

**Chen Duxiu. “Preface to Science and the Philosophy of Life” 科学与
人生观序 [Kexue yu Rensheng Guan Xu], *La Jeunesse* 新青年 2
(1923): 34-39.**

By Shibin Zhang, Xin Qing, and Yuda Qin

亚东图书馆汇印讨论科学与人生观的文章，命我作序，我方在病中而且无事，却很欢喜的做这篇序。第一，因为文化落后的中国，到现在才讨论这个问题，（文化落后的俄国前此关于这问题也有过剧烈的讨论，现在他们的社会科学进了步，稍懂得一点社会科学门径的人，都不会有这种无常识的讨论了，和我们中国的知识阶级现在也不至于讨论什么天圆地方、天动地静、电线是不是蜘蛛精这等问题一样。）而却已开始讨论这个问题，进步虽说太缓，总算是有了进步；只可惜一班攻击张君劢、梁启超的人们，表面上好象是得了胜利，其实并未攻破敌人的大本营，不过打散了几个支队，有的还是表面上在那里开战，暗中却已投降了（如范寿康先天的形式说，及任叔永人生观的科学是不可能说）。就是主将丁文江大攻击张君劢唯心的见解，其实他自己也是以五十步笑百步，这是因为有一种可以攻破敌人大本营的武器，他们素来不相信，因此不肯用。“科学何以不能支配人生观”，敌人方面却举出一些似是而非的证据出来；“科学何以能支配人生观”，这方面却一个证据也没举出来。我以为不但不曾得着胜利，而且几乎是卸甲丢盔的大败战，大家的文章写得虽多，大半是“下笔千言离题万里”，令人看了好象是“科学概论讲义”，不容易看出他们和张君劢的争点究竟是什么，张君劢那边离开争点之枝叶更加倍之多，这乃一场辩论的最大遗憾！第二，因为适之最近对我说，“唯物史观至多只能解释大部分的问题”，经过这回辩论之后，适之必能百尺竿头更进一步！因为这两个缘故，我很欢喜的做这篇序。

Before the Yadong Library printed the collection of articles regarding the debate on science and the philosophy of life, I was invited to write a preface for this collection.

Though sick and idle at the time, I joyfully wrote the preface. Firstly, the issue of science and the philosophy of life, owing to the cultural backwardness of China, has not been discussed until recently. (Culturally backward Russia has had heated discussions on this issue before. Since then, their social sciences have developed, and any Russian who knows a little about social sciences will no longer have such meaningless discussions. This is similar to the situation where the Chinese clerisy will not talk about such questions as the ancient Chinese cosmology of the round sky and the square earth, what it is like when the sky moves and the earth is still, and whether the electric wires are spider monsters.) No matter how slow the process is, the issue has finally begun to be discussed. Although the supporters of science seemed to be triumphant in the opposing the debate on Zhang Junmai and Liang Qichao, it was a pity that they did not break through the enemies' stronghold. They only broke up several detachments, and some advocates of science, behind the facade of fighting, have secretly surrendered. (For instance, "A priori modes" from Fan Shoukang and Agnosticism of Science from Ren Shuyong's *Philosophy of Life*.)¹ Serving as the "chief debater", Ding Wenjiang strongly refuted Zhang Junmai's idealistic views. In fact, Ding himself was an example of "the pot calling the kettle black". Although there was a weapon that could be used to break through the enemies' stronghold, they never believed it, so they were not willing to use it. The supporters of metaphysics presented some plausible evidence on "How science cannot dominate the philosophy of life"; however, there was no evidence provided on "How science can dominate the philosophy of life" by the supporters of science. From my perspective, this was not a victory for the advocates of science, but virtually a disastrous defeat. Although there were a large number of articles written, most of them were "thousands of words written, straying far from the topic". For readers, they seemed to read "the lecture notes of the introduction to science", yet they could barely find the arguments of both

¹ "A priori and a posteriori" were popularized by Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, an influential work in the history of philosophy. Kitcher, Philip "A Priori Knowledge Revisited" in *New Essays on the A Priori*. ed. Paul Boghossian & Christopher Peacocke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002): 65-91.

sides. The excessively irrelevant arguments from Zhang were straying away from the topic, the greatest pity throughout the dispute! Secondly, Hu Shi still believed that “Historical materialism can at most explain most problems of life”.² After participating in this debate, Hu Shi would no doubt make great progress in his philosophy of life! Concerning the two previous reasons, I was delighted to write this preface.

