotism. Prof. Bai pointed out that the French philosopher, Montesquieu, was the first thinker in the West to describe China as an autocracy and to cast a negative light on the country. Liang Qichao picked up the word from the Japanese sources, and Sun Yatsen used it as well. Prof. Bai believed that the Chinese accepted the idea of calling their own country a despotic society. He examined the original intent of Montesquieu, who argued that governments must be checked by independent entities in the country, such as by the aristocracy, the church, or by rule of law. Since the Chinese rulers were unchecked in their power, and were therefore despots. Prof. Bai concluded that while Montesquieu erred in his assessment of China, his prediction of what happened after the feudal system dismantled was accurate. [Prof. Bai’s article was not included in the conference volume; the above summary was based on the author’s notes.]

The question of the nature of Chinese Nationalism (民族主義)

was explored thoughtfully by Prof. 高全喜 of Beihang University, in his article “試論當代中國民族主義問題之無解。” Prof. Gao believed that there are three stages to Chinese nationalism: the late Qing, early Republic nationalism; nationalism as promoted by the New Culture Movement and the political parties; and the Chinese Communist nationalism of post-1949. Prof. Gao pointed out that today's Chinese society has not moved to the direction of a constitutional system with guarantees of personal freedom, and combined with the political control of the party system, would move toward an extreme form of nationalism. He suggested as a solution a democratic constitutional government with a federalism system, one that could protect the rights of the citizens, tolerate minorities, and build a strong country.

Prof. 歐陽哲生 of Peking University offered a new interpretation of the New Culture Movement. He found three levels of discourse about this historical event, and stressed that understanding the language of this discourse is crucial to re-evaluating the New Culture Movement. The first level is a concern for the collapse of the framework of the Chinese nation and the Chinese family. The second is a new paradigm available for the reconstruction of the national politics and culture. The third level is the opportunity for China to reassess the Western model following the debacle of WWI. Prof. Ouyang argued that Chen Duxiu's "fuzzy logic" set up a dichotomy between old culture and freedom and democracy. This obfuscated the real binary, which should be dictatorship against freedom and democracy. Looking back at the re-evaluation of the New Culture Movement in the 1980s and 1990s, Prof. Ouyang found that soon after the devastation of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the New Culture Movement was celebrated once again for its championing of freedom of thought and of the individual. In the 1990s, however, the conservative

elements of the New Culture Movement as represented by the National Essence group, were re-interpreted as attempting to search for a different model of new culture, and were not the “old fashioned” and detrimental opponents to the New Culture intellectuals. In fact, their reputation was revised as being both in opposition and in agreement with the New Culture Movement. Today, Prof. Ouyang suggested, we should preserve our classical tradition and selectively adopt Western knowledge, in order to create truly a blended new culture.

Prof. 段寶林 of Peking University sent in his article in praise of communism. Titled “新文化的終極關懷,” Prof. Duan argued that history has demonstrated that the special characteristic of the Chinese revolution is a militant revolution. The new democracy is only realized through the leadership of the party by the proletariat class. He declared that a new and open version of communism is the best system for the world.

Panel: The Chinese Problem and Western Ideology (中國的問題與西方的主義)

Prof. 韓水法 of Peking University, in his paper, “中國的問題與西方的主義〈「問題與主義」之爭——從哲學的觀點看〉評議” was intrigued by Prof. Zhang Rulun’s (張汝倫) comment on Deng Xiaoping’s lack of understanding of socialism, and decided to revisit the debate on “Problems and -Isms” from the philosopher’s viewpoint. He argued that the catastrophic political decisions made in the first thirty years of the PRC were the result of making policy decisions by ideology and not by an investigation of the real issues at hand. Tracing back in history, Prof. Han pointed out that the New Culture intellectuals also conflated the search for concrete social problems with political policy. The problem, as Prof. Han

reasoned, is that Chinese social problems do not fit the imported –isms and ideologies from the West. He found it paradoxical that even though the Chinese knowledge of political theories is shallow and still dependent on imported ideas, the Chinese experience of social problems is much more profound. Therefore, it is best for the leaders to understand the social problems in a comprehensive manner first, then think about -isms and ideologies.

