

- (6) Die Versorgung des Widerstands könnte theoretisch über iranisches Territorium erfolgen, ohne daß eine Vertragsverletzung vorläge, da Iran nicht zu den Signatarstaaten gehört. Teherans Außenpolitik schließt eine solche Möglichkeit allerdings praktisch aus.
- (7) Vgl. hierzu entsprechende Erklärungen, die Pir Sayed Ahmed Gailani, einer der Führer der sunnitischen Allianz, gegenüber AFP abgegeben hat (SZ, 15.7.1989, S.7). Ein klarer Positionsbezug von Prof. Rabbani, dem Führer der Jamiat-i-Islami, einer der stärksten Parteien des Widerstands, der auch Ahmed Shah Masud mit seinen ca. 13.000 Kämpfern angehört, steht noch aus. Klarheit in dieser Frage wäre aber für jede Einschätzung der künftigen Entwicklung von großer Bedeutung.
- (8) In einem Interview mit Radio Moskau erklärte der afghanische Verteidigungsminister, Generalleutnant Shahnawaz Tanay: "Es ist noch zu früh, um von einem vollständigen Sieg über die Extremisten zu sprechen. ... Alles in allem haben wir die Lage wiederhergestellt, wie sie am 6.März (1989), d.h. vor der Offensive der Extremisten gegen Jalalabad, bestand"; vgl. SWB/FE/0505/C/3, 11.7.1989.
- (9) Vgl. SWB/FE/0507/C/2, 13.7.1989.
- (10) Vgl. SWB/FE/0467/C/1-3, 26.5.1989.
- (11) Vgl. SWB/FE/0020/C/1-9, 8.12.1987.
- (12) Vgl. SWB/FE/0467/C/3-4, 26.5.1989.
- (13) Eine andere Frage ist, ob es der Übergangsregierung gelingen könnte, die neutralen oder sich abwartend verhaltenden Segmente der Bevölkerung (insbesondere der Städte) für sich zu gewinnen. Hier scheint Zweifel angebracht.
- (14) Die Frage, inwieweit sowjetische Militärberater nach wie vor maßgeblich an der Planung und Führung von Kampfoperationen der Regierungstruppen beteiligt sind, soll in diesem Zusammenhang außer acht bleiben; vgl. hierzu Krasnaja Swesda (Moskau), 1.6.1989, S.3.
- (15) Nach bisher vorliegenden Erkenntnissen wurde auch das an China grenzende Wakhan-Hochtal von sowjetischen Truppen geräumt.
- (16) Vgl. Teheran Times, 31.7.1989, in: SWB/ME/0524/A/3, 2.8.1989.
- (17) Hierunter ist auch die Beteiligung von Teilen der DVPA zu verstehen, die der jetzigen Führung nicht angehören (die sog. "good Muslims from Kabul").
- (18) Vgl. auch The Middle East, London, Juli 1989, S.19.
- (19) Vgl. The Independent, London, 20.6.1989, S.12.
- (20) Das Zögern der Bush-Administration im Hinblick auf eine Konfliktregelung durch Verhandlungen hängt anscheinend mit der Sorge zusammen, daß die DVPA aufgrund organisatorischer und anderer Vorteile politisch überleben und zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt ihren Führungsanspruch verwirklichen könnte; vgl. u.a. The Independent, London, 20.6.1989, S.12.

The Relations between the Ruler and the People according to Confucius and his early Followers

Erwin Wickert

I speak to you not as a scholar, but as a man who for many years of his life dealt with political questions and who now looks back on the political situation and political principles of Confucius and his early followers.

In those times there was the ruler and there were the people under his rule. And between them were the gentlemen, the *junzi*, the *literati*, the intellectuals who could read and write and who were to become the class of the gentry. They were closer to the ruler than to the masses (*min*), the *xiao ren*, the "blackhaired people". They were a class all by themselves. The gulf between them and the masses was wide, as it still is today. Nevertheless, though the *literati* did not speak to the masses, but to the ruler, their advice was always to the advantage of the masses.

