

Warlord, Social Welfare and Philanthropy

The Case of Guangzhou Under Chen Jitang, 1929-1936

ALFRED H. Y. LIN

University of Hong Kong

This study highlights the administration of social welfare and philanthropy in Guangzhou in the 1930s. It aims to elucidate three important points about state-society relationships under warlordism. First, a warlord could not afford to ignore the needs of society, for satisfying such needs (or at least making attempts to satisfy such needs) was vital to the credibility and survival of his regime. Second, a warlord would have little problem funding social welfare projects, for he always had recourse to extrabudgetary sources of revenue to finance desired undertakings. And third, the administration of social welfare and philanthropy by a warlord was an integral part of his drive toward total control of state and society. Indeed, care and control made up the two sides of a warlord's strategy of governance: care laid the foundation of stable rule, whereas control served as the means to safeguard this foundation.

Keywords: *Chen Jitang; Guangzhou (Canton); warlordism; social welfare; philanthropy*

Philanthropy addresses the human problem of poverty, transcending the bounds of space and time. But philanthropy is also culturally specific, for both its idea and practice are steeped in diverse national traditions. Moreover, although philanthropy is by definition an act of benevolence, the motives that underlie the willingness of individuals

AUTHOR'S NOTE: *I am grateful to the Committees of Management of the Louis Cha Fund and the Hsu Long-sing Research Fund, the University of Hong Kong, for financing my research on Guangzhou and on Chen Jitang, respectively. I also thank two anonymous referees for Modern China, who made useful comments on my manuscript.*

MODERN CHINA, Vol. 30 No. 2, April 2004 151-198
DOI: 10.1177/0097700403261823
© 2004 Sage Publications

or groups to ameliorate the woes of the needy, or to change the conditions causing such woes, can be different.

A recent study of U.S. philanthropy puts donors into seven categories, according to their motivation: the Communitarian, who sees donation to local nonprofits as "good for the giver as it is for the recipient"; the Devout, who considers giving "a religious act"; the Investor, who views contribution as "good business"; the Socialite, who finds "doing good is fun"; the Altruist, who perceives giving as "a moral imperative"; the Repayer, who has benefited from some institution and now "supports that institution from a feeling of gratitude, loyalty or obligation"; and the Dynast, who recognizes philanthropy as "a strong family value" (Prince and File, 1994: 14-16, 22, 32, 95). Significantly, all believe that nonprofits are more effective than the government in addressing social and human problems (Prince and File, 1994: 18-19, 35-36, 45-46, 58-59, 73, 86, 98).

China has a time-honored tradition of philanthropy. In the imperial period, it was common for individuals, lineages, temples, and the state to provide alms to widowers (*guan*), widows (*gua*), orphans (*gu*), the childless (*du*), and the poor (*pin*). Not until Ming and Qing times were "charitable halls" (*shantang*) established by the local gentry and merchants (Liang Qizi, 1997: 9; Liang Yungu, 1935: 63-74). Voluntary and state action were often intertwined, producing a "'mixed economy' of welfare" similar to that prevalent in Europe before the mid-nineteenth century (Cunningham, 1998: 2). But while the Europeans usually distinguished *philanthropy* from *charity*, linking the latter to the alms mandated by Christianity, the two were rarely differentiated in China, where alms giving was largely secular.

In Confucian China, beneficence was regarded as a personal and a social virtue: a concrete expression of the cardinal value of "benevolence" (*ren*), which justified the existence of both the individual and the state. Accordingly, the main focus of philanthropy was the benefactor; the beneficiary's needs constituted only a secondary consideration. If the homeless, poor, and sick were housed, fed, and cured, it was because the Chinese people believed that human beings had to be safe and sound before they could benefit from instruction in moral principles. Physical relief was thus "largely a means to a different end," namely, "to morally reform the indigent" (Lum, 1985: 206-7). Philanthropy in traditional China was not a social policy with rational

economic underpinnings but a function of “edification” (*jiaohua*): a means to reinforce orthodox social and cultural norms (Liang Qizi, 1997: 3, 239). It therefore failed to tackle the fundamental problem of human poverty.

The rise of the “welfare state” in the West in the second half of the nineteenth century affected the infant Chinese Republic, where an embryonic form of modern “relief administration” (*jiuji xingzheng*) took shape within the Ministry of Internal Affairs (*Neiwubu*) at Beijing (Chen Xuxian, 1943: 7). But it was only after “political tutelage” (*xunzheng*) started under the Nationalists in October 1928 that China began to approach the West in state management of social welfare (Wang Yunjun, 2001: 86, 99). In January 1929, the Nationalist government established at Nanjing China’s first social welfare bureau (*shehuiju*), which integrated social welfare into municipal administration (Nanjing *tebieshi zhengfu*, 1929: 14-15, 51-55). Legislation passed in June of the same year promoted social welfare nationwide (Qiu Chuanghuan, 1977: 103-4).

Largely driving this new trend was the government’s attempt to legitimize itself by creating a cult of Sun Yat-sen; these developments demonstrated allegiance to Sun’s teaching that “socialized distribution” (*fenpei zhi shehuihua*) is the key to solving social problems, as shown by “the actual facts of social progress in the West during the last few decades” (Sun Yat-sen [1924b] 1996: 943-44). Besides, the Nationalists must have been cognizant of their duty to administer social welfare since they aimed to set up a modern government recognized as such by other nations. With a view to learning from other countries’ experiences, the Nanjing authorities sent Chen Lingyun on an inspection mission to Europe, the Soviet Union, the United States, and Japan. His report contained the most comprehensive account of contemporary welfare systems to date (Chen Lingyun, 1937).

A new awareness had thus emerged during the Nanjing Decade (1928-1937)—that social welfare is a hallmark of the modern nation-state. Indeed, the idea of the “welfare state” began to be widely disseminated through the writings of many Chinese intellectuals. Western municipal administration fascinated them, not only because of its efficiency but also because of its concern for “public welfare” (*gongyi*) (Yang Zheming, 1929: 9-11). So did the discipline of social work, which emphasized field investigations in studying social problems. In

1929, Yanjing (Yenching) University, a missionary college, converted its Department of Sociology into the Department of Sociology and Social Work; it trained a good number of social workers (Lin Wanyi, 1994: 174).

The term *social relief work* (*shehui jiuji shiye*) gained wide currency in the 1930s as this new awareness spread. Significantly, for contemporaries, it was associated with Western concepts—*social welfare* (*shehui fuli*), *social work* (*shehui shiye*), or *public assistance* (*gonggong xiezhu*)—rather than the traditional mode of dispensing relief by state and voluntary bodies (Chen Lingyun, 1937: pref., 1; Chen Xuxian, 1943: 8-9).

Several characteristics of social relief work in the Nanjing Decade merit further attention. First, the Nationalist government recognized “social relief” as the state’s responsibility and its citizens’ right. Second, it recognized the imperative need to extend its scope from “passive relief” (*xiaoji jiuji*) to “active relief” (*jiji jiuji*), making it not merely a palliative for distress but also a social policy that aims to remove the causes of poverty and misery. Third, Nanjing regularized the administration of social relief, which came under the jurisdiction of special state organs at various levels: the Ministry of Social Welfare (*Shehuibu*) at the central level, departments of civil administration (*minzhengting*) or departments of reconstruction (*jiansheting*) at the provincial level, social welfare bureaus (*shehuiju*) at the municipal level, and social welfare sections (*shehuike*) or civil administration sections (*minzhengke*) at the county level. And fourth, it drew a clear distinction between state action and voluntary action, both of which came under the purview of the Ministry of the Interior (*Neizhengbu*) (Chen Xuxian, 1943: 7-14, 69-77, 101-2, 129-34; Chen Jie, 1937: 10). When discussing the late 1920s and 1930s, I refer to state action as *social welfare* and voluntary action as *philanthropy*.

Given the chronic disorder that plagued China during the period of warlordism and “residual warlordism” (Sheridan, 1966: 14-16), one might expect a rising demand for relief and wonder how the warlord regimes responded. Surprisingly, the vast body of scholarly literature on both warlordism and residual warlordism sheds little light on this important aspect of Republican history.

James Sheridan’s seminal study of the warlord Feng Yuxiang briefly mentions Feng’s establishment of “various welfare institu-

tions” at Kalgan (Zhangjiakou, in Chaha’er province) in the mid-1920s, later repeated in Suiyuan and Gansu provinces: a nursery; an orphanage; a home for the blind, crippled, and impoverished elderly; a clubhouse for laborers; rooms for rickshaw coolies; a bathhouse for poor workers; and a clinic and a hospital for civilians (Sheridan, 1966: 158-59). More generally, according to Sheridan,

The most tragic characteristic of warlordism was the oppression, injury, and hardship that it inflicted on the Chinese people. During the warlord era there was little constructive governmental action, even in critical emergencies. When famine or plague struck, provincial warlord governments often failed to provide effective relief; their disorder and greed also rendered it difficult or impossible for foreign relief organizations to aid the suffering people. [Sheridan, 1966: 23-24]

Although this conventional view of warlordism has been challenged, revisionist studies contain scant information on the role of warlords or residual warlords in relief provision. For instance, Donald Gillin’s book on the Shanxi warlord Yan Xishan only touches on Yan’s concern for public health and for storing grain to combat famines in the late 1910s and early 1920s. Gillin’s detailed discussion of Shanxi’s Ten-Year Reconstruction Plan in the 1930s says nothing about relief work (Gillin, 1967: 36-38, 125-207). So, too, while Diana Lary’s study of the Guangxi Clique and the Guangxi Reconstruction Movement that started in late 1931 notes that “the Kwangsi [Guangxi] leaders were anxious to create an impression of closeness to the masses, [and] of a paternalistic concern for the welfare of the people,” she is short on specifics: “For the first time the missionaries’ charitable work received official approval,” and “under the patronage of . . . Madame Li Tsung-jen [Li Zongren] . . . charitable works became fashionable” (Lary, 1974: 185-86). Eugene William Levich similarly tells us little in this regard, observing only that the Guangxi leaders were committed to promoting public health and operating granaries (Levich, 1993: 155-56, 217-20).

Yet a wealth of information exists on social welfare and philanthropy in Guangzhou (Canton) under the military regime of Chen Jitang (1929-1936).¹ Drawing on it, this study highlights three points that are central to understanding state-society relationships under warlordism. First, even a warlord ruling mainly by force could not

afford to ignore social needs, for satisfying such needs (or at least attempting to do so) was vital to the credibility and survival of his regime. Second, a warlord would have little problem funding social welfare projects, despite the demands of his military sector—he always had recourse to extrabudgetary sources of revenue to finance desired undertakings. Third, the administration of social welfare and philanthropy by a warlord was integral to his drive toward total control of state and society. As we will see, Chen brought private charities under state control by establishing the Hall of Benevolence (*Ren'ai shantang*), which functioned as the headquarters of all private charities in Guangdong province; he even appropriated the assets of some, using various pretexts. I start with a brief discussion of philanthropy in Guangzhou before the ascendancy of Chen Jitang, then examine in greater detail Chen's centralized administration of social welfare and philanthropy from 1929 to 1936.

*PHILANTHROPY IN GUANGZHOU
FROM THE LATE QING TO 1928*

THE ROLE OF THE STATE

In late nineteenth-century Guangzhou, relief for the old and disabled officially fell to the Hall of General Relief (*Pujitang*), which comprised five distinct institutions located in or beyond the eastern suburb (*dongguan*): a home for old men (*nan laorenyuan*), a home for old women (*nü laorenyuan*), a leprosarium (*mafengyuan*), an old home for the blind (*jiu gumuyuan*), and a new home for the blind (*xin gumuyuan*). Because of ineffectual administration, their inmates often took to begging (*Guangzhonianjian*, [GN], 1935: 17.1-2; Lum, 1985: 15-26, 178-81, 187-89).

Two changes occurred in the early twentieth century: first, Governor-General Cen Chunxuan (1903-1907) converted the new home for the blind into a military surveying office; second, the Guangzhou authorities placed the leprosarium under the charge of the Public Health Bureau (*Weishengju*) shortly after the establishment of the Republic in February 1912 (GN, 1935: 17.1-2). The Guangzhou authorities maintained the facilities that were left, now called the Three Institutes

of General Relief (Puji sanyuan), until the summer of 1919 when Mo Rongxin, Guangdong's military governor, cut off their funding. Chen Jiongmeng, who toppled Mo's regime in 1920, found little time to handle philanthropic work. He placed the remaining institutes under the management of a French Catholic mission, though he gave them 3,000 yuan (Guangdong dollars) per month. Apparently, the mission's chief concern was to proselytize the inmates, who became increasingly unruly. In 1924, a riot occurred in the home of the blind when Mayor Sun Ke turned part of its premises into the Municipal School for the Blind (Shili mangren xueyuan) and displaced some residents; order was restored only after the police were called in (GN, 1935: 17.2).

