

SPECIAL THEME (1):
COMPARATIVE PHILOSOPHY AS A GENERAL WAY OF
DOING PHILOSOPHY THROUGH CROSS-TRADITION ENGAGEMENT
TOWARD WORLD PHILOSOPHY

PART II: ILLUSTRATING CASES
OF CROSS-TRADITION ENGAGEMENT WORLDWIDE <3>

DOING PHILOSOPHY COMPARATIVELY IN CHINA:
CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT OF MARXIST, WESTERN,
AND CHINESE TRADITIONAL PHILOSOPHY (2000-2022)

HONGYIN ZHOU & JIABIN YE

ABSTRACT: *Marxist philosophy, Western philosophy, and Chinese traditional philosophy constitute three main forces of contemporary Chinese philosophy. In the past two decades, a great deal of in-depth and extensive constructive engagement has been carried out among the three. Previous studies on such constructive engagement have focused on the perspectives of Western or Chinese traditional philosophy, while the perspective of Marxist philosophy has been neglected to a large extent. Given the key position of Marxist philosophy in contemporary Chinese philosophy, it is undoubtedly regrettable that such a perspective is missing. This paper aims to fill this gap in the perspective of examination from the perspective of Marxist philosophy by examining the constructive engagement between various research paths within contemporary Chinese Marxist philosophy on the one hand, and the constructive engagement between Marxist philosophy, Western and Chinese traditional philosophy on the other hand.*

Keywords: *Chinese traditional philosophy, constructive engagement, Marxist philosophy, Western philosophy*

Contemporary Chinese philosophy mainly includes (but is not limited to) three aspects: Marxist philosophy, Chinese traditional philosophy, and Western philosophy. The

ZHOU, HONGYIN (周宏胤): Postdoctoral Fellow, College of Philosophy, Nankai University, Tianjin, P. R. China. Email: 9820200111@nankai.edu.cn

YE, JIABIN (葉甲斌): Postdoctoral Fellow, Institute of Marxist Philosophy and Chinese Modernization & Department of Philosophy, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, P. R. China. Email: yejb8@mail.sysu.edu.cn

pattern of tripartite confrontation is both the result of the division of Chinese philosophical disciplines and the objective result of the historical development of Chinese philosophical disciplines.

Marxist philosophy, as a tradition of modern philosophy, involves a complex relationship of its origin and development. On the whole, the philosophical thoughts of Marx and Engels, the founders of Marxist philosophy, are undoubtedly the source of the entire Marxist philosophy. Following Marx and Engels, Marxist theorists of the Second International created a philosophical morphology of historical materialism with a strong historicist character. Marxist philosophers in Soviet Russia created a philosophical morphology of dialectical materialism with materialist ontology at its core. Western Marxist philosophers created a practical philosophical morphology with the critical theory of culture as its core. The above philosophical morphologies have successively become important conceptual sources of Marxist philosophy. By “Marxist philosophy” in this paper, we mainly refer to “contemporary Chinese Marxist philosophy”. On the one hand, it is the product of the engagement between the aforementioned sources of Marxist philosophy, and on the other hand, it is also the product of the engagement between Marxist philosophy as a whole and two other academic forces in contemporary China, Chinese traditional philosophy and Western philosophy. In this process, in terms of general trends, the methodological perspective and methodological instruments of Chinese Marxist philosophical research have undergone a shift from singular to pluralistic, and the methodological guiding principles have undergone a change from closed to open. In this paper, we will focus on the following two aspects respectively: (1) constructive engagement within contemporary Chinese Marxist philosophy; (2) constructive engagement of contemporary Chinese Marxist philosophy with traditional Chinese and Western philosophy. Finally, we will also present our thoughts on these two aspects in the context of the constructive engagement strategy. Due to the limited information possessed and space available, this paper cannot be exhaustive and is only for reference in further research.

1. CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN MARXIST PHILOSOPHY

Since the beginning of the 21st century, Chinese Marxist philosophical research has diversified in terms of disciplinary structure, research directions, and research paradigms, and its methodological guiding principle has become increasingly tolerant, incorporating many theoretical resources that were originally excluded by orthodox Marxism. The following illustrates the current situation of five main paths of contemporary Chinese Marxist philosophical research.

(1) Research on principles of Marxist Philosophy (馬克思主義哲學原理). Until the 1990s, research on principles of Marxist philosophy had been the mainstream of Chinese Marxist philosophical research. Influenced by the Soviet philosophy textbook system (蘇聯哲學教科書體系), the research on the principles of Marxist philosophy had originally focused on both *dialectical materialism* (辯證唯物主義) and *historical*

materialism (歷史唯物主義). Since the reform and opening up, the reform of the Soviet philosophy textbook system has become a hot topic in the academic community of Marxist philosophy. Some alternative systems have been proposed, the most representative of which is *practical materialism* (實踐唯物主義) characterized by the emphasis on understanding the relationship between human beings and the world from the perspective of human practice. In recent years, research in this area has evolved into a reflective study of the fundamental theories of Marxist philosophy due to its increasingly distinct trend of diversification and de-systematization. The ontology and epistemology of Marxist philosophy have all become hot topics.

(2) Research on history of Marxist philosophy (馬克思主義哲學史). It is primarily a research on the history of the emergence and development of Marxist philosophy. For a long time, the history of Marxist philosophy has been based on the model of the ideological history of revolutionary leaders and revolutionary mentors and has regarded the specific theoretical perspectives of revolutionary mentors and leaders as unquestionable. The history of Marxist philosophy is seen as a linear process of development, namely, the founding period of Marxist philosophy (Marx, Engels) - the period of dissemination during the Second International (Kautsky, Bernstein) - Soviet Russian Marxist philosophy (Lenin, Stalin) - Chinese Marxist philosophy (Mao Zedong, Deng Xiaoping). Such an unilinear narrative model excludes many unorthodox Marxist philosophers of different historical periods, and its unquestionable theoretical attitude prevents us from properly judging the thoughts of these Marxist philosophers. As a result, the process, when Marxist philosophy had been developed in abundant ways, has been simplified. In the last two decades, as the study of Marxist philosophy abroad has come into full swing, many non-orthodox Marxist schools, scholars, and their views have been incorporated into the research on the history of Marxist philosophy, and they are no longer viewed as objects of theoretical criticism, but as an indispensable part of the history of Marxist philosophy. Such an enlightened methodological guiding principle allows us to view the history of Marxist philosophy from increasing perspectives and brings to light the differences between the perspectives and the interactive engagement between them.

(3) Research on Foreign Marxist Philosophy (國外馬克思主義哲學). Foreign Marxist philosophy was introduced into the research horizon of Chinese Marxist philosophy and gradually became the conceptual resource of Chinese Marxist philosophy, when Chinese scholars and researchers criticized the textbook system of Marxist philosophical principles and reflected on the relationship between Chinese Marxist philosophy and the origin and development of Soviet Russian Marxist philosophy. On the whole, the research on foreign Marxist philosophy in China has undergone a process from initial negative critique to constructive engagement. Foreign Marxist philosophy was introduced into China in the early 1980s. The philosophers of foreign Marxism earliest known to Chinese scholars include Georg Lukács, Gramsci Antonio, Karl Korsch, Ernst Bloch, Henri Lefebvre, Jean-Paul Sartre, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Galvano Del-la-Volpe, Lucio Colletti and Louis Pierre Althusser. The new perspectives of historicism, practical philosophy, humanism, existentialism and structuralism they adopted differed dramatically from the dialectical materialist

