

The Criticism of Western Paradigm and the Double Transcendence of the Community of Shared Future for Mankind

Bingxin Zhang^{1, a}

¹School of Marxism, Shandong Normal University, Ji'nan 250358, China.

^azbxsdnu@163.com

Abstract

The congenital defects of the Western paradigm keeps itself trapped in the contradiction between ideals and reality for a long time, and also makes its perception of the world often fall into the trap of zero-sum logic. Its nature is instrumental and selfish. The West's vacillation in its understanding of whether China's rise is a threat or an opportunity reflects the pale side of its "autobiographical" discourse system. The community with a shared future for mankind is a new oriental paradigm with an inclusive core. It has surpassed the sociological basis and value basis of the Western paradigm, and is a new paradigm worthy of the international community's expectations.

Keywords

Western Paradigm; Community with a Shared Future for Mankind; Transcendence.

1. Exordium

The world is being held by a rusty chain, which is being tightened by the hands of the old world. Today, no matter where people are born, what their beliefs are, or whether they are willing or not, they are actually in a community of shared destiny, and sharing a common destiny with breathing has more practical connotations. The birth of a global value aimed at meeting the common challenges of mankind has become inevitable, the transcendence of the traditional Western narrative paradigm has become inevitable, and the replacement of zero-sum game with mutual benefit and win-win has become inevitable.

2. The Lost of the Western Paradigm

Since the establishment of the capitalist world economic system, the world's right to speak has been monopolized by the West for a long time. Hundreds of years have passed, the old chains have been rusty and crumbling. The narrators are polite and still believe in Thucydides, but ignore the fact that they are the troublemakers of the world. The chaos in the Middle East, the crisis in Northeast Asia, and the intensification of contradictions across the Taiwan Strait show that: The traditional Western narrative paradigm has become a wrapper for neo-interventionism and hegemonism. The globalization constructed by Western countries has not realized the so-called fairness and justice. Its essence is to realize and guarantee its own "unequal export" to the outside world and even implement neocolonialism. The rising China has adapted to Western rules, and is actively using these rules to break the interest chain of the West parasitic in globalization. The West is also feeling uncomfortable with its own rules. China's growing foreign exchange reserves and long-term trade surplus make some Western countries feel uncomfortable, and the strong momentum of the socialist market economy makes them envy and hate. In March 2018, China's crude oil futures were listed on the market, and the internationalization of the RMB based on the "Belt and Road Initiative" accelerated, which made the West increasingly uneasy and anxious.

The in-depth development of globalization tends to be complete. People living on the blue planet are getting closer and closer, and are moving closer to an integrated collection. The new requirements for coordinated handling of international relations among countries have challenged the instrumental and selfish nature of the Western paradigm. Whether it is the Thucydides trap, the Huntington civilization conflict, or the realist “game theory”, the words used to describe barbarism can only give birth to more barbarians. The essence of “civilization conflict” is “uncivilized conflict”. The pursuit of power and desire dominates the thinking and actions of the West. They often initiate “clash of civilizations” and they are convinced that a rising China is bound to challenge or even replace their current international status. It is precisely because of this that the paradigm of a community of shared future for mankind is a lie in their eyes—it is no different from the lie of freedom and democracy that they have woven themselves.

Some people want to view flowers and regard flowers as good and evil. Some people want to use grass and use grass as good and evil. Regardless of “threat”, “opportunity” or “collapse”, the Western discourse system for China is overflowing with “autobiographical” narcissism and self-pity, which is based on self-need judgment. In the West, the “rise of China” is more like an emotional object than an objective existence. The deep-rooted desire in the collective subconscious mind of the West allows the West to dig itself into conflict traps. Regarding the rise of China, the West is not sure whether “desire” can be satisfied from a powerful China, which makes it psychologically trapped in the entanglement of “threat theory” and “opportunity theory”. In the West, whether it is liberalism or realism, they have the same strong exclusivity as religious fundamentalism. They have no intention to compromise with the existing world. Facing the “uncertain” world, they are more inclined (like devout believers). Use “conflict” to eliminate imaginary opponents and the unknown world, so as to calm the inner fear. We can perceive that the anxious West has taken “home country first” as a criterion for self-protection. It is also a description of the world. A community with a shared future for mankind—a development path that is in harmony with the world—a path of proactive, cooperative and win-win results—trying to avoid repeating historical mistakes, in contrast to the passiveness and pale hypocrisy of the Western model Highlighted.

