



# Nationalism, Egalitarianism and Global Justice

Su Gu<sup>1</sup>

Received: 25 January 2019 / Accepted: 22 February 2019 / Published online: 4 March 2019  
© Fudan University 2019

## Abstract

Global distributive justice requires that universal standards and values be recognized and respected to avoid moral relativism. Egalitarianism in domestic context demands equal treatment of all persons, whereas in global context, egalitarianism means equal treatment of all nations or peoples. Nationalist appeal quite often neglects universal values and standards in dealing with global justice. Although Rawls rejected global egalitarianism in his late works, the main idea developed by his *A Theory of Justice* is still important for global justice. The reason why just arrangements should benefit the least advantaged domestically is parallel to that why they should benefit the poorest nations in global justice. Equality of opportunities in global context means that equal respect and treatment of all people, and nationality and religious beliefs should not obstruct anyone from getting a job or position. One of the moral arguments for benefiting the least advantaged is luck egalitarianism, and the luck/choice distinction is used for explaining personal responsibility in social and economic differences. It is bad when one person is worse off than another through no fault or choice of her own. But it is unjust when someone does better than others only because of her social class or family background. And social institutions that discriminate against persons based on arbitrary traits like nationality, gender, origin of country or region, religious beliefs, etc., are a bad example of unjust distribution. Rawls' difference principle does not make a distinction between two reasons that cause disadvantage. Therefore, the requirement to benefit the least advantaged should embody the luck/choice distinction; people should be responsible for the cost of their choice and not for their natural assets. This principle may be extended to global justice. For those who live in poverty because of their lack of natural resources and gifts, compensation should be made to let them lead a decent life, and to those who voluntarily choose their lifestyle that causes their disadvantage, the efforts to benefit them should be to their minimal satisfaction, as a humanitarian appeal. And some nations voluntarily choose their institutions, ways of life, including working style, ways of doing business, educational efforts and political corruption, which cause lower economic development and efficiency. Social and economic equality in such circumstances is not unconditional, and international assistance should consider the choice factor.

---

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

**Keywords** Global distributive justice · Egalitarianism · Nationalism · Luck egalitarianism · Luck/choice distinction

Distributive justice is an important part of global justice, and egalitarian position and approach has much appealing strength. I will discuss how principles of equality in domestic context can be extended to global context, and what it means for equality of all nations or peoples. From normative perspective, standards and values should be recognized and respected in response to nationalist appeals and to avoid moral relativism. Among the egalitarian principles suitable for persons, I will explore how equality of opportunities can be extended to global context and what revision should be done for global justice. In rejecting teleological principle of equality, when we extend Rawlsian principle of difference to global justice, luck egalitarianism is quite attractive, the luck/choice distinction stresses personal responsibility in making choices, and I will explore its meaning to global justice.

## 1 Nationalism and Universal Values for Global Justice

As we discuss the moral foundation for global distributive justice, a theoretical problem of justification is unavoidable. The problem is: on which moral foundation is global justice based. Quite often, the official response by some authorities is this: every country has its own criteria for justice; any nation cannot impose its own standards on other nations. The same response exists in issues on international relations. “Only the foot can tell whether the shoe fits,” which means that any particular nation evaluates or judges justice with its own feeling or standard, and all others are not entitled to comment or criticize.

Such a kind of reply suggests that since justice depends on the nation, community, culture, time, etc., there are no universal standards for justice, whether domestic or global, just as there are no universal moral values. That argument implies a cultural and moral relativism, which means that when a policy on social justice issues is criticized, a universal value for justice is not suitable. Such a position is often taken as an excuse for escaping a universal obligation for global justice.

If there is no a universal standard for justice, any request for justice will be futile. A denial of universal values would lead to giving up all obligations for justice. For evaluating or criticizing any institutions, public policy or any way of distributing resources, a universal standard or criterion is necessary. When some social critics point out many unjust policies and institutions, asking for a just system embodying ideals of justice among nations, theoretically, they don't recognize universal values and standards of justice in the same era. That shows a logical contradiction: they do not recognize any universal standard for justice, but at the same time, criticize unjust institutions of other nations or societies, and boast themselves as an example of a just system and policy arrangements.

