

Hu Shih 胡適

By Sung-Peng Hsu

Published in *Chinese Thought: An Introduction*

Edited by Donald H. Bishop

Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1985, 1995

South Asia Books, 2001

Corrections on January 30, 2014: The year when the vernacular language was required in public school is changed from 1911 to 1920; also correction of some typos

A. Hu Shih's Life

Hu Shih (1891-1962) was born in Shanghai, where his father was a minor official of the Ch'ing Dynasty. His ancestral home was Chi-hsi in Anhwei Province. He was the only child of his father's third wife, who married him at the age of seventeen. As his father died when he was only four years old, Hu Shih was raised under the care of his young mother. The mother was an illiterate peasant woman and a devotee of the Buddhist Bodhisattva, Kuan-yin (Avalokiteshvara), commonly worshipped as a goddess in China since about the tenth century. Hu Shih used to accompany her to pay homage to Kuan-yin. In spite of her personal faith in popular Buddhism, the mother was determined to follow her husband's will that Hu Shih be given a good education so that he would become a great Confucian scholar. Every morning she would tell the son all she knew about his father and remind him to follow in this father's footsteps.¹

Hu Shih's early childhood was much influenced by the Buddhist ideas of heavens, hells, rebirth and Pure Land. But his education was strictly Confucian. Before he was three, he had learned over eight hundred characters from his father. A little after three, he was already in school in Chi-hsi. His mother paid the teacher more than the usual tuition in order that the teacher would not teach him by rote memory alone, and would explain the meaning of the classical texts to him. Before the age of eight, Hu Shih could read almost everything with very little assistance. He read many books other than the Four Books and the Five Classics and became absorbed in vernacular novels. This interest in colloquial literature led him eventually to advocating what was later known as the Literary Revolution in China.

At the age of thirteen Hu Shih was sent to Shanghai for further education, where he was exposed to a new world. He studied in three schools that offered courses in Western culture and came under the influence of the reformist and revolutionary ideas advocated by Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (1873-1929) and Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925). The Darwinian theory of evolution was a favorite subject among students. Hu Shih's personal name, Shih or Shih-chih, was adopted from the idea of "fitness" in the phrase "survival of the fittest."

From 1908 to 1910 Hu gave up his studies and taught English and Chinese in order to support himself and his mother. He became very depressed with his personal life, and pessimistic about the future of China. In his despair he composed a poem that contained this line: "How proudly does the wintry frost scorn the powerless rays of the sun!" One evening, he became dead drunk and fought with a policeman in the street. He was jailed for the night. The next morning, he went home and saw in the mirror the bruises on his face. The following line from Li Po's "Drinking Song" came to his mind: "Some use might yet be made of this material born in me."² He decided to take the examination in Peking for the scholarship, founded on the returned portion of the Boxer Indemnity, to study in the United States.³ After a month of hard work, he succeeded in the examination and became one of the seventy chosen in 1910.

Hu Shih began his study in the College of Agriculture at Cornell University in September 1910. He had planned to learn something useful for the salvation of China. But his greater interest and ability in literature and philosophical subjects prompted him to change his area of study. He completed the B.A. degree in philosophy in February 1914, and went on to the graduate program. Since he became dissatisfied with the idealistic emphasis in the Sage School at Cornell, he transferred to Columbia University the next year to study with John Dewey. Two years later, in 1917, he completed his doctoral program with the dissertation, "The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China."

Before his return to China in the summer of 1917, Hu Shih was already involved in the problem of Chinese language reform. His article "Tentative Proposals for the Improvement of Literature" was published in January 1917 in the *New Youth* founded by Ch'en Tu-hsiu (1879-1942) in 1915. This article has generally been regarded as the formal call of the Literary Revolution.

When he began his teaching at the National Peking University, Hu Shih was already hailed as an intellectual leader in China. The Literary Revolution was unexpectedly successful. The classical language was pronounced dead. In a few years the colloquial language was widely used in newspapers, magazines, and literature. The Peking government in 1920 ordered that the colloquial be taught in schools. In fact, the Literary Revolution was a part of a general movement usually called New Culture Movement, which covered the period from about 1915 to 1923. The *New Youth* was the leading periodical of the movement. Through the vernacular language the intellectuals consciously introduced new ideas to the masses. Gradually, the "literary revolution" became "revolutionary literature."

The New Culture Movement was given the additional impetus by the May Fourth Movement in 1919, which was originally a nationwide protest against the Paris Peace Conference held after the First World War. The Conference had decided to grant Japan's claim on Shantung. The May Fourth Movement forced the Chinese government not to sign the peace treaty. It also generated greater effects on the various social, cultural, and political forces in China. Quite a few important intellectuals became disillusioned with the democratic countries that attended the Paris Peace Conference. Many of them turned to Communism for the salvation of China. Ch'en Tu-hsiu was converted to Communism and with others organized the Chinese Communist Party in 1920.⁴

Hu Shih's reputation was established when he taught at Peking University from 1917 to 1926. He was generally regarded as one of the foremost spokesmen of the Literary Revolution, the New Culture Movement, and the May Fourth Movement. After that productive period, he served in many different positions, including the deanship and presidency of Peking University. During the Second World War, he was appointed ambassador to the United States (from 1938 to 1942). He lectured and taught in several major universities in America. After the Communist victory in 1949, Hu Shih lived in the United States. In 1957 he accepted the invitation from the Nationalists in Taiwan to become the director of the Academia Sinica. Before his death in 1962, he had received thirty-five honorary degrees from various universities in the world.

B. Hu Shih's Conception of Philosophy

Hu Shih lived in a turbulent period of Chinese history. In such a situation, one could have responded with a philosophy of resignation. But that was not the kind of philosophy Hu Shih advocated. We can find two basic points in his conception of philosophy. First, he insists that in doing philosophy we must concentrate on the actual problems that we are confronted with in our life. The task of philosophy is to solve those problems. Second, he maintains that all answers to the problems are hypothetical and instrumental in nature. They should not be taken as absolute. They are true or good only if they can solve our problems. If they cannot solve our problems, we should reject them, or revise and improve them. These two points are expressed in many different contexts in his writings.

In his *Outline of the History of Chinese Philosophy* published in 1919 Hu Shih defines philosophy as "the kind of learning that investigates the basic and crucial problems of human life and seeks a fundamental solution to them from the fundamental point of view."⁵ He lists the following six points as the basic problems of philosophy:

1. What is the origin of the universe and the myriad things?
2. What is the extent, function, and method of knowledge and thought?
3. What ought man to do in this world?
4. How can we educate people to gain knowledge, to think, and to do what is good and to avoid what is bad?
5. How should man organize and maintain a society or state?
6. What is the ultimate destiny of human life?

