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第一章 導論

歐洲的中國研究最興盛之國家當屬法國、荷蘭，其他歐洲國家的中國研究相較之下較為勢弱，但這並不意謂其他國家不具代表性及重要性。本文以德國為例，德國的中國研究與中國的發展有密切關聯，並且其內容隨著德國與中國的連結而演變。本文即以出現在二十世紀的德國漢學到中國學研究的轉變為首要探討內容。

被稱做「歐洲經驗最豐富的東亞問題專家」金德曼（Gottfried-Karl Kindermann, 1926-）出生、成長於一次大戰以後，求學歷經二次大戰，正是歐陸政治大變動的時期，而這也成為金氏個人學術生涯的機會與挑戰。他與其他政治學者的明顯差異在於他並不是一位不出門、待在書齋中研究天下事的學者，所謂的「armchair researcher」。相反地，他致力於實地考察東亞各國環境，並走訪政治人物，與東亞各國建立密切良好的關係，而這樣的田野奔波也確實使他在研究的問題上有了嶄新的視野，建立起他獨特的東亞問題分析模式。在東亞問題研究的領域中，金德曼對於中國近代史、儒家思想到孫中山思想都有他獨到的理解與看法。

本文以金德曼個人的學術史為研究對象，藉由觀察其身處德國漢學、中國學研究轉型的十字路口，如何在因緣際會及個人主動選擇下，融合漢學及中國學研究領域，展現出與其他學者不同的中國圖像，走出自己的一條路來，並進一步探索德國由「漢學」到「中國學」轉型的脈絡。
第一節 研究動機

一、為何研究中國

一) 中國研究熱潮又起

二十世紀八○年代後，中國實施改革開放政策使得中國社會產生了巨大的變化，迄今約莫三十年，除了在國際社會中的政治地位更加鞏固，高速的經濟發展也備受矚目；隨著中國的崛起印象無所不在，關注中國、研究中國的熱潮又逐漸從世界各處興起，時局的演變已逐漸証實「世界問題在亞洲，亞洲問題在中國」這一認識有其時代性，反映各地瞭解中國的熱切需要。1

二) 中國研究的視角

研究中國的角度與視野，自然受到研究者所在社會的歷史文化所影響，同樣身為所謂東方人，便與西方人看東方的方式有所不同，想法也會有迥異之處，即便是亞洲各地的中國學研究都不盡相同了，更不用說與歐洲學者之間的差距，如此不同的個人或群體傳承下，自會描繪出不同的中國圖像。因此，當今的中國學實際上又曾有中國的「國學」、日本的「支那學」、歐美的「漢學」之分。2

1 張壽平，1970，《西德的漢學研究及其他》，台北：廣文書局，頁102。
2 Herbert Frank, Sinologie an Deutschen Universitaeten, (Wiesbaden, 1968)，轉引自張國剛，1994，《德國的漢學研究》，北京：中華書局，頁112-114。
身在中國及其東亞周邊，對於中國學研究看似有一定的語言與歷史優勢，但若畫地自限，便不能理解他人（國）中國研究中的褒貶、裁量、論述與分析，並藉以反省自身研究視野與盲點，這不但是學術的切磋，同時也是促進文化交流的強大力量；對於中西文化大通的時代，透過對中國的研究進行這樣的相互審視，不論是磨合、衝突或相融，都會更多元地開拓中國學的研究。在德國漢學學者羅梅君（Mechthild Leutner）看來，「漢學是站在歐洲的立場來觀察中國，而任何科學的經驗都是受到觀察者所處的社會和歷史的影響的，任何一種理論都是『首先把來自內部聯繫的經驗普遍化』」。這樣，漢學的研究就絕不是一種純粹知識的敘述。她更表示，「對中國的學術研究，不僅僅是以學者為主體、以中國為客體之間的一種認識過程，而且是『兩種社會轉移的研究』。」漢學研究在不同的國家會產生不同的社會轉移的過程，在這過程中必須去了解其中的客觀、主觀與意識形態等不同的面向，認識兩個不同主體互動時是如何影響彼此，透過這樣的方式，借鑑他國的經驗對於漢學，才能真正了解漢學的本質，而不是固守在自己固有的知識假設中。

尽管漢學在近代成為確立的學術體系，但於現今只有英語之漢學研究傳播較廣，而英語漢學之源頭可以追溯到歐洲漢學，且早在十三世紀，歐洲就與中國交流頻繁。德國漢學研究在歐洲各國之中，動機最為單純，尤其是二十世紀德國漢學，使得德國漢學研究的研究成果令人矚目，在在顯示德國漢學研究在世界漢學

研究中的重要性。

(三) 德國二十世紀漢學的轉型與金德曼的連結

漢學與中國學此二名詞，在定義上至今仍含糊不明，在各國的學術界中，各有其生態。德國漢學自七○年代以後，研究範疇有了轉變，除了進行傳統漢學研究外，另外一方面也建立了「中國學」研究。德國漢學研究傳統與中國學的區隔在於：漢學注重文獻，屬於人文科學範疇，而中國學注重當代，屬於社會科學範疇；雖然當時的研究議題已做出此區隔，在大學內仍舊統稱漢學系或中國學系。作為德國二十世紀著名的東亞研究學者的金德曼，對於中國的研究可以說是橫跨漢學與中國學兩者，但他堅稱自己為一社會科學家，而非漢學家，究竟其間存在甚麼樣不同的作用力驅使其作出這樣的選擇，是值得我們從其學思歷程中去探求的。

二、德國中國研究的特色

(一) 德國的中國研究之路

英美漢學研究雖於二戰後獨霸全球，但追本溯源英美漢學研究是奠基在歐洲漢學百年的基礎上，而法國又被公認為歐洲漢學學科設立的起源。對於漢學研究首先在歐洲發軔的原因，德國漢學家傅海波（Herbert Franke, 1914-2011）認為，歐洲漢學的發展

---

4 朱政惠編，2007，《海外中國學評論》，上海：上海古籍出版社，頁18-19。
與傳教確實有關，卻並非唯一的因素，漢學興起也與歐洲列強工業革命、海外擴張和殖民統治的需要有關聯性。早在十七世紀時，荷蘭積極拓展海上貿易，稍後於東南亞建立殖民勢力，因地緣而在漢學研究上有相當貢獻，成為當時歐洲漢學研究中的先驅。同時期，俄國與中國有密切的交往，俄國漢學於是也成為歐洲漢學重要的組成部分。英、法各國對中國的研究興趣的確是基於經濟、政治及宗教上的目的而展開。傅海波又指出，德國人研究漢學的動機則相對單純，德國學者具有特殊的、超越世俗利益的學術好奇心，在德、中之間沒有貿易關係的時代、在研究漢學不會被授予學位的時代，德國就已經取得不錯的成績。

然而只憑藉著一份單純求知慾的德國漢學研究，卻足以讓漢學研究在德國歷久不衰。起步雖較其他歐洲國家晚，至十九世紀末才得以建立漢學學科，卻能在漢學研究上相當扎實且迅速發展的德國，在二十世紀卻面臨一連串的考驗，從第三帝國、納粹統治到第二次世界大戰，再歷經東西德分裂到兩德統一的各種變遷，使漢學研究曾經一度岌岌可危，但為何能於二十世紀末再度興起第二波漢學熱，擺脫之前舊有的漢學框架，融合經濟、政治、民族學、哲學等學科方法，進行多面向的中國研究？這一段由學科確立、轉變及再興的過程與其他歐洲國家的漢學研究的過程

5 [德]傅海波著，胡志宏譯：《中國研究：歐洲漢學史簡評》，載《國際漢學》第七輯，第 80 頁，載於胡志宏，2002，《西方中國古代史研究導論》，鄭州：大象出版社，第 8 頁。
6 張國剛，1994，《德國的漢學研究》，北京：中華書局，第 112-114 頁。
有所不同，而其中二十世紀下半葉德國漢學轉變為中國學的過程更是最耐人尋味的一段。

德國漢學家朗宓榭 7 於中文版《德國漢學：歷史、人物與視角》 8 出版的賀詞中說：

有關漢學研究中有沒有“德國特色”是一個很難回答的問題。當然跟其他西方國家相比，德國漢學時間上的遜後尤其是學科建立上的時間較晚，是一個顯而易見的現象。但就德國漢學家的科研重點而言，除了某些帶有強烈政治色彩的特點之外，很難勾勒出所謂的“德國輪廓”。我們最多可以在眾多的研究興趣中看到德國漢學對中國的思想史尤其是對儒學有一定的側重。（p. 2）

也就是說：“建制晚”、“帶有強烈政治色彩”及“側重儒學”可以成為我們掌握德國漢學特點的主軸。

(二) 處於德國漢學轉型過程中的金德曼

二十世紀的上半葉德國漢學研究經歷了許多曲折，而二次大戰後德國分裂成東德（Deutsche Demokratische Republik/ DDR）與西德（Bundesrepublik Deutschland/ BRD），又對漢學發展造成關鍵性的影響。漢學研究在東、西德不同的政治條件下，走上了各自的發展道路，9 逐漸產生不盡相同的研究議題與研究成果。

7 現為德國艾爾蘭根—紐倫堡大學中遠東語言文化學院院長、漢學系系主任、講座教授。
8 朗氏在其賀詞中稱本書的中文書名為《德語世界的漢學發展：歷史、人物與視角》與之後出版的書名《德國漢學：歷史、人物與視角》略有差異，前者更符合德文書名“Chinawissenschaften-Deutschsprachige Entwicklungen: Geschichte, Personen, Perspektiven”的本義，書中內容涵蓋若干德國以外的德語地區的漢學發展。
9 何培忠主編，2006，《當代國外中國學研究》，北京：商務印書館，頁 135-137。
由於東德與中國在政治、經濟與文化各領域皆有密切的交流，使得東德的漢學研究迅速另闢曲徑，六○年代起，從原有的中國古代史與文學的研究興趣轉向近現代史議題；西德則在七○年代才逐漸轉向研究當代中國的議題。但事實上兩德的漢學研究除了在轉型的時間先後略有差異外，從傳統的漢學轉向中國學（當代中國議題）研究的趨勢卻是有志一同。

這一波漢學研究的轉型趨勢，著實開啟了德國學者另外一扇認識中國的大門，金德曼教授 (Gottfried-Karl Kindermann) 就是其中一位代表。他所屬的研究單位——德國慕尼黑大學戈氏政治學研究所（Geschwister Scholl Institut fuer Politische Wissenschaft），1958年在創建時曾以中國古代政治思想的哲學基礎為研究重點，而於 1967 年金氏正式進入該所時，開始重視中國當代政治、外交以及中國大陸與台灣、香港之間的關係等議題，相較於當時其他西德同儕，金氏可說是開風氣之先。

由於受到文化大革命的影響，當時在西德漢學轉型過程中，曾形成一股「毛澤東思想熱」，許多西德當代中國研究者都以毛思想為主要的研究議題，金德曼卻未隨同他們的熱情，除了研究東亞、南亞等遠東的區域政治議題外，孫中山思想始終是他研究的重點，對於孫中山與德國相關議題著墨甚多，例如孫中山與威瑪共和、孫中山與膠州灣事件、孫中山的德國印象和德國文學印

10 馬漢茂等主編，張西平等譯，2005，《德國漢學：歷史、發展、人物與視角》，鄭州：大象出版社，頁 289-290、340。
11 張國剛，1994，《德國的漢學研究》，北京：中華書局，頁 159、203。
象等議題。除了對孫中山做學術上的探討以外，金德曼更致力於推廣中山思想，像是於1979年在奧地利的薩爾斯堡舉辦了第一屆「中歐孫逸仙學術研討會」，之後並積極爭取德國巴伐利亞邦的協助，於1982年舉辦了「巴伐利亞孫逸仙展覽會」，並與巴伐利亞電視台合作，錄製了影片「科學系列——孫逸仙對中國及第三世界之影響」，在推動中山思想上不遺餘力。

於專書《儒家學說、孫文主義及中國共產主義》（Konfuzianismus, Sunyatsenismus und chinesischer Kommunismus）中，金德曼對孫文主義與儒家學說及中國文化傳統之關係、孫文主義與共產主義之關係和孫文主義為新中國民族意識之基礎等議題有詳盡的分析評論。他曾表示，他有一項重要的任務，即是喚回歐洲各界有心人對孫文主義的記憶。身處在以研究毛思想為主流的六○、七○年代的中國研究環境中，金德曼著實為當時學術界的異數。

由於德國漢學在七○年代進入轉型，中國近當代政治、經濟與社會等領域成為炙手可熱的議題。金德曼在當時德國探討遠東議題的方式更是獨樹一格，他使用他所創立的慕尼黑新自由主義學派的「座系分析」（constellation analysis）來探討遠東議題，如美中台、中韓、中日等國際現勢。

12 請見Gottfried-Karl Kindermann, Sun Yat-Sen and Germany, (Kaohsiung: Conference on Dr. Sun yat-sen and modern China, 1985), pp. 1-20.
13 見金德曼著，葉陽明譯，1984，《談孫逸仙研究在德國之實況》，革命思想月刊，第十五卷，第二期，頁23-25。
14 座系分析 constellation analysis：一種整體性的多重方法體系。群列分析方法試圖對各個層次上的現相進行分析，如國內因素對外交政策的影響，國際體系結構對互動模式的影響。群體分析包括以下六方面的分析範疇：(1)系統與決策；(2)認知和現實；(3)利益和權力；(4)規範和優勢；(5)結構和相互依存；(6)合作和衝突。
第二節 研究背景

一、二十世紀以前的德國漢學研究

相較於亞洲國家的漢學研究，歐洲的漢學發軔無疑較晚。歐洲人對於中國的認識最早可以追溯到十三世紀旅人的傳述，其中最知名的就是馬可波羅（Marco Polo, 1254-1324）。馬可波羅旅居中國十七年後返回威尼斯，向歐洲傳播了大量來自中國的物質文明與精神文明。此一時期歐洲人心目中的中國是東方的遙遠國度，有著與歐洲國家截然不同的文化、語言、風俗習慣與宗教，對歐洲人散發著獨特、神秘且讓人嚮往的魅力。到了十四世紀末，由於伊斯蘭國家的崛起，歐洲與中國的直接交往一度趨於沉寂。15十五世紀末的航海時代，藉由航海家新航路的探索與新大陸的發現，東西方的貿易與文化交流又再度熱絡起來。

十六世紀至十八世紀間歐洲與中國的交流奠基於耶穌會的東進，如利瑪竇（Matteo Ricci, 1552-1610）與湯若望（Koegler Adam Schall von Bell, 1591-1666）等傳教士進入中國，傳教士除了扮演宗教傳播者與自然科學知識的傳遞者外，同時也將彼等在中國的經歷與見聞傳回歐洲。歐洲人透過傳教士的作品就可以認識中國，雙方交流的載體逐漸從原本的器皿、文物與傳說轉變成書籍。

15《德中協會通訊》[Mitteilungsblatt der DCG]1992 年第三期，載於張國剛，1994，《德國的漢學研究》，北京：中華書局，頁 3。
文字，在傳教士對中國介紹與推崇的浪潮中，歐洲形成一股「親華熱」。受到這波的親華熱影響，漢學研究在德國逐漸發芽生根，漢學書籍的德譯對於德國的中國認識產生了重大影響，同時德國也出現了不同於傳教士的漢學家，鑽研的興趣也逐漸從與宗教相關的哲學、宗教的領域擴大到中國的文字結構、曆法、歷史與文化，如門澤爾（Christian Mentzel,1622-1701）對於中國文字的研究與萊布尼茲（Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz,1646-1716）對於中國文化的研究。\(^{16}\)

縱使德國漢學家在十七、十八世紀便開始了漢學的研究，但當時在德國大學中並未確立門戶，成為獨立的學科。十九世紀初，歐洲與中國在國際政治與商業接觸更為頻繁，歐洲各國皆爭相培育漢學人才，以獲取其政治、經濟上的利益，但德國的漢學發展仍未因而受到同等的重視，欲修習漢學者必須依靠自習或者前往法國巴黎東方語言學校進修，\(^{17}\) 期間造就的知名學者，如威廉碩特（Wilhelm Schott,1807-1889）與賈伯棱茲（Georg von der Gabelentz, 1840-1893）。直到十九世紀末，在俾斯麥（Otto Von Bismarck, 1818-1890）的支持下，德國終於成立了第一所漢學研究相關的機構－柏林東方語言研究所，爾後漢學的教研機構相繼成立，如柏林大學漢學講座、萊比錫大學與法蘭克福大學等，德國漢學在學院中的地位從此確立。

\(^{16}\) 張國剛，1994，《德國的漢學研究》，北京：中華書局，頁13-19。
\(^{17}\) 前揭書，頁20。
二、二十世紀以後的德國漢學研究

在十九世紀末二十世紀初德國漢學教研機構如雨後春筍成立的同時，有關東亞與漢學的雜誌也紛紛創刊，如《中國檔案》（*China Archiv*）、《東亞雜誌》（*Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*）、《中國學報》（*Sinica*）與《泰東》（*Asia Major*）等。三〇年代的德國在漢學教學與研究的職位驟增，與歐洲其他國家相比已相去不遠。

二十世紀上半葉德國漢學的蓬勃發展，傅海波十分自豪地稱此時期德國在漢學上的努力彌補了以往德國漢學發展的顛簸不順，而漸入佳境。18

促成二十世紀上半葉德國漢學的蓬勃發展的因素是有跡可循的。一次大戰前正是德國與中國往來互動最密切的一個時期：1898年德國強占膠州灣以降，在山東劃分勢力範圍，一戰德國失利，失去殖民地的同時，國內的經濟危機更促使其對西方文明優越性的質疑，而這也增加了對東亞價值系統的興趣，促成漢學的興起。19


1912-2007）等都在其他国家进行汉学的研究，但发表作品所使用的语文已多非德语。20 由于大批移民汉学家的离开使得德国境内的汉学发展受到重创，造成后继无人的状况，导致汉学研究的盛世自此式微。

二战后的德国分裂成东德（民主德国）与西德（联邦德国），五〇年代中国作为二战后东德最重要的盟国，汉学研究在东德的进展较西德为快速且具规模。同时，西德的汉学研究逐渐从古典汉学到中古代历史、政治、经济等领域。但随著六〇年代中苏交恶，东欧国家与中国关系日趋冷淡，汉学在东德的教学与研究也遭池鱼之殃，逐渐萎靡。而在西德方面，古典汉学的力量却持续进行。

西德在战后与中国的接触机会微乎其微，这也正是当时西德汉学研究面临的最大困境。文革期间，台湾就成了西德研究中国的学者的中国替身。21 六〇年代初期由于文化大革命与西德学潮影响，在欧洲形成一股毛泽东热，当时的学生产生对共产主义的乌托邦社会并极度崇拜毛思想，认为辩论、抗争、造反与游行是合理的，造成对六〇、七〇年代西德汉学强大的冲击。七〇年代起德国大学的教育制度有重大的改革，各大大学的汉学研究机构为了迎合潮流，修订课程，如加入较多现代化课程、使用白话文，并

20 为了避免被贴上「移民」此一称号，当时迁往外国的德国汉学家多不使用德语发表作品。见傅吾康，《德国汉学家的年轻一代》，页 437。载於马鸿茂等主编，张西平等译，2005，《德国汉学：历史、发展、人物与视角》，郑州：大象出版社，页 228。

21 张西平编，2006，《欧澳汉学研究的理论与现状》，郑州：大象出版社，页 272。
注重課程實用性，替西德奠定近代中國研究的基礎，漢學「現代化」的轉向促成七○與八○年代德國「第二波」的漢學熱。但這樣的熱潮卻持續不久。九○年代起，漢學的發展情況大不如前，大學中的漢學科系逐漸減少，而大學中的漢學或中國學相關課程縮減，甚至只剩下最基本的漢語語言課程。

第三節 問題意識與研究目的

在不同時期中的德國漢學家受到不同力量的推動，進而開闢不同的漢學研究領域。就二十世紀的德國漢學來看，二次大戰無疑是一個分水嶺。二次大戰之後，德國漢學面臨漢學資源流失、經濟破敗待整與東西德分離的政治因素等難題，再加上中國與東西德關係的變化，也使兩德漢學研究呈現不同的進程。但就整體而言，東西兩德漢學發展雖一前一後，或明顯或隱諱地，「現代化」的趨勢卻是一致的。處於二戰後「古典」與「現代」漢學典範轉換的十字路口的學者們如何回應這因緣際會的轉移？學者的家庭背景、社會觀、世界觀對其知識興趣產生何種關鍵性的影響，而他個人的人生際遇以及學院機制又在其知識史的形成中扮演甚麼樣的角色。藉由探索身處漢學「古典」與「現代」十字路口的金德曼的學思歷程，是否可以更清楚窺見德國漢學轉變的端倪及實際的折衝？而德國漢學的轉變過程又如何對個別學者的學術生

22 見張國剛，1994，《德國的漢學研究》，北京：中華書局，頁112-122。
涯留下印記？

簡言之，本文的研究目的有：

一、身為二戰後的代表學者金德曼的中國研究及中國研究，包括其動機、目的、問題意識、方法與內容，尤其是他如何在中國研究中自我定位。

二、認識二次戰後德國漢學轉型，其轉型的進程如何影響金德曼的中國研究。

第四節 文獻回顧

研究德國漢學研究的專著不多，以下就筆者所蒐集到的資料作介紹。

一、《德國的漢學研究》一書是由張國剛在 1989 年時應德國洪堡基金會（Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung）的邀請，至德國各地訪查的成果，對於德國漢學的歷史與現況有非常詳細的描述，其中多為第一手資料，相當可貴，可惜的是由於成書於 1991 年，之後的二十年發展無從自該書得窺，但仍為目前談論德國漢學史最重要的中文著作。

二、《德國漢學：歷史、發展、人物與視角》（1999）可說是迄今闡述德國漢學發展最完整、最重要的一部著作。本書以 1997 年馬漢茂（1940-1999）所主持召開的德國漢學協會（Die Deutsche Vereinigung für China-studien e.V.）第八屆年會的發表論文為主體，主要包括五大主題：學術理論、漢學史、
東西德漢學、人物與圖書館。本書集合當代德國漢學各領域具代表性的學者，就個別專精的課題論述，難能可貴的是，兼顧了東西德的發展與差異，組合成一部詳實而全面的德國漢學發展史。書中對於導致德國漢學轉型的特定事件有詳細的論述，如二戰前中國留學生對於漢學的貢獻與推動、德國對華文化政策的作用與德國漢學家的遷徙等，敘述了當時的德中關係與德國漢學發展的關聯等。而其中並包括了一些過去鮮被碰觸的敏感議題，如二戰時期德國納粹和漢學家們的關係。本書中文版編輯張西平（2005）就指出本書是「德國漢學家們的第一次集體亮相」、「這本書最顯著的特點就是給我們展現了一幅的德國漢學的全景圖」。（p.13）

三、黃長著、孫越生、王祖望主編的《歐洲中國學》一書對於德國漢學發展的描述分為兩大部分，一為中國學的歷史，尤其是對十九、二十世紀的德國漢學做了細部的介紹，其中包括德國漢學學術機構、政治事件對於漢學研究的影響等；第二部分則為個別學者的介紹，包括漢學家的資料與研究項目，依學者姓氏排列，較適合作為查詢之用，其中若干學者資料未能做即時更新，亦為美中不足。

馬漢茂在前言中提及：當時西德漢學界的重要學者有四分之一來自東德或在那兒受過教育，原本希望這些有東德淵源的學者能對過往的東德漢學做一些探討，但遭到拒絕，而這些來自東德的西德漢學大老對於費路（Felber）在會中發表的〈民主德國的當代中國研究〉也多所批評，並拒絕與會。

本書介紹了關於德國漢學中的語言文字、哲學、宗教與民俗、歷史和制度、文學、藝術與考古等，另外在經典作家部分也敘述的非常清楚。

舉例而言，本書出版於2004年，但對於1997年過世的鮑吾剛（Wolfgang Bauer）及1999年過世的馬漢茂（Helmut Martin）的卒年資料都未載入。
在二十世紀前德國漢學的變遷，在各專書中的敘述大多相同，皆認為傳教士漢學為主要的德國漢學的前身，並提到多名德國著名的漢學學者之研究與當時的多處漢學研究機構的建立；這些著作認為二十世紀以前的德國漢學並未呈現明顯的轉折。但自二十世紀起，德國漢學受到許多不同因素的影響而產生階段性的改變，如《歐洲中國學》與《德國的漢學研究》都提到一戰前有關於德中的膠州灣事件、漢學學科的確立與漢學教授的設立等，同為二十世紀初期影德國漢學史上的大事。自漢學學科在大學建制，漢學研究隨即蓬勃發展，在兩次大戰中間德國漢學經歷前所未有的全盛時期。而二十世紀以來的興盛發展，又以二次世界大戰作為轉型的分水嶺，各專書著作對轉型的方向都明確指出，但其中的歷程卻未見詳述。筆者希望透過對處於轉型期的金德曼教授的學思研究，釐清二十世紀德國漢學轉變的脈絡及對個別學者產生的影響。

第五節 研究方法與途徑

本文旨在於研究二十世紀德國漢學的轉變與金德曼的中國認知及研究，須從德國漢學轉變的歷史脈絡中尋求彼此的關聯性，故以歷史研究途徑來了解德國漢學在二十世紀各個時期的不同，其實質內涵的發展與轉變，以及對金德曼中國認識的影響。

主要採用的研究方法有二，分別是文獻分析法以及口述史研究法，藉由文獻分析法與口述史研究法交互運用，依據歷史紀錄與主觀認識的發展進行探討。
一、文獻分析法

文獻分析法是透過引用原始文件、官方資料及正式的學術論文，作為資料的來源與分析的基礎。對於二十世紀德國漢學轉變、當代德中關係、金德曼所處的個人成長背景與其中國研究，皆須從文獻中加以爬梳，以探討分析重要的趨勢與轉變。本文以文獻分析法蒐集國內外專家學者之專著與期刊論文，以進行歸納探討的工作，相關文獻以中文為主，德文為輔。

二、口述史研究法

對人文學家而言，口述史是一種透過對話方式，來蒐集過去事件相關資料的一種方法。學者 Tuchman 也曾提出歷史不只是過去事件而已，過去事件與目前日常生活往往有著強烈的關聯；在談論歷史時，很難將現在與過去剝離，現在和過去存著某種的緊張關係，而這些關係卻是建構出集體感情與記憶的要素。本文希望藉由對金德曼先生的訪談，更了解其成長背景與職業歷練以及從事中國研究時背後的所思所想及時代的氛圍，以求對其人其學有更全面的了解，並藉以呼應文獻分析法的使用，相互比較與印證。

26 吳家安，1998，《中共史學新探》，台北：幼獅文化，頁 384。
28 潘淑滿，2003，《質性研究—理論與應用》，台北：心理出版社，頁 195-196。
第六節 章節安排

本文共分五章，首先第一章說明研究背景、研究動機、問題意識與研究目的、文獻回顧、研究方法與途徑以及章節安排。第二章則介紹金德曼的學思歷程，包括他的成長背景、學習過程、學術生涯，以及學術成就的回顧。第三章則以金德曼學術的終生熱情之所在─孫文思想之研究與推廣─為探討的主題，第四章則藉由金德曼的著作《儒家學說、孫文主義及中國共產主義》（*Konfuzianismus, Sunyatsenismus und chinesischer Kommunismus*）與《北京的中國對手》（*Pekings chinesische Gegenspieler*）等著作，析論金德曼認識中國的方式，並藉此再探討其中國認識與研究在當代德國漢學中的意義。第五章則為結論。
第二章 金德曼其人其学

金德曼出生於但澤自由市，雙親皆為奧地利人，父親方面且有貴族封爵的家世。幼年及青少年時期主要在但澤自由市及奧地利渡過，大學及碩士都在德國取得，博士學位則在美國芝加哥大學取得，隨即返回德國，先後在佛萊堡大學、慕尼黑大學任教。以下各節將就其人生各階段的經歷來探討與其學術思想之關聯性。

第一節 成長與求學

戈特弗里特-卡爾．金德曼（Gottfried-Karl Kindermann）於1926年出生於但澤自由市（Danzig），也即是現今波蘭的格但斯克市（Gdańsk）。但澤自由市為第一次世界大戰後所形成的特殊地區，是德國戰敗後，受到波蘭要求獲得出海口而特別規劃的地區，但同時波蘭也極欲將但澤納入自身國土之中，卻因居住於當地的人口多為德國人，最終形成一特殊的自由區，其擁有自主的貨幣、旗幟與自治組織；但澤市30當時為波羅的海沿岸地區一

29 金德曼教授訪談 II。  
30 但澤自由市的面積有 1,966 平方公里。1919 年時，有人口 35 萬 7 千人左右。其中絕大部分都是以德語為母語的德國人。1933 年 5 月，納粹取得了但澤自由市選舉的勝利。1939 年 9 月 2 日，但澤自由市再次與德國合併。在第二次世界大戰中，但澤自由市幾乎化為灰燼。二戰結束後，但澤自由市被劃入波蘭，更名為格但斯克 Gdansk。當地的主體民族也由德國人變成了波蘭人。
個重要的航運與貿易中心。

金德曼的父31 母原居住於奧地利維也納，兩人在德國柏林大學相識後而結婚；婚後金德曼的父親返回維也納擔任教育部的官員，由於維也納的教育制度改革，使父親必須另謀高就，來到但澤市居住，金德曼與姐姐皆在但澤市出生長大，在此度過了人生的第三個十年；也因父親工作緣故，転轉居住過不同城市，如德國明斯特、柏林與維也納等地，體驗過不同的地區文化。金德曼的父親對於戲劇與歷史文化興趣濃厚，在明斯特大學擔任教職期間就有許多相關的研究，爾後在維也納創立了戲劇學院，此戲劇學院培養了許多著名的舞台監製與導演，在學院創立後金德曼一家人便長住在維也納。金德曼曾說，從小父親的工作繁忙，沒有太多時間陪伴家人，甚至要以預約的方式才能與父親交談，所以在他的學習過程中並沒有從父親那兒獲得太多直接的幫助；但單就金德曼對父親在歷史文化方面濃厚興趣的體會，在其成長過程中仍有一定的薰陶。

金德曼年幼時並未就讀幼稚園，父母認為在家自學(home school)較能激發孩子獨立思考能力，金德曼的父母從小就培養金德曼閱讀各式典籍，母親甚至以真實歷史故事取代一般兒童的床邊故事，金德曼因此對於歷史事件的敏銳度非常高。

幼年時期的金德曼在但澤市就讀於私立學校，每年假期都會隨父母返回維也納，途中會在柏林姨婆家停留數日，但金德曼不同於其他孩童選擇去戶外玩耍，而是前往柏林各個博物館參觀，

