

第六章

社会生活和政治生活

／ Chapter Six **Social and Political Life** ／



一. 公共精神的缺乏

中国是一个个人主义的民族，他们系心于各自的家庭而不知有社会，此种只顾效忠家族的心理实即为扩大的自私心理。在中国人思想中初无“社团”这个名词的存在，不可谓非奇事。在孔教的社会和政治哲学里面，我们可以看出人民组织范型的接续阶段乃自家直接上升于国。《大学》有云：“古之欲明德于天下者，先治其国，欲治其国者，先齐其家……”又曰：“……身修而后家齐，家齐而后国治，国治而后天下平。”欲求一与“社团”这个字眼意识最相近的名词，在中文里头乃不能不推两个单字缀成的“国家”这个连语，这是中国抽象名词构成原则而来的。

“公共精神”为一新名词，“公共意识”一词亦然，“社会服务”一词亦然，中国原来没有这种东西。但“社会事件”当然也是有的，如婚丧喜庆、僧侣仪仗、四时令节。所缺乏者，乃属于那些足以构成英美人士的社会生活者，如运动，如政治结社，如宗教，这是很显而易见的。中国没有教堂也没有教会。中国人视谈论政治如宗教上的禁例，他们不投票，也没有讨论政治的党社。他们不事放纵于运动，运动乃为联系合群的最佳方法，固为英美人士社会生活的基础。当然，中国人也玩玩种种游戏竞技以资消遣，不过此等游戏竞技大率系

属于中国人个人主义的特性的。中国式的游戏并不把竞技者的分组对立两大组合，如斗蟋蟀，并非以一个组合对另一组合而作竞赛。组合这件事情，向非所知。中国人的斗牌游戏，每人各自为战。中国人欢喜打扑克一类的牌戏而不欢喜Bridge一类的牌戏（Bridge与Whist相类，系四人成局以两人为一组，两两相对的一种牌戏）。中国人常喜搓麻将，固已久著盛名，麻将即近似扑克，非似Bridge。从这个麻将哲学中，可以看出中国人个人主义的素质。

中国人的个人主义的例证，可见之于中国新闻纸的组织。中国人经营报纸，譬如搓麻将。著者常见《中国日报》请了主任编辑，专门担任写写社论；国内新闻，另有主编的人，他有他的固定的篇幅；国际电讯，又另有主编的人，他有他的固定篇幅；本埠新闻也另有编辑的人，他也有他的固定园地。如此四人各自掌理各自的部分，好比搓麻将的四个搭子，各人要竭力揣摩别人手中捏着的什么牌，各人想让自己先挺张，而掉出所不要的牌给下家的人。倘遇国内新闻过于拥挤，他可以随随便便地移入本埠新闻版，倘遇本埠新闻亦甚拥挤，又可移入盗警火警栏的地位（对于读者向来不通知）。这样一来，固需乎第一版的特意编排，材料无须乎选择，没有调和作用，也没有首要次要之分，每个编辑先生都能写写意意早些回府。制度本身固已很够简单，加以编者和读者，两方面都是生而为个人主义者。出版新闻为编辑先生的职务，而阅读新闻，乃在读者，故两方互不相涉。这是中国几种最老最大最广销的报纸所沿用迄今之专门技术。

假定你要问为什么没有调和作用，其唯一答句即为缺乏公共精神。因为假使总编辑而意欲施行改组，或许觉得本埠编辑之庸暗而欲予以开除，他就与家庭制度相冲突。他的干涉他人事务，居心何在？是不是他的用意在于撵出这位本埠编辑，敲碎他的饭碗，更连带地使一切依赖于这位编辑身上的人同陷饥饿；更倘遇这位本埠编辑的夫人是老板的外甥女，他能不能撵他出去

呢？这还了得！假使这位总编辑稍具中国式的社交觉悟，他不致干出这等事情；若遇这位总编辑是新近回国的美国密苏里新闻专科学校毕业生，还是快些走开为上策。于是来一个熟知中国人社交方式者取而代之，旧的制度乃仍延续工作下去，读者照样赖以查阅新闻，而报纸照样扩展其发行额而赚钱。