State relief for the needy made considerable progress after the Chinese Nationalist Party (Guomindang) inaugurated the National Government in Guangzhou in July 1925. At the time that the Northern Expedition was launched in July 1926, the Education Bureau (Jiaoyuju) established the Municipal Poorhouse (Shili pinmin jiaoyangyuan) in the poverty-stricken district of Gaogang in the upper western suburb (*shangxiguan*) to provide the old with a refuge and the young with training at some trade (GN, 1935: 17.2-3). In the same year, the Public Health Bureau founded the First Municipal Insane Asylum (Shili diyi shenjingbingyuan); in 1927, an asylum previously run by an American mission became the Second Municipal Insane Asylum² (Shili dier shenjingbingyuan) (Lee, 1936: 104-5).

Lin Yungai, who became mayor of Guangzhou in January 1928, promoted social relief with a view to improving municipal administration. After taking up office, Lin decided to establish a large-scale poorhouse that would admit first the beggars; second, the unemployed; and, third, other categories of the poor. A provisional committee set up in August to carry out this project instructed the Public Security Bureau (Gonganju) to collect information on beggars and to survey existing relief institutions in the city (GN, 1935: 17.3). The data compiled in October revealed that of the 685 beggars in Guangzhou, 151 were crippled, 93 blind or dumb, 108 young and able-bodied, 311 old and weak, and 22 infant (Guangzhoushi shizhengfu tongjigu, 1929: 68). The Public Security Bureau also reported that the Three Institutes of General Relief, the Municipal School for the Blind, and the Municipal Poorhouse were poorly

managed. They were incorporated, on 1 November 1928, into one grand relief institution: the Guangzhou Municipal Poorhouse (Guangzhoushi pinmin jiaoyangyuan), to be located at Shipai, at some distance away from the eastern suburb. The municipal government appropriated 3,900 *mu* of land and ordered the Public Works Bureau (Gongwujū) to construct 32 buildings to house the poor. It then levied a surtax on land in Guangzhou, called the “fee to bring up the poor” (*pinmin jiaoyangfei*), to finance the new institution (GN, 1935: 17.3-4).

THE ROLE OF VOLUNTARY PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATIONS

Nongovernmental philanthropic organizations, known generically as “charitable associations” (*shanshe*) or “charitable halls” (*shantang*), sprang up in late Qing Guangzhou. The earliest of these voluntary agencies—excluding charitable medical centers run by foreigners³—was apparently the Runshen Association, founded in 1869 by the literati of the eastern suburb. Initially a literary club, it did not take up philanthropic work until the bubonic plague hit Guangzhou in 1894 (Li Huichuan, 1981: 202-3; Benedict, 1996: 133-35). The first charitable hall was the Aiyu, founded in 1871 by various merchant guilds (*hang*) in the prosperous western suburb (*xiguan*); it became the most prominent of the renowned Nine Charitable Halls (Jiushantang) of Guangzhou (Li Huichuan, 1981: 195-204; Lum, 1985: 121-24, 127-29, 138-41; Tsin, 1999: 25-26).

Table 1, based on extant records and personal reminiscences, lists the 34 private charities that were established in late Qing and early Republican Guangzhou: 27 before and 7 after the fall of the Qing dynasty. Significantly, 20 out of the 27 from the late Qing were founded after 1890 (not counting 3 whose dates are uncertain). Ten of the 27 were located in areas dominated by the gentry (the Old City, the New City, Henan, and the eastern suburb) and 17 in areas dominated by merchants (the western and southern suburbs). Indeed, the benefactors and managers of these private charities were either the local gentry or merchants, who mixed philanthropy with edification by sponsoring public lectures on moral maxims (Lum, 1985: 118-21, 139).

TABLE 1: Voluntary Philanthropic Organizations in Guangzhou, 1869-1928

<i>Organization and Location</i>	<i>Year Founded</i>	<i>Source of Funding</i>	<i>Charities Provided</i>
The Nine Charitable Halls			
1. Runshen Association; E	1869	Members' subscription	Medical care, food, clothing, and schooling
2. Aiyu Charitable Hall; W	1871	Public subscription and rental	Medical care, food, clothing, coffins, burials, and schooling
3. Liangyue Guangren Charitable Hall; S	1890	Public subscription and rental	Medical care, food, clothing, coffins, and burials
4. Guangji Hospital; S	1892	Rental	Medical care and relief in stricken areas
5. Chongzheng Charitable Hall; W	1896	Public subscription and rental	Medical care
6. Shushan Charitable Hall; W	1897	Public subscription and rental	Medical care, food, and clothing
7. Mingde Charitable Hall; W	1898	Unknown	Medical care and relief in stricken areas
8. Fangbian Hospital; W	1899	Public subscription	Medical care and relief in stricken areas
9. Huixing Charitable Institute; New City	1900	Public subscription and rental	Medical care and relief in stricken areas
Other charitable halls			
10. Leshan Charitable Hall; W	Late Qing	Unknown	Medical care
11. Lian'an Charitable Association; W	Late Qing	Public subscription	Medical care
12. Shenggongcao Hall; Old City	Late Qing	Public subscription	Medical care
13. Shoushi Charitable Hall; S	1876	Rental	Medical care and relief in stricken areas
14. Simiao Charitable Hall; W	1885	Rental	Medical care
15. Zunsheng Charitable Hall; E	1894	Members' subscription	Medical care and burials
16. Chongben Charitable Hall; Old City	1898	Members' subscription	Medical care
17. Pu Charitable Hall; W	1898	Public subscription	Medical care
18. Rouji (Hackett) Hospital; W	1899	Subscription by the American Presbyterian Mission	Medical care
19. Huichun Charitable Institute; W	1904	Public subscription	Medical care
20. Yongchang Charitable Association; S	1904	Public subscription	Medical care

(continued)

TABLE 1 (continued)

<i>Organization and Location</i>	<i>Year Founded</i>	<i>Source of Funding</i>	<i>Charities Provided</i>
21. Aiqun Charitable Institute; W	1905	Members' subscription	Medical care
22. Zanyu Medical Association; Henan	1905	Members' subscription and rental	Medical care
23. Liangguang Baptist Foundling Home; E	1907	Members' subscription	Care for orphans
24. Guanghua Hospital; S	1908	Members' subscription	Medical care
25. Zhide Hospital for Infants; W	1908	Public subscription	Medical care for sick infants
26. Home for Chinese Returning from Peru; E	1909	Subscription by Chinese emigrants in Peru	Lodging, food, and medical care for returned emigrants
27. Henan Renji Hospital; Henan	1910	Public subscription and rental	Medical care, coffins, and burials
28. Zuile Charitable Hall; Old City	1915	Public subscription	Medical care
29. Liangguang Baptist Hospital; E	1919	Public subscription and rental	Medical care
30. Charitable Firefighting Association; S	1920	Public subscription	Firefighting
31. Xiajupu Joint Firefighting Association; W	1921	Members' subscription	Firefighting
32. Henan Free Medical Center; Henan	1925	Subscription by the Chinese Doctors' Association	Medical care
33. Henan Charitable Medical Association; Henan	1927	Members' subscription	Medical care
34. Xiguan Free Medical Center; W	1928	Public subscription	Medical care

SOURCE: GN, 1935:17.113-16; Li Huichuan (1981: 196-208).

NOTE: E = eastern suburb; W = western suburb; S = southern suburb.

The sudden proliferation of private charities was presumably due to the inability of local government to fund and manage relief, particularly at times of crisis. After Guangzhou was hit by a devastating tornado in 1877, the gentry and merchants assumed the task of coordinating relief in the stricken areas (Li Huichuan, 1981: 195-96). However, it was not until the plague outbreak of 1894 that private charities mushroomed all over the city.⁴ In no time, they “were transformed into the signal representative of an important new entity: ‘society’ (*shehui*),” with the Nine Charitable Halls standing out as “the embodiment of the new *qun* or society” (Tsin, 1999: 10, 30).

This emergence of elite-run charities typifies what Mary Rankin (1986) and William Rowe (1984, 1989) describe as late Qing civic activism. On one hand, the extrabureaucratic elites managed the charitable halls under the close watch of the imperial government, which sometimes exercised control by funding and participating in their activities (Lum, 1985: 205; Tsin, 1999: 25, 29; Yeung, 1999: 179-80); on the other hand, their leadership of these new civic organizations brought them a measure of power, which facilitated their involvement in nonphilanthropic matters when the opportunity arose. Thus, as the Guangzhou merchants became increasingly politicized in the 1900s, they used their newly gained power to organize new forms of association that could affect Guangdong’s antforeign, constitutional, and revolutionary politics (Rhoads, 1974).

The 1911 Revolution further empowered the Guangzhou merchants, as they finally succeeded in organizing a citywide, guild-based militia—the Guangzhou Merchant Corps (Guangzhou shangtuan)—to protect their interests (Yeung, 1999: 185-86). Ironically, the ensuing chaos in Guangdong strengthened rather than weakened their position, for successive provincial governments found their support indispensable (Qiu Jie, 2002a: 56-60; 2002b: 78). The charitable halls also became very active in local and even national politics early in the Republic. For instance, they jointly petitioned and advised the central government in Beijing not to take sides in World War I (Shenbao, 13 June 1914). Especially influential were the Nine Charitable Halls, in whose name military governor Long Jiguang, a protégé of President Yuan Shikai, rejected Li Liejun’s proposal in May 1916 to let his National Protection Army (Huguojun) march through Guangzhou (Yu Yanguang and Chen Fulin, 1989: 63).

The Guomindang's return to power in Guangzhou in the early 1920s marked a decline in the power and influence of the charitable halls. In 1921, the newly inaugurated Guangzhou Municipality (Guangzhoushi shizhengting) assigned the duty of overseeing the general behavior and welfare of society to the Education Bureau, which became responsible for managing municipal charities and supervising private charities (Tsin, 1999: 64). But the most severe blow to both the merchants and charities was the Merchant Corps Incident (Shangtuan shibian) of 1924. Because its leader, Chen Lianbo, had chaired the Guangzhou General Chamber of Commerce (Guangzhou zongshanghui) in 1920-1922 and was closely associated with a number of charitable halls (particularly the Aiyu), the Guangzhou municipal government disbanded the Guangzhou Merchant Corps and tightened its control of the Nine Charitable Halls.⁵ The charities' leaders were criticized as people with "old ideas," who were "opposed to modern social policies in which self-governing civic organizations (*zizhi tuanti*) exist in order to complement the government" (Tsin, 1999: 112-13). State control of private charities reached new heights and took a new form in the 1930s when Guangdong came under the rule of Chen Jitang, the famed "King of the Southern Skies" (Nantianwang).

*THE ADMINISTRATION OF SOCIAL WELFARE IN
GUANGZHOU UNDER CHEN JITANG, 1929-1936*

The Nationalist government's inauguration of "political tutelage" in October 1928 signified the end of "revolutionary destruction" (*geming pohuai*) and the beginning of "revolutionary reconstruction" (*geming jianshe*). It made reconstruction a vogue in China until the outbreak of war with Japan in 1937.

Enthusiasm for reconstruction ran high in Guangdong, the cradle of the National Revolution and the starting point of the recently completed Northern Expedition.⁶ The mission was soon taken up by Chen Jitang, who, since taking command of all regular forces in April 1929, had become the province's *de facto* ruler. Chen Mingshu, chairman of the Guangdong provincial government and Chen Jitang's archrival, was made a figurehead; he fled Guangzhou on 28 April 1931. By

1932, Chen Jitang reigned supreme in Guangdong. He further gained the support of the New Guangxi Clique and made the southwest semi-independent of Nanjing, though still pledging allegiance to Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kai-shek) (Lin, 2002: 180-83).

Political circumstances after Chen Jitang assumed power largely explain his determination to promote “social relief work” in Guangdong. As the leader of a semi-independent regime that stood to rival the Nationalist government’s claim to legitimate leadership of the National Revolution, Chen needed to show the people of Guangdong that his government had much to offer. And since Chen posed as a faithful disciple of Sun Yat-sen, he certainly felt obliged to “make [the improvement of] people’s livelihood the foremost task of reconstruction,” which was Sun’s motto (Sun Yat-sen, [1924a] 1996: 709). Behind Chen’s desire to promote social relief work undoubtedly lay his ambitions to make Guangdong into a showcase, model province (Lin, 2002: 203). Moreover, it was Chen’s belief that “‘social relief work’ has a tremendous bearing on the maintenance of local peace” (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 27 Sept. 1934); its success would therefore help to safeguard Guangdong and reassure the Guangdong people (Lin, 2002: 178).