31 金德曼之父 Heinz Kindermann 為維也納著名劇作家與文化歷史學者，著有歐洲戲劇史十冊，影響歐洲戲劇文學甚深。
了解各國的文化與藝術。由於阿姨家境富裕，藏書眾多，金德曼除了前往博物館以外，就是駐足大宅書房閱讀書籍，在此不難看出他個人對於文化、歷史與文字的濃厚興趣。金德曼在 12 歲時第一次接觸到中國相關的知識，是來自於父母所贈的書籍──林語堂的《吾土與吾民》（My Country and my people）。這本書賦予金德曼對於中國無限的想像空間，自此之後他對中國文化深深著迷。金德曼的父母也相當驚訝，一個年僅 12 歲的孩子對一個遙遠國度的好奇心如此的強烈，十分支持他的興趣，並在書籍的添置上，盡量滿足金德曼對中國知識的渴求。自此，金德曼除了仰慕中國文化外，對其歷史也甚感興趣，於是展開了中國歷史文化的学习。

二戰期間，國際情勢不穩，資訊也未如現今發達，但金德曼憑藉著對中國事物的熱忱，從未放棄任何一個可以認識中國的機會，因緣際會下與一位維也納大學的專任講師格萊瑟（Benno Greiser, 1873-?）相識，格萊瑟在大學中負責教授華語與中國歷史，格萊瑟見金德曼十分誠懇與努力，雖然他的年紀仍輕，但同意他進入維也納大學作旁聽生。金德曼作為一位旁聽生，除了每日自修中國歷史、閱讀中國相關書籍以外，由於格萊瑟習慣在課後健行返家，金德曼便每日伴隨老師行走一小時，以聽取更多格萊瑟的中國經驗。格萊瑟在中國居住過 14 年，期間曾獲孫中山邀請至中國廣東省觀音山的自家宅邸中作客；曾與蔣介石會面，並參與多場國民黨的講演，且目睹了中國軍閥割據過程。追隨格萊瑟的期間，金德曼獲取許多書本之外的中國見聞，也開啟了金德曼認識中國的另一扇窗。
金德曼本身對於認識中國這一件事非常主動，在二戰期間，金德曼在一個夏季學習營遇見了當時應是敵對國的中國及日本學生，說明自己對於遠東問題非常好奇，並請兩位學生介紹一本書籍，以幫助他釐清遠東問題。兩位學生居然有志一同的推薦了莉莉安貝（Lily Abegg）所著之《中國復興》（Chinas Erneurung），並協助他了解書中許多中國問題，在同一夏季學習營中更接觸到德國第一本國民黨刊物《新中國》（Das neue China），使他得到更多中國的資訊。

二戰期間，因奧地利當時被德國佔領，奧地利籍的金德曼也必須投入戰場，為德國海軍作戰，途中歷經多次生死關頭，卻對於他將來從事中國研究的夢想的堅持卻始終如一。1946 年他從戰場上返回維也納，隨即再度投入中國研究的領域之中，進入維也納大學東方學院修習中國相關課程。當時父親希望他攻讀法律，他敵不過父親的要求，大學時選擇法律作為其專業，但他從未放棄對於政治科學的興趣。

戰後的奧地利被蘇聯、美國、英國與法國四國割據，當時維也納的文化可以說是相當多元，在四個國家駐軍佔領下，各國不停向維也納輸入本國的物產、戲劇、文學與建築等，使得當時維也納成為一個多元且國際化的大都市，在此地生活的人民可以接觸到各式各樣的文化。雖然當時維也納擁有十分多元的生活環境，但缺點在於，維也納大學的授課內容是受到這些佔領國家監
控的，尤其是政治科學相關的系所。當時擔任聯合國駐奧地利協會外國事務部門主席的金德曼（Chairman of Foreign Affairs Section of Austria United Nation’s Association），便聯合其他對於政治與外交事務有興趣的同學，向此四個佔領國家尋求幫助。他們首先到俄羅斯代表處邀請加入講習所，但被蘇聯一口回絕，而金德曼則回應若蘇联回絕，那麼會立刻至美國代表處邀請美國。而當時美俄關係不佳，在任何事物上皆互別苗頭，對方因此就答應了邀請。美國代表處雖認同此計畫，初始卻有鐘點費的要求，金德曼則以蘇聯分毫不取回應，美國隨即願意無償加入。在美蘇兩國加入後，英法也毫不考慮的加入了奧地利外交事務講習所，經過一連串的奔波，維也納設立了第一個由四個國家共同承辦的政治與外交事務講習所，可以說是當時空前的創舉。

另一方面，金德曼也尋求出國學習的機會，他在報上見美國史丹佛大學提供一名全額獎學金，由於他在維也納整合政治學科學習資源的表現，受到美國官員的矚目，也成為他得到此獎學金的助力，而此獎學金更有助於他在中國研究上的發展。1949 年金德曼前往美國史丹佛大學，當時正值中國國共內戰時期，國民黨撤退來台重建政權，中國新的局勢發展讓金德曼深深著迷。這一年獎學金學程之中，他為了更了解中國與亞洲，終日埋首胡佛研究所的圖書館書堆之中，同時也參與了許多與中國相關的研討會。在史丹佛校園中，金德曼遇見了來替共和黨造勢的美國前總統尼克森（Richard Milhous Nixon, 1913-1994），尼克森正在競選參議員，33 因緣際會下金德曼參與了尼克森後續的選舉演講與...

33 尼克森告訴金德曼，他的競爭對手海倫（Helen Gahagan Douglas）在選舉中，
宣傳活動，這也是他得以接近並體驗民主政治的一個經驗。結束了這充實的一年，本要返回德國的金德曼前往了紐約，意外地從奧地利駐聯合國的秘書長手中接下一份在聯合國祕書處新聞部門實習的機會。1950年韓戰爆發當時，金德曼就在聯合國會議的現場見證這段歷史，以及中國在聯合國中的代表問題之爭。而金德曼在聯合國擔任實習生時，一位官員告訴他：「你在書中學不到的真正政治，你必須到歷史之中去體驗他。」這句話讓金德曼的人生方向有了非常大的改變，而他之後所從事的就是到歷史之中去體驗真正的政治。

在美國留學及實習的機會對始經歐陸戰亂洗禮的金克曼提供了全新的政治體驗，也為他之後的學術生涯產生了決定性的影響。

第二節 邁向研究之路

一、現實的啓示

金德曼對於人生規劃有非常多的想法，以其學術背景，可以乘坐直升機從天而降的進行選舉造勢，但換作是他，他則會實在的運用直升機去勘查馬歇爾計畫的執行效率，尼克森在此充分的表達了對政治的衝勁與熱忱；金德曼認為尼克森的這份衝勁能夠將他推向更高點，1952年當他再度遇見尼克森，尼克森已成為總統選舉中艾森豪的副手。

當時輪值主席蘇聯代表不願將中華民國代表蔣廷黻算入有效票中，但由於蔣廷黻對議事規則甚為熟習，一副從容的態度沒三句話便將問題解決，同時也使蘇聯代表無法反駁且又羞又氣。
有非常多元化的選項。對金德曼而言，母親對他影響很大且一路都給予他支持。金德曼在做生涯規劃時，原以外交官或律師為目標，但母親卻認為成為政治科學或歷史學科教授是一份最適合他的工作。金德曼的一位叔父是駐日外交官，做為一位優秀的大使，卻成日必須接待每位將自己視為重要人物的客人，妻子也須忙進忙出，小孩更難與自己父親相聚，而他在工作崗位上寫出來的精闢分析，卻被長官批評過於冗長。可見，外交人員或許看起來光鮮亮麗，但或許會被分派至無意願的國家，必須說出或許不想說的言詞。當金德曼在外交講習所擔任教職時，便一再提醒未來的外交人員對外要口徑一致，以國家利益為最優先，要將任何個人思想拋諸腦後，不論政策的好壞都必須要支持它，對內則需要面對層級節制的壓力。至於律師，對金德曼而言固然應是一份好工作，只是律師必須不停的為客戶辯護，且為了辯護成功可能就必須扭曲真相。

最後金德曼選擇了學術路線，成為一名社會科學教授，訪談時，他強烈表示，縱使時間倒轉也不會後悔選擇這條道路。金德曼在博士畢業時，芝加哥大學政治所的所長邀請他留在當地教授政治科學相關科目，另一方面德國也有知名學者邀請他回到德國，並告訴他，留在美國確實可以過著安逸的生活，回到德國不僅薪水少、工作多且麻煩也多，但這是一個挑戰，也是一個讓你成為創立嶄新的德國政治科學的先鋒的機會。金德曼最後選擇接受挑戰，選擇了後者。
二、教授的引領

(一)摩根索（Hans J. Morgenthau, 1904-1980）


金德曼選中的課程並沒有特別與中國有相關性，大多是與政治、歷史相關的課程，金德曼雖然對中國的一切非常嚮往，稱許

金德曼認為美國與歐洲的教學風格相去甚遠，在美國的教授並不如歐洲教授那樣的嚴肅，是十分有親和力且樂意回答學生問題的，所以在相比之下，美國的學習效果較好，他非常能融入這樣的學習環境。
陶瓷、詩詞等中國傳統藝術的美好，但他很確定自己並沒有要成為一名漢學家，他所想要的並非只是如集郵般獵奇、收集、然後歸檔的方式去研究中國，而是期待以社會科學方法研究，成為一名關注世界議題的社會科學家。

1967年金德曼在慕尼黑大學新成立的國際政治所擔任教職，他以摩根索的現實主義為基礎，創建了慕尼黑新現實主義學派。它與摩根索的現實主義卻同中有異：以外交政策為例，摩根索不重視國內政治的因素，但金德曼的理論則認為國內政治對外交政策有極大的影響，因為國內政治決定了誰掌握政策大權、以哪個政黨的主張為主、以怎樣的觀點、以哪些國家利益為主等要件，所以外交政策從國內政治中就開始發酵醞釀。金德曼指出決策者必須像是羅馬神話中的雙面神雅努斯（Janus），一面注視國內政治，觀察外交政治對國內的影響，按照正反兩面的態度去調配外交政策；而另一面則負責察看國際政治，型塑國家利益，所以政府須兼顧國內與國外，兩面態勢都必須持續注意。摩根索的現實主義理論中的決定性要素是權力；而在慕尼黑新現實主義學派中，決定性要素則是政治，金德曼認為政治是以決策為導向，而決策的導向則由實際行動決定；決策者每日都在做決策，局勢日日都有變動，決策者必須做出最適合國家的政策，不論是外交政策或其他國家政策，都是透過決策；決策者會不停受到政黨、社會大眾的壓力，然後做出不同的決策。

金德曼以摩根索的現實主義作為基礎，創立了慕尼黑新現實主義學派，實際上是受到摩根索的肯定的，並認可這是一現實主義理論的延續。而金德曼也將此一學說廣泛應用在各項研究中，
其門生也廣受影響，如台灣政治大學葉陽明教授也以此理論為基礎撰寫了博士論文《孫逸仙之中國南方政府（1917-1922）與護法運動》。而他擔任外交人員的學生也十分重視金德曼用以分析東亞局勢的群列分析理論，並在外交上多所請益。

(二) 阿諾爾德·貝格史特萊瑟 (Arnold Bergstraesser, 1896-1964)

1950年代末，金德曼再度遭遇一位影響他後續學術發展的重要學者阿諾爾德·貝格史特萊瑟。貝氏被稱為是德國二戰後政治科學的創建人之一，1954年自美返國，於佛萊堡大學社會學系及政治學系擔任教授，1955-1959年期間並受聘為德國外交協會（German Council of Foreign Relations）與政治科學中心（Centre of Science of Politics）的主任，而後者是當時波昂政府的主力智庫。金德曼在美國取得博士學位後，前往佛萊堡（Freiburg）任教職，並邀請貝氏擔任他取得大學任教資格（Habilitation）論文的導師。金德曼稱貝氏是他一生中遇見最有個人魅力的一位教授，從與人會晤到令人信服的談吐都不停地散發個人魅力。貝氏生活十分忙碌，負責的事務非常多，只有從甲地移動到乙地短短數分鐘的時間能夠與他交談，他曾告訴金德曼： sebagai一個政治科學學者，應該到各國進行考察，觀察各國政府，了解各國政治體系。金德曼除了受到貝氏強調「實地田野工作」的言教啟發外，更藉由貝氏取得從事實務工作的機會，如1959-60年聯合國教科文組織的研究計劃—佛教、伊斯蘭、儒家思想的國家調查，即是貝格史特萊瑟教授在擔任聯合國教科文組織德國委員會（The German Commission for UNESCO）主席時委託金德曼進行的。
三、亞洲考察之行

1955 年，被稱作新德國之父的前德國總理阿德諾（Konrad Adenauer, 1876-1967）廣邀學者成立一個德國外交事務協會，並且在各國設立據點；金德曼除了擔任過該協會的美國專員，還擔任了遠東事務的專員。金德曼在 1959 至 1960 年間曾受到德國對外政策協會（Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Auswärtige Politik）的委託至亞洲進行他的第一次政治學研究考察。

1959 年金德曼開始了他的亞洲實地考察，第一站他來到香港，由於香港在當時融合了中國各個黨派文化，共產黨、國民黨、中立派甚至是難民都聚集在香港。在香港的政治生態十分特殊，可以看見特殊的景象，例如旗海戰，在十月一號可以看到滿街的五星旗慶祝中共國慶，但相隔九天的十月十日卻又能看見青天白日滿地紅滿街簇擁；在此金德曼體驗了與中國內地不同的中國經驗。

在香港，他訪問周鯨文，周鯨文當時是中國民主同盟領袖之一；而作為一個與中國共產黨合作的團體，在中國共產黨取代中國國民黨拿下政權之後，享有相當多的特權，可以出席共產黨的會議場合。他從周鯨文口中了解到許多在中國共產黨統治下的社會現實面，如土地的爭奪，共黨會想盡藉口將土地的所有人入罪，再奪取其土地，大部分的農民、地主是抵擋不住共產黨手段的，最後只能在牢中等待死亡，而幸運一點的則是提早被槍決。文匯報的總編在當時也是金德曼的訪談對象之一，金德曼與總編談論有關於台海戰爭的可能性與當時的東西德問題。
金德曼的訪談之旅第二站來到台灣，抵達台灣後，金德曼隨即向外交人員說明想要與哪些學者專家會晤，也極力表達出想要訪談蔣介石的意願。在見到蔣介石前，他需與蔣介石的秘書先行會面並說明訪談的題目與內容，但秘書在知悉題目後卻婉轉回答蔣介石年歲已高，可能無法回憶起如此多的問題，但金德曼認為蔣的經歷是他記憶中最重要的一頁，才說服秘書，但前提是若蔣介石在問題訪談時同意回應，才能夠繼續訪談，否則需要更換其他題目；金德曼在訪談中與蔣介石談論了許多關於 1927 年中國內戰的問題，例如為什麼佔據上海對蔣介石很重要？理由為何？蔣介石則回應的慷慨激昂；另外也談論到有關於立法院長張道藩的計劃書，他提出台灣如果要更民主化，就應該效仿土耳其的模式，對此問題蔣介石的回覆十分制式。與蔣的會面，金德曼認為十分有趣且獲益良多。

在台灣金德曼也訪問了孫科、雷震、吳三連、李萬居、高玉樹與胡適，當中最讓金德曼記憶深刻的是與胡適的會面。胡適時任中研陝院院長，同時也是哲學家與文學家。當時金德曼向胡適請教，關於蔣介石是否會三度競選總統，胡適告訴金德曼，台灣的總統選舉若是在一個民主的制度之中，怎麼敢這樣想，但若民主制度不存在，則情況就不同了。數日後與陳誠的會面，陳誠以論語顏淵篇的一句『言君如風，民如草；草上加風，則草必臥，東西隨風，如民從君也』回應同樣的問題，而金德曼聽了之後認為，蔣介石是非常想要再度連任的。除了台灣的學者以外，金德曼也與駐台的美國大使會晤以了解更多亞洲情勢，如馬康衛與安克志。安克志是後來負責在台宣布台美斷交的大使。
金德曼的亞洲之行第三站來到日本，在日本時金德曼受到駐日的奧地利大使高規格接待，並與兩位前日本首相岸信介與大平正芳會面。岸信介與金德曼談論了日本經濟與東北亞各地關係，戰後日本負債無力償還，岸信介提出以產品與技術轉移作為賠償方式，除了替日本解決債務問題，同時緩和日本與債權國關係，並打開了日本東北亞的經貿市場。日本在 1952 年本與中華民國簽有和平協定，但卻在 1971 年尼克森衝擊之後加以撕毀，金德曼在與大平正芳的會面中便向大平提及此問題，基於國際法，日本是否有權單方面撕毀和平協定，大平無法用國際法來解釋這個事件，但大平卻以一張東北亞地圖示意，日本周圍分別為中國與俄羅斯，兩大強國圍繞伺機而動，所以維護日中與日俄關係是日本至關重要的國家利益，所以日本必須這樣做。後續金德曼也與負責來台宣布取消安全協定的日本大使會面，大使原以為在這樣衝擊事件中來台或許會有危險，在路上接送大使的車輛確實被投擲物品，但僅僅只是吐司麵包，並沒有傷害到任何人員。

金德曼的訪談第四站原訂是要往中國內地前進，但由於一直無法取得進入中國的簽證，於是金德曼前往澳門，他在澳門與一位紐約時報駐澳門記者會面，試圖了解中國內地的狀況；此外在澳門也有許多的難民，金德曼從難民身上也得知許多在中國內部的故事，當時正值人民公社時期，這些人民的烹煮用具都被沒收，被迫進到中國共產黨所設立的小餐廳用餐，而在餐廳內部則是不停重複的廣播、宣傳與推廣中國共產黨理念，實際上這也是歷史上一個大型人性實驗，眼前所見，每個人都穿著藍套裝並手持小紅書。
1960年，金德曼執行貝格施特萊瑟教授所分派的聯合國教科文組織的計畫時，探討各國精英對於文化與傳統走向現代的態度，共挑選了三個性質不同的國家，分別是佛教泰國、伊斯蘭教印尼與儒家台灣。他訪談了印尼總統蘇卡諾、泰國的外交部長柯曼（Thanat Khoman）、印尼的共產領袖艾地（Dipa Nusantara Aidit）。同年，金德曼發行了他個人第一本著作《儒家、孫文主義與中國共產主義》，主要談論他執行聯合國教科文組織計畫的內容。

四、亞洲相關研究會議的發起

金德曼除了自身學術研究以外，同時不停累積在亞洲的實際訪談經驗，此外也與其他學者在歐洲或亞洲發起了數個研討會。金德曼發起一系列對分裂國家進行分析比較的德韓會議，其中一屆於1975年在慕尼黑召開，這一系列的會議持續舉辦了二十年，當時他的同事金大中（Kim Dalchoong）和維納·古姆佩爾（Werner Gumpel）在當中也扮演很重要的角色。1979年在奧地利的薩爾斯堡，則舉辦了第一屆「中歐孫逸仙學術研討會」，另外金德曼也積極爭取德國巴伐利亞邦的協助，於1982年舉辦了「巴伐利亞孫逸仙展覽會」，在波昂、法蘭克福與薩爾斯堡都有展出，並與巴伐利亞電視台合作，錄製了影片「科學系列-孫逸仙對中國及第三世界之影響」。

1970年代，金德曼參與了數次台美研討會，與談者多為美國學者與台灣的教授，談論有關於中國的動態與趨勢，於是啟發
了金德曼舉辦台歐研討會的想法。他會同政治大學國際關係研究中心向行政院新聞局提出此研討會的計畫書，而當時的審核是由杭立武與宋楚瑜36所負責，而計畫案也順利通過，台歐研討會也一直從過去舉辦至今，緊密了金德曼與台灣的關係。

五、與台灣的緊密關係

金德曼曾經多次造訪台灣，除了研究計劃及工作出差需求外，在學術上也曾訪談台灣的政治領袖，總統、政黨主席等；通過此些經驗，無庸置疑的台灣人、土地、文化與社會就帶給金德曼十分良好的印象。由於金德曼對於中山思想與儒家思想的肯定，更加深了他對台灣的好感，尤其相較於中國大陸的專制獨裁，台灣的民主政治發展令他欣賞，他曾經來台觀察台灣總統大選的進程，他十分認同台灣民主的落實，以及台灣在地的文化。

金德曼同時也是一位台灣女婿；他與妻子蔡芳芳女士，是在他在台灣進行學術研究時所結識，由於金德曼不諳漢語，於是聘請一位助理，即是其妻子，蔡芳芳女士的英文流利，當時擔任其隨行研究助理；金德曼表示，蔡芳芳女士在擔任助理時非常細心與仔細，在學術用語上力求精確，對於金德曼在台灣的議題研究上有一定的助益。

36 宋楚瑜時任新聞局長。
第三節 金德曼整體研究概述

金德曼在政治科學上的學習除了受到博士指導教授摩根索「現實主義」學說的影響外，也受益於返國後受到貝氏強調政治實務工作之啟發，促使他在六○年起進行一連串的亞洲實地走訪考察的研究工作，而他的理論也因此得到更完善的印證。金德曼的學術研究大略可以分成三大項目：一、孫文研究；二、兩岸關係研究；三、國際關係研究。

一、孫文研究

在金德曼的中國研究當中，最主要探討的可分作兩個項目，一是儒家與中山思想，另一重點則是屬於他分裂國家研究一環的兩岸關係。

在儒家與孫中山研究部分，金德曼除了探討德國本身對於中山思想相關文獻所欲表達之意涵與特殊性外，對於針砭中山思想的著作也予以回應與解釋。37

金德曼認為孫中山在東亞歷史上所扮演的角色舉足輕重，並在其書中引用韋伯所提出的政治魅力38來形容孫中山的領導者風

37 例如金德曼指出福格及其他馬克思主義的信徒，嘗試從孫逸仙的階級基礎的角度來評論孫氏。孫逸仙來自遠較許多早期中共領導人物為貧窮的百姓階層；來自佔中國勞動人口多數的農民階層。

38 韋伯指出政治魅力乃是偉大的革新人物所具有之特性，他推翻所位權威性的傳統與常理法下的體制；具有此種魅力的人必然是創造新秩序與打破例行秩序的人；他們所提出的新法則，不然出現於現行社會的運作常軌。
範；一九六三年金德曼訪問印尼總理蘇卡諾時，蘇卡諾表示，早年他的政治理想就是成為「印尼的孫中山」，
39 荷蘭人撤出印尼後，他必須要原本由荷蘭佔據的南部整合起來，蘇卡諾閱讀了列
寧、馬克思，甚至美國建國之父等的思想，但蘇卡諾認為最終唯一幫助到他的理論來自於孫中山。

金德曼相信孫文主義是孫中山留給中國人民的精神遺產，甚至足以作為全世界的典範。他在書中提出孫文主義的核心思想是
所調的三民主義，
40 並提出孫文主義的依據為經典的儒家學說，
金德曼在其一論文中提及孫中山先生衷心認為他的出而領導中國
革命，乃是順天應人的，就像中國儒家所謂之「天命」，應乎天
命，視乎時代潮流，順乎民意之下而產生一個領導者。

金德曼清楚的闡述並舉例，所謂的三民主義如何應用在國家、社會與人民之中；又實行三民主義之國家如台灣，所展現的
國家能力並不一般，他認為台灣之所以能夠如此現代化、民主化，
全拜三民主義所賜。1963 年，金德曼根據之前所執行的亞洲的
佛、儒與伊斯蘭的研究計劃，出版《儒家學說、孫文主義及中國
共產主義》（Konfuzianismus, Sun yat-senismus und Chinesischer
Kommunismus）一書介紹孫文主義與儒家學說及傳統中國文化傳
統的關係、孫文主義與共產主義之關係、孫文主義為新中國民族
意識之基礎。此外，金德曼是歐洲第一位使用「孫文主義」
（Sunyatsenism）的學者，他認為三民主義這名詞固然好，但他

39 Gottfried-Karl Kindermann, Sun yat-sen: Founder and Symbol of China’s
40 金德曼，2010，《中國與東亞崛起》，北京：社會科學文獻出版社，頁 110。
認為這樣一個有意義的理論，應該從字面上實際反應出人物的影響力，並且極力尋找實例以證明中山思想的價值。

二、兩岸關係研究

金德曼的兩岸關係研究是以德國視角來討論台灣與中國分裂的關係，因為德國當時也是分裂國家，以東西德分別為共產與民主兩種制度分治，就如同中國與台灣，此外也曾以南北韓關係反觀兩岸關係。此外，中國與香港和澳門的連結，中國與台灣的連結也是其探討內容之一。金德曼提出台海的和平並不是台灣單方面能夠維持，而台灣也並不是一直擺出維持和平的姿態，針對各種兩岸和平的政策，金德曼有其不同的解讀。而在 2010 年接受訪談時，他也提出他對反分裂法的推動與 ECFA 簽署的個人看法。他認為台灣人民還不夠了解內容，但政府對此似乎無關痛癢。金德曼在探討兩岸關係的議題，常就整個東亞局勢做分析，其中更常討論兩岸關係之間的第三者如美國、日本、俄羅斯在中國和台灣之間扮演的角色。

三、國際關係研究

金德曼對國際關係議題之探討，建構在其座系分析（constellation analysis）架構之上，這個理論乃是自他指導教授摩根索之現實主義衍生出來的慕尼黑新現實主義學派中的一環。其中以六個要素作為主要的分析範疇：系統與決策、認知和現實、利益和權力、規範和優勢、結構和相互依賴、合作和衝突。
金德曼以這六個範疇來分析各國之間的外交關係，以現況為例，金德曼認為在全球化的趨勢之下，國家、文化和經濟體制之間互賴與聯繫日趨密切，各國即便是處於競爭關係－如美國與中國，也會在無形之中自我形塑出一種對話方式，而透過此種對話方式，能夠使彼此產生解決衝突、交流、妥協甚至合作的可能性，並促進限制衝突的規範，但這樣的關係必須建立在互信的基礎之上才會有成效。

第四節  金德曼中國認識與研究在德國漢學轉型上的意義

二十世紀初的德國漢學研究仍屬於幼年時期，但當時學者福蘭閣（Otto Franke, 1862-1946）已提出漢學應該注重兩方面，一方面是中國傳統文化研究，另一方面是當代中國問題和局勢的研究所觀點是當時非常特殊的意見，並與之前的東方學作出了區隔。而五○年代慕尼黑漢學創系主任海尼士（Erich Haenisch, 1880-1966）曾與福蘭閣之子、也是漢學家的傅吾康（Wolfgang Bauer）及創建海德堡大學漢學系的鮑吾剛（Wolfgang Bauer）都是他的弟子。

41 金德曼，2010，《中國與東亞崛起》，北京：社會科學文獻出版社，頁602。
42 陳純德編，2010，《漢學研究》，北京：學苑出版社，頁364。
43 海尼士是由德國漢學界自己培養出來的第一代漢學家，之前分別曾在萊比錫大學、柏林大學擔任教職，二戰後才轉任到慕尼黑大學，將慕尼黑漢學從無到有建立起來；許多德國的漢學權威，如之後接任他當慕尼黑漢學系主任的傅海波（Herbert Franke）及創建海德堡大學漢學系的鮑吾剛（Wolfgang Bauer）都是他的弟子。
Franke, 1912-2007) 展開漢學古今之辯，前者視中國為一過往的古典文明，後者則努力尋找現代中國、現代歷史及當代中國發展的軌跡。而這樣的辯論在當時並未造成廣泛的迴響，而只是被視為個人立場的不同。

到了六○年代，學生運動風起雲湧，古老神秘的中國一夕之間成為現代革命的先驅，以鑽研中國古典文獻為專業的漢學系開始被質疑是以十九世紀過時的研究方法探討當代中國，根本對於變動中的中國社會一無所知。新舊漢學的切割辯論正式展開。

1968 年時任慕尼黑大學漢學系教授的鮑吾剛 (Wolfgang Bauer, 1930-1997) 在東亞文化與語言學系落成典禮上的演講中充分表達了當時德國漢學所面臨的處境。他提到當時德國漢學面臨方法上專業化（Spezialisierung）的要求，以及當代中國情勢的挑戰，談到傳統漢學及當代中國研究分道的趨勢及問題。他並且提到美國曾於 1964 年的一個漢學家會議中討論此一議題，最終亦無法化解漢學家之間的緊張關係，結果僅獲得一個共識，即加強各學門漢學家間的合作，同時也促進漢學與不同學科間的交流與合作，而這也成了慕尼黑大學漢學系後來努力的方向。鮑吾剛

44 馬漢茂（1999），〈德國的漢學研究：歷史、問題與展望〉，《德國漢學：歷史、發展、人物與視角》，頁 33。
46 金德曼在訪談中也提到，當時曾受某大集團的委託代尋中國經濟專家，卻在慕尼黑大學遍尋不著。（金德曼教授訪談 II）
在演講中提到 1968 年一月起與金德曼所帶領的國際政治學系有關當代中國課題的合作關係。

慕尼黑大學漢學系當時回應這波漢學轉型要求的作法是，以往以培養學生書面語能力的漢學系，開始設立語言實驗室（Sprachlabor），以加強學生口語能力，並支持漢學系與校內校外對中國研究感興趣的學者及機構的接觸與合作。在專業化及傳統與現代中國研究並列的要求下，漢學的一分為二似乎是必然的趨勢，但在鮑吾剛看來，那樣的結果將會是一個雙方都不滿意、卻不得不的切割，而且有鑑於德國在漢學研究的資源上遠比不上美國，如再作分散，只會更加削弱個別研究與教學的能量，折衷之道只能是儘量開放，開放課題、開放方法、開放與所有對中國有興趣的學科門間的合作。而對非漢學系而從事中國研究者的情況而言，如金德曼所代表的國際政治學系並未特別設立中國研究部門，而是碰巧金德曼對中國有相當研究，就開一門中國相關的課程，但系上並不規律地開設中國相關課程。現代中國研究在當時的慕尼黑大學來說既可以是漢學系的一部分，也可以是國際政治學系的一部分，但都是處於依附的角色，而這也是當時大部德國漢學研究在二戰後轉型時大致的情況。

第五節 小結

本章敘述了金德曼的成長、求學、任教與學術研究的歷程，從而觀察到金德曼對於中國認識最初起於透過書籍認識中國歷史與文學，書籍文字描繪下的中國對於金德曼而言充滿神秘且迷人的色彩，醞釀了他幼年時期的「夢想中國」。青少年時期自維也納大學的華語講師格萊瑟及中國、日本留學生處獲取的中國見聞，成為他二手的中國經驗，構築了他的「傳說中國」。而 1949-1950 年前往美國留學及實習的經驗，拉近了他與亞洲的距離，而之後中國境內的國共分裂及南北韓分治也使他的歐洲經驗逐漸與亞洲產生了互動，而這也使他過往認識中國的方式有了關鍵性的轉變，過去坐在書齋中攝取中國知識的方式所獲取的靜止中國已不能滿足他所要認識的中國，他要以更主動、更直接的「田野實務」方式去探索中國，以「社會科學」的方式去接近他心儀的對象。