许多这样的总结都隐藏于一切中国人的社交往来后面，吾们可以很容易举出许多例子显示缺乏公共精神，简直使二十世纪的西洋人难以置信。我所说“二十世纪的人”，因为他已经接受过十九世纪博爱主义的精神的教养而具有较为广阔的社会眼界。举一个典型的例子，这个例子真堪为中国社会事业的思想代表。下面一段是我逐句从《论语》两周刊（一种幽默杂志）上摘录下来的，它记述一位中国军阀对于民众教育运动的演说。有些青年醉心于现代美国社会服务的热情，组织一种团体，推行“扫除文盲”运动。这位军阀便发挥其鸿论说：“学生应该勤勉读书而不宜干预外界事务。人家吃饱了自己的饭，干自家的事情，而你们却要扫除他们！”那动听的论据是这样说法的：不识字的人不来干预你们，为什么你们偏偏要去干预他们？这些字句何等简短，何等有力，而且那样真实。因为这些字句，字字直接发自演说者的心坎，毫无遮隐，毫无润饰。在中国人看来，社会工作常视作干预他人的事。一人热心于社会改革或任何其他公共事业，看来常觉得有些可笑。吾们不顾他的诚意，又不能了解他为什么跑出来干这些事业，用意何在？是不是在向社会公众献殷勤？为什么他不效忠于家庭，更为什么不巴图上进，升官发财，俾及早帮助其亲戚和自己的家庭？吾们决定他因为是年轻，或则为正常人类典型的迷路者。

常有这样迷失人类正常典型的人物被称为豪侠，可是这些人无疑即为盗贼或漂泊浮浪的人物。他们是单身汉，不结婚，有一颗浮浪不肯安稳的心儿，常很愿意纵身入水以拯救一个不相识的小孩。或则他们是结了婚的人，而死的

时候，往往身后萧条，不名一文，让他的妻子含辛茹苦以度日。吾们欢迎这种人，爱这种人，但不愿我们自己的家庭中产生这样一个物。当我们瞧见一个孩子具有公共精神太丰富，勇于参加困难纠纷，吾们将确信地预言这个孩子定为父母的致命伤。倘使吾人能及早挫折他，压服他，他或许会从家庭流浪出去而加入行侠的盗伙。这就是为什么他们是被认为舍离正道的理由。

这样的情形怎会发生，中国人不是那样的邪教徒，深陷于罪孽若基督徒所想象者。虽然中国人因为不是基督徒，仍可用受尽基督教诅咒的“邪教徒”这个名词加诸其身。倘基督教会能尽力以求了解他们，而从根源攻击他们的劣点，则似较为适宜，因为劣点的背后是一种完全不同于基督教的社会哲理观念，这不同就是双方观点不同之由来。受了现代教育的中国最优秀之青年还是不能明了西洋妇女一定要组织“禁止虐待动物会”的意义，她们为什么高兴去替狗担心事，又为什么不好好坐在家里看护看护自家的孩子。吾们可断定她们是因为没有孩子，因之在家里也没有更好的事情可做，这样的推断或许往往是不差的。矛盾常存在于家族观念与公共精神二者间，一个人倘勤俭积财，而吝啬得够程度，常可发现其家族观念在发生作用。

因为家族制度是中国社会的根底，中国的一切社会特性无不出自此家族制度。家族制度与村社制度——村社制度为家庭组织进一步而范围稍为扩大的范型——可以统括地说明一切中国社会生活的现象。面子、宠嬖、特殊、报恩、礼仪、官吏贪污、公共组织、学校、基尔特（同业联合会）、博爱、慈善、优待、公正，而最后全部中国政治组织——一切都出自此家族及村社制度，一切都从它摄取特质和状态，更一切都从它寻取解释特殊性质的说明。从家族制度里头产生了家族观念，更从家族观念产生社会行为的某项法规。将此等特性加以研究是很有兴趣的，吾们将看出人生在缺乏公共精神的环境里，怎样作为社会一分子而行动着。

I. Absence of The Social Mind

THE Chinese are a nation of individualists. They are family-minded, not social-minded, and the family mind is only a form of magnified selfishness. It is curious that the word "society" does not exist as an idea in Chinese thought. In the Confucian social and political philosophy we see a direct transition from the family, *chia*, to the state, *kuo*, as successive stages of human organization, as in such sayings as "When the family is orderly, then the state is peaceful," or "Put the family in order and rule the state in peace." The nearest equivalent to the notion of society is then a compound of the two words, *kuochia*, or "state-family," in accordance with the rule for forming Chinese abstract terms.

