

共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性
—與中島隆博教授的對談
**On The Importance of a Philosophy of
Co-Becoming for Our Strait and Our World:
A Conversation with Professor Nakajima Takahiro**

受訪人：中島隆博
NAKAJIMA Takahiro
The University of Tokyo Center for Philosophy

與談人：賴錫三、莫加南
His-San LAI, Mark McCONAGHY
Department of Chinese Literature
National Sun Yat-sen University

逐字稿整理：賴奕瑋*

賴錫三（國立中山大學中國文學系教授）：

Before the interview begins, I want to express my appreciation to

*國立中山大學中國文學系碩士生。

professor Nakajima. Especially, next year we will have an international conference on the topic of co-existence. I don't know how you would translate this word, the Chinese term would be *gongsheng* (共生). It's much more meaningful than "existence." We want to think of the trans-cultural complexities of this term. So maybe you can give us a new translation about *gongsheng*.

中島隆博（東京大學共生哲學研究中心教授）：

Yes, definitely.

賴錫三教授：

I'll say on next year we have an international conference, thank you for promising us to use the name EAA (East Asian Academy for New Liberal Arts, 東アジア藝文書院) to support our conference in National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

中島隆博教授：

Yes. It's our honor to co-host this international conference that professor Ishii is very eager to join.

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

莫加南（國立中山大學中國文學系助理教授）：

So I see it's about 9:30. I think we can begin and I'll just do a brief introduction of professor Nakajima and I'll do it in English and Chinese. 線上的朋友，非常歡迎大家參與我們今天共生哲學的訪談活動，今天的活動是雙語的，我們會使用英文跟中文。訪談的部分，以英文為主。So, the interview will use English primarily, but of course, when we do Q&A and we can also have our listeners use Chinese to ask questions.

Today we are truly honored to have professor 中島隆博, Nakajima Takahiro, to meet with us online to discuss issues surrounding the philosophy of co-existence, mutual coexistence and 共生哲學. And we will go into a host of topics around this issue of coexistence and how Daoism, in particular, can help us think through that question. Professor Nakajima comes to us from the University of Tokyo and he is at the University of Tokyo's Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia. He is also the director of EAA, the East Asian Academy for New Liberal Arts at the University of Tokyo, which is a very interesting initiative that we will also discuss today. And so we are very honored to be able to conduct this interview. I'll just remind our friends online that if they could just mute their microphone. We won't have any noise to disrupt, and today's forum will be about 90 minutes to 2 hours. Professor Lai

Hsi-San and I will engage in dialogue with professor Nakajima. In the last half an hour, we will open the form up for Q&A. We'll have English and Chinese questions on the PowerPoint. So our friends online can follow our conversation. We will be also very honored to have professor Lai Hsi-San, ask our first question and I'll first give over the time to professor Lai, and then we can begin our program.

賴錫三教授：

Okay. Thanks, Mark. It's my turn I want to ask the first question to Professor Nakajima, we are honored today to have the opportunity to interview you. First, we would like to ask you, how do you define “co-existence” and “a philosophy of mutual co-existence”? You have discussed these concepts in the past, emphasizing that philosophy of mutual “co-existence” on the one hand cannot extricate itself completely from “politics”, but on the other hand should not be equated with “politics”. Could you expand upon this idea for us?

中島隆博教授：

So, thank you so much for your very elaborated question. First of all, I'd like to say thank you for all of this organization, I am very honored to reply to your questions. But frankly, or honestly speaking, I

like to become a questioner instead of a replier, because these questions are very profound and very complicated. However, I'll do my best to try to reply to them. Professor Lai asks about the translation of *gongsheng* into English. Is it co-existence or symbiosis? Such a translation is somehow tricky for the Chinese or Japanese meaning of *gongsheng*. *gongsheng* is literally a “co-living”, right? So if we trace back by using a conceptual history of *gongsheng* in Japanese context, we are facing the emphasis on life in Meiji and Taishō era (明治和大正時代). At that moment, *gongsheng* became an elaborated concept in the Japanese context.

For example, professor Nishida Kitarō (西田幾多郎), the first philosopher of modern Japanese philosophy had a very profound concern on the life. He believed philosophy should be focusing on this concept of life. That is a starting point of modern Japanese philosophy. So *gongsheng* is also folded and interpreted in this background. How? This is somehow relevant to your question. However, this concept of “life” was closely relevant to the politics at the time. So Japanese government especially during the war period emphasized the notion of co-living and co-dying altogether (*gongsheng gongsi* 共生共死). That means, *gongsheng*, co-living was highly politicized at that time. I'd like to deconstruct such a highly politicized concept of *gongsheng* in

different contexts, especially in the 21st century. That's why I dare to propose the translation such as co-becoming and human co-becoming. For example, in English context, human being is regarded as something being relevant to "being," but in East Asian context, it is very difficult to find such a Europe-centered concept of being. In comparison to it, "becoming" would be much more effective to think of a philosophical milieu. Instead of human being, we could think of human becoming. We are human [in the sense of learning the process of] becoming human. This is a starting point of the perspective from east Asia. If that is the case, *gongsheng* can be translated to human co-becoming or mutually becoming human. That would be one possibility of the translation, but, as mentioned above, *gongsheng* has many different ways, including "life." In the last half of your questioning, we are invited to think of the current situation of Covid-19, especially of the bio-politics. Life should be reconsidered in our actual context in which we can find some moves to bio-politics. In sum, I'd like to say *gongsheng* has a conceptual history and maybe we change our term of translation into human co-becoming for the *gongsheng*. And as for the politics, *gongsheng* is a highly politicized concept in the prewar Japanese situation, but it is also a term having a chance to go beyond such a politicized situation. It can show us a new type of human

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

association. That's my very quick reply to your question.

賴錫三教授：

Thank you for your reply and re-translating this term *gongsheng*, actually we are also not satisfied with this translation. We have a friend 何乏筆 (Fabian Heubel) who told us he would like to translate to co-living. I think if you use a new translation as you say, human co-becoming, this word makes me recall the professor Roger Ames (安樂哲). He also translated the Dao (道), Laozi's Dao, he used "way-making", but you also want to emphasize the process of becoming. So I think it's a good translation for us and get new meaning from this term.

中島隆博教授：

Yes, you are definitely right. So "ing" as a process is very important to think of *gongsheng*. Is *gongsheng* a fixed condition? No, it is a process for us to become something different, right? It is a process of becoming human. I imagine Roger Ames' definition of human becoming in my mind and I'd like to a little bit change that definition into human co-becoming. Human co-living would be fine as well, if we are focusing on "ing" as a process in *gongsheng*.

賴錫三教授：

The second question I'm going to ask you, in the past you have discussed the notion of "An Open Philosophy in East Asia." I remember you'd given a lecture at Peking University (北京大學). The title was "An Open Philosophy in East Asia." Within this context, what does philosophy mean? What kind of role can Chinese philosophy or philosophy in the Chinese language play? What can "East Asia" mean? Does this open philosophy seek to imagine a new "Community of Common Destiny for East Asia"? Or does it seek to transcend the regionalism of "East Asia", imbuing itself with a more universal sensibility as a "world philosophy"?

