

THE INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF CHINESE MODERNITY

CULTURAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT IN THE REPUBLICAN ERA

Edmund S. K. Fung



CAMBRIDGE

The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity

In the early part of the twentieth century, China was on the brink of change. Different ideologies – those of radicalism, conservatism, liberalism and social democracy – were much debated in political and intellectual circles. Whereas previous works have analysed these trends in isolation, Edmund S. K. Fung shows how they related to each other and how intellectuals in China engaged according to their different cultural and political persuasions. In fact, the author argues, Republican ideologies are best understood as a triad of liberal, radical and conservative thought, which arose at about the same time and in similar circumstances, each a modern response to the challenges of modernity. It is this interrelatedness and the interplay between different schools of thought that are central to the understanding of Chinese modernity, for many of the debates which began in the Republican era still resonate in China today. The book charts the development of these different ideologies and explores the work and influence of intellectuals who were associated with them. In its challenge to previous scholarship and the breadth of its approach, the book promises to make a major contribution to the study of Chinese political philosophy and intellectual history.

Edmund S. K. Fung is Professor of Asian Studies at the University of Western Sydney. His previous publications include *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929–1949* (Cambridge, 2000), *The Diplomacy of Imperial Retreat: Britain's South China Policy, 1924–1931* (1991) and *The Military Dimension of the Chinese Revolution: The New Army and Its Role in the Revolution of 1911* (1980).

中國現代性的

思想基礎

王汎森



敬啟者

The Intellectual Foundations
of Chinese Modernity

*Cultural and Political Thought in the
Republican Era*

EDMUND S. K. FUNG

University of Western Sydney



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press
32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA
www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521195119

© Edmund S. K. Fung 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2010

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data

Fung, Edmund S. K.

The intellectual foundations of Chinese modernity : cultural and political
thought in the Republican era / Edmund S. K. Fung.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-19511-9 (hbk.)

1. China – Intellectual life – 1912–1949. 2. China – Politics and government –
1912–1949. 3. Liberalism – China – History – 20th century. 4. Conservatism – China –
History – 20th century. 5. Socialism – China – History – 20th century. 6. Social
change – China – History – 20th century. I. Title.

DS775.2.F86 2010

951.04 – dc22 2009042268

ISBN 978-0-521-19511-9 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in
this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

To my wife, Lucia 穗芳

my son, Eugene 育君

and

my grandchildren, Harry 孝严, Emma 孝慈 and Daniel 孝祖

Contents

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | <i>page ix</i> |
| <i>Abbreviations</i> | <i>xiii</i> |
| <i>A Note on Romanization</i> | <i>xv</i> |
| Introduction | 1 |
| <i>Towards an Understanding of Chinese Modernity</i> | 5 |
| <i>Some Methodological Issues</i> | 13 |
| <i>A Community of Critical Intellectuals</i> | 18 |
| <i>The Main Arguments of the Book</i> | 20 |
| <i>The Structure of the Book</i> | 24 |
| 1 The Push of Westernized Radicalism | 27 |
| <i>The Early East–West Debate</i> | 31 |
| <i>The Advocacy of Thorough Westernization</i> | 37 |
| <i>Total Westernization: The Advocacy of a Fervent Nationalist</i> | 46 |
| <i>The Decline of Westernized Radicalism</i> | 56 |
| <i>A Critique of Westernized Radicalism</i> | 58 |
| 2 The Pull of Cultural Conservatism | 61 |
| <i>The Rise of Modern Chinese Conservatism</i> | 63 |
| <i>Easternization: The Quest for Cultural Equality</i> | 72 |
| <i>Central Themes of the Conservative Counter-Discourse</i> | 76 |
| <i>Tiaohelun: The Doctrine of Mediation and Harmony</i> | 84 |
| <i>New Confucianism</i> | 90 |
| <i>Reflections on Cultural Conservatism</i> | 93 |
| 3 The Politics of Modern Chinese Conservatism | 96 |
| <i>Nationalism, Modernity and Politicocultural Nationalism</i> | 98 |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| | <i>The Politicocultural Thought of Liang Shuming and Zhang Junmai</i> | 103 |
| | <i>The Politics of China-Based Cultural Reconstruction</i> | 113 |
| | <i>Wartime Politicocultural Nationalism</i> | 117 |
| | <i>The Political Thought of the Warring States Group</i> | 120 |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | 126 |
| 4 | Liberalism in China and Chinese Liberal Thought | 128 |
| | <i>The Rise of Chinese Liberalism</i> | 130 |
| | <i>The Liberals as a Differentiated Category</i> | 134 |
| | <i>How Was Liberalism Understood in Modern China?</i> | 138 |
| | <i>The Features and Specific Concerns of Chinese Liberal Thought</i> | 146 |
| | <i>Liberal Thought, Cultural Radicalism, Cultural Conservatism</i> | 157 |
| 5 | The State, Government and the Rule of Law | 159 |
| | <i>What Did a Strong Chinese State Mean?</i> | 161 |
| | <i>Omnipotent Government and Government with a Plan</i> | 167 |
| | <i>Good Government and Government by 'Good Men'</i> | 171 |
| | <i>The Rule of Law</i> | 182 |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | 189 |
| 6 | The Rise of Reformist Socialist Thought | 191 |
| | <i>The Socialist Discourse, 1919</i> | 193 |
| | <i>The 1920 Controversy: Capitalism Versus Socialism</i> | 199 |
| | <i>Zhang Junmai and the German Influence</i> | 205 |
| | <i>The Influence of British Socialism</i> | 211 |
| | <i>A Liberal Response to the Soviet Experiment of the 1920s</i> | 213 |
| | <i>Protosocialism in Ancient Chinese Thought</i> | 219 |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | 222 |
| 7 | From State Socialism to Social Democracy | 224 |
| | <i>State Socialist Thought to 1945</i> | 226 |
| | <i>Postwar Social Democratic Thought</i> | 238 |
| | <i>A Comparative Perspective</i> | 253 |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | 256 |
| | <i>Glossary</i> | 269 |
| | <i>Selected Bibliography</i> | 281 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 307 |

Acknowledgements

This book has been six years in the works. In its early days, the project began on a modest scale, supported by a grant from the University of Western Sydney's Research Committee in 2004. In the following year, it developed into a more ambitious project when I secured funding from the Australian Research Council as an ARC Discovery Project for the next three years. In 2008, I was on a Professional Development Programme (study leave) during the autumn semester, which enabled me to complete the project and produce a full manuscript for review by Cambridge University Press. I am most grateful to the Australian Research Council and to the University of Western Sydney for their financial support over the years.

The bulk of the research for this book was carried out in China and Taiwan. During my numerous visits to the Institute of Modern History, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing, I enjoyed the academic hospitality of the former director of the Institute, Professor Zhang Haipeng. Two members of the Institute, Professors Zheng Dahua and Zuo Yuhe, shared their thoughts with me on various questions of interest. I have also benefited from their prolific works on Chinese intellectual history of the Republican era. Through these three men I have been invited to several international conferences on modern Chinese intellectual history held on the mainland. To all of them I here convey my sincere thanks. My research in China also took me to Beijing University. The assistance of the Beida Library staff is gratefully acknowledged.

I made frequent visits to Academia Sinica in Taiwan during the past six years. I was attached to its Institute of Modern History, whose former director, Professor Chen Yung-fa, has been of great help to me. He treated me as more than a visiting scholar and made me feel most welcome. Indeed, I felt like I was coming home, or *binzhi rugui*, as the Chinese

put it. I am most grateful to him and to his wife, perfect hosts. Also at the Institute of Modern History is my old friend, Professor Chang Peng-yuan, many years my senior, whom I still call *laoshi*. Now retired, but still doing research in a relaxed manner, Professor Chang, more than anyone, has given me a great deal of encouragement and moral support. There is another old friend, Professor Chu Hung-yuan, who invited me to several conferences held in Taipei and to dinners with his friends and family members, which I enjoyed very much. I would also like to mention Dr Pan Kuang-che, who has arranged for me to present semesters at the Institute and assisted me in locating some materials on Hu Shi.

I should thank two other members of Academia Sinica: First, Professor Wang Fan-sen, the former director of the Institute of History and Philology and now a vice president of Academia Sinica, has been extremely kind to me. His calligraphy provides the frontispiece of this book. Second is Dr Caroline Hui-yu Ts'ai of the Institute of Taiwan Historical Studies, a friend dating back to the early 1990s. She arranged for my accommodation at the Academic Activities Centre and went to great lengths to ensure that my stay in Taipei was comfortable. She has also helped me in many other ways.

This book has left out Marxism for reasons given in the introduction. Nonetheless, I am grateful to my former colleague, Professor Nick Knight, now retired, for sharing his thoughts with me on the ultimate triumph of Marxism over liberal, conservative and non-Marxist socialist thought in the Republican era. I sought his advice while he was on holiday in Tasmania in February 2009. He promptly provided it to me.

The manuscript has gone through many drafts. Dr Peter Zarrow of the Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica, read an early draft of the introduction. Professor Edward Krebs, now retired, read a later draft of the introduction and also shared his thoughts with me on several papers that were published and eventually became parts of the book. Professor Chang Peng-yuan read nearly the entire manuscript. I thank all of them for their comments and suggestions. Special thanks go to the two anonymous Cambridge University Press readers, who were rigorous in reviewing the manuscript and made the most constructive criticisms. They will find that all their comments and suggestions have been considered and many have been incorporated into the book, although I maintain my own position on some points and issues. It goes without saying that none of the individuals mentioned here is in any way responsible for the opinions I have expressed or for any errors of fact or judgement that I may have committed.

Some of the ideas canvassed in this book were first raised at various international conferences held in Beijing, Yantai, Sydney, Christchurch and Dunedin, and at seminars given at the Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica, and at the National Central University (Taiwan). Thanks are due to many people who have generously given me their comments.

Earlier versions of chapters or parts of chapters in this book appeared in the following publications.

Chapter 3: 'Nationalism and modernity: the politics of cultural conservatism in Republican China', *Modern Asian Studies* 43, 3 (May 2009): 777–813.

Chapter 4: 'Were Chinese liberals liberal? Reflections on the understanding of liberalism in modern China', *Pacific Affairs* 81, 4 (Winter 2008/2009): 557–76; and 'The idea of freedom in modern China revisited: multiple conceptions and dual responsibilities', *Modern China* 32, 4 (October 2006): 453–82.

Chapters 6 and 7: 'Socialism, capitalism, and democracy in Republican China: the political thought of Zhang Dongsun', *Modern China* 28, 4 (October 2002): 399–431; and 'State building, capital development, and social justice: social democracy in China's modern transformation, 1921–1949', *Modern China* 31, 3 (July 2005): 318–52.

Permissions from the publishers listed above to make use of these materials are gratefully acknowledged.

At Cambridge University Press, Marigold Acland, the Senior Commissioning Editor for the Middle East, Asia and Islamic Studies, deserves special thanks. It has been a privilege and a pleasure working with her on the book. I should also thank the production editor, Sarah Green, for her advice, and the copy editor, Laura Tendler, for removing some of the stylistic infelicities and making the book more readable. To Peggy Rote, project manager at Aptara, I also say many thanks for her help in numerous ways. Not least of all, this book has benefited from the expertise of Joan Curtis, who carefully proofread it at the final stages.

Finally, I owe more than I can express to my wife, Lucia, for her patience, understanding and support over the years. I dedicate the book to her as well as to my son and grandchildren.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------|---|
| CCP | The Chinese Communist Party (Zhongguo Gongchandang 中国共产党) |
| <i>DXWC</i> | <i>Duxiu wencun</i> 独秀文存 (The collected works of Chen Duxiu) |
| <i>DYQWC</i> | <i>Du Yaquan wencun</i> 杜亚泉文存 (The collected works of Du Yaquan) |
| GMD | The Chinese Nationalist Party (Zhongguo Guomindang 中国国民党) |
| <i>HSWJ</i> | <i>Hu Shi wenji</i> 胡适文集 (The collected works of Hu Shi) |
| <i>LQCQJ</i> | <i>Liang Qichao quanji</i> 梁启超全集 (The complete works of Liang Qichao) |
| <i>LSMQJ</i> | <i>Liang Shuming quanji</i> 梁漱溟全集 (The complete works of Liang Shuming) |
| PRC | The People's Republic of China |
| <i>ZSZQJ</i> | <i>Zhang Shizhao quanji</i> 章士钊全集 (The complete works of Zhang Shizhao) |

A Note on Romanization

The *pinyin* system is used throughout for transliterating Chinese names and terms, with some exceptions for personal names that are long familiar in the West, notably Chiang Kai-shek, Sun Yat-sen, H. H. Kung (Kong Xiangxi) and T. V. Soong (Song Ziwen), and that are used by the authors themselves in their English writings, such as Hao Chang and Yü Ying-shih. In the footnotes and in the Bibliography, however, the *pinyin* system is used throughout with the only exception of Hong Kong.

Introduction

Modernity, ‘an unfinished project’, as Jürgen Habermas terms it,¹ has been a subject of considerable interest to intellectuals in the People’s Republic of China (PRC) since the late 1980s, with some scholars questioning the postmodernist claim that modernity is dead. In 1997, for example, the intellectual historian Xu Jilin asked rhetorically whether modernity had really come to an end. Certainly not, he said, as far as Chinese modernity is concerned.² More importantly, in the same year, a lively debate took place between the liberals (or neoliberals) and the so-called New Left following the publication of the literary scholar and intellectual historian Wang Hui’s provocative article ‘Contemporary Chinese thought and the question of modernity’. The article has since attracted a great deal of scholarly attention at home and abroad and has been translated into Korean, Japanese and English.³ In many respects, the debate was between liberal thought, especially classical liberalism, and socialist thought in the contexts of China’s transition to a global market economy and of the social and economic inequalities spawned by the economic reforms.⁴ The debate is ongoing, which reminds us of the cultural

¹ Maurizio Passerin D’Entrèves and Seyla Benhabib (eds.), *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).

² Xu Jilin 许纪霖, *Xunqiu yiyi: xiandaihua bianqian yu wenhua pipan* 寻求意义: 现代化变迁与文化批判 (Shanghai: Shanghai sanlian shudian, 1997), 258–64.

³ Wang Hui, ‘Contemporary Chinese thought and the question of modernity’. This article, known in Chinese as ‘Dangdai Zhongguo de sixiang zhuangkuang yu xiandaixing wenti’ 当代中国的思想状况与现代性问题, was originally published in the journal *Tianya* 天涯 (Frontiers) and has been reprinted in *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, ed. Li Shitao 李世涛 (Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002), 83–123.

⁴ See Li Shitao (ed.), *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi*; Gao Like 高力克, ‘Zhuanxingzhong de xiandaixing zhi zheng’ 转型中的现代性之争, in *Qiusuo xiandaixing* 求索现代性 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang daxue chubanshe, 1999), 26–32; and more recently, various chapters in

and intellectual controversies of the precommunist period. There are similarities. Intellectuals of the Republican era wrestled with questions of modernization, wealth and power, liberty, democracy, equality and social justice and contemplated China's place in the world. Contemporary intellectuals, finding themselves in an era of reform and globalization, continue the search for Chinese modernity that had begun three quarters of a century earlier. They, too, grapple with the question of 'whither China', using a similar language of critical inquiry to explore issues some of which stretch back many decades. The similarities are instructive – the intellectual foundations of Chinese modernity date back to the Republican era.

This historical study is concerned with the cultural and political dimensions of Chinese modernity that are underpinned by a triad of liberal, conservative and socialist thought during the period under review. Previous scholarship has tended to treat each component of this triad in isolation, as though the three are separate, distinct and mutually opposed. Consequently, it has overlooked their interrelatedness and interactions, leaving many assumptions, some old and some more recent, about modern Chinese thought open to challenge. Chinese conservatism is often seen as essentially a cultural conservatism and not a political one⁵ or as part of a post-World War I antimodernization phenomenon in the non-West.⁶ Liberalism, imported into China first through Japan and then directly from the West, often is said to have been misunderstood, and even distorted, by Chinese intellectuals, who are blamed for the damage done to the liberal cause in the Republican era.⁷ And socialism is all too often studied in the context of the communist movement as revolutionary socialism. PRC scholars have long maintained that liberalism (which subsumes cultural radicalism), cultural conservatism and Marxism were the three competing currents of thought during the Republican period.

Qimeng de ziwu wanjie: 1990 niandai yilai Zhongguo sixiang wenhuaqie zhongda lunzheng yanjiu 启蒙的自我瓦解: 1990 年以来中国思想文化界重大论争研究, eds. Xu Jilin 许纪霖 and Luo Gang 罗岗 et al. (Changchun: Jilin chubansh, 2007).

⁵ Benjamin I. Schwartz, 'Notes on conservatism in general and in China in particular', in *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, ed. Charlotte Furth (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 3–14.

⁶ Ai Kai 艾恺 [Guy S. Alitto], *Wenhua shoucheng zhuyi lun: fanxiandaihua sichao de pouxu* 文化守成主义论: 反现代化思潮的剖析 (Taipei: Shibao wenhua, 1986); republished unchanged in a PRC edition under a new title, *Shijie fanweinei de fanxiandaihua sichao: lun wenhua shoucheng zhuyi* 世界范围内的反现代化思潮: 论文化守成主义 (Guiyang: Guizhou renmin chubanshe, 1991).

⁷ See, for example, Liu Junning 刘军宁, *Gonghe, minzhu, xianzheng: ziyou zhuyi sixiang yanjiu* 共和、民主、宪政: 自由主义思想研究 (Shanghai: Sanlian shudian, 1998), 292–301, 340–1.

In their scholarship, socialism since 1921 is equated with Marxism along with the thought of Mao Zedong, producing a communist-dominated historiography that obscures the reformist alternative put forward by non-Marxist, noncommunist intellectuals who had a socialistic impulse.⁸ This disregards the fact that socialist thought of a reformist kind was an important feature of modern Chinese political thought.

This study seeks to offer a new frame of reference for thinking about this triad. It takes a fresh, integrated approach, treating the three entities simultaneously in an intricate relationship. Little, however, will be written about democratic thought, which I have treated elsewhere.⁹ It should also be stated at the outset that socialist thought here refers not to Marxism, even though Marxism was itself an ideology of modernization, but to reformist socialism of a kind akin to the revisionist socialism of Western Europe. Marxism is left out not only because it is well covered elsewhere,¹⁰ but also because the key figures studied here were not Marxists. It was not that Marxist thought was marginalized; in fact, there was great interest in it (or in dialectical materialism) between 1928 and 1935 as ‘the defining feature of Chinese thought’,¹¹ not to say by the 1940s. But the intellectuals in this study were not that leftist; although they accepted Marxism’s critique of capitalism, they repudiated the notion of class struggle and social revolution.

This book proceeds from the premise that liberal, conservative and socialist thought was all a response to the ‘crisis of modernization’ and that modern Chinese thought is marked by a plurality of competing ideas. Unravelling their complexity, interrelatedness, interactions and dialectical relationship is the key to understanding Chinese modernity in its intellectual, cultural and political configurations. This book seeks to illuminate the processes and pathos of Chinese intellectual history in the interweaving of a variety of ideas – Chinese and Western, old and new, modern and traditional, liberal and conservative, radical and

⁸ See, for example, the review article by Fu Qingmin 付庆敏 and Yu Zuohua 于作敏, ‘Shehui zhuyi sichao ji Makesi zhuyi Zhongguohua’ 社会主义思潮及马克思主义中国化, in *Zhongguo jindai shehui wenhua sichao yanjiu tonglan* 中国近代社会文化思想研究通鉴, eds. Yu Zuhua 俞祖华 and Zhao Huifeng 赵慧峰 (Jinan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 2005), 302–419.

⁹ Edmund S. K. Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929–1949* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

¹⁰ See, for example, Arif Dirlik, *Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919–1937* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978); also Dirlik, *Marxism in the Chinese Revolution* (Lanham, Md.: Rowan & Littlefield, 2005); Nick Knight, *Marxist Philosophy in China: From Qu Qiubai to Mao Zedong, 1923–1945* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2005).

¹¹ Dirlik, *Revolution and History*, 43.

reformist – addressing broader questions and the underlying issues that cannot be analysed by using binary explanatory categories.

China has a long history of responding to the Western intrusion dating back to the latter half of the nineteenth century, following the Opium War and other armed conflicts with foreign powers. Underscoring the response was reformist thought that evolved through several phases. The first phase was the Self-Strengthening Movement (dating approximately from 1860 to 1894), which was characterized by a strategy and a mind-set of ‘learning from the barbarians to deal with the barbarians’ (*yiyi zhiyi*), with its focus on the acquisition of Western arms and technologies. The second phase, from the aftermath of the Sino-Japanese War (1894–5) through the ‘New Administration’ of the post-Boxer decade to the end of the Qing Dynasty (1644–1912), was marked by a new emphasis on institutional change. The third phase, from the founding of the Republic to the New Culture Movement (1915–21), saw a shift in intellectual thinking to the role of culture in China’s modern transformation.¹² Other phases that followed featured culture, politics and economics as intimately intertwined in the quest for modernity.

Driven by the need to survive as a nation, China’s new intellectuals sought a new level of integration into the modern world. They attempted to achieve this in three sometimes overlapping modes. The first mode was represented by cultural radicalism, which found expression in the thought of the Westernizers who took an iconoclastic attitude towards the Chinese heritage. This radical antitraditionalism, asserts Lin Yü-sheng, began in the May Fourth period,¹³ although the birth of modern Chinese radicalism really started in the late Qing. It culminated in the 1930s in the call by the political scientist and sociologist Chen Xujing (1903–67) for ‘total Westernization’. The most extreme statement of this position was made by those who idealized Western culture, society and institutions. This first mode represents a strand of liberal thought that I call ‘Westernized radicalism’ in Chapter 1. The second mode, represented by cultural conservatism and linked to modern conservative thought, defended the national heritage while emphasizing cultural synthesis through a confluence of Chinese and Western ideas. The third mode, represented by the New Confucians, was a variant of the second mode, emphasizing either

¹² Yü Yingshi 余英时, ‘Zhongguo wenhua weiji ji qi sixiangshi de beijing’ 中国文化危机及其思想史的背景, in Yü Yingshi, *Lishi renwu yu wenhua weiji* 历史人物与文化危机 (Taipei: Dongda tushu, 1995), 187–8.

¹³ Lin Yü-sheng, *The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness: Radical Antitraditionalism in the May Fourth Era* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979).

‘returning to the roots in order to be creative and new’ (*fanben kaixin*) or ‘creating something new in order to strengthen the core’ (*chuangxin guben*). There was a fourth mode, represented by radical Marxism, which is outside the scope of this study.

The non-Marxist, noncommunist elite studied here constituted a group of mainstream intellectuals who were basically social and political reformers, even though some were cultural radicals. They appropriated Western ideas, adapted them to local conditions and used them to rethink, reevaluate and reformulate the Chinese past and articulate visions of Chinese modernity. They lived in an age when traditional authority had been eroded, first, by the abolition of the civil service examinations in 1905, and then by the demise of the monarchical system. The literati of yesteryear were reeducating themselves in order to seek a leadership role in the post-imperial order. Those of a younger generation, the new intellectuals, were exposed to a range of ideologies, from liberalism to democracy to capitalism to socialism to anarchism to Marxism, about which they were keen to learn within so short a time – what Brantly Womack has called ‘compressed intellectual modernization’.¹⁴ Politically, they favoured a strong state marked by national cohesion, constitutionalism, powerful government, administrative efficiency and the rule of law. They, too, had a socialistic impulse.

How different schools of thought contended, interacted and influenced one another as they developed is the main concern of this study. A number of themes will be developed, namely, cultural radicalism, cultural conservatism, reformism, nationalism, statism, state building, capitalist development, social justice, liberty and equality. These themes are linked to the three currents of thought and to the three modes of integrating China into the modern world. In this way, this book seeks to promote a better understanding of the intellectual foundations of Chinese modernity from the perspective of non-Marxist intellectuals.

Towards an Understanding of Chinese Modernity

Anyone who writes about Chinese modernity confronts an interpretive problem at the outset: What does the term mean? It has been defined in a variety of ways, even by the same writer at different times. For example, in 1990, the literary scholar Leo Ou-fan Lee wrote that, since the turn of

¹⁴ Brantly Womack, ‘The phases of Chinese modernization’, in *Modernization in China*, ed. Steve S. K. Chin (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Centre of Asian Studies, 1979), 1–16.

the twentieth century, Chinese modernity was ‘a mode of consciousness of time and history as unilinear [sic] progress, moving in a continuous “stream” or “tide” from the past to the present . . . [leading] prophetically to a purposeful future’.¹⁵ To be modern was to be new as in ‘new thought’, ‘New Literature’, in the journals *New Youth* and *New Tide* and so forth. The emphasis on newness was intended to contrast the old with the new and the past with the present, suggesting either a succession of time or a break with the past. Before the decade was over, however, Lee took a new, postmodernist approach to studying modern Shanghai during the 1930s and 1940s. Interested in a new urban consumerism and in a new genealogy of knowledge and focusing on styles and images rather than on ideas and ideologies, Lee views Shanghai as ‘the very embodiment of modernity’, with its material culture, cinemas, bookshops, advertising, popular entertainments and commercialization. He links the elitist project of enlightenment with a populist commodity culture and images of a Western-style urban life.¹⁶ In the changing urban culture, music and films reflected many of the new ideas of the age.¹⁷ Remaking the Chinese city is hailed as a means of passage to modernity and beyond.¹⁸ There also has been much scholarly interest in urban ideas.¹⁹

Clearly, there has been a shift of interest from new thought to something more concrete and material. More recently, Peter Zarrow and colleagues speak of ‘creating Chinese modernity’ in terms of knowledge and everyday life in the first four decades of the twentieth century.²⁰ In a similar vein, Madeleine Yue Dong and associates deploy the notion of ‘everydayness’, the idea that many of the most mundane everyday life experiences, such as people’s search for food, water and lighting and their contradictory attitudes towards women, provide excellent material from which to investigate the processes of modernity in twentieth-century

¹⁵ Leo Ou-fan Lee, ‘In search of modernity: some reflections on a new mode of consciousness in twentieth-century Chinese history and literature’, in *Ideas Across Cultures: Essays on Chinese Thought in Honor of Benjamin I. Schwartz*, ed. Paul A. Cohen and Merle Goldman (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), 122.

¹⁶ Leo Ou-fan Lee, *Shanghai Modern: The Flowering of a New Urban Culture in China 1930–1945* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

¹⁷ Yingjin Zhang (ed.), *Cinema and Urban Culture in Shanghai, 1922–1943* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999).

¹⁸ Joseph W. Esherick (ed.), *Remaking the Chinese City: Modernity & National Identity, 1900–1950* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2002).

¹⁹ See, for example, Rana Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution: China’s Struggle with the Modern World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

²⁰ Peter Zarrow (ed.), *Creating Chinese Modernity: Knowledge and Everyday Life, 1900–1940* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006).

China.²¹ Frank Dikötter looks at the culture of material objects in late imperial and early modern China, ranging widely from transport to modern urban architecture to modern utilities to private houses to clothing to food to sights and sounds.²² Also, Ruth Rogaski, focusing on the treaty-port city of Tianjin, speaks of 'hygienic modernity' (*weisheng*), which not only concerned the cleanliness of bodies and a variety of regimens of diet, meditation and self-medication intended for internal vitalities, but also served as a vehicle through which the treaty-port elite sought to transform the state, society and individual.²³

These are important works. However, it is premature to write off the nation as a site from which to study Chinese modernity. The historian Margherita Zanasi draws attention back to the nation by exploring economic modernity in the Nanjing Decade (1928–37) as a way of saving the nation,²⁴ supplementing William Kirby's work on industrial modernity at the birth of the Nationalist developmental state.²⁵ Ideas are central to the discourse of modernity. Most recently, Weipin Tsai illuminates three dimensions of Chinese modernity as reflected through the images of Shanghai urbanites in the readership of *Shenbao* (*Eastern Times*). One of these is a new concept of citizenship in which the individual is treated as the basic unit composing the nation.²⁶ In some ways, the equation of cultural and national identity with modernity remains an important framework for studies of modernity in the Republican era.²⁷

Philosophically, modernity is not so much a concept as 'a conceptual cluster of overlapping and sometimes contradictory elements', write David Hall and Roger Ames. As a state or condition, modernity is 'a multivalent and richly vague complex that cannot be too sharply defined' or understood in a coherent manner. Yet philosophical interpretations of modernity are grounded in conceptions of self and society. According to

²¹ Madeleine Yue Dong and Joshua Goldstein (eds.), *Everyday Modernity in China* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006).

²² Frank Dikötter, *Things Modern: Material Culture and Everyday Life in China* (London: Hurst & Co., 2007).

²³ Ruth Rogaski, *Hygienic Modernity: Meaning of Health and Disease in Treaty-Port China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

²⁴ Margherita Zanasi, *Saving the Nation: Economic Modernity in Republican China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

²⁵ William C. Kirby, 'Engineering China: birth of the developmental state, 1928–1937', in *Becoming Chinese: Passages to Modernity and Beyond*, ed. Wen-hsin Yeh (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 137–60.

²⁶ Weipin Tsai, *Reading Shenbao: Nationalism, Consumerism and Individuality in China 1919–37* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

²⁷ See, for example, Yeh (ed.), *Becoming Chinese*.

Hall and Ames, four principal strands are associated with these interpretations: self-consciousness, self-assertion, self-gratification and aesthetic self-expression, which run afoul of China's communitarian traditions. The challenge for twentieth-century Chinese intellectuals was to accommodate liberalism (or rights-based democracy), free enterprise capitalism and rational technologies.²⁸

Historically, modernity meant, first, a society that was industrialized, capitalistic in its mode of production and driven by a constantly growing economy; and second, the formation of the nation-state, which offered its members a cultural and political identity, a single economic unit (the national market) and political sovereignty exercised by the state. Further, modernity involved increasingly well-organized social classes that engaged each other, sometimes in violent conflict.²⁹ To all of this must be added secularization, functional differentiation, increasing levels of popular participation in politics and a valorization of the state as an appropriate agency for achieving desirable political, economic and social change.³⁰

As a broad philosophy, modernity has been identified with the Enlightenment, with its faith in reason, in progress and in unbounded human capacity for pursuing happiness in this world rather than in the afterlife. Core beliefs of the Enlightenment include perfectibility; the application of science and technology to solve the problems not only of the natural world but also of humanity; principles governing nature, people and society; and secularism. And it spoke of 'the good life', promising a bright future for all humanity. These characteristics of modernity are Eurocentric. It is precisely for this reason that they often appear to be arbitrary, especially in terms of the often rigid distinction drawn between East and West, tradition and modernity. The non-West had a late start in modernization, which raises the question: Did the non-Western historical experience define modernity as well? S. N. Eisenstadt thinks so, for he has long spoken of each non-Western society that engaged in modernization having its own internal dynamics. What struck him was modernity as 'a new civilization and the differential patterns of its expansion'.³¹

²⁸ David L. Hall and Roger T. Ames, *The Democracy of the Dead: Dewey, Confucius, and the Hope for Democracy in China* (Chicago: Open Court, 1999), 66.

²⁹ John Schwarzmantel, *The Age of Ideology: Political Ideologies from the American Revolution to Postmodern Times* (London: Macmillan, 1998), 4–6.

³⁰ David E. Apter, *The Politics of Modernization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

³¹ S. N. Eisenstadt, 'Introduction', in *Patterns of Modernity, Vol. II: Beyond the West*, ed. S. N. Eisenstadt (London: Frances Pinter, 1987), 5–9.

Some scholars maintain that modernity has a dual character: cultural and societal. The term 'cultural modernity' is often used to emphasize what the nineteenth-century French poet and artist Charles-Pierre Baudelaire called 'aesthetics of the self'. Central to the concept of cultural modernity are such issues as mass media and mass culture, entertainment, commercial arts and advertising, rapid social change, utopian or dystopian visions, cultural clashes and encounters with the alien 'Other'. On the other hand, 'societal modernity' involves a set of cognitive and social transformations and often refers to the process of change that stresses the overall rationalization of social life that has led to what Max Weber called the 'iron cage' of economic compulsion and bureaucratic domination.³² For the contemporary social thinker Anthony Giddens, modernity refers to 'modes of social life or organization which emerged in Europe from about the seventeenth century onwards and which subsequently became more or less worldwide in their influence'.³³ Modernity, Giddens adds, is 'multidimensional on the level of institutions'.³⁴

This dualism has evoked different responses from contemporary social thinkers. The postmodernist Jean-François Lyotard has challenged the underlying legitimization of the 'grand narratives' of modernity and has pronounced modernity's end in a narrow and special sense.³⁵ Jürgen Habermas, however, comes to its defence as an 'unfinished', redeemable project. And Giddens has argued that rather than entering a period of postmodernity, contemporary societies 'are moving into one in which the consequences of modernity are becoming more radicalised and universalised than before'.³⁶

Modernity, then, is a multifaceted phenomenon. It is both an epochal concept, the 'new age', as Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel conceptualized,³⁷ and an attitude, as Michel Foucault maintains. By

³² Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, 'On alternative modernities', in *Alternative Modernities*, ed. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001), 1–5. See also Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 3rd edn., trans. Stephen Kalberg (Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing, 2002).

³³ Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990), 1.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

³⁵ Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1984).

³⁶ Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 3.

³⁷ For Hegel, modernity is not simply the present, but a unique period in history, distinct in its nature and orientation from antiquity and the Middle Ages. See Jürgen Habermas's critique of Hegel in *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*, trans. Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge: Polity in association with Basil Blackwell, 1987), 51–69.

'attitude', Foucault, echoing Immanuel Kant, means 'a mode of relating to contemporary reality; a voluntary choice made by certain people; in the end, a way of thinking and feeling; a way, too, of acting and behaving that at one and the same time marks a relation of belonging and presents itself as a task'.³⁸ What is important to Foucault is 'a type of philosophical interrogation', one that 'simultaneously problematizes man's relation to the present, man's historical mode of being, and the constitution of the self as an autonomous subject', coupled with 'a philosophical ethos that could be described as a permanent critique of our historical era'.³⁹ In other words, modernity, intellectually, is an attitude of questioning the past and the present and linking them with the future. It questions everything and, Weber would say, measures everything against a unitary principle of rationality. (Weber, however, recognized that this questioning of reality by reason was ultimately self-defeating and self-destructive.) It is this spirit of critique that is the most valued legacy of the Enlightenment, even though today, the Enlightenment is viewed by postmodernist, postcolonial and poststructural theorists as an historical anomaly.

As an attitude of questioning the past and the present, modernity entails a criticism of modernity itself. Habermas has contended that the assumptions of progress and of the superiority of the 'new age' to the past need to be justified and that self-reflection is inherent to the very nature of modernist culture.⁴⁰ What Habermas tells us is that modernity is internally complex and contains many paradoxes, tensions and contradictions – the 'pathologies of modernity'.

Understanding modernity as both an epoch and an attitude of questioning the past and the present is important to this study. The concept of the age underscores the relationships among Chinese liberal, conservative and socialist thought. It relates to the responses to the 'crisis of modernization' and is linked to the different modes of integrating China into the modern world. In terms of attitude, a spirit of *fansi* (reflection), *pipan* (critique) and (*zijue*) self-consciousness pervaded the intellectual discourse of the Republican era. Wang Hui puts it in an historical perspective: '[T]he basic characteristics of Chinese thought on modernity are doubt and critique. As a result, at the heart of the search for Chinese modernity in Chinese thinking and in some of China's most important

³⁸ Michel Foucault, 'What is Enlightenment?', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin Books, 1991), 39.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁴⁰ Andrew Edgar, *The Philosophy of Habermas* (Chesham: Acumen Publishing, 2005), 191–2.

intellectuals stands a huge paradox.’⁴¹ In the quest for modernity, Chinese intellectuals critiqued it not only because of its very nature but also and especially because of China’s different culture and recent history. They reflected on China’s past and present, on imperialist expansion and on the social inequities of capitalism in the West all at once. They believed that it was important to consider how modernization could avoid or remedy the political and social problems that would inevitably arise in the wake of liberal democracy, capitalist development and the advance of modern science and technology.

They also pondered the relationship between Enlightenment universalism and Chinese particularity. It was clear to them that modernity, or modernization, meant progress, liberty and national wealth and power, and that it entailed a reevaluation of Chinese traditions against Western values. But they thought the West should be critiqued, too, where appropriate. As Hao Chang (Zhang Hao) writes, ‘[The Chinese elite] critiqued modernization with tradition and tradition with modernization’.⁴² In this way, they resembled Paul Gilroy’s black Atlantic, who strove to be both European and black, requiring some specific forms of double consciousness. They, too, to borrow Gilroy’s words, had ‘a sense of embeddedness in the modern world, [. . .] sometimes as defenders of the West, sometimes as its sharpest critics’.⁴³

Chinese modernity is defined by both Chinese and Western historical experiences and by reflections on both the past and the present. The recent Chinese past brought into sharp relief foreign intrusions, imperialism, the demise of the imperial system, military ascendancy, political instability, incessant civil strife and state and nation building, among other things. This history is very different from the grand narrative of the European Enlightenment. Yet the Western experience was important for an understanding of how the West had blazed a trail to modernity and what lessons it had for China. Much of the Republican Chinese literature in culture and politics has its roots in an attempt to analyse the conditions governing the changes that must take place in the nation. Few intellectuals were detached from the social and political realities. Such issues as imperialism, underdevelopment and capitalism impinged on their consciousness and had a definite influence on their thought

⁴¹ Wang Hui, ‘Contemporary Chinese thought’, 150.

⁴² Zhang Hao 张灏, *Youan yishi yu minzhu chuantong* 幽暗意识与民主传统 (Taipei: Lianjing chubangongsi, 1989), 117–38.

⁴³ Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double-Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), 1.

and action. As the philosopher Liang Shuming (1893–1988), looking back on his academic and political life over the decades, wrote in 1949, ‘I did not pursue knowledge merely for knowledge’s sake. I had feelings for, and was excited by, the problem of China. I was anxious to find a solution to it and accordingly traced the problem back to China’s history and culture.’⁴⁴ Chinese intellectuals were concerned about the pressing issues of the day. Few held ideas in purely philosophical terms.

It is unnecessary to view Chinese modernity as an alternative modernity that breaks with ‘universal truths’ where modernization is undertaken with a local flavour. To do so is to acknowledge the existence of a universal modernity that has been called into question and to adopt a cultural theory as opposed to an acultural theory of modernity.⁴⁵ It is more useful to think about Chinese modernity as a discourse that underscores the universality–particularity nexus. Drawing on the contemporary notion of global modernity,⁴⁶ I view Chinese modernity as having both global and local aspects that interact and are negotiable – it is possible to embed one in the other. Chinese intellectuals have reasons to think that the West has quite as much to learn from China as they from the West. While they grapple with local issues, they also deal with questions concerning all humankind and those about China’s place in the world. Chinese thought, too, has universal values.

Historically, the rise of Chinese modernity, the crisis it faced as it evolved and its internal dynamics were all embedded in the process of East–West cultural communication. Writing in a contemporary context, Wang Hui argues that questions about Chinese modernity and its

⁴⁴ Liang Shuming 梁漱溟, ‘Zhongguo wenhua yaoyi’ 中国文化要义, in *LSMQJ*, III, 4.

⁴⁵ According to Charles Taylor, an acultural theory is a theory of convergence that will end up making all cultures look alike as a result of the inexorable march of modernity. By contrast, a cultural theory is a theory of divergence that holds that as different nations and cultures modernize at different points and under different circumstances, the outcomes are different, despite convergence in some areas where changes may be similar. See Charles Taylor, ‘Two theories of modernity’, in *Alternative Modernities*, ed. Gaonkar, 172–96. It might be added that a cultural theory of modernity underscores cultural pluralism rather than the cultural relativism that has fuelled the contemporary ‘Asian values’ debate. It echoes Eisenstadt’s view of the ‘dynamics of the crystallization of modern civilization’, with different modes of incorporation and reinterpretation of the premises of modernity. See Eisenstadt, ‘Introduction’, 10.

⁴⁶ See, for example, Arif Dirlik, *Global Modernity: Modernity in the Age of Global Capitalism* (Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Publishers, 2007); A. G. Hopkins (ed.), *Global History: Interactions between the Universal and the Local* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake, *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1996).

pathologies should not be considered merely issues within Chinese society or as simply the results of the transplant of foreign cultures onto Chinese soil; more importantly, they should be considered as issues of cultural interactions using a common language of being modern. It is important to recognize the cultural autonomy of Chinese modernity as it evolves, taking into consideration China's historical narrative. The study of Chinese modernity, in essence, involves a kind of 'cultural communicative action'.⁴⁷ Although Wang's concern is with the contemporary period, his insights are also relevant to the Republican era.

Some Methodological Issues

Apart from this understanding of Chinese modernity, a few methodological issues need to be set forth at the outset. First is what Benjamin Schwartz calls 'a framework of common concepts of the age'. Writing in 1976 on the emergence in modern Europe of conservatism, liberalism and radicalism, Schwartz pointed out that the three entities arose at roughly the same time and that they all operated within a framework of common concepts. Drawing on the work of Karl Mannheim, Schwartz identified modern conservatism's underlying concepts as historicism, holism, sociologism, organic growth and nationalism, all of which could be appropriated to radicalism. He also found certain characteristics of liberalism identical with conservatism, such as a belief in piecemeal change. In terms of the relationship of conservatism to modernization, Schwartz noted that in some contexts, it was plausible to call modernizers conservatives, but that in others, modernization could be seen as the very antithesis of conservatism.⁴⁸

I draw on Schwartz's notion of the common concepts of the age to comprehend the intricate relationships among different schools of modern Chinese thought. The common concepts were nationalism, progress, change, organic growth, science and democracy, which provided a shared central ground on which the themes of national survival, state building, capitalist development, social and political reform, liberty, equality and social justice were thrashed out. This common frame of reference underscores what Wang Hui has called the 'identity of attitudes' (his English),

⁴⁷ Wang Hui 汪晖, 'Weibo yu Zhongguo de xiandaixing wenti' 韦伯与中国的现代性问题, in Wang Hui, *Wang Hui zixuanji* 汪晖自选集 (Nanning: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 1997), 35.

⁴⁸ Schwartz, 'Notes on conservatism', 3–14.

or *taidu de tongyixing*, of the May Fourth intellectuals, despite their diverse thought.⁴⁹ Wang means that, although there was no unified epistemology or common methodology in thinking about China's problems, a belief in being modern was shared across the intellectual spectrum. During and after May Fourth, intellectuals were ardent participants in the discourse on modernity. To be sure, understandings of modernity varied from person to person and from group to group. But each made his or her own judgement and cultural selection through a process of critical reflection, using the same keywords and raising the same or similar questions, even if the answers were different.

Liberal, conservative and socialist thought on organic growth, reform and gradual change drew so close as to be almost indistinguishable. Mainstream Chinese thought rejected political violence but not social engineering, which sought to eradicate such problems as poverty, illiteracy and corruption and to promote education and industrial development.⁵⁰ Mainstream thought recognized the state as embodying the power to impose order on society and the rule of law as the cornerstone of the modern state. It fell afoul of Marxism over class struggle, even though historical materialism was embraced by some moderates and conservatives, such as the Nationalist figure Hu Hanmin (1879–1936) and the professor of politics Gao Yihan (1885–1968), before it came to be monopolized by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and identified exclusively with it.⁵¹ In mainstream thought, society is not viewed as composed of discrete elements held together merely mechanically. Instead, on one hand, society is rendered atomistic and unhealthy by a lack of public morality and by laissez-faire economics, selfishness and greed. On the other hand, organic conceptions of society are not carried to the extreme at which the individual becomes nothing and society everything.

It is customary to characterize individual intellectuals as a liberal, a conservative, a radical, a socialist or whatever the case may be.⁵² Yet the use of labels is problematic for two reasons. One is that labels are always imprecise, each representing a concept of limited explanatory power.

⁴⁹ Wang Hui, 'Yuyan yu lishi (shang pian): Zhongguo xiandai lishi zhong de wusi qimeng yundong' 预言与历史 (上篇): 中国现代历史中的五四启蒙运动, *Wenxue pinglun* 文学评论 3 (1989): 18–20.

⁵⁰ On social engineering, see Yung-chen Chiang, *Social Engineering and the Social Sciences in China, 1919–1949* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

⁵¹ Dirlik, *Revolution and History*, 21, 22, 31.

⁵² A classic example is Chow Tse-tsung, *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

The other is that the person labelled as such may not run true to form or may hold ideas that are inconsistent or that change from time to time. However, it is not necessary to ban the labels because we need to refer to intellectuals in some ways. No one would see any problem in calling Hu Shi (1891–1962), a student of John Dewey at Columbia University and often regarded as the representative of liberal aspirations in modern China, a liberal. Nor should we hesitate to call Liang Shuming a cultural conservative. What is necessary is to understand their ideas and to explain what they mean in what the Japanese scholar Hamaguchi Esyun has called a ‘contextual cultural and political frame of reference’.⁵³ The distinction between liberals and conservatives, for example, very much depends on their precise perspective. It is also a matter of degree, at least at certain times, within a common desire to synthesize traditional–modern, old–new and Chinese–Western. One might emphasize tradition; another, modernity. None wanted to keep Chinese culture and politics unchanged.

It is also important to appreciate that many leading members of the intelligentsia were what the historian Fu Sinian (1896–1950) of New Culture vintage termed ‘a bundle of contradictions’.⁵⁴ They would think and behave like a liberal one day, a conservative the next and a socialist the third, or all at once sometimes, as in the case of the contemporary scholar Daniel Bell, who has described himself as a socialist in economics, a liberal in politics and a conservative in culture.⁵⁵ This bundle of contradictions reflects diverse interests and multiple commitments, changing circumstances, historical contingencies and exigencies and maturity of the mind over time.

The intellectual boundaries were not demarcated. Zhang Junmai (Carsun Chang, 1887–1969), educated in Japan and Germany, exemplifies this blurring of the line, being at once a conservative, liberal and socialist. Hu Shi proved to be a cultural conservative and patriot when he spent a great deal of time and energy excavating the Chinese past in search of antecedents to support liberal and democratic change. He was on good terms with the prominent reformer Liang Qichao

⁵³ Hamaguchi Esyun, ‘A contextual model of the Japanese: toward a methodological innovation in Japan studies’, *Journal of Japanese Studies* 11, 2 (Summer 1985): 289–321.

⁵⁴ Wang Fan-sen, *Fu Ssu-nien: A Life in Chinese History and Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 48–54.

⁵⁵ Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 1978), xi.

(1873–1929) personally and intellectually. The British-educated geologist Ding Wenjiang (1877–1936), described by Hu Shi as ‘the most Europeanized Chinese’ of his day,⁵⁶ revealed a conservative side to his liberal thought when he affirmed the Confucian precept of moral rule, pinned high hopes on a change in the individual character of China’s rulers, entrusted the future of the country to a minority of elites and, in 1934–5, called for a ‘new-style dictatorship’. Ding was in good company with Liang Qichao and Zhang Junmai, despite their differences in 1923 over science and metaphysics. Liang Shuming also revealed an anticonservative side when he critiqued Chinese tradition in an attempt to restore its authenticity. In the New Culture Movement, he supported Chen Duxiu (1879–1942) in advocating science and democracy. And Cai Yuanpei (1868–1940), once an anarchist and best known as the chancellor of Beijing University from 1917 to 1927 (with some interruptions), was so liberal minded that he appointed to the faculty a galaxy of talents of different persuasions. He was closer to Liang Qichao than to Hu Shi in matters of cultural change and selective assimilation.

The point here is that many educated Chinese were liberal in one respect, conservative in another and socialist in a third, each representing a modern response to China’s sociopolitical crisis. They debated about the fundamental difference between Chinese and Western cultures, about Westernization, about the future of China and about capitalism and socialism. Yet all were interested in achieving a modern society that was liberal, democratic, just and still Chinese. Although some would sometimes think in terms of opposites, many more were disposed towards reconciling East and West, modern and traditional, liberal and conservative, liberty and equality, reason and emotions, value and history and so forth. This study redefines the way we understand the relationships among different schools of thought.

A second methodological issue is the need for a clear insight into the historicity of modern Chinese thought – its origins and evolution in specific cultural and political circumstances. None of the thinkers in this study can be fully understood if plucked ahistorically from his or her intellectual, cultural and political contexts. To be sure, contemporary thinking may provide a new perspective on the ideas of earlier periods. But it is often problematic to deploy contemporary theory, based on most recent or current issues, to make judgements about the past.

⁵⁶ Hu Shi 胡适 et al., *Ding Wenjiang zhegeren* 丁文江这个人 (Taipei: Zhuanji wenxue chubanshe, 1969), 2.

A third issue concerns the political dynamics of Chinese cultural thought. Although it is a truism that culture and politics in modern China were intertwined, it is still often thought that the Westernizers of the New Culture/May Fourth period assigned primacy to intellectual and cultural change prior to the creation of a new political order, as though they were all averse to politics. The truth, I think, is that some of them tended to perceive intellectual and cultural change as coterminous with political change. Politics moved to centre stage quickly (not suddenly) after the grandiose talk about cultural transformation. The editor of the influential journal *New Youth* (*Xin qingnian*), Chen Duxiu, declared politics as an important aspect of community life, advocating mass movement as well as social transformation and proclaiming that ‘in a genuine democracy political rights must be distributed to people as a whole’.⁵⁷ Hu Shi’s vernacular movement had democratic implications and did not diminish his concerns about the political issues of his day. As I describe in Chapter 5, Hu and his friends urged political reform early in the 1920s, even though he would not form a political party or join one. The cultural conservatives, too, were deeply political. As will be seen in Chapter 3, the political dynamics of cultural conservatism are as remarkable as they are neglected.

A fourth issue relates to the international context in which modern Chinese thought is in part situated. The Republican era supports Rebecca Karl’s thesis that, since the early days of the twentieth century, Chinese intellectuals had read the Chinese situation in a global context.⁵⁸ Elite ideas examined in this study often represent responses or reactions to intellectual and political developments outside China. For example, as I point out in Chapter 2, conservative critiques of the West after World War I bore a striking resemblance to those made by Western critics themselves, and Liang Shuming’s notion of Easternization was expressed in global terms and not just as a narrow reaction to Westernization. Chinese conceptions of liberty, as I argue in Chapter 4, are reminiscent of the thinking of a number of Western liberals who were concerned about the tension between individual liberty and the public good. Also, as described in Chapter 6, the Chinese socialistic impulse resonated with the socialist movement in Western Europe. This book, in other words, treats modern Chinese thought not merely in a local context but also as part of a worldwide movement of ideas.

⁵⁷ Chen Duxiu 陈独秀, ‘Xin qingnian xuanyan’ 新青年宣言, in *DXWC*, 245.

⁵⁸ Rebecca Karl, *Staging the World: Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002).

