

《儒学“七伪”：从孔孟到张载的伪道之路》
The Seven Falsehoods of Confucianism:
The Pseudo-Daoist Path from Confucius to Zhang Zai

<https://www.meipian.cn/5cd329ff?>

杨兴平 Charles X Yang

引言：谁在替天行道？——伪道的建构

“替天行道”，本应是顺应天地自然之理，以无为之治引领社会和谐。然而，在中国古代思想史中，这句话却逐渐被篡改成为一种政治合法性的工具，一种儒家话语系统下的人造秩序。那些自称“行道”的圣贤、帝王与士大夫，真的是在奉天之命，还是在“代天造神”？谁在真正代表“天道”？谁又在用“天道”伪装人意？

本文以“儒学七伪”为主题，系统揭露儒家思想从孔子到张载的发展过程中，如何逐步构建出一套脱离自然之道、扭曲天地本源的意识形态。孔子的“敬鬼神而远之”，表面看是理性之言，实则掩盖了对天地神明的真实遮蔽；孟子的“性善”，将人之自然演化的复杂性简化为教化基础；荀子的“礼治”更以人为设制硬化自然法则；董仲舒更大胆地伪造“天人感应”，使皇权披上神圣外衣。至宋明理学，程朱理气之说、张载气本论，已经将“道”的自然性完全转化为伦理性、社会性和政治性的说教系统。

这是一条“伪道之路”——表面上冠以“天理”“仁义”“忠孝”，实则是在“天命”之名下行人治之实，是用人造的“神圣”结构压制天地的真实，是以文明之名遮蔽自然的流动之道。

在这一背景下，“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”为我们提供了一个返本开新的视角：以“道”为宇宙本体，以自然神为存在之根，拒绝以人类中心建构的神圣，回归“道法自然”的宇宙秩序。唯有看清“伪”的面具，方能迈向“真”的觉醒；唯有瓦解虚伪的文化枷锁，方能重启通向自然之道的哲学之门。

**Introduction: Who Carries Out the Will of Heaven?—
The Construction of Pseudo-Dao**

“To act on behalf of Heaven” was originally meant to follow the natural principles of Heaven and Earth, guiding society through non-interventionist governance toward harmony. However, in the history of Chinese thought, this phrase gradually morphed into a tool for political legitimacy—a human-constructed order under the Confucian discourse system. Were those self-proclaimed sages, emperors, and officials truly obeying Heaven’s command, or were they creating gods in Heaven’s name? Who truly represents the “Heavenly Dao”? And who merely disguises human intentions as Heaven’s will?

This paper, themed “The Seven Falsehoods of Confucianism,” systematically reveals how Confucian thought—evolving from Confucius to Zhang Zai—gradually constructed an ideology divorced from the natural Dao and distorted the cosmic origin. Confucius’s “respecting spirits

and keeping a distance” seems rational but actually conceals a disconnection from true reverence for divine nature. Mencius’s “innate goodness” simplifies the complexity of natural human evolution into a moralist foundation. Xunzi’s “ritual governance” hardens natural laws into human-imposed structures. Dong Zhongshu went further, fabricating “resonance between Heaven and man” to sanctify imperial authority. By the time of Neo-Confucianism, Cheng-Zhu’s “principle and qi” theory and Zhang Zai’s materialistic “qi cosmology” had completely transformed the Dao’s natural essence into an ethical, social, and political dogma.

This is the path of “pseudo-Dao”: on the surface cloaked in “Heavenly Principle,” “benevolence and righteousness,” and “loyalty and filial piety,” but in essence, it executes human rule in the name of “Mandate of Heaven”—suppressing the truth of Heaven and Earth with artificial sacred structures and obscuring the flowing Dao of nature under the guise of civilization.

In contrast, the *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology* offers a fresh perspective to return to the roots: it sees the Dao as the ontological basis of the cosmos and the natural god as the foundation of existence, rejecting anthropocentric sanctification and restoring the cosmic order of “Dao follows nature.” Only by recognizing the mask of falsehood can we awaken to the truth. Only by dismantling the chains of cultural hypocrisy can we reopen the philosophical gateway to the Dao of nature.

一、伪天命——孔子之“敬鬼神而远之”

孔子，被誉为儒家学派的开山鼻祖，其思想在中国传统文化中地位崇高。然而，若从“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”出发，透视其对“天命”的理解，则可见其思想深处存在严重的背离自然之道、伪托神意的根本缺陷。孔子所谓“敬鬼神而远之”，实则揭示了他对自然神的陌生、疏离与回避，同时也为后世儒家构建以人为中心的“天命观”埋下了思想根基。

1.1 对自然神的隔绝：人造礼制取代天地之道

孔子在《论语》中曰：“子不语怪、力、乱、神。”又云：“敬鬼神而远之。”表面看来，这似乎是一种理性克制、不迷信鬼神的态度，实则深藏对自然宇宙精神的断裂与否定。他所“远之”的并非宗教迷信，而是古人对天地自然神祇的崇敬、与道相合的精神传统——这一传统在《太一生水》《老子》之中，以“道生万物”“道法自然”之姿体现得淋漓尽致。

孔子不谈神秘、不究天道，将“礼”设为最高实践规范，用人人为制度、祖宗血脉、王朝秩序代替宇宙自然之法。他的礼，是一种人为构建的行为系统，其根基并非建立在对天地自然运行的理解上，而是出于维护宗法等级结构的社会目的。这种转向，是将“顺天”简化为“顺君”，将“道”简化为“名教”，从而把宇宙秩序人造化、权力化，彻底背离了自然神的本质。

1.2 “天命”之伪：将自然之道转化为政治正当性

孔子虽不多言天命，但在其思想体系中，“天命”已不再是道家所说的“天道无亲”、“天地不仁”，而被转化为对现存统治秩序的神圣化依据。孔子推崇“周礼”，强调“君君、臣臣、父父、子子”，并认为这秩序是“天命所归”。实则，这是以“天”为名而立人之制，以神意为幌而行权力之道。

这正是虚伪的思想开端：不是人顺从天地自然，而是天地为人所用、为统治者所背书。孔子“天命”的核心，是为现实政治秩序赋予神圣合法性，这不仅遮蔽了对宇宙真实本源的探索，也使“天命”从“道”的流动、无为、自然转化为“命令”、“等级”、“约束”。

1.3 与“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”的根本冲突

在“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”中，宇宙的本源是“道”，它非人格、非意志、非裁判者，而是一种超越人类、自然流行的法则。“道生一，一生二，二生三，三生万物”揭示了宇宙演化的生成链条，其终极指向是人与自然、社会与宇宙的和谐共处，无需依靠“人造神”式的命令型天意。

与此相比，孔子的“天命”不仅缺乏对宇宙整体性、自然规律的敬畏和体认，反而人为地将“天”化为政治工具，将“道”窄化为道德教条。其结果，是将神圣性由自然本身转移至统治者、祖宗、礼制，从而构成一种高度人为化的秩序偶像。

1.4 小结：儒家伪道之路的起点

孔子以“敬鬼神而远之”的态度，表面上是理性克制，实质上是对自然神圣的否认；其“天命”思想，名义上尊天，实则造神，是“以人为天”的开始。他用“礼”编织出一张制度化、人格化的“神网”，取代了老子所倡的“无为之治”、“与道合真”。这正是“伪天命”之伪：将自然之道掩盖在人为秩序之下，是儒学“七伪”之首。