中島隆博教授：

Thank you so much. This is also a very elaborated question and very hard to reply to it, but I try my best to reply to it. As for open philosophy, I used this concept at PKU (Peking University) as well as at Yonsei University (延世大學), Korea. It was published as an article in a Korean journal. My idea is very simple. There is a notion like an open city, right? The open city is a disarmed city. Its opening is supported by disarmed conditions. So my thinking is that philosophy has been armed with some concepts like "being." Maybe we had better

change this armed philosophy into disarmed philosophy, which makes us truly be open to the others. In this framework, I dare to think of “Open Philosophy” in East Asia. However, why do we think of East Asia for Open Philosophy? This is the core of your questioning. In recent years, I have been publishing a “World Philosophy” or “History of World Philosophy”. By trying to elaborate the notion of World Philosophy, we come to think that it is not philosophies in the world such as Chinese philosophy, Japanese philosophy, Korean philosophy in the world. No! We try to think of the universalizing process in philosophy too. This is also ing-process. From this process of universalizing, we have to pay good attention to the indigenous notions in each local philosophies. Maybe we can have some indigenous notions in Chinese philosophy or Japanese, Korean philosophy, but that is different from an emphasis on the uniqueness of such philosophy. Such uniqueness has been used to strengthen the universal framework. Rather, I’d like to change this western-centered universal framework by elaborating indigenous notions in each philosophy into the universalizing. So East Asia is a name of this starting point of indigenous notions. But it must enter the process of universalizing. Otherwise, we’re easily falling into a uniqueness of Chinese philosophy or uniqueness of Chinese language philosophy. I have been thinking

that the legacy or tradition of Chinese philosophy is not monopolized by some specific places or people. No, it is a common legacy for the people everywhere in the world. That is why, for example Japanese people like me can seriously think of Chinese philosophy. If this is the case, East Asia is a name of the starting point for the universalizing process of World Philosophy. An Open Philosophy is a name to make room to think of the universalizing process from the indigenous notions. That's my answer.

賴錫三教授：

When we think of the concept of East Asia, for you, it's not just a local concept or local expression or tribal thinking. East Asia is a starting point, but it's also opening to the world. The meaning of East-Asian philosophy is not just derived from a series of simple words. It's not just a unique vision, it has an open meaning, it has the potential to develop a universal global meaning for the world.

中島隆博教授：

Yes, your discourse is much better than mine. Yes, you are definitely right.

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

莫加南教授：

I appreciate this idea of the common legacy of different traditions that for example, we can talk about Chinese philosophy or Japanese philosophy or Indian philosophy, but we are not essentializing these to be monopolized by one specific people or one specific era, but that these traditions are open and a common legacy for all of us to study and learn. For example, that someone like me, who learned Chinese later in life, can seriously think in these philosophical categories is a testament to the fact that these indigenous traditions can be thought in an open way and enabling way. We avoid that the kind of essentializing of tradition, which produces nationalism and all kinds of other things. We can think of tradition as a kind of common legacy. I really appreciate that idea.

中島隆博教授：

Yeah, the essentializing of philosophy voids people like us. Mark and I are always marginalized in a Chinese philosophy framework. But I'd like to change this structure. Chinese philosophy has many profound and open characteristics for all of us. How can we inherit the common legacy from Chinese philosophy? This is our task to think of seriously.

莫加南教授：

Absolutely. And I think that's also what happens when you think about Chinese philosophy from, let's say, a space outside of mainland China, either Taiwan or Japan or the Philippines or America. But once you start mobilizing these languages and concepts outside of a center, then it's a different relationship because it's a question of how does this legacy, this tradition, gets mobilized in different historical spaces and yet retains that openness for us to push forward certain ideas.

中島隆博教授：

Again, your discourse is much better than mine.

莫加南教授：

I think actually this relates to our third question. Because professor Nakajima has been really a trailblazer in cross-cultural collaboration around philosophical inquiry, philosophical text, and translations, one of the really amazing I think products of that collaborative model is a 2015 volume that was published by Roger Ames, who was mentioned today, the volume is entitled "Zhuangzi and the Happy Fish." This is really an amazing volume. I recommend all of our friends online to look at it, if they haven't read it. Professor Ames

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

and professor Nakajima invited a range of scholars operating in different geographic, historical, and linguistic spaces to think about Zhuangzi and particularly this famous story about the happy fish, in Chinese we call the Haoliangzhibian (濠梁之辯). And this one story was analyzed by a dozen of scholars. All of the scholars produce different readings, and different interpretations are really pushed in Zhuangzi's text to come up with a series of fascinating interpretations. My first question is I just thought you could talk a little bit about this volume and the process of working collectively in a platform that is cross-cultural, translingual, and on a specific example, like the Zhuangzi.

中島隆博教授：

Thank you so much. Roger Ames is my close and old friend. He invited me to edit this volume of "Zhuangzi and the Happy Fish." This was a very challenging project for me. We, two of us, invited some other scholars to seriously think of this problem of the debate of the Hao River. That was a fascinating collaboration for us. We can say that this is a kind of example of Open Philosophy in East Asia. For me, following this edition, I published one book in Japanese on the Zhuangzi.

In the Zhuangzi, I think the problem of the other is very much

important, but the setting of the other is somehow different from the western type of setting. In my article, I dare to emphasize the meaning of wuhua (物化), i.e., becoming others, becoming another thing. In the debate of the Hao River, Zhuangzi tries to elaborate the conception of the happy fish. It is very close to contemporary problems in the analytic philosophy, but I do not want to analyze it from the analytic philosophical framework. I try to analyze it from the East Asian philosophical context. Happy fish for Zhuangzi is not just an object outside of Zhuangzi as a subject, but in some context, there is a possibility of “Wuhua”, a transformative ability, lying between happy fish and Zhuangzi. So the core question is as follows: how can two seemingly different things share this world? This is a profound question in this Hao River debate. In my thinking, in the “Wuhua,” the world itself is also transformed simultaneously, but all of us share this world through the possibilities of mutual transformation. We have a sensibility of this sharing world, and in the debate of the Hao river, I think Zhuangzi emphasized this sensitivity of sharing this worldness. Our world is covered by this happiness. Such an enjoyment is embodied in the text of the Zhuangzi. That is a fascinating idea in the Zhuangzi.

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

莫加南教授：

Yeah, absolutely. I agreed with this happiness and this notion of becoming other or this world in a share between self and other. Professor Nakajima, I know wuhua is a very important idea for you and reading the Zhuangzi and this idea of transformation, this idea of a dynamic self constantly changing open to the world that can't be thought of in a static or fixed or 本質 terms. This ideas has come up quite frequently in our discussions on this online platform. Wuhua (物化), this is also something that professor Lai has emphasized in his reading of the Zhuangzi. This is our 9th meeting where we've talked about Laozi, Zhuangzi, and *gongsheng* philosophy. I don't know if professor Lai wanted to add anything about wuhua or the Haoliangzhibian.

賴錫三教授：

For me, the concept of wuhua is almost the most important notion in the Zhuangzi. It can transcend western thinking about a subject/object dualism and also signify that we are living in the same world. It's not a steady world, and it's a world defined as a process of becoming. What this concept asserts is that everyone exists in the same world of existence, we are co-living in the transforming world. We always encounter with each other. We can't divide ourselves from

another and have an isolated subjectivity. So we also encounter the others as professor Nakajima said. So, you can open an important potential possibility to think about the world as a mutual process of co-becoming.

中島隆博教授：

I totally agree with you. In wuhua in the Zhuangzi, we face the mutual transforming process, but this process in the Zhuangzi has no fixed end. We can go in any direction in wuhua transformation. In the Confucian setting, they tried to fix the direction to become human in their own way. Do we think that the fixed end in the Confucian setting is better than the Zhuangzi's thinking? That is what we have to think of in the history of Chinese philosophy. At some point, Zhuangzi's thinking is very dangerous, because it does not pretend to any ethical presupposition. It seems to be going beyond some ethical setting, while the Confucian setting is a very ethical one. We are asked to rethink of the meaning of this ethical setting. At this point, I think the dialogue between the Zhuangzi and the Confucian thinkers would be important.

