

# 革命的幽靈： 兩個「反激進主義」觀點

陳宜中

中央研究院人文社會科學研究中心副研究員

本文探究當代大陸思想界的兩個「反激進主義」觀點，及其背後「漸進實現憲政民主」的問題意識。李澤厚從告別革命的出發點，通過對辛亥革命、政治激進主義、激進主義思潮的批評，以強化「革命有害無利」、「漸進道路可能成功」等政治見解。袁偉時則從思想啓蒙的視野，結合自由民主與聯邦共和理念，通過對孫中山的「革命幼稚病」、政治激進主義的批評，以肯認中國「需要思想觀念的徹底變革」、「應實現自由民主與聯邦共和」等主張。本文視李、袁的政治言說為當代大陸反激進主義思潮的兩個重要案例，並對其進行思想性的探討。本文分析指出：李、袁皆採取借古諷今、以史載道的言說策略，皆把歷史上的「漸進失敗」主要歸因於、並歸咎於「政治激進主義」。實則，李、袁的政治言說皆立基於中國當下，且各有其獨特的政治關懷。李澤厚認為六四後中國的最大危險，來自於可能導致革命的政治激進主義；袁偉時則把政治激進主義界定成一種反自由、反民主、反法治、主張黨國集權的意識型態。本文並從「漸進實現憲政民主」的視角指出：李、袁之極度強調「反激進」、「反革命」，帶來了一些值得商榷的言說效果。特別是，革命思想被凸顯為「漸進失敗」的最主要因素，甚至單一因素；其他制約漸進道路的政治社會因素，則未能得到同等的重視。

關鍵字：革命、政治激進主義、憲政、民主、聯邦制

## Specters of Revolution: Two “Counter-Radical” Perspectives

I-chung Chen

Associate Research Fellow

Research Center for Humanities and Social Sciences, Academia Sinica

### ABSTRACT

This paper examines two influential “counter-radical” perspectives on modern Chinese politics and history, especially in relation to Sun Yat-Sen and the Revolution of 1911. One version regards the Revolution of 1911 as a political mistake made by Sun and his followers. According to this view, what caused the Revolution had been, above all else, Sun’s “political radicalism,” which obstructed the “constitutional monarchy” alternative that would presumably be superior to a revolutionary break. The other version, focusing on what immediately followed the Revolution, has it that Sun’s addiction to endless revolution, an infantile disorder, was chiefly responsible for the failure of post-revolutionary constitutionalism and parliamentary politics, as well as for the dissolution of the devolutionary federalist movement of the 1920s. This paper argues that both “counter-radical” perspectives are at best partial. In ascribing to “political radicalism” too much causal weight that is dubious, both versions tend to sidestep important questions pertaining to political sociology, while overestimating the powers stemming from “radical thought.” Furthermore, as a negation of political radicalism, both fail to grasp that under certain circumstances even the seemingly rather mild scenario of “gradual realization of constitutional democracy” could itself be condemned as politically radical. This implies that the very dramatic opposition between “political radicalism” and “democratic gradualism,” as evident in both versions, is largely unsustainable. Thus, both are found to be wanting as an account of politics and insofar as the democratic future of China is concerned.

Key Words: revolution, political radicalism, constitutionalism, democracy, federalism