Hu Shih did not write any book to answer these questions in any systematic manner. But his views can be found in his various writings about his own life and about his attempts to solve China's problems. He was eager to defend his views against criticisms, but he was careful to admit that his personal views were not absolute.

Hu Shih hold that his personal views about the basic problems of philosophy can be separated from the method of thinking that he advocates. This method of thinking is summarized in eight Chinese characters: *Ta-tan chia-she hsiao-hsin ch'iu-cheng* (大膽假設小心求證), boldness in proposing hypothesis and carefulness in seeking verification. This statement has become a familiar slogan and a mark of Hu Shih's teachings. He believes that, if the Chinese people would accept this method of thinking to solve their problems, a new culture would be created in China and China could be saved. It is not important whether Hu Shih's personal philosophy is accepted.

Hu Shih acknowledges that Thomas Huxley and John Dewey were the two most important persons who had taught him how to think honestly and think well. Huxley taught him the spirit of doubting everything that has insufficient evidence. Dewey taught him to focus attention on the actual problems at hand, to regard all theories or ideals as hypotheses yet to be verified and to be concerned with the effects of thought. According to Hu Shih, Dewey's method of thinking is not only true of discoveries in the experimental sciences but also of the best researches in the historical sciences such as textual criticism, philological reconstruction and higher criticism. He gave Dewey's instrumental logic credit for having turned him into a historical worker. Hu learned to think genetically and he attributed to the genetic habit of thinking the key to success in all his work in the history of thought and literature.⁶

An important aspect of the New Culture Movement was to introduce new ideas from the West. As a result, many "isms" were preached by the enthusiasts of Western culture. Hu Shih saw great dangers in talking about isms to the extent of neglecting actual problems. In a series of articles written in 1919 entitled "Problems and Isms" Hu Shih called on the Chinese intellectuals to exert more energy and spend more time on studying actual problems in China and less on isms. He said,

"We do not study the livelihood of rickshaw drivers, but we make an abstract talk about Socialism. We do not study how to liberate women or improve family system, but we make an abstract talk about the isms of sharing wives and free love. We do not study now to liberate the Anfu Club of the warlords or how to solve the civil war between the south and the north, but we make an abstract talk about anarchism. Yet we boast that we are talking about fundamental 'solution.' To tell the truth, it is just a dream talk that deceives oneself as well as others. It is solid evidence of the bankruptcy of Chinese thought. It is a death sentence to the cause of improving Chinese society."⁷

Hu Shih asserted that the reason that so many people were fond of talking about isms was their laziness. It is easy to talk about isms because a parrot or a record player can also do it.

According to Hsu Shih, all isms were originally formulated in response to actual problems in concrete historical situations. Those who were concerned about the evil conditions of the times investigated the causes of the problems and offered a method of solution. When the method was propagated to a large number of people, the proposal was summarized in a few words for the sake of simplicity and convenience. In this way, a proposal became an ism, and a concrete plan became an abstract term. Here lies the danger and weakness of isms.

Hu Shih challenged the Chinese intellectuals to produce original thought in response to the peculiar problems in China. According to him, the first step of thought is to investigate all the aspects of the problems, to find out the causes of the evil conditions. The next is to propose all possible prescriptions on the basis of one's experience and knowledge. Then one should use one's imagination, together with one's experience and knowledge, to infer the possible consequences of each prescription and to determine whether it could solve the actual problems. Finally, one chooses a particular method of solution to be one's proposal.

Hu Shih did not really oppose the study of isms. Isms are worthy of study as long as they are regarded as theories, hypotheses, or instrumentalities. The knowledge of many isms could enable us to find a good solution to our problems. One should however avoid "hanging an ism on one's lips" and believing it dogmatically. Hu Shih suggests that when we study a theory, we must take three things into consideration. First, we must know the historical circumstances in which the theory was formulated. Second, we must consider the biographical and cultural background of the person who formulated the theory. Finally, we must investigate the effects the theory has produced. These three points constitute what he calls the "historical attitude" or "genetic method."⁸ This attitude or method should be applied to the study of the theories imported from the West as well as the study of the philosophies found in the Chinese tradition.⁹

In Hu Shih's judgment, the greatest problems or evils in China that await solutions are poverty, disease, ignorance, corruption and disorder.¹⁰ He believes that nothing less than a total transformation of Chinese culture could eliminate these evils. This is why Hu Shih was such a fervent advocate of new culture. To him, the Literary Revolution was not simply to replace the classical language with the colloquial language. It was also to replace the mode of thinking embodied in the old culture, with a new mode of thinking that was to be developed in the vernacular literature. In his *Tentative Proposals for the Improvement of Literature* written in 1917, Hu Shih listed the following eight points for emphasis:

1. Write with substance; do not write when there is nothing substantial to say.
2. Do not imitate the ancients.
3. Write with a grammatical structure.
4. Do not use gloomy language when there is nothing to complain.
5. Eliminate rotten expressions and conventional phrases.
6. Do not use ancient allusions or quotations.
7. Do not use the ancient rules of couplets and parallelisms in poetry.
8. Do not shun vernacular words or phrases.¹¹

It is clear that these rules were intended to break loose the traditional way of thinking. A year later, Hu Shih mentioned the following four points in order to emphasize the constructive spirit of the revolution:

1. Speak only if there is something to say.
2. Say what there is to say and say the way it is to be said.
3. Speak your own words; do not repeat what others say.
4. Use the living language of our own times.¹²

Hu Shih obviously hoped that the development of a vernacular language and a new literature would help the transformation of Chinese culture, which in turn would help to eliminate poverty, disease, ignorance, corruption, and disorder.¹³ In a sense, the New Culture Movement that Hu Shih promoted tried to accomplish the combined results of the Renaissance, Reformation, Enlightenment, Industrial Revolution, etc. in the West.

Unlike some other people, Hu Shih did not regard capitalism and imperialism as the major causes of the evils in China. In his view, capitalism had not yet been developed enough in China to become a major cause of China's problems. The Western and Japanese invasions of China were in his judgment mainly due to the weakness of China herself.¹⁴ Hu Shih may have underestimated the close connection between domestic affairs and international situations, but he may have wanted to emphasize the importance of putting one's own house into order rather than blaming others for the mess. In any case, he has often been criticized as an agent of Japanese or Western imperialism.