数学、物理学、化学等科学，和人生观有什么关系，这问题本不用着讨论。可是后来科学的观察、分类说明等方法应用到活动的生物，更应用到最活动的人类社会，于是便有人把科学略分为自然科学与社会科学二类。社会科学中最主要的是经济学、社会学、历史学、心理学、哲学（这里所指的是实验主义的及唯物史观的人生哲学，不是指本体论、宇宙论的玄学，即所谓形而上的哲学）。这些社会科学，不用说和那些自然科学都还在幼稚时代，然即是幼稚，已经有许多不可否认的成绩，若因为还幼稚便不要他，我们不必这样蠢。自然科学已经说明了自然界许多现象，这是我们不能否认的；社会科学已经说明了人类社会许多现象，这也是我们不能否认的。自然界及社会都有他的实际现象。科学家说明得对，他原来是那样；科学家说明得不对，他仍旧是那样；玄学家无论如何胡想乱说，他仍旧是那样；他的实际现象是死板板的，不是随着你们唯物论唯心论改变的。哥白尼以前，地球原来在那里绕日而行，孟轲以后，渐渐变成了无君的世界；科学的说明能和这死板板的实际一一符合，才是最后的成功。我们所以相信科学（无论自然科学或社会科学）也就是因为“科学家之最大目的，曰摒除人意之作用，而一切现象化之为客观的，因而可以推算，可以穷其因果之相生”（张君劭语），必如此而后可以根据实际寻求实际，而后可以说明自然界及人类社会死板板的实际，和玄学家的胡想乱说不同。

2 The general theory of the motive forces and laws of social change, developed on the basis of Marx's discoveries, is known as the materialist conception of history, or historical materialism. The materialist conception of history was arrived at by applying the materialist world outlook to the solution of social problems. And because he made this application, materialism was with Marx no longer simply a theory aimed at interpreting the world, but a guide to the practice of changing the world, of building a society without exploitation of man by man. Above all, historical materialism has a contemporary significance. Cornforth, Maurice Campbell, *Historical materialism* (New York: International Publishers, 1954), Vol. 2, 12.

There is no need to discuss the relationship between mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other natural sciences and the philosophy of life. However, scientific methods of observation and classification are subsequently applied to living creatures, and even to human society with the highest activeness. Therefore, science is roughly divided into two categories, i.e., natural sciences and social sciences. The most prominent pillars of social sciences are economics, sociology, history, psychology, and philosophy. Here, philosophy refers to experimentalism and historical materialism, but not the metaphysics of ontology and cosmology. Needless to say, social sciences, along with natural sciences, are still immature. Even so, they have already achieved undeniable achievements. If we abandon those sciences because of their weaknesses, it is not a wise move. It is incontestable that the natural sciences have demonstrated and explained many phenomena in the natural world, and the social sciences also have illustrated many phenomena in human society. Nature and human society have their own actual phenomenon. A scientist's hypothesis will not change the truth; neither will the flight of fancies of a metaphysician; the actual phenomenon is solid and immutable with either materialism or idealism. Before Copernicus's discovery, the earth has always been revolving around the sun. Following Mencius, the world gradually became one without kings. The final success is when scientific inductions can match this immutable reality one after another. The reason why we believe in science (either natural sciences or social sciences) is that "The ultimate goal of scientists is to eliminate the role of human inclination and objectify all phenomena. Therefore, all phenomena can be projected and all the causation can be calculated." (quoted from Zhang Junmai). If so, then we can seek further realities based on truth and conclude that the immutable reality of nature and human society is different from the fallacies of metaphysicians.