Nationalist appeals and patriotic sentiments are quite influential in international relations. As far as global justice is concerned, it is understandable that national interests

take priority over other nations, politicians often say that their policy-decisions will be based on consideration of national and world peoples' interests. Patriotic sentiments come from natural feelings for one's own nation, ethnicity, history and culture. But when there are conflicts of interest among nations, national partiality is not always justifiable. Here, the problem is how moral universalism of global justice and moral particularism of nationalism can be compatible. Nationalist appeals are always attractive to many people, rich or poor countries alike, such as "America first," "Russia first" or "China first." From the perspective of global justice, any nation's first priority should be verified by a universal standard. Denial of universal standards for justice, criticism of unjust deeds of any nation and society by using such phrases like "unjust," "unfair," "unequal treatment of nations," "double standards to international issues," etc., are all actually self-destroying in theory and practice. A correct attitude is to recognize universal values and standards of justice and check all policies and system of distribution with the universal criteria, such as human rights, the rule of law, and compliance with treaties and contracts.

A responsible nation or people obliged to global justice should respect universal values and standards of justice in dealing with international relations. There is no excuse for evading international supervision and checkout on global justice. As China is arising as a world economic and political power, observing universal standards and rules, complying with regulations and contracts of international treaties are crucial to its obligation for global justice. Nationalist sentiments quite often obstruct its observation of universal values on international issues, which results in taking its national characteristics and interests as an excuse for neglecting universal values on global justice. Leftist ideology such as theories of class struggle, colonialism and imperialism has long been guidelines in dealing with international relations; it encourages a partial standpoint in judging international issues. For a long period of time, an absolute support of poorer and former colonies against imperialism was its main foreign policy. Since adopting the "reform and open up" policy, opening up to the world and participating in world affairs has changed some of its foreign policies, but theoretically, how to avoid a nationalist partiality and recognize universal values in global justice is still a great task to fulfill.

As Rawls says: "Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is the systems of thought. A theory however elegant and economical must be rejected or revised if it is untrue; likewise laws and institutions no matter how efficient and well-arranged must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust." (Rawls 1971: 3) Although Rawls argues for justice in a well-ordered society in *A Theory of Justice*, he develops it in *the Law of peoples*, where he extends justice from domestic to global, dealing with the law among peoples. Since there are some differences between justice within a country and justice among nations, the universal standards that exist in such issues like human rights, democracy, equality, freedom, etc., serve as a common denominator for people among nations to deal with each other.

## 2 Equality of All Peoples

When we talk about egalitarianism in global justice, an important question is: What kinds of equality do we really want? There are different forms of equalitarianism, teleological equalitarianism sets equality of results as the ultimate target, thinking itself is good, neglecting that requirement of equality should be restraint by justice and legitimacy. Equalitarianism in that sense cannot address violations of human rights of liberty as it appeals to leveling down people's income and also neglects other values of justice, such as greater and further benefits brought by the positivity in stimulating human production and creativity. The doctrine of priority or sufficiency held by Frankfurt, Nagel and Parfit tries to avoid horizontal comparisons between people and guarantee everyone sufficient things by examining absolute living standard, or benefiting the least advantaged, which embodies Rawlsian principle of difference. And safeguarding equality of liberties is the principle of equality that takes priority in recognizing social differences.

So egalitarian approach in global distributive justice has its own appeal, which is mainly the principle of equality among all peoples, that can be derived from the principle of equality among all persons. But its content and meaning still need to be clarified.

All humans are created equally, which is politically and morally equal. Equal treatment of all persons means taking everyone as equal human with equal rights. Egalitarianism here stresses everyone's equal moral worth, rather than economic equality. Teleological equalitarianism sets equality of economic results as the ultimate target, thinking itself as good, and leveling down of wealth from rich to poor is necessary. As Parfit summarizes that principle of equality: "It is in itself bad if some people are worse off than others" (Parfit 2000: 84). The principle requires that everyone get the same income or be in the same economic condition, which is unrealistic and not always acceptable because it could encourage forceful leveling down of the rich to the poor and neglect other values of justice.

Therefore, liberal egalitarian principle in domestic justice requires equality of persons in political and moral sense, not in economic conditions. And according to Rawls, one of the important principles of equality for distributive justice is the equality of opportunity, which means that everyone is equal in her chance of receiving education, getting position in public office, etc., irrespective of her race, nationality, family background and so on.

