

Article

On the "Public world" Thought in Waiting for the Dawn: A Plan for the Prince

Fudong Ni^{1,*}
¹ School of Marxism, Hangzhou Medical College, Hangzhou, China

* Correspondence: Fudong Ni, School of Marxism, Hangzhou Medical College, Hangzhou, China

Abstract: *Waiting for the Dawn: A Plan for the Prince* is a seminal work of political thought by the eminent Ming-Qing transition scholar Huang Zongxi. Its core concept of the "Public world" not only embodies his profound critique of the "private family rule" political form under traditional monarchy, but also reflects his supreme ideal of constructing a democratic and people-oriented political system. In this foundational text, Huang elaborates his "Public world" thought along three main dimensions: the philosophical principle that "the world is the master, the ruler is the guest"; the institutional design asserting that "only with law-based governance can there be good rulers"; and the practical pathway of "restricting monarchy and promoting democracy." Furthermore, this comprehensive framework is consistently carried through by three integral elements: the underlying principle of the "Public world," the institutional mechanism of "Establishing Public Law," and the moral cultivation of "Cultivating Public-Minded Persons," which specifically encompasses the ruler, ministers, scholars, and officials. By systematically analyzing these dimensions, this paper explores the historical significance and contemporary value of Huang's political philosophy. Ultimately, the study reveals how his vision of a public-oriented governance model challenged autocratic traditions and provided a crucial theoretical foundation for early democratic thought in Chinese intellectual history, offering enduring insights into modern political institutional design and public administration.

Keywords: political thought; public governance; chinese philosophy; democratic theory; institutional design

1. Introduction

Waiting for the Dawn: A Plan for the Prince was completed in October 1663, during the early years of the Kangxi reign. This work represents a profound intellectual response to the historical crisis precipitated by the collapse of the Ming dynasty, embodying Huang Zongxi's lifelong commitment to pragmatic statecraft grounded in moral principle and institutional reflection. Rather than offering abstract philosophical speculation, the text systematically examines the structural and ethical foundations of governance through a rigorous analysis of historical patterns across dynastic transitions. Its central concern lies in diagnosing the systemic failures that led to prolonged political instability and social disarray, particularly the erosion of normative standards in official conduct, the weakening of institutional checks on authority, and the misalignment between fiscal policy and agrarian welfare. The composition follows a deliberate hierarchical architecture—beginning with foundational principles of sovereignty and proceeding downward through layers of administrative function—culminating in critiques of peripheral yet influential actors such as eunuchs. This arrangement reflects not only a logical progression from core to contingent elements of governance but also a prioritized sequence of reform-oriented inquiry, where each chapter isolates a distinct domain—monarchical legitimacy, ministerial accountability, scholarly education, military organization, land tenure, taxation, and legal codification—for sustained critical scrutiny. As articulated in the author's preface, the overarching objective is to delineate enduring

Received: 15 August 2026

Revised: 26 September 2026

Accepted: 06 October 2026

Published: 09 October 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

principles of sound administration, understood not as rigid prescriptions but as adaptable frameworks responsive to changing societal needs. Within this framework, two interdependent axes emerge: the human dimension—encompassing rulers, ministers, literati, and bureaucratic functionaries—and the institutional dimension—including legal statutes, educational institutions, land management systems, and defense structures. Both axes converge upon a shared ethical orientation: the realization of collective well-being rather than private advantage [1–3]. The concept of the 'Public world' thus signifies a normative ideal wherein leadership selection emphasizes virtue and competence over lineage or patronage, and legal norms are designed to serve impartial justice and broad-based prosperity. Such an ideal presupposes mechanisms for meritocratic recruitment, transparent deliberation, and institutionalized oversight—features Huang Zongxi explores in detail through concrete proposals concerning examination reforms, school-based advisory councils, standardized land redistribution protocols, and civilian-led military logistics. His vision resists both autocratic concentration and anarchic decentralization, instead advocating for balanced, participatory governance anchored in Confucian ethical commitments and empirically informed institutional design. The following discussion will first clarify the conceptual contours of this 'Public world' ideal before undertaking a systematic exposition along the dual dimensions of personnel cultivation and institutional construction.

