

Building a Community with a Shared Future for Humanity: Promoting the Resolution of Economic Justice Issues in the International Context

Bao Chen^{1,a,*}, Xinyu Sun^{1,b}

¹*Marxism College, Shanghai University of Political Science and Law, 7989 Waiqingsong Road,
Qingpu District, Shanghai, China*

a. cb612@sina.com, b. candice4325@sina.com

**corresponding author*

Abstract: Achieving economic justice remains a persistent value goal for humanity. Economic justice manifests itself in the disparities between individuals and has become a universal social concern. This implies that, from the perspective of the relationship between individuals and communities, we can examine and analyze the fundamental causes of economic justice and find contemporary approaches to addressing economic justice issues through the correct handling of the historical development path of the relationship between communities and individuals. The commitment to building a community with a shared future for humanity in the international community is a great innovation of the socialist ideology with Chinese characteristics in the new era. It aims to realize the common values of humanity in the new international governance structure. From the principles of consultation, joint construction, and shared benefits, the core issue of justice should be economic justice. Managing the relationship between the community with a shared future for humanity and various countries and regions is conducive to promoting the resolution of economic justice issues on the international stage.

Keywords: Community, Individual, Economic Justice, Labor-Capital Relations, Community with a Shared Future for Humanity

1. Introduction

Against the backdrop of contemporary manifestations in productivity, scientific and technological advancements, and social development, people continue to question the roots of issues such as “poverty resembling the mice in a church.” This signifies that achieving economic justice remains an enduring value goal for humanity. The analysis of the roots of economic justice issues—or, in other words, questioning the origins of modernity—is often based on the socio-economic and political operational modes, as well as organizational forms. Economic justice emerges from the disparities between individuals and becomes a pervasive issue in society. From the perspective of the relationship between individuals and communities, it is possible to examine and analyze the fundamental causes of economic justice and, by correctly addressing the historical development path of the relationship between communities and individuals, discover contemporary approaches to resolving economic justice issues. Viewing individuals’ inherent social nature, individuals are

inherently fused and inseparable from the community. However, the relationship between individuals and the community is not in a state of eternal stasis; instead, it undergoes historical changes, resulting in the development of economic justice issues from non-existence to existence. This paper aims to explore the relationship between the community with a shared future for humanity and individuals in the context of economic justice, with a focus on the generation and resolution path of economic justice.

2. Historical Examination of Economic Justice Issues

The existence and development of individuals first manifest as the material needs of organic life and social progress, which must be fulfilled through reliance on the community. From this perspective, individuals and the community possess a natural unity, subsequently revealing the essential attribute of humans—sociality—within the community. Social individuals, within the community, gradually exhibit differences among themselves. These differences not only refer to innate natural attributes such as gender and physical strength but fundamentally point to disparities in status, property ownership, and power within the community, arising from economic, political, and other factors. It is in the manifestation of these differences that the process of the emergence of economic justice issues from non-existence to existence becomes apparent. It can be seen that the specific conditions of an individual's identity and status within a community, and consequently, the relationship between individuals and communities that emerges, constitute the root cause of economic justice issues.

The relationship between the community and the individual is first manifested as production relations formed for the purpose of survival. Survival and development are the primary needs of individuals, and the direct means to satisfy these needs, or the material resources required for the organism's life, are through productive activities. In this regard, the primary content of the relationship between the community and the individual is production relations. Why does this kind of production relation manifest itself in the early stages of human society? Individuals form communities for the purpose of common survival and development, and the formation of communities strengthens the power of individual survival and development. Individuals, for the sake of their own survival, will consciously safeguard the interests of the community or other individuals. This indicates that, at the inception of the community, the two possess primitive unity. The differences among individuals within the community, mainly in terms of gender, physical strength, and other natural factors, lead to primitive equality in production relations based on these factors, without the later inequalities and conflicts arising from differences in wealth and social status. Economic justice, characterized by differences in wealth and fundamental opposition, does not emerge as a universal social problem here, nor does it become an individual's value pursuit as a social problem.

