THE PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEM OF DEMOCRACY IN EAST ASIA

Kim Eunjoong
Yonsei University, Korea

Abstract

This paper will investigate the possibilities of democracy in East Asia. It will examine the conditions behind the genesis of democracy in ancient Greece. And will relate this to the emergence of reason and the hypothetic deductive system. It will then contrast the growth of Western rationality with Eastern traditions of logic in order to determine how appropriate Western styles of democracy are to the Asian situation.

Introduction

1.   In Asia in 1994, there was a dispute over "Asian values" between Mr. Kim Dae-Jung, Chief Director of Asia-Pacific Peace Foundation at that time and Lee Kuan Yew, ex-Prime Minister of Singapore. In the issue of March and April 1994 of *Foreign Affairs*, Lee Kuan Yew insisted, "Western democracy and human rights can't be applied to East Asia whose culture is different from that of the West because culture is fate. "He evaluated the political and economic system of East Asia affirmative, emphasizing the hypocrisy of the western view of value and the limitation of the western system. This insistence of Lee Kuan Yew's has become the origin of the promoters of "Asian values."

2   However, Kim Dae-Jung publicly refuted Lee Kuan Yew's insistence through writing for the issue of November and December 1994 of *Foreign Affairs*. Kim Dae-Jung insisted, "Lee Kuan Yew's wrong insistence is to justify denial of democracy." He added, "The traditional thoughts of the East contain the ideology of democracy like Mencius' idea of popular sovereignty and Innaecheon Thought ("Man is the heaven") of Donghak which are 2,000 years ahead of John Locke who prepared the

ground for modern democracy of the West. The biggest barrier of Asian democracy is authoritative leaders' resistance, not cultural traditions."

3. This dispute was ignited again in Seoul in 1999 by Lee Kuan Yew's visit to Seoul at the end of October 1999. Lee Kuan Yew, through an annual meeting of FKI International Advisory, and Kim Dae-Jung, President of Korea, through Forum of Democratic Leaders in the Asia-Pacific, stated their insistences and refuted each other. Kim Dae-Jung criticized, "Lee Kuan Yew's theory of efficient national management is to rationalize dictatorial government." And he was convinced that western democracy would be possible in Asia too.

4. Can western democracy be realized in Asia? Do the traditional thoughts of the East contain the logic and ideology of western democracy? It is not appearance of democracy, but contents and form of it that we should pay attention to. For this, we need to investigate: the social background of Greece where western democracy was born; the process that democracy was settled after polis was made in Greece; the thought through reason and logic that appeared in the process that democracy was settled; and its difference from Asian values.

From Monarchia to Politics

1. The true character of civilization of Mycenae and Creta in ancient Greece is monarchism. The kings in the age of monarchism (monarchia) had to carry out three functions; (1) as general who commands subordinates; (2) as priest who communicates with the gods through a religious ceremony; and (3) as judge who finally judges whether a criminal is guilty or not at a court.

2. Around 1,200 B. C., monarchism of Mycenae and Creta fell with invasion of Dorians living in the North, and for about 400 years since then, Greece was in a state of confusion, the reason for which being the lack of any political system to replace monarchism. The position that finally replaced the sovereign, called *basileus*, was *basileia* as noble, the head of Dorians. It meant a shift from monarchism to aristocracy, which meant that power, which was formerly concentrated on one person, became distributed to several people.

3.   Basileia lost its military authority as soon as a military commander, called *polemarchos*, appeared, and further, lost its sovereignty as soon as the system of *archon* (administrative minister) appeared. As basileia's military and administrative authorities were distributed to administrative ministers, the kings lost their three functions. Their absolute authority, which could control disagreements among confronting groups or conflicts among basically different social classes, disappeared. The Greek democracy was created as the result of concern over how to solve these conflicts and how to decide upon the standards for the solutions. However, it is not true that democracy came right from conflicts. It was changes in the form of battles and in the method of raising horses supplied for the battles that led to democracy.