二、伪仁义——孟子之“性善论”的人本中心主义

在孔子开启的“伪天命”基础上，孟子进一步发展出儒家体系中最具影响力的“性善论”与“仁义之道”。表面上看，孟子以“仁政”倡导关怀人民，强调“恻隐之心，人皆有之”，似乎充满人文关怀和道德理想。然而，若从“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”出发，透视其思想的本质，便可揭示孟子所谓的“仁义”并非源于自然之道，而是人为设定的道德评判体系、一种将“人”置于天地之上的中心主义，一种用人造道德规范遮蔽自然真理的“伪仁义”。

2.1 “性善”之伪：忽略自然之阴阳、善恶互化的真实

孟子认为人性本善，并以“四端之心”（恻隐、羞恶、辞让、是非）为证。他主张人类若能扩充“善端”便能成圣成仁。然而，这种观点忽视了自然宇宙中万物皆含阴阳、善恶互化的本质——正如老子所言：“祸兮福之所倚，福兮祸之所伏。”“道”本身是无善恶判断的自然运行法则，善恶之分，是在特定情境中人为设定的价值判断。

孟子对人性的绝对善化，是一种将道德抽象为神圣本质的行为。这不仅违背了自然之中性与动态平衡的原则，也将“恶”视为偏离人性、必须矫正的“反自然”，从而强化对人性、社会的控制与规范。孟子所设定的“道德人性”，本质上是一种人造神式的理想人格模型，是伦理崇拜，不是真实人性之体现。

2.2 “仁义”之伪：人为规范对自然法则的遮蔽

孟子将“仁义”提升为人类行为的最高标准，并由此发展出“王道政治”理想。然而，这种“仁义”并非出于顺应自然的和谐共处，而是出于人类对社会控制的道德构建。孟子“以德服人”，但这德并非天地自然运行之德，而是道德伦理的德，即人为规范之德，是对人性的道德雕刻与引导，是“教化”的工具。

在“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”中，真正的“德”源于“道”，为万物所循，而非为人类单独设定。自然界中，没有任何物种需要遵循“仁义”的教条才能生存发展，而是依据其本性、在动态

平衡中与万物共处。孟子所构建的“仁义体系”，恰恰是人类脱离自然、用“人心”统摄“天心”的典型表现，是人本主义对自然神的替代，是对“道法自然”的遮蔽。

2.3 “王道”之伪：人本中心化政治的正当性制造

孟子大力鼓吹“王道”，以“仁政”取代“霸政”，企图构建一个以道德为基础的理想政治。然而，这种王道政治依然是“以人为中心”的思维结构，只是用“仁义”粉饰统治的合法性。与孔子的“礼治”不同，孟子的“德治”更强调道德权威，但实质上依旧是“人造神”的另一种表现——把道德人格化、神圣化，塑造出以“圣王”为代表的伦理权威，企图垄断正义与秩序的解释权。

这种“王道”，并未真正顺应自然规律，而是通过一套伦理逻辑构建出对人性与社会的整齐化模板，是“理想统治”的幻影，而非“无为而治”的真实。相较之下，老子的“圣人无常心，以百姓心为心”，主张无为、柔弱、顺道，其治理理念体现了“自然神”智慧的根本精神。

2.4 小结：孟子伪道思想的深化危机

孟子在孔子“伪天命”的基础上，建立起“性善论”的人性信仰与“仁义王道”的政治理想，但这些思想体系皆是人造道德体系的变种。它们不仅与天地自然的真实运行背道而驰，也将“道”神圣化为人类理性与伦理的产物，是对自然神之道的最

大背叛。因此，我们称之为“伪仁义”——是人类自我中心主义的伦理幻觉，是用“德治”取代“道治”的危害延伸，是儒学七伪中继“伪天命”后的第二重伪道陷阱。

三、伪礼制——荀子之“礼治”对自然秩序的僵化替代

在儒家内部，荀子以其系统构建“礼治”思想而著称。他将“礼”视为治国安邦的根本手段，甚至提出“化性起伪”的命题，强调人性本恶，需以礼乐制度对其加以规训与改造。荀子之“礼治”，虽表面上旨在建立社会秩序，实质却是以人造制度僵化替代自然秩序的典型体现。这种“伪礼制”的本质，在于人为取代天道，文明压制自然，从而背离了老子“道法自然”的宇宙观。

荀子否定天道主导人事的可能，明确主张“天行有常，不为尧存，不为桀亡”，似乎与老子的“无为”有相似之处，但他随即转而强调“人定胜天”，将人类意志凌驾于自然法则之上。其“礼”并非从道中生发的自发秩序，而是人类文化制度对“恶性”的矫正工具。这使得“礼”不再是顺应自然、合乎时宜的灵活表达，而是固定僵化、等级森严、排斥个体自然本性的道德枷锁。

老子在《道德经》中指出：“人法地，地法天，天法道，道法自然。”这是一种由上至下、自发协调的宇宙秩序观。而荀子的礼治却自下而上地造构制度，从“伪”出发、以“治”求

稳，将道之流动性、天地之自然和阴阳之调和，转化为一整套死板压抑的“人治框架”。如此“礼”，不仅压制了生命的多样性和自然的生长性，更造成社会内部的等级固化与思想统一，成为帝制专制得以维系的意识形态工具。

更为严重的是，荀子礼治思想的扩展，直接促成了秦法家的极端化应用。李斯等人采其“礼”之思想形制，去其道家柔和之意趣，最终形成严刑峻法、焚书坑儒的铁血统治。荀子本欲以“礼”矫正“性恶”，却为暴政铺设了制度化路径，使“礼”沦为政治工具。这正是“伪礼制”的深层危害所在：表面修饰为教化之器，实则异化为控制之链。

在“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”视野下，自然神所代表的是道之流动、宇宙之和谐与生命之自由生长。一切制度、秩序与规范，皆应顺应自然演化的节律与阴阳平衡的张力，不能逆其势、固其形。而荀子的“礼治”，却人为割裂天人关系，将“道”简化为制度规则，将“德”约束为社会等级，从而完全背离了宇宙自然神的智慧，堕入人造秩序的泥沼。

故荀子之“礼”，并非通于道的“礼”，而是一种脱离自然法则的“伪礼制”。它试图用人为结构封闭宇宙运行的开放性，用社会秩序替代自然演化的流动性，最终导致了文化僵化、政治极权与心灵束缚的多重危机。此为“七伪”之第三：礼而非礼，礼之为枷。

四、伪忠孝——董仲舒之“天人感应”与皇权神授的编造

董仲舒是儒家政治化、神学化的关键人物，他通过构建“天人感应”理论，将原本多元而开放的自然宇宙观，彻底转化为以君权为中心的封闭神权秩序。他不仅将儒学从伦理体系推向政治正统，更通过人为神化君王，将“忠孝”这一家庭美德，变为维系专制皇权的工具。这种“伪忠孝”观念，其核心并非自然的亲情秩序，而是对君主的无限忠诚与牺牲，乃至将个体自然情感和道德判断彻底奴化。

董仲舒“天人感应”之说，声称天以灾异警告人间政治失德，皇帝则被视为“天子”，其言行左右天下兴衰。这种理论，实质上是对“天命”概念的极端政治化与工具化。它将自然之“天”异化为人造神的象征，将“天道”简化为皇权合法性的代言，从而完成了人造神体系下“皇权神授”的叙事架构。