Finally, this study moves away from individual-centred history that takes the form of a biography or semibiography. The individual-centred history has its strengths, but it could lose sight of the broader intellectual perspective. The present study takes a different approach, considering both individuals and groups. Ideas are explored not in the realm of conceptualization but in the domain of human consciousness as related to cultural and political backgrounds. It would be impossible to cover all of the numerous intellectual figures within the limited space of this book. I shall, therefore, focus on the key people who are not paraded as great thinkers in themselves or as the living embodiments of the thought of an era but rather as representatives of particular schools of thought. I shall also bring into the picture some lesser known figures who are generally little studied. They are shown to hold ideas that are sometimes liberal, sometimes conservative and sometimes socialist, or all three at the same time. Also, they may hold ideas that go oddly together or that change sharply over time and space, between youth and age or that are basically inconsistent. It is rare that the thought of an individual remains unchanged throughout his or her life, despite certain firm convictions. Those in this book responded to the challenges of modernity over several decades in ever-changing circumstances. Their ideas may have changed as they evolved, but some also have an internal logic that is followed through every stage.

A Community of Critical Intellectuals

The intellectuals in this study were a mix of historians, philosophers, literary scholars, publicists, political scientists, educationalists and sociologists. Few were economists and scientists. Most of them earned their living as university professors, journal and newspaper editors, social and political critics and literary writers. Many taught at Beijing University (Beida) at one time or another, most notably Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu, Liang Shuming and Lu Xun (1881–1936).

The new intellectuals belonged to one of three generations, some with overlaps. The first generation consisted of those born between 1865 and 1880, such as Zhang Binglin (1868–1936), Wang Guowei (1877–1927), Liang Qichao and Cai Yuanpei. They were classical scholars with varying degrees of knowledge of the West and the modern world. This was a transitional generation, from the late Qing to the early Republic and from literati to modern intellectuals. The second was the New Culture/May Fourth generation, comprising those born between 1880 and 1895, such

as Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu, Liang Shuming and Lu Xun, who no longer followed the same career path as the literati of old but instead developed new ones in their respective fields. Initially trained in Chinese classical studies, most of them received further education overseas (in Japan, Europe and the United States), completing their intellectual transition to the modern world. This exciting generation explored new thought and new possibilities with a boldness never seen before. The third was the post-May Fourth generation made up of those born between 1895 and 1920. In their student days, many, such as Fu Sinian, were influenced by the New Culture/May Fourth Movement. Others of this generation included Feng Youlan (1895–1990), Luo Longji (1898–1965) and He Lin (1902–92), who earned postgraduate degrees at Western universities. This third generation saw China in war and revolution, in which many were politically involved.

This intellectual community is not reducible to one single, distinct category. They were not part of the establishment, although some, while opposed to regime malfeasance, had connections with the government of the day or had become deeply implicated in its work.⁵⁹ They were critical intellectuals – critical not only regarding cultural issues but also of the prevailing sociopolitical order. They viewed themselves as the conscience of society, or to borrow Foucault's words, 'the consciousness/conscience of us all', the 'master of truth and justice'.⁶⁰ And they grappled with specific issues about the nation and its future.

As civil elites, their ideas of modernity did not preclude them from working with the military elite. In the 1920s, Hu Shi had no problem with the warlord Duan Qirui (1864–1936), and he also hoped to be able to work with another warlord, Wu Peifu (1874–1939).⁶¹ Hu was not alone in thinking it necessary to come to terms with military power, however distasteful it might be, as the agent of political and social change. In the 1930s, Zhang Junmai, too, attempted to ally with the Shanxi warlord Yan Xishan (1883–1960) and the Guangxi strongman Li Zongren (1890–1969) to help develop their provinces.⁶²

⁵⁹ For example, Hu Shi served as Chiang Kai-shek's man in Washington from 1938 to 1942, and Fu Sinian was instrumental in the establishment in 1928 of the Institute of History and Philology at Academia Sinica, becoming its first director.

⁶⁰ Michel Foucault, *Power*, ed. James D. Faubion and trans. Robert Hurley and others, vol. 3 (New York: The New Press, 1994), 126.

⁶¹ Jerome B. Grieder, *Hu Shi and the Chinese Renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution, 1917–1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 202.

⁶² Roger B. Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China: The Politics of Zhang Junmai (Carsun Chang) 1906–1941* (Lanham, Md.: Rowan & Littlefield, 1997), 207–8, 210–11.

To disseminate their ideas, the intellectual elite sometimes operated individually, writing books and articles as well as giving public lectures, but more often as groups of like-minded people. Liberal groups coalesced around such publications as *New Youth*, *Endeavour Weekly* (*Nuli zhoubao*), *The Crescent* (*Xinyue*), *Independent Critic* (*Duli pinglun*) and the postwar (War of Resistance, or the Second Sino-Japanese War) *The Observer* (*Guancha*) and *Century Critic* (*Shiji pinglun*), to name the major ones. There were reformist journals, such as *Emancipation and Reconstruction* (*Jiefang yu gaizao*), later shortened to *Reconstruction* ('*La Rekonstruo*'). Conservative groups published the *Eastern Miscellany* (*Dongfang zazhi*), *Critical Review* (*Xueheng*) and the wartime *Annals of the Warring States* (*Zhanguoce*). There were also party organs, such as the minor Chinese State Socialist Party's *Zaisheng* ('*National Renaissance*'). The intellectuals were urban oriented, with the notable exception of Liang Shuming and his Rural Reconstruction Group.⁶³ Politically, many in the 1940s became sympathetic with the Chinese communist movement.

They enjoyed far greater freedoms of speech, publication and association than was the fortune of their epigones in the communist period that followed. None of their journals was published by state-owned publishing houses, unlike the journals produced by contemporary intellectuals. Notwithstanding warlord violence, political repression, war, revolution and the illiberal era in which they lived, they managed not only to express their views but also to organize minor political parties and groups that were outlawed until 1936 but were accommodated by the ruling Chinese Nationalist Party (GMD) on the eve of the War of Resistance. The Nationalist party-state was a weak authoritarianism that proved unable to control the intelligentsia. The Republican intellectual scene was more vibrant than is sometimes thought, with a diversity of ideas underpinning the quest for modernity.

The Main Arguments of the Book

This book is constructed around four main arguments. The first of these, and the basic one, is that Chinese thought in the Republican era was not

⁶³ Mention should also be made of Yan Yangchu (1890–1990), better known to the West as Jimmy Yen, who, in 1923, launched an experimental project in Dingxian (Hebei), where he built schools, a health care system and farmers' cooperatives. See Charles W. Hayford, *To the People: Jimmy Yen and Village China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).

dominated by Marxism, revolutionary socialism or any particular school of thought but instead was a mix of liberal, conservative and socialist thought that provided the intellectual and philosophical underpinnings for Chinese modernity. Rather than treat Chinese modernity in a monistic mode of thinking, the key to understanding it lies in an appreciation of the interrelatedness and interplay of different schools of thought. There was no one single vision of Chinese modernity. Instead, different visions contested, interacted and influenced one another. The educated elite had common concerns and shared interests, perhaps more than they acknowledged, and they all drew on a variety of cultural resources, old and new, Chinese and Western, as they wrestled with the issues of the day. Their ideas were shaped partly by convictions and partly by the national crisis and historical contingencies. Chinese modernity had both universal and particular aspects, embedded in a process of East–West cultural communication as well as in a Chinese historical narrative.

The second main argument is that modern Chinese conservatism was a force to be reckoned with, one that served the purposes of modernization. Lin Yü-sheng has argued that there were different forms of conservatism in China, all of them reactions against the radical antitraditionalism of the May Fourth Movement. Lin views conservatism as a weak force that nonetheless ‘sought to preserve the cultural-moral heritage in the modernization process and refused to seek accord between tradition and modernity to facilitate modernization’.⁶⁴ The problem with this view is that it frames conservatism and modernization in an adversarial relationship, creating a tradition–modernity dichotomy. This dichotomy, a feature of American writings on China in the post–World War II period, had been critiqued by many scholars in the 1970s and 1980s.⁶⁵ It is unnecessary to rehearse their critiques here. Suffice it to argue that conservatism in the Republican era was neither weak nor negative but instead was a modern intellectual force distinct from

⁶⁴ Lin Yüsheng 林毓生, *Zhuanhua yu chuangzao* 转化与创造 (Taipei: Youshi wenhua shiye gongsi, 1993), 102.

⁶⁵ See, in particular, Benjamin Schwartz, ‘The limits of “tradition versus modernity”: the case of the Chinese intellectuals’, in Benjamin I. Schwartz, *China and Other Matters* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), 45–64; Thomas A. Metzger, *Escape from Predicament: The Evolution of Chinese Political Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977); Paul A. Cohen, *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 57–61; and more recently, Judith B. Farquhar and James L. Hevia, ‘Culture and postwar American historiography of China’, *positions: east asia cultures critique* 1, 2 (1993): 486–525.

traditionalism or traditional conservatism, and from the conservative thought of the late Qing period. It arose as a reaction to the horrors of World War I, to Enlightenment modernism and to New Culture/May Fourth radicalism. Postwar conservative Chinese thought reflected the philosophies of Friedrich Nietzsche, Henri Bergson, Rudolph Eucken, Hans Driesch and Bertrand Russell as well as of Neo-Confucianism, as described in Chapter 2. And it was an 'ideology' of modernization, or what Wang Hui has termed 'an anti-modern theory of modernization' (*fanxiandaixing de xiandai lilun*), or 'a modernity of counter-modernity' (*fanxiandaixing de xiandaixing*), based on a critical understanding of Enlightenment modernism.⁶⁶ As it evolved, cultural conservatism acquired a political dynamics linked to nationalism and modernity. I argue that, although conservatism in China did not defend the prevailing sociopolitical order as a whole, as Benjamin Schwartz has long maintained,⁶⁷ the politics of cultural conservatism was nuanced and that the cultural conservatives were nationalistic and stood in an ambiguous relationship with the prevailing political order.

The third main argument is that modern China's liberal intellectuals understood liberalism and represented the liberal vision in a particular contextual frame of reference. I question the contemporary neoliberal view in PRC scholarship that Republican intellectuals misunderstood liberalism because they failed to recognize classical liberalism, especially the link between liberalism and a free market economy, and that consequently great harm was done to the liberal cause in the precommunist period. Instead, I suggest that the key to understanding Chinese liberalism is an acknowledgement of different strands of liberalism, an historicist approach that takes account of the historical contingencies and conjunctures of modern China, and an appreciation of what Lydia Liu calls 'translingual practices'⁶⁸ and what Douglas Howland calls 'translating the West'.⁶⁹ In this way, we can see that Chinese liberalism grew out of a confluence of cultural, political and specific historical circumstances: The semicolonization of China by the Western powers, the demise of the

⁶⁶ Wang Hui, 'Contemporary Chinese thought', 150; Wang Hui 汪晖 and Ke Kaijun 柯凯军, 'Guanyu xiandaixing wenti dawen' 关于现代性问题问答, in *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi*, ed. Li Shitao, 131.

⁶⁷ Schwartz, 'Notes on conservatism', 16–17.

⁶⁸ Lydia Liu, *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity: China, 1900–1937* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995).

⁶⁹ Douglas R. Howland, *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002).

monarchical system, the failure of the Republic, the spread of Enlightenment ideas, the ascendancy of the military, the rise of nationalism and the demands of state building all contributed to the Chinese narrative that was so different from the meta-narrative of modern Europe. Bound up with national survival, social change, war and revolution, Chinese liberalism was a contingent creation of specific historical conditions as well as a functional account of the value of autonomous agency. Without passing judgement on whether China's liberals were 'genuinely' liberal, I contend that their understandings of liberalism were nuanced and that Chinese liberalism had both universal and peculiar characteristics. Although it took a particular form, Chinese liberalism also followed the liberal trend in Western Europe, which was less than classical during the first half of the twentieth century. I further argue that Republican liberals on the whole were statist with democratic socialist leanings. They represent an early phase in the development of Chinese liberalism and present a contrast to the new generation of liberals that has emerged in the PRC since the mid-1990s.

Republican liberals advocated a strong state, a 'government with a plan' and political elitism – a position that can be justified in modern liberal theory and also dictated by practical considerations. I argue that as they operated outside the existing political framework, the liberals inevitably came into conflict with the ruling elite, especially the Nationalists after 1928, who had a different state-building project entailing political tutelage and one-party rule. The liberal vision of modernity was at odds with that of the party-state.

The fourth main argument is that Chinese intellectuals of all persuasions had a socialistic impulse. As with modern conservatism, Chinese reformist socialist thought rose in reaction to the socioeconomic phenomenon in Europe in the wake of World War I and as a response to the Russian Revolution of 1917 and to the rise of Marxism in China. Republican reformers came under the influence of Weimar German democracy and British socialism and also felt the impact of Soviet Russia's economic development in the 1920s. At the same time, they drew on indigenous cultural resources for protosocialist elements to support a moderate socialism in the twentieth century. Many in the 1930s favoured a variant of state socialism. I argue that state socialism as an ideology and a political movement was a stage in the evolution of social democracy, which reached a high point after 1945 despite the renewal of civil war.

The Structure of the Book

The book is issue oriented and arranged thematically, but each chapter is also chronological. Chapter 1 is concerned with the push of Westernized radicalism, examining the ideas of the Westernizers who stood opposed to the cultural conservatives. It begins by introducing the cultural debate on the fundamental difference between the East and West and then probes radical thought in the 1920s and 1930s, focusing on Hu Shi and Chen Xujing. This chapter ends with a critique of Westernized radicalism, pointing out that this radicalism was not peculiar to China and that in rejecting cultural pluralism, it unwittingly ran counter to the liberal cause.

Chapter 2 is concerned with the pull of cultural conservatism. It begins by tracing the rise of modern conservative thought and then discusses the major issues in Chinese modernity from the cultural conservative perspective. Two particular themes are highlighted, namely, Easternization (*dongfanghua*) and the doctrine of mediation and harmony (*tiaohelun*), which provide a philosophical basis for a dialogue between different schools of thought. This is followed by a brief description of New Confucianism as it relates to modernity and, finally, by a critique of cultural conservatism to underscore the problems it faced.

As conservative thought was related to nationalism and modernity, Chapter 3 explores the culture–politics nexus by rethinking Benjamin Schwartz’s ideas about conservatism in China. Acknowledging the complexities of conservatism and nationalism, this chapter understands politicocultural conservatism as politicocultural nationalism. It identifies the cultural conservatives with the nationalists, without implying that other groups, such as the Communists, liberals and so forth, were not nationalistic. It first revisits the ideas of some noted cultural conservatives and then looks at the lesser known conservative thought of the war period (1937–45), especially that of the *Zhanguo*ce writers, to illustrate the interplay of war, culture and nationalism.

Chapter 4 takes the reader to an exploration of Chinese liberal thought. I seek the answers to two questions. First, how did Republican intellectuals understand liberalism? This question is raised in response to the contemporary neoliberal view in PRC scholarship that intellectuals of modern China misunderstood liberalism. Second, what were the features and specific concerns of Chinese liberal thought? Following the thread of the preceding chapters, the last section of this chapter attempts to answer another two questions: How did liberal intellectuals relate to

the cultural radicals? And how did some cultural conservatives come to embrace liberalism?

Chapter 5 is concerned with the issues of state, government and rule of law from a liberal perspective. Liberalism and the modern state are commonly regarded as the benchmarks of modernity, yet there is some tension between the two. This chapter will demonstrate that Chinese elites sought a strong state served by a powerful, efficient government, one with a plan for political, social and economic transformations that also provided good governance. A strong liberal state is not an oxymoron. Chinese thinking on this matter was dictated by the frustrating political condition of China. This chapter also explores the idea of 'good men government' in the context of the short-lived 'good men cabinet' of 1922, the failure of which underscored the importance of institutional change and the rule of law.

Chapter 6 examines the rise of reformist socialist thought in the wake of World War I. It first discusses the attraction of socialism in the immediate postwar period and then probes the ideas of Liang Qichao, Zhang Dongsun (1886–1973), Zhang Junmai and others who were active participants in the early socialist discourse. It goes on to examine the influences of German social democracy and British socialism as well as Chinese responses to Soviet Russia's New Economic Policy of the 1920s. Finally, it draws attention to the protosocialist elements in ancient Chinese thought to demonstrate the existence of indigenous cultural resources that could be drawn on to smooth the way to socialism in twentieth-century China.

Chapter 7 treats state socialism as a stage in the development of social democracy. It first examines state socialism as an ideology and a political movement in China from the 1930s to 1945 and then looks at the immediate postwar period, which saw a renewed interest in 'new liberalism' and a debate on the liberty–equality nexus, as well as an ongoing search for the third way between capitalism and communism. Before closing, this chapter makes some remarks on the Chinese social democratic movement in comparison to those in prewar Japan and colonial India.

The conclusion recapitulates the main points of the book. Afterwards, I reflect on Chinese modernity past and present by reviewing the intellectual scene in contemporary China during the 1980s and 1990s, when many of the central themes developed in this study recurred. The emergence of such themes as neorationalism, neocultural iconoclasm, neo-conservatism, neoliberalism and so forth was accompanied by intellectual efforts to reconstruct a Chinese modernity based on Western thought and

on a creatively transformed, indigenous cultural heritage. The questions and themes that informed the Republican debates still engage Chinese intellectuals today. Although the contemporary discourse takes different forms and emphases in different circumstances, there are elements of historical continuity suggesting that ideas about Chinese modernity will continue to be contested, not least among the Chinese themselves.

The Push of Westernized Radicalism

The question of modernity in post-imperial China dates back to the New Culture/May Fourth Movement (1915–23),¹ which is often symbolically interpreted as the Chinese Enlightenment.² Just as the European Enlightenment was a diverse and complex movement that developed in different ways in France, England, Scotland and elsewhere with thinkers as diverse as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet), John Locke and David Hume, so New Culture/May Fourth was a multilayered movement that makes an excellent study in contrast. Its strongest feature, as Hao Chang has pointed out, was the binary and dialectical nature (*liangqixing*) of its thought – rationalism and romanticism, scepticism and ‘new religion’, individualism and collectivist consciousness, nationalism and cosmopolitanism. There were a variety of ideologies – liberalism, democracy, anarchism, socialism, utopianism and humanism, among others – representing competing ideas that interplayed and reacted with one another.³ As Rana Mitter has written, ‘the May Fourth period marked . . . a sense of real and impending crisis; a combination of a plurality of competing ideas aimed at “saving the nation”, and an audience ready to

¹ I use 1915 as the starting point for the New Culture Movement on the grounds that it saw the launch of the journal *New Youth*. The New Culture Movement and the May Fourth Movement were not a single movement or phenomenon. The former was an intellectual movement, and the latter was more political beginning with the May Fourth incident of 1919 and continuing into the following decade until 1923. Some historians have used 1925 as the end point for the May Fourth period. I lump the two together because the dominant themes of the New Culture Movement were later taken up by those who used them to forge the tools for justifying the politics of the other movement.

² Vera Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment: Intellectuals and the Legacy of the May Fourth Movement of 1919* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

³ Zhang Hao 张灏, ‘Chongfang wusi: lun wusi sixiang de liangqixing’ 重访五四: 论五四思想的两歧性, in Yü Yingshi 余英时 et al., *Wusi xinlun* 五四新论 (Taipei: Lianjing shudian, 1999), 33–65.

receive, welcome, contest, and adapt these ideas'.⁴ Two of those ideas were cultural radicalism and cultural conservatism, one representing the modernity of Enlightenment and the other representing counter-Enlightenment.

At the outset, the discourse on modernity concerned the future of Chinese culture in the post-imperial era. To be modern, China needed to Westernize. A number of questions were raised by Republican intellectuals: Where was China going as it met the world without the monarchy? What did Westernization entail? Was it possible to embrace and critique the West simultaneously? Could China make a recognized contribution to world civilization while holding on to its traditions and values that preserved a link with the past? If so, what did China have to offer to the world?

These questions may be familiar to historians of modern China. Less familiar is the intricate relationship between the two main intellectual groups that grappled with them, namely, the Westernizers and the cultural conservatives. The former were cultural radicals, the latter neo-traditionalists with a modernizing outlook. At first sight, the two were opposites, one embracing Western modernity and the other resisting it. This binary perspective – East–West, traditional–modern, science–morality (or religion), materialistic–spiritual – is evident in much of the earlier scholarship.⁵ However, scrutiny of the two groups reveals the simplicity of this perspective. As different as they may appear on the surface, they had a great deal in common. Both were dissatisfied with the cultural, social and political status quo; each was responding to 'the crisis of modernization', and each represented a vision of modernity with ideas that were in many ways complementary. Both engaged in critical reflection, and above all, both were concerned with 'saving the nation' (*jiuguo*).⁶

⁴ Rana Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 23. See also Hung-yok Ip, Tze-ki Hon and Chiu-chun Lee, 'The plurality of Chinese modernity: a review of recent scholarship on the May Fourth movement', *Modern China* 29, 4 (October 2003): 490–509.

⁵ See, for example, Zheng Dahua 郑大华, *Liang Shuming yu Hu Shi: wenhua baoshou zhuyi yu xihua sixiang de bijiao* 梁漱溟与胡适: 文化保守主义与西化思想的比较 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1994).

⁶ One recent study suggests that the early Republican radical antitraditionalists were modern China's fourth-generation 'national salvationists', and the cultural conservatives, its fifth-generation. The earlier generations consisted of those from the mid-nineteenth century to the demise of the Qing Dynasty. See Zhai Zhicheng 翟志成, *Feng Youlan xuesi shengming qianzhuan (1895–1949)* 冯友兰学思生命前传 (1895–1949) (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, 2007), 29, 42.

This chapter provides an analysis of the radical thought of the first group that constituted what I call 'Westernized radicalism'. (The thought of the cultural conservatives is the subject of the next chapter.) Before I explain this term, it should be stated that 'radicalism' denotes an extreme attitude towards change – culturally, socially and politically. Radicalism began in the late Qing and had developed progressively since. The distinguished historian Yü Ying-shih has written on what he terms the 'radicalization of China' in the twentieth century. According to Yü, cultural radicalism had been growing progressively since the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when the literati and scholar-officials responded to the Western intrusions and the challenges of modernity. Yü traces the process of radicalization back to Yan Fu, the distinguished translator who 'discovered' the West and offered a new alternative to the old Chinese way (*dao*). Yan's early radicalism, marked by the dissemination of liberal ideas and tempered by gradualism, was boldly developed by Kang Youwei (1858–1927) and Tan Sitong (1865–98) of 'Hundred Days' Reform' (1898) fame, who were bona fide radical scholars seeking institutional change. Kang regarded Confucius as a reformer and attempted to reinvent Confucianism as a philosophy of social change, and Tan condemned both the monarchy and the 'three bonds' (*sangang*) of Confucian ethics. They were radical in that they proposed a wide range of sociopolitical reform that they wanted to effect hastily and in a thoroughgoing manner. Meanwhile, Kang's leading disciple, Liang Qichao, rejected traditional historiography to advocate a 'New History' in the Enlightenment mode. Late Qing radicalism, however, paled in significance in comparison with the radicalism of the New Culture/May Fourth Movement, which rendered the old generation of reformers men of the past. In the decades that followed, the radicalization of the Chinese mind continued unabated. By the 1960s, Yü viewed the Cultural Revolution as its culmination.⁷ His ideas are further developed in his Chinese writings,⁸ making a significant impact on PRC scholarship in the 1990s.⁹

⁷ Yü Ying-shih, 'The radicalization of China in the twentieth century', *Dialohus* 122, 2 (Spring 1993): 125–50.

⁸ Yü Ying-shih 余英时, 'Zhongguo jindai sixiangshi shang de jijin yu baoshao' 中国现代思想史的激进与保守, in Yü Ying-shih, *Qian Mu yu Zhongguo wenhua* 钱穆与中国文化 (Shanghai: Yundong chubanshe, 1994), 188–295.

⁹ See, for example, Gao Like 高力克, 'Xiandai Zhongguo sixiangzhong de wenhua jijin zhuyi' 现代中国思想中的文化激进主义, in Gao Like, *Qiusuo xiandaixing* 求索现代性 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang daxue chubanshe, 1999), 151–64; Wang Guimei 王桂妹, 'Wusi wenhua jijin zhuyi xunzong' 五四文化激进主义寻踪, *Jilin daxue shehui kexue xuebao* 吉林大学社会科学学报 3 (May 1991): 104–11; Yu Zuhua 俞祖华, 'Jindai Zhongguo jijin zhuyi sichao yanjiu

The radicalization of the Chinese mind developed in different directions. Peter Zarrow has called the movement that arose among the late Qing scholar-officials 'Confucian radicalism', which called for 'thoroughgoing reform based on readings of the Confucian classics and made by men... educated in the Confucian tradition'.¹⁰ At the same time, there were anti-Manchu radicalism and anarchism, which manifested in attempted assassinations of high Manchu officials in the revolutionary movement.¹¹ In the early Republican period, anarchism was an important part of mainstream political discourse from the dissolution of imperial Confucianism in the early twentieth century to the rise of Marxism; it came close to being the defining core of radicalism until the 1920s.¹² In addition, two other forms of radicalism emerged: Marxism and Westernized radicalism. Radical Marxism provided the ideological underpinnings for the communist movement. The founders of the CCP, Chen Duxiu, Li Dazhao (1888–1927) and Qu Qiubai (1899–1935), later joined by Yun Daiying (1895–1931), represented a form of politicocultural radicalism that linked cultural change to political revolution and attached great importance to the role of the human agent and willpower in bringing about change.¹³

Westernized radicalism was a form of cultural radicalism characterized by a belief in the superiority of Western culture, cultural iconoclasm, a rejection of atavism and cultural syncretism and a passion for things Western. It signified strident calls for thoroughgoing change through a programme grounded in a Western view of the world. Those who were Western-educated or who had acquired some knowledge of the West wanted China to become a modern nation like France, Britain and the United States. Westernized radicalism was identified with liberal

zongshu' 近代中国激进主义思潮研究综述, in *Zhongguo jindai shehua wenhua sichao yanjiu tonglan* 中国近代社会文化思想研究通鉴, eds. Yu Zuhua 俞祖华 and Zhao Huifeng 赵慧峰 (Jinan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 2005), 267–84.

¹⁰ Peter Zarrow, *China in War and Revolution 1895–1949* (London: Routledge, 2005), 13.

¹¹ The best-known assassins were Wu Yue and Xu Xilin, hailed as heroes by their sympathizers. See Michael Gasster, *Chinese Intellectuals and the Revolution of 1911* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969), 234.

¹² See Peter Zarrow, *Anarchism and Chinese Political Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Arif Dirlik, *Anarchism in the Chinese Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); Edward S. Krebs, *Shifu, Soul of Chinese Anarchism* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998).

¹³ See Hu Weixi 胡伟希 and Tian Wei 田薇, 'Zhongguo wenhua jijin zhuyi sichao de lishi yanjiu' 中国文化激进主义思潮的历史研究, *Zhongguo renmin daxue xuebao* 中国人民大学学报 6 (2001): 112–16; and 'Ershi shiji Zhongguo "wenhua jijin zhuyi" sichao chuyi' 二十世纪中国 '文化激进主义' 思潮初议, *Tianjin shehui kexue* 天津社会科学 1 (2002): 25–30.

thought, reflecting the Enlightenment epistemology and representing a Euro-American vision of modernity based on the ideas of progress, science, democracy, rationality, secularism and capitalist development. Its relentless assaults on Chinese traditions culminated in a call in the 1930s for total Westernization by the sociologist Chen Xujing. However, not all Westernizers were cultural radicals. Many actually were not – they were only pro-Western.

Westernized radicalism was not total antitraditionalism. It targeted Chinese traditions strategically, that is, only aspects of them – the Confucian ‘religion of rites’ (*lijiao*), the family system, the subordination of women, the hierarchical social order, the patriarchal power structure and the eight-legged essays. As it waxed in the 1920s and the early years of the following decade, Westernized radicalism consciously exaggerated the power of difference between China and the West, rejecting not only the cultural heritage but also ideas of cross-cultural fertilization. But it waned after 1935, pulled back by the force of conservatism during the years of Nationalist rule. Wiped out of the intellectual scene after 1949, Westernized radicalism was not revived until 1988, when calls for total Westernization were renewed by a new post-Mao generation of cultural radicals through the television documentary *River Elegy* (*Heshang*) in the midst of a ‘culture craze’ (*wenhua*).

The Early East–West Debate

The East–West discourse at the start of the New Culture Movement took the form of a cultural debate between the Westernizers and the cultural conservatives: Were East and West a difference in kind or in the degree of development? This was not a new question. Historically, there had long been a perceived East–West dichotomy between Western and Asian men of letters. In the West, most popularly the British writer and poet Rudyard Kipling (1865–1936) introduced to the literary world in 1889 a jingle that even children would chant: ‘Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet.’ Those who had more sympathy for the Orient, such as the English poet and cultural critic Matthew Arnold (1822–88), found a redeeming quality in its pacifism and spirituality.¹⁴ In Asia, the Japanese samurai-scholar Satsuma Shōzan (1811–64) coined the term *Tōyō dōtoku sei'yō gijutsu*, or ‘Eastern ethics, Western technology’, before

¹⁴Stephen N. Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China, and India* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 6.

the eminent Qing official Zhang Zhidong (1837–1909) developed the principle *Zhongxue weiti, xixue weiyong* (Chinese learning as essence, Western learning for practical use), or *ti-yong* in short. Likewise, nineteenth-century Koreans of a self-styled ‘enlightenment’ (*kaehwa*) mind coined the slogan *Tongdo sogi*, or ‘Eastern ways, Western machines’.¹⁵

The cultural debate was initiated by Chen Duxiu, the founder and editor of the journal *New Youth*, in an essay titled ‘The French and modern civilization’, published in the inaugural issue of the journal in 1915. In it, Chen began by writing:

Modern civilization is in an East–West binary. Eastern civilizations are represented by India and China. Although these two nations are not without their difference, on the whole they both remain the old frame of an ancient civilization. Though said to be modern, they are actually the inheritors of antiquity. What we refer to as modern civilization is a European monopoly. Western civilization is European civilization.¹⁶

The salient feature of modern civilization, Chen continued, was a desire to change the old. In recent times, the world had been altered significantly by three bodies of thought: human rights theory, evolutionism and socialism.¹⁷ Chen admired France in particular, crediting it with making the greatest contributions to the creation of a new world civilization.¹⁸

To Chen, the West was not just a geographical expression but also an historical construct. He could see that European society, and French society in particular, was developed, industrialized, urbanized, secular, modern and democratic. The West as an idea, a concept and a system of representation helped him to explain its difference from the East. Seen from a temporal standpoint, it was, in essence, the difference between past and present, old and new, traditional and modern, backward and advanced. What was past and present in terms of linear time was represented spatially as East and West, or Asia and Europe. Between China and the West, Chen found ‘a difference of a thousand years in thought’ with regard to traditional ethics, law, scholarship and customs – in China, all of these concepts were the ‘heritage of feudalism’. Chen warned

¹⁵ Joshua A. Fogel, ‘Issues in the evolution of modern China’, in *China’s Quest for Modernization: A Historical Perspective*, ed. Frederic E. Wakeman Jr and Wang Xi (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1997), 373–4.

¹⁶ Chen Duxiu 陈独秀, ‘Falanxi wenming yu jindai wenming’ 法兰西文明与近代文明, in *DXWC*, 10.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 12.

that unless changes were made, the people of China would be kept out of the twentieth century and be trapped in the dark ages 'fit only for slaves, cattle and horses'. He called on China's youth to be independent, progressive, aggressive, cosmopolitan, utilitarian and scientific instead of servile, conservative, retiring, isolationist, formalistic and imaginative.¹⁹

However, the East–West difference was equally a difference in the degree of development, a view grounded in evolutionary theory, which holds that just as biological evolution had culminated in the birth of *Homo sapiens*, so social evolution had culminated in the great composite of material, metaphysical and spiritual elements known as Western civilization.²⁰ Humanity can be fused into one long progression, with the West securely in the forefront. As society evolves, it acquires the characteristics of its age; each epoch has its own ethos transcending cultural and national boundaries. This idea underscores the universal modernity in which the West defines where non-Western nations should be positioned on the historical stage in terms of their level of development. It represents a linear view of history, a universal civilization and a monistic epistemology, all of them embedded in the Enlightenment sensitivity. In this view, human history follows a steady trajectory of progress, arrested and sometimes retarded, but irresistible and inexorable in the end.

Evolutionism and social Darwinism had dominated Chinese intellectual thought since Yan Fu's translation in 1895–6 of the English botanist Thomas Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics* (1893).²¹ Ideas of natural selection, competition between individuals, groups, nations and ideas and the 'survival of the fittest' (a term coined by the English philosopher and sociologist Herbert Spencer) provided an analytical framework and a powerful rationale for embracing Western modernity. It was in this context that the Westernizers represented Chinese culture as still imprisoned in what was the Chinese equivalent of Europe's Middle Ages. In this representation, the East–West contrast was sharp: Eastern civilization placed a high value

¹⁹ Chen Duxiu, 'Jinggao qingnian' 敬告青年, in *DXWC*, 3–9.

²⁰ History, wrote the French philosopher Auguste Comte (1798–1857), fell into three distinct stages: the theological, the metaphysical and the positive. The first stage, progressing from primitive polytheism to monotheism, lasted until the end of the Middle Ages. The eighteenth century was the apex of the metaphysical stage. In the nineteenth century, the positive stage was born – the stage of science, in which theology and metaphysics were set aside in order to look at the positive facts of society, the world as it is. See Lee Cameron McDonald, *Western Political Theory, Part 3, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968), 442–3.

²¹ Benjamin I. Schwartz, *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), 98–112.

on antiquity and its conservation, on the metaphysical and the religious, on being natural and on the spiritual life, whereas Western civilization placed great emphasis on change, science, competition, human action and the material life. Chen Duxiu wrote that Western nations extolled war in their value system, whereas Eastern nations extolled peace; where the West stressed the primacy of the individual, the East stressed that of the family; and where Westerners emphasized the rule of law and utilitarian issues, Orientals emphasized interpersonal feelings and formalistic matters.²² The young Hu Shi also highlighted the 'intrinsic and objective difference' between Chinese and Western cultures in terms of attitudes towards the merchant class and conceptions of law and intellectual life.²³

At the same time, the Westernizers provided a narrative emphasizing the historicity, temporality and universalism of cultures. It is a paradox of the East–West dichotomy that if the difference is basically a matter of time and development, then there is no such thing as East versus West, for modernity is neither geographically determined nor nation-specific; what matters is progress. The world civilization underscores a universal human dimension – the desire for existence and progress – and every society can become modern. It was from this perspective that the modern scholar Chang Yansheng argued in 1926 that, although there was a plurality of cultures at the micro level, none of them was at odds with the grand narrative of the evolution of all humanity.²⁴ According to this perspective, the West had blazed a trail to modernity because Europe was the first to transform itself. The East could catch up through a process of Westernization. Apparently, Chang understood Westernization as a developmental concept, an historical process and an acultural theory of modernity.

Historically, the modern West was unique, produced by certain historical processes operating in unique circumstances that were perhaps unrepeatable. Yet European modernity was transferable to the rest of the world. Thus, Hu Shi differed from the cultural conservative Liang

²² Chen Duxiu, 'Dongxi minzu genben sixiang zhi chayi', 东西民族根本思想之差异, in *DXWC*, 27–31.

²³ Hu Shi pointed out that Chinese elites traditionally despised the merchant class, had no conception of law as it was understood in the West and privileged literary education over the study of science. See Hu Shih, 'Conflict of cultures', in *Problems of the Pacific* 1931, ed. Bruno Lasker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), 474–6.

²⁴ Chang Yansheng 常燕生, 'Dongxi wenhua wenti zhi Hu Shizhi xiansheng' 东西文化问题 质胡适之先生, *Xiandai pinglun* 现代评论 4, 90 and 91 (1926): 16–18.

Shuming, who argued that India, China and the West had followed different paths because of different philosophies (see Chapter 2). Rather, Hu contended that East and West had been following more or less ‘the same path that life was meant to be from the start’ – the universal path of progress based on a common humanity and on what he called the ‘principle of limited possibilities’ (*youxian de kenengshuo*). What distinguished the West was that it had developed apace, controlled and changed the environment and thus had become the apogee of modern civilization, whereas the non-West, somewhere along that path, had faced many insurmountable obstacles and lagged far behind.²⁵ In Hu’s view, China, once a great civilization, had long ago become stagnant and inferior; it needed a complete transformation by following the universal path to progress.

Of course, the cultural conservatives’ views were different, best represented by the editor of the Shanghai journal *Eastern Miscellany*, Du Yaquan (1873–1933), one of the very few New Culture intellectuals with a scientific background.²⁶ In a 1916 article, Du argued that Chinese civilization had originated and evolved differently from Western civilization because of variations in geography, demography, natural environments, languages, races and customs. Consequently, Chinese society (here, Du used the term ‘society’ rather than ‘culture’) viewed nature as good, sought peace with it and followed the will of Heaven, whereas Western society viewed nature as evil, sought to conquer it and emphasized the role of the human agent. Chinese society was internally oriented, self-contented and self-restrained; Western society was externally oriented and individualistic. Whereas Chinese society was pacifist and moralistic, Western society was aggressive and competitive, privileging self-interest above morality. And whereas Chinese society stressed self-cultivation, Western society placed a high premium on activities and individual rights. Du reduced these differences to a *jing–dong* (quiet–active) dichotomy.²⁷

²⁵ Hu Shi 胡适, ‘Du Liang Shuming xiansheng de “Dongxi wenhua ji qi zhixue”’ 读梁漱溟先生的《东西文化及其哲学》, in *HSWJ*, III, 193–4.

²⁶ Born into a merchant family in Shaoxing (Zhejiang), Du initially trained as a classical scholar before developing an abiding interest in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and other science subjects. He taught science in a local school for a couple of years before moving to Shanghai, where he launched a science education magazine. In 1904, Du was appointed as a science editor at Shanghai’s Commercial Press, becoming chief editor of the journal *Eastern Miscellany* seven years later. See Gao Like 高力克, *Tiaoshi de zhihui: Du Yaquan sixiang yanjiu* 调适的智慧: 杜亚泉思想研究 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1998), 8–10.

²⁷ Du Yaquan 杜亚泉, ‘Jing de wenming yu dong de wenming’ 静的文明与动的文明, in *DYQWC*, 338–44.

Underlying this dichotomy is a spatiality and geographical determinism, which is to say that space and environment make a difference. Du did not see the East–West difference as merely a matter of degree in the evolutionary process, and still less did he see it as a power relationship. To him, East and West were just intrinsically different – the Prometheus–Faustian culture of the West versus the harmonious spirit of Eastern aestheticism – and the two were not polarized. Du scoffed at the thought that Eastern civilization was necessarily inferior, for each had its strengths and weaknesses that could be complementary. His *jing–dong* theory was informed by his perception that World War I, then raging in Europe, exposed the flaws of Western civilization and the problems of modern life. Du envisioned the birth of a new civilization after the war, one that would extract all the good elements from the modern world and omit all the bad ones.²⁸

His *jing–dong* theory struck a responsive chord with the New Culture protagonist Li Dazhao, then the chief librarian at Beida. In a 1917 essay on the fundamental difference between East and West, Li also subscribed to geographical determinism, writing erroneously that the North–South geographical divide represented the East–West cultural divide. Echoing Du’s sentiment, Li invoked Kipling’s famous jingle, only to advance the contrary view that the twain shall meet. Li envisaged an imminent world crisis brought about by what he thought was Western civilization’s crumbling under the weight of crass materialism. The crisis could be averted only by the arrival of a ‘new, third civilization’. The world was awaiting a new synthesizing impulse, wrote Li, sanguine that cross-cultural fertilization would give birth to this new civilization to the benefit of all humanity, to which Chinese culture could make a significant contribution.²⁹ In 1917, Li was saluting the Russian October Revolution, which seemed to him to mark the dawn of a new world civilization.³⁰

Like Du Yaquan, Li refused to pass a value judgement on the East–West difference: ‘Because of the cultural difference between East and West there are always nations looking down upon others with a bias. This is regretted by modern statesmen. Frankly speaking, each of the cultures

²⁸ Du Yaquan, ‘Zhanhou dongxi wenming zhi tiaohé’ 战后东西文明之调和, in *DYQWC*, 345–6.

²⁹ Li Dazhao 李大钊, ‘Dongxi wenming genben zhi yidian’ 东西文明根本之要点, in *Li Dazhao quanji* 李大钊全集, 4 vols., ed. Zhu Wentong 朱文通 (Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe, 1999), vol. III, 39–54.

³⁰ Maurice Meisner, *Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism* (New York: Atheneum, 1970), 60–70.

of East and West has its strengths and weaknesses. It is inappropriate to say which is superior or inferior.’³¹

The truth is that the difference is in time (past versus present), in degree (development versus underdevelopment) and in kind (one tradition versus the other, each essentialized), all simultaneously. For now, the cultural debate is reduced to the question of whether a new cultural and national identity could be forged without a rupture with the past. The radicals’ answer was unequivocal: There was no choice but to abandon the past in its entirety in order to embrace modernity.

The Advocacy of Thorough Westernization

Conceptually, a distinction may be drawn between Westernized radicalism and Western learning as a movement of Western borrowing. The latter dates back to the nineteenth century when late Qing officials, such as Wenxiang (1818–76), Zeng Guofan (1811–72), Zuo Zongtang (1812–85) and Li Hongzhang (1823–1901), were involved in the Self-Strengthening Movement, and scholars, including Feng Guifen (1809–74) and Wang Tao (1828–97), called for the introduction of Western thought. Yan Fu was perhaps the most distinguished spokesman of the day for Western learning. His major contribution lay in a reappraisal of the *ti-yong* mode of thinking. He likened the difference between Chinese and Western learning to that between people’s looks – similar yet not the same. Essence and function are a unit rather than separate and distinct. ‘Freedom is the essence, democracy is the function’ – the two are intimately intertwined.³² Yan’s thought laid the groundwork for the advocacy of thorough Westernization in the May Fourth era.

By then, Westernization as cultural radicalism entailed a leap from Western borrowing to indiscriminate imitation of the West. This led to savage assaults on the indigenous culture on the grounds that it was entirely at odds with the modern culture of the West and totally unsuited to the new age. Chen Duxiu, who had joined Beida as dean of arts in 1917, hailed Europeanization and attacked the family system, particularly the traditional patriarchy, filial piety and the subordination of women.³³ The popular writer Lu Xun castigated the family in his novel

³¹ Li, ‘Dongxi wenming’, 54.

³² Hu Weixi 胡伟希, Gao Ruiquan 高瑞泉 and Zhang Limin 张利民, *Shiji jietou yu ta* 十字街头与塔 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1991), 61.

³³ Chen Duxiu, ‘Wuren zuihou zhi juewu’ 吾人最后之觉悟, in *DXWC*, 37–41.

Diary of a Madman, calling it a ‘man-eating’ system that degraded humanity. The anarchist Wu Zhihui (1865–1953) discredited Confucianism with the famous slogan ‘Take all those old books and throw them into the privy for thirty years’.³⁴ The philologist and linguist Qian Xuantong (1887–1939) called for the replacement of the Chinese language with Esperanto, convinced that Europe represented the modern culture of the world.³⁵ Luo Jialun (1897–1969) and Fu Sinian, then students at Beida, responded to the call for Europeanization by launching *New Tide* magazine with the objective of bringing new thought to Chinese society to further the ‘spiritual liberation’ of the nation.³⁶ As is well-known, the leaders of the New Culture Movement called for science, democracy and social change, gender equality and women’s rights. The vernacular (*baihua*) movement spearheaded by Hu Shi, who had recently returned from the United States to join the Beida faculty, spawned a refreshing ‘New Literature’, which showed a clear contempt for the past.³⁷ Beida emerged as the epicentre of intellectual radicalism from whence the New Culture/May Fourth Movement spread to Shanghai and Hangzhou and to some provinces, most notably Hunan.³⁸

³⁴ Quoted in Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West*, 218.

³⁵ Qian Xuantong 钱玄同, *Qian Xutong wenji* 钱玄同文集, no ed., 6 vols. (Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 1999–2000), vol. III, 77.

³⁶ Wang Fan-sen, *Fu Ssu-nien: A Life in Chinese History and Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 27–8.

³⁷ During the next two decades, the most creative artists were interested in imitating foreign trends. Many novels with Chinese subjects reflected the Western tendency towards social realism. Mao Dun (1896–1981) moved the ‘New Literature’ out of the youth and students into the petty bourgeois and the masses. His novel *Midnight* and his trilogy of stories – *Spring Silkworms*, *Autumn Harvest* and *Winter Ruin* – describe the changing mores of a variety of petty bourgeois characters in the cities, like Shanghai, and the countryside. Some writers launched a movement of folk literature, departing from the Confucian concern with morality to focus on freedom, spontaneity and the emotions, and using literature to serve the majority of the people rather than the upper class. See Leo Ou-fan Lee, ‘Literary trends: the road to revolution, 1927–1949’, in *An Intellectual History of Modern China*, eds. Merle Goldman and Leo Ou-fan Lee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 196–266; Chang-tai Hung, *Going to the People: Chinese Intellectuals and Folk Literature, 1918–1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985), 169, 177–80.

³⁸ See Joseph T. Chen, *The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: The Makings of a Social Movement in Modern China* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971); Wen-hsin Yeh, *Provincial Passages: Culture, Space, and the Origins of Chinese Communism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996). During the next decade and beyond, Shanghai would become the locus of a form of Chinese modernity. The effects of the May Fourth Movement were also felt in the Manchurian city of Harbin. See James R. Carter, *Creating a Chinese Harbin: Nationalism in an International City, 1916–1932* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2002).

Unlike Japanese leaders, who had achieved the goals of Westernization without uprooting their cultural traditions, the New Culture/May Fourth radicals threatened to pull down the structure that had sustained China for more than two millennia. The historian Lin Yü-sheng has termed this antitraditionalism 'totalistic iconoclasm' or 'iconoclastic totalism', tracing its origins to a notion that stressed 'the necessary priority of intellectual and cultural change over political, social, and economic changes'.³⁹ He calls this notion a 'cultural-intellectualistic' approach that assumed that cultural change was the 'foundation of all other necessary changes' and was influenced by 'a deep-seated traditional Chinese cultural predisposition, in the form of a monistic and intellectual mode of thinking'.⁴⁰ He also regards, incorrectly in my view, the radicalism of the Cultural Revolution as heir to the May Fourth iconoclasm, anticipating by more than a decade Yü Ying-shih's contention that the radicalization of China culminated in the Cultural Revolution. No doubt, the iconoclasts provided a powerful critique of Chinese traditions. Benjamin Schwartz has noted that totalistic iconoclasm essentially involves two assumptions: One is that 'the social-cultural-political order of the past must be treated as a whole' and the other is that 'it must be rejected as a whole'.⁴¹ These assumptions are questionable, however, because the social-cultural-political order of the past need not be treated as a whole. Even more problematic is a third assumption: that iconoclasm was mainstream thought in and after the New Culture/May Fourth era. Lin has ignored or underestimated the conservative backlash that occurred at the same time. As Zarrow has noted, the tendency of historians to define May Fourth in terms of radicalism and iconoclasm is overdrawn.⁴² As a matter of fact, the iconoclasts did not entirely turn their backs on Chinese traditions. They were iconoclastic only when compared with the earlier generation of radical reformers. Intellectually and emotionally, they were a transitional generation, with obligations to both the past and the future, and their attitudes were no less influenced by traditional concerns.

Westernized radicalism was not 'totalistic iconoclasm' but a strategy of repudiating the Chinese past. To illustrate, let us consider the thought of Hu Shi and Chen Xujing, two very different scholars of different generations, one based in Beijing and the other in Guangzhou. The

³⁹ Lin Yü-sheng, *The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness: Radical Antitraditionalism in the May Fourth Era* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979), 26.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁴¹ Schwartz's 'Foreword' in *ibid.*, x.

⁴² Zarrow, *China in War and Revolution*, 183.

predominant influence in Hu's thought was American, not French or British. His experiences as a student in the United States from 1910 to 1917 were positive and instructive. Thus, when Hu wrote of Western culture, he had American culture in mind. In January 1927, Hu visited the United States after an absence of nearly ten years. On this occasion, he saw for himself how much American society had changed for the better. It was a time when American power, wealth and prestige were at a new high (before the Great Depression set in). What particularly impressed him was that the United States had become 'a nation of automobiles'. (The United States enjoyed a postwar boom largely based on the attractions of the automobile, whereas many European countries, including France and England, not to mention Germany, were experiencing considerable economic difficulties.) From a New York weekly, Hu learned that America accounted for 81 per cent of the world's car ownership, with on average every five persons owning a car. Car ownership was not a monopoly of the rich in the United States; it was a symbol of social progress across the board. Every adult had a driver's license. Even carpenters and cement workers drove to work, and children in rural areas went to school by public transport, in sharp contrast to the 'sedan and rickshaw civilization of China'. The working class was so well-off that Hu could not help but feel that the happiness of Americans was 'beyond Chinese imagination'.⁴³

The car was more than a means of transport; it was the very embodiment of modernity. In a treaty-port city like Shanghai in the 1920s, nothing could be more modern than driving a private car, especially with a chauffeur. The car was a status symbol suggestive of a good life. Modern life was both materialistic and spiritual. Thus, Hu rejected the naïve contrast of Western culture as materialistic to Eastern culture as spiritual. The material and the spiritual were not two separate and distinct domains. Modern civilization, wrote Hu, rested on three premises: First, the end of life is happiness; second, poverty is an evil; and third, diseases are evils as well. These premises had particular relevance to China because it was impoverished, disease ridden and full of misery for the vast majority of the population. Only when the people ceased to live in poverty and began to enjoy good health could they speak of a spiritual life. To that end, it was necessary to develop new resources, increase and reward production, improve the manufacturing sector, expand commerce, modernize the transport infrastructure, improve the health system, prevent infectious diseases and promote sports, among other things. Modern civilization, as

⁴³ Hu Shi, 'Manyou de ganxiang' 漫游的感想, in *HSWJ*, IV, 30.

exemplified by the United States, promoted 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number' by improving the environment, developing the economy, reforming social and political institutions and promoting education. It was not only materialistic but also 'highly idealistic and spiritual'.⁴⁴ Spiritual qualities were found not in China's poverty and backwardness but in the West's material progress. In the West, materialism and spirituality were not a binary but two sides of the same coin. It was this dualism that led Hu to flatly declare that the machine age of the present rightly deserved the appellation 'spiritual':

The West has during the last two hundred years moved far ahead of the East merely because certain Western nations have been able to devise new tools for the conquest of nature and for the multiplication of the power to do work. The East... is left behind in the state of manual labor while the Western world has long entered the age of steam and electricity.⁴⁵

Central to Hu's idea of modernity, therefore, is an emphasis on the material aspects that had an impact on people in everyday life. Hu linked modernity to science, for it was the application of science and technology that helped to increase production and improve working conditions and living standards. The focus of his concern had shifted from 'new thought', which was intellectual, to the livelihood of the people, which was socioeconomic. Hu understood livelihood not only in terms of meeting the basic needs of clothing, food, shelter and transport, but also in terms of enabling the people of China to enjoy the same material life as those of the West. Development was imperative, and the use of machines helped people avoid pain. In short, Hu felt strongly that only when a good life was enjoyed could spiritual life be meaningful; otherwise, spiritual life meant simply accepting a fatalist philosophy of life, one entrenched in poverty and inertia.⁴⁶ 'Look at China', he wrote poignantly, 'and you see a civilization of a lazy race that lacks an impulse towards improvement and the brains necessary to change the environment for the greatest happiness of the greatest number.'⁴⁷ As long as the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people, especially women, were in dire destitution, it made no sense to talk about spirituality and the wisdom of the sages.