Can those principles of equality be extended from domestic to global distributive justice? First, equality of persons can be extended to equality of peoples. As in *a theory of justice*, Rawls indicates how justice as fairness can be extended to international law for the limited purpose of judging the aims and limits of just war. And in *the Law of Peoples*, he develops his views on principles governing the law of peoples. Rawls says that "what distinguishes peoples from states—and this is crucial—is that just peoples are fully prepared to grant the very same proper respect and recognition to other peoples as equals. Their equality doesn't mean, however, that inequalities of certain kinds are not agreed to in various cooperative institutions among peoples, such as the United Nations, ideally conceived.

This recognition of inequalities, rather, parallels citizens' accepting functional social and economic inequalities in their liberal society" (Rawls 1999: 35).

In response to the question of inconsistency between treating persons and treating representatives of peoples equally, Rawls says: "Clearly, I have supposed that the representatives of peoples are to be situated equally, even though the ideas of justice of the decent nonliberal societies they represent allow basic inequalities among their member." So there is no inconsistency: "a people sincerely affirming a nonliberal idea of justice may still reasonably think its society should be treated equally in a reasonable just Law of Peoples. Although full equality may be lacking within a society, equality may be reasonably put forward in making claims against other societies." (Rawls 1999: 70) An example is that churches may be treated equally and are to be consulted as equals on policy questions, even though some of them are hierarchically organized.

How can principles of equality extended from domestic to global justice? Rawls says that proceeding in a way analogous to the procedure in *A Theory of Justice*, his eight principles of justice among free and democratic peoples include: 1. Peoples are free and independent, and their freedom and independence are to be respected by other peoples. 3. Peoples are equal and are parties to the agreements that bind them. 4. Peoples are to observe a duty of nonintervention (Rawls 1999: 36–37). Rawls stresses that free and independent well-ordered peoples are ready to recognize certain basic principles of political justice as governing their conduct; these principles constitute the basic charter of the Law of Peoples.

So justice as fairness in domestic context can be extended to global justice; as Rawls says, his eight principles of the Law of Peoples are superior to any others. "Much as in examining the distributive principles in justice as fairness, we begin with the baseline of equality—in the case of justice as fairness the equality of social and economic primary goods, in this case the equality of and the equal rights of all peoples." And in law of peoples, persons are not under one but many governments, and the representatives of peoples will want to preserve the equality and independence of their own society (Rawls 1999: 41). Hence, it is a natural conclusion that equality of persons within a state should extend to a sense that people across state or societal boundaries should treat one another as equals. Equality and equal rights of all peoples constitute an important content of global justice, which requires that all peoples and nations, big or small, rich or poor, strong or weak, should be treated and respected equally.

Equal respect and treatment of all peoples should be universal, not only for those in liberal democratic and decent societies, but also for those of outlaw states or those in unfavorable conditions. A principle of justice such as that of nonintervention may have to be qualified in the general case of outlaw states and grave violations of human rights, but the principle of equal respect and treatment still is suitable to all peoples. To those outlaw states, when humanitarian disasters happen, a punishment and intervention is necessary, equal treatment of all peoples is still requisite. From the perspective of international relations, a people is like a person, has its own personality, equal rights and respect of persons can be extended to global context. Just as Dworkin points out: "government must not only treat people with concern and respect, but with equal concern and respect. It must not distribute

goods or opportunities unequally on the ground that some citizens are entitled to more because they are worthy of more concern. It must not constrain liberty on the ground that one citizen's conception of the good life of one group is nobler or superior to another's" (Dworkin 1977: 272–273). Equal treatment is most important rights to a person. Peoples are equal in the world, and they should not be prejudiced or discriminated against for the sake of their geographical size, population, religion, race, and cultural tradition.

Another principle of equality in global distributive justice is equality of opportunity. Its main appeal is that people born with equal potential or equal natural ability should have an equal chance of obtaining the best jobs, if they make the same effort. As Rawls points out, the principle demands that individuals with "the same level of talent and ability and the same willingness to use these gifts should have the same prospects of success ... In all parts of society there are to be roughly the same ... prospects of achievement" (Rawls 2001: 44).