The People

I start with the People, for, as the Book of Documents says:

"The people are the root of a country;
when the root is firm, the country is tranquil."

Aristotle called man a *zoon politicon* - a political animal. But the masses in Confucius' times were not individual "political animals". They were members of farmer families living in the greater family of the ruler's state. They lived in direst poverty in reed-decked huts. Their main concern was to obtain enough food for the family to avoid starvation. They had customs, songs and myths, but their horizon did not extend much beyond their family and clan. They could neither read nor write, nor were they able to discuss abstract questions of political ethics with the learned *junzi*.

Confucius believed they could be made to follow the WAY, but not to understand it. The living conditions of the masses were so miserable that it would have been impossible - he assumed - to open their minds for other thoughts. But they had the capacity to learn and become educated. "Everybody may become a Yao or a Shun." (Mencius)

At first sight this Confucianist picture of the common people seems convincing, though somewhat condescending. Chinese intellectuals still like to adopt a patronizing attitude towards non-intellectuals who work with their hands. Even today you can hear from intellectuals that the Chinese people are not yet mature enough for democracy because there are so many illiterates among them - an argument not very convincing in view of the fact that the quota of illiterates is just as great in a democracy like India, and enormous even in the United States. I wonder whether the common hauteur of the literati vis-à-vis the illiterates may even have led Confucius to the possibly unwarranted conclusion that the masses in his time were mentally retarded and unable to understand the WAY.

The Book of Documents had a higher opinion of the people. It said quite aptly:

"When I look at all under Heaven,
even the little man and woman
may surpass me in wisdom and virtue."

The state in Confucius' time was but an enlarged mirror image of the family. The individual or rather the member of a family in Confucius' society had a two-fold loyalty: Firstly towards the family, secondly towards the ruler. The loyalty towards the family was the overriding principle, higher even than the loyalty towards the ruler; however, this opinion apparently was contested even in Confucius' time, not to mention the time of Shang Yang and Han Feizi.

When Confucius was told a man named Upright Kung had borne witness against his father who had stolen a sheep, the Master replied, in his country a father will shield his son and the son his father so that they would not be brought to trial. Filial piety had priority over law and justice.

Now this principle, although once discussed but not settled in Plato's dialogue "Eutyphron", is difficult to understand for Westerners who learn already in their first years at school that Roman fathers held the law so sacred that they ordered even their sons to be executed if they had broken military law and discipline, and they were highly admired for having made this sacrifice.

I for my part wonder whether Confucius' principle to shield members of the family who had infringed the law is not rather a questionable rule. At any rate it had a longtime deplorable effect on Chinese society as it promoted clannishness, lawlessness, corruption and other "unsound" phenomena.

In political life, in questions of war or peace, the masses had no voice. The decision was with the ruler. The masses were passive objects of his will. They had to till the land and perform their corvée duties at given times; they had to be obedient and respectful towards the ruler just as towards the head of the family.

"Those who in private life behave well towards their parents and elder brothers, in public life seldom show a disposition to resist the authority of their superiors. And as for such men starting a revolution, no instance of it has ever occurred."

Nevertheless Confucius remarked that women and *xiao ren* were difficult to handle, and the Book of Documents warned of the potential dangers of an unruly people:

"If the king makes mistakes repeatedly in conducting the government, dissatisfaction will prevail and dangers will appear. Before they appear, they should be guarded against. In my dealing with the millions of the people I should feel as if I were driving a chariot of six horses with a rotten rein."

The Ruler

People and ruler were bound to each other by mutual obligations. The people were not sovereign, but the ruler could not do with them as he pleased. He had to be careful not to irritate them. He had to approach them with dignity and respect and to treat them with benevolence. He had to free them from want and misery, see to it that they had enough to eat and make them well-to-do. First duty of a benevolent ruler was to improve the living conditions of the people and to educate them. "Only when cloth and food suffice for their needs, will they distinguish between honor and shame", said Mencius.