⁴⁴ Hu Shi, 'Women duiyu xiyang jindai wenming de taidu' 我们对于西洋近代文明的态度, in *HSWJ*, IV, 3-13.

⁴⁵ Hu Shih, 'The civilizations of the East and the West', in *Whither Mankind: A Panorama of Modern Civilization*, ed. Charles A. Beard (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928), 25-41. The quote is on p. 27.

⁴⁶ Hu Shi, 'Qing dajia lai zhaozhao jingzi' 请大家来照照镜子, in *HSWJ*, IV, 23-8.

⁴⁷ Hu, 'Women duiyu xiyang', 12-13.

Hu had many supporters, among them the Western-educated humorist Lin Yutang (1895–1976), a professor of English literature at Beida, who waxed eloquently about the positive relation of the ‘civilization of the machine’ to the ‘civilization of the spiritual’.⁴⁸

In a 1928 article titled ‘Will everyone please look into the mirror’, Hu Shi lamented that China was inferior to the West in every respect (*baishi bu ruren*) – not only in material life but also in terms of politics, society and morality. He urged his fellow countrymen to take a long, hard look at the nation.⁴⁹ In a later article, Hu told them that China was inferior also in art and literature, music and personal physique. ‘Admit you are wrong, and only then can you learn from others wholeheartedly! Don’t be afraid to imitate [the West] . . . and don’t be afraid to lose our national culture. . . . Your duty is not to conserve but to be progressive.’⁵⁰ The worst things about the Chinese past, wrote Hu, were the ‘three harms’ (*sanhai*) (opium-smoking, foot-binding and the eight-legged essays), and the worst things of the present were the ‘five devils’ (*wugui*) (poverty, diseases, ignorance, corruption and disorder).⁵¹ In the midst of the Japanese aggression in Manchuria and North China, Hu, instead of condemning the Japanese, engaged in self-reflection (*fanxing*) as a way of saving the nation. His concept of self-reflection takes the intransitive form, meaning ‘to undergo self-criticism, wake up and admit you are wrong’. In Hu’s own reflection, China had failed as a nation because the people were lethargic and never admitted they had problems of their own making – a ‘what you reap is what you sowed’⁵² philosophy. It was only through self-reflection and wholehearted learning from the West that confidence in the nation could be restored. In criticizing his fellow countrymen, Hu illustrates one of the dominant themes of the discourse on Chinese modernity, namely, the faulting of the national character (*guominxing*).⁵³

This theme is grounded in an assumption that the national character was deeply flawed because Chinese traditions were bad and that to change the character, Chinese traditions must be jettisoned. Significantly, though, behind the powerful rhetoric of self-critique, which looks like a form of self-Orientalizing in our day, lay the promise of redemption.

⁴⁸ Lin Yutang 林语堂, ‘Jiqi yu jingshen’ 机器与精神, appendage to *ibid.*, 14–22.

⁴⁹ Hu, ‘Qing dajia lai zhaozhao jingzi’, 27.

⁵⁰ Hu Shi, ‘Jieshao wo ziji de sixiang’ 介绍我自己的思想, in *HSWJ*, V, 515.

⁵¹ Hu Shi, ‘Cantong de huiyi yu fanxing’ 惨痛的回忆与反省, in *HSWJ*, V, 380.

⁵² Hu Shi, ‘Xinxin yu fanxing’ 信心与反省, and ‘Zailun xinxin yu fanxing’ 再论信心与反省, in *HSWJ*, V, 385–90, 391–6, respectively.

⁵³ Notably, Lu Xun’s fiction *The True Story of Ah Q* represents a certain cultural image of the Chinese as culturally backward and morally cowardly, lacking in sincerity and love.

Hu was driven by a sense of patriotism, as he engaged in *fanxing* himself. China was sick, yet to Hu the optimist, there was a cure. He was attempting to turn China's sickness and failure as a culture and nation into a new building block for the construction of a new national identity. Failure and humiliations, as the literary scholar Jing Tsu has demonstrated, were thought of as strengths on which success could be built in the making of a new cultural and national identity. Excavating the flaws of the national character was a productive and impassioned part of the nation-building project.⁵⁴ Hu was no less patriotic than his critics. Self-reflection helped him to overcome his sense of shame at the nation's shortcomings.

The question for Hu was how to treat Western culture in the face of cultural conservatism. In an English article titled 'Conflict of cultures' published in the *Chinese Christian Yearbook* (1929), Hu outlined three options: 'to resist it, to adopt it whole-heartedly or to take a middle course – what is called "selective assimilation"'.⁵⁵ In his view, resistance had long ceased to be an option; selective assimilation seemed the most reasonable of the three, but under scrutiny, it was 'a subterfuge, a refuge behind which the old resistance shelters itself, a new disguise for the same old conservatism'.⁵⁶ Here, 'the same old conservatism' refers to the cultural and social inertia that he had long bemoaned. Hu's view was that 'we must *unreservedly* accept this modern civilization of the West because we need it to solve our most pressing problems, the problems of poverty, ignorance, disease and corruption [emphasis added]'.⁵⁷ To accept the West unreservedly was to embrace science and democracy, to raise the social status of the merchant, to industrialize, to institute the rule of law and to promote a new system of education that privileged natural science over classical scholarship. To those who feared that this would spell an end to Chinese traditions, Hu responded:

I am convinced that *the old traditions will not be lost even when we take an extreme view of the need for modernization*, because civilizations are conservative by their nature. Due to the natural inertia of cultures, the vast majority will take good care of those traditional values. But *it behooves the leaders to go as far as they can* in order that they may bring the masses to move a few steps farther in the direction of solving the most urgent problems of the nation by means of every instrumentality which this new world civilization can offer [emphasis added].⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Jing Tsu, *Failure, Nationalism, and Literature* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2005).

⁵⁵ Hu, 'Conflict of cultures', 477.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

Clearly, Hu's public image as a cultural iconoclast is misleading. Earlier, he had written in his Columbia doctoral dissertation on the development of the logical method in ancient China: 'How can we best assimilate modern civilization in such a manner as to make it congenial and congruous and continuous with the civilization of our own making?'⁵⁹ This quote is well-known to intellectual historians of modern China. Less known is that in a 1922 Chinese book based on his dissertation, the quote is preceded by the following lines:

A nation that has a glorious history and a self-created bright culture will certainly not be at ease in a new culture that is seen as imported from abroad. Especially, if the new culture is imposed by external forces and by the imperatives of national survival, the unease is as natural as it is reasonable. If the new culture is not accepted in an organized form of absorption but in a form of abrupt substitution, thus causing the destruction of the old culture, this would definitely be a great loss to all humankind.⁶⁰

Unlike the volatile and emotive Chen Duxiu, who favoured a 'fundamental solution', Hu subscribed to a version of evolutionary theory that holds that social change is a gradual process in which each problem needs to be researched and solved step by step, or, in his famous phrase, 'drop by drop' (*yidian yidi*).⁶¹ Urbane, cool and amicable, Hu was a scholar and pragmatist, not a revolutionary. His cultural iconoclasm was incomplete, for his ultimate concern was a 're-creation of civilization' (*zaizao wenming*), the 'only aim of new thought'.⁶²

From the outset, Hu adopted the scientific method and a modernist attitude towards the classical heritage, judging earlier traditions according to their compatibility with modern ideas. To that end, he joined Liang Qichao in a movement for the 'reorganization of the national heritage' (*zhengli guogu*). He desired to see a 'humanistic and rationalistic China resurrected by the touch of the scientific and democratic civilization of the new world'.⁶³ He followed Friedrich Nietzsche in calling for the 'transvaluation [sic] of all values' (Nietzsche's phrase). On the other hand, he affirmed the positive things of the Chinese past, researching the eighteenth-century novel *The Dream of the Red Chamber*,

⁵⁹ Quoted in Jerome B. Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution, 1917-1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 160.

⁶⁰ Hu Shi, *XianQin mingxue shi* 先秦名学史, reprint (Shanghai: Xuelin, 1983; first published in 1922), 7-8.

⁶¹ Hu Shi, 'Xinsichao de yiyi' 新思潮的意义, in *HSWJ*, II, 558.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West*, 216.

studying Chinese philosophy with a new approach, developing a deep interest in the history of Chan Buddhism and departing from the *kaoju* (evidence verification) tradition of the late Qing to reexamine the cultural heritage. As Jerome Grieder has noted, Hu tirelessly searched for 'Chinese antecedents that might ease the strain of cultural innovation', suggesting 'the existence of a submerged tradition of greater historical significance than the Confucian tradition itself'.⁶⁴ His antitraditionalism can be seen, paradoxically, as a manifestation of what Edward Shils has termed 'Western positive anti-traditionalism,' which was 'creative', 'scientific', 'rational', 'progressivistic' and which had spread to the non-West.⁶⁵

Politically, Hu was responding to the rise to power in 1928 of the Nationalists, who inaugurated a period of political tutelage. The new ruling elites were instituting a 'Party-ized' education underpinned by Sun Yat-sen's ideology, the Three Principles of the People (*sanmin zhuyi*), and they banned all antigovernment publications and cracked down on political dissent. Hu urged the new government to recognize the significance of the New Culture Movement and acknowledge that the old culture was no longer suited to modern times. He made it clear that accepting the modern civilization of the world meant emulating the Western model in terms of liberal democracy, constitutionalism, rule of law and respect for human rights. It also meant the promotion of education without political indoctrination.⁶⁶

In his private life, Hu was more traditional than Westernized. He did not have the courage to seek his own emancipation from the family fetters that he had vociferously attacked. His marriage to an illiterate, foot-binding rural woman, arranged by his widowed mother, was a result of his filial piety. He confessed to a relative that he feigned a happily married sex life to please his mother.⁶⁷ On occasion he found release by visiting brothels, as many fellow intellectuals did in his day. He often wore a long gown in public. According to a close friend, Hu was '30 per cent Westernized and 70 per cent traditional in his way of thinking'.⁶⁸ In my view, fifty-fifty is closer to the mark.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 321.

⁶⁵ Edward Shils, *Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 235–9.

⁶⁶ Hu Shi, 'Xin wenhua yundong yu Guomindang' 新文化运动与国民党, *Xinyue* 新月 2, 6 and 7 combined (10 September 1929): 1–15.

⁶⁷ Shi Yuangao 石原皋, *Xianhua Hu Shi* 网话胡适 (Hefei: Anhui renmin chubanshe, 1985), 15–16; Zheng, *Liang Shuming yu Hu Shi*, 340.

⁶⁸ Tang Degang 唐德刚, *Hu Shi zayi* 胡适杂议 (Taipei: Fengyun shidai, 1990), 37–55.

Total Westernization: The Advocacy of a Fervent Nationalist

It was Chen Xujing, twelve years Hu's junior, who emerged early in the 1930s as the staunchest advocate of Westernization. Chen was born in 1903 in a village in Wenchang County on Hainan Island, the son of a poor shopkeeper. When he was a child, his parents moved with him to Singapore. There, Chen completed his primary education and spent one year in a secondary school before returning to China in 1920 to attend Guangzhou's Lingnan High School. In 1922, he moved to Shanghai to study sociology at Fudan University, graduating two years ahead of his classmates. In 1925, he went to the United States, where he studied politics and sociology at the University of Illinois, earning an M.A. in 1926 and a Ph.D. in political science two years later. (His doctoral dissertation was titled 'Recent theories of sovereignty'.) He then returned to China to take up an assistant professorship at Guangzhou's Lingnan University, a missionary institution. In 1929, he went to Germany, where he performed research at Berlin University, followed by a stint (1931–2) at the Institute of World Economics at Kiel University, where he also learned French, German and Latin. While in Germany, the young Chen, aged twenty-eight, wrote an article titled 'Perspectives on the cultures of the East and the West' (1931) for the Chinese *Journal of Sociology*, in which he criticized Chinese culture as 'stagnant', 'monotonous', 'superstitious' and 'polytheistic'. He coined the phrase *quanpan jieshou xifang wenhua*, or 'total acceptance of Western culture', from which the term *quanpan xihua*, or 'total Westernization', is derived.⁶⁹

Prior to the publication of his 1931 article, many Western thinkers had been assessing the values of modern civilization and speculating about its destiny. Anxious inquirers included Rabindranath Tagore in India, Yusuke Tsurumi in Japan, Oswald Spengler in Germany and H. G. Wells, G. K. Chesterton, J. H. Belloc and G. B. Shaw in England. Even in the United States, which had emerged as a great power after World War I, some were asking, 'Where do we go from here?' But optimists were not lacking. The horrible images of World War I had diminished, and a refreshing appraisal of modern civilization had begun. A prime example is an edited volume, *Whither Mankind: A Panorama of Modern Civilization* (1928), published in New York. Edited by the influential American historian Charles A. Beard, coauthor of the wide-ranging and bestselling *The Rise of American Civilization* (1927), the volume was about the future of

⁶⁹ The article was later expanded into a book and published in 1933.

humanity, with contributions from sixteen international scholars, among them Hu Shi. It rejected the pessimistic views of thinkers, such as Spengler and Tagore, and substituted for visions of despair a more cheerful outlook on the future of the West and humanity. In his thoughtful introduction to the volume, Beard wrote about the superiority of the modern civilization of science and the machine. Also, Bertrand Russell, a contributor, noted that science and the machine had transformed ordinary life enormously, most notably in two areas: the diminution of poverty and improvement in public health. This represented 'an almost incalculable increase in average happiness, and each of them is capable of being carried very much further than has yet been done'.⁷⁰ Russell concluded that the remedy for the 'one-sidedness and harshness of our present civilization is to be sought, not in less science, but in more'.⁷¹ It was this sort of scientific optimism that informed Chen Xujing's understanding of the West.

In 1931, Chen returned to Lingnan University as a full professor of sociology.⁷² There, he frequently discussed questions of total Westernization with his colleagues and students. His early years in Singapore under British rule, his American education, his German experience and the liberal intellectual climate at Lingnan all contributed to his Western outlook. In December 1933, at the invitation of Zhongshan University, Chen delivered a lecture titled 'The future of Chinese culture', in which he advocated *quanpan xihua*, or total Westernization, stirring up a controversy, first in Guangzhou and then in Beijing, Shanghai and elsewhere, which lasted more than a year.

The lecture was turned into a book titled *The Future of Chinese Culture*, published by Shanghai's Commercial Press early in 1934. In it, Chen expressed opposition to atavistic movements, such as the National Essence School, and to selective assimilation, or cultural syncretism, reinforcing the view that East and West differed in the degree of development and not in kind.⁷³ Like Hu Shi, Chen held that human cultures the world over were essentially the same from the start, all proceeding from the same premise. Some had become more advanced and more complex than others, creating a hierarchy of cultures. Yet avenues of

⁷⁰ Bertrand Russell, 'Science', in *Whither Mankind*, ed. Beard, 81–2.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁷² Liu Jilin 刘集林, *Chen Xujing wenhua sixiang yanjiu* 陈序经文化思想研究 (Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chubanshe, 2003), 1–4.

⁷³ Chen Xujing 陈序经, *Zhongguo wenhua de chulu* 中国文化的出路, reprint (Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2004; first published in 1934), 39–61.

upward mobility were open to the inferior cultures that were willing to absorb the elements of the superior culture and to develop continuously.

Chen dismissed the *ti-yong* paradigm as ineffective for understanding the East–West relationship. He faulted those who made a distinction between spiritual culture and material culture, arguing, like Hu Shi, that spirituality and materiality were two sides of the same coin. He also rejected Du Yaquan's *jing-dong* theory, contending instead that all cultures were active, regardless of space, because culture was a tool and a product of efforts to improve the environment and satisfy human needs.⁷⁴ He did not believe that Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi had gone far enough in espousing Westernization. He faulted Chen Duxiu for being interested only in science and democracy and not in the entire Western culture and Hu for maintaining that academic research in China during the past three hundred years had been consistent with the scientific method that distinguished Western civilization. Understanding individualism as 'the central force of modern culture', he did not think that either Chen Duxiu or Hu Shi was committed to it normatively.⁷⁵

Chen Xujing gave two principal reasons for embracing the West in its entirety. One was that modern European culture was far more progressive than Chinese culture. The West was 'the best and the most complete culture' in the world. Europe was superior in every respect, whereas Chinese culture had long become 'dry and monotonous'.⁷⁶ Here, one hears the echoes of Hu Shi: Whatever material goods China possessed, the West had a great deal more; whatever the Chinese thought excellent was never as good as in the West; and whatever was bad was a thousand times worse in China. Chen's verdict was that China's contributions to the world had been insignificant. The other reason was that Western culture was the 'world culture and world trend'. If China was to survive as a nation, it had to go to the extreme to Westernize.⁷⁷ The influence of evolutionary theory – the idea of natural selection and the survival of the fittest – is unmistakable: Nations with an inferior culture are doomed. Chen's was the voice of an Enlightenment optimist, prophesying a bright future for China only if it followed the European path to modernity.

Chen's view of culture was holistic – that is, culture consists of many component parts that are intimately integrated; when one component

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 37–59.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 91, 128–9.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 102–6.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 106–7.

changes, all the others change with it, and because culture is an indistinct, organic system, it cannot be compartmentalized.⁷⁸ His point was that there could be no half way to modernize, for when two cultures met, the inferior one would eventually be displaced; eclecticism was an abnormal phenomenon in the transition to modernity.

Chen drew on a number of Western works that argued that civilization had evolved through a number of stages from primitive society through others to modern society, each stage being higher than and superior to the one preceding it.⁷⁹ He acknowledged that cultural change could be gradual or abrupt. To achieve abrupt change would not be bad for the inferior culture, for it was not necessary to evolve through the same stages through which the superior culture had passed. Leapfrogging was possible by imitating the West.⁸⁰

Chen assumed that when cultures met, whether they were similar or entirely different, the outcome was the same – cultural ‘oneness and harmony’.⁸¹ His logic was that old cultures no longer met the needs of modern times and therefore would eventually be eliminated. There was no bifurcation of Chinese and Western learning, only a distinction between old and new learning. In the end, all cultures would be at one, producing a state of harmony. This optimism led Chen to reject the idea of preserving China’s ‘inherent ancestral culture’ (*guyou wenhua*). The term *guyou wenhua*, often used by cultural conservatives, is close to but not exactly the same as the term *chuantong wenhua* (traditional culture). More accurately, *guyou wenhua* refers to the culture dating back to ancient times when it was first formed and crystallized. To preserve *guyou wenhua* sounded to Chen as though the original culture was immutable and had hardly changed since ancient times. That made no sense to him because no culture could remain unchanged once it had encountered others. Chinese culture had had many foreign encounters, especially with Buddhism from India for a millennium. The result of cultural encounters was something shared across cultures; the longer the encounters, the more to share. Encounters, however, did not mean the parallels of equal cultures. The inferior culture was a transitional culture until it was at

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 11–19.

⁷⁹ Especially Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization* (1877); Alexander Sutherland, *The Origin and Growth of Moral Instinct* (1898); and Charles Ellwood, *Cultural Evolution: A Study of Social Origins and Development* (1927).

⁸⁰ Chen, *Zhongguo wenhua de chulu*, 24–30.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 31–8.

one with the superior culture.⁸² Apparently, Chen was attracted to a teleology that will eventually make all cultures look alike as a result of the inexorable march of progress.

His views drew immediate criticism not only from cultural conservatives but also from many liberal intellectuals. The Columbia University-educated political scientist Zhang Xiruo (1889–1973) exemplifies those who favoured Westernization but defended many things Chinese, especially traditional architecture, paintings and aesthetics. Zhang would not expect people to stop eating rice and using chopsticks, nor did he think it necessary for a Chinese man to take off his hat when greeting a lady or for the boss to kiss his female subordinate on the cheek when awarding her a prize. What China needed first and foremost, Zhang argued, were an industrial revolution and the accompanying scientific method. Yet to embrace industrialism and science did not mean accepting all Western cultural traits. He criticized Chen's cultural monism as 'single-digit determinism' (*danwei dingminglun*), pointing out that there was a difference between Westernizing to a great extent and total Westernization, which was a difference between quality and quantity. Zhang acknowledged that many things were intertwined, such as industrialism and science, capitalism and labour-management relations, modern society and human rights. Yet he also realized that Western culture was not monolithic, that there were rival values, systems and ideologies: Democracy, capitalism, individualism, fascism, socialism, communism, corporatism, free trade and protectionism all existed in different parts of Europe. The world being so diverse, Zhang refused to see East and West as a dichotomy. It was important to him that national dignity and self-confidence did not diminish in the Westernization process.⁸³

There are good and bad elements in every culture. It is one thing to say that China was poor and backward; another to say that Chinese culture in its entirety was rotten and must be thrown away, boots and all. To his critics, Chen Xujing ignored the internal dynamics of Chinese history, compounding the inferiority complex from which many Chinese were already suffering. They were concerned about the loss of self-dignity and self-confidence in nation and state building. Even the May Fourth veteran Lu Xun acknowledged that there was something good in the old culture that could be used for cultural reconstruction. Although he welcomed

⁸² *Ibid.*, 36–7.

⁸³ Zhang Xiruo 张熙若, 'Quanpan xihua yu Zhongguo benwei' 全盘西化与中国本位, in *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化建设讨论集, ed. Ma Fangruo 马芳若 (Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935), part II, 248–50.

the idea of progress, Lu, who had gravitated to Marxism, dismissed total Westernization as unsuited to the needs of the time.⁸⁴

The American-educated sociologist Wu Jingchao (1901–68, Ph.D. University of Chicago) rejected Chen's organic view of culture. He countered that, although some cultural components were integrated, others were separate and distinct. For instance, the application of science and technology did not require one to take up Western dancing; nor did one need to convert to Christianity. Natural and medical sciences from the West should be accepted completely, whereas art and literature could remain distinctively Chinese; capitalism should be developed but not without concerns about its social inequities; and Western ideas such as 'lack of seriousness towards marriage', 'lustful dancing' and 'excessive extravagance' should be rejected. In short, Wu argued, Westernization should be selective rather than taken as a complete package.⁸⁵

Others objected to the assumption that when cultures meet, the outcome is invariably oneness and harmony. They countered that selective assimilation and cultural syncretism produced harmony, not oneness. Pitting one culture against another on a hierarchical basis was an affront to Chinese sensitivities at a time when nationalist sentiment was running deep in the midst of Japanese aggression. Moreover, there is always a choice in life, at least in theory. Zhang Foquan (1907–94), an American-educated professor of politics and himself an advocate of Westernization, rejected the idea of 'all or none' in cultural borrowing. He thought it important to differentiate between the fundamentals, which must be accepted in full, and the less important, which is optional. It is the content and spirit that matters.⁸⁶ Zhang would sympathize with the idea of total if it meant an attitude and an atmosphere (*qingdiao*). He urged people to Westernize 'from the roots' (*cong genbenchu xihua*), beginning with 'the Greek spirit', from which Western Europeans derived literature and the arts, philosophy and pure mathematics and an urbane social outlook. He wanted educated Chinese to develop the brains of a Westerner that were critical and scientific.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Zhao Libin 赵立彬, *Minzu lichang yu xiandai zhuiqiu: 20 shiji 20–40 niandai de quanpan xihua sichao* 民族立场与现代追求: 20 世纪 20–40 年代的全盘西化思潮 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2005), 282.

⁸⁵ Wu Jingchao 吴景超, 'Jianshe wenti yu dongxi wenhua' 建设问题与东西文化, in *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji*, ed. Ma, part II, 2–3.

⁸⁶ Zhang Foquan 张佛泉, 'Xihua wenti zhi pipan' 西化问题之批判, in *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji*, ed. Ma, part II, 18–23.

⁸⁷ Zhang Foquan, 'Xihua wenti de weisheng' 西化问题的尾声, in *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji*, ed. Ma, part II, 283, 285.

The strongest backlash against total Westernization yet came from ten university professors who issued a 'Declaration of cultural reconstruction on a Chinese base' on 10 January 1935.⁸⁸ The declaration began by deploring 'the loss of China in the cultural domain and of Chinese characteristics in its political style, social organizations and thought'. It proclaimed that the modernization of China should entail a syncretism of Western and Chinese cultures, with an emphasis on science and technology as well as on moral and cultural values. Thus, stated the ten professors, '[we] must adopt a critical attitude and the scientific method, review China's past and grasp its present'. China would always have its peculiarities reflecting its past and present. It was fruitless either to glorify or condemn ancient Chinese thought and institutions. What China needed was a new culture capable of 'meeting its needs at the present time and in the present circumstances'. Accordingly, it was important to reevaluate all Chinese thought and institutions with a view to sifting out the good from the bad and to absorb Euro-American culture, but not uncritically. The ten professors were sanguine that once a new culture was reconstructed along these lines, it would be as good as any other and would make a valuable contribution to the world.

It is all too easy to attack Chen for his extreme position. Total Westernization is neither practicable nor necessary. The problem with Chen is that he treated the West as though it were a completely known quantity, whereas in fact, 'the West remains as problematic as ever' even to Western scholars, as Benjamin Schwartz cautions.⁸⁹ Chen ignored the differences among the Western states (between Western and Eastern Europe, the Germanic northern and the Latin southern cultures, the Nordic and Mediterranean peoples and so on), and hardly reflected on such developments as the rise of fascism in the 1930s. He minimized the tension between capitalism and socialism, and erred in thinking that Soviet Russia was befriending the capitalist states of the West and developing capitalism via the socialist route.⁹⁰

Yet we can better understand, and make sense of, Chen's extremism from two particular perspectives. One is a perspective of modernity. In

⁸⁸ The declaration was published in the *Cultural Construction Monthly*, the organ of the government-sponsored Chinese Cultural Construction Council. The ten signatories were Wang Xinming, He Bingsong, Wu Yugan, Sun Hanbing, Huang Wenshan, Tao Xisheng, Zhang Yi, Chen Gaoyong, Fan Zhongyun and Sa Mengwu. See Ma (ed.), *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji*, part I, 1-6.

⁸⁹ Schwartz, *In Search of Wealth and Power*, 2.

⁹⁰ Chen's handwritten manuscript, 'Dongxi wenhuaguan' 东西文化观, cited in Zhao, *Minzu lichang yu xiandai zhuiqiu*, 266.

questioning China's past and present, the most important thing for Chen was the progressive and creative spirit of Western culture that China lacked. His like-minded colleague at Lingnan University, Feng Enrong, defended their position thus: 'To Westernize, we must speak of the fundamental spirit of the West and its complete system of thought. It is futile simply to learn about the practical things of the West.'⁹¹ What was the fundamental spirit of the West? It was the spirit of 'cultural creativity', wrote another Lingnan colleague.⁹²

To the criticism that he showed a lack of confidence in the nation, Chen responded poignantly:

A blind belief in the superiority of the culture of our ancestors of several thousand years to the modern culture of the West will only retard our own culture as before. Worse still, this kind of self-confidence is merely that of a slave, a willing slave to the ancestors. Those who are willing slaves to the ancestors will inevitably become slaves to Westerners as well. Let's ask ourselves: Is such self-confidence worth having?⁹³

Second, we can make sense of Chen's radicalism from the perspective of a fervent nationalist. Like many of his generation, Chen was driven by a nationalistic impulse, worrying that unless China followed 'the world trend', 'we are just awaiting extinction [as a nation] with our hands tied'.⁹⁴ If China failed to Westernize, he warned, it would be forced by foreign powers to do so and would become enslaved to them in the process. Responding to criticism, Chen wrote in December 1935, 'If we think, as many people do, that Western culture is a culture of imperialism, then the best means of overthrowing imperialism is to use its very culture and not our own culture of the kingly way (*wangdao*) – that is, not our culture of pacifism.'⁹⁵ Japan, having left the ranks of Asia to join Europe, had emerged as a modern state and an imperialist power. Chen warned that any nation refusing to embrace the culture of the new age faced

⁹¹ Feng Enrong 冯恩荣, 'Quanpan xihua de yiyi' 全盘西化的意义, cited in Zhang Shibao 张世保, *Chen Xujing zhengzhi zhixue yanjiu* 政治陈序经哲学研究 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2007), 228.

⁹² Lü Xuehai 吕学海, 'Du Zhang Junmai xiansheng "xueshujie zhi fangxiang yu xuezhe zhi zeren"' 读张君勱先生《学术界之方向与学者之责任》, cited in *ibid.*, 228.

⁹³ Chen Xujing, 'Ping Zhang Dongxun xiansheng de Zhongxi wenhuaguan' 评张东荪先生的中西文化观, in *Quanpan xihua yanlun xuji* 全盘西化言论续集, ed. Feng Enrong 冯恩荣 (Guangzhou: Lingnan daxue, 1935), 116–17.

⁹⁴ Chen, *Zhongguo wenhua de chulu*, 106.

⁹⁵ Chen Xujing, 'Quanpan xihua lun' 全盘西化论, in *Chen Xujing ji* 陈序经文集, eds. Yu Dingbang 余定邦 and Niu Junkai 牛军凯 (Guangzhou: Zhongshan daxue chubanshe, 2004), 55.

ultimate extinction. Total Westernization would be required to secure China's independence and freedom.⁹⁶

Chen noted that the Nationalist government was already on a path to Westernization by building factories, promoting industry, reforming agriculture and developing mining. 'It is a fact that total Westernization is going in the direction of material culture. Can there be any doubt?'⁹⁷ Chen was convinced, like Hu Shi, that the people of China deserved to enjoy the same material life as people in the West. To that end, China must manufacture its own goods as much as possible. 'The challenge for us from now on is immediately to Westernize *through our own efforts* if we don't want to be forced like a slave to Westernize [emphasis added].'⁹⁸ To Westernize was not to consume foreign goods but to manufacture goods of foreign quality. This entailed economic self-sufficiency and competition. Westernization required digesting things Western and being creative, not simply importing foreign goods and transplanting foreign ideas onto Chinese soil.⁹⁹ Chen was arguing for a politically and economically independent China. In embracing the West, he accepted the idea of imperialism as part of the discourse on modernity. Perhaps he would have had no problem with China becoming an imperialist power one day, just like Britain and Japan. For the present, he was anxious to fight economic imperialism in his country.

In everyday life, Chen was not much different from other Chinese scholars. By most accounts an amicable man, Chen had good interpersonal skills that were more traditional than Western. He liked Chinese dinners (and used chopsticks) as much as he enjoyed Western cuisine. He wrote Chinese with a brush from right to left and without punctuation marks in the classical style. He extolled Christianity but never saw the light to convert to it. While a student in the United States, he turned to Mencius' (c. 372–289 BC) philosophy for character building.¹⁰⁰ The paradoxes in Chen undercut his assumption that Chinese modernity was just a matter of abandoning the indigenous and embracing the West.

With regard to his relationship with Hu Shi, the two did not meet until 1935, though they had been in correspondence for some years. As

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 45–6.

⁹⁷ Chen Xujing, *Dongxi wenhuaguan* 东西文化观, reprint (Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2004; first published in 1933), 185.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 184.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 192–3, 226.

¹⁰⁰ Liu, *Chen Xujing wenhua sixiang yanjiu*, 334.

expected, Hu endorsed Chen's position on Westernization.¹⁰¹ Yet, for some time, Hu had been upset by the eugenicist Pan Guangdan's (1899–1967) objection to his use of the term 'wholesale' or 'wholehearted' Westernization in his 1929 article 'Conflict of cultures'.¹⁰² Furthermore, circa 1935, the weight of cultural conservatism, discussed in the next chapter, compelled Hu to acknowledge that total Westernization, meaning one hundred per cent, was neither necessary nor practicable. Thus, Hu resorted to a less provocative term, *chongfen shijiehua* (abundant cosmopolitanization), which meant 'exerting full effort' (*yong quanli*) or 'trying as hard as possible' (*jinliang*). He also acknowledged that Westernization could not be quantified. In everyday life, one cannot expect every Chinese to change to a Western diet, use knives and forks, convert to Christianity and so on.¹⁰³ From Chen's point of view, however, Hu was backsliding. To Chen, the term abundant cosmopolitanization was 'confusing' and 'no less suggestive of selective assimilation'.¹⁰⁴

For his part, Hu was at last able to situate his idea in a cosmopolitan, rational framework. 'Our idea of abundant cosmopolitanization means the use of reason to define our direction [and to] educate people to accept them; [it also means] exerting ourselves in the fullest measure to overcome all conservative and antiquarian sentiments [and to] lead the nation as a whole in the direction we have chosen – this and nothing more.'¹⁰⁵ Hu felt the need to resolve the tension between liberal gradualism and cultural radicalism. Moreover, in using the term 'abundant cosmopolitanization', Hu appeared disposed towards an inclusive universalism in which there was a place for the Chinese local.

Clearly, his and Chen's approaches to Westernization were different in some respects. Whereas Hu made his ultimate goal the re-creation of culture and a return to the Chinese fold via the Western democratic-scientific route, Chen was preoccupied with the displacement of Chinese culture with that of the modern West. Total Westernization for Chen was both a means to an end and an end in itself; abundant cosmopolitanization

¹⁰¹ Hu Shi, 'Woshi wanquan zancheng Chen Xujing xiansheng de quanpan xihualun' 我是完全赞成陈序经的全盘西化论, in *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji*, ed. Ma, part II, 14.

¹⁰² Jerome Ch'en, *China and the West: Society and Culture, 1815–1937* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979), 444.

¹⁰³ Hu Shi, 'Chongfen shijiehua yu quanpan xihua' 充分世界化与全盘西化, in *HSWJ*, V, 454–5.

¹⁰⁴ Chen Xujing, 'Quanpan xihua de bianhu' 全盘西化的辩护, *Duli pinglun* 独立评论 160 (July 1935): 10–15.

¹⁰⁵ Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 287–8; I have made some minor changes to Grieder's translation; Hu Shi, 'Da Chen Xujing xiansheng' 答陈序经先生, in *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji*, ed. Ma, part II, 282.

for Hu was a stratagem. Each approached the problem of China from a somewhat different perspective. Hu was a philosopher, a scholar of literary history and more of a gradualist; Chen, a political scientist, a sociologist and more of a social engineer.

The Westernizers were city dwellers and urban oriented remote from the rural masses. Nowhere in Hu's and Chen's writings is a discussion of how the masses, illiterate, mired in poverty and concerned above all with survival, were to Westernize. Perhaps it was simply assumed that after society accepted the notion of Westernization, the masses would accept the tutelage of the enlightened elite. But it is hard to image how ordinary people could be asked to Westernize in everyday life without sufficient socioeconomic change and the promotion of education across the country.

The Decline of Westernized Radicalism

Chen Xujing's writings had but a limited impact, confined largely to a small circle of like-minded colleagues at Lingnan University. By the latter half of the 1930s, as China was fighting a war against the Japanese, the push of Westernized radicalism was weakened by the pull of cultural conservatism that was linked in some ways to Nationalist rule. Hu Shi's departure in 1938 for the United States as Chinese ambassador did not help the cause of total Westernization at home. To enlist American support for China's war efforts against Japan, Hu spoke to American audiences about Chinese traditions in a favourable light. Now the question for those at home was not whether Western culture was superior but how it could be best assimilated.

A corollary of this was that the notion of *xiandaihua* (modernization) substituted that of *xihua* (Westernization) in the Chinese discourse.¹⁰⁶ There was a view that modernization subsumed Westernization, but not vice versa. Westernization, now a disparaged term, meant indiscriminate copying of Western ways, whereas modernization meant rationalization. It was in this context that Zhang Xiruo spoke of two kinds of modernization as they related to China and the West. One concerned the improvement of all things Chinese, including reading Chinese classics in phrases and translating them into the vernacular. The other concerned the rationalization of all things Western that the Chinese wanted

¹⁰⁶ Zhang, 'Xihua wenti de weisheng', 282–3.

to imitate and appropriate.¹⁰⁷ What Zhang was suggesting was that all things Chinese should be rationalized but not necessarily Westernized, depending on their nature. There were things Western that needed to be modernized, too. Each culture had its strengths and weaknesses. On balance, though, the West had an unquestionable superiority qualitatively.

To speak of modernization rather than Westernization was not merely a matter of lexicons. It was indicative of a change in the way Western culture was appreciated: The West was superior not because it was Western but because it was modern and rational. The concept of modernization removed the centre of change from the hegemonic West and relocated it in a linear sequence of changes through time, from the ever-receding 'traditional' to the ever-arriving 'modern'.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, if total Westernization was hard Westernization, modernization was soft Westernization, cushioned by sensitivity to nationalist feelings, allowing for self-affirmation. Modernization recognized the internal dynamics of the indigenous culture and its innate capability for change and also provided a sense of solidarity with the land and people of one's birth. In this respect, the Chinese discourse of the 1930s anticipated the modernization discourse in the West by three decades.¹⁰⁹

In 1939, during the War of Resistance (1937–45), Chen Xujing attempted to reignite the controversy by publishing a short book responding to the criticisms that had been levelled at him. Again, early in 1941, while teaching at Kunming's wartime National Southwest Associated University, he published an article in the liberal journal *Century Critic* defending total Westernization. He maintained that total Westernization did not mean passive Westernization or slavish imitation, but creative absorption and assimilation of things Western. Chinese culture was backward precisely because it lacked a creative spirit.¹¹⁰ Chen went on to debate the philosophers Feng Youlan, He Lin and Zhang Shenfu (1893–1986), but the impact was insignificant. In 1944, he left for the United States, where he taught successively at several universities, returning after the

¹⁰⁷ Zhang, 'Quanpan xihua yu Zhongguo benwei', 255.

¹⁰⁸ Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West*, 330.

¹⁰⁹ In 1966, Eisenstadt theorized that the relationship between modernization and Westernization is 'a problem of the extent to which non-Western societies may develop all the characteristics of modernity without becoming Westernized in the cultural sense, without adapting the concrete cultural and organization forms of modernity as they developed in the Western countries, even if these countries were the first to have become modernized'. See S. N. Eisenstadt, *Modernization: Protest and Change* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966), 49.

¹¹⁰ Cited in Zhao, *Minzu lichang yu xiandai zhuiqiu*, 218–19.

war to take up an appointment at Tianjin's Nankai University. In 1948, he was appointed president of Lingnan University, where he stayed on after the establishment of the PRC. (Lingnan later merged with Zhongshan University.) During the Cultural Revolution, Chen was purged for his Western views. He died on 16 February 1967 of a heart attack. It was not until 1979 that he was rehabilitated posthumously by the Chinese communist leadership.¹¹¹

A Critique of Westernized Radicalism

The European historian Theodore H. von Laue has written on the historical process known as 'the world revolution of Westernization' since World War I, which constituted the central force that shaped the twentieth century. A gigantic, all-inclusive revolution, it had caused the global violence and warfare of the previous century. According to von Laue, the non-Western world had not, however, been merely forced to Westernize; the process had been pressed forward by the locals themselves. He sees 'a furious anti-Westernism' that covered up 'the blatant imitation' of the West by non-Western elites.¹¹²

China's Westernizers could see the world revolution of Westernization unfolding and wanted their country to be a part of it. Underpinning their radicalism were evolutionism, social Darwinism and a cultural universalism that assumed that only by becoming like the West could China survive as a nation. Once a great civilization, China's greatness was a thing of the past, long sapped of its energy and vitality. Chinese culture had ossified. By contrast, European culture was dynamic and had an unquestionable superiority in issues affecting modern life, and therefore it was a necessary substitute for the inferior culture of China.¹¹³

At a general level, one can see parallels between the Westernizers here and those in other modernizing countries. The first to come to mind were nineteenth-century Russia's Westernizers, who believed that

¹¹¹ Liu, *Chen Xujing*, 4–5.

¹¹² Theodore H. von Laue, *The World Revolution of Westernization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 6.

¹¹³ However, Europe was not the limit of modernizing imaginations. The journalist Zou Taofen (1895–1944) looked to modern Turkey for inspiration. Mustapha Kemal (1881–1938, better known as Atatürk from 1934), founder of the Republic of Turkey and its first president, transformed the ruins of the Ottoman Empire into a modern, democratic, secular nation-state through a major programme of political, economic and cultural reforms. For some Chinese intellectuals, Kemal's Turkey could well be a model for emulation. See Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution*, 129–30.

their nation's development depended on the adoption of Western technology and liberal government. Piotr Y. Chaadayev (1794–1856) posed the question of Russia's relation to the West, articulated a ruthless criticism of Russian history, culture and the Orthodox religion and advocated assimilation of Roman Catholicism and Western European culture. Some remained moderate liberals; others became socialists and political radicals, such as Aleksandr I. Herzen (1812–70) and Vissarion G. Belinsky (1811–48), who believed that Russia's hope lay in following European ways and in assimilating European rationalism and civic freedom.¹¹⁴ In Meiji Japan, the journalist Tokutomi Sohō (1863–1957), a champion of liberal democracy and populism, advocated Westernization by publishing the magazine *Friends of the Nation* (*Kuokumin no tomo*) from 1887 to 1898. He regarded Westernism as essential to Japan's national progress.¹¹⁵ In India, the noted historian Jadunath Sarkar (1870–1958), later Sir Jadunath, admired the liberal culture of Britain and its empiricist thinkers, from John Locke to Edmund Burke to Bertrand Russell, although he was critical of the constricted vision and selfish workings of British imperialism in India. He feared that if Indians did not modernize and become capable of competing with the outside world to the fullest extent, they were doomed as a nation.¹¹⁶

China's Westernizers put their conservative rivals on the defensive, forcing them to respond to the challenges of the new age in a modern, albeit different manner, as we shall see in the next chapter. In this way, they made a significant contribution to the discourse on modernity. On the other hand, the Westernizers became progressively moderate rather than progressively radical after 1935 because of the conservative backlash and rising nationalism. From the start, Westernized radicalism was problematic not because it assaulted Chinese traditions but because it took the view that the non-West could be modern only by identifying with the West *simpliciter*. This view is fundamentally flawed in that it rests on the premise of an East–West dichotomy. Furthermore, it ignores the fact that Western progress had emerged from its own unique path of glory and decay as well as against its own cultural and historical backgrounds. Western modernity could not be replicated in the non-West without regard for

¹¹⁴ See Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*, trans. Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

¹¹⁵ John D. Pierson, *Tokutomi Sohō 1863–1957: A Journalist for Modern Japan* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980), 86–9, 164–5, 177–9.

¹¹⁶ Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West*, 258.

local conditions. In denying the indigenous culture's internal dynamics and its ability to renew itself and in rejecting cross-cultural fertilization, Westernized radicalism ran counter to the liberal principle of piecemeal change and to the value of cultural pluralism.

In the end, few cultural radicals proved to be as iconoclastic as is sometimes thought, for none could escape entirely the cultural skins within which he or she lived, to paraphrase Paul Cohen.¹¹⁷ The cultural heritage was too great to be ever discarded in its entirety. Both Hu Shi and Chen Xujing had invoked the old Chinese principle *qufahushang, jinde-qizhong* (start from the top, and what you get is only the middle) to justify their radicalism. Viewed from this perspective, Westernized radicalism was a product of historical contingency. Hu, Chen and no doubt many others¹¹⁸ betrayed a Chineseness that disguised an attachment to certain traditional values that remained part of everyday life.

¹¹⁷ Paul A. Cohen, *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 95.

¹¹⁸ These include Chen Duxiu. In the New Culture Movement, Chen opposed only the 'three bonds' (*sangang*) without repudiating the 'five regulars' (*wuchang*) and the 'five ethics' (*wulun*), except the emperor–subject relationship. In his later years, he even ceased attacking the three bonds, acknowledging that loyalty, filial piety and chastity were governed by both ethics and emotions. See Gao, *Tiaoshi de zhihui*, 92.

The Pull of Cultural Conservatism

Cultural conservatism stood opposed to cultural radicalism, yet the two were in more of a dialectical than an antithetical relationship. To understand this relationship, it is necessary to begin with a clarification of the term ‘cultural conservatism’. Yü Ying-shih uses the term to denote an attitude or inclination towards maintaining the cultural status quo. In line with his view on the progressive ‘radicalization of China’ in the twentieth century, Yü sees an excess of radicalism culminating in the Cultural Revolution. He laments that conservatism was too weak as a restraint and counterforce, adding that throughout the century there were no true conservatives in China, only varying degrees of reformism and radicalism.¹

Yü’s view has been challenged by the PRC writer Jiang Yihua, who, drawing on the work of the British conservative Hugh Cecil (1869–1956), argues that conservatism meant not opposition to change but ‘change within a defined scope and within a specific framework of value orientation that respects tradition, authority and nationalism’.² Jiang finds conservatism in twentieth-century China too strong and too enduring and blames it for China’s failure to resolve its myriad problems. On the other hand, radicalism was rather weak in terms of its capacity to establish new economic, political, social and cultural categories and structures for change. The Cultural Revolution was not the culmination of radicalism but the result of ‘an inherited poison of feudal despotic thought and

¹Yü Yingshi 余英时, ‘Zhongguo jindai sixiangshi shang de jijin yu baoshao’ 中国现代思想史的激进与保守, in Yü Yingshi, *Qian Mu yu Zhongguo wenhua* 钱穆与中国文化 (Shanghai: Yundong chubanshe, 1994), 188–295.

²Jiang Yihua 姜义华, ‘Jijin yu baoshou: yu Yü Yingshi xiansheng shangque’ 激进与保守: 与余英时先生商榷, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 10 (April 1992): 134–5.

politics'.³ Notwithstanding their differences, both authors view cultural conservatism as an intellectual orientation, the test of which was a positive attitude towards the cultural heritage. Another PRC scholar argues that any study of conservative or radical thought needs to be put in an historical context, as different people took different attitudes towards the sociopolitical order. Neither current of thought could be generalized because each varied over time and space.⁴

It is my own considered opinion that cultural conservatism in the Republican era was by no means a weak force, though not an overwhelming force either, and that it is best defined not by the conservatives' deriving their categories of thought from the cultural heritage but by a faith in traditional values that could be revitalized and harnessed to the purposes of modernization. Republican conservatism distinguished itself from late Qing traditionalism and traditional conservatism by its modernizing outlook and reflective double consciousness. Opposition to New Culture/May Fourth radicalism did not make Chinese conservatism anti-Western. There was no thought of cultural fundamentalism.⁵ No educated Chinese believed that the nation could survive without a movement of cultural borrowing from the West. Many neotraditionalists completed their Chinese classical education with years of studies overseas. Diehard conservatives were rare, with the possible exception of the eccentric English-speaking Singaporean-born Gu Hongming (1857–1928), a Confucian obscurantist whose influence was but minimal. Even the much-maligned National Essence (*guocui*) School begun in the late Qing consisted of reformist scholars, such as Zhang Binglin, Liu Shipai (1884–1919) and Huang Jie (1874–1935), who were influenced by a

³ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁴ Li Liangyu 李良玉, 'Jijin, baoshou yu zhishi fenzi de zeren' 激进、保守与知识分子的责任, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 12 (August 1992): 132–4.

⁵ There is no tradition of fundamentalism in Chinese thought. To the contrary, there is a long tradition of eclecticism dating back to ancient times. Guy Alitto has explained how ancient Chinese conceptions of the cosmos shaped Chinese thought and philosophy in terms of a unity of Heaven, Earth and humans and of a complementary and dialectical relationship between different elements, producing a culture that defies simple categories. This inclusiveness bred tolerance, allowing different schools of thought to contend, interact and influence one another. When Neo-Confucianism emerged in the Song Dynasty, it was a reaction to the pervasive influence of Buddhism imported from India. This revived Confucianism had incorporated Daoist and Buddhist ideas. See Guy S. Alitto, 'Zhongguo wenhua xingcheng de yaosu ji qi tezheng' 中国文化形成的要素及其特征, in *Guo Tingyi xiansheng jiuzhi danchen jinian lunwenji* 郭廷以先生九秩诞辰纪念论文集, 2 vols., ed. Chen Sanjing 陈三井 (Nangang: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1995), vol. II, 249–71.

variety of Western ideas and theories through Japanese translations and who exploited native traditions as a source of political criticism of imperial orthodoxy.⁶

This chapter first traces the rise of modern Chinese conservatism and some of the conservative groups and individuals, then explores the central themes of conservative thought and finally reflects on cultural conservatism as an attitude and a modern strand of thought. I challenge the view that Chinese cultural conservatism was part of a worldwide post-World War I antimodernization trend, especially in the non-West, and that the conservatives regarded the modernization process as something foreign that was forced on them.⁷ I further question the assertion that Chinese conservatism sought to preserve the cultural-moral heritage in the modernization process without recognizing the accord between tradition and modernization.⁸ Instead, I argue that critiquing the West and Western modernity did not mean a total repudiation of Enlightenment modernism or opposition to Westernization. Modern Chinese conservatism represented what Wang Hui has termed 'a modernity of counter-modernity'.⁹

The Rise of Modern Chinese Conservatism

In the West, the term 'conservatism' denotes an attitude that attaches great importance to institutions, practices, customs and traditions that have evolved over time and are manifestations of continuity and stability.

⁶ The term *guocui* is derived from the Meiji neologism *kokusui*, which entered the Chinese vocabulary in approximately 1903 as a slogan to refer to the presumed essence of China's classical heritage in philosophy, history and art. However, according to Huang Jie, *guocui* 'consists not only in what is indigenous and still suitable but also in what is borrowed but capable of being adapted to the needs of our nation'. Quoted in Yü Ying-shih, 'The radicalization of China in the twentieth century', *Daelalus* 122, 2 (Spring 1993): 130. See also Laurence A. Schneider, 'National essence and the new intelligentsia', in *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, ed. Charlotte Furth (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 57–89.

⁷ Ai Kai 艾恺 [Guy S. Alitto], *Wenhua shoucheng zhuyi lun: fanxiandaihua sichao de pouxu* 文化守成主义论：反现代化思潮的剖析 (Taipei: Shibao wenhua, 1986), especially 251–62.

⁸ Lin Yüsheng 林毓生, *Zhuanhua yu chuangzao* 转化与创造 (Taipei: Youshi wenhua shiye gongsi, 1993), 102.

⁹ Wang Hui, 'Contemporary Chinese thought and the question of modernity', trans. Rebecca Karl, in *China's New Order: Society, Politics, and Economy in Transition*, ed. Theodore Hutters (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 150; Wang Hui 汪晖 and Ke Kaijun 柯凯军, 'Guanyu xiandaixing wenti dawen' 关于现代性问题答问, in *Zhishi fenzi lichang: zizhou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场：自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, ed. Li Shitao 李世涛 (Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002), 131.