perspective of orthodox Marxist philosophy, impressing Chinese scholars at the time and directly contributing to the debates on issues of alienation, humanism, and subjectivity among them. However, the methodological guiding principles of Chinese Marxist philosophy were still quite closed at that time, so that the East-West dichotomy was still prevalent. In the following decade or so, Foreign Marxist philosophy was regarded as a heresy of Marxist philosophy and was cautiously treated as a non-Marxist ideology. With the increasingly individualized and diversified interpretations of the theoretical nature and connotations of Marxist philosophy since the beginning of the 21st century, the research on foreign Marxist philosophy has been provided with a more liberal research environment, and it has become more and more common to reconstruct Marxist philosophy through the perspectives and methods of Foreign Marxist philosophy. In addition to the above-mentioned foreign Marxist philosophers, philosophers in the tradition of analytical Marxism, ecological Marxism, post-Marxism, and contemporary radical left-wing Marxism have brought new perspectives for the study of Marxist philosophy in China and have attracted the participation by a large number of scholars and students.

(4) Research on sinicization of Marxist Philosophy (馬克思主義哲學中國化). Research on sinicization of Marxist Philosophy specifically involves two aspects: one is the integration of Marxist philosophy with traditional Chinese culture; the other is the integration of Marxist philosophy with the present reality of China. For a long time, the focus of research in this area has been on making arguments for the leaders' doctrines (e.g., arguing that they have accomplished a deep integration of the universal principles of Marxist philosophy with the concrete reality of China), and thus it can hardly be delineated from ideological propaganda, and its academic nature has been questioned by academically minded scholars. In the last two decades, many scholars have shifted their focus to research on the history of the early spread of Marxist philosophy in China from a more neutral academic standpoint, as well as on the fit between Marxist philosophy and traditional Chinese culture, and have published some highly scholarly papers and monographs, achieving the shift to some extent.

(5) Research on sub-disciplines of philosophy (部門哲學) from the perspective of Marxist Philosophy. In addition to the research fields already mentioned above, some other scholars have stepped out of the traditional framework of disciplinary division and have been actively involved in research activities with other secondary disciplines of philosophy or other empirical sciences from the perspective of Marxist philosophy, resulting in some interdisciplinary research findings. He Ping (何萍) and Yi Junqing (衣俊卿) et al. have investigated Marxist philosophy of culture, Yu Yuanpei (余源培), Sun Bokui (孫伯鏘) and Zhang Yibing (張一兵) et al. have investigated Marxist philosophy of economy, and Gao Qinghai (高清海), Feng Ziyi (丰子義), and Liu Senlin (劉森林) et al. have researched Marxist philosophy of development and social philosophy. In addition, Li Lianke (李連科) and Li Deshun (李德順) et al. have researched Marxist philosophy of value, Qiao Ruijin (喬瑞金) has researched Marxist philosophy of technology, and Wang Nanshi (王南湜) and Xu Changfu (徐長福) et al. have researched Marxist philosophy of practice. These interdisciplinary constructive

engagements have broadened the horizons of Marxist philosophical research as well as facilitated deeper research on common issues between disciplines.

As can be seen above, Marxist philosophy today has long ceased to be dogmatic. It has become a very inclusive discipline. These endeavors lay the groundwork for external constructive engagements between Marxist philosophy, Western philosophy, and Chinese traditional philosophy.

2. CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN MARXIST, WESTERN, AND CHINESE TRADITIONAL PHILOSOPHY

2.1 DISCUSSIONS ON THE METHODOLOGY OF ENGAGEMENT

There is an old joke in Chinese philosophical circles that “to master Chinese philosophy, Western philosophy, and Marxist philosophy at the same time is tantamount to bragging” (打通中西馬，吹破古今牛). It reflects the consensus among Chinese scholars that Marxist philosophy, Chinese traditional philosophy, and Western philosophy are all complicated theoretical systems, and it is quite difficult for a single person to integrate them at the same time. Nevertheless, this does not prevent a lively discussion among many Chinese scholars on the necessity, methodology, and goal of engagement between Marxist philosophy, Western philosophy, and Chinese traditional philosophy.