The ruler should not burden them with heavy taxes. He should, said Confucius in contrast to Shang Yang of the 4th century, pardon lesser crimes. He should not be concerned if the people were poor, but rather if goods were unevenly distributed. The model ruler, as Confucius imagined him, was to the people what a father is to his family. He heeded public opinion, sent people out to listen to the songs they sang: And if they sounded sad he knew that the people needed help. To govern did not mean to suppress the people, but, as the Master said: "Lead them! Encourage them! Untiringly!"

Under no circumstances should he put people to death because they did not follow the WAY. "You are there to rule, not to slay the people", Confucius unequivocally said. And Mencius stated:

"When scholars are put to death without any crime, the great officers may leave the country. When the people are slaughtered without any crime, the scholars may remove."

The ruler should not kill people, but show affection towards his subjects and treat them with benevolence. "He whose Wisdom brings him to power needs Goodness to secure that power."

The opening chapter of the Guo Yu or "Conversations from the States" relates a dialogue between King Li of the Zhou Dynasty and his chief minister, the duke of Shao. It is a text which does not at all sound outmoded. I will repeat it in the recent translation by Burton Watson:

"King Li behaved in a tyrannical manner and the people of the kingdom criticized him. The duke of Shao, his minister, reported this to the king, saying, "The people cannot endure their fate."

The king, enraged, employed the shamans of Wei to search out those who voiced criticism, and the persons they reported he put to death. The people of the kingdom no longer dared speak, but eyed one another meaningfully when they met in the street.

The king was pleased and announced to the duke of Shao, "I have succeeded in silencing their criticism. Now no one dares to speak out!"

The duke of Shao said, "You have merely dammed them up. But stopping up the mouths of the people is more dangerous than stopping up a river. When a river is blocked and then breaks through, many persons are bound to be injured, and it is the same with the people. Therefore, one who desires to control a river will leave an opening where the water can be drawn off. And one who would control the people should do likewise, encouraging them to speak."

The ruler, he continued, should try to find out what the people say, sing and think. "In this way", the Guo Yu concludes, "affairs can be carried out without miscarriage."

Similarly Confucius demanded that the ruler should court the people to win their confidence. The three most important elements of the ruler's government, he said, were food, the army and the confidence of the common people. One could, if necessary, dispense with army and food, the Master said. "But a people that no longer trusts its rulers is lost indeed." This is probably one of Confucius' wisest political observations and valid for rulers and governments of all times.

The philosopher Immanuel Kant called a government as envisaged by Confucius "based upon the principle of benevolence towards the people just like a father's attitude towards his children", i.e. a paternalistic government, "the greatest despotism". "For here the subjects are treated as minors, who could not discern what is really advantageous and what is harmful, and are therefore forced to remain passive."

Kant had the European society of the 18th century in mind, the Age of Enlightenment, when he wrote this. But Confucius proceeded from the assumption that the masses in his time were not at all 'enlightened', but in fact politically and spiritually under age and unable to discern what is advantageous and what is harmful. Therefore, the best rule they could hope for was, in his view, a rule of benevolence.

But the ruler not only had obligations towards the masses, his main obligation was to observe the DAO and to live an upright and blameless life and thus to be a shining moral example to the people.

"If the ruler himself is upright, all will go well even though he does not give orders. But if he himself is not upright, even though he gives orders, they will not be obeyed."

Thus a corrupt ruler and government may issue intelligent and reasonable decrees; but because of the corruptness of the ruling class even these decrees will not be accepted and obeyed by the people. In the "Discourses on Salt and Iron" (*Yantielun*) in 81 B.C. the *ru*, the literati, called the dignitaries present at the hearing thieves and robbers and repeated endlessly and sometimes naively their credo: If the worthies only led an upright and ethical life all political problems of the day would immediately vanish into thin air.

The Intellectuals

The literati were the third force between ruler and people - the *junzi*, the intellectuals who could read and write and who knew the ritual and therefore had had a special position in state and society for time immemorial. Although placed between people and ruler the intellectuals did not mediate between them. As a matter of fact, like the Master himself, they kept aloof of the uncouth, illiterate masses. But they did not despise them, on the contrary, they stood up and pleaded for them.