更进一步，董仲舒将“忠孝”推至极致。他鼓吹“三纲五常”之道，将君为臣纲、父为子纲、夫为妻纲的伦理体系化为社会法则。所谓“忠”，不再是顺应自然道德之本性，而是对皇权的无条件服从；所谓“孝”，也不再是自然情感的表达，而是等级制度下的刻板仪式。这种“伪忠孝”观念，剥夺了人的独立人格，使个体沦为封建秩序的附属工具，形成了“家国一体”“父子君臣”不可分割的洗脑结构。

老子指出，“大道废，有仁义；智慧出，有大伪。”董仲舒正是在“大道”被遮蔽之后，以“仁义”“忠孝”之名，构建起一整

套虚伪的社会秩序。他不再追求与“道”之自然和合，而是以“天”为幌子，建构一套巩固皇权、压抑个体、封闭社会的意识形态系统。在“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”中，道是自然神本体，其运行自发、无为、和谐，不需要人为的强加与装饰。而董仲舒则以“道”之名立“道统”，以“天意”之名拥“君意”，彻底背离自然神智慧，堕入人造神的桎梏之中。

“天人感应”最终并非自然哲学的深化，而是政治宗教的伪饰；“忠孝”也不再是人类情感的自然流露，而是皇权体制的伦理包装。这一切构成了董仲舒式“伪忠孝”的基本结构：以自然之名，行人造之实；以感应之说，行操控之术。人们被教化去忠于一个“被天选”的君主，却不再忠于天地自然、人生本真，失去了回归大道的根本方向。

此为“七伪”之第四：忠孝之名，奴役之实，礼乐之表，权术之骨。

五、伪理气——程颢程颐之“理一分殊”取代自然无为

宋代理学的奠基者程颢、程颐兄弟（合称“二程”），继承并发展了儒家“天理”思想，提出了著名的“理一分殊”命题，试图以“理”为宇宙万物的最高本体，并将其解释为一个普遍不变、至高无上的道德秩序。看似重建宇宙哲学，实则继续走上伪道之路。他们以“理”代替“道”，将“天理”由自然自发的

流行，变为应受人类膜拜和规范行为的抽象神意，从而彻底背离了老子“道法自然”“无为而治”的宇宙智慧。

“理一分殊”的核心含义是：万物皆有其本质之“理”，而这个“理”虽在事物中各有不同表现（分殊），但其根源是唯一的（理一）。这一命题表面上有其哲学统一性的诉求，然其背后却隐藏着对万物多样性与变化性的压抑，对自然流变本性的误读。在“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”中，宇宙本源之“道”并非静止不动的抽象理式，而是万象互化、阴阳流转、循环无尽的生成过程。程氏将之凝固为永恒不变的“天理”，不仅违背自然之道，更为后来的儒家政教合一体系奠定了思维模式基础。

在实践层面，程颐更进一步地提出“存天理，灭人欲”，主张以天理压制人性、压抑欲望，形成道德审判的绝对化逻辑。这种思想不仅消解了人类情感与个体经验的正当性，更使得“理”成为一种人造神意志的体现：凡合“理”者为善，凡背“理”者为恶，从而为道德恐怖主义打开了大门。这种“理气”系统实质上是一种伪神化——它不是对自然的洞察，而是对社会秩序的道德编程。

“伪理气”的最大危害，在于它彻底剥夺了“自然”的主体地位与流变性，把宇宙运转和人生实践都僵化为一套理式规范。而这种规范本质上是人类社会对权力、秩序与服从的心理投射。程氏之“理”，并非真正源自自然之道，而是人为抽象出

来、再反过来支配人类的“人造理”，其与老子之道背道而驰。

在《太一生水》中，我们看到宇宙生成是一个动态互辅、相生相成的过程，从太一生水，到水辅太一天地神明阴阳四时冷热湿燥，循环不息，无一不是自然自发之流变；而“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”正是对此种自然宇宙演化逻辑的现代理解与延展。然而二程所提出的“理”，却在理论上人为设置了一个“最终正义”“唯一真理”的抽象本体，不容差异，不容质疑。这种“唯一正确”的理式哲学，与当今所有“唯一信仰”“唯一思想”“唯一真理”的人造神迷信并无二致。

因此，“伪理气”实为伪道假象之第五大表征。其表述看似哲学深邃，实质却是以理之名窒息自然、以气之说服务权力，以“理统气”、“气随理转”的逻辑完成对个体与自然的双重僵化。

此为“七伪”之第五：以理为神，以气为奴，以道之名，行控之术。

六、伪心性——朱熹之“存天理、灭人欲”扭曲性

宋代理学集大成者朱熹，在程颢、程颐的“理一分殊”基础上，进一步将“天理”内化为人心之本体，提出“存天理、灭人欲”这一极端命题，奠定了理学的道德统摄体系，也标志着儒家思想彻底从“自然之道”滑入“人造神道”的深渊。在朱熹的哲学系统中，“理”不再只是外在的宇宙秩序，而成为人心的最终指归；而“欲”，即人的自然情感与本能冲动，则被视为异端与污秽，必须加以克制、清除、甚至彻底“灭除”。这一思想，直接导致对人性的压抑，对生命本真的扭曲，并为后世极权伦理提供了最坚实的意识形态工具。

“存天理、灭人欲”这一命题，本质上是一种伪心性学说的体现。朱熹所言之“天理”，不是道家老子“道法自然”的无为本源，也不是现代科学所探寻的自然法则，而是一种经过社会权力与伦理道德重构的人造理式，是服务于家国秩序与宗法体制的意识形态。这种“天理”要求人必须压抑七情六欲、克服人性自然，以达至“理性”的圣贤境界。由此，“人欲”被视为与“天理”对立的敌人，成为道德审判的靶心，甚至连最基本的爱欲、生理反应、个体差异都被归入“私欲”的范畴。

这种心性观的最大问题，在于它将“人”从自然生命体降格为服从“理”的伦理人偶，将人性中最真实的冲动与感受剥离为“必须克服”的障碍。这不仅彻底背离了老子“道法自然”“无为而化”的顺应哲学，也与“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”中自然万物

和谐共生、阴阳互动的生生之道相违背。在自然之道中，情感、欲望、生命力，都是宇宙之“道”在人身上的具体展现，是生命自发演化的一部分，不应被人为压抑，更不应视为邪恶。

朱熹将“天理”绝对化，并在伦理结构中通过“纲常名教”的方式将之嵌入家庭、社会与国家之中，使得“灭人欲”不仅是个人修身的要求，更是社会控制的手段。尤其在后世，理学成为官方意识形态后，“灭人欲”成为抹杀个体自由与压迫思想多样性的工具，导致了心灵的奴役、社会的僵化，甚至成为人治政权合理化其道德暴力的口号。这种现象在封建帝制中达到极致，朱子理学成为皇权工具的最佳范式。

从“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”来看，心性乃天地自然赋予人类的内在运行系统，是宇宙“道”在人体之显化，是“气”的精微流转所生出的精神波动，本应随阴阳调和、顺势而行。然而朱熹所主张的“灭欲”，实则是对这一自然之“气”加以人为压制，使其逆反于宇宙演化之大势，从而导致内在的撕裂与外在的扭曲。