Although his promotion of social relief work was primarily intended to enhance the prestige and credibility of his regime, Chen Jitang’s attitude toward it was very much shaped by his strong cultural predisposition (Xiao Zili, 2002: 398-99). He took pride in China’s tradition of beneficence, felt sorry for “the decrepit and dispirited state of local philanthropy,” and saw state management of social relief as the only way to “carry forward the strong points of native culture and morality” (Chen Jitang, 1935: 2). The mismanagement of local charities certainly disappointed Chen, but it was the work of foreign philanthropists in China that battered his sense of cultural pride. By then, Western philanthropic agencies—notably the YMCA, Red Cross, China International Famine Relief Commission, Salvation Army, and Rockefeller Foundation—had won wide acclaim among the Chinese people, for they had contributed much to famine relief, medical care, education, and rural reconstruction, as well as to youth and labor welfare throughout China (Lin Wanyi, 1994: 169-73; Ogilvie, 1997; Trescott, 1997). Western missions in Guangzhou had also earned people’s respect by running hospitals and schools (Lee, 1936: 103, 113-

14). Such a state of affairs, as Chen openly admitted, “called for our compunction and introspection” (Chen Jitang, 1935: 2); he deemed it imperative to take personal charge of strengthening local charities and promoting public welfare.

Notwithstanding Chen Jitang’s concern for the welfare of the masses, he was resolute in refusing to let them go their own way. “The power of the masses is great,” he once remarked, “but the masses are easily deceived, and they easily abuse power. . . . Our party must therefore openheartedly guide them and arouse them . . . to stand by and fight with us” (Chen Jitang, [1928] 1985: 19). Unsurprisingly, Chen ruled in the fashion of a benevolent despot, generous as he saw fit yet always imposing total control to safeguard his regime. The state was, in short, omnipotent, and society “was simultaneously the organ from which [the state’s] legitimacy was supposed to be derived and the subject on which [it] exercised . . . governmental power” (Tsin, 1999: 14). Presumably, Chen’s efforts to demonstrate that he always had the welfare of the masses in mind, described below, were also aimed at mitigating the state’s oppression. The following discussion highlights the administration of social welfare in Guangzhou under Chen’s regime.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SOCIAL WELFARE BUREAU (SHEHUIJU)

Although Guangzhou inaugurated China’s first modern municipal government on 15 February 1921, as six distinct administrative bureaus were established,⁷ it was not until 11 September 1929 that a special department—the Social Welfare Bureau—was set up to focus on the general welfare of society (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 11 Sept. 1929). On 19 September 1931, it was tasked with investigating social conditions, publishing survey findings, registering public associations, supervising state and voluntary relief work, formulating plans for solving social problems, providing public recreational facilities, holding exhibitions, monitoring social customs and practices, and censoring films and publications of various kinds. Administrative duties were distributed among three offices (*ke*)—social administration (*shehui xingzheng*), public welfare (*gongyi*), and social culture (*shehui wenhua*)—under the overall command of the bureau chief (GN, 1935: 6.66-70).

In late 1932, the Social Welfare Bureau drafted a program of “rectification” (*zhengli*) and “reconstruction” (*jianshe*) to be carried out in three phases over a three-year period (see Table 2). It was incorporated into the Three-Year Administrative Plan of the Guangzhou Municipality (Guangzhoushi sannian shizheng jihua) and put into effect in early 1933.

Clearly, the Social Welfare Bureau’s responsibility was to administer “all social affairs” (*yiqie shehui shiwu*) (Guangzhoushi shehuiju, 1934: 1.1). It not only conveyed the state’s beneficence but also served as the government’s watchdog: monitoring public behavior, censoring seditious propaganda, and setting standards for proper social conduct. Contemporaries translated *Shehuiju* as the “Social Welfare Bureau” (Lee, 1936: 84), but it was a multifunctional bureau of social affairs. The assigning of diverse duties to this single institution drives home the point that although the Guangzhou municipal government recognized the modern Western concept of social welfare, it still subscribed to the traditional Chinese view of philanthropy as *edification*, a term that often appeared in the philanthropic literature of the 1930s.

THE REORGANIZATION OF EXISTING STATE RELIEF
INSTITUTIONS INTO THE GUANGZHOU MUNICIPAL
RELIEF INSTITUTE (GUANGZHOU SHI JIUJIYUAN)

As already mentioned, Mayor Lin Yungai established the Guangzhou Municipal Poorhouse at Shipai in November 1928. The facility, which accommodated an average of 2,400 men and women—mostly workers, farmers, peddlers, and coolies (Guangzhoushi shizhengfu tongjigu, 1929: 209-11)—came under the jurisdiction of the Social Welfare Bureau immediately after the latter was established in September 1929.

Jian Youwen, who became chief of the Social Welfare Bureau in August 1931, was dissatisfied with the slack management of the poorhouse. He thus decided, in October, to house the able-bodied, old, and disabled in three different quarters—the First, Second, and Third Relief Institutes, respectively—administered separately. This arrangement was again changed two years later when another new bureau chief, Zhang Yuanfeng, incorporated the three institutes into one centralized organization, known as the Guangzhou Municipal

TABLE 2: The Social Welfare Bureau's Plan for Rectification and Reconstruction, 1933-1935

	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
Rectification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Look into property belonging to local philanthropic organizations. 2. Reorganize state relief institutions centrally under the Guangzhou Relief Institute. 3. Register fortune-tellers, astrologers, sorcerers, and geomancers. 4. Improve marriage and funeral customs. 5. Set standards for film censorship. 6. Compile the calendar. 7. Register monks and nuns. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the living conditions of factory workers. 2. Provide advice to farmers living in the suburbs. 3. Limit the business of fortune-tellers, astrologers, sorcerers, and geomancers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better the pay and conditions of store clerks. 2. Better the pay and conditions of apprentices. 3. Ban fortune-tellers, astrologers, sorcerers, and geomancers.
Reconstruction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a public assembly hall. 2. Build 200 quarters for the common people. 3. Encourage cooperative enterprises. 4. Build a municipal exhibition hall. 5. Promote insurance for workers. 6. Establish the Third Free Clinic in Henan. 7. Prepare to establish a native products emporium. 8. Establish the Third Common People's Dormitory in Henan. 9. Compile the Guangzhou Yearbook. 10. Build a hall to exhibit commercial products. 11. Prepare to establish an orphanage. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare to establish a workshop for the unemployed. 2. Prepare to establish a municipal theater. 3. Prepare to establish a factory manufacturing articles of daily use. 4. Establish the Fourth Common People's Dormitory in the eastern suburb. 5. Establish a maternity clinic for the common people. 6. Establish the Fourth Free Clinic in the eastern suburb. 7. Prepare to build four poorhouses for coolies. 8. Promote workers' production cooperatives. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare to establish municipal public clubs. 2. Prepare to establish two public recreational grounds. 3. Prepare to establish public dining halls. 4. Establish the Fifth Common People's Dormitory in the upper western suburb. 5. Establish the Fifth Free Clinic in the upper western suburb. 6. Complete the workshop for the unemployed. 7. Complete the factory for manufacturing articles of daily use. 8. Carry out the second census. 9. Construct 200 houses to be sold cheaply.

SOURCE: Guangzhoushi shehuiju (1934: 1.3-15).

Relief Institute, in compliance with the “rectification” program of Guangzhou’s Three-Year Plan (GN, 1935: 17.4-5). At the time of the restructuring, the three institutes sheltered 4,120 men and women (Guangzhoushi shehuiju, 1934: 7.19).

According to the “Regulations Governing the Organization of the Guangzhou Municipal Relief Institute” (“Guangzhoushi jiujiyuan zuzhi zhangcheng”), the new institute aimed to protect the helpless and to help the poor to become independent. Administrative functions were assigned to six units: a general affairs office (*zongwuchu*); a training home for men and women, ages 14 to 59, who were without means of support (*jiaoyangsuo*); a home for men and women, age 60 or older, who were no longer fit to earn a living (*huilaosuo*); a farm with an experimental forestry area and an experimental garden (*nonglinchang*); various workshops—for printing, working with rattan and bamboo, carpentry, tailoring, and manufacturing daily household supplies (*gongyichang*); and a medical clinic (*shiyisuo*). All young and able-bodied inmates had at most three years to become proficient at some trade; at the end of their stay, they would be tested and, if successful, placed in a job. This regulation did not apply to the old, infirm, and totally disabled (Guangzhoushi shehuiju, 1934: 6.4-12).

According to a survey conducted by the Public Security Bureau at the time of the opening of the Guangzhou Municipal Relief Institute, more than 7,000 men and women in the city lacked any means of livelihood (Minjian zhoubao, 13 Nov. 1933). Although the institute set a cap of 6,000 residents (Guangzhoushi shehuiju, 1934: 7.17), it never operated at capacity. On average, the institute housed 4,600 at any one time from October 1933 to June 1934 (Guangzhoushi shehuiju, 1934: 7.19). It registered a total of 4,500 inmates in November 1934 (Wu Yang, 1935: 107), 4,506 in February 1935 (Guangzhoushi shehuiju, 1935: 14), and 4,000 in November 1935 (Wu Yang, 1935: 138).

The residents’ general lack of discipline caused serious problems for the staff. In response, Chen Jitang introduced strict measures of control: seven army instructors were stationed at the institute to maintain order, a daily military drill was made mandatory for all able-bodied men, regular lectures hammered home the “doctrine of settling down and getting on with one’s pursuit” (*anshen liming zhi dao*), inmates permitted to leave the grounds wore badges publicly identifying them and were forbidden to beg, and women were compelled in

the name of cleanliness to cut their hair short (GN, 1935: 17.8-9; Liu Jiwen, 1935: 391-92). Since Chen considered discipline equally important for the staff, he also required them to undergo military training (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 15 May 1935).

Although the municipal government approved a monthly budget of 36,000 yuan—6,000 yuan to defray administrative expenses and the remainder for food, clothing, blankets, and sundries provided free to the inmates (GN, 1935: 17.5)—the allocation did not cover the institute's costs. Initially, additional funds were required for the new facilities at Shipai. Unlike Guangzhou proper, Shipai had no electricity and no water supply. The conditions spawned numerous complaints to the municipal government: night patrol was a nightmare for the staff, water from the artesian wells contained borax and was therefore unfit to drink, and cooking and sanitary facilities in the hostels were grossly inadequate. Determined to make improvements, Chen Jitang donated 23,700 yuan to the institute earmarked for the installation of a diesel generator, a huge water tower, and electric water pumps, as well as additional kitchens, bathrooms, and toilets (Liu Jiwen, 1935: 391; Guangzhoushi jiujiyuan, 1935: 17).

Capital was also needed to start the relief farm and workshops. Reclamation and the purchase of seeds and farming implements were subsequently funded by donations: 8,000 yuan from Chen Jitang and 2,000 yuan from He Luo, chief of the Public Security Bureau. The workshops also received two donations to enable them to purchase equipment and accessories: 5,000 yuan from He Luo and 4,500 yuan from the municipal horse-racing club (GN, 1935: 17.10-13; Liu Jiwen, 1935: 391-92; Guangzhoushi jiujiyuan, 1935: 12, 17). After Weng Banxuan was appointed the institute's director in September 1934, Chen instructed the First Group Army General Headquarters (Diyi jituanjun zongsilingbu) and the Public Security Bureau to send monthly subsidies of 10,000 and 5,000 yuan, respectively, to assist the operation of the relief farm and workshops (Luo Suyue, 1937: 2). Chen's liberality in this regard should cause no surprise, for Weng was secretary of the First Group Army General Headquarters, as well as Chen's personal geomancer and trusted friend.

When Edward Lee, the author of *Modern Canton* (Lee, 1936), visited the institute, he noted that it "presented the appearance of a village." He was particularly impressed by the relief farm, where "there

was a plentiful supply of vegetables of all kind, including rice, beans, melon, sugar cane and pineapples,” and where “sheep, cattle, pigs, chicken and duck” were raised. Lee observed that only the rattan, carpentry, and bamboo workshops were in operation; their output was “mostly consumed by various departments of the government or . . . sold on the market” (Lee, 1936: 87).

THE PROVISION OF CHEAP LODGINGS FOR THE MASSES

While the Guangzhou Municipal Relief Institute provided free lodgings and food for the helpless and indigent, various cheap lodgings for the needy were established by the municipal government in 1930-1936. They comprised the so-called Common People's Palace (Pingmingong),⁸ the First Common People's Dormitory (Di yi pingmin sushe), the Second Common People's Dormitory (Dier pingmin sushe), the shelters for laborers (*laogong anjisuo*, nos. 1-2), and lodging houses and dormitories for laborers (*laogong zhuzhai*, nos. 1-7) (see Table 3 for details). These twelve quarters were all placed under the jurisdiction of the Social Welfare Bureau.

None received more publicity than the Common People's Palace, whose founding sheds light on how social welfare projects in Guangzhou might be funded. In August 1929, Chen Jitang, then commander in chief of the Eighth Route Army (Dibalu jun), seized a Guangxi vessel, the *SS Tianyi*, in the act of smuggling opium into Guangdong. After fining the captain 60,000 yuan before releasing the ship, he turned the money over to Mayor Lin Yungai for a modern, Western-style hostel that could rent cheap rooms to the toiling masses (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 3 Aug. 1929).⁹ Lin then entrusted the design and construction of the hostel to Cheng Tiangu, chief of the Public Works Bureau. According to Cheng, he modeled this 15,800-square-foot hostel after an almshouse in London that he had visited, adding three arched doorways at the rear to signify veneration for Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles (Sanmin zhuyi). The municipal government eventually granted an additional sum of 10,000 yuan to cover the total construction costs (Cheng Tiangu, 1930: 156; Guangzhou minguo ribao, 16 Dec. 1931).