Prof. 應奇 of Zhejiang University, in his paper “一種非歷史主義政治學的可能路徑,” revisited the debate between historicism and positivism, and offered a path to creating a non-historicized political philosophy. He first discussed Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey’s critique of Kant’s views on political philosophy in their textbook, *History of Political Philosophy*. He examined Kant’s views on the subject in the latter’s book, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, and merged them with the views of Luc Ferry, a French contemporary political philosopher, to create the new theory.

In “革命雖已成功，啟蒙尚須努力——嚴復與近代中國啟蒙的局限,” Prof. 張國清 of Zhejiang University critiqued the limited success of Yan Fu’s effort to bring about Chinese enlightenment via the translation of Thomas Huxley’s *Evolution and Ethics*. Prof. Zhang listed the five components of Yan’s system of enlightenment: 1. He introduced Western science and rational thinking to demonstrate the weakness of Chinese learning. 2. He emphasized the importance of freedom and rights for citizens, and brought in the concepts of nation and society to the Chinese readers. 3. He attacked autocracy and advocated a democratic system of governance. 4. He introduced the idea of people’s sovereignty. 5. He supported the mutual accommodation of personal welfare and society’s welfare, and considered economic activity as the basis for social activity. However, the historical conditions under which Yan promoted

enlightenment were fraught with limitations. Prof. Zhang listed the following challenges facing Yan's attempt: China experienced conflicts with imperialism and feudalism, and the enlightenment effort rapidly transformed into a save-the-country (救亡) mission, thus derailing the enlightenment effort. Secondly, Yan Fu's description of the West as driven by survival of the fittest gave an erroneous impression, and allowed the demonization of the West. Thirdly, the "survival of the fittest" theme failed to focus on how the West succeeded in advocating equality freedom, universal love, human rights and respect for the individual. Fourth, Yan Fu's message was tailored to a small class of elite and did not address the concerns of the small peasants, which consisted of the majority of China. Lastly, Yan Fu believed that success to a nation could only be brought about incrementally, after the people have developed economically, strengthened their moral standard, and received solid education. Based on these limitations, Prof. Zhang concluded that there is much work to be done toward enlightenment in China today.

Panel: The Turn of Chinese Philosophy (中國哲學轉型)

Prof. 胡軍 of Peking University, in his paper, “問題與方法——中國哲學現代轉型的必由之路” analyzed the influence of Hu Shi's treatment of Chinese philosophy on the field. According to Cai Yuanpei, Hu Shi's influential work, *An Outline of the History of Chinese Philosophy*, introduced evidence-based scholarship, strategic methodology, equal treatment of all materials, as well as a systematic research agenda to the field. Prof. Hu questioned whether or not Chinese thought systems could be identified with Western philosophical tradition as one. More

importantly, Prof. Hu pointed out that Hu Shi's methodology elided an important component in the study of philosophy, and that is the development and analysis of the Chinese system of knowledge, and the need to be vigilante about how the methodology in rational debate (理性思辨的方法論) is used.

The problem of defining Chinese metaphysics was the subject of a prolonged debate on science and metaphysics among New Culture intellectuals in the 1920s. There were those who maintained that there is a unique quality to Chinese metaphysics in opposition to those who argued that the problems confronting Western metaphysics are universal and applicable to Chinese philosophy. Tracing the development of the concept of metaphysics in the history of Chinese philosophy, Prof. 韓立坤 of Shenyang University in his paper, " 中國近現代哲學中的「形而上學」觀念研究 ," found that the reconstruction of metaphysics in modern Chinese philosophy is inextricably linked with science, culture and ethics. This differentiated the "ancient" metaphysics from the modern concept.