"Public spirit" is a new term, so is "civic consciousness" and so is "social service." There are no such commodities in China. To be sure, there are "social affairs," such as weddings, funerals, and birthday celebrations and Buddhistic processions and annual festivals. But the things which make up English and American social life, viz. sport, politics and religion, are conspicuously absent. There is no church and no church community. The Chinese religiously abstain from talking politics; they do not cast votes, and they have no clubhouse debates on politics. They do not indulge in sport, which binds human beings together, and which is the essence of the English

and American social life. They play games, to be sure, but these games are characteristic of Chinese individualism. Chinese games do not divide the players into two parties, as in cricket, with one team playing against the other. Teamwork is unknown. In Chinese card games, each man plays for himself. The Chinese like poker, and do not like bridge. They have always played mahjong, which is nearer to poker than to bridge. In this philosophy of mahjong may be seen the essence of Chinese individualism.

An illustration of Chinese individualism may be seen in the organization of a Chinese newspaper. The Chinese run their papers as they play their mahjong. I have seen Chinese daily papers so edited as to require an editor-in-chief whose only business is to write editorials. The man in charge of domestic news has his page, the man in charge of international cables has his, and the man in charge of city news again has his own ground. These four men handle their respective departments like the four hands at a mahjong table, each trying to guess what the others have got. Each tries to make up his set and throws out the unwanted bamboo to the next man. If there is too much domestic news, it can conveniently flow over (without warning, as far as the reader is concerned) to the page for city news, and if this again has too much copy, it can conveniently flow over to the murders and conflagrations. There is no necessity for front-page make-up, no selection, no co-ordination, no subordination. Each editor can retire at his own good time. The scheme is simplicity itself. Moreover, both the editors and the readers are born individualists. It is the editor's business to publish the news, and the reader's business to look for it. They do not interfere with one another. This is the journalistic technique of some of the oldest, largest and most popular daily papers in China to this day.

If you ask why there is no co-ordination, the answer is, there's no social mind. For if the editor-in-chief tries to initiate reforms and fire the city editor for obstruction, he will run up against the family system. What does he mean by interfering with other people's business? Does he mean to throw

the city editor out and break his rice-bowl, starving all the people dependent upon him? And if the city editor's wife is the proprietor's niece, can he throw him out? If the editor-in-chief has any Chinese social consciousness, he will not attempt such a thing, and if he is a raw American-returned graduate of the Missouri School of Journalism, he will soon have to get out. Another man who knows Chinese social ways will get in, the old scheme will go on working, the readers will go on hunting for their news and the paper will go on increasing its circulation and making money.

Some such psychology is hidden behind all Chinese social intercourse, and it would be easy to multiply examples showing a lack of the social mind truly bewildering to the twentieth-century Western man. I say twentieth-century man because he has received the benefits of nineteenth-century humanitarianism, with a broadened social outlook. As a typically bewildering example, which is yet truly representative of Chinese thought regarding social work, I quote verbally from the *Analects Fortnightly* (a magazine devoted to unconscious Chinese humor) reporting the speech of a native warlord regarding the movement for mass education. The young people caught with the modern American enthusiasm for social service organized a movement for "annihilating literary blindness." So saith the General, therefore, in a speech: "Students ought to work at their books and not meddle with public affairs. The people do their own business and eat their own rice, and you want to annihilate the people!" The persuasive argument is this: the illiterate are not interfering with you, why must you interfere with them? Those words, so short, so forceful, are yet so true because they come direct and undisguised from the speaker's heart. To a Chinese, social work always looks like "meddling with other people's business." A man enthusiastic for social reform or in fact for any kind of public work always looks a little bit ridiculous. We discount his sincerity. We cannot understand him. What does he mean by going out of his way to do all this work? Is he courting publicity? Why is he not loyal to his family and why does he not get official promotion

and help his family first? We decide he is young, or else he is a deviation from the normal human type.