人生观和（社会）科学的关系是很显明的，为什么大家还要讨论？哈哈！就是讨论这个问题之本身，也可以证明人生观和科学的关系之深了。孔德分人类社会为三时代，我们还在宗教迷信时代。你看全国最大多数的人，还是迷信、巫鬼、符咒、算命、卜卦等超物质以上的神秘；次多数象张君劢这样相信玄学的人，旧

的士的阶级全体，新的士的阶级一大部分皆是，象丁在君这样相信科学的人，其数目几乎不能列入统计。现在由迷信时代进步到科学时代，自然要经过玄学先生的狂吠，这种社会的实际现象，想无人能够否认。倘不能否认，便不能不承认孔德三时代说是社会科学上一种定律。这个定律便可以说明许多时代、许多社会、许多个人的人生观之所以不同。譬如张君劢是个饱学秀才，他一日病了，他的未尝学问的家族要去求符咒仙方，张君劢立意要延医诊脉服药；他的朋友丁在君方从外国留学回来，说汉医靠不住，坚劝他去请西医，张君劢不但不相信，并说出许多西医不及汉医的证据；两人争持正烈的时候，张君劢的家族说，西医、汉医都靠不住，还是符咒仙方好。他们如此不同的见解，也便是他们如此不同的人生观，他们如此不同的人生观，都是他们所遭客观的环境造成的，决不是天外飞来主观的意志造成的，这本是社会科学可以说明的，决不是形而上的玄学可以说明的。

There are obvious relations between the philosophy of life and (social) sciences, then why do we still have discussions on this topic? That is because the discussion itself could become proof of how tight the connection is between the philosophy of life and science. Comte divided human society by the law into three stages and we Chinese are still in the theological stage.³ The great majority of people in China today are still in the theological stage, believing superstition, such as witchcraft, spells, fortune-telling, and divination. The second largest group of Chinese people are people like Zhang Junmai who believes in pseudoscience. They include clerisy in Imperial China and most intellectuals in the Republic. Only a few people like Ding Zaijun believe in science and these people barely exist in China. This is a common phenomenon that people who believe in pseudoscience will continue to speak out strongly against science when we are advancing from the theological stage into the positive stage.⁴ No one can deny such a social transformation must take place and

³ The theological stage, the first stage in the law of the three stages by Comte, relies on supernatural or religious explanations of the phenomena of human behavior, representing “迷信时代” in the source text. Auguste Comte, *Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings* (Transaction Publishers, 1975), 286.

⁴ The positive stage, the third stage in the law of the three stages by Comte, is when the mind stops searching for the cause of phenomena and realizes that laws exist to govern human behavior and that

then the law of three stages by Comte must be recognized as a law in the social sciences field. This law can indicate why people's philosophy of life is different from each other in during different eras of history and across different societies. For example, Zhang Junmai was a learned scholar and one day he was sick. His family who was not as educated as he was wanted to find spells and witchcraft to cure his illness, but Zhang decided to seek the help of Chinese traditional doctors and herbal medicine. His friend Ding Zaijun graduated overseas and came back to China and persuaded him that he should see Western doctors instead of taking Chinese herbal medicines. Zhang was not convinced and provided proof that Western medicine was inferior to Chinese medicine. While the two were arguing, Zhang Junmai's family said that neither Western medicine nor Chinese medicine could be trusted and that it was better to try spells and witchcraft. Their different opinions on how to deal with the disease are their different philosophy of life. The difference is caused by the objective circumstances they were subjected to, but not by their subjective will. The difference could only be explained by social sciences but not by metaphysics.⁵

张君劢举出九项人生观，说都是主观的，起于直觉的、综合的、自由意志的，起于人格之单一性的，而不为客观的、论理的、分析的、因果律的科学所支配。今就其九项人生观看起来：第一，大家族主义和小家族主义，纯粹是由农业经济宗法社会进化到工业经济军国社会之自然的现象。第二，男女尊卑及婚姻制度，也是由于农业宗法社会亲与夫都把子女及妻当作生产工具，当作一种财产，到了工业社会，家庭手工已不适用，有了雇工制度，也用不着拿家族当生产工具，于是女权运动自然会兴旺起来。第三，财产公有私有制度，在原始共产社会，人弱

this stage can be explained rationally with the use of reason and observation, indicating representing “科学时代” in the source text. *Auguste Comte, Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings* (Transaction Publishers, 1975), 289.