3. The Community of Shared Future for Mankind Transcends the Sociological Basis of the Western Paradigm

Big industry unveiled a new look in human history, “because it makes the satisfaction of the needs of every civilized country and everyone in these countries dependent on the entire world, because it eliminates the isolation of countries that have formed naturally in the past” [1], western sociologists are increasingly interested in the study of a worldwide community. However, sociologists who cannot escape the influence of capital are trapped in the logical trap of “either or the other”—there is only one left of human community and individual freedom—even the later Spencer, Durkheim and Tennis could not get rid of this shackle—no matter which kind of community they propose, it is a false community because it is only the essence of the will to satisfy some human needs. Neither “European Ideas”, “Islamism”, or “U.S. leadership of the world” can change the essence of egoism that satisfies their own desire for power. Therefore, the old international social order itself has become controlled by a few countries. Self-interest needs as a tool of defense, and its prominent Western-centrism is rejected by the international community. Unlike the “zero-sum” paradigm of winner-take-all, The Community with a Shared Future for Mankind advocates multilateral cooperation and a global governance action plan that replaces confrontation with dialogue, providing a new paradigm for the construction of human society in the future. The community with a shared future for mankind takes cooperation and win-win as its core. It advocates equality and respect in politics, mutual benefit

in economy, harmony in culture, and seeks the greatest common divisor in international rules [2]. Its unique inclusiveness and Strong tolerance provides people of different countries, different ethnic groups, different religions, and different races with a more credible and new paradigm.

4. The Community of Shared Future for Mankind Transcends the Value Foundation of the Western Paradigm

In the mid-nineteenth century, the sobriety of human consciousness caused God's hands to tremble. I don't know when, the West actually abandoned its belief in "heaven" and believed in the "rules of the jungle" of its society. When the lies of "heaven" and the reality of "jungle" made the ruled people suffer, the West weaves a new lie: "universal value"-the "common value" used to occupy the moral high ground. The essence of "universal value" is to confuse the universality of value with universalism. It "absoluteizes value, completely separates the universality from particularity and individuality of value, and only uses a certain value as the only Standards are imposed on others" [3], so the cunning West will be regarded as the absolute unique value of mankind as the "freedom, democracy, and equality" under the cloak of capital, and under its cover, the reality of hegemonism-this is "non-common values". More and more countries, regions and their people in the world have awakened from the false "freedom, democracy, and human rights" poison: a West whose internal strata division is increasing cannot give the world a true and reliable value paradigm. The community with a shared future for mankind honestly and sincerely proposed a new "common value" for the world. In terms of power concept, it emphasizes that the in-depth development of globalization has made the interdependence between countries closer. No country can be alone. To realize its own rights and interests, it must maintain the existing international order (multilateral open)-the most effective and stable The power balance mechanism of the United States, replaces confrontation with dialogue, and replaces conflict with negotiation, resolutely oppose hegemonism, and jointly safeguard world peace. In terms of the concept of interests, it advocates mutual benefit and win-win results, and advocates that any country must also allow others to develop in order to achieve development. If countries want to achieve their own sustainable development, they must integrate into the global family with a more inclusive and open attitude. In terms of civilization, it encourages exchanges and mutual learning among different civilizations in the world, and safeguards the diversity of world civilizations, and countries should make their due contributions to the prosperity of world civilization with a more confident and tolerant attitude. In terms of security, it abandons "expansionism" and "isolationism", advocates common, comprehensive, cooperative, and sustainable, advocates that all countries in the world increase mutual trust, bridge differences, and deepen cooperation, and are committed to creating a joint construction, sharing, and win-win situation. In terms of sustainable development, it opposes various forms of protectionism, advocates the settlement of economic problems through consultation, and advocates participating in global environmental protection with a more responsible attitude. In terms of global governance, it advocates co-construction and sharing, and seeks to strengthen international norms and international mechanisms to build a multilateral "global mechanism" that is more institutionally binding and ethical.

5. Conclusion

After the second world war, the West was even more convinced that if a powerful country wants to rise, it must challenge the existing powers and eventually lead to the outbreak of war. This is still a zero-sum mentality. From the perspective of the core of the community with a shared future for mankind, "it is no longer to conform to the globalization situation that a few developed countries in the West is committed to maintaining, nor is it to seek the selfishness of

a single country, but to protect the hegemonic world. Kind of challenge or transcendence” [4]. Take China as an example. Its rise is not to seek hegemony, but to oppose hegemony. Regardless of whether China's rise is “threatening” or “uncertain”, after all, it is an insinuation of the fearful emotions lingering in the deep valley of the Western “clash of civilizations”. President Xi Jinping emphasized on many occasions that China has always been a builder of world peace and firmly pursues the path of peaceful development. China has always insisted on the same words and deeds. China's rise is undoubtedly a peaceful rise, and China's rise is undoubtedly a peaceful China. Generally speaking, the community with a shared future for mankind presents a new value that correctly treats rights, obligations, behaviors, and responsibilities in international politics. Its openness and universality are against hidden hegemonism, exclusivity, protectionism, and The essential transcendence of various “non-universal” Western value paradigms such as isolationism and regionalism.

References

- [1] Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Volume 1, (People's Publishing House, China 2012), p.194.
- [2] Fajun Shao:Xi Jinping's thought of "human destiny community" and Its Contemporary Value, (2017) No.4,p.1-8.
- [3] Ke Chen, Dan Zhou: Criticism of “Universal Value” and the Cohesion of Socialist Value Consensus, Marxist Studies,(2017)No.6,p.140-146.
- [4] Peiren Shao, Yongyu Xu: The historical transcendence and practical tension of the idea of a community with a shared future for mankind: From the perspective of new cosmopolitan analysis, China Publishing, (2018) No1.p.5-9.