

Mizoguchi Yuzo. "Chugoku ni okeru ko, shi gainen no tenkai." The development of the concepts of 'gong' (public) and 'si' (private) in China *Shiso* (1980): 19-38.

Notes by Peter C. Perdue  
March 4, 2005

Amazing breadth and range of thinkers covered. Brilliant exposition of gong and si. Trend to extension of meaning of gong from hierarchy, benevolence of a single ruler to equality & inclusion of economic implications and common people, trend seen since late Ming.

Cited by WT Rowe as basis of his discussion of the public sphere [see *Modern China*, 1990]

p.19

In Chinese, character element [厶] is common to gong and si, meaning to meet, open. Si = monopolize, steal, be wicked, gong = #1. gong in common, tong, in touch w masses, equal or #2. common place of activity, worship, threshing ground, or the clan chief who manages the hall ground.

In Japan: oyake has only meaning #2: large house, storehouse, or its manager → miyake as applied to emperor's house, but does not include equality, tong.

p.21

Yet emperor is still under moral restraint, cannot rule autocratically disregarding justice: moral meanings of gong still survive in Japan.

In Japan: oyake vs. watakushi is not a moral contrast, only one of public vs. private realms. In China, gong = correct, morally right; si is wrong. (Cf. Fukuzawa: OK for han to act for self-interest in dealing with each other; vs Sun Yatsen: aims for international moral ideals as part of minzu zhuyi.)

But tendency from pre-Qin to Tang is to accentuate #2 meaning: political, official meanings of gong. Lu Buwei: gong is personal characteristic, impartiality, Li Ji stresses community interest in Datong, justice for all. By Tang, gong means opposition to hereditary office, choosing of rulers according to merit : a much narrower definition than in Han.

p.23 Cheng Mingdao: unite your heart with Nature; renqing is opposed to dao, i.e. butong (revises gong to mean tong).

Zhu Xi: meaning of ren is to find heart of Nature (=gong) vs Daoist contemplation, overcome si. Si is multiple, gong is One. Individual wills are morally denied, restricted by unity of Nature. Song reexpands meaning of gong to attach it to tianli: the universal, equal to ziran. Nature is just, zheng, impartial, gong, vs. human desires are partial, distorting (NB Daoist influence on Neo-Cfu here: link of justice with Nature).

p.25

Unification needed in economic-social relations, not just internal psychological (e.g. landlord tenant relation needs \*mutual\* restraint: Hu Wufeng). Then it is not possible to judge gong and si separately by two different principles.

Zhu Xi, Li Zhi, and Dai Zhen all in fact affirm desire (!), but for Zhu Xi it is personal desires (physiological), for Li Zhi social desires (food and property), for Dai Zhen it is existential desire. But human desires are originally a product of Nature (Lo Qinshun) (desire to eat, beauty, etc.). Goal is not to deny desire but to achieve peace within oneself

by unifying personal desires with Heavenly Principle (Hu Wufeng) (sounds like Dai Zhen). But natural desires includes also social desires (property and wealth).

p.27 Li Zhi does not affirm all si. He attacks those after fame and wealth, only approves social desires for property. Huang Zongxi goes farther and affirms sili = rights to hold private property free from autocratic rule. Huang defends aristocratic class of wealthy property holders vs. Li whose si is extended to commoners.

Li Zhi: desire for food & clothing is the true moral way. If you reject all schemes, true emptiness reduces to these basic needs. But goal-directed striving for Heavenly Principle is wrong; it must be an unavoidable gushing out. Li introduces Buddhist element to Cfu here, like Wang Yangming “beyond Good and Evil”. But Wang Yangming rejects external determination of Principle for internal original Good. Wang Yangming a response to Ming social change in taxation, land, diversity of social values growing. Li Zhi radicalizes this to find principle in Nature = social desires.

Lu Kun does not advocate leveling the wealth of the rich, only teach them compassion, overcome engrossment by haoqiang [powerful and arrogant elites]. Obedience by the poor. Both sides should dingfen [maintain their social status]. But si are subsumed by gong, each should eliminate his selfish desires. Lu Kun preserves Song ideas of Unity of Principle, only extends it from individual to social realm. But antinomy of Principle & Desire is breaking down in 16c. Feng Congwu, Chen Que as examples.