⁵ The word “metaphysics” is notoriously hard to define. Twentieth-century coinages like “meta-language” and “metaphilosophy” encourage the impression that metaphysics is a study that somehow “goes beyond” physics, a study devoted to matters that transcend the mundane concerns of Newton and Einstein and Heisenberg. Perhaps the wider application of the word “metaphysics” was due to the fact that the word “physics” was coming to be a name for a new, quantitative science, the science that bears that name today, and was becoming increasingly inapplicable to the investigation of many traditional philosophical problems about changing things (and of some newly discovered problems about changing things). Van Inwagen, Peter and Meghan Sullivan, “Metaphysics”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2021 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.) <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/metaphysics/>.

于兽，势必结群合作，原无财产私有之必要与可能（假定有人格之单一性的张先生，生在那个社会，他的主观，他的直觉，他的自由意志，忽然要把财产私有起来，怎奈他所得的果物兽肉无地存储，并没有防腐的方法，又不能变卖金钱存在银行，结果恐怕只有放弃他私有财产的人生观）；到了农业社会，有了一定的住所，有了仓库，谷物又比较的易于保存，独立生产的小农，只有土地占有的必要，没有通力合作的必要，私有财产观念，是如此发生的。到了工业社会，家庭的手工的独立生产制已不能存立，成千成万的人组织在一个通力合作的机关之内，大家无工做便无饭吃，无工具便不能做工，大家都没有生产工具，生产工具已为少数资本家私有了，非将生产工具收归公有，大家只好卖力给资本家，公有财产观念，是如此发生的。第四，守旧维新之争持，乃因为现社会有了经济的变化，而与此变化不适应的前社会之制度仍旧存在，束缚着这变化的发展，于是在经济上利害不同的阶级，自然会随着变化之激徐，或激或徐的冲突起来。第五，物质精神之异见，少数人因为有他的特殊环境，一般论起来，慢说工厂里体力工人了，就是商务印书馆月薪二三十元的编辑先生，日愁衣食不济，那有如许闲情像张君劢、梁启超高谈什么精神文明东方文化。第六，社会主义之发生，和公有财产制是一事。第七，人性中本有为我利他两种本能，个人本能发挥的机会，乃由于所遭环境及所受历史的社会的暗示之不同而异。第八，悲观、乐观见解之不同，亦由于个人所遭环境及所受历史的社会的暗示而异，试观各国自杀的统计不但自杀的原因都是环境使然，而且和年龄、性别、职业、季节等都有关系。第九，宗教思想之变迁，更是要受时代及社会势力支配的。各民族原始的宗教，依据所传神话，大都是崇拜太阳、火、高山、巨石、毒蛇、猛兽等的自然教；后来到了农业经济宗法社会，族神祖先农神等多神教遂至流行；后来商业发达，随着国家的统一运动，一神教遂至得势；后来工业发达，科学勃兴，无神非宗教之说随之而起；即在同一时代，各民族各社会产业进化之迟速不同，宗教思想亦随之而异，非洲、美洲、南洋蛮族，仍在自然宗教时代，中国、印度，乃信多神，商工业发达之欧美，多奉基督；使中国圣人之徒生于伦敦，他也要奉洋教，歌颂耶和華；使基督信徒生在中国穷乡僻壤，他也要崇拜祖宗与狐狸。以上九项种种不同的人生观都为种种不同客观的因果所支配，而社会科学可一一加以分析的论理的说明，找不出那一种是没有客观的原因，而由于个人主观的直觉的自由意志凭空发生的。

Zhang Junmai enumerated nine philosophies of life, all of which he said were subjective, arising from intuition, synthesis, freedom of will, and the singularity of personality, but not governed by such attributes of science as objectivity, logic methods, analytical approach, and causation. Zhang's nine philosophies of life are analyzed into nine points listed below: Firstly, the phenomena of *Dajiazu Zhuyi* (大家族主义, an extended family) and *Xiaojiazu Zhuyi* (小家族主义, a nuclear family) are purely natural evolutions from an agrarian patriarchal society to an industrial military society. Secondly, the changes in the status of men and women and the forms of marriage are also the results of social changes. In the agrarian patriarchal society, parents and husbands treat their children and their wives as instruments of production and as a form of property. In the industrial society, where domestic handwork is no longer applicable and labor hire exists, there is no need to use the family as an instrument of production, so the feminist movement naturally flourished. Thirdly, the difference between common and private ownership of property. In primitive societies, where humankind was weaker than beasts, there was no need or possibility of private ownership of property, so men were bound to cooperate in groups. (For example, Mr. X, with his unique personality, lived in a primitive society. Even though he wanted to have private ownership of property out of subjectivity and the freedom of will, there was no place for him to store the fruit and meat he acquired, nor were there ways for him to preserve and sell the food and save the money in the bank. I am afraid that Mr. X had to give up his private ownership of property. In the agricultural society, where there was a certain number of shelters and storehouses, and grains were easier to preserve, the individual farmers only needed to occupy the land with no demands to collaborate. This is how the notion of private property came about. In industrial society, self-reliant family labor has disappeared, and thousands of people are organized in cooperative units. Everyone must make a living by working with tools. Only a few capitalists own the production tools. Without common property, everyone must work hard for capitalists. Then the notion of common property exists. Fourthly, the conflict between conservatives and reformists. As a result of economic changes in society, the former social system, which was incompatible with these changes,