賴錫三教授：

I also noticed that you have a criticism about Zhuangzi's

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

limitation, especially Zhuangzi's lack of an ethical approach, but in Taiwan, we have some friends who try to dig Zhuangzi's ethical potentiality. So for me, this is an important question.

中島隆博教授：

I intentionally give it to the happiness in the debate of Hao river, so this happiness probably would be relevant to the ethical setting of the Zhuangzi. The basic feeling to all the world would be based on the ethical setting in the Zhuangzi. So happiness could play a role within ethics at this point.

賴錫三教授：

I totally agree with you. You emphasize the enjoyment and I also notice these sense of humor in the Zhuangzi. For me, humor can also open another dimension that opens up on to ethical meaning.

中島隆博教授：

Yes. This is definitely so.

莫加南教授：

In some of our previous sessions, professor Lai has emphasized the sense of humor as a crucial idea because when you read the

Zhuangzi, it's so funny. There are parts of it that are really fun. I don't read Plato and laugh, but I read the Zhuangzi and laugh. There's something powerful about as you said, the happiness that kind courses through the text or that colors the text. This kind of humor is really important when we try to think of a Zhuangzi in ethics or Taoist ethics. I know that professor Lai has been working on humor in the Zhuangzi.

中島隆博教授：

Yeah! Humor in the Zhuangzi plays a very great role. I think it is somehow cutting off the status quo and re-connecting it again in a different mode. The humor lies in this cutting and re-connecting movement.

莫加南教授：

That's wonderful and I'm sure we'll speak more about the Zhuangzi a little later and perhaps in Q&A, but we should probably move on to the 4th question. Speaking of humor, this is probably the least humorous question. We're going to talk about the politics of negation or the fodingzhengzhixue (否定政治學), so I'll let professor Lai ask the question.

賴錫三教授：

The next question is much more serious and a little bit long. In the past, your writings have compared the concept of “politica negativa” and “a philosophy of co-living or human co-becoming”, arguing that the mode of thought presented by the former, so-called negation politics, including that of Mou Zongsan (牟宗三) and Nishida Kitarō (西田幾多郎). You’ve provided profound and strong reflection regarding Mou Zongsan and Nishida, maybe they fell into the traps of “the negation of the self (自我否定)” and “the nothingness of the self (自我無化)”. For you, these examples of speculative philosophy, which carry with them metaphysical qualities, have difficulty in producing critiques of the present, and often fell into conservative tendencies. As such, you have advocated that we use a “philosophy of co-existence” to overcome the limitations of “politica negativa”, emphasizing that new possibilities can be opened up by working through the relations between people; by dealing with the question of the other. You mentioned before, “encounter with the other”; “by producing a thoroughgoing critique of the present”; and “by re-defining certain concepts”. Could you discuss in further detail your understanding of “politica negativa” and your critique of it? And I know you’ve discussed the historical origin of this concept, it connects with Buddhist thinking. Also, as you understand

them, does Laozi and Zhuangzi trend towards a mode of thought in line with “politica negativa”? Or are they opening a potential for contributing to a “philosophy of co-existence”?

中島隆博教授：

Thank you so much. This question is also very complicated and difficult, but I'll try to reply to it. When I think of a politica negativa, I always compare it to “theologia negativa, negative theology” in the western context. Negative theology is a movement to reaffirm the self or the god in a much higher and stronger way. I tried to criticize this process of the reaffirmation of the self or of the god, for example, in Nishida or Mou Zongsan. Both of them refer to the self-negation, and that negation is supported by the reaffirmation of the greater self. That's a big problem. So how can we escape from such a framework of negative politics and negative theology? For example, Nishida especially in his later writing reaffirmed huangdao (皇道, the emperor's way) in a very serious mode. He affirmed the status quo at the time in Japan. That's a very depressing story for Japanese philosophy. How can we escape from such a process? If we have some insight in the conceptual history of “theologia negativa or politica negativa” in China, we would have some exit. In China, maybe we have two different

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

resources, such as Laozhuang (老莊), and Buddhism. I pick up Wang Bi (王弼) in the series of Laozhuang as the representative of this process of “politica negativa.” When Wang Bi elevated the Wu (無), the notion of nothing, I think, it created a very profound metaphysics by reaffirming the status quo. This is a very setting of theologia negativa. Nonetheless, in recent years, I slightly changed my mind that Wang Bi’s notion is not limited to this theologia negativa, but also has a very open idea to the process of “ing.” Putting Wang Bi put aside, Laozi, especially Zhuangzi has many profound possibilities regarding the concept of nothingness. The nothingness is not limited to the theologia negativa or politica negativa. In my recent thinking, nothingness in the Zhuangzi is an important tool to criticize the theologia negativa. As for the Buddhism, I think Buddhism also has a similar possibility regarding nothingness, which is different from theologia negative or politica negativa. That’s my current thinking.

賴錫三教授：

Your answer could also link to Professor Ishii Tsuyoshi (石井剛)’s discussion regarding Zhuangzi’s huanzhong (環中). He mentioned that from the pre-Qing dynasty to the Qing dynasty, there are two types of interpretation of Zhuangzi’s nothingness. About huanzhong, through

Guo Songtao (郭嵩燾) and Zhang Taiyan (章太炎), he talked about there's a turning point from the metaphysical interpretation coming back to the ground, the earth, the human relationship. So huanzhong cannot get out of the relationship between humans, or between "shifei (是非, Right or Wrong)", "bishishifei (彼是是非, one must be right, the other wrong)". It can generate some political sensibilities to criticize some rules or some principles, like "gongli (公理, axiom)", generating new meanings for human culture.

中島隆博教授：

It must be true. The Zhuangzi emphasized a kind of liberation which is free from the settings of human beings. It must be relevant to our human body or feelings, which is an important part of our body. So, nothingness would play the role to transform our feelings and to have new experiences for human beings.

賴錫三教授：

Today you provide me with a new mode of thinking about religion. I think you criticize Buddhist thinking, but also mention that Buddhism's empty or nothingness has some potential.

莫加南教授：

Wonderful. Thank you very much for this wonderful exchange. And I'm sure we'll have more time to discuss, particularly on Zhuangzi and Buddhism, but we'll just move on to the 5th question now, just because the time is limited. So, this question was written by me. It's a question that pertains more actually to my own training. I'm a historian of modern Chinese literature and the process of the Chinese revolution in its relationship to culture. So I spent a long time reading Luxun (魯迅) and Maodun (茅盾) and Mao Zedong (毛澤東). I'm thinking through revolution, right? What did "geming (革命, revolution)" mean in the modern Chinese context and what did it mean for culture right in relation to "wensexixiang (文學思想, literary thought)", "wenshizhe (文史哲, literary, historical and philosophical tradition)" and "hanxue (漢學, sinology tradition)"? And I think when scholars, particularly Marxist scholars, see the term *gongsheng*, the first thing they would think of is the question of capitalism. So, how can a philosophy of mutual coexistence deal with or think about the kind of antagonisms that exists within capitalism? Because the means of production are not owned collectively. Capitalism is an interesting thing. It's actually a structural question, and it's about the structure of economy; it is really not a question of individual moral edification, for example many

capitalists, who exploited workers, are excellent individuals. They have a very high moral education or moral sensibilities, but it's their place within the structure of the system that makes them exploit their workers. And as Marx told us, if they don't exploit their workers, then they can't produce surplus value and they can't make more money. So it's really not a question of whether I want to be nice to my workers or not. It's a question of structure. I was just wondering as you have developed the philosophy of coexistence, or a mutual becoming, how have you thought about this in relation to the economy, in relation to capitalism? Is there a dialogue between Marxism and human co-becoming? Is there a potential for dialogue there? I think that's really what I wanted to think about with this question.