No doubt wishing to make the Common People's Palace a showcase, Chen Jitang heartily approved of Cheng's grand design for the

TABLE 3: Cheap Lodgings Provided by the Guangzhou Municipal Government, 1930-1936

<i>Type of Lodgings</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Date Founded</i>	<i>Capacity (n)</i>	<i>Rent (yuan)</i>	<i>Meal (yuan)</i>
The Common People's Palace	City (south)	12/15/1931	268		
Class A dormitory			96	2.00/15 days	4.50/15 days
Class B dormitory			120	1.00/15 days	3.00/15 days
Class C dormitory			52	0.20/day	0.10-0.15/day
The First Common People's Dormitory	City (north)	3/1/1931	180	0.80/month, 0.04/day	Not provided
The Second Common People's Dormitory	Shipai	9/5/1930	424	0.80/month, 0.04/day	5.00/month, 0.20/day
Special quarters for laborers					
1. Number 1 Shelter for Laborers	Under southern span of Pearl River Bridge	10/26/1934	228	0.02/day	Not provided
2. Number 2 Shelter for Laborers	Under northern span of Pearl River Bridge	5/11/1935	312	0.02/day	Not provided
3. Number 1 Lodging House for Laborers	Southern suburb	5/1/1935	48	4.00/month	Not provided
4. Number 2 Dormitory for Laborers	Southern suburb	5/1/1935	300	0.80/month	Not provided
5. Number 3 Lodging House and Dormitory for Laborers	Henan	9/16/1935	278		Not provided
Lodging house			30	4.00/month	
Dormitory			248	0.80/month	
6. Number 4 Lodging House for Laborers	Henan	9/16/1935	162	4.00/month	Not provided
7. Number 5 Dormitory for Laborers	City (south)	6/19/1936	432	0.80/month	Not provided
8. Number 6 Dormitory for Laborers	Eastern suburb	6/19/1936	304	0.80/month	Not provided
9. Number 7 Dormitory for Laborers	Western suburb	6/19/1936	304	0.80/month	Not provided

SOURCE: GN 1935: (17.57-59, 64-68); Liu Jiwen (1936: 61, 412-14); GSF 1935: (21-28); Guangzhou minguo ribao (9 Mar. 1935, 19-23 June 1936); Lee (1936: 90-92).

hostel. Edward Lee, after visiting the place, was impressed: "The spacious entrance and lobby appeared more like the entrance to some school; and in fact the general external appearance of the brick and concrete building itself with its verandahs gave the fleeting impression of a mansion for aristocrats rather than a dormitory for workmen" (Lee, 1936: 90).

Apart from dormitories, bathrooms, toilets, a laundry, and a dining hall that served the basic needs of its residents, the Common People's Palace also provided educational, recreational, and social facilities open to the public: a library, a room for reading newspapers, sports ground, gardens, an auditorium, cooperatives, and an office for extending loans to peddlers (Guangzhoushi shehuiju, 1934: 7.50-52). In addition, it offered classes for fees (including the teaching of English) and invited distinguished personages to give public lectures on weekends (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 4, 21 Mar. 1932, 3 Aug. 1932; GN, 1935: 17.54).¹⁰ In these ways, the Common People's Palace aimed to ameliorate social conditions by "promoting moral, intellectual, and physical education" (*zengjin de zhi ti sanyu*) (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 16 Sept. 1929). On 18 June 1935, the Social Welfare Bureau set up an employment office inside the hostel to help its residents find jobs ("Bensheng yaozheng rizhi," 1935: 4.81).

By regulation, the Common People's Palace was open to all men, regardless of their employment status (GN, 1935: 17.54-55); women did not qualify for residence (GSF, 1936: 22). Competition for admittance was keen, for the hostel could accommodate only 268 individuals at any one time. During his visit to the hostel, Lee "noticed individuals whose dress revealed they do not belong to the working class" (Lee, 1936: 90). There was indeed public dissatisfaction with the hostel's admission policy. A popular Guangzhou magazine, for instance, carried an article that ridiculed the hostel for being "packed with students and junior officers." "The real Common People's Palace," the author noted sarcastically, "is to be found on the sidewalks, underneath the verandahs of the city's buildings. That's the only place which is rent-free, spacious, and well ventilated" (Qicui Guanzhu, 1933: 26).

The extent to which this facility truly catered to the well-being of the toiling masses can be judged from Table 4, which shows the occupations of its residents between July 1933 and June 1934. The long-

TABLE 4: Residents of the Common People's Palace, July 1933-June 1934 (by Occupation)

Occupation	Farmer	Worker	Peddler and Shopkeeper	Student	Army Man	Civil Servant	Professional	Unemployed	All Groups
Long-term residents, <i>n</i>									
1933									
July	0	137	91	84	7	12	0	75	406
August	2	114	87	61	9	10	41	40	364
September	4	120	83	52	8	6	44	36	353
October	2	136	73	48	2	3	40	52	356
November	0	111	102	67	7	7	44	43	381
December	0	87	82	60	2	5	13	60	309
1934									
January	0	51	77	44	2	4	16	61	255
February	0	49	72	33	3	4	11	61	233
March	0	47	84	48	5	4	12	51	251
April	0	49	59	62	10	6	26	83	295
May	0	127	45	18	7	11	34	90	332
June	11	189	16	11	8	4	29	53	321
July 1933 to June 1934	19	1,217	871	588	70	76	310	705	3,856
<i>n</i>									
%	0.5	31.6	22.6	15.2	1.8	2.0	8.0	18.3	100.0
Short-term residents, <i>n</i>									
1933									
July	2	45	71	65	39	8	69	500	799
August	6	32	82	50	48	13	47	529	807
September	7	26	51	34	28	9	77	616	848
October	5	50	36	10	19	9	39	511	679

November	0	339	340	184	88	55	91	89	1,186
December	1	198	96	103	32	17	15	352	814
1934									
January	4	302	134	354	6	4	11	277	1,092
February	4	229	191	340	34	23	18	158	997
March	3	364	314	297	21	17	14	227	1,257
April	3	284	252	354	34	19	20	299	1,265
May	10	239	171	204	227	122	56	115	1,144
June	26	544	151	19	176	27	64	139	1,146
July 1933 to June 1934									
<i>n</i>	71	2,652	1,889	2,014	752	323	521	3,812	12,034
%	0.6	22.0	15.7	16.7	6.2	2.7	4.3	31.7	100.0

SOURCE: Guangzhoushi shehuiju (1934: 7.55).

NOTE: Figures reflect totals during the period in question, not the numbers in residence at any particular time.

term residents (i.e., those who paid rent every fifteen days) were mostly workers (31.6%), peddlers and shopkeepers (22.6%), the unemployed (18.3%), and students (15.2%), whereas the short-term residents (i.e., those who paid rent daily) were largely the unemployed (31.7%), workers (22.0%), students (16.7%), and peddlers and shopkeepers (15.7%). There were certainly army men living in the hostel, but their numbers were insignificant in comparison.

Unlike the Common People's Palace, the First and Second Common People's Dormitories were humble in appearance. They held a total of 604 men and women at any one time, but the dormitories for males and females were set apart. According to extant records, over the same period, the lodgers of the First Common People's Dormitory were mostly the unemployed, workers, coolies, and peddlers, whereas those of the Second Common People's Dormitory were largely sojourners in Guangzhou, many of whom had failed to find any job (GN, 1935: 17.57-73).

All three quarters, which opened in 1930-1931, were oversubscribed; high rents were driving many poor laborers to sleep in the open. The municipal government therefore drew up more housing plans (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 11 Nov., 21 Dec. 1932; 22 Aug., 16 Sept., 25 Nov. 1933).

In November 1933, the Guangzhou authorities arrested Huang Yongyu, chairman of the Guangzhou Rice Bran Guild (Guangzhou mikang tongye gonghui), for a swindle tied to the government's new policy of taxing foreign rice; they fined him 50,000 yuan in February 1934 and earmarked that money for the construction of new dormitories to house more laborers (Minjian zhoubao, 1 Jan. 1934; MSG, 1982: 3.535). Expressing a personal interest in this project, Chen Jitang called a preparatory meeting in July, after which a subscription campaign was launched. Chen started the ball rolling by personally donating 50,000 yuan. He then ordered various tax stations (*shuichang*) in Guangdong to subscribe to the project. Officers of the First Group Army, party members, and civil servants were all required to contribute a fixed portion of their monthly salary from August to October. Merchant associations and academic institutions were also asked to subscribe (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 25, 26 July 1934, 2, 17,

23 Aug. 1934). These funds made it possible to build nine new quarters, which opened to the laborers from October 1934 to June 1936 (see Table 3).

Shelters 1 and 2 were built underneath the Zhujiang (Pearl River) Bridge; their brick-and-concrete walls enclosed rows of bunks and washrooms fitted with rows of sinks, and they housed a total of 540 male laborers each night. Occupants were required to register their names and occupations at six o'clock every evening; they were given blankets upon paying 2 coppers (0.02 yuan) but had to clear out at seven every morning (GSF, 1935: 25-26). Of the 6,074 persons who stayed in the Number 1 Shelter in February 1935, 3,818 (62.7%) were registered as coolies, 1,981 (32.6%) as rickshaw pullers, 192 (3.2%) as construction workers, 41 (0.7%) as metalworkers, and 42 (0.7%) as laborers performing other work. While 1,331 (21.9%) were registered as locals, 4,587 (75.5%) came from other places in Guangdong, and 156 (2.6%) were natives of other provinces (Guangzhoushi shehuiju, 1935: 15).

Lodging houses and dormitories 1 through 4, completed in 1935, had a total capacity of 788 persons, who paid rent monthly. The lodging houses provided self-contained suites for individual families; the dormitories, which admitted male laborers only, were of less elaborate design, containing rows of bunks made of concrete with wooden planks laid on top. Applicants for a suite were required to secure a written recommendation from their respective labor unions; those who succeeded were mostly members of the mechanics, teahouse, and seamen's unions. The occupants of the dormitories were largely coolies, factory workers, and peddlers (Liu Jiwen, 1935: 412-14; GSF, 1935: 27-29). The Public Security Bureau bore all construction costs for dormitories 5 through 7; completed in mid-1936, they could house a total of 1,040 male laborers (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 19, 20, 22, 23 June 1936).

By July 1936, when Chen Jitang fell, the total capacity of this municipal housing was 3,240 individuals—a drop in the bucket when set against the 280,000 laborers living in Guangzhou in the mid-1930s (Lee, 1936: app. 5). But there is little doubt that Chen's regime had commendably addressed itself to a serious problem.

THE PROVISION OF FREE MEDICAL CARE FOR THE MASSES

The Guangzhou municipal government showed its care for the sick by providing outpatient services and medicine at three "free clinics" (*zengyishiyaochu*) run by the Social Welfare Bureau. They were open to the public except on Sundays and public holidays.

The Number 1 Free Clinic, which opened near the Bund (Changti) on 10 November 1931, specially catered to the boat people, coolies, peddlers, and shopkeepers who lived or worked in that region, many of whom were suffering from respiratory troubles, skin diseases, and indigestion because of their cramped living conditions and hard labor. It treated a total of 25,408 outpatients between July 1933 and June 1934: boat people made up 27.9% of that number; coolies, 27.1%; peddlers and shopkeepers, 16.0%; students, 5.0%; farmers, 3.7%; civil servants, 3.2%; police and army men, 3.1%; and others, 14.2% (GN, 1935: 17.94-99; GSF, 1936: 31-32).

The Number 2 Free Clinic, which opened in the northern part of the city on 1 June 1932, provided only Chinese and no Western medical treatment; prescriptions could be filled free of charge at two nearby pharmacies. It treated a total of 18,996 outpatients (25.2% men, 33.1% women, and 41.7% children) between June 1932 and June 1933 and a total of 16,617 outpatients (23.5% men, 28.4% women, and 48.0% children) between July 1933 and June 1934 (GN, 1935: 17.99-104; GSF, 1936: 32-33). The Number 3 Free Clinic, opened on 15 November 1933, catered to the residents of Henan. It ran its own drugstore and treated a total of 11,276 outpatients (31.3% men, 51.2% women, and 17.5% children) between mid-November 1933 and June 1934 (GN, 1935: 17.105-10; GSF, 1936: 33-34).

