

*Ren as Pouvoir in Wu Lun: The Five Power-Relations*¹

Anton Heinrich L. Rennesland

University of Santo Tomas | alrennesland@ust.edu.ph

Abstract: *Kong Zi's* prescription of *Zheng Ming* entails *Wu Lun*. The Rectification of Names outlines the duties and corresponding responsibilities attached to *Ming* unto the *Yi* of the individual. The essence of this rectification is in the ideal; a dialectical-anthropological consideration of the conditions of the individuals presents conflicts to this inkling: What is seemingly whitewashed in the apparent utopic presentation of *Wu Lun* is an interplay of forces—of the individual's *Ren*—present in the respective relations. Through this, *Wu Lun* becomes power-relations through the understanding of the interplay between the greater and smaller figures. This paper seeks to redefine *Ren* as *power (pouvoir)* insofar as it—as constituted by *Yi*—is exemplified by each individual situated in *Wu Lun*. What this analysis provides is another way of considering relations by maintaining the essential balance. It is a dialectical engagement with the presented social order; by striking the balance in the on-going movement within the power-relations, that *Lun* is totally realized.

Keywords: *Wu Lun, Ren, power (pouvoir), power-relations*

Introduction

“When *Zi Lu* said, ‘The Prince of *Wei* is awaiting you to take his government. What will be your first measure?’ *Kong Zi* replied, ‘It would be *Zheng Ming*.’”² Here, *Kong Zi* idealizes this return to the proper order of relations. He does not directly answer with a particular form of government but, in general, “was all about social order.”³ This is guided by the principle: “A *Ming* or a social title defines one’s relationship with others as well as his duty towards them. Everyone in society requires responsibility by virtue of *Yi*.”⁴ *Zheng Ming* stems from *Yi*, which in turn finds its root in *Ren*. The basic idea is of humanity, the “consciousness-of-human-other,” while *Yi*, therefore, is having responsibility for one’s neighbours, “consciousness-of-one’s-moral-oughtness.”⁵ Through this, an exemplification of one’s moral imperative is found in living in society,

¹ This paper was written on September 29, 2017, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the course Chinese Philosophy, under the guidance of The Venerable Master, Professor Emeritus Alfredo P. Co, Ph.D. It seeks to answer the following question: In translating *Ren* as *pouvoir*, how are the Five Relations (*Wu Lun*) better understood on the anthropological level as power-relations?

² Kong Zi, *Lun Yu*, Bk. 12, Pt. 11, As quoted in Alfredo P. Co, *The Blooming of a Hundred Flowers: Philosophy of Ancient China*, vol. 1 of *Across the Philosophical Silk Road: A Festschrift in Honor of Alfredo P. Co* (Manila: UST Publishing House, 2009), 115.

³ Kai Vogelsang, “Beyond Confucius: A Socio-historical Reading of the ‘Lunyu,’” *Oriens Extremus*, Vol. 49 (Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010): 33.

⁴ Co, *The Blooming of a Hundred Flowers: Philosophy of Ancient China*, 115.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 112 and 115.

acting in proper accordance; *Ming* is attached, each categorized throughout *Wu Lun. Kong Zi*, therefore, ascribes to the notion one ought to be directed by one's name, by his *Ming* in relation to others.

The point of interest for this paper is directed against the seemingly assumed ideal carried by the *Wu Lun. Kong Zi* appears to speak in ideal terms, devoid of the individual's historicity. This paper brings this to a more anthropological level: the dialectical aspect of this Confucian thought enables the individual's dynamism; the characters are unique, and hence, to understand the five relations as a whole demands an understanding of the conditions of those individuals. However, this does not disprove *Wu Lun* but recognizes the dialectics within. *Wu Lun* is understood more concretely through the interplay of forces or by the notion of power-relations. *Wu Lun* is the manifestation of one's *Ren* through *Yi*. In this sense, this paper argues for translating *Ren* into *power (pouvoir)* as a characterization of each individual's capacity to enact being truly human.