2. Public World (the World Is the Master, the Ruler Is the Guest)

Huang Zongxi's conceptualization of the 'Public World' emerged from a profound engagement with historical experience and ethical reflection, shaped by the transformative sociopolitical transitions of the late Ming and early Qing periods. As a scholar deeply rooted in classical learning, his intellectual trajectory was informed not by partisan allegiance but by sustained inquiry into the foundations of legitimate governance, social harmony, and institutional responsibility. His writings reflect a systematic re-examination of long-standing assumptions about authority, duty, and the moral basis of political order—assumptions that had been traditionally anchored in classical texts and transmitted through centuries of scholarly commentary. In this context, he posed fundamental questions concerning the practical realization of ethical ideals: Why did normative visions of virtuous rule repeatedly fail to produce stable, equitable, and enduring institutions? How might the cyclical patterns observed in dynastic historiography be interpreted not as inevitable fate, but as outcomes of structural features embedded in governance models themselves? His analysis extended to the classical notion of human nature, interrogating whether societal well-being could realistically depend upon the exceptional virtue or impartiality of individual rulers. He observed that historical records consistently revealed a pattern wherein political power tended to become hereditary, institutionalized within familial lineages, rather than being entrusted solely on the basis of merit, public service, or moral qualification. This tendency, he noted, stemmed from deeply ingrained human inclinations toward self-preservation and familial continuity—tendencies acknowledged even in foundational classical sources. Rather than treating Yao, Shun, and Yu as literal historical figures, Huang approached them as symbolic representations of idealized governance grounded in collective welfare and procedural fairness. Against this backdrop, he advanced the principle that the realm belongs fundamentally to the people, and that those who assume leadership roles do so not as proprietors or inheritors of sovereign entitlement, but as appointed stewards entrusted with safeguarding shared interests [4–6]. The ruler's legitimacy, therefore, derives not from lineage or divine sanction alone, but from functional accountability, transparency in decision-making, and fidelity to the common good. This perspective implies a structural reorientation: governance is not an exercise of private prerogative, but a public vocation requiring institutional safeguards, consultative mechanisms, and normative constraints [7, 8]. Huang's thought thus anticipates later developments in administrative ethics and civic philosophy—not as ideological advocacy, but as a historically grounded contribution to the evolution of political theory within the Chinese

intellectual tradition. His emphasis on service-oriented leadership, institutional responsibility, and the primacy of collective welfare remains relevant for contemporary discussions on governance quality, public administration reform, and the ethical foundations of statecraft.

3. Establishing Public Law ("Only with Law-Based Governance Can There Be Good Rulers")

From the perspective of legal institutional design, a stable, impartial, and publicly oriented legal framework serves as the foundational condition for sustainable governance excellence. Classical thinkers emphasized that reliance solely on individual virtue—however admirable—introduces unacceptable variability into state administration; human judgment, even when well-intentioned, remains subject to personal bias, temporal limitations, and situational pressures. In contrast, a robust legal order provides continuity, predictability, and shared standards that transcend individual tenure. This insight underscores a long-standing intellectual tradition affirming that enduring governance quality arises not from exceptional personalities but from carefully structured institutions grounded in principle and public accountability. Within this framework, mechanisms for distributing responsibility and reinforcing collective deliberation become essential. One such proposal involved the formal reestablishment of a high-level coordinating office—historically designated as the Prime Ministerate—to serve as a constitutional counterweight, ensuring that executive functions were exercised through consultation, review, and shared stewardship rather than unilateral discretion. Such an arrangement would foster balanced decision-making by embedding multiple perspectives into the core administrative process, thereby reducing the risk of arbitrary or unexamined action. Furthermore, institutional safeguards were deemed necessary to prevent influence from sources external to the formal civil service—particularly individuals whose proximity to authority derived not from merit or public mandate but from personal access or ceremonial roles. To preserve integrity in governance, it was considered vital to maintain clear boundaries between administrative duties and private or domestic spheres, ensuring that official responsibilities remained distinct from informal or non-institutional channels of influence. Strengthening the professional capacity of the civil service constituted another pillar of this vision. Systematic cultivation of talent through dedicated educational institutions formed the cornerstone of long-term administrative resilience. These institutions were envisioned not merely as centers for transmitting technical knowledge but as dynamic forums where ethical reasoning, historical understanding, and practical statecraft converged. Curriculum design emphasized both theoretical grounding and applied analysis, encouraging learners to engage critically with administrative challenges while remaining anchored in principles of public service. The role of such institutions extended beyond training: they functioned as hubs for policy reflection, intergenerational knowledge transfer, and normative reinforcement—serving as repositories of institutional memory and ethical orientation. Their graduates were expected to embody competence, integrity, and civic commitment, forming a cohesive cohort capable of sustaining coherent governance across changing circumstances. Regarding strategic security architecture, certain proposals advocated for the revitalization of regional defense formations—structured as professionally trained, locally integrated forces operating under standardized command protocols. These formations were intended to fulfill dual objectives: maintaining readiness against external threats and reinforcing systemic stability through structural balance. Their operational independence was conceived not as separation from central coordination but as functional specialization enabling rapid, context-sensitive response. By virtue of their geographic embedding and mission focus, such formations contributed to national resilience without compromising unity of purpose or adherence to common standards. The underlying rationale rested on the principle that institutional diversity—when aligned with shared norms and coordinated through transparent mechanisms—enhances overall system robustness. This approach avoided concentration of capability in any single node while preserving