4.   Nobles showed their remarkable capacity in the classical hand-to-hand fights whose victory and defeat was decided by horseback combat between the heads. At that time when there were always wars, the fighting power was regarded as the top arête so brave nobles took possession of power, lands and wealth in return. However, the noble knights could not defend for themselves and accordingly, *hoplites*—heavily armed infantry unit consisting of rich farmers—appeared and a new type of battle appeared too. The advent of a new type of battle—heavily armed organized infantry action—brought fundamental revolution in the social system.[1]

5.   Changes also occurred with the raising horses. Horse tanks belonged to the kingdom in the times of Mycenae. At that time, the king securing the army owned various military machines too, which meant revelation of power and authority at that time. However, *basileia* who were inferior to the king in terms of power and authority couldn't have tanks. The nobles entrusted ownership and breeding of horses to rich citizens. Therefore, in addition to the right to own horses, citizens gained the rights to master combat techniques, to own lands, and to participate in politics.

6.   The phenomenon that many ordinary people, not a small number of nobles, became the subject playing an important role in a battle started to have influence on the social structure. Relatively, the value of groups of people, that is, ordinary people (infantrymen), rather than a noble (general), became greater and this trend played a decisive role in changing the social structure. That is, people composing demos became a

unit of phalange and at this time, polis started to appear, which fell in the relationship of homologie with the phalange. Like polis, an army was made with interchangeable unities, and a person as citizen unit (demos) was acknowledged to be equal to a person in a military unit (laos). Consequently, the soldiers (laos) who played an important role in a battle were able to claim, even after a battle, a reward as demos as much as the values they showed in a battle. Demos strongly requested sharing of war trophies and occupied lands, and the right to equally participate in decision making for the matters of the land where they lived, and of their community.

7. Heavily armed infantrymen (hoplites) should have necessary equipment at their expense, which made farmer-infantrymen insist on the right for their own allotment.[2] They requested to organize citizens' general assembly and insisted upon what they deserved through a speech at the assembly. This request for political and social equality collapsed aristocratism and further, made a way toward polis isonomique that all the citizens could have the same right. Consequently, politics appeared for the first time in the human history.

8. From two viewpoints, Greek democracy is regarded as the most ideal political system in the history of human politics. First, citizens reflected their opinions to the national affairs through a special unity of polis. Second, in order to maintain order in the unity, individuals observed the laws according to their own judgment, regardless of that the laws were made through their agreement or by their ancestors.[3] Polis in Greece that was changed to public society from common society consisted of heterogeneous factors, and in order to maintain polis, the members of polis required a powerful system that could unify heterogeneity into homogeneity.[4]

9. Polis gave homogeneity to people belonging to the same space by setting the national border between itself and its neighboring polis. However, the homogeneity was very weak. Polis that was composed of various groups was too heterogeneous a group for its members to feel complete homogeneity in it so it needed more powerful strength that could group them under homogeneity.

10. In polis, a zone having common interest (which was opposite to private interest) and a practical and public zone (which was opposite to secret process) started to come to light. The punchy insistence on openness

drove them to the public's sight. Polis guided behaviors, knowledge and procedures (exclusive special rights of arche and gene) to gradual occupation by groups.

11. Polis took the leading part in converting otherness into homogeneity, and living in polis trained citizens to follow the laws and justice (dike) that were commonly accepted by several people transcending relativity, not doxa. It gave them an opportunity to think from another level. Therefore, the Greeks ought to have an ability of differentiating objects according to type. It means to separate the same from the different, and to group the same into one or the different into one.[5] That is, it means to classify objects according to type. Based on this ability, The Greeks could differentiate private things (individual and physis) from public (nation and nomos).

The Appearance of Speech and Competition

1.   Polis allowed even the poorest people to participate in the common people's assembly. Speech was used as the means for participants in the polis, regardless of their social class (noble or common people). It was the great political tool within the polis, a method to give a command to others, and also the means of control. They thought that the technique of politics was management of language, and believed that discussion was the best means to organize a public system and to efficiently operate the system.[6] Speech was a live discussion, argument and dispute, not strict order made in a religious event or the king's final judgment. Under this circumstance, the Greeks developed a remarkable ability of speech and dispute.

2.   Politics started to become eloquent competition and dispute. The stage for the dispute was agora, a public plaza.[7] It was the place for meeting, not only the market. Citizens having horses competed for horse breeding in army. Those who mastered the technology of competition competed at agora through language. Those who competed for horse started to compete through language. Those who competed through language and eloquence become the same class. Competition could be made among those who were in the same position.