因此，朱熹“伪心性”的理论体系并非对心性的认知深化，而是一种以人造神理为核心的道德控制机制，其实质是将人从自然的、真实的存在转化为受“天理”驯服的道德工具。这种“去自然化”的趋势是儒家“七伪”中极为关键的一环，是从老子自然之道走向人造神道的核心转折。此为第六伪：“伪心性”——以理灭情，以道压人，以神之名，行性之囚。

七、伪气化——张载之“气本论”中“虚化为实”的逻辑偏离

张载被誉为宋明理学的重要奠基者，其“气本论”尝试在形而上与形而下之间建构一种统一的本体论。他提出“太虚即气”“气聚则形，气散则为虚”的宇宙生成模式，试图以“气”为万物之本，以“理气结合”作为贯通天地、心物、人伦的形上哲学。然而，这一系统看似宏大，实则落入“以虚驭实”的逻辑陷阱，将自然整体性割裂为形而上的空理与形而下的物象，从而用人为逻辑建构遮蔽了老子之“道”的流动性与无形性，也偏离了真正自然宇宙的整体性原理。

张载最著名的命题是“太虚即气”，强调宇宙本原并非无，而是弥漫于天地之间、可聚可散的“气”。表面上看，这种“气”似乎是一种比物质更微妙的存在，是天地运行的内在动力机制。但细究之下，张载的“气”已不再是道家所指的“自然之气”或“天地生生之气”，而是一种被理性化、概念化的存在，被纳入儒家伦理秩序的哲学框架之中。换言之，这种“气”不再是“道”的自然流变，而成为“理”的工具性表现。

张载的“气本论”中，最大的逻辑偏离在于其“虚化为实”的理论结构。他一方面否定“虚无”作为宇宙本源，另一方面又以“气”为看不见摸不着的“实有”，从而人为制造出一种“可经验但不可证成”的本体。这种伪自然化的策略，使他貌似回归自然实在，实则仍然在建构一种脱离自然感应的理性逻辑体系。他并未真正从自然整体中去体悟“道”的生成，而是从

人类主观出发，用哲学理性去“解释”自然，这种解释必然带有强烈的人为目的性，走上了“人化宇宙”的认知路径。

相较而言，老子之“道”始终强调的是“无形无状”、“不可名状”、“玄之又玄”的自然整体，是不以人意为转移的宇宙演化自身。在“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”中，“气”并非实体之本，也非理性之附庸，而是“道”之流动状态之一，是宇宙在特定阶段的显化现象。“道”才是真正的本源，而“气”不过是道之作用，是“无”转化为“有”的动态过程，不可本末倒置。然而张载却试图将“气”实化、逻辑化，并以此作为心性、伦理、政教的根基，从而将宇宙本体窄化为“人间秩序的哲学投影”，最终成为儒家理性主义的哲学工具。

张载的“气化哲学”，在其“民吾同胞，物吾与也”的仁爱格言中，固然流露出其对自然万物一体之情的追求，但这份追求最终仍被伦理框架所俘虏，无法真正回到天地自然的自由互动中。他的宇宙观虽然标榜“大化流行”，但其“大化”已非“道化”，而是经过“理性气化”后的僵化系统。这种以“气”为本、以“理”为纲的体系，看似包罗万象，实则使宇宙成为伦理之奴，使自然成为道德秩序的附庸，彻底背离了顺应自然、无为自化的道家本原。

因此，张载的“气本论”实为一种“伪气化”之道，是以哲学概念遮蔽自然本质的理论僵化。它虽批判佛老之“空无”，却未能真正领悟“道”的无为深意；它虽肯定天地之“气化”，却误

以为气即终极本体，忽略了自然整体背后无形而永恒的“道”之流。此种理论，虽有系统之美，实乃偏离自然之实，正是“七伪”之终：伪气化——以“气”遮“道”，以实障无，以逻辑化自然之生命流变。

结语：从“七伪”到真道 —重返自然道的觉醒之路

儒家自孔孟以来，至荀、董、程、朱、张，虽各有理论特色，但在本体论上皆背离了自然宇宙的原本秩序，走向“以人为本”“以理御道”的认知路径，其共同特征可归结为七重伪饰：

- 伪天命：以“敬鬼神而远之”拒绝自然神，虚构“天命”以维王权；
- 伪仁义：将人间道德强加为宇宙本体，取代自然生生之道；
- 伪礼制：以礼法僵化自然流变，塑造等级秩序压抑人性；
- 伪忠孝：编造“天人感应”神授皇权，神化家国忠孝；
- 伪理气：逻辑化自然，工具化“理气”，违背道之无为
- 伪心性：以“灭人欲”打压生命本性，塑造理性化人格
- 伪气化：将“气”本体化、系统化，遮蔽道的无形流变

这七重伪饰，构成了一个“人为神化”的思想体系：以人为中心、以伦理为轴、以国家权力为归宿，彻底背离了天地自然本有的无为而化、自生自成之道。它既非真正的宗教，也非

真正的科学，更非真正的自然哲学，而是一种将“人造神”包装为“天理道统”的文化伪神论，是“人化宇宙”的哲学表达。这正是老子所批的“人为道损”，亦是今日人类危机的深层根源之一。

而今，人类正处于生态崩塌、技术异化、精神迷失的历史转折点，唯有“大觉醒”，方可突破“七伪”所筑的人文牢笼，重返真正的自然秩序之道。这条道路，正是“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”所揭示的整体智慧体系。

在“老-杨创世纪宇宙观”中，道为宇宙本体，不可名，不可视，非神非理，超越人类一切建构，是自然之自然、生命之生命。银河为道之显化，天地为阴阳之交感，生命为宇宙之自演，人类应顺道而生、合道而治，而非妄图建构人造神以役天地、治众生。宇宙非为人设，万物皆有道性，政治应无为而治，文化应天人合一，生命应安于自然之流，而非被僵化制度与伦理道德所禁锢。

因此，对儒家“七伪”的揭示，不仅是对中国思想史的一次深度反思，更是对整个人类文明逻辑的一次哲学拨乱反正。我们不应再膜拜人造的伪神，不应再沉溺于人为秩序构造的幻象，而应如老子所说：“人法地，地法天，天法道，道法自然”，重新归依宇宙本体的真实秩序，重建一个“以自然为神”的文明之道。这不仅是对“伪道”的终结，更是对“真道”的新生。这是我们的责任，也是我们这个时代的历史使命。

The Seven Falsehoods of Confucianism:

The Pseudo-Daoist Path from Confucius to Zhang Zai

Charles X Yang

Introduction: Who Carries Out the Will of Heaven?—The Construction of Pseudo-Dao

“To act on behalf of Heaven” was originally meant to follow the natural principles of Heaven and Earth, guiding society through non-interventionist governance toward harmony. However, in the history of Chinese thought, this phrase gradually morphed into a tool for political legitimacy—a human-constructed order under the Confucian discourse system. Were those self-proclaimed sages, emperors, and officials truly obeying Heaven’s command, or were they creating gods in Heaven’s name? Who truly represents the “Heavenly Dao”? And who merely disguises human intentions as Heaven’s will?