(1) The necessity of engagement. The standpoint of He Lai (賀來) is representative. He argues that the study of Marxist, Chinese traditional, and Western philosophy is “necessary” and yet not “sufficient” for the theme of Chinese society’s self-understanding, exploration, and creation of “contemporary Chinese philosophy”. In that sense, there is a strong need for a cross-tradition engagement. (He Lai, 2004)

(2) The methodology of engagement. Wang Nanshi points out that engagement should begin with a common problem. (Wang Nanshi, 2002) Zhao Dunhua (趙敦華) argues that Western philosophy can be used as an intermediary to build a bridge between Marxist philosophy and Chinese traditional philosophy. (Zhao Dunhua, 2021) According to Cheng Zhongying (成中英), engagement should seek understanding and common ground while reserving differences. (Chen Zhongying, 2012) Zhang Rulun (張汝倫) takes the principle of dialogue of the *Xun-Zi* (《荀子》), “Speak with a benevolent heart, listen with a learned heart, and argue with a fair heart” (以仁心說，以學心聽，以公心辯) as a guiding principle for the cross-discipline engagement. (Zhang Rulun, 2016)

(3) The goal of engagement. The most influential opinion is the slogan proposed by Gao Qinghai: “Creating a contemporary Chinese philosophy of our own”. (Gao Qinghai, 2004)

2.2 CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN MARXIST AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

Undoubtedly, Marxist philosophy arose in the West, depending on Western philosophy, especially German classical philosophy as its indispensable theoretical source. In the “Postface to the Second Edition” of *Das Kapital*, Marx acknowledged to be under the influence of Hegel. Even during the period when Chinese philosophy was standardized by the Soviet philosophy textbook system, the intellectual connection between German classical philosophy and Marx’s philosophy was highly valued. During that period, the relationship between Marx’s philosophy and German classical philosophy was understood as “critical inheritance” (批判繼承), that is, Marx’s philosophy was considered to inherit and at the same time surpass German classical philosophy. This research paradigm for sure has its value as a research perspective and instrumental method, but its closed and exclusive methodological principle is problematic. In consequence, even though scholars at that time realized the intrinsic relationship between Marxist philosophy and Western philosophy, there had been little constructive engagement between the two.

After China began the period of reform and opening up, the process of “liberation of thought” (思想解放) caused the interaction between Marxist philosophy and Western philosophy to increase, and constructive engagement gradually deepened. On the one hand, China entered a new round of translations of and research on Western philosophy. By absorbing, criticizing and responding to the relevant theories of Western philosophy, the study of Marxism in contemporary China has by now emerged with a completely different vision and atmosphere. On the other hand, most of the scholars who first turned to Western philosophical studies had undergone academic training in Marxist philosophy, hence Marxist philosophy had an important influence on their understanding of and reflection on Western philosophy. The two important debates that arose in the field of Marxist philosophy in the post Soviet philosophy textbook system era reveal the state of the constructive engagement between Marxist and Western philosophy.

The first debate in Marxist philosophy centered on Marxist practical philosophy. This debate started in the 1990s and has been influential ever since. Initially, scholars put forward competing interpretations such as “Practical Materialism”, “Practical Ontology” (實踐本體論) and “Practical Way of Thinking” (實踐的思維方式) in an attempt to replace the “Dialectical Materialism” and “Material Ontology” (物質本體論) of the textbook system. The practical philosophies of Western philosophers such as Aristotle, Kant, Hegel, Heidegger, and Arendt provide valuable methodological perspectives and instruments to the discussion and study of Marxist practical philosophy. Aristotle’s distinction between *praxis* and *poiesis* as well as Hannah Arendt’s distinction between labor, action, and work provides a significant perspective for reflecting on Marx’s concept of labor. Kant’s analysis of the relationship between *praxis* and freedom, Hegel’s historical dialectic on labor, and Heidegger’s existentialist *Ontologie*, reveal different approaches for reinterpreting Marx’s practical philosophy. Meanwhile, the historical materialism and dialectic of *praxis* of Marx’s practical

philosophy in turn provides important intellectual resources for relevant studies of Western practical philosophy. Marx's practical philosophy and other traditions of Western practical philosophy compete and at the same time complement one another, creating a new situation for the study of practical philosophy in China. On this basis, scholars like Xu Changfu put forward new and original concepts of practical philosophy, such as the "Philosophy of Heterogeneity" (異質性哲學) which reflects the achievements of a constructive engagement between Marxist philosophy and Western philosophy (Xu Changfu, 2008).