中島隆博教授：

Thank you so much for your questioning. I will publish a book entitled *Capitalism for Human Co-becoming*. This is a dialogue between philosophers and economists. How can we think of capitalism today from the angle of human co-becoming? For example, you must know Harari in his *Homo Deus* to show us a very shocking notion like “useless class.” Useless class, it is different from Marxist thinking of proletariat. The proletariat can unite themselves through their labor,

while the useless class has no possibility to unite themselves, because they are just useless in working. They have no opportunity to work. This would be a nightmare in the future, if we follow Yuval Noah Harari's thinking. I believe that capitalism has its own history. 21st century capitalism is completely different from the 20th century capitalism. Right now, 1% super rich people share 1/2 of the wealth in the world. That means 1% people cannot invest their wealth again, because they have too much wealth to invest. Ironically speaking, they are opposite to capitalism. How can we get back to the idea of capitalism, whose basement is the investment. That's a crucial point at this moment. In the past, it is very simple. We invest for the commonalities. That was a capitalism based upon things. But after that, capitalism went to the happenings, experiences, or events. The capitalism created a subtle difference in events. That's why I say capitalism for things, characteristics, events. Well, now we are asked to think of capitalism for human co-becoming. The investment would be directed to human co-becoming. That's my thinking. How can we persuade the investors or businesspersons to think of human co-becoming seriously or human conditions of living together? In this aspect, *gongsheng* would propose some insight to the capitalism as well.

莫加南教授：

That's a wonderful thought and answer. I can't wait to read the new work as it sounds exactly like what I've been thinking about, for since we began thinking about *gongsheng* and mutual coexistence or co-becoming. I just wanted to echo that issue, for example, the historical difference between 19th and 20th century's capitalism versus 21st century's capitalism, as well as how the traditional theory of the proletariat was. There was a time when you could think of solidarity in class terms as a working class. There were obviously historical successes and breakthroughs, and yet it seems that this notion of the proletariat is historically very complicated. It's very hard to think of solidarity in class terms in our current configuration as you said. We now have not even a working class but potentially a useless class, a class that is not even part of the labor system. Of course, we have other solidarities of nation or family or ethnicity that seems to still have a real pull, right? So the idea of working people of the world unite, like “wuchanjiejiwansui (無產階級萬歲, long live the proletarian)”, this idea of the proletariat may not have force today. And potentially, if we want a more ethical capitalism, we need to move our thinking towards something like what does an investment for coexistence mean, opposed to simple objects or profit or things. I think that's a very powerful re-

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

articulation, because ultimately the proletariat corresponds to 19th and 20th century's capitalism. We have to face the 21st century.

中島隆博教授：

Now one of the most critical and profound problems in our society is solitude, I think. We are separated, we are divided into a very solitary situation. How can we recover so called social relational capital, shehuiguanxiziben (社會關係資本) in Chinese? This is a very highly crucial question. There arises an idea in the younger generation, saying that it's time to say goodbye to capitalism itself by referring to later Marxist thinking of association going beyond the capitalism. It is somehow relevant to this solitude problem.

莫加南教授：

And it's ironic because even if we were to attempt to go beyond capitalism, we do not actually have any idea of what that could be. We only have the historical experiences of the Soviet Union and China as state socialism. And of course, China moved towards a market model in the 1980s, so I completely agree the idea of just a simple leap beyond is unclear, what we would be leaping beyond to? Thinking about this notion of social relational capital is absolutely crucial. An association

is a solidarity within a market economy, and how to redirect investment towards producing those forms of solidarity, against inequality...I think, it's worth thinking about.

中島隆博教授：

So in this aspect of solidarity, *Gongsheng Zhexue* (共生哲學) can provide a new insight regarding capitalism too. That's my thinking.

莫加南教授：

Thank you, professor Nakajima. I'm sure next year at our conference, if we can go for coffee, we'll have a lot more to talk about. We move on to our 6th question. This question actually is related to the issue of solitude that professor Nakajima just mentioned, at least if we think about some of the social movements that have emerged so forcefully in Canada, the United States, and Taiwan. For example, Black Lives Matter, which asserts the human dignity of African Americans, given their historical repression, their collective injury within the history of the United States; in Canada, the relationship of indigenous peoples to the Canadian state has recently been a very important topic. Just last month, there was discovered the mass graves of indigenous children at residential schools, which were set up by the

Canadian state in the 19th century to teach aboriginal students. These schools were essentially colonial prisons. Now we've found mass graves, so these historical atrocities have made us think about this question of the colonial histories of a place like Canada. Or we can think within the Taiwanese context. Of course, the relationship between Taiwan's indigenous people (原住民) and Han people (漢人) has also been rethought and criticized in recent years. So this speaks to this question. And, I would also add the LGBTQ+ movement for their rights, which has exploded in Canada, America, Europe, and Taiwan. I'm not sure about Japan, but again this is a marginalized community that is demanding that society recognize its dignity.

On the one hand, these movements are absolutely crucial to restoring dignity to historically marginalized peoples. We must reckon with our colonial past. On the other hand, we have to think about how to build a new solidarity, right? Not to stay in our solitude, whether of self or of minoritarian grouping. I guess the first question would be how does a philosophy of co-becoming dialogue with postcolonial theory because all of those movements, whether it's Black Lives Matter or the fight for First Nations rights in Canada or LGBTQ+ rights in Taiwan, are all related to a kind of post colonial thinking, a challenging of a historical hegemony. How can *Gongsheng Zhexue* help us think about

the colonial past and the post colonial future? How can we, on the one hand, recognize the human dignity of the minoritarian group, at the same time try to keep a sense of social solidarity? So, two questions, how does *Gongsheng Zhexue* dialogue with post colonial theory and how can we build solidarity in a post colonial moment? Thank you.

中島隆博教授：

This is also a very important and complicated question. *Gongsheng Zhexue* probably provides an insight to this question. Right of discourse and right of living would be very crucial ideas for the minority movement. So they are trying to recover their dignity by declaring their right of discourse and right of living. How can we return justice to them in the dimension of discourse or living? This is very crucial and important. At this point, *Gongsheng Zhexue* totally agrees with the minority movement. At the same time, how can we build a bridge between the minority and the majority? For example, when we think of the right of discourse in China, right now there's a *Tianxia* (天下) movement. It is a criticism against the west-centered notion of the world. Nonetheless, it has its own danger by becoming a China-centered notion. We have to avoid such a mistake, because, in previous Japanese situation, Japan did the same declaration such as

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

Daitoakyoeken (大東亜共栄圏). We do not need to repeat such a mistake, we need a dialogue between the minority and the majority. In this context, I dare to propose a mutual criticism in *gongsheng* philosophy which leads us to mutual transformation. But mutual transformation should be preceded by criticism of the status quo. How to criticize the status quo of the majority and how to criticize the danger of minority declaration becoming another majority: we must build a bridge between the two of them by referring to a process of mutual criticism. However, this mutual criticism is not an equal one, because the majority should have greater responsibility in this mutual criticism.