3.   The precondition for speech was audience. Audience was judge who decided victory and defeat of dispute or speech made between two parties. Only the audience could guarantee victory of one against the other. It was the matter of who would decide dike. Those who were in the control position hierarchically, had decided it before, but now audience started to decide it. That is, citizens themselves developed the standards for judging truth and falsity, or reasonableness and unreasonableness.

4.   Command and obedience in polis were no longer an order any longer that couldn't be reversed, but horizontal tension that could be reversed anytime.[8] This was founded on the precondition that citizens had a reasonable ability to persuade or to be persuaded through free mutual contacts.[9]

5.   Eloquence, dispute, and discussion became formalized as debate which was opposite to demonstration. Therefore, there was close relation and mutual combination between politics and logos. The technique of politics became management of logos. Logos had accepted itself, its rules, and the sense of its efficiency through political functions. Historically, rhetoric and sophistic techniques that were performed in assembly or court defined the rule of proof, together with the technique of persuasion. It made a way for Aristotle's research. Aristotle stipulated logic over the matters that could be verified or theoretically understood, which were opposite to superficial and plausible logic.[10]

6.   The Greeks became winners in a dispute by capturing a universal. For example, once what I say is proved to be more universal and the more the audience agrees with it, then I can become a winner in the dispute. Socrates and Plato systematized dialectic, but the dispute that the Greeks had in agora was the starting of dialectic. Citizens took a strategy to appeal to audience to become a winner, which meant catching logos through logos.

7.   There are two types of universals that show themselves in competition. One shows itself while a competitor's privacy is sublated and the other shows itself while a competitor's privacy is controlled. Greece pursued the former.[11] In Greek thinking, the way of proving myself comes from something transcendental. The Greek philosophy starts from the idea of who I am and what drives me here. In the process that Greek thinking goes toward abstraction, we should pay attention to how it was changed

to universalism. This is clarified through logic or pure mathematics. That is, logic and pure mathematics of Greece that are organized in the hypothetic deductive system are the products of this politics and society.

8.   It means the process of reasonable thought to capture logos through logos. The concept of equality became the origin of Greek democracy, but it couldn't make Greek democracy settled. Greek democracy handled affairs happening in polis as public matters (to demosion), not as private matters (to idion), through public decision making like discussions and agreement among citizens.[12] As Plato explained, a human was individually inferior to animals, but he/she could surpass animals by building up polis and having political techniques (politike techne).[13]

9.   The instinct of simple expression (telling one's experience) was shifted to a new level of study that asks the nature of an object under a proposition, "What is X?" It was the culture of several public activities taken by citizens in Athens in the plaza of agora. The Greek people believed that discussion was the best device for constructing of public system and operating it efficiently.[14]

10. A speech for the general public at agora where several opinions contradict causes a peculiar problem that can't be found in tales among individuals. It requires another work - proving that one's opinion is best and making the attendants agree with the proof. However, to get consent from the participants is just all so the proof is just agreement based on an individual's doxa, not strict proof.

11. Their relativism that put its standard for judgment on doxa succeeded to give relative value to numerous individual doxas, but failed in finding the absolute truth that could be universally applied to all people. And further, it reached at skepticism that denied the concept of truth. Philosophy in the times of Athens that started from the fundamental reflection on intelligent environment intended to propose academic foundations for universality of human knowledge, not satisfied with physis.[15]

The Creation of Hypothetic Deductive System

1.   It was the hypothetic deductive system that the Greeks invented to settle public things. It was regulated as the absolute truth, to which

everything in the world belonged. It was logos to carry out the hypothetic deductive system.[16] In mathematics and formal logic, the hypothetic deductive system according to logos centralism appeared obviously.

2. Construction of the deductive system was the foundation for all the scientific ideologies including formal logic, which was originated from the trust that all the existences could come into a certain principle. And the principle was thought as the shape that could be understood only by reason in the European traditions since the time of the ancient Greeks.[17] In this aspect, logic was the real science. It was only mathematics, besides philosophy, that could be understood by reason only and that handled objects beyond sense. The shapes in geometry are not incomplete sensual shapes drawn on paper.