Yi and Zheng Ming

"The Master answered, 'It would be, of course, to assure that *Ming*, (names), were being applied *Zheng* (correctly!)"⁶ The Rectification of Names stems from *Kong Zi*'s vision for social order. This is in junction with *Yi*: "*Yi* makes social structure and social control possible."⁷ The emphasis he places on *Ming* is that there is an equivalent and corresponding practical mode of being; thus, specific names, proper distinctions and associated actions are expected. *Kong Zi*'s *Zheng Ming* provides an internal movement within the individuals in the form of an introspection regarding their social statuses. What is blatant in this is the exterior adherence to one's primal character assigned: each is expected to act in light of his own *Ming*. What results is an ontological necessity: the *Yi* prescribes—and demands—action according to its intrinsic edict found in relation to the other, and according to one's situation, *Ming*. The ontological necessity is understood not as an ideal prescription but as a practical instruction for daily living.

"*Yi* is the very principle which should make a person's conduct morally acceptable to others and which should justify the morality of human action."⁸ *Yi* is thus the basis of one's judgements in relations. "At its most fundamental level, *Yi* is the importation of moral significance to personal action in the world [from where *Yi*] as 'meaning' or 'significance' arises."⁹ In being able to signify oneself, one, therefore, expresses its distinct features and characteristics through one's being (be it in the metaphysical understanding or as a nominal basis or title). "*Yi* means appropriateness to one's own person. [...] Thus, it is said that to realize *Yi* in one's actions is called attaining it in oneself; to neglect *Yi* [is] called self-negligence."¹⁰ It is in this exact way that self-realization occurs, that is, by acting in accordance with one's *Ming*, one discovers more of oneself:

The normative force of *Yi* exists in spite of its inchoate character at the beginning of *Yi* acts. The articulation of *Yi* with respect to a given situation involves the emerging awareness of what is or is

⁶ Kong Zi, "Analects," Edward Gilman Slingerland, tr., *Readings in Classical Chinese Philosophy*, Philip J. Ivanhoe and Bryan W. Van Norden, Eds. (Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2001), 13.3, 34.

⁷ Co, *The Blooming of a Hundred Flowers: Philosophy of Ancient China*, 115.

⁸ Chung-ying Cheng, "On *Yi* as a Universal Principle of Specific Application in Confucian Morality," *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (University of Hawai'i Press, July 1972): 269.

⁹ David L. Hall and Roger T. Ames, "Getting It Right: On Saving Confucius from the Confucians," *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (University of Hawai'i Press, January 1984): 8.

¹⁰ *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu*, 8/8b, as quoted in David L. Hall and Roger T. Ames, *Thinking Through Confucius* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1987), 92.

not appropriate in that situation and how one might act so as to realize this appropriateness in its highest degree. [...] Neither determined nor determining, *Yi* is actualized in the interplay between decision and circumstance; in this manner it achieves its appropriateness.¹¹

The development of the normative force behind the *Yi* is evident even from the beginning. “*Yi* has normative force without itself constituting a ‘norm.’”¹² It is an interplay between the individual and their surroundings. It is an imperative without actual content. This prescription, therefore, entails a certain historical ground for the individual to fill in; it is through one’s social context of *Ming* that *Yi* gains its imperative. Consequently, it becomes a practical imperative, eliciting a moral response.

“Confucius emphasized human-heartedness and righteousness[,] Righteousness (*Yi*) means the ‘oughtness’ of a situation.”¹³ The intrinsic self-determination of the individual is his *Yi*, the capacity for action in accordance with a certain principle: righteousness. “[T]hings in actual fact should be made to accord with the implication attached to them by names.”¹⁴ The necessity that *Yi* is efficacious is seen in concrete terms through *Ming*, how one aligns with society. With this, another aspect of *Yi* is understood: it is not a static idea but contains “a reflective morality[.]”¹⁵ Hence, in declaring the necessity of actions because of *Ming*, recognizes the reflective morality it presupposes—the ability to self-critique in the dialectic situation the character is in.