This chapter, themed “The Seven Falsehoods of Confucianism,” systematically reveals how Confucian thought—evolving from Confucius to Zhang Zai—gradually constructed an ideology divorced from the natural Dao and distorted the cosmic origin. Confucius’s “respecting spirits and keeping a distance” seems rational but actually conceals a disconnection from true reverence for divine nature. Mencius’s “innate goodness” simplifies the complexity of natural human evolution into a moralist foundation. Xunzi’s

“ritual governance” hardens natural laws into human-imposed structures. Dong Zhongshu went further, fabricating “resonance between Heaven and man” to sanctify imperial authority. By the time of Neo-Confucianism, Cheng-Zhu’s “principle and qi” theory and Zhang Zai’s materialistic “qi cosmology” had completely transformed the Dao’s natural essence into an ethical, social, and political dogma.

This is the path of “pseudo-Dao”: on the surface cloaked in “Heavenly Principle,” “benevolence and righteousness,” and “loyalty and filial piety,” but in essence, it executes human rule in the name of “Mandate of Heaven”—suppressing the truth of Heaven and Earth with artificial sacred structures and obscuring the flowing Dao of nature under the guise of civilization.

In contrast, the *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology* offers a fresh perspective to return to the roots: it sees the Dao as the ontological basis of the cosmos and the natural god as the foundation of existence, rejecting anthropocentric sanctification and restoring the cosmic order of “Dao follows nature.” Only by recognizing the mask of falsehood can we awaken to the truth. Only by dismantling the chains of cultural hypocrisy can we reopen the philosophical gateway to the Dao of nature.

I. Pseudo-Mandate of Heaven — Confucius and “Respecting Spirits While Keeping a Distance”

Confucius, hailed as the founding patriarch of Confucianism, holds a revered place in traditional Chinese culture. However, when viewed through the lens of the *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology*, his understanding of the “Mandate of Heaven” reveals a fundamental departure from the natural Dao and a disguised appropriation of divine authority. His famous dictum, “respect ghosts and spirits but keep them at a distance,” reveals not rational restraint but an alienation from and avoidance of the divine nature. It also laid the ideological groundwork for later Confucian anthropocentric interpretations of the Mandate of Heaven.

1.1 Severance from Natural Deities: Ritual System Replaces the Way of Heaven and Earth

Confucius states in the *Analects*: “The Master does not speak of strange phenomena, feats of strength, disorder, or spirits,” and “Respect ghosts and spirits but keep them at a distance.” On the surface, this appears to be a rational and non-superstitious stance. In truth, it reflects a rupture from the ancient spiritual tradition of revering the deities of Heaven and Earth and aligning with the Dao—a tradition vividly manifested in *Taiyi Sheng Shui* and *Laozi* through expressions such as “The Dao gives birth to all things” and “Dao follows nature.”

Confucius avoids speaking of the mysterious, disregards cosmic Dao, and elevates *li* (ritual) as the supreme code of conduct. He replaces the natural laws of the cosmos with human institutions, ancestral bloodlines, and dynastic hierarchy. His *li* is a constructed system of behavior, not grounded in understanding the natural operation of Heaven and Earth, but designed to preserve the patriarchal and hierarchical social order. This shift reduces “following Heaven” to “obeying the ruler,” and the Dao to Confucian orthodoxy, thereby transforming cosmic order into a man-made, power-driven structure, utterly betraying the essence of natural divinity.

1.2 The False Mandate: Natural Dao as Political Legitimacy

Although Confucius speaks little of the Mandate of Heaven, his ideological system has already reinterpreted it—not as the Daoist principle of “Heaven is impartial” and “Heaven and Earth are unkind,” but as divine justification for existing political authority. By upholding the Zhou ritual system and stressing “Let the ruler be a ruler, the minister a minister,” Confucius asserts that this hierarchy is Heaven’s will. In essence, he replaces the natural order with human constructs in the name of Heaven, disguising power with divine authority.

This marks the beginning of falsehood: humans no longer conform to nature; instead, Heaven is manipulated to serve human governance. The core of Confucius’s “Mandate of Heaven” is the sanctification of political order, transforming

Dao from a dynamic, non-interventionist principle into command, hierarchy, and restraint.

1.3 Fundamental Conflict with the Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology

In the *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology*, the ultimate source of the universe is the Dao—a non-personified, non-willed, non-judging principle that transcends humanity and flows through all nature. “Dao gives birth to One, One gives birth to Two, Two gives birth to Three, Three gives birth to all things” describes a generative chain of cosmic evolution pointing toward harmony between humanity, society, and the cosmos—without relying on command-style divine mandates.

By contrast, Confucius’s interpretation of the Mandate lacks reverence and recognition of the cosmos’ wholeness and natural laws. Instead, it reduces Heaven into a political instrument and transforms Dao into moral dogma. The result is a transfer of sanctity from nature to rulers, ancestors, and rituals—constructing an artificial idol of order.

1.4 Summary: The Starting Point of Confucian False Dao

Confucius’s posture of “respecting spirits while keeping a distance” seems like rational restraint, but is in fact a denial of natural divinity. His concept of the Mandate of Heaven, in name honoring Heaven, is in essence creating gods—a

beginning of “man as Heaven.” With *li*, he weaves a web of institutionalized, personified divinity that replaces the “governance through non-action” and “truth through unity with Dao” advocated by Laozi. This is the essence of the “pseudo-Mandate”: concealing the natural Dao beneath artificial order—the first of Confucianism’s Seven Falsehoods.

II. Pseudo-Benevolence and Righteousness — Mencius’s Human-Centered Doctrine of Innate Goodness

Building upon Confucius’s pseudo-Mandate of Heaven, Mencius developed the most influential ideological framework in Confucianism: the doctrine of innate human goodness (*xing shan*) and the moral path of benevolence and righteousness (*ren yi*). On the surface, Mencius promotes a humane government and moral ideals, emphasizing that “the heart of compassion exists in everyone.” However, from the perspective of the *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology*, it becomes clear that Mencius’s ideas are not rooted in the natural Dao, but in a moralistic system that places humans above Heaven and Earth—a human-centered ethic that masks natural truth with fabricated morality.

2.1 The Falsehood of Innate Goodness: Ignoring the Yin-Yang Dynamic of Nature

Mencius claims that human nature is inherently good and uses the “four beginnings” (compassion, shame, deference, and discernment) as evidence. He believes that by expanding these “sprouts,” one can become a sage. However, this perspective ignores the natural universe’s inherent balance of yin and yang, where good and evil transform into each other—as Laozi says, “Misfortune rests upon fortune; fortune hides within misfortune.” The Dao itself operates without moral judgment; good and evil are situational value constructs.

Mencius’s absolutist moralization of human nature violates nature’s neutrality and dynamic balance. By portraying evil as a deviation from an ideal good nature, it demands correction, reinforcing social control and moral discipline. His moral human nature becomes an artificial divine ideal—a model of ethical worship, not a reflection of true humanity.

2.2 The Falsehood of Benevolence and Righteousness: Moral Constructs Obscuring Natural Law

Mencius elevates *ren yi* (benevolence and righteousness) as the highest human behavioral standards, constructing the ideal of the “Way of the King.” But these virtues are not born of harmony with nature—they are moral architectures of social control. Mencius aims to “rule through virtue,” but this virtue is not the virtue of Dao as followed by all things; it is moral virtue—constructed, taught, and used as a tool for social regulation.

In the *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology*, true *de* (virtue) flows from the Dao and is followed by all beings. No species in nature requires “benevolence” or “righteousness” to live and evolve. They coexist through instinct and dynamic balance. Mencius’s moral system is a departure from nature, where “human intention” replaces the “mind of Heaven”—a humanist substitution for the divine Dao.