There were always such deviations from type, the haohsia or "chivalrous men," but they were invariably of the bandit or vagabond class, unmarried, bachelors with good vagabond souls, willing to jump into the water to save an unknown drowning child. (Married men in China do not do that.) Or else they were married men who died penniless and made their wives and children suffer. We admire them, we love them, but we do not like to have them in the family. When we see a boy who has too much public spirit, getting himself into all sorts of scrapes, we confidently predict that boy will be the death of his parents. If we can break him early enough, well and good; if not, he will go to jail and ruin the family fortune besides. But it isn't always as bad as that. If we cannot break him, he will probably run away from home and join the public-spirited brigands. That is why they are "deviations."

How is such a state of things possible? The Chinese are not such heathens, deep drowned in their sins, as the Christian missionaries would imagine, although here the word "heathen," with all the force of Christian contempt and condemnation, seems eminently applicable. It would be better if the missionaries tried to understand them and attack the evil from its source, for back of it is a social philosophy different from theirs. The difference is a difference of point of view. The best modern educated Chinese still cannot understand why Western women should organize a "Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals." Why bother about the dogs, and why do they not stay at home and nurse their babies? We decide that these women have no children and therefore have nothing better to do, which is probably often true. The conflict is between the family mind and the social mind. If one scratches deep enough, one always finds the family mind at work.

For the family system is the root of Chinese society, from which all Chinese social characteristics derive. The family system and the village system, which is the family raised to a higher exponent, account for all there is

to explain in the Chinese social life. Face, favor, privilege, gratitude, courtesy, official corruption, public institutions, the school, the guild, philanthropy, hospitality, justice, and finally the whole government of China—all spring from the family and village system, all borrow from it their peculiar tenor and complexion, and all find in it enlightening explanations for their peculiar characteristics. For from the family system there arises the family mind, and from the family mind there arise certain laws of social behavior. It will be interesting to study these and see how man behaves as a social being in the absence of a social mind.

二. 家族制度

吾国古时并无所谓“家族制度”这种社会学上的名词。吾们所知道的“家”，它只是为“契本”或为人类社会之本的家。家族制度渲染了吾们一切社会生活的色彩。它是属人主义的，即吾人对于政府之概念亦系把它看做人格化的。家族制度所教导吾们的孩子们的第一个课程，是在人与人之间的社交的义务：自重、礼貌、责任心和相互调整补充的要务。责任心的意义，是阐述得很明确的，即是对于父母的感恩图报的义务观念和对于长辈的敬意。它很近乎代替宗教的作用而给予人们以社会长存与家族永续的意识，因以满足人类巴求永生的愿望。经由崇拜祖先的制度，它使永生的意识倍显活跃。它教导人以一种家族光荣的意识，此种意识在西方固不难搜得类似的例证。

家族制度的影响于吾人，就恰恰在于私人的日常生活中。它从吾们手中剥夺了订婚权，而予以之授予我们的父母；它使吾人结婚不是娶了一个妻子，却是娶了一房媳妇，更使吾人妻子生产儿子成为“养孙子”；它把新娘的义务加重了百倍；它使年轻夫妇白昼掩扉成为非礼行为，而使“秘密”二字成为中国人所不知的名词。警方一架收音机，它使吾人安于闹的

习惯，闹的婚礼，闹的葬仪，闹的饮食，以至于闹的睡眠。它麻痹了我们的神经而发展了吾们的耐性。欧美人民好像一个闺女，她只消照顾自身，因之她只消使她自己外观整洁美丽；中国人民则好像一位大家庭中的媳妇，她有许许多多家庭的本分须行料理，吾们是以在很小的年龄就已养成了端庄性，它使吾们的青年人恪守本分；它过度保护我们的孩子，不知道怎么倒很少有孩子反抗家庭而出走的。凡父母太以自己为中心而太专制，它时常剥夺了青年的事业心和发明天才。著者认为这一点是家族制度所施于中国人的特性最恶劣的影响。父母的丧仪又涉及士子应试的机会，居父母之丧的读书人，必须停止应考三年，同时又为士大夫阶级提出辞呈的最好理由。