3. Pure mathematics means mathematics that is deductively systematized through strict dispute based on a small number of groups of axioms, regardless of calculating techniques to be applied to actual living. The pattern of pure mathematics that was materialized in Euclid's *Stoicheia* has become the frame of the western intelligence history as the symbol of logos. Advent of utilitarian demonstrative mathematic that was made in Greece first was an epoch-making accident. It was an important indication showing fundamental difference in the culture between the East and the West, and it was the reason why the western scientific civilization was not created in the East.

4. Greek mathematics has a characteristic - all the theorems necessarily accompany proof. In Euclid's *Stoicheia*, a sentence, "This should have been proved. " is attached to the end of the proof of each proposition, which tells that proof in mathematics was an indispensable property. The process of proof that is related with a square in *Meno* is a good example to suggest how a theorem was proved in the early days of the Greek mathematics.[18] It was a technique that citizens in polis were required to have in agora.

5. What we should pay attention to is that at the time of explaining Euclid geometry with the deductive system, ultra-mathematical investigation was being made which reflected on geometric thought itself and intended to clarify the logical structure of it. In general, in order to organize science with the deductive system, reflection on the thought over science is indispensable. Therefore, construction of the deductive system means

perfect unification of scientific thought and reflection on the scientific thought itself. This logical structure of the scientific world is a cultural phenomenon available in Europe only.[19]

6. Dialogue (dialogos) of Plato is a technique that two people investigate truth through (dia) language (logos). His dialogue becomes possible when two people dynamically continuously pursue truths according to the instinct of eros while guiding each other to the state of having *nous* from the state of having no *nous*. It suggests a direction of philosophical investigation, but it doesn't correctly specify its methods. Categoriae of Aristotle practically suggests concrete methodologies of science, a step ahead of Plato's dialogue. That is, it talks about the standards that a man needs to define and understand a certain object at the level of *nous*; it talks about how substance and properties of a certain object (which are found based on the standard of category) should be combined without any error; and his logic talks about the types or methods of right thinking.

7. Based on the concept that had logical homogeneity as a meaning indicating a certain existence, on the definition that classified the concept into specific difference and proximate genus, on the category (the highest generic concept containing all the generic concepts that were used for classification of an object) and on the judgment over a certain object or phenomenon in the type of the subject concept and the objective concept combined, logic reasoned a new conclusion from the already known major and minor propositions, and verified whether the reasoning was appropriately made or not. It could make a science by making judgment (universal statement about species) possible, not by simple expression of an object in daily conversations.

8. The human instinct for expression (desire for stating one's feelings and opinions) was sublimated into the spirit of love for aletheia in the Athenian philosophy (having a meaning to clarify justness of interpretation and reasoning in language and proposition) through the stage of love for aletheia in terms of the natural philosophy (which intends to find unhidden appearance of an object toward the subject). This spirit of philosophy or science that came from public activities in polis provided profound insights into the general matters of politics, society and ethics, which deepened politics more.

9. It is true that European logic had been created by Europeans

since the time of the Greeks, but in consideration of that its nature is the product of human's universal reason, it can be applied to cultures other than those in Europe. However, on the other hand, in some aspects, western logic is a culture of Europe's own, therefore, it is closely related with the ideological tradition of Europe.

Formal Logic or Collectivism and the Waiting Opposite as a Partner

1.   In the documents of mathematics available in the ancient civilized society, except for Greece, and in the Chinese traditional society, there is no theorem made through strict logical deduction from the basic proposition, and whatever theorem there is, it just explains simple solution. The lack of established forms for general theorem means that the concepts of definition, postulate, axiom, deduction, theorem, and demonstration were not settled yet.

2.   East Asia doesn't belong to the top world or the tradition of the Greek polis. The language and thinking system of East Asia doesn't possess the method of Greek substantialization. For example, the language system of the West which is represented by alphabets indicates the logic of one-sided decision which requires the subject to coincide with the predicate, whilst in the Korean language, the subject, an object, and a complement, except for the predicate, are not fixed or settled in a sentence, and the predicate is always pushed to the end of a sentence. In Chinese, a copula that shows the relationship between the subject and the predicate is not used at all. This linguistic difference suggests that the western thinking system (represented in Greece) is different from that of the Korean peninsula in East Asia. That is, it means that the experience of both parties are different and further, their views of the world are different.

