



The Association for
Asian Studies

Review

Reviewed Work(s): Confucianism and Human Rights by Wm. Theodore de Bary and Tu Weiming

Review by: Marina Svensson

Source: *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 58, No. 2 (May, 1999), pp. 483-484

Published by: Association for Asian Studies

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2659425>

Accessed: 13-05-2019 08:36 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Association for Asian Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Asian Studies*

gospel theology and what the missions actually did in China may not be as direct as Cui supposes.

These criticisms notwithstanding, this is a valuable study which belongs in library collections on China, and on missions, and will be consulted with profit by students of both.

RYAN DUNCH
University of Alberta

Confucianism and Human Rights. Edited by WM. THEODORE DE BARY and TU WEIMING. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998. xxiii, 327 pp. \$40.00.

Discussions on human rights in the Chinese context often focus on the relationship between Chinese culture and human rights; whether, and which, human rights are compatible with Chinese culture, etc. This volume is an example of such a cultural approach to the understanding of human rights. One could say that the majority of the authors stress China's "sameness" (or, in the case of Henry Rosemont Jr., superiority), in contrast to those who see "China-as-the-other." The latter would either argue that Chinese culture is hostile to human rights, therefore precluding, or hindering, the realization of human rights, or that it explains and allows for differences with respect to human rights (the view of the Chinese government).

The volume consists of mostly philosophical and theoretical papers by North American and Chinese scholars from the first in a series of conferences on Confucianism and human rights. Some of the authors search the Confucian classics for examples of human rights friendly notions or equivalences to human rights ideas (Sumner B. Twiss, Irene Bloom, Wejen Chang), whereas others focus on Chinese intellectuals in the beginning of the century, who grappled with new ideas and concepts, including human rights (Joan Judge, Peter Zarrow). Others address more contemporary discussions and the relevance of tradition for that debate (Randall Peerenboom, Jeremy T. Paltiel).

The editors, and some of the contributors, are vocal advocates of Neo-Confucianism and believe not only in the compatibility of Confucianism and human rights, but also that Confucianism can contribute to and enrich, or, in the case of Henry Rosemont Jr., serve as an alternative to human rights talk in the contemporary world. They do not argue, however, that there existed protohuman rights ideas in traditional China. Instead they are content to identify similarities and thus focus on ideas of human dignity and equality, which they argue are found in Confucianism—particularly its Mencian variety—and which can nurture ideas of human rights. Whereas I agree that some version of Confucianism is compatible with human rights and that notions of human dignity are embedded in, and can nurture, human rights, I believe that there is a difference between a language of benevolence and a language of rights which the authors tend to gloss over.

One problem with this volume is of course its narrow focus on Confucianism, as other traditions, for example Buddhism, are also of interest if one wants to argue for an internal justification of human rights. The lack of a clear definition of Confucianism is also a problem, which only Randall Peerenboom mentions (footnote 10, p. 255). The authors furthermore have a tendency to pick those ideas which fit human rights ideas, but tend to forget, or ignore, other central tenets of Confucianism, such as its

hierarchical nature, the low status of women, etc., which are at odds with contemporary human rights ideas. Randall Peerenboom and Jeremy T. Paltiel are the only ones to discuss this problem and voice some scepticism about the situation for human rights in a Confucian society.

Another question is whether a Confucian legitimacy really is a crucial precondition for the justification and realization of human rights in contemporary China—an implicit premise in many of the papers. The influence and relevance of Confucianism in the contemporary human rights discourse can also be questioned. It should be noted, for example, that Chinese dissidents do not invoke Confucianism in their struggle for human rights; to them the relationship between Confucianism and human rights is an academic, and irrelevant, issue. And whereas the contributors to this volume emphasize the liberal and humanitarian aspects of Confucianism, the CCP (which in the past rejected and criticized Confucianism but now praises it) singles out the more conservative and authoritarian aspects, as several of the contributors also point out (de Bary, p. xiv, Peerenboom, p. 237, p. 253). Such an interpretation of Confucianism shows its political malleability, and that politics, more than culture, in the final analysis shapes the Chinese human rights discourse.

The editors and Henry Rosemont Jr. see Confucianism as a remedy, not only of the ills in China but of those in the West as well. They share their appreciation of Confucianism and dismay with contemporary Liberalism with the advocates in the Asian values debate and the Communitarians. Like them they argue that the unbridled individualism, materialism, crime, and disorder, which they observe in the West (read the U.S.) partly is due to its excessive “rights talk.” Confucianism’s stress on duties, social harmony, and family values would, in their opinion, alleviate these problems. Henry Rosemont Jr. goes the furthest, and argues that Confucianism is a genuine alternative to the West’s rights discourse. But given China’s past, it is strange that the dangers associated with an excessive “duties talk,” especially in an authoritarian society, are not discussed.

In future volumes I would like to see, instead of only references to Mencius, some discussions of Neo-Confucians, such as Liang Shuming and Zhang Junmai, who discussed human rights, and more on whether, how, and to what extent Confucianism in the past and at present really influences and shapes the debate on human rights in China.

MARINA SVENSSON
Lund University

The Problematic of Self in Modern Chinese Literature: Hu Feng and Lu Ling. By KIRK A. DENTON. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998. xiv, 324 pp. \$49.50.

Although numerous books have been published about the Hu Feng case since Hu Feng’s reappearance on the literary scene in 1979, scholarly treatment of his theory and his close literary associates’ practice remains scanty and fragmentary in both China and the West. In a recent memoir of her late husband, Mei Zhi admits that Hu Feng’s literary theory is too complex for her to deal with systematically. (See Mei Zhi, *Hu Feng: A Biography* [Beijing: Shiyue chubanshe, 1998], p. 790.) This new book by Kirk Denton is, therefore, a welcome and much needed one. It is a significant scholarly contribution to the study of Hu Feng and Lu Ling, embodying the two aspects of the