2.3 The Falsehood of the Way of the King: Legitimizing Anthropocentric Politics

Mencius advocates for the “Way of the King,” replacing hegemonic rule with moral governance. Yet this remains a human-centered ideology, merely decorating domination with ethical labels. Unlike Confucius’s “ritual rule,” Mencius’s “rule by virtue” emphasizes moral authority—but in essence, it still embodies the human-made divine: moral virtue personified and sanctified, embodied in the sage-king who monopolizes the discourse of justice and order.

This so-called “Way of the King” does not align with natural law. It imposes a uniform ethical model upon humanity and society through ideological constructs. It is a mirage of ideal rule, not the Daoist reality of “non-action.” Laozi says, “The sage has no constant heart; he takes the heart of the people as his own,” embodying the wisdom of natural divinity through humility, softness, and alignment with the Dao.

2.4 Summary: Mencius and the Deepening Crisis of the False Dao

Mencius built upon Confucius’s pseudo-Mandate by crafting doctrines of moralized human nature and political ideals of benevolence and righteousness. These systems are iterations of human-constructed morality that not only contradict the true operation of nature but also sanctify Dao as a product of human reason and ethics—an ultimate betrayal of the Dao of natural divinity. Hence, this is “pseudo-benevolence and righteousness”—an ethical illusion born of anthropocentrism, a perilous extension of replacing Dao-governance with moral governance, and the second trap in Confucianism’s Seven Falsehoods following the pseudo-Mandate.

III. False Ritual Order — Xunzi’s “Rule by Rites” as a Rigid Replacement of Natural Order

Within the Confucian tradition, Xunzi is renowned for his systematic construction of the concept of “rule by rites” (*li zhi*). He regarded ritual (*li*) as the fundamental means to govern the state and pacify society. He even proposed the thesis of “transforming human nature and initiating artificiality” (*hua xing qi wei*), emphasizing that human nature is inherently evil and thus requires regulation and transformation through ritual and musical institutions. On the surface, Xunzi’s ritualism appears to aim at social order,

but in essence, it is a typical manifestation of using human-made institutions to rigidly replace natural order. This “false ritual order” is essentially a substitution of human constructs for the Dao of Heaven, with civilization suppressing nature—thereby deviating from Laozi’s cosmology of “Dao follows nature” (*dao fa ziran*).

Xunzi denied the possibility that the heavenly Dao governs human affairs. He clearly asserted, “Heaven operates with constant patterns; it does not survive for Yao, nor perish for Jie,” a statement that seems to echo Laozi’s idea of *wu wei* (non-action). Yet he immediately shifted to emphasize “human will triumphs over heaven” (*ren ding sheng tian*), placing human will above natural law. His concept of *li* was not a spontaneous order emerging from the Dao, but a corrective tool imposed by human culture to restrain “evil nature.” Thus, ritual in Xunzi’s framework ceased to be a flexible expression aligned with natural rhythms and became a rigid, hierarchical moral shackle that rejected individual natural disposition.

Laozi, in the *Dao De Jing*, states: “Man follows Earth, Earth follows Heaven, Heaven follows the Dao, and the Dao follows nature.” This expresses a top-down, spontaneously harmonized cosmic order. In contrast, Xunzi’s ritualism builds institutions from the bottom up, starting from artificiality and seeking stability through governance. It transforms the fluidity of the Dao, the spontaneity of Heaven and Earth, and the harmony of yin and yang into a rigid framework of human rule. Such *li* suppresses the diversity of

life and the generativity of nature, leading to entrenched social hierarchies and ideological conformity, ultimately serving as a tool for sustaining autocratic imperial regimes.

More seriously, Xunzi's ritualist thought directly influenced the radical implementation of Legalism under the Qin dynasty. Li Si and others adopted the form and structure of Xunzi's *li*, stripped of any Daoist softness, resulting in a regime of harsh laws, book burnings, and persecution of scholars. Xunzi originally intended to correct "evil nature" with *li*, but instead paved a systemic path toward tyranny, reducing *li* to a political instrument. This reveals the deeper danger of the "false ritual order": it disguises itself as a tool of moral education but in truth becomes a chain of control.

From the perspective of the Lao–Yang Genesis Cosmology, the natural god represents the flow of the Dao, cosmic harmony, and the free growth of life. All institutions, orders, and norms should conform to the rhythms of natural evolution and the dynamic tension of yin–yang balance. They must not go against this momentum nor fix its form. However, Xunzi's *li* artificially severs the relationship between Heaven and humanity, reducing the Dao to institutional rules, and confining *de* (virtue) to a stratified social order—completely betraying the wisdom of the natural god and falling into the mire of artificial systems.

Thus, Xunzi's *li* is not the *li* that communicates with the Dao but a "false ritual order" detached from the laws of nature. It seeks to seal the openness of cosmic operation with

artificial structures, to replace the flow of natural evolution with social order, ultimately leading to cultural stagnation, political authoritarianism, and spiritual repression.

This is the third of the “Seven Falsehoods”: ritual that is not true ritual, *li* that becomes a shackle.

IV. False Loyalty and Filial Piety — Dong Zhongshu’s “Heaven–Human Resonance” and the Fabrication of Divine Imperial Authority

Dong Zhongshu was a key figure in the politicization and theologization of Confucianism. By constructing the theory of “Heaven–Human Resonance” (*tian ren gan ying*), he completely transformed what was once a pluralistic and open cosmology into a closed theocratic order centered on imperial power. Not only did he elevate Confucianism from an ethical framework to a political orthodoxy, but he also deified the monarch, turning *zhong xiao* (loyalty and filial piety), originally familial virtues, into tools for sustaining autocratic rule. This concept of “false loyalty and filial piety” no longer centers on natural kinship but demands absolute loyalty and self-sacrifice to the sovereign—thereby enslaving individual emotions and moral judgment.

Dong’s theory claimed that Heaven sends omens to warn of political misgovernance and that the emperor, as the “Son of Heaven,” holds the power to influence the world’s fate. In

essence, this was an extreme politicization and instrumentalization of the Mandate of Heaven (*tian ming*). It alienated the natural *Tian* into a symbol of a man-made god and reduced the Dao of Heaven into a narrative tool for legitimizing imperial authority—thus constructing a divine-right monarchy under an artificial theology.

Furthermore, Dong pushed the concepts of *zhong* and *xiao* to extremes. Through promoting the “Three Bonds and Five Constants,” he turned hierarchical relationships—ruler-subject, father-son, husband-wife—into rigid laws of society. *Zhong* no longer meant aligning with one’s natural moral compass, but instead became unconditional submission to the ruler; *xiao* ceased to be the natural expression of affection and became a mechanical ritual under patriarchal hierarchy. This notion of “false loyalty and filial piety” stripped individuals of independent identity, reducing them to mere tools of the feudal order and reinforcing a brainwashing structure of inseparable “family-nation,” “father-son-ruler-minister” ideology.

As Laozi observed, “When the great Dao is abandoned, there is righteousness and benevolence; when wisdom arises, there is great falsity.” Dong Zhongshu, in the aftermath of the Dao’s eclipse, built an entire artificial social order in the name of *ren yi* (benevolence and righteousness) and *zhong xiao*. He no longer sought harmony with the Dao but instead used “Heaven” as a disguise to construct an ideological system that reinforced royal power, suppressed individuals, and closed off society. In the Lao–Yang Genesis Cosmology,

the Dao is the body of the natural god—its operation is spontaneous, non-coercive, and harmonious. Dong, however, established “orthodoxy” in the name of Dao, and used “Heaven’s will” to endorse “imperial will,” ultimately betraying the wisdom of the natural god and falling into the trap of artificial divinity.