周詠盛, doctoral candidate at National Taiwan University, in his paper, " 從傳統經學、現代學科到中國哲學：論胡適《中國哲學大綱》之方法建構 ," explored in detail the contribution to the methodology of the history of Chinese philosophy. Mr. Zhou argued that while Hu's treatise may not have made original contribution to the field of philosophy, but it elevated the history of philosophy into a scholarly category of its own. In specific, Hu Shi gave equal consideration and meticulous attention to the selection of the topics of his research; he categorized the content based on philosophical topics, as opposed to traditional organization according to the classics, and finally he systematized the transformation of theoretical concepts. Hu Shi gave special consideration to the blending of Eastern and Western philosophical methods, and paved the way for the

future development of the history of Chinese philosophy.

Panel: The International Context for the New Culture (新文化的國際背景)

In explaining why the New Culture Movement did not develop in Hong Kong, Prof. 陳學然 of Hong Kong City University delved into the historical context of the colony at the turn of the century. In the paper “新文化運動在香港難以興起的原因：政、學、商因素，” Prof. Chen pointed out that unlike Beijing and Shanghai, Hong Kong did not have an intellectual stratum in the 1920s. Hong Kong University had only one hundred twenty or so students. These comprised mainly of children of wealthy overseas family, in particular from Southeast Asia, and they did not share the concerns of mainland Chinese students. The elite families in Hong Kong were culturally conservative, and the political, commercial and academic leaders of the city were united in their conservatism. The colonial structure of the government was also a determinant factor in the lack of a massive response during the May Fourth movement in 1919.

Prof. 陳繼東 of Aoyama Gaku University in Tokyo, Japan, described the reaction of three renowned Japanese intellectuals to the New Culture Movement in his very informative paper, “新文化運動在日本的反響——以諸橋轍次、青木正兒、內藤湖南爲例。” Tetsuji Morohashi (諸橋轍次) spent two years studying in Beijing from 1919 to 1920. He observed the rapidly changing Chinese society with a detached stance, but was disparaging of Chen Duxiu. He pointed out that the family/clan system is the essence of Chinese society, and wondered what would become of China as the New Culture intellectuals called for its destruction. He worried that culturally China was moving away from Japanese influence,

and sensed a strong anti-Japan current in the New Culture Movement agenda. Aoki Masaru (青木正兒), however, was very inspired by the new ideas and energy of the New Culture intellectuals. He admired Hu Shi's scientific way of treating the history of philosophy, and Chen Duxiu's enthusiasm in bringing about a literary revolution. Aoki Masaru's positive appraisal of the New Culture Movement, according to Prof. Chen, is a rarity among Japanese intellectuals of the time. Naito Konan (內藤湖南) assessed the cultural upheaval and decided that the Chinese should not abandon their cultural tradition, which was a most valuable heritage. He believed that present day Japanese culture was a new amalgamation of ancient Chinese culture and Western influence, which would turn Japan into the most influential center of East Asia.

Prof. 葉雋 of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, in his paper “中國現代文化場域的僑易格局與知識型構,” used his concept of 僑易 [here translated as cultural transformation over space] to follow Wu Mi's peregrination from the South (Dongnan University) to the North (Tsinghua University), as an example of how cultural ideas changed as they moved through space. He also studied the difference in the influence of the intellectuals in the academic temples (學術廟堂) versus those “on the streets” (江湖). In conclusion he argued that the paradigm for the cultural transformation over space actually contained three factors: order within spatial change (僑中有序), change as constant (變度漸常), and the emergence of a principle from the changes (由象見道).

Prof. 張偉雄 of Sapporo University in Japan studied 楊昌濟 in his paper, “楊昌濟的傳統思想與日本經驗.” He mentioned that Yang spent a total of ten years in Japan, Scotland and Germany. Yang advocated for China to resist Western cultural influence, and search for China's own culture. [Lack of a submitted paper precludes a more detailed summary of

Prof. Zhang's work.]