The production relations formed between the community and the individual based on the aforementioned purposes have social historical significance. Under the premise of the common goals mentioned above, these production relations naturally exhibit fundamental characteristics of multiple unity, including the unity of kinship and geography, the unity of production and consumption, and the unity of people and means of production. If history is measured not according to some external scale but according to the internal scale of history—production activities and production relations—we should observe that the level and scope of individual production activities are continuously improving and advancing. This implies that the production relations between individuals will also be in a state of development. Ultimately, this is manifested as the relationship between the community and the individual being in a process of change and development, thereby giving it social historical significance. We also have reason to believe that the aforementioned dual unity will inevitably move towards a state of negation with the development of social historicity, providing real conditions for the rupture of the primitive equal relationship between individuals. Marx and Engels both recognized this process of transition from unity to rupture and provided systematic demonstration.

Marx's examination of the relationship between communities and individuals is carried out in tandem with the critique of the "general ideological consciousness." Using the form of ownership as the entry point and the chain of ownership—production relations—mode of production—human survival and development as the main thread, Marx's analysis forms both a critique of abstract consciousness and a realistic interpretation of human survival and development. The term "humanity" itself indicates that people take on the appearance of unfolding activities in the form of a community. The community composed on the basis of kinship and geographical proximity is universally recognized as the initial form of human community, referred to by Marx as the "tribal community" or "natural community." [1] Marx's reference to human activities in this context involves acquiring the survival and development of the community through collective efforts, even portraying exchange activities as "the exchange between humans and nature, i.e., exchanging human labor for the products of nature." In this communal stage with these essential elements, activities between individuals involve natural objects or objects of use, and production relations based on oppression, exploitation, and possession have yet to emerge. Economic justice issues are not present due to the absence of social conditions for their generation, making them neither a current reality nor a subject of study.

Engels' theoretical position on the relationship between the community and individuals is mainly reflected in the examination of the origin of the family, private property, and the state. In the production relations of wealth private ownership—appropriating the labor fruits of others and enslaving others, blood ties and geographical ties gradually break and expand, with members directly expressing exploitation by producers against the proletariat. This gives rise to the emergence of a new form of community—the state. The emergence of the state represents the rupture of equal relationships among individuals within the original community, leading to a process of regeneration based on production relations and wealth ownership. This process directly demonstrates that as a new form of community, the relationship between the state and individuals is one of exploitation, opposition, ownership, and resistance, rather than the equal relationship of common production, direct distribution, and consumption as before. The demand and call for economic justice then become an inevitable issue in social development. In summary, economic justice issues are the inevitable result of the production relations reaching a certain stage, namely, the universal stage of the "rupture" of the community and the widespread individual ownership of private property.

3. The Theoretical Foundation and Practical Basis of the Concept of a Community of Shared Future for Mankind

Dedicated to constructing a community with a shared future for humanity in the international community, this is a great innovation of the new era's socialism with Chinese characteristics, aiming to achieve the common values of humanity in the new international governance framework. General Secretary Xi Jinping has pointed out that justice is a common value for all of humanity, [2] and building a community with a shared future for humanity represents the "Chinese solution" to realize this value. From the perspective of the principles of consultation, joint construction, and shared benefits, the core issue of justice should be economic justice. Effectively managing the relationship between the community with a shared future for humanity and various countries and regions is conducive to addressing economic justice issues on the international stage. The ideology of a community with a shared future for humanity is the latest theoretical outcome of the Sinicization of Marx's community ideology. It shares commonalities or similarities with respect to practical foundations, modern context, development goals, and serves as a theoretical manifestation of the continuity between the two.

In terms of the practical foundation, Marx grasped the fundamental issue of civil society at the time, namely, the polarization of wealth and the resulting social conflicts. While combating the "ideology" of the time, he advocated shifting the focus to the development of industrial and

commercial history, especially the description of the life status of individuals in the context of wealth disparity. This description, seen as the hardships of labor by Smith and others, was regarded by Marx as a form of “alienated, coerced life activity.” Laborers in employment relationships are manifested as both the “objectivity of others” (others’ property) and the “subjectivity of others” (the subjectivity of capital). [3] The state of individual laborers being denied reflects the universal situation of economic justice issues in civil society. When discussing the disparities between countries in the context of economic globalization, Xi Jinping pointed out that “the contribution rate of emerging market countries and developing countries to global economic growth has reached 80%.” However, he expressed concern about the “wealth of the richest one percent of the global population exceeding the total wealth of the remaining 99 percent of the population, with unequal income distribution and imbalanced development space.” [4] The economic justice issues existing between the international system or world market and emerging market countries have become urgent problems that need to be addressed.

