

weak gnawed away at one another, the old ties of the enfeoffment system were completely destroyed, and by Warring States times almost nothing of it survived. How then could it possibly keep the nine regions of the empire in submission or secure the obedience of the various feudal lords and princes? Consequently the states were divided up into commanderies (*jun*) and prefectures (*xian*), and men were selected to administer them. The prefectural system existed even in pre-Qin times. All Qin destroyed was [a China that consisted of] seven states. It was not responsible for the destruction of all the fiefs established during the Three Dynasties. So how could one have made the division into commanderies and prefectures, whereby those talented and capable of ruling the people were put in positions of authority where they could exploit their talents for governing the people if this had been contrary to the general interest of all-under-Heaven? Among the ancients the feudal lords handed down their states from generation to generation, and subsequently their officials followed their example and the tenure of office became hereditary. This was a gradual development made inevitable by the prevailing trend. However, as the sons of officials always became officials, and the sons of peasants always remained peasants, and there was no selection and utilization of those who were naturally talented, there were stupid men among the officials and accomplished men among the peasants. The accomplished could not submit to the stupid indefinitely, and so there ensued a struggle between them to gain the chance to rise in the world. This was a violent development made inevitable by the prevailing conditions. The enfeoffment system was destroyed, and the selection of officials through the examination system became the practice.

[*Quanshan yishu*, *Du Tongjian lun* 1:1a–b — IM]

THE JUSTIFICATION OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DIVISIONS

Wang develops his arguments for the preservation of the distinctions between gentlemen (*junzi*) and mean men (*xiaoren*), Chinese and barbarians, in a parallel way. In both cases there is a difference in the stage of civilization attained, and the ultimate criterion is moral. Culture rather than race is still the prime consideration, even in the case of foreigners: Wang specifically declares that indigenous ethnic groups do not count as barbarians.

There are in the world two great lines of demarcation to be drawn: that between Chinese and barbarians and that between the gentleman and the mean man. It is not the case that there was originally no difference between them and that the former kings arbitrarily set up barriers between them. Barbarians and Chinese are born (live) in different lands. Since their lands are different, the climates are different too. Since their climates are different, so too are their habits,

and consequently all they know and all they do is different. The noble and the inferior emerge spontaneously among them. It is simply that they are divided by physical frontiers and that their climates are different, and so there must be no confusion. If there is confusion, the destruction of (the order of) the human sector will ensue, and the people of China will suffer from the encroachments of the barbarians and be distressed. If, however, early measures are taken to ward off the barbarians, (the order of) the human sector will thereby be stabilized and human life protected. This is in accord with Heaven. As for the gentleman and the mean man, they are born of different stock. Since they are born of different stock, their physical substance is different. Since they differ in their physical substance, their habits too are different, and consequently all they know and all they do are different. The clever and the stupid emerge spontaneously among them. It is simply that they are born of different stock and have different values, and so there must be no confusion. If there is confusion, then the principles of man are contravened. The poor and weak among the people will suffer from the encroachments (of the mean men) and be distressed. If, however, one prevents the excesses of the mean men, one may thereby preserve the principles of man and enrich human life. This is in accord with Heaven. Alas, the confusion that mean men have created between themselves and gentlemen is no different from that which the barbarians have created between themselves and the Chinese! Some people may toy with the prospect, but the gravity of the harm done thereby is beyond all expectation.

Among mean men the clever and stupid divide themselves into different classes. The stupid are content to rest in their stupidity, and so bring hardship on themselves. The clever use their cleverness to wrong others. The stupid become peasants: they bring hardship on themselves but do not harm others.

The Han regarded laboring in the fields as the equivalent [among commoners] of filial virtue in selecting officials, and the result was that rites and education were gradually destroyed. This is why people say that since the Three Dynasties orderly government has never flourished. It is because confusion has been created between the peasants and gentlemen that the situation has deteriorated. This is even more true of the merchants. The merchants are the clever members of the class of mean men, and their destruction of man's nature and ruin of men's lives have already become extremely serious. Their (constitution) is such that they always frequent the barbarians, and their physical substance is such that they always get on well with the barbarians. Consequently, when the barbarians prosper, the merchants are esteemed. . . .

There are, fundamentally speaking, two great lines of demarcation to be drawn in the world, but ultimately they are one. What is this one line of demarcation? It is that between morality and profit. . . .