The municipal government also supervised six hospitals run by the Public Health Bureau: the Guangzhou Municipal Hospital (*Guangzhoushi shili yiyuan*), the National Zhongshan University Hospital (*Guoli Zhongshan daxue yiyuan*), the Municipal Hospital for Contagious Diseases (*Shili chuanranbingyuan*), the First and Second Municipal Asylums (*Shili diyi dier shenjingbingyuan*), and the Eastern Suburb Municipal Leprosarium (*Shili dongjiao mafengyuan*). These institutions were not new, but all had expanded and updated their facilities since the late 1920s (GN, 1935: 17.116-18; Li Taizao, 1935; Yu Shiwu, 1935; Deng Xiangguang, 1935; Lee, 1936: 102-6).

THE PROVISION OF RELIEF TO RETURNED EMIGRANTS

The Great Depression hit Guangdong in the early 1930s, as numerous Chinese emigrants who had lost their overseas jobs returned home via Guangzhou, Shantou (Swatow), and Haikou;¹¹ they strained existing resources and aggravated local unemployment problems.

On 16 December 1930, the Guangdong provincial government deliberated about aiding returned emigrants disembarking in Guangzhou and resolved to set up a relief office (*jiuqiao banshichu*) immediately.¹² To help returned emigrants settle in, on 6 January 1931, the provincial government decided to grant the relief office a sum of 100,000 yuan, to be shared equally by the Department of Finance (Caizhengting) and the provincial mint (*zaobichang*) (MSG, 1987: 2.471, 480). The Department of Reconstruction then proposed sending the returnees to the Leizhou Peninsula and Hainan Island, where they could help to bring wasteland under cultivation. Because those areas were still being pacified, the provincial government instructed the Departments of Reconstruction, Finance, and Civil Administration to work out the scheme in consultation with the First Group Army General Headquarters (MSG, 1987: 2.486-87; 3.48, 100, 104).

The relief office started work in January 1931. Besides providing lodgings and food to returned emigrants stranded in Guangzhou, it also helped the able-bodied to find jobs, referred the sick to hospitals, sent the old to the Guangzhou Municipal Poorhouse (renamed the Guangzhou Municipal Relief Institute on 1 October 1933), and aided those who wished to return to their home villages. On 21 July 1931, it was officially named the Office for Relieving Unemployed Returned Emigrants (*Jiuji shiye huiguo huaqiao banshichu*) and placed under the Department of Civil Administration. At the end of September 1932, the 100,000 yuan initially earmarked for relief was nearly spent, and the Department of Civil Administration was asked to maintain the office by whatever means it saw fit (Guangdongsheng minzhengting, 1934: 8, 17-18, 33-34, 42-43).

Table 5 documents relief provided to returned emigrants in 1931-1933. A total of 8,550 individuals had registered with the relief office (many called and left on the same day without registering). Of those, 8,370 were sent away at one time or another: 474 (5.7%) to work in mines or on farms, 1,589 (19.0%) to work in other sectors, 611 (7.3%)

TABLE 5: Numbers of Returned Emigrants Receiving Relief in Guangzhou, 1931-1933

Date	Total Outlay (yuan)	Total Registered	Employed by Mines and Farms	Employed by Other Sectors	Sent to Other Relief Institutes	Sent to Hospitals	Sent to Home Village	Total Sent Away
1931								
January	1,708	425	38	68	41	4	59	210
February	7,075	310	50	20	13	8	72	163
March	4,745	709	0	75	34	21	123	253
April	4,705	380	50	200	57	33	212	552
May	15,105	205	0	120	22	36	216	394
June	4,488	100	0	200	43	26	110	379
July	1,560	158	0	0	19	11	88	118
August	1,977	213	0	51	2	7	77	137
September	2,290	181	0	26	3	18	122	169
October	2,945	298	40	28	13	31	75	187
November	3,298	222	72	61	19	25	12	189
December	4,695	241	11	25	63	46	96	241
January to December	54,591	3,442	261	874	329	266	1,262	2,992
1932								
January	4,008	183	25	25	5	42	56	153
February	4,236	211	17	33	9	35	49	143
March	4,612	192	0	135	12	51	18	216
April	4,420	240	74	95	17	31	60	277
May	4,090	240	17	60	59	42	85	263
June	4,103	288	0	62	3	139	98	302
July	4,603	880	80	0	1	59	522	662
August	5,548	686	0	0	2	62	544	608

September	5,974	348	0	86	4	64	166	320
October	6,142	264	0	20	11	66	134	231
November	6,304	217	0	18	1	72	57	148
December	6,636	172	0	56	0	87	54	197
January to December	60,676	3,921	213	590	124	750	1,843	3,520
1933								
January	6,401	136	0	0	0	93	26	119
February	5,900	170	0	15	10	108	30	163
March	6,567	194	0	55	24	101	23	203
April	5,740	172	0	25	124	80	60	289
May	5,831	117	0	30	0	78	33	141
June	5,473	82	0	0	0	79	20	99
July	6,767	46	0	0	0	22	613	635
August	1,962	42	0	0	0	6	16	22
September	2,144	58	0	0	0	20	14	34
October	2,305	53	0	0	0	14	22	36
November	2,309	42	0	0	0	14	16	30
December	2,530	75	0	0	0	12	75	87
January to December	53,929	1,187	0	125	158	627	948	1,858
1931-1933	169,196	8,550	474	1,589	611	1,643	4,053	8,370

SOURCE: Guangdongsheng minzhengting (1934: 34-36, 43-45, 48-57).

to the Municipal Poorhouse (later the Municipal Relief Institute), 1,643 (19.6%) to hospitals, and 4,053 (48.4%) back to their home villages. People who chose to return home were not only issued a railway or ferry pass but were also given traveling expenses of 3 to 10 yuan each, depending on the length of their journey (Guangdongsheng minzhengting, 1934: 42). The relief office's expenditures during this time totaled 169,196 yuan. The Department of Civil Administration's records show that most of those employed through the relief office were hired as highway and road builders; most others as coal miners, stonemasons, coolies, and farm laborers; and a small number as county policemen (Guangdongsheng minzhengting, 1934: 48-52).

In addition, numerous returned emigrants who did not register with the relief office were hired by the government to open up wasteland and barren hills in remote parts of the province. In the summer of 1932, a large contingent was sent to the Leizhou Peninsula to clear a vast stretch of dense forest in aid of bandit suppression. Bandits killed many workers; more died of pernicious malaria and dropsy (Liang Guowu, 1993: 100). The government also encouraged returned emigrants with savings to start small businesses and invest in reclamation (Minjian zhoubao, 20 Nov. 1933). In the summer of 1933, the Northwest Resettlement and Reclamation Bureau (Xibei qu yikenju) invited up to 129 returned emigrants and their families to apply for investment in the Number 1 Resettlement and Reclamation District (Diyi yikenqu) of Yingde County. Each family, in return for investing 590 yuan, would be allotted 55 mu of land: 50 mu to be reclaimed over a three-year period and 5 mu for a residence. Successful reclamation would entitle a family to own the land, as well as win a three-year exemption from the land tax ("Bensheng xibei qu yikenju," 1933: 59-60).

When the number of returned emigrants declined sharply in the mid-1930s, the provincial government closed the relief office. On 29 June 1935, the Office for Relieving Unemployed Returned Emigrants was dissolved; of the 110 persons who still remained under its care, 10 were sent to the Municipal Relief Institute and the remainder back to their home villages. A newly formed committee—the Guangdong Committee of Overseas Chinese Affairs (Guangdong qiaowu weiyuanhui)—took over responsibility for a much smaller number of returned emigrants (Chen Baozhi, 1935: 7-8).

This new committee set up a reception post (*shourongsuo*), which reportedly admitted 450 returned emigrants between July 1935 and March 1936, sending away 398: 383 back to their home villages, 11 to the Municipal Relief Institute, and 4 to hospitals. The committee requested the provincial government to resettle the remaining 52 able-bodied returnees on Hainan Island ("Guangdong qiaowu weiyuanhui," 1936).

*THE ADMINISTRATION OF PHILANTHROPY IN
GUANGZHOU UNDER CHEN JITANG, 1929-1936*

As already discussed, private charities represented by the Nine Charitable Halls flourished in late Qing and early Republican Guangzhou; their prestige and influence waned after the early 1920s, particularly following the Merchant Corps Incident of 1924. It was Chen Jitang who finally dealt a fatal blow to the autonomy of the charitable halls, placing them all under government control.

In August 1929, the Aiyu, which headed the Nine Charitable Halls, was openly rebuked for defrauding the public by holding superstitious ceremonies and soliciting subscriptions without performing charitable works (*Guangzhou minguo ribao*, 22 Aug. 1929). It is difficult to know whether such accusations were well grounded or were intended to intimidate the city's charitable halls by discrediting the most eminent one. It is similarly unclear whether these accusations were meant to win public support or to warn both the charitable halls and the public that the ongoing campaign to eliminate superstitious beliefs and practices was serious. But it seems certain that the Social Welfare Bureau, immediately after its founding in September 1929, was determined to tighten control over all charitable halls in the city; it lost no time in adopting a series of measures claimed to rectify abuses committed by their leaders.

*THE REGISTRATION, RECTIFICATION, AND REGULATION
OF VOLUNTARY PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATIONS*

Its on-the-spot investigations led the Social Welfare Bureau to conclude that many charitable halls in the city were poorly managed. On 9

October 1929, the bureau stipulated that all, within one month, had to apply for registration by submitting full and detailed records of their finances, histories, charters, real and liquid assets, and current activities. Only by securing a license would a charitable hall be entitled to protection by the Public Security Bureau (*Guangzhou minguo ribao*, 9 Oct. 1929; GSF, 1936: 35-37).

Leaders of the charities became anxious, for they feared that the registration order was nothing but a smoke screen that concealed the government's lust for their property. Such a fear was not unfounded. In November 1929, a municipal party branch charged the Yongchang Charitable Hall with harboring swindlers and encroaching on public property; it proposed that the government confiscate the Yongchang's premises for use by local party members (*Guangzhou minguo ribao*, 27 Nov. 1929). To demonstrate their displeasure, the leaders of charitable halls made no announcement about the usual dispensation of winter relief; only when the Social Welfare Bureau started issuing licenses did they begin preparing to dispense warm clothing and congee to the poor (*Guangzhou minguo ribao*, 2 Dec. 1929).

Eventually, all were granted licenses. Of the 34 charitable halls founded in 1868-1928 (see Table 1), 11 were licensed in late 1929, 16 in 1930, 1 in 1932, and 1 in 1933; the remaining 5 were defunct when registration was mandated (GN, 1935: 17.113-16). Notwithstanding the granting of licenses, the Social Welfare Bureau continued to regulate the charities.

In December 1929, the Chongben Charitable Hall was censured for running a school that charged extravagant tuition fees. The Social Welfare Bureau gave the Chongben fifteen days to convert that school into a charitable institution; it also ordered the charity to dispense Western in addition to Chinese medicines (*Guangzhou minguo ribao*, 28 Dec. 1929). In January 1930, the bureau instructed the Guangzhou General Chamber of Commerce to use care in filling the vacancies on the board of directors of the ill-managed Guangji Hospital and to raise subscriptions to maintain its operation; the bureau sent its own men to monitor the hospital (*Guangzhou minguo ribao*, 8 Jan. 1930). The bureau also convened a number of joint meetings with the charitable halls: delegates were asked to report on the current state of affairs in their respective organizations, and each was given specific

instructions aimed at “promoting what is beneficial and eradicating what is harmful (*xingli chubi*)” (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 24, 28 Jan. 1930).

The new rules passed to regulate the activities of private charities governed all aspects of their operations: the management of charitable halls; the running of charitable schools, foundling homes, homes for the disabled, and homes for the old; the dispensation of clothing and congee; the provision of medical care, midwifery, and burials; the organization of fire brigades; and the launching of subscription campaigns. Under these rules, which came into effect in June-October 1930, all charitable halls were expected to perform most if not all of the above tasks, to follow the advice of the government, and to collaborate when major calamities struck. None was allowed to engage in superstitious practices with a view toward defrauding the public (GSF, 1936: 37-47).

Since many charitable halls had invested public subscriptions in real estate to provide steady revenue, the Social Welfare Bureau deemed it necessary to look into their deeds, leases, and monthly accounts. It was empowered to take whatever measures it saw fit if any embezzlement or misuse of public funds by members of philanthropic organizations was discovered (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 2 June 1931; Liu Jiwen, 1935: 385-86).

In mid-1932, the Social Welfare Bureau exposed the corrupt management of the Fangbian Clinic, a subsidiary of the Fangbian Hospital, in the northern part of the city. As a result, the clinic was closed down: its premises were taken over by the bureau's Number 2 Free Clinic, and its sizable assets were appropriated for the avowed purpose of promoting social welfare (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 18 Apr. 1932).