remained in place and fettered the development of society. Therefore, classes with different economic interests naturally clashed with each other in a mild or radical way due to the degrees of these changes. Fifth, people have different views of material and spiritual objects. A minority of people can possess a unique/luxurious environment. Generally, it is not just manual workers in factories, even the editors at *Shangwu Yinshuguan* (商务印书馆, the Commercial Press), who earn 20 to 30 silver coins a month, are worried about food and clothing every day. They do not have the leisure time or energy to talk about Eastern spiritual civilisation as Zhang Junmai and Liang Qichao do. Sixth, the emergence of socialism is inherently the same as common ownership. Seventh, there are two instincts in human nature, egoism, and altruism. However, the occurrences of one instinct, either for the self or for others, are subject to the time and the social environment where an individual is living. Eighth, different understandings of the same matter, either from a pessimist or an optimist, are also affected by time and the social environment. Statistics on suicide in various countries have indicated that they are caused by the environment, in addition to other factors, such as age, gender, occupation, seasons, etc. Ninth, the shift of religious thinking is dictated more by time and social forces. The primitive religions of various ethnic nations, according to their own legends, were mostly nature religions worshipping natural objects, including the sun, fire, mountains, boulders, poisonous snakes, beasts, and so on. Later, in the patriarchal society based on the agricultural economy, polytheism prevailed as people worshiped clan spirits, ancestor spirits, and agricultural gods. Later developments in commerce and the national unification movement allowed monotheism to dominate mainstream religion. The subsequent development in industry and the flourishing of science led to the popularisation of atheism and antitheism. Even though people of different ethnic nations lived in the same period, the pace of their social and technological developments varied, and so are their religious thoughts. The primitive tribal peoples in Africa, America, and Southeast Asia practiced naturalistic religions, those in China and India polytheism, and those in Europe and the United States, with the developed commerce and industry, Christianity. If a follower of Confucius were born in London, he would also believe in

Christianity and praise Jehovah. If a Christian were born in a desolate place in China, he would worship his ancestors and foxes. Each of these nine views of life is governed by objective causation, which can be analysed one after another by social sciences. None of these philosophies of life can exist without objective causes, occurring groundlessly out of subjectivity, intuition, and freedom of will.

梁启超究竟比张君勱高明些，他说：“君劭列举‘我对非我’之九项，他以为不能用科学方法解答者，依我看来，什有八九倒是要用科学方法解答。”梁启超取了骑墙态度，一面不赞成张君劭，一面也不赞成丁在君，他自己的意见是：

Liang Qichao was indeed smarter than Zhang Junmai. He said, “Jun Mai listed the differences in nine pairs on “the I” versus “the Non-I”, which he didn’t believe could be solved by scientific methods.⁶ But in my opinion, most of them can be explained with scientific methods.” Liang Qichao was sitting on the fence. He agreed with neither Zhang Junmai nor Ding Zaijun. His assertions were:

“人生问题，有大部分是可以——而且必要用科学方法来解决的。却有一小部分——或者还是最重要的部分是超科学的。”

“In terms of the problems of life, at least most of them can and should be solved scientifically. Yet there is a small part, perhaps the most important part, above science.⁷”

他所谓大部分是指人生关涉理智方面的事项，他所谓一小部分是指关于情感方面的事项。他说：“既涉到物界，自然为环境上——时间空间——种种法则所支配。”理智方面事项，固然不离物界，难道情感方面事项不涉到物界吗？感官如何受刺激，如何反应，情感如何而起，这都是极普通的心理学。关于情感超科学这种怪论，唐钺已经驳得很明白。但是唐钺驳梁启超说：“我们论事实的时候，

6 D. w. Y, *Scientism in Chinese Thought, 1900-1950*. (New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1971; Reprinted from the 1965 edition, Yale University Press), 148. (Page references are to the reprint).