C. Science and Philosophy of Life

After the Opium War with the British in 1840, China was forced to open her doors to the Western powers. The Chinese were first impressed by the gunpowder and warships of Western civilization. Then they realized that behind the military equipment were science and democracy. The superiority of Western culture was gradually conceded. The traditional conception that China was the center of the world became a myth. China had to learn from the West not only technology but also science and a way of life. By the time of the New Culture Movement there was already a widespread acceptance of science and democracy among Chinese intellectuals. The famous slogans in the movement were "Mr. Science" and "Mr. Democracy." In the names of Mr. Science and Mr. Democracy, the enthusiasts hoped to drive away the "evil spirit" of the old culture by chanting "Down with the curiosity shop of Confucius!" (打倒孔家店). Hu Shih was one of the enthusiasts, but in general his radical position was somewhat balanced by a tolerant, moderate, conciliatory, and scholarly attitude – a seemingly paradoxical combination in his personality.¹⁵

The emphasis on science and democracy was challenged however by the defenders of Chinese tradition, especially after the First World War. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, who had been a strong supporter of science, led a group of Chinese intellectuals to visit post-war Europe. After his return, he published *Impressions of My European Journey* in 1919, in

which he presented the views expressed by many European thinkers, that Western civilization was bankrupt and that it was time for the West to look towards the East for salvation.¹⁶ This book was used by the traditionalists to support their cause. In 1921, Liang Sou-ming, professor of Indian and Chinese philosophies at Peking University, published *Eastern and Western Civilizations and their Philosophies*, in which he argued that the world civilization of the future should be a rejuvenated Chinese culture. According to him, Western civilization since the Renaissance represents a way of life in which the will seeks satisfaction by the conquest of nature and struggle for existence. On the other hand, the Indian civilization represents a way of life in which the will seeks to suppress human desires and ignore actual problems in the present world. The Chinese civilization is the most reasonable because it represents a way of life in which the will seeks equilibrium and self-contentment.¹⁷ This books added another weapon on the side of the traditionalists.

The conflict between the promoters of a new culture (often called “modernists” or “westernizers”) and the traditionalists took the form of a debate on science and philosophy of life in 1923 after Carsun Chang (Chang Chun-mai, 1886-1969) delivered a lecture entitled “The Philosophy of Life” to the students at Tsing Hua University. According to him, there is qualitative difference between the impersonal and materialistic nature of science (Not-I) and the personal and spiritual nature of philosophy of life (I). The former is said to be objective, logical, analytical, causal, and uniform in character; the latter is said to be subjective, intuitive, synthetic, based on freedom of the will and rising from the uniqueness of human personality. Because of this difference, Chang argued, science cannot and should not determine the question of values that constitute a philosophy of life.

Chang’s view was quickly attacked by Ting Wen-chiang (V.K. Ting, 1887-1936), a famous geologist, who found in Chang’s view a “metaphysical ghost” who had long been unemployed in the West and suddenly appeared in China. In less than a year, virtually all the major intellectuals in China joined in the battle. At the end of 1923, the major articles in this debate were collected and published as *Science and Philosophy of Life*, which amounts to 250,000 words. Hu Shih and Ch’en Tu-hsiu were asked to write introductions to it. During the debate Hu Shih was not actively involved due to his illness, but he was certainly in the pro-science camp.¹⁸

An important issue in the debate is the nature of science. It is possible for a traditionalist to define science so narrowly that the question of values is entirely beyond its boundary. The modernists tended to hold a broader conception of science, including natural as well as social and human sciences. Another important issue concerns the place of human will in the natural world. The traditionalists generally emphasized freedom of the will to such an extent that there was an absolute dichotomy between body and spirit in man. The modernists tended to minimize the importance of human will or understand it within the context of the natural world.

Hu Shih’s position will be analyzed in detail later. In general, his view is similar to John Dewey’s. Like Dewey, Hu rejected the dualism of body and spirit. If there is no such dualism, there would be no reason why science, understood broadly as in Pragmatism, could not deal with the spiritual aspect of man. In *Reconstruction in Philosophy* published in 1919, Dewey in fact advocated an American “new culture movement” mainly because, in his view, the traditional dichotomy between body and soul could no longer be the foundation of philosophy. Dewey admitted that the methods used in natural sciences were inadequate for the study of social and human problems, but he was confident that it would be possible to develop, form, and produce “the intellectual instrumentalities which will progressively direct inquiry into the deeply and inclusively human – that is to say, moral – facts of the present scene and situation.”¹⁹

Hu Shih believed in the freedom of human will, but he held that the will should be understood within the general framework of a naturalist universe. The naturalistic tendency in Hu’s thought began very early in his life. The first seed was sown by the rationalistic and naturalistic elements in Confucianism. In his childhood, Hu Shih was very much terrified by the vivid descriptions of various hells and ugly and fierce gods in popular Buddhism. At the age of eleven, while rereading aloud *The Elementary Lessons* of Chu Hsi, he came upon a passage where Chu Hsi quoted Ssu-ma Kuang in an attack on the popular belief in heaven and hell. The quotation reads: “When the body has decayed, the spirit fades away. Even if there be such cruel tortures in Hell as Chiseling, Burning, Pounding, and Grinding, whereon are these to be inflicted?” Hu Shih began to doubt the idea of judgment after death.²⁰ Shortly afterward, when he was reading Ssu-ma Kuang’s *The General Mirror for Government*, he came upon a passage which he credited to making him an atheist. The passage tells a philosopher of the fifth century A.D. named Fan Chen who championed the theory of the destructibility of the spirit or soul against the whole Imperial Court, which was then patronizing Mahayana

Buddhism. Fan Chen's view was summed up by Ssu-ma Kung in these words: "The body is the material basis of the spirit, and the spirit is only the functioning of the body. The spirit is to the body what sharpness is to a sharp knife. We have never known the existence of sharpness after the destruction of the knife. How can we admit the survival of the spirit when the body is gone?" Fan Chen also attacked the Buddhist doctrine of *karma*, and Hu Shih found his argument convincing.²¹

Hu Shih's naturalistic orientation was of course later reinforced by the Darwinian theory of biological evolution and Dewey's philosophy.