“If names be not correct, language is not in accordance with the truth of things. If language be not in accordance with the truth of things, affairs cannot be carried on to success.”¹⁶ *Kong Zi*’s emphasis on *Ming* reveals a deeper concern for certain aspects of practical living. This truth of reality is actuality; contra any arbitrariness does the man of virtue speak. “*Ming* is often translated as Fate, Destiny, or Decree. To Confucius, it meant the Decree [or] Will of Heaven; [it] was conceived of as a purposeful force; [eventually] the total existent conditions and forces of the whole universe.”¹⁷ The drive behind practical imperative is the destined order of being—and the conditions and eventual position arising in one’s situation are manifestations of this order. “*Yi* is a unique personal contribution which serves to define a ‘human becoming’ in the world. [Despite his independence,] his environment is in some sense contributing to and determining his emergence as a person.”¹⁸ It is thus a continual dialectic between the individual and the universe, the self and the other.¹⁹ What is left for the individual

¹¹ Hall and Ames, *Thinking Through Confucius*, 102.

¹² Hall and Ames, “Getting It Right: On Saving Confucius from the Confucians,” *Philosophy East and West* 34, no. 1 (January 1984): 15.

¹³ Fung Yu-Lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, Derk Bodde, ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1948), 42.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 41.

¹⁵ Thomé H. Fang, *Chinese Philosophy: Its Spirit and Its Development* (Taipei: Linking Publishing Co. Ltd, 1981), 101

¹⁶ Kong Zi, *Analects of Confucius*, James Legge, tr., from the original *Lun Yu*, 13.3; available from <http://china.usc.edu/confucius-analects-13>; Internet; accessed 24 September 2017.

¹⁷ Yu-Lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, 45.

¹⁸ Hall and Ames, “Getting It Right,” 9.

¹⁹ Hall and Ames demarcate the difference between two characters that both translate as *Yi*. “At a very basic level, these two characters are congruent in their meaning of ‘appropriateness, rightness, propriety.’ They diverge, however, in that whereas *yi(a)* denotes appropriateness to one’s own person, *yi(z)* refers to appropriateness to one’s context. [Tung Chung-shu] defines *yi(a)* explicitly as ‘appropriateness to one’s own person’ (*yi tsai wo che*). It is the active and contributory integrating of self with circumstances, where self originates unique moral activity and construes itself on its own terms in a novel and creative way. It is the articulation and contribution of the moral self to the organism. [...] *yi(a)* is on personal self (that is, *person-in-context*), the focus of *yi(z)* is on the environment (that is, *person-in-context*); where *yi(a)* is fundamentally self-assertive and meaning-bestowing, *yi(z)* is self-sacrificing and meaning-deriving.” *Ibid.*, 9. The difference

to do is to exemplify the order of *Ming* in a particular fashion—*Zheng*. To live out one’s *Ming*, thus, enables the continuity or cycle of being that balances existence.

Ming and Wu Lun

The move toward a rectification brings about the centrality of the Five Relations. Let it be clear, however, that “Confucius never spoke of ‘five relations’ [as] far as we can tell from the *Analects*. The first mention of the ‘five relations’ occurs in the *Mencius*.”²⁰ However, it is in *Kong Zi* that these relations find root. Retuning to the idea, in living out this particular rectification, an individual becomes aware of his *Yi* and finds himself in the respective relations: “[M]an has the ability to cultivate *Ren* (Benevolence) that could empower him to live a life of *Yi* (Rectitude-Duty) with a right sense of *Li* (Propriety), and with a cultivated *Zhi* (Wisdom)[.]”²¹ The interconnectedness of the virtues points to a holistic development rooted in his human-ness (*Ren*). *Yi*’s translation as rectitude-duty stresses the consequence of interdependence, of how one is constantly in a relation to others:

“By properly calibrating the human sense of *Yi*, a father will be benevolent to his family, a son will be filial to his father, a husband will be providing for his wife, a wife will be submissive to her husband, a senior brother will be kind to his younger brother, a junior brother will be deferential to his senior brother, a sovereign will be benevolent to his subjects and the subjects will be loyal to his sovereign.”²²

The Five Relations exhibit particular associations within a society, the arrangement between two individuals, generally one superior and the other inferior. It is through *Zheng Ming* that an individual realizes his position in these relations—whether as a father, son, brother, friend, or a stranger. It is a practical consciousness of one’s situated-ness in present society.

Power and the right to rule belong to superiors over subordinates[.] Each person has to give obedience and respect to “superiors” [.] The “superior,” however, owes loving responsibility to the inferior.²³

It is also because of this consciousness that one realizes one’s power and responsibilities. In a more classical understanding of the relationships, power is regarded as belonging to the superior and as a proper manifestation of his *Yi*. The superior character, in dominating the relation, carries within himself a particular responsibility in caring for the inferior. It is a continual association between the two characters, each embodying a necessary practicality in their existence.

Ren and Power-Relations

“*Ren* is a plurisignificative character [etymologically] referring to two people in a harmonious relationship.”²⁴ The compound character prefigures a kind of equality shared by between individuals,

highlights the unitary principle that make *Yi* a profound character: the diversion between both the static and the dynamic. It encompasses appropriateness in the sense of the individual and his locality.

²⁰ Hsü Dau-Lin, “The Myth of the ‘Five Human Relations’ of Confucius,” *Monumenta Serica*, Vol. 29 (Taylor & Francis, Ltd., 1970-1971), 28.

²¹ Alfredo P. Co, “At the Agora, in the Wilderness, Across the Warring States: Landscapes and Travel Across the Ancient Philosophical Discourses,” in *Across the Philosophical World: Essays in Comparative Philosophy* (Manila: UST Publishing House, 2009), 12.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Global Education, “Confucianism: The Birth of a New Type of Binary Trading?”; available from <http://www.globaled.org/chinaproject/confucian/reading1.html>, accessed 25 September 2017.

²⁴ Richard G. Ang, O.P., *The Concept of Ren*, Dissertation presented to the Ecclesiastical Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Santo Tomas (Manila: UST Publishing House, 2011), Abstract.

the mark of humanity that “transcends race, creed, [and] time.”²⁵ As a “consciousness-of-human-other,”²⁶ what *Ren* brings to light is an awareness of both one’s own and of another’s existence, of the human-other. It is not simply a consciousness of a distinct being, but a recognition of one’s humanity in the (humanity of the) other. The manner of illustrating *Ren* “consists in consideration for others[,]”²⁷ not limited to merely an awareness of the other, but also involves taking them into practical consideration both prior to and during action.

The Master said, “Zengzi! All that I teach is unified by one guiding principle.” [...] Zengzi said, “All of what the Master teaches amounts to nothing more than *zhong*, ‘loyalty,’ tempered by *shu*, ‘sympathetic understanding.’”²⁸

“Teach,” in this respect, is translated as *Dao*, meaning both “to teach” and “the Way.” The *Dao* that *Kong Zi* prescribes could be understood as bounded together by a single thread; hence, it is through *Zhong* and *Shu* that the *Dao* of *Kong Zi* is understood. “*Zhong* therefore is the positive aspect of practice of *Ren*. [...] *Shu* on the other hand signifies a cautious and prohibitive advice.”²⁹ What the Master teaches is the way he guides his pupils. These instructions are not abstract ideals, but “practical insights of a cultivated person, permeated with a sense of purpose and a passionate concern for the welfare of his fellow human beings.”³⁰ What *Kong Zi* points to is practical living of and in civil society. It is *the way* of life—in accordance with one’s reality, a multifarious amalgamation of individuals, concepts and ideas, and power-relations.

Furthermore, in understanding *Ren*, *Kong Zi* did not offer a clear definition to it. One that brings it to greater clarity, however, is that it is “the process whereby [the] quality of humanity is realized.”³¹ Thus, to set oneself in the path of the *Dao*, then, means to realize one’s potentialities: to probe the depths of being; a task of consistently evaluating quality rather than quantity;³² a lifetime process of sublation, integration, realization, and most importantly, of exercising one’s *Ren*.

Ren, as this essay argues, is translatable as *power (pouvoir)*— not as something exploitive or authoritarian, but as something expressed productively in social relations, even in the most miniscule interactions.³³ *Ren* is the exemplification of what it means to be truly human, stressing the presence of moral principles and expecting action accordingly. *Yi* is associated to this: “[T]he practice of *Chung* and *Shu* means the practice of *Ren* [and leads to] the carrying out of one’s responsibilities and duties in society, in which is comprised the quality of *Yi* or righteousness.”³⁴ To be conscious of the other is to act through *Zhong* and *Shu*, which effectuates change in the social sphere—one acts according to one’s role in society, fulfilling responsibilities and duties as a manifestation of power.

²⁵ Magdalena Alonso-Villaba, *Philosophy of the East* (Manila: UST Publishing House, 1996), 133.

²⁶ Co, *The Blooming of a Hundred Flowers*, 112.

²⁷ Yu-Lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, 43.

²⁸ Kong Zi, “Analects,” *Readings in Classical Chinese Philosophy*, 4.15, p. 11.

²⁹ Co, *The Blooming of a Hundred Flowers*, 108.

³⁰ Ang, O.P., *The Concept of Ren*, 7.

³¹ Nylan and Wilsom, *Lives of Confucius: Civilization’s Greatest Sage Through the Ages*, 114.

Through this, it can be viewed in several ways: “1. as a particular virtue, 2. As a general virtue, 3. As an innate moral principle, 4. As an ethical ideal, and 5. As a practice.” (Ang, O.P., *The Concept of Ren*, 24.)

³² Cf. Alonso-Villaba, *Philosophy of the East*, 136.

³³ Cf. Clare O’Farrell, “Key Concepts,” (2007) Available from <http://www.michel-foucault.com/concepts/>; Internet; accessed 24 September 2017.

³⁴ Yu-Lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, 44.

The event ontology that is presupposed in our analysis requires that we not consider *Yi* as a static "virtue," but as dispositional. *Yi* involves persons disposing themselves in this or that manner within particular contexts.³⁵

This marks a shift from a strictly traditional understanding of power framed in one-sided perspective to a more anthropological dimension that this paper evokes. The necessity that arises from *Yi*, rooted in one's *Ren*, reveals *Yi* as a dynamic, situational virtue. It enables the individual to act according to certain principles—in relation to another, particularly to the direct relation he is in, such as father to son, husband to wife, and ruler to subject.

*“Mais ce n’est pas tout: car ce n’est pas seulement l’homme qui a peur du Pouvoir, le sujet qui a peur du maître, c’est encore le maître qui a peur de l’esclave, le Pouvoir qui a peur des sujets auxquels il commande.”*³⁶ What, then, is power? Power evokes fear, but it is not one-sided. Fear is multifarious in meaning: fear in relation to a threat and fear as a venerated form of respect. The former is fear of the unknown, while the latter is in constant dialogue with the known. Power, therefore, evokes a certain understanding and knowing of the other that conjures fear, e.g., the subject fearing the master, the son to the father, and the wife to the husband—and also of having the intimate relationship with that other, e.g., the wife to the husband, the brothers, and the friends. It is also a stirring of the consciousness of the superior character toward the capabilities of the inferior: that the master and the father (and the husband) are fully aware of what the exercise of independence by the inferior may result to.

Ren is that principle of efficacious change. “[W]hile the human subject is placed in relations of production and of signification, he is equally placed in power relations that are very complex.”³⁷ The multiple aspects at play in these relations refer to the various spheres or relations the character finds himself in (as, at the same time, the individual may be both father and son, ruler and subject, friend, brother, spouse). These give rise to complexities in the relation that, at moments, might even demand a compromise of one over the other. “We need a historical awareness of our present circumstance.” This highlights the importance of understanding the multiple presences of a single character, as seen from different angles within the power-relations. The argument of this paper is thus that the individual is aware of his capacity in light of his relation; this, though, is also in conjunction with the other various relations he is in, and with the manifestation of his *Ren*—his power. “The reference to the root of practicing *Ren* [...] lies at the heart of the Analects.”³⁸ *Kong Zi*'s central idea is that of *Wei Ren*—practicing *Ren*. The embodiment of one's *Ren* takes the form of his *Yi*, of how he conducts himself according to his *Ming*. The adjective of *Zheng* stresses how he must conduct in the relations—how his entitled position in the relation is not solely one of dominance, but one that carries an expected responsibility akin to duties.

³⁵ Hall and Ames, *Thinking Through Confucius*, 105.

³⁶ Alexandre Koyré, “Pouvoir,” *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l’Étranger*, Vol. 136, No. 4/6 (Presses Universitaires de France, Avril-Juin 1946): 232.

³⁷ Michel Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” *The Essential Foucault: Selections from the Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, eds. (New York: The New Press, 2003), 127

³⁸ Kim-Chong Chong, “The Practice of Jen,” *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 49, No. 3, Human "Nature" in Chinese Philosophy: A Panel of the 1995 Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies (University of Hawai'i Press, July 1999): 300.

“*Le pouvoir assujettit en déterminant des conduites.*”³⁹ The emphasis on *Ren* as *pouvoir* lies in the idea that power creates individuals. Through the weight by which *Ren* determines the individuals, as he comes to know himself through the relations and others, dynamic forces are at play through this exemplification of power. “Power exists only as exercised by some on others, only when it is put into action[.]”⁴⁰ Thus, a full understanding of one’s *Ren* exists only insofar as the relation remains dynamic; when the relation ceases, the power dissipates. However, the question of whether it can truly cease and disappear is rhetorical for the individual is continually embedded in such relations. “Neither the newly emerging public roles nor the time-honored familial roles could claim self-evident validity, everything had to be re considered and re-defined.”⁴¹ The individual is inextricably part of these relations, but an anthropological re-understanding of *Wu Lun* reveals the internal movement of power within. The traditional roles and values upheld by this principle find renewed meaning in acknowledging the power of each individual. It is precisely in seeing the continual shifts in power-relations that *Wu Lun* is acknowledged.

Conclusion

“*L’homme – à moins de voir des catastrophes révolutionnaires et guerrières se renouveler toujours plus profondes et toujours plus violentes – devra apprendre à se gouverner lui-même.*”⁴² In response to the prince’s inquiry about the art of governance, the insight is simple: man must learn to govern himself. The social order, as exhibited by the power-relations, in fact, establishes the individual in junction with the other. “The Master said, ‘By nature people are similar; they diverge as the result’ of practice.”⁴³ The idea of man’s fundamental equality is *Ren*; the difference is the manifest through the relations he is in. Each person possesses *pouvoir*, the capacity for the divergences of principles. The *Wu Lun* prescribed does not sufficiently probe into the depths of *Ren* and the individuals’ capacities. This attempt has sought to approximate the individual’s exemplification of *Ren*, that is, to unearth his essential power: how he exists in relation to others. The superior-inferior dichotomy is an understanding of what the individual is—by means of his *Ming*—but this does not limit his capacity. The idea of power-relations as the anthropological understanding of *Wu Lun* asserts that the dimensions of the individual’s experience

³⁹ Jacques Rollet, “Michel Foucault et la Question du Pouvoir,” *Archives de Philosophie*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Centre Sèvres – Facultés jésuites de Paris, Octobre-Décembre 1988): 1.

⁴⁰ Foucault, *The Subject and Power*, 137.

⁴¹ Vogelsang, “Beyond Confucius: A Socio-historical Reading of the ‘Lunyu,’” *Oriens Extremus*, 41. I also include what Vogelsang notes in this: “[André Kieserling in *Kommunikation unter Anwesenden: Studien über Interaktionssysteme (english translation)* (Frankfurt : Suhrkamp, 1999),] 454, points out ‘the oft-repeated anthropological observation that under these circumstances [i.e., in segmentary societies] there is no or hardly any privacy.’ It seems that a real private sphere appeared only as a counterpart of an emerging of a public sphere: this means that both spheres were new and had to be organized.” The dichotomy that Kieserling identifies in regard to the private spaces of individuals is not inessential in undertaking the implications of translation *Ren* as *power*. Vogelsang strengthens the idea of the movement between standards and that of a holistic perspective, noting that both spheres indeed have to be organized. They exist in continual dialectics—the novelty of both arises from the distinction laid out by the (power) relations encapsulated by the *Wu Lun*. Though not longer encompassed within this essay, I wish to further extend my redefinition of *Ren* toward its emancipatory impulse. *Kong Zi* may not have been fully aware, but there are traces of a better order (as seen in the direction of his answer towards a social order rather than a form of government.) “An elite society in which all men are brothers: this thought would have been unthinkable.” (Vogelsang, 44) This utopic vision of everyone acting accordingly is, therefore, a truly remarkable idea that—as is often the case with many utopic postulations—lacks anthropological dimensions, ergo lacking a possible applicability (sans totalitarian regimes).

⁴² Koyré, “Pouvoir,” *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l’Étranger*, 239.

⁴³ Confucius, “Analects,” *Readings in Classical Chinese Philosophy*, 17.1, p. 48.

are vital to his holistic development and realization. The imperative of conduct (*Yi*) is the primal source of the divergence from idea to subject: the anthropological effect is that the relations are not purely one-sided; power is not solely of the superior character. In seeing the close connection between the key terms have with one another, one is able to identify the flow and subjectification of *Ren*,⁴⁴ the power of the individual as externalized through the *Wu Lun* as power-relations.

⁴⁴ The subjectification of the *Ren* (power) centers on the importance of the historicity and the anthropological dimension of the individual. He is not merely a white-washed idea or a reproduced copy of another, but a dynamic individual constituting his own historicity and unique marks. The movement, therefore, is a personal, interior movement that recognizes the individual's capacity and power, particularly as expressed in his relations.

Bibliography

- Alonso-Villaba, Magdalena. *Philosophy of the East*. Manila: UST Publishing House, 1996.
- Ang, Richard G. *The Concept of Ren*. Presented to the Ecclesiastical Faculty of Philosophy, University of Santo Tomas. Manila: UST Publishing House, 2011.
- Cheng, Chung-ying. "On Yi as a Universal Principle of Specific Application in Confucian Morality." *Philosophy East and West* 22, no. 3. (July 1972): 269-280.
- Chong, Kim-Chong. "The Practice of Jen." *Philosophy East and West* 49, no. 3, (July 1999): 298-316.
- Co, Alfredo P. *The Blooming of a Hundred Flowers: Philosophy of Ancient China*. Vol. 1 of *Across the Philosophical Silk Road: A Festschrift in Honor of Alfredo P. Co*. Manila: UST Publishing House, 2009.
- . "At the Agora, in the Wilderness, Across the Warring States: Landscapes and Travel Across the Ancient Philosophical Discourses." In *Across the Philosophical World: Essays in Comparative Philosophy*. Manila: UST Publishing House, 2009.
- Fang, Thomé H. *Chinese Philosophy: Its Spirit and Its Development*. Taipei: Linking Publishing Co. Ltd, 1981.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power." *The Essential Foucault: Selections from the Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. Edited by Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose. New York: The New Press, 2003.
- Global Education. "Confucianism: The Birth of a New Type of Binary Trading?" Available from <http://www.globaled.org/chinaproject/confucian/reading1.html>. Accessed 25 September 2017.
- Hall, David L. and Roger T. Ames. *Thinking Through Confucius*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1987.
- . "Getting It Right: On Saving Confucius from the Confucians." *Philosophy East and West* 34, no. 1 (January 1984): 3-23.
- Hsü, Dau-Lin. "The Myth of the 'Five Human Relations' of Confucius." *Monumenta Serica* 29 (1970-1971): 27-37.
- Kieserling, André. *Kommunikation unter Anwesenden: Studien über Interaktionssysteme*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1999.
- Kong Zi. "Analects." Translated by Edward Gilman Slingerland from the original Lun Yu. Readings in Classical Chinese Philosophy. Edited by Ivanhoe, Philip J. and Bryan W. Van Norden. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2001.
- Kong Zi. *Analects of Confucius*. Translated by James Legge from the original Lun Yu. Available from <http://china.usc.edu/confucius-analects>. Accessed 24 September 2017.
- Koyré, Alexandre. "Pouvoir." *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger* 136, no. 4/6. (Avril-Juin 1946): 230-239.
- Nylan, Michael and Thomas Wilsom. *Lives of Confucius: Civilization's Greatest Sage Through the Ages*. New York: Double day, 2010.

- O'Farrell, Clare. "Key Concepts." 2007. Available from <https://michel-foucault.com/key-concepts/>. Accessed 24 September 2017.
- Rollet, Jacques. "Michel Foucault et la Question du Pouvoir." *Archives de Philosophie* 51, no. 4. (Octobre-Décembre 1988): 647-663.
- Vogelsang, Kai. "Beyond Confucius: A Socio-historical Reading of the 'Lunyu'." *Oriens Extremus* 49 (2010): 29-61. Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Yu-Lan, Fung. *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*. Edited by Derk Bodde. New York: The Free Press, 1948.