coherence through interoperability, mutual accountability, and common training frameworks. It also reflected a broader understanding of governance as a distributed, adaptive practice requiring layered capacities rather than monolithic control. Finally, the emphasis on decentralization was never conceived as fragmentation but as intelligent allocation—assigning responsibilities according to functional logic, geographic relevance, and capacity thresholds. When properly calibrated, such distribution supported responsiveness, innovation, and local ownership without undermining national cohesion or strategic alignment. Historical experience suggested that systems exhibiting moderate structural plurality—combined with strong normative anchoring and consistent oversight—demonstrated greater durability and adaptability over extended periods. Thus, the integration of legal clarity, institutional balance, professional development, and strategic layering represented a holistic conception of governance excellence rooted in empirical observation and sustained reflection.

4. Cultivating Public-Minded Persons (“Restricting Monarchy and Promoting Democracy”)

From the dimension of “persons”, Huang Zongxi emphasized that ethical cultivation—particularly the development of public-spiritedness—constitutes a foundational requirement for those entrusted with governance responsibilities, including rulers, ministers, and scholarly officials. In his seminal work, he articulated a vision of political morality grounded in collective welfare rather than individual advantage. He observed that early human societies faced a fundamental coordination challenge: while common interests existed—such as shared safety, equitable resource access, and mutual protection—no institutional mechanism or moral consensus existed to reliably advance them. This condition necessitated the emergence of individuals willing to subordinate personal considerations to broader societal needs [9–11]. Such figures were not motivated by ambition or material reward but by a sense of duty toward the common good. Historical comparison formed a key part of his analysis: he contrasted idealized models of ancient governance—where authority was exercised with humility, restraint, and sustained attention to popular well-being—with later developments in which political office increasingly functioned as a vehicle for private enrichment and dynastic consolidation. The shift, in his view, reflected a deepening misalignment between formal authority and its normative justification. Rather than treating governance as a vocation rooted in service, successive regimes came to regard administrative power as an extension of familial or proprietary control. This transformation undermined the legitimacy of rule and weakened the capacity of institutions to respond effectively to complex social needs. His critique thus centered not on abstract constitutional forms but on the moral dispositions underpinning political practice. Within this framework, law occupied a distinctly instrumental role—it served as a tool deployed at the discretion of the ruler rather than as an autonomous standard binding upon all, including those in power. The absence of a tradition emphasizing legal supremacy stemmed from long-standing cultural assumptions about virtuous leadership, wherein exemplary conduct by rulers and officials was expected to shape social norms more effectively than codified statutes. Nevertheless, Huang recognized that increasing centralization of authority, especially during the late imperial period, strained this model. As decision-making became concentrated in fewer hands and less responsive to local conditions or expert input, governance grew less adaptive and more prone to error. He therefore stressed that rational administration required not only sound intentions but also structural safeguards—mechanisms ensuring accountability, deliberation, and functional specialization. His concern extended beyond mere procedural correctness to encompass the epistemic foundations of policy: effective governance demanded accurate information, contextual understanding, and responsiveness to evolving circumstances—all of which were compromised when authority operated without checks or collaborative oversight. Consequently, he maintained that the moral expectation placed upon rulers must be exceptionally high—not because they occupy a privileged status, but because their

decisions bear disproportionate consequences for the entire population. Their position entails a fiduciary responsibility grounded in the principle that political office exists solely to serve communal ends, not to satisfy personal aspirations or consolidate familial advantage.