The second debate in Marxist philosophy involves Hegelian and Kantian approaches in interpreting Marx's philosophy. As the study of Western philosophy progressed, scholars have been increasingly unsatisfied with the dogmatic assertion that Marx "critically inherited" German classical philosophy. Instead, they have been focusing on reinterpreting Marx's philosophy in the light of German classical philosophy. It is in this process that the Hegelian and Kantian interpretations of Marx's philosophy unfold competing perspectives and instrumental methods. This debate is not only a question of how to understand Marx's philosophy, but also to a large extent a dispute among comparative studies of Marx, Hegel and Kant. What is even more remarkable is that both sides of the debate uphold the guiding principle of an open methodology, acknowledge the importance of the debate, realize where there is mutual agreement, and advance related research together (Wang Nanshi, 2020). This debate reflects the new progress of constructive engagement between Marxist philosophy and Western philosophy in contemporary China.

2.3 CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN MARXIST AND CHINESE TRADITIONAL PHILOSOPHY

In the last two decades, integrating the basic principles of Marxism with the excellent Chinese traditional culture has been both an official cultural strategy and a conscious pursuit of many Chinese scholars. In this general trend, the engagement between Marxist philosophy and Chinese traditional philosophy is the most crucial part. Many scholars in the discipline of Marxist philosophy have conducted in-depth discussions on the similarities between Marxist philosophy and Chinese traditional philosophy. Here are some examples.

(1) Similarity in cosmology. He Zhonghua (何中華) argues that Chinese traditional philosophy emphasizes "*the unity of heaven and man*" (天人合一), while Marxist philosophy emphasizes the unity of the "*naturalization of man*" (人的自然化) and the "*humanization of nature*" (自然的人化). (He Zhonghua, 2018)

(2) Similarity in conception of history. He Zhonghua also argues that both Marxist philosophy and Chinese traditional philosophy believe that history is consistent with law and also emphasize its purposeful nature. (He Zhonghua, 2018)

(3) Similarity in practical way of thinking. Wang Nanshi thinks that both Marxist philosophy and Chinese traditional philosophy emphasize the primacy of real-life practice or the life-world over the primacy of the transcendent, metaphysical sphere of non-real life. (Wang Nanshi, 2002)

(4) Similarity in dialectical way of thinking. He Zhonghua argues that Confucianism emphasizes ‘*change*’ (變易) and ‘*generation*’ (生成), and sees the whole world and everything in it as a process that “repeats itself”, advocates the dialectics of “the daily renovation which it produces is what is meant by the abundance of its virtue, production and reproduction is what is called (the process of) change” (日新之謂盛德, 生生之謂易), which is similar to the dialectics emphasized by Marxist philosophy. (He Zhonghua, 2018)

(5) Similarity in value belief. Wang Lisheng (王立勝) points out that Chinese traditional philosophy advocates a people-centered value belief, while Marxist philosophy emphasizes the liberation of the entire human race and the free and comprehensive development of each individual. They both hold a humanitarian or human-centered value belief. (Wang Lisheng, 2022)

(6) Similarity in transcendental social ideals. He Zhonghua argues that there is a certain consistency between the Confucian ideal of the ‘Great Harmony society’ (大同社會) and the Marxist ideal of communism. (He Zhonghua, 2018)

Besides these comparative studies on similarities, some scholars have integrated theoretical resources of Marxist philosophy with Chinese traditional philosophy and put forward some original ideas.