7 *Ibid*, 159.

不能躡入价值问题。”而他自己论到田横事件，解释过于浅薄，并且说出“没有多大价值”的话，如此何能使梁启超心服！其实孝子割股疗亲，程婴、杵臼代人而死，田横、乃木自杀等主动，在社会科学家看起来，无所谓忧不忧，无所谓合理不合理，无所谓有价值无价值，无所谓不可解，无所谓神秘，不过是农业的宗法社会封建时代所应有之人生观。这种人生观乃是农业的宗法社会封建时代之道德传说及一切社会的暗示所铸而成，试问在工业的资本主义社会，有没有这样举动，有没有这样情感，有没有这样的自由意志？

What Liang Qichao called “most of them” is related to reason, while “a small part” is emotions. “As long as the problems are related to the physical world, they are undoubtedly dictated by time, space, and other natural laws.” Liang said. Since reason-oriented matters are inseparable from the physical world, how can emotions be alienated from the physical world? All these phenomena, like how senses are stimulated, how they react, and how emotions arise, are very common in psychology. Tang Yue has strongly rebutted the fallacy that emotions sits above science. But Tang Yue could not refute Liang validly on the value of emotions. Instead, Tang stated, “As we are discussing facts, we should exclude the issue of value.” Moreover, Tang gave superficial explanations for the death of Tian Heng and claimed the suicides of 500 people after their master Tian Heng was “of little value”. By doing so, how could Tang persuade Liang Qichao that emotions are not above science? In fact, a filial son’s cutting the stock as a cure for the parents, Cheng Ying and Chujiu’s dying for others, and the suicides of Tian Heng and Nogi Maresuke, all these examples, in sociologists’ perspective, have nothing to do with the superior view of life, reason, values, solution, and mystery.⁸ They are merely a view of life conforming to the

⁸ In 597 BCE Cheng Ying and Chujiu hid and saved Zhao Wu, the last child of the most influential clan at that time, the Zhao’s, from being killed like the rest of the clan. Cheng Ying and Chujiu died for the acts. Si Maqian, 司马迁, *Shiji Zhaoshijia* 史记·赵世家 [A record of History, The Aristocratic Clan of Zhao]. <https://ctext.org/shiji/zhao-shi-jia/zhs>; In 202 BCE, Tian Heng and his 500 soliders, as the last survivals in the Warring States, committed suicides after the first emperor of Han Dynasty took the power. Si Maqian, 司马迁, *Shiji Tiandan Liezhuan* 史记·田儋列传 [A record of History, The Biography of Tiandan]. <https://ctext.org/shiji/tian-dan-lie-zhuan1/zhs>; Nogi Maresuke (December 25, 1849 – September 13, 1912), was a Japanese general in the Imperial Japanese Army and a governor-general of Taiwan. Benesch, Oleg, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 153

social environment in feudal society. Such a view of life is shaped by morals, legends, and social implications of the time. Are there such acts, emotions, or freedom of will in the industrialized capitalist society?

范寿康也是一个骑墙论者，他主张科学是指广义的科学，他主张科学决不能解决人生问题的全部。他说：“人生观一部分是先天的，一部分是后天的。先天的形式是由主观的直觉而得，决不是科学所能干涉。后天的内容应由科学的方法探讨而定，决不是主观所应妄定。“他所谓先天的形式，即指良心命令人类做各人所自认为善的行为。

Fan Shoukang is also a man sitting on the fence. He argued that science should be defined in a broad sense but insisted it cannot solve all the problems of life. As Fan said, “Part of the view of life is determined a priori and part a posteriori.” “A priori modes” are acquired by subjectivity and intuition; they must not be intruded on by science. The contents “a posteriori” should be determined by the discussions of the scientific methods. They are not determined by subjectivity and illusion.” His so-called “A priori modes” meant consciences could command human beings to do what individuals believed to be benevolent.