This expectation of public-spirited conduct applied equally to ministers and other high-ranking officials. Huang underscored that the rationale for establishing ministerial offices derived from practical necessity: no single individual, however capable, could manage the vast scope and intricate complexity of state affairs alone. Governance therefore required a distributed system of responsibility, wherein specialized knowledge and localized expertise could inform decision-making across multiple domains. Ministers were not subordinates in a hierarchical chain of command but co-responsible agents whose primary allegiance lay with the realm and its inhabitants. Their relationship with the ruler was thus conceptualized as one of cooperative stewardship rather than unilateral subordination. He employed the metaphor of collective labor—comparing governance to a group effort requiring coordinated action—to illustrate how rulers and ministers jointly bore responsibility for maintaining orderly administration. Within this arrangement, mutual respect, intellectual exchange, and shared commitment to public welfare constituted essential features. Ministers were expected to act as critical interlocutors, offering counsel grounded in substantive analysis rather than deferential affirmation. Their role included identifying emerging challenges, proposing evidence-informed solutions, and advocating for policies aligned with long-term societal flourishing. Crucially, Huang distinguished between service oriented toward the people's enduring interests and service oriented toward transient expressions of personal preference. Officials who prioritized short-term appeasement over sustainable development, or who accommodated narrow interests at the expense of broader equity, failed to fulfill their core mandate. He further noted that institutional evolution had progressively eroded these collaborative dynamics. The abolition of the prime ministership during the Ming dynasty represented a pivotal moment in this trajectory, concentrating executive functions within the imperial household and diminishing opportunities for structured consultation [12–14]. Without formal channels for deliberative engagement among senior administrators, policy formulation risked becoming insular and detached from operational realities. Restoring such mechanisms, he argued, would enhance both the quality and legitimacy of governance. Delegating specific responsibilities to qualified ministers would not only alleviate cognitive overload on the sovereign but also promote functional differentiation—allowing individuals with domain-specific competencies to address issues requiring technical proficiency. This approach reflected a sophisticated understanding of organizational design, recognizing that effective governance depends not only on moral intent but also on appropriate institutional architecture. By assigning clearly defined roles and fostering environments conducive to informed debate, administrative systems could better anticipate challenges, mitigate unintended consequences, and adapt to changing conditions. Such arrangements supported what might be termed 'epistemically robust' governance—one in which decisions emerged from diverse perspectives, rigorous analysis, and sustained reflection rather than unilateral judgment.

Beyond structural reforms, Huang placed significant emphasis on personnel selection as a cornerstone of sound governance [11]. He advocated for recruitment practices that prioritized demonstrable competence over formal credentials alone. During his era, the civil service examination system heavily emphasized literary composition, particularly the highly stylized eight-legged essay format, which tested rhetorical skill and classical erudition but offered limited insight into candidates' analytical abilities, administrative acumen, or practical judgment. While mastery of canonical texts provided valuable historical and ethical grounding, Huang contended that it did not suffice as a proxy for real-world problem-solving capacity. He proposed a two-stage evaluation process: initial screening could remain relatively inclusive to encourage broad participation, but subsequent assessment should rigorously evaluate candidates' aptitude