“Heaven–Human Resonance” was not a deepening of natural philosophy but a façade for political religion; *zhong xiao* no longer reflected human emotional truth but became the ethical mask of monarchic power. Together, they form the foundation of Dong Zhongshu’s “false loyalty and filial piety”: invoking nature, enacting artificiality; speaking of resonance, practicing control. People were indoctrinated to be loyal to a “Heaven-chosen” ruler, yet forgot to be loyal to Heaven and Earth, to their true selves—losing the path back to the Dao.

This is the fourth of the “Seven Falsehoods”: loyalty and filial piety in name, enslavement in substance; rituals in form, power in essence.

V. False Principle and Vital Force — The Cheng Brothers’ “Unified Principle, Differentiated Manifestations” and the Rejection of Natural Spontaneity

Cheng Hao and Cheng Yi, the founding brothers of Song dynasty Neo-Confucianism (known collectively as the “Two Chengs”), inherited and developed the Confucian concept of *tianli* (Heavenly Principle), proposing the well-known doctrine of “li is one, but its manifestations are diverse” (*li yi fen shu*). They attempted to make *li* the highest ontological reality of all things in the universe, interpreting it as a supreme and unchanging moral order. Although appearing to reconstruct cosmic philosophy, they in fact continued the path of pseudo-Dao. They replaced *Dao* with *li*, transforming the spontaneous flow of *tianli* into an abstract divine will to be worshipped and used to regulate human behavior—thus completely departing from Laozi’s cosmological wisdom of *dao fa ziran* and *wuwei er zhi* (governing by non-action).

The core idea of “li is one, but its manifestations are diverse” is that all things share an essential *li*, and although this *li* appears differently in various forms, its origin is singular. While this has a surface-level appeal for philosophical unity, it conceals a suppression of diversity and transformation, and misreads the inherently fluid nature of reality. In the Lao–Yang Genesis Cosmology, the Dao is not a static abstract principle but a generative process of mutual transformation, yin–yang exchange, and ceaseless cycles. The Cheng brothers solidified this into an eternal, immutable *tianli*, violating the Dao of nature and laying the

foundation for a Confucian thought system intertwined with political and religious control.

In practice, Cheng Yi further advanced this by promoting “preserve *tianli*, extinguish human desire” (*cun tianli, mie renyu*), advocating moral absolutism in which natural human emotions and desires were to be repressed under the domination of *tianli*. This ideology delegitimized personal feelings and individual experience, turning *li* into a projection of an artificial divine will: what conforms to *li* is good, what opposes it is evil—thus opening the door to moral authoritarianism. This *li-qi* (principle–vital force) framework is essentially a false divinization—not insight into nature, but a moral programming of society.

The greatest danger of this “false principle and vital force” is that it entirely strips nature of its primacy and dynamism, reducing cosmic operation and human life into rigid systems of norms. These norms are in truth psychological projections of human desire for power, order, and obedience. The Chengs’ *li* does not arise from the natural Dao but is an artificial abstraction that turns back to dominate humanity—utterly opposed to Laozi’s Dao.

In *Taiyi Sheng Shui* (Taiyi Gives Birth to Water), we see that the universe emerges through a dynamic process of mutual assistance and cyclical transformation—from Taiyi to water, then Heaven and Earth, divine clarity, yin and yang, the four seasons, cold and heat, wetness and dryness—everything flows spontaneously. The Lao–Yang Genesis Cosmology is a

modern interpretation and extension of this natural cosmic logic. However, the Chengs' *li* artificially imposes a “final justice” and “only truth,” leaving no room for difference or doubt. This “one correct principle” philosophy is no different from contemporary idolatries of “one faith,” “one ideology,” and “one truth.”

Therefore, “false principle and vital force” is the fifth major symptom of pseudo-Dao. Though cloaked in philosophical depth, it suffocates nature in the name of *li*, enslaves vitality through the concept of *qi*, and completes a dual rigidity of both individual and nature with the logic of “principle governs force” and “force obeys principle.”

This is the fifth of the “Seven Falsehoods”: *li* as deity, *qi* as servant; in the name of Dao, the technique of control.

VI. Pseudo-Nature of Human Disposition — The Distortion Behind Zhu Xi's Doctrine of “Preserving Heavenly Principle and Eliminating Human Desires”

Zhu Xi, the great synthesizer of Neo-Confucianism during the Song dynasty, further developed the Cheng brothers' notion of “li is one but its manifestations are many” by internalizing “Heavenly Principle” (*tianli*) as the ontological essence of the human mind. His radical proposition— “preserve Heavenly Principle, eliminate human desires”— established a moral governance system for Neo-Confucianism and marked the point at which Confucian

thought fully descended from the “Way of Nature” (Dao) into the abyss of man-made divine order.

In Zhu Xi’s philosophical system, “li” was no longer merely the external cosmic order but the ultimate destination of the human heart. “Desire,” referring to natural human emotions and instinctual impulses, was redefined as heretical and impure, something to be suppressed, purged, or even entirely “eliminated.” This ideology led directly to the repression of human nature and distortion of authentic life, and later served as one of the most potent ideological tools for totalitarian moral control.

The slogan “preserve Heavenly Principle and eliminate human desires” embodies a fundamentally pseudo-nature theory of mind and disposition. The “Heavenly Principle” Zhu Xi spoke of was not Laozi’s “Dao that follows Nature,” nor was it akin to natural laws discovered through modern science. Rather, it was a fabricated rational order restructured through social power and moral dogma—an ideology serving patriarchal and political hierarchy. This “principle” demanded the suppression of human emotions and desires in order to attain the rational ideal of the sage. Thus, “human desires” were cast as the moral enemy of “Heavenly Principle,” turning even the most basic impulses—love, physiological needs, individual differences—into objects of condemnation under the label of “private desire.”

The gravest issue with this theory of human disposition is that it reduces the human being from a natural, living entity

into an ethical puppet—a being stripped of its truest impulses and emotional authenticity, now forced to serve a constructed order of “principle.” This sharply deviates from Laozi’s philosophy of “Dao follows Nature” and “transformation through non-action,” and violates the *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology*, which emphasizes the harmonious coexistence of all things, the interaction of yin and yang, and the generative rhythm of the cosmos. In the way of Nature, emotion, desire, and vitality are all embodied expressions of the Dao within humans—integral parts of spontaneous cosmic evolution. They should not be artificially repressed, and certainly not treated as evil.

Zhu Xi’s absolutization of “Heavenly Principle” was embedded into social and political structures through a system of “moral propriety,” making the elimination of human desire not just an individual demand but a mechanism of social control. Especially in later generations, as Neo-Confucianism became the official ideology, “eliminating desires” evolved into a tool to obliterate personal freedom and suppress intellectual diversity, leading to spiritual enslavement, societal rigidity, and moral violence under authoritarian regimes. Zhu Xi’s teachings became the perfect philosophical apparatus for imperial power.

According to the *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology*, human mind and disposition are a natural inner operating system endowed by Heaven and Earth, a manifestation of the Dao within the human body—a vibrational current of qi shaped by yin-yang harmony. Zhu Xi’s call for “elimination of

desire,” however, is a human attempt to suppress this natural flow of qi, opposing the cosmic momentum and resulting in internal rupture and external distortion.