什么先天的形式，什么良心，什么直觉，什么自由意志，一概都是生活状况不同的各时代各民族之社会的暗示所铸而成。一个人生在印度婆罗门家，自然不愿意杀人，他若生在非洲酋长家，自然以多杀为无上荣誉；一个女子生在中国阀阅之家，自然以贞节为他的义务，他若生在意大利，会以多获面首夸示其群；西洋人见中国人赤膊对女子则骇然，中国人见西洋人用字纸揩粪则惊讶；匈奴可汗父死遂妻其母，满族初入中国不知汉人礼俗，皇太后再嫁其夫弟而不以为耻；中国人以厚葬其亲为孝，而蛮族有委亲尸于山野以被鸟兽所噬为荣幸者；欧美妇女每当稠人广众吻其所亲，而以为人妾为奇耻大辱；中国妇人每以得为贵人之妾为荣幸，而当众接吻虽娼妓亦羞为之。由此看来，世界上那里真有什么良心，什么直觉，什么自由意志！

All the terms mentioned above, whether a priori mode, conscience, intuition, or freedom of will, were implicitly created either at different ages, in different nations, or with different living conditions. One born into an Indian Brahmin family is naturally resistant to killing; but if one was born into the family of an African tribal chief, one will naturally regard killings as the supreme glory. A woman born into a Chinese family of nobles will regard conserving her chastity as an obligation; if she was born in Italy, she will flaunt gigolos before her peers. The Westerners are appalled when they see a Chinese man bare-chested before a woman, whereas the Chinese are astonished when they see a Westerner using written sheets to wipe excrement. The old Huns Khan died and his son married his mother. When the Manchu people first set foot in Ming China, they did not know the rituals and customs of the Han people and it was not disgraceful for the queen dowager to remarry her husband's younger brother. The Chinese consider a lavish funeral a sign of filial piety, while the barbarians see it as an honor to leave a corpse in the mountains to be eaten by birds and beasts. European and American women will kiss their beloved in public, but they deem being a concubine as a humiliation. A Chinese woman feels honored to be a concubine of a nobleman, but even a prostitute would blush if kissed in public. By this token, there are no such terms as conscience, intuition, or freedom of will on earth!

丁在君不但未曾说明“科学何以能支配人生观”，并且他的思想之根底，仍和张君劢走的是一条道路。我现在举出两个证据：

Ding did not explain the question “How can science dominate the philosophy of life?”, and the basis of his opinions is essentially the same as Zhang Junmai’s. Here are two pieces of evidence:

第一，他自号存疑的唯心论，这是沿袭了赫胥黎、斯宾塞诸人的谬误，你既承认宇宙间有不可知的部分而存疑，科学家站开，且让玄学家来解疑。此所以张君劢说：“既已存疑，则研究形而上界之玄学，不应有丑诋之词。”其实我们对于未发见的物质固然可以存疑，而对于超物质而独立存在并且可以支配物质的什

么心（心即是物之一种表现），什么神灵与上帝，我们已无疑可存了。说我们武断也好，说我们专制也好，若无证据给我们看，我们断然不能抛弃我们的信仰。

First of all, idealism, which he proclaimed with skepticism, follows the errors of Huxley, Spencer, and the like. Since there are doubts about the unknown parts of the universe, why bother scientists? Why not let metaphysicians step in? This is what Zhang Junmai said, "Since there are doubts, studying metaphysics should not be reviled." We can certainly have doubts about substances that are not discovered, but there are no such doubts as to either subjective consciousness (also a manifestation of object) existing independently of objects and governing the concrete world, or the divine and God. Be it arbitrary or authoritarian, we shall not waver in our faith without proof.