From a Marxist perspective, Yu Wujin (俞吾金) makes a distinction between two different concepts of innate human *nature* (本性) and acquired human *essence* (本質) to defuse the debate on human nature in Chinese traditional philosophy. (Yu Wujin, 2013) Wang Nanshi believes that the “kingdom of freedom”, which is the ultimate value ideal of Marxist philosophy, can be reasonably transformed into the corresponding value ideal in Chinese traditional philosophy to rebuild the value ideal of the Chinese nation, such as the concept of “People are my brothers and all things are my kinds” (民胞物與) of Confucianist Zhang Zai (張載). (Wang Nanshi, 2018) Wang Nanshi also argues that the ontological basis of Marxist philosophy can be reconstructed by borrowing the ‘*shi*’ (事) ontology of Chinese traditional philosophy. (Wang Nanshi, 2022)

In summary, the engagement between Marxist philosophy and Chinese traditional philosophy is still very scarce, most of the studies focus on comparison of similarities and differences, and such comparisons are still very general and not specific enough. Most of the truly valuable studies are conducted by senior scholars, while most young scholars in the Marxist discipline have neither the necessary knowledge storage nor sufficient interest to conduct such kind of research. This contrasts sharply with the engagement between Marxist philosophy and Western philosophy in which many young scholars are enthusiastically involved.

3. ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES

Bound by the methodological guiding principle of dogmatism for a long time, many Chinese Marxist researchers had regarded the Marxist philosophy they believe in as the solely correct one, reduced it to a few philosophical principles that have been fixed

and solidified, and taken them as the criteria for criticizing other different Marxist philosophical theories. Specifically, when it comes to other schools of Marxist philosophy, traditional Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy, they are constrained to simply compare the differences between the two in terms of specific theoretical perspectives, instead of analyzing the socio-historical conditions under which they emerged and the cultural traditions in which they are embedded, and thus deny the philosophical creations of theorists from other traditions and paths. Such an inappropriate methodological guiding principle had kept the Chinese academic community in a state of muddle for a long time. Since the reform and opening up, especially since the beginning of the 21st century, the Marxist philosophers have profoundly criticized and reflected on the methodological guiding principle of dogmatism. From what has been described above, after more than twenty years of development, the discipline of Marxist philosophy has become one of the disciplines with the most diverse methodological perspectives and the most abundant instrumental approaches among eight secondary disciplines of contemporary Chinese philosophy.

Despite the encouraging achievements, the constructive engagement between the various disciplines of contemporary Chinese philosophy is still in its infancy, and some distinct challenges call for theoretical responses.

First, it is about the relationship between the scientific and ideological aspects of Marxist philosophical research. On this issue, some Chinese Marxist philosophers have been vacillating between two extremes, either ideology completely drowning out the scientific nature of Marxist philosophy, or one-sidedly emphasizing the scientific nature of Marxist philosophy and advocating total de-ideologizing. In our view, both extremes are undesirable, as excessive ideologized development may cause Marxist philosophy to lose its theoretically persuasive power and be completely reduced to an instrument of policy defense, while excessive academicized development may likely lead to a disconnect between Marxist philosophical research and China's real-world problems. Marxist philosophy is not merely present in contemporary China as a simply academic theory, but also as a theoretical basis of ideology undertaking some functions of social indoctrination. Given this, we believe that the crux of the problem lies not in replacing one with the other, but in confronting Marxist philosophy as a common object of study. While fully affirming the rationality of both scientific and ideological perspectives, we should adopt an appropriate methodological guiding principle to regulate the two, so that they are in a functional complementary relationship rather than in an antagonistic relationship of mutual substitution.

Second, it is the issue of the methodological guiding principle of "taking the essence and discarding the dross" (取其精華, 去其糟粕) that many contemporary Chinese scholars often refer to when engaging in cross-traditional comparative studies. We argue that such a methodological guiding principle, although seemingly quite reasonable at first glance, presupposes the supremacy of a single theoretical perspective from which we may judge whether other theoretical perspectives are the 'essence' to be retained or the 'dross' to be discarded. Objectively speaking, when engaging in theoretical research, researchers adopt a specific theoretical perspective based on their interests and needs, and inevitably observe other theoretical perspectives from this

perspective, which is beyond reproach. However, provided that the researchers do not critically reflect on the theoretical perspectives they adopt and are not aware of the limits of their rationality, they are likely to take a condescending attitude when dealing with other similarly rational perspectives, brutally leaving aside those that do not fit their theoretical preferences. In our opinion, a prerequisite for the researcher to adopt the methodological guiding principle of taking the essence and discarding the dross as fair as possible is an openness and willingness to accept criticism on the theoretical perspective adopted by the researcher.