Thus, Zhu Xi’s theory of human nature is not a deepening of understanding, but a moral control mechanism centered on man-made divine order. Its essence is to transform humans from natural, real beings into moral tools subjugated to “Heavenly Principle.” This trend of “de-naturalization” forms a pivotal element in the Confucian “Seven Pseudo-Doctrines,” a decisive turning point from the natural Dao of Laozi to an artificial divine order.

This is the sixth pseudo-doctrine:

“Pseudo-Nature” — suppressing emotion through principle, oppressing humanity through the Dao, imprisoning the mind in the name of the divine.

VII. Pseudo-Qi Transformation — Zhang Zai’s “Qi as Substance” and the Logical Deviation of Turning the Void into the Real

Zhang Zai, a foundational figure in Neo-Confucian cosmology, proposed the idea of “Qi as the root of all existence,” constructing a metaphysical framework centered on qi as both ontological substance and dynamic force. In his *Western Inscription*, he wrote: “Heaven is my father, Earth is my mother, and even such a small being as I finds a place

within their midst.” His ambition was clear: to provide Confucianism with a naturalized cosmology, using qi to explain the origin and order of all things.

However, Zhang Zai’s qi theory bears a fundamental logical deviation: he sought to replace the concept of “Dao as void” with a substantialized, metaphysical qi, thereby reifying the formless, turning the non-being into being, and ultimately betraying the essence of natural transformation. His so-called “Qi-Transformational Theory” became not a return to nature, but a repackaging of Confucian orthodoxy in the guise of nature—yet still an artificial divine order cloaked in the language of substance.

Zhang Zai viewed qi as the original material of the universe, believing that all things arise from the condensation and dispersal of qi, and return to it upon death. This theory may appear to approach Laozi’s cosmology or resemble modern physics’ concepts of matter and energy, but it lacks the critical foundation of non-being. It does not recognize the primacy of the Dao as the void, the source of spontaneous emergence and dissolution. Instead, it elevates qi into an ontological absolute, treating a dynamic process as a fixed substance—a false inversion of reality.

The *Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology* clearly distinguishes between “Dao” and “qi.” “Dao” is the supreme law of the universe, formless, nameless, spontaneously arising and ceaselessly transforming—it is non-being that gives rise to being. “Qi” is the medium through which the Dao manifests

—it is a derivative, not a source; a tool, not a foundation. To elevate qi to the status of Dao is to confuse tool with origin, to collapse the invisible order into visible substance, and to reduce the infinite flow into finite form. This is the core fallacy of Zhang Zai’s system.

Furthermore, Zhang Zai’s qi theory ultimately serves the moral agenda of Confucianism, embedding qi into the structure of propriety, righteousness, loyalty, and filial piety. His ideal of “establishing the heart for Heaven and Earth, establishing the Dao for the people” is not rooted in natural spontaneity but in political moralism. In his framework, qi is no longer natural flow, but becomes a carrier of moral order, constrained by Confucian norms. The so-called “Great Harmony” is not born of yin-yang balance and cosmic evolution, but constructed by humanistic values and social design.

This is the final descent of Confucianism: from natural Dao to moral principle, from Dao to li, from li to qi, and from qi to fabricated cosmology under political ideology. Zhang Zai’s qi transformation theory appears to align with nature, but is in fact a pseudo-natural theory wrapped in human-centered teleology.

**This is the seventh pseudo-doctrine:
“Pseudo-Qi Transformation” — turning process into substance, misusing the void, and fabricating divine order through the name of Heaven and Earth.**

Conclusion: From the “Seven Pseudo-Doctrines” to the True Dao — The Awakening Path Back to the Natural Dao

From Confucius and Mencius to Xunzi, Dong Zhongshu, the Cheng brothers, Zhu Xi, and Zhang Zai, Confucianism, despite its diverse theoretical expressions, has in its ontological core deviated from the original order of the natural universe. It has followed a cognitive trajectory centered on “anthropocentrism” and the subjugation of the Dao to human-imposed principle. This path is marked by seven layers of falsification:

- **Pseudo-Mandate of Heaven — rejecting the natural divine by “respecting ghosts and spirits but keeping them at a distance,” while fabricating the “Mandate of Heaven” to legitimize royal authority;**
- **Pseudo-Benevolence and Righteousness — imposing human moral codes as the cosmic foundation, replacing the natural Dao of spontaneous generation;**
- **Pseudo-Ritual Order — freezing the dynamic flow of nature with rigid ritual laws, constructing hierarchical systems that suppress human nature;**
- **Pseudo-Loyalty and Filial Piety — inventing the doctrine of “resonance between Heaven and humanity” to sanctify imperial rule and mythologize family-state loyalty;**
- **Pseudo-Principle and Qi — rationalizing and instrumentalizing nature through the categories of li and qi, violating the effortless spontaneity of the Dao;**

- **Pseudo-Mind and Nature** — repressing the vitality of life with the slogan “eliminate human desires,” shaping a rationalized and constrained personality;
- **Pseudo-Qi Transformation** — reifying and systematizing qi, thereby obscuring the invisible, ever-transforming flow of the Dao.

These seven falsifications constitute an ideological system of man-made divinization: anthropocentric, ethically constructed, and ultimately serving state power. They thoroughly abandon the original Dao of Heaven and Earth—the self-transforming, self-generating, and non-coercive natural way. This system is neither true religion nor true science, nor even authentic natural philosophy. Rather, it is a cultural pseudo-theology that disguises human-made constructs as “Heavenly principle” and expresses a cosmic anthropomorphism in philosophical form. This is precisely what Laozi criticized as “the loss of the Dao through human interference,” and it remains one of the deep-rooted causes of today’s human crisis.

Today, humanity stands at a historical crossroads marked by ecological collapse, technological alienation, and spiritual disorientation. Only through a great awakening can we break free from the cultural prison built by these “Seven Pseudo-Doctrines” and return to the authentic order of the natural Dao. This path is precisely the holistic wisdom revealed by the Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology.

In the Lao-Yang Genesis Cosmology, the Dao is the fundamental substance of the cosmos—nameless, invisible, neither deity nor principle, transcending all human constructs. It is nature’s nature, life’s life. The Milky Way is the visible manifestation of Dao; Heaven and Earth are the resonance of Yin and Yang; life is the universe’s self-expression. Humanity should live in accordance with the Dao and govern through harmony with it—not fabricate artificial gods to dominate Heaven and Earth or control all living beings. The universe was not created for humanity; all things possess their own Dao-nature. Politics should be governed by non-action (wuwei), culture should embrace the unity of Heaven and humanity, and life should flow naturally rather than be confined by rigid institutions and ethical codes.

Therefore, exposing the “Seven Pseudo-Doctrines” of Confucianism is not only a deep reflection on Chinese intellectual history—it is also a philosophical correction of the trajectory of human civilization. We must no longer worship fabricated pseudo-gods, nor indulge in illusions built upon man-made orders. As Laozi said:

“Man follows the Earth, Earth follows Heaven, Heaven follows the Dao, and the Dao follows what is natural.”

We must once again align ourselves with the true cosmic order and rebuild a civilization that reveres Nature as the divine.

This is not merely the end of false Dao, but the rebirth of the True Dao. It is our responsibility—and the historical mission of our time.