Panel: Between Old and New Culture (新舊文化之間)

Prof. 李翔海 of Peking University, in his paper “文化保守主義是怎樣被歸入「舊文化」陣營的——一個觀念史考察” reconsidered the binary opposition set up by the New Culture intellectuals between old and new, designating Western culture and knowledge as “new” and positive, and traditional culture and knowledge as “old” and negative. Prof. Li pointed out that Liang Shuming, in going against the prevailing anti-Confucian sentiment, courageously championed New Confucianism. His consideration of the differences of the three civilizations, Western, Chinese and Indian, demonstrated his eclectic approach in reconciling Western and Chinese culture, blending the old and the new. Therefore, Prof. Li argued that the conservative cultural ideals revolving around the New Confucianism should be regarded as modern, and a branch of the “new culture” during the New Culture Movement.

Prof. 章啟群 of Peking University analyzed the pervasive influence of nihilism in present day society in his article, “中國當代虛無主義之誕生——作為思想史問題。” Prof. Zhang defined nihilism as the philosophy that denied truth, justice, and kindness as universal values, and regarded material gains as the ultimate goal. He believed that contemporary Chinese society is nihilist, and that it is imperative for China to rebuild its own culture and its own moral standard.

In “中國美學和新文化運動：以蔡元培的生命歷程及著作為重點，” Dr. Geiger from Bonn [no available information on his institutional affiliation] pointed out the importance of aesthetics in Cai Yuanpei's life

and in his work. He explained that since the 19th century, aesthetics was considered the bridge between the phenomenal world and the spiritual realm. Even though it achieved the same effect in China, but conflated with the twentieth century political conditions, aesthetics also served as a bridge between the global community and the Chinese race. As a result it developed a completely different trajectory from its fate in Germany.

In “試析民國激進派繪畫變革觀念中的傳統內涵與古意呈現，” Prof. 陳野 of Zhejiang Academy of Social Sciences argued that the “radical” reformers of the Chinese painting tradition during the New Culture Movement, were strongly grounded in the techniques and appreciation of the traditional Chinese aesthetic sensibility. He argued that by setting up a false dichotomy between radicals such as Kang Youwei, Chen Duxiu, and Xu Beihong, against the “moderates” such as Chen Shizeng, Jin Cheng, Fu Lei, the interconnection between the two groups is ignored. Prof. Chen pointed out that these radicals were trained in the traditional techniques, and learned to critique paintings from a traditional perspective, as a result, they were able to draw from a rich and multi-faceted Chinese aesthetic tradition, one that was not monolithic and immutable. Consequently it is too simplistic and inaccurate to set up a simple binary between the radicals and the conservative proponents of modern Chinese art.

Panel: Language Literature and Modernization (語言文學與現代化)

In “又破而立：新文化運動後的語文建設，” Prof. 劉怡伶 of St. Mary’s Medicine Nursing and Management College, examined the development of baihua (白話) or national language (國語) education after the New Culture Movement. By researching the textbooks on

Chinese language, newspapers and journals, as well as instructional texts on teaching in national language, Prof. Liu found that the journals were generally published over a long period of time, offered varied and wide-ranging topics. These materials offered a great deal of information on how the pedagogical methodology was chosen and how the education in the national language was carried out.

Prof. 陳俊啟 of National Chung Cheng University, in his paper, “周作人與文學革命——一個文學史的再考察,” argued that there was a great deal of heterogeneity of viewpoints among the literary reformers of the New Culture Movement. Zhou Zuoren, for instance, approximated the opinions of the National Essence group. Under the influence of Irving Babbitt, the National essence group believed that morality and ethics could revive Chinese culture, and opposed the iconoclast position of doing away with Chinese tradition. Zhou admired Greek literature, and unlike the proponent of colloquial Chinese such as Hu Shi, believed that the classical Chinese language (文言文) contained useful parts that did not need to be discarded. Therefore even though Zhou Zuoren was considered one of the leaders of the New Culture Movement, his thoughts and writings often disagreed with the mainstream New Culture rhetoric. While he was not a member of the National Essence group, many of his opinions agreed with them.