3.   The western logic has made deductive logic while moving to the city order from the order of Moira and gods. On the other hand, the oriental logic has made collectivism (requiring the waiting opposite as a partner)[20] while moving to city from fate.[21] The ancient Greek philosophers adopted universalism (using an individual or a special in creating the city order), while the advanced philosophers adopted collectivism that requires the waiting opposite as a partner of individuals (or parts).

4.   In Greece, the orator had to persuade the general public to follow them. Therefore, under this environment, logic was regarded very important, which was natural. In China, there was this tendency in the age of civil wars, but the object for it was not the general public, but feudal lords, logical school or intellectuals belonging to the school. This tendency faded after the advent of the powerful "Han" dynasty.

5.   In logic, it is very important to clarify a concept, which is called definition. Therefore, it is natural that Confucius mentioned Zheng-Ming (to define the names) first. Just as Socrates intended to get correct knowledge of definition, Confucius took the first step into logic. However, in ancient China, Zheng-Ming had never been applied to pure intellectual interest.

6.   With no doubt, Confucius' thought is rational thought based on human's intelligence, denying conventional traditional thought like incantation or superstition. The basic attitude of Confucianism is the thought of Zheng-Ming, the thought of Zie-Ming (to know the names), and self-consciousness of limitation of intelligence. The intellectual action of Zheng-Ming was regarded important as the means of solving social and political matters. It was not important in itself. Zheng-Ming is an attempt to reconstruct politics and morality intellectually. Here, intelligence is superior and it is the position of intellectual practice. The pivotal key of this intellectualism is Zheng-Ming. However, Zheng-Ming of Confucianism is short of intellectual investigation. Zheng-Ming of Confucius is ideologically different from Socrates who pursued definition.

7.   As for Socrates, to get correct knowledge through definition was to practice right morality, but when he pursued knowledge, he thought from the intellectual position and made a decision. Therefore, as a stage to reach a definition, he needed dialogue, which was developed to dialectic. Dialogue is a process of investigating the discussed thoughts or concepts, and of excluding any contradiction that may be found in it. Through this intellectual work, a correct definition can be obtained. That is why Socrates' theory of definition contains a possibility for Aristotle's logic.

8.   Confucius' Zheng-Ming was to practice right morality. However, upward reasoning is not found in Confucius. Therefore, to become fatherly doesn't consist of generic concept and specific difference, but it is a collection of several cases of becoming fatherly. It is often found

in the Analects of Confucius. For example, Confucius showed several explanations of humanity, which all are cases of humanity.[22] His way of answer is not to catch the universal concept of humanity. Accordingly, formal logic that requires deductive reasoning is not found in Confucius. What the leader of China was required to have was to evaluate whether a case is humane or not.

9.   In response to the question, "Can the virtue be taught?", Socrates asks in the *Meno*, "What is the virtue?" in In *Euthrophro*, he asks what is piety (that which makes all the pious things pious, and is not individual cases of piety). In this aspect, Confucius, who takes an example of humanity to the question what humanity is, is clearly different from Socrates. That is the difference whether there is deductive logic or not. The reason for this difference is that Greece thinks the definition of a universal concept can be recognized, while China suggests it impossible to recognize universal concepts or universals. It involves the fact that the hypothetic deduction system is impossible.[23]

10. Deduction is not only found in Confucius, but also in other philosophers of China. In Gongsunlong's saying "A white horse is not a horse," a white horse is not subordinate to the universal concept of horse.[24] As for him, a white horse is a white horse that is not included in horse. In a certain aspect, logic or the concept of mathexis has peculiarity of the European culture so strictly speaking, it is difficult to call both the western logic and the oriental logic.

11. Knowledge of numbers or shapes is a universal phenomenon that can be seen in any place at any time through the history of human culture, but mathematics or logic as the science differentiated from collection of knowledge of numbers or shapes is an historical event that can be seen only in Europe. Construction of the deductive system can't be seen in the culture and traditions of the East centering on China.