In 1933-1934, the Renji Hospital in Henan nearly shared the fate of the Fangbian Clinic. Founded in 1910 and licensed by the Social Welfare Bureau in November 1929, the Renji had beds for 100 patients. Dispensing Chinese and Western medicines, congee, and clothing, as well as providing inoculation, midwifery, and burial services, it was extremely popular among the local inhabitants. But the resignation of a number of influential directors in the early 1930s had reduced the Renji's activities and finances, and its downturn caught the attention

of the bureau. In 1933, the municipal government intended to open the Third Common People's Dormitory in Henan, in accordance with the Three-Year Plan of Guangzhou (see Table 2). Noting certain vacant wings of the Renji, it proposed to convert them into a dormitory for laborers. Alarmed, the hospital directors and prominent residents of Henan met in August and resolved to set up a rectification committee, start a subscription campaign, and petition for the retention of all quarters for hospital use. They raised a total of 22,000 yuan between September 1933 and April 1934, resumed philanthropic work in full, and elected a new board of directors in mid-1934. Such timely efforts saved the hospital, as the Social Welfare Bureau found little excuse for requisitioning the Renji's premises (GN, 1935: 17.111-13). The bureau nevertheless reminded all charitable halls of its steadfast concern for rectifying management abuses (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 1 Apr. 1934).

In the fall of 1934, Chen Jitang resolved to bring all local charitable halls under his sway. All autonomy was lost, as they became mere appendages of a newly established philanthropic headquarters: the Hall of Benevolence (Ren'ai shantang).

THE CENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION OF PHILANTHROPY

The Hall of Benevolence, inaugurated with pomp on 7 October 1934, was Chen Jitang's brainchild. At its opening, Chen declared that the chronic mismanagement of local private charities had put the whole province to shame—hence the urgent need to set up a model philanthropic institution in Guangzhou “to give full play to the true spirit of philanthropy” (Chen Jitang, 1935: 1-2). Huang Guoqi, the hall's chief executive director, echoed Chen's view. He explained that the new institution was set up to accomplish two noble missions, “alms giving” (*bushi*) and “edification” (*xuanhua*); by setting standards for the proper conduct of philanthropy, it would enable all local charitable halls to follow its lead and achieve unity of purpose under its banner (Huang Guoqi, 1935: 4-5).

While Chen Jitang may have been troubled by the failings of local private charities, he must have worried more about the threats posed by the charitable halls, for they provided the local elites with a lucrative power base. Yet he knew that the political cost of banning private

charities was too high. Instead, Chen decided to bring all the charitable halls under one roof and under his personal control.

Significantly, this centralization of philanthropic administration paralleled a broader trend toward tighter social control then under way. With a view toward controlling thoughts, Chen Jitang orchestrated an “honor Confucius, study the classics” (*zhuankong dujing*) campaign in the summer of 1934. He reinforced the edificatory function of education in September by making “training in the [Confucian] classics” (*jingxun*) mandatory for all primary and secondary schools in Guangdong (Li Jiezhi, 1990: 104-12). On the economic front, Chen made the production of white sugar a government monopoly and entrusted its sale to ten wholesale merchants, who were licensed under strict regulations in May 1934 (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 11, 24, 25 May 1934, 1 June 1934). He went a step further in September by decreeing the “unified control of commerce” (*shangye tongzhi*); the merchants voiced their discontent to no avail (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 15, 17 Sept. 1934). All these policies undoubtedly reflected Chen’s growing drive for total control of state and society.

Chen Jitang’s paradoxical desire to both serve and gag the public shaped the Hall of Benevolence. Although its spokesmen took great pains to explain that this philanthropic headquarters was to be “run by the people” (*minying*) (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 10 Feb., 27 June 1935), the public must have been amazed by its strong official flavor. Indeed, the hall’s most remarkable feature was its elaborate structure (see Table 6), which resembled the military-cum-civil establishment of Guangdong.

At the top of the hierarchy was a 52-person board of directors: 18 senior military officers, 26 senior civil officials, 7 merchant leaders, and Chen Jitang’s wife, Mo Shuying (RX, 1935: 1, 1 *zhangze*, 9-12). The board of directors elected Chen as chairman, giving him control over the operation of the Hall of Benevolence. Four departments—general affairs (*zongwu*), alms giving (*bushi*), edification (*xuanhua*), and finance (*caizheng*)—were responsible for implementing decisions made by the board of directors. They were supervised by a chief executive director and two deputy executive directors appointed by, and responsible to, the board (RX, 1935: 1, 1 *zhangze*, 12-13).

The tasks of enlisting hall members (*sheyuan*) and collecting membership fees (20 yuan per year) were assigned to twenty professional

TABLE 6: Organization of the Hall of Benevolence in Early 1935

BOARD OF DIRECTORS		
Chairman: Chen Jitang (commander in chief of the First Group Army)		
Vice Chairman: Lin Yungai (chairman of the Guangdong Provincial Government)		
Vice Chairman: Huo Zhiting (chairman of the Guangzhou Municipal Assembly; tax farmer)		
Vice Chairman: Hu Wenhu (member of the Nationalist Government's Overseas Chinese Affairs Committee; overseas entrepreneur)		
52 directors		
LEADING EXECUTIVE ORGANS		
Post	Holder	Personal Details
Chief executive director	Huang Guoqi	Staff officer, First Group Army General Headquarters; member of Guangdong Provincial Assembly
Deputy executive director	Zhan Muchan	Inspector, First Group Army General Headquarters; secretary and member of Guangdong Provincial Assembly
Deputy executive director	Wang Renkang	Deputy chief, Guangzhou-Hankou Railway Bureau
Head, Department of General Affairs	Huang Weiqi	Graduate, Department of Politics of National Beijing University; principal of Qiushan Government Secondary School (Fengshun county)
Head, Department of Alms Giving	Liang Jinsan	Director of general affairs, Taihe Charitable Hall (Chaoan county)
Head, Department of Edification	Zhang Yiyi	Graduate, Department of Law of National Beijing University
Head, Department of Finance	Fan Jianjiang	Former secretary and section chief of various military and civil organizations
Secretary	Chen Meihu	Compiler, Guangdong Gazetteer Compilation Office

RECRUITMENT UNITS: TEAMS AND SQUADS

<i>Designation of Team</i>	<i>Number of Squads</i>	<i>Leader</i>	<i>Personal Details</i>
1. Military	22	Chen Jitang	Commander in chief of the First Group Army
2. Political	3	Lin Yungai	Chairman of the Guangdong provincial government
3. Civil Administration	98	Lin Yizhong	Director of the Department of Civil Administration
4. Financial	26	Qu Fangpu	Director of the Department of Finance
5. Reconstruction	10	He Qili	Director of the Department of Reconstruction
6. Education	30	Huang Linshu	Director of the Department of Education
7. National Learning	6	Zou Haibin (Lu)	President of National Zhongshan University
8. Municipal Administration	11	Liu Jiwen	Mayor of Guangzhou Municipality
9. Salt Transport	22	Chen Weizhou	Salt Transport commissioner of Guangdong and Guangxi; brother of Chen Jitang
10. Public Security	29	He Luo	Chief of the Public Security Bureau
11. Women's	21	He Mingkun	Wife of the late Gu Yingfen, Chen Jitang's longtime patron
12. Commercial	31	Xiong Shaokang	Chairman of the Guangzhou Chamber of Commerce
13. Railway	8	Li Xian'gen	Chief of the Guangzhou-Hankou Railway Bureau
14. Independent	63	Huo Zhiting	Chairman of the Guangzhou Municipal Assembly
15. Judicial	64	Xie Yingzhou	President of the Supreme Court of Guangdong
16. Assembly	124	Lin Guopei	President of the Guangdong Provincial Assembly
17. Party Affairs	23	Peng Zhuoren	Member of the Guangdong Provincial Committee of the Guomindang
18. Overseas Chinese Affairs	16	Zou Minchu	No data for 1935 (member of the Committee of the Guangdong Provincial Government in 1937)
19. Hong Kong and Macau	22	Cai Chang	Managing director of the Daxin Company in Shanghai, Guangzhou, and Hong Kong
20. Propaganda	46	The Press Association	—

SOURCES: RX, 1935: (1, 1 *zhangze*, 9-14; *zhengqiu sheyuan zhuanlan*, 3-14; *tangwu jiyao*, 12-14; *fulu*, 5).

teams (*dui*), listed in Table 6. Each team in turn commanded a number of squads (*fendui*), which together totaled 675 (RX, 1935: 1, 1 *zhengqiu sheyuan zhuanlan*, 3-14; *tangwu jiyao*, 12-14). The recruitment of hall members was carried out from 15 December 1934 to 31 January 1935 (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 8 Dec. 1934). It was reported that several thousand individuals were enlisted, with the military team, led by Chen Jitang, surpassing all others in this exercise (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 8 Mar. 1935).

The third meeting of the Board of Directors of the Hall of Benevolence, held on 6 January 1935, endorsed Chen Jitang's proposal to "centralize the organization of charitable halls in the entire province" (*tongyi quansheng shantang zuzhi*). It drew up a number of regulations toward that end: first, the Hall of Benevolence should be recognized as the headquarters of all philanthropic organizations in Guangdong; second, all existing municipal and county charitable halls should be reorganized as the Ren'ai's branch halls (*fentang*); third, their assets should be used to defray their operational costs; fourth, all branch halls should submit their monthly budgets, accounts, and work reports to the headquarters for approval; and fifth, no branch hall would be allowed to collect donations without the headquarters' permission (RX, 1935: 1, 1 *fulu*, 7-8).

Once the meeting adjourned, Chen Jitang instructed all municipal and county authorities to submit detailed records of existing charitable halls under their jurisdiction and to expedite the required reorganization (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 13, 18 Jan. 1935). The task of reorganization nevertheless fell behind schedule, as there was much confusion about the meaning of the new policy at the local level. Many county authorities mistakenly believed that private charities were to be banned; when they turned local charitable halls into state-run relief institutes, they alarmed the local elites. In the summer of 1935, Chen therefore issued clarifying statements: private charities should coexist with state-run relief institutes, for the two complemented each other in promoting public welfare; any county that did not have charitable halls should immediately establish a branch of the Hall of Benevolence, with premises provided by the county government but "run by the people"; and all existing charitable halls, as branches of the Hall of Benevolence, should follow its example by setting up four sections (*gu*)—general affairs, alms giving, edification, and finance—supervised

by a chief executive director and one or two deputy executive directors (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 27 June, 5 July, 8 Aug., 23 Sept. 1935).

Chen Jitang was particularly eager to bring private charities in Guangzhou under his direct control. On 5 October 1935, the Social Welfare Bureau ordered all charitable halls in that city to comply with these orders and speed up reorganization (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 8 Oct. 1935). At the same time, the Hall of Benevolence assumed the oversight duties in Guangzhou hitherto performed by the Social Welfare Bureau. In early 1936, the inhabitants of the western suburb reportedly filed a complaint against the leaders of Pu Charitable Hall. After making investigations, the Hall of Benevolence found the suspects guilty of swindling the public, pocketing donations, and falsifying records. It then sent the police to arrest Pu's leaders, took over its property, and turned its premises into the Number 2 Free Clinic of the Hall of Benevolence (RY, 1935: 1, 10-11 *fulu*, 192; 1, 12 *tangwu jiyao*, 137; Guangzhou minguo ribao, 3, 23, 28 Feb. 1936, 3 Mar. 1936). During this period, two other private charities and their leaders shared the same fate (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 15 Feb., 25 Mar. 1936).

Chen Jitang's high-handed policy of centralizing philanthropic administration naturally enraged the leaders of charitable halls, but there is no record of open resistance. Presumably, all understood that objections would only invite reprisals. Yet certain leaders obviously procrastinated in carrying out his desires, for the task of converting all local private charities into "branch halls" of the Ren'ai was still not completed by May 1936, two months before Chen fell from power (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 18 May 1936).

Because the Hall of Benevolence was supposed to exemplify the clean and orderly management of philanthropy, Chen Jitang required its entire staff to undergo military training, to wear a uniform while on duty, to take an oath of office, and to lodge in quarters provided by the hall. He also decreed that anyone found guilty of malfeasance would receive the same kind of penalties that were meted out to corrupt officials and soldiers (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 15 May, 19 June 1935; 28 Apr. 1936). No doubt, the establishment of the Hall of Benevolence had led to the bureaucratization and militarization of philanthropic administration in Guangdong.

The philanthropic activities of the Hall of Benevolence were fully recorded in its official journal: the *Ren'ai xunkan* (*Journal of the Hall*

of Benevolence Published Every Ten Days), which appeared between January and March 1935, followed by the *Ren'ai yuekan* (*Monthly Journal of the Hall of Benevolence*), published from April 1935 to April 1936.¹³ These included providing free medical care and burials; dispensing summer, winter, and emergency relief; running charitable schools; and propagating philanthropic ideals by holding public lectures and disseminating philanthropic literature. The opening of the Number 1 Foundling Home of the Hall of Benevolence in July 1935, with Chen Jitang's wife, Mo Shuying, serving as its director (*Guangzhou minguo ribao*, 2, 4 July 1935), and the opening of the Ren'ai Hospital in January 1936 deserve special mention (RY, 1935: 1, 10-11 *tangwu jiyao*, 147-48).