Looking at it from the perspective of modernity, whether in Marx’s era or in the present new era, production based on capital and the resulting production relations remain common issues in reality. Marx not only emphasized that modern production begins with capital but also elaborated on the relationships between capital and money, capital and labor, capital and value appreciation, and capital and the world market. Even when discussing the impact of socialization on agriculture involving capital, Marx pointed out the transformation of agriculture from individually operated industry to “capital-operated agriculture.” This is intended to highlight the control of capital over land ownership, the transformation of farmers into wage workers, and the formation of an employment relationship. This is akin to “taking away the sons and daughters of the earth from the nurturing embrace, so that even the cultivation of the land, which is in nature a direct source of survival, becomes a purely indirect source of survival dependent on social relations.” [5] Land is no longer the direct expression of the identity between humans and nature but has become the material element or value appreciation material condition upon which the expectation of capital appreciation is based. With capital as a premise, wage labor extends in this form throughout the entire community. Regarding the significant imbalance in global wealth distribution, General Secretary Xi Jinping also emphasized, “Allowing capital to pursue profits unchecked will result in triggering a new crisis. ... The situation where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer is not only difficult to maintain but also contrary to fairness and justice.” [6] The exploitative nature of capital and the destructive consequences of its flow on an international scale ultimately lead to the transformation of differences within the community into North-South opposition and existential crises. Based on a common understanding of the nature of capital, it is evident that modernity’s crises and economic justice issues on a global scale are part of the same process.

In terms of development goals, the two share commonalities. Marx believed that with the global movement and combination of capital, especially the formation of the world market, individual wage laborers should unite to break the shell of capitalist private ownership. They should transform wage labor into labor, transform civil society into “society,” and thereby restore workers to “social individuals,” that is, individuals with free and comprehensive development in a communist society. How should the promotion of building a community with a shared future for humanity handle relations with other countries? General Secretary Xi Jinping pointed out, “A community with a shared future for humanity, as the name suggests, means that the destinies of each nation and each country are closely linked, ... turning the aspirations of people of all countries for a better life into reality.” [7] This inherently encompasses the life status of people worldwide who have achieved economic justice. Looking at future social development goals, individuals with free and comprehensive development and harmonious relations with the community are common elements of both classical theories and the socialist ideology with Chinese characteristics in the new era.

4. The Implementation Path for Resolving Economic Justice Issues in the International Perspective

In addressing the relationship between the community and individuals, especially the relationship within the community with a shared future for humanity and its members, General Secretary Xi Jinping's concept of a community with a shared future for humanity differs fundamentally from Marx's classic works. Unlike Marx's advocacy for the unity of wage laborers and violent revolution, building a community with a shared future for humanity and closely linking the destinies of each country must also adapt to contemporary conditions. Handling the relationship between the community's shared destiny and its individual members, achieving joint construction, sharing, and win-win outcomes can also realize the value goal of economic justice. The "Chinese discourse" in the new era can be broadly summarized in terms of implementation paths and key measures:

Firstly, from a theoretical perspective, effectively managing the relationship between the "spiritual monster" and cooperative win-win situations holds significant importance for the relations between the community's shared destiny and individual member countries and regions. It also plays a crucial role in achieving economic justice on the international stage. In the primitive communal period, individuals collaborated in labor and were even able to achieve cooperation and sharing under the guidance of egalitarian principles. However, the low level of production and living conditions limited this to a primitive form of sharing, providing neither the economic conditions for the emergence of exploitation nor the ideological conditions for the conception of economic justice. The establishment of a production mode based on capital enabled humanity to create unprecedented wealth, but this wealth belonged solely to the owners of capital. As Marx stated, "It creates a world after its own image." [8] The more capital and its owners create a world solely for themselves, the more laborers lose their place in this world—although they inhabit the same world. This ultimately exacerbates the antagonistic relationship between labor and capital and contributes to the widespread occurrence of economic justice issues. Cooperation is passive for laborers, and true win-win situations do not exist in reality. Contrastingly, in the process of capital creating a world for itself, it not only transforms all production prerequisites domestically into conditions for its own appreciation but also finds production prerequisites on the world market that are equally conducive to its appreciation. It not only "undermines the national foundation beneath its industrial feet," but also makes "intercourse and mutual dependence among all nations in all aspects" a universal phenomenon. [9] The movement of capital in the world market, and the situation where various production conditions serve its own purposes, Marx referred to as the "spiritual monster." [10] Spirituality, from a production perspective, describes the relationship between capital and the world market. The term "monster" fundamentally points to the act of "creating a world for itself." This results in the relationships between communities and individuals within the world market inevitably manifesting disparities, oppositions, differentiations, and resistances.

However, the movement of capital in the world market also has limitations, and no matter how innovation and development redefine the profit-seeking methods and spaces, it ultimately reaches a point where it must abide by its own limits. Marx, while discussing the "four limits of capital," also pointed out that "capital is neither the absolute form of the development of productive forces nor the wealth form absolutely consistent with the development of productive forces." [11] Beyond the limits of capital's development in creating a world for itself, as a social relationship, capital will inevitably manifest in other aspects, particularly as "public property belonging to all members of society." Moreover, as capital in this form of property, it is "not an individual force but a social force." [12] This broadly explains that capital, as a social force, still universally promotes the development of productive forces in contemporary development and self-adjustment processes. As the "spiritual monster," it can continue to play a promotive role in the field of production while limiting its

disruptive tendencies. Looking at the current and foreseeable future, as long as there exists a capital market and the practical situation of utilizing capital to develop productive forces, understanding the issues of capital limits discussed in Marx's critical theory remains necessary. Although contemporary China has eliminated private ownership of capital, and the analysis of capital in China differs significantly from Marx's critique based on bourgeois society, it is still essential to minimize the inherent exploitative nature of capital. This should not conflict with the essence of socialism and the purpose of production and should serve the goal of comprehensive building of a moderately prosperous society. [13] In the essence of capital as a social relationship, seeking equal cooperative relations among all members within the community, striving for win-win situations in economic development, and ultimately progressing towards the value goal of economic justice while gradually narrowing the gap is crucial. The specific path to achieve this goal is not about discussing the limitations of "microfinance" or why the poor have almost no access to loans. [14] Instead, it involves delving into the foundation of human existence and development—the historical premise of material production—and taking effective measures to achieve multiple wins on the basis of mutual construction and sharing. These scientific pathways are broadly encapsulated in the following ideas: "Adhere to innovation-driven development and create a vibrant growth model; insist on coordinated linkage and build an open and win-win cooperation model. The 'Belt and Road' initiative enriches the concept of international economic cooperation and the connotation of multilateralism, providing an important avenue for promoting world economic growth and achieving common development." [15] When Western scholars dedicate themselves to delineating the concept of "community" in the general historical process of Europe and attempting to reconcile the opposition between so-called rationalism and historicism, [16] China, in the implementation process of the "Belt and Road" initiative, has embarked on a high-quality development path that provides a solid economic foundation for achieving cooperative win-win outcomes. Only on this basis of pragmatic cooperation can the relationship between the community and individuals be further addressed, and the gradual realization of the value goal of economic justice be achieved on the foundation of mutual construction, sharing, and winning together.