What is gong for Li Zhi? No clear answer in social terms. Gu Yanwu is specific: gong unites & contains private interests in land, as in well field system. Later dynasties covered this up, disguised rulers' si as gong. But reformed autocracy, w local rule by wealthy elite, will unite si & gong. They are not two separate opposed principles. Both ruler and people benefit. Lu Kun emphasizes relationship between si of rich and poor. It is inequality that makes some have excess, others suffer from inability to fulfill desires.

p.31 Ruan Yuan points out in Han ren meant “pairing” of two people. Tan Sitong develops ren to be equal sympathy between two people, rejecting hierarchical ideals of loyalty & benevolence. 18<sup>th</sup> century Dai Zhen lives at time when landlord tenant relationship is the dominant one after diding merger of poll tax and land tax. (NB MY fails to show direct connection here). Argues that li only restrains the poor and weak, base from achieving their desires, still does not call for equality, only for “false commonwealth” of benevolence from above as in late Ming Lu Kun. But better called a Chinese form of commonwealth.

p. 30

Wang Fuzhi: Datong means when everyone can fulfill his desires. Thus unites Desire and Principle. Dai Zhen splits ji (self) from yu (desire). Desires are natural, principle is the ultimate extension of desire. Fulfillment of one's life is everyone's goal: this is ren, failure to fulfill it is buren.

p.32

part 5. Taiping raise gong in Christian guise as equality of all like brothers. In fact, it is very little Christian influenced, draws on Buddhist equality and Cfu ideas of ping, jun, underground tradition of “brotherhood.” After defeat of Taiping, it goes underground again; among elite, development of gong into economic-social ideas dies out until socialism revives it in late 19<sup>th</sup> c. Special Chinese characteristics: li is not God, is not transcendental, it is imminent in Nature in things. European natural science opposed human nature to external laws of God. In China there is no necessity to oppose human nature to li. Harmonious commonwealth is possible; by contrast with Hobbes,

development from Zhu Xi to Dai Zhen is “modernization” of Chinese thought in Chinese terms. Gong Zizhen however, predicts disaster for country if gap between rich and poor is not eased. Begins new modern move to democracy.

p.34 Kang Youwei’s Datongshu is founded on optimism about disappearance of conflicts of private interest. Thus faith in unity of human nature & principle. Optimistic in traditional form. Not for individual citizen rights, but closer to Lao Zhuang Buddhist. Thus highly traditional in assertion of Unity, denial of individuality. Datongshu as Utopia is entirely removed from practical programs of reform movement, which stress individual freedom.

Anon, Gongsì Bian (1903), uses Gu, Huang to assert ultimate goal of si by the people as being truly gong in opposition to ruler’s si for his interest.

Reason: concern for preservation of nation turns elite thinkers away from economic implications to political focus of gong. Yan Fu justifies private rights, says West respects gong, China respects only xiao. Promotes constitutional monarchy with unity of ruler and people, but based on people’s will.

p.36

But wrong to see all this as merely backward. Traditional ideas are given revolutionary energy to overthrow dynasty. NB also Chinese nationalism stands on principle of gong against “selfish” Western imperialists, a contrast with Japanese nationalism, which never denies self interest. Optimistic universalism makes easy the transition from democracy to socialist ideas. Even though Sun Yatsen and esp. Zhang Binglin espouse stage theories, they do not believe peasant masses can participate yet.

But in fact it is not individual citizen rights but rights of people as a whole : national rights are gong. Thus again si is swallowed up in gong. Very similar to Kang Youwei, though here it is fansi instead of wusi. Chen Tianhua denies that democracy = individual freedom. Necessary to restrict freedom of a few (Manchus) to ensure freedom of the whole. Still very traditional ideas: Zou Rong, Sun Yatsen’s democracy = unity of the Han race against Manchus, not universal equality.

p.38 But Zhu Zhixin, Sun Yatsen proclaim revolution both against small minority of powerholders & small minority of holders of wealth, easily linking democratic revolution & socialism. Li Dazhao turns to faith in people, unlike Zhang Binglin. But Marxist optimism about people is modern version of Heavenly Principle optimism. Thus revolutionary thought revives economic implications of gong first announced by Li Zhi.

Basic theme is persistence of debate over oppositional relationship between gong and si these mix conceptions of morality, psychology, institutions, and politics. Does not really support analogy of gong and si to civil society vs. the state. NB that ruler’s can be si [“private”] if they serve their own interests, or society can be “gong” just. So public/private dichotomy is blurred here, seen in different terms.

[Compare to R. Bin Wong on special characteristics of Chinese versions of the social.]