家族主义之伦理哲学甚至限制吾人之远游与运动，因为在《孝经》中，产生了一个学理，殆为每个小学生都须熟记者，即“身体发肤，受之父母，不敢毁伤”。曾子为孔子门人之佼佼者，当其临终之际，这样说：“启予足，启予手。”盖曾子保全其身体发肤而终，可告无愧于祖宗。此种思想已极临近于宗教思想。它又限制我们的向外发展，因为孔子说过：“父母在，不远游，游必有方。”游历的最好形式，本应该是无一定目的地、无预定目的地的，依照孔子的学理，这便不可能了。所谓孝子，应该慎惜身体，不可爬高山，不可走险路。这样一来，阿尔卑斯俱乐部（Alpine Club）中遂找不出一个配称孝子的人了。

总之，家族制度为个人主义之否定，它又限制个人的活动有如骑士之缰索控制阿拉伯野马的奔驰。有时遇着骑师是个好人，他帮忙良马在赛马会中夺取锦标，而骑师不常是好人，有时控制马匹的且不是一个骑师而仅为一辆不中用的货车，你看还成怎个样子。中国社会固无所庸于阿拉伯良马，其最充分之明证即为中国社会之从不产生良马，中国社会把良马屠杀

个精光，把它们穷追驱入山林，或把它们禁闭入收容所。中国社会所需要的马为呆滞鲁钝服缰之马，果然，吾们的社会上便真饶有这样的弩马。

“名分学说”，即孔子学说通常所被称之代名词，实为家族制度背后的社会哲学。这是一种道理乃所以维持中国社会之秩序者，它同时为社会组织与社会控驭之原理。其基本理想为名分。名分赋予每一个男子或女子在社会上所应处的一定之地位。有如人文主义者的理想欲“令任何事物都归于适当地位”。名分的社会理想亦为个人都处于适当地位。“名”的意义为名称，“分”的意义为本分。孔子学说实际上常被称为“名教”或即为“名分的宗教”。名称是一个称号，所以给予人表明各个在社会上所处的一定地位，即身份，更表明其与别人的关系。缺乏一个名号，或在社会关系中的定限，一个人就不知道他自己的本分，从而也不知道怎样控制他的行为。孔子的理想便是这样，倘使每个人知道自己的本分，而其行动适合于自己的地位，则社会秩序便能有把握地维持。关于中国社会所宗奉的五大伦，其中四伦是与“家”有关的。此五大人伦即君臣之关系、父子之关系、夫妇之关系，以及兄弟朋友之关系。其最后一伦朋友之关系可为之合并于家庭，因为朋友乃为那些可以包括入“家”的范围内的人——他们是家族间的朋友。家族是以可为一切道德行为的出发点。

不过吾人于此必须提示者：孔子从未想把家族意识去夺取社会意识或民族意识的地位，亦并未想把它发展成一种高度自私的形式——后世的结果，尽孔子全部实践的智慧，实未能料及。家族制度的缺点，在韩非子时代已很明显（约当基督前三世纪末期）。依著者愚见，韩非子实为那时代最伟大的政治思想家。《韩非子》一书所记载的当时政治实况的描写，可以映出今日中国的形貌。例如由于亲贵偏宠而使文官制度的崩坏，不啻攘夺了国家资产而增富了私家。高官显宦之建筑富丽的别庄，渎职官吏之缺

乏任何制裁，因此缺乏公民观念和一般的缺乏社会意识。此等劣点都经韩非子一一指出，他主张组织一个法治的政府，他认为法治政府才是政治上唯一的出路。可是韩非子自己的结局却是被迫仰药而死，类乎苏格拉底的命运。

但至少在学习理上，孔子并非有意牺牲了社会的完整而使家族意识发展为自私观念的。在他的道德律里面，他也曾容许某种程度的超家族的仁爱。他把家庭内的道德训练作为普通道德训练的基础，他计划想从此普通的道德训练，实现一个社会，这个社会是要很适宜于和谐幸福的共同生活的。只有在这种悟性里面一个人才能了解重视孝道的意义。孝在中国伦理观念里面，是居于百善之先的。中国文字里头，那个教育的教字甚至是从“孝”字蜕化而来的。《孝经》上对于孝的意义，作下面的解释：

子曰：“君子之教以孝也，非家至而日见之也；教以孝，所以敬天下之为人父者也。教以悌，所以敬天下之为人兄者也。教以臣，所以敬天下之为人君者也。”