for actual governance tasks—including fiscal management, legal interpretation, infrastructure planning, and crisis response. This distinction between eligibility and suitability reflected a nuanced appreciation of human capital development: entry into office marked the beginning, not the culmination, of professional formation. Ongoing training, mentorship, and performance review would therefore be indispensable components of an effective civil service system. Moreover, he highlighted the importance of diversifying recruitment pathways to incorporate individuals with non-traditional backgrounds—such as engineers, agronomists, medical practitioners, and logistical specialists—whose expertise addressed concrete societal needs often overlooked in conventional curricula. Such inclusivity would strengthen institutional resilience by expanding the repertoire of available knowledge and reducing reliance on homogenous modes of reasoning. His advocacy for 'practical statesmanship' thus represented more than a critique of contemporary shortcomings; it constituted a forward-looking vision of administrative professionalism grounded in empirical observation, methodological pluralism, and continuous learning. It acknowledged that governance is inherently interdisciplinary, requiring integration of ethical reflection, technical knowledge, historical awareness, and contextual sensitivity. By aligning personnel systems with these principles, institutions could cultivate leaders capable of navigating complexity, balancing competing priorities, and sustaining long-term societal advancement. This perspective remains relevant today, as modern governance continues to confront multifaceted challenges demanding both principled commitment and pragmatic adaptability.

5. Conclusion

In sum, a rigorous examination of institutional design, social organization, and power distribution reveals deep-seated structural contradictions within the political order of the late imperial period. The critique advanced centers on two interlocking dimensions: the normative role and ethical accountability of political actors, and the substantive legitimacy and procedural fairness of legal frameworks. Historical analysis identifies a pivotal conceptual rupture occurring around the transition from the early dynastic era—often idealized in classical discourse as embodying collective stewardship—to subsequent periods characterized by increasingly centralized, hereditary authority structures. This shift is not merely chronological but epistemological: it reflects a transformation in the foundational justification of governance, moving from conceptions rooted in shared welfare and communal responsibility toward models grounded in dynastic continuity and hierarchical prerogative. Within this framework, the vision of governance articulated in foundational texts emphasizes that legitimate political order must originate from an unwavering commitment to the common good rather than private or familial interest. From this principle, a coherent sequence follows: first, the deliberate construction of institutional arrangements—laws, offices, and procedures—that institutionalize fairness, transparency, and accountability; second, the cultivation of individuals whose moral formation, intellectual training, and practical experience align with those institutional aims. Such individuals are not conceived as exceptional moral agents operating outside systemic constraints, but as functionally integrated participants whose conduct is both enabled and disciplined by just institutions. The interdependence between law and character is thus constitutive: neither can sustainably realize justice without the other. Moreover, this model resists reduction to either technocratic formalism or virtue-based individualism; instead, it posits a dynamic equilibrium wherein institutional integrity shapes ethical disposition, and ethical sensibility informs institutional refinement. Contemporary relevance lies not in historical replication but in the enduring analytical value of interrogating how power, law, and moral agency co-constitute political possibility.

References

1. D. F. Kettl, *The Transformation of Governance: Public Administration for the Twenty-First Century*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press, 2015.
2. P. D. Aligica, P. J. Boettke, and V. Tarko, *Public Governance and the Classical-Liberal Perspective: Political Economy Foundations*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2019.
3. K. Morrell, "Governance and the public good," *Public Administration*, vol. 87, no. 3, pp. 538–556, 2009.
4. J. Kooiman, "Governance. A social-political perspective," in *Participatory Governance: Political and Societal Implications*. Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2002, pp. 71–96.
5. R. A. W. Rhodes, "Governance and Public," in *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy*, 2000, p. 54.
6. A. Weale, "New modes of governance, political accountability and public reason," *Government and Opposition*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 58–80, 2011.
7. W. Walters, "Some critical notes on 'governance'," *Studies in Political Economy*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 27–46, 2004.
8. H. Bang and A. Esmark, "Good governance in network society: Reconfiguring the political from politics to policy," *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 7–37, 2009.
9. P. Katsamunskia, "The concept of governance and public governance theories," *Economic Alternatives*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 133–141, 2016.
10. J. Kooiman, "Social-political governance: overview, reflections and design," *Public Management: An International Journal of Research and Theory*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 67–92, 1999.
11. J. Pløger, "Public participation and the art of governance," *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 219–241, 2001.
12. B. G. Peters and J. Pierre, "Governance without government? Rethinking public administration," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 223–243, 1998.
13. C. Stivers, *Governance in Dark Times: Practical Philosophy for Public Service*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2008.
14. K. Kim, "Public Policy and Governance: Some Thoughts on Its Elements," SSRN, 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2589526>.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.