莫加南教授：

Thank you very much for those really wonderful thoughts and this idea of a mutual criticism as a part of mutual becoming, as you said, the *gongsheng* can be described as a co-becoming. As we try to build a bridge between majority and minority, I completely agree the bridge needs to be based on dialogue, but also a kind of mutual critique. And yet it's not an equal form of critique, in the sense that the majority clearly owes some kind of justice to the minority group. Just speaking in the Canadian context, for example, when I was young, I was born in the 1980s and during that era we believed in Canada, we were taught in

schools that Canada was a just, multicultural nation that fought fascism and contributed to the defeat of Nazism during World War II and that we built a multicultural society in the post war period. We were never taught the history of these residential schools and what the state did to aboriginal people and the way they forced aboriginal children away from their homes and forced them to learn English or French and outlawed their religious practices and their culture. So now we're having a reckoning with that, and the question is if we say that Canada was a colonial project, based on violence from the beginning...the problem is Canada has to continue to go on tomorrow and the next day and the day after that, right? Settler Canadians are not all going to go back to Europe, we can't simply deconstruct this nation completely. So you need that bridge, where you build that relationship between the majority and the minority, where the majority now knows that they had the privilege of a violent state that produced this country for them. That is really a very important dialogue and I hope it's happening in the United States, in Canada, in Taiwan. I think, this idea of a mutual criticism and a mutual co-becoming, we have to learn to live together and grow together, is really powerful.

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

中島隆博教授：

Actually, this notion of mutual criticism or critique derives from Maruyama Masao (丸山真男), a Japanese scholar of political philosophy. He thought of the Okinawa problem. Okinawa was and is highly marginalized in Japan and suffered from a Japanese colonial violence. How can we think of Okinawa from mainland Japan? In this context, Maruyama proposed a mutual critique by emphasizing the responsibility of the majority [to critique itself]. Japan had such a history, and need to think of the rights of the minority.

莫加南教授：

Absolutely. Professor Lai, if you wanted to talk about tianxia or anything that you wanted to jump in...

賴錫三教授：

I just want to emphasize that Professor Nakajima said mutual critique is a very important idea. In the series of our reading online, we always emphasize the co-transformation, co-existence, and co-living, but today I think there's a new dimension about mutual critique, because it is a dynamic process. So, from mutual reflection, mutual critique, people open the third space, where can live together and

transform with each other. Critique for me is a very important dimension.

莫加南教授：

Absolutely. Thank you so much. That's a wonderful dialogue, and just in the interest of time we will move on. We have three more questions. Professor Nakajima has been so kind to us too. He patiently answered these very difficult questions. Actually the following questions, I think we can make a link to what professor Nakajima just mentioned about Okinawa in Japan.

Basically, the modern Japanese experience is incredibly complicated. I noticed that professor Nakajima in his English writings over the last two years has thought a lot about and written a lot about the question of you could say Japanese modernity, including issues of the state, issues of constitutionalism, sovereignty, the role of Confucianism in modern Japan, religion, et cetera. In a moment, we're going to talk about EAA and the institutionalization of the philosophy of mutual coexistence.

But now, I just want to ask professor Nakajima, when you think through modern Japanese history or modern Japanese thought, how does that act as a resource for you to think about co-becoming and what

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

can modern Japanese history offer us as we think about co-becoming?
Every country has its colonial history, right? As you said, as a country like Japan has to deal with a colonial past as well, just like Canada, America, Taiwan, So how do you think through *gongsheng* in relation to modern Japanese history and thought?

中島隆博教授：

Thank you so much for your reading of my articles in recent years. In these English articles, I tried to contemplate Japanese modernity and Japanese contemporaneity. As you can easily imagine, there are many complicated layers in Japanese modernity. There is a colonial past in Japan, but in postwar Japanese society, Japanese people were asked to forget such a colonial past by saying that Japan is just a single ethnic country with four islands. This is a post-war scenario to forget the colonial past, but I don't think this is a good way to say goodbye to the previous Japan. Rather, we have to face the meaning of the colonial past in Japan to overcome it. That's my basic thinking. At this point, I intentionally picked up Okinawa as a focusing point of the Japanese colonial past. That is why I use Maruyama Masao, especially his mutual critique, to be introduced into *Gongsheng Zhexue*.

For example, from Okinawa, how can we think of sovereignty as

a single highly powerful notion? I dare to ask the question of a “shared sovereignty.” How can we divide and share the sovereignty? *Gongsheng Zhexue* provides us some movement of cutting and connecting at the same time. We need some cutting i.e. separation from the major conceptual settings like sovereignty and civilization, but at the same time, we also need to ask to reconstruct the meaning of sovereignty and civilization. We cannot escape from sovereignty and civilization in an easy way. They have been haunting us. We had better treat them in a much better and more tolerable way.

莫加南教授：

Absolutely. And the notion of shared sovereignty is really important, as you said. It's not a question of escaping from modernity, sovereignty, and civilization, but it's a question related to a mutual becoming, mutual criticism. How does a society think about, for example, a question like sovereignty in a shared, mutual manner as opposed to a colonial model that was based on one-way hegemony? I think that issue of shared sovereignty is certainly one that has many meanings, when we think of Taiwanese history and our shared commitment to the island between Han and aboriginal peoples in Taiwan. Of course, the sovereign status of the island is a very vexed

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

question. So, to think about sovereignty in new ways, I think it's actually very meaningful.

賴錫三教授：

I have also another question. May I ask a about Confucianism and the constitution? As you know, we can find a Chinese scholar, like Jiang Qing (蔣慶). They want to emphasize a political Confucianism, so they went to combine Confucianism and the constitution. How do you think about this kind of movement in mainland China?

中島隆博教授：

Yeah. Actually, I wrote some essays on the current Chinese Confucian movement. By doing so, I always felt that we Japanese had a very similar situation in prewar Japanese society. It was a highly Confucianized society. It's a kind of amalgam of Confucianism and Shintoism, but the Confucianism played a very great role in this tandem. So how can we de-Confucianize Japanese society? That was a crucial questioning in postwar Japan. Now in China, there is a tendency to interrogate the Confucian values or political Confucianism. It can be interpreted as a fragment of the so-called post-secular society in the world. Well, I do not think Confucianism will get a popular majority in

mainland China, because they know what a bad example Japan was. Maybe they need some elaborations or some shifts in their own thinking of political Confucianism. Especially they can learn from Japan's failed experience in political Confucianism.

賴錫三教授：

I also feel this method will have difficulty in succeeding, because there is this tendency to want to completely oppose Western forces. They want to emphasize there is a glorious age, like the Han dynasty; there is a glorious Confucianism and totally combined with the sovereignty of the Han dynasty. They thought it was a golden age, because politics and morals were combined completely. They believed it can overcome Western modernity.

中島隆博教授：

My feeling is somehow different from you. They also use a very modern framework like the constitution. They need a Confucian constitution. It is a very contemporary modernized Confucianism. That's the point. Even going back to the Han period is also very modern to me.

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

莫加南教授：

The only thing I would add is one way of putting this political Confucianism into context in China, there is still a search for some kind of discourse to explain the reform and opening to have some kind of coherent narrative about China, right? During the Maoist period, it was the coherent narrative with socialism in class struggle; but China now is clearly a capitalist society, a market-driven society. It is very difficult to go back to a discourse of class struggle, because the party does not want class struggle. They want stability, right? So, what discourse can be used to produce a coherent understanding of the state of China's development over the last 30 years? I see things like political Confucianism as in some way trying to respond to this ideological question of what is China now. It's not Maoist, nor is it traditionally Marxist in the sense of demanding the means of production be controlled by the working class, and the state certainly has not withered away. It's a very complicated question.

中島隆博教授：

This is a very dangerous question if you use ask it in Mainland China, because it is very a difficult thing to differentiate from the old communist discourses. However, you are right. It is not communist

China...they try to leave it, and go back to the Confucian tradition, but that is somehow different from Jiang Qing and some others who advocate the political Confucianism. Although the Communist party tries to use something similar to their discourse, I don't think it works very well, especially for the younger generation. They have no engaged idea about Confucianism. It is very similar to the Japanese postwar situation. If you ask Japanese people, "are you Confucianist?" All of them would say that we are not Confucianist. In the prewar Japanese situation, Japan was a Confucian state in every meaning. But like Japan now, China has no foundation to support the Confucian discourses. It is almost impossible. In prewar Japan, we had the emperor as a symbol to remind society of Confucian discourses. Now China does not have such a symbol.