Third, it concerns the external factors that influence the constructive engagement approach. When summarizing the achievements of Marxist philosophy in China from 1978 to 2008, Yang Xuegong (楊學功) have pointed out that “the achievements made in the past 30 years of Marxist philosophical research are the result of the joint efforts, bold exploration, and hard work of three generations of scholars, as well as of the practical implementation and enforcement of the two principles (a hundred flowers bloom and a hundred schools of thought contend) and the practice of academic freedom.” (Yang Xuegong, 2010) This review aptly reflects the dual reasons for the prosperity of contemporary Marxist philosophical research in China: (1) the individual efforts and pursuits of scholars; and (2) the liberal cultural policies and ideological atmosphere at the national level. In the light of the development of contemporary Chinese philosophy in the past two decades, we want to emphasize here that, whether scholars can maintain an open academic mindset and adopt an appropriate methodological guiding principle in their academic research is not only determined by the logic of the academic research itself, but also influenced by various realistic factors (such as economic, political, and ideological factors). It is particularly pronounced in contemporary Chinese philosophical dialogue activities. Here we might cite an example given by Hu Daping (胡大平): “David Harvey’s historical geographical materialism is highly regarded by Chinese scholars, but he can hardly occupy a prominent place in Chinese Marxist studies. The most important reason is his critique of China as a neoliberal state, which puts Chinese scholars in a dilemma. If Chinese scholars accept this view, it means that they take an anti-official position in their analysis of the nature of the local society. At the same time, if they avoid Harvey’s theoretical contribution because of the latter point, they will lose an essential reference for the development of historical materialism.” (Hu Daping, 2012) The above example typifies some real-life dilemmas in the reception and study of Western philosophy by Chinese scholars. Therefore, despite the importance of theoretically exploring a methodological strategy for philosophical constructive engagement across traditions and cultures, we should also consider how to put it into practice in a complicated academic environment in order to truly facilitate the exploration of philosophical issues.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Editor-in-Chief Bo Mou for his extensive and at times painstakingly detailed

comments, all of which served to improve previous versions of this paper. Zhou Hongyin acknowledges support from the “Philosophy and Social Science Planned Program of Tianjin” (No. TJZX21-004). Ye Jiabin acknowledges support from “the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities” (No. 22qntd6605).