D. Hu Shih's Basic Philosophical Position

Hu Shih's basic philosophical position is most fully expressed in his introductory article for *Science and Philosophy of Life*. In examining the views expressed in the great debate, he felt that there was a common defect among the defenders of science in that they concentrated too much on the general and abstract question whether it is possible for science to deal with human values. He suggested that they should go a step further to state what was actually a scientific philosophy of life, so that the debate would be on more concrete issues. He detected that the defenders of science were reluctant to state their views of life on the basis of science because they were not sure what a scientific philosophy of life was, and also because they were afraid to get into the territory of metaphysics that they were attacking. He agreed with Ch'en Tu-hsiu when Ch'en said that, if the scientists failed to provide a scientific view of life, then the metaphysicians would have the monopoly of answering all the problems of human life.²²

According to Hu Shih, those who believe in science should be willing to develop a grand hypothesis about the universe and man's place in it, which is a philosophy of life. As long as the hypothesis is based on the facts already known and can be revised and improved on the basis of new evidence, there is no reason why scientists should not enter the realm of the so-called "unknown," the realm that has been unwittingly conceded to metaphysicians. Hu Shih highly recommended Wu Chih-hui (1865-1953), a philosophical materialist, because he was the only person boldly stating his "materialistic and mechanistic philosophy of life" to combat the "metaphysical ghosts." In this way, the real or crucial issue is no longer whether science can solve human problems. The issues become whether there is God, whether there are spirits and ghosts, whether there are souls.

Hu Shih took up his own challenge, and formulated his philosophy of life on the foundation of available scientific knowledge. He proposed it as a grand hypothesis and called it "the naturalistic conception of life and the universe." Since the hypothesis is stated in ten points and is very anti-religion in tone, hostile Christian missionaries called it "Hu Shih's New Decalogue." The ten points, in his words, are:

1. On the basis of our knowledge of astronomy and physics, we should recognize that the world of space is infinitely large.
2. On the basis of our geological and paleontological knowledge, we should recognize that that the universe extends over infinite time.
3. On the basis of all our verifiable scientific knowledge, we should recognize that the universe and everything in it follow natural laws of movement and change – "natural" in the Chinese sense of "being so of themselves" – and that there is no need for the concept of a supernatural Ruler or Creator.
4. On the basis of the biological sciences, we should recognize the terrific wastefulness and brutality in the struggle for existence in the biological world, and consequently the un-tenability of the hypothesis of a benevolent Ruler.
5. On the basis of the biological, physiological, and psychological sciences, we should recognize that man is only one species in the animal kingdom and differs from the other species only in degree, but not in kind.
6. On the basis of the knowledge derived from anthropology, sociology, and biological sciences, we should understand the history and causes of the evolution of living organisms and of human society.
7. On the basis of the biological and psychological sciences, we should recognize that all psychological phenomena are explainable through the law of causality.
8. On the basis of biological and historical knowledge, we should recognize that morality and religion are subject to change, and that the causes of such change can be scientifically studied.
9. On the basis of our newer knowledge of physics and chemistry, we should recognize that matter is full of motion and not static.

10. On the basis of biological, sociological, and historical knowledge, we should recognize that the individual self is subject to death and decay, but the sum total of individual achievement, for better or for worse, lives on in the immortality of the Larger Self; that to live for the sake of the species and posterity is religion of the highest kind; and that those religions which seek a future life either in Heaven or in the Pure Land, are selfish religions.²³

In spite of his atheistic and naturalistic stand, Hu Shih was very much interested in the function of religion in human society and was also concerned with problem of ultimate human destiny. Living in depressing times in China, Hu Shih was at first quite pessimistic about the meaning of life. After he went to study at Cornell, he found it difficult to cheer and shout with the crowd while watching football games. In the summer of 1911, after the semester was over, he was invited to attend a conference of the Chinese Christian Students' Association held at Pocono Pines, Pennsylvania. Moved by a testimony about a new life in Jesus Christ, Hu stood up and declared his desire to become a Christian. But later he drifted away from Christianity and came to think that in that episode he was a victim of a trap set up by the preacher on the basis of human emotion.²⁴ Gradually, he became caught up with the optimistic spirit of America. In 1915 he wrote the essay "In Defense of Browning's Optimism," and was awarded the Hiram Corson Prize for the best essay on Robert Browning. From then on, he was able to face the "terrific wastefulness and brutality in the struggle for existence in the biological world" with an optimistic view.

For many years, Hu Shih had contented himself with an ancient Chinese doctrine of "three immortalities" found in the Tso Commentary of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*: the immortality of virtue, of service, and of wise speech. In 1918, when his mother died, Hu Shih felt that this doctrine was in need of revision because it neglected the common people who did not have great virtue, service, or wise speech for the posterity to remember, and because it failed to "furnish any negative check on human conduct." He came to believe that everything we do, whether great or small, good or bad, would have direct or indirect effects on other people. What we are today is result of what our forefathers consciously or unconsciously did. For this reason Hu Shih often blamed the Chinese forefathers for the great evils that the Chinese people suffer today. He also urged the Chinese to "create new (good) causes" so that our posterity would enjoy a better life.²⁵ He said,

"As I reviewed the life of my dead mother, whose activities has never gone beyond the trivial details of the home but whose influence could be clearly seen on the faces of those men and women who came to mourn her death, and as I recalled the personal influence of my father on her whole life and its lasting effect on myself, I came to the conviction that everything is immortal. Everything that we are, everything that we do, and everything that we say is immortal in the sense that it has an effect everywhere in this world, and that effect in truth will have its results somewhere else, and the thing goes on in infinite time and space."²⁶

For Hu Shih, the larger Self is basically the human society, but it could also be extended to mean the natural universe as a whole. To live for the good of the Larger Self is in his view religion of the highest kind.

E. Hu Shih's Thought and Communism

The two most important figures in the New Culture Movement were Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Hu Shih. Hu Shih's rise was to a large extent aided by Ch'en, then a dean of Peking University and the editor of the *New Youth*. After 1919, Ch'en turned from Mr. Democracy to Communism largely because of his disappointment at the Versailles decision in which the democratic nations betrayed China by granting Japan's demand for the Shantung Peninsula.

During the great debate in 1923, both Hu and Ch'en were on the side of science and both were invited to write an introduction to *Science and the Philosophy of Life*. But one finds significant difference between them, especially the questions of human will and the place of culture in the universe.

According to Hu Shih, freedom of the will is very limited, but it is very important for creating a new culture and for transforming Chinese society. Hu's optimism lies mainly in his confidence that man can "create new causes" for the good of the future. Man can use his intelligence to create new ideas and through the ideas to master the natural forces for human happiness. He said,

“In this naturalistic universe, in this universe of infinite space and time, man, the two-handed animal whose average height is about five feet and a half and whose age rarely exceeds a hundred years, is indeed a mere infinitesimal microbe. In this naturalistic universe, where every motion in the heavens has its regular course and every change follows laws of nature, where causality governs man’s life and the struggle for existence spurs his activities – in such a universe man has very little freedom indeed.