Despite its numerous philanthropic activities, the Hall of Benevolence remained financially sound up to May 1936 (see Table 7). Beyond paying their annual membership fees, its members had contributed to a foundation fund (*jijin*). Chen Jitang's brother Weizhou (one of the directors and team leaders) gave an especially generous donation of 12,000 yuan to the foundation fund; Chen himself donated 1,000 yuan (RX, 1935: 1, 1 *zhengxinlu*, 1). The Hall of Benevolence was also able to draw on the financial support of the First Group Army General Headquarters, the Public Security Bureau, and the Opium-Suppression Bureau (*Jinyanju*), as well as various business establishments, theatrical companies, and charitable-minded individuals (RX, 1935: 1, 1 *zhengxinlu*, 1-3). Whenever Chen decided to carry out large-scale relief in the name of the hall, he would require both army men and civil servants to contribute a fixed portion of their monthly salary for that purpose. Thus, when flood devastated the whole province in the summer of 1935, Chen led the provincewide relief campaign: to aid flood victims, all military and civil staff contributed 5% of their salary for the month of August to the Hall of Benevolence ("Bensheng yaozheng rizhi," 1935: 5.68-69, 6.163).

To everyone's surprise, after Chen Jitang's abortive coup d'état against Jiang Jieshi, the Hall of Benevolence was found to have incurred a deficit of more than 30,000 yuan. Huang Guoqi (the chief executive director) and Zhan Muchan (a deputy executive director), who were responsible for handling the hall's finances, had also fled, and no one could explain the insolvency (*Guangzhou minguo ribao*, 21, 22 July 1936). In mid-August, Zeng Yangfu, the new major of

TABLE 7: Income and Expenditures of the Hall of Benevolence, October 1934 to May 1936 (in yuan)

	<i>Income</i>	<i>Balance Forward</i>	<i>Total Receipts</i>	<i>Expenditure</i>	<i>Balance</i>
1934					
October-December	48,804	—	48,804	46,056	2,748
1935					
January	NA	2,748	NA	NA	9,388
February	19,910	9,388	29,298	24,365	4,933
March	39,089	4,933	44,022	17,872	26,150
April	59,451	26,150	85,601	12,482	73,119
May	51,520	73,119	124,639	40,498	84,141
June	33,188	84,141	117,329	21,900	95,429
July	20,039	95,429	115,468	37,410	78,058
August	71,992	78,058	150,050	121,306	28,744
September	29,753	28,744	58,497	18,291	40,206
October	33,870	40,206	74,076	29,577	44,499
November	12,053	44,499	56,552	23,488	33,064
December	72,337	33,064	105,401	52,564	52,837
1936					
January	6,171	52,837	59,008	32,367	26,641
February	36,583	26,641	63,224	34,991	28,233
March	20,555	28,233	48,788	22,208	26,580
April	34,610	26,580	61,190	24,721	36,469
May	27,406	36,469	63,875	25,003	38,872

SOURCE: RX, 1935: (1, 1 *zhengxinlu* [records of contributions], 1-3); Guangzhou minguo ribao (11 Mar., 5 April, 5 May, 8 June, 9 July, 17 Aug., 26 Sept., 24 Oct., 15 Nov., 22 Dec. 1935; 17 Jan., 28 Feb., 1, 25 Apr., 3 June, 10 July 1936).

NA = not available.

Guangzhou, decided to place the Hall of Benevolence under the jurisdiction of the municipal government; he instructed the Social Welfare Bureau to take over its operations on 7 September (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 16 Aug., 7 Sept. 1936).

CARE AND CONTROL: THE TWO SIDES OF A WARLORD'S STRATEGY OF GOVERNANCE

This study highlights the interaction between state and society in Guangzhou under the rule of Chen Jitang. It confirms my view, expressed in a previous article, that “Chen’s style of rule was

unmistakably arbitrary and coercive, leaving no room for any sort of compromise" (Lin, 2002: 204). But it also drives home the point that even a powerful warlord such as Chen could not afford to ignore the needs of society in his quest for regime legitimization. Modern state building should therefore be seen as a two-way street rather than as a purely top-down process, as it "requires the state to expand its political base to, and therefore to share its goal with, the population being governed—in addition to being able to penetrate the local society for the maintenance of social order and the mobilization of resources" (Zhang, 2000: 273).

If Chen Jitang was truly motivated by benevolent sentiments to provide for the needy, he must also have conceived of state action in this regard as good for the credibility of his regime and for the stability of society. In other words, Chen promoted social welfare because he saw doing so as a win-win policy. As a warlord, however, Chen tended to rule by force. He demanded absolute control of state and society and was therefore the final arbiter of what to give, how to give, and how much to give to the deserving poor. In this light, private charities constituted a threat to his authority; he subsequently deprived them of autonomy under the pretext of centralizing the administration of philanthropy for the good of society.

In the final analysis, care and control made up the two sides of a warlord's strategy of governance; from a warlord's point of view, care laid the foundation of stable rule, which control served to safeguard. In recognizing the promotion of social welfare as an integral part of modern governance, Chen Jitang had elevated care to the plane of a modernist project. But in hammering out this project in complete accordance with his own wishes and by placing private charities under his command, he had also raised control to new heights. His modernist project was thus "at once emancipatory and disciplinary" (Tsin, 1999: 14). It may have dawned on the people of Guangzhou that social welfare is a matter of state responsibility, but the state remained omnipotent and took an active role in "policing [the] dreams of awakening communities" (Fitzgerald, 1996: 316). Chen apparently saw such a role played by the state as imperative, for he feared that the sweet dreams of society might one day become a waking nightmare for his regime.

NOTES

1. For more information on the rise of Chen Jitang and the characteristics of his military regime, see Lin (2001, 2002).
2. The Hospital for the Insane, the first hospital for the insane ever established in China, had been founded in 1898 by John G. Kerr, a well-known American physician and the first president of the China Medical Missionary Association (Balme, 1921: 96, 104).
3. Foreigners, especially missionaries, had established a number of charitable medical centers in Guangzhou in the first half of the nineteenth century: a dispensary set up in 1820 by Robert Morrison of the London Missionary Society and John R. Livingston of the British East India Company; another dispensary, set up in 1828 by Thomas Colledge of the British East India Company; the famous Ophthalmic (Canton) Hospital founded in 1835 by an American Presbyterian medical missionary, Peter Parker; and another hospital founded in 1848 by Benjamin Hobson of the London Missionary Society (Balme, 1921: 38-40, 46; Choa, 1990: 7-8, 23-24, 26).
4. The bubonic plague took almost 100,000 lives in Guangzhou (Lee, 1936: 99). Carol Benedict points out that by the time it broke out in the Pearl River Delta, "elite-initiated *shantang* were flourishing in both Canton and Hong Kong. It was these elite philanthropic associations that directed relief efforts when both cities were struck by plague in 1894" (Benedict, 1996: 133). Although the existing *shantang* in Guangzhou were active in relieving plague victims, the epidemic prompted fresh philanthropic efforts, which evolved into new *shantang* in its aftermath.
5. For more recent analyses of the Guangzhou Merchant Corps and the Merchant Corps Incident of 1924, see Wen Xiaohong (2001) and Qiu Jie (2002a).
6. Following the central government's call for reconstruction, a number of provincial and municipal "reconstruction plans" (*jianshe jihua*) were drafted in 1929-1932. The well-known Three-Year Administrative Plan of Guangdong Province (Guangdongsheng sannian shizheng jihua), inaugurated on 1 January 1933, incorporated these earlier plans. For details, see Lin (2001: 406-20).
7. The six bureaus were those of finance (*caizheng*), public works (*gongwu*), public safety (*gongan*), public health (*weisheng*), public utilities (*gongyong*), and education (*jiaoyu*). For a detailed discussion of the Guangzhou Municipality in 1921-1925, see Yeung (1999: 259-355).
8. The term *pingmingong*, coined in the 1920s, is a euphemism for first-class hostels open to the masses. They reportedly existed in many cities of China in the late 1920s (Cheng Tiangu, 1930: 86); one in the New Territories of Hong Kong in the mid-1930s was modest compared with Guangzhou's (Huang Peijia, 1935: 2.186).
9. According to Lin Yizhong, Chen Jitang's right-hand man and director of the Department of Civil Administration in 1931-1936, the idea of building modern-style hostels for the masses was conceived in 1927 when he and Chen went on an inspection tour to Europe. Lin said they were particularly impressed by the clean, well-furnished, and cheap workers' hostels they saw in the Soviet Union and decided to do something similar for the Chinese people (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 29-30 May 1930).
10. The titles of these lectures included "The Publishing Business in Guangzhou," "The Mission of the Social Welfare Bureau," "The Question of Prostitution in Guangzhou," and "How to Solve the Problems of Livelihood" (Guangzhou minguo ribao, 19 Nov., 10 Dec. 1932; 30 Sept., 11 Nov. 1933).
11. According to the Department of Civil Administration, Chinese emigrants in Southeast Asia were most seriously affected because rubber plantations and tin mines in that region closed down. The Mexican government's mandate that 80% of the employees in Chinese shops must be locals drove out many (Guangdongsheng minzhengting, 1934: 1-4). Contemporary newspapers

frequently reported on the massive return of overseas Chinese. See, for instance, Guangzhou minguo ribao (11, 27 Sept., 11 Nov. 1930; 10 Apr., 22 Aug., 10 Sept., 14 Oct. 1931).

12. The Guangdong provincial government also resolved to set up a branch of the relief office in Shantou. It started operation in March 1931, under the jurisdiction of the Shantou municipal government. For details of the Shantou branch of the relief office, see Guangdong sheng minzhengting (1934: 37-39, 45-47).

13. The *Ren'ai xunkan* and *Ren'ai yuekan* were edited by the Hall of Benevolence's Department of Edification. Unfortunately, no complete set of these two journals remains. The Guangdong Provincial Zhongshan Library (Guangdong sheng Zhongshan tushuguan) has vol. 1, nos. 1 and 8, of the *Ren'ai xunkan* and vol. 1, nos. 4, 5, and 9-12, of the *Ren'ai yuekan*.

REFERENCES

- BALME, HAROLD (1921) *China and Modern Medicine: A Study in Medical Missionary Development*. London: United Council for Missionary Education.
- BENEDICT, CAROL (1996) *Bubonic Plague in Nineteenth-Century China*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- "Bensheng xibeiqu yikenju zhaoshou shiye huaqiao yiken" [The Northwest Resettlement and Reclamation Bureau of this province recruits unemployed overseas Chinese for resettlement and reclamation purposes] (1933) *Xin Guangdong yuekan*, no. 8: 59-60.
- "Bensheng yaozheng rizhi" [Daily record of important political events in this province] (1935) *Guangdong sheng canyihui yuekan*, no. 4: 75-84; no. 5: 59-69; no. 6: 161-68.
- CHEN BAOZHI (1935) "Ershisnian shengzheng sheshi zhi huigu" (Review of facilities provided by the provincial administration in 1935). *Xin Guangdong yuekan*, no. 36: 1-39.
- CHEN JIE (1937) "Shehui wenti yu jiuji shiye" (Social problems and relief work). *Guangzhou shi jiujiyuan jikan* 2:8-10.
- CHEN JITANG ([1928] 1985) "Dangyuan xunlian de yi yi he mudi" (The significance and aims of training party members). Pp. 15-21 in *Guangdong sheng dang'anguan* (Guangdong Provincial Archives) (ed.), *Chen Jitang yanjiu shiliao, 1928-1936* (Historical materials for research on Chen Jitang, 1928-1936). Guangzhou: Guangdong sheng dang'anguan.
- (1935) "Ren'ai shantang zhengli zhi zongzhi yu suofu zhi shiming" (The aims of establishing the Hall of Benevolence and the mission it shoulders). *Ren'ai xunkan* 1, 1: 1-3.
- CHEN LINGYUN (1937) *Xiandai geguo shehui jiuji* (Contemporary social relief in various countries). Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan.
- CHEN XUXIAN (1943) *Shehui jiuji xingzheng* (The administration of social relief). Chongqing: Zhengzhong shuju.
- CHENG TIANGU (1930) *Guangzhou gongwu zhi shishi jihua* (Plan for carrying out public works in Guangzhou). Guangzhou: n.p.
- CHOA, G. H. (1990) "Heal the Sick" Was Their Motto: The Protestant Medical Missionaries in China. Hong Kong: Chinese Univ. Press.
- CUNNINGHAM, HUGH (1998) "Introduction." Pp. 1-14 in Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes (eds.), *Charity, Philanthropy, and Reform from the 1690s to 1850*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- DENG XIANGGUANG (1935) "Shili dier shenjingbingyuan gongzuo gaiyao" (Outline of the work of the Second Municipal Asylum). *Guangzhou weisheng* 1:107-10.
- FITZGERALD, JOHN (1996) *Awakening China: Politics, Culture, and Class in the Nationalist Revolution*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