REFERENCES

- Cheng, Zhongying 成中英 (2012), “尋求保留差異的中西馬哲學會通之路” [Seeking the path of convergence between Chinese, Western and Marxist philosophy that preserves difference], 《社會科學戰線》 [*Social Science Front*] 2: 44-52.
- Feng, Jun 馮俊 (2009), “西方哲學在中國的發展和中、西、馬哲學對話” [The development of Western philosophy in China and dialogue between Chinese, Western and Marxist philosophies], 《中國社會科學》 [*Social Sciences in China*] 30.3: 163-175.
- Gao, Qinghai 高青海 (2004), “中華民族的未來發展需要有自己的哲學理論” [The future development of the Chinese nation needs its philosophical theory], 《吉林大學學報（社會科學版）》 [*Jilin University Journal (Social Sciences Edition)*] 2: 5-7.
- He, Lai 賀來 (2004), “馬哲、中哲、西哲的‘功能統一性’與當代中國哲學的探索” [Functional Unification of Marxist Philosophy, Chinese Philosophy, Western Philosophy and the Exploration of Contemporary Chinese Philosophy], 《吉林大學社會科學學報》 [*Jilin University Journal (Social Sciences Edition)*] 2: 17-20.
- Hu, Daping 胡大平 (2012), “近十年馬克思主義哲學理論熱點解析” [Hot Topics of Marxist Philosophical Research in Recent Decade], 《南京大學學報（哲學·人文科學·社會科學）》 [*Journal of Nanjing University (Philosophy, Humanities and Social Sciences)*] 1: 5-16.
- He, Zhonghua 何中華 (2018), “馬克思主義與儒學的會通何以可能？” [How the Integration of Marxism and Confucianism Becomes Possible], 《文史哲》 [*Literature, History, and Philosophy*] 2: 5-30.
- Wang, Nanshi 王南湜 (2002), “中國傳統哲學精神的重建與馬克思哲學的深度中國化” [The Reconstruction of the Spirit of Chinese Traditional Philosophy and the Deep Sincization of Marxist Philosophy], 《南開大學學報（哲學、文學、社會科學版）》 [*Nankai Journal (Philosophy, Literature and Social Science Edition)*] 1: 14-16.
- Wang, Nanshi (2018), “中西現代性的再認識—馬克思主義哲學與中國古典哲學比較與匯通的前提性考察” [Reconceptualization of Modernity in East and West—A Premise Examination of the Comparison and Convergence of Marxist Philosophy and Classical Chinese Philosophy], 《哲學動態》 [*Philosophical Trends*] 10: 5-21.
- Wang, Nanshi (2020), “我看馬克思哲學闡釋中的康德黑格爾兩種傾向之爭” [The Controversy between the Two Tendencies of Kantian and Hegelian Interpretation of Marx’s Philosophy in My Eyes], 《學術界》 [*Academics*] 9: 125-130.

- Wang, Nanshi (2022), “‘贊天地之化育’與‘人是對象性活動’的比較與會通—中國化馬克思主義哲學‘事的本體論’建構論綱”[Comparison and Integration of ‘Assisting the Transforming and Nourishing Powers of Heaven and Earth’ and ‘Man is Objective Activity’—The Constructive Outline of ‘Ontology of Shi (Human Affairs)’ in Sinicized Marxist Philosophy], 《學習與探索》[*Study & Exploration*] 1: 10-20.
- Wang, Lisheng 王立勝 (2022), “馬克思主義與中華優秀傳統文化融合的哲學探析”[A Philosophical Exploration of the Integration of Marxism and Excellent Chinese Traditional Culture], 《濟南大學學報（社會科學版）》[*Journal of University of JiNan (Social Science Edition)*] 32.3: 22-31.
- Xu, Changfu 徐長福 (2008), 《走向實踐智慧：探尋實踐哲學的新進路》[A New Approach to Practical Philosophy: Towards Practical Wisdom], (北京 Beijing: 社會科學文獻出版社 Social Sciences Academic Press).
- Yu, Wujin 俞吾金 (2013), “再論中國傳統人性理論的去魅與重建” [The Disenchantment and Reconstruction of Chinese Traditional Theory of Human Nature], 《哲學分析》[*Philosophical Analysis*] 4.1: 26-35.
- Yang, Xuegong 楊學功 (2010), “學術回顧與反思：馬克思主義哲學研究 30 年（1978–2008）之一，從真理標準討論到教科書體系改革” [Academic Review and Reflection: 30 Years of Marxist Philosophical Research (1978-2008): From the Discussion of Truth Standards to Textbook System Reform], 《中共天津市委黨校學報》[*Journal of the Party School of Tianjin Committee of the CPC*] 12: 32-40.
- Zhang, Rulun 張汝倫 (2016), “哲學對話與中國精神的重建” [Philosophical Dialogue and Chinese Spirit Reconstruction], 《中國高校社會科學》[*Social Sciences in Chinese Higher Education Institutions*] 2: 4-12.
- Zhao, Dunhua 趙敦華 (2021), “中西哲學與馬克思主義哲學交流” [Communication between Chinese and Western Philosophy and Marxist Philosophy], 《中國高校社會科學》[*Social Sciences in Chinese Higher Education Institutions*] 1: 47-52.