Etymologically, it implies an attempt to conserve the existing social order and hold steadfastly to those traditions and values that preserve a link with the past. Edmund Burke (1729–97), a Whig in the British Parliament, is credited with the origin of conservatism as an ideology in reaction to the French Revolution of 1789. However, as Benjamin Schwartz has argued, '[I]t is probably more correct to say that the doctrine of conservatism rose in dialectic reaction to certain trends of the Enlightenment.'¹⁰ Karl Mannheim distinguished between two broad categories of conservatism: traditionalism, or traditional conservatism, and conservatism, or modern conservatism.¹¹ Klaus Epstein, writing on German conservatism, traced its genesis to Enlightenment progressivism, to the growth of commercial capitalism and to the rise of the middle class following the French Revolution.¹² As a counter movement, modern conservatism was a response to the 'crisis of modernization' beginning in Europe.

As an intellectual attitude, conservatism has no fixed, invariable, immutable, substantive ideals.¹³ It does, however, maintain that civilized society requires order and class, that prudent change is the means of social preservation and that society is joined in perpetuity by a moral bond among the dead, the living and those yet to be born. Additionally, conservatism is opposed to economic and political levelling.¹⁴ Burkean conservatism affirms the existing sociopolitical order as a whole and the historical processes that brought it into being. It opposes change for change's sake, but not change that is indispensable for social stability and continuity, as made clear in Burke's well-known line 'A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation.'¹⁵

Whereas conservatism in Europe was born in reaction to the French Revolution, modern conservatism in China rose in reaction to the horrors of World War I and to the radicalism of the New Culture/May Fourth Movement, not to the Revolution of 1911, there being no Chinese equivalent of Burke. Few educated Chinese opposed the innovations of the

¹⁰ Benjamin I. Schwartz, 'Notes on conservatism in general and in China in particular', in *The Limits of Change*, ed. Furth, 5.

¹¹ Karl Mannheim, 'Conservative thought', in his *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology*, trans. and ed. Paul Kecskemeti (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1953), 94–9.

¹² Klaus Epstein, *The Genesis of German Conservatism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966), 3.

¹³ Carl J. Friedrich, *Tradition and Authority* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1972), 21.

¹⁴ Russell Kirk, *The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana*, 7th edn. (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2001), 8–9.

¹⁵ Quoted in Robert Nisbet, *Conservatism: Dream and Reality* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986), 26.

early Republic, despite its many shortcomings. Fewer felt nostalgia for the monarchy that was gone forever after the last attempt to restore it in 1919 by the militarist Zhang Xun (1854–1923). None wanted to rescue the notion of universal kingship or defend the assumptions on which the imperial order had rested. Conservatism in the Republican era was a response to the ‘crisis of modernization’ as China struggled to become a modern nation-state.

It is not suggested that there was no conservative thought before World War I and the New Culture/May Fourth Movement. The thought of the late Qing reformers and, even more importantly, of the National Essence School is well-known to historians of modern China. Nor is it suggested that the vibrant cultural life during the first years of twentieth-century China that marked a watershed between the conservative old regime and the ostensibly iconoclastic New Culture can be ignored. Rather, conservatism as an attitude and a modern strand of thought rose at a particular point in twentieth-century Chinese history, making it part of the worldwide quest for modernity.

The conservative reaction to cultural radicalism, although internally driven, had a fitting European context as well. For a century prior to World War I, some European thinkers, notably Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78), Arthur Schopenhauer (1788–1860) and Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) had critiqued the Enlightenment’s overweening belief in scientific rationality and progress. Before the century was over, a number of British men of letters had expressed concerns about the crass materialism of modern civilization, notably Cardinal John Henry Newman (1801–90), Matthew Arnold (1822–88), William Morris (1834–96) and the Adams brothers (Henry, 1838–1918 and Brooks, 1848–1927), among others on the Continent.¹⁶ After the turn of the century, most notably the German historian Oswald Spengler (1880–1936) expressed anxiety about progress in the West in his best seller, *The Decline of the West* (1918). In this morphology of world history, Spengler put forth a cyclical theory of the rise and decline of civilizations, which he likened to living organisms that all evolved through stages of birth, growth, prosperity, decay and eventual death. He saw seven of the world’s eight major civilizations – Egyptian, Babylonian, Indian, Chinese, Greek, Arabic and Mexican – as dead and Western civilization as already in the senescent period of its cycle. Questioning the Enlightenment view of history, Spengler expressed doubts about the future of Western culture and drew

¹⁶ Ai Kai, *Wenhua shoucheng zhuyi lun*, 91–6.

attention to some non-Western societies that could offer some food for thought. *The Decline of the West* was translated into different languages and became an instant best seller in Europe, catapulting the author from a little-known high school teacher to international fame and the rank of great cultural thinkers. The book became available to Chinese readers in 1922.¹⁷

World War I was exactly the kind of conflict that the Enlightenment had intended to prevent, but it came to pass and turned out to be a horror for liberals everywhere. China participated in the war on the side of the Allies in 1917, when hundreds of thousands of Europeans had already been killed and injured. This prompted some Chinese intellectuals to question what wealth and power really meant to humanity. As the war came to an end, Liang Qichao, once the leading publicist of Western ideas and now retired from politics but still standing as an elder statesman, highlighted its horrors and made its impact felt at home after his return from a tour of Europe in 1918–19 as a member of an unofficial delegation to the Paris Peace Conference.¹⁸ The politics of the conference aside, Liang found many Europeans disillusioned with their own civilization, causing him to think that the West, with its overweening belief in the omnipotence of science, had become too materialistic. Humankind, Liang thought, had not become happier but had met with abundant disasters during the past hundred years.¹⁹

Earlier, in a radical departure from traditional Chinese historiography, Liang had adopted in his treatise ‘New historiography’ (1902) a world-view firmly rooted in an evolutionary view of history based on the principle of causality. He was interested in writing a national history born of a philosophical impulse that reflected the Enlightenment tradition. After 1919, however, although his interest in a national history was undiminished, Liang began publishing a series of articles questioning the evolutionary view of history and characterizing Eastern civilization as spiritual and Western civilization as materialistic and, by implication, inferior.²⁰

¹⁷ Zhang Junmai introduced the book in an article published in the journal *Reconstruction* in January 1922 and mentioned it again in *Eastern Miscellany* in the following month.

¹⁸ Liang Qichao 梁启超, ‘Ouyou xinyinglu’ 欧游心影录, in *LQCQJ*, IV, 2968–78.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 2974.

²⁰ Liang’s 1921 treatise ‘Methods for the study of Chinese history’ was a repudiation of the social Darwinist theory of progress. See Axel Schneider, ‘The one and the many: a classicist reading of China’s tradition and its role in the modern world’, in *Zhongguo wenxue lishi yu sixing zhong de guannian bianqian guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 中国文学历史与思想中的观念变迁国际学术研讨会论文集, ed. Guoli Taiwan daxue wenxueyuan 国立台湾大学文学院编 (Taipei: Taiwan daxue wenxueyuan, 2005), 334–6.

He based his nationalism on a universal principle of progress, accepting and rejecting Enlightenment universalism simultaneously.²¹

This attitudinal change had much to do with his impressions of Europe during his recent tour. Liang recounted a meeting with the French idealist philosopher Émile Boutroux, who expressed deep admiration for Chinese philosophy. On another occasion, Liang met with a group of socialists in Paris and explained to them Confucius' sayings about 'all men being brothers within the four seas' and about the ancient 'well-field' system of communal ownership of land. On hearing that, the socialists rose to their feet, exclaiming, 'You Chinese really should be ashamed of yourselves! You have such valuable things at home and yet you hoard them up and don't share them with us!'²² Flattered, Liang came away more strongly convinced that the West was morally corrupt and degenerate. He felt that China, with a quarter of the world's population, had a responsibility to make a contribution to international culture. 'To shirk this responsibility is to do a disservice to our ancestors, to our fellow human beings and to ourselves. Our lovely youths, arise and march! Millions of people across the ocean are bewailing the bankruptcy of [their] material civilization. They are desperately crying out for help, waiting for you to save them!'²³ This message was laden with emotion, but Liang was correct in suggesting that Chinese civilization had something to teach the West, even though there was little chance that the West would heed it.²⁴

Liang was not alone in thinking that World War I exposed the weaknesses of Western civilization. Du Yaquan, the editor of the journal *Eastern Miscellany*, also believed that advances in science and technology and the relentless pursuit of materialism, wealth and power were the causes of

²¹ Xiaobing Tang, *Global Space and the Nationalist Discourse of Modernity: The Historical Thinking of Liang Qichao* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996), chap. 5.

²² Liang, 'Ouyou xinyinglu', *LQCQJ*, IV, 2974.

²³ *Ibid.*, 2987.

²⁴ It is worth noting Bertrand Russell's view that the distinctive merit of Chinese civilization was 'a just conception of the ends of life', in contrast with the scientific method that distinguished Western civilization. He wrote after World War I, 'The Great War showed that something is wrong with our civilization; . . . The Chinese have discovered, and have practised for many centuries, a way of life which, if it could be adopted by all the world, would make all the world happy. We Europeans have not. Our way of life demands strife, exploitation, restless change, discontent and destruction. Efficiency directed to destruction can only end in annihilation, and it is to this consummation that our civilization is tending, if it cannot learn some of that wisdom for which it despises the East.' See Bertrand Russell, *The Problem of China* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922), 17–18, 194.

great human misery in recent times. World War I debunked the myth that Western civilization could be relied on to wipe out human suffering.²⁵ Likewise, the constitutionalist Zhang Junmai, who had accompanied Liang on his European tour, perceived 'a cultural crisis' in postwar Europe.²⁶ He saw a downside to progress, which prompted him to stay in Germany for a year to study with the idealist and 1908 Nobel laureate in literature, Rudolph Eucken (1846–1926), and collaborate on a book attempting to synthesize the ethical and metaphysical ideas of China and the West.²⁷

Eucken represented a brand of philosophy that rejected intellectualism and abstruse speculation. A strident critic of naturalism, Eucken held that the soul of a human being distinguishes him or her from the rest of the natural world and that the soul cannot be explained only by reference to natural processes. He grounded his philosophy in actual human experience, maintaining that human beings are the meeting place of nature and spirit and that it is their duty and privilege to overcome their nonspiritual nature by incessant active striving after the spiritual life. Sometimes termed ethical activism, this pursuit involves all of the individual's faculties but especially requires effort of the will and intuition.²⁸

In 1922, Eucken was invited to visit China by Zhang Junmai. When he was unable to go, his disciple Hans Driesch (1867–1941) went instead, staying from October 1922 to July 1923. Driesch's advice on the need to hold steadfastly to the humanistic values of China's Buddhist and Confucian heritages reinforced the conservative stand against scientism.²⁹ His thought captured the attention of the native press, especially the *Eastern Miscellany*, which devoted a special issue (April 1923) to his works. It was no coincidence that the well-known science versus metaphysics controversy involving Zhang Junmai, Ding Wenjiang and others took place during Driesch's visit.

²⁵ Du Yaquan 杜亚泉, 'Zhanhou dongxi wenming zhi tiaohé' 战后东西文明之调和, in *DYQWC*, 345–50.

²⁶ Zhang Junmai 新张君劢, 'Ouzhou wenhua zhi weiji ji Zhongguo xinwenhua zhi quxiang' 欧洲文化之危机及中国新文化之趋向, *Dongfang zazhi* 东方杂志 19, 3 (February 1922): 121.

²⁷ Rudolph Eucken and Carsun Chang, *Das Lebensproblem in China und in Europa* (Leipzig: Verlag Quelle & Meyer, 1922).

²⁸ Stuart C. Brown et al. (eds.), *Biographical Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Philosophers* (London: Routledge Reference, 1996), 219.

²⁹ Guy A. Alitto, *The Last Confucian: Liang Shu-ming and the Chinese Dilemma of Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 98–100, 112; Lü Xichen 吕希晨 and Chen Ying 陈莹, *Zhang Junmai sixiang yanjiu* 张君劢思想研究 (Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chubanshe, 1996), 151–63.

Equally significant was the Vitalism and intuitionist philosophy of the leading French philosopher Henri Bergson (1859–1941), introduced to China in the late 1910s and early 1920s. His book *L'Évolution créatrice* (1907), the most widely known and discussed of his works, constitutes one of the most profound and original contributions to the philosophical consideration of the theory of evolution. It challenges Charles Darwin's view of natural selection. In Bergson's view, species do not change in order to compete with one another but are pushed continually to evolve on their own according to necessities. Evolution is not primarily explicable by adaptation to the environment; instead, it is truly creative, like the work of an artist, driven by a life force, *élan vital*. Bergson distinguished between instinct and intellect; the two are more or less separate but never wholly without each other.³⁰ His notion of *élan vital* held great appeal for those who took delight in the possibility of creative, self-generating change rather than change driven by fierce competition and the survival of the fittest.

The philosopher Zhang Dongsun (1886–1973) translated *L'Évolution créatrice* into Chinese in 1919.³¹ Zhang was struck by the idea that those who survive the competition for survival may not be the fittest, and that each species has its own basic instinct, its own drive for freedom and its own circumstances for continued existence. He followed Bergson in postulating that 'The instinct of life is extraordinarily rich and the parameters of its freedom are immense. . . . The myriad living things all have their own circumstances for advancement. They do not harm each other, nor do they make concessions toward one another.'³²

To these European influences was added New Humanism, initiated by Irving Babbitt (1865–1933), which had emerged as a modern literary and moral movement in the United States. A professor of French literature at Harvard University, a cultural critic and moralist, Babbitt held that a genuinely moral concern for others presupposes difficult self-discipline on the part of the bearer and a keen awareness of both

³⁰ Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy*, new edn. (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961), 758.

³¹ Zhang Dongsun's translated work is titled *Chuanghua lun (On Creative Evolution)*. In 1922, he went on to translate Bergson's *Matter and Memory*. See Wen-shun Chi, *Ideological Conflicts in Modern China: Democracy and Authoritarianism* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1986), 158; Zuo Yuhe 左玉河, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu sixiang pingzhuan* 张东荪学术思想评传 (Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 1999), 10.

³² Quoted in Jing Tsu, *Failure, Nationalism, and Literature* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2005), 208.

the lower and the higher potentialities in self and others.³³ In his most important work, *Rousseau and Romanticism* (1919), Babbitt criticized in depth various aspects of Romanticism. He rejected Rousseau's naturalism, a belief that people are naturally good but corrupted by society and flawed institutions. Instead, Babbitt emphasized the integrity of humanity, the importance of ethics and the need for a balance of development and normalcy of life. He strongly emphasized self-cultivation and self-restraint – that one should never deny oneself but should exercise the freedom of will in the highest sense. There is always a struggle between good and evil in the heart and mind of the individual; society and flawed institutions are not alone in corrupting humans. In this way, Babbitt brought a moral and cultural conservatism into the order of freedom. Russell Kirk calls it a 'critical conservatism'.³⁴

Babbitt was at odds with many of his contemporaries in American literature and scholarship. Yet he had some admirers among his students, including the poet T. S. Eliot and a number of Chinese, most notably Wu Mi, Mei Guangdi, Hu Xiansu, Liu Boming and Tang Yongtong, who would return to China to launch the conservative journal *Critical Review* (*Xueheng* 1922–33) in Nanjing. The avowed objectives of the journal were to 'spread the quintessence of native Chinese culture [and to] absorb new knowledge' in order to achieve a balance of Western culture and Chinese classical culture. It emphasized the need to 'express Western ideas using Chinese characters [classical Chinese as opposed to the vernacular]'.³⁵ Babbitt's New Humanism was given full expression in the pages of *Critical Review*. In 1929, one of his former students, Liang Shiqiu (1902–87), compiled a collection of Chinese writings on his works and published it through Shanghai's Crescent Bookshop.

The Critical Review Group was opposed to New Culture not because it was new but because of its romanticism, its utilitarianism and above all its iconoclasm.³⁶ Wu Mi (1894–1978), the leader of the group and a controversial figure (especially because of his private life), dismissed the vernacular as superficial, crude and unaesthetic.³⁷ He conceived of a

³³ For an introduction to Babbitt's life and work, see George A. Panichas and Claes G. Ryn (eds.), *Irving Babbitt in Our Time* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986).

³⁴ Kirk, *The Conservative Mind*, 415ff.

³⁵ *Xueheng* 学衡 1 (January 1922): 3.

³⁶ Schneider, 'The one and the many', 32. According to Schneider, there were three sub-groups: one focused on literature and literary criticism, another on historical geography and a third consisted of historians loosely associated with the group.

³⁷ Wu Mi 吴宓, 'Lun jinri wenxue chuanguang zhi zhengfa' 论今日文学创造之正法, *Xueheng* 15 (March 1923): 1–17.

philosophy of life in three spheres: a 'heavenly sphere', a 'human sphere' and a 'material sphere'. The heavenly sphere is the upper circle where Christianity, Buddhism and other universal religions belong. The material sphere is the lower circle where Western materialism and scientific culture belong. And the human sphere is the intermediate circle where Confucianism and Western classical humanism belong. In this perspective, the New Culture Movement belonged to the material sphere, which 'denigrated and forsook religion and morality'. Wu rejected the view that national essence had to be destroyed prior to Europeanization. Instead, he grounded cultural reconstruction in New Humanism, which had relevance to Chinese society because it was modern and fused with national essence.³⁸ He sought to resurrect and revitalize traditional values from a modern perspective.

The leading members of the Critical Review Group distinguished themselves from other conservatives by their very fine foreign education. Significantly, they did not maintain, as did Liang Qichao and Liang Shuming, that Euro-American culture was in crisis. What they sought was a constructive dialogue between East and West, or Sino-foreign cultural exchange, for they believed in the affinities between certain elements of traditional Chinese thought and elements of modern Western thought. Nowhere in their writings did they claim that Confucianism was a remedy to Western ills.³⁹

It is worth noting that, although the conservatives were disposed to claim the high moral-spiritual ground for Chinese culture, they gave a polite, cool reception to Rabindranath Tagore's visit in 1924. The 1913 Nobel laureate in literature, Tagore (1861–1941), went to China with a message that Asia's intellectual leaders should be linked in a united front for the revitalization of their common heritage of spirituality, peace-giving light and love. To Zhang Junmai, Liang Shuming and many others, Tagore's idea of Eastern spiritual civilization standing aloof from, and undefiled by, a materialistic West was unhelpful.⁴⁰

In sum, the conservative reaction to World War I, the appeal of European irrationalism and the attraction of New Humanism all combined to situate Chinese conservative thought in a global context, making it part of a worldwide revolt against the so-called 'rational consensus' but

³⁸ Wu Mi, 'Lun xinwenhua yundong' 论新文化运动, *Xueheng* 4 (April 1922): 20–1.

³⁹ Li Yi 李怡, 'Lun "Xuehengpai" yu wusi xinwenxue yundong' 论'学衡派'与五四新文学运动, *Zhongguo shehui kexue* 中国社会科学 6 (1998): 152–4; Schneider, 'The one and the many', 362.

⁴⁰ The only notable person who received the message with enthusiasm was Gu Hongming. See Stephen N. Hay, *Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China, and India* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), chap. 6.

not part of an antimodernization tide that had risen in the non-West. For all their differences, cultural conservatism and Westernized radicalism shared a concern with modernity. Whereas the Westernizers drew on Enlightenment thought, evolutionary theory, social Darwinism, pragmatism, empiricism and utilitarianism, the cultural conservatives drew on Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Bergson, Eucken, Driesch, Babbitt, Kant and Hegel. The contest between the two camps was as much a manifestation of the tensions within modernity itself (the divisions in Western thought) as it was a difference between Western and Chinese sensitivities. Faith in tradition, morality, humanism, family, community and religion was not peculiar to Chinese conservatism. In one form or another, it had been the central issue of conservatism in the West.

In questioning the monolithic claims of Enlightenment modernity and in promoting the national culture and traditional aesthetic categories, China's cultural conservatives call to mind the elite of nineteenth-century Czarist Russia, who mapped out a Russian route to cultural modernity by proposing a model emphasizing their nation's ability to absorb the best that other cultures had to offer as the basis for a universal, inclusive national culture. This cultural hermeneutic within the fold of the Russian 'national modern' propagated an image of Russia as 'a mediating civilization between East and West – and the belief that she has a special ability to appreciate all cultures, to absorb them without acting being a part of them', as well as developing the political-theological notion of Moscow as 'the third Rome'.⁴¹ At the same time, the intellectual movement of Slavophilism contended that Russia should rely on its own character and history to determine its future.⁴²

China's cultural conservatives did not want to remain indifferent to the West, as the Slavophiles did, nor did they claim that Chinese culture was unique. In their own way, some, most notably Liang Shuming, developed a notion of Easternization that placed Chinese culture in a global context.

Easternization: The Quest for Cultural Equality

Easternization (*dongfanghua*) was a post-World War I concept attributed to Liang Shuming in his book *Eastern and Western Cultures and Their*

⁴¹ Andrew Wachtel, 'Translation, imperialism, and national self-definition in Russia', in *Alternative Modernities*, ed. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001), 63–4, 77.

⁴² See Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*, trans. Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

Philosophies (1921). As the term was employed by other cultural conservatives, it acquired several shades of meaning. First, it denoted a state of being Eastern (or Asian in contemporary language) in the face of the Western challenge: To Easternize was to remain essentially Asian while making some necessary change on Western lines. Second, it meant the revival of Eastern cultures (read: Chinese culture), which had been undermined by the Western intrusion since the nineteenth century. Easternization raised the prospect of an Asian Renaissance (read: Chinese Renaissance). It denoted an historic, messianic movement to save the West from moral deficiencies and crass materialism, providing an antidote to the perceived ills of Western society. The cultural conservatives believed that many Europeans, especially Germans, had begun to take a great interest in Eastern cultures.⁴³ China had much to offer to the West in a cultural exchange. This mood was captured by the cultural historian Liu Yizheng, an associate of the Critical Review Group, in 1924, when he wrote that the current issue in Sino-Western cultural relations was not how the East was to Westernize but how Chinese culture was best introduced to the West.⁴⁴ This led to a third and most significant shade of meaning – Easternization as a quest for global recognition of the universalism of a reinvigorated Confucianism, best explained by Liang Shuming.

Self-taught in philosophy, Liang Shuming was the son of a low-ranking late Qing official, Liang Ji, who had committed suicide in 1918. A brilliant man, the young Liang was appointed to the Beida faculty at age twenty-seven, quickly establishing himself as a savant and popular professor. He catapulted to fame with his book *Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies*. In this work, Liang put forth a theory that China, India and the West had evolved three different cultural types that represented three different attitudes (*taidu*), or ‘directions’ of the Will (*yiyu*, which is akin to Schopenhauer’s concept of the Will). The first type, represented by the West, had as its fundamental spirit the Will to move continuously forward. It was a progressive attitude and way of life, characterized by a will to dominate and conquer the world of nature, hence the development of science and democracy. The second type, represented by India, tended to look to the past and to withdraw from the world. The third type,

⁴³ Zheng Dahua 郑大华, ‘Diyici shijie dazhan dui zhanhou (1918–1927) Zhongguo sixiang wenhua de yingxiang’ 第一次世界大战对战后 (1918–1927) 中国思想文化的影响, in *Xifang sixiang zai jindai Zhongguo* 西方思想在近代中国, eds. Zheng Dahua and Zou Xiaozhan 邹小站 (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2005), 164–6.

⁴⁴ Liu Yizheng 柳怡徵, ‘Zhongguo wenhua xibi zhi shangque’ 中国文化西彼之商榷, *Xueheng* 学衡 27 (1924): 1–7.

represented by the Chinese, was guided by a principle of balance and harmony focusing on the inner world. In this comparative perspective, Westerners had an optimistic belief in progress and in a rational calculation focusing on the external world, whereas both China and India were inactive, lagging behind the West in development. Liang asserted that philosophically, Western life exercised the intellect through intuition; Chinese life exercised intuition through the intellect; and Indian life expressed sensation through the intellect. (These are questionable assertions.) He rejected the Indian view of life and accepted Western culture, but not without criticism. At the same time, he thought it important to reflect on China's cultural heritage to salvage it for modern use.

Liang's book has been extensively studied elsewhere.⁴⁵ For my purpose here, I am only interested in his ideas about Easternization, which provided a frame of reference within which to describe cultural China and its relation to the West. To Easternize was to remain Confucian. (Liang dismissed Indian culture as an undesirable path for humanity and saw Japan as already a Westernized state.) In Liang's view, the real issue in the cultural debate was not whether the West was different and superior to the East but whether Chinese culture was in danger of extinction in the face of Westernization. To survive, Chinese culture must be revived.⁴⁶ That was the first step. The next step was to promote it around the world. 'Can Easternization be given a new lease of life (*fanshen*)?' Liang asked and went on to explain what *fanshen* meant and what it would lead to:

Here, *fanshen* means that not only will Chinese still Easternize, but renewed Easternization will be exactly like Westernization, that is, *a world culture*. Currently, the so-called science and 'democracy' in Westernization are the two things that no people on earth can do without. Thus, put bluntly, the question now is whether Easternization can renew itself and become *a world culture*? If Easternization cannot become *a world culture*, it cannot exist fundamentally. And if it survives, not only does it apply to China but it must become *a world culture* [emphasis added].⁴⁷

The emphasis on a world culture underscored a global (*shijie* in Liang's words) question that concerned Confucianism as being of universal significance. In the face of the Western challenge, Liang was anxious to

⁴⁵ For criticisms of the book, see Alitto, *The Last Confucian*, chap. 5.

⁴⁶ Liang Shuming 梁漱溟, 'Dongxi wenhua ji qi zhexue daoyan' 东西文化及其哲学导言, in *LSMQJ*, I, 256, 261–2.

⁴⁷ Liang Shuming, 'Dongxi wenhua ji qi zhexue' 东西文化及其哲学, in *LSMQJ*, I, 338.

revitalize Confucianism and claim its stake in the world. He was pro-Confucian rather than anti-Western. In the New Culture Movement, he sided with Chen Duxiu in embracing science and democracy.⁴⁸ He was cognizant of some of the momentous changes that had taken place in Western Europe – the shift from laissez-faire economics to social concerns in economic life, from pedagogy (epistemology) to the emotions in psychology and from an overweening belief in reason to idealist philosophies.⁴⁹

One notes the tension in Liang's cultural thought – his acknowledgement, on one hand, of Western culture as the world culture by virtue of its superiority in science and democracy, and his belief, on the other, in reviving the 'original Chinese attitude' (i.e., 'authentic' Confucianism), with its emphasis on benevolence (*ren*), human feelings, rites and music and on the Confucian tenets of strength and resoluteness (*gang*).⁵⁰ That was what China had to offer the world, he thought. Easternization was not at odds with science and democracy. Liang saw that both East and West were changing: China, driven by the imperatives of national survival, was turning to reason to observe outer matters and to learn about democracy, individualism and functional and structural differentiations; in the West, such thinkers as Bergson, Eucken, Bertrand Russell (1872–1970) and John Dewey (1859–1952) were expressing a need to turn to moral institutions, study the inner life and develop a stronger culture of rites and music in search of an antidote to crass materialism.⁵¹

The West had subjugated nature and conquered the environment, but it had yet to improve community life and achieve spirituality. In his critique of the West, Liang was able to invoke Western critics against the West itself. In claiming that the West was Easternizing to correct its bias towards 'exteriority', the 'material' and the 'flesh', he was in fact stating that Westerners could understand themselves better by understanding 'authentic' Confucianism. Liang was anticipating a reverse process of assimilation because the West had quite as much to learn from China as China did from the West.⁵² He did not claim that Chinese culture was

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 531–2.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 488–505.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 537–9.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 401–7.

⁵² Bertrand Russell expressed a similar view in *The Problem of China*, 197–8, 'I think contact between East and West is likely to be fruitful to both parties. They may learn from us the indispensable minimum of practical efficiency, and we may learn from them something of that contemplative wisdom which has enabled them to persist while all the other nations of antiquity have perished.'

unique, unlike the protagonists of Japan's new culturalism of the 1930s.⁵³ But he did proclaim the universalism of Confucianism. Easternization was on an equal footing with Westernization, in Liang's view. It was a challenge to the Eurocentric view of modern culture.

In any event, East and West must meet and interact. Although Liang rejected cultural blending categorically in the preface to *Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies* on the grounds that East and West reflected different directions of the Will, at the end of the book he unwittingly arrived at an entirely different conclusion: that East and West were, after all, complementary.⁵⁴

To critics, however, Easternization was reactionary, unscientific and Sinocentric. How could Chinese culture make a contribution to the world when it could not even save China itself? Wu Zhihui dismissed it as 'the sort of talk that would spell disaster, and even destruction, to the nation', and Chen Duxiu denounced its exponents as 'more detestable and more harmful' than the militarists Cao Kun and Wu Peifu.⁵⁵ What critics failed to see were the universalistic aspirations of Easternization that were part of global modernity.

Central Themes of the Conservative Counter-Discourse

In addition to Easternization, the conservative counter-discourse focused on a number of central themes. In this section, I confine myself to discussing three of those themes, namely, the old–new dichotomy, the science–religion divide and the science–philosophy of life binary. I will also look at the question of how Confucian thought could be adapted to meet China's modern needs.

Inherent in the idea of modernity is a contrast between the old and the new. Abraham Lincoln once inquired about conservatism, 'Is it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried?'⁵⁶ The

⁵³ Many Japanese intellectuals claimed that Japanese culture was exceptional, unique and qualified to assume leadership in Asia and 'to lead the world to a higher level of cultural synthesis that surpassed Western modernism itself'. See Tetsuo Najita and H. D. Harootunian, 'Japanese revolt against the West: political and cultural criticism in the twentieth century', in *The Cambridge History of Japan*, vol. 6, eds. John W. Hall et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 712.

⁵⁴ Liang, 'Dongxi wenhua ji qi zhexue', 338–43, 539–40.

⁵⁵ Quoted in Zhang Qing 章青, 'Hu Shi pai xuerenqun' yu xiandai Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi '胡适派学人群' 与现代中国自由主义 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004), 409.

⁵⁶ Quoted in Kirk, *The Conservative Mind*, 8.

answer is yes, but it is more complex, for past and present are ineluctably intertwined. To discuss the question of the old and the new is to discuss the tradition–modernity binary. The conservatives acknowledged the binary, only to transcend it. Here, the view of Du Yaquan is illuminating. Debating Chen Duxiu in 1918 in the pages of *New Youth* and *Eastern Miscellany*, Du argued that, although Eastern and Western civilizations were fundamentally different, they were not diametrically opposed but reconcilable. He had come around to Hegel's notion of the 'new age' and acknowledged that *shidai* (the age) was the defining factor in modernity. The relationship between old and new, then, is an historical one. It is a question of time, which is to say that the two are historical categories with meanings that vary over time. Du cited the ideas that were new during the 'Hundred Days' Reform' but that became fairly old after World War I: In 1898, new thought meant 'imitating Western civilization' and old thought meant 'holding steadfastly to China's old habits', but their meanings had changed since:

What is old and new today is very different from what it was in the Hundred Days. Considering this carefully, [I have to say that] the new thought of modern times seeks change to our inherent ancestral civilization (*guyou wenming*) through the scientific method without advocating stubborn conservatism. And it seeks extensive assimilation of Western civilization but not wholesale imitation. Judged by the thought of the Hundred Days, [we are now] neither old nor new but somewhere in between.⁵⁷

Disillusionment resulting from World War I led Du to rethink the idea of modernity. He came to judge new thought by its capacity to 'create a future civilization' and regarded old thought as 'maintaining the modern civilization'.⁵⁸ Du was looking to the future at the same time that he felt obligations to the past and present. He believed that modern Western civilization, based on liberal capitalism, was no longer suited to the new age because it was unsustainable and soon would be replaced (presumably by socialism). The West had no monopoly on a new civilization. China had a role to play in its creation and indeed a responsibility. In any event, old thought could not remain unchanged. In appropriating Western ideas, new thought did not mean a total break with Eastern thought. Old and new is a matter of degree, determined by

⁵⁷ Du Yaquan, 'Xinjiu sixiang zhi zhezong' 新旧思想之折衷, in *DYQWC*, 402.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 401.

the extent of knowledge and by the strength of feelings about different matters.⁵⁹

Du disagreed with the American-trained educator Jiang Menglin (1886–1964), better known in English as Chiang Menlin (Ph.D. Columbia University), on this issue. Jiang's view was that new thought meant a new, progressive attitude, and old thought a reaction against it.⁶⁰ Du, drawing a distinction between attitude and thought, argued that attitude is 'exterior' – that is, an expression of feelings (*ganxing*), whereas thought is 'interior' – that is, an expression of reason (*lixing*). New thought is new where it introduces a new relationship between matters or between concepts. For example, democracy is new in relation to the notion of universal kingship; evolutionary theory is new in relation to creation theory; and socialism is new in relation to capitalism.⁶¹ Du would accept new thought not for novelty's sake but for its rationale and content. Socialism was a new thought to him because it featured mutual aid as a means of achieving progress.⁶²

The old–new relationship is one of 'inheritance and continuity'. Du explained:

This [notion of inheritance and continuity, *jiexu zhuyi*] implies development and progress on one hand and conservation on the other. Inheritance and continuity mean connecting the old with the new. Conservation without development and progress is stagnation. . . . It is sheer stubbornness. . . . Development and progress without conservation, and breaking the links with the old, would only shake the state to its foundations.⁶³

This notion was echoed by the cultural conservative Zhang Shizhao (1881–1973), one of the most influential political thinkers in the early Republican era. Initially trained as a classical scholar, Zhang had spent three years (1908–11) in Scotland and Germany studying Western political thought, a combination that placed him in an excellent position to evaluate the thought and institutions of China and the West. In 1913, Zhang was involved in the so-called Second Revolution, the failure of which forced him to flee to Tokyo, where in 1914 he founded the critical journal *Jiayin zazhi* (English title *The Tiger*) with the object of analysing the political condition of China. In 1917, he returned

⁵⁹ Du Yaquan, 'Zailun xinjiu sixiang zhi chongtu' 再论新旧思想之冲突, in *DYQWC*, 354.

⁶⁰ Jiang Menglin 蒋梦麟, 'Xinjiu yu tiaohé' 新旧与调和, in *DYQWC*, 412–14.

⁶¹ Du Yaquan, 'Hewei xinsixiang' 何谓新思想, in *DYQWC*, 408–11.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 410.

⁶³ Du Yaquan, 'Jiexu zhuyi' 接续主义, in *DYQWC*, 13.

home to take up a teaching position at Beida, where he relaunched *The Tiger*.⁶⁴

Zhang Shizhao defended tradition with a view of history that considers each new age as the inheritor of the one preceding it, which continues into the next. The 'new age' is an historical concept and not a sudden phenomenon arising from nowhere. To Zhang, progress is neither linear nor timeless but a combination of the old and the new. The traditional periodization of world history into the ancient, the Middle Ages and the modern is arbitrary and an expression of historical contingencies because the dividing line between one age and another can never be clearly drawn.⁶⁵ In emphasizing historical continuities, Zhang pointed to a modernity that did not require a rupture with the past.

For others, such as Wu Mi, it is not always easy to determine absolutely what is old and new. Some things never change, for example, 'heavenly principles' (*tianli*) and human relations (*renqing*); others change all the time in cycles according to universal patterns, such as the climate, rains, clouds and the rainbows; still others change only on the surface. It is rare to find things that are absolutely new, that did not grow out of the old or built on it. More often than not, things have an ephemeral nature, being new one day and old the next. It is therefore unhelpful to categorize things as either 'good' or 'bad'. Instead of harping on the old-new binary, Wu thought it was important to reform and improve the old to make progress. Human achievements were the result of historical processes and accumulated knowledge.⁶⁶

Central to conservative thinking was an appreciation of the process of constant interactions between the past, present and future. The conservatives deconstructed tradition in a modern context rather than abstractly inherited it. For them, tradition was reproduced not for its own sake but to explore new possibilities, and as such, it was a rich resource on which to draw for a cultural construction of modernity.

Another theme relates to the relationship between science and religion. Science was viewed by the New Culture proponents as a weapon with which to combat superstition and as a means of understanding the world as it is. Religion, on the other hand, underscored the identity crisis faced by the new intellectuals, one brought about by the crumbling of the traditional worldview and way of life, of traditional symbols, values

⁶⁴ For a biography of Zhang, see Bai Ji'an 白吉庵, *Zhang Shizhao zhuan* 章士钊传 (Beijing: Zuojia chubanshe, 2004).

⁶⁵ Zhang Shizhao 章士钊, 'Xinshidai zhi qingnian' 新时代之青年, in *ZSZQJ*, IV, 109–10.

⁶⁶ Wu, 'Lun xinwenhua yundong', 3.

and beliefs, as well as by the introduction of an array of foreign ideas. Hao Chang has examined this crisis in terms of moral (or value), existential and metaphysical disorientations in relation to the rise of New Confucianism.⁶⁷ The cultural conservatives believed that only when a view of life with meaning is found can one absorb and assimilate the spirit of science and democracy. Such a life is at once spiritual, aesthetic and materialistic, combining Confucian humanism with the progressive optimism of the West. In their view, reconstructing a new Chinese *Weltanschauung* and a new *Lebensanschauung* was a possibility.

New Culture radicals pitted science against religion. Chen Duxiu dismissed Christianity as superstitious and a hindrance to scientific development and human progress.⁶⁸ Hu Shi, proclaiming himself an atheist, put forth a scientific view of life based on pragmatism.⁶⁹ The conservatives came to religion's defence as a spiritual resource and an essential part of human life. Du Yaquan, coming from a scientific background, considered religion as important as science – the two meet different needs in life. He predicted a religious revival in the West in the imminent future:

The scientific thought of today derived from Greek thought and had since developed to the extreme, resulting in wars. . . . There is a pattern that every time human power triumphs in the natural world, religious thought is weakened, and yet when religion is in the doldrums, it is bound to resurge. Therefore, the next era will see a revival of Hebrew thought, paralleling the historic era of the Renaissance.⁷⁰

Du felt certain that science was no substitute for religion; the two must go hand in hand as integral parts of a proper philosophy of life. Likewise, Liang Shuming felt that human beings need religion for their psychological and emotional comfort and for dealing with the problems of existence that the intellect is helpless to explain.⁷¹ Wu Mi regarded religion as the highest achievement of civilization and worried about its decline in the face of the scientific advance.⁷² His conception of religion was at once moralistic and humanistic:

The function of religion is to cultivate the self and to render it modest and humble. Those who are modest and humble from the bottom of their

⁶⁷ Hao Chang, 'New Confucianism and the intellectual crisis of contemporary China', in *The Limits of Change*, ed. Furth, 276–83.

⁶⁸ Chen Duxiu 陈独秀, 'Jidujiao yu mixin guishen' 基督教与迷信鬼神, in *DXWC*, 555.

⁶⁹ Hu Shi 胡适, 'Kexue yu renshengguan xu' 科学与人生观序, in *HSWJ*, III, 151–65.

⁷⁰ Du, 'Zhanhou dongxi wenming zhi tiaohu', 349.

⁷¹ Liang, 'Dongxi wenhua ji qi zhexue', 417.

⁷² Wu Mi, 'Wo zhi renshengguan' 我之人生观, *Xueheng* 16 (April 1923): 3–4.

hearts can be said to be religious believers even if they burn no incense, read no Sutras and never pray. Only a person of modesty and humility can exercise self-restraint. And those who are incapable of self-restraint can expect no moral achievements. Modesty and humility are the fundamentals of religion, and self-restraint is the source of morality.⁷³

Wu Mi believed in the dualism of human nature: People are neither innately good nor innately evil but are both good and evil. He grounded this dualism in morality, there being two parts to the soul: reason and impulse. The individual exercises the freedom of the will, which is, however, accompanied by a 'will to refrain' (Wu's English). Individuals choose between good and evil and take responsibility for their choices.⁷⁴ Wu's New Humanism underscored what the nineteenth-century French thinker Auguste Comte called 'the religion of humanity' in his book *The System of Positive Polity* (1851–4). This was important in the new age of science, in which theology and metaphysics were set aside in order to look at the positive facts of society – the world as it is.

In correcting the antireligious bias of the Westernized radicals, the cultural conservatives made an important contribution to the philosophical discourse of modernity. Chen Duxiu felt compelled to acknowledge that Christianity was 'a religion of love and humanity'. He even called for the 'exalted, great personality' of Jesus Christ and His 'warm and profound feelings' to be 'deeply infused into the Chinese blood', and he acknowledged that Christianity was 'a very great awakening' in Chinese society.⁷⁵ Also, Hu Shi, for all his appeal to critical reason and a scientific view of life, spoke philosophically of a new religion based on humanism: his theory of social immortality, which will be described in Chapter 4.

At the same time, there were questions about the philosophy of life, brought into sharp relief in the well-known science versus metaphysics controversy of 1923. This controversy was triggered by Zhang Junmai in a lecture delivered at Beijing's Qinghua College on 14 February. To comprehend Zhang's position, it is necessary to understand what he termed 'different levels of knowledge'. Zhang identified three categories of knowledge: science (both natural and physical), philosophy and metaphysics (including religion). Science and philosophy are not in the same category, nor are science and metaphysics; therefore, *Lebensanschauung*

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 11–14.

⁷⁵ Chen Duxiu, 'Jidujiao yu Zhongguoren' 基督教与中国人, in *DXWC*, 280.

is separate and distinct from science.⁷⁶ Zhang's debate with Ding Wenjiang was basically a matter of opposing science to metaphysics, physics to psychology and reason to intuition. The important point here is that Zhang defended the autonomy of value.

Revisiting the controversy, Wang Hui has analysed Zhang's thought on three levels: on the first, knowledge is separate from culture; on the second, morality and aesthetics are separate from science; and on the third, each domain of knowledge has a relation to the social system. In Wang's analysis, the controversy was located within the knowledge category, indicating an 'epistemology turn' in the discourse on modernity. The question for Zhang Junmai was whether morality and aesthetics belong to the science domain or to the *Lebensanschauung* domain. To answer this question, Zhang took as his point of departure personal autonomy and one's inner world, which, however, is not to be confused with the atomistic view of the individual. The meaning of life, the roots of morality and the autonomy of the emotions no longer rest on cultural values and institutions alone; the secret lies in social science, where psychology, ethics and aesthetics belong, as distinct from natural and physical science. When knowledge is no longer seen as an appendage to culture, its autonomy is recognized as having its own concerns, language and logic. Adherence to morality is no longer a cultural question, for morality is autonomous within the realm of knowledge in social science.⁷⁷ Wang notes that substituting epistemology for culture implies that the questions facing humanity are universal; solving them requires methods and language that are universal.⁷⁸

What this means, as I interpret it, is that Zhang Junmai's *Lebensanschauung* is a universal concept, and his thoughts on science are not reducible to a reason-irrationality dichotomy. In opposing empiricism, Zhang accepted Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, which states that basic principles such as cause and effect can be derived without relying on empirical knowledge because there are synthetic *a priori* truths. He followed Kant's argument that pure reason leads to fallacies and that the only correct use of reason is directed to moral ends.⁷⁹ A critic of the Enlightenment

⁷⁶ Zhang Junmai, 'Wo zhi zhexue sixiang' 我之哲学思想, in *Zhongxiyin zhexue wenji* 中西印哲学文集, 2 vols., ed. Cheng Wenxi 程文熙 (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuzhu, 1981), vol. I, 37.

⁷⁷ Wang Hui, *Xiandai Zhongguo sixiang de xingqi* 现代中国思想的兴起, 4 vols. (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2004.), vol. I, part II, 1334-7.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 1339-40.

⁷⁹ He Xinquan 何信全, *Ruxue yu xiandai minzhu: dangdai xinrujia zhengzhi zhexue yanjiu* 儒学与现代民主: 当代新儒家政治哲学研究 (Taipei: Zhongyan yanjiuyuan Zhongguo wenzhesuo, 1996), 137-8; Zhang Rulun 张汝伦, 'Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi shang de Zhang

from within, Zhang rejected Hu Shi's idea of a scientific view of life but endorsed his call for the 'transvaluation of all values'. In Zhang's 'reflective thinking' (his English), science is not exempt from reevaluation:

We should not merely accept what science in the West gives us just because of its achievements; we must also be prepared to think critically about science and about all its assumptions. . . . I urge our scientists to be like Newton, Einstein and Darwin – that is, to engage in autonomous scientific thinking rather than passively driven by [existing] scientific thought.⁸⁰

As the cultural debate continued in the 1930s, a question arose for the conservatives: How was Confucian thought to be adapted to a modern China? Liang Shuming's answer was imprecise. It was Zhang Dongsun who, in 1935, confronted this question from the standpoint of a cultural conservative and scholar of Western thought. Zhang refused to accept that East and West were simply a difference in time, arguing instead that it was, intellectually, a difference in kind. East and West differed in their modes of thinking: One grew out of the Greco-Hebrew traditions that led to advances in science and a fanatical belief in religion and the other out of a philosophy of life in which politics, economics and law were subsumed. From the outset, the dominant theme of Confucianism was how to be a person (*zuoren*), proper in thought and in behaviour, hence the idea of self-cultivation (*xiushen*), followed by putting one's house in order (*qijia*), then running the state (*zhiguo*) and ultimately achieving world peace (*pingtianxia*). In Confucian thought, there was little talk about politics and economics. Whereas Western thought was immersed in methods, especially the scientific method, Chinese thought was immersed in principles (*daoli*). The trouble with Confucius (c. 551–479 BC), argued Zhang, was that he said little about political systems; as a result, his thought was often used by autocrats to maintain their power and vested interests. Confucius' moral and ethical thought was nearly utopian. He opposed misrule, yet he did not oppose the autocratic dynastic tradition. 'How is modern China to learn from Confucius?' Zhang asked. His answer was to cherish the Confucian spirit and hold on to Confucius' ideas about how to be a proper person but to confront questions about politics and economics in a European fashion. In this way,

Junmai' 中国现代思想史上的张君勱, in *Ershi shiji Zhongguo sixiangshilun* 二十世纪中国思想史论, 2 vols., ed. Xu Jilin 许纪霖 (Shanghai: Dongfang chubanshe, 2000), vol. II, 149.

⁸⁰ Zhang Junmai, 'Renshengguan lunzhan zhi huigu' 人生观论战之回顾, in *Zhongxiyin zhhexue wenji*, ed. Cheng, vol. II, 1003.

there could be no dichotomy between Chinese and Western learning.⁸¹ In other words, Zhang sought a fusion of Confucian humanism and Western politics and economics. In the context of the 1930s, Zhang was criticizing Hu Shi's view that China was inferior to the West in every respect, Chen Xujing's advocacy of total Westernization and the Nationalist government's Respect Confucius and Study the Classics Movement, which appeared to him to be treating Chinese traditions like antiques in a museum.

Tiaohelun: The Doctrine of Mediation and Harmony

Tiaohelun as a modern doctrine was first developed in the 1910s by Zhang Shizhao, Du Yaquan and others. Yet it had long roots tracing back to ancient times. Philosophically, the idea of *tiaohe* is based on a set of principles derived from the ancient notions of harmony in the One Universe, of the union and synthesizing of opposites, of maintaining equilibriums and proportions. It is assumed that the world is one yet diverse, that change is accompanied by stability and that there is unity between East and West. Associated with this is the *yin-yang* metaphysics, which represents all of the opposite elements in the universe. Additionally, the Chinese classic *Zhongyong* (*Doctrine of the Mean*) preaches a practical philosophy of life that is not uniquely Chinese. The ancient Greek philosophers Socrates (c. 470–399 BC), Plato (c. 428–348 BC) and Aristotle (384–322 BC) also opposed moving towards the extreme.⁸²

The *yin-yang* metaphysics is an expression of 'having it both ways' (*jianliang*), as articulated by the philosopher Xunzi (c. 300–230 BC), who held that nothing on earth is perfect, complete or entirely satisfactory and that everything is only part of the whole and represents a bias. People see what they want to see.⁸³ Again, this philosophy is not uniquely Chinese. The Greek philosopher Heraclitus (c. 535–475 BC), too, understood the universe as one and dynamic, maintaining a view of the mingling of opposites.⁸⁴ In this perspective, the world is diverse,

⁸¹ Zhang Dongxun 张东荪, 'Xiandai de Zhongguo zenyang yao xue Kongzi' 现代的中国怎样要学孔子, in *Zhishi yu wenhua: Zhang Dongsun wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 知识与文化: 张东荪文化论著辑要, ed. Zhang Yaonan 张耀南 (Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995), 404–13.

⁸² Russell, *History of Western Philosophy*, 186.

⁸³ Cited in Guo Huaqing 郭华清, *Kuanrong yu tuoxie: Zhang Shizhao de tiaohelun yanjiu* 宽容与妥协: 章士钊的调和论研究 (Tianjin: Tianjin guji chubanshe, 2004), 96.

⁸⁴ Russell, *History of Western Philosophy*, 62.

yet there is unity formed by the combination of opposites, producing a motion of harmony.

Tiaohelun has its modern philosophical underpinnings. Modern life is a balancing act of spirituality against materialism, liberty against restraint, self-interest against the public good, sense against sensibility, reason against emotions, science against religion and so forth. It is a good life when the balance is right and a bad life when the balance is wrong. This philosophy of life is particularly pertinent to modern times, in which people are at war with themselves and among one another, as Bertrand Russell illustrated in his book *Principles of Social Reconstruction* (1917).

Culturally, *tiaohelun* represents a kind of syncretism that is often the result of East–West encounters. According to Edward Shils, ‘When the center of one country expands into another country it encounters an established society with its own traditions. The tenacity of tradition is exemplified very well by the high degree of impermeability of large parts of these indigenous cultures. Except in scientific knowledge, syncretism is the furthest point reached in the movement of traditions.’⁸⁵ Chinese conservatives were disposed towards syncretism, or cultural eclecticism (*wenhua zhezong*), through selective borrowing, which was neither conservative nor limited to China. As Alitto points out, ‘In the West, too, religious thinkers and political movements have selectively borrowed foundations and scaffolding for their theories and programs.’ It was only the Chinese intellectuals’ ‘spotty understanding of the West and its intellectual history’ that made their eclectic borrowings appear strange to people in the West.⁸⁶

Seen in this light, *tiaohelun* stands for a dialectical renewal of Chinese culture. Appropriating Western ideas and preserving the best of Chinese traditions are not contradictory, a point made with particular force by Wu Mi:

If we want to create a new Chinese culture, we must take the best of Chinese and Western civilizations, synthesize them and render them fully communicable. Our country’s academic works, morality, art and literature, rules and regulations, both past and present, all should be studied, preserved, promoted and illuminated. And so be those of the West, translated, studied, absorbed, understood and utilized.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Edward Shils, *Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 253–4.

⁸⁶ Alitto, *The Last Confucian*, 107–8.

⁸⁷ Wu, ‘Lun xinwenhua yundong’, 14.