Without notes or a submitted paper, Prof. 王達敏 of the Academy of Social Sciences and Anhui University delivered a cogent and informative lecture on “現代性與桐城派轉型.” Prof. Wang discussed the continued relevance and importance of the 桐城派 after the New Culture Movement. During the late Qing, 桐城派 was engaged in a theoretical struggle with the proponents of 漢學派, and since the members were also from Anhui, it was a battle of co-provincials. In late Qing 桐城派 moved into the late Qing political center, especially in the diplomatic arena led by Wu

Rulun. Anhui province also produced two of the leading members of the New Culture Movement, Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi. After 1949, 桐城派 continued to thrive. They moved from the center of classical literature to modern literature, as well as produced famous women writers. 桐城派 is a central part of the literary transformation of China, and remained relevant today by undergoing multiple adjustments.

Prof. 劉大椿 of Renmin University of China delivered a talk on “關於科學觀的選擇性——過往研究和宣傳馬克思科學觀的得失。” [Paper and abstract not available].

Prof. 王前 of Dalian University of Technology traced the reception of Western science in the years following the New Culture Movement in his paper, “對新文化運動以來中國科學觀變遷的反響。” Following the debate on science and metaphysics in the 1920s, Prof. Wang noted that every sector of society embraced the concept of science. The liberals led by Ding Wenjiang and Hu Shi called for a scientific way to govern the nation. This headlong rush to embrace science as a belief system, according to Prof. Wang, led to hidden problems that surfaced in the reform era. In the 1950s, the emphasis on collectivization and application of science on practical matters led to a move away from learning basic science. By the 1980s the scientific spirit became once more fashionable, and a fad for “pseudo science” appeared. Thanks to the emphasis on scientific research by the academy, today the public understanding of science has deepened. He believed that the task now is to ameliorate the limitations of Western science with Chinese culture.

Prof. 段偉文 of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences discussed the changes in the general discussion on science by the academy and by society in the years after the 1923 debate on science and metaphysics. In his paper, “略論科玄論戰以來科學「概論」之變遷,” Prof. Duan

argued that the accelerated pace with which Chinese intellectuals embraced science led to a simplistic understanding and a rigid binary between acceptance and rejection of science. By the 1980s, proponents of the dialectics of nature declared that “science and technology are the first forces of production.” This led to a discourse that encouraged collaboration with technological advancement, and an exploration of the influence of technology. In the 1990s, the discourse on science involved reflection on technology, and encompassed diverse ideas such as postpositivism in the philosophy of science, and the philosophy of science from the feminist perspective. In the last twenty years, Prof. Duan concluded that the effort to answer the question of “how to interpret science in the age of technology” has produced a bevy of philosophical doctrines related to technical ethics, such as the philosophy of technology. He believed that the multi-faceted, logical and open-minded perspective represents the return to the pursuit of truth on the part of the Chinese philosophers of science. Lastly Prof. Duan mentioned the important work on this topic conducted by scholars in Taiwan.

Panel: Concept of Man

Prof. 韓林合 of Peking University discussed Wittgenstein’s view of human nature in the paper, “人是遵守規則的動物——一種維特根斯坦式的人性觀。” Expanding on Aristotle’s famous proposition that man is a rational animal, Prof. Han used Kant’s conception of reason to rephrase Aristotle’s definition of man as a rule-following animal. He expanded on this idea with the help of Wittgenstein’s insights on rule-following.

Prof. 徐龍飛 of Peking University asked the question: at what point does a man differentiate himself from an animal? In his paper, “人

作為宗教的存在——或曰：宗教作為人的本質” he argued that the conceptualization of the soul represented the ability of man to establish relationships. It also signified man’s effort to forge affinity with truth, great love, and immortality. He quoted Joseph Ratzinger (aka Pope Benedict XVI) who defined this as “truth, great love and immortality: God.” Prof. Xu surveyed multiple analyses from theology, philosophy biology, and found that all agreed that the soul represented a transcendental consciousness and marked the point of differentiation of humans from animals. He urged scholars to adopt a multi-disciplinary perspective to find answers to these questions.