金德曼雖非漢學科班出身的中國研究者，但由於他個人自幼對中國的興趣，使其在進入政治科學的領域之後，中國得以成為他政治探索中的重要板塊。此外，1960 年代末期適逢西方企欲洞窺變動中國的熱潮，而使擁有「語文」工具的漢學研究者興起與具備「方法」工具的中國學研究者共同開發新課題的念頭，而慕尼黑大學裡漢學系與政治學系的合作模式可以說是 1970 年代之後德國漢學轉型的先驅。而金德曼的中國興趣得以在這樣的氛圍中充分展開。
第三章 金德曼的「孫文主義」

金德曼認為自己是一名社會科學家，而非漢學家，但透過其研究內容，不可否認的是，其研究確實受到傳統漢學的若干影響，尤其表現在對孫文主義的研究上。金德曼於 1960 年執行聯合國教科文組織的計畫，探討各國精英對於文化與傳統走向現代的態度，計畫共挑選了三個性質不同的國家，分別是佛教泰國、伊斯蘭教印尼與儒家台灣。同年，金德曼發行了他個人第一本著作《儒家、孫文主義與中國共產主義》，可說是金氏「孫文主義」研究的代表作。金德曼認為孫文主義奠基在儒家思想之上，本章欲先簡述 17 到 20 世紀德國的儒家思想研究的典範轉移，了解各時期具有代表性的德國學者對於儒家思想的認識及評價，進而展開對金德曼以儒家思想研究的進路對孫文主義作出詮釋的探索。此外，金德曼認為，孫文主義能成為近代中國的一個思想體系，是與孫中山的個人特質有密切的關係，因此欲掌握孫文主義之精髓，自須認識孫中山的個人特質，本章也將金氏對孫中山其人的認識作介紹。本章最後將透過金德曼的視角來追蹤當代孫文主義，觀察孫文主義在落實於社會的過程中，是完整的傳承，抑或在歷經百年後已有全然不同的發展。
第一節 中國認識的典範轉換

典範轉換是關乎時代的，是思潮的更迭的深層結構。時代在演進中勢必形成與過去典範不相符的新學說，從而使一種既有的標準發生變動，最終造成典範的轉換。\(^9\)德國思想家的中國認識也同樣經歷過如此典範轉換的過程，尤其是儒家思想的典範轉移，本節試從哲學家萊布尼茲、黑格爾、漢學家衛禮賢到雅斯佩斯對儒家思想研究中，了解從十七世紀到二十世紀德國的中國認識之脈絡。

一、萊布尼茲 (Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, 1646-1716)

理想化的中國觀

十七、十八世紀的德國漢學正值「浪漫漢學」時期，\(^5\)而萊布尼茲是當時德國漢學不可或缺的人物，他所編著的《中國近況》 (Novissima Sinica)（1697）是當時歐洲認識中國的經典之作，學者葛林 (Tilemann Grimm, 1922-2002) 認為萊布尼茲有一種切實體認，欲將居於歐亞大陸兩端的兩種不同文化相連，使之互相交流。\(^5\) 萊布尼茲充滿探索中國的熱忱，縱使他這一生未曾踏

---

\(^9\)李雪濤，2008，《日爾曼學術譜系中的漢學—德國漢學之研究》，北京：外語教學與研究出版社，頁 110。

\(^5\)在德國浪漫漢學時代，對於中國文化充滿熱情的還有歌德 (Johann Wolfgang von Goethe) 與洪堡兄弟 (Wilhelm und Alexander von Humboldt)。

\(^5\)張國剛，1994，《德國的漢學研究》，北京：中華書局，頁 17。
上過中國的土地一步，但仍透過各種方式認識中國，如大量閱讀與中國相關的書籍、與傳教士會晤以及探訪他國與中國相關之機構等；而其中最著名的是萊布尼茲與傳教士白晉（Joachim Bouvet, 1656-1730）的通信，由《易經》中所提及的陰陽和二進制，推算《易經》與上帝存在的關聯；另外他的名著《單子論》（La Monadologie）也被認為受到《易經》的影響。

萊布尼茲對於異文化採開放且兼容並蓄的態度，是他對中國感到興趣的關鍵要素，他認為儒家哲學比古希臘哲學更接近基督教神學，他對於中國文化的寬容、開放的態度，實際上也正因如此。萊布尼茲所認識的中國主要是受到耶穌會教士的影響，傳教士對於中國文化、體制、社會的讚頌，讓他認為當時的中國接近「理性化國家」的理想，萊布尼茲從教士口中得知當時康熙皇帝給予佛、道、基督教在中國平等傳教的機會，此外，中國的平民百姓的相互尊重、明確的倫理道德使得社稷安定，在與歐洲當時情況相較之下，他認為這一切都是歐洲社會所應學習的。儘管這只是萊布尼茲透過傳教士轉述後所建構出來的浪漫圖像，對於這一理想化的中國圖像一直要到 18 世紀才有所改變。

二、黑格爾（Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, 1770-1831）——批判的中國觀

17 世紀時，中國文化之所以能在歐洲傳遞，耶穌會傳教士

---

52 李霽濤，2008，《日爾曼學術譜系中的漢學——德國漢學之研究》，北京：外語教學與研究出版社，頁 113。
53 前揭書，頁 114。
扮演了極其重要的角色，但隨著康熙在 18 世紀初禁教後，中國文化便缺少了此一傳遞媒介，取而代之來到中國的只有重商主義的商團人士，故當中外官商關係交惡時，中國文化在歐洲的形象遭受到詆毀。在法國大革命後，許多歷史學家已指出，17 世紀歐洲普遍所建構的中國形象過度美好，只是一種純粹烏托邦式的想像，隨著中國經濟衰退與歐洲社會結構變化，中國在歐洲所建立的理想化形象不付存在。當時德國學者赫爾德（Johann Gottfried von Herder, 1744-1803）即批評孔子的傳承只是一副箝制中國人的鎖鍊，使得中國人的思想無法自由地發展。54

在黑格爾身上所完成的典範轉移，即是發生在這樣的時空背景之下。黑格爾是一位理論結構縝密的哲學家，他將世界歷史如人生階段作分期，東亞文化在他的分期中被認定為是剛起步的孩童時代。他認為，真正的哲學是從西方開始的，他以西方哲學的標準，對中國哲學進行評價，相較於萊布尼茲對於儒家的高度肯定，在他的哲學框架中，只有道家得到較高的評價。黑格爾認為《論語》中所談的無非只是道德常識，並且在任何民族文化中都找得到類似的觀點，甚至有更出色的。並認為孔子的著作若未被翻譯，反倒可能保有其聲譽。55 黑格爾對東方思想的評價，尤其是對中國思想的貶抑，不過是組成他哲學體系的一小部分，但卻影響了他之後近兩個世紀西方主流對中國的認識，黑格爾的中國

54 李雪濤，2008，《日爾曼學術譜系中的漢學——德國漢學之研究》，北京：外語教學與研究出版社，頁 121-123。
55 前揭書，頁 124。
觀直至二十世紀才慢慢由其他哲學家所改變。56

三、雅斯佩斯（Karl Theodor Jaspers, 1883-1969）與衛禮賢（Richard Wilhelm, 1873-1930）— 認同的中國觀

儒家思想在歷經萊布尼茲與黑格爾時代兩個典範後，在雅斯佩斯的時代又產生一個嶄新的轉變。雅斯佩斯提出「軸心時代」（Achsenzeit）的論點，「軸心時代」這段時期是人類的重大突破時期，各地區的文明都出現了偉大的精神導師，如希臘的蘇格拉底和柏拉圖、以色列的先知、印度的釋迦牟尼、中國的孔子與老子等；而這些哲人的出現創造了規範，在在影響後代的子子孫孫。

雅斯佩斯盛讚孔子以教育來塑造人類並創造一套秩序，也認同孔子使用禮樂來維護社會秩序的根本；他認為想要恢復周禮的孔子，是想要利用對古代的復興以實現對人類的救濟，他並感覺到孔子的思想中，引導他的是人間社會的統攝（das Umgreifende）理念，只有在這樣的理法之中，人才可以成為人。

衛禮賢原本是十九世紀末基督教同善會差派到山東的傳教士，在接觸到中國文化後深受吸引，漢學研究逐漸取代宗教成為他的使命，成為中國文化積極的研究者和傳播者。不同於上述幾位哲學家的是，他曾旅居中國二十五年，衛禮賢所著之《中國靈李雪濤，2008，《日爾曼學術譜系中的漢學—德國漢學之研究》，北京：外語教學與研究出版社，頁 129。
魂》（Die Seele Chinas）在当时欧洲引起非常大的回响。他的写作内容是奠基在他的中国生活经验之上的。书中在描述儒家思想的部分，特别强调中国社会中的和谐，认为和谐是儒家思想的核心。一切都在和谐中生存，一切都在喜乐中运行，一切都有自己的完善的秩序。57 衛禮賢認為所謂中國靈魂的基本特徵即為「安寧」與「溫和」，而這是歸功於孔子的基本思想，因為孔子將其思想不可磨滅地灌輸給中國人與中國文化。58 衛禮賢所帶給當代人們的中國印象是富認同感的，以他個人親身所見所聞為佐證，成為了一種新的中國認識的典範。

衛禮賢與雅斯佩斯對於孔子與儒家的詮釋徹底地扭轉了先前黑格爾對於儒家思想的不屑一顧，並且發展了一套對於儒家思想的獨特詮釋，影響了後人對於儒家思想的看法。從現今角度來看，萊布尼茲的理想化的中國、黑格爾的僵化的中國、雅斯佩斯與衛禮賢饒富認同感等不同的中國認識，均有時代背景，沒有絕對的對或錯，他們的觀點都代表了一種典範的形成，除了能夠了解德國當時的中國認識以外，更能了解當時時空背景給予這些典範的具體影響為何。

德國漢學對中國的思想史興趣一向十分濃厚，尤其是對儒學有一定的偏重，從十七、十八世紀的萊布尼茲、十九世紀的黑格爾到二十世紀的雅斯佩斯、衛禮賢一致以儒學思想為中國文化精髓，再進一步從仰慕或批判的角度加以詮釋，與雅斯佩斯和衛禮

57 馬漢茂等主编，张平平等译，2005，《德國學者：歷史、發展、人物與視角》，郑州：大象出版社，页78。
58 前揭书，页79。
賢同處於二十世紀的金德曼，其對於儒家思想的認識與此兩位學者是較為接近的，而金德曼將儒家思想與孫文主義所作之聯結，也正是此一傳統之延續。以下將就金德曼的儒家詮釋及與孫文主義之連結做進一步的說明。

第二節 金德曼的儒家詮釋與孫文主義

一、近代儒家思想與孫文主義的關聯性

金德曼提到由於他對於孫文主義的興趣，推動了他對於儒家思想的探索，而他在五○、六○年代撰寫及研究儒家思想時，是以台灣為主要的研究對象。當時要進入大陸做這類的研究是不可能的，以致許多學者選擇以台灣作為研究中國大陸的替身，尤其儒家思想在中國大陸當時可以說是一種詛咒，人們不可以提及孔孟的議題，甚至到圖書館借閱《論語》就會被貼上異教份子的標籤，嚴重者還會受到處罰，所以當時金德曼選擇台灣作為研究儒家思想的地區。

金德曼提到孫文學說產生的背景是中國面臨內外交迫的时代。十九世紀中葉，中國由於受到西方世界殖民帝國主義擴張的影響，尤其在強大的西方軍事與文化力量侵略之下，中國原本以「中央之國」（Reiches der Mitte）的自我認同受到動搖，這樣的衝擊也讓傳統舊中國逐漸打開大門認識這個之外的世界，但最重
要的是，這同時成為推動中國內部改革與社會制度變遷的關鍵之一。當時的社會菁英體認到，中國所面對的難題不只是西方的技術、產業與文化的優勢；問題同時存在於中國的傳統體制之中，這是需要從中國根本的制度上去做改變，而此改變的願望便成為推動十九與二十世紀中國思想史的要素之一。59

金德曼指出，當時的社會菁英試圖由兩個面向去改革中國的問題，一個面向是採用改革後的儒家思想，而另外一個面向則是依循孫文主義的進程；兩者用不同的方式去關切相同的問題，前者從上層進行，試圖透過改革儒家思想並倣效日本明治維新模式60，進行一場不流血的改革；從下層進行的是孫文主義的推行，是基於前者的失敗而改採的革命形式；但兩者同時都擔心過度採用西方模式會使中國失去既有的文化靈魂，但西方模式的採用是勢在必行的，何不將原有的文化傳統融合西方的思想與制度，同時思想家對於自身文化傳統進行反思，以人民能予以肯定的方式尋找最適合中國的改革模式。61

在這個時期以儒家思想改革重點在於中國內部的革新，當時支持以儒家思想改革的革新者有曾國藩、左宗棠與李鴻章等，他們深信改革後的儒家規範能夠有效地安內攘外。根據金德曼的理解，當時清朝所進行的百日維新，就是一次中國重要的儒家思想改革運動；革新者認為透過重新詮釋儒家經典並配合新的經驗，

60 前揭書，頁 31。
61 前揭書，頁 32。
如此一來人們才能真正認識到儒家思想的典範，而不是死守傳統，經歷數個發展階段，最終達到儒家所欲傳達之和諧、沒有階級之分的大同世界。這些革新者關注的並不只是孔子或儒家思想究竟成就了甚麼（res gestae），更重要的是在遇到問題時如何因應，包括如何解決當前西方勢力的擴張，能夠提供甚麼行動（res gerendae）；在國家倫理方面，革新者也特別強調「天命」，也就是君主是上天給予的使命，君主只是一個權力的載體（Machtträgern），而這個權力的行使是以人民的幸福為先決條件等等。62

不過，這樣的儒家思想改革並未替清朝帶來太多正面的改變，金德曼認為這並不是因為儒家思想改革的失敗，而是在於清朝並未徹底地實施改革後的儒家思想，同時革新的運動並不如預期順遂的推動，導致在上層進行改革的失敗，而從下層著手的孫文主義持續進行，但實際上孫文主義與改革後的儒家思想之間思想相去不遠，只是施行的方式有所不同。金德曼認為從上層著手的儒家思想改革內容，與孫中山的孫文主義大多不謀而合，孫文主義歸根究柢仍是奠基於儒家思想之上，而孫文主義的核心思想就是三民主義，從孫中山的三民主義的內容之中，不難看出儒家思想與孫文主義的密切關聯。

而三民主義的三民，講述的即是民族、民權以及民生。首先是民族主義，也就是以民族感情為基本的理論；孫中山試圖用民族主義來取代人們對王朝的效忠，將人民放置到政治之最上層，
以中華民族的全體人民做為行使政權最重要的根基，而不是以傳統帝制作為基準。孫中山推行革命，就是為了讓全中國的人民做國家的主人，這樣的鬥爭並不是階級的鬥爭，而是一種爭取獨立的鬥爭，是為了做到真正地以民為本。同時要孫中山強調傳統的重要性，呼籲人民要恢復舊有精神、道德與知識的關聯性，如同禮記大學篇所述的「修身、齊家、治國而平天下」。\(^{63}\)

第二項提到的則是民權主義，也就是重視人民的權益，由人民進行對政治的監督。民權主義以儒家的「天命」之說為本，認為天命本應是應乎人民的意願，當統治的制度不符合人民的意願時，人民有群起推翻的權利、人民有選賢與能的權利，而這一切所做所為都是應乎天命的，人民應享有四項政治權利（選舉、罷免、創制與複決），而政府應該實行五權分立（行政、立法、司法、考試與監察）；管理政府的人只是專門為此制度負責的專家。\(^{64}\) 金德曼認為民權主義是一個民主化的過程，是從最基層逐漸往上層推行民主的進程（從鄉、省到國家），另外再配合五權分立，成就一個完善的制度。

最後則是提到了民生主義，民生主義關注人民的福利，主要討論的是社會制度與當時的經濟制度，孫中山認為中國應該擺脫階級的鬥爭，人民應該組成一個沒有階級、不分你我的大家庭，而金德曼指出此正是儒家平等、博愛的精神。此外，孫中山認為國家應在經濟政策改革上有所作為，例如土地改革，應做到耕者

\(^{63}\) 金德曼，2010，《中國與東亞崛起》，北京：社會科學文獻出版社，頁 111。

\(^{64}\) 前揭書，頁 112。
有其田，國家要更合理地分配土地，而不是試圖從人民身上謀取利益；另外也討論基礎工業與交通事業的國有化的建設等議題。金德曼認為民生主義對於國家而言是十分重要的，稱讚孫中山所提出的民生主義是非常有遠見的，他認為孫中山早在實際問題發生前就預見了問題，例如人性的貪婪，對於利益的爭奪永無止境的慾望，如一戰時的農業產品的缺乏或生產過剩的問題，作為政府應該有立馬處置的能力。

金德曼在詮釋三民主義時，同時以儒家的說法來對照，在其著作當中，也引述中文文獻來驗證，如崔書琴曾提及儒家思想的烏托邦與孫文主義。金德曼並認為孫文主義也因此對台灣的經濟發展與民主化產生了決定性的影響，促使台灣逐步走向和諧與大同的境界，此點將在第三節作更詳細的說明。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>三民主義與儒家思想的對照</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>民族主義</td>
<td>大道之行也，天下為公。</td>
<td>民為貴，社稷次之，君為輕。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民權主義</td>
<td>順應天命</td>
<td>選賢與能</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民生主義</td>
<td>平等</td>
<td>博愛</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>民生主義</td>
<td>和諧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>大同世界</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

65 前揭書，頁 113。
二、孫中山的人格特質

金德曼指出，在二十世紀的中國，幾乎沒有任何其他政治家比孫中山更頻繁地接觸中國以外的世界，此外孫中山年紀輕輕便至國外求學、遊歷，足跡遍佈美洲、歐洲與亞洲許多國家，因此他吸收了各式各樣的外來文化，一心投入革命事業，不斷接觸新思想的衝擊，他可以說是中國當代融合新知與傳統於一身的重要政治家。

金德曼認為孫中山的思想與成就除了受到兩岸人民與海內外華人肯定外，同時也受到其他國家的重要人物所肯定，如日本前首相犬養毅曾經公開表達支持孫中山的革命思想；印尼前總理蘇卡諾早年的政治事業理想，就是成為印尼的孫中山；美國前總統柯林頓評論孫中山為中國的富蘭克林與華盛頓等，這些例子證明了孫中山在世界各地具有一定的影響力。金德曼認為孫中山的思想受到幾乎一貫的正面評價，是一種異常且空前的現象，而此思想與其人格特質有密切的關聯性，透過整理孫中山相關著作研究的書籍後，金德曼統整出三個基本的理由來說明：

1. 中外政治領袖透過海內外中國人民在歷史的自我認同，感受到孫中山極富魅力的人格與抱負，而此也是孫中山能夠成為中華民國國父的領導力與影響力的要素。
2. 孫中山具有確切了解各國與其政治體系內容的能力，如美

國的民主、早期蘇俄的反帝國主義與日本的自我發展等；孫中山在考察各國情況後便會選擇性地納入符合中國國情及利益的制度來幫助中國的發展。

3. 孫中山創造了第一個行為取向的第三世界意識形態體系，其中囊括了許多開發中國家的期望與目標，例如民主化與社會改革、工業化、土地改革、保留國家自我文化認同的現代化等。由此可見，孫文主義作為一種思想體系並不只單單反映出現今中國的典型與目標，同時也反映出第三世界國家所需。

金德曼主張以「政治魅力」68（political charisma）一詞來評斷孫中山的人格特質與其領導特質，他認為這正是孫中山在生前能成為中華民國國父與中國現代化的推動者之緣由，而他的魅力在死後仍然歷久不衰，可以稱之為「歷史性的政治魅力」（historical charisma）。針對孫中山的政治魅力與歷史魅力能夠延續至今，金德曼提出兩種解釋：一個是主觀因素，也就是孫中山的超凡人格，這也是作一個有政治魅力的領導人所必須具備的，孫中山對於革命始終堅持且不屈不撓的精神，他認為創造新中國是上天給予他的使命，使其得以堅定不移，一再為推動中國的改革而努力。而另外一個相輔相成的因素則是中國當時面臨外來勢力的侵略，中國不斷受到欺壓，更顯舊有體制崩壞，不足以因應保護中國，必須找尋新的思想行為模式才能帶領中國脫離困境。而此

68 政治魅力，乃是具有吸引力的領導者所具備的一種特殊能力，通常是在社會混亂的情況下最能表現出來。他們往往提種達到更美好未來的新遠景、價值與行為模式，因而使支持他們的人絕對相信其選擇目標的正確性。
時孫中山的西方新知與愛國情操，他試圖提供中國一條符合世界潮流與新價值觀的道路，孫中山與其思想幾乎是帶領中國走向烏托邦的象徵。69

金德曼舉出的例子試圖證明孫中山的人格特質與其所推動的思想體系的密切關聯，對孫文思想也極為稱許，但在稱許之餘，金德曼並不否認孫文主義有其缺失之處。金德曼認為每一種理論都可能存在其缺失，孫中山也未曾說過其思想是完美無缺，金德曼認為孫中山並不是為了著作一個理論而生，他的重點是放在於如何實踐這個理論，如何去動員全部的人民一起建立新的社會與新的政治架構等，終其一生都為了改革中國而努力。孫中山最後確實創建了現代化的中國，受到大眾的景仰，他所提出的孫文主義也成為一個極具影響力的改革典範，但更應該受到注目的應該是孫中山不同於他人的人格特質，才是成就這一切的關鍵。

第三節 當代的孫文主義

金德曼認為孫文主義是極少數從建立民國以來，仍顯現其具有實彈價值的政治遺產，而且切合社會需求的一種思想。他相信孫中山是二十世紀政治家中，最堅決倡導民主政治的人，他期望人民能夠在完全自主和有保障的政治環境下表達自己的意願，成為國家決策過程中的決定者。

就如同金德曼所敘述一般，孫文主義作為一個典範或意識形態，應該要同時能夠落實在政治勢力極度不對等的兩岸，而中國既作為孫文主義的發源地，同時也是孫文主義思想的先驅國家，則當前孫文主義的發展是否依舊具有優勢並得以持續發展，有所作為，在本節會進行簡略的探討。

一、孫文主義的實踐

金德曼曾經至台灣進行一系列的孫文主義的研究，他認為台灣相較於中國，才是真正落實孫文主義的國家。雖然中國曾作為孫文主義的發源地，但共產主義的出現，瞬間取代了孫文主義的位置。金德曼認為，由於1949年後的中國奉共產主義為圭臬，縱使中國不否認孫文主義是中國改革的先行者，但對孫文主義的內涵多所忽略，導致在一次廣東中山縣的訪問經驗中，金德曼發現，甚至是中山博物館的館長對於孫中山的許多事件是一無所知，更遑論孫文主義。

反之，金德曼認為台灣在先天條件上就有優勢，因為台灣擁有反對共產主義的政黨，即使當時共產主義在中國的勝利具有強大的吸引力，許多人幾乎被這股勝利所迷惑，且開始信奉共產主義思想，然而台灣卻因為反共思想而阻擋了這股勢力，即至台灣受到民主化進程的影響，孫文主義中的民族、民權與民生共同成爲了指導台灣進步的最大動力。

另外，蔣經國也可以說是半個孫文主義的推手。台灣在當時的亞洲扮演的是一個新興民主化國家的角色。在蔣介石過世後，
蔣經國意識到人口結構的改變，當時與蔣介石一同來台的同胞已經老成凋謝，新一代的年輕人生長在台灣、長在台灣、與台灣人結婚、支持台灣本土的政黨，已經形成台灣在地化（Taiwanisation），縱使蔣經國知道民主化會替國民黨樹敵，他仍舊認為是勢在必行的，而這波民主化就隨著台灣在地化進程一起發展，原先領導台灣的魅力型領袖，如蔣介石、蔣經國，改由人民的選票決定的候選人所取代，而這就真正開啓了孫文主義中的民主制度，台灣唯有如此才能順利轉型，也因此金德曼因此認為，台灣才是孫文主義的扎根地，因為孫文主義的落實，使台灣才能享有現今的經濟發展與現代化。

二、兩岸的孫文主義

金德曼認為，中國在共產主義統治之後，不停地在尋找一種適合中國社會的模式。然而，孫文主義是否能夠在現今的中國徹底施行呢？金德曼認為，中國的上層階級從孫文主義中確實得到了許多實用的思想模式，諸如和諧、大同的理念，並試圖施行於社會之中，但他們並不會將這理念的來源公諸於社會。金德曼舉毛澤東的言行變化為例子時指出，毛澤東在 1949 年前，提及孫中山的名稱甚至多過於列寧或史達林，但在取得政權之後，則絕口不提，金德曼認為，對毛澤東而言，孫文主義不過是當時他所使用的伎倆之一。

金德曼在許多著作中強調台灣的現代化發展是建立在孫文主義的基礎上，但現今中國的發展較台灣毫不遜色，卻是透過階級
鬥爭換來的，而孫文主義是絕對反對階級鬥爭的，由此可知，中國所使用的，絕對不是源自孫文主義的思想模式。金德曼並不否認中國確實在快速發展之中，但他認為外界只看見了富裕的沿岸城市，對內陸城市的情況其實缺乏認識。

金德曼說中國可以鬆綁經濟、文化、社會等各項政策，但唯一不會放手的則是權力的集中。他以法輪功為例，法輪功原本並不是一項以政治為目的的集會團體，但對於共產黨而言，必須在一股力量有效聚集與形成前就先做處置。金德曼又提出另外一個關於在天安門事件後的例子，當時德國電視台訪問周邊農民，請教他們對於民主的看法，他們認為民主雖好，但是能夠溫飽更好，可見中國並未實踐孫文主義。

對於中國人民而言，認識真正孫文主義似乎是一件困難的任務，但金德曼則認為，中國大陸人民仍然有機會在中國認識孫文主義，而最近的一次機會是在辛亥革命一百年的到來，屆時兩岸三地將會進行一系列的慶祝活動，舉辦各種展覽與儀式，便可藉此觀察中國大陸各界在活動中如何展現孫中山，便能對孫文主義的效力加以評斷。

在台灣，雖然理論上已經按照孫中山的憲政觀念實施五權憲法，而全民政治的理念也在台灣落實了，但金德曼認為在台灣現行的政治之中，仍然未完全發揮孫文主義的精神。他認為最主要的癥結在於，許多團體與學者過度地將孫文主義教條化（ritualization），縱使他們是出於善意，但實際上已經造成反效果；任何企圖將孫文主義提升到國家教條（ritualistic）的企圖反而會框限其發展，減少其落實的機會。金德曼認為目前台灣所真正實踐的孫文主義
除了前述的憲政觀念與全民政治外，還有土地改革與工業發展，但除此之外還仍有可以推展的餘地。

另外金德曼也批評台灣的孫文主義教育，他認為台灣的孫文主義教育方式並不恰當，孫文主義一旦成為一個考試科目，便失去其原有的精神，剩餘的只有背誦以換取成績的作用，但對於這樣的情況，他感到無能為力，因為如此起步的教育制度已經積重難返。考試的作法會與原先孫中山提出孫文主義的理念背道而馳，孫文主義因此又再度回到單純的理論面向，而非以實踐作為最高準則。

金德曼認為，孫文主義對於政治生活而言是促進劑，而不是需要被供奉的教條，尤其是在教育青年方面，這樣的教育方式對孫中山造成「去人性化」（dehumanizing）的效果，但實際上孫中山是有血有肉有熱忱的人，無數的成敗、歷史經驗與冒險交織成他的人生，若是將孫中山寫成了完美無缺的偉人，只會抹滅青年試圖認識中華歷史真相的熱誠。70 而現今的台灣不就面臨這樣的現象，甚至在教育改革之後，原本的三民主義已不在考試範圍之內，學子甚至失去了拿起三民主義課本的動力，如此一來，接觸孫文主義的機會就更少之又少了。

第四節 小結

金德曼對於孫文思想的興趣早在他 1948 年在奧中友協（the Austria-China Friendship Association）的第一次公開演講時已顯現出來，他的講題即是孫中山。之後在美國芝加哥大學博士論文題目為《孫中山的中俄協約政策》（“The Sino-Russian Entente Policies of Sun Yat-Sen”），1963 年金德曼根據之前所執行的亞洲的佛、儒與伊斯蘭的研究計劃，出版《儒家學說、孫文主義及中國共產主義》一書；在 1967 年進入慕尼黑大學戈氏政治學研究所後，對於儒家思想與孫文主義思想一系列的研究也持續不斷。

金德曼認為從狹隘的標準來看，孫中山並沒有真正有機會實踐他的孫文主義，但他提出來的理念至今仍然適用於華人社會之中，儘管他的理論與實踐中有錯誤存在，而這當中還有許多理論需要後人去完成。但不可否認的是孫中山將會是中國社會永遠的精神領袖，是帶領中國走向現代化與度過艱困二十世紀民主過程的象徵，孫中山的精神將會永續的影響世世代代的華人。

金德曼對孫文主義的肯定推崇不只表現在其著作之中，而他在德奧兩國籌辦孫中山相關研討會、展覽、影片的行動，更展現出對孫文主義服膺推廣的熱情，金德曼對於孫文主義幾乎已臻「信仰」之境界，而孫文幾乎成為他政治理念中的「聖像」（icon）。
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慕尼黑大學政治研究所在 1967 年後開始重視中國當代的外交政策和中國大陸、台灣和香港之間的關係等議題，也因此推動。金德曼在東亞與中國大陸議題方面更有深入探討的機會，但更重要的是，在研究東亞議題的途徑，金德曼所使用的並不是完全傳承傳統漢學的研究方法，而是金德曼本身在美國求學時期，在摩根所門下所學習到的政治學理論基礎，其中更尤其受到現實主義的影響，金德曼在德國漢學轉型時期，不只在研究議題上有所轉變，在研究方法上更有新的創建，也即是「慕尼黑新現實主義學派」，而此學派也更鑄就了金德曼的東亞研究基礎，使金德曼從研究傳統的中國政治哲學思想跨入社會科學研究。