Defending cultural autonomy, Wu echoed Babbitt's view that 'in seeking progress, China must not throw the baby out of the bath water'.⁸⁸

A similar argument was made by fellow Critic Review Group member Mei Guangdi (1890–1945), a professor of literature at Nanjing's Southeast University:

To reform the inherent ancestral culture (*guyou wenhua*) and to absorb other cultures, we need to study all of them thoroughly and make our own judgments clearly and accurately. Add to this a precise and correct procedure and the efforts of hundreds of learned scholars who understand both East and West, and a new climate in which to educate our people is created. Only then [can we] expect great achievements in forty or fifty years.⁸⁹

Mei's aim was to achieve a higher Sino-Western synthesis first by purifying the two-thousand-year-old Confucian tradition and then by firmly grasping European learning at its roots.⁹⁰ Mei told Hu Shi, once regarded as a friend but then (in the 1920s) estranged, that old Chinese texts ought to be studied afresh by following Western systems of organizing areas of human knowledge like literature, philosophy and law.⁹¹

The conservatives were capable of engaging the modernists. They took pains to show that a salutary tradition could come from the cultural heritage and that affirming the past was not antimodern. What was important was to foster a new spirit. Zhang Junmai wrote in 1922, 'I think China's old culture is rotten to the extreme. It needs an injection of foreign blood to cleanse it. Thus, such elements in Western *Lebensanschauung* as the spirit of individual autonomy, political democracy and the scientific method should be fully imported; otherwise, Chinese culture would be devoid of vitality.'⁹²

When the cultures of East and West met, the result was not the substitution of the superior for the inferior, as Chen Xujing viewed it, but intercultural transformations. This affirmative attitude is exemplified by the distinguished scholar Wang Guowei (1877–1927), a pioneer in fields as diverse as philosophy, aesthetics, literary criticism, Chinese ancient

⁸⁸ Hu Xiansu 胡先肃 (trans.), 'Bai Bide Zhongxi renwen jiaoyutan' 白璧德中西人文教育, *Xueheng* 3 (March 1922): 4.

⁸⁹ Mei Guangdi 梅光迪, 'Ping tichang xinwenhuazhe' 评提倡新文化者, *Xueheng* 1 (January 1922): 7.

⁹⁰ Yü Ying-shih, 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment: a historian's reflections on the May Fourth movement', in *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, ed. Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and Oldřich Král (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 315.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² Zhang, 'Ouzhou wenhua zhi weiji', 121–2.

history, epigraphy and philology. Influenced by Kant, Schiller, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, Wang believed in the universal nature of all forms of learning. He sought truth from facts by scientific analysis, investigating ideas from different points of view, and he refused to make a distinction between Chinese and Western learning and between modern and classical learning because there is only learning (*xue wu Zhongxi*). Wang did not worry that the flourishing of Western culture in China would impede the evolution of Chinese culture or vice versa. He maintained, 'Chinese and Western studies par excellence can interact on [sic] and promote each other to the extent that they thrive and decline in a synchronous fashion. That is to say, one cannot do without the other in terms of their respective rise and fall. This is especially so in the case of the contemporary world and learning.'⁹³ Striding two cultures, Wang employed a notion of intercultural transformation to probe questions of human nature, principle and fate.⁹⁴

The historian Chen Yinke (1890–1969), who was associated with the Cultural Review Group, believed that Sino-foreign cultural exchange offered the best guarantee for preserving the core of Chinese cultural identity. Born into a gentry family, Chen initially trained as a classical scholar before studying in Japan, Germany, Switzerland, France and the United States (at Harvard University, where he met Wu Mi). Hailed by Yü Ying-shih as 'one of the most important Chinese historians of the twentieth century', 'talented and profoundly learned' and 'a legend', Chen was a classical linguist with a knowledge of Greek, Latin, Sanskrit and some Central Asian languages as well as Mongolian, Tibetan, Manchu and Persian. As a student abroad for more than a decade, Chen had a profound understanding of Western classical culture, having read the poetry of Homer, the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle and the works of Cicero, among others. As an historian, Chen showed an extraordinary command of Chinese sources, placing issues at the centre of his historical inquiries. An authority on the history of the Sui and the Tang, Chen was the only Chinese historian of his day capable of comprehending the rise and fall of the Tang Dynasty (618–907) from a socioeconomic perspective.⁹⁵

⁹³ Cited in Keping Wang, 'Wang Guowei: philosophy of criticism', in *Contemporary Chinese Philosophy*, ed. Chung-ying Cheng and Nicholas Bunnin (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 40–1.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ Yü Ying-shih, 'Chen Yinke de xueshu jingshen he wannian xinjing' 陈寅恪的学术精神和晚年心境, in Yü Ying-shih, *Xiandai weiji yu sixiang renwu* 现代危机与思想人物 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2005), 361–73.

Culturally, Chen was convinced that Confucian morality was relevant to modern times. He acknowledged the fundamental difference between China and the West and stressed China's cultural particularity and 'national spirit', but he also placed all cultures on an equal footing, rejecting suggestions that there were absolute values that constituted the norms for cultural comparisons. To Chen, there was no question of an unchanging national essence.⁹⁶

Tiaohelun is imbued with a belief in intellectual, social and political pluralism. Liang Qichao reconciled his ideas of morality and free will with scientific reason and evolutionary theory,⁹⁷ and more broadly, he had faith in the reconciliation of individualism, socialism, nationalism and cosmopolitanism.⁹⁸ Du Yaquan viewed science and morality as of equal importance: One improves the material life and the other sustains the spiritual life.⁹⁹ Morality is not at odds with the survival of the fittest. Du discovered in Herbert Spencer a strand of thought that views social cooperation and mutual aid as a characteristic of human progress. The survival of the fittest was not the whole of evolutionism.¹⁰⁰

Politically, *tiaohelun* preaches compromise and toleration. Du's reading of political developments in Europe led him to three general conclusions: 1) No single ideology contains everything, and different ideologies coexist to the benefit of one another; 2) there is always some common ground shared by competing ideologies, and differences do not exclude the possibility of a synthesis; and 3) ideologies, being the products of the human mind, have no natural boundaries, and thinking people do interact with one another.¹⁰¹ Conflict of ideas is inevitable, but progress grows from it when the conflict is resolved. It is important that people are open-minded and do not exclude dissenting views or insist on theirs to the extreme.¹⁰² Du was clear that belief in nonviolence and compromise was a feature of *tiaohe* thought.¹⁰³

This belief was shared by Zhang Shizhao. In 1914, Zhang published an article titled 'The foundations of politics' in the inaugural issue of the journal *The Tiger*. He began by attacking the autocratic rule of Yuan

⁹⁶ Schneider, 'The one and the many', 326–7.

⁹⁷ For details, see Wang, *Xiandai Zhongguo sixiang de xingqi*, vol. I, part 2, 924–9.

⁹⁸ Liang, 'Ouyou xinyinlu', *LQCQJ*, IV, 2976–7.

⁹⁹ Du, 'Zhanhou dongxi wenming zhi tiaohu', 346–50.

¹⁰⁰ Du Yaquan, 'Jingshen jiuguolun' 精神救国论, in *DYQWC*, 35.

¹⁰¹ Du Yaquan, 'Maodun zhi tiaohu' 矛盾之调和, in *DYQWC*, 28–32.

¹⁰² Du Yaquan, 'Lun sixiangzhan' 论思想战, in *DYQWC*, 60.

¹⁰³ Du Yaquan, 'Zhen gonghe buneng yi wuli qizhi lun' 真共和不能以武力求之论, in *DYQWC*, 162–6.

Shikai and then argued that the grammar of politics consisted of toleration, mutual supervision and compromise between government and opposition. In politics, wrote Zhang, it is important to adopt an attitude of not 'favouring the same and hating the different' (*haotong wuyi*). He criticized the Republican revolutionaries for behaving just like their political foes and took pains to demonstrate how toleration and compromise could resolve China's political problems.¹⁰⁴ In another article, titled 'On *tiaohelun* as the basis of state building', Zhang reiterated his view, adding that class struggle and radical change were no solutions to civil strife. He believed that political intolerance bred dictatorship, as in the case of Oliver Cromwell, the Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland from 1653 to 1658, who assumed dictatorial powers as he suppressed all political dissent. Zhang liked modern British politics. He was impressed with the Westminster system and the British tradition of compromise and moderation. He acknowledged the Gladstonian liberal journalist, statesman and biographer John Morley (1839–1923), who explored issues of compromise and conformity, the freedom of thought and the need to tolerate dissent in his essay 'On compromise' (1874).¹⁰⁵

Zhang Shizhao further linked *tiaohelun* with social evolution. As society evolves, he wrote, social conflicts are capable of reconciliation even where morality is concerned. Morality is not absolute, nor is it the end of truth. Moral standards vary from time to time and from society to society. What is important is to reconcile differences in the interest of harmony and progress.¹⁰⁶ Politically, progress and evolution must lead to democracy, constitutionalism and republicanism. Zhang sought political reform by legalizing opposition and giving it a political space. He further argued that *tiaohe* flourished on 'a civic heart' (*gongxin*) and general knowledge. By 'a civic heart', Zhang meant a concern with the general well-being of the population; by general knowledge, he meant an understanding of world trends and an awareness of competing societal interests. In his view, social evolution was the result of *tiaohe*, not of the competition for survival, and social revolution was the result of violence.¹⁰⁷

The ancient doctrine of the mean could be used to warrant a modern *tiaohelun* that provides a form of pluralism grounded in the concept of *modus vivendi*. As such, modern *tiaolun* is every bit as liberal as liberalism.

¹⁰⁴ Zhang Shizhao, 'Zhengben' 固本, in *ZZQJ*, III, 1–18.

¹⁰⁵ Zhang Shizhao, 'Tiaohe liguolun (shang)' 调和立国论 (上), in *ZZQJ*, III, 251–77.

¹⁰⁶ Zhang, 'Xinshidai zhi qingnian', 111, 114.

¹⁰⁷ Wu Pi 吴丕, *Jinhualun yu Zhongguo jijin zhuyi*, 1859–1924 进化论与中国激进主义, 1859–1924 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005), 165.

The only problem is, where is the mean, and how is it determined? Is it just a strategy of sorts, the averaging of two extremes? In some cases, compromise may not be the best option. From the Westernizer's point of view, half-baked Westernization was a flawed modernity. Given China's entrenched cultural and social inertia, Hu Shi had reason to question *tiaohelun*'s efficacy in coping with change in the twentieth century. In Chen Duxiu's view, *tiaohelun* was 'an unfortunate phenomenon that grows naturally out of human inertia', and as such, it was 'an objective thing and not a subjective decision, as well as an obstacle to progress and evolution'.¹⁰⁸ From a communist point of view, what China needed was a social revolution that made no compromise with the 'feudal' forces.

New Confucianism

Some of the themes discussed above are reflected in New Confucianism. As a strand of twentieth-century conservative thought and an intellectual movement, New Confucianism had its beginnings during the War of Resistance, when Xiong Shili (1885–1968), Feng Youlan, He Lin and Ma Yifu (1883–1967) developed it as a philosophy and faith in a refreshing manner. Xiong and Liang Shuming were first-generation New Confucians. Zhang Junmai straddled the first generation and the second generation, which included Tang Junyi (1909–78), Mou Zongsan (1909–95) and Xu Fuguan (1904–82), all of them Xiong's students. As a philosophical movement, New Confucianism did not grow apace until the 1960s (outside China); it has since developed into a field of study in a number of tertiary institutions in the United States, Hong Kong, Taiwan and, more recently, on the mainland. A number of distinguished scholars in Western academe, most notably Tu Wei-ming, Liu Shu-hsien and Cheng Chung-ying, form the backbone of the third generation. Recently, John Makeham and his associates from China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Australia have subjected New Confucianism to critical historical examination.¹⁰⁹ The corpus of literature on it is large, especially in Chinese, and is still growing.

I am interested in New Confucianism only to the extent that it illustrates the themes that have been discussed thus far. One of these is the

¹⁰⁸ Chen Duxiu, 'Tiaohelun yu jiudaode' 调和论与旧道德, in *DXWC*, 564.

¹⁰⁹ John T. Makeham (ed.), *New Confucianism: A Critical Examination* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003). Makeham, on p. 43, argues that 'New Confucianism' was an invention of the Confucian revival of the 1980s. He ignores its historical roots dating back a few decades.

ti-yong paradigm. The New Confucians refused to see the two in terms of a dichotomy. Xiong Shili, hailed by many scholars as one of the most original thinkers of his day,¹¹⁰ confronted the original human mind and the ultimate reality of the universe and sought the metaphysical meanings of fundamental Confucian concepts. He argued that if Chinese learning is the *ti*, it must be useful and functional; otherwise, it must seek help from Western learning. If *ti* is totally devoid of function, it is a dead body. Thus, *ti* and *yong* stand in an intimate relationship: *ti* is the substance of *yong* and *yong* is the function of *ti*.¹¹¹ It follows from this that modern culture is not bifurcated into East and West, or essence and application. Xiong dismissed total Westernization as ‘culturally hollow’, maintaining that it could only destroy all that was good and inherent in Chinese culture before the good elements of the West were transplanted. He believed, like Liang Qichao, Du Yaquan and Wu Mi, in a harmonious synthesis.¹¹²

The American- and German-educated He Lin shared Xiong’s belief. He provided a reappraisal of Neo-Confucianism of the Song through to the Ming periods by interpreting the thought of Cheng Yi, Zhu Xi, Lu Jiuyuan and Wang Yangming from the perspective of New Hegelism. He Lin’s thinking transcends the *ti-yong* divide: The two are inseparable because there is organic unity between them as well as between different cultural components.¹¹³ Whether it is Chinese or Western, each way of learning has its own system of thought, essence and function. The idea of assimilating Western culture is to ‘enrich essence with essence and to complement function with function’.¹¹⁴ To He Lin, the Western impact was both a crisis and an opportunity: a crisis because Confucianism’s survival was at stake and an opportunity because Confucianism could be revived and transformed by Western learning. Writing in 1947, He Lin was confident that Western philosophy could be used to enhance and promote Neo-Confucianism, Christianity to enrich Confucian rites and

¹¹⁰ Tu Wei-ming, ‘Hsiung Shi-li’s quest for authentic existence’, in *The Limits of Change*, ed. Furth, 249.

¹¹¹ He Xiaoming 何晓明, *Fanben yu kaixin: jindai Zhongguo wenhua baoshou zhuyi xinlun* 反本与开新: 近代中国近代文化保守主义新论 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2006), 219. See also Ng Yu-kwan, ‘Xiong Shili’s metaphysical theory about the non-separability of substance and function’, in *New Confucianism*, ed. Makeham, 219–52.

¹¹² He, *Fanben yu kaixin*, 219–20.

¹¹³ Song Zhiming 宋志明 (ed.), *Rujia sixing de xin kaizhan: He Lin xinruxue lunzhu jiyao* 儒家思想的新开展: 贺麟新儒学论著辑要, 2 vols. (Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi, 1995), vol. I, 4, 6–10.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

Western art and literature to develop Confucian teachings and Chinese poetry. In return, a revitalized Confucianism would have much to offer to the world.¹¹⁵

This returns us briefly to the debate on the fundamental difference between East and West. Feng Youlan (Ph.D. Columbia University), who rose to fame early in the 1930s with his book *History of Chinese Philosophy* (in two volumes, 1931, 1933) and went on to publish another six books during the next ten years, rejected the ‘difference in kind’ argument, contending instead that it was an historical and a temporal question. ‘The reason why China had fallen behind in every respect during the past hundred years was *not because its culture was Chinese but because it was medieval* [emphasis added]’, wrote Feng in 1940.¹¹⁶ He saw Japan and the industrialized, urbanized, commercialized West standing in stark contrast to China, which remained a predominantly agrarian society. This was the difference between city and countryside, master and slave. Rural China must change through industrialism.¹¹⁷ Feng, too, opposed total Westernization and argued for a modern doctrine of the mean that does not suggest ‘half-way in work’, ‘ambivalent in attitude’, ‘mediocre in quality’ or ‘uncouth in style’; rather, it means refraining from excesses and behaving normally in everyday life. In this way, the doctrine of the mean is practicable and not sheer rhetoric.¹¹⁸

There were two different approaches to Confucian revival. One was to ‘create something new in order to consolidate and strengthen the core’ (*chuangxin guben*); the other, to ‘seek renewal by returning to the roots’ (*fanben kaixin*), which aims to establish a *daotong* (interconnecting thread of the way) in Confucian discourse. The New Confucians favoured the first approach. Zhang Junmai, for one, critiqued the concept of *daotong* on the grounds that it represented a kind of intellectual monism. He opposed holding stubbornly onto the old culture as strongly as he objected to slavish copying of the West. He emphasized that Western learning was not a means to an end but an end in itself, and that the Westernizing process should create something new, thereby strengthening the indigenous core.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ He Lin 贺麟, *Wenhua yu rensheng* 文化与人生, reprint (Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1990), 6–9.

¹¹⁶ Feng Youlan 冯友兰, ‘Xinshilun’ 新事论, in *Sansongtang quanji* 三松堂全集, 15 vols., comp. Tu Youguang 涂又光 (Zhengzhou: Henan renmin chubanshe, 1985), vol. IV, 225.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 240–51.

¹¹⁸ Zhai Zhicheng 翟志成, *Feng Youlan xuesi shengming qianzhuan (1895–1949)* 冯友兰学思生命前传 (1895–1949) (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, 2007), 272–9.

¹¹⁹ Zhang Rulun, ‘Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi shang de Zhang Junmai’, 124–53.

Finally, in a clear echo of Liang Shuming, the New Confucians proclaimed the universalism of Confucianism as distinct from the autocratic imperial system. They sought an intellectual marketplace for Confucianism around the world, sending the West the very message that Liang had sent in 1921.

Reflections on Cultural Conservatism

Modern Chinese conservative thought has been interpreted here in a more positive light than in previous scholarship as a response to the 'crisis of modernization', as an alternative to cultural radicalism and as 'a modernity of counter-modernity'. It was neither cultural fundamentalism nor antimodernization but a critical conservatism, to borrow Russell Kirk's term. The impact of World War I, the influence of the irrational philosophies of postwar Europe and of the American-derived New Humanism, the modern education of the conservatives (many held foreign degrees) and a belief in intercultural communications and political pluralism all combined to distinguish the conservatives from the traditionalists of old. In rejecting the East–West and old–new dichotomies, they showed a dualism in their thinking about Enlightenment modernity: affirming it on one hand and critiquing it on the other. That is to say, they reflected on the very ontology, values and possibilities of modernity for which they searched. At the core of their thinking was the broad question of how Chinese modernity was to be constructed. In contrast with the Westernizers who wanted to construct it on the ruins of Confucianism and on the universal claims of Enlightenment modernism, the cultural conservatives sought a fusion of Western and Chinese sensitivities. In defending the cultural heritage, their aim was to revitalize it so that it could claim a global space by making a contribution to world civilization. This made them conservative and progressive, traditional and modern, universal and local all at the same time. The New Confucians in particular cherished core Confucian values as a norm, not only to be adhered to by the people of China but also to be shared by all people around the world. This belief in shared values reveals a universal human dimension to Chinese conservative thought.

Cultural conservatism had the effect of rolling back the wave of Westernized radicalism, especially after 1935. On this basis, it is necessary to rethink Yü Ying-shih's thoughts on the progressive radicalization of China during the Republican period – not that Yü is incorrect, but that he overlooks the reverse process of cultural moderation that the challenge to

cultural radicalism produced. Although radicalization continued among those on the left supporting social revolution and sympathizing with the communist movement, it was by no means widespread. Yü concedes that radicalization was only one 'among the many faces of modern China', and that not all intellectuals had been radicalized since the turn of the century or since the May Fourth Movement.¹²⁰ Conservative thought remained tenacious until the last years of the 1940s.

On the other hand, cultural conservatism failed to provide an effective way to overcome the cultural and social inertia that Hu Shi bemoaned. Often, there was an excess of what the New Confucians called 'an empathetic understanding' of the past.¹²¹ Many harked back to the moral utopianism of the ancient tradition in which the perfect society was ethics based, secured by the natural harmony of social relations. A great deal of time and energy was expended on reconstructing Chinese culture on the level of values. Few, with the notable exceptions of Zhang Junmai and Liang Shuming, were prepared to engage in social organizations or in a state-building project, as we shall see. In particular, it has been a challenge for the New Confucians to reconcile democracy with the traditional Chinese political culture. There has been no lack of ideas.¹²² In practice, though, the tension between the two, inherent in what is sometimes called Confucian democracy or Confucian liberalism, has not been fully resolved.¹²³ How rulers can be sage-kings (*neisheng waiwang*) in the modern world, and how the gap between moral-cultural ideals and modern sociopolitical goals is to be bridged, is a question that remains largely unanswered.¹²⁴ The 'creative transformation of Chinese traditions' is an

¹²⁰ Yü, 'The radicalization of China', 146–7.

¹²¹ Zhai, *Feng Youlan*, 129.

¹²² A notable effort was made by Xu Fuguan to integrate democracy, liberty and human rights with political Confucianism, in his book *Rujia zhengzhi sixiang yu minzhu ziyou renquan* 儒家政治思想与民主自由人权, ed. Xiao Xinyi 萧欣义 (Taipei: Bashi niandai chubanshe, 1979).

¹²³ Recent attempts to resolve this tension include Daniel A. Bell and Hahm Chaibong (eds.), *Confucianism for the Modern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Daniel A. Bell, *Beyond Liberal Democracy: Political Thinking for an East Asian Context* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006).

¹²⁴ David L. Hall and Roger T. Roger in *Democracy of the Dead: Dewey, Confucius, and the Hope for Democracy in China* (Chicago: Open Court, 1999), and Tan Sor-hoon in *Confucian Democracy: A Deweyan Reconstruction* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2004), have found resources in Confucianism that could be used to develop a Chinese democracy compatible with John Dewey's democratic thought. Yet so far no contemporary scholar has been able to articulate a Confucian theory of modernity that can be used to construct coherent systems in terms of institutions, norms, legal rules, social practices and outcomes.

ongoing project in China today and a challenge to contemporary New Confucians.¹²⁵

¹²⁵ Lin Yü-sheng is credited with the notion of 'creative transformation of Chinese traditions'. See *The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness: Radical Antitraditionalism in the May Fourth Era* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979), 160n6. Lin elaborates on it in his Chinese-language book *Zhongguo chuantong de chuangzaoxing zhuanhua* 中国传统的创造性转化 (Taipei: Youshi wenhua shiye gongsi, 1993). The notion is fine. However, as a practical solution, it has intractable problems. See a critique of it by Liu Dong 刘东, 'Chuangzuoxing zhuanhua de fanwei yu xianzhi' 创造性转化的范围与限制, *Ershiye shiji* 30 (August 1995): 139–42.

The Politics of Modern Chinese Conservatism

This chapter continues our exploration of conservative thought with a different focus on the relationship of cultural conservatism to nationalism and modernity. I begin with a 1976 essay by Benjamin Schwartz on conservatism in general and in China in particular. Schwartz stated that conservatism in China was largely cultural conservatism and not political conservatism because ‘few members of the articulate Chinese intelligentsia [were] prepared to defend the current sociopolitical order as a whole’.¹ He attempted to show that Chinese conservatives were different from Edmund Burke, who affirmed the prevailing political order in late eighteenth-century England, despite his criticism of aspects of it. Burkean conservatism is noted for its respect for freedom and defence of the liberal tradition. His essay has influenced an entire generation of students of conservatism in the PRC.² In Western scholarship, as recently as 2005, Peter Zarrow has suggested that it is useful to distinguish between culture and politics so that a given intellectual could be understood as culturally conservative and politically reformist.³

¹ Benjamin I. Schwartz, ‘Notes on conservatism in general and in China in particular’, in *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, ed. Charlotte Furth (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 16–17.

² In 1992, the intellectual historian Xu Jilin insisted that when conservatism was used as an analytical tool to explain twentieth-century Chinese thought as a phenomenon on various levels, ‘we must strictly distinguish between cultural conservatism and political conservatism because each had its own criteria, and they are different’. See Xu Jilin 许纪霖, ‘Jijin yu baoshou de mihuo’ 激进与保守的迷惑, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 11 (June 1992): 137. In 1994, Zheng Dahua studied Chinese conservatism in terms of a cultural orientation believed to be inconsistent with its political orientation. See Zheng Dahua 郑大华, *Liang Shuming yu Hu Shi: wenhua baoshou zhuyi yu xihua sixiang de bijiao* 梁漱溟与胡适: 文化保守主义与西化思想的比较 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1994), 2–19. More recent PRC writings on Chinese conservatism have also been influenced by Schwartz’s interpretation.

³ Peter Zarrow, *China in War and Revolution 1895–1949* (London: Routledge, 2005), 173.

Both Schwartz's statement and Zarrow's suggestion are correct but need qualification, because cultural conservatism was in fact profoundly political. It is a truism that culture and politics in China were not separate and distinct; neither author would have argued otherwise. The fact that few members of the intelligentsia were prepared to defend the prevailing sociopolitical order as a whole does not mean that they all sought the same kind of political system or supported the same extent of political change. In fact, politically, conservatism in China was marked by a certain critique of Western-style liberal democracy, and it was not uncommon to defend some form of authoritarianism. Liang Qichao, for all his reformist thought, never retreated from his 1906 position on enlightened despotism.⁴ The Critical Review Group leader Wu Mi, drawing on the idea of his mentor, Irving Babbitt, emphasized the quality of government leaders more than the democratic system of government.⁵ Fellow group colleague Hu Xiansu thought the time was not ripe for democracy in China and that democracy could be a terrible thing when the nation was not ready for it.⁶ Another group member, Liu Boming, acknowledged that republicanism was a good form of government and a corrective to autocracy, but he also defended traditional autocracy on the grounds of administrative efficiency.⁷ In the 1930s, erstwhile liberals Ding Wenjiang and Jiang Tingfu advocated a 'new-style dictatorship' as they sought an effective modernizing government. At the same time, the conservative Chinese Youth Party figure Chen Qitian (1893–1984) launched the Neo-Legalism movement with the objective of reviving the ancient Legalist School of Shang Yang, Han Fei and Li Si to strengthen the authority and power of the state in an age of international conflict.⁸

⁴ Liang Qichao wrote the essay 'On enlightened despotism' in 1906, drawing on the ideas of the Swiss scholar Johann Kaspar Bluntschli and the German statist thinker Gustav Bornhak. The essay rejected republicanism and advocated enlightened absolutism on the grounds that the establishment of a republic required special conditions that did not exist in China. See Hao Chang, *Liang Ch'ì-ch'ao and Intellectual Transition in China, 1890–1907* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977), 248–9, 250–3.

⁵ Wu Mi 吴宓, 'Baibide lun minzhi yu lingxiu' 白璧德论民治与领袖, *Xueheng* 学衡 32 (August 1925): 15.

⁶ Hu Xiansu 胡先肃, 'Lun pipingjia zhi zeren' 论批评家之责任, *Xueheng* 3 (March 1922): 8–9.

⁷ Liu Boming 刘伯明, 'Gonghe guomin zhi jingshen' 共和国民之精神, *Xueheng* 10 (October 1922): 4–6.

⁸ Chen Qitian envisioned a 'new epoch of warring states' in the wake of World War I. He believed that the rivalries of the great powers were contingent upon their economic, political and military muscle. For China to survive in the new era, what it needed was not Neo-Confucianism but a new means to wealth and power that he found in the Legalist School. See Sun Chengxi 孙承希, 'Xi guojia zhuyipai de "xin fajia zhuyi" yu "shengwu shiguan"' 析国家主义派的“新法家主义”与“生物史观”, *Fudan xubao* 复旦学报 3 (2003): 109–18.

There was no lack of cultural conservatives who sympathized with the Nationalist party-state at the same time that they criticized it. Also in the 1940s, Liang Shuming, a leader of the Chinese Democratic League, had reservations about constitutional rule and Western democracy on cultural and political grounds. He thought that constitutionalism was incongruous with the national spirit and that the nation would be better served by going down a Chinese road to democracy.⁹

Accordingly, this chapter focuses on the culture–politics nexus in Chinese conservatism in the context of nationalism and modernity. Here, the cultural conservatives are identified with the nationalists, and cultural conservatism is understood as politicocultural nationalism. This is not to imply that other groups were not nationalistic or to suggest a special relationship between conservative thought and nationalism. It suggests only that the politics of cultural conservatism represented an important concern of conservative thought. My basic argument is that whereas the conservatives did not defend the prevailing sociopolitical order as a whole, their understandings of politics were nuanced and complex, shaped and influenced by the conditions of China, and that they stood in an ambiguous relationship with the existing regime and the party-state. To develop this argument, this chapter first discusses the concept of politicocultural nationalism, then revisits the ideas of Liang Shuming and Zhang Junmai and examines the politics of China-based cultural reconstruction and finally explores the conservative thought of the war period (1937–45) to illustrate the interplay of war, culture and nationalism.

Nationalism, Modernity and Politicocultural Nationalism

Historically, there was a tangible, if ambiguous, link between nationalism and modernity. One scholar regards nationalism as the modern Janus, standing in an ambiguous relationship with both the Enlightenment project and the very processes of modernity.¹⁰ Another describes nationalism as ‘both modern and anti-modern’, combining ‘elements of Enlightenment and modernity with appeals to tradition’.¹¹ The connections among nationalism, modernity and conservatism in the

⁹ Liang Shuming 梁漱溟, ‘Yugao xuanzai, zhulun xianzheng’ 預告選災, 追論憲政, and ‘Tan Zhongguo xianzheng wenti’ 談中國憲政問題, in *LSMQJ*, VI, 5–10, 491–2, respectively.

¹⁰ Tom Nairn, *The Break-up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Traditionalism* (London: Verso, 1981), 329.

¹¹ John Schwarzmantel, *The Age of Ideology: Political Ideologies from the American Revolution to Postmodern Times* (London: Macmillan, 1998), 134.

Republican era were stronger than the existing literature has demonstrated.¹²

Nationalism is one of the most studied subjects. It will suffice here to mention a few well-known works that may or may not serve my purpose. One of these is the work of Ernest Gellner, who rejects both the commonplace view that nationalism is a doctrine invented in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century¹³ and the idea that as an historical development, the persistence of nationalism in modern societies is a lamentable anomaly. Instead, Gellner argues that it is the need of modern societies for cultural homogeneity that creates nationalism: National consciousness is much more than an expression of atavism; it is a 'more or less inevitable outgrowth of a modern industrial society' – that is, a sociologically necessary phenomenon of the industrial epoch emerging in the process of modernization. In this argument, nations are expressions of a literate, school-transmitted 'high culture' supported by specialists and by a mass, compulsory public education system.¹⁴ Finally, Gellner argues that national cultures are responses to the mobility and anonymity of modern societies. Far from being a movement of retreat from the modern world, nationalism is a solution to some of its most distinctive problems.¹⁵

Gellner's theory of nationalism is, however, not useful to me for three reasons. First, he dismisses nationalist thought as 'hardly worth analysing'.¹⁶ But in modern China, the discursive power of nationalism was tremendous, as Prasenjit Duara has demonstrated.¹⁷ Second, the Chinese nation-state was not brought into existence by the rise of an industrial society but was sought by Republican state builders who had to deal with the issue of escalating foreign imperialism. This leads to the third reason; to wit, Geller neglects the part imperialism played in the rise of nationalism in colonial and semicolonial societies.

More helpful in some ways is the work of Liah Greenfeld, whose study of nationalism in sixteenth-century England, revolutionary and

¹² See, for example, Suisheng Zhao, *A Nation-State by Construction: Dynamics of Modern Chinese Nationalism* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004).

¹³ See, for example, Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 4th edn. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

¹⁴ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), especially 140–1.

¹⁵ Yet Geller cautiously anticipates the possibility of its decline after the atrocities and 'ethnic cleansing' of the 1990s. See Ernest Geller, *Nationalism* (New York: New York University Press, 1997).

¹⁶ Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 124.

¹⁷ Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questions and Narrative of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

postrevolutionary France, nineteenth-century Germany and Russia and the American War of Independence demonstrates that, albeit with local differences, the five cases represent 'five roads to modernity'. Greenfeld is interested in the elite, in the power of ideas and in issues of class, status and the subjective interactions of people with their worlds, which are not Gellner's concerns. Her conclusion is that the idea of nationalism is constitutive of modernity and not the other way around, and that once adopted as the way forward, nationalism 'accelerated the process of change, channeled it into a certain direction, limited the possibilities of future development, and became a major factor in it. It thus both acknowledged and accomplished the grand social transformation from the old order to modernity'.¹⁸ Yet Greenfeld's study is not without its troubles. She hardly mentions nationalism in the non-West and, like Gellner, she ignores the parts played by imperialism and colonialism.

In 1986, the Indian political philosopher and theorist Partha Chatterjee advanced a view of nationalism as 'a derivative discourse' in that nationalist elites in Asia and Africa appropriated the discourse of nationalism to challenge European domination but remained imprisoned in the post-Enlightenment rationalism. He demonstrated how Indian nationalism sought to be different from the modernist framework imbibed from the West, yet the different Indian discourse remained dominated by the very structure of power it sought to repudiate.¹⁹ In a later work, Chatterjee challenges an assumption made in Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1983) that nationalism in Africa and Asia could do nothing more than follow forms earlier established in Europe.²⁰ Chatterjee argues that anti-colonial nationalists produced their own domain of sovereignty within colonial society well before they started their political battle with the colonial power. In the case of India, Chatterjee continues, the nationalists

¹⁸ Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 487.

¹⁹ Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?* (London: Zed Books for the United Nations University, 1986).

²⁰ Anderson argues that nations were not so much the product of specific sociological conditions, such as language, race and religion, but were imagined by nationalist elites into existence, first in Europe and the Americans and later in Asia and Africa – imagined because 'the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion'. See Benedict R. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), 6.

divided the world of social institutions and practices into two separate and distinct domains – the material and the spiritual, or ‘the outer’ and the ‘inner’. The ‘outer domain’ was that of the economy, statecraft, science and technology, where the colonized succumbed to proven Western superiority; and the ‘inner domain’ was that of a modern, distinctive national culture ‘recognizably different from the Western’ and from which the colonial state was excluded.²¹

The case of modern China is somewhat different. Whereas India was under British rule, China never became a colony of any single power, even though Sun Yat-sen characterized it as a ‘sub-colony’ and the Communists called it ‘semi-colonial’. The national history of India was a series of ‘fragments’. Chinese elites, by contrast, had a notion of the unitary state identified with the nation. In China, the ‘outer domain’ and the ‘inner domain’ were not separate and distinct. Chinese nationalists did not seek a national culture from which the imperialist powers were excluded. They promoted a national renaissance that was not devoid of Western influences, and they forged a national identity that was at once cultural and political. Nationalism in China was, as Prasenjit Duara writes, ‘quintessentially a politics of culture’.²²

Considering the culture–politics nexus in China, I find the work of the historian John Hutchinson helpful in explaining what I term ‘politico-cultural nationalism’. On the basis of a study of modern Irish history, Hutchinson has argued that there are two distinctive and sometimes competing types of nationalism: ‘a political nationalism that has as its aim autonomous state institutions; and a cultural nationalism that seeks a moral regeneration of the community’.²³ The latter may look backward, but it is not regressive. Rather, Hutchinson continues:

[Cultural nationalism] puts forward a mobile view of history that evokes a golden age of achievement as a critique of the present, with the hope of propelling the community to ever higher stages of development. Indeed, at times of crisis generated by the modernization process, cultural nationalists play the role of moral innovators proposing alternative indigenous models of progress.²⁴

²¹ Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), 6–8.

²² Prasenjit Duara, ‘Provincial narratives of the nation: centralism and federalism in Republican China’, in *Cultural Nationalism in East Asia*, ed. Harumi Befu (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1993), 9.

²³ John Hutchinson, *Modern Nationalism* (London: Fontana Press, 1994), 41.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

Acknowledging that the two nationalisms often converge in movements of new secular groups that are subversive of the traditional order, Hutchinson insists on their distinctive conceptions that often find expression in quite different organizations and political strategies.²⁵ Cultural nationalism tends to develop into a political movement and may eventually give way to state-oriented movements because the alternative models of progress can only be implemented through the state. Cultural nationalists tend to be, at least initially, historical scholars and artists who form academic and cultural societies designed to evoke a love of the cultural heritage in the members of the nation and thereby shape the future according to the 'national spirit' derived from the past. They promote a cultural revival and national renaissance, re-creating the idea of the nation as 'the animating force in the lives of the people'. Hutchinson challenges the assumption that nationalism is statist, insisting that nationalism places the nation (as distinct from the state) at the centre of its concerns.²⁶

Thus, in Hutchinson's schema, the nation may be pitted against the state. Yet this is not the case with Republican China. Unlike contemporary China's cultural nationalists in Yingjie Guo's study,²⁷ those of the Republican era did not pit the nation against the state, or tradition against modernity. Instead, they stood for both, combining the attributes of the two nationalisms that Hutchinson describes. As 'moral innovators', they carried out a cultural and political movement aimed at sapping an uncritical dependence on the West and providing modernizing strategies that differed from those of the zealous Westernizers and cultural radicals. What they demonstrated was that conservatism in China was as political as it was cultural and that nation and state were inseparable in a negotiable relationship.

Accordingly, I use the term 'politicocultural nationalism' to underscore the political dynamics of conservatism in which the two nationalisms converged. The cultural conservatives sought a moral regeneration of the nation by attempting to transform the valued heritage that could be used to promote social, political and economic reforms, thereby

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 43.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

²⁷ Guo argues that in contemporary China, the most fundamental difference between the two nationalisms lies in their positions on nation versus state, tradition versus modernity. Whereas cultural nationalism 'represents identification with the nation, particularly with "national spirit" or "national essence,"' political nationalism 'is galvanized by a drive for a strong, sovereign state, national salvation and modernity, capitalist or socialist, at the sacrifice of cultural traditions'. See Yingjie Guo, *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary China: The Search for National Identity under Reform* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004), 17.

enabling China to survive and compete in a world dominated by the West. Their conservatism was not part of a state-sponsored nationalism. Unlike Hutchinson's cultural nationalists, they were sometimes antistate and sometimes pro-state, depending on the political situation, and they stood in an ambiguous relationship with the existing political order and the party-state. To illustrate, I first revisit below the thought of Liang Shuming and Zhang Junmai.

The Politicocultural Thought of Liang Shuming and Zhang Junmai

Liang and Zhang were two very different personalities. The former was home grown and self-taught in philosophy; the latter initially trained as a classical scholar and then received a foreign education in Japan and Germany. Liang had established himself as a philosopher by the early 1920s. Zhang did not shift his interest from social science to philosophy until he came under the influence of Bergson and Eucken. Whereas Liang was interested in village self-government, Zhang was interested in national politics and constitutionalism. The two also differed with regard to Western learning but were united by a common concern about the problems and future of China and by an abiding interest in Confucianism. The details of their cultural thought need not detain us here. My focus is on the politics of their cultural conservatism.

Both men were moral innovators spreading a message of national rebirth and renewal as a way of saving the nation and achieving modernity. Spreading such a message was not, paradoxically, conservative unless one regards nationalism as conservative, which would be ahistorical. Chinese politicocultural nationalism was an historical contingency. To be conservative was to be nationalistic, but not necessarily vice versa. The Communists, too, were nationalistic despite their internationalism; so were the liberals despite their cosmopolitanism.

In a climate of anti-imperialism following the May Fourth incident of 1919, Liang Shuming worried about the foreign threat. Not only was the nation bullied and insulted, but worse, it was under growing pressure from economic imperialism, which threatened to keep the Chinese people in perpetual thralldom with no chance of ever throwing off the foreign yoke. This aggravated the internal problems caused by the rapacious acts of the warlords that resulted in huge losses of lives and extensive destruction of property. China had to save itself.²⁸

²⁸ Liang Shuming, 'Dongxi wenhua ji qi zhixue' 东西文化及其哲学, in *LSMQJ*, I, 529–30.

Liang Shuming lectured at Beida between 1918 and 1924. During that time, he was not very happy because apparently he was not treated with respect by his foreign-educated colleagues. Hu Shi once referred to Liang, without mentioning his name, as one of 'those foolish men who hadn't been overseas and yet cry "Go East, go East, the West is a no-through road"'.²⁹ Nor was there much of a friendship between Liang and Chen Duxiu, although they saw each other frequently on the campus.³⁰ Liang seemed to get on well with Li Dazhao; otherwise, he was more at ease with those advocating Confucianism and traditional ethics.

In 1924, Liang left Beida and moved to Caozhou in Shandong, where he was placed in charge of a provincial high school. He had plans to establish a university in Qufu. Those plans, however, never materialized. Disappointed, Liang returned to Beijing in the spring of 1925 and spent the following year working on the posthumous works of his father. Early in 1927, when the Northern Expedition reached a decisive phase, Liang accepted an invitation from the provincial strongmen Li Jishen (1885–1959) and Chen Mingshu (1889–1965) to work in Guangdong. His first task there was to prepare for the establishment of the Institute of Rural Self-Government in Guangzhou. However, the time was not really ripe for his experiment. Thus, in February 1929, Liang returned to the north. Along the way, he visited the rural reform association in Jiangsu formed by the Vocational Educationalist Huang Yanpei (1878–1965) and learned about Yan Yangchu's (Jimmy Yen, 1890–1990) rural education experiment in Dingxian (Hebei) and about Yan Xishan's local self-government project in Shanxi. In 1931, Liang moved to Zouping County to establish the Shandong Rural Reconstruction Institute. He published a series of articles on his rural experiences, which formed the basis of his next book, *The Final Awakening of the Chinese National Self-Salvation Movement* (1931).³¹

The concept of awakening (*juewu*) in 1920s China has been studied by John Fitzgerald, who links it with nationalism and the Nationalist revolution.³² Liang Shuming was not involved in the Nationalist revolution, but he partook in the politics of national awakening in his own

²⁹ Hu Shi 胡适, 'Jieshao wo ziji de sixiang' 介绍我自己的思想, in *HSWJ*, V, 514–15.

³⁰ Liang Shuming, *Liang Shuming wendalu* 梁漱溟问答录 (Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1988), 35.

³¹ Zheng Dahua 郑大华, *Liang Shuming zhuan* 梁漱溟传 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2001), 165–96.

³² John Fitzgerald, *Awakening China: Politics, Culture, and Class in the Nationalist Revolution* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996).

way. Since the publication of *Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies*, Liang had undergone a cerebral change. In 1921, he woke up, as it were, to accept Western culture in terms of science and democracy, while urging his fellow Chinese to 'critically reappraise and bring forth anew China's original attitude [culture]'. A decade later, in a 'final awakening', he believed that 'Europeanization is not necessarily good, and Europeans not worthy of emulation'.³³ His change of heart, which appeared to be a step backward, represented an attempt to restore national confidence at a time when educated Chinese were suffering from an inferiority complex vis-à-vis Westerners. A frustrated Liang blamed China's inability to save itself on Western learning – 'all those Western tricks' (*yiqie de xifang baxi*) that allegedly undermined the spirit of Chinese culture.³⁴ China must be saved by its own efforts, 'in our own spirit and in our own way'. Liang explained this self-help:

The real life of a nation depends on its fundamental spirit. To throw away our own fundamental spirit is to put an end to our own future. Our own future and our new life are dependent on the spirit inherent in us, which provides a basis for improvement. [We] must neither look to the outside [for help] nor retreat and degrade [ourselves]. It is only by fully developing and utilizing our strengths and standing on our feet that we can strive [for success.] Don't depart from this one single step.³⁵

Liang 'discovered' that neither European democracy nor the Soviet Russian system was a 'through road' for China and that the only through road was rural reconstruction.³⁶ Western democracy ran afoul of Chinese tradition and culture. The Chinese were not ready for democracy because, explained Liang, they were politically passive and believed in moderation and social harmony, in humility and modesty and in mutual trust and human innate goodness. Their self-contentment and peace-loving nature were ill suited to the competitive politics of the West. Moreover, the material conditions for democracy were not present: China was extremely poor, the mass of the population ignorant, the transport infrastructure woefully inadequate and industrialism and commerce both underdeveloped.³⁷

³³ Liang Shuming, 'Zhongguo minzu ziji yundong zhi zuihou juewu' 中国民族自救运动之最后觉悟, in *LSMQJ*, V, 112.

³⁴ Liang Shuming, "'Cunzhi" zhi zibai' 《村治》之自白, in *LSMQJ*, V, 13.

³⁵ Liang, 'Zhongguo minzu ziji yundong', 109–10.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 111–16.

³⁷ Liang Shuming, 'Women zhengzhi shang de diyi ge butong de lu', 我们政治上的第一个不通的路, in *LSMQJ*, V, 133–73.

Liang was not, however, entirely anti-Western. He recognized four great strengths of Western life: its corporate spirit and organizations, the participation of members of organizations in corporate life, respect for the individual and the 'socialization of property' (by which he meant moderate socialism). All of these should be learned and combined with the five relationships (*wulun*) in Chinese ethics.³⁸ The modern state was industrialized, but Liang could not accept that as the only possible economic modernity, for he viewed agriculture as the foundation of the nation and its development as the prerequisite to industrial growth.³⁹

Guy Alitto has characterized rural reconstruction as 'Confucian modernization'.⁴⁰ Yet it was more than that; it was also a national self-salvation movement involving mobilization of the peasants. To put it in perspective, during the 1930s, rural reconstruction was on the agenda of both the Nationalist government and the CCP. The Wang Jingwei–Chen Gongbo Cabinet in the government had a strategy grounded in an assumption that rural reconstruction would lead to increased production and to an improvement in the peasants' livelihood and thus would curtail the communist influence. Rural reform was implemented by the National Economic Council, especially through its Cotton Control Commission.⁴¹ The Communists, too, began to carry out land reform and village reconstruction in northern Shaanxi in 1934.⁴²

Liang Shuming's antiurbanism and self-reliance bore a close resemblance to Mao Zedong's rural outlook, but he opposed the CCP's peasant movement and wanted to eliminate it by providing an alternative. Liang explained in 1937:

A peasant movement is necessary for present-day China. Anyone who ignores the peasant movement is out of touch. To eliminate the CCP's peasant movement, it is necessary to launch an alternative movement. Not only does our rural organization protect the locality against the [infiltration of the] CCP, but being the right kind of peasant movement, we can replace

³⁸ Liang Shuming, 'Xiangcun jianshe lilun' 乡村建设理论, in *LSMQJ*, II, 308–9.

³⁹ Here, Liang was not original. In 1923, Zhang Shizhao, then director-general of education in the Beijing government, was a strong advocate of agriculture on the same grounds. See Bai Ji'an 白吉庵, *Zhang Shizhao zhuan* 章士钊传 (Beijing: Zuoqia chubanshe, 2004), 160–8.

⁴⁰ Guy S. Alitto, *The Last Confucian: Liang Shu-ming and the Chinese Dilemma of Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), chap. 9.

⁴¹ Margherita Zanasi, *Saving the Nation: Economic Modernity in Republican China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 55 and chap. 5.

⁴² For the CCP's land programme, see Pauline B. Keating, *Two Revolutions: Village Reconstruction and the Cooperative Movement in Northern Shaanxi 1934–1945* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997).

it... With our movement, we don't need others, *and we can do without the CCP* [emphasis added].⁴³

Liang always tried to see China's problems from a cultural point of view and to solve the cultural question first.⁴⁴ That was the easy part. The difficult part was finding a political solution to those problems:

Suppose [you have] no idea and no confidence about solving political problems and only want to talk about other issues. That's a sheer waste of time. Our rural organization is the beginning of the ideal society, a sprout that will grow into the reconstruction of Chinese culture. But this beginning, this sprout, must count on economic progress for its growth... and economic progress must await the solutions to political problems.⁴⁵

Clearly, rural reconstruction was not a 'non-political solution to China's modern crisis', as Alitto would have it.⁴⁶ It was a political solution to the agrarian problem and a means of achieving social reform in the countryside. The dilemma facing Liang was whether the Nationalist government should have a role to play. Initially, Liang and his associates sought rural self-rule and autonomy in promoting education and other local reforms; they were not opposed to the government, but they took no initiative to cooperate with it. Because of financial difficulties and numerous other problems, however, they soon felt compelled to accept a government role. Their efforts to mobilize the peasants socially had limited success.⁴⁷

What is particularly instructive is Liang's ambiguity towards the prevailing political order. Although he was no government supporter, Liang would not contemplate a seizure of power. In January 1938, he visited Yan'an to see for himself what the Communists were doing there. He met with Mao Zedong and other communist leaders and came away with a good impression of them. In July, he attended the wartime People's Political Council in Hankou, convened by Chiang Kai-shek. Also, in 1941, he played a key role along with Zhang Junmai and others in founding the Democratic League in a 'third force' movement.⁴⁸

⁴³ Liang, 'Xiangcun jianshe lilun', 411.

⁴⁴ Alitto, *The Last Confucian*, 205.

⁴⁵ Liang, 'Xiangcun jianshe lilun', 433-4.

⁴⁶ Alitto, *The Last Confucian*, 205.

⁴⁷ Cao Lixin 曹立新, 'Zouxiang zhengzhi jie jue de xiangcun jianshe yundong' 走向政治解决的乡村建设运动, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 91 (October 2005): 83-5.

⁴⁸ Alitto, *The Last Confucian*, 283-92, 304-10; Edmund S. K. Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929-1949* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 230-5.

Now let me turn to Zhang Junmai. Zhang shared with Liang an idea of national salvation but articulated it with a nuance. Like Europe's cultural nationalists, Zhang stressed that there was a spirit of the nation seeking cultural and political expression. He encouraged that expression by concentrating on a national renaissance movement and became its chief exponent in the 1930s. A vocal critic of the Nationalist party-state, Zhang was kidnapped in June 1929 by Nationalist secret agents in Shanghai, where he had been teaching at Zhixing College in the International Settlement. After his release, Zhang went to Germany for a third time, returning in August 1931 to take up a position at Beijing's Yanjing University to teach the philosophy of Hegel. There, during the next few years, he watched with great concern Japanese aggression in Manchuria and North China. His persistent criticism of Nanjing's weak-kneed policy towards the Japanese angered the government, forcing him to resign from Yanjing early in 1933. In the following year, Zhang travelled to Shanxi and Guangdong, where he taught at Zhongshan University for six months before moving back to Beijing.⁴⁹ During that time and in the ensuing years, he managed to find time to write three important books, *The Academic Basis of National Renaissance* (1935), *Chinese Culture Tomorrow* (1936) and *The Way to Build the State* (1938), which provided clear insights into the politics of his cultural conservatism. These books, however, have received little attention from his American biographer.⁵⁰

The first book was a series of lectures given on various occasions in the first half of the 1930s, covering a broad range of topics from Chinese philosophy to comparative East–West thought. Zhang vainly likened the book to Johann Gottlieb Fichte's (1762–1814) celebrated *Addresses to the German Nation* (*Reden an die deutsche Nation*), a series of lectures given in French-occupied Berlin in the winter of 1807–1808 designed to inflame appeals to German nationalism. Stirred by Napoleon's defeat of Prussia, Fichte pointed to the need to bring together the high culture of German life with the power that could make it effective in the world. His initial concern was with education and the question of national identity, particularly the relationship between language and nationality. Yet Fichte quickly turned his treatment of education into an evaluation of what had gone wrong with German life and had led to the national disaster. Like fellow

⁴⁹ Roger B. Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China: The Politics of Zhang Junmai (Carsun Chang) 1906–1941* (Lanham, Md.: Rowan & Littlefield, 1997), 105–11; Zheng Dahua 郑大华, *Zhang Junmai zhuan* 张君勱传 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997), 216–21, 229.