“Yet this tiny animal of two hands has his proper place and worth in that world of infinite magnitude. Making good use of his hands and a large brain, he has actually succeeded in making a number of tools, thinking out ways and means, and creating his own civilization. He has not only domesticated the wild animals, but he has also studied and discovered a considerable number of the secrets and laws of nature by means of which he has become a master of the natural forces and is now ordering electricity to drive his carriage and ether to deliver his message.

“The increase of his knowledge has extended his power, but it has also widened his vision and elevated his imagination. There were times when he worshipped stones and animals and was afraid of the gods and ghosts. But he is now moving away from these childish habits, and is slowly coming to a realization that the infinity of space only enhances his aesthetic appreciation of the universe, the infinite length of geological and archaeological time only makes him better understand the terrific hardship his forefathers had to encounter in building up this human inheritance, and the regularity of the movements and changes in the heavens and on earth only furnishes him the key to his dominion over nature.

“Even the absolute universality of the law of causality does not necessarily limit his freedom, because the law of causality not only enables him to explain the past and predict the future, but also encourages him to use his intelligence to create new causes and attain new results. Even the apparent cruelty in the struggle for existence does not necessarily make him a hardened brute; on the contrary, it may intensify his sympathy for his fellow men, make him believe more firmly in the necessity of cooperation, and convince him of the importance of conscious human endeavor as the only means of reducing the brutality and wastefulness of the natural struggles. In short, this naturalistic conception of the universe and life is not necessarily devoid of beauty, of poetry, of moral responsibility, and of the fullest opportunity for the exercise of the creative intelligence of man.”²⁷

It is significant to note that Hu Shih has not tried to derive human values logically from facts about the natural universe. He is only pointing to the possibility of creating values in such a universe. It is possible for a person, such as a Buddhist, to agree with Hu Shih on everything he has said about the natural universe, and yet to believe that it would be futile to find happiness in this world. This is the major difference between Hu Shih’s philosophy and a philosophy such as Buddhism.

Hu Shih’s view that man can use his will and freedom to create a desirable civilization was attacked by Ch’en Tu-hsiu from the Marxist point of view. In his introductory essay for *Science and Philosophy of Life*, Ch’en used the theory of Dialectical Materialism to reject Chang Chung-mai’s view that philosophy of life is subjective, intuitive, synthetic, based on the freedom of the will and arisen from the uniqueness of human personality. According to Ch’en, all the different philosophies of life mentioned by Chang were determined by “objective material causes,” namely the economic conditions of the times. He rejected the idea that there was such a thing as conscience, intuition, or the freedom of the will that could determine a philosophy of life, explain history, or change a society. At the end of his article, he accused Ting Wen-chiang and indirectly Hu Shih of an “idealistic” tendency because they failed to explain the formation of a philosophy of life exclusively in terms of “objective material conditions.”²⁸

Ch’en’s accusation gave rise to a round of debate between Ch’en and Hu. In his reply, Hu Shih says that the issue depends very much on what is meant by “objective material causes.” He states that it is no problem for him to regard the mind as a manifestation of matter. He goes on to say that just because of this, when one talks about “objective material causes,” one must include all the activities of the mind, such as knowledge, thought, speech, education, etc. He objects to Ch’en’s method of reducing “matter” to “economic forces.” According to Hu, the Marxist interpretation of history in terms of economics can at most explain a majority of historical phenomena but not the whole. Finally, he asks Ch’en if Ch’en had not really believed that knowledge, thought, speech, and education could change a society, explain history, and determine a philosophy of life, then he should have sat down in an armchair and just observed the

changing process of economic conditions. He should not have worked so hard for propagating new ideas and for creating a new culture.²⁹

In his reply, Ch'en Tu-hsiu reiterates his view that economics is the cause of all changes in knowledge, thought, speech and education of a given historical period, and denies that it is only one of many causes along with knowledge, thought, etc. He calls the former view "monism" and the latter "pluralism." Ch'en, however, admits that human effort and the exercise of intelligence are necessary for the progress of society, and adds that their effects are limited to the extent made possible by the material conditions of the society.³⁰

The basic issue in the debate between Ch'en and Hu is on the nature of human will in the natural world. This is a perennial philosophical problem. Neither Hu Shih nor Ch'en Tu-hsiu has gone into a detailed analysis of the problem. Whatever the theoretical difficulties in their respective philosophical systems, it is clear that both Hu and Ch'en theoretically recognize much less freedom of the will than the traditionalists do. Between Hu and Ch'en, Hu acknowledges a greater role of the free will than Ch'en does. But in practice, Hu Shih was the strongest advocate of the freedom of the will in the form of individualism. Following the tradition of liberalism in the West, Hu Shih holds that a good society must consist of individuals who are free to express their views and to create new ideas for the improvement of human life. The traditionalists tended to emphasize the need for individuals to conform to ancient teachings. The Communists believe in Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism and later Maoism as the absolute truth. It is indeed very paradoxical that, while theoretically discounting the importance of ideas in changing a society, the Communists, in practice, resort to the most careful control of thought and use of propaganda to create and maintain a society. This dogmatic and authoritarian orientation in Communism is one reason Hu Shih was so much opposed to.

In proposing his philosophy of life, Hu Shih did not mean to assert an absolute truth based on science. Apart from the fact it was proposed as a hypothesis, he stated that the ten points that he had formulated were only intended to be the "minimum" common ground for building a view of life. The implication is that each individual is to a certain degree free to "create new causes" for making life happy. Hu Shih's universe is therefore a universe open to novelty. The biological world is wasteful and brutal, but man can overcome the evils. In spite of the tension between the biological world and the ideal society, Hu Shih resisted a bifurcation between body and mind in his philosophy.