金德曼在其早年負笈美國期間，經歷了中國政權的更迭 — 從國民政府到中華人民共和國，同時也親眼目睹了美國政壇對於「誰失去了中國的辯論」。他接著擔任聯合國的實習生，目睹了中國於聯合國中的代表問題之爭，然後又到摩根索門下擔任助理與博士生，但仍然脫離不了與中國問題的連結。金德曼這一生與中國問題始終十分密切，他也被稱為歐洲經驗最為豐富的東亞問題專家。針對東亞問題曾多次訪談各國首長及政要；此外，金德曼從七○年代就與台灣的學術機構互動繁多，同時也是台歐學術研討會的重要推手。他並多次來台進行選舉觀察，對於台灣的民
主化、兩岸關係等議題有相當研究，因此探討金德曼對於台灣內部的看法，及其對於兩岸關係的看法，是有助於整理他的中國認識。

由於金德曼受教於現實主義大師摩根索門下，根據現實主義創立他自己的慕尼黑新現實主義學派，並將其論點應用在之後諸多研究中，尤其是有關東亞、中國與台灣的問題上。本章第一節主要探討慕尼黑新現實主義學派的特色。第二節與第三節則從金德曼的專著與訪談探究其二十世紀的中國與台灣關係之研究。最後則是探討慕尼黑新現實主義對於此兩者之影響，以及觀察金德曼對於中國、台灣的認識有何特別之處。

第一節 慕尼黑新現實主義學派

一、慕尼黑新現實主義學派（Munich School of Neorealism in International Politics）的創立與內容

現實主義的巨擘摩根索（Hans J. Morgenthau）所出版的《國家間政治》（Politics Among Nations）是國際政治科學中的重要經典，書中強調國家的一切行為歸因於取得權力、增長權力及保持權力，而權力不僅是國家生存的手段，更是國際關係暨國家本身的終極目的，此書為現實主義的發展奠定根基及促成國際政治的主導地位。^{71}

---
^{71} 張亞中編，2010，《國際關係總論》，台北：揚智文化事業股份有限公司，頁14-15。
金德曼的學術研究與摩根索關係十分密切，他既是摩根索的學生、助理，也是朋友，在學術上受摩根索的影響及啟發甚多，特別是在慕尼黑新現實主義學派的創立。金德曼在摩根索現實主義學說的基礎上，結合其個人教學經驗與研究成果，建立了一個理論與方法，他稱之為慕尼黑新現實主義學派，並將其廣泛地運用在東亞國際關係的探討之中。金德曼所建立的這套系統是衍生自摩根索的現實主義，稱其「新」(neo)現實主義學派，則是因要將其與古典現實主義作出區隔，在尊重古典現實理論的正統性上開展，並避免混淆。72

起初，金德曼在建立慕尼黑新現實主義學派時，十分擔憂會使摩根索產生不愉快的感受，但在摩根索替慕尼黑新現實主義寫下序言後，才確信此一學派已然受到摩根索本人所肯定。金德曼表示，慕尼黑新現實主義的創立，使得他的學術研究脈絡更為清晰，如同醫生看診一般，透過數個不同的病徵，試圖找出病灶並總和出診斷的結果，而他的研究正是如此。金德曼在撰寫其專書《中國與東亞崛起》(Der Aufstieg Ostasien in der Weltpolitik)即是應用慕尼黑新現實主義，受其指導的台灣學者葉陽明教授在博士論文《孫逸仙之中國南方政府與護法運動》中，也是以慕尼黑新現實主義為基礎。

慕尼黑新現實主義學派的主要論點，以國內與國際政治的互動來進行外交政策的分析。新學派與古典現實主義學派中最大的不同之處在於，不同於以往以獲取國家權力作為國家利益為最主

要決策方向，而是透過觀察決策對於國內與國際的交互作用後，再進一步以其反饋作為決策的主要取向。為了能夠更確切地分析一國的外交政策及多國互動過程，慕尼黑新現實主義提出一套「座系分析」（constellation analysis）

系統，以具兩個相互關聯概念的總共六組範疇作為分析單位，這六個分析範疇主要用來解釋單國或多國的外交政策，兩者在受到國際政治影響後所產生的決策行為，座系（constellation）的概念係用來表示在分析國家間或其他行為者在特定時間點中的行為時，應先界定與決策有關的各種內外與各個層次的因素，如同圍繞以決策者為一主要星座的群星列，以及處理問題時的彼此牽引與互動過程。此六個分析範疇如下：

1. 系統與決策：用來檢視國內及國外的外交政策行動的決定性要素。
2. 認知與現實：決策者的主觀認識，如世界觀、自我形象等，對於外交政策的影響。
3. 利益與權力：決策者如何根據其對國家利益的認識來確定權力在實現外交政策目標中的作用。
4. 規範與優勢：國家的法律、道德或意識形態如何決定國家在國際體系中互動的決策。
5. 結構與相互依賴：結構對相互依賴的程度和互動模式的影響，不單指國與國之間的互動，也包括國家與非國家行為者。

6. 衝突與合作：最後一項是總和上述五項範疇如何影響行為體，並產生針對其他行為體的策略進行衝突、合作或中立的模式。\(^\text{74}\)

二、慕尼黑新現實主義學派的運用 — 以《中國與東亞崛起》為例

金德曼在著作《中國與東亞崛起》一書時開頭便提出，他在著作此書時運用甚多慕尼黑新現實主義學派之觀念；本書重點在於太平洋西岸地區有影響力的幾個國家在外交政策方面的態度、他們之間的交互作用過程，以及看待這些力量對比情況時的世界政治觀點。\(^\text{75}\) 换句話說，這即指向系分析的第一點與第三點，系統與決策、利益與權力的部分，在執行決策時，必須要考慮國內內政與國際情勢，選擇出最適合國家的決策，並且使國家的利益最大化。

在大多數國家裡，外交政策向來屬於一些人數有限的小集團，而這些決策者之間存在著不同的世界觀，因此對於形勢常有不同的判斷，利益結構也不相同。金德曼認為，在東亞文化圈，有幾千年的儒教思想始終強調「統治者」的重要作用。例如儒家思想認為要實施「人」治而非「法」治，這種觀點強化了領袖人物的象徵意義，如孫中山、蔣介石與毛澤東等。\(^\text{76}\) 而此處則指向


\(^{75}\) 金德曼，2010，《中國與東亞崛起》，北京：社會科學文獻出版社，頁 2。

\(^{76}\) 前揭書，頁 2-3。
座系分析的第二點和第四點—認知與現實、規範與優勢兩部分。決策者如前文所舉例，其自身的主觀認識、形象都會影響到一個國家決策的制定，然而一個國家的道德、法律或是意識形態即是形塑一個人的人格特質的重要要素，這是牽一髮而動全身的。

而國內政策和社會內部發展過程則決定，在一定的歷史時期內對外政策主導權掌握在誰的手上。77例如帝國主義、殖民主義等摧毀了亞洲的一些國家，包括中國等傳統的國家、社會、經濟結構，導致國家革命，而革命也連帶使國家的權力有所轉移。78最後則是指向第五點和第六點，分別是結構與相互依賴、衝突與合作，其間最淺顯易懂的範例即是 孫中山的革命。金德曼分析指出，由於帝國主義的擴張，中國內部結構改變而產生革命，內部權力產生轉移，然後方有國共兩黨的產生，兩黨（行為體）基於外在環境與利益之上的與他國（黨）的合作或衝突。

第二節 金德曼眼中的兩岸

金德曼在其專著《中國與東亞崛起》中，將東亞太平洋地區的國際政策大略分做四個階段，第一個階段是從鴉片戰爭到1900年的義和團運動，第二階段是從二十世紀初期的日俄戰爭直至1945第二次世界大戰為止，第三階段則是共產主義中國時期，
第四章 金德曼的「慕尼黑新現實主義學派」及中國與東亞研究

最後，第四階段為二十世紀末九○年代初期蘇聯解體後。而本節在此主要探討第四階段，也就是二十世紀九○年代後的中國與台灣。

一、中國

(一)政治

從二十世紀九○年代起，中國成為亞洲的最主要活躍國家以及世界政治發展過程中最強而有力的亞洲國家，中國的崛起也就成為東亞太平洋地區國際政治最重要的議題。在新世紀裡，如此情況很可能長期繼續下去。金德曼敘述他所見到的中國時，毫不否認中國的崛起，並且他認為自中共取得政權之後，中共的外交政策是十分成功的。

國家的領導人對於國家的內政外交決策有絕對的影響力，金德曼特別提出三代的代表人物，分別為毛澤東、鄧小平及江澤民，他舉例從毛澤東時代的朝鮮戰爭、越戰、中印邊界戰爭及解放蘇聯等，都是毛澤東時代中國成功透過其外交政策取得國家利益的事蹟。毛澤東過世後，鄧小平在外交事務上也毫不遜色，他使中國外交正常化並以國際法孤立台灣。另外，香港與澳門的回歸、蘇聯與中國冷戰結束，皆是在鄧小平統治時期中發生的。金德曼認為中國所取得的一系列顯著的成就，增強了中國的自我

79 前揭書，頁 600-602。
意識，並且提高了國際地位，其中最積極明顯的例子，即是中共數次對台軍事演習。在內政部份，鄧小平降低了黨與國家對於人民現實生活施加的控制，在工作、文化、科學等的社會自由權利日益增加。第三代的領導人代表則為江澤民，他主張中國要實行現代化並改革開放，但必須以馬克思列寧主義和毛澤東思想為理論基礎，否則中國共產黨將會失去根基。江澤民同時也承認中國有參與全球化進程的必要性，而此舉確實也替中國帶來無庸置疑的好處，在全球化進程中，現今中國的角色乃是一個強大的經濟、軍事與政治力量，有哪些國家會拒絕與中國合作？

(二) 經濟

在經濟體制方面鄧小平認為不對外開放，中國的經濟不可能繁榮，他以四個現代化為標誌（農業現代化、工業現代化、科學技術現代化和國防現代化），在經濟體制方面降低了黨和國家的影響，試圖發展「社會主義市場經濟」，並與台灣地區也開始有經濟往來，此舉大力推進了中國經濟。金德曼形容鄧小平的接班人江澤民即主張建立一種計畫和市場相結合的社會主義商品經濟體制，其中的重點是將市場經濟和計劃經濟有機的結合在一起。

改革的口號不斷為政治與經濟的改革提供正當性，西方學者原本認為，更大的經濟自由必定將引起與其程度相符的政治生活
自由化，但金德曼認為，在中國的情況則未必。金德曼認為中國在共產黨的統治下，實質的民主化進展在短期間是不可能發生的。以金德曼 80 年代訪問中國人民外交學會會長郝德青的經驗為例，他們在討論有關於國民黨之問題時，郝德青先是表示認同國民黨為全中國的政黨之一，並且國民黨可以在中國設置分部並發行報刊雜誌，甚至電視、媒體的參與也不會是問題，並且國民黨也有共同參與選舉的機會。但當金德曼問及倘若國民黨在選舉中勝選，國民黨是否可以改變中共憲法第二條的規定？然而郝德青卻臉色一沉地告訴金德曼，他認為金德曼作為一個外國人不該干涉太多中國內政問題，也不需要像考試一般質問他相關問題。由此可見，雖然中國在政治、經濟上都疾呼改革開放，並且也願意追隨全球化的腳步，但仍舊不會放下自己的權力，民主仍然只會作為其中的一個口號罷了。

二、台灣

（一）政治

西方的中國專家總認為，以中國組織結構的官僚系統、法治國家理念和獨裁統治的狀況，他們很難想像中國能夠成功引入一種多元化的法治國家的民主形式，因此二十世紀八○年代末，台
灣開始進行的民主化進程是讓國際社會十分驚訝的。87

金德曼認為台灣民主化的轉捩點是蔣經國。蔣介石時代，台灣仍處於獨裁統治的社會體制之中，當時的蔣經國就在父親的安排下，在政府不同的部門中學習，因此當蔣經國登上政府最高領導後，他已擁有許多管理與領導的經驗，他選擇採取一種親民的領導方式，並與台灣各地各界不同領域的人士互動與聯繫。金德曼認為最重要的是，他不間斷地將土生土長的台灣人納入政府和國民黨之中，因蔣經國認為若要保留國民政府，需要建立一個能有效與民衆穩定的聯繫，在社會方面，蔣經國也進行了一些放寬的措施，如廢除勞動教訓、廢除黨禁等。88 由於此些放寬的措施，促進了與國民黨以外的政黨的集結與發展，人民擁有更多的自由及替自己發聲的權利，社會大眾逐漸擁有真正當家作主的能力，自此開啟了台灣民主化的大門。

金德曼指出，李登輝繼蔣經國之後擔任總統，他擴大了蔣經國所開始的台灣自由化和民主化進程，包括實行集會遊行自由、廢除報禁與改選國會等，金德曼認為這是中華民國歷史轉折的一次革命。如果說在此之前台灣政權源於兩位蔣姓總統的話，那麼自此台灣的政權源自於台灣人民。在總統民選後，李登輝當選為第一任民選總統，前三任選的中、台關係格局並沒有任何太大改變，但在 1999 年，德國之聲 (Deutsche Welle) 對李登輝進行的一次訪談導致了台灣與中國大陸的緊張局勢升高，李登輝在訪談中提及，台灣與中國的關係為「國家與國家」，至少是「特殊

87 金德曼，2010，《中國與東亞崛起》，北京：社會科學文獻出版社，頁 562。
88 前揭書，頁 563。
的國與國的關係」；而北京方面則強烈反應李登輝的言論是將台灣從中國分離出去，此舉也造成兩岸關係的惡化。89

從李登輝時期的緊張氣氛一直延續至第二次總統大選，北京不願見到主張台獨的民主進步黨候選人陳水扁當選，但最不願見到的結果仍成為事實。金德曼則表示他並不認為陳水扁執政時期會宣布台獨，因為金德曼曾在陳水扁擔任市長時詢問他，台灣是否真要在國際之間實行台獨，而陳水扁則大聲回應：「當然！我們要爭取獨立」，事後又小聲說：「我們實際上早就獨立了」，金德曼又問：「那麼，孫中山先生的中華民國就不存在了？」陳水扁大聲喊：「孫中山先生的中華民國在台灣，統一是遲早」，事後他又小聲說：「我們這樣維持現狀不是很好？」。90 金德曼認為陳水扁這樣的應答，可見其靈活善變，懂得適時地調整，不會使台灣陷於絕境。果不其然，陳水扁就任時所發表的五點聲明之中，第一點即是陳水扁就任總統期間不宣布台獨，此舉也適度的緩和了兩岸的緊張氣氛。

而在2008年馬英九當選總統之後，兩岸情勢更加緩和。金德曼曾於2009年時代表德國國際政治期刊專訪馬英九，馬英九表示兩岸的相關協商必須要在「對等、尊嚴、互惠」的原則下，並且兩德分裂的模式並不適用於台灣與中國的模式之下，台灣與中國的關係仍取決於人民，而當前他所遵從的兩岸關係指標為正

89 前揭書，頁564。
90 金德曼，2000，《德國「外交政治協會」：陳水扁以公投、制憲、建國考驗美國台海兩岸政策的底線非明智之舉》，2011年1月18日取自http://www.tangben.com/German/04/feimzh.htm。
視現實，建立互信，擱置爭議，共創雙贏。\(^{91}\)

金德曼觀察到，台灣歷經數位民選總統的領導，皆未曾出現採取勢必獨立或統一的政策，在選舉時或許會提出諸如「台獨」來爭取選票，但在實際上任後，卻未作出任何實際的決策，大多都採取中間微微偏左或偏右的路線。金德曼則認為台灣與中國之間目前尚未出現統一或獨立的契機，除非任一方發生再次的革命，否則兩岸目前只會維持現狀。

(二) 經濟

七○、八○年代，在美國改採與中國關係正常化政策後，國民政府歷經許多在外交上的失敗，甚至失去在聯合國中的席次，但台灣於七○與八○年代的經濟並未因此外交風波所擊垮，反而發展出更好的前景。金德曼認為這是五○年代所進行的土地改革產生了效用。土地改革替當時以農業為主的台灣提供了保障，幫助農民獲得農耕地，同時提升了農業出口的比例，而由於農業出口比例的提高，其所獲得的利潤又重新投入市場，活絡市場上其他產業的運作；八○年代台灣更在鋼鐵、機械、造船與石化等重工業上有所發展，促使台灣經濟結構的轉變。\(^{92}\) 由於台灣經濟結構的轉變，由原本的農業主軸轉變成以重工業為主軸，成功地替台灣帶入更多的外匯存底，並與當時的新加坡、南韓與香港並稱「亞洲四小龍」，經濟實力不容小覷。
對於台灣在物資缺乏的年代就能取得經濟發展的成功，金德曼認為必須歸功於跟隨蔣介石來台的專家，這些專家原本在中國大陸即負責許多與政府相關的經濟事務，在共產黨統治中國後，選擇來台，他們使用的經濟政策與當時毛澤東所統治的大陸迥然不同，而是以理性為基礎，當時的政府在經濟發展中所扮演的角色十分重要，必須同時扮演引路人、支持者和激發能力等各方面的不同角色，才能有效地促進經濟的運作。\(^93\)

此外，台灣雖然受到中國大陸在外交上的處處封鎖，但台灣仍然成為一些具影響力的經濟組織的成員，如亞太經濟合作會議（APEC）和亞洲發展銀行（CAREC）。台灣並有足夠能力提供許多發展中國家資金與技術的援助，而此也為台灣在發展外交關係時政治戰略的助力，對於台灣的外交關係產生正面加分的效果。\(^94\)

不可否認的是，大陸近年來的經濟實力急速起飛，許多外資選擇轉而投向大陸的市場，連帶台灣本土企業也大量的西進。金德曼對於此情況則是抱持憂心忡忡的態度，坦承他不認為應該簡單地把中國當成是世界上經濟超快成長的巨大市場，他看到的事實反而是中國市場太大，各地不一，目前所見發展良好的地區大多集中在沿海，但內陸仍然有許多省份有許多問題，這是一般人所忽略的。金德曼認為：台灣的產業轉移至大陸仍然有其一定的風險存在，他表示台灣投資中國大陸的資金實在過於龐大，多到令人擔心，一但經濟依賴程度高，可能會從經濟控制轉為政治控

\(^93\) 前揭書，頁 562。
\(^94\) 同前註。
制，尤其是在中國這樣一個國家。中國了解用武力打不掉他們不想看到的選票，李登輝、陳水扁在武嚇下仍然是當選了，那麼如果武打不成，在經濟上封鎖呢？

直至在 2010 年兩岸簽署的 ECFA，金德曼認為台灣的政府不該在人民都還不清楚 ECFA 的明確內容下，就貿然行事。若只觀看中國大陸讓利的那一面，對於台灣而言是非常危險的事，必須注意以經濟讓利之名行政治控制之實的狀況，對於中國大陸的態度還是要小心為妙。然而中國大陸與台灣的政治分歧雖大，卻仍未給予兩者之間在經濟上的互動太大的影響，儘管台灣擔心經濟上的依賴可能會導致政治的操弄，而實施台商在中國大陸投資的限制，但雙方的經濟來往已成為領導者不可忽視的一個因素。

第三節 他國在中國和台灣之間扮演的角色

金德曼認為 1945 年以來，分裂的國家和民族在世界政治中始終是地區和國際緊張關係產生的策源地和中心，其中的兩個，即分裂的朝鮮半島及大陸和台灣的關係，而二十世紀之後仍然都是東亞太平洋地區懸而未決的利益衝突地帶。特別的是中國與台灣在政治上的關係卻未因此影響了雙方的經貿往來，反而基於國家利益之上，互動日益增長，在經濟日趨密切的情況下，北京釋出善意，對台灣的兩岸關係政策也趨於和緩，但是仍未能化解

95 金德曼，2010，《中國與東亞崛起》，北京：社會科學文獻出版社，頁 602。
政治層面的僵持。金德曼指出，兩岸關係的複雜性並不是眼下所見到的如此單純，實際上東亞太平洋地區的國家對於兩岸關係的關心與互動，是日漸複雜的，尤其是太平洋周邊國家，如俄羅斯與日本，這些國家對於兩岸關係如何產生作用，又扮演甚麼角色，是本節所欲探討的。

一、俄羅斯

自冷戰後，世界政治的安全體系以美國為首，向歐洲與亞洲擴展，並且美國透過國內法律，形成對於台灣模糊的保護作用，而這股力量沒有任何一股其他結盟勢力可以與之相對。 96 1989 年後，隨著中國與俄羅斯的關係正常化，中俄不再處於相互鬥爭狀態， 1996 年中國和俄國之間建立「面向 21 世紀的戰略協作夥伴關係」，字面上除了是結盟的意義以外，同時也表達了兩者的夥伴關係建立在一種平等的基礎之上。 97 在這樣的夥伴關係之下，中國和俄羅斯也形成一股與美國相互抗衡的力量。

針對東亞太平洋地區政策，俄羅斯和中國分享共同的理念，也就是要加強與發展中國家的合作，並且推動朝鮮半島的南北對話，穩定區域的安全，致力於與東協國家的合作；此外，在兩岸關係的問題上，俄羅斯是支持北京政府在台灣問題上的立場。90年代的俄羅斯與中國為了抵禦美國勢力，並基於國家利益，在多

96 前揭書，頁 587。
97 前揭書，頁 588。
方面顛覆以往路線，相互靠攏。98

二、日本

分裂的朝鮮半島與台灣海峽的情勢緊張，直接影響到日本。而日本一直以來的安全政策基礎，都是奠基於與美國組成的跨太平洋同盟關係之上，1999年更與美國發展《日美防衛合作新指針》，強化日本周邊地區的安全，並且和美國簽屬TMD的協定；而此兩項安全合作受到中國與北韓的譴責，指出這是破壞戰略平衡的行為，但實際上北京更擔心台灣加入日本的戰區導彈防衛系統體系之中，於是就不再受到中國常設的武力所威嚇，因此北京也開始以一些反對行動威嚇美國。而美國與日本政府之間達成更加緊密的軍事合作，除了可能使日本軍隊介入兩韓、兩岸問題與南中國海問題外，日美的緊密合作將會是中國統一台灣的潛在威脅。99

三、美國

金德曼認為，中國和美國在二十世紀末的關係是東亞太平洋地區最重要同時也是問題最多的關係結構，尤其是將台灣也一起納入思考的時候，問題變得更加複雜。金德曼曾訪談一位中國外交官，他對金德曼說：「雖然美國對中國持友好態度，但卻仍在

98 前揭書，頁589。
99 前揭書，頁594-595。
東南亞地區和其他國家結盟，而此結盟可能是針對中國，理論上
美國承認一個中國原則，但若中共在緊急情況下以武力解決台灣
問題，美國卻又以『嚴重問題』威嚇中國。」此外交官所想對金
德曼表達的是，雖然美國的中國政策變得較為溫和了，但仍推行
另一種針對中國的封鎖政策。\(^\text{100}\)

在二十世紀末的東亞局勢之中，美國對於中國而言具有一定
的威脅性，金德曼於書中提出十二項中國於 20 世紀末欲達到之
目標，當中有五項便直接或者間接將矛頭指向美國，但雙方仍舊
基於國家利益，相互保持良好關係，然而由於 1999 年南斯拉夫
中國大使館爆炸案及中國迫害法輪功的人權事件等影響了兩國的
來往。在經濟方面，1997 年的金融風暴席捲全亞洲，但中國的
經濟與軍事實力不減反增，中國在多方面力量的增長使得周邊國
家相繼採取實際行動，如東北亞地區美、日、韓三國的安全政策
合作以及南亞地區的東協，\(^\text{101}\) 以美國為首的安全政策合作使得
中國再次感到威脅。

二十世紀末，柯林頓政府對於中國所採用的是一種可以理解
為「建設性接觸」的「戰略夥伴關係」，儘管柯林頓曾經於 1998
年訪中時表達認同北京的台灣政策，但美國政府內部，如參眾兩
院，仍然一貫維持基於《台灣關係法》的態度，近二十年來，美
國對於台灣一向擁有高度好感，這要歸功於存於美國各立法機
構、媒體、宗教團體中的遊說團及他們的公關政策。\(^\text{102}\) 北京同

\(^\text{100}\) 前揭書，頁 589。
\(^\text{101}\) 前揭書，頁 591。
\(^\text{102}\) 前揭書，頁 593-594。
樣也重視美國對於中國的觀感，但北京仍受限於在台灣問題上的既有立場，在面對兩岸問題時仍然須保持一定的強硬態度。

東亞太平洋地區國家各具有其一定的軍事、經濟、政治的實力，彼此之間的合作、衝突、競爭的互動繁多，但卻不難從中看出，美國在當中扮演十分重要的角色，尤其是在面對兩岸問題時。金德曼認為中、台雙方都想要利用美國去對付另外一方，中國要求美國減少對台軍售，拒絕台灣任何形式獨立，李登輝所提出特殊的國家與國家的關係是堅決受到北京所反對的。至於台灣方面，則希望借助《台灣關係法》得到美國的保護。\textsuperscript{103} 美、中、台之間因此形成一種微妙的牽制效應，金德曼表示兩岸問題决定了東亞太平洋地區的未來命運，兩岸能否成功在借助美國或者在沒有美國介入的情況下，找到新的對話與共存的方式，以及美國對中國的建設性接觸政策能否解決問題。金德曼認為針對台灣問題，中國內部及國際所持不同利益，以及彼此協商形式，都持續對東亞太平洋地區的國際政策及未來的情勢產生影響，他更提出當中最需要關注的是，美國方面需要多長的時間有效結合柯林頓的「建設性接觸」與艾森豪的「戰略模糊」政策，\textsuperscript{104} 深深影響兩岸的關係與東亞太平洋地區的安全。
第五章 結論

本論文的主要研究對象為金德曼的中國認識及其在德國漢學轉型上的意義。最初選擇此一主題的研究動機為，大多數的學者皆將漢學及中國學研究的目光聚焦在英美的漢學研究之上，而忽略了歐陸對於中國及東亞地區研究的代表性。尤其是台灣的漢學研究學科一向受美國實證主義主流的影響，而呈現出方法上的單調，社會科學研究皆以專業分工，以經濟、政治與社會等科目加以分門別類，學者多半採用西方的文獻資料與理論架構，所做出來的研究多半為美式學術研究的延伸，嚴格來說應稱作美式的台灣漢學研究，於是藉由其他非英美地區的漢學研究來反觀台灣的中國認識，有其必要性。再者，德國作為一個漢學研究的場域，相較於其他歐陸國家的特殊性在於：它是唯一一個在二十世紀的兩次大戰皆與中國發生戰爭的國家，而德中關係的變化影響德國對中國的基本觀感及中國研究推動的方向。而這也顯現出德國漢學不同於他國之處。本文欲藉由了解金德曼的生平、學思背景與學術研究內容，來反映不同於英美主流的中國認識，此外，更希望藉此了解二戰後德國新舊漢學轉型間的複雜關係，以及轉型的進程對於金德曼個人的影響。

漢學家還是現代中國專家？

金德曼學思歷程十分特殊，金德曼表示，他認為他自己的研
究歷程並不如他人順遂，並不是一路順利地往上念，求學過程經歷許多波折，而始終如一的是他對中國的濃厚興趣。幼年時，透過書籍，並積極地汲取他人的中國經驗；在戰爭動亂年代裡，身不由己地上了戰場，史求學進修暫告中止，但在戰後隨即積極地實踐自己的求知夢想，進入大學殿堂。起初依照父親的意見，修習法律，在取得法律碩士學位後，他因未能忘卻對於中國的熱愛以及政治科學的召喚，在奧地利沒有任何政治科學系所的情況下，金德曼自發性地發起外交事務講習所，這也成為他前往美國的助力。在美國期間，適逢中國政局劇變，使其對中國的一切更加著迷。此外，在美國跟隨摩根索的研究與學習，更成為他一生學術成就的關鍵，摩根索現實主義的影響正是金德曼爾後創立慕尼黑新現實主義學派的基礎，其中的座系分析理論，更成為他分析東亞地區各個國家外交決策的有力工具。

金德曼研究中國的動機，原發於其對於中國人事物的好奇，再加上其本身對於歷史的興趣，而1949-1950年前往美國留學及實習的經驗，拉近了他與亞洲的距離，而期間他目睹中國政局的變動，促使他認識中國的方式有了關鍵性的轉變，過去坐在書齋中攝取中國知識的方式所獲取的靜止中國圖像，已不能滿足他所需要認識的中國，他要以更主動、更直接的「田野實務」的方式來探索中國，而這也是他以「社會科學家」自居的主要原因。

對他所訪察到的中國與東亞政治現象與哲學、歷史作聯結，則不是一般僅受過社會科學訓練的學者所能辦得到的。例如在《中國與東亞崛起》一書中，他就以十九到二十一世紀的中國歷史為主線深入探討東亞地區的政治，並以傳統儒家思想加以評論。金
德曼之所以重视儒家思想在诠释中国政治的重要性，主要是他认为「政治学的基础就是人类学，是处理人，处理人在面临政治处境时的人性」，\(^{105}\)而儒家思想代表的就是中国人在面对政治时的主要处理方式。他在对孙中山思想的研究上也是从儒家思想出发来加以诠释。

有些汉学研究书籍，将金德曼归类为汉学家，但于访谈时，金德曼多次表示，他是一名社会科学家，而非汉学家。如果从古典汉学的观念来看，他不谙汉语，确实不足入列汉学家，而他的慕尼黑新现实主义及对东亚问题的研究分析也的确使他成为重要的社会科学家。但就上述他从中国古代政治思想理路去探讨现代的政治现象，以及从文化角度去思索近代政治人物的思想背景，不难看出金德曼在社会科学专业之外的中国政治哲学的底蕴，二者的相辅相成就造就了金德曼的学术特色。

金德曼在接受访谈时提到，《论语》中他最喜欢的一句话是「君子不器」，他用这句话来描述他个人的学术历程，他说他的学术生涯对许多人来说是非典型的，尤其是他的中国研究。以他当时的学术背景，他可以从事许多领域的研究，像是美国外交政策专家等，但他觉得不是很有趣，最后他还是回到他自年幼起就深深着迷的中国，而这样的学术热情及坚持，也的确为他赢得「欧洲经验最丰富的东亚问题专家」的声誉。金德曼非典型的学术研究历程除了显现出他个人广博的学术涵养外，也标誌了当时新旧汉学间的複杂关系。

\(^{105}\) 钱德曼访谈纪录。
新舊漢學間的代表性人物

金德曼雖非漢學科班出身的中國研究者，但由於他個人自幼對中國的興趣，使其在進入政治科學的領域之後，中國得以成為他政治探索中的重要板塊。而1960年代末西方興起洞窺變動中國的熱潮，更成為擁有「語文」工具的漢學研究者與具備「方法」工具的中國學研究者合作的動力，金德曼任教的慕尼黑大學1968年漢學系與政治學系的合作模式可以說是1970年代之後德國漢學轉型的先驅。而金德曼的中國研究典範既是個人的，也是時代的成果。
E: Professor Kindermann does research on China really different from other scholars in Germany

K: Well, I just mentioned to you, it’s related to my early past. Because when I was 12 years old, my parents gave me the famous book by Lin Yu-tang (林語堂) “My Land and My People”, as you know, a world bestseller, which was translated into 60 languages. And I read that book and became fascinated with China. And at the tender age of 12, I decide to marry a Chinese. But then, since I’m also very strongly interested in history, I have always been that. I started to study Chinese history. At the university of Vienna, there was an elderly gentleman who was teaching Chinese and Chinese history, and I was permitted to, as a student, as a boy student in high school, nevertheless to study at the university. That was very special at that time. And he had the habit of walking home from the university to his private home for one hour. He had spent 40 years in China; he had been there already at the time of the
Boxer Uprising, and he has been the guest of Sun Yat-sen in his residence in Guanyinshan (觀音山). Because when the government of Duan Qi-rui (段祺瑞) declared war on Germany, he was afraid that he would be arrested my teacher, so he went south. He knew that Sun Yat-sen opposed the entry of China into the war against Germany; and then he met him and heard his lectures, his Sanminzhuyi (三民主義) lecture and so on. So he told me a lot about it. He was a personal witness. And also at one occasion at a tea party in the Guanyinshan residence of Sun Yat-sen, he met Chiang Kai-shek, who is that time the director of Whampoa Military Academy. And so, I continued to be interested in the Republican history of China. So my parents knowing my interest gave me this book, by a gentleman, a German industrialist who stayed in China and worked together with Sun Yat-sen, means “Sun Yat-sen’s legacy”.