In “中國人在世界歷史進程中的覺悟與選擇——從自由的啟蒙究竟遭遇到什麼問題說起,” Prof. 張曙光 of Beijing Normal University described the fate of the concept of freedom in the years post May Fourth. He pointed out that the social reforms hastily conducted in the Cold War years gave the erroneous interpretation of socialism as nationalism, and collectivism as equality. Individual freedom and national unity were sacrificed in the intense class struggles of those years. Prof. Zhang believed that China would not be able to import the Western method of enlightenment, but it had to find its own intellectual enlightenment by a thorough understanding of its own historical conditions and demands. More than “individual freedom,” China needs to realize the responsibility and rights of a person as an actor in a collective and as a member of the human race.

In a brief essay titled “理論與社會中的人,” Prof. 劉愛軍 of Center for the Study of Theoretical Systems with Chinese Characteristics of Heilongjiang province, argued that man is a social animal, one who creates theories, needs theories, and can never deviate from theoretical guidance for daily life.

Panel: Science and Society (科學與社會)

In his paper, “新文化運動與中醫的復興,” Prof. 苑舉正 of National Taiwan University traced the revival of Chinese medicine by evoking Paul Feyerabend’s perspective of the pluralistic cultural theory in the philosophy of science (多元文化論下的科學哲學) and Mao Zedong’s advocacy of Chinese medicine in the 1950s. Mao believed that the Eastern and Western medicinal approaches should not be bifurcated, and ordered that Western medicine learn from Eastern medicine. Prof. Yuan divided the analysis of this revival into three components: its chronology, its methodology and finally the rebuilding of a structural system. He reached three conclusions: 1. That the revival of Chinese medicine represented a breakthrough by a Chinese institution faced with a rapid influx of Western medicine; 2. that the significance of this breakthrough was in accordance with the pluralistic cultural theory of the scientific perspective; and 3. that this experience offered a scenario for other disciplines that could benefit from a pluralistic approach to redefining their directions.

Exploring the connection between democracy and science, Prof. 徐飛 of the University of Science and Technology of China, in his paper “民主何以與科學同行——文明社會的一體兩面,” evoked the Mertonian norms of “universalism, communism, disinterested, and organized skepticism” as a tool of analysis. He concluded that the inner logic of the Mertonian norms point to a rigorous vetting of examination, where facts must be proven by logic and evidence. This removes the potential of having selfish motivation or false embellishment from being attached to any experimental results. This critical standard in scientific activities is strongly linked to the democratic nature of human social life. In the scientific world, Prof. Xu pointed out, everyone is equal, and this applies

also to a democratic society. He concluded that the commonality between democracy and science is that both pursue and respect reason (講理).

In her presentation, “ 挖掘陳獨秀筆下的中國人與自由觀：數位人文方法初探 ,” Dr. Anne S. Chao (趙沈允) of Rice University adopted a digital humanities approach, and used the text-mining technique to trace the evolution of Chen Duxiu’s concept of “Chinese” and “freedom.” Adopting Prof. Jin Guantao’s method of using Zipf’s Law and Pearson’s coefficient to detect important keywords, she applied the method on the 504 pieces of political writing in 陳獨秀著作選編 (ed. by 任建樹 , Shanghai renmin chubanshe 2009), consisting of 723,896 Chinese characters. Using the statistical programming language of R, she found certain words with higher frequency than others in Chen’s writing. These are called umbrella words and companion words. These words were found to occur at various frequencies over four periods of Chen’s life, 1897-1914, 1915-1921, 1922-1928, and 1929-1942. The three umbrella words that were examined are 中國人 , 國民 , and 自由 . Dr. Chao’s conclusion is that in the changing conception of 中國人 , Chen began by explaining the Chinese place in relation to the nation, and ended by urging the Chinese people to link up with socialist countries all over the world, but also to unite as Chinese to fight against Japan. For 國民 , Chen explained to his readers that the citizens of a nation should expect a government to guarantee fundamental rights and freedom, and called for a truly representative assembly that included all classes of people. He also sanctioned the violent struggle of the laborers and peasants against the bourgeois class. For 自由 , Chen moved from admiring the Western concept of individual freedom to the concept of a class based democratic movement. Toward the end of his life he seemed to have backed away from the concept of class struggle, and called for the “ultimate” freedom

that allowed the flowering of human wisdom, such as the arts, religion and political systems in the West.