12. In the civilization of the ancient orient before the Greek times or in the Chinese culture, highly advanced mathematical knowledge had been formed earlier, but the deductive and democratic system, pure mathematics, had not been settled, which means that these cultures had no deduction (which was born within the same process which western democracy was rooted) and that there was no process of the western democracy.

13. The history of Greece went through the process: extinction of monarchism; advent of social conditions that made the class of citizens grow up; advent of the citizen class; activation of speech and dispute; transfer to public order from private interest; creation of universal concept; and set-up of formal logic or deduction. In this process, they made universal concepts and acted upon these universal concepts. It is logos centralism that was melted in this process. The Greek reason was not results of human negotiations toward things but results of human relations toward human. It had developed through the skill that a man superintended another, not the skill that applied it to the world.[25]

Conclusion

1. Formal logic is the power that made western democracy possible.[26] It means to create formal logic in their livings, not to learn formal logic. Creation of formal logic was possibly made by training of rational thought, and formal logic was subordinate to the proposition of the created hypothetic deductive system, which made western democracy possible.

2. In the tradition of the East Asian cultures, there were no speech, dispute, transfer to public order, creation of universal concepts, and advent of deduction. There was no major proposition that could be found through dialectic discussion and accordingly, there was no rational object to obey. This is the fate of the East Asian culture. In consideration of the fact that democracy is not form, but process and contents in it, democracy in East Asia that appeared in the 20th century had form, but did not have process and contents.

3. As Kim Dae-Jung insisted, Mencius insisted popular sovereignty and Donghak insisted Innaecheon (human is equal to Heaven). However, popular sovereignty emphasizes politics for people to the leader, but it doesn't insist establishing deductive order through training the public to have rational thought. Further, popular sovereignty is not established by demos' free will, which is same as the Innaecheon Thought of Donghak. The hypothetic deductive system is not found in Innaecheon. Both Mencius' popular sovereignty and Donghak's Innaecheon mean to realize humanism.

In this aspect, the ideology of the East is humanism, but it is not identical with western democracy. Superficially, the ideology of East Asia is surely democratic, but it is also far from democracy from a concrete viewpoint.

4. The Oriental philosophers tried to teach what politicians should do rather than to emphasize deductive order coming from demos who were trained logos. Politicians were required to govern according to the collectivistic spirit. In China, the kings were responsible for the order of nature and the universe, not only for good politics for people. Society and nature become one, and the kings were in the center of it. This understanding had been continued until the monarchy was abolished in 1911, but it is not true that China after 1911 turned to western democracy. Korea built up a provisional government based on democracy in 1919, but it was democracy in terms of form only. It was not democracy in terms of its contents or process. Korea went through historical accidents like independence in 1945, April 19 Revolution in 1960 and citizens' strife in 1987, but it was just the same as the class of citizens that appeared in the early days of the Greek times.

5. The fact that East Asia's values are not identical with western democracy doesn't mean that the East Asia's values lead to inferior political systems or anti-humanism. In this aspect, Kim Dae-Jung didn't correctly understand the values of East Asia. On the other hand, Lee Kuan Yew correctly understood it. It is not to emphasize that Asia should stick to Asian values. In order to change the fate of the Asian culture to western democracy, corresponding social changes, advent of rational thought, and the hypothetic deductive logic system should be preceded or accompanied. European Democracy is not cultural fate in East Asia.

ENDNOTES

[1] The change in the battle type—from lightly armed hand-to-hand fight to heavily armed infantry action—made a stress laid on a group of normal soldiers who moved forward in the same steps with shields just like one person moved. That is, many soldiers following the given command through self-control (sophrosyne) in the clear mental state became to play a more important role rather than generals showing more abilities than humans' in the hypnotic state (lyssa). Alike, an individual's value was shown only through dynamic functions performed in the relationship with the whole group, not through the individual itself.

[2] Socrates participated in the war as hoplites.

[3] The basic interests of Greek poleis were freedom and autonomy. The freedom implied the freedom from the domination of other poleis. The autonomy implied the establishment of law. L. de Blois & R. J. van der Spek, *An Introduction to the Ancient World*, 1997, p. 91.

[4] However, democratic political system was not common to every polis. A few poleis were governed by the kings.

[5] *Politikos*, 282b7-8., *Sophist*, 243b5.