In 1930 Hu Shih wrote an article introducing his own thought. He said that Ch'en Tu-hsiu had at one time made the suggestion that, since Pragmatism and Dialectical Materialism were the two most important methods of thought in the modern world, the two methods should make an alliance to fight against traditional thought. He rejected the idea, saying that the Dialectical Method has originated in Hegel's philosophy and was a metaphysical method established before the development of Darwin's theory of evolution. Pragmatism or Experimentalism was, on the other hand, a scientific method developed after the evolutionary theory was established. He said,

"Darwin's theory of biological evolution taught us a great lesson, namely that biological evolution, whether through natural development or human selection, is a gradual process of small changes one at a time. It is a very complex phenomenon. There is no simple goal that can be attained by a giant leap, nor is there any permanent state that can be reached after such a leap. The philosophy of Dialectical Method was originally a theory of evolution established before the development of biology. According to its own theory, the process of changes between thesis and antithesis should continue without an end. But the Communists of the narrow kind seem to have forgotten this principle. They dogmatically and illusorily set up an ideal world of shared production and shared ownership. They believe that it can be easily attained by the means of class struggle, and that, when it has been attained, it can be kept from further changes under the dictatorship of a class. To reduce the complex to the simple and to deny the continuous process of changes is one hundred percent a dogmatic thought before the rise of Darwinism. It is much more dogmatic than Hegel's philosophy."³¹

One may properly raise the question whether Hu Shih had adequately understood Communism or whether his interpretation of Darwinism was sound. In any case, it is clear that his criticism of Communism and his interpretation of Darwinism do reflect his philosophical orientation. Like Dewey, Hu believed that society should be changed and reformed through a piecemeal process. Hu Shih said,

"A culture is not formed altogether at once. It is formed little by little. Evolution is not completed altogether overnight. It takes place little by little. People today love to talk about 'liberation' and 'reform.' One must realize

that liberation is not liberation altogether and that reform is not reform altogether. Liberation is the liberation of this or that institution, this or that thought, this or that person. It must be a gradual liberation, little by little. Reform is the reform of this or that institution, this or that thought, this or that person. It must be gradual reform, little by little."³²

Ch'en Tu-hsiu did not have such great patience for gradual changes. Nor did the Communists.

In 1949 the Communists succeeded in bringing about the most drastic revolution in Chinese history. Hu Shih fled to the United States. The Communists did not forget him, nor was his thought forgotten in China. In 1951, the Communists launched a nationwide campaign to purge Hu Shih's thought from China. It began with an attack on a work written by one of Hu's former students at Peking University, a work about the famous novel *The Dream of the Red Chamber*. Hu Shih's philosophy was allegedly found in it. As the campaign went on, his thought was found in almost every area of cultural and scholarly activities, in philosophy, history, literature, arts, language and politics. One of the many people persecuted was a person called Hu Feng, someone not personally known to Hu Shih. His name literally means "the wind of Hu." He was criticized for having advocated freedom of expression in the arts and literature. According to Hu's own calculation, the government-sponsored campaign against his thought from 1951 to 1955 produced articles and volumes in China amounting to at least seven to eight million words. Hu Shih's thought was denounced as reactionary, bourgeois, capitalistic, imperialistic, and anti-Chinese.³³

F. Hu Shih's Evaluation of Chinese Culture

There is a certain dilemma in Hu Shih's attitude toward traditional Chinese culture. On the one hand, in order to promote a new culture, he attacked it as strongly as possible so that his countrymen would realize its bankruptcy and the need to learn from the West. On the other hand, being a historian of thought, he knew that there could be some continuity between the old and the new by emphasizing certain aspects of the old culture. This could also be a good strategy for gaining some sympathy from the tradition-minded people.

In *The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China* written in 1917, Hu Shih raised the question: "How can we best assimilate modern civilization in such a manner as to make it congenial and congruous and continuous with the civilization of our own making?"³⁴ He expressed the fear that an abrupt acceptance of the new would cause the disappearance of the good in the old. He learned later that to emphasize continuity tended to strengthen the traditionalist position that it was only necessary to revive the old as the "foundation" and to adopt the good from the West as the "branches."

Thus Hu Shih became more and more impatient with the problem of preserving the good elements in the old. He argued in 1935 that the thing we should worry about was not how to preserve the good thing in the old but how to deal with the inertia of the old culture because it was the very nature of the old culture to preserve itself.³⁵ Hu Shih was willing to throw away the gems together with the trash in order to create a new civilization, for the gems could in any case be picked up again later. Hu Shih has often been regarded as one of those who advocated "wholesale westernization" of China. In an article written in 1935, he suggested that the phrase "wholehearted modernization" would be a better description of his position.³⁶

It would be reasonable to say that of all the philosophies in China, Confucianism is closest to Hu Shih's thought. But there is a great controversy as to what Confucianism actually means. Does it refer to the teachings of Confucius himself, or Mencius, or Hsun Tzu, or Tung Chung-shu, or Chu Hsi, or Wang Yang-ming? Does it also mean the state cult, the civil service examination, the eight-legged style of writing, etc.? Should Confucianism be blamed for concubinage, foot-binding of women, prostitution, or the eunuch system? Since Confucianism stands for the main tradition of China for more than two thousand years, it is always easy to find something in it to criticize or praise. In the battle cry against the old tradition, Hu Shih was able to shout with his fellow modernists, "Down with Confucius and Sons!" But in his sober and scholarly works Hu was willing to admit that his own thought was very much influenced by Confucian philosophy and that Confucianism had been a very important civilizing force in China.

In an article on Chinese thought written in 1946 for Western readers, he approvingly stressed the basically rationalistic, naturalistic, and humanistic orientation of Confucian thought.³⁷ The failure to produce natural sciences and to develop a democratic system of society were usually mentioned as its shortcomings. He also pointed out that

the rationalistic Neo-Confucianism tended to be dogmatic, authoritarian and metaphysical. For this reason, he was more sympathetic to the empirical-oriented, anti-rationalistic and anti-metaphysical thinkers of the Ch'ing Dynasty such as Tai Chen (1724-1777).³⁸ Hu Shih recognized that some democratic ideas did exist in Confucianism as in Mencius' thought and that some scientific spirit could be found in Chu Hsi's philosophy and the Ch'ing Confucian thought.³⁹

Partly to show varieties in the Chinese heritage and partly to put down the dominant position of Confucianism, Hu Shih gave equal or even more favorable treatment of non-Confucian schools in his study of classical Chinese philosophy. He applied the "genetic method" to the major schools of thought. In so doing, he opened up new problems, new perspectives, and new interpretations, and stimulated many controversies and further researches by other scholars. Hu Shih emphasized Lao Tzu's and Chuang Tzu's roles as a critic of contemporary society and went so far as to characterize them, especially Lao Tzu, as a "revolutionary," apparently in the sense of advocating individual freedom against social conformity and the ruler's power. The mystical aspect of their teachings was either discounted or minimized. Their naturalistic thought was highly stressed. He found in Chuang Tzu's thought a theory of biological evolution comparable to Darwin's theory. But he later admitted that he had gone too far in making the comparison.⁴⁰

Hu Shih was mainly responsible for bring scholars' attention to the logical theories developed in Later Mohism. The Mohist principles of universal love and utilitarianism were also appreciated.⁴¹ As to the "Legalist School," Hu was sympathetic to its position that all men should be equal before the law. The Legalists also advocated that a new culture should be created according to the needs of the new historical circumstances.⁴²

Needless to say, Hu Shih did not believe that any of the ancient philosophies was adequate for solving the problems of twentieth-century China. He could not endorse the dictatorial view of government advocated in the Legalist School, the personalistic conception of Heaven in Mohism, or the negative and passive attitude toward human civilization in Taoism.