E: So since then you start your research?

K: Yes. Although they didn’t see me a particularly interested in China, but they thought it’s quite unusual for such a young boy, 12-year-old, 14-year-old. He is so interested in one particular country, maybe in the future something will come out of that, so we promote it. And the next book I got was by the same author but on Chang Kai-shek. That was published in 1939. I was 13 years old then. And then during the war I met plenty of Chinese and Japanese students. There was a summer academy in a very beautiful mountain resort, about two hours away from Vienna. There were Chinese and Japanese students, I simply went to them and said I’m interested, what’s going on in the Far East. I asked them can you recommend to me a good book on the war and conflict between China and Japan? And believe it or not, the Japanese and the Chinese recommended the same book. That is this famous book, it was written by Lily Abegg,” Chinas Erneurung”. That means “the renewal of
China”. She was a psychologist, student of the famous professor Jung in Switzerland, who was next to Sigmund Freud, the most famous psychologist of that period, he could speak Chinese and Japanese, and during the war he was changing from Japan to free China, Japan to China, back and forth. So it was really an excellent book. They also helped me to understand these things, and I made friendship with those students. And there was a Chinese physician, a doctor, by the name of Meng Hao-lin. And he gave me these booklets, actually an illustrated paper published by the Kuomintang in Germany: “Das Neue China”.

E: By Kuomintang?

K: By the Kuomingtang section in Germany. During the war, look, 1940, June 1940, May 1940. He wrote in education, Dr. Meng Hao-lin. I read it with great interest, there was a speech by Chiang Kai-shek’s for instance, and the minister of finance H. H. Kung (孔祥熙), also wrote in it. And so on, I think an article by Madam Chiang Kai-shek. So, then came the war, and at the end of the war I was drafted into the navy, although I’m Austrian, but as you remember, Austria was at that time occupied by Germany, like 東北. And so I had to be drafted and I volunteered for the navy, because I didn’t want to be in the land war, which was very cruel. Well I was assigned to the navy artillery and spent some exciting time, always having to fight against incoming American or British planes, who tried to shoot at our position or throw bombs at us. And then the question was always “who hits first?” or “who’s frigate sunk first”. But then the war was over, and the British came and said: “well you are all prisoners of war”. And I said to myself: “why should I be a prisoner of war?” So, one day I simply escaped and went to the British headquarters in Germany, in Cuxhaven, and I talked to an officer and said “I want to be released”. He said: “why?” I said “well, first of all I am an Austrian, and Austria has nothing to do with this war. They didn’t fight for our
causes, for our interests, they made us fight for their interests. And secondly, this was true, my parents were very loving but not very practical, they sent me for my birthday 1945, such a set of volumes of Shakespeare’s dramas and writings. I was not permitted to keep them in the military barracks, so I had to put it with some German family who I hardly knew. And I said to the British officer “I want these Shakespeare volumes, they’re precious to me, and I want to get them.” And the officer looked at me with a very strange expression on his face. Then he put his hand in his pocket, pulled out his identity card, and his name was Hamlet. We all laughed, and I got released, immediately released, and after an adventurous journey…together with a friend of mine who was also from Austria. And then I came back to Austria, and in the year 1946 I started to study there. Of course, I also listened to the lectures in the Oriental Institute in Vienna. It’s in the same street in which Sigmund Freud used to have his doctors office. However, my father thought I should study law; actually I want to study political science. But at that time the Austrian government did not permit political science. Why not? Because the country for ten years was occupied by four different powers: the Russians, the Americans, the British and the French. And Vienna was occupied by all four of them. But the sections were not separated from each other, different from Berlin, we could move freely through all of Vienna, and there was one Austrian federal government for all part of Austria. However, the four allied powers had a veto right, if they agreed, they never agreed. The Austrians did what they wanted. And however, there’s a fierce competition in these fierce cultures. Each of the powers wants to show its greatness, its glory, its special characteristics and so they sent to Vienna all kinds of theater troupes, or movies, or they made exhibitions and… and… and… So it was a very interesting and very international place to stay at that time in Austria.
However, since we didn’t have this political science, I was thinking what to do. I was a member of the Austrian United Nations’ association and that had a foreign affairs section. And I was elected chairman of that foreign affairs section when I was student. And I had an idea, I said we should exploit the presence of four powers in Vienna, and I establish now seminars for politics and diplomacy, attended by students who want to join the diplomatic services, who want to join politics. And I went to the four powers, first to the Soviets, because they were the most difficult. And I said, “Would you want to come to lecture about Russian politics and so on?” “No, we rather don’t want to do that.” And I said, “Alright, you’re the first one which I asked. I just show my respect for you, but you will understand now since you say no, I will ask the other ones nevertheless. And now next I will go to the Americans.” “You want to go to the Americans, wait, wait, wait. I think we could participate.” So, I went to the American headquarters, they said: “Marvelous idea, very good, very good, young man, how much are you going to pay for our lectures?” “We students in war devastated Austria, have no money”, I said, “Sir, I’m sorry, I didn’t think of it because the Russians didn’t say anything about it. So I didn’t think of it”. "Oh! Please forget about it! It was just a joke. Of course we are participating!” Then, ok, it was easy to get the British and the French plus the Austrians. And that was, believe it or not, during the Cold War, worldwide, the only institution where all of those four powers were teaching political science. And then, I read in the newspaper that Stanford University had given a scholarship, one scholarship, to Austria. Though I didn’t have any hope, but I applied for it, and I got it. And the reason why I got it, was that the Americans, I heard that later on, were impressed by my activities establishing these seminars for politics and diplomacy. And then, in the year 1949, I went to America, Stanford University, and of course I was so excited about the civil war in China. The takeover of the Maoist in October. Then the
Establish, reestablish the Republic of China on Taiwan. My! Every day I was fascinated. Of course I participated in many China seminars, as you know, there’s this big tower, the Hoover institute for world peace and revolution, which has a lot of materials on the Chinese and Russian and other revolutions. And I was fascinated from dawn to dusk. When finally this one year was over and I went home, I wanted to go home. Before that, I went to New York. And in New York I met our Council General, and he said: “Hey, we’ve just been offered a student internship for the United Nations. You don’t get paid anything, but maybe because you said you studied political science, if you’re interested.” I said, “Oh my, of course I’m interested.” Then he said, “You go and you introduce yourself to the Deputy Secretary General of the United Nations by the name of Benjamin Cohen of Chile, from Latin American Chile.” So I went there, and he said “Haha, young man, and where are you from?” I said “From Vienna”. He said: “Vienna, my favorite city in Europe. Oh yes”. And then he knew, of course, because he was Deputy General of the UN, he knew the United Nations Association of Austria. And so we discovered quite a number of common friends, acquaintances and so. And he said: “Okay, now you do your work here, you start your work today and then we will see”. That was on June 23, 1950. Two days later, North Korea attacked, and the Korean War began. And on the 26th the Deputy Council General asked me to come to him. He said: “Listen, I’m in a hurry, are you not the boy from Vienna, the one who studies politics?” I said “Yes, sir.” He said: “I tell you what, you learn nothing about politics from books, but now I let you learn from history. I give you an assignment in the press section of the UN Security Council and you listen and watch”. And he was gone. So from June 27th, when the UN Security Council decided to make war against North Korea, I was there everyday, for four months. And that was very exciting to see the
top leaders, the top diplomats arguing for and against each other. The Soviets, the Americans and who who who... And I remember especially on the 27th, when they wanted to make this decision on Korea, everybody stood there and looked at the door, whether the Soviet delegate would come or not to cast the veto. He did not come. He did not come. Because Stalin had told Kim Ill-song, I support you, but I don’t want to be connected with that war. NATO was just established in Europe, and I have lots of things to do in Europe. So, the ambassador did not come, because if he had come, everybody would have said “Aha”, because they were boycotting the United Nations. You know why? They protested against the fact that the Republic of China was still holding the seat for all of China. Since they protested it, they boycotted the UN. And if in that situation the ambassador would have come only to cast the veto then everybody would have said, “Aha, Russia is behind it.” So, the UN Security Council could pass this resolution to call upon the states of the world, the member states, to help defend South Korea against the North Korean aggression. On August 1st, the chairmanship rotated month by month from state to state to state, it came to the Soviet Union. And then the Soviet ambassador came, and he immediately caused big trouble. Why? As chairman he did not count the vote of the Chinese chef delegate from the Republic of China, a famous historian by the name of Chiang Ting-fu (蔣廷黻), who had two wives. And the American delegate, a senator by the name of Warren Austin, he got quite red and blue on his face, pouted “Tame Louis the 5th”, and shouted “Come to count, we are eleven, we are not ten.” And then the Soviet ambassador Malik said: “Well, we have 10 duly accredited delegates and one man, I don’t know why he’s sitting here.” Pointing at Chiang Ting-fu.” But Chiang Ting-fu took revenge. You see the rules of procedure of the Security Council are really very complicated, and occasionally Malik didn’t know how to proceed, but Chiang Ting-fu was a master of the
rules of procedure. Then he showed up his arm and he said “Mister President,” he spoke Hunanese English, “this situation as I see it…” then came three sentences, everything was clear, there was applause, and Malik was very angry and embarrassed. So, Chiang Ting-fu had his revenge. Well, then I was returning to Austria.

E: When you were in all these conferences there was only you but no other students?

K: No no no no no, from all member states there was one student. They formed a group. It was very interesting, very interesting. For instance, what did we discuss about, what was the hottest topic. It was a little booklet printed by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London. And what was the title, the title was United Europe: a Functional or a Federal Approach. So the British students, the Scandinavian students and Yugoslavs, they were for European Union only. The French, the Austrian, the Dutch and Italians were for Federation. A real United States of Europe, that was our dream at that time, a passionate dream. We belonged to that student generation who wanted to run to the borders and pull out the border marcations. We were very influenced by the book of a Count, Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, who in 1926 had founded the Pan-European Union in Vienna. That was the beginning of a European integration movement. He had written very impressive books about it. His father was an Austrian, his mother was a Japanese. He had already in 1926 a big founded/opening conference in Vienna. And people like Konrad Adenauer already at that time already were member of that movement, Churchill was very much in favor of it, Édouard Herriot from France, and so on and so on. And ja, and I invited from time to time some famous people who visited Vienna to lecture at our student seminars. One day I read in the newspaper: Hans Joachim Morgenthau, the founder of the realist school of international politics, was coming to
Vienna. So, I invited him to lecture, and I translated his lecture into German, although he could speak German, but at that time, because it was shortly after war, and he was Jewish, he didn’t want to. So I had to translate his bad English into German. Our meeting place was also very beautiful. As you know Vienna has many palaces, so our meeting was in a palace. And I always persuaded the music department of the university of Vienna to play some pieces of chamber music before the lecture and after the lecture. So it was very solemn with candles and so on and very serious discussions. And Morgenthau was deeply impressed. Actually he suffered from America. He was 100% European and he could really not inwardly adjust to the American society, and this was his first comeback here. And then he asked me to talk to him and I told him about my interests and what I had done and about these student seminars and so on. He gave me a book of his and left. And then, after a few weeks I got a letter from him whether I wanted to join him at the University of Chicago as his assistant. So I said of course yes, and returned then to the United States, I studied at the University of Chicago as his assistant and I experienced the beginning of the great debate, realism against idealism, back and forth, back and forth. Very interesting. Because one famous realist here, one famous idealist here. Then a fierce debate and the students could join. Oh marvelous! I wrote my dissertation there, and this is it, that is the topic: “The Sino-Russian Entente Policies of Sun Yat-sen.”

E: That’s really cool. I believe that was a really wonderful chance and a really big chance to you.

K: Ja! Ah, one thing that I didn’t tell you. The first lecture of my life was in my, I was the youngest member of the Austrian-Chinese Friendship Association. And they invited me to give a lecture in front of the beautiful palaces in Vienna, still existing, Pallavicini, baroque style.
And my topic was Sun Yat-sen. That I dared to do that actually, I didn’t know enough, but I had read quite a lot. I had gotten a lot of direct information from my teacher, who knew Sun Yat-sen personally. I had read those of books and so on and so on. And I dared to do that because the other ones knew even less than me about Sun Yat-sen. So in 1948 my first public lecture on Sun Yat-sen, that I should add to that. And of course I was very interested in Trade of Taiwan at that time, and I contacted all kinds of Chinese diplomats in Washington and in New York, and participated in debates. Because at that time this book by Edgar Snow *Red Star Over China*, which actually had been dedicated to him by Mao Zedong 毛澤東. It was so influential in America. I should also tell you that when I was still at Stanford, one day I read in the student newspaper, I read the student newspaper everyday, that a certain representative, by the name of Richard Nixon, would come to the campus to persuade students to vote for the Republican Party. Then I went there, I saw Mr. Nixon standing there, holding a donut and a cup of coffee and rather lonely. I was very interested as a student in him. So I took my chance and went there and said my name is so and so, I’m from Europe, happy to meet you. And then he said: “Ah since you’re from Europe I’ll tell you something. I’m now in the election campaign for the Senate, and my opponent is a women. She’s an actress by the name of Helen Gahagan Douglas, and you know what she does? She appears at election rallies by helicopter, like an angel from the sky, such a stunt. I Richard Nixon, I use helicopters differently. I use them in Greece to fly into distant mountain villages to see whether Marshall Plan aids arrive there or whether it disappears in the harbor of Piraeus.” Then he asked what I was studying. I said “Political science.” “Oh,” he said “then maybe you might be interested in watching my campaign, I like you”. I said “I would be very honored”. And he introduced to me his campaign manager, my, but that guy had a face like a gangster, hahaha, really
frightening. And so I really attended many election rallies of Richard Nixon, and I met him again in 1952. At that time the Republican Party had its rally at the Hilton Hotel in Chicago. And I was going up with one elevator, who was there? Nixon. I said, “Oh! I wrote about you to our Counsel General, I told him after we met in Stanford you would make a great career, that was my impression.” In the meantime he had just become a senator. He said: “Did you tell your Counsel that I make a career, then just watch the newspapers tomorrow, bye bye.” Next morning in the newspapers, “Nixon running mate of Eisenhower.” So that was my meeting with Mr. Nixon. And then, after my studies I was thinking what to do. The dean of our political science department in Chicago asked me to stay there to go into politics in one university and so on. But, then I was approached by a very famous scholar from Germany, who said: “Look, you can of course join an American university, and life will be very easy for you. In Germany we’ve just started to rebuild, in a new fashion, political science. You get less money, you’ll have more troubles, but you will be one of the first, one of the pioneers.” Of course, I decided to go to Germany. The headquarter at that time was in Frankfurt. And Konrad Adenauer, the first founding father of new Germany, had asked for a German foreign affairs association to be established. France had one, Britain had one, so Germany should have also one…and I was the Far Eastern area specialist, and secondly I was the American affairs specialist. And that was very interesting because this institute was tied to a magazine called *Europa Archives, European Archive*, which was Germany’s first leading foreign affairs magazine co-sponsored by the German foreign office. And then, one day, this professor by the name of Bergsträsser, who was one of the founding fathers of new German political science, said to me: “Actually, you should go to the Far East. You should make a facts-finding mission, looking at governments, looking at politics, especially in Eastern Asia.”
So, I was sent as a first German political facts-finding mission to East Asia in 1959 and 1960.

E: In which country?

K: First Hong Kong. Because in Hong Kong everybody was there, the Communists were there, the Chinese Nationalists were there, the neutral people were there. A lot of very interesting refugees, for instance Chou Ching-wen (周鯨文). Chou Ching-wen was one of the leaders of the Democratic League (中國民主同盟), which cooperated with the 共產黨. And therefore, after the takeover of power by the communists, they were permitted to continue to exist, and especially this Chou Ching-wen was permitted to attend all public meetings. He told me of the many mock trials against the landowners. The farmers were told: “We shall distribute the land, you can have land, for yourself, but not for nothing. We have to take it away from the landowners. Now we cannot take it away for no reason, you have to think very hard, whether that man committed crimes, and then we make it popular at people’s court, we discuss his letter, we sentence him. If he’s guilty, you can have the land. If he’s innocent of course you cannot”. So you can imagine. So these poor people were put before people’s courts, land-hungry, angry, greedy peasants and farmers around them, in between the cadres of the 共產黨. And then they put, as Chou Ching-wen told me, wire strings around their necks, and when they wanted to say something they would pull, and they could not speak anymore. And usually they were condemned to death and then beaten to death, those who were fortunate were shot, the other one were hit until they didn’t move anymore. And I met also this famous general Zhang Fa-kui (張發奎). I think many people in Taiwan don’t know, that after World War II the Republic of China was asked by the allies to occupy North Vietnam. The Chinese occupied North Vietnam and South Vietnam was occupied by the British. The purpose was not to
let the French to come back to Indo-China, that was the idea. And there were two generals, Lu Han (盧漢) and Zhang Fa-kui, who where commanding these Chinese troops. But in the meantime, the communists had taken over, Ho Chi Minh (胡志明) and his Viet Minh, National Communist Movements. Okay, he was a very shrewd guy, so he made a patriot collecting of gold, took some of the gold, went to the two generals, and said: “You see, we are very happy you’re here, and we hope you feel good here, and you can see the country, but we understand that you didn’t study Vietnamese things, I, Ho Chi Minh, I translated the Sanminzhuyi (三民主義) from Chinese into Vietnamese, and now we have elections here for the parliament. But you see elections are always risky, you never know how much votes you will get.” There was a party called Vietnam Quốc Dân Đảng, that was the Vietnamese form of the Kuomintang, imitated after the Kuomintang. So how many votes do you want? One hundred, two hundred or how many? So they made the two generals happy, they didn’t interfere, and then the civil war was raging in China. Chiang Kai-shek said I need my soldiers, so he put the soldiers out, made an agreement with the French, and the French moved back into North Vietnam. And the British said, well, if the French are back in North Vietnam, what are we doing in South Vietnam, so they also pulled their soldiers out, so the French got back into Vietnam. And then they waged an eight years colonial war against the Viet Minh. At the end they were defeated at Dien Bien Phu and then went out. So, these were some of the interesting people I could meet in Hong Kong. Also I saw the flag war, October 1" they got so many 共產黨, People’s Republic of China flags, but at October 10th Nationalists Chinese flags where the majority, because there were so many refugees, who of course were in favor of the Republic of China. And I also met an old gentleman, who always appeared in a long Chinese gown with a long white beard. He was the chairman of the Hong Kong United Nations Association. And he had
established a movement for Hong Kong as a state like Singapore, independent city state Hong Kong, but he didn’t get many followers. And the British then controlled it. And the communists were represented there not officially but through the editor of the 文匯報 (the Communist Chinese newspaper), and I made an appointment with their editor in chief, and he said: “You come into the harbor at midnight.” The headquarters’ that had a gate with big iron bars was closed, so I banged there and somebody came with a big bamboo stick opening the door. So I went in, closed the door, go up, then there was a room with windows to the harbor side, the harbor with full moon. The moon was shining in the harbor and reflected…the moonlight was reflected. And what could I see? There was a gigantic American aircraft carrier. But on the table in the room where we were sitting, there was a big tiger mask, with an Uncle Sam hat; American paper tiger. So I talked to this mister, Lee Ta-chung was his name, and I said: “Well, I see here this paper tiger mask, and I see this huge aircraft carrier, if you want to take Taiwan, do you think they would fight?” And he said: “In any case we should prepare for that”. And he wanted to know from me about East Germany. I said that’s easy to explain, East Germany is Germany’s 東北. Like the Japanese dominated 東北 the Soviets have dominated East Germany. He could understand me. Naja, and then one day I was flying to Taipei, I tried to get a visa to China but they didn’t want, they didn’t give it to me, so I was then given a room in the “Friends of Free China Club” (FFCC), it was opposite of 總統府, a kind of hotel for foreign guests. And the chairman of the GIO was an ambassador, Chen Jen-yi, who was very easygoing, and I told him who I wanted to see, including Chiang Kai-shek. Ja, why? Chiang Kai-shek had written a book, called Soviet Russia in China: a Summing-up at 70, and a German publisher was looking for someone who knew something about Chinese modern history, and the role of Chiang Kai-shek. So he asked me to write for that book an
introduction for Germans, because Chiang Kai-shek was referring to many persons and many events, and of course unless you studied Chinese history you don’t know what, so I had to write this introduction. And that helped me probably to get me that interview with Chiang Kai-shek. And I was always interested, very interested, in the start of the Chinese Civil War in 1927. And before I was able to talk to Chiang Kai-shek, his Secretary General (誤，當為「國策顧問」，"adviser"), James C.H. Shen (沈劍虹), who was the last ambassador of the Republic of China in Washington later on, asked me: “What do you want to ask?” I said: “Well, I have some current questions and some historical questions.” “Now what for instance?” he asked. I said “So so so.” He said: “How can you think that the old man will remember? That’s so long ago.” I said: “Sir, I’ve studied a little bit of Chinese history, and in my imagination that was one of the most important phases of his life.” “Okay” he said, “you may ask one question in that direction, if he answers, you may continue, if he evades then change the subject.” And then… I’m just thinking…what was the name of the last director general of the palace museum, in Taiwan, in Taipei? Okay, that man (秦孝儀?) at that time was the history secretary of Chiang Kai-shek. Secretary for historical affairs, he was also present at that meeting. And then I asked Chiang Kai-shek a few questions about current affairs and he said “hao hao hao”. And then I said, ja, “Now about Shanghai in 1927, why was it so important for you to get Shanghai?” Immediately, he got up and said: “Yes, I had to become independent of Russian money, I had to continue the 北伐, after Beijing, the Russians had betrayed me, I had to send them out of the country. So I needed money, and that could be provided by the big firms in Shanghai.” So I looked at Mr. Shen, he was nodding, so I could continue to ask. And that was a very interesting meeting with Chiang Kai-shek. But I met also the son of Sun Yat-sen, Sun Ke (孫科). And I met also the opponent of the government. You know who was Lei
Zhen (雷震)? A famous journalist, he was against Chiang Kai-shek and he was later on sentenced to prison for ten years. Then also these old Taiwanese leaders like Wu San-lieh (吳三連), Lee Wan-chu (李萬居), Kao Yu-shu (高玉樹), but most interesting was the meeting with Dr. Hu Shih (胡適). He was one of the great man of Chinese philosophy and literature. He was president of the Academia Sinica (中研院), and he graciously permitted me to translate one of his writings on Confucianism. I will show you later on this volume. It was my first book which I published in Germany. And, ja I asked 胡適, “Do you think that President Chiang will want to run for the third time for presidency?” That was a big issue at that time. And he said full of irony in his voice: “Oh...our President is such a democrat, how would he dare to think of it?” 100% percent knowing that he would, but pretending he wouldn’t. And few days later I talked to Prime Minister Chen Chen (陳誠), and he said to me: “In the Lun-yu (論語) it says “The ruler is like the wind, and the people is like the grass, the grass bends in the direction that the wind goes (言君如風。民如草。草上加風。則草必臥。東西隨風。如民從君也。)”. So, I was quite sure that Chiang Kai-shek would want to be reelected. There was another thing, the 立法院 had a chairman by the name of Chang Tao-fan (張道藩), and he made an interesting proposal. He said: “To make our system more democratic, we follow the example of Turkey, where the President İnönü had divided the ruling party in two parts. One part for the government, and one part is the loyal opposition, to be always critical, but loyal.” And so he said “We could do the same with Kuomintang.” I mentioned it to Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang Kai-shek said “Well, well, well. But there’s one disadvantage, what should I do? If I join the one group of congress, the other group will feel betrayed, and if I join the other, the one group will feel betrayed. So the idea is not practical.” A typical Chiang Kai-shek’s answer. He’s like de Gaulle, for himself to be the incarnation of free China. People like de Gaulle or like
Winston Churchill and in that sense maybe here Konrad Adenauer, they do so much for their country and they are so much in control of it that they begin to identify themselves with their own country, and that was true for Chiang Kai-shek. And of course at that time, the people who moved to Taiwan from the Mainland were still relatively young, now in the meantime they have become so old they no longer exist. So we have quite a different composition of the population, there are very few original Mainlanders anymore, who were born in the Mainland, raised up in Mainland and then moved to Taiwan. But there are of course Mainland who have children, but these children already were born in Taiwan. So I had very very very very interesting time in Taiwan, and I traveled as far as Kaohsiung. In中山大學 there’s one lady professor, who was my student.

E: Yes, I also got in contact with your students in Taiwan. I will also do some interviews with them. And I’ll also do the part of how much Professor Kindermann influenced your Sinology thought, German 20th century sinology. I’ve already interviewed your student, Yeh Yang-ming (葉陽明), professor Ye Yangming.

K: I asked him to write a dissertation on a topic that is not well-known, which is “Sun Yat-sen’s government in Guangzhou（廣州）”. He did a very good job.

E: Yes, a big one, I got it.

K: Ah yes ok, very good.

E: He told me a lot of things during the interview.

K: Yes, ok. Then from Taiwan I went to Japan. And also I was lucky, because in Japan a distant uncle of mine was Austrian ambassador. And so I got easily high level interviews for instance with Prime Minister Kishi（Kishi Nobusuke 岸信介）, who told me about Japan’s economic
diplomacies in Southeast Asia. See all those Southeast Asian countries demanded a lot of reparations from Japan, and Kishi had to go from country to country to country, faced with fantastic demands. He always had to tell them, “Postwar Japan is so poor, we can give you no money, however if you want to have something, Japanese capital goods, Japanese spare parts, Japanese fuels, and Japanese engineers.” So most of them took that, after they found out they couldn’t get any money. And that was the great comeback of the Japanese economy into the market of Southeast Asia. And later on I also met this Prime Minister Ohira (Ôhira Masayoshi 大平正芳), and Japan had a peace treaty with Taiwan, which was the Republic of China, in 1952. And then in 1971, because of the Nixon Shock, they simply cancelled the peace treaty, which one cannot in in international law. So I asked Ohira: “Can you explain to me in terms of international law, are you able to cancel a peace treaty?” He said: “Mr. Kindermann, in term of international law I cannot explain nothing. However, look here is the map, here is Japan, here is China, here is Russia, our two big neighbors. To have diplomatic relations with both of them is of the vital interest to Japan, therefore we had to do it. Then I met the Japanese diplomats who had to bring the message to Chiang Kai-shek, that Japan would cut relations officially because they would have to recognize Beijing. And he told me that on his way from Songshan Airport（松山機場）to the Office of the President（總統府）there were demonstrators throwing something on his car. I said: “Oh my, that can be dangerous. What did they throw?” He said: “Toast bread.” I said: “What? Toast bread?” He said: “Yeah, I also wondered.” I asked, “Did it have symbolic meaning?” The answer was “No, but it doesn’t scratch the lacquer of the car.” I also met Dr. McConaughy（馬康衛）, an American ambassador who’s easy to talk to, and they don’t even care and sent him back into Korea. And Ambassador Leonard S. Unger (安 克志) was the one who got the order to go at two o’clock in the morning
to wake up Chiang Ching-kuo (蔣經國) and to tell him that six hours later Carter would announce himself by TV that they cut the relations with Taiwan. They renounced the defense treaty and withdrew some troops from Taiwan. And, however, Carter thought that the microphone was already shut off, and he said to himself in a rather smug and self-satisfied manner: message unclosed to other nations. But he was wrong, because there was an uproar of indignation, this shabby crap of paper, an old, loyal, very successful ally, and then dump him with that kind of wild west trick, cowboy trick, at two o’clock in the morning, giving him no thought, no time to think, no time to react. Carter was afraid of China only, but then the China lobby got into action, all the Senate hearings, and the result was the Taiwan Relations Act. Because the congress is full of the intelligent lawyers, and they said: okay, bilateral agreements with Taiwan are impossible now, however nothing prevents us from passing a unilateral law binding the United States by itself to do something for Taiwan. Sell weapons, protect it in case of violence and so on. That’s the origins of the Taiwan relations act. Carter was against it, he didn’t want it, but the majority in both houses of Congress was so big, he couldn’t do anything. So Unger told me that he was himself very embarrassed to do this, because Chiang Ching-kuo at that time was already quite sick, quite ill, and had treatment. Well, having returned from the first Far East facts finding mission, I went then again to Hong Kong, and tried through a friend of Zhou Enlai (周恩來), a Japanese, to get an entrance visa, but they simply didn’t want to give it to me. I went to Macau at that time which was pretty influential (1:07:30), and I met interesting journalist Hermann Derlin. He was the China correspondent of The New York Times, a very interesting gentleman to talk to and so on. So through the refugees I could learn a lot about China, because it was the time of the people’s communes, and some of the refugees were simply people who told me the worst thing they did to us was to take away our cooking
utensils. I said “Why?” “Because,” they said, “from now on we are obliged for each bite that we eat to go to the cadres, and be dependent on them, and if they didn’t want they canceled one meal or ten meals. So you were really poor. And then you must eat in these canteens, and in the canteens there were loud speakers influencing people with propaganda.” This was the biggest experiment in mankind history, this egalitarianism. Everyone was wearing this blue suit and was running around with little red book. About the little red book, I had an interesting experience at Harvard University. I stood at Kennedy federal tower, 1985. And there’s an East Asia institute, it seems. And a colleague asked me to come in the evening, they had a very interesting Chinese speaker, and who is he? He is Mr. Su Shaozhi (蘇紹智). He’s the director of the institute of Marx-Lenin-Mao thought in Beijing, a top of top of top of the ideological pillar. So I was very interested in what he was going to say. I had no illusions, I thought he would give us all that stuff about Mao Zedong, but then he was giving the lecture …

(start of the second file k071602) Then you see in 1963, I published my first book, it’s called *Confucianism, Sunyatsenism and Chinese Communism*. Well in the introduction you get in a nutshell my impressions at that time. I was impressed by the fact that Sunyatsenism is the only Chinese alternative to Maoism. There’s nothing else. You know the famous saying by Trotsky?—“Marxism or Sunyatsenism? That is the question”. And I was quite angry often about the way in which 孫文主義 is taught in Taiwan. It is taught in such a way that the students hate it, and that makes me so angry. Such an interesting, intelligent and far-reaching theory, but if you’re forced to deal with it like the bible, then of course you don’t like it.