⁵⁰ Jeans refers to the first book in a footnote. The second book rates no mention, and the third one is mentioned fleetingly.

Prussian Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803), Fichte stressed the importance of the national spirit but took it a stage further by cutting it off from the Enlightenment notion of universalism that underpinned the French Revolution. Exposing nationalism's uneasy relationship with the Enlightenment, Fichte invented German nationalism at a particular point for a particular purpose. His was an exclusive nationalism underpinned by a national spirit that had a mysterious inbred quality present in the heart of every member of the German nation.⁵¹

Zhang Junmai was stirred by the imperialism of the Western powers and more recently by Japanese aggression in Manchuria and North China. He emphasized the need to save China by unifying the nation and by taking pride in its past achievements. In 1932, Zhang translated *Addresses to the German Nation* into Chinese and published it in serialized form in the journal *Zaisheng* ('*National Renaissance*'). (The translation was later published in book form.) Lauding Fichte as the most outstanding figure in the German nationalist movement, Zhang found in him a spirit of the self capable of differentiating between disgrace and glory – a spontaneous spirit that manifested itself in personal conduct and behaviour with a sense of duty to the nation.⁵²

Zhang placed the nation at the centre of his conservative thought. He became a nationalist partly as a result of sentiment or sentimentality, but more through genuine, objective, practical necessity, that is, national survival and modernization. He sought to transform the existing order into a modern society and a constitutional state. To that end, he and his close friend Zhang Dongsun surreptitiously founded the Chinese State Socialist Party (Zhongguo Guojia Shehuidang) in 1932, which became public in 1934 at its First Party Congress. The party stood for a strong unified state with a powerful and efficient government capable of restoring domestic order and resisting foreign imperialism (more on this party in Chapter 7).

Zhang Junmai attached great importance to the role of the state in Hegelian fashion.⁵³ He was attracted to a kind of continental European nationalism based on the uniqueness of the nation and on the concept of

⁵¹ Greenfeld, *Nationalism*, 369.

⁵² Zhang Junmai 张君勱, 'Fei Xide dui Deyizhi guomin yanjiang zhaiyao' 费希德对德意志国民演讲摘要, *Zaisheng* 再生 1, 3 (June 1932): 1–13.

⁵³ Hegel views the State as 'the Idea of Spirit in the external manifestation of Human Will and Freedom' and that 'individuals only have objectivity, truth and morality insofar as they are members of the State whose true context and purpose are in unison'. Cited in Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy*, new edn. (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961), 710.

the state as a source from which the nation derived its dignity. He spoke of the 'greater freedom of the nation' that offered the best protection of individual liberty in a time of national crisis. Gravely worried about the Japanese aggression, Zhang considered a war of resistance unavoidable and necessary after the Tanggu Truce of May 1933 failed to stop the Japanese advance. He advocated 'total war', translated the German general Erich Ludendorff's (1865–1937) *Der Totale Krieg* (1935) into Chinese and published it early in 1937 through Shanghai's Commercial Press.⁵⁴

Zhang the cultural nationalist and modernizer evoked the usable past to promote a national culture and revive a Chinese historicist vision of the nation. It was important to him that the neotraditionalists and zealous Westernizers were reconciled so that they could be united in constructing a new Chinese culture capable of competing in the modern world. He began by asking the question that Hu Shi and others had asked before: 'What is wrong with the Chinese nation?' His answer was found in *The Academic Basis of National Renaissance*:

Other nations possess knowledge and are capable of unity, division of labour and cooperation. By contrast, the vast majority of our four hundred million people are uneducated and barely superior to pigs. How can they understand the meaning of patriotism? . . . Other countries use nations as the foundations of their states; their people are integrated under an Organic Law whereby they enjoy individual liberties on one hand and have a powerful government on the other. This is where our political institutions are inferior. . . . Also, academically, we are inferior in science and philosophy.⁵⁵

The challenge, then, was 'to educate the people, so that the 390,000,000 [uneducated] can recognize that they are the Chinese nation'.⁵⁶ Following Fichte, Zhang linked education with nationalism.

At the core of Zhang's national consciousness was a belief in 'national will' (*minzu yili*), the very thing that had driven the Germans under Otto von Bismarck (1871–90) to achieve the unification of Germany in the nineteenth century. Inspired by Bismarck and Fichte, Zhang viewed national will as a unifying force and a source of strength to fight Japanese aggression. He sought to instil in the Chinese mind a pride in nationhood

⁵⁴ Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China*, 215–16; Zheng, *Zhang Junmai zhuan*, 279.

⁵⁵ Zhang Junmai, *Minzu fuxing zhi xueshu jichu* 民族复兴之学术基础, 2 vols. (Beiping: Zaisheng zazhishe, 1935), vol. I, 1–2.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. II, 74.

and a 'unity of will' leading to 'unity of action' so that the nation could be assured of survival and the state could achieve independence.⁵⁷

State building required the support of a self-assured and self-confident nation. What troubled Zhang was that the relentless assaults on Chinese traditions reflected the inferiority complex of the cultural iconoclasts vis-à-vis Westerners. He reacted sharply to Hu Shi's faulting of the Chinese national character. What other nations could do, so could the Chinese, Zhang insisted, and a nation lacking in self-confidence was not qualified for state building. Self-confidence entailed reverence for the nation's history, culture and tradition, hence a cultural revival and reaffirmation. Zhang criticized the likes of Hu Shi for wittingly becoming slaves to foreign ideas. Autonomy of thought was important to Zhang because it promoted cultural diversity and national distinctiveness simultaneously. He believed that only a nation with a distinctive character and an independent spirit could be proud of itself, and only then could it make a contribution to a new world culture.⁵⁸

In *Chinese Culture Tomorrow* (1936), Zhang Junmai provided a comparative analysis of Eastern and Western cultures from a perspective very different from that of Liang Shuming in *Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies*, which he had criticized for its flawed assumptions and methodology.⁵⁹ Zhang first looked at Indian and then European culture; it was the latter that captured most of his attention. He identified four distinguishing characteristics of Western developments since the Renaissance. The first was the formation of nation-states, which he regarded as more significant than the revival of art and literature and the advance of science. The second was the development of democracy, which he considered good for all humankind, despite problems with some Western governments. The third was the thirst for knowledge, pursued through exploration and the scientific method. The fourth was the change in notions of morality, as a consequence of the influence of Kant, Hegel and other Idealists. Zhang admired the democratic traditions of the ancient Greeks and Romans and also recognized the contributions of Christianity.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. II, 73-4.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. I, 148-9.

⁵⁹ Zhang Junmai, 'Ouzhou wenhua zhi weiji ji Zhongguo xinwenhua zhi quxiang' 欧洲文化之危机及中国新文化之趋向, *Dongfang zazhi* 东方杂志 19, 3 (February 1922): 119-21.

⁶⁰ Zhang Junmai, *Mingri zhi Zhongguo wenhua* 明日之中国文化 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1936), 56-79.

As a result of these developments, Zhang saw several lessons for China. The formation of the Chinese nation-state, only just begun, was not helped by internal disunity and foreign imperialism. Politically, China under Nationalist rule had yet to democratize. Intellectually, China's knowledge base had to be broadened by the extensive use of the scientific method. Morally and philosophically, Chinese needed to cherish such Western values as individual autonomy and self-dignity, love of the nation and mutual cooperation. In particular, Zhang commended Kant's philosophy that every individual should be treated as an end in him- or herself, not a means to an end.⁶¹

In an overview of the past three thousand years, Zhang divided the cultural history of China into three distinct periods based on what he called the 'prosperity and decline of the nation' (*minzu zhi shengshuai*) and 'national energies' (*minzu huoli*). The first and ancient period was prior to the Qin and Han dynasties. The second period was from the Wei and Jin dynasties through the Tang to the Song. The third was from the Yuan to the Qing. Each period had its own characteristics. It is not my concern whether Zhang's narrative is accurate, but it is worth noting his revisionist views. Zhang departed from the traditional historiography that used the Qin as the dividing line between ancient and imperial China. He praised the first emperor, Qin Shihuang (221–206 BC), traditionally condemned as a tyrant, for unifying the country. He thought the expansion of national energies during the Sui and the Tang was the result of ethnic assimilation during the previous three hundred years. He also posited a correlation between culture and national energies: A culture waxed when national energies were in abundance and waned when in short supply. A streak of Han chauvinism in Zhang cannot be missed, for he despised the Mongols and the Manchus, whose rule was 'really a national disgrace'.⁶²

In a reflective mood, though, Zhang identified flaws in Chinese culture. First, the autocratic imperial system left no room for individual freedom but instead led to court intrigues, political conflicts, usurpation of power and eunuch interference in politics. Second, the family system not only compounded the individual's sense of dependence but also fostered a culture of hypocrisy in which outward harmony disguised the reality of family feuds. Third, the scholastic tradition suffered from an arcane written language and a lack of orientation towards cognitive study

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 84–104.

of theory; it failed to nurture men of creative talent and to develop great systems of thought because of a preoccupation with evidential research. Finally, Chinese culture lacked 'a spirit of martyrdom'; men of integrity were rare, with the exceptions of the Neo-Confucians of the Song period. Zhang found satisfaction only in Chinese art, literature, aesthetics, history compilation and Neo-Confucianism.⁶³

National renaissance, then, was a movement not to revive old art, literature and aesthetics but to renew Chinese thought and cultural symbols. Zhang was impressed with modern Germany and Britain: The Germans had made great strides in science and philosophy, yet they still respected Luther, Goethe and Bismarck, and the British were untiring in their efforts at creative renewal, making them a great nation, yet their reverence for Milton, Shakespeare, Hume and Mill was undiminished. Zhang concluded, 'In the midst of renewal the old is conserved. That is, creative renewal inherits the past and develops the future, both emerging from the same path.'⁶⁴

Whereas Fichte was silent on political forms, Zhang was loud and clear. In his third book, *The Way to Build the State*, published after the outbreak of the War of Resistance, Zhang provided a blueprint for democratic socialism in China. Among other things, he revisited the question of national self-confidence, reaffirming the importance of national will, resolution and self-esteem.⁶⁵ A committed constitutionalist, Zhang rejected the Nationalist rhetoric of political tutelage but would cooperate with the government if constitutional change were effected. I will explore his democratic socialist thought in Chapter 7.

The Politics of China-Based Cultural Reconstruction

In approximately the mid-1930s, a wave of neotraditionalism swept across the territory under Nationalist control as the government attempted to create a nationalist ethos by revitalizing the old Confucian tradition. In 1934, Chiang Kai-shek staged the New Life Movement in Nanchang (Jiangxi) to inculcate old virtues and improve personal hygiene and conduct. It was followed by the Respect Confucius and Study the Classics Movement launched by the progovernment military strongmen He Jian (1887–1956) and Chen Jitang (1890–1954) in Guangdong. The government went on to restore Confucius to sagehood and resumed official

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 107–17.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 123.

⁶⁵ Zhang Junmai, *Liguo zhi dao* 立国之道 (Guilin: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1938), 20–7.

observance of his birthday (27 August). In the meantime, a movement spearheaded by the Whampoa Clique was under way to make Chiang Kai-shek a dictator.⁶⁶ Ideologically driven, these movements were aimed at defending the party-state against corrosion by liberalism on one hand and countering the growing influence of Marxism on the other.

The Nationalist government had a dual character. It was conservative to a fault, corrupt, bureaucratic and incompetent. Yet it was also the most modern government China had ever seen. It had recruited many well-educated men into its new ministries of foreign affairs, finance, economic affairs education, justice and communication – many with doctorates from European and American universities who were ardent participants in China's modernization.⁶⁷ There was no lack of Nationalist visions of modernity. Chiang Kai-shek had a vision of economic modernity, demonstrated by his government's industrial strategy of 1931–3.⁶⁸ Also, the party functionary and ideologue Chen Lifu (1900–2001) outlined his vision in his philosophical work *Vitalism* (*Weishenglun*), a refutation of dialectical materialism.⁶⁹

Not surprisingly, some conservatives were supportive of the government. Most notable among them were the ten professors who issued a joint 'Declaration of cultural construction on a Chinese base' on 10 January 1935, mentioned in Chapter 1. Critics failed to appreciate that the declaration underscored the connection between cultural conservatism and nationalism. Appearing at a time when Chen Xujing was stridently advocating wholesale Westernization, the declaration had a whiff of national consciousness. It echoed the anxiety of Liang Shuming

⁶⁶ For details, see Lloyd E. Eastman, *The Abortive Revolution: China under Nationalist Rule, 1927–1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), chap. 2.

⁶⁷ According to Jiang Tingfu, 90 per cent of the government officials could be called intellectuals in the traditional Chinese sense. See Jiang Tingfu 蒋廷黻, 'Mantan zhishi fenzi zhi shiming' 漫谈知识分子之使命, in *Zhishi fenzi yu Zhongguo* 知识分子与中国, ed. Zhou Yangshan 周阳山 (Taipei: Shidai chuban gongsi, 1980), 53–8. Other well-known intellectuals in the government included Weng Wenhao, Fu Sinian and Luo Jialun, to mention just a few.

⁶⁸ This strategy led to the establishment in November 1932 of the National Defence Planning Commission and the National Resources Commission that grew out of it. See William C. Kirby, *Germany and Republican China* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1984), chap. 4.

⁶⁹ Terry Bodenhorn found in *Vitalism* many of the key intangibles that Western social scientists, such as Gellner, Giddens and Charles Taylor, have equated with modernity, noting Chen's belief in human rationality, progress, social discipline, orderliness and efficiency, as well as in trust and confidence. See his essay, 'Chen Lifu's *Vitalism*: A Guomindang vision of modernity circa 1934', in *Defining Modernity: Guomindang Rhetorics of a New China, 1920–1970*, ed. Terry Bodenhorn (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002), 93–4, 113–14.

and Zhang Junmai, with whom the ten professors were not associated, to restore confidence in the nation's ability to face the present and the future. The ten professors' approach to cultural change was rational and reflexive. They insisted that they were not stubbornly adhering to the past, only seeking to distil the good from the bad with 'a critical attitude' and 'self-cognition' and to harmonize East and West with the scientific method. That was not atavistic language. The ten professors were not hostile to the appropriation of Western ideas and values, only to indiscriminate borrowing. Their position on selective assimilation was no different in principle from Hu Shi's idea that modern culture should be absorbed in such a way as to make the inherent culture of China congruous with it and to develop harmoniously. Uncritical acceptance of the West was unscientific and contrary to the modernist philosophy that all values are subject to reevaluation. The ten professors were able to hoist the zealous Westernizers on their own petard.

Responding to criticisms, the ten professors defended their position and specified China's current needs in terms of the improvement of the livelihood of the people, the development of the national economy and the struggle for national survival.⁷⁰ They echoed Sun Yat-sen's ideology, less his principle of democracy, suggesting that they accepted the political tutelage of the Nationalist leadership as an historical contingency. This had much to do with the fact that, for all its faults, Nanjing was a modernizing regime that deserved support in 1935, when the nation was confronted with a late imperialism in Japanese aggression. War seemed inevitable. Cultural conservatism was linked with anti-imperialist nationalism.

Most notable among the ten professors was Tao Xisheng (1899–1988), probably the most nationalistic. An economic and intellectual historian at Beida, the case of Tao illustrates the complexity of the conservative outlook. A graduate of Beida, Tao first made his mark on the intellectual scene in the mid-1920s as a Marxist historian, but after the collapse of the GMD–CCP united front, he parted company with fellow Marxists over class struggle and social revolution. In 1929–30, Tao participated in the social history controversy, arguing that feudalism had long disintegrated in China after the Warring States Period (475–221 BC), displaced by a commercial capitalism that emerged in the late Zhou period and

⁷⁰ Wang Xinming 王新命 et al., 'Women de zong dafu' 我们的总答复, in *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化建设讨论集, ed. Ma Fangruo 马芳若 (Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935), part II, 180–3.

continued to grow in the imperial era that followed, despite the domination of the gentry class.⁷¹

As a Nationalist intellectual, Tao made a contribution to the government's theory of 'integrative revolution'. According to Arif Dirlik, Tao was always 'a proponent of change', but his idea of change did not entail 'a total break with the past or the violent revolutionary transformation of Chinese social structure'.⁷² Change was desirable, but it must be under control, accord with the historical condition of Chinese society and meet its particular needs. Social and political upheavals must be arrested, for social revolution could only make things worse. Tao rejected the notion of class struggle as well as New Culture demands for radical cultural change.⁷³

For Tao, the 1935 declaration was an attempt to liberate China from Western cultural domination. He asked Hu Shi rhetorically, 'Should we Chinese of a semi-colony not discover ourselves? Should we not consciously move forward?'⁷⁴ He went on to provide his own answer:

From a Chinese point of view, we should not follow Europe and the United States and become an appendage to them. This is what I honestly think. I know nationalist thought is a kind of sentiment, and it is what Chinese of a semi-colony ought to have. I also hope that those in academic circles will wake up and consider China's position as well as the state of the world in any situation that may arise.⁷⁵

In a postscript, Tao lectured Hu Shi, many years his senior, 'I would not expect any scholar of authority to abandon the thought of semi-colonial China achieving national independence', adding that 'we should not be arrogant, but neither should we be on our knees whenever we see [Westerners]'.⁷⁶ This personal attack forced Hu to defend himself against charges of unpatriotic thinking.⁷⁷

⁷¹ Tao Xisheng 陶希圣, 'Fengjian zhidu yi ziben zhuyi?' 封建制度抑资本主义?, in *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian* 中国现代思想史资料简编, 5 vols., ed. Jiang Yihua 姜义华 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe), vol. III, 71-7.

⁷² Arif Dirlik, 'Tao Hsi-sheng: the social limits of change', in *The Limits of Change*, ed. Furth, 305.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ Tao Xisheng, 'Wei shenme founen xianzai de Zhongguo da Hu Shi' 为什么否认现在的中国答胡适, in *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji*, ed. Ma, part II, 47.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁷⁶ Quoted in Wang Zhongjiang 汪中江, 'Quanpan xihua yu benwei wenhua lunzhan' 全盘西化与本位文化论战, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 8 (December 1991): 44.

⁷⁷ In a letter to Tao, Hu wrote that his deep love of the country made him critical of Chinese culture so that he could, as a loyal critic, diagnose what was wrong with it. See Hu Shi, *Hu Shi de riji (shougaoben)* 胡适的日记 (手稿本), reprint. 18 vols. (Taipei: Yuanliu chubangongsi, 1990), vol. XII, entry 12 June 1935.

Wartime Politicocultural Nationalism

During the War of Resistance (1937–45), burgeoning nationalism underscored the particularity of the Chinese nation. Again, cultural conservatism was identified with politicocultural nationalism. Taking pride in the motherland and in its distinctive culture was morally uplifting.

The politics of cultural conservatism found expression in the Sinification (*Zhongguohua*) movement, which highlighted the specificities of Chinese history, culture and politics. The historian Qian Mu (1894–1990), who had taught at Yanqing, Beijing and Qinghua universities, illustrated this in his book, *A General History of China* (1940), which sought ‘to show the true face of China’s national culture and to promote its spirit, thereby illustrating the true historical processes the country had undergone, explaining the present and pointing to the future’.⁷⁸ Driven by nationalism, Qian finished the book within a year with inadequate empirical research and referencing. It was a work of macro history. Writing this kind of history, wrote Qian, required first a real understanding of where the developmental character of that country’s culture lay, and, second, a grasp of its specific environment and enterprise. His concern was with the reform of China and how history could be used to help determine where China was headed. Historically, China had had its fair share of problems. However, reminiscent of Spengler, Qian maintained that all cultures had undergone cycles of prosperity and decline. Chinese culture was not dead; it would flourish again. It was a mistake to negate the past in its totality. Instead of blaming all the current problems on the Confucian tradition and the ancients, it was important to diagnose the malaise and identify the root causes; only then could there be a basis for reform. History, Qian insisted, is relevant to the present and provides a guide to the future, its function being to serve the purposes of reform and state building.⁷⁹

Nationalist sentiment led Qian to make some dubious claims about Chinese history. Since the Qin and Han dynasties, he wrote, the imperial system was not practically destitute of ‘democracy’, as the literati had enjoyed the right of political participation. As China evolved from a feudal to a unified state, it experienced a gradual opening up of the political system, marked by a meritocracy based on the civil service examinations and a policy of recruiting talents by recommendation. Qian argued that China’s political institutions did not develop in Western

⁷⁸ Qian Mu 钱穆, *Guoshi dagang* 国史大纲, 2nd edn. (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1947), 7.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

fashion because its scale of state building and evolutionary path were different. Imperial China was neither 'feudal' nor 'bourgeois' – it was in a class of its own. Core Confucian values were adhered to by every section of the population; not even the emperor and his ministers could ignore them.⁸⁰ As Charlotte Furth comments, Qian carried on the National Essence historiography in portraying the Chinese nation as 'the historical bearer of universal moral values capable of being realized in progressively more perfected historical forms'.⁸¹

A General History of China was adopted as a college text during the war years and became a best seller. It won the applause of the Nationalist government. Chiang Kai-shek apparently took his cue from it when he wrote *China's Destiny* in 1943 (reportedly ghostwritten by Tao Xisheng), which was an apology for Chinese conservatism.

Meanwhile, the philosopher Feng Youlan published a new book, *On New Matters* (1940). In one of the chapters, he wrote about progress in China in an anti-imperialist frame of mind, using such words and phrases as 'colony', 'semi-colony', 'resurrection', 'oppression', 'revolution' and 'world revolution' – language perhaps influenced by communist propaganda. His message was that the War of Resistance would be victorious, the task of state building would be completed and Japan would be eventually defeated because the people of China were a proud nation and had regained their national dignity and shed their sense of inferiority vis-à-vis the foreign powers.⁸²

The Communists launched their own Sinification movement in the border regions under their control. Mao Zedong was full of praise for the history of 'this great country', with its many thinkers, scientists, inventors, politicians, military strategists, literary figures and artists as well as its rich cultural works. He glorified the essence of Chinese culture and gave voice to the 'soul of China' in art and literature while at the same time condemning its 'feudal trash'. Everything came to acquire a Chinese flavour. A 'national defence literature' and a 'national revolutionary war literature' were promoted. Art for art's sake was replaced with art for the masses, harnessed to the purpose of prosecuting the war. Literature was expunged of its bourgeois taste. A new form of popular literature (critics would call it vulgar) with themes on the labouring classes and the

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Charlotte Furth, 'Culture and politics in Chinese conservatism', in *The Limits of Change*, ed., Furth, 36–7.

⁸² Zhai Zhicheng 翟志成, *Feng Youlan xuesi shengming qianzhuàn (1895–1949)* 冯友兰学思生命前传 (1895–1949) (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, 2007), 198–201.

countryside came into vogue. A rural-based mass culture was privileged over elitist urban culture.⁸³ Mao's well-known 1942 talk at the Yan'an Forum on art and literature combined a brand of populism with a pride in the 'revolutionary tradition' of the masses. Furthermore, Mao adapted Marxism to Chinese conditions, developing his own thought into a template for the Chinese revolution.

What is particularly interesting about the communist Sinification movement was its link to the war of national liberation. For Mao, each nation had its own style (*zuofeng*) and air of importance (*qipai*), conditioned by its long history, economics, geography, race and traditions, among other things. The Chinese style and air of importance were best found in the rural masses and in the localities with their local dialects, customs, arts, folklores and the like.⁸⁴ For Mao, as for Liang Shuming and Zhang Junmai, the idea of a distinctive nation was the constitutive element of modernity.

Yet the Sinification movement was not as antimodern or anti-Western as is sometimes thought. The contemporary historian Feng Chongyi has asserted that the movement represented 'a tragic return to conservatism', a testimony to the failure of the May Fourth project, succeeding only in reviving the traditionalism dormant in the Chinese mind.⁸⁵ A different interpretation, I submit, is that Sinification at this point represented a form of cultural nationalism contingently appropriate to China's social, political and intellectual conditions during the war, keeping alive the linkage between the exogenous and the indigenous. The wartime sociologist Ji Wenfu would not regard it either as 'cultural anti-foreignism' or as 'a reinvention of the *ti-yong* dichotomy'. He expressed approval of it as a process of assimilating the best of all possible worlds, digesting foreign borrowings and giving them a Chinese flavour. Sinification represented 'a third kind of culture' in which Chineseness was embedded in cosmopolitanism.⁸⁶

⁸³ For details, see Feng Chongyi 冯崇义, *Guohun, zai guonan zhong zhengzha: kangRi zhanzheng shiqi de Zhongguo wenhua* 国魂, 在国难中挣扎: 抗日战争时期的中国文化 (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 1995), 75–86.

⁸⁴ Wang Hui 汪晖, *Xiandai Zhongguo sixiang de xingqi* 现代中国思想的兴起, 4 vols. (Beijing: Sanlian shidian, 2004), vol. II, part 2, 1496–8.

⁸⁵ Feng Chongyi, 'Zhongguo kangRi zhanzheng shiqi de Zhongguohua sichao' 中国抗日战争时期的中国化思潮, *Wenshi tiandi* 文史天地 98, 2 (1995): 78–9.

⁸⁶ Ji Wenfu 稽文甫, 'Mantan xueshu Zhongguohua wenti 漫谈学术中国化问题', in *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian* 中国现代思想史资料简编, 5 vols., ed. Cai Shangsi 蔡尚思 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1982), vol. IV, 50–1.

The Political Thought of the Warring States Group

For the purpose of this chapter, even more significant than the Sinification movement was the rise of a wartime school of conservative thought that was pregnant with politics. It was associated with the Warring States Group, a group of largely Western-educated professors at the National Southwest Associated University in Kunming who founded in 1940 the journal *Zhanguo ce* (named after the famous classic known in English as *Annals of the Warring States*) and the next year a 'Warring States' supplement to Chongqing's influential newspaper *Dagongbao* ('*L'Impartial*'). This group, which has received relatively little attention in Western scholarship,⁸⁷ comprised a diversity of patriotic elements united by a concern about the war and the future of China.

There were three interrelated dominant themes of *Zhanguo ce* thought. The first was the link between cultural reconstruction and national power. In this theme, the purpose of cultural reconstruction was to reform the feeble character of the nation by reviving the ancient culture of the Warring States in the first instance. Leading *Zhanguo ce* writers took a morphological approach to Chinese history and civilization, following Splenger and, more recently, the British historian Arnold J. Toynbee (1889–1975). Splenger's study of culture as a living organism that went through a course of birth, growth, maturity and decay, and Toynbee's categorization of historical growth and decay, bore a close resemblance to the 'dynastic cycle' that appealed to Chinese sensitivities. Thus, Lin Tongji (1906–80), a scholar of Shakespeare and international relations (B.A. University of Michigan, Ph.D. University of California, Berkeley), maintained that all world civilizations had undergone three phases: feudalism, contending states and grand unity. Each phase had its *gestalt* (*li-xiang*), but the age of contending states had been the brightest, most active and most creative. All civilizations would ultimately perish like those of Egypt, Greece and Rome. For the present, modern Europe was still in the heyday of the age of contending states. As for Chinese civilization, it had long passed the Warring States Period and had also experienced grand unity during the past two thousand years. It was not dead. Yet if China was to survive the international conflicts of the present age, it needed to go back two thousand years to reconstruct the Warring States consciousness. It was important to transform the culture of great unity

⁸⁷ Mention should be made of an earlier article by Michael Godley, 'Politics from history: Lei Haizong and the Zhanguo ce clique', *Papers on Far Eastern History* 40 (September 1989): 95–122.

back into a culture of war to root out the self-content, laziness, inertia, cowardice and feebleness of the Chinese character. Only then could the nation be revitalized and become strong and powerful. Lin called this transformative process 'a repeat of the age of the Warring States', dismissing the Chinese ideal of great unity as unsuited to the present time.⁸⁸ In following Spengler's morphology of world history, Lin was imbued, if somewhat paradoxically, with Chinese nationalism.

His colleague, historian Lei Haizong (1902–62), who earned a Ph.D. in medieval European history at the University of Chicago, put forth a unique theory of 'two cycles of Chinese civilization', which departed from Spengler's view that Chinese history had ended long ago. The first cycle, from the dim beginnings to 383, was that of classical China, during which the Chinese race remained comparatively pure and its culture indigenous. The second cycle, beginning with the Battle of the Fei River (383) to the present (1940), was that of Tartar-Buddhist China, characterized by repeated conquests of the country by the barbarians from the north and by the gradual transformation through Buddhism of the classical civilization into a new synthesis that contained much of an alien culture. This second cycle continued into the modern era but was drawing to a close. The War of Resistance marked the beginning of a third cycle, in which a new China would arise from the rubble of the war. Chinese history had not come to an end.⁸⁹

Lei reappraised Chinese civilization from a military perspective, seeking to rebuild China on a military culture to revive national power. In his view, the aristocratic knights of the Spring and Autumn Period (744–481 BC) were good citizens who cherished both civil (*wen*) and military (*wu*) values and took responsibility for the security of the state. Unfortunately, after the Qin Dynasty (221–206 BC), men of standing lost all taste for soldiering, valued only *wen* and shirked their responsibility for the country's defence, thus reducing Chinese culture to an 'a-military culture' (*wubing de wenhua*). This was reflected by Chinese institutional structures throughout the imperial era and beyond, and the effect had

⁸⁸ Lin Tongji 林同济, 'Xingtai lishiguan' 形态历史观, in *Shidai zhi bo: Zhanguo cepai wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 时代之波: 战国策派文化论著辑要, eds. Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍 (Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995), 5–13; also Lin Tongji, 'Zhanguo shidai de chongyan' 战国时代的重演, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding 丁晓萍, 1–8.

⁸⁹ Lei Haizong 雷海宗, 'Zhongguo wenhua de liangzhou' 中国文化的两周, in *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, eds. Wen and Ding, 140; see also H. T. Lei, 'Periodization: Chinese history and world history', *The Chinese Social and Political Science Review* 20 (1935–1938), reprinted in *The Pattern of Chinese History: Cycles, Development, or Stagnation*, ed. John Meskill (Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1965), 43–51.

been politically debilitating. Lei's ideal nation was one in which both *wen* and *wu* were valued. He found the source of national power in the ancient culture of the Warring States.⁹⁰ His ideas were at one with Lin Tongji's view that ancient China's 'knights' (*dafushi*) had long become the literati (*shidafu*) of the imperial era and that what China needed now was a revival of the spirit of the knights.⁹¹

This leads to another dominant theme of *Zhanguo* thought emphasizing the necessity of war, the will to power and hero worship. External wars, wrote Lin Tongji, were completely aimed at annihilating the enemy with the intent of global hegemony. Ethics could offer no solution to international conflicts. Only wars and power could achieve that. Nations that had no capacity for fighting or willingness to go to war could not survive. China's survival was contingent on its capacity to reproduce the 'Warring States culture'.⁹² In an article titled 'On power', Lin put forth a worldview in which power is seen as the manifestation of all lives: 'Power is life, life is power, and life without power is death.'⁹³ In this worldview, life, power and action constitute a trinity, with power being the product of 'vitality' and 'energy', and action being 'an expression and exercise of power'. Lin criticized the Chinese as cowards who dared not challenge others but were always willing to yield and compromise. He told his fellow countrymen not to be afraid to go to war, for life was not meant to be Buddhist or Daoist escapism seeking temporary peace or tolerating the intolerable. Wars were necessary, unavoidable and the *raison d'être* for the modern state. To fight the War of Resistance was to be a man, to appreciate the true meaning of being a man. Chinese must be their own masters, not slaves to other nations.⁹⁴

The theme of war and power was further developed by the political scientist He Yongji (1902–?, Ph.D. Harvard University). Supporting Lin Tongji's view that war was the *raison d'être* for the modern state, He invoked the Greek philosopher Heraclitus, who once wrote, 'War is the father of all things', to discard the Confucian values of harmony, benevolence and great unity in favour of the Legalist school of thought that emphasized power and authority. He distinguished between two types of war:

⁹⁰ Lei Haizong, 'Wubing de wenhua' 无兵的文化, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 108–31.

⁹¹ Lin Tongji, 'Dafushi yu shidafu: guoshi shang de liangzhong rengexing' 大夫士与士大夫: 国史上的两种人格性, in *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, eds. Wen and Ding, 61–8.

⁹² Lin Tongji, 'Zhanguo shidai de chongyan' 战国时代的重演, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 2–4.

⁹³ Lin Tongji, 'Li' 力, in *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, eds. Wen and Ding, 3.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 4–7.

war for victory and war for annihilation. The former was partial war; the latter, total war. To fight the Japanese, total war was necessary. He asked his readers not to place any hope on the League of Nations, third-party mediation or the prospect of a negotiated peace. There was only one way to end the war – either you win or you lose. On the basis of China's conditions and international politics, He expressed a view of politics that was two-directional: externally oriented and internally oriented. Chinese politics were fragmented because of regional power. He demanded that all of the armies be nationalized and external politics take precedence over domestic politics. 'We must recognize that war is the ontology of the state, and remember that there are always conflicts of all kinds among states. We must place all domestic affairs behind this great state enterprise [of going to war]. I call this a view of externally oriented high politics.'⁹⁵

He Yongji's 'high politics' (his English) were power politics on the global stage, the politics of *Realpolitik*. He portrayed China as a small fish or a 'gold fish' that used to be free and happy in its own little pond of 'peace and righteousness'. Yet now it was thrown into the ocean, soon to be swallowed by the sharks or other sea monsters. To save itself, China must become a part of the politics of the ocean by aligning with a big fish, such as the Soviet Union.⁹⁶ There was no room for neutrality in world affairs. If Adolph Hitler could play the great powers off against one another by forming an alliance with the Soviet Union, why could China not do the same? 'From this it can be seen that in high politics there is no ism, no love and hate, no [lasting] peace, only national security! National security is the defining factor [in international politics]. The rest is all a smoke screen!'⁹⁷ In this view, wars were amoral and just a necessity.

The emphasis on war and power reflected the influence of Nietzsche, whose idea of '*der Wille zur Macht*', or 'the Will to Power', was appropriated. Nietzsche did not abhor wars. Actually, he welcomed them, remarking with joy that the classical age of war was coming and holding that victors in war and their descendants were usually biologically superior to the vanquished.⁹⁸ The German-educated playwright and literary critic Chen Quan (1905–69) thus asserted that the strong always conquered

⁹⁵ He Yongji 何永佶, 'Zhengzhiguan: waixiang yu neixiang' 政治观: 外向与内向, *Zhanguo* 战国策 1 (April 1940): 37–42; the quote is on 39.

⁹⁶ He Yongji, 'Lun dazhengzhi' 论大政治, *Zhanguo* 2 (April 1940): 3–7.

⁹⁷ He Yongji, 'Xitela de waijiao' 希特拉的外交, *Zhanguo* 12 (September 1940): 23.

⁹⁸ Russell, *History of Western Philosophy*, 721, 736.

the weak. Holding up Nietzsche's 'morality of the master' as an alternative to China's traditional 'morality of the slave', Chen, too, viewed war as a necessity rather than as a moral question. He rejected Schopenhauer's pessimism in favour of Nietzsche's optimism and enterprising spirit. His belief in hero worship underlined Nietzsche's concept of the *Übermensch* ('superman'), which is intrinsically connected to the will to power. Chen distinguished hero worship from obsequiousness by the worshipper's sincerity and integrity. The hero was exemplary. Consequently, Chen argued that it required strong leadership and collectivist consciousness to correct the inertia and mediocrity of the Chinese people, reform the 'bungled and botched' (Nietzsche's phrase) and promote national unity.⁹⁹ For Chen, the German character – idealist, pragmatic, precise, hero worshipping, nationalistic and warlike all at the same time – was a model for emulation.¹⁰⁰ Was there a superman in China? There has been no suggestion that Chen had Chiang Kai-shek in mind.¹⁰¹

Another *Zhanguo* writer, the Hegelian philosopher and New Confucian He Lin, defended Chen Quan against allegations of fascist views. He clarified for Chen that hero worship meant admiration and respect for outstanding people, recognizing their great achievements, following them and looking up to them for inspiration. There were great men and women in every field of human endeavours. To worship them did not mean believing in tyranny or militarism. He Lin invoked the Scottish essayist and historian Thomas Carlyle (1795–1881), who worshipped Napoleon for his military and political talents and whose works were popular in Chinese literary circles. He argued that hero worship was not antithetical to, but a condition for, democracy because if people worshipped only themselves, there was no respect for others. Hero worship was not to be confused with absolute obedience to the leader.¹⁰²

Unlike Nietzsche, who was neither a nationalist nor a worshipper of the state, the *Zhanguo* writers stood for the nation and for state power. Rising nationalism drove Chen Quan to launch a 'nationalist literature'

⁹⁹ Chen Quan 陈铨, 'Lun yingxiong chongbai' 论英雄崇拜, *Zhanguo* 4 (May 1940): 1–10, 1–10.

¹⁰⁰ Chen Quan, 'Deguo minzu de xingge he sixiang' 德国民族的性格和思想, *Zhanguo* 6 (June 1940): 26, 26–32.

¹⁰¹ According to Godley, 'Politics from history', 110, Chen Quan had published a play in which his Nietzschean superman bore a close resemblance to Wang Jingwei, then head of a puppet regime in Nanjing serving the occupying Japanese forces.

¹⁰² He Lin 贺麟, 'Yingxiong chongbai yu renge jiaoyu' 英雄崇拜与人格教育, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 302–11.

movement that sought to promote the ancient Chinese martial spirit and national consciousness. Using Chinese themes and contents, this literature was aimed at a local readership; it was 'peculiar' and 'creative', and it departed from the New Culture Movement, which had privileged individualism over nationalism. Chen thought that every epoch had a literature reflecting its *gestalt* and the nation.¹⁰³ Looking to the future, he regarded nationalist literature as the literature of a prosperous rather than a dying age.¹⁰⁴

The third dominant theme of *Zhanguo* thought concerned the supremacy of the nation-state. China was in a 'great era' (*dashidai*); its problems were political. There was no room for filial piety because loyalty must be given to the nation-state first. In an age of contending states, citizens must be part of an organic state that emphasized the public interest (*gong*) rather than self-interest (*si*).¹⁰⁵

The *Zhanguo* writers acknowledged the contributions of the May Fourth Movement to the emancipation of the individual but faulted it on three counts. First, although May Fourth had begun as an expression of nationalism, it quickly reoriented towards international peace, producing a pacifism not suited to the real world. Second, May Fourth intellectuals had misread the political tide of the twentieth century by placing individualism ahead of collectivism instead of seeking national freedom before individual liberties. Third, they had overemphasized rationality and worshipped science to the neglect of the emotions, intuition and irrationalism.¹⁰⁶ Contrasting the May Fourth Movement with the German Romantic Movement of the nineteenth century, Chen Quan emphasized the point that May Fourth had not gone far enough to reconstruct Chinese culture on a basis of national power.¹⁰⁷ He desired to see the Faustian spirit in Goethe's plays to be instilled in the Chinese mind.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ Chen Quan, 'Minzu wenxue yundong' 民族文学运动, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 368–79, 375–8.

¹⁰⁴ Chen Quan, 'Shengshi wenxue yu moshi wenxue' 盛世文学与末世文学, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 411–16.

¹⁰⁵ Lin Tongji, 'Da zhengzhi shidai de lunli: yige guanyu zhongxiao wenti de taolun' 大政治时代的伦理：一个关于忠孝问题的讨论, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 167–75.

¹⁰⁶ Chen Quan, 'Wusi yundong yu kuangbiao yundong' 五四运动与狂飙运动, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 342–7.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ Chen Quan, 'Fushide de jingshen' 浮士德的精神, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 9–16.

The Communists attacked the *Zhanguo* writers for their 'rightist' views, 'fascist' tendencies and pro-Nationalist attitude. Recent scholarship in the PRC, however, has challenged the Communist allegations, pointing out that the *Zhanguo* writers were not entirely antiliberal, that they were no advocates of dictatorship, that their hero worship emphasized only the exemplary role and contributions of the great man and that they hardly mentioned fascism and Chiang Kai-shek.¹⁰⁹ Moreover, there was no lack of criticism of the Nationalist government. Lin Tongji loathed the corrupt bureaucracy, castigated 'bureaucratic capitalism' and attacked the government for failing to eradicate official graft and corruption.¹¹⁰ Others criticized Chiang Kai-shek's reluctance to mobilize the masses militarily. On the other hand, all wanted the government to lead, to unite the nation and to fight the Japanese to the bitter end. No one wanted to overthrow the government for the Communists.

In short, *Zhanguo* conservatism harked back to antiquity and to the contending schools of thought of the pre-Qin times. Yet its vision of the Chinese state as a military power was modern in its day. *Zhanguo* conservatism represented a modernity that combined military and civil virtues, guaranteed national security and enabled the country to stand up against foreign aggression. It was concerned with imperialism and the relations of power.

Conclusion

This chapter has illuminated the political dynamics of conservatism in the Republican era. At the heart of this conservatism were concerns about imperialism, the future of the nation and the foreign threat. The nation-state, a central pillar of modernity, was the basis for an identity of interest between conservatism and nationalism. State building was all the more important when linked to the issue of national survival. Conservatism, like liberalism and Marxism, served political purposes. Liang Shuming believed that China should work out its own salvation. His rural reconstruction project combined local self-government, political awakening of the peasants and reverence for the Confucian heritage. For Zhang Junmai, China's reconstruction required a national renaissance,

¹⁰⁹ See Jiang Pei 江沛, *Zhanguocapai sixiang yanjiu* 战国策派思想研究 (Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chubanshe, 2001), especially chap. 7.

¹¹⁰ Lin Tongji, 'Guanliao chuantong: huanquan zhi hua' 官僚传统: 皇权之花 and 'Zhongbao: guanliao chuantong de yimian' 中饱: 官僚传统的一面, in *Shidai zhi bo*, eds. Wen and Ding, 76–83 and 84–95, respectively.

national will, self-confidence and pride in the nation's history without being uncritical of it. For the 'ten professors', cultural reconstruction was a modernizing project that, as Tao Xisheng made clear, was political in its expressions of anti-imperialism, national pride and self-esteem.

During the War of Resistance, the Sinification movement would have been insignificant had it not been so political. Qian Mu used history as an instrument in the service of the state, promoting China's distinctive culture. Feng Youlan believed that the Chinese no longer worshipped or despised things foreign but had emerged from an inferiority complex. Finally, the *Zhanguoce* writers revived the ancient culture of the Warring States to reform the feeble character of the nation, extol military values, enhance national power and fight the Japanese in what could be a total war. They saw the war as a necessary purgative for Chinese society, ridding it of old ills and liberating the still-vital energies of the nation. To them, ideas of war and nation were constitutive of modernity.

It should now be clear that, although conservatism in China was not political conservatism in a Burkean sense, it was profoundly political. The conservatives stood in an ambiguous relationship with the existing regime and the party-state. Some had reservations about liberal democracy and would defend a form of enlightened despotism or new-style dictatorship. Others spoke of revisionist democracy. Still others, as much as they desired democracy, thought Chinese conditions were not ripe for constitutionalism. The conservatives were in the main loyal critics who would be willing to cooperate with the government if it carried out reform and implemented constitutional rule.

Linking culture with politics, modern Chinese conservatism was not a neatly labelled category. It was reformist, pro-state, proauthority and, for some, prowar. But it was not anti-Western, antiliberal or antidemocratic. It represented a morally innovative path to modernity.

Liberalism in China and Chinese Liberal Thought

This chapter sets out to explore modern Chinese liberal thought on the premise that liberalism is the political doctrine of modernity. It is fitting to begin with a reference to Jerome Grieder's seminal work on Hu Shi in which the author draws a distinction between liberalism in China and Chinese liberalism:

Liberalism in China... meant much the same thing that liberalism has meant elsewhere: a belief in popularly based institutions of government, in the rule of law, in political processes that are made legitimate by the manner in which they function rather than by the ends ascribed to them; and, uniting all these elements, a belief in the creative and benign power of free intelligence. Liberalism in China remained, in the context of Chinese conditions, essentially an abstraction.¹

On the other hand, '*Chinese* liberalism meant something more concrete in the Chinese mind: a pattern of personal values reminiscent of the values of the Confucian "superior man," an ideal that had existed virtually unchanged through the long centuries of imperial history.'² Grieder's point is that the Confucian tradition profoundly influenced Chinese liberal thought. The distinction he draws helps me to frame two questions for investigation in this chapter. First, how did Republican Chinese intellectuals understand liberalism? Second, what were the features and specific concerns of their liberal thought? In answering these questions, I will also attempt, at the end of the chapter, to shed light on the relationship of liberal thought to cultural radicalism and to conservative

¹ Jerome B. Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution, 1917-1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 344.

² *Ibid.*

thought. How the liberals came to take a statist bend and moved from state socialism to social democracy will be explored in Chapters 6 and 7.

With regard to the first question, Chinese scholarship during the past fifteen years or so has maintained that the intellectuals of modern China misunderstood liberalism, and even distorted it, because they failed to recognize classical liberalism, especially the link between liberalism and a free market economy. Consequently, great harm had been done to the cause of liberalism in the precommunist period. Liberal intellectuals are blamed for the 'failure' of liberalism in modern China because they did not appreciate the normative values of liberalism and grasp the essence of the liberal doctrine. This is a neoliberal view and suggests that Chinese liberals were not 'true' liberals. Many Western writers, too, often wonder about this issue. To me, however, whether Chinese liberals were genuine liberals is not important. What is relevant is to understand their liberal thought and concerns in a contextual cultural and political frame of reference.

Liberalism has been understood in a variety of ways. Stephen Holmes maintains that liberalism contains many strands and tensions and 'continues to be a field of contest, not an unambiguous creed that demands total allegiance and stigmatizes dissent'.³ He further states that none of the liberal thinkers from Milton to Spinoza to Locke to Kant to Bentham to John Stuart Mill and many others can be fully understood 'if plucked ahistorically from his political and intellectual context'.⁴ In a similar fashion, John Gray writes that essential to any correct understanding of liberalism is 'a clear insight into its historicity, its origins in a definite cultural and political circumstance and its background in the context of European individualism in the early modern period'.⁵ Also, Richard Rorty has argued that the contingency of a liberal state is a lack of objection to it. Liberal societies and states are wholly contingent creations of specific historical practices; they cannot, and need not, claim to be privileged or especially authentic expressions of 'human nature'.⁶

The key to understanding modern Chinese liberalism is, therefore, an acknowledgement of different strands of liberal thought in the West and

³ Stephen Holmes, *Passions and Constraint: On the Theory of Liberal Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁵ John Gray, *Liberalism*, 2nd edn. (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995), xi, 8.

⁶ Richard Rorty, *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 52, 60.

an historicist approach that takes account of the historical contingencies and conjunctures of modern China. From this perspective, modern Chinese liberal thought grew from a confluence of cultural, political and specific historical factors: China's semicolonization by the foreign powers, the demise of the monarchical system, the failure of the Republican experiment, the spread of Enlightenment thought, the exigencies of nationalism and the imperatives of state building. Given these factors, to which must be added the Confucian heritage, it is only natural that Chinese liberalism should have peculiar characteristics. But it also had universal aspects in that in some ways it followed the liberal trend in Western Europe that was less than classical during the first half of the twentieth century. These factors also explain the specific concerns that Chinese intellectuals had about their country from a liberal point of view.

The Rise of Chinese Liberalism

Although the rise of Chinese liberalism was a modern development, William Theodore de Bary has long maintained that there was a pre-modern liberal tradition in the Song–Ming period.⁷ De Bary discerns a kind of 'Confucian individualism' and terms it 'personalism', which 'expresses the worth and dignity of the person, not as a raw, "rugged" individual, but as a self formed and shaped in the context of a given cultural tradition, its own social community and its natural environment to reach full personhood'.⁸ The Confucian ideal, he writes, is a balance of public and private interests, self and society. He grounds the liberal tradition partly in the centuries-old idea of 'community compact' (*xiangyue*), with its emphasis on voluntarism, local autonomy, consensual and cooperative arrangement for the improvement of village life; on minimal autocratic and bureaucratic interference at the local level; and on responsible leadership based on shared values that were rooted in the daily life of the common people. On the state level, de Bary singles out the Neo-Confucian scholar Huang Zongxi (1610–95) of the Ming Dynasty, who asserted the intellectual and moral authority of the literati and had a plan for the Prince that represented a 'Confucian constitutionalism'. De Bary draws attention to 'public opinion' in the scholarly community and to the autonomy of local academies, arguing that there were freedoms of

⁷ Wm. Theodore de Bary, *The Liberal Tradition in China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), chaps. 2–4.

⁸ Wm. Theodore de Bary, *Asian Values and Human Rights: A Confucian Communitarian Perspective* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 25.

discussion and association in the Confucian tradition. He distinguishes between two parallel political traditions in imperial China: the dominant autocratic dynastic tradition and the liberal tradition of critique.⁹

The claim of a liberal tradition dating back to Song–Ming times has been questioned by Paul Cohen, who criticized de Bary for employing a conception of liberalism that is excessively broad and for being motivated by a desire to look for some kind of change towards modernity in the history of traditional China that is worthy of attention but is defined by the Western historical experience.¹⁰ In response, de Bary defends his position against what he calls ‘Western parochialism’ in the treatment of philosophical constructs as they appear in different cultural contexts.¹¹

Interestingly, Hu Shi had claimed long before de Bary that a liberal tradition had existed in ancient Chinese thought, which persisted into the twentieth century. The basis for his claim was the Confucian conception of human nature as innately good, the Mencian justification of rebellions against tyrannical rule, the casteless social structure in which education was open to all, the selections of state officials through a meritorious competitive examination system and the tradition of remonstrance against the wrongdoings of the emperor.¹² The intellectual heritage of ancient China, according to Hu, was marked by ‘humanism’, ‘rationalism’ and a ‘spirit of freedom’, which had been ‘the bedrock of Chinese cultural and intellectual life throughout all subsequent ages’. Hu also pointed to ‘a scientific methodology’ during the past three hundred years in the study of Chinese classics.¹³ This claim was made early in the 1940s, when Hu, as Chinese ambassador to the United States, was very keen to speak highly of Chinese culture to underscore its congruence with the modern

⁹ Wm. Theodore de Bary, ‘Individualism and humanitarianism in late Ming thought’, in *Self and Society in Ming Thought*, ed. Wm. Theodore de Bary (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), 145–248.