- GILLIN, DONALD G. (1967) *Warlord: Yen Hsi-shan in Shansi Province, 1911-1949*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- GN. See *Guangzhou nianjian bianzuan weiyuanhui*, 1935.
- GSF. See *Guangzhou shizheng fagui bianzuan weiyuanhui*, 1936.
- "Guangdong qiaowu weiyuanhui jiuji shiye huiyue qiansong tongji" [Statistics of relieving and sending away unemployed returned emigrants by the Guangdong Committee of Overseas Chinese Affairs] (1936) *Qiaosheng banyuekan* 1:33-34.
- Guangdong Ren'ai shantang xuanhuabu [The Department of Edification of the Hall of Benevolence of Guangdong] (1935) *Ren'ai xunkan* (Journal of the Hall of Benevolence published every ten days). Guangzhou: Ren'ai shantang. Cited as RX.
- (1935-1936) *Ren'ai yuekan* (Monthly journal of the Hall of Benevolence). Guangzhou: Ren'ai shantang. Cited as RY.
- Guangdongsheng dang'anguan [Guangdong Provincial Archives] [ed.] (1987-1989) *Minguo shiqi Guangdongsheng zhengfu dang'an shiliao xuanbian* (Selection of archival materials pertaining to the Guangdong Provincial Government during the Republican period). 11 vols. Guangzhou: Guangdongsheng dang'anguan. Cited as MSG.
- Guangdongsheng minzhengting [Guangdong Provincial Department of Civil Administration] [ed.] (1934) *Guangdong jiuji shiye huiguo huaqiao jishi* (True records of relieving unemployed returned emigrants in Guangdong). Guangzhou: Guangdongsheng minzhengting.
- Guangzhou minguo ribao [MinKao Daily News]. Canton.
- Guangzhou nianjian bianzuan weiyuanhui [Guangzhou Yearbook Compilation Committee] [ed.] (1935) *Guangzhou nianjian* (Guangzhou yearbook). Guangzhou: Guangzhoushi shizhengfu. Cited as GN.
- Guangzhou shizheng fagui bianzuan weiyuanhui [The Committee for Compiling the Laws and Regulations of the Municipal Administration of Guangzhou] [comp.] (1936) *Guangzhou shizheng fagui* (Laws and regulations of the municipal administration of Guangzhou). Guangzhou: Guangdongsheng zhengfu. Cited as GSF.
- Guangzhoushi jiujiyuan [The Guangzhou Municipal Relief Institute] [ed.] (1935) *Guangzhoushi jiujiyuan yuanwu gailan* (Outline of the work of the Guangzhou Municipal Relief Institute). Guangzhou: n.p.
- Guangzhoushi shehuiju [The Social Welfare Bureau of the Municipality of Guangzhou] [ed.] (1934) *Guangzhoushi shehuiju yewu baogao* (Report on the work of the Social Welfare Bureau of the Municipality of Guangzhou). Guangzhou: Guangzhoushi shehuiju.
- (1935) *Guangzhoushi shehui tongji huikan* (Collected social statistics of the Municipality of Guangzhou). Guangzhou: Guangzhoushi shehuiju.
- Guangzhoushi shizhengfu tongjigu [The Statistical Section of the Guangzhou Municipal Government] [ed.] (1929) *Guangzhoushi shizhengfu tongji nianjian* (Statistical yearbook of the Guangzhou municipal government). Guangzhou: Guangzhoushi shizhengfu.
- HUANG GUOQI (1935) "Ren'ai shantang suofu zhi shiming ji qi shishi chengxu" (The mission shouldered by the Hall of Benevolence and the procedure of implementation). *Ren'ai xunkan* 1, 1: 3-6.
- HUANG PEIJIA (1935) *Xianggang Xinjie fengtu mingsheng daguan* (Grand sight of natural conditions, social customs, scenic spots, and historical sites in the New Territories of Hong Kong). 3 vols. Xianggang: n.p.
- LARY, DIANA (1974) *Region and Nation: The Kwangsi Clique in Chinese Politics, 1925-1937*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- LEE, EDWARD BING-SHUEY (1936) *Modern Canton*. Shanghai: Mercury Press.
- LEVICH, EUGENE WILLIAM (1993) *The Kwangsi Way in Kuomintang China, 1931-1939*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

- LI HUICHUAN (1981) "Guangzhou ge gongyi shetuan gaikuang" (Conditions of various public welfare organizations in Guangzhou). *Guangzhou wenshi ziliao* 22:195-210.
- LI JIEZHI (1990) "Chen Jitang tichang dujing de jingguo" (The incident of Chen Jitang's advocacy of studying the Confucian Classics). *Guangdong wenshi ziliao* 62:104-21.
- LI TAIZAO (1935) "Shili yiyuan yewu zhi huigu yu qianzhan" (Review and forecast of the work of the Municipal Hospital). *Guangzhou weisheng* 1:93-99.
- LIANG GUOWU (1993) "Leizhou bandao feihuo jianwen" (What I saw and heard about banditry in the Leizhou peninsula). Pp. 89-101 in *Hebei wenshi ziliao bianjibu* (Hebei Historical Materials Editorial Department) (ed.), *Jindai Zhongguo tufei shilu* (True records of banditry in modern China). Vol. 3. Beijing: Qunzhong chubanshe.
- LIANG QIZI (1997) *Shishan yu jiaohua: Ming Qing de cishan zuji* (Philanthropy and edification: philanthropic associations in Ming and Qing times). Taipei: Lianjing chubanshiye gongsi.
- LIANG YUNGU (1935) "Zhongguo guyou zhi jige jiuzhi zhidu" (Several relief systems that had long existed in China). *Ren'ai yuekan* 1, 4: 63-74.
- LIN, ALFRED H. Y. (2001) "Chen Jitang juyue de youlai yu 'Guangdongsheng sannian shizheng jihua' de yuanqi" (The origins of Chen Jitang's domination of Guangdong and the genesis of the "Three-Year Administrative Plan of Guangdong Province"). *Guangdong dangshi ziliao* 35:378-420.
- (2002) "Building and funding a warlord regime: the experience of Chen Jitang in Guangdong, 1929-1936." *Modern China* 28, 2 (Apr.): 177-212.
- LIN WANYI (1994) *Fuli guojia—lishi bijiao de fenxi* (The welfare state—a comparative historical analysis). Taipei: Juliu tushu gongsi.
- LIU JIWEN (1935) *Guangzhou shizhengfu sannianlai shizheng baogaoshu* (Report on the administrative work of the municipal government of Guangzhou in the past three years). Guangzhou: Guangzhoushi shizhengfu.
- LUM, RAYMOND DAVID (1985) "Philanthropy and Public Welfare in Late Imperial China." Ph.D. diss., Harvard Univ.
- LUO SUYUE (1937) "Guangzhoushi jiujiyuan bannianlai gongzuo gaiyao yu jinhou zhi sheshi" (Outline of the work of the Guangzhou Municipal Relief Institute in the past half year and the facilities to be provided in the future). *Guangzhoushi jiujiyuan jikan* 2:1-3.
- Minjian zhoubao [People's Weekly]. Guangzhou.
- MSG. See *Guangdongsheng dang'anguan*, 1987-1989.
- Nanjing tebieshi zhengfu mishuchu bianyigu [The Compilation and Translation Section of the Secretariat of the Special Municipality of Nanjing] [ed.] (1929) *Shoudou shizheng* (Municipal administration of the capital). Nanjing: Nanjing tebieshi zhengfu.
- Ogilvie, Marilyn Bailey (1997) "The Rockefeller Foundation, China, Western medicine, and PUMC." Pp. 21-37 in Soma Hwa and Philo Hove (eds.), *Philanthropy and Cultural Context: Western Philanthropy in South, East, and Southeast Asia in the 20th Century*. Lanham, MD: Univ. Press of America.
- PRINCE, RUSS ALAN and KAREN MARU FILE (1994) *The Seven Faces of Philanthropy: A New Approach to Cultivating Major Donors*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- QICUI GUANZHU [pseud.] (1933) "Zhenzheng de pingmingong" (The real common people's palace). *Guangzhou zazhi* 13:26.
- QIU CHUANGHUAN (1977) *Zhongguo shehui fuli sixiang zhidu gaiyao* (Essentials of social welfare thoughts and systems in China). Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan.
- QIU JIE (2002a) "Guangzhou shangtuan yu shangtuan shibian—cong shangren tuanti jiaodu zai tantao" (The Guangzhou Merchant Corps and the Merchant Corps Incident: a reexamination from the perspective of merchant associations). *Lishi yanjiu* 2:53-66.

- (2002b) "Jindai Guangdong shangren yu Guangdong zaoqi xiandaihua" (Guangdong merchants in the modern period and the early stage of modernization in Guangdong). *Guangdong shehui kexue* 2:75-82.
- RANKIN, MARY B. (1986) *Elite Activism and Political Transformation in China: Zhejiang Province, 1865-1911*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- RHOADS, EDWARD J. M. (1974) "Merchant Associations in Canton, 1895-1911." Pp. 97-117 in Mark Elvin and G. William Skinner (eds.), *The Chinese City between Two Worlds*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- ROWE, WILLIAM T. (1984) *Hankow: Commerce and Society in a Chinese City, 1796-1889*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- (1989) *Hankow: Conflict and Community in a Chinese City, 1796-1895*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- RX. See Guangdong Ren'ai shantang xuanhuabu, 1935.
- RY. See Guangdong Ren'ai yuekan, 1935-36.
- Shenbao [The Shenbao]. Shanghai.
- SHERIDAN, JAMES (1966) *Chinese Warlord: The Career of Feng Yu-hsiang*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- SUN YAT-SEN ([1924a] 1996) "Guomin zhengfu jianguo dagang" (Fundamentals of national reconstruction). Pp. 709-12 in *Lingnan wenku bianji weiyuanhui* (The Committee for the Compilation of Books on South China) and *Guangdong zhonghua minzu wenhua cujinhui* (The Guangdong Association for the Promotion of Chinese Culture) (eds.), *Sun Zhongshan wencui* (The essence of Sun Yat-sen's writings). Shaoguan: Guangdong renmin chubanshe.
- ([1924b] 1996) "Minsheng zhuyi" (The principle of people's livelihood). Pp. 928-1014 in *Lingnan wenku bianji weiyuanhui* (The Committee for the Compilation of Books on South China) and *Guangdong zhonghua minzu wenhua cujinhui* (The Guangdong Association for the Promotion of Chinese Culture) (eds.), *Sun Zhongshan wencui* (The essence of Sun Yat-sen's writings). Shaoguan: Guangdong renmin chubanshe.
- TRESCOTT, PAUL B. (1997) "American philanthropy and the development of academic economics in China before 1949." Pp. 157-81 in Soma Hewa and Philo Hove (eds.), *Philanthropy and Cultural Context: Western Philanthropy in South, East, and Southeast Asia in the 20th Century*. Lanham, MD: Univ. Press of America.
- TSIN, MICHAEL (1999) *Nation, Governance, and Modernity in China: Canton, 1900-1927*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- WANG YUNJUN (2001) *Minguo Nanjing chengshi shehui guanli* (The management of urban society at Nanjing in the Republican period). Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe.
- WEN XIAOHONG (2001) "Yijiusersi nian Guangdong 'shangtuan shibian' zaitan" (Reexamination of the 1924 "Merchant Corps Incident" in Guangdong). *Zhejiang shehui kexue* 3:124-31.
- WU YANG (1935) "Sannianlai Guangzhou shizheng sheshi gaikuang (xia)" (Conditions of facilities provided by the municipal administration of Guangzhou in the past three years, part 2). *Xin Guangdong yuekan*, no. 36: 97-142.
- XIAO ZILI (2002) *Chen Jitang*. Shaoguan: Guangdong renmin chubanshe.
- YANG ZHEMING (1929) *Xiandai shizheng tonglun* (A general survey of modern municipal administration). Shanghai: Minzhi shuju.
- YEUNG, HANS WING YU (1999) "Guangzhou, 1800-1925: The Urban Evolution of a Chinese Provincial Capital." Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Hong Kong.
- YU SHIWU (1935) "Shili diyi shenjingbingyuan gongzuo gaiyao" (Outline of the work of the First Municipal Asylum). *Guangzhou weisheng* 1:105-6.

- YU YANGUANG and CHEN FULIN [eds.] (1989) *Nanyue geju—cong Long Jiguang dao Chen Jitang* (Separatist rule in Guangdong: from Long Jiguang to Chen Jitang). Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe.
- ZHANG, XIN (2000) *Social Transformation in Modern China: The State and Local Elites in Henan, 1900-1937*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Alfred H. Y. Lin is an associate professor of history at the University of Hong Kong. His work includes The Rural Economy of Guangdong, 1870-1937: A Study of the Agrarian Crisis and Its Origins in Southernmost China (1997). He is currently researching Guangdong politics and society in the 1920s and 1930s, with particular reference to Guangzhou.