[6] J. -P. Vernant, *The Origins of Greek Thought*, 1982, p. 49.

[7] Agora meant: (1) citizens' assembly (Boule, Ekklesia) in which speech was made or the place where citizens' assembly was held (political meaning); (2) speech at plaza (general philosophical meaning); (3) court (legal meaning); and (4) act of buying and selling daily necessities (economic meaning). These meanings of agora have corresponding verbs and the verbs such as 'have a speech at citizens 'assembly', 'speak at plaza or court', etc. were philosophically important. That is, it is quite different from daily conversations to have speech in front of the general public at citizens' assembly, plaza or court. It is to express one's opinion in language having a certain form (it has a certain form so it will not be changed any more) that one tells one;s doxa to others. The fact that more than two people have conversations means that one tells one's opinion, one listens to what one says, and one recognizes what one says through what others say (different from one's idea).

[8] J. -P. Vernant*, ibid*., p. 60.

[9] G. H. Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, 1986, Vol. 1, p. 60.

[10] J. -P. Vernant, *ibid.*, 1982, p. 50.

[11] The Greek words, ho men and ho de, symbolically show that a certain man has this view and another has that view over the same situation. It made an affirmative contribution to development and settlement of democracy in Greece. At this time, Greeks found something to group ho men and ho de into one.

[12] In Greece, the best person was the best citizen. cf. G. L. Dickinson, *The Greek View of Life*, 1957, p. 80. This means the equality or identity of the polis and citizen, universal and individual.

[13] *Protagoras*, 322a-323c.

[14] G. H. Sabine, *ibid*., p. 59.

[15] Against the natural philosophy that emphasized only theorein without reflection on from what level an object got to appear, and against sophists who intended to find truth from doxa, Plato and Aristotle insisted that an object was made from three dimensions like sense, doxa and nous. These two philosophers intended to overcome skepticism by proposing a possible foundation for truth with universality, and they insisted that we should find truth in the real facts (pragma) through dialogs (dialogos) and logic (organon), not through eloquence or rhetoric.

[16] They maintained logos centralism, derivatives of which are existing as eidos, substance, existing as ousia, time existing as a dot of the present time and a

moment, consciousness, subjectivity, common existing of self and others, and mutual subjectivity of self toward directional phenomenon.

[17] E. Kapp, *Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic*, 1967, pp.6-8.

[18] *Meno*, 82b~85e.

[19] The culture of logical construction of the scientific system also signifies the logical construction of life world. The logical means here the formal logic.

[20] It is a theory that the opposite things help each other and become an adjustment body. However according to Greek logic, opposite things mean personal argument (doxa). So the confucius' logic of the waiting opposite as a partner never reach the major premise, public idea or truth.

[21] D. Park, 'Urban Philosophers, On What Do They Depend?'(not published)

[22] The man who is not humane cannot endure adversity. / Only the humane person can love person and hate person. / The man who loves humanity is perfect.(*Analects of Confucius,* Ch. Liein*),* The humane person works difficult things ahead others. / The humane person gives a person credit for good thing.(*Analects of Confucius,* Ch. Ongya*)*

[23] In Greek thought, the universal can be known by the human reason. However in Chinese thinking, the Heaven cannot be known by human. This is the fundamental difference between Europe and East Asia.

[24] Gongsunlong, *Gongsunlongtzu.*

[25] J.-P. Vernant, *ibid.*, p.132.

[26] The important thing here is not the democracy itself but the method of the democratic thinking that is rational and deductive, searching for the universal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

L.de Blois & R. J. van der Spek, *An Introduction to the Ancient World*, 1997.

F.M.Conford, *From Religion to Philosophy*, 1957.

Confucius, *Analects of Confucius.*

G.L.Dickinson, *The Greek View of Life*, 1957.

Gongsunlong, *Gongsunlongtzu.*

E.Kapp, *Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic*, 1967

E.Neumann, *The Origins & History of Consciousness*, 1954.

Platoni's Opera, *Euthyphro, Meno, Politikos, Protagoras, Sophist*, 1972.

G.H.Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, 1986.

E. B.Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 1920.

J.- P.Vernant, *The Origins of Greek Thought*, 1982.