¹⁰ Paul A. Cohen, ‘The quest for liberalism in the Chinese past: stepping stone to a cosmopolitan world or the last stand of Western parochialism: a review of *The Liberal Tradition in China*’, *Philosophy East and West* 35, 3 (July 1985): 305–10; and ‘A reply to Professor Wm. Theodore de Bary’, 413–17.

¹¹ Wm. Theodore de Bary, ‘Confucian liberalism and Western parochialism’, *Philosophy East and West* 35, 3 (July 1985): 399–412.

¹² Hu Shih, ‘Historical foundations for a democratic China’, in *Lectures on Government: Second Series*, ed. Edmund J. James (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1941), 1–12.

¹³ Hu Shih, ‘Chinese thought’, *Asia* 42, 10 (October 1942): 582–4; and ‘The struggle for intellectual freedom in historic China’, *World Affairs* 105, 3 (September 1942): 170–3. Hu maintained his view to the end of his life. See his nearly last English article, ‘The scientific spirit and method in Chinese philosophy’, in *The Chinese Mind: Essentials of Chinese Philosophy and Culture*, ed. Charles A. Moore (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1962), 104–31.

world in an effort to win American support in the war against Japan. He made the same assertion in March 1949, when he arrived in Taiwan and delivered a lecture titled 'The liberal tradition in Chinese culture'.¹⁴

Although Hu and de Bary made some interesting claims, in fact, it was not until the late Qing period that notions of parliament, democracy and liberty were brought to China by foreign missionaries and mentioned in the reformist writings of the scholar-officials Lin Zexu, Wei Yuan and later Kang Youwei. Sprouts of Chinese liberalism may be found during the 'Hundred Days' Reform', when Tan Sitong blended the Confucian notion of benevolence (*ren*) with Western ideas to advance a notion of liberty based on equality. But it was Yan Fu who introduced liberalism into China through his translations of the works of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Thomas Huxley, Herbert Spencer and Montesquieu (Charles-Louis de Secondat), among others, supplemented with his commentaries.¹⁵ For his contributions, Yan is hailed by some historians as 'the father of Chinese liberalism' and 'the real pioneer in the Chinese liberal movement'.¹⁶ Liang Qichao, who lived in exile in Japan following the fiasco of the 'Hundred Days' Reform', learned about liberalism and democracy from Meiji Japan's leading interpreters of English liberalism, Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835–1901), Nakamura Masanao (1832–91) and Katō Hiroyuki (1836–1916). Liang made the transition from a classical scholar to a modern intellectual with an interest in Western liberal thought in 1902, when he wrote the well-known essay 'New citizen' (*Xinminshuo*),¹⁷ which contained liberal ideas, such as a spirit of individualism and initiative, moral and physical courage, political participation and a sense of civic responsibility.

Some intellectual historians, however, ignore the late Qing genesis of modern liberal thought and instead see the New Culture/May Fourth period as marking its beginnings. They regard Yan Fu as the precursor of Chinese liberalism, not its representative. Thus, Xu Jilin argues that it was only when the worth and dignity of the individual, liberty, reason and the universal ideas of the Enlightenment were recognized that 'true' liberalism could emerge. In his view, neither Yan Fu nor Liang Qichao

¹⁴ See Hu Songping 胡颂平 (ed.), *Hu Shizhi xiansheng nianpu changbian chugao* 胡适先生年谱长编初稿, 6 vols. (Taipei: Lianjing chubanshe, 1984), vol. VI, 2078–81.

¹⁵ See Benjamin I. Schwartz, *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964).

¹⁶ Hu Weixi 胡伟希, Gao Ruiquan 高瑞泉 and Zhang Limin 张利民, *Shiji jietou yu ta* 十字街头与塔 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1991), 23.

¹⁷ Hao Chang, *Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Intellectual Transition in China, 1890–1907* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977).

pursued those values as their ultimate concern, and even in the May Fourth period Chinese liberal thought was vague and ambivalent. It was not until the late 1920s and 1930s (prior to the outbreak of war with Japan) that liberalism was visible as an intellectual and political movement.¹⁸

Whether one takes the late Qing or the early Republic as the point of departure, Chinese liberal thought did enter a new phase in the May Fourth period, finding expression in ideas of individual liberation, ethical revolution and gender equality, as well as in the 'New Literature'. It was identified with anti-Confucianism, science, democracy, liberty, progress and the vernacular movement. Also, it was associated with Westernized radicalism, as described in Chapter 1.

The background against which Chinese liberal thought emerged and evolved was marked by weak institutions, exploitative landlord-tenant relations and hierarchical familial practices. From the start, the Chinese case was different from the European experience because of the nonexistence of clericalism and, even more importantly, the absence of the Industrial Revolution, which accompanied the scientific revolution and from which developed a powerful middle class that contributed to the individualistic social order in the West. Bound up with nationalism, moreover, Chinese liberalism was not grounded in a theory of natural rights, whose appeal to early twentieth-century Chinese intellectuals was short-lived; many soon came to be influenced by evolutionary theory and social Darwinism. Nor was the Chinese claim to liberty founded on an appeal to ancient rights and historical precedents, as in the case of English liberalism. Rather, the claim was grounded in ideas of individual emancipation from the fetters of the Confucian tradition, especially of the family; in national survival; in cultural regeneration; and in political and social change.

The rise of Chinese liberalism was thus characterized by the absence of a classical phase. Whereas 'revisionist' liberalism was the second phase in the horizontal development of the liberal creed in Europe, it was the first in China. China did not experience anything like the European Renaissance, which apotheosized the individual and glorified in his or her potential for achievement. Nor was there an age of reasoned dissent – of Enlightenment, as in Europe, where liberalism found the first systematic expositions in the seventeenth century. Chinese liberals

¹⁸ Xu Jilin 许纪霖, 'Xiandai Zhongguo de ziyou zhuyi chuantong' 现代中国的自由主义传统, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 42 (August 1997): 27.

were revisionist and utilitarian from the outset. They came to liberalism bypassing the laissez-faire phase that was considered incompatible with the Chinese communitarian tradition. Few showed an interest in Locke, Smith, Montesquieu and other eighteenth-century liberal thinkers. Instead, they were interested primarily in the modern or state liberalism of nineteenth-century Europe, then in the New Liberalism of early twentieth-century England, before embracing the social democratic ideology of Western Europe.¹⁹ Chinese liberalism rose in reaction to, and as a critique of, modern capitalism.

The Liberals as a Differentiated Category

Chinese liberals, either self-proclaimed or as labelled by others, were a differentiated category. They had ideas that may have oddly gone together, may have changed sharply between youth and age and may have been far too nuanced to fit comfortably under the liberal banner. Examples abound. Yan Fu, as the precursor of Chinese liberalism, was exceedingly conservative in his late years when he supported autocratic rule. Liang Qichao, the best-known publicist of Western thought of his day, was at once liberal and conservative, changing his ideas at different times in different circumstances and eventually advocating enlightened despotism. Ding Wenjiang and the American-trained diplomatic historian Jiang Tingfu (Ph.D. Columbia University), who had all the appearances of a liberal in the 1920s, advocated a 'new-style dictatorship' in 1934. Chen Duxiu and Li Dazhao converted to Marxism but retained certain liberal ideas. The cultural conservative Zhang Shizhao argued for a national economy based on agriculture, but his political views easily qualified him as an English liberal. Zhang Junmai was critical of Hu Shi regarding his understanding of science, ethics, religion and the Enlightenment,²⁰ but he was every bit as liberal as Hu regarding constitutionalism, democracy and human rights. The liberal-minded chancellor of Beida, Cai Yuanpei, was by all accounts a traditionalist when he exhorted his students to resist temptations to wealth and power and to pursue a life of contemplation as morally superior individuals.²¹ Also, the historian and cultural

¹⁹ Hu, Gao and Zhang, *Shizi jietou yu ta*, 70–1.

²⁰ Zhang Junmai 张君勱, 'Hu Shi sixiangjie luxian pinglun' 胡适思想界路线评论, in *Zhongxiyin zhexue wenji* 中西印哲学文集, 2 vols., ed. Cheng Wenxi 程文熙 (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuzhu, 1981), vol. II, 1030–2.

²¹ Timothy B. Weston, *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals, and Chinese Political Culture, 1898–1929* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 119.

conservative Chen Yinke demanded 'freedom of thought, independence of spirit' (*ziyou sixiang, duli jingshen*) in the face of the GMD's political indoctrination in education.²²

Xu Jilin distinguishes between two types of Chinese liberals: the men of ideas and the men of action. Hu Shi was the spiritual leader of the men of ideas, who eschewed politics, working at universities and colleges and promoting their liberal views in journals, books, newspapers and public forums. They were critical intellectuals. The men of action were interested in political participation. As professors, editors and writers, they sought change from within the government or as oppositionists. Prominent among them were Zhang Junmai, Luo Longji (1898–1965) and Wang Zaoshi (1903–71). The boundaries between the two types were not, however, clearly delineated. Zhang, Luo, Wang and many others were both thinker-activists and ardent participants in the political movements of the 1930s and 1940s.²³

Many liberals maintained ambiguous relations with the ruling elite. A prime example is Hu Shi, who once said as a student in the United States that he would not participate in politics for at least twenty years,²⁴ yet his actions were not always apolitical. His role as a cofounder in 1922 of *Endeavour Weekly* (*Nuli zhoubao*), published by Shanghai's Commercial Press, was manifestly political. While teaching at Beida from 1917 to 1926, Hu sought change within the framework of the Beijing government. Through his association with Liang Qichao and with the Constitution Study Society, Hu was able to establish good personal relations with many officials, such as Zhang Jiaao, Wang Zhengting, Wang Chonghui, Gu Weijun (Wellington Koo), Jiang Menglin, Tang Erhe and Luo Wengan, and through them to maintain a dialogue with the government. At the same time, Hu tried to advise the warlord Wu Peifu through Wu's personal staff on matters relating to finances, federation

²² Wang Rongzu 汪荣祖, *Shijia Chen Yinke zhuan* 史家陈寅恪传 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005), 210–18; Guo Yapei 郭亚佩, 'Lishi de Chen Yinke: "ziyou sixiang, duli jingshen" yu Zhongguo zhengzhi xiandaixing' 历史的陈寅恪: '自由主义思想, 独立精神' 与中国政治现代性, in *Ziyou zhuyi yu renwen chuantong: Lin Yusheng xiansheng qizhi shouqing lunwenji* 自由主义与人文传统: 林毓生先生七秩寿庆论文集, ed. Qiu Huifen 丘惠芬 (Taipei: Yunchen wenhua, 2005), 403–12.

²³ Xu Jilin 许纪霖, 'Xiandai Zhongguo de shehui minzhu zhuyi chuantong' 现代中国的社会主义传统, in Xu Jilin, *Lingyizhong qimeng* 另一种启蒙 (Guangzhou: Huacheng chubanshe, 1999), 99–107; and 'Xiandai Zhongguo de ziyou zhuyi chuantong' 现代中国的自由主义传统, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 42 (August 1997): 27–8.

²⁴ Tang Degang 唐德刚 (ed.), *Hu Shi koushu zizhuan* 胡适口述自传 (Taipei: Zhuanji wenxue, 1986), 36.

and local self-government. He frequently met with representatives from the provinces. In 1925, Hu accepted an invitation from Premier Duan Qirui to participate in the Rehabilitation Conference alongside such high officials as Tang Shaoyi, Wang Jingwei and Huang Fu. In July 1927, back from a trip to the United States, Hu did not return to Beijing but instead went to Shanghai, where he became principal of the China Public Institute in 1928 while many of his old friends joined the new Nationalist government in Nanjing.²⁵ Hu was involved in a human rights movement in 1929–31 along with Luo Longji and Liang Shiqiu, and he founded the journal *Independent Critic* with the objective of expressing liberal views on political change. He tirelessly campaigned for democracy and constitutionalism. In 1932, Hu returned to Beida as dean of arts and head of the Chinese Department, and in 1938, he was appointed ambassador to the United States. In taking up this appointment, Hu removed his last vestiges of being an independent critic and apolitical scholar, although he never joined a political party. He had always been a loyal critic (*zhengyou*).

Some were reluctant political participants. Although he had no taste for politics, the philosopher Zhang Dongsun joined his close friend Zhang Junmai in 1932 to found the Chinese State Socialist Party. But once he was in it, he never turned back. The two were comfortable being in academia and politics at the same time. Others became politically engaged, only to return to academia when disillusioned, such as Huang Yanpei, leader of the Vocational Educationalists.

We can distinguish three generations of liberal thinkers in the Republican era. The first generation was that of Yan Fu and Liang Qichao, who began their education and careers in the late Qing; Liang retained much of his influence until his death in 1929. The next generation consisted of Hu Shi, the pre-Marxist Chen Duxiu and Li Dazhao, Zhang Junmai, Zhang Dongsun and others of the May Fourth period. It is sometimes said that this second generation had a choice between two liberal models: the British model of Locke and the French model of Rousseau. It follows from this, the argument goes, that the gradualists chose the former and the radicals the latter. The inference is that from the early 1920s, Chinese liberalism went down the wrong path in Rousseauist fashion, privileging equality over liberty and positive liberty over negative liberty.²⁶ Although this is an interesting argument, this two-model theory is open

²⁵ Li Qingxi 李庆西, 'Ziyou zhuyi zhishi fenzi' 自由主义知识分子, *Dushu* 读书 2 (2000): 61–3.

²⁶ See, for example, Gao Like 高力克, *Tiaoshi de zhihui: Du Yaquan sixiang yanjiu* 调适的智慧: 杜亚泉思想研究 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1998), 183–90.

to criticism on two counts. One is that whereas some, most notably Chen Duxiu, were attracted to the French model, many more were interested in Anglo-American liberal democracy. What converted the likes of Chen to Marxism after 1920 had little to do with French political thought and was much more influenced by events in Russia.²⁷ Second, British liberalism and American liberalism were (and still are) not identical. Liang Qichao was more interested in British politics; Hu Shi, in American democracy. Early in the 1920s, it was John Dewey rather than Bertrand Russell who had a greater influence on China's liberal intellectuals.²⁸ Furthermore, there was a German influence, as the case of Zhang Junmai demonstrates (see Chapter 6).

A third generation emerged in the early 1930s. Many of this generation were influenced by the British political thinker Harold Laski (1893–1950). Among Laski's former graduate or undergraduate students at the London School of Economics, at one time or another, were Luo Longji, Wang Zaoshi, Chu Anping, Fei Xiaotong, Gong Xiangrui, Wu Enyu, Zou Wenhui, Lou Bangyan, Qian Changzhao and Hang Liwu, to mention just a few. (The poet Xu Zhimo had also studied politics under Laski before he went to Cambridge University to study literature.) They returned to China to become university professors, economists, writers, journal editors, social critics and political activists. Some, such as Qian Changzhao (1899–1988), served in the Nationalist government in various senior positions. They were liberals with a social democratic bend.²⁹ Laski never visited China, but many of his books were translated into Chinese.³⁰ This third generation extended to the post-1945 period, which saw a split within the liberal camp as the communist movement gathered pace, eventually forcing the intellectuals to make a choice in 1949. Some chose to remain in China to support the new regime. Others fled to Taiwan, Hong Kong and the West.

²⁷ See a critique of this view in Gan Yang 甘阳, 'Ziyou zhuyi: guizu de haishi pingmin de?', 自由主义: 贵族的还是平民的?, in *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, ed. Li Shitao 李世涛 (Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002), 1–4.

²⁸ Zhu Xueqin 朱学勤, 'Rangren weinan de Luosu' 让人为难的罗素, *Dushu* 读书 1 (January 1996): 1–10. Dewey had a greater influence because of his views on the importance of education.

²⁹ Sun Hongyun 孙洪云, 'La Siji yu minguo zhishijie' 拉斯基与民国知识界, in *Liang'an sandi yanjiusheng shiyexia de jindai Zhongguo yantaohui lunwenji* 两岸三地研究生视野下的近代中国研讨会论文集, eds. Hu Chunhui 胡春惠 and Zhou Huimin 周惠民 (Taipei and Hong Kong: Zhengzhi daxue lishixi, Xianggang zhuhai shuyuan, 1990), 483–97.

³⁰ See Chap. 6, 212–13.

These three generations represent three phases in the development of Chinese liberalism in a chronological progression. But taken as a whole, the Republican period represented a broad statist stage in this development, with which I will deal in the next two chapters. For the moment, I will explore the question of how Republican intellectuals understood liberalism.

How Was Liberalism Understood in Modern China?

To begin, it is interesting to note the view of the liberal scholar Yin Haiguang (1919–69) that Chinese liberalism had ‘a premature birth followed by post-natal disorders’. By ‘premature birth’, he meant that liberalism did not grow out of native soil but was a foreign import, hence an insufficient understanding of the liberal creed; there was no Chinese writing nearly like John Stuart Mill’s ‘On liberty’ or Friedrich von Hayek’s *The Constitution of Liberty*. By ‘postnatal disorders’, Yin meant that modern China was convulsed by imperialism, war and revolution as well as by social and political upheavals.³¹

Related to the notion of premature birth is a widely held view among PRC scholars that Chinese liberal thought did not reflect ‘true’ or ‘pure’ liberalism and that the liberals were more interested in social realities and the application of liberal ideas to problem solving and political designs than in the epistemology of liberalism.³² One scholar asserts that Chinese liberals failed to provide a clear ‘intellectual spectrum’, lacking both a commitment to liberalism’s normative values and an appreciation of the relationship between liberty and capitalist development. He sees liberalism in China as symbolically linked to capitalism and to the West without a systematic epistemological foundation.³³ Another scholar maintains that because the liberals were driven by considerations of national survival and sociopolitical reform, liberalism in China as a system of thought and philosophy of life was robbed of its space in the realm of practical politics.³⁴ Each asserts that the liberals’ commitment to individualism

³¹ Yin Haiguang 殷海光, *Zhongguo wenhua de zhanwang* 中国文化的展望 (Taipei: Guiguan chubanshe, 1988), 320–1.

³² Xu Jilin, ‘Shehui minzhu zhuyi de lishi yichan: xiandai Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi de huigu’ 社会民主主义的遗产：现代中国自由主义的回顾, in *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng*, ed. Li Shitao, 474–6.

³³ Zhang Qing 章青, ‘Hu Shi pai xuerenqun’ yu xiandai Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi ‘胡适派学人群’与现代中国自由主义 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004), 2–3.

³⁴ Ren Jiantao 任剑涛, *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang mailuo zhong de ziyou zhuyi* 中国现代思想脉络中的自由主义 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2004), 12.

was weak and blames the ‘failure’ of liberalism in modern China on their misunderstanding or distortion of the liberal creed, leading yet another writer to go so far as to reject outright suggestions of a liberal tradition in modern China.³⁵ To these scholars, Chinese liberalism was a current of thought without an epistemology.

This begs the question stated at the start of this chapter: How was liberalism understood by Republican intellectuals? A popular view among contemporary PRC writers is that it was ‘misunderstood’ (*wujie*), suggesting that Chinese liberalism was inauthentic. The political scientist Liu Junning particularly asserts that classical liberalism was ‘lost’ (*shiluo*) in modern Chinese liberal thought because the intellectuals had failed to grasp it. Liu faults Yan Fu for not stressing the worth of the individual, personal autonomy and the pursuit of individual happiness and for viewing liberalism as a means to wealth and power in the service of the state. Following Benjamin Schwartz, Liu finds in Yan the Faustian-Promethean strain of modern Western development that exalts energy and power over both the physical nature and within human society.³⁶ Liu also faults Liang Qichao for viewing liberalism through the prism of the group. Liang regarded strengthening the rights of his ‘new citizen’ as a means of weakening the power of the monarch to eventually achieve republican goals. He did not proceed from the premise that representative institutions were driven by self-interest – the interest of a market economy.³⁷ What Liu is leading up to is that liberalism was misunderstood from the outset because Chinese liberal thought had no foundation in laissez-faire economics.

Second-generation liberals gravitated to the strand of political thought that exalted such values as democracy, freedom and equality. Sociopolitical reform was on the liberal agenda, despite preoccupations with cultural change. Even so, argues Liu Junning, Hu Shi ‘had no confidence in the relation between government and the market’ and was more interested in New Liberalism. Liu blames the ‘loss’ of classical liberalism in Chinese liberal thought partly on culture – Confucianism’s disdain for the merchant class and disparagement of self-interest, greed and accumulation of personal wealth – and partly on social Darwinism

³⁵ Lei Chiyue 雷池月, ‘Zhuyi zhi bu cun, huanglun chuantong?’ 主义之不存、遑论传统? in *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng*, ed. Li Shitao, 487–96.

³⁶ Liu Junning 刘军宁, *Gonghe, minzhu, xianzheng: ziyou zhuyi sixiang yanjiu* 共和、民主、宪政：自由主义思想研究 (Shanghai: Sanlian shudian, 1998), 292–300.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 301, 340–1.

in China, which placed politics above economics.³⁸ Liu's point about Confucian influence is not new. Grieder has made the same argument before. Other historians, mainly Chinese, also have demonstrated that there is no shortage of resources in the native tradition to develop a form of local liberalism.³⁹

Perhaps we need to be clear about what we mean by liberalism before judging how liberal Chinese liberals were during the Republican period. Like many concepts of political philosophy, liberalism is a broad church that presents problems when one tries to define it definitively, in part because it has been defined, redefined and variously construed by its advocates and critics alike. Nevertheless, there is a consensus on its essentials. John Gray tells us that common to all variants of liberalism is a definite conception of man and society, which is 'individualist', 'egalitarian', 'universalist' and 'meliorist'.⁴⁰ Also common to all definitions of liberalism is the notion of limited government and a belief in the kinds of ideas to which Grieder refers and in property rights. Liberals celebrate the pursuit of self-interest. Yet the liberal creed is not necessarily fixated on economic self-interest and individual rights as inalienable at all times and in any circumstances. Classical liberals attach great importance to the 'invisible hand'. Yet, as Holmes maintains, economic self-interest, however important, is merely one among the core practices valued, historically, by the 'ideal-typical liberal'. The idea that nothing matters except the pursuit of personal and material gain is 'an overly theatrical view of the liberal tradition'.⁴¹

The fact that Chinese liberals did not emphasize laissez-faire economics is not in dispute. Indeed, by including what James Richardson calls 'social liberalism'⁴² in the liberal discourse, they did not see laissez-faire economics as the supreme, defining value. Their position is perhaps incorrect from the contemporary neoliberal point of view. However, classical liberalism, rather than constituting the whole of the liberal tradition, only refers to a particular historical phase. Even core values shared by all variants of liberalism, such as individualism, liberty and progress, are each nuanced and open to somewhat different interpretations. No single

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 301–3.

³⁹ See, for example, Liu Qingfeng 刘青峰 and Cen Guoliang 岑国良 (eds.), *Ziyou zhuyi yu Zhongguo jindai chuantong* 自由主义与中国近代传统 (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2002).

⁴⁰ Gray, *Liberalism*, p. x.

⁴¹ Holmes, *Passions and Constraint*, 24.

⁴² James L. Richardson, *Contending Liberalisms in World Politics: Ideology and Power* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001), 36–42.

strand of liberal thought can claim to be uniquely authoritative to the exclusion of others.

Two major factors contributed to a Chinese understanding of liberalism from the start: translingualism and historical contingency. The translingual factor is a question of translation, one that is important historically. As Lydia Liu points out, the modern intellectual tradition in China began with translation, adaptation, appropriation and other interlingual practices related to the West.⁴³ Liu draws attention to the possibility in translation of changing the meaning of the basic concepts derived from foreign sources. One does not translate between equivalents; rather, one creates 'tropes of equivalence' in the fluid zone of translation between the host and guest languages.⁴⁴

Douglas Howland's study of Meiji Japan's Westernization, or *bunmei kaika* (civilization and enlightenment), also addresses the problem of what he terms 'translating the West'. Howland takes an approach, based on *Begriffsgeschichte* (conceptual history), pointing out that central to the significant adoption of material from an alien culture is the adoption of concepts. At the beginning of the Meiji period, a vast range of concepts was introduced from Europe and America as the new oligarchy pursued a project of wide-ranging political, social and cultural change modelled after Western countries. Howland examines the introduction and development of a number of key concepts from Western political theory, primarily liberalism, in the first two decades of the Meiji period. He interprets Japanese efforts to translate the West as a problem of both language and action.⁴⁵ He notes that the Japanese term for people's rights, *minken*, derived from the Chinese characters *minquan*, was used to encapsulate the dual meaning it carried of the people's right to participate in government and their rights as protected by the government. *Ken*, or *quan* in Chinese, means both rights and power/authority. Howland also notes that in Katō Hiroyuki's *Jinken shinsetsu* ('A new theory of human rights', 1882), the concept of rights tended towards that of 'legal rights' rather than 'natural rights', and in the writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi (1834–1901), people's rights were subsumed within state sovereignty (*kokken*). Fukuzawa and Nakamura used the term *shakai* (society, or *shehui* in Chinese) as a unifying concern and to denote the totality of the people of Japan, with Nakamura writing particularly on

⁴³ Lydia Liu, *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity: China, 1900–1937* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995), 25.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 3–7.

⁴⁵ Douglas R. Howland, *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 2, 7.

the public limits of liberty. Howland has demonstrated that from the start there was a tendency towards understanding liberty in terms of its contribution to *bunmei kaika* rather than in terms of natural, inalienable rights.⁴⁶

Initially, educated Chinese learned about liberalism through Japanese sources. The Japanese neologism *jiyū*, derived from the Chinese characters *ziyou*, was brought back to China and became the accepted, standard translation of 'liberty', which contains the problem of the nuance of selfishness that the term (and alternatives such as *jizai*, or *zizai* in Chinese) carries. The other Japanese terms, *minken*, *kokken* and *shakai*, also became Chinese terms with similar connotations. Laissez-faire then became *fangren* in Chinese, with the connotations of licentiousness and of taking no responsibility for one's behaviour and actions. In modern China, as in modern Japan, there was continuing tension between liberty conceived within the individual realm and liberty conceived within the social and political realm.

The neologism *geren zhuyi* (individualism), too, was invented by Meiji intellectuals (*kojin shugi* in Japanese). Following its introduction into China in the late Qing, individualism was seen by many as utterly alien to Chinese culture. It was promoted not as a notion of personal autonomy but rather as 'a modern version of Confucianism' that sought to liberate the individual from the family bonds and as 'a version of socialism' that affirmed the social good.⁴⁷ This caused Lu Xun to complain in 1907 that the term *geren* or *geren zhuyi* had fast become 'the butt of ridicule and debasement by those among our scholars who are purported to understand the world and keep abreast of the times'.⁴⁸ The trouble was that in Chinese, *ziyou zhuyi* was not liberalism but the doctrine of spontaneous licence (*fangren*), and *geren zhuyi* was not individualism but the doctrine of self-centredness. It made sense for the Chinese, as it did not for an American or a Briton, to say that the doctrine of spontaneous licence rested on the doctrine of self-centredness.⁴⁹ In Chinese culture, *fangren* is not a good thing.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, chap. 5.

⁴⁷ Liu, *Translingual Practice*, 89, 91. Liu is referring to Du Yaquan's interpretation.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 85.

⁴⁹ I have benefited from the insight of John King Fairbank, who wrote in a book review 'To say that liberalism rests on individualism under the supremacy of law is more sensible than to say, as one does in Chinese, that the doctrine of spontaneous license (*ziyou zhuyi*) rests on the doctrine of self-centeredness (*geren zhuyi*) under the supremacy of administrative regulation (*fa lu*).' See *China Quarterly* 96 (December 1982): 739.

In a separate study on the introduction of John Stuart Mill's thought to Japan and China, Howland demonstrates that central to Yan Fu's liberal thought was an emphasis on mutuality between the group and the self. According to Howland, Yan contributed to resolving the practical problem raised but left unanswered by Mill: 'how to best negotiate the proper spheres of authority and judgement respective to society and the individual'. Yan's answer to this question, based on a mutual territory of authority, embedded the self within the group, imposing mutual obligations on both society and the individual. Howland maintains that Yan did not systematically alter Mill's argument that individual liberties contribute to the progress of humanity; 'rather, he was emphasizing and expanding points already in Mill'. Whereas Mill mentioned in passing that a 'love of virtue' was implied in human character, Yan insisted that virtue was fundamental to the enjoyment of liberty. Thus, Howland concludes, 'Yan's emphasis on the moral prerequisites of individual liberty point toward a solution to the conflict at the heart of Mill's essay.'⁵⁰

Earlier, the historian Huang Kewu has critiqued the conventional view that Yan Fu, in his translation of Mill's 'On liberty' (1859), wittingly distorted liberalism to serve a utilitarian purpose. (Yan's translation is titled *Qunji quanjie lun*, literally, on the boundaries of authority between the group and the self). After examining Yan's translation against the English original, Huang comes to a different conclusion: that Yan was able to conceive of liberty in his own way by integrating Mill's ideas with the ancient thought of Mozi, Laozi and Confucius as well as with Daoism and Neo-Confucianism. In the process, Yan provided a critique of Mill's essay, revising his *raison d'être* for liberty. Yan's liberal thought was marked by a streak of utilitarianism and an affirmation of liberty, democracy and capitalism, but he refused to privilege the self over the group. He emphasized gradual reform through adjustment, a typical liberal principle. What Yan failed to understand, argues Huang, was not Mill's views on liberty and personal dignity but his *raison d'être* for liberty. Yan departed from Mill's idea of 'civil or social liberty' to construct a notion of democracy that attaches equal importance to the individual and the group in a mutually supportive relationship. Huang acknowledges that Yan had some difficulties in translating such terms as 'privacy', 'taste', 'rights' and 'legitimate self-interest' and also was ambiguous about the terms 'will', 'reason', 'judgement' and 'individual spontaneity' because he was

⁵⁰ Douglas R. Howland, *Personal Liberty and Public Good: The Introduction of John Stuart Mill to Japan and China* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 83.

looking at Western individualism from the Confucian perspective.⁵¹ The question, though, is whether Yan really understood Mill or whether he misread Mill through Chinese traditions. We just don't know for sure.

With regard to the historical contingency factor, Chinese intellectuals understood liberalism in the context of a specific cultural, social and political frame. Yan Fu's emphasis on wealth and power was a response not only to the Western impact but also to the Chinese situation of his day. Some recent revisionist works in the PRC are illuminating. One scholar asserts that, contrary to popular belief, Yan was an advocate of economic freedom. Another hails him as 'the exemplary representative of modern Chinese economic liberalism'. A third asserts that some of Yan's ideas bear a resemblance to those in prerevolutionary France and most of them to the utilitarianism of nineteenth-century England. Finally, a fourth situates Yan in both the classical and utilitarian traditions but closer to the New Liberalism of early twentieth-century England.⁵² These revisionist works are by no means definitive, but each suggests that Yan was driven by historical contingency and circumstance to accord higher priority to collective productivity than to laissez-faire economics.

The case of Liang Qichao also illustrates this point. Contrary to the conventional wisdom that he believed in the natural harmony of social relations and conceived of freedom as service to the state and for social ends,⁵³ Liang was conscious of the evil nature of human beings. He affirmed self-determination, personal autonomy and the worth of the individual and believed in broad political participation, multiparty competition, toleration and compromise. He sought to balance people's rights against state power, combining political pluralism with consensus based on a notion of public morality.⁵⁴ Liang placed more stress on political participation than on individual liberties because the latter had no meaning in a country that was not independent. The conditions of China

⁵¹ Huang Kewu 黄克武, *Ziyou zhi suoyiran: Yan Fu dui Yuehan Mier ziyou sixiang de renshi yu pipan* 自由的所以然: 严复对约翰弥尔自由思想的认识与批判 (Taipei: Yunchen wenhua, 1998); see also Max Ko-Wu Huang, *The Meaning of Freedom: Yan Fu and the Origins of Chinese Liberalism* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2008).

⁵² All cited in Yu Zuhua 俞祖华 and Zhao Huifeng 赵慧峰, 'Jindai Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi sichao yanjiu zongshu' 近代中国自由主义思潮研究综述 in *Zhongguo jindai shehui wenhua sichao yanjiu tonglan* 中国近代社会文化思想研究通鉴, eds. Yu Zuhua and Zhao Huifeng (Jinan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 2005), 258.

⁵³ See Andrew J. Nathan, *Chinese Democracy: The Individual and the State in Twentieth Century China* (New York: Knopf, 1985), 45–66.

⁵⁴ Huang Kewu 黄克武, *Yige beifang de xuanze: Liang Qichao tiaoshi sixiang zhi yanjiu* 一个被放弃的选择: 梁启超调适思想之研究 (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1994).

in an age of imperialism dictated that its citizens should be of service to the state so that national freedom could be achieved. Influenced by Katō Hiroyuki, a leading advocate of national polity (*kokutai*) in Meiji Japan who expounded the social Darwinist concept of might-as-right, Liang linked the concept of rights with that of struggle.⁵⁵

Hao Chang's view that Liang basically 'came to terms with Western liberal ideals within a collectivistic framework... and did not seem to have grasped, let alone become committed to, the spirit of Western liberalism'⁵⁶ is only a half-truth. There is no reason to believe that Liang did not recognize the core values and beliefs of liberalism, such as individualism, civil rights and liberties. He placed them under the banners of nationalism and collectivism only because the nation was facing a host of external and internal problems. Moreover, as one contemporary scholar has pointed out, Liang the nationalist conceived of an ideal international community grounded in the basic liberal ideas of equal rights and autonomy. His 'new citizen' was a member of the nation and of the world at the same time.⁵⁷ Thus, one finds in Liang ideas that were complex and nuanced and that changed from time to time. He lived in exile in Japan after the abortive 'Hundred Days' Reform', travelled to the United States in 1903, returned to China following the fall of the Qing Dynasty in 1912 and toured Shanghai, Hong Kong and other cities at various times, seeing things differently at each point. A variety of factors contributed to the formation and metamorphosis of his liberal thought, notably the Confucian tradition, circumstances in China, his perceptions of Japan and the West and his views about what was needed to forge a new national identity and to save the nation. If Liang stood in an ambiguous relationship with Western liberalism, it was because of China's conditions and pressing needs.

Apparently, Chinese understandings of liberalism were based on two premises: that of rights, which is as much a moral-value question as a constitutional and legal one, and that of utility, which was bound up with state building.⁵⁸ The two premises represent two clusters of values that

⁵⁵ Chang, *Liang Qichao and Intellectual Transition in China, 1890–1907*, 193–4.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 206.

⁵⁷ Xiaobing Tang, *Global Space and the Nationalist Discourse of Modernity: The Historical Thinking of Liang Qichao* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996), 22.

⁵⁸ Peter Zarrow has demonstrated that rights talk in the late Qing treated rights as morally necessary and as a tool for the critique of Qing despotism and for the building of a modern state. See his article 'Anti-despotism and "rights talk": the intellectual origins of modern human rights thinking in the late Qing', *Modern China* 34, 2 (April 2008): 179–209.

are intertwined. The liberal doctrine does not require a choice between value rationality and instrumental rationality, between political rights and socioeconomic equality or between self and society. It is possible to have both. That was exactly what modern Chinese liberals hoped to achieve, if at times they felt compelled to make a choice because of practical considerations.

The Features and Specific Concerns of Chinese Liberal Thought

Now I attempt to answer the second question: What were the features and specific concerns of Chinese liberal thought? I address this by analysing liberal thought on three levels. On one level were the practical problems of the day, such as poverty, disorder, imperialism, military ascendancy, one-party rule, bad government and official corruption. Here, the liberals sought political reform, democracy, constitutional government, the rule of law and civil and human rights. The constitutional movement in which they were involved was real – it was sustained even during the anti-Japanese war years. They also sought social change, especially the promotion of education, gender equality and women's rights. Economically, the liberals advocated industrialism but not without concerns about the social inequities accompanying capitalist development. They had a socialistic impulse, believing in evolutionary socialism of one kind or another. Indeed, a critique of capitalism was an important, perhaps even dominant feature of Chinese liberal thought, as will be elaborated later in this book. Many were institution builders and social reformers. I will examine those issues in the following chapters. For now, I return to the issue of nationalism, which was no monopoly of the cultural conservatives, to examine its relationship to liberalism.

It is fair to say that educated Chinese were patriotic in that they worried about the constant foreign threat. The liberals were no exception. The question they faced was how to deal with it. Many blamed China's predicament on foreign powers, as though all of the problems were externally caused. The result was the rise of a negative nationalism that was stridently anti-imperialist. Others were convinced that the problems were largely internally caused. The most outspoken proponent of this view was Hu Shi, who identified the main problems as 'poverty, diseases, ignorance, corruption and disorder', all of which had little to do with imperialism. To rid the country of these 'five devils' (*wugui*) or 'five enemies' (*choudi*), it was necessary first to recognize their nature in indigenous terms and then to make a conscious effort at reform. Anti-imperialist

and revolutionary slogans were not the solution.⁵⁹ Following the outbreak of the Shenyang Incident (18 September 1931), Hu refused to join the chorus of those demanding immediate war with the Japanese. Instead, he tried to understand why the crisis had come to a head in the first place. The Japanese were to blame only to a certain extent, for the Chinese nation was 'sick'. China had fallen victim to foreign aggression because it had been arrogant in refusing to acknowledge its inferiority and seek improvement. The nation needed to reflect on itself (as noted in Chapter 1). 'To fight foreign aggression, to save the nation, to revive the nation, this is not a task that can be undertaken by social organizations that rest on a sheet of loose sand [borrowing the metaphor from Sun Yat-sen].'⁶⁰ It made no sense to proclaim 'Down with imperialism!' or to talk about about national renaissance without trying to diagnose the Chinese disease. To be patriotic was not to be antforeign or to completely ignore the faults of the nation. Instead, it was important to launch a 'self-saving movement' for military, political, economic and educational reforms. Until these reforms were successfully carried out, which would take years, it was necessary to make concessions to Japan. Hu's was the voice of a rational liberal and loyal critic who 'does not fear to see the doctor in order to cure the disease'.⁶¹ To him, the most superficial form of nationalism was antforeignism, which was narrow and unproductive, and the next worst form was a defence of China's *guyou wenhua* (inherent ancestral culture). The noblest and most difficult form was the establishment of a nation-state that was stable, prosperous, civilized, modern and united.⁶² Hu blended the idea of nationalism with a spirit of critical self-reflection and a demand for social and political change; liberalism and nationalism were not opposed to each other. He was no less patriotic than others of his generation. When he later served as Chinese ambassador to the United States, the American journalist and writer John Gunther introduced him to the world as 'the best type of discriminating Chinese nationalist'.⁶³

The liberals did not speak with one voice about imperialism in general and Japanese aggression in particular. Hu's former student Fu Sinian,

⁵⁹ Hu Shi 胡适, 'Women zou natiolou' 我们走那条路, in *HSWJ*, V, 351–63.

⁶⁰ Hu Shi, 'Cantong de huiyi yu fanxing' 惨痛的回忆与反省, in *HSWJ*, IV, 383.

⁶¹ Hu to his critic, Tao Xisheng, 12 June 1935, in *Hu Shi de riji: shougaoben* 胡适的日记: 手稿本, reprint, 18 vols. (Taipei: Yuanliu chubangongsi, 1990), vol. XII, 12.

⁶² Hu Shi, 'Geren ziyou yu shehui jinbu: zaitan wusi yundong' 个人自由与社会进步: 再谈五四运动, *Duli pinglun* 独立评论 150 (May 1935): 4–5; Hu, 'Women zou natiolou', 356.

⁶³ John Gunther, *Inside Asia* (New York: Harper, 1939), 262.

who had returned from studies in London and Berlin and had become director of the Institute of History and Philology at Academia Sinica, was infuriated by Hu's call in 1932 for a truce with the Japanese army in North China. Intensely nationalistic, Fu took a hard line, demanding armed resistance at all costs. He immediately wrote an outline history of Northeastern China intended to prove to the League of Nations' Lytton Commission that Manchuria had been an integral part of China since ancient times. (Note that Fu refused to use the proper name Manchuria.) He could not see any prospect of a peaceful solution to the Sino-Japanese conflict.⁶⁴

The different positions that Hu and Fu took reflected a clash between liberalism and anti-imperialist nationalism. All concerned citizens faced a dilemma: when to make concessions to aggression and when to take a firm stand? The intensifying Japanese aggression demanded unity, loyalty, solidarity and personal sacrifice for the national interest. This posed a threat to the universal values of individualism, personal autonomy, reflection and choice. Yet, epistemologically, liberalism and nationalism are not necessarily incompatible, as the political scientist Zhang Foquan argued in 1934.

Zhang Foquan had studied politics at Princeton University under Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy. After his return to China, he worked as editor of Tianjin's *Dagongbao* ('*L'Impartial*') newspaper before joining the Beida faculty. In 1934, in an article published in the widely circulated *National News Weekly*, he revisited the idea of nationalism, making an important theoretical contribution to a crucial debate that should be of interest to anyone trying to come to terms with Chinese politics. Drawing on a range of Western works, Zhang made a distinction between nation and state and between nationality and statehood in an attempt to de-emphasize race (*minzu*) in the nationalist discourse, in which the term *minzu zhuyi* was popularly used. Instead, Zhang coined the term *bangguo zhuyi* with an emphasis on the state and statehood. (The characters *bang* and *guo*, according to the first Chinese dictionary *Shuowen*, mean 'state'.) Zhang faulted Sun Yat-sen for his superficial understanding of nationalism, pointing out that his 1924 lectures on nationalism were almost entirely externally oriented (i.e., aimed at imperialism). For Zhang, *bangguo zhuyi* was a political force essential for state building, particularly for self-government, and one that was binding on the nation-state.

⁶⁴ Wang Fan-sen, *Fu Ssu-nien: A Life in Chinese History and Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 149.

He refused to accept Alfred Eckhard Zimmern's suggestion in *Nationality and Government* (1919) that freedom and self-government were two separate concepts. Instead, Zhang was attracted to the theory of self-government expounded by the British writer Ramsay Muir in *Nationalism and Internationalism* (1919). Although Zhang's article was highly theoretical, his purpose was to promote a positive nationalism capable of tackling China's political problems within a framework of self-government. China had all the attributes of a nation and a distinctive nationality, wrote Zhang, but that was not enough for state building with the cooperation of the people. Citing Muir, Zhang contended that there must be a purpose-oriented 'general will' before the people would cooperate with the state. He concluded that nationalism was internally oriented, a centripetal force, rather than externally oriented and centrifugal. China's old nationalism was unproductive because it targeted foreign interests, so it should be substituted with a new nationalism that was not antiforeign but instead harnessed to the purposes of national reconstruction.⁶⁵

The significance of Zhang Foquan's article lay in its originality and in his republican vision of nationalism. Zhang introduced liberal values into the nationalist discourse with a notion of *bangguo zhuyi* that is compatible with liberalism. The underlying principle is that the individual is as autonomous as the state is sovereign and independent, and both nation and state have their ideals in liberty. Zhang's way of thinking is in tune with the contemporary Israeli scholar Yael Tamir's theory of liberal nationalism, which holds that 'the importance of belonging, membership and cultural affiliations, as well as the particular moral commitments that follow from them' can be reconciled with 'the value of personal autonomy and individual rights and freedoms, and sustains a commitment for social justice both between and within nations'.⁶⁶ For Zhang, it was possible to promote a political community that combined universal values with local concerns, although at times the citizen felt obliged to give national interests priority over liberal values. As I have demonstrated elsewhere, even during the war years, nationalism need not prevail over liberalism.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Zhang Foquan 张佛泉, 'Bangguo zhuyi de jiantao' 邦国主义的检讨, *Guowen zhoubao* 国闻周报 11, 40 (November 1934): 1–8; continued in the following issue, 1–8.

⁶⁶ Yael Tamir, *Liberal Nationalism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995).

⁶⁷ Edmund S. K. Fung, 'Chinese nationalism and democracy during the war period, 1937–1945: a critique of the *jiuwan–qimeng* dichotomy', in *Power and Identity in the Chinese World Order: Festschrift in Honour of Professor Wang Gungwu*, eds. Billy K. K. So et al. (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003), 201–20.

On a second level where Chinese liberal thought is analysed, the self takes a central place, with the normative values of liberalism, such as individualism, self-fulfilment, independent personality and moral autonomy, being cherished. It simply is not true, as is often said, that modern Chinese intellectuals had no commitment to these values. Take, for example, the political scientist Zhang Xiruo, who spoke the language of the Enlightenment to underscore the importance of individual emancipation that he hailed as the ‘foundation of Euro-American democracy’, without which there could not have been modern science and modern culture. ‘Individual emancipation is an historic tide, an irresistible conquering force, and it is unavoidably contagious’, wrote Zhang in 1935.⁶⁸ He appreciated that liberal philosophy recognizes, first, that the end of all social organizations is for the individual; second, that all the power of social organizations is derived from the people who constitute them and belongs to the people alone; and third, that all social organizations should be self-managed directly or indirectly by the people who constitute them. ‘This is a correct philosophy. That means the individual becomes the source, the foundation and the ultimate concern of all social organizations. *Individuals are the masters of their lives and the centre of the cosmos* [emphasis added]’.⁶⁹

The individual is the final judge of what is right and wrong, but Zhang Xiruo also believed that individuals do what is right according to their conscience rather than do what they wish, and that it is their conscience that drives them to criticize the authorities for wrongdoings.⁷⁰ He attached great importance to personal integrity and individuality, reaffirming such core liberal values as freedom of thought and speech. Writing at a time when war with Japan was imminent, Zhang remained convinced that these values were essential not only for the individual but also for national salvation. Not surprisingly, John King Fairbank, who was in Chongqing working for the U.S. government during the war years, described Zhang, who had moved to Kunming, as the ‘liberal who had been most resolutely individualist and Anglo-Saxon during World War II’.⁷¹

Regarding moral autonomy, liberal intellectuals reflected the Confucian tradition that seeks inner freedom from one’s mind, retreating to

⁶⁸ Zhang Xiruo 张熙若, ‘Guomin renge zhi peiyang’ 国民人格之培养, *Duli pinglun* 独立评论 150 (May 1935): 15.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 15–16.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁷¹ John King Fairbank, *Chinabound: A Fiftieth-Year Memoir* (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), 417.

the inner citadel but not from the world.⁷² Moral autonomy expresses the idea of the autonomous individual overcoming the evil impulses in one's character. Yan Fu, while channeling individual energies to collective ends in search of wealth and power, insisted that 'the pleasure of liberty is enjoyed only by those who have a great capacity for self-rule. To enjoy liberty, one must shake off the fetters of utter desire.'⁷³ He did not subscribe to natural rights theory or to the idea of the 'noble savage'.⁷⁴ Liang Qichao exhorted that 'one must not be a slave to anyone, least of all to oneself. It is possible to liberate [you] from slavery to another person, but definitely not from slavery to yourself.'⁷⁵ His major concern was with self-determination: 'Since I was born for myself and live for myself, I use my conscience to discriminate between matters and make my own judgement and to determine my behavior. I will not be ruled, controlled or tempted by anyone other than myself. This is called free will and independent spirit.'⁷⁶ Likewise, Hu Shi, despite his Western outlook, placed a premium on the traditional value of self-cultivation (*xiushen*).⁷⁷

On a third level of analysis, one sees the individual standing in a relationship with society that could be 'negative' or 'positive'. A negative relationship is one in which people enjoy personal freedoms in libertarian fashion, keep to themselves or retreat from the world and make no conscious effort to contribute to society. By contrast, a positive relationship rests on the premise of a symbiotic rights–duties nexus. As the liberal theorist Joseph Raz postulates, 'Rights are the grounds of duties in the sense that one way of justifying holding a person to be subject to a duty is that this serves the interest on which another's right is based.'⁷⁸ It is a duty to act in the interest of other beings. The government or

⁷² See Irene Bloom, 'The moral autonomy of the individual in Confucian tradition', in *Realms of Freedom in Modern China*, ed. William C. Kirby (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004), 41–2.

⁷³ Preface to Yan's translation of Mill's 'On liberty,' cited in Zhou Changlong 周昌龙, *Chaoyue xichao: Hu Shi yu Zhongguo chuantong* 超越西潮: 胡适与中国传统 (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 2001), 36.

⁷⁴ Zhou Changlong, 'Yan Fu ziyouguan de sanceng yiyi' 严复自由观的三层意义, *Hanxue yanjiu* 汉学研究 13, 1 (June 1995): 54–5.

⁷⁵ Liang Qichao 梁启超, 'Ziyou shu' 自由书, in *LQCQJ*, II, 679.

⁷⁶ Liang Qichao, 'Feisi de rensheng tianzhi lunshuping' 菲斯的人生天职论述评, in *LQCQJ*, V, 2752–3.

⁷⁷ Yang Zhende 杨贞德, 'Hu Shi de ziyou zhuyi yu "xiushen" de zhengzhiguan' 胡适的自由主义与「修身」的政治观, in *Dangdai ruxue lunwenji: tiaozhan yu huiying* 当代儒学论文集: 挑战与回应, ed. Liu Shuxian 刘述先 (Taipei: Zhonggang yanjiuyuan Zhongguo wenzhe yanjiusuo, 1995), 61–104.

⁷⁸ Joseph Raz, *The Morality of Freedom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 183.

the appropriate authorities are often held duty bound to promote the interest on which a right is based.⁷⁹

Early in the twentieth century, L. T. Hobhouse (1864–1929) had developed the theme that liberty is ‘a necessity of society’ more than a right of the individual. Hobhouse held that the validity of rights rests ultimately on an individual’s contribution to realizing the moral aims of society as a whole; in other words, rights ‘are defined by the common good’.⁸⁰ In a clear echo of Rousseau, Hobhouse wrote, ‘An individual right cannot conflict with the common good nor could a right exist apart from the common good, [since] the individual finds his own good in the common good.’⁸¹ Liberty for self-development on the part of each individual is, in this account, a constitutive element in the common good, with each person viewed as rational, purposive and self-directing. Rights and duties are relative. The individual in a community has certain obligations and certain claims on the community – his or her rights. No rights as such are inviolable. Social harmony exists where society is just and where each person shares in the good of society in proportion to his or her capacity.⁸²

Hobhouse’s New Liberalism resonated with many Chinese intellectuals. Zhang Dongsun, for one, went further in characterizing liberalism as a ‘cultural necessity’, a ‘cultural category’ and a ‘cultural value’.⁸³ Writing in the 1940s, Zhang conceived of liberty as a moral good premised on reciprocity, invoking Confucius’ injunction of ‘not doing to others what one would not want done to oneself’. Turning to the history of European philosophy, he argued that the enjoyment of civil liberties in the West was preceded by expressions of ‘a spirit of freedom’ as a result of ‘self-awakening’ and that the starting point for liberty was conscience. Although the notion of conscience pervaded traditional Chinese thought, ‘self-awakening’ was slow to impinge on the Chinese consciousness. Zhang Dongsun found liberty important not because it is a natural right but because it is a value, a motor of progress and a condition of the common good. Following Hobhouse, he rejected the dichotomy between individual liberty and collective responsibility, viewing the

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

⁸⁰ L. T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1911), 66, 68.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 69.

⁸² Hugh Carter, *The Social Theories of L. T. Hobhouse* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1927), 129.