The characteristics that should not influence people's opportunities include gender, ethnicity, class, religious believes and so on, and the only factor that should affect people's opportunities is talent and hard working. Can such analysis be extended from domestic to global context for equality of opportunity? To analyze gender, ethnicity, class, believes, all that can be taken into account in global equality of opportunity, the special factor in global justice is religious believes; as in the current world, many people have been prejudiced and oppressed in choosing jobs and lives for their different religious believes.

Another factor in consideration is nationality, as Caney points out: "persons of different nations should enjoy equal opportunities: no one should face worse opportunities because of their nationality." (Caney 2005: 122) Why should not one's nationality be the feature that influences her obtaining favorable jobs or positions, success in life? Because ultimately it is a morally arbitrary characteristic, to be born and identified with a particular nation should not be one's privileged condition, since the only prerequisite for one to get a job and position is her talent and hard working. So global equality of opportunity requires that when it comes to distributing jobs or the rewards attached to them, nationality should not make a difference. In current world, there are still important factors that influence people's opportunity to their success and flourishing; a great deal of resources should be spent on infrastructure among the world's poor. For example, educational opportunities should be equalized. Nationality, religious and political affiliation, gender, race, ethnicity, class and other factors may still influence one's fair chance. Equality of opportunity is a hard task to fulfill in global justice.

### 3 Luck/Choice Distinction and Egalitarianism

Economic equality in the international arena is an important topic for global justice. As long as there is disparity between rich and poor countries, economic inequality should always be addressed for global justice, just as domestic distributive justice should deal with inequality among individuals in a community or nation. Economic equality among citizens in a society can be a problem of justice for several reasons.

In his *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls expounds principles of justice, the second of which says: “Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone’s advantage and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all” (Rawls 1971: 60). Rawls further explains article (a) as “to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, consistent with the just saving principle” (Rawls 1971: 302). When arrangement to the benefit of the least advantaged is fulfilled, all others will be benefited from it by chain reaction.

Is such a liberal egalitarian approach to distributive justice suitable for global justice? Although Rawls rejected global egalitarianism in his late works, the main ideas developed by him for domestic justice are still important for global justice. The main difference is the subject or entity of justice. It is citizens in the domestic context, and institutions or nations in the global context. Principles suitable for individuals may not be suitable for institutions. But my point is that it may not be totally contradictory; they at least overlap with each other partly.

The reason why just arrangements should benefit the least advantaged is parallel to that why they should benefit the poorest nations in global justice. One of the moral arguments for benefiting the least advantaged is luck egalitarianism put forward by Cohen, Dworkin, Arneson and others. It holds that a distribution of economic goods is just when it tracks individual choices and ambition, rather than good or bad luck, and one of its main aims is to rectify the influence of luck on people’s lives. Here, the luck/choice dichotomy is used for explaining personal responsibility in social and economic differences. Luck egalitarians emphasize that it is bad when one person is worse off than another through no fault or choice of her own (Cohen 1989). For example, one person studies hard, makes great efforts in working, and she justly gets and deserves a better life prospect. But it is unjust when someone does better than others only because of her social class, or family background, which accidentally happened to her, rather than her hard work and efforts. And social institutions that discriminate against persons based on arbitrary traits like nationality, gender, origin of country or region, religious beliefs, etc., are bad examples of unjust distribution.

The egalitarian’s main concern here is with comparative fairness. Among equally deserving people, it is unfair for someone to be worse off than others through no fault or choice of their own. On the other hand, it is not unfair for someone to be worse off than others through her own choice and efforts, such as laziness, refusal of studying hard, spending too much on some luxury hobbies, or even drug abuse, or committing a crime by her own will. According to Rawls’ principle of difference, social arrangements should benefit the least advantaged, but if we consider the difference between luck and choice among causes for one being better or worse off than others, should there be some different treatment in compensating the least advantaged? It is another kind of unfairness for a society to disproportionately compensate those who are worse off than others through their own choice. Such a welfare arrangement may bring some undesirable results; in particular, it may discourage people’s efforts to produce social goods. As in the case of welfare states, over-compensation of the disadvantaged results in lower efficiency and motivation to work.