E: Yes in Taiwan we learn it in high school. And when we learn it we just have to remember the rules. The teacher does not teach why he did it this
way, but you just have to remember it. You have to copy it in your mind and in the exam you have to write all the rules, all the thoughts on the paper, and if get it all right then you get a 100%. They never explain it and we won’t know. I believe that students, some of the students, would like to know why he did that, and how he influenced other people by these things, but I don’t know why in Taiwan it is so strange.

K: Ja, when I in 1963 went to Indonesia, I was a member of a UNESCO mission to study the role of tradition and modernity in the political thought of Asian elite, so I was interviewing Sukarno, the President of Indonesia. And somehow, I don’t know how, we came to the question of national identity, and he said: “When the Dutch were gone, driven out, we had to establish a new state consisting of thousands of islands and so many dialects, and distributed different experiences.” And I was thinking how to do it and how to manage it, and I was reading Lenin and Marx and the American founding fathers, but the only thing that really helped me, and I shall be grateful to this, well that is Sun Yat-sen. I was very satisfied to hear that and I quote that in my exhibition, hopefully forthcoming. And ja, of course from time to time I was going to Taiwan for international conferences. Ja in the 1970s, that is important, really important. I attended one or two of these Sino-American conferences on Mainland China. I don’t know whether you’ve heard about that? Every year a conference between American scholars from different universities and some Taiwanese universities to discuss what’s happening in 大陸, in the People’s Republic of China. Then I made a proposal to the Taiwanese government to make a Sino-European Series of conferences with the institute of international relations in 木柵. I made this proposal...there’s small group of people present, Han Li-wu (杭立武) and Sung Chu-yu (宋楚瑜). Sung at that time the director of GIO (行政院新聞局). And we discussed this problem, I presented him my idea and I was very happy to find out that they accepted my idea. And ever
since that time there are annually these Sino-European, or now Taiwanese-European, conferences.

E: Yes in Zhengzhi University (政治大學).

K: Ja up in the 木柵 Institute. And that must have been around 1975 or so.

E: Cause I have checked some of your speeches on internet, they showed…

K: Oh yes!

E: I’ve tried to search all the materials I could get in Taiwan.

K: Oh my, you are hard working.

E: I'm just trying to do good work.

K: You are a good researcher. To do research is the beginning of becoming a scholar. Very good.

E: I hope so.

K: Well yeah in any case I was, on many occasions telling them this way of teaching Sun Yat-sen was absolutely wrong, but I could not change their education system, Chiang Kai-shek had started that, and that was of course wrong.

E: Before in Taiwan you had to take the exams to get into a university and we did have the topic of 三民主義, but now it is cancelled.

K: That is again maybe going too far. Because you should have a section of Chinese political philosophy, of course there is one reason the constitution of the Republic of China, which is the constitution of Taiwan, is based on the five power concept of Sun Yat-sen. And there’s a lot of Sun Yat-sen ideas in the face of Taiwan, for instance the “land reform”. I can also give you some writings of mine in which I was discussing the land reform in Taiwan and in China. Do you know it?
E: Some of them.

K: I was also interested in land reform, because of the immense cruelty the communists had done that, and finally in the end they took the land away again. They gave it to the farmers to keep them in the 共產黨 until they had won victory, in the movement of the People’s Commune in 1958. They transformed the peasants into an industrial army for the land. With military discipline, in regimen, brigades and companies to do these sort of work. And also there was this ridiculous blast furnace to produce steel, a huge waste of coal and iron and steel. Many things were destroyed. Well, and I have written a history, the only one in German language, *A History of Far Eastern International Politics from the Opium War to the year 2000*. In that, of course, I dealt also in detail with the Taiwan crisis, and the change on Taiwan to the government of Chen Shui-bien, and so on, and also the Lee Teng-hui era. Because that is not only nationalist internationalism, it is an implication. So, do you have any questions that you want to ask?

E: Yes yes yes. I prepared some questions and sent to you by e-mail, but I printed it out, I printed it with bigger words. The first one is, can you talk about your family, your family background?

K: Well here you see my grandfather, he was Field Marshall of the Austria-Hungarian army. And up there you see the the family code of arms that I also have here on my ring. Because, there’s a story behind it. My grandfather was involved in a battle in Russia against the Russians in World War I. And he won the battle, and he was very lucky because at that time the young Austrian Emperor Charles (Karl) was with his army, witnessed this victory, and then made him baron, which is a nobility title, that goes with the code of arms. And then the code of arms, you see, is divided, at the one side there is a bullet, because during the battle one Russian bullet crushed the upper tie of my grandfather. He kept that
bullet, like that big and with some pieces of bone attached. And on the other side, two sabers crossed, the one saber was a military saber, the other one was a saber carried by civil service officers, because our family had done the military and civil services offices. And underneath is the key principle "If I will, I can do", and underneath you see the double headed eagle of the Austrian Emperor, and underneath the old Emperor Francis Joseph, my parents and of course my grandfather lived in the time when he was still governing. He was ruling Austria for 68 years, that’s how he became a mythological figure, a legendary figure. In Vienna you can see many reminiscences of him. And that on the left side is myself, at the age of 5 or 6, painted by the same painter. And up there, this young girl is my mother. Then family history, family background. My parents were students when they met each other in Berlin, they were Austrians but studying in Berlin, Germanistics (German Studies). My father, who was an official of the Austrian ministry of education, and then in charge of their popular education, like his Volkshochschule for Austria. Because of the Habilitation, you see here if you make your doctorate it is not enough to become professor; you must make a super PhD called Habilitation, which is much more strict and much more difficult. And then he got an appointment as professor at the technical college of Danzig. Danzig at that time was a city state, as one of the strange results of the Treaty of Versailles. Danzig was separated from Germany, became a city state of its own, it had its own flag, it had its own currency, it had its own hem. And lived in the tradition of one of the hanze cities, like Hamburg, Bremen, Danzig was one of the big German hanze cities. And there I spent the first ten years of my life. We lived in a suburb of Danzig, it was very close to the beach, the beach of the eastern sea, and so very often we could go there, it took 15 minutes, 20 minutes and we were at the beach. Behind the beach there were huge forests of dark trees, it was a very beautiful landscape combination, the
dark background of these forests, then the white sand and then the green sea. At the beach you could even find little pieces of amber, which we kids loved to find. And also there was my sister born; she’s four years older than me. She’s my closest relative, she lives in Salzburg, she became a doctor and then in addition a dentist. And she married the Count of Meran. You see, the Emperor Princess of Austria had two famous brothers; the one was Karl, who was the first general to defeat Napoleon in an open battle. It was near Vienna, the Battle of Aspern-Essling. And the second brother was a very popular reformer, and he fell in love with the daughter of a postmaster, at that time, postmaster, so he let those two wait for ten years until they agreed to get married. And he had to change his title, he was no longer the Habsburg’s prince, but he had to call himself Count of Meran. That one’s grandson was the husband of my sister. So he’s the Count of Meran. Later on we moved because my father got an apartment at the University of Münster in Westphalia. And already there he began to take particular interest and research in or on theater history, and he as a Viennese he had good relations with Vienna, and he was the founder of the now very famous Vienna theater institute, where many art actors, many stage managers had been famed. Very beautiful, right in the center of Vienna. My father wrote a ten volume History of the European Theater, which were useful to people studying that. He got also interested in Far Eastern theater; he made with the Nihon University, which has a very beautiful theater, an exhibition of theater museum, a Japanese theater exhibition in Vienna. Noh and Kabuki（能與歌舞伎）, two famous forms of Japanese theater that was very popular and had to be prolonged. Then came the war, as I told you, I was drafted in the navy, in the navy artillery, and I was attached to one anti-aircraft battery, guarding the entrance of the Elbe River. One piece of heavy artillery was behind the cement, blocks of cement, hardened stone, it could see in various directions. I was attached
to the lighter artillery, that meant I had to stand on the dam of the Elbe River with no cover at all, stand upright with a small fire gun. What was dangerous was not only the attacking planes who were shooting from up down, but also when they shells of our heavy artillery exploded, they didn’t stay in the shell of course, there were falling down some pieces like that big, if they would hit you they could’ve torn off your arm. I said that to the command of the artillery, the heavy artillery, he said: “Well, in the military we say fire goes be fore cover.” Well, then the war was over, and I still had a very dangerous assignment, because a British tank division was approaching, and the commander of the battery told me, you have to go with a Walkie-talkie on your back until you see the enemy. Keep yourself hidden and connect us, and tell us how we shoot, whether we hit or not. I thought my god this the end of me, I’ll get into the crossfire of the British and the Germans and that’s the end. And I still remember, I was thinking my god, now my life ends, and in the morning when I was already preparing to go, the radio said Hitler died. And then the commander of the battery came and said “Okay then we finish, we don’t do anything anymore.” So we waited until the British came, and I’ve told you how they released me. Very strange, my life is full of coincidences. And we were traveling also always on the locomotive, because the father of the friend who went with me, was some leading person in the Austrian railway system. And then the lokfurer (locomotive driver) permitted us to go on the loks, because we had no money to pay for two. And I went from Hamburg with him to Frankfurt, to Munich. It was one devastated place after another, you cannot imagine unless you see it. In the Munich city museum, we had a Munich miniature at that time; I think of four houses, only one was standing, you can’t imagine that destruction. And since I was 13, I was also exposed to the 1939 bombing raids, that meant we had to go to the basement at that time, my two brothers were born, they were babies. I
had to pick up these two babies, carry them down into the basement, and then you heard the bombs fall hoeeeeeee and boom! Coming near or far and wondering my god when do they hit our house, if the house breaks down, will people come to dig us out. And if the water pipe breaks, we will be drown. If the gas pipe breaks, we will be suffocated. So, I didn’t have a pleasant youth. And one day I came to the school, the school was gone. There was only three meters of debris, that was all, underneath the house warden and his family, crushed. But fortunately my father then got a job in Vienna, was appointed professor of theater science, and first director, founding director of the theater institute.

E: During the war, are your father and mother still in Germany or they returned back to Vienna?

K: They moved back to Vienna.

E: So you the oldest of your family, or how many sisters or brothers do you have?

K: My sister also went to Vienna, and my two brothers of course also, the entire family went, which is lucky, because the house which we lived in the city Munster was crushed by bombs after we left. Vienna was also bombarded, ja very strange, we firmly believed that the son of the last Austrian Emperor Otto von Habsburg, who had a good relationship with Roosevelt, could have persuaded Roosevelt not to bombard Vienna. And at least in the beginning for quite a lot of years Vienna was not bombarded. And then one day, it was a Sunday, my mother and I went to the church, and suddenly the priest said: “You must go home, it is air alert.” So we went calmly home, because never anything had happened, only we were surprised that behind us there was a tremendous noise. And my mother said: “Very strange, nowadays they put these anti-aircraft guns in the middle of the city” that was never the case. Then,
when we arrived at home we turned back and saw a lot of black smoke, not our house but many other houses had been hit. The way that we had been walking had been hit here and there. But our belief that this would not happen was so strong that we didn’t imagine any bomb, we thought it was a loud anti-aircraft gun. And our home was lucky, it was not destroyed in Vienna, only it was robbed by the Russians. When the Russians took the city, there was an orgy of murder, rape and zest. My mother had escaped by boat on the Danube together with my sister and two little brothers they went to Salzburg. And Salzburg happened to be in the American occupation zone. So, they escaped the Russians. However when we came back, I had nothing. All my jeans, my shoes, all of them were stolen by the Russians. And at that time you could hardly get anything, there was nothing... and very little to eat. The first two winters, you got a spoonful, a soup spoon full of fat with then one or two pieces of black bread and another spoon full of sugar, and then soup from peas. That was it. So we were always hungry, and sometimes you were lucky and you could buy something on the black market, but that was expensive. So we had to sell quite a number of valuable belongings of the family in order to be able to buy on the black market. And it was so cold, the windows were broken, and we had paper windows, even those paper windows were damaged so I had both hands frozen. Because on the cold paper you can see if you write, I have a very low blood pressure, it means it was always easy to freeze. But the positive thing was the beginning of the studies. In the early 1940’s, it was January 1946, I began with the study Roman law. You see Roman law was the basis of all European law systems, except for England and Scandinavia. So that creates a very important basis for the European spiritual and cultural unity; the law. What a big difference that is from China. And the professor came, professor Kremer, and he said: “I tell you, freedom of teaching is restored in Austria.” A few tears (Kindermann sounds very
moved, sheds a few tears). After the dictatorship, we had Austria restored. Because Germany simply treated Austria like a captured province, not even a province, a single area of Austria. And Governors from Germany came. There was no unit called Austria anymore. The country disappeared. So it was very moving to have it back. I thought Roman law was very interesting, but it was not enough for me. I established these seminars for politics and diplomacy as I told you, so I was very busy at that time. I might say all the students were so happy that they were able to study and study freely. We felt back in a different world. And actually we never made any nonsense. I mean when we met and talked, we really like to go to famous coffee houses especially for students. We were not discussing lavatory and so what, but always very serious things, but in a way that students do it. I studied also rhetorics, and we went to a communist meeting for instance in order to study the behaving of the communists, the enemy. And Austria had some leading Communists who were very good speakers, and the country was divided black and red. Black was the Christian democrats, and Red were the Austrian, in the beginning they were the Marxist-socialists, and all the jobs were either red or black. And they tried to keep the balance everywhere, so for each institution there must have been at least one black and red part. This was very unpleasant and disappointing. Instead of coalition democracy as they called it…naja…ok this is a schooling experience.

E: Another question about your family. So both of your younger brothers study as a scholar as well or did they have another job?

K: No no no. One of them became a journalist, and joined one of Austria’s most powerful and most influential newspapers. If you imagine, the country today has 8 million citizens and that newspaper sells one million copies. Can you imagine that? So it is very very powerful. Although in
terms of journalism not the best, although my brother is very conscientious. The other brother became a self-made man, a self-thought man, and he became an opera director (Intendant). He really directed opera’s. Now he recently is in pension, and occasionally he is called to make one opera here one opera there. He also worked for a long time in Trier, which is a very lovely city in Germany. Looks almost like a Roman ancient city. Marx was born there. A very beautiful city with many relics from the Roman period, especially a big city gate, and then also a theater.

E: Can you also maybe talk about your wife and your son?

K: Ja, I met her in 1970, and I had a project on this triangle: America, Taiwan and China. And for that I did research in Taiwan, so in the 聯合報 I made an announcement, European professor needs assistants, and 15 people volunteered, including my wife. So I employed her and we worked together and on one day, I asked myself a question. I said “my goodness, how is it possible?” I walk around the corner and there was a shop for tea and ham, for us it is a strange combination, but in Taiwan it’s customary. How is it possible that I feel so happy every morning when Ms. Tsai appears? And then I began to realize that I fell in love with her. But then I had to go, and we wrote each other many many letters back and forth, and then I invited her, because in the next April I had to do some work in Hong Kong, and I invited her to join me in Hong Kong, which she did. So we spent some time together in Hong Kong and also in Macau, those two places at that time were much more romantic than they are now. And since I knew Hong Kong quite well, I could guide her around, and she said my god, the problem is that I don’t understand one single word that these 廣東人 are talking, 廣東話, nothing, I can only read the characters. I considered that as our honeymoon, and I can show you some pictures that we took at that time.
And then our next meeting was in Canada, where her sister is living. And from Canada she went with me to Japan to do some work, especially in the Foreign Correspondents’ Club in the Yurakucho building, interviewing Japanese politicians and so on. And then she went with me to Taiwan. And to my surprise, she asked me to stay in her home, I said: “Well, if you are serious.” She said yes, she is serious. So her mother was greeting me very warmly, but her father was so angry that he moved out of the house. So, in order to let him come back we had to move out also. That was of course very strange that suddenly a European with his daughter appeared, however I decided to out-Chinese the Chinese. To behave as a senior son, and that was so efficient, so effective I should say, that I became his favorite son in law. It took me some time. I invited my parents in law to Europe, to Austria, to Italy. But at first I took my wife to Munich and from there to Innsbruck, Austria. A very dramatic city, very beautiful. Mountains on two sides and so on, having a great role in Austrian history. And from there then I went with her to Venice, and from Venice to Rome, and then I decided to show her Naples, plus my two favorite places there, Pompeii and Ercolano, and then she went back to Taiwan. But in the end then she came back to Munich, and when we were living there we finally got married, and my little daughter was then born shortly after. We married not in Innsbruck, but in Kufstein, that is the closest city of Austria, one hour from Munich. And at that time Austria was very generous, and immediately gave her the citizenship. And she always enjoyed the protection by the Austrian diplomats because of me. Occasionally, she had difficulties to travel to Hong Kong, so the Austrian ambassador in Tokyo had to write to the Austrian consul in Hong Kong to get her an entrance into Hong Kong. And then she became an Austrian citizen.

E: And would you like to talk about your son?
K: Yes, my son is from my first marriage. My first wife at that time was in charge of the Austria-British Society. I was in charge of the Austrian Foreign Affairs Society, so the two of us got together and fell in love. And then I got her scholarship to Chicago, because at the time I was in Chicago, and we married in Chicago. But then our first son was born after our return to Europe. After, I left Frankfurt to join the University of Freiburg. In Freiburg I was junior professor. In Freiburg I published this book. In Freiburg I made my habilitation, and the topic of my habilitation was International Aspects of the Chinese Civil War, so I could use my many contacts for writing this publication. But then in 1966, I got an invitation to become a full professor of law at the University of Mainz. Actually I should become professor of law at that university, but secretly, it was not permitted. The University of Munich contacted me, and said: “If you say no to Mainz, we will offer you a full professorship, plus an institute, but you have to say no.” But that was very risky, because if I did that, I had no guarantee, I could not have legally any guarantee from Munich. So it was very exciting for me, I got an enormous psychological pressure. While the thing was going back and forth between Mainz and Munich I simply left for England and left no address, I was hiding in England. I lived there in the Austrian Culture Institute, and London is a very beautiful city as you know, very very interesting university there, the British Museum Library, the Institute of Oriental and African Studies, and so on and so on. And when I came back, the matter was settled, and I could bargain with the Ministry of Culture. Because at that time, professors who were full professors, individually bargained their conditions of employment with the Bavarian Ministry of Culture. And my son was born at that time, just a few days before I came back from the Far East. I was going back from the Far East and on the way back I made some stopovers. At that time flying there was so special and you could make stopovers wherever you wanted.
to and stay as long as you wanted and easily change from one airline to another. So I made a stopover in Calcutta, which was awful, people lying in the streets, you have to step over them. At the railway station, people lying there, if you want to buy ticket, you have to step over them. And so many beggars and then people who if they see you will pursue and say: “Gentleman, sir, do you want a girl, 14 years old, 16 years old, 15 years old.” No. I made also a stopover at Istanbul, I looked around there, I remember I was flying there with Scandinavian Airlines, and when we were boarding the plane the crew told us, that the other plane coming from Scandinavia in direction of Istanbul had crashed. It was winter, but somehow there was too much ice on the wings, so it crashed and they were all killed. So then at that time I stayed in Freiburg, and in Freiburg I was junior professor, and there was this one professor who I mentioned, Bergsträsser, who was the founding father of modern German political science. He was one of the most fascinating human beings I have ever met in my life. Actually, he fascinated me, in the way of talking to people, speaking, convincing people. He founded the German Council of Foreign Relations. He founded the Centre for Science and Politics, which is the German government’s main think-tank in Bonn, then later on in Berlin of course. He founded the Association for Democratic Education, teaching German democracy, and and and. The only thing about him was he was so busy, when he was in Frankfurt and I wanted to talk to him, a hundred people wanted to talk to him. And he would say, ah yes, you join me, I have to go by taxi to the railway station, we have five minutes, a lot of time we can talk. But because of this way of life he would kill himself, as he died very early, a heart failure. Ja he was also President of the German UNESCO. And in fact, he sent me in 1963 as a part of a small mission, with three other colleagues, I was the senior, to East Asia, to study the attitude of elites with regard to their own culture and tradition and to modernity. And we took one Buddhist country-
Thailand, one Islamic country-Indonesia, and one Confucian country-Taiwan. That was one of the reasons that I was in Taiwan in 1963. That was also the way in which I could contact Sukarno, the president of Indonesia. Two years before the great Civil War started in Indonesia. Sukarno collects great speeches, he was a great speaker, and then the left started the civil war by attacking, they thought their main enemy was the military. So they murdered soldiers, threw them into a so-called crocodile swamp near Jakarta, cut their penis, put them in their mouth, really. But I had earlier interviewed the commander of the Siliwangi Division, it was an elite division. And he said, “Well, do you know who made this country? The army! Do you know who’s the first modern organization before all the other organizations? It’s the army. And who will be loyal to Sukarno until the last? The army. And who will not be pushed away from the position of power when the situation changes? The army.” He was the one man to move his Siliwangi Division into Jakarta and then began the big killing of the Communists, and of the Chinese. The hatred of Chinese was enormous. After our mission was finished, Indonesia, I wanted to show gratitude to the leaders of the Academy of Science. I invited them for dinner. And I had selected the finest Chinese restaurant in Glodok, Glodok is the Chinatown of Jakarta. We went there, we got out of the cars, they stopped, they wouldn’t move. I said “I would like to invite you here, I tried it out, very very good Chinese food.” But “no we don’t go in here.” I said naively “Do you have any conflict with the owner?” They said, “No, they are Chinese.” So I was really embarrassed what to do. Fortunately I remembered an Indian restaurant, so we went to the Indian restaurant. Another day I was in Bandung, in the night I saw fire and a tremendous noise, but I was too sleepy to look. The next day my Indonesian assistant came and I said “Mohammed, what was the matter last night?” And he said “Well, Indonesian students attacked the Chinese students, and then took their
motor scooters, and tied them up, put gasoline on them and burned them.” “Well Mohammed, why did they do this? I would like an honest answer.” Because really, anything that was running efficient was run by the Chinese, they were hard working. The Indonesians were so lazy and slow. But I was in Bali also, and many Chinese shops had painted signboards with the Chinese communist flag on them, they thought that would protect them. Quite on the contrary, that was the place where they would go on murdering people. A Chinese scholar whom I asked whether he was a citizen of Indonesia, he said “Yes, I have the passport, it was no use, I have a Chinese face.” Naja, so, ja and my family. I could show you a photo where he is maybe five years old. He and I are sitting and playing chess. He looks triumphant, I look depressed. From small age on, he was playing chess, already as a ten year old boy he was already grown up. And so he became international grandmaster of chess. He established a very successful chess academy here in Munich. And now has a daughter, my first granddaughter, called Anita, who just finished her four years of grammar school. So he lives nearby. So what else?

E: Would you like to talk about your mother?

K: She was from the beginning always very religious. Throughout her life she always volunteered to teach religion to kids. Because she said, I think she was right, “Unless you accept religion in your heart and mind when you are very young, later on you will not make it.” First she was protestant, and later on she converted to Catholicism. She was a great Austrian patriot. All her life long she hoped for a return of the Habsburg monarchy, which of course didn’t occur. But in the living room there was a big picture of my grandfather, her father, and a statue of the emperor. And also the black and yellow flag of the Habsburg Dynasty, all in her living room. She was a very devout Catholic, she was a very
devout monarchist. She was very close to me, actually she was the person who had the biggest influence on me in my early life. My father was a workaholic, I hardly could talk to him, I hardly could see him. It was almost like I had to ask for a *Sprechstunde*. He appeared mostly when something very serious had happened or if something went very wrong, then he would be there. He didn’t really care about what I’m doing.

E: But he did give you the most important book in your life?

K: Yes! Yes! He understood that it is important for a young boy to have some spiritual directions, some special interest, and that he promoted. And my hobby from the very beginning, from grammar school, was history, and about history I often knew more than my teachers, my teachers were afraid of me, not I of them. In history that is.

E: So of your parents the one that most influenced you is your mom and not your dad or both?

K: My mother. My father hardly talked to me.

E: When you decided to study about history, about China, did she support your idea?

K: Yes, she was for it. I was considering either to go into diplomatic service or to become a lawyer, or to make my money as a professor, or to go into politics and history. However, as I told you, one uncle of mine was Austrian ambassador to Tokyo for eight years, the first Austrian postwar ambassador, who was before Council General in New York, and then ambassador in Canada and then in Australia. After I saw the way he lived, hardly one single evening for himself. Everyday came visitors, from Austria, from Vienna, and everybody considering himself the most important person, and being like children in a strange way, and accepting to be helped here and to be helped there. And the poor wife
had to do the cooking, had to take care of the guests. And the children
hardly saw the father. And he wrote excellent analysis as ambassador of
Japan. He showed it to me, very detailed and very scholarly also and
very true in the prediction. And then one day he never got any answer
from the Foreign Office, he finally wrote to the Secretary General of the
Foreign Office, how do you find my report? In which way could I
improve for my reporting? The answer was-write shorter. I mean it looks
very nice, ambassadors going to receptions and holding champagne
glasses and so and so, but then after four years you have to change, and
they make you go to a country that doesn’t interest you at all or to a
country that you dislike. You cannot say that you are interested in Far
East, therefore you want to stay in Far East, you cannot. In America you
can, but in Germany, in Austria you cannot. I kept contact with the
Foreign Office since the 1970s, I taught Far Eastern history, Far Eastern
politics in the foreign office, and I continue doing that and continue to
have contact with them. Many of my former students will see me when
I’m in Asia, and that’s very nice, but to become a diplomat. Also you
must think, and I tell my students also, that before you become a
diplomat you must consider, one country can speak to the outside world
only with one voice, you cannot say what you want. And even if you
think that’s crazy, this policy, you have to support it, at home and abroad.
Because there is only one voice for one country internationally. And if
you have a government which you dislike, which decides bad things that
you dislike, then you have to… You cannot say what you want. Of
course then inside the ministry there are strict hierarchies, and you have
to deal with so so many bosses and and and. But some of my early
friends became ambassadors, but I wouldn’t. And then lawyers. Of
course I mean it’s interesting, but in order to be successful you have to
lie. You have to lie for criminals you defend. And even if you know that
they lie, you have to. You have to wash the dirty laundry of other people.
So in the end, I made a university career, I never regretted it, never. That was the best thing, it was made for me. My schooling was interesting.

E: Professor do you still remember many from your kindergarten or anything?

K: I never went to kindergarten, my parents didn’t want to. I was neatly sent to grammar school, and that was a private grammar school in Danzig. Every year we went home to Austria. So every year we made a loooong trip, at that time a long trip from Danzig, to Poland to Berlin. And in Berlin there was an aunt of my mother, she had married a very rich lawyer, and they had a very beautiful house in the center of the city. Luftgarten overseeing all of Berlin. And I was taught the first interesting book-Robinson Crusoe. And I was very interested in that. There was a very good history museum, where you saw reminiscenses of King Frederick II, King of Prussia, who made war against Austria and many things, and I was very intersted. And my mother used to read to us not only from fairy tale books but also from history books. Then I went to the so-called gymnasmum in Danzig, the first class. We were wearing this red capped, very proud of that of course. My gymnasmum was a very famous one, but then I had to go to Munster, but I didn’t like Munster at all, I hated the place. It seemed to me so, how should I say, industrial, small minded in a sense, compared to Danzig. A harbor city, a hanze city, a city state and so on and so on, but what could I do? And there I had my first experience with war. It was 1939, I told you I went to school, but my school was hit and disappeared. So I continued then later on when my father was located in Vienna, in Austria, and that was also the place where after the war I started to study. (sounds of them pouring some tea and some smalltalk) Ok, beginning of the studies of China and my experience at the German embassy, 1962.

E: Excuse me, so you went to the University of Vienna?
K: Yes, the law faculty of the University of Vienna. I did the first state examination in law in Vienna, Austria. And I was recognized by the University of Chicago, and I went there for a master degree.

E: beginning of the studies of China and the experience at the German embassy in 1962.

K: What do you mean by my experience at the German embassy in 1962?

E: Actually this is a question that professor Shih Chih-yu asked me to give it to you. This is for reference.

K: Oh, but then he must have misunderstood something. It should be in 1963. I was a member of a UNESCO team going to three countries (Indonesia, Thailand, and Taiwan). And of course it is not easy if you come to such a country for a few weeks to get high level contacts. How? Because you are only a stranger in this country. So of course I relied on the embassies, but the German embassy could help us very little, but the Austrian embassy could help so much. That was the big difference. Our research team relied mostly on the Austrian embassy, and in Taiwan, they relied on me, because at that time I had already had a lot of contacts and friends in Taiwan. So, in 1963 for instance, I interviewed Thanat Khoman, he was the foreign minister of Thailand and the father of ASEAN, he had the idea of ASEAN, the Association of South-East Asian Nations, this big international organization of the states of South-East Asia. Well of course Bangkok was a very beautiful city, a very exciting city, with a great number of beautiful buildings. And you can really see Thai culture not by being in the museum, but by being out in the life of the people. And also there was a very lively nightlife, for a young man it was very exciting. Jakarta then being something very different. You could see some hostility against the foreigners. But even so, we managed to see all the important people, including the leader of
the Communist Party of Indonesia, which was the biggest Communist party in the world after the Chinese, bigger than the Soviet. And his name was Aidit, Dipa Nusantara Aidit. When I visited him, his headquarter was behind Baturaja, and he looked to me quite Chinese. So I asked him whether he was Chinese, and he gave an embarrassed smile, and said my grandmother was a Chinese. He was the only communist leader in the world of whom Mao Zedong said “He has developed Marxism in a creative manner.” The only one. And as you know, the 共産党, and the Communist Party of Indonesia, and also Sukarno, tried at that time to establish a counter-United Nations, a United Nations only for the former colonies, the afro-Asian nations. The Newly Emerging Voices it was called, NEV, there were a lot of abbreviations like that. Sukarno was a neutralist he was not really a leftist. There were some experiences, some problems the United Nations were facing, for instance when we were there, there was a visit by the German president, the West-German president. East-Germany had in Indonesia only a continu termini (not clear what he says). Enfin, the airplane was approaching the airport, and all the diplomats were lined up to greet the president. Suddenly, the chief of the protocol had it stopped, because he saw the East-German Consul General. He went to him and said, “You are not invited, you have to go.” And then the gentleman pulled out an invitation out of his pocket and said “Since your president invited me, who are you to disinvite me?” The German ambassador came and said to his protocol chief, “Let it go, he was invited.” So the plane started rolling out already, and then the chief of the protocol called to policemen, one took the East German by one side, the other by the other and they pulled him, his legs were on the floor, the entire row of diplomats had lined up there. When he came past the Russian ambassador, he said to him, “Help me, I am in a very unworthy, undignified situation!” But the Russian said, “Sorry, I am a guest here, you are a guest here, we have to do what our host is
telling us.” I was told this story by the Austrian ambassador, who could speak Russian, and so he overheard what the Russian ambassador was saying to that man. So it was very exciting at that time. It was at that time that Germany was trying to impress other countries, in their favor relatively speaking. So that was 1962.