Next, from the perspective of real-world development, in dealing with and utilizing capital to promote the construction of a community with a shared future for humanity, there should be an emphasis on "promoting government and social capital cooperation, building a diversified financing system and a multi-level capital market, developing inclusive finance, and improving financial service networks." [17] Ultimately, achieving cooperation and mutual benefit among community members, narrowing the wealth gap between nations, and reaching the intrinsic requirements of the value goal of economic justice. The term "social capital," as emphasized here, compared to the "capital" discussed in Marx's critique of capital theory, should be understood in the context of the development of the times. It should not be interpreted as a state of primitive and unregulated growth at the beginning of capitalism. Similar to how Marx referred to joint-stock companies as the self-denial and development within the capitalist mode of production, in the process of promoting the construction of a community with a shared future for humanity, the liquidity of capital and its characteristics of self-adjustment and development must be fully leveraged. The liquidity of capital allows the world market to serve as an external space for value production and appreciation. However, this appreciation does not rely on individual capitalists or individual member countries exclusively enjoying profits. After all, capital, as a social production relationship, contains the ability to adapt to itself in the development of production. Otherwise, the realization of the essence of value appreciation would not occur. The implementation of the aforementioned joint-stock system has proven that it has reduced the exploitative and oppressive aspects it carried in its initial development—similar to what Marx described when discussing the production of absolute surplus value, where workers engage in production by using their lives, continuing their existence in a manner that destroys life—to a level

consistent with political and legal rights and social rights. Although this does not necessarily represent the elimination of class conflict in the economic sphere, it does ease labor-capital relations in the social and political aspects. Marx extensively discussed this point and viewed it as the self-adjustment of capitalist production relations.

Contemporary China has fully recognized the challenges faced by the international old order in addressing the global development issues mentioned above. The crisis in the West has prompted us to reflect on the need for sustained and healthy development while achieving mutual benefit in the international market, as opposed to the colonial and exploitative development practices of the past. Domestically, effective measures such as structural adjustments, strategic transformations, and initiatives like destocking, de-capacity, and deleveraging have been implemented. These measures have not led to the destruction of goods or a regression in productivity. Moreover, they have not resulted in the societal upheaval seen during previous crises, maintaining both economic and social health and marking a fundamental distinction from the “plague of overproduction” under capitalism. More fundamentally, while focusing on domestic development, China plans cooperation and mutual benefit among nations worldwide based on the concept of a community of shared future. General Secretary Xi Jinping has mentioned that “the contribution of emerging market countries and developing countries to global economic growth has reached 80 percent... and the global governance system does not reflect the new situation, lacking sufficient representativeness and inclusiveness.” The stark contrast between the new layout of global industries, new risks in global financial markets, and the current trend towards closed and fragmented rules in the global mechanism indicates the need for new “solutions” for a global governance system. China is willing to work with countries around the world to achieve mutual benefit on the basis of sharing its own development opportunities and achievements.

From an international perspective, it allows the world to understand “what kind of country China will be as it develops.” The United Kingdom, which led the industrial revolution and attained the status of “world’s factory” in the production sector, illustrated the implications for other nations simply by being referred to as the “empire on which the sun never sets.” The post-World War II formation of the United States’ global status and the establishment of global political organizations (such as the United Nations), economic organizations (WTO), as well as institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund centered around the United States, demonstrated the effects on numerous developing countries, as evidenced by the previously mentioned Gini coefficient. The economic and social development goals of contemporary China are well-known globally, as is its achieved economic aggregate and global standing. The question of “what kind of country China will be as it develops” has become an unavoidable topic. Will it, like developed Western countries, establish an international community centered solely on self-interest? General Secretary Xi Jinping, when addressing this question, emphasizes two factual states, domestically and internationally. Domestically, he notes, “China needs the most harmonious and stable domestic environment and a peaceful international environment... Although China is a big entity, our ancestors over two thousand years ago recognized the wisdom that ‘a large country, if bellicose, is doomed to perish.’ Those empires that once considered themselves invincible in history are now a thing of the past.” Internationally, he observes, “The trend in today’s world is only one—peace, development, cooperation, and mutual benefit.” All of these provide the overarching premise for building a community of shared future for humanity. Having good intentions alone is not sufficient; one must avoid falling into conceptual reveries. The current emergence of “new economic growth points” in China, coupled with its market potential, economic restructuring, and optimization of industrial structure, can “provide international and regional partners with a broader market, more abundant capital, richer products, and valuable cooperation opportunities.” These constitute the practical basis for building a community of shared future for humanity. In the global market, China will not engage

in exploitative profit-seeking, nor harbor colonial dominance thinking. Under the premise of mutual benefit, it establishes equal production relations among nations, providing a solid economic foundation for a community of shared future for humanity. This departure from the “plague of overproduction” under the old international order fosters continuous development in cooperative win-win scenarios, ensuring that the fruits of development benefit people worldwide.