In his rich and thoughtful paper, “新文化運動為何要高舉「科學」大旗?” Prof. 周程 of Peking University explored the difference between the development of science in the West and the development of Confucian learning in China. He first outlined the development of microbiology in the West, from Robert Hooke’s discovery of cellular structure in 1665 to Paul Ehrlich’s research on immunology, especially on his development of Salvarsan, a medicine to treat syphilis. Prof. Zhou then analyzed the way Confucian scholars incorporated the study of nature in their world order, claiming that the natural order is the basis for social order. This conflated a physical spatial relationship with the order of a value system, and according to Prof. Zhou, led to a lack of logical equation. Because Western science relied on evidence and logic, while Confucian learning emphasized conclusions and annotation, the Chinese epistemological system is lacking in rigor and reliability. Prof. Zhou concluded that reviving Confucianism is a good thing, but it must be put to the rigorous test of deductive and inductive logic and be open to the challenge put forth by science.

Prof. 周偉馳 of the National Academy of Social Sciences explored the attempt to create a new personhood in the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom in his paper, “太平天國的「新人」理想.” To create a new kingdom, all members of the “Heavenly Kingdom” must undergo new ideological indoctrination. The Taiping leader Hong Xiuquan required that his subjects regard him as the “heavenly father,” and to reject Confucian teaching. The Taiping rebels wrote textbooks with their version of Christianity, and held the equivalent of civil service exams based on their theological teaching. Children in their “kingdom” recited classics that shared the same title as the Confucian classics, such as the “*Three Character Classic*” (三

字經), but the content was changed to the creation of the Christian world according to Hong Xiuquan. In this way, the Taiping rebels substituted their brand of Christian theology for Confucian learning.

In his unfinished paper, “新文化運動與中國人的宗教觀念初探：宗教如何取代？——以陳獨秀「以科學帶宗教」說起，” Prof. 沙宗平 of Peking University found that Chen Duxiu was full of disdain for the practices of Buddhism and Daoism in China. He advocated equal treatment of all religions, and argued that since neither Buddhism nor Daoism were elevated to the status of state religion, than neither should Confucianism. In the 1920s and 30s New Culture intellectuals were looking for alternatives to religion; Cai Yuanpei suggested replacing religion with aestheticism, Liang Shuming proposed using ethics to take the place of religion, and Chen Duxiu called for science to represent religion.

The development of the study of immortality (仙學) is a case of how a misunderstanding of Western science gave rise to creative solutions in Chinese cultural and religious spheres. Prof. 程樂松 of Peking University explored the work of 陳撻寧 in his interesting paper, “仙學：超越科學與道教的「終結」——以陳撻寧的仙學理論與科學觀念為例的研究。” He found multiple contradictions in Chen’s life. Even as Chen was considered an important and influential theoretician of Daoism by the cultural and religious establishments of early twentieth century China, he was an adamant nonbeliever who announced the end of Daoism. In his decade long search for immortality when he conducted open and highly publicized experiments and discussions on methods of achieving immortality, he not only did not end Daoism, but ironically provided a modernizing path to furthering Daoism. Prof. Cheng discussed the development of Daoism around the time of the New Culture Movement,

and used Chen's case to demonstrate how intellectuals steeped in Chinese tradition attempted to modernize their belief systems based on erroneous interpretation of Western culture.