莫加南教授：

That's very fascinating, very interesting. We'll have to continue to think about this question, and in the interest of time, we will move on to the 8th question. I actually think why don't we move onto the 9th question, and then I will link questions 8th and 10th. So, it's a question that professor Lai wanted to ask professor Nakajima, particularly about the East Asian Academy for New Liberal Arts. So, I will let professor

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

Lai speak.

賴錫三教授：

Our time is limited, so I will just shorten my question a little bit. When it comes to the EAA, *Dongya Yiwen Shuyuan* (東亞藝文書院), as I know, professor Nakajima is a key person to establish this special institution about the educational, cultural, and academic institution and collaborate with Peking University and Tokyo University. It comes from your dream. When you were young, you would like to establish a special educational environment. Congratulations! Your dream comes true. For me, it's like you've established a bridge between China and Japan, as we know, there is a big contradiction between the two countries, but you reach a certain way to make an important effort to let universities cooperate and let young students rethink the transformation or co-existence. So, can you introduce this institution a little more for Taiwanese friends, also I would like to ask what do you think of the situation in Taiwan? In recent, especially now we're facing a serious problem between America and China, because these two superpowers each have their intentions, Taiwan now is forced to take sides, this is also a question of colonization. What would you suggest for Taiwanese scholars or friends? It's my final question.

中島隆博教授：

Thank you. For over 10 years I have run UTCP, University of Tokyo Center for the Philosophy, in which we had many collaborations with other universities, including China, Taiwan, Korea, Southeast Asia, European and American universities. In this framework, we tried to realize the idea of *gongsheng* in education and research. But at the same time, I felt that something was lacking in this UTCP movement. That is institutionalization! So UTCP had a very active performance at that time, but they were just research activities. How can we institutionalize *Gongsheng Zhexue* in the university system? That became our crucial question. My institutional imagination was that we would have an East Asian university, including Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and Mainland China. That was my imagination or dream. In this respect, it was very lucky to launch EAA, East Asian Academy for New Liberal Arts. It is an institutionalized platform between PKU and UTokyo. It is a partial realization of my institutional imagination. So, I would like to invite Taiwanese and Korean friends to this framework as well. What is the background of my imagination? I just had a conversation with colleagues at the University of Tokyo, that was realized in my report. In this report, I said it's time to share professors, share students among the different universities. Right now, University of Tokyo has its own

professors and its own students, UTokyo professors teach UTokyo students. But, if professors from every university teach UTokyo students, the situation would be drastically changed. Vice versa, UTokyo professors teach in Taiwanese universities. That's my imagination.

EAA is a kind of historical event at the University of Tokyo or in Japan. This is a totally new concept to build a bridge between China and Japan. Now we, the two of us PKU and UTokyo, have similar curriculums and share our students together. And we share our professors. So, I don't know if this is a very tiny project or not. We share just ten students with each other. I don't know if this impact will need some big influence or not, but this is a totally new project. Two national universities came to share professors and students. I do want to enlarge this institutional imagination to other universities, including Korea and Taiwan in the future. I think the Taiwanese situation is very complicated and difficult. But from the academic side, there are some possibilities for us to make some good influence to this difficult and complicated situation. Hope that EAA can provide a kind of example to Taiwanese friends.

賴錫三教授：

It's good news for Taiwanese and Korean students. I want to show my greatest appreciation to you. For me, you have a great imagination because so many contemporary scholars pay so much attention today to professionalization and professional details, but they lack imagination. You and EAA are opening a new imagination and using this new image to open up possibilities. Finally, I would like to express our appreciation, because you and professor Ishii Tsuyoshi agree with us to use your EAA title to cooperate with the international conference about co-transformation in next year. So, it's our greatest honor. Thank you very much.

莫加南教授：

Thank you. It's a very wonderful honor, absolutely. I just wanted to echo professor Nakajima's insight on the academic and intellectual space, that we have professors, students, that we have these organizations these institutions. When we are faced with such a complicated political situation, such as Taiwan, or the relationship between Japan and China, as scholars, there still is a space within academic work and the spirit of Shuyuan (書院), where you have people coming from different backgrounds to collaborate in a liberal

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

arts tradition to understand and enrich one another. I think that is very important. Wonderful! We are looking forward to participating in more EAA events and to publicize more EAA events, and to make it really well known throughout Taiwan.

中島隆博教授：

You are always welcome. Thank you.

莫加南教授：

I think we'll ask our final question for professor Nakajima. This is a question I'm sure that is on everybody's minds and I know professor Nakajima just recently in *Shijie Sixiang* (世界思想), they have published a piece addressing the Covid-19 pandemic. Really, this question is about what the world has been through over the last year and a half. Japan has been through so much, just having hosted the Olympics and still working to control the pandemic. So, this is a big question, what do you think the Covid pandemic has meant for philosophy? How does it challenge those modes of thoughts or categories that we took for granted before? We weren't really thinking of something as globally challenging, as deeply traumatic, as the pandemic has been and continues to be. As philosophers, how do we

respond to it? And of course, these are just initial thoughts as we're all thinking about these issues in real time, but any initial thoughts you have in relation to this moment of the pandemic would be wonderful to hear.

中島隆博教授：

Thank you so much. Covid-19 showed us again old problematics, such as inequality, solitude, and so on. And we had to face such problems before the Covid-19, but we could not do that. So Covid-19 showed us such old problematics were still at stake. Another moment is as follows: Covid-19 asks us to think of biopolitics once again. Jiankang (健康), health, is a core for us, but such a health is always a health for the nation. Health is our obligation. We have to have vaccinated for the protection of the nation, not primarily for ourselves. We are asked to rethink of such a modern concept of health for the nation and our life. This is a very critical questioning from Covid-19. In the first part of today's session, I referred to the life in 20th century's Japan. Once again, we are asked to rethink of the concept of life in 20th century, which was somehow relevant to the nation. Life for the nation. But at the same time, we are asked to have an alternative way of thinking for living or life. For example, can we reintroduce *gangsheng* (養生,

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

nutrition life) instead of *weisheng* (衛生) in Chinese, Eisei (衛生) in Japanese? *Weisheng* is a modern concept. So, maybe we have a chance to escape from the modern biopolitics finally in this Covid-19 situation.

莫加南教授：

Yeah, and I really appreciate professor Nakajima's very interesting way into this question, which is Covid-19 has reminded us of old problematics. As a modern society, we thought we won't ever have another pandemic, those older modes of crisis around solitude, disease, and hygiene. We have modern medical systems, pandemics are something that happened 100 years ago. But, Covid-19 has forced us in some ways to understand that these older problems can't be solved for ever. They are still with us in such an event like this, and also help us to think about our mutual vulnerability. I used the term vulnerability or a kind of "cui ruoxing (脆弱性)". Taiwan has done a very good job of managing Covid-19. Taiwan is an island, it's been able to secure its borders. However, the problem is whatever you do within your own national borders, it's impossible to control the rest of the world. We're at some point still going to do commerce with the rest of the world and be open to the rest of the world. So you cannot think in national terms. So, it's funny, because even a victory in your own national space does

not protect you. You may keep your borders closed and forever, but we would like to live in a world where we have some mobility. So it challenges the logic of the nation-state. You can defeat the pandemic at home, but if it's certainly around the world, it's going to come again. Right? We have to think in global terms and *yangsheng* cannot just be the national *yangsheng*. Right? In Chinese, we could think about a *xianghu yilai de cuiruoxing* (相互依賴的脆弱性), an interdependence of vulnerability. We are so vulnerable, and Covid-19 shows us that we are interconnected in this deep way in our bodies, and it should be a starting point for our thinking about *yangsheng* or *gongsheng*. Professor Lai, I don't know if you want to have any thoughts about this.