In summary, the historical alternation of production relations and societal development provides theoretical possibilities for discussing the economic foundation of a community. Alongside the internationalization of production, it becomes necessary to address issues related to the production relations in the construction of a community of shared future for humanity and the resultant economic foundation. Contemporary China advocates the concept of a community of shared future for humanity. The reason it has gained universal recognition in the international community and become a “Chinese wisdom” in global development and governance lies in its fundamental subversion of the outer shell based on capitalist private ownership. This approach challenges phenomena such as creating a world solely for oneself and spreading the plague of overproduction, associated with the old international order. It introduces a new understanding that deviates from the international old order, making the basic principles of co-construction, sharing, and mutual benefit the foundation for building a community of shared future for humanity. This, in turn, ensures the continuous realization of global economic justice under the “Chinese solution.” While Western works such as *The Theory of Economic Justice* and their scholars are still using “utility functions” to calculate how to achieve global economic justice, the “Chinese solution” is translating the concept of a community of shared future for humanity into tangible actions. It is consistently achieving a series of noteworthy accomplishments.

5. Conclusion

This article, based on the perspective of the relationship between individuals and communities, analyzes the fundamental reasons for the emergence of economic justice. It explores contemporary methods to address economic justice issues within the historical development context of appropriately managing the relationship between communities and individuals. The relationship between communities and individuals is intrinsically linked to economic justice as a universal social issue. The appropriateness of handling this relationship is consistent with achieving universal economic justice, eliminating wealth disparities, and mitigating social class conflicts. To address economic justice issues on an international scale, China proposes a solution – the construction of a community with a shared future for humanity. China has been committed to managing the relationship between the community’s shared destiny and its member countries and regions on the basis of cooperation and equality. From regional community destinies to a global community destiny, and from establishing funds to the establishment of specialized banks, China provides a practical material foundation for win-win cooperation. Simultaneously, it fosters a relationship of equal mutual benefit and cooperative production among nations, preventing emerging market countries from becoming objects of exploitation and plunder. Together, these nations are dedicated to advancing economic globalization towards openness, inclusiveness, universality, balance, and mutual benefit. They work with countries worldwide to build a “world of lasting peace, universal security, common prosperity, openness and inclusiveness, and a clean and beautiful environment” – a world jointly constructed by nations, progressively realizing economic justice.

References

- [1] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2012). *Selected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 1*. Beijing: People’s Publishing House.
- [2] Xi Jinping. (2018). *On Adhering to and Promoting the Building of a Community with a Shared Future for Humanity*. Beijing: Central Literature Publishing House.

- [3] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 30*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- [4] Xi Jinping. (2018). *On Adhering to and Promoting the Building of a Community with a Shared Future for Humanity*. Beijing: Central Literature Publishing House.
- [5] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 30*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- [6] Xi Jinping. (2018). *On Adhering to and Promoting the Building of a Community with a Shared Future for Humanity*. Beijing: Central Literature Publishing House.
- [7] Xi Jinping. (2018). *On Adhering to and Promoting the Building of a Community with a Shared Future for Humanity*. Beijing: Central Literature Publishing House.
- [8] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2012). *Selected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 1*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- [9] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2012). *Selected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 1*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- [10] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 30*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- [11] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2009). *Collected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 8*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- [12] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2012). *Selected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 1*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- [13] Wang, W., & Xu, Y. (2019). On the Capital Limits of "Chinese Discourse." *Journal of Shanghai University of Finance and Economics*, 21(04), 129-139.
- [14] Sen, A., & Diftlo, E. (2018). *The Nature of Poverty*. (J. Fang, Trans.). Beijing: CITIC Publishing Group.
- [15] Xi Jinping. (2020). *Xi Jinping on Governance and Statecraft: Volume 3*. Beijing: Foreign Language Press.
- [16] Tönnies, F. (2019). *Community and Society*. (W. Zhang, Trans.). Beijing: Commercial Press.
- [17] Xi Jinping. (2018). *On Adhering to and Promoting the Building of a Community with a Shared Future for Humanity*. Beijing: Central Literature Publishing House.