Although his own philosophy is strongly anti-Buddhist, he did considerable research on Chinese Buddhism. He regarded the introduction of Buddhism into China as an unfortunate event and blamed Buddhism for the "religious fanaticism" in the Medieval Period, such as cutting off one's own arm or setting oneself on fire for the faith. The "Indianization" of China was compared by him to the Christianization of Europe in the Middle ages. In both cases, it was regarded as a dark age. "Modernization" was seen by him largely as a liberation from medieval thought. Hu Shih gave credit to Neo-Confucianism for restoring some rationality and humanity to China.⁴³

Hu Shih's historical research covered philosophy, religion, literature, arts, and politics. He made contributions and aroused criticisms in every field. He had the gift and the patience needed for combing a vast amount of historical materials. No wonder that, when the Communists decided to purge his influence from China, they found his ghost everywhere.

G. Civilizations East and West

It has often been said that Eastern civilization is "spiritual" and the Western civilization is "materialistic." Such a view was expressed by many European thinkers after the First World War and was reflected in Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's *Impressions of my European Journey*, and in Liang Sou-ming's *Eastern and Western Civilizations*. Hu Shih felt that such a view was a dangerous "myth" that would prevent China from modernization. So in 1926 he wrote an article in Chinese entitled "Our Attitude Toward the Modern Civilization of the West." A revised English version was published in 1928 as "The Civilizations of the East and the West." These articles provoked bitter reactions in the East and the West.

Consistent with his rejection of the dualism of body and mind, Hu Shih holds that a civilization is really a joint product of the material and the spiritual. It is "simply the sum-product of (a race's) achievement in adjusting itself to its environment."⁴⁴ Our intelligence, which is spiritual, is essentially for the invention of the "necessary and effective tools" to adjust or control the environment. Advancement in civilization depends upon "the improvement of tools." No civilization is purely spiritual, for the spiritual must be expressed in the material.

The term “tools” may mean “theories,” as in the Pragmatist theory of knowledge. But Hu Shih uses it here to mean material tools, such as stone, fire, agriculture, writing, printing, telescope, etc. For him, such names as the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, the Iron Age, and the Steam and Electricity Age tell the tale of the development of civilization. Thus the difference between the Eastern and Western civilizations is not that between the spiritual and the material but that between the tools used. Since the West has moved far ahead in the invention of new tools to conquer nature in the last two hundred years, a major difference between the East and the West is that between the use of human labor and the use of machinery as the source of power.

To use vivid language, Hu Shih calls the Oriental civilization a rickshaw civilization and the Occidental civilization a motor-car civilization. He says that when we call a motor-car material, we are only referring to the physical aspect of the car. He adds that a motor-car really presupposes a quality of human intelligence that is not inferior to the mind that composes a poem. There is therefore no point for the person riding a rickshaw to boast about his “spiritual” life and laugh at the person who has invented and is driving a motor vehicle.⁴⁵

Hu Shih not only argues that the spirituality presupposed in the making of a car is superior to the spirituality presupposed in the making of a rickshaw, he also argues that in science, morality, literature, arts and music, the West is more spiritual than the East. Nothing is more spiritual than to know the truth that science has discovered, and nothing is more spiritual than the dignity of human life that a democratic society has provided.

Hu Shih goes on to attack the so-called “spirituality” in Oriental religions such as Buddhism. He asks: “What spirituality is there, let us say, in the old beggar-woman who dies while still mumbling, “Nama Amita Buddha!” and in the clear conviction that she will surely enter that blissful paradise presided over by Amita Buddha? Do we earnestly think it moral or spiritual to inculcate in that beggar-woman a false belief which shall so hypnotize her as to make her willingly live and die in such dire conditions where she ought not to have been had she been born in a different civilization?”⁴⁶ According to Hu Shih, such a religion is “hypnotic” in character. It is defeatism, conceding that man cannot control his own life and cannot build a good society on earth. Hu includes Christianity among the hypnotic religions, and he quotes a revolutionary song to make his point:

I fight alone, and win or sink,
I need no one to make me free;
I want no Jesus Christ to think
That he could ever die for me.⁴⁷

According to Hu Shih, the West has largely freed itself from the Christianity that dominated the West in the Medieval Ages, but the East is still very much under the power of medieval hypnotic religions.

Hu Shih suggests that the term “material civilization” ought to have a purely neutral meaning because all tools of civilization are material embodiments of ideas. But the phrase “materialistic civilization” is a more appropriate name for Eastern than Western civilizations, because the former are under the control of matter and incapable of mastering it. To try to transcend matter by means of gods and a future life is only an illusory solution. The truly spiritual civilization is to make full use of human intelligence for the conquest of nature and for the improvement of the conditions of man.

Conclusion

A figure like Hu Shih is bound to be evaluated by many people from their partisan points of view. He has been regarded as the champion of the liberal cause in the twentieth-century China. The Communists have attacked him as a reactionary and a running dog of Western imperialism. The traditionalists and the Nationalists tend to blame him for the mess and eventually the loss of China to the Communists. One may also find that at the bottom of his heart Hu Shih was a Confucian gentleman. Whatever one’s evaluation of his life and thought, there is no doubt that he will be long remembered for the role he played in the New Culture Movement.

Hu Shih believes that the task of philosophy is to solve problems. In his attempt to solve China’s problems, he has answered most of the fundamental questions of philosophy. He tried to convince other people to accept his views, but he was more concerned that other people would think for themselves according to the method of thinking that he

advocated. In the 1930 article, in which he introduced his own thought to the young people in China, Hu Shih concluded by saying,

“A Ch’an monk once said, ‘Bodhidharma came to China just for the purpose of finding a person who would not be deluded.’ In my works that amount to hundreds of thousands of words, I am also only teaching people a method by which they would not be deluded. It is certainly not good to be led by Confucius and Chu Hsi by the nose. To be led by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin by the nose is not a great man either. I myself never intend to lead anybody by the nose. I am only hoping that through my humble effort the young people will be taught an ability to defend themselves so that they would strive to become a person who cannot be deluded.”⁴⁸