在另一节里，孔子又说：

爱亲者，不敢恶于人；敬亲者，不敢慢于人。

由于这种意义，孔子对他的弟子曾子说：

夫教，德之本也，教之所由生也。复坐，吾语汝，身体发肤，受之父母，不敢毁伤，孝之始也。立身行道，扬名于后世，以显父母，孝之终

也。夫孝，始于事亲，中于事君，终于立身……

全部道德哲理，在社会上，基于模拟的学理；在教育上，基于习惯的学理。社会教育的方法，即自儿童时代培植纯正的心智态度，其出发点乃天然开始于家庭中。这种方法，并为差误。它的唯一弱点为政治与道德的混合，其结果对于家庭是有优良的成效的，而对于国家则为危害。

家族制度又似社会制度，它是坚定而又一贯的。它肯定地信仰一个宜兄宜弟、如手如足的民族应构成一个健全的国家。但是从现代的眼光看来，孔氏学说在人类五大人伦中，脱漏了人对于异域人的社会义务，这遗漏是巨大的灾难。博爱在中国向非所知而且实际加以消极地抑制的。学理上，博爱的精义可谓已包容互助说里面。孔子称君子者谓：“夫仁者，己欲达而达人，己欲立而立人。”但是这个施仁于他人的热忱，却是不列于五伦之内，亦无明确之定义。一个家族，加以朋友，构成铜墙铁壁的堡垒。在其内部为最高的结合体，且彼此互助，对于外界则取冷待的消极抵抗的态度。其结局，由于自然的发展，家族成为一座堡垒，在它的外面，一切的一切，都是合法的可掠夺物。

II. The Family System

THERE was formerly no such word as "family system" as a sociological term; we knew the family only as "the basis of the state," or rather as the basis of human society. The system colors all our social life. It is personal, as our conception of government is personal. It teaches our children the first lessons in social obligations between man and man, the necessity of mutual adjustment, self-control, courtesy, a sense of duty, which is very well defined, a sense of obligation and gratitude toward parents, and respect for elders. It very nearly takes the place of religion by giving man a sense of social survival and family continuity, thus satisfying man's craving for immortality, and through the ancestral worship it makes the sense of immortality very vivid. It breeds a sense of family honor, for which it is so easy to find parallels in the West.

It touches us even in very personal ways. It takes the right of contracting marriage from our hands and gives it to those of our parents; it makes us marry, not wives but "daughters-in-law," and it makes our wives give birth, not to children but to "grandchildren." It multiplies the obligations of the bride a hundredfold. It makes it rude for a young couple to close the door of their room in the family house in the daytime, and makes privacy an unknown word in China. Like the radio, it accustoms us to noisy weddings,

noisy funerals, noisy suppers and noisy sleep. And like the radio, it benumbs our nerves and develops our good temper. The Western man is like a maiden who has only herself to look after, and who consequently manages to look neat and tidy, while the Chinese man is like the daughter-in-law of a big family who has a thousand and one household obligations to attend to. It therefore breeds in us soberness at an early age. It keeps our young in their places. It overprotects our children, and it is strange how few children rebel and run away. Where the parents are too self-centered and autocratic, it often deprives the young man of enterprise and initiative, and I consider this the most disastrous effect of the family system on Chinese character. A parent's funeral interferes with a scholar's chances at the official examinations for three years, and is good ground for the resignation of a cabinet minister.

Family ethics interferes even with our travel and sport, for the theory was developed in the Hsiao-king, or Classic of Filial Piety (which every schoolboy used to memorize) that "the body, the hair and the skin are received from the parents and may not be injured." Tsengtse, the great disciple of Confucius, said on his deathbed, "Examine my hands, examine my feet," which had been kept intact to return to his forefathers. This already borders on a religious feeling. It limits our travels, for Confucius said, "A man does not travel to distant places when his parents are living, and if he does, he must have a definite destination." The best form of travel, i.e., travel without destination and without hoping to arrive anywhere, is therefore theoretically impossible. The filial son "does not climb high, and does not tread on dangerous places." There is therefore not a single filial son in the Alpine Club.

In short, the family system is the negation of individualism itself, and it holds a man back, as the reins of the jockey hold back the dashing Arabian horse. Sometimes the jockey is good, and then he helps the horse to win the race, but sometimes he is not so good. Sometimes it is not a jockey that is holding the horse back but merely a refuse cart. But then, Chinese society has no use for fine Arabian thoroughbreds, the best proof of which is that we have