Panel: New Culture and Modern China (新文化與當代中國)

Prof. 張永超 of Zhengzhou University explored the limitations of the modernizing efforts of the New Culture Movement in his paper, “從思維方式上探究新文化運動時期觀念革新的限度與意義——兼與明末清初西學觀念傳入比較。” He explored the fact that even though many Western tracts in philosophy, science, logic, geometry, geography and astronomy were translated into Chinese as early as the Ming dynasty (1368-1644), yet the gap between East and West in terms of cultural difference lasted until the early twentieth century. He found that the result of blending the two cultures in the twentieth century usually manifested in three problems: a pursuit of Western technology accompanied by a lack of understanding of the theory behind the research, an emphasis on the pursuit of material life coupled with an ignorance of the spiritual aspect, and finally a reliance on experimental affirmation and the attendant de-emphasis on the formation of a priori reasoning. The key, according to Prof. Zhang, is to reconstruct a new way of thinking, a new mentality that could accept a rational and modern way of life.

In the intriguing paper titled “西方邏輯學傳入過程中「辨學」與「辯學」概念的演變,” Profs. 尚智叢 and 王慧斌 traced the translation of the Western term for logic into Chinese. In the late Ming and early Qing time, both ‘辨學’ (*bianxue*) and ‘辯學’ (*bianxue*) were used to refer to either a part or all of the concept of deductive logic. But by late Qing,

Western form of logic was translated into ‘辨學’ (*bianxue*). Eventually two other phrases, 名學 (*mingxue*) and 理論學 (*lilunxue*) replaced ‘辨學’ (*bianxue*). However, ‘辨學’ (*bianxue*) acquired new connotation, indicating debate. This allowed ‘辨學’ (*bianxue*), indicating Western logic, to be equated with ‘辯學’ (*bianxue*), which still meant Chinese logic. The identification of these two terms not only facilitated the introduction of Western form of logic into China, but also lent legitimation to Chinese logic and Chinese philosophy in modern times.

In “啟蒙與物質主義,” Prof. 盧風 of Tsinghua University condemned the materialistic tendencies of contemporary society, which he attributed to modernization and the process of Enlightenment. He regarded the order by former premier Jiang Zemin to allow businessmen to join the CCP as an act that greatly elevated the social status of the merchant class. This change removed the state and the intellectuals as guardians of morality, and instead allowed the market force to serve as guide. He also lamented the ecological consequence of a society driven by materialism, and called for the launching of a new Chinese Enlightenment that would demonstrate the fallacies of science and technology, and the absurdity of materialism.

In “「五四」的文化轉型：全盤反傳統還是中西合流” Prof. 陳衛平 of East China Normal University explored the cultural transformation of the May Fourth values. He argued that although Western cultural influence was accepted by the Chinese intellectuals, but was transformed into an indigenous new culture. As a result, the cultural transformation of the May Fourth was not a total opposition of tradition, but a new creation out of the blending of Eastern and Western cultural currents.

Prof. 楊大春 of Zhejiang University, in his paper “從烏托邦到異托邦——新文化運動研究的當代性之維” examined the legacy of the New Culture Movement in contemporary times. He placed the exchange

of Eastern and Western culture in global space. Claiming that Chinese culture has a tendency to emphasize homogeneity and assimilation, Prof. Yang questioned whether the New Culture Movement was able to break out of this paradigm. He wondered if Western civilization represented a utopian ideal, or a pragmatic heterotopia by evoking Foucault's definition of the two states. He found that the acceptance of Western science led to a worldview that focused on using science to guide social and political issues, but one that elided the aspirations and ideals of the scientific discipline. In this way science became co-opted by Chinese culture. Prof. Yang suggested that rather than viewing the Chinese strategy of confronting Western culture as a state of utopia, we should look at it from the perspective of heterotopia.

Conclusion

In adherence to the conference title of "Personhood: concept and freedom," this excellent collection of conference papers discussed in a broad-ranging way the concept of man, the many development of Chinese culture after the New Culture Movement, and the relevant of this historic movement today. It is a sign of the times that more than a few papers focused on the challenges of democracy in China. Science and democracy, the two emblematic values of the New Culture Movement, still serve as signposts for the discussion of China's political future, especially on the viability of the freedom of individual in the presence of a powerful state.