Teleological egalitarians take economic equality as good without distinguishing different circumstances and reasons that cause differences among people. Luck

egalitarians try to make a distinction between luck and choice in factors causing people's differences. So motivation and incentive to work is a factor that should be considered in evaluating an egalitarian approach. It is not always good to bring people total equality in social and economic results, so the substance of equality should be deliberated upon in deciding just arrangement. Luck egalitarians try to equalize people's natural and social circumstances, so that one will not be worse than others for reasons outside her control, such as natural endowments and social background.

On the other hand, if the bad situation is not caused by her natural and social circumstances, but by her own choice, such as the lifestyle one freely chooses, then why should economic income be equalized by forcing the advantaged to compensate the disadvantaged? Rawls' difference principle does not make a distinction between the two reasons that cause the disadvantage. Treating people with equal concern does not mean that everyone gets the same without analyzing reasons that cause the difference; it requires people pay for the cost of their own choice. So if we recognize the luck/choice distinction in explaining the difference principle, the requirement to benefit the least advantaged should embody such a distinction, and it should not unconditionally benefit the least advantaged without referring to the reason for the disadvantage. People should be responsible for the cost of their choice and not for their natural assets. The difference principle should take those factors into account, making some difference between the two kinds of factors, and its requirement to benefit the least advantaged should also adjust to the distinction. To those who are naturally disadvantaged, compensation should be made to let them lead a decent life, and to those who voluntarily choose their lifestyle that causes their disadvantage; the efforts to benefit them should be to their minimal satisfaction, as a humanitarian appeal.

#### **4 Choice Responsibility and Global Egalitarianism**

Turning to global egalitarianism, treating nations as equals is the main principle, similarly to individuals in domestic justice. Here, nations are parallel to individuals, but they are not always the same to deal with. An individual has definite free will, behaves in accordance with her own decisions and takes a full responsibility for what she chooses to do. A nation consists of different individuals with different opinions and attitudes; it seems there is no definite free will for a nation. But a view in global justice still takes a nation as somehow similar to an individual, it has a personality, and its collective will looks like a person's free will. Although there are differences among people in a nation, some general trends or characters within its people do exist.

Although Rawls may not be a luck egalitarian and a global egalitarian, but his theory of justice is still an important reference for global justice. In general, nations should be treated as equals; no hegemony is legitimate in international relations. Equal respect and concern of nations is a universal value for global justice. And national autonomy and self-determination should be respected and honored as a cosmopolitan principle. Those liberal egalitarian principles for individuals can be extended to global justice.



As to economic inequalities in the world, Rawls' difference principle can be applied globally. It requires arrangements to the benefit of the least advantaged nations or peoples, and the rich countries should assist the poor countries in various ways. One way is people to people, to redistribute resources from citizens in rich countries to citizens in poor countries, directly or indirectly (Van Parijs 1995: 223–228). But there are some problems with the transferring of resources, one of which is the method of transference. Unlike within a sovereign country with some institutions to fulfill such redistribution, there are no such global institutions to engage in the international remedy of resources. A world government does not exist. And the United Nations is far from fulfilling such a task, in that it has no efficient working mechanism to make effective decisions on and implement redistribution. Quite often, the United Nations cannot make any valid decision on transferring resources because of political differences among its members. So the creation of effective international institutions for global redistribution is still a hard task to implement, but it is necessary because of our natural duty to justice.

Even when there is no such a global institution, transferring resources directly from people to people is somehow possible by international aid groups. Many resources are distributed through local governments. Their work efficiency quite often decides the achievements of redistribution. Corruption of government officials would leave many resources in the hands of the advantaged, and the real disadvantaged people are still in need of assistance.

When we consider the moral argument for the difference principle as applied to global justice, the luck/choice distinction comes again. Why should just arrangement benefit the least advantaged people? If those people living in poverty are caused by bad luck, such as lack of natural resources and gifts, infertile lands, bad physical and mental conditions, then benefiting the poor and letting them lead decent lives are fair and reasonable; the main work is to improve their natural circumstances and living conditions, such as transportation, hospitals and educational facilities. But there is another kind of reason that causes people in poverty, which is people's free choice. Some people in a poor country may willingly choose their way of life, such as efforts, attitude toward business, consumption habits, which are similar to individuals' choices of lifestyle. In the international context, there are some special factors in people's choice, such as social system and institutions, which may influence people's economic conditions. Political corruption influences people's income distribution; in the international economic aid case, the poor people cannot get real assistance as a few corrupt families embezzle the money; and concentration of wealth in a few families may leave general masses in poverty. Even in some newly democratized countries, which have free election systems for their political leaders and officials, corruption and lack of well-trained and responsible officials result in their people living in bad economic conditions. Although in those conditions, poor people may not take the full responsibility for its current political institutions, in general, a nation's system has been chosen by its people and culture. As in domestic situations where some economic aid has not achieved its goals, because disadvantaged individuals keep their old way of life and refuse to make efforts to improve their living conditions, if there is no constant aid to them, their poverty will continue for a

long time. Similar things happen in the international arena, economic aid has not changed some poor people's lives, because they refuse to make greater efforts to improve their lifestyle and living conditions, including infrastructures, education and health systems; rather, they use the economic aid for some wasteful habits, like the ritualistic act of worshipping.

As to global economic inequality, scholars emphasize the uneven distribution of resources and great disparity between rich and poor nations. Some request a radical transferring of resources from rich to poor countries, which is reasonable and needs some reform. But the choice responsibility of the disadvantaged people is quite often neglected. Although the role luck and choice factors play in causing poverty is hard to make clear, sometimes they are mixed up. For example, many poor people in a country may have no good natural resources and gifts and also have no great ambition and efforts to make progress, which leave them bad health and educational conditions. But in general, we still can argue that the main responsibility lies in choice, which can explain why some aid has no results or has not achieved its general goal to eliminate poverty.

This is similar to economic assistance to individuals. The difference here is something like capacity-building. As a Chinese saying goes, "Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day. Teach a man to fish and he will eat for the rest of his life," the best way to help those disadvantaged people is to increase their abilities and ambition to achieve, rather than unconditional supply of materials.

So I agree with global egalitarianism that the Rawlsian principle of difference can be extended globally, but some clarification is needed. If we recognize the luck/choice distinction in explaining the difference principle, the requirement to benefit the least advantaged should embody such a distinction. It should not unconditionally benefit the least advantaged without referring to the reasons for the disadvantage. People should be responsible for the cost of their choices and not for their natural assets. In global context, transferring of resources from rich to poor countries for those people who lack natural resources and gifts is necessary to let them lead a decent life, but for those people who voluntarily choose the lifestyle and institutions that are responsible for their poverty, international aid is also required for their minimal satisfaction, but all the efforts in aid and benefits should not neglect the task of improving their abilities and efforts to produce social goods.

**Acknowledgements** Funding was provided by National Planning Office of Philosophy and Social Science of China (Grant No. 17BZX082).

## References

- Cohen, G.A. 1989. On the Currency of Egalitarian Justice. *Ethics* 99: 906–944.
- Caney, Simon. 2005. *Justice Beyond Borders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dworkin, Ronald. 1977. *Taking Rights Seriously*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Parfit, Derek. 2000. Equality or Priority. In *The Ideal of Equality*, ed. Matthew Clayton et al. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, John. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.  
Rawls, John. 2001. *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.  
Van Parijs, Philippe. 1995. *Real Freedom for All*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Su Gu** Doctor of Philosophy, Research Fellow, Institute for Advanced Studies in Social Sciences of Fudan University; Professor of Philosophy and Law, Nanjing University. Main areas of research: Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Law. He is Acting member of Council of Association for Modern Foreign Philosophy of China, member of Council of Association for History of Foreign Philosophy of China, research fellow of Hong Fan Institute of Law and Economics. He has published about 10 academic books including *Essential Ideas of Liberalism*, *A History of Western Political and Legal Thoughts*, *After Republic: Writings in Political and Legal Philosophy*, and many research papers.

## Affiliations

Su Gu<sup>1</sup> 

✉ Su Gu  
gusunj@163.com

<sup>1</sup> Fudan Institute for Advanced Study in Social Sciences, Fudan University, Room 2807, East Main Building, Guanghai Tower, No. 220, Handan Road, Yangpu District, Shanghai 200433, China