There are those who are born into villages of profit and grow up in the paths of profit. It is what their elders esteem, what their own flesh and blood predispose them to, and what their hearts long after. Their will and their constitution

act on one another, and so too do their minds and spirits. The result is that they are so deeply sunk in profit they cannot be made to move into the stream of gentlemen and Chinese. All are men, but the barbarians are separated from the Chinese by frontiers, while the mean men are differentiated from the gentlemen by their class. One cannot but be strict in drawing the lines of demarcation.

[*Quanshan yishu*, *Du Tongjian lun* 14:2a–3a —IM]

THE PRESERVATION OF CHINESE POLITICAL AND CULTURAL INTEGRITY

Wang's conviction that different peoples should live separately, "ignoring one another like the fish in rivers and lakes," is clearly linked to the philosophical conception outlined in his commentaries on the *Classic of Changes* and Zhang Zai. In his *Huang shu*, he develops the idea of a natural division into different species and draws out its political implications for Chinese survival. Wang's nationalism is remarkable in the history of Chinese thought not only for the violence and frequency of its expression but also for its theoretical justification.

This is why mountain creatures have cloven hoofs and those in the marshes have webbed feet; why the strengths of animals used for riding and animals used for ploughing lie in different directions; why water birds are proper to the south and cold-weather birds to the north. It is not a deliberate suppression of the state of confusion and dispersion that causes this great classification into different species: it is simply that conditions bring it about as the only way that (these creatures) can preserve themselves and ward off disaster. . . .

Therefore the sage, finding that this was true for all creatures and that each species defined its own limits, in controlling the empire and acting as its ruler separated the clever and the stupid, clarified cases where there was doubt, overcame the vicious and evil, and established lofty defensive barriers (between the groups) in order to ward off disaster and enable them to preserve themselves.

. . .

Man is like other creatures insofar as he is constituted of yin and yang and eats and breathes, but he cannot be put in the same category as other creatures. The Chinese are like the barbarians insofar as their general physical characteristics are similar and they are both subject to assemblies and divisions, but the Chinese cannot be put in the same category as the barbarians. Why is this? It is because if man does not draw lines of demarcation in order to set himself apart from other creatures, the order of Heaven is violated; if the Chinese do not draw lines of demarcation in order to set themselves apart from the barbarians, terrestrial order is violated. Heaven and earth regulate mankind through such demarcations, and if men are incapable of drawing the lines of demar-

cation between different groups, human order is violated. This is the way the three orders control the three sectors of Heaven, earth, and humankind. . . .

Now even the ants have rulers who preside over the territory of their nests, and when red ants or flying white ants penetrate their gates, the ruler organizes all his own kind into troops to bite and kill the intruders, drive them far away from the anthill, and prevent foreign interference. Thus he who rules the swarm must have the means to protect it. If, however, a ruler fails to make long-term plans, neglects the integrity of his territory, esteems his own person more than the empire, antagonizes colleagues, creates divisions where none should exist, is driven by suspicion to exercise a repressive control, and weakens the central region, then, while he clings desperately to his privileged status and enjoys the advantages of his position without fulfilling its obligations, disaster strikes and he is incapable of overcoming it. Confronted with an external menace, he is unable to stand firm against it. He can neither keep the succession for his own descendants nor protect his own kind. Such an extinction of the Way of the true king was what the *Spring and Autumn Annals* mourned. . . .

And so, with a mind full of grief and anger, and a heart full of sorrow, I rectify what went wrong in order to restore the original divisions established by the Yellow Emperor. I look forward eagerly to the advent of an enlightened ruler, who will restore sovereignty to the country, accomplish its mission, and stabilize its frontiers, and thereby guard the central territory and drive off the barbarians forever. Once this were accomplished, then though my body may perish my soul would rejoice.

[*Quanshan yishu*, *Huang shu* 1a–2b, and *houxu* 1b — IM]

GU YANWU, BEACON OF QING SCHOLARSHIP

Gu Yanwu (1613–1682), born in the last years of the Ming dynasty, had already achieved considerable reputation as a scholar when Beijing fell to the Manchus in 1644. The following year he took part in an attempt to defend his native city in Jiangnan (central China) against the invading Qing armies. With the fall of the city his foster mother, who had raised him from infancy, starved herself to death rather than live under the rule of the Manchus, on her deathbed entreating Yanwu never to serve the new dynasty in any official capacity. Gu remained true to her wishes, spending the rest of his life traveling about North China; he worked for brief periods at jobs of an unofficial but often practical nature while carrying on his researches.

During the chaotic days at the end of the Ming, Gu had already become interested in such practical subjects as economics, government, and military defense. The fall of the native dynasty before the Manchu invaders spurred him to pursue these studies with renewed vigor in an effort to find out why the old dynasty had faltered and how its mistakes could be avoided in the future. He