E: So since 1963 you started to go around the world for the embassy?

K: No. I started teaching in the foreign office in the 1970s, before that I had only an occasional visit there, because I was, as I told you, in charge of the Far Eastern Desk in the German Institute of Foreign Affairs. And of course I visited them, to find out what they were thinking about this issue and that issue, and I visited the various embassies over there, but I was not a part of the Foreign Office, because I am an Austrian citizen.

E: You mentioned that you've done research for Confucius in Taiwan, and Buddhism in Thailand, and Islam in Indonesia, but why didn’t you do Confucianism in China?

K: Because at that time, Confucius was declared an enemy. The word of Confucius was a cursed word. I wrote about what they were doing in the introduction of this book, I can give you this introduction. I tried to study what were they doing in China, in 大陸. But in Taiwan, you have an open relationship with Confucius, in China you do not dare to say anything, because you are not allowed to read the book. I was asking a student in China whether they could just go to a bookstore and buy the 論語 for instance. He said we can go to the library to loan such books as the 論語 or the Four Classics, but in that case, they stamped our name and we are suspicious, so you better don’t loan a book, so we have no idea. In the end most people did not want to talk, especially not to a foreigner.

E: Would you like to talk about your curricula, the faculty, the institution and the advisor during your graduate training?
K: Well, the faculty of course was the social science faculty of the University of Chicago, which had a fine number of famous members, Quincy Wright for instance, who was teaching international law. And some of them were from Germany, Leo Strauss and Morgenthau, and some other ones. I was very happy there, very well. Professors over there were much more friendly to students than in Europe. In Europe a professor was a strict figure and students hardly dared to talk to him, while in America, the professors said: “Well, the students are those who pay for us. Without their tuition, the university could not live.” So they had a different approach towards the students. I enjoyed that very much. And one of the professors in Far Eastern field was Donald Lach, who wrote also on Far Eastern international history, a very remarkable volume. And then a professor, Klessar (name unclear). And then another professor, whose name I don’t have on the mind but I have his book. A very courageous man, who wrote the first book about the Nisei Japanese in America, people who only because of their Japanese origin are told they were not American citizens during the war, and were expelled from the Western states of America, because the Americans were so afraid of them. So the faculty was full of interesting people. And in the sinology department, there was a professor by the name of Creel (Herrlee Glessner Creel), he wrote one of the most famous American biographies of Confucius in America. In political science there were people talk about everything, but know about nothing. But even so I learned a lot from the school.

E: Have you ever taken any courses or practicum in Chicago University only for China Studies?

K: No, always connected with historical or political topics. I have no interest in becoming a sinologist, because they spent a lot of time on something like silk, poetry, ancient poetry, everything very lovely, but I won’t fill my life with it.
E: But now the definition of Sinology has changed a lot, they do have a lot of different branches.

K: Of course, now they are more interested in the social life also. But even so, once, when I was asked by a very famous German firm, a big firm like Siemens or so, to recommend to them a sinologist who was at the same time an economic expert. I couldn’t find anyone at the Munich University. But have you heard of a new type of international theory, the neo-realist, the Munich School of Neo-Realist International Law, they give quite a lot of thought to Morgenthau’s theory, but it goes its own ways in quite a number of important points. And that kept me of course very busy. Because for instance, just to give you an example, that’s easier to understand. Out of the determinants behind foreign policy, Morgenthau excludes domestic politics. But in my opinion, domestic politics is enormously important for foreign politics. Because it decides first of all who can make policy, which party, having which point of view, which interest is making policy, which personnel, etcetera etcetera. So, foreign politics begins at home. And the decision makers are like the roman god January/Lanuarius (Janus), with two heads, one looking in the last year, one looking in the first year, then the new year, that’s why it is called January. So, the decision-maker looks into domestic politics, how does my foreign policy affect my chances to be reelected, my influence, my support, my opposition, and then you can make foreign policy. And on the other side, if you look outside and you see other states, to shape the interests of the states, you are continuously obliged to have a double-sided view. And the basic, which way to start is the domestic infrastructure, the national infrastructure. For instance, in Morgenthau’s theory, the most decisive term of category is power. There’s actually only two categories, power and interest. For me the most decisive element is politics, and I define politics as decision-oriented thought, action-oriented decision making. You have always to
make decisions, every day the world changes, something is different the next morning, and you have to adjust the policies of your country to that change. That means foreign policy or policy, politics at all is decision-making. This party wants that, that party wants that, this person wants that, that person wants that, you are constantly faced with pressures from the society and you have to make decisions. That decision-making in public affairs is decision-oriented, action-oriented decision-making in public affairs, that’s it. And Morgenthau said that he does not want to describe politics as it really is, but politics as it ought to be if you want to conduct successful politics. First of all, you have to study politics as it really is, even so it disturbs the rationalities of your arguments or of your policies, but politics is that way, and you cannot simply say, “This is my intention, this is my plan, and I carry it out, everybody has to go.” That’s the most you can do, if you are a super dictator, like Stalin or Hitler or Mao Zedong. But that is not the normal condition. Even dictatorships, some dictators are not that powerful, so they have to rely on other groups and so on. And so my theory is somewhat different, I can show you one of the basic books which I wrote about that, establishing my theory. But Morgenthau was quite generous to me, he usually was not very friendly with people who had different opinions than he, but he recognized that this was a continuation of his school, which deserved a new name, the Munich School of Neo-Realism in International Affairs. And for instance, Yeh Yang-ming was able to apply this too, the study of Sun Yat-sen’s policies in 廣東. And many of my students did, it is funny to meet students who later on went into the foreign services, they all remembered the constellation analysis, which I said is the most important aspect to study in politics. You must ask a number of diagnostic questions, like a doctor with a patient, in order to find out what wrong with him, you have to ask, how’s your this, how’s your that, how’s your this? And then from that you get
a mosaic of information, and that combination of information tells him what is what. If you distinguish a sickness, for a diagnosis. This started already in the 1970s, actually about 1976. And that’s the matter I’m teaching here (Munich). I had the luck that I was appointed as the first chair-holder of the political science discipline, international politics.
金德曼教授訪談 II

K: You see here Confucius, and this is my favorite quotation from the Lunyu (論語): “君子不器”, “A noble man is nobody’s instrument”, the position of a scholar. But the officials, he, intelligent as he was, has to obey the discipline of the ministry, scholars too. So I am afraid to tell you, my career, if you want to call it that way, is so atypical, it is not you know the typical thing first and then that and that and that, not so, especially my China concern. I could have studied anything else. With my background I could have become a specialist of American foreign policy, of course much more important for the people here, much more interesting, but I had this fascination with China. Now if you ask me why? I told you, at the age of 12, I read this 林語堂. And at the same time I started to look at Chinese pictures and architecture, and I was so charmed by it, I found it so unusually beautiful, so different from the European way of beauty, that I was like, I don’t know, like falling in love with something. I also saw some pictures of Chinese girls, maybe that gave me the idea to marry a Chinese.

E: But it had to be a really big power that pushed you into this kind of research?

K: I cannot find it. It was an interest. The Buddhists would have the answer, simply in a former life you were Chinese, that’s really simple. Maybe, I don’t know. Are you Buddhist? No. So, we have no answer. I can only explain that I had in many dimensions an attraction to things Chinese and not only Chinese but also Far Eastern. You see, Lili Abegg wrote marvelous books about Japan. The Japanese spirit, that impressed me as well. Korea I got into contact only with later, due to the experience of the Korean War, in the Security Council, and also there I got into direct contact, I could directly see Mr. 蔣廷黻 and talk with him about the
Taiwan issue. Because immediately the Chinese of course sent somebody to complain about the 7th fleet sent into the Taiwan Strait. And then in Stanford, everybody was fascinated, my god what’s happening with China? America’s great friend, China was considered a friend state, overnight got into a hateful enemy? Oh my! And therefore it was a shock result, we immediately sent the foreign minister and he said: “We withdraw, we withdraw from the continent, and protect nothing except the chain of islands: Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand.” Also we had read that and we thought well, Taiwan, Korea, Vietnam is gone. Then came the Korean War, shock, surprise, Truman called his ministers and then the beginning of the discussion he makes a big speech and says: “It started that way in Europe, counter-appeasement. Hitler took Austria, and Czechoslovakia, then war with Poland and so on and so on. One has to stop it when it begins, not when it’s already all over the continent. And so, we were all, I mean we all studied politics and international politics and then that happened. Now what could be more interesting? Nowadays normalcy can be quite boring, but at that time there was still fire in the ashes. And then my China, I was so interested. And throughout my life I have been attracted by the Chinese type of woman, I don’t know why, I cannot give you any answer. But in this effect, the Far Eastern women had something that fascinated me.

E: Something that I’m really interested in is, why didn’t you learn Chinese?

K: I did learn Chinese. It means I started to learn Chinese in Vienna after the war next to the study of law. But then the only man who could teach, was Mr. Greiser, I told you about him, 40 years in China and so on. He died, and there was no replacement. And I couldn’t study anywhere else. And then after that, in Chicago I was assistant, and that left me not much time to study political science, and these guys over there were really excellent scholars and very demanding. So that after my doctor PhD
prelims, under such pressure, I got a kidney stone, and the doctor said that comes from stress. And then being back, I had two jobs. And you see, unless you study Chinese comprehensively, it’s no use, you cannot really with hundred percent certainty interpret a document, a the diplomatic document or something. And then of course life has spoiled me. I married a Chinese linguist, a Taiwanese linguist, she was studying English. So, she was a very very good interpreter and everything, in case I needed an interpreter. But since I had this unique presence, studying foreign policies don’t need to speak to the people on the street usually, you talk to high-up people in the decision-making area, and most of them do speak English very well.

E: During the time that you were in school, in university and in postgraduate school, there’s only one teacher who influenced you on China?

K: He was not even a professor, he was only a lecturer.

E: A lecturer? So there was no other teacher that really gave…?

K: We had one very famous man, who was too old by that time, who was the last Austrian Imperial ambassador to Imperial China. A great sinologist, a great sociologist at the same time, but by the time I could study he was much too old to teach. But I met him in the Austria-Chinese Friendship Association, but he was no longer at the university.

E: So, there were only two, a lecturer and a professor that really gave you some class on China?

K: Well. Don’t forget I had, since my 15th year, friendships with Chinese and Japanese students, and I read the best of literature that I could get in Germany at that time, so in that sense I was self-educated. But not in a linguistic way, it’s a pity but...

E: So you learn a lot of China stuff from different books?
K: From different books, from different contexts. I visited art museums, Chinese art and so on. I went to the missionary museums. I talked to many people who had been in China, because they were all in our association.

E: So have you been to China for a quite long time, maybe for teaching or any other purpose?

K: No. To be in that position in China is not good. You should always be only in China for a short time, contact the important people, and I had of course Chinese students who studied with me. And if I’m in China, they talk to me in a very honest way, very different from the other people.

E: Also in Taiwan the same situation?

K: In Taiwan I was longer of course, months. But not a year or so, because I didn’t want to leave my job here. I couldn’t.

E: Would you like to talk about from start to now your professional career? From the first day that you became a professor and teaching students? Because I have asked professor Ye Yangming the question, I asked “Did professor Kindermann influence your China index?” And he said, “Actually not, no, nothing”, and I said, “Why?”, and he said, “I just took the courses from him and I didn’t really...”. He said he was very interested in diplomacy, but not in Chinese study, so that’s why he didn’t really have some influence from this part.

K: I disagree, because before I met him, he had not learned very much on Sun Yat-sen. To write such a dissertation, and you’ll see, he has carefully registered his annotations; he did years of intensive work on that, and whether he knows it or whether he acknowledge it or not, it has influenced of course this way on Chinese history. Because it influenced him by getting him the facts, which he formerly didn’t pay attention to, very simple.
E: Professor, you taught in LMU (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) right? What kind of courses or lectures did you give to students? Was it related to China?

K: In LMU, each time when I made a lecture or a seminar dealing with a Chinese or Far Eastern issue, then I did that. But we did not have any regular Chinese course or Far Eastern course. We had here three professors who were dealing with Far Eastern questions, now they have none. Definitely a decline of political science here. It’s due to interfaculty affairs and so on, it had never to do with science. But I thought it’s possible for me in each semester to teach at least one course or a seminar dealing with China. Then, I was also teaching one thing that I considered the most important thing of all, it is the Introductory Basic Course, because that’s the only one in which you touch all the key issues of international affairs. That’s what they have to know. Later on the seminars or the lectures always specialized, on this topic, on that topic and so on. But in that one course, they get a general picture, and I tried to give them a picture of the world, that with certain evidence includes Taiwan, includes China, and includes Japan. I’m telling them there are three continents that are important for world politics, which are Europe, North America and Eastern Asia, and maybe in the future also South Asia, depending on the Indians. But formerly they were purely Eurocentric.

E: So did not have a course on Sunyatsenism for your students? (16:44)

K: No, not in that sense. But, if I had a course let’s say on China in the 1920s, or history of the Chinese Civil War, or Start of the Chinese Republic. As you know, I made here an exhibition, about the Chinese revolution of 1911, establishment of the Republic, and the first years of the Republic until the death of Sun Yat-sen. It was not only for the students, but for the general public. First here in Munich, then in Bonn,
which was the old capital, and then in Frankfurt and Main and then a small one in Salzburg. I can give you actually a table of content of my English book of the Sun Yat-sen conference in Salzburg.

E: And someone did a book review of that book, and he mentioned that Professor Kindermann is the first one who came up with the idea of Sunyatsenism, can you explain why you used this word to describe Sun Yat-sen’s ideas?

K: Yes, of course, because Sanmin Zhuyi (三民主義) sounds good, easy to remember and the Chinese have this mystic of numbers, number 7 or number 3 and so and so. But I ask myself what is the real impact of Sun Yat-sen? First of all, his nationalism, but the nationalism which at the same time is democratic, because it tells the people not the emperor, but the people is the sovereign of the nation. You yourself are the sovereign, you have to understand that and you have to behave accordingly, so it’s a democratic type of nationalism. Secondly, it is his type of, I would not even say democracy but democratization. After the failure of the democracy in the first two years of the Republic, to build it up from the 鄉 level to the province level to the state level, the republic, that is very original thought, and then plus the combination, the synthesis between western and eastern thought in the constitution, the five power constitution. And then, economics, to issue social laws, worker protection laws before industrialization begins. Because once it begins, it is very difficult, because people become very greedy to produce more and more and more. So industrialization should grow into a net of pre-established social networks, social protection networks. And that is of course a very particular item. And also his plans, far-reaching plans, with the industrial development of China. His absolutely correct prediction after World War I; overproduction. We need to avoid economic classicism, because during the war, the production of many
things had been lagging, and then there was an immense desire to get those things again, but then came the moment when people were satisfied, they hated those thing again, and then the demand dropped, and that was the easiest thing, because that was a universal phenomenon. His plans were to build harbors, were to build railways, etcetera etcetera etcetera. Real harbors, and as you see the Communists have done a lot of it. Not admitting it, but they did it. And then of course, history of culture, his high respect for Confucius culture, but Confucian culture, as 胡適 said, that should be tested in order to find out which elements of Confucianism are bound in time in the past and cannot be cloned, cannot be continued, and which ones have eternal validity because they deal with human nature, and human nature did not change since the age of Confucius or of Socrates or the Egyptians even. If you read today an Egyptian love poem, you feel moved, you feel touched, because the element is the same, but in a romantic form. What has changed is the outside world, technology and so on is, but not our inside. And therefore we are able to understand and all, why Caesar, for instance, did this and that and that and that, and the other ones, we can clearly understand it. Why? Because the human nature is trans-epochal, it goes through the various phases of history and that is also the value of political science, human nature. The basis of political science is anthropological, it begins to deal with men, with the nature of men, in political situations. I believe in political science you have this element of anthropology as I said, and I did this and that on China but never as a pre-arranged course. Each student has to take each on course on China or so, no, but as long as I was or as long as the other professors were there, there was Far Eastern teaching, in many ways. So we were privileged in that sense. And when that stopped, when they no longer had anyone interested in China or activities on China, then I established this inter-disciplinary committee on East Asian and Southeast Asian history and politics. And then I
persuaded each winter semester colleagues of mine to hold free of charge lectures on Far Eastern topics, and they have done so in the last 14 years, and the students at the end of it cannot get any credit, but they get from me a document that they attended this lecture course on Eastern Asia, which they can use if they want to make an application for this and that, that they have this sort of interest and so on, so it is very popular.

E: I just mentioned that professor came up with the idea of the word of Sunyatsenism, and I think that it is really a critical idea that even Chinese haven’t thought about this part.

K: If you read my article in this book, from the international conference in Salzburg, you’ll find many things that are not taught at the usual schools in Taiwan.

E: I do read some parts of that one, because in Taiwan it is really hard to get that kind of material, I don’t know why. And I read a book that you also mentioned, that between Taiwan and China Taiwan is the country which had a good development of Sunyatsenism, better than China, and, I don’t know how to ask you, but based on what kind of theory or which kind of situation do you think Taiwan is a better country that developed Sunyatsenism better?

K: Very simple, in China communism was developed. And communism in many ways is contradictory to Sunyatsenism, although they dare to say he was our forerunner, the forerunner of the democratic revolution. I was shocked to see that in 中山縣 and I asked the director of the museum there: “When was the democratic revolution?” He said “Ah, m, ah, ja, well, and actually…they further developed it.” “But you said he was the forerunner, but who did the democratic revolution, and what was the 辛亥 revolution? Was it a feudal revolution? Or what?” And he said, “I’m here administering, I’m not a scholar.”
E: But from what kind of perspective, I mean, from the economy, from society, or from which part that you think that Taiwan is better developed?

K: It was qualified because it was lucky enough to get a political party which had a definite ideology that immunized the country against communism, at a time that in the West many people were impressed by communists’ success, many people were seduced, seduced by the success, and then started only to talk about and get interested into Communist China, no longer in Taiwan or Confucianism or modernity. And I thought ok, I don’t think so. I think that the model of Taiwan is very important. And that it is indeed, Eastern Asia one of the first democracies. Japanese democracy was imposed by the American’s, in a ridiculous way.

E: But Taiwan, I think Taiwan’s democratization and modernization were both pushed by the Americans?

K: Yeah push, but they didn’t demand. I mean 蔣經國 was in full power, at the time he opened the doors for democratic development, he knew the KMT had two enemies, the separatists and the communists. And the separatists would form their own party. But he also knew the population had changed, the people who had come with Chiang Kai-shek were old, 70 or 80 years old, out of the picture. And the young people had been born already in Taiwan, they seemed Taiwanese, spoke Taiwanese, partly, married Taiwanese. So democratization and Taiwanization went hand in hand. Taiwan could become overnight a democracy because the democratic institutions were there, but they had been paralyzed by the civil war legislation. And the moment in which the civil war legislation was gone, democracy could live again, especially after they sent home the Non-Parliament. Because formerly the decisions on Taiwan came from above, from charismatic leaders, Chiang Kai-shek, Chiang Ching-
kuo, now they come from below, the voters divide power, so many percentages for this party, so many percentages for this and for this. So that is the revolution in the roman sense of the word, it means “turn over”, “revolt”. So formerly power from above, now, power from below. That is the secret of Taiwanese democracy. And since they had the democratic start of Sun Yat-sen and the democratic institutions of Sun Yat-sen, they could very easily change from one system to the other. China is nothing of the type. Sun Yat-sen sometimes, if it fits them, if they want to show a very peaceful face then they hang up Sun yat-sen on the Tiananmen Square and then- I have the picture I can show you of 胡錦濤 standing before a huge portrait of Sun Yat-sen, making a speech on his birthday. Here, that’s him. And many leading Communists have spoken positively about Sun Yat-sen, but always with the thought in the back of the mind adjust, we want to make ourselves attractive to the Taiwanese.

E: That is really interesting. I mean you just mentioned that in some perspectives, maybe economics and society, in which Taiwan has changed a lot, you think it is from Sunyatsenism, and I remember that I read some book in which you think, your idea is that because Taiwan has more of a great modernization because of Sunyatsenism, but now, China has already changed a lot also, but they also said “Ah because we used Sunyatsenism, so that is why we have a really great society.” So maybe Communism is the extension of Sunyatsenism?

K: It is not because of the basic promises. If you read the works of Mao Zedong, you can feel one red bug running from the first to the very last, and that is class war including the killing of state enemies. Sun Yat-sen explicitly rejected class war, he even said it's the disease of society, it is not as the communist claim “an instrument of progress”, it is a disease. And secondly, the way the communists deal with the opposition, even
after decades of Communist rule, even after Deng Xiaoping visited America and was very popular there, Tiananmen came afterwards. That is the realism. The communists have relaxed on many things, economics, culture, socialized, foreign contact, yes that was pleasant of them, but there’s one thing that they have not changed at all and that is power. Therefore, they’ve cruelly persecuted the 法輪功, although the 法輪功 in the beginning was not in the least political, it was a purely humanitarian sort of Daoist movement to combine exercises for health and body, but, any organization, any, even the most harmless one, that is not controllable by the 共產黨 is the enemy, it has to be crushed. And today to the young people, the communist say: “Look, what we have got, lots of progress, better houses, chances to travel abroad and so on. But the freedom? Oh forget about freedom, why do you need freedom? Can you eat breakfast from freedom? And the German TV team after the 天安門 that went around in villages around Beijing, asking farmers, instead the answer was democracy is good, except you cannot eat it. And then of course they were shocked about what happened to the Soviet Union, one huge empire that might make other nations fear it, crumbled into pieces within months, within months, not only crumbled but they started to kill each other. Sunyatsenism is based on Confucianism, Confucian ethics. But the communists now start to take over certain principles and concepts, as you know very well, one of the principles of Confucianism is harmony. And 胡錦濤 said our key concept is harmony, but he didn’t say it Confucian. It sounds like Mr. 胡 invented it. And 毛澤東 said fight, struggle, struggle all the time, otherwise you will become something very bad, the rotten. So, a gigantic difference. Sun Yat-sen was a humanitarian. Communists are not in the least. Also the way that they treat their workers, hundreds and hundreds of them have died. Irrational minds. Cold minds.

E: But in China, without Sunyatsenism, they do have a good development.
K: Yes, for three hundred and also one billion and four hundred million. Go west, and you see the real China. This is also in the empire, the coastal provinces were the first to be developed, most of all I think 廣東 and the south.

K: China has become more modern, and now Taiwan and China have a lot of interaction, would you think that maybe perhaps Suyatsenism already developed in China?

K: It did already in a few ways. First of all, Sun Yat-sen said that “We cannot separate ourselves from our glorious past and culture.” They’ve learned a lesson, but they don’t admit it. If they were honest, they would say Sun Yat-sen was the first one to say so. Because, as you remember, after the end of the empire, the trend was absolute westernization. 陳獨秀、李大釗 issued the slogan, “Either you are western and modern or you are rotten and old and traditional, but nothing inbetween” -- May fourth movement. 胡適 was one of the few who thought differently. But Sun Yat-sen said “Yeah, we have to be practical, we have to examine what is still valuable of the heritage of Confucianism, and what is no longer acceptable, for example binding the feed, which is not Confucian. How awful if you think that hundreds and hundreds of years in China, the women, starting form six years, had to suffer for years with their feet bound in such a way that the toes grow into the sole, how awful. And how that looks, and then the women cannot move naturally, so they would get fat. But they practiced it for hundreds of years for all the upper classes. I think more research should be done on that, what we have now is not sufficient.

E: So, you think that Sun Yatsenism won’t be truly spread in China?

K: The upper class, the ruling elite uses it to depict itself as being more harmless than they are, and also if they find practical ideas, for instance, in Sun Yat-sen’s book “Industrial Development of China”, they will
imitate without saying so, that it was from his book. Would be an interesting topic of dissertation: the development of modern China, in how far Sunyatsenist? Or effected with Sun Yat-sen’s blueprint of industrialization? Certainly an economist should do that.

E: So they were affected but they won’t confess it.

K: Yes, they don’t confess it. They say he’s a humble forerunner. If you read the writings of Mao Zedong, I have tried to count it, he mentions the name of Sun Yat-sen more often than the name of Lenin or Stalin, interesting. And immediately that stops after he seizes power in 1949, immediately, finished. So, using the name of Sun Yat-sen was of a technical intention, but not really a matter of the heart and of the mind. As if you analyzed, there’s also another interesting thing, in which way, in which connection did Mao Zedong quote Sun Yat-sen? A very interesting topic.

E: Mao did use a lot of sentences to describe what Sun Yat-sen did and how...he uses different ways to express to other people that his ideas and Sun Yat-sen’s ideas are really close, but he never confessed that he has changed.

K: Ok, I mean Mao is not original anyway, if you know the works of Stalin and of Lenin. The only thing is, the most original thought was the instrument to gain power, to exploit the poor peasants. And once you have the power, you take step by step the land back and you get it for yourself. Until today all the land belongs to the state.

E: So, there’s no chance for China to get well known for Sunyatsenism, right?

K: Well, they could. I give you an example, you will see it. They reuse the centenary, October 2011, to celebrate Sun Yat-sen as the symbol of Chinese and Taiwanese togetherness, and I make a bet with you, they
will do that. Maybe in a big start. So, we shall wait and see. And I would try to do that here, but I don’t know whether I would have the chance.

E: And another question. Since China now is getting better and better, I mean improving a lot, and their economy is getting stronger and even stronger than Taiwan, and now they are getting signed for ECFA because, it’s the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement between Taiwan and China. What do you feel about this agreement? I mean, from the perspective of Sunyatsenism is Taiwan ok to sign this kind of agreement to get attached to China in this way? K: Well, if you read the ECFA, as far as it is known, you’ll find out that China offered to Taiwan a very good bargain. But that bargain has no economic motive, there is a political motive and that is of swallowing Taiwan, by economically sucking it up. And of course you can say that at least it is a peaceful method, they don’t plan war, although to keep established one thousand five hundred rockets targeted on concrete objectives in Taiwan, the railway station of Taipei, the airport and and and two airports, etc. That shows us the real mentality, that is the real China. On the one side the friendly hand, on the other side the pistol under your belly. I would like to say to the communists of China, “Now how naïve do you think the Taiwanese are?” They overlook them. The only thing is they have gotten accustomed to it, and the danger to which they have accustomed somehow one day loses its dramatic aspect, but it is a danger. If these rockets are released for any reason. Now the two parties have decided to conclude with each other a peace agreement, which is to acknowledge, that since 1927, since April 1927, they do have a civil war, which was somewhat subdued during the Japanese war, but then immediately came back and they had not concluded it, the peace agreement. Taiwan has done onesidedly many things, when they gave up the claim to rule the mainland. They gave up the claim that they are bandits, and so on. But in the definition of 马英九, the Republic of China is China. I asked him, as
you know: “You said we have the one China definition, what is it?” “It’s the Republic of China.” Now the Republic of China has many faces. The Republic of China was 大陸, 1911, without Taiwan, then it became 大陸 with Taiwan, then it became Taiwan without 大陸. But the coincidence of the Constitution; all the provinces of Mainland China belong to the Republic of China, only they are not under practical rule. So the situation is very similar to the German situation, there’s very difficult legislation about that, whether West Germany is still all Germany or is the legal successor. Now, the Republic of China on Taiwan is it the legal successor of the Republic of 1911? But communist China claims to be the successor, so, what? And the American said Taiwan is not a State, it’s an unresolved issue… So what is China?

E: This question was asked by a teacher, my teacher when I was in university, and he’s in the 民進黨, cause I graduated from Soochow University, German Department, and my teacher is 謝志偉…

K: Ah, a very nice man!

E: A coincidence. And 謝志偉 is in the 民進黨, and another teacher is also in the 民進黨, and his name is Xu Yongmin (not sure about the characters), famous in TV talkshows, in Taiwan his talkshow is very famous, and after a show he comes back to our class and then he asked us “What do you think about China? What is China?” And he used “China” not in Chinese, he did not say 中國, but he said China. So go back home and check what China is. So he often asked these kind of questions, and for me that really is a powerful question. If you ask, “What is 中國?”, then I would say, “Ok, Mainland China”, and if you ask, “What is Taiwan?”, I would say “Taiwan”, but he asked, “What is China?” I think that this is a question that even a grownup in Taiwan, they will refuse to answer what is China. It is really a hard question even to express your own ideas.
K: 宋楚瑜 and 馬英九 both have said in the election campaign, our principle is Taiwan first. What do they do? They throw themselves on the floor and kiss the earth of Taiwan. Both of them did. But I would do that only in two countries, certainly not in China.

E: But for me, if I use the Sunyatsenism ideas, these kind of question, I would say Sunyatsenism gives us the idea that we have to give our love to everyone. But why do we have to love the people on the other side of the strait? Is that the truth? Should I use it this way to do these kind of things? I’m just so curious about these kind of questions, they ask people to agree, this kind of ECFA, how do we have to sign ECFA cause we can gain a lot of profit and can comeback to be an economic power in Asia, and we won’t be replaced by other countries.