The Master never talked of social or political problems of the masses in detail, nor did he give advice to them, except for admonishing them to be obedient, nor did he show ways and means of how to improve their material condition. These were minor and technical questions. More important to him was the attitude of the ruler towards his people, how he met, accommodated and ruled them, and whether he treated them with benevolence, since the people were his responsibility.

But what if the ruler did not come up to the sage's expectations? Then the learned adviser should frankly correct him. And if his words were not heeded? Then he should "wrap up his talents and hide them in the folds of his dress" and leave.

We do not know how Confucius would have acted had a conflict occurred between ruler and people. His follower Mencius had no doubt that the ruler would have brought such a calamity upon himself by a rotten government, and that he had better make up for it, if he wanted to save his throne. Mencius made it quite clear that the people were the masters and the ruler the servant. Jie and Zhou, the infamous tyrannical rulers "lost the throne", Mencius said, "because they had lost the people; and to lose the people, means to lose their hearts...- There is a way to get their hearts: It is simply to collect for them what they like, and not to lay on them what they dislike." If the administrators were cruel to the people, the people should pay them back by not loving the ruler anymore and by refusing to sacrifice themselves in battle. And Xunzi, one hundred years later, admonished the rulers:

"When the horses are fearful of the carriage-traces the master cannot ride in safety; when horses fear the carriage-traces, nothing serves so well as to calm them. When the common people fear the government

nothing serves so well as to favor them... There is a traditional saying that "The ruler is the boat; the common people are the water. The water can sustain the boat; the water can overturn the boat." (Watson, *Hsün-tse*, p.36/37)

Confucius spoke to the advantage of the people, but he did not try to push his ideas through. "What is called a great minister", he told his pupils, "is one who serves his prince according to what is right, and when he finds he cannot do so, retires". Confucius did not bang his fist on the table. He was strangely mild and reticent compared to the sometimes harsh and brusque accusations some of his contemporary advisers hurled at the rulers. When his words were not heeded or the ruler's comportment was unbearable, he left.

Confucius' followers were more self-confident. Mencius did not hesitate to sharply rebuke the rulers. He claimed the role of an arbiter who would pass judgement upon the actions of the ruler. And Xunzi, a few generations later, made it quite clear that "it is not for the sake of the ruler that heaven brings forth the people. Rather, it is for the sake of the people that heaven establishes the ruler." He was the advocate of the people. He absolved it of any responsibility for political failures. It was the people's right to remonstrate, it was the right of the servitors to disobey a bad ruler, who did not deserve any better.

"When a servitor slays his ruler or an inferior assassinates his superior, surrenders his ruler's cities to the enemy, violates his obligation of loyal service, and fails to serve faithfully unto death, there is no other cause than that the ruler has brought it upon himself by misgovernment."

The intellectuals acted as if they were the elected representatives of the people. They had no institutional rights and power. They were free roaming knights fighting for what they considered right, and severe judges of the ruler and the authorities. They were public opinion. In the "Discourse on Salt and Iron" the Lord Grand Secretary complained bitterly about them: "For too long a time the din raised by this mob has been unbearable in the great metropolitan offices of the ministers."

The same literati attacked not only the policies but also the personal conduct of high officials. They charged the Lord High Minister with corruption.

"While the people are impoverished and in dire distress your own family has amassed a fortune estimated at tens of thousands pieces of gold."

Moved by a wrath like the prophets of the Old Testament, they cried out at the high officials of the court:

"Our present jacks-in-office, having obtained a thievish hold upon the laws of the state, push forward with never a glance back at their path of crime. Sooner or later, the crisis will come; then shall we see the rush of chariots and the flight of men, - all of no avail against inevitable death. The accumulated plunder will be found insufficient to redeem them from the lot of a slave; their wives and children will find no sheltering place in their flight; while they themselves, locked in deep dungeons, will never know a glance of compassion. In those moments will they find time for mirth?"