賴錫三教授：

For me, we have no solitude; we're always in Dasein with the other people; we also exist with other beings; we share the air, the water, the earth here; we just live on the same earth and we just have one earth. So, we can't close ourselves too long, that's impossible. And now for me, Covid-19 just shows the fact, that we are always existing with others, including viruses. Also, we must live co-terminously with the virus. This kind of thinking, for me, is the absolute other. In fact, from ancient times, we have never actually been free from risk. We always

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

faced various complex problems larger and small, not just at this moment, Right?

中島隆博教授：

Yes. You are absolutely right. Yes, the virus is our other, but we cannot avoid it totally. We have to cooperate with the virus. That's a crucial point. Someone says our mind is somehow similar to the virus of the body. So, we are already living with others in our own way of living. We have to invent a new way of living with the virus. That's our challenge in this Covid-19 situation. You are totally right.

莫加南教授：

From these series of classes and talks we've had on Zhuangzi and the *Gongsheng Zhexue*, professor Lai has repeatedly reminded us that the self is never closed. It's an open self: it's dynamic; it's constantly in negotiation and interaction with the other. Covid-19, I think, has just shown that. So explicitly I told my colleagues, in America and Canada, who had reached 70% of the vaccination level, don't think that the covid pandemic is over, because you are open to the world as we are. You have a responsibility not just to your own nation, but to the entire world to make those drugs available. If the world can truly move on, it will be

because we've overcome the nationalist logic. The virus will come. As professor Lai said, it's with us. We have to learn *yangsheng* has something that transcends the local. This is truly a global crisis and thus demands a global response.

中島隆博教授：

Yes. Absolutely.

莫加南教授：

Thank you so much for this opportunity to discuss these questions. I think we have today really opened up a lot of territories and discussed a lot of questions. Actually, every question we asked could be its own seminar, its own conference. Now we are opening up questions for all of our friends online.

蔡瑞霖（臺灣警察專科學校教授）：

Professor Nakajima, I am Raylin Tsai (蔡瑞霖). Your speech is very brilliant! Please allow me to ask you a little question. What do you think about Ōe Kenzaburō (大江健三郎), the Nobel Prize winner in literature 1994, his work, a literary report with deep criticism on to the Okinawa Event, but eventually he has to protest against the government

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

to defend his efforts on that event? Is it a key-functional part of your idea of mutual co-becoming that can help us to understand Ōe Kenzaburō's motivation? How does Japanese society agree with you? And finally, according to Zhuangzi, do you think the so-called disaster writing is necessary for social reciprocity? How do we read properly the disaster literature in mutual interaction of human beings? How to pacify the collective trauma? I mean that could there be an unhappy fish intangible in Zhuangzi's mind?

中島隆博教授：

Thank you so much for your questions. The first one is about Ōe Kenzaburo, especially his idea embedded in his 1970 book entitled Okinawa nōto (沖縄ノ一ト), Okinawa Note. Ōe Kenzaburo, 1994 Nobel Prize winner in literature and published an Okinawa Note, in which he emphasized that he faced the colonial past in Japan and how to build a bridge between Okinawa and Mainland Japan. It was a very provocative publishing at that time before Okinawa's reversion to Japan in 1972. Right now, Ōe is too old to reply to the current situation of Okinawa, especially the American military base problem. But it's time not for him, but for us to think of Okinawa's problem seriously. That's why I dared to publish some articles on Okinawa by emphasizing the

meaning of mutual critique and shared sovereignty. That's my reply to your first question.

The second one is on how to share our *gongsheng* idea in Japanese society? Thanks to some activities of NPO (Nonprofit Organization), *Gongsheng* becomes a very popular concept in Japan. For example, the Japanese government also uses the notion of *gongsheng* in their political agenda. I think that *gongsheng* has now become a very effective idea in Japan. Nonetheless, we have to watch the governmental use of *gongsheng* as it is politicized. How we can criticize this direction of politicization of *gongsheng* is very crucial.

And your third question is on the “proper” reading of the Zhuangzi and other texts in some contexts. The “proper” is a very critical and dangerous idea, but I do not say we are open to every type of reading. No, there are some limitations of reading due to the text. Our reading is somehow limited from the way of texturing, the conceptual structure, or historical background. Maybe we can find not a proper, but a better way of reading the Zhuangzi by referring to the conditions mentioned above.

莫加南教授：

Thank you very much, Mr. Tsai for these wonderful questions. I

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

see Lai Yiwei (賴奕瑋), our assistant has raised his hand, so I think will give Lai Yiwei a chance to ask a question.

賴奕瑋 (國立中山大學中國文學系碩士生):

Professor Nakajima, it's nice to see you again. So I would like to ask, because as we know, the Olympics in Tokyo just ended and I just found out there was an interesting team called Team Refugees. I would like to elaborate that at this human co-becoming or you can say co-living agenda really works, because it's kind of like building up an agency or institution for this human co-becoming project. So, my question would be how to invite all these people, maybe they are stateless. How this kind of people could enjoy or join our project or another kind of people, they are from different cultures or we can say in Asia is so multicultural, maybe Southeast Asia or the Middle East is of Asia but in different cultural identities or different cultural backgrounds. How to becoming or how to be in this part of this agenda? That would be my question, because I think the invitation to let everybody join the human co-becoming system will be the most important part.

中島隆博教授：

Thank you so much. According to Hannah Arendt, refugees are our contemporary features in the 20th century. In the 21st century, I think her observation is still effective. Refugees are not just outsiders. No, they are our own features. In the idea of human co-becoming, we are asked to invite refugees into this framework. You are completely right. For that sake, how can we deconstruct the national boundary or national sovereignty? This is a highly crucial questioning. We are still living in the 19th century sovereignty or national state system. I don't think it is a plausible situation for the 21st century. Taiwan is a good example. We have to overcome such a 19th century system of sovereignty. I think there are many good things to learn from the Taiwanese experience. I love to learn much more about Taiwanese experiences. Thank you.

莫加南教授：

Thank you, Professor Nakajima. As a scholar in Taiwan, who teaches Taiwanese students every semester, I can say my students also teach me the most about the Taiwanese experience. It is a very rich experience, if we're thinking about precise questions of hospitality and questions of the obligation towards other, as well as the limits of the nation-state. So thank you very much. I see professor Lai has a question.

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

賴錫三教授：

I would like to to ask a question of professor Nakajima. For me, you and professor Ishii have created the so-called Tokyo School, and I always have a tendency to compare it to the Kyoto School. Within Western philosophical discourse, when the questions emerged of how Asian philosophy can connect with the world, can create a discourse of worldly philosophical depth and meaning, Kyoto School scholars such as Kitaoro Nishida and D.T. Suzuki are always mentioned. Of course, their work is engaged deeply with European Continental Philosophy, Phenomenology, and Heidegger. The Tokyo School that you lead seems to have a more critical dimension, indeed a deconstructive one, particularly in its critique of metaphysics. Could I ask you to compare your school with the Kyoto school, discussing the former as an intellectual movement. What are its central characteristics?