Notes

1. For Hu Shih’s life, see his own article “Hu Shih” in Albert Einstein, etc., *Living Philosophies* (Forum Publishing Co., 1939; Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1931), 235-263. For further information, see Jerome B. Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance* (Harvard University Press, 1970) and Fan Kuang-huan, *A Study of Hu Shih’s Thought* (New York University, Ph.D. dissertation, 1963).
2. *Living Philosophies*, 250.
3. The Boxer Rebellion against the foreigners took place in 1900. As a result, China paid a large amount of indemnity to many nations. The United States returned her portion to establish scholarships.
4. On the May Fourth Movement, see Tse-tung Chow, *The May Fourth Movement* (Harvard University Press, 1960). Also Hu Shih, *The Chinese Renaissance* (University of Chicago Press, 1934; Paragon Book Co., 1963).
5. Hu Shih, *Chung-kuo che-hsueh-shih ta-kang* (Outline of the History of Chinese Philosophy). Since only the first part has been published, it is also called *Chung-kuo ku-tai che-hsueh shih* (History of Ancient Chinese Philosophy). The edition used here was published in 1958 by the Commercial Press in Taiwan; p. 1.
6. *Living Philosophies*, 254-256.
7. “Wen-t’i yu chu-i” (Problems and Issues), in *Hu Shih wen-ts’un* (Collection of Hu Shih’s Works, hereafter *HSWT*; the edition used here was published in 1953 by Yuan-tung Book Co. in Taiwan), I, 345.
8. *Ibid.*, I, 374-378.
9. Basically the same method is discussed in his *Outline of the History of Chinese Philosophy*, 3-5.
10. See “Wo-men tsou na-t’iao lu?” (Which Road Should We Take?, written in 1930), *HSWT*, IV, 431-432.
11. “Wen-hsueh kai-liang ch’u-i” (Tentative Proposals for the Improvement of Literature), *HSWT*, I, 5.
12. “Chien-she-ti wen-hsueh ko-ming lun” (On Constructive Literary Revolution), *HSWT*, I, 56.
13. Hu Shih was an admirer of Henrik Ibsen, and advocated Ibsenism, which stands for realism and naturalism in literature and individualism in social philosophy. See “I-pi-shen chu-i” (Ibsenism, written in 1918), *HSWT*, I, 629-647.
14. “Which Road Should We Take?”, *HSWT*, IV, 432.
15. For the various responses to science in China, see D.W.Y. Kwok, *Scientism in Chinese Thought: 1900-1950* (Yale University Press, 1965).
16. *Ou-yu hsin-ying lu* (Impressions of My European Journey). A condensed version is in his *Yin-ping-shih ho-chi* (Collected Works from the Ice-Drinker’s Studio). For Hu Shih’s response, see *HSWT*, II, 121-124.
17. *Tung hsi wen-hua chi ch’i che-hsueh* (Eastern and Western Civilizations and Their Philosophies; Shanghai, Commercial Press, 1922). For Hu Shih’s response, see *HSWT*, II, 158-177.
18. *K’o-hsueh yu jen-sheng-kuan* (Science and Philosophy of Life, 2 vols.; Shanghai: Yu-tung, 1923). Hu Shih’s preface or introductory essay is also found in *HSWT*, II, 120-139.
19. John Dewey, *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (enlarged edition, Beacon Press, 1948), xxvii (from his 1948 Introduction).
20. *Living Philosophies*, 243.
21. *Ibid.*, 243-244.
22. *HSWT*, II, 127-129.
23. *HSWT*, II, 136-137. The translation here was by Hu Shih himself in *Living Philosophies*, 260-261.
24. *Hu Shih liu-hsueh jih-chi* (Hu Shih’s Diary While Studying Abroad; Shanghai: Ya-tung, 1939; Commercial Press, 1947), I, 50. Also Tuan Hung-chun, ed., *Hu Shih yu-ts’ui* (Hu Shih’s Selected Works: Taipei: Ta-his-yang, 1970), 113-115.
25. *HSWT*, IV, 452, 463.

26. *Living Philosophies*, 257. Cf., "Pu-hsiu: wo-ti tsung-chiao" (Immortality: My Religion, published in 1919), *HSWT*, I, 693-702.
27. *Living Philosophies*, 262-263. Cf., *HSWT*, II, 137-138.
28. Chen Tu-hsiu's preface is found in *HSWT*, II, 139-147.
29. *HSWT*, II, 147-149.
30. *HSWT*, II, 149-154.
31. "Chieh-shao wo tzu-chi ti ssu-hsiang" (Introducing My Own Thought), *HSWT*, IV, 608-609.
32. *Ibid.*, IV, 609.
33. Tuan Hung-chun, *op. cit.*, 289-291. Also Chan Lien, "Chinese Communism Versus Pragmatism: The Criticism of Hu Shih's Philosophy, 1950-1958," *Journal of Asian Studies*, 27:3 (May, 1968), 551-570.
34. Hu Shih, *The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China* (Shanghai: Oriental Book Co., 1922; reprint, Paragon Book Co., 1963), 7.
35. *HSWT*, IV, 535-540.
36. *HSWT*, IV, 541-544.
37. Hu Shih, "Chinese Thought," in Harley F. MacNair, *China* (University of California Press, 1946), 221-230.
38. See "Chi-ko fan li-hsueh ti ssu-hsiang-chia" (Several Anti-rationalistic Thinkers), *HSWT*, I, 53-108.
39. See Hu Shih, "Chinese Thought," *op. cit.* Also see the following articles by Hu Shih: "The Scientific Spirit and Method in Chinese Philosophy," in Charles A. Moore, ed., *Philosophy and Culture—East and West* (University of Hawaii Press, 1962), 199-222; "The Right to Doubt in Ancient Chinese Thought," *Philosophy East and West*, 12:4 (January, 1963), 295-300.
40. See his 1958 preface to the *Outline of the History of Chinese Philosophy*, 2-3. Also *Outline*, I, 43-46; II, 109-133.
41. See his *Development of the Logical Method*, 53-130; *Outline*, II, 1-30; 39-108.
42. See *Outline*, III, 78-100.
43. "Chinese Thought," *op. cit.*, 228.
44. Hu Shih, "The Civilization of the East and the West," in Charles A. Beard, ed., *Whither Mankind* (Longmans, Green, and Co., 1928), 27. Cf., "Wo-men tui-yu hsi-yang chin-tai wen-ming ti t'ai-tu" (Our Attitude toward the Modern Civilization of the West), *HSWT*, III, 1-15.
45. Hu Shih, "The Civilizations of the East and the West," *op. cit.*, 27-29.
46. *Ibid.*, 30.
47. *Ibid.*, 31.
48. *HSWT*, IV, 623-624.