K: Well, ECFA is not without risk. But allegedly it comes with so many advantages and the government continues to emphasize that there is an escape clause, that means they can anytime quit. Of course that would then create a crisis, depending on how they do it. If they advance purely for economic reasons, everybody can see and count and understand. If it’s political reasons, if Chen Shui-bian would do it, I don’t believe it. The truth is, if one considers China and Taiwan as a whole, then China is divided. And Hong Kong is Hong Kong, Hong Kong is not real China. Otherwise, why do they have a special law? A special condition? Macau the same. So this whole which we call China, is simply not politically united, even if it’s culturally united, and even culturally there are differences. Both both sides have found that this compromise of 1992 is very convenient. It’s a wonderful compromise formula, and as long as all sides permit it, or adhere to it, admit to serve the peace. But as you know the anti-secession law says that war will be made against Taiwan not only if they declare their independence, but also if for a long time they refuse to discuss unification. So if I want to annoy those people, in
China I always say, “Look, who was the first one to issue principles of national reunification?” It was 李登輝. “And who put them out of thought? Invalidated them?” 陳水扁.

E: A really interesting issue.

K: But a dangerous issue. We just have to wait and see…

E: After ECFA?

K: Yes.

E: Let’s keep going on questions. Cause I’m really interested in the part of the ECFA, because I think that is really related to our daily life. I’m really interested in this part, that is why I’m asking you, because you are the expert.

K: But I would need more information on the ECFA, for example, is there a full text of ECFA available in Chinese?

E: No, not really, but parts. I think people in Taiwan don’t really know what ECFA is, it’s really strange that the government asks people to agree to this kind of agreement, while they don’t even publish a book or anything that is telling you what ECFA is, they do have an add, an advertisement on television telling you, “Wow, we are going to sign ECFA, we are going to import what what and export what what”, but they never said anything about FTA’s and other things included in ECFA, and that feels so strange. Since I started to look up some materials, some books, some journals, some other materials about ECFA, I thought that ECFA is not only a simple agreement about economics, but yeah it’s a weird thing. And another thing, I don’t know whether it is suitable to have a record of this part, because even I don’t know if it’s the government or scholars that, maybe from the government they do come to our school and talk about the ECFA, and how if we sign
ECFA Taiwan won’t be blah blah blah and it won’t be blah blah blah, and we should try it. And I said them to stop and I asked the question, I said, “Ok, if we sign the ECFA, we need them to pay the tax for other countries, but if they try to, but if our companies move out into other countries, and they also have no tax there, and they do have another, they don’t need them to pay so much as in Taiwan for labor, for factories, for example like that.” And they say, “No, you say it in the opposite way. All the companies that have already moved out of Taiwan they will come back to Taiwan and blah blah blah blah.” I was just so frightened, how could he say that? I don’t think that is a true thing, because we do import foreign laborers, and now in Taiwan there are people arbeitslos (workless).

K: Yes this is a danger, this is dangerous.

E: Yes but they said, “Oh no, they will come back since we do have cheap labor, we do have cheap materials from other countries, and we need them to pay the taxes. Blah blah blah. And Taiwan will have a great relation with other countries.”

K: I was listening to the dialogue between 馬英九 and 蔡英文, of course 馬英九 also said that we will feel some suffering in certain fields, but all in all it is advantageous. Now of course with this ‘all in all’ it is the question how it will effect the entire population, because the population is the master of politics. They will vote. And what happens if the 民進黨 gets a number of votes that before they did not get. I mean if you read for instance the public opinion polls, then the votes opposing ECFA, then the percentage is bigger than the percentage that voted for the 民進黨 as a political party, which means that a part of the 國民黨 people are against ECFA too. So now, in terms of opinion, it is 50-50.

E: But after the debate the people who support ECFA were more than the ones who don’t.
K: Ja, well, I think I would need more information on ECFA before I can say something definite. But one thing seems clear to me, it has the face of a “lure”, a bait for the fish, and that is apparent generosity of Beijing towards Taiwan. They want to have that, they want to have that ECFA, not for economic reasons. Economically they are so well of, they don’t need that. No. It’s just political. And ja, and one thing that really shocked me, I read in one newspaper that visitors from 大陸 came to a school, and then the school took down the Republic of China flags, removed the pictures of Sun Yat-sen.

E: Yes, that is true.

K: What mentality is that? Are they slaves?

E: I was studying in Wenzhou Ursuline College of Languages for my major German, and sometimes we do have some foreign students from other countries, and also we do have some students from China, and our teacher had already asked us to avoid to say something about, like for example, don’t use our flags, don’t talk about Sun Yat-sen, and also we do take off our presidents’ photos.

K: That is incredible. That is making oneself a slave before one becomes one.

E: It is so strange in Taiwan, for me I don’t feel good when teacher’s talk about this part.

K: That I can understand very well. No matter who the other side is, no matter which other country appears, and what is the impression of the Chinese. The Chinese might think, if we only wreck their appetite they don’t know.

E: My friend in Germany, he now exchanges by TU, and two weeks ago he went to Wimbledon for tennis, and the Taiwanese player called Lu Yen-
hsun played the tennis and he asked me to bring a flag of Taiwan, a flag for him, and I heard that he told me that later some Chinese from China asked him not to waive the flag.

K: Ok that the Chinese don’t want that that is understandable. Very simple they don’t want to admit there is a de-facto independent Taiwan, for the time being Taiwan is factually independent. And as a matter of fact, if you count, Taiwan has been ruled by the mainland in the last century, in the last 100 years only for 15 years. From 1945 to 1949 and then in the last years of the Empire, before the war with Japan. 15 years, so…

E: I’m really interested in this part.

K: Yeah I can see. Politics is the faith, politics is a faith making subject.

E: But that wasn’t my topic, my thesis today, but I love it.

K: Goethe used to say, “Politik, das ist der sixer” (not sure which German word he uses here 29: 49)

E: Yes. Ok let’s go on. I will wrote this part, something about ECFA, maybe a paragraph, something inside, because I will do a paragraph, maybe a chapter writing about your theory.

K: Let me think about it.

E: Maybe after I finish my thesis, maybe I can sent you a copy.

K: Yes of course, I would be delighted. Interested. Of course.

E: But in Chinese, not in German or English.

K: Naja…

E: Maybe someone can help you read it, or I can come here again I wish.

K: Oh yes, even also, even better.
E: Professor you have mentioned that you haven’t taken any China related courses in university right?

K: Except for the very first ones in the Oriental Institute of the University of Vienna. That’s very long ago, and it was primarily about the transition of old-China to New China, that was it. And also I was taking some private lessons from a Chinese doctor, this doctor Meng, who would teach me in Chinese. But that was all, there was nothing else to study really decently.

E: As a foreigner I think it is quite hard to get other, I mean the materials, books, videos, photos about something, about China in…

K: No, not really.

E: I thought it was hard?

K: The University of Chicago was so fantastic, and here also the Statsbibliothek, in Munchen, they have an audience section that is quite impressive. And then the Institute of Chinese Studies, the Sinological Institute, they bought many libraries, or no, not so many…

E: So you start to study about Sunyatsenism, I mean doing research on Sun Yat-sen since you graduated from university and then go to Chicago right?

K: No, since I was a high school boy. Yeah, I showed you those books. And I started to study intensively after World War II when I became a member of the Austrian-Chinese society and gave myself the assignment of making a lecture on Sun Yat-sen, and that was the moment at which I started to study that seriously, and I had my support literature on Sun Yat-sen, and also my teacher, as I told you, everyday I accompanied him for one hour, he liked to talk, he was telling me about what was the China he saw, he came there before the Boxer uprising and stayed close
to the Second World War. A very long time, 48 years. A pity he died so soon after my studies started, and there was nobody…

E: I believe that he is the person who really influenced you a lot about China.

K: Yes, well China is for me much more than just a study, a study object, a subject. There is this very strange attraction which I could not explain until now. Two things Chinese: Chinese culture and Confucian thought.

E: I believe that Chinese culture is fantastic for you.

K: Oh yes indeed.

E: Because in this room I can see your truth. So can you tell me the teacher’s name, the one who stayed in China for 48 years?

K: Benno Greiser. He was lecturer of Chinese at the University of Vienna.

E: Would you like to describe his China image?

K: Oh, he was passionately for Chinese, even too much sometimes. He often, if he was dissatisfied with something, he would say in China that is much much better. Once my mother overheard him, she was in the pharmacy, and he hadn’t seen her, and he was talking to the pharmacist, he was annoyed about something, and he was saying “Ah in China that is much much better and so and so.” Then the pharmacist got so angry at him he said, “Then why the hell don’t you go to China?” So my mother always remembered that, “Why the hell don’t you go to China?” Yeah but he described landscapes, he described mentalities, Chinese peacefulness, especially he stressed the lugginess by Chinese not to go and fight each other in the court but rather take a 中人 and to settle things peacefully and personally. He craved the Chinese, Taiwanese spirit, which is indeed until today very impressive. These sort of things. He also did an analysis in the Cold War that the Russians would win the
Cold War, I said in my opinion the Americans. In many of my predictions I was right. For instance I was sixteen years old when Hitler started the war with Russia, the Soviet Union. And a teacher of mine took me along to show me a lock gate, the ships go in and then the water rises and then they go out on the other side. And on the way he said, “What do you think about the war with Russia?” I said to him, “Now the war is lost.” He said, “How dare you say that? They will kill your entire family, shut up, don’t say anything, but before you shut up tell me why you would say that?” Then I said to him “Not even Napoleon, who was a military genius, was able to defeat simultaneously the biggest land power Russia and the biggest sea power Great Britain. Hitler is not even a genius, and now he makes war against Russia and Great Britain, and that he will not win. In order to win it is necessary to rule the sea, but the German navy is too weak to do that.” I was sixteen years, but then I told you, history was my favorite subject and I read much much much more about history than the teachers told us to do.

E: So are there any examples that you have talked to your teacher about something about China that really interested you or attracted you and then you always remembered?

K: Yes, I asked him about Sun Yat-sen. And he said, “The thing about him was that whenever he spoke, he had a way to be so convincing, that when you left him you were sure he must be right. He had something special in dealing with people.”

E: Like charisma?

K: That is charisma, yes definitely that is charisma, in a Max Weber sense.

E: Ah you had a teaching in 政治 university (NCCU) about this part.

K: Yes yes yes.
E: I read it.

K: Oh my.

E: You first described what is charisma, and the you described in what kind of way Sunyatsenism is charisma.

K: Yes right, you are a hardworking lady.

E: No just a coincidence.

K: No no no I don’t think that.

E: Yeah I am also really interested in this part that you mention, that Dr. Sun Yat-sen is a really, a person who is really charismatic, and that really attracted other people to believe in him, cause I think both you and me haven’t had a chance to change to me about Dr. Sun Yat-sen, but you do think about Sun Yat-sen as this kind of people.

K: Yes, what I admire greatly is that he suffered so many defeats, he suffered so many setbacks, and never he was really discouraged, he always got on his feet again, because of the strength of his beliefs, to have a mission for China. We have also one man in Austria who is in the same category, to be so convinced that he has a mission to do that and that and that for his own country, and the ability to convey this feeling of mission to other people, so that they believe in your leadership.

E: I tried to read some easier books that describe about Sun Yat-sen, I believe that he is a person who really dared to challenge everything.

K: Yes and he was very prophetic in many things, for instance in his last speeches in Japan, the last public speeches of his life, he says he would imagine a union between Japan and China to free the suppressed nations. All of Southeast Asia, for instance, was ruled by racist colonialist regimes, and he wanted China to liberate those countries, once China
became strong. And he also included amongst the suppressed nations Germany. He had that special liking for Germany, he quoted Bismarck more often than many other famous people, because Bismarck was able to unite a Germany that was split in many different states, and also because of his social legislation. Because the communists claim that social traditions must become worse and worse and worse, but Sun Yat-sen said no, that has been changing. And what would he have said to know about the German system of social free market economy, he said “Yes! That’s actually what I imagined.” Yes and he said in this phase in Japan, there are two ways, either to cooperate with China or to make war with China, but then that war Japan will not be able to win, it will destroy itself. And China was the key issue of the Pacific War. In the last round of the negotiations between the Americans and the Japanese the Americans demanded that Japan without any compensation go out of China, where they had waged war successfully for three and a half years. Of course everyone knew the Japanese could not accept this, and would not accept this, and not one of the ministers of Roosevelt believed the Japanese could or would accept that. But Sun Yat-sen was right, Japan could not defeat China, although it though it could. It was able to win so many battles, but it wasn’t able to win the war, and the war was this decisive thing. On the other side the Japanese saved the 共產黨. One of the key interests of mine is the Chinese Civil War, 共產黨 against 國民黨 and also the fantastic ideas of Lenin, you see he was always talking about a world revolution and when it happened then everybody would be free, but then it didn’t happen. The hope for Germany was great, he was a great admirer of Germany, nothing happened, a few Communist uprisings here and there, but that was it. In France and England, North America, Japan, nowhere. So his fellow communists asked him, “Comrad Lenin what happened to that world revolution of you?” But he gave a marvelous answer, he said “Look, I can explain it to
you, those industrial capitalist powers have colonies, and from the colonies by exploitation they get super profits to bribe their own labor force. In the moment when they lose the colonies, they can no longer bribe the labor force, the proletariat will be really poor, and then we will have the world revolution, and that means, the road to Paris goes by a picking at Calcutta. It means; the proletarian revolution can win only if it is supported by the anti-colonial movement in Asia and Africa. And then he found in the biggest country of Asia, China, Sun Yat-sen. That’s how the 共產黨 get to contact, on Moscow’s order, the 共產黨. They were not happy. Chen Duxiu and Li Dazhao were not happy about the command by Moscow. You must support the 國民黨, your leaders must even become members of the 國民黨. Zhou Enlai did, Mao Zedong did and so on. But they also got the secret order from Moscow, think of one thing, you always have to consider that your ally today, 國民黨, will be the enemy of tomorrow, so by cooperating with them, try to split them, try to get their members away into your party, and then see to it that you get the leadership of the Chinese revolution. And Chiang Kai-shek was one of the very very few to see so clearly, very clearly, therefore my opinion was that it was one of the most important deeds of his entire life. By the way, since you are so interested in history, a short while ago a book has been published which we have been waiting for a long long long time, for decades, the first scientific biography of Chiang Kai-shek. By a certain Jay Taylor, and the author was permitted by Stanford it seems to use Chiang Kai-shek’s secret diaries.

E: Ah I know that one I think.

K: Such a thing, a very big book, the name of the book is The Generalissimo. I bought it in Taiwan in this book shop in the 101, I discovered it there. They are better than Eslite, although Eslite is quite nice, they have a coffee shop there.
E: I really enjoy this part of history, it is really interesting.

K: Oh yes indeed.

E: A lot of things came together and they changed a lot of histories.

K: Ja history is absolutely fascinating, if you are in it.

E: I read the journal that you wrote, called *Sun Yat-sen and Germany* or *Germany and Sun Yat-sen*. You mention a part that Sun Yat-sen’s personality is really interesting. I read a part where he talked with a general from America I think, and he mentioned why China had to join the war.

K: Yes yes yes.

E: That part is really really interesting.

K: Yes. He wrote also a book about China in World War One, in which this thesis has been expanded. Which, I forgot the name, I can show you another time.

E: But it is still so good to have this part here. It is really good to know about this part.

K: Oh yes, I find sometimes if I talk to Chinese historians, about certain parts of Chinese history I know more than them. I don’t know why. For instance Yang Xuekun (not certain about his name) who was the president of the diplomatic academy, he sent scholars to Africa, I said that... somehow in a conversation it came up that, as we were discussing before that the troops of the Republic of China were occupying North Vietnam. He said never, never heard of it. Embarrassing. One man who knew a lot of history was Zhou Shoukan (not sure about the name) he suffered a lot from the Americans, and he was ambassador to the Vatican, and there he suffered from the long-lasting religious ceremonies. He’s
not a Catholic, he’s not a Christian, so these religious ceremonies at the Vatican really took some patience.

E: I think professor your Chinese study category is really huge.

K: No.

E: No I think it is huge.

K: No no no no, but it is an unending story. And very interesting, after the death of Mao Zedong, the interest in Mao Zedong has stopped. The last big thing was this book by Jon Halliday, you must read it, I think it is translated into Chinese, otherwise in English. You can also get it in German. Really frightening. I didn’t know that at one occasion, in one conversation Mao Zedong said that “The Emperor of Qin has buried 325 Confucian scholars alive, there we have done better.” I thought it was just a way of talking, until from that book I learned that he had thousands of people buried alive. Oriana Fallaci, a journalist, an Italian journalist, a very daring woman, she asked Deng Xiaoping “Why didn’t you and intelligent people like Zhou Enlai stop Mao Zedong from doing many evil things?” “It was impossible to contradict him, he was creating such an atmosphere of fear, nobody could do anything.”

E: Another question, I don’t understand why people accept communism in China instead of Sunyatsenism.

K: Yes of course, you have to see the development. After the war China was in a very bad situation. The Japanese had done the work of the 共產黨, crushing so many achievements of the KMT period. Creating in a very poor country, even much bigger misery. Misery being the soil of revolution. So China was in a very bad situation after the war. And then the KMT committed severe mistakes. Financially, the currency reform was a catastrophe, and strategic mistakes. One thing was they took to Manchuria before they had secured the access to Manchuria, so the
communists cut them off, destroyed them, took Manchuria, and then came down. The Americans warned Chiang Kai-shek against this, but he insisted, because he said that Manchuria was the first country that I loved, we lost it with Japan, and we lost it by Russian occupation, now we don’t want to lose it by communist rule, therefore we must have Manchuria.

E: You mentioned this part in *Germany and Sun Yat-sen*, maybe in page 8 or 7 or something.

K: Oh, you have a memory, frightening, but fantastic.

E: I also have to study more in order to complete this project better, I don’t want my teacher to think that I am a lazy student.

K: No, I admire you, really. Well, there had not been, not in the Russian Revolution or in the French Revolution, a popular uprising, nowhere, because one army crossing down further and further and further than another army, which then disintegrated and demoralized because they lost so many battles. It has nothing to do with ideas, you cannot use ideas to fight tanks. Yeah ideas can encourage you to do something that can be done, but this cannot be done, you can die a hero. Besides, for stupid people, as we have said, and its true, back to Mao’s writings, I think in every one of his later writings it was Sun Yat-sen as justifying what he’s doing. … (name unclear) is not an expert on that.

E: I’m just curious why people accept communism and they won’t come up and fight for another maybe ideology?

K: Well, as a matter of fact, communism, at least the old communism gave a big perspective. Karl Marx said, “Ok, mankind is structured like a pyramid. The lowest bottom of the pyramid is the proletariat. If they proletariat rises to the top of the pyramid, then everybody is equal, If everybody is equal then they are free, and then they will be the big
brotherhood, and that can be achieved however only by class war. However, our consolation is that is the last war.” Therefore in the hymn of the communist international resist: “Auf, zum letzten Gefecht! Die Internationale erkämpft das Menschenrecht.” And that means, the big change of mankind is around the corner, you just have to support the communist movement. They are the ones who have understood history, the Marxists. They are the ones who say that they can make history as they want, so they are the ones who are thinking the importance of ideas. We know what comes, and it is the proletariat because this is destined. History walks to the end line, it is not the bourgeoisie, but the proletariat, and therefore the proletariat is destined to save mankind. But, it has enemies and they have to be crushed, and so we have to sacrifice ourselves for the good cause. And then nations will no longer consider each other as enemies. In the communist manifesto it says, nationalism will die, what for? What will be the new cooperation? The new cooperation will be the class cooperation. The proletarians of one nation will be, the bourgeois of one nation will cooperate with each other. Nonsense, even today. The European Union is prevented by nationalism. And the Chinese, instead of communism are now agitating nationalists, we are so great, again.

E: It’s strange that people always believe that kind of ideology.

K: Ja, it seems they need more than just eat and sleep and work. They need some sense in their lives, at least within the people, and then they are maybe willing to sacrifice themselves for this cause, for this higher cause.

E: But I think in reality in China, I think maybe perhaps a lot of people believed that communism was going help them, but they didn’t have another ideology in their mind. I think, in my opinion. Because I watched some kind of movies that show the daily lives of people who
live in China. In the morning they sing a song for Mao Zedong, but they do totally different things, which didn’t follow the rules of communism, they just capitalized the cities.

K: Materialism, it is simple as direct materialism, it says “we live for getting better”. Getting richer. That can be done only by money. So the value of persons and of situations is measured in terms of money. And all the other things…whatever, are for idealists.

E: So in your personal mind China changed a lot since you started to know about China.

K: Oh yes of course, China has changed a lot. From the empire to the republic. From the first republic, anarchic republic to the Nationalist Chinese Republic, to the Communist People’s Republic, although people have no place in this destiny. From the revolution by the peasants for their promised land to the point where they were deprived of all land. From the terrors of the Cultural Revolution to the new pragmatism of Deng Xiaoping. To seek the truth and the facts no longer in the ideas. As Su Shaoqi said recently.

E: So do you think that China changed in a better way or?

K: Well compared to Maoism certainly in a better way, my god. Of course.

E: Except for Mao’s period, how do you think about China’s change?

K: You mean from the old China to new China?

E: Yes, after the 70’s.

K: Yes after the 70’s the communists were reasonable enough to understand the law of economics. No longer Marxism. They began to see, yes Marx, he was right, a hundred years ago, but now hundred years have passed. Things are changing, and so we have to change and besides Deng
Xiaoping has said that it doesn’t matter if some get rich earlier then other ones. That was opening the doors to capitalism. But at the same time they are bloody intolerant towards the students. Students, everybody with children knows they are idealist creatures mostly. They just would have to stop the water supply for a few days and they would have surrendered without people dying. No, they intentionally, they have a Chinese saying, “to kill the chicken to frighten the monkey”, that was it.

E: So until now it is the same situation for you?

K: No no, now it’s a new situation, now materially China is much better of, that means, 300 million. And it is far more open, but in the question of political power, they know that opposition and revolution starts from small roots, so you must watch for the smallest crack in the wall of political power, then you have to do something, otherwise it will eat you up. And they have 60 million of party members, these are privileged human beings in a big society, they are watchdogs, voluntary watchdogs, and once political power is lost to a central power it is very difficult to get that power back. In Germany there have been forty attempts to kill Hitler, but they did not succeed. In China also, if even Deng Xiaoping says “If Mao looks at me I’m afraid to speak”, what do you expect? It is clever. If there is no law to protect you, no judge to protect you, if each organization that wants to be independent is suppressed and forbidden then you are helpless. Already Aristotle gives this very very very intelligent description of different types of government and why one type of government changes into another, it says, the method of the parent of a dictator is to make each person in society isolated. Isolated from friends, isolated from associations, so they can be ruled by a central power. Therefore they are against anything that wants to have an independent organization. Therefore the suppression of the 法輪功, as I
said it is a harmless organization, only they became political after they were suppressed, because now they protest against their oppression, unnecessary.

E: So any chance for China to maybe get democratization?

K: Maybe not. This theory that economic progress automatically leads to democracy is false. Look at Germany, the Third Reich, look at fascist Italy, look at militarist Japan, look at Indonesia in the time of Suharto, look at South Korea, the meteoric take-off phase was during the autocratic rule of Park Chung-hee. There is no automatic connection between material progress and democracy, especially in a country that has no democratic tradition. When I’m asked by my students what are the big differences between Europe and China, I say, “Well, there are two things. The Chinese never had a rule of law, and in our continent, which combines the republic consciousness of people with law, in German it is rechtbewustsein, and that is based on Roman law, which gives rights not only to the people above against the people below, but also to people below to protect themselves against everyone else above them. And the second thing is, that all our philosophical thought is based upon classical Greek philosophy, which has developed all the forms of modern philosophy already at that time, and especially by combining philosophy with mathematics. Mathematics led to science, which led to technology. While Chinese philosophy, thinking, focuses on human relations. That makes a big difference. For instance, all the modern inventions, from the steam engine to the radio, to tv, to the locomotive, to the hairdryer, everything was invented in the West, nothing was invented in India or China, not even in Japan. The Japanese have greatly improved cars and certain technical gadgets, but they didn’t invent them. And I believe that that is connected with the rooting of our thought in Greek philosophy. I may be wrong, but I didn’t find a better explanation.
And what shock me about China, Chinese society today is this almost depressing imitationism, everything is imitated to the detail, everything. For instance, if people graduate, they will throw up their caps, or the way a conductor of an orchestra dresses, or the way the military is marching, or the military salute, unnecessary, but everything is taken from the West. Some Western Russian or American patterns, why? Or the music, awful enough. And there’s still in China a kind of colonial feeling towards the west, although outwardly they are very proud, but even so, they are not realizing that they take over so much.

E: Is this normal for Chinese or the whole Asia that everyone seems to become a copycat of Western?

K: Yeah, look at India, India is the worst. And the most ridiculous is Africa, if you see a court in Africa, and because the British had this white wigs for the dresses and the members of the jury and so on, those black negroes put on white wigs. In England it has historical reasons, in Africa it has no reason whatsoever. It is just so ridiculous, to see those white faces behind those cheap white wigs.

E: But I don’t know, in China at least, because I got a good friend from Shanghai, and she told me that it is very normal to use western things here in China, they didn’t even use the original things from China, they use a lot of import stuff and they don’t, they like to, I don’t know is that a kind of worship of western?

K: Very strange, it has become a kind of fashion to do that, and there’s nothing else. There’s nothing else. No invention of any own stuff. No own creativity, and that is so sad. Formerly such a rich, splendid, glorious culture, and now that.

E: I believe that professor believes that the Chinese own culture is the most beautiful culture that China owns?
K: Yeah of course, the rest is imitated from the west. Capably imitated, and the Japanese have improved certain machinery, yes, definitely, some very good cars, some of their cars are better than European cars, maybe the Chinese will achieve that also, but they are overwhelmed by the west. And so it is a new type of spiritual colonialism that continues to exist.

E: Maybe in the Chinese idea we think that something from the west maybe makes us more stronger.

K: Oh yes, very definitely. The original idea was, why are those damn westerners so strong? Answer: they have better cannons, they have better ships, we have to learn how to build the same kind of cannon, we have to build the same type of ship. And Sun Yat-sen in 三民主義 he wrote, if you remember I’m sure, China would be very quick to develop because they would not have to go long slow way from invention to invention, from improvement to improvement, but they take over the latest, the newest, so they save themselves the long way that the westerners have come up with their industry. An interesting thought.

E: Another question, cause I am studying about strategy, and in Taiwan we bought a lot of, I don’t know if it is a suitable question for you, but in Taiwan we bought a lot of weapons from America. And some of our officials ask our government “Why don’t we just built our own missiles, our own tanks, our own submarines? Just do it by ourselves, why do we have to pay the double amount of money to buy the weapons from America or from France?”

K: It is a very very good question. There’s the Zhongshan Institute, and the Zhongshan Institute specializes on the development of modern weapon types in Taiwan. But even so, maybe their total equipment is not yet developed to the point where they can produce state of the art weapons, ships, planes, and so on, but they would very much like to. And the
Americans are in a dilemma, on the one side they want to sell, for economic reasons, stuff to Taiwan, secondly for strategic reasons they don’t want Taiwan to be in the hands of the Communists. But on the other side they don’t dare to sell them the most effective stuff, which Taiwan would need if faced with the superiority of the communists. And besides, those rockets have the intention, if war occurs, to cripple Taiwan in one blow. And for that Taiwan needs a counter-strike force, for instance to blow up the Yangtze dams or something like that, because they are so small they have to do something dramatic.

E: Because Taiwan has recently self-developed a new kind of missile, and that made the weapon company in America so nervous.

K: I see, that’s good!

E: And they immediately answered: “Well we want to sell you that and that missile!” Yeah, immediately when they found out that Taiwan had its own power to do something.

K: Of course no money, besides those military transactions are committed by so much corruption. I mean actually a soldier has his own ethics, he should fight and prepare to fight for a struggle, and not in order to make big big secret pocket money by selling or buying arms. That is actually a scandal and a shame for the military class.

E: Yes, last month or two months ago we do have the same scandal as what happened to Lafayette.

K: No that is a shame. And some people really exploit that to the extreme, they should be punished.

E: It is something that happened in Taiwan, I think it is really similar from China, but in a different way. Taiwan is buying a lot of weapons and something from America, and China maybe they try to renew everything
instead. They import a lot of weapon things inside of their own culture.

K: They blackmail foreign firms into giving them the plans, the technical plans for their products. Not only the product plans, but also the message of making them, that is also a kind of blackmailing.

E: So this is the good way for department or it is?

K: It is very difficult to fight corruption, and the communist leaders, from time to time corruption is so bad that they mention it, they need to fight corruption. To say that is one thing, to do is another. For instance the children of presidents and high officials, they all sit with each other, because they are accustomed to go to a bank and say for example “I need a loan of how much”, you know who my father is. One South Korean president had to jump out of the window for that (actually he jumped from a mountain cliff), Roh Moo-hyun, because his family was corrupt. And also Kim Dae-jung, although he is a peace Nobel prize winner, his family also corrupt. And Chen Shui-bian, in the election campaign he appeared as a poor little guy who fought his way up, a decent guy, and then…I don’t know why, are they afraid for their age? Actually they get a very good salary, and probably they should get a good pension too I imagine, so why do they want an addition to corrupt this money? And that always goes through family channels. The big corruption cases in the Far East for a big percentage are family cases.

E: This part is very similar in Taiwan and China.

K: Yes unfortunately that is true.

E: I believe that this is a serious problem in these two countries.

K: Yes, but at least corruption is done secretly. One friend of mine, from Persia, told me how corruption is done in his country, if you are a citizen and you want something from the government, imagine if you want to
have a license to open up a shop, you go to the ministry or to the office and there’s an official, he sits behind a big desk, a very big desk. He sits on the other side, you sit here, and underneath there is a drawer that can be pushed in this direction, and can be pushed in this direction. So the official would ask you to say what you want, you say that and that and that, in the meantime the official would push the drawer in your direction, you put some money in, he pulls it in his direction, looks at it and then says “Naja, for 50% we have agreed”. So for instance in one occasion the police wanted, in Teheran, to arrest his father. His father said to the policemen: “Are you nuts? You want to arrest me, such a religious man? Don’t you know what the prophet Mohammed has said? You should give to the poor. Don’t you remember how much I give to the poor? Ah you don’t believe me or don’t know me? Here, take the money and take it to the poor for me, in the name of Allah!”

E: Unbelievable.

K: Oh there’s so many ways to corrupt. But I thought that that was very cute.

E: So are there any other sides of China you have seen in these years?

K: Well my favorite city is Nanjing, because of the many trees in the streets, which means there is shadow, and because in the KMT period they made very interesting experiments with combinations of Chinese and western architecture. That was really something, it looks very good. Cause these big buildings, that formerly used to be ministries, big public offices, and then of course the gravesite of Sun Yat-sen, the Mausoleum, very beautiful, built in the purple mountains, that is so well-done. And the city is not too big, not too small, only the climate is murderous. It is very very hot in summer and it is very very cold in winter, but otherwise it is a lovely city.
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