第二，把欧洲文化破产的责任归到科学与物质文明，固然是十分糊涂，但丁在君把这个责任归到玄学家、教育家、政治家身上，却也离开事实太远了。欧洲大战分明是英德两大工业资本发展到不得不互争世界商场之战争，但看他们战争结果所定的和约便知道，如此大的变动，那里是玄学家、教育家、政治家能够制造得来的。如果离了物质的即经济的原因，排科学的玄学家、教育家、政治家能够造成这样空前的大战，那末，我们不得不承认张君所谓自由意志的人生观真有力量了。

Secondly, it was not a wise choice to lay the blame on science and the civilization of material pursuits for the collapse of European culture. On the other hand, Ding Zaijun laid the blame on metaphysicians, educators, and politicians, which was far from the truth. The Great War in Europe was obviously a competition in which the two industrial powerhouses of England and Germany fought against each other for the global market. However, the agreement they reached after the war demonstrated that such a significant change could not be simply made by metaphysicians, educators and politicians. If the anti-science metaphysicians, educators, and politicians could instigate such an unprecedented war without material or economic reasons, then we

had to admit that Zhang Junmai's so-called freedom-of-will philosophy of life was truly potent.

我们相信只有客观的物质原因可以变动社会，可以解释历史，可以支配人生观，这便是“唯物的历史观”。我们现在要请问丁在君先生和胡适之先生：相信“唯物的历史观”为完全真理呢，还是相信唯物以外象张君劢等类人所主张的唯心观也能够超科学而存在？

We believe nothing but objective material causes can change society, explain history, and govern the philosophy of life. This is what we refer to as “Historical Materialism”. We would like to kindly raise a question to Mr. Ding Zaijun and Mr. Hu Shizhi, should we consider that “Historical Materialism” is the absolute truth, or that idealism beyond materialism, which is advocated by Zhang Junmai and other metaphysicians, exists above science?

十二，十一，十三

November 13th, 1923.

Bibliography

Benesch, Oleg. *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Chen Duxiu. "Preface to Science and the Philosophy of Life" 科学人生观序[*Kexue yu Rensheng Guan Xu*], *La Jeunesse* 新青年 2 (1923): 34-39.

Chen, Pingyuan. *Touches of History*. The Netherlands: Brill, 2011.

Chow, Tse-tsung. *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*. *Harvard East Asian Studies* 6. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Comte, Auguste. *Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1975.

Cornforth, Maurice Campbell. *Historical materialism (Vol. 2)*. New York: International Publishers, 1954.

Jiang Wei 江伟. "Kexue Yu Rensheng Guan Lunzhan Shuping" 科学与人生观论战述评[An Analytic Review on "The Debates on Science and the Philosophy of Life"], *Journal of Henan University(Social Science)* 河南大学学报(社科版) 34, no. 2(1994):64-69.

Kitcher, Philip. "A Priori Knowledge Revisited" in *New Essays on the A Priori*. edited by Paul Boghossian & Christopher Peacocke, 65-91. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Kwok, D. w. Y. *Scientism in Chinese Thought, 1900-1950*. New York: Biblio and Tannen, 1971.

Schwarz, Vera. *The Chinese Enlightenment: Intellectuals and the Legacy of the May Fourth Movement of 1919*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Schwartz, Benjamin. "Themes in intellectual history: May Fourth and after." In *The*

Cambridge History of China. Volume 12: Republican China 1912-1949, Part I edited by Denis Twitchett and John K. Fairbank, 426-444. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Si Maqian, 司马迁. *Shiji Tiandan Liezhuan* 史记·田儋列传 [*A record of History, The Biography of Tiandan*]. <https://ctext.org/shiji/tian-dan-lie-zhuan1/zhs>.

Si Maqian, 司马迁. *Shiji Zhaoshijia* 史记·赵世家 [*A record of History, The Aristocratic Clan of Zhao*]. <https://ctext.org/shiji/zhao-shi-jia/zhs>.

Ding, W.J. et.al. *Kexue Yu Rensheng Guan* 科学人生观 [Science and a view of life]. Anhui: Huangshan Shushe, 2008.

Tsaba, Niobeh Crowfoot. "Facing both ways: Yan Fu, Hu Shi, and Chen Duxiu: Facing both ways: Yan Fu, Hu Shi, and Chen Duxiu: Chinese intellectuals and the meaning of modern science, 1895-1923". *Dissertations and Theses Paper* 4134. (1990):150. <https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.6017>.

Van Inwagen, Peter & Meghan Sullivan. "Metaphysics". In Edward N. Zalta (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2021 Edition)*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/metaphysics/>.