中島隆博教授：

Yes, thank you so much for your wonderful question. In these four years, I have been thinking of the Tokyo School. Kyoto School is a term, which is highly popularized in international academia. There are many papers about Nishida Kitaro, but there is very little attention to Tokyo school. Kyoto School has Nishida as a core. It is a highly metaphysical

and national philosophical setting. But what is the point of Tokyo School? Before the war, in the prewar situation, Tokyo School was highly connected with the Japanese national politics. It was a politicized philosophy at the moment, but in a postwar situation, Tokyo school tried to criticize the previous attitude of a philosophy highly politicized with the government. Tokyo School was trying to escape from the prewar Japanese situation. So, we try to follow this spirit of postwar Tokyo School thinking. This postwar Tokyo School thinking was embodied in, for example, Sakabe Megumi (坂部恵), Hiromatsu Wataru (廣松涉), and Omori Shozo (大森莊蔵). They were professors at the University of Tokyo especially in the Komaba campus (東京大学駒場地区キャンパス). Komaba people may want to say Komaba School (駒場學派) instead of Tokyo School. The characteristic is a highly critical thinking against the Kyoto School and prewar Tokyo School thinking. That's my answer.

賴錫三教授：

我也要中文回應一下。我非常期待東京大學的思想運動，不只是純粹的學術性的 *speculative philosophy*，它是具有很強的經世的關懷，對於整個社會政治以及人的存在處境，回到一個 *ground*，這個 *ground* 不是建構在一個形而上學的基礎上，而是回

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

歸人類的具體處境來重新面對他者、恢復學問和學術責任，也就是把宗教性的或終極性關懷帶回到對於人的真正感受，我覺得這是一個非常值得關注的思想運動。

中島隆博教授：

I totally agree with you. Thank you so much.

莫加南教授：

現在聊天室有兩個問題。第一個問題是，前面談到後疫情的「衛生」問題，「衛」字有保衛、對抗的意思。生物學哲學裡面的主體性問題，免疫系統如何對抗外來者而保衛自己，其分辨敵我的功能有可能被挪用至「如何實現自我之主體」。也就是說，現在問題就變成了：我們要保衛誰的生？一個族群能不能被視為具有主體性？再者，前面您提到一種 *disarmed* 的哲學構想，也就是卸下武裝的哲學，但我們是否能在任何情況都沒有衛生，又可以維持生存的需要？

中島隆博教授：

衛生是保衛什麼生, *Whose live does public health protect? That is the point of this question. It's a very elaborated question. Weisheng thinking tries to protect a life of some kind of subjectivity. But this life*

of the subjectivity, 主體之生 (zhutizhisheng), is directed for the nation, or for the state. My thinking is somehow different from this *weisheng* thinking, because we cannot protect such a subjectivity for the nation. As long as we are living in a related situation with others, our living is not monopolized by our own subjectivity, but it is shared for living with others. So, *yangsheng* (養生), this traditional and old-fashioned concept, however, would be realistic to give us some insights in this related living or related subjectivities. That's my reply to your question. The disarmed, open philosophy would be relevant to co-living with others.

莫加南教授：

The second question is, “money as a media has operated the capitalism, however there's no such a market liquidity within social capital. In *gongsheng* and co-shared, is social capital predictable or unpredictable?” So the second question is about the media of establishing the social capital. What medium do we use to establish social capital?

中島隆博教授：

I think right now the concept of money itself becomes very

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

unstable. For example, sovereign money, like the Japanese Yen, is diminished by its intentional effort. So how can we rely on such money? When I refer to *Shehui Guanxi Ziben* (社會關係資本), I think it is so far powerful than the popularity of the money. That's my answer.

莫加南教授：

Yeah, very interesting. Just going back to the question of the *weisheng* question and thinking about the relationality of ourselves with others, which is to say we do not monopolize the space we exist in. We exist with others, through others, so what Covid-19 has done, it shown even if Taiwan can control our own internal Covid-19 situation, we still live in a world with others, and so we must work with others too. *Yangsheng*, to nurture their lives in some ways, it's a kind of mutual relatedness into clear relief. We cannot have the fantasy of a monopoly or a fantasy of independence. That is a particular, I would say American fantasy.

中島隆博教授：

So it is important to break out such a fantasy. That's a very crucial point. Now we are asked to have an alternative social imaginary.

莫加南教授：

Absolutely all right. We have about 5 minutes left. Li Zhihuan (李志桓) has asked a question. Nationalism is a problem that we can't really get out of, because we all have linguistic and cultural differences. So, maybe there are two kinds of nationalism: 養生的民族主義 (the nationalism of nurturing) and 衛生的民族主義 (the nationalism of protecting).

中島隆博教授：

This is a very tricky question. I don't think the difference between languages and cultures would disappear. These characteristics are very important. On this basement, we do not need to establish the nationalism, right? Nationalism is completely different from language and culture, maybe we can find an alternative approach to language and culture. That's my thinking. How to deconstruct the nationalism, so in this sake, *yangsheng de minzuzhuyi* (養生的民族主義) would play a better role.

賴錫三教授：

I want to correspond to nurturing life, *yangsheng*. We can originate this notion from Zhuangzi, the chapter three, *yangshengzhu* (養生主).

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

Zhuangzi used an interesting metaphor, “cutting the ox”. And that for me is a symbolic meaning of the others and relationship. That means natural life cannot escape from the ox, cannot escape from the relationship. But the relationship also means trouble, because everyone, according to his ego centralism, is just like a sharp knife. So, people encounter each other which also means cutting with each other, hurting with each other, but sometimes they are friends. There are some people who will emphasize Zhuangzi wants to escape from the relationship to keep his living only. But for me, according to the metaphor of Cook Ting Butchers the Ox (庖丁解牛), we always want to have the art of co-transformation and cooperate with ox, with relationship, that is fully nurturing life.

中島隆博教授：

Yes. For the way of the *Yansheng*, we need some art of co-transformation. So how can we invent this art of co-existence or co-living based upon co-transformation? That is a very important and crucial question and that the Zhuangzi will give us some insights for this direction.

莫加南教授：

Yeah, absolutely. I think this also relates to this question of *Shehui Guanxi Ziben* (社會關係資本), right? I'm very excited to read your work on capitalism and coexistence, but it would seem to me that one way of rethinking capitalism is as regardless of how economic activity takes place, it has to generate this skill, this nurturing, for co-living, co-existence, and co-prosperity. One of the problems of capitalism is that, it does have this inequality built into it, but can it be re-engineered towards co-flourishing? So that those antagonisms be lessened. I think that's very interesting. This language of flourishing, or the art of co-living, is not a language that's traditional to Marxism, right? So, this is where *Gongsheng Zhexue* can really dialogue with Marxism. Maybe it's the question of art, of *yangsheng*, of nurturing, of co-living, and how to think through in those ways which are not just based on a traditional proletarian imaginary. Producing a more complicated imaginary.

中島隆博教授：

Absolutely. Thank you so much.

莫加南教授：

I think we are out of time, today has been truly a very special and

中島隆博、賴錫三、莫加南 共生哲學對當前世界、兩岸處境的迫切性

insightful event for me personally. We have touched on so many issues from Covid-19 to Zhuangzi, from capitalism to minoritarian movements, to build EAA and institutions around a philosophy of coexistence. Such a a rich event. I want to thank professor Nakajima for his patience and his insights, as he has helped us think through these important issues.

中島隆博教授：

Yes, thank you so much for having this wonderful opportunity. I learned many things from your questions and discussions. Thank you so much!

賴錫三教授：

I hope someday professor Nakajima and professor Ishii can come back to Taiwan to meet us and discuss with us. It's our greatest honor. I want to say it again. Thank you very much.

中島隆博教授：

Yes, thank you so much. Looking forward to seeing you again.

《現象學與人文科學》第 13 期

莫加南教授：

Yes. We will see each other next year in July. At the conference in July and we are looking forward to having coffee on the beach at the National Sun Yet-sen University, we can continue talking about these issues and continue enriching our dialogue.

中島隆博教授：

Thank you.