⁸³ Zhang Dongsun 张东荪, *Lixing yu minzhu 理性与民主* (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1946), 131.

tension between the two as a matter of striking a balance that varies, depending on the time and circumstances.⁸⁴ His concern that freedom could be easily abused or misused was in tune with Hu Shi's notion of dual responsibilities.

Hu's notion of dual responsibilities, developed in the 1920s, was based on a view of individualism initially influenced by the Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen (1828–1906). Ibsen's plays held immense appeal for Hu – particularly *A Doll's House*, whose heroine, Nora, eventually saves herself by courageously leaving her husband, who has been treating her like a plaything; and *A Public Enemy*, whose hero, Dr Stockman, becomes a public enemy when he speaks out against social ills in the community. Whereas Nora demonstrates her worth, dignity and independence, the good doctor displays his freedom of personality and concerns about social issues.

To free oneself, as Nora does, is an expression of 'free individuality'. But Hu did not consider individualism merely an end in itself. For him, the most valuable individualism combines individuality with free will to advance the interests of both the individual and others. How can the individual be of benefit to society? Ibsen's answer was that there was no better way than 'by coining the metal you have in yourself'. Hu further translated Ibsen's words as follows: 'If you desire to be of use to society, the best thing you can do is to forge yourself – this lump of material – into a finished instrument (*chengqi*).'⁸⁵ Hu added in the translation: 'At times I feel that the whole world is like a ship sinking at sea [because it is so corrupt] and that the most important thing is to save oneself.'⁸⁶ The greater the number of people who saved themselves, the better the chances that society would be reformed. Hu considered this 'a most healthy individualism'.⁸⁷

In a self-governing society and a republican state, wrote Hu, individuals exercise their rights to make choices and take responsibility for their actions. Deprived of freedom of choice and lacking any sense of responsibility, a person is no different from a slave. And a person without a free and independent personality 'is like wine without yeast, bread without yeast powder, a body without a brain'.⁸⁸ But Hu departed from Ibsen when he distinguished between three types of individualism: egoism,

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 118–27.

⁸⁵ Quoted in Grieder, *Hu Shi and the Chinese Renaissance*, 94.

⁸⁶ Hu Shi, 'Yibosheng zhuyi' 易生主义, in *HSWJ*, II, 486.

⁸⁷ Hu Shi, 'Jieshao wo ziji de sixiang' 介绍我自己的思想, in *HSWJ*, V, 511.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 488.

detached individualism and true individualism. For the first type, Hu used the Chinese words *weiwu zhuyi* (me-ism) in the very sense that Alexis de Tocqueville used the French word *égoïsme*, meaning 'a passionate and exaggerated love of self, which leads a man to conduct everything with himself and to prefer himself to everything in the world'.⁸⁹ *Weiwu zhuyi* is a false individualism that has no regard for the interests of others. Detached individualism is driven by discontent with society in which individuals feel so helpless and dismayed that they decide to retreat from it in search of a quietist, transcendent life. Finally, true individualism consists of individuality, free will and responsibility.⁹⁰

Hu Shi criticized the New Village Movement launched by the essayist Zhou Zuoren (Lu Xun's younger brother, 1885–1967) in 1922, which followed a similar movement in Japan in advocating a lifestyle divorced from the real world and holding that social reform must begin with reform of the individual. The individual and society are inseparable, argued Hu, and reform of society and of the individual can take place simultaneously. One does not retreat from society but seeks to change it. That is 'true' individualism, which stands in sharp contrast to those who escape from social responsibility and care for none of society's ills.⁹¹

In Hu's liberal thought, responsibility has a twofold meaning: being responsible for one's choice and actions and being socially responsible. From this, it follows that to reform the individual is to reform society – the two are not easily separable. These dual responsibilities underscore the connection between personal freedom and social progress.⁹² Responsibility, social action (or purpose) and individual liberties are not competing ends; all three are goal and value oriented, and together, they constitute Hu's view of the immortality of society (*shehui buxiulun*), which holds that

I – this 'lesser self' (*xiaowo*) – do not exist independently. I am in direct or indirect relationships with myriads of other lesser selves, with the whole of society and with the entire world, influencing one another. I am in a relationship of causality with society and the world, both with respect to their past and to their future. All the causalities of the past and the myriads of small selves of the present have become a part of my lesser self. Combined with the past and present causalities, my lesser self will pass on to the next generation, giving birth to innumerable other lesser selves. The infinite numbers of lesser selves of the past, the present and the future

⁸⁹ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, introduction by Alan Ryan, 2 vols. (New York: Knopf, 1994), vol. II, 98.

⁹⁰ Hu Shi, 'Fei geren zhuyi de xinshenghuo' 非个人主义的新生活, in *HSWJ*, II, 564.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 564–72.

⁹² Hu, 'Geren ziyou yu shehui jinbu', 2–5.

accumulate. The result is the 'greater self' (*dawo*), which lives on eternally, flowing inexorably like running water. The lesser self will disappear, the greater self will not. The lesser self will die, the greater self will not, because it is immortal. Yet everything that the lesser self has done, good or bad, right or wrong, will remain in the greater self eternally. This greater self is the monument to all the lesser selves of the past, the present and the yet unborn. Because it is immortal, everything about the lesser selves of which it is constituted . . . is also immortal. This is what [I call] the immortality of society, the immortality of the greater self.⁹³

Society is immortal because it is a record of the words and deeds of all the lesser selves – good and bad, high and low. This infinite family of selves approximates the German philosopher and mathematician Gottfried Leibniz's (1646–1716) 'monads', each being a soul and immortal.⁹⁴

Hu's theory represents a value system that sees society as providing both a platform from which individuals can perform to the best of their ability, pursuing happiness without external impediments, and opportunities for them to contribute to society and the public good. The lesser self and the greater self do not represent a bifurcated structure of social relationship because they are organically linked. Being responsible to the greater self does not devalue the worth of the individual. On the contrary, because the lesser self will always leave an indelible mark on society, positively or negatively, the worth of the individual is recognized.

This dualism – the sanctity of personal freedom grounded in rights and conscience and the public morality of service to society grounded in an ethics of social responsibility – is an important feature of Chinese liberal thought. Hu was not original here. T. H. Green once wrote that liberty is not 'merely freedom to do as we like irrespectively of what it is that we like', but rather people's successful resolve 'to make the most and best of themselves' in order to contribute to the common good.⁹⁵ Also, one of Lord Acton's famous quotes is 'Liberty is not the right to do what we like, but the right to do what we ought.' It is as much a moral issue as a rights issue. How individuals live their lives is going to affect others in the community as well. Just as John Dewey held that the individual is particular but not discrete, so Hu would see that freedom

⁹³ Hu Shi, 'Buxiu (wo de zongjiao)' 不朽 (我的宗教), in *HSWJ*, II, 529–30; also Hu's unpublished lecture delivered at the New York Society for Ethical Culture on 7 April 1940, 'A view of immortality', in *Hu Shi weikan yingwen yigao* 胡适未刊英文遗稿, ed. Zhou Zhiping 周质平 (Taipei: Lianjing chubang gongsi, 2001), 171–7.

⁹⁴ Hu acknowledged Leibniz's notion of substance enunciated in the *Monadology* and the *Principles of Nature and of Grace*, but his *xiaowo*–*dawo* language was traditional Chinese.

⁹⁵ Quoted in Gray, *Liberalism*, 75.

is efficacious, not abstract, and that individualism enjoins life together with social responsibilities.

Is the individual expected to make ceaseless sacrifices for the collective good and for the state? 'Certainly not', wrote Hu. 'Let me tell you this: To fight for your personal freedoms is to fight for the freedom of the state. And to fight for your own individuality is to fight for the individuality of the state. A free, equal state is not made of a community of slaves!'⁹⁶

The idea of bridging the gap between the individual and society and between the nation and the state is grounded in the liberal creed, argued Zhang Foquan, who participated in the liberty discourse. In a 1935 article titled 'On liberty' (a witting resemblance to J. S. Mill's essay), Zhang analysed Mill's essay, especially his utilitarian view of individualism, his 'harm principle' and his idea of 'province of liberty'. Zhang went on to scrutinize Laski's conception of liberty in *Liberty in the Modern State* (1930), particularly his notion of 'multi-verse' (rather than universe) made up of multiple experiences of the self that are never the same. Zhang faulted both thinkers for proceeding from the premise of the discrete individual. Instead, he agreed with Hobhouse that liberty was a necessity of society. He also drew on the Oxford University professor of philosophy Bernard Bosanquet's *The Philosophical Theory of the State* (1899), to argue that society has a right to interfere with the individual as long as the interference is based on reason. Individuals will always encounter some sort of external restraint in the course of realizing their full potential. That is a fact of life. The restraints are sometimes harmful, sometimes beneficial. Zhang desired a positive relationship between the self and society while at the same time defending individual liberties.⁹⁷

In another article titled 'Individual freedom and social control', Zhang first acknowledged the importance to social progress of individuality and personal freedoms and then provided a critique of Mill's view of the good. He found it very hard to determine what the good is prior to its achievement, where it is a matter of value judgement. Freedom from external restraints and hindrances by itself does not constitute the good, nor does it automatically benefit society. The good is not a known quality. There are rival views and competing beliefs, and some goods are honoured in particular ways of life. Thus, argued Zhang, in the absence of a rational consensus, necessity, not the good, is the test of freedom. It is necessary to restrict personal freedoms rationally to build a cohesive

⁹⁶ Hu, 'Jieshao wo ziji de sixiang', 511-12.

⁹⁷ Zhang Foquan 张佛泉, 'Lun ziyou' 论自由, *Guowen zhoubao* 国闻周报 12, 3 (January 1935): 1-10.

nation and promote common beliefs. It is also necessary to maintain social stability without being illiberal and undemocratic and to reconcile social stability with individual liberty, which requires social control.⁹⁸

Thus, a concern with freedom and social order at the same time was another feature of Chinese liberal thought, underscoring what Li Dazhao called 'orderly freedoms in a free order'. True individualism, wrote Li, does not ignore the social order; neither does true socialism ignore individual liberties. The social order is a living organism, and true freedom represents social progress. In a free order, the orderly individual enjoys freedom without threatening social norms.⁹⁹ From a contemporary point of view, the idea of social control approximates what Anthony Giddens terms 'surveillance', which is a dimension of modernity at the institutional level.¹⁰⁰

In sum, Chinese liberal thinkers, from Yan Fu to Liang Qichao to Hu Shi to Zhang Dongsun to Zhang Foquan and many others, posited a connection between liberty and other values, such as responsibility, equality, utility and social justice. They treated liberty as an important but not a distinct value, certainly not as the supreme value that could be justified *simpliciter* by opposing it to others or by opposing the individual to society and state. Their ideas were consistent with those of Western liberals of New Liberalism and democratic socialist persuasions, demonstrating the areas of continuity in liberalism from Europe to Asia.

Liberal Thought, Cultural Radicalism, Cultural Conservatism

Given the issues explored in this and the preceding three chapters, questions are bound to arise about the relationship of liberal thought

⁹⁸ Zhang Foquan, 'Geren ziyou yu shehui tongzhi' 个人自由与社会统制, *Guowen zhoubao* 12, 28 (July 1935): 1–11. If Hu Shi and Zhang Foquan represented the mainstream thought on the relationship between the self and society, there were individuals who departed from it. One such person was Zhou Zuoren. Through his literary and aesthetic practice as a writer, Zhou attempted to construct the individual and affirmed the individual's importance in opposition to the normative national subject of most May Fourth intellectuals. He questioned the monolithic claims of modernity by using traditional aesthetic categories, by ascribing importance to the locality rather than the nation and by constructing a literary history that valued openness and individualism. See Susan Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, distributed by Harvard University Press, 2000).

⁹⁹ Li Dazhao 李大钊, 'Ziyou yu zhixu' 自由与秩序, in *Li Dazhao quanji* 李大钊全集, ed. Zhu Wentong 朱文通, 4 vols. (Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe, 1999), vol. III, 578.

¹⁰⁰ Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990), 59.

to cultural radicalism and to conservative thought. Why and how did some liberal intellectuals identify themselves with cultural radicalism? By the same token, why and how did some cultural conservatives come to embrace liberal thought? The answer to the first question lies in the nature of the antitraditionalism of the New Culture/May Fourth period. As I argued in Chapter 1, this antitraditionalism was not as 'totalistic' as is often thought, nor was it an end in itself. Rather, it was more of a strategy aimed at overcoming the inertia deeply rooted in the Confucian tradition. Cultural iconoclasm was driven by a sense of urgency regarding the reform that must be undertaken in Chinese society, and in this sense radical liberalism was a product of historical contingency. Being liberal-minded and culturally iconoclastic did not seem to be a contradiction at the time. Eventually, though, it was necessary to reconcile the tension between Westernized radicalism and the liberal principle of piecemeal change, as Hu Shi discovered. Hu retained an attachment to tradition that was as intellectual as it was emotional.¹⁰¹ The association of liberal thought with cultural iconoclasm was not an enduring phenomenon.

With regard to the second question, the cultural conservatives were modern and future oriented, appropriating Western ideas selectively and injecting new blood into Chinese culture. Like the zealous Westernizers, they sought sociopolitical change, constitutional government and the rule of law. Both held that rights were a social and moral necessity as well as a tool for state building, and both spoke a language of modernity, despite their different emphases on the global and the Chinese local. Where they shared a common ground, they interacted and influenced each other. Exponents of modern *tiaohelun*, for example, were every bit as liberal as the Westernized elite. Indeed, it is no contradiction for cultural conservatives to embrace liberal thought and be characterized as liberal conservatives.

¹⁰¹ This is contrary to the late Joseph Levenson's view of the 'tensions of intellectual choice'. Levenson argued that China's new intellectuals were torn between the appeal of their own traditions and the modernity of the West, thus conjuring up a dichotomy between intellectual attachment to modernity ('value') and emotional attachment to tradition ('history'). See his *Confucian China and Its Modern Fate*, 3 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958–65) and *Liang Ch'î-ch'ao and the Mind of Modern China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953). Levenson's view has been critiqued by some scholars. See, for example, Chang, *Liang Ch'î-ch'ao and Intellectual Transition in China, 1890–1907*, 112–14.

The State, Government and the Rule of Law

This chapter continues our exploration of Chinese liberal thought by probing the underlying issues of political modernity in terms of state power, good government, political elitism and institutional development. From the beginning of the Republican era, the quest for modernity was a state-building project. The modern state is a complex organization with the following characteristics: a defined territory, popular sovereignty, a rational bureaucracy, rule of law, industrialism, the use of rational technologies, a national economy, a sizable bourgeoisie, democratic institutions, a national taxation system and universal education. Externally, the modern state obeys international law, has a national armed force and is prepared to go to war to defend its sovereignty, territorial integrity and national interests. As such, the modern state was a tall order for Republican China's state builders. The early Republic was at best a political experiment and at worst a shoddy political structure ruled by a succession of militarists after the death of President Yuan Shikai until 1928. Even after 1928, the military was in the ascendant. Industrialization was only just beginning, civil society was weak, law and order were poorly maintained, a rational administration was nonexistent and the foreign threat was ever increasing. The challenges for the state builders were enormous. A key question for them was: What sort of government was best suited to China's conditions, and what was the role of the state?

From the classical liberal point of view, the best state is the minimal state, and the best government governs least. Traditionally, the liberal state is characterized as an organization to promote individual happiness, an essential condition of which is liberty. To protect liberty, government is kept confined within proper moral bounds, and the state is normally not entitled to invade areas marked by rights boundaries. The functions of the state, classical liberals have long argued, should be restricted to

protection against foreign states, the keeping of order, the administration of law and justice and the maintenance of certain public works and institutions. Yet, as John Gray has pointed out, this position is not a majority view within the liberal tradition. Most acknowledge that the liberal state may have a range of service functions, going beyond rights protection and the upholding of justice. There are a variety of liberal states. 'The *sine qua non* of the liberal state in all its varieties', writes Gray, 'is that governmental power and authority be limited by a system of constitutional rules and practices in which individual liberty and the equality of persons under the rule of law are respected.'¹

A strong state can be justified in liberal principles. State power and individual liberty are not simply opposed – they are interdependent. Stephen Holmes has drawn attention to a positive correlation between individual rights and state capacity in the history of Western liberal thought. Liberal institutions strengthen the state's capacity to govern and solve collective problems. A liberal need not be ardently antistatist.² Holmes has also challenged the conventional view that the potential of liberalism is optimized in a weak state. The relationship between liberalism and a strong state remains a contentious one.³

The strong state poses a threat to individual liberty – the stronger the state, the greater the threat. Yet there is also a view that the strong state could be a source of liberty, provided that its power is limited by constitutional means in a democracy. Joseph Raz has argued that governments can create conditions enabling their people to enjoy greater liberty than they otherwise would. Governments can, and indeed should – in certain situations not all that rare – act to promote freedom while staying out of certain areas of people's lives or avoiding interfering with them in certain ways.⁴

Chinese intellectuals and state builders accepted the doctrine of limited government in terms of constitutional restraints on state power, and they campaigned hard for constitutional rule. But they rejected the notion of the minimal state in favour of state power to solve China's myriad problems and to support the development of the individual through progressive social policies. They identified the modern state

¹ John Gray, *Liberalism*, 2nd edn. (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995), 71–2.

² Stephen Holmes, *Passions and Constraint: On the Theory of Liberal Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 19–21.

³ Stephen Holmes, 'Can weak-state liberalism survive?', in *Liberalism and Its Practice*, ed. Dan Avnon and Avner de-Shalit (London: Routledge, 1999), 31–49.

⁴ Joseph Raz, *The Morality of Freedom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 18–19.

with a strong state, because, having been so weak in its recent past, China could not survive without a strong government. A strong state with a legitimate central authority would be better able to restore order, rein in the centrifugal forces, develop the economy, treat social ills and provide stability and security against internal and external threats. Indeed, statism has been an important feature of modern Chinese political thought.

Certainly China was far from the fertile soil on which the minimal state could grow. The state could be minimal only in an ideally liberal society with a strong bourgeoisie, a stable democratic system, a capitalist economy, an individualistic order and a citizenry that actively chooses to act in a liberal fashion. Such requisites were not present in China. Moreover, practical considerations weighed heavily on the minds of the state builders: A reform programme with any realistic hope of success must come to terms with state power as the agent of its own plans for economic, social and political transformations. State power equalled the capacity to change the sociopolitical order, as Enlightenment's long love affairs with the enlightened despots demonstrated.⁵ Republican intellectuals had to deal with the power holders, first the warlords and then the Nationalists after 1928.

What Did a Strong Chinese State Mean?

Historically, the Chinese state had played an important role both in myth and in reality. It had come to be identified with China's greatness and grandeur, its cultural achievements, its commercialization and its scientific inventions that placed China far ahead of Europe in the Middle Ages. It was underpinned by the concept of universal kingship in which the emperor embodies within his person both Heaven and man (*tianren heyi*), as well as both the supreme political order and the spiritual-ethical authority of the entire society (*zhengjiao heyi*). Since the Han Dynasty (206 BC–220 AD), an authoritarian political culture based on hierarchy and status had been developed and sustained. Yet, considering the entire sweep of Chinese history, the Confucian state was more of an autocratic minimal state than an intrusive state. As the late Qing anarchist Liu Shipei pointed out, the dynastic politics of China had long been shaped by Confucianism and Daoism, both of which emphasized noninterference. Confucianism was a system of ethics that sought to transform people with morality and rites rather than control them by laws and punishments,

⁵J. S. McClelland, *A History of Western Political Thought* (London: Routledge, 1996), 428.

and Daoism sought to substitute the natural workings of Heaven for the governing of people.⁶ More recently, Benjamin Schwartz noted that 'the main line of Confucianism ran counter to the notion of aggressive state intervention in every domain of society, and that on the contrary, it favored "light" government'.⁷ As long as officials were able to collect taxes for the imperial coffers, the emperor would prefer to leave the people alone until antitax riots or revolts against corrupt local officials became widespread. Also, traditionally, there was a distinction between the formal structures of government and the operational realities of governance as well as between governmental institutions and administrative practice. Philip Huang terms this phenomenon 'centralized minimalism'.⁸

This tradition of light government was beginning to change in the late Qing as the country faced the twin incubi of internal decay and foreign intrusions. This had much to do with the rise of nationalism. Frederic Wakeman Jr noted that by the turn of the twentieth century, nationalism had 'generated support for a strong centralized state and sanctioned the central government's penetration into areas once dominated by local authority structures in China'.⁹ The urge to save the nation drove Liang Qichao to pen the essay 'Enlightened despotism' (1906), informed by German statist thought in an age of imperialism.¹⁰ His espousal of state power resonated with a good many intellectuals and political leaders. The establishment of the Republic and the civil strife that followed fuelled the drive for a strong state. As the country descended into chaos while facing foreign aggression, Beijing's political leaders could ill afford to abandon centralized power for a regionalized state. To espouse a weak state was to indulge in a reverie at best and, at worst, to render the country less governable and more fragile than it already was. Michael Hunt writes succinctly, 'An important, perhaps even dominant feature

⁶ Peter Zarrow, *Anarchism and Chinese Political Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 109.

⁷ Benjamin I. Schwartz, 'The primacy of the political order in East Asian societies: some preliminary generalizations', in *Foundations and Limits of State Power in China*, ed. Stuart R. Schram (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1987), 4.

⁸ Philip C. C. Huang, 'Centralized minimalism: semiformal governance by quasi officials and dispute resolution in China', *Modern China* 34, 1 (January 2008): 9–35.

⁹ Frederic E. Wakeman Jr, 'Introduction', in *China's Quest for Modernization: A Historical Perspective*, ed. Frederic E. Wakeman Jr and Wang Xi (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1997), xxii.

¹⁰ Hao Chang, *Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Intellectual Transition in China, 1890–1907* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977), 252, 255–7.

of Chinese national identity has been a preoccupation with creating and maintaining a strong centralized state.¹¹

A strong state could take one of three forms. One was a centralized state based on the assumption that the centre had the power to hold the country together. It underscored the sometimes difficult relations between the centre and the periphery, or the tension between centralism and federalism. Such tensions had received little attention from the revolutionaries of the 1911 period, who advocated an American-style republic. However, following Yuan Shikai's assumption of the presidency of the Republic, his opponents sought regional power to counter his centralist tendencies.¹² Liang Qichao came to favour some sort of a federal system – German, American, Swiss, Canadian or Australian – that could be adapted to Chinese conditions.¹³ A federation of self-governing provinces with a high degree of regional autonomy was preferred by many others, including the classical scholar Zhang Binglin, who blamed the country's political chaos on the concentration of power in Beijing's military regime.¹⁴ Zhang Shizhao was attracted to federalism from a democratic point of view.¹⁵ Hu Shi, after returning from the United States in 1917, also advocated federalism as a solution to the problem of military separatism and as a way of allowing the regional regimes to develop the potential that was latent there.¹⁶

The idea that a strong state was a centralized state was a contested one. In 1919, Hunan was the site of a federal self-government movement launched by the military leader Tan Yankai (1876–1930).¹⁷ In 1921, the civil governor of Guangdong, Chen Jiongming (1878–1933), carried out a similar movement, followed by other regional leaders in Yunnan,

¹¹ Michael Hunt, 'Chinese national identity and the strong state: the late Qing-Republican crisis', in *China's Quest for National Identity*, ed. Lowell Dittmer and Samuel S. Kim (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993), 62.

¹² On the politics of the early republic, see Ernest P. Young, *The Presidency of Yuan Shih-k'ai: Liberalism and Dictatorship in Early Republican China* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977).

¹³ Liang Qichao 梁启超, 'Xin Zhongguo jianshe wenti' 新中国建设问题, in *LQCQJ*, IV, 2433–7.

¹⁴ Young-tsu Wong, *The Search for Modern Nationalism: Zhang Binglin and Revolutionary China 1869–1936* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1989), 120–1.

¹⁵ Zhang Shizhao 章士钊, 'Lianbanglun' 联邦论, in *ZSZQJ*, III, 281–96; Bai Ji'an 白吉庵, *Zhang Shizhao zhuan* 章士钊传 (Beijing: Zuojia chubanshe, 2004), 93–4.

¹⁶ Jerome B. Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution, 1917–1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 195–6.

¹⁷ Jean Chesneaux, 'The federalist movement in China, 1920–23', in *Modern China's Search for a Political Form*, ed. Jack Gray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 96–137.

Guangxi and Guizhou, in opposition to Sun Yat-sen's centralist vision.¹⁸ Sun, locked in a power struggle with the local warlords in the south, rejected federalism for fear that it would be in the service of regional and warlord power and would thereby encourage the country's partition. He dreamt of a sovereign nation united under a powerful centralized state. It eluded his comprehension that regionalism could be a stage in the development of nationalism, as Diana Lary's study of the Guangxi military clique has demonstrated.¹⁹ The federalist vision was a subaltern version of nationalism that countered the centralist position that assumed that federalists were advocates of separatism and therefore unpatriotic.²⁰ By early 1925, the federalist movement had all fizzled out in the face of the Nationalist revolution. In the Nanjing Decade that followed, domestic politics, combined with anti-imperialist nationalism, militated against the federalist vision as the party-state emerged. Nevertheless, federalism remained an important theme in Republican intellectual discourse.

The second form in which a strong state could exist was a one-party state. This was the case despite the fact that the authoritarian Nationalist state after 1928 never became an effective strong state. Not very different from a one-party state was Ding Wenjiang's idea of a new-style dictatorship, supported by Jiang Tingfu and others. The significance of Ding's idea lay in what he believed a new-style dictatorship could do for the country: It could help to overcome the national crisis and unify the country, and it was a response to modernization and an ideology of delayed development.²¹ This form of strong state was rejected by those, such as Hu Shi, who disapproved of any kind of dictatorship, old or new. But the idea that a strong state was action oriented and must act in the national interest was shared across the political spectrum.

The third form was the opposite of the second – a democratic state with a powerful government that enjoyed popular support. State and

¹⁸ Leslie H. Chen, *Chen Jiongming and the Federalist Movement: Regional Leadership and Nation Building in Early Republican China* (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1999).

¹⁹ Diana Lary, *Region and Nation: The Kwangsi Clique in Chinese Politics, 1925–1937* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

²⁰ For an in-depth discussion of this point, see Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questions and Narrative of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), chap. 6; and his essay, 'Provincial narratives of the nation: centralism and federalism in Republican China', in *Cultural Nationalism in East Asia*, ed. Harumi Befu (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1993), 9–35.

²¹ Edmund S. K. Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929–1949* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 104–12.

government are not the same; in practice, however, they are not always significantly distinguishable, as the latter represents the former and acts in its name.²² A strong state and a powerful government are nearly synonymous, and neither must be undemocratic. Indeed, to make a strong state democratic was what many educated Chinese desired. It is worth noting that, early in 1912, when the Republic was founded, Zhang Shizhao expressed the view that a strong and powerful government was a government controlled by a political party that had a majority in Parliament and that formed the cabinet. Zhang was an influential political thinker at the time. Recently returned from Europe, he spoke highly of the French political system, under which the government was strong and powerful, as it derived its power from the people in whom sovereignty of the state was vested.²³ Zhang was not alone. A strong state with a powerful government that was constitutional and democratic was a political ideal widely shared by liberal and conservative intellectuals alike.

Whatever form a strong state may take, the most important question is: What is the purpose of state power? Put differently, what is the end of the state? State power is not just about the legitimate use of physical force and coercion as a monopoly of the state,²⁴ it is about the end of the state. In imperial Chinese thought, 'All the land under Heaven belongs to the emperor; all the defenders of the land, the seas and the coasts are his ministers' (*putian zhi xia, mofei wangtu; shuaitu zhi bin, mofei wangchen*), hence the notion of 'all under Heaven' (*tianxia*), the universalistic claims of the emperor. The emperor had a 'Mandate of Heaven' (*tianming*) to rule, which conferred on him a duty to fulfil. It was his duty to treat the people (*min*) as the foundations (*ben*) of the state. Mencius said, 'The people come first, territory second, the king last' (*minweigui, sheji cizhi, junweiqing*). Again: 'Heaven sees as the people see and hears as the people hear' (*tianshi ziwo minshi, tianting ziwo minting*). Likewise, Xunzi said, 'Heaven creates people not for the ruler; Heaven establishes the ruler for the people (*tianzhi shengmin, feiwei junye, tianzhi lijun, yiwei minye*).' Also,

²² Laski wrote, 'Government exists to carry out the purposes of the state . . . it is not itself the supreme coercive power; it is simply the mechanism of administration which gives effect to the purposes of that power.' See Harold J. Laski, *The State in Theory and Practice* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935), 23.

²³ Zhang Shizhao, 'Shuo qiangyouli de zhengfu' 说强有力的政府, in *ZSZQJ*, II, 51–2.

²⁴ Weber viewed the state as 'a political organization . . . [that] successfully claims a monopoly over the legitimate physical coercion necessary for the implementation of its laws and decrees'. See Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, eds. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 231.

'The ruler is the boat, the people are the waters. The people can carry the ruler with them, but they can also throw him overboard (*jundengyuzhou, mindengyushui; minkezaijun, yikefujun*). The ruler who ponders this danger averts it.'²⁵ This principle of the people, known as *minben*, represents a Chinese conception of the end of the state.²⁶ There is, however, a gulf between principle and practice. No emperor had ever regarded the state as anything but his territorial possession. *Minben* thought legitimized autocratic benevolent rule and bestowed on the people the right to rebel when the emperor lost his Mandate of Heaven through bad governance, but it was neither a concept of democracy as popular sovereignty nor a vision based on individual and political rights.

Of course, in modern times, the end of the state has been viewed in a very different light. For Harold Laski, it is 'the satisfaction, *at the highest possible level*, of its subjects' demands [emphasis added]'.²⁷ It is this duty of satisfying popular demands that provides justification for state power and the exercise of coercive authority beyond the plane of formal law. The state not only defends its borders but also protects its citizens' rights and promotes their well-being. This is a contractarian view of the state: 'The claim of the state to obedience rests upon its will and ability to secure to its citizens the maximum satisfaction of their wants.'²⁸

Laski's ideas had an influence on many liberals of the Nationalist period. Following his mentor, in 1929, the human rights advocate Luo Longji expounded the notion that the state derives its authority and legitimacy from the people and that no person or organization is to exercise state authority without popular consent. Government is responsible not to the ruling party, individuals or sectarian interests but to the people alone. Its legitimacy depends on the rule of law, the protection of rights and the appropriate use of force and coercion. Again, following Laski, Luo maintained that the functions of the state are to protect private property rights and to perform a wide range of service functions – social, cultural, economic and educational, among others. The authority of the state is limited and popular obedience to it conditional; the state that fails to protect rights loses its legitimacy and the obedience of the people.²⁹

²⁵ Cited in Jin Yaoji 金耀基, *Zhongguo minben sixiangshi* 中国民本思想史, 2nd edn. (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1997), 57, 60, 77.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Laski, *The State in Theory and Practice*, 160.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 104.

²⁹ Luo Longji 罗隆基, 'Lun renquan' 论人权, *Xinyue* 新月 2, 5 (July 1929): 7–10.

The state was no longer a ‘necessary evil’ but ‘a positive good’. The professor of politics Wang Zaoshi (Ph.D. University of Wisconsin), also a one-time student of Laski, postulated in 1935 that to recognize the end of the state as ‘the greatest happiness of the greatest number’ was to acknowledge the change that had long taken place in Europe from an individual-based view of the state to one based on the public good. An equitable society is one in which individuals are rewarded for their labour in direct proportion to their contributions to the state and society. For its part, the government, properly constituted, has a duty to respect the rights to subsistence and to work as well as the basic freedoms of speech, publication, assembly, association and beliefs.³⁰

In the Chinese context, the end of the state was often understood first and foremost as the satisfaction of the basic needs of the population rather than the satisfaction, at the highest possible level, of popular demands. In human rights terms, this meant the right to subsistence, which was privileged over civil and political rights. The problem with the Chinese population was not so much its size as its entrenched poverty due to underdevelopment. Political leaders of every stripe who cared about the well-being of the people would assign the state a particular function – the provision of clothing, food, shelter and transport to the vast majority of the population through development. If this function were not fulfilled, one would assume that the people could not be expected to obey the state or have any obligations to it.

Omnipotent Government and Government with a Plan

How powerful should the government be so that it can function efficiently? Sun Yat-sen’s answer is well-known: there should be five powers, namely, an executive, a legislature, a judiciary plus control and examination, which formed the five Yuans (ministries) in the Nationalist government. In return, the people enjoyed four rights: election, recall, initiative and referendum. Sun was vague about the division of powers. Instead, he had a clear notion of ‘omnipotent government’ (*wanneng zhengfu*) that distinguishes between sovereignty (*quan*) and ability (*neng*). Sovereignty is vested in the people. But not everybody has intelligence and foresight, because people are not born equal. Those who are highly qualified should be in government serving the people. Sun made an analogy: The master gives the order where to go, and the chauffeur knows best

³⁰ Wang Zaoshi 王造时, *Huangminji* 荒谬集 (N.p.: Ziyou yanlunshe, 1935), 80, 268–9.

how to get there.³¹ The trouble, though, is that an omnipotent government borders on a dictatorship.

Sun's statist thought is marked by a dilemma of modernity. Although he stood for an all-embracing government, he also saw the need to institute a system of checks and balances in the Five-Power Constitution and to enact laws guaranteeing the rights of assembly, association, speech, publications, residence and liberty of conscience. Sun favoured elite rule, yet he trusted that everyone could act even without previous theoretical knowledge – his idea of *zhinan xingyi* (knowing is difficult, acting is easy). Sun was no liberal democrat; he would impose a six-year period of political tutelage on the nation prior to constitutional rule.³² His strong state would provide for the well-being of the people. Yet Sun conflated the state with the nation. His vision of modernity was the vision of a party-state. And it was 'a nationless state', as John Fitzgerald describes it, which claimed to represent the nation that the state 'created and re-created in the struggle for state power' and defined as 'a reward of victory'.³³

However, even critics of the party-state subscribed to Sun's notion of omnipotent government, albeit with different versions. One version was provided by Zhang Junmai, who shared with Sun a commitment to securing the livelihood of the people and to efficient government. But Zhang differed from Sun in that he insisted on individual liberty alongside state power. A government must have wide powers to discharge its functions, but that could lead to a disregard for civil liberties. As a safeguard, Zhang insisted on a balance between state power and personal freedom. He likened the two to a person's feet and the wheels of a chariot – one cannot function without the other.³⁴ They are in a mutually supportive relationship, especially in terms of state building: 'Individual liberties are entrusted to the state, and the state consolidates itself by relying on individual liberties. This is the quintessence of state building. From this point of view, a glimmer of hope for the future of Chinese politics lies in striking a balance between the two.'³⁵

How is the balance to be struck? Zhang Junmai's idea, as I interpret it, was to separate the public sphere of government administration from

³¹ Sun Yat-sen's fifth lecture (1924) on *minquan zhuyi*, in *Guofu quanji* 国父全集, 6 vols., comp. Zhongguo Guomindang zhongyang weiyuanhui dangshi weiyuanhui 中国国民党中央委员会党史委员会编 (Taipei: Zhongguo Guomindang dangshihui, 1981), vol. I, 128–36.

³² Sun Yat-sen, 'Jianguo fanglue' 建国方略, in *Guofu quanji*, vol. I, 469.

³³ John Fitzgerald, 'The nationless state: the search for a nation in modern Chinese nationalism', *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs* 33 (January 1995): 78.

³⁴ Zhang Junmai 张君勱, *Liguo zhi dao* 立国之道 (Guilin: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1938), 95.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 99.

the private sphere, where the individual enjoys freedoms of thought, speech and assembly and is entitled to pursue legitimate self-interest. To his thinking, there is no contradiction between a strong state and a free individual. A powerful government that respects individual liberties and obeys its own laws is a good government. Freedom and authority are not antithetical. Zhang expected the free individual to be socially responsible and to act in a way that promoted the national interest. He had no problem with strong state power that is based on the constitutional principle of legality.

The modern state, Weber tells us, has two kinds of officials: 'administrative' and 'political'; one is the bureaucrat and the other the political leader. The former must carry out their duties in an impartial manner, and the latter must lead, 'take a stand' and be 'passionate'.³⁶ In a similar vein, Zhang Junmai held that for the government to carry out the purposes of the state, two conditions must hold: executive power and expert administrators. He distinguished between the minister and the administrator. All ministers, especially cabinet ministers, should be recruited on merits from all political parties and groups, and the ruling party should have no monopoly on official appointments. Administrators should be selected on merits, too; even more importantly, they should be politically neutral. Those who were below the rank of vice-ministers should not be removed on the departure of their political masters. Not least of all, the civil service should be depoliticized to ensure efficiency, stability and continuity.³⁷ Zhang sought a modern bureaucracy that was rationalized and professional.

The issue here is administrative efficiency and the separation of powers, particularly between the executive branch of government and the legislature. Zhang Junmai wanted the executive to be given extraordinary powers to make plans and implement policies. Writing in the early 1930s, Zhang refused to give the yet-to-be-reconvened National Assembly the power to overrule, impeach or remove the government by a vote of no-confidence, as long as the executive was capable of implementing a three- or five-year administrative programme (*xingzheng gangyao*) that the National Assembly would have approved.³⁸

Yet in China, extraordinary executive powers were not the critical factor in efficiency, as Zhang Junmai made them out to be. The Nationalist

³⁶ Anthony Giddens, *Politics and Sociology in the Thought of Max Weber* (London: Macmillan, 1972), 38.

³⁷ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 142–51.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

government did not lack the power needed to make plans and implement policies. The Executive Yuan was already so powerful that it overshadowed the Legislative Yuan.³⁹ The administration was clogged with paperwork and weakly committed to the attainment of policy goals.⁴⁰ Although the government did not lack a reinvigorated, task-oriented bureaucracy, especially in industrial and national defence matters,⁴¹ it failed to realize projects because of a combination of political and moral weakness, official corruption, factionalism, lack of funds and ineffectual control over areas nominally under Nanjing's rule.

Associated with state power was the idea of 'government with a plan' (*jihua zhengfu*). This idea was not new. Hu Shi had talked about it in 1914 as a student in the United States: 'The greatest need at present is to fix one's purpose and to establish a fundamental policy . . . and, when this has been done, to work steadily for a period of twenty or fifty years without faltering. Only then can there be some hope for national salvation.'⁴² Again in 1922, back in China, Hu wrote, 'A nation is a great instrument, and politics is a great undertaking. . . . Men without [plans] are not worthy to engage in politics.'⁴³ Hu criticized the Beijing government for having no plans and for 'drifting aimlessly'. He considered planning 'the source of efficiency' and felt that even an ordinary plan was better than no plan at all.⁴⁴ Planning meant action by the government in the public interest. But Hu's demand for planning and action was not unqualified: It was conditional on the government being run by men of talent who could produce the desired results.⁴⁵ In other words, it was not action for action's sake or action by incompetent bureaucrats.

³⁹ John King Fairbank, *China: A New History* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992), 292.

⁴⁰ Chiang Kai-shek admitted in 1932: 'When something arrives at a government office it is *yamenized* – all reform projects are handled lackadaisically, negligently, and inefficiently.' Quoted in Fairbank, *China*, 292. See also Lloyd E. Eastman, 'The Kuomintang in the 1930s', in *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, ed. Charlotte Furth (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 208–9.

⁴¹ See William C. Kirby, *Germany and Republican China* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1984), chap. 3.

⁴² Quoted in Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 193.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Hu Shi 胡适 et al., 'Women de zhengzhi zhuzhang' 我们的政治主张, *Nuli zhoubao* 努力周报 2 (May 1922): 2.

⁴⁵ In 1933, Hu argued for a *wuwei* politics, or a politics of nonaction (i.e., a nonactive government). Seeing that many of the Nationalist leaders were unfit for their tasks, and considering China's 'objective material conditions', he called on the government to abandon its grandiose plans for modernization and instead to stop existing abuses and to improve the conditions of rural life. See Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 261–4.

‘Government with a plan’ presupposed a state-building project for economic, social and political transformations for the benefit of the population. If the government should become authoritarian in the process, some would accept that as a price to pay. For example, the Harvard-educated political scientist Qian Duansheng (1900–90), an advocate of representative institutions and parliamentary democracy, wrote in 1935:

I now still have limitless hope for governments that take the common people as their primary concern, and have not in the least lessened my detestation for dictatorships that ignore the welfare of the common people. But I cannot ignore a government form that is organized, idealistic, and that can plan for the benefit of the masses – even if it is a dictatorship.⁴⁶

Qian accepted Ding Wenjiang’s proposal for a new-style dictatorship because he recognized the importance of rational planning in handling the complex operations of a modern economy. Qian even thought that the dictatorial regimes in Italy and Soviet Russia had been very successful in this respect.⁴⁷

The notion of government with a plan underpinned the interventionist state sought by liberals and revisionist socialists, described in the next two chapters. For the present, I will explore the Chinese idea of good government.

Good Government and Government by ‘Good Men’

The liberal vision of political modernity rests on the premise that there be a government and that it is a good government. The term ‘good government’ carries two connotations: first, a good structure of power in the governmental authority marked by a separation of powers, differentiation of functions, rule of law and supervisory mechanisms; and second, good governance, normatively and functionally. The assumption is that a sound administrative structure is conducive to, perhaps even a condition of, good government. In our day, good governance is ideally participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective, efficient, equitable, inclusive and ‘rational-legal’ (Weber’s word). It assures that corruption and coercion are minimized by putting in place supervisory mechanisms for monitoring abuses of power. Also, it is responsive to the needs of the people. This ideal is difficult to achieve in its totality. Not many countries have come close to achieving it.

⁴⁶ Quoted in Frederic J. Spar, ‘Human rights and political activism: Luo Longji in Chinese politics, 1928–1958’, an unpublished manuscript, 1993, 128.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

To explore the notion of good government in the Republican era, we will do well to start by returning to the early 1920s. Following the death in 1916 of President Yuan Shikai, China descended into a period of military separatism and political fragmentation. It was convulsed by political instability and violence, with civil wars raging between warlords in the north and between the Beijing government and the revolutionary regime in the south. In May 1921, President Xu Shichang ordered the northern troops to wage war on Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary regime with the support of the Guangxi warlord Lu Rongting. Sun responded by launching the Northern Expedition against Hunan and Jiangxi in February in the following year. In separate developments, the first war between the forces of the Zhili and Fengtian Cliques regarding the Liang Shiyi cabinet erupted in April, with major engagements near Beijing. The fiercest battle was fought between troops loyal to the Manchurian warlord Zhang Zuolin and those loyal to the Zhili militarist Wu Peifu. Early in May, Zhang proclaimed the independence of the three northeastern provinces in support of Sun's troops in the southwest. Eventually, Zhang's army was defeated and forced to retreat beyond the Great Wall at Shanhaiguan. The result was a total breakdown of order in the country.

This was a cause for concern to the civil elite, who desired to see a restoration of order and a good government capable of bringing about political reform. On 14 May 1922, a manifesto, 'Our political proposals', appeared in the second issue of *Endeavour Weekly*, which had been launched by Hu Shi, Ding Wenjiang and others only about a week earlier. Penned by Hu and cosigned by fifteen other public figures, the manifesto called for the restoration of peace and political reform. Specifically, it urged a resolution of the conflict between the Beijing government and the southern revolutionary regime by holding a peace conference of all the warring factions, reconvening the 1917 National Assembly, drafting a new constitution and demobilizing surplus troops.⁴⁸ The manifesto underscored the need to bring order to Chinese politics. It sought to put an end to anarchism as a phenomenon and a current of thought that had influenced many Chinese intellectuals. It recognized that the Beijing government was unstable, badly run and military dominated. It also sent a message to the educated elite that only a stable order under constitutional rule could provide good governance and ensure the protection of personal security and liberties. Essentially, the manifesto represented a liberal attempt to solve the pressing problems of Chinese politics.

⁴⁸ Hu et al., 'Women de zhengzhi zhuzhang', 1–2.

Most of the signatories were scholars. Eleven, including Hu Shi, were full- or part-time members of the Beida faculty, namely, Cai Yuanpei (the university chancellor), Li Dazhao, Wang Chonghui, Luo Wengan, Liang Shuming, Tao Menghe, Zhu Jingnong, Zhang Weici, Gao Yihan and Xu Baohuang. The others included Ding Wenjiang, the former head of the Institute of Geological Investigation; Tang Erhe, a Japanese- and German-trained physician and former president of the Beijing Medical College; Tao Xingzhi, head of the Education Department at the National Southeast University; Wang Boqiu, head of the Department of Law and Economics at the same university; and Wang Zheng, former secretary to the New American Banking Consortium in China. They were a diverse group from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, united by a common desire to see a cessation of civil war and a restoration of order followed by political reform.

The signatories defined good government ‘negatively’ as ‘a proper organization that can control and eliminate all selfish, corrupt and non-law-abiding officials’, and ‘positively’ as ‘an organization that makes the fullest use of the machinery of politics for the welfare of society as a whole, respects personal liberties and protects the development of individuality’.⁴⁹ A good government was ‘constitutional’, ‘open’ and one with ‘a plan’.⁵⁰

‘Our political proposals’ urged the educated elite not to withdraw from politics, not to stand aloof (*ziming qinggao*), but instead to come forward to serve the country and to fight ‘evil forces’. It was a matter of elite responsibility. Ding Wenjiang made this point with particular force in a lecture delivered at Qinghua College in June. Attributing China’s current political problems to the reluctance of men of talent to participate in government, he regretted that the ‘good men’ who had served the early Republic had quit in frustration and utter disillusionment or retired one after another while old-fashioned bureaucrats had returned to power. Ding even blamed them for the political chaos:

The chaos of Chinese politics is due not to official corruption or the arbitrary power of the military but to ‘a small minority’ that lacks both a sense of responsibility and the capacity to bear responsibility. . . . The worst thing is that knowledgeable and moralistic people refuse to work hard in politics. . . . This is worse than diplomatic failures, worse than the bankruptcy of the Beijing regime and worse than the north–south civil war.⁵¹

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Ding Wenjiang 丁文江, ‘Shaoshuren de zeren’ 少数人的责任, *Nuli zhoubao* 7 (June 1922): 2.

Forming a government, Ding stressed, was ‘a matter for a small minority’, because in China, with a population of four hundred million, only eighty thousand were educated. He quoted the British statesman and writer John Morley as writing that the success story was always the story of a small minority.⁵² It was a question of leadership – the leadership of a well-educated small minority.

Responsibility and leadership entailed political action. The following ‘Song of Hard Work’ (*Nulige*) appeared in *Endeavour Weekly* on 28 May:⁵³

Without good society, how can there be good government?
Without good government, how can there be good society?
How is one to break this [vicious] circle?

When education is bad, how can there be good politics?
When politics is bad, how can there be good education?
How is one to break this [vicious] circle?

Without destruction first, how is reconstruction possible?
Without reconstruction, what is [there] to destroy?
How is one to break this [vicious] circle?

The Kingdom of Qi had a queen,
Who refused to disentangle a jade bracelet.
She raised a golden hammer and smashed it to pieces.

My friends
You have a golden hammer, too.
It is called ‘Endeavour’, also known as ‘Action’!

You haven’t done it, have you?
Just do it! Action!
And the bracelet is smashed!

The call for political action was a repudiation of the May Fourth idea of the primacy of intellectual-cultural change. Ding urged his fellow intellectuals to take a more active interest in politics, even though he was not prepared to form a political party on the grounds that it was too expensive to run.⁵⁴ In addition to his professional interest as a geologist, Ding was extremely concerned about public administration.

Given the fact that eleven of the signatories were members of the Beida faculty, it was only natural that education should be one of their

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Nuli zhoubao* 4 (May 1922): 2.

⁵⁴ Ding thought that lowly paid intellectuals like him simply did not have the resources to finance a political party. To rely on external funding would compromise the party itself. See Ding Wenjiang, ‘Da guanyu “women de zhengzhi zhuzhang”’ 答关于 ‘我们的政治主张’, *Nuli zhoubao* 6, 7 (June 1922): 2–3; Charlotte Furth, *Ting Wen-chiang: Science and China’s New Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 149–50.

main concerns. Education was bad because the government was bad, bemoaned the Japanese-educated professor of politics Gao Yihan, who was driven into politics by a desire to ensure that the government would provide high-quality education as a necessity for social reform.⁵⁵

There was a clear connection between good men and elite rule. In September, three of the signatories, Wang Chonghui (Ph.D. Yale University), a respected lawyer, diplomat and educator; Luo Wengan, an Oxford-trained lawyer; and the physician Tang Erhe were appointed premier, minister of finance and minister of education, respectively, in the new government under the restored presidency of Li Yuanhong. Their inclusion led the cabinet in which they served to be dubbed the 'good men cabinet'.

'Good men' were experts in their fields with foreign experience. They were presumably men of superior intellect and high character, fit to govern, who constituted an ideal type of political leaders and administrative officials. Did they include the military elite? Ding Wenjiang was unequivocal: 'Military men are included among those of whom I speak, because they are also citizens, and there are also good men among them. It is not proper to use the common abstract expressions "militarist" and "warlord" in speaking of individuals.'⁵⁶ Contrary to popular views, Ding considered many military men patriotic. It was a shame that few of them had received a modern education; otherwise, he thought, they could make great contributions to the country.⁵⁷ As it happened, Ding was most adept at working with some members of the military elite, especially Wu Peifu and Sun Chuanfang (1885–1935), who were considered progressive and reformist.

However, Hu Shi was a little ambivalent towards the military elite. In 1922, he nominated twelve of the greatest men in China. Three were classical scholars (Zhang Binglin, Luo Zhenyu and Wang Guowei); four were recent thinkers (Kang Youwei, Liang Qichao, Cai Yuanpei and Chen Duxiu); one was a revolutionary leader (Sun Yat-sen); only two were military leaders (Duan Qirui and Wu Peifu); and the other two were Wu Zhihui and the industrialist Zhang Jian. Hu's nominations may be compared with those of the readers of Shanghai's *Mill's Review*, namely, Feng Yuxiang, Wu Peifu, Yan Xishan, Li Yuanhong and Chen Jiongmeng, all of whom had military backgrounds, and Sun Yat-sen, Gu Weijun

⁵⁵ Gao Yihan 高一涵, 'Zhengzhi yu shehui' 政治与社会, *Nuli zhoubao* 3 (June 1933): 3.

⁵⁶ Quoted in Furth, *Ting Wen-chiang*, 150–1.

⁵⁷ Jiang Tingfu 蒋廷黻, 'Wo suo zhidao de Ding Zaijun' 我所知道的丁在君, in Hu Shi et al., *Ding Wenjiang zhegeren* 丁文江这个人 (Taipei: Zhuanji wenxue chubanshe, 1969), 176–81.

(Wellington Koo), Wang Chonghui, Cai Yuanpei, Zhang Jian, Yu Rizhang and Wang Zhengting.⁵⁸ Although Hu considered intellectual elites the most eminent candidates for membership in the good men club, he, too, recognized their