# Comparative Analysis of <u>Fastern and Western</u> Tyranny in <u>Fast and Wes:</u> Focusing on With Special Focus on Aristotle and Mencius

Kang Jung In and Eom Kwanyong

#### Abstract

The purpose of this essay is to show that there has been a strong tradition in Confucian political thought which criticizes and resists tyranny and even-justifies revolta revolution against it, contrary to the perennial Western assumption that tyranny is fit suitable for for Asia. In order to do this, first of all, wwe will first examine the Aristotelian —nonotion of tyranny in order to find out how Aristotle coupled tyranny and Asia were coupled—in his nascent form of political Orientalism. After such examination, we will then we-compare Aristotle's analysis of tyranny with the political thought of Mencius (fit f 372-289 B.C.) to prove that there has also been a great long tradition in East Asia to checkchecking and controlcontrolling tyranny. In conclusion, the order to undertake such comparison, first, we examine Aristotle's analysis of tyranny in more detail. Then, we analyze Confucian analysis of tyranny focusing mainly upon Mencius's works, while comparing it with Aristotle's. This comparison will show that the Westcentric concept of Oriental despotism, which which appeared in itsa pristine form in Aristotle and has been inherited and further strengthened reinforced by modern and contemporary Western thinkers since Montesquieu, might not apply to the Confucian tradition of East Asia.

Keywords: Confucianism, Orientalism, Hellenocentrism, Oriental despotism, Westcentrism (Eurocentrism), Aristotle, Mencius, democracy, tyranny.

Kang Jung In\_(Kang, Jeong-in) is\_a Professor of Political Science at Sogang University. \_He received his Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley in 1987 with a dissertation entitled "Political Participation: Its Meaning, Concept and Forms." He has authored many books including *Minjujuui-ui ihae* (Understanding of Democracy) (1997) and *Segyehwa, jeongbohwa, geurigo minjujuui* (Democracy in the Age of Globalization and Information) (1998). E-mail: jkang@sogang.ac.kr

Eom Kwanyong\_(악권용; 로마나이즈하기?Eom, Gwan-yong) is a Ph.D. Student in the Department of Political Science at Sogang University. He has authored some articles (written in Korean) including "—An Analysis of Sans-Culottism in the French Revolution" (2000), "A Comparative Analysis of Tyranny in Eastern and Western Political Thought of Ancient Times" "(M.A. thesis, 2002), "A Comparative Analysis of Unification Proposals between South and North Korea" (2003) (in Korean). E-mail: ekypd@hanmail.net.

```
만약 업관용의 논문을 한글로 영문표기 하시겠다면, (참고자료)

2000. " 프랑스혁명기 상퀼로트주의," ?서강논집? 14집(우수논문상수상).

2002. " 동서양고대정치사상에서 나타난 폭군정에 대한 비교연구," 서강대학교정치

의교학과 석사학위논문.

2003. " 남북한 통일방안의 비교: 유사점과 차이점," 민주평화통일자문회의, 2003
```

```
년도 서울지역대학생 통일문제토론회 발표논문(2003년 5월 6일).
```

```
편집관련 주문사항
```

```
1) 나중에 교정본 원고를 확인용으로 제계 보내주십시오.
2) 주를 다는 방식이 일관되지 않습니다. 주 번호 다음에 < ) >가 처음에 없다가나중에 있는데, 잘 몰라서 일단 손대지 않았습니다. 편집과정에서 적절하일관되게 조정해 주시길 바랍니다.
3) 인용문 다음에 indentation 하지 않은 경우가 있는데, 이는 동일단락이계속된다는 것을 표시하기 위한 것입니다. 그런데 편집과정에서 자주 깨어져인용문 다음에 새로운 단락처럼 처리되는 경향이 있는 것 같습니다. 이 점을유의해 주십시요. 이 부분에 관해, 저희가 혹시 놓친 부분이 있다면 검토과정에서 알려주시기 바랍니다.
```

### Introduction

Westcentrism, which has been developed in close association with Hegelian historicism since the Enlightenment, underlies liberalism and Marxism, which thecreated by modern European civilization created as universal political ideologies. It has also served as thea core assumption of modernization theory since World War II, and as well as that of the civilizing mission of European colonialism and imperialism in the nineteenth century. In the process of of the its evolution of Westcentrism, modern Western thinkers actively took advantage of the intellectual heritage of the ancient Greek civilization, which they set called upon as their ancestor, so that the Greek philosophers could make an unwittingly influence upon the shaping of modern Westcentrism. For example, while in examining his examination of tyranny in his Politics, which would later become the classics of Western political science, Aristotle described tyranny as originating from and therefore best fit suitable for Asia. Later Enlightenment thinkers in Europe thus took embarked on the mission to re-appropriate Aristotelian Hellenocentric coupling of Asia and tyranny and to elaborate it in the Westcentric concept of ""Oriental despotism" which was fully formulated by Montesquieu. -

Thus, the Aristotelian conception of tyranny based on Hellenocentric version of civilization-barbarism had beenwas inherited and expanded in Montesquieu's notion of Oriental despotism. Montesquieu stated that, since the peoples of Asia and Africa possessed a servile spirit and lacked the spirit of liberty throughout all periods of their entire history, despotism—a form of government in which "a single man, unrestrained by law and other rules, dominate[d] by his will and caprices"—reigned supreme outside Europe (Richter 1977, 196, 214).2 And John

<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>2</sup> 

Stuart Mill, who had completed the development of modern liberalism, asserted that Asians had never undertaken any form of systematic resistance against ruling power, so that Asian civilizations had repeated a cycle of stagnation and decay (recit. from Yi Seung-hwan 1998, 82).

Such Western bias against Asian civilizations in the modern era of imperialism and colonialism seems to find its contemporary reverberation, for example, in the argument of Samuel P. Huntington, a Harvard political scientist, with regard to the prospects of democracy in East Asia. He notes, that Confucian democracy is a contradiction in terms, because Confucian tradition is hostile to democracy. Thus Huntington asserts in his survey of recent democratization in non-Western societies that Confucianism is a more critical barrier to democracy more critical than Islam, while Christianity encourages the development of democracy (Huntington 1991). In this context, we might interpret that Montesquieu's assertion that tyranny had reigned supreme in Asia is in parallelcorrelates with the with Aristotelian thought understanding that Asia showed presents an archetypicalarchetypal example of tyranny. Also, , and that Mill's statement-assertion that the Asian history of lacks systematic resistance was absent in Asia is a modern version of the Aristotelian position approach claiming thatthat the peoples of Asia are servile and therefore took-take ftyrannical rule for granted tyrannical rule, as they were servile. Furthermore, Huntington's characterization of Confucianism as hostile to democracy and democracy in East Asia as "dominant party-democracy" suggests, too, that authoritarianism, a contemporary substitute for tyranny, is normal acceptable and natural in East Asia, while democracy therein is unstable and deviant.3 Overall Considering the line of thought from Aristotle to Huntington, we can see that, this shows that Westcentrism has its deephas been deeply rooted in the Western intellectual tradition for overmore than two thousand years, although itand did emerged later in a full-blown form to legitimate Western imperialism and colonialism in the modern era.

The purpose of this essay is to refute the perennial assumption held by Western thinkers and scholars such as Aristotle, Montesquieu, J. S. Mill and Samuel P. Huntington. The essay, thus, willto show that there has been a strong tradition in Confucian political thought which thought that criticizes and resists tyranny and even justifies-a revoltingution against it, contrary to the common and perennial assumption held by Western thinkers and scholars such as Aristotle, Montesquieu, J.S. Mill and Samuel P. Huntington. In order to do this, We will first of all, we shall examine the Aristotelian notion Aristotelian notion of tyranny in order to find out how tyranny and Asia were combined in his-Aristotle's nascent form of political Orientalism. After such examination Next, then we shall compare Aristotle's analysis of tyranny with the political thought of Mencius ( = 372 = 389 B.C.) who was a great Confucian thinker in the pre-Chin period of China, in order to prove that there has also been a great tradition in East Asia to check and control tyranny.4 In order to undertake such comparison, first, we shall examine Aristotle's analysis of tyranny in more detail. Then we shall analyze Confucian theory of tyranny focusing mainly upon Mencius's works, while comparing it with Aristotle's. This comparison will show that the Westcentric concept of Oriental despotism, which appeared in a pristine form in Aristotle and has been inherited and further

3

expanded by modern and contemporary Western thinkers since Montesquieu, might not apply to the Confucian tradition of East Asia. We will show that, in fact, resistance against oppression and tyranny of which the resistance against oppression and tyranny and its legitimation has been anis an active component in Confucian tradition.

This <u>concluding</u>insight might be <u>found to be more</u> useful in forming a united intellectual front of East and West <u>for in the struggles against to resist</u> contemporary tyrann<u>y in the world lies plaguing the world Today</u>, than such Orientalist thought still stubbornly haunt<u>sing</u> the world, that (as?) dividinges the world into the a dichotomy of civilization and barbarism, and assert<u>ings</u> that authoritarianism, a modern substitute for tyranny, is natural and normal to in the <u>ERaest</u>, while democracy is natural and normal to in the West, assertion that might somehow connive the cause of contemporary tyrannies in many parts of the world. Also, by comparing Aristotle's theory who theorized on the politics of city-states with Mencius, who lived in the Spring and Autumn Period of pre-Chin China, this discussion proves we may conduct a preliminary kind of dialogue among civilizations.

### Hellenocentric Orientalism in Aristotle's Concept of Tyranny

Aristotle\_(384-322 B.C.) wrote *The Politics* by collecting materials from the Greek polis and neighboring states, and by empirically analyzing and comparing their political systems in empirical vein. Although it—*The Politics* is still considered has been respected until today as—one of the greatest books in politics, the book reflects Aristotle exhibited and pristine form of Orientalism. This refers to Aristotle's in the book due to his Hellenocentric world—view (then—and acceptable view, at the timecurrent) that the Greek citizens, living who lived—freely in a self-governing polis, and—had—developed reason to the fullest degree (had—and) reached the highest stage of human beingsdevelopment. Although his research method was objective and empirical, thus, Aristotle committed the erredor of in defining the differences between the Greeks and the neighboring tribes as natural and essential, thereby—and presenting conceiving—the latter—"other" as barbarian, due to his Hellenocentric world view. Aristotle's *Politics* sets the Greeks against the Persians through Hellenocentric eThe Greek Eexceptionalism and Orientalism.

<u>eContemporary</u> Westcentrism <u>has thereafter inherited and expanded</u> such Such-Hellenocentric attitude, adopting <u>sm, claimed</u> has been inherited by and even expanded in the contemporary Western tradition which sets the ancient Greek civilization as its intellectual origin, <u>and thus (identified itself</u> ->identifying Hellenocentrism) <u>with soas</u> ( that it may be identified as the -> its) archetype (of Westcentrism -> delete).

Now we need to Next we shall examine how tyranny and Asia were coupled in Aristotle's political thought. In the beginning of *The Politics*, As is well known, Aristotle distinguishes the rule of a statesman from those of a monarch and a house manager\_(a patriarch) in the beginning of *The Politics*. The rule of a statesman as the a\_horizontal ruler over -free and equal citizens is basically democratic in the sense that he—the ruler exercises "his authority in conformity with the rules imposed by the art of statesmanship and as one who rules and is ruled in turn" (Aristotle 1969, -1-2). In contrast, the rule of a monarch and a patriarch as the

vertical one over unfree and unequal humans are basically despotic in the sense they wield an "uncontrolled and sole authority" (Aristotle 1969, 1).

Aristotle also distinguishes between the Greeks and the barbarians, and here the latter includinges both Europeans and Asians\_(Persians). That is to say, the ancient Greeks retained their own identity felt themselves distinct from Europeans and Asians. (While the >The) Greek stock belonged to the natural master and ruling element, as it had the capacity, "by virtue of its intelligence, to exercise forethought" (Aristotle 1969, 3). By contrast, the barbarian stock (was is->was) in the a state of slavery by nature, as itbecause it (lacks->lacked)ed a natural the ruling element by nature and (has >had)d "the element which (is > [was] able, by virtue of its bodily power, to do the physical work" (Aristotle 1969, 3). Thus, the barbarians and the slaves were are the same by nature. Thus, Aristotle quotes the following phrase from a poem: " ... barbarous peoples should be governed by the Greeks" (Aristotle 1969, 3). Hence, it It was natural for the ancient Greeks to think that it was the Greeksthey were equipped with the rational faculty and freedom that allowed them to could participate in the political life of the polis, which the Greeks assumed as thetheir supreme political association. And the The polis, as the civilized political community, was supposed to pursue the common interest of free citizens.

(In this regard, we need to be reminded that T the > Thus, the) famous Aristotelian proposition that "-man is a political animal" - or, more accurately, that " man is by nature an animal intended to live in a polis" as a more accurate translation (Aristotle 1969, 5) - (is should be understood as) a direct expression of expresses properly the Greek Eexceptionalism. For the This proposition was intended to apply not to all (humans people >peoples?)\_ but to the Greeks only.6 Thus, \_Tthe common interpretation by (some -> most) non-Western scholars as well as Westerners scholars that the Aristotelian proposition, "man is a political animal," should appliesy to all humans peoples? commits the fallacy of is an anachronistic misinterpretation, contrary to Aristotle's, and thereby the contemporary Greek assumption. For Aristotle, then, the human nature is not something common and instinctual to all human beings, as we may often associate it with human instincts, but something revealed in the ultimate end, as a goal to be attained. - which things and humans grow to reach. So In fact, only the Greeks, who have reached the stage of living in the polis, are indeed political animals by nature, and the barbarians including Persians who are "without a polis, by reason of [their] own nature and not of some accident<u>"</u> constitute <u>"</u>a poor sort of being<u>"</u>(Aristotle 1969, 5). Therefore According to Aristotle's, the pristine form of Orientalism, is formulated that the life of the slavesslavery is fit for barbarians when they live in Greece, and the tyrannical rule for their political association is suitable for barbarians when they live outside, as because they lack the reason, and the ruling element of the free men.

Thus, iIt seems mandatory to examine in more detail the Aristotelian notion of tyranny which is that is fit for barbarians. For Aristotle, the a city-state composed occupied of by free citizens is conceived as the ideal political association by in which people can pursueing their common interest. In contrast, "[t]hose constitutions which consider only the personal interest of the rulers are all wrong constitutions, or perversions of the right forms" (Aristotle 1969, 112). Furthermore, " [w]e may say that when the One, or the Few, or the Many, rule with a view to the common interest, the constitutions under which they do so must necessarily be right

constitutions. On the other hand the constitutions directed to the personal interest of the One, or the Few, or the Masses, must necessarily be perversions" (Aristotle 1969, 114). Thus, Aristotle presents kingship, aristocracy and the polity as <a href="right-correct">right-correct</a> constitutions <a href="white-that">which-that</a> pursue <a href="the-people's</a> common interest, and <a href="the-tyranny">the-tyranny</a>, oligarchy and democracy as <a href="their-perverse">their-perverse</a> formsperverse. Among the three perversions, the tyranny is conceived as the worst form, as it is the perverse form of kingship, the best constitution (Aristotle 1969, 158).

Plato also suggests the that tyranny as theis an extremely corrupt political system. In *The Republic* he describes the deterioration process of his ideal city and defines it tyranny as the "extreme illness of a city" in *The Republic* when he describes the deterioration process of his ideal city (Plato 1968, 222). Likewise, Aristotle also defines the tyranny as an unnatural state of chaos and confusion: "There is no society which is meant by its nature for rule of the tyrannical type, or for rule of the other types found in wrong or perverted constitutions: the societies that are under such types of rule have fallen into an unnatural condition" (Aristotle 1969, 150). Thus, the supreme duty of citizens is to overcome the unnatural condition of tyranny and restore the natural, normal condition— (Aristotle 1969, 150).

However, for For Aristotle, the capacity to overcome tyranny is a privilege reserved as a privilege only to be entertained only by the for ""civilized" Greeks. For the outside Bbarbarians, however, are servile and like slaves, familiar to the with tyrannical rule, and accustomed to living under it. When he discusses the In discussing the natural faculties of citizens fit for his ideal state, thus, Aristotle notes that "[t]he peoples of cold countries generally, and particularly those of Europe, are full of spirit, but deficient in skill and intelligence," and that "[t]he peoples of Asia are endowed with skill and intelligence, but are deficient in spirit." Therefore, the Europeans "attain no political development and show no capacity for governing others," and the Asians "continue to be peoples of subjects and slaves." In contrast, the Greek stock equipped with the best qualities of the two peoples continues to remain free and is capable of attaining the "highest political development" and "governing every other people—\_if only it could once achieve political unity" (Aristotle 1969, 296).8 As is shown in the above As these quotes show, Aristotle clearly distinguishes the between the Greeks from and the Europeans and Asians, calling the latter and despised the latter as two barbarians.

Not being satisfied with merely distinguishing between Greeks and outside barbarians, Aristotle further subdivides barbarians even further, presenting Asians as more servile than Europeans: in a vertical way (When he examines Examining various forms of monarchy, he suggests describes the tyrannical nature of the barbarian kingship as follows: >delete): "... These uncivilized peoples are more servile in character than Greeks (as the peoples of Asia, in turn, are more servile than those of Europe)" (Aristotle 1969, 138). (and they will therefore tolerate despotic rule without any complaint. Kingships among uncivilized peoples are thus of the nature of tyrannies (Aristotle 1969, 138) >delete) Thus, for Aristotle, Europeans are more servile than the Greeks, and the Asians are more so than Europeans. Here, Asia referrerefersd to the confines of Persia and its vicinities in the east of the Aegean Sea. Therefore, what Aristotle referred to as Asia included only the small area, the ancient "nNear eEast." which was far smaller than what we today

<sup>7</sup> 

<sup>8</sup> 

understand as Asia (Bae 2001, 205).9

Aristotle defines human natures in terms of (ethnical differencesethics->ethnic differences). He, so that he regards the servile-Asians as servile, as enduring leading aa s slavish life without any resistance and taking tyrannical rule for granted-the tyrannical rule. He extends his definition extend of human natures based on ethnic differences to the natures of political community. Judging from this examination, the-Aristotle's argument that "[t]here is no society which is meant by its nature for rule of the tyrannical type" (Aristotle 1969, 150) turns out to be in fact intended to applyapplicable only to the Greek city-states, and so the tyrannyies remain natural and constitutional for European and Asian barbarians, as can be seen in the following passage:

Another type of kingship is the sort which is to be found among some uncivilized [i.e. non-Hellenic] peoples. Kingships of this sort all possess an authority similar to that of tyrannies; but they are, non the less, constitutional.... The reason is that these uncivilized peoples are more servile in character than Greeks...(Aristotle 1969, 138).

Thus, Aristotle finds identifies the archetype of tyranny in in the Persian monarchy, as is shown in the following passages:

Many of its characteristics are supposed to have been originally instituted by Periander of Corinth; but many of its features may also be derived from the Persian system of government (Aristotle 1969, 244).

From our examination so far, it seems self-evident that the Aristotelian essentialist (sequence reversed) scheme of civilization-barbarism with its essentialist conception leads to the conclusion that non-Greek barbarians did not have any the capacity nor any right to resist tyranny. For Aristotle assumed that the barbarians kingship of the barbarians was of the was permanently tyrannical nature and that they impossible towere not able to overthrow—it. In contrast, he supposed that tyrannies in Greece could and should be overturned—into the right rules, although theyand that if they do might in fact exist in Greece as they are mere perversions.

We might not dispute Aristotle's point mightelian point if hebe indisputable had he based his definitioned of the Persian kingship—askingship on tyrannical on the basis of his empirical research. Clearly, however, but the problem with Aristotle was that he imprinted permanent nature uponbranded Asian as tyrannically based on his Hellenocentic bias(Ok? Grammatically?). For him, barbarian the tyrannyies of the barbarians, the external others, was were a natural and normal political systems for the servile and slavish Asians, (i) who had servile qualities and slavish habits, Wwhile >, while) the Greek tyrannyies, the internal others, were—was regarded as a temporary and pathological aberrations. With this point in mind, we will nownow is the time to turn to the examinatione of Aristotle's analysis of tyranny in more detail.

## Aristotle's Analysis of Tyranny

Aristotle examines and formulates ideal political systems in volumes two and seven of his Politics, and devotes himself to analyzing actual actual politics in volumes three to five. Regarding tyranny in particular, H he describes and diagnoses tyranny comparing in comparison with other types of political systems, and examines the cause of its collapse and measures for for its preservation in volumes three and four. Aristotle describes major features of tyranny thus:

### Aristotle describes major features of tyranny in the following:

Tyranny is single-person government of the political association on the line of despotism [i.e. treating the citizens as a master treats slaves](Aristotle 1969, 115).

-···he [the tyrant] too uses coercion by virtue of superior power\_(Aristotle 1969, 122).

···the tyrant, who rules contrary to the will of his subjects, has a [foreign] bodyguard to protect him against them (Aristotle 1969, 138).

Tyranny is bound to exist where a single person governs men, who are all his peers or superiors, without any form of responsibility, and with a view to his own advantage rather than that of his subjects\_" (Aristotle 1969, 179).

According to the above quotes, Aristotle sees the tyranny is as a political system whichsystem that obtains by transformsing equal relations among free men into those between a master? and slaves. It also serves the private interest of the ruler himself, not the common interest of the whole community. If While kingship rules with the consent of subjects and within the legal limit, tyranny does not respect law nor satisfy the consent of subjects as the condition for legitimate political power (Aristotle 1969, 241). When If a tyrant appears feigns to takinge into consideration the consent of the ruledsubjects, he only abuses does so the consent instrumentally to legitimate its his rule for private gains. As he is notBut when he is un able to gain the consent of his subjects, however, what he could relyhe relies upon is physical coercion such as a foreign bodyguards—or mercenariesy. He corrupts his citizens into and turns them into servile subjects. He maintains his rule mainly by coercive forces and ideological deceits. Thus tyranny is the most corrupt political regime among those existing in reality, and quite an unnatural state condition not worthy of being called \_\_"political\_" in the least association at all.

After diagnosing major symptoms of tyranny, Aristotle examines the causes of its collapse and the necessary measures for its preservation. Its collapse is caused by internal quarrels among partners in a tyranny, the actual attacks of revolutionaries against the office and life of a tyrant, and so on (Aristotle 1969, 237, 240). The reasons why subjects rebel against their tyrants are often "unjust oppression, fear, and contempt" (Aristotle 1969, 237). According to Aristotle, "[t]he honours paid to the man who assassinates a tyrant — and not a mere thief — are also great" (Aristotle 1969, 66).

<sup>10</sup> 

Then, following the empiricist spirit, Aristotle then discusses the method for preserving tyranny. According to him, it is preserved in "two ways which are utterly opposed to one another." (period added)": The first is one is "traditional; and is "still followed by the majority of tyrants," and the other second is the very reverse of the first, "turning of tyranny into the nature of a kingship" (Aristotle 1969, 244, 246). While the first method presupposes that the subjects are hostile to a tyrant and "the aim is to make them unable to conspire." the second aims at "making the subjects indisposed to conspire." (Aristotle 1969, 246, Barker's note)

The first method includes a numberconsists of various measures. One of them is the purge of outstanding and spirited men, as they can be a threat to tyranny. A second line of policy is to breed mutual distrust and discord among subjects,—12\_so that they remain strangers estranged to each other and are not unable to launch collective action against theira tyrant. A third line of policy is to encourage ignorance among subjects and to place every oneall people under in constant surveillance through of secret police, thus keeping so that people remain in isolation and atomization. A fourth line of policy pursued by tyrants—is "that of\_"-impoverishing their subjects,\_" partly to prevent them people from having the means for engaging in political action and partly to keep them so busy earning their own livesa living. Some examples of this policy are the waging of frequent wars, imposition of heavy taxes, and initiating a large-scale construction works such as ""building of temple to Olympian Zeus by the family of Peisistratus\_" (Aristotle 1969, 244-45).

In By contrast, the the second method seeks to prolong tyranny by disguising itself in as kingship: "The tyrant should act, or at any rate appears to act, in the role of a good player of the part of King...He should plan and adorn his city as if he were not a tyrant, but a trustee for its benefit. He should always show a particular zeal in the cult of the gods" (Aristotle 1969, 247-48). Just as Glaucon says in Plato's *Republic* that the "extreme of injustice is to seem to be just when one is not" (Plato 1968, 38), the tyrant, a man of extreme injustice, may prolong his rule by acting as if he were not unjust. For example, the tyrant may justify his rule by acting more as a steward—thansteward than as a tyrant, more as public arbitrator than as a seeker of private interest, more as a guardian of his subjects than as their dominator, more as people's representative than as their demagogue, and more as a guardian of tradition—thantradition than as its destroyer. After all, Aristotle ended up bringing the superiority of kingship into sharp relief in his recommendation for the second method (Mandt 1994, 55).

Thus far, we have summarized Aristotle's theory of tyranny. It is interesting to note that the elaborate diagnosis and critique of tyranny was present in classical Confucianism, notably in *The Works of Mencius*, Aristotle's contemporary in pre-Chin China. Mencius established the "Theory of the Overthrow and Punishment of a Tyrant" as an important strand in the Confucian tradition, so that and his theory has laid the groundwork for Confucian justification of the revolutionary thought struggle against fighting tyranny and autocracy-throughout history. So it It seems is mandatory to examine Mencius' theory of tyranny and compareing it with Aristotle's s.

The Theory of the Overthrow and Punishment of-a Tyrants in Classical

<sup>12</sup> 

## Confucianism\_(in >:: With Special Focus on the Political Thought of?) Mencius Mencius

According to-Aristotle defines \_tyranny was as the rule by a single arbitrary ruler and points to Asia (including Persia) as its archetypeical form was found in Asia including Persia. However, there is in fact a strong critical voice opposing tyranny in the political thought of Mencius that contradicts But contrary to Aristotle's (Hellenocentrist > Hellenocentric?) convictionrism, we find a strong spirit critical of tyranny in the political thought of Mencius. The political thought of Mencius's political philosophy may be characterized as the ideal of Kingly Rule (or the Rule of Virtue). Its major features can be summarized as follows: requiring the support and consent of the people as the a condition for legitimate political rule; the provision of basic property (or material needs) for the people; requiring the joint rule of a monarch and ministers to prevent a single, man's arbitrary rule; abiding by the theory of the overthrow and punishment of a tyrants; and, finally, ruling the rule of virtuouslye with generosity instead of rather than with strict rule of law with heavy punishments (advanced propagated by Chinese Legalists).

While Aristotle devotes himself considerably to describing major features of tyranny and examining the method for preserving maintaining tyranntyrannical rule<del>y</del>, The Works of Mencius such consideration does not include such considerations is lacking in The Works of Mencius. Instead, Mencius focuses his attention mainly on describing major features of genuine kingship, proposing preventive measures against tyranny, and legitimizing the overthrow and punishment of a tyrants. 15 Thus, iCn order to find the concrete descriptions of tyranny in Confucian political thought philosophy can be found, mainly we need to rely onin The the Shijoo King (The Shoo King, The Book of Songs Book of History: 현재는 Shijing으로 발음하는지 모르지만 제가 참조한 레게 번역본은 1960년에 나왔고, 제목의 발음을 The Shoo King으로 하고 있다는 문제점이 있습니다.)16 as well as (in?) The Works of Mencius. Thus, wWe shall next identify major features of tyranny presented in Confucian political thought relying upon The Shoo King as wellthe Shijing, and then examine Mencius' critical analysis of tyranny and justification of revolution in comparison in this section, in both cases comparing them with (Aristotle-> Aristotle's??).! s when necessary

-The Shijing and The Works of Mencius reflect similarities between Confucian and Aristotelian descriptions of tyranny in the following In order to find the similarities between Confucian and Aristotelian descriptions of tyranny, we need to draw upon relevant passages in The Shoo King as well as The Works of Mencius:

After the death of King (Yâo Yao) and King Shun, the principles that mark sages fell into decay. Oppressive sovereigns arose one after another, who pulled down houses to make ponds and lakes, so that the people could not get clothes and food. Afterwards, corrupt speakings and oppressive deeds became more rife; gardens and parks, ponds and lakes, thickets and marshes became more numerous, and birds and beasts swarmed. By the time of the tyrant Chau, the kingdom was again in a state of great confusion (Mencius

<sup>14</sup> 

<sup>15</sup> 

<sup>16</sup> 

1960, 280).

The king of Hea extinguished his virtue and played the tyrant, extending his oppression over you, the people of the myriad regions. Suffering from his cruel injuries, and unable to endure the wormwood and poison, you protested with one accord your innocence to the spirits of heaven and earth (Confucius 1960, 186).

Now, Show, <sup>17</sup> the king of Shang, does not reverence Heaven above, and inflicts calamities on the people below. He has been abandoned to drunkenness, and reckless in lust. He has dared to exercise cruel oppression. Along with criminals he has punished all their relatives. He has put men into office on the hereditary principle. He has made it his pursuit to have palaces, towers, pavilions, embankments, ponds, and all other extravagances, to the most painful injury of you, the myriad people. He has burned and roasted the loyal and good. He has ripped up pregnant women (Confucius 1960, 284-85).

Now Show, the king of Shang treats with contemptuous slight the five constant virtues, and abandons himself to wild idleness and irreverence. He has cut himself off from heaven, and brought enmity between himself and the people. He cut through the leg-bones of those who were wading in the morning; he cut out the heart of the worth man. By the use of his power killing and murdering, he has poisoned and sickened all within the four seas. His honour and confidence are given to the villainous and bad. He has driven from him his instructors and guardians. He has thrown to the winds the statutes and penal laws. He has imprisoned and enslaved the upright officer. He neglects the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth. He has discontinued the offerings in the ancestral temple. He makes contrivances of wonderful device and extraordinary cunning; to please his woman (Confucius 1960, 294-95).

Reading the above quotes, we may easily recognize it is clear that there are many similarities between Aristotelian and Confucian descriptions of tyranny; worthy of close examination. First of all, the tyranny in Confucian thought refers to the form of rule enforced entirely relying upon by violent and immoral means. As the above quotes show, the foremost feature of tyranny is is shown in the cruel behaviors described in the above quotes, violent rule of terror causing instilling constant fear is the foremost feature of tyranny.— Such reign of terror is similar to the rule of Aristotle's tyrant who mobilizes coercive force and relies upon foreign bodyguards. It was by ruling with violent and immoral means that Chieh and Chau, the two notorious tyrants, caused drove people to desert them. —

Second, while just as Aristotle defines kingship as the rule within the limit of law

17

and tyranny as the rule in violation of law, the tyrant in the The Shoo KingShijing is portrayed as an arbitrary destroyer of law, as we can see in the passage, "He has thrown to the winds the statutes and penal laws..." Third, while Aristotle states that tyranny is maintained by the removal of outstanding men and men of spirit who can be a threaten to it it, and in the Shijing, t tyrants in The Shoo King kill loyal ministers, i.e., those representing the will of people as in the phrase, "burning the loyal and the good." Furthermore "imprisoning and enslaving the upright officers" is an idea similar to Aristotle's description of theelian tyrant who's corrupting turns free citizens into subjects. \_-

Fourth, just as the tyrant in the Shoo KingShijing built palaces, towers, pavilions, embankments, ponds, and all other extravagances, to increase his own pleasure and to do harm to his people, so did Aristotle's tyrant impoverish his people by undertaking large-scale construction works. This also confirms Aristotle's elian point that tyranny is a single person's government rule with a view to his own advantage. Finally, Aristotle suggests that the tyrant is a destroyer of tradition by advising that showing that the tyrant always need to show display a particular particular cultist zeal in the cult of god. Chinese tyrants is are also found to be a destroyover of tradition as shown in the passage: "He neglects the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth. He has discontinued the offerings in the ancestral temple." Considered all this together, the discussion of tyranny in classical Confucianism that appears in The Works of Mencius and the The Shoo KingShijing is very much similar to to that of Aristotle's ideas of tyranny.

Turning to Mencius' critique of tyranny and justification of its overthrow, it should be noted that Mencius stressed the idea of the joint rule of a king and ministers and the will of people as the source of legitimate political rule, either to prevent tyranny or to overthrow it. First of all, it was for the sake of preventing a single man's arbitrary rule that Mencius stressed the joint rule of a king and ministers. The king Shun whom Mencius admires most was famous for his willingness to consult with and follow others in his rule, instead of insisting on his own way: "He [(Shun)() - del. Chinese character)] regarded virtue as the common property of himself and others, giving up his own way to follow that of others, and delighting to learn from others to practise what was good" (Mencius 1960, 205).

Shun's precedent worked served an as an exemplary model action to emulate, not only for saintly kings but also for kings and lords in during the Spring and Autumn period who placed priority to on real politics more than moral politics:

There was the behaviour of Tang to Î-I Yin:— he first learned of him, and then employed him as his minister; and so without difficulty he became kingly sovereign. There was the behaviour of the duke Hwan to Kwan Chung:— he first learned of him, and then employed him as his minister; and so without difficulty he became chief of all the princes (Mencius 1960, 214).

In Confucian political thought, <sup>18</sup> the relation between a king and ministers is basically based basically on righteousness and reason, so that the latterministers may leave abandon the a king if (righteousness and reason > the two parties or the two) \_are in there is a discord between the two. This means that A king's arbitrary

rule over his-ministers is rejected in Confucian political thought. Furthermore, as is shown in the above quote, Confucianism argues that the king may exercise his rulership by learning of? of his ministers. \_ In this way, Mencius warned against the danger of a single man's man's rule by a monarch and contributed to consolidating the idea of the a joint rule of a king and ministers, a uniquely Confucian political idea.

Mencius also (criticized -> criticizes) monarch's tyrannical rule by employing the analogy of a lapidary. He (argued -> argues) \_ and arguing that the government of the country should be relyied upon expert knowledge, and that and even a king's authority should not interfere with ministers, just as carving and polishing a gemstone should be completely trusted to a lapidary (Mencius 1960, 168). Here the Mencius' idea of the rule by experts is very similar to Plato'snie idea of philosopher-rulers, and contrastsin sharply contrasted to the with Aristotle's elian (idea understanding of of rule by amateur rule -> stress on the rule by amateurs)s.

<u>Had</u>(<u>indentification needed</u>)<u>However, if</u>\_Mencius's argument <u>had</u> stopped at <u>this pointhere</u>, then <u>his political thoughthe</u> might have been criticized for <u>merely</u> defending <u>merely the</u> oligarchic rule by a small class of intellectuals or experts, just as Plato has been <u>criticized</u>.

\_However, Mencius was not satisfied merely with his argument for the joint rule of a king and ministers in order to check against tyrannical ruley. He even further proposed the support and consent of the people as the condition for legitimate political power, which may be understood in line with Aristotle's stress on the rule with subjects' consent as the essential condition distinguishing kingship from tyranny. The support and consent of the people satisfaction of this condition may be confirmed in a passive waypassively, such as when people welcome a given policy of a king or he makes it a rule (to shares > to share) pleasures with his own people\_\_\_\_ as is shown in Mencius' principle of 'sharing pleasures with people.' But more importantly, we may find in the political thought of that Mencius insists that power comes from the people and is exercised in accordance with the will of the people.

First of all, Mencius declares that the source of power lies in the people. According to him, the authority of kings such as Yao and Shun was recognized and given by Heaven, and Heaven which in turn also reflected the will of the people. In his explanation of the succession from Yao to Shun, Mencius stated that Heaven and the people accepted Shun in turn, when Yao presented Shun to both of them respectively (Mencius 1960, 355). Quoting a passage from the The Shoo Kings Shijing, Mencius says of the relation between the twothat: "Heaven sees according as my people see; Heaven hears according as my people hear" (Mencius 1960, 357). This means that Heaven reflects the will of people in the end, although both of the two began are as a separate sources of authority.

Turning toRegarding the exercise of political power—which reflects the will of people, Mencius explicitly states that the will of the people as a whole should be reflected in important government policies. —For example, the appointment of ministers and penal administration were important government affairs in ancient China, and Mencius stresses that a king should implement such policies, as those of appointing and dismissing ministers and passing a death sentence upon a criminal, only after all the people approve them. Mencius states thus He notes:

When all those about you say,— 'This is a man of talents and worth,' you may not therefore believe it. When your great officers all say,— 'This is a

man of talents and virtue,' neither may you for that believe it. When all the people say,—'This is a man of talents and virtue,' then examine into the case, and when you find that the man is such, employ him. . . . You must act in this way in order to be the parent of the people\_(Mencius 1960, 166).

Thus, Mencius asserts here that in appointing ministers, a king should deliberate in a long series of hearing processes from with diverse strata of courtiers, ministers and people, and then make a final decision on the basis of these hearings and his own reflections (Mencius 1960, 166). Here we can confirm that Mencius places great importance toon the will of people in policy-making process. —Although the mechanism to representing the will of people in ancient Chinese states was not institutionalized, Mencius's' political thought clearly incorporates the spirit and idea toof represented the will of people into in Confucian political thought. This might suggest that Confucian political thought possibly contains follows the concepthe element of "by to by the people." in addition to the elements of "of the people" and "for the people", whereas it has been commonly thought to contain only the latter two among the three elements of democracy before. Mencius' trust in the will of people's will also indicates that that the common argument that Confucian tradition is a critical barrier to the development of democracy in East Asia may be made in a too cursory way at best.

Finally, it should be is important to note noted that for Mencius, the support and consent of people is crucial not only in legitimating political power, but also in resisting and overthrowing tyranny. Thus, Mencius stressed the fact that —people enthusiastically welcomed it enthusiastically when Kings Tang and Wu as leaders of revolutions \_, respectively, when they undertook the overthrow and punishment of tyrants:

While Tang punished their rulers, he consoled the people. His progress was like the falling of opportune rain, and the people were delighted. It is said in the Book of History, "We have waited for our prince. When our prince comes, we may escape from the punishments under which we suffer (delete period)" (Mencius 1960, 273).

Mencius replied, ""If the people of Yen will be pleased with your taking possession of it, then do so."—\_Among the ancients there was one who acted on this principle, namely king Wu. "If the people of Yen will not be pleased with your taking possession of it, then do not do so."—A Among the ancients there was one who acted on this principle, namely king Wân (Mencius 1960, 273).

People's delight with <u>(""his > Tang's)</u> "progress<u>""</u> as if it were "the falling of opportune rain<u>""</u> explicitly indicates their active support and consent to the new political order. Of course, the institutionalized validation procedure of popular support and consent was absent in the times of Mencius. Yet Mencius' recognition that political power is effective only when it is based on popular support and consent <u>clearly</u> shows his deep insight into the origin and generation of political power.

In addition, in his legitimationlegitimization of the resistance against tyranny, Mencius argues that the tyrant is not a king but merely a (robber thief-> robber) or a ruffian:

The king The king —Hsuan of Ch'i asked, saying, "Was it so, that Tang banished Chieh, and that king Wu smote Chau?" Mencius replied, "It is so in the records." The king said, "May a minister then put his sovereign to death?" Mencius said, "He who outrages the benevolence proper to his nature, is called a robber; he who outrages righteousness, is called a ruffian. The robber and ruffian we call a mere fellow. I have heard of the cutting off of the fellow Chau, but I have not heard of the putting a sovereign to death, in his case" (Mencius 1960, 167).

Mencius'ss attitude to callcalling a tyrants a"—"mere fellows"" not rather thana "kings" reverberates, across time and space, in the a similar passage in Two Treatises of Government of John Locke, who is famous for his theory of resistance's Two Treatises of Government which is famous for his theory of resistance. Pointing to the danger of the arbitrary and tyrannical nature of a a supreme rulerr??? Locke states in the following: "But when he quits this Representation, this Publick Will, and acts by his own private Will, he degrades himself, and is but a single private Person without Power, and without Will, that has any Right to Obedience (del)" (Locke 1967, 386). Here thea "private person" is nothing more than acquivalent to Mencius' "mere fellow." mentioned by Mencius. And Mencius' logic of removing a robber or a ruffian by overthrowing and punishing a tyrant is comparable to Aristotle's praise of tyrannicide in which he said that he who would kills a tyrant is awarded with great honor. Likewise, Tang and Wu, who overthrew and punished tyrants, have been honored and enshrined as "sage kings" in the Confucian political thought.

Mencius' theory and insight so far delineated prevents so far delineated clearly shows that Oriental despotism is, a Western invention of stigma upon Asia, from and is inapplicableapplying to ancient Chinese and—therefore East Asian—civilization and classical Confucianism. Mencius' In short the political ideal philosophy is clearly of Mencius is incompatible with tyranny. Thus, And therefore, Mill's derogatory remark that the history of a lack of systematic resistance lacked in Asia to tyranny turns out to be clearly—only the product of Orientalist ideology m based on poor evidence.

### Conclusion

Aristotle defines tyranny as a single man's arbitrary rule which is disrespectful of the law, goes against the will of the people, against the will of people, which does not respect law at all, relies on coercive force, and pursues the ruler's private interest. As is examined According to Aristotle, such tyranny also seeks to preserve itself by employing various measures such as those breeding mutual distrust and fear through constant surveillance—among—people, encouraging ignorance and impoverishment of people, and suppressing free political action by citizens. Such features—of T—tyranny thus represents how—the opposite—antithesis—side—of to Aristotle's ideal polity in which the governance depends on the support and consent of the free citizens and political action is based on deliberative consensus—would prevail. Aristotle also examines the measures to preserve those elements maintaining

tyranny\_\_\_ not satisfied with the mere diagnosis of tyranny. Heand also notes that great honors are given to citizens who overthrow tyranny.

Mencius provided a path-breaking turning point in the history of Confucian political thought by enhancing elevating the status of people as high as the mandate of Heaven. Thus, for For Mencius, tyranny, which rules against the will of people, is may well be the worst political system. According to Mencius, the tyrant is no more than a robber or a ruffian who deserts betrays benevolence and righteousness proper to his nature, and is thereby demoted to thus, the status of "a mere fellow," although hewho happens to occupy the throne. According to Mencius, tTyranny is an open dictatorship of terror, which fails to provide basic living conditions for people, exercises arbitrary rule of men which trespasses the standard of propriety and law, oppresses virtuous ministers, ignores the popular opinion, and imposes the rule by violencet force.

Thus, the tyrant who dominates over the people with cruelty and greed rightfully becomes is the object of popular grievance and hatred, and is a in everyday life as well as the public enemy whose might be murdered will be with the supported by of popular will. Thus WfFor example, wwhen Tang and Wu overthrew and punished Chieh and Chau, they were empowered by popular support and consent. Tang and Wu While the former were able to do it by gaining the people—popular support and consent, while Chieh and Chau—the latter were overthrown by losing themthat support.

Thus far, we have compared Confucian theory of tyranny with that of Aristotle. By—Through this comparison, we have been able to criticized and overcomethe Aristotelian, Hellenocentric argument based on Hellenocentrism that the peoples of Asia were servile and tyranny was fitnaturally suits for their political systems. At the same time, we—have found that Aristotelian analysis of tyranny sheds insightful light on understanding tyranny in ancient China and that Mencius' analysis—understanding of tyranny is very similar to that of Aristotle. Thus, tThe political thought of Mencius has remained an important source of East Asian tradition. Mencius, which—encourages and approves the—active resistance and struggle against tyranny and oppression, (to add comma?) and, to strives after for the realization of virtuous the kingly rule—of virtue. In no way does Mencius preach and not—the—"orientalized" tradition—which, according to Aristotle and Mill, hasencourages, remained—passivitye and discourages without any resistance against tyrannical rules. The r.

In short, the reReexamination of ancient political thought in East Asia which suggestsed thate traditionally, there was a criteria of judgement for the rightproper politicsal which system and asserted the that it was legitimate to overthrow and punishment of a tyrants. With this in mind, we will be better equipped to would enable us to rejuvenate the elements hospitable to progress in in—East Asian traditionn tradition, and to conduct a genuine dialogue between civilizations eastern and western civilizations.

## **Bibliography**

<sup>\*</sup> English Materials

- Aristotle. 1969. *The Politics of Aristotle*—, edited and translated by with an introduction by Ernest Barker. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *The Nichomachean Ethics*, ttranslated by with an introduction by David Ross. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ashcroft, Bill, et. al. 1998. Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies. London: Routledge.
- Barker, Ernest. 1969. <u>"</u>—Introduction-<u>"</u> —in *The Politics of Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <u>앞의 Aristotle과 연도가 틀립니다.</u> 연도 확인 부탁드립니다.
- Confucius. 1960. <u>The Shoo King The Shoo King Shijing</u>. Vol. 3 of The Chinese Classics, translated by James Legge. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. (레게본은 The Shoo King으로 제목이 붙여지 있음)
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1991. *The Third Wave.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Kang, Jung In. 1999. "Confucianism and Democracy in East Asia: A Critique of Samuel Pp. Huntington's *Third Wave*." *Korea Journal* 39:: 3 (Autumn): 315-337.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. "Some Reflections on Recent Democratization in South Korea." *Korea Journal* 40::.2 (Summer).: 195-224.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. "The Rule of Law and the Rule of Virtue: On the Necessity for Their Mutual Integration." *Korea Journal* 43::.1 (Spring): 233-260.
- Locke, John. 1967. *Two Treatises of Government*. 2nd ed., eedited by Peter Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mencius. 1960. *The Works of Mencius*. Vol. 2 of *The Chinese Classics*, translated by James Legge. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
  - Plato. 1968. —The Republic of Plato, translated with notes and an interpretive essay by Allan Bloom. New York: Basic Books. 과란 부분 때면 안되나요?(매세요)
  - Richter, Melvin. 1977. *The Political Theory of Montesquieu*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## \* Materials written in Korean

- Bae, Cheol-hyunhyeon. 2001. "In Search of the Origin of Europe." *Gyegan ssasang* [(Political Thought Quarterly-) 13::. 3 (Autumn).
- Hwang, Jong-hi. 2000. *Myungidaebangrok* (Waiting for the Dawn). Seoul: Hangilsa Publishing Co.
- <u>Yi, Seung-hwanLee, Seung hwan</u>. 1998. "A Discursive Analysis of Western Understanding of Confucianism." *Gyegan Ssasang* [Political Thought Quarterly] 10::. 1 (Spring).
- Mandt, Hella. 1994. Pokjungron Pokjeongron-gkwa jfeohangkgwon. [(The Theory of Tyranny and the Right to Resistance]), translated by Sim Jae-woou-Shim. Seoul: Minumsa Publishing Co. Originally from published as Tyrannislehre und Widerstandsrecht. Darmstadt: Luchterhand, 1974. 원본책중의 한 chapter??(독일어 책이 한글로 번역된 것인데 번역되면서 제목이 다소 변형된 것임)

## Foot notes

서식 있음

- 1) Eurocentrism is the word more frequently—used more frequently than Westcentrism. This paper will But in this paper we shall—use the latter latter termto to explicitly include the United States, Canada, ian, Australia, etc., and so forth. Westcentrism consists of three general propositions. First, that modern Western civilization has reached the highest stage of development in thehuman history of human kind (Western superiority). Second, that the developmental stages in Western history are universally applicable to all human histories in the world, applying not only to the West, but also to the rest of the world (universalism and historicism). Third, that, non-Western societies placed positioned in lower stages of development in history can improve themselves only by emulating and accepting Western civilization (civil-ization/modernization = westernization-thesis).
- 2) In opposition to suchthis Orientalistm attitude, anone interpretation has been presentednotes that the rule of virtue and the rule of law (or ritual/propriety) were closely intertwined in in the thought of classical Confucianismm represented by Confucius, Mencius and Xunzi. Also, the rule of and that the rule of li (ritual/propriety) in Confucianism was actually a non-liberal form of constitutionalism related to the constitutional issue of how to control rulers. See Kang (2003).
- 3) At the same time, it may be said that democracy in the West is normal and natural, while Nazism, Fascism and Franco's authoritarianism may appear to have been temporary perversions. With regard to the critique of Western scholars' (particularly Huntington's) Westcentrism with regard to democracy, see Kang (1999 & 2000).
- 4) As-Aristotle lived from 384 to 322 B.C. and Mencius from 372 to 289 B.C. the two, they might be said to havemen lived almost in the same period.
- 5) As we shall later examine, Aristotle defines human nature as essentialistic in terms of ethnic differences. According to Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies,: "
- Essentialism is the assumption that groups, categories or classes of objects have one or several defining features exclusive to all members of that category. Some studies of race or gender, for instance, assume the presence of essential characteristics distinguishing one race from another or the feminine from the masculine. In analyses of culture it is a (generally implicit) assumption that individuals share an essential cultural identity..." y...(Ashcroft et. al. 1998, 77). Quotation mark and other necessary forms required
- <u>6) DoubtlesslyNo doubt,</u> even the Greek women were excluded as well-from its intended application.
- 7) Hella Mandt is one among contemporary theorists who presents the resistance to tyranny, not as thea right but as the duty (Mandt 1994, 61).
- 8) Thus, according to Ernest Barker, "Aristotle advised Alexander, in the exortation 'On Colonies', to distinguish between Greeks and barbarians," treating the former as a constitutional leader and the latter as a despotic master, as the latter, including Persians, lacked the capacity to develop virtues. However, Alexander

- who had a good sense of balance as a politician, did not follow Aristotle's advice, but treated Greeks and Persians equally, promoting "intermarriage and common military service" (Barker 1969, ilix, xvii). Thus, Barker continues, "It meant a great revolution," giving birth to "the cosmopolis in place and instead of the polis" (Barker 1969, ilix).
- 9) Because of the constraints of his times, Aristotle could not have extended his research of political systems to the east farther thanfarther east than-Persia.
- 10) Aristotle asserted that "kingships among uncivilized peoples," for example, in Asia, —a are thus "of the nature of tyrannies." According to Aristotle, then, the law in the kingships of Asia is a means for maintaining tyranny rather than an instrument for checking it.
- 11) For example, refer to the following passage: "...and when it is imposed, by fraud or by force, it is instantly regarded as a form of tyranny"" (Aristotle 1969, 241). In addition, Aristotle's explanation of deceitful actions the tyrant takes to preserve his rule proves this points well (Aristotle 1969, 246-50).
- 12) Thus we find the following sentence in *The Nichomachean Ethics*: ""It[j]ustice] exists least in the worst form: in tyranny there is little or no friendship"" (Aristotle 1998, 212).
- 13) Of course Aristotle adds the one-crucial safeguard that "the reformed tyrant shall retain power, and is still in a position to govern his subjects with or without their consent" (Aristotle 1969, 247).
- 14) When comparing But in comparison with Confucius and Mencius, Mencius stressed 'righteousness' more strongly than 'benevolence' among the Confucian cardinal virtues.
- 15) This is also the difference between Aristotle and Mencius. While Aristotle examines the method of preserving tyranny as well as overcoming it, Mencius rather takes a firm stand against tyranny. Thus, although both of them display strong normative attitude in their political analysis, still we could say by comparison that Aristotle shows more positivist temper, while Mencius doesmaintains a more normative spirit.
- 16) The Shoo KingShijing is a collection of books on history covering the earliest three dynasties in ancient Chinese historyhistory, which were originally kept by the offices of history in various dynasties and were later filed and edited by Confucius. Thus, the theory of the overthrow and punishment of a tyrants did not appear first in The Works of Mencius for the first time, but had been present from the beginning of Chinese political thought. However, Confucius, the founder of Confucianism, did not mention the overthrow and punishment of tyrants it in his Analects. which preserved his words and deeds. Thus it is Mencius who contributed to promoting the theory into one of the core principles of Confucianism.
- 17) Show is the name for Chau, the last king of Shang.
- 18) How ministers serve the prince depends on how the latter treats the former. 
  "When the prince regards his ministers as his hands and feet, his ministers

regard their prince as their belly and heart...; when he regards them as the ground or as grass, they regard him as a robber and an enemy" (Mencius 1960, 318).. The founder of Ming empire —was allegedly exasperated at this passage, and removed it from *The Works of Mencius* as well as the following passage: "The people are the most important element in a nation; the spirits of the land and grain are the next; the sovereign is the lightestlast" (Mencius 1960, 483). See Hwang Jong-hi (2000, 54, note 16).

19) Of course, this point should not be interpreted as asserting that all thConfuciane heritage of Confucianism is hospitable to democracy. Rather it only intends to criticize some Western scholars who are more than happy to throw the baby out with the bath water, that is, who deny the value of Confucianism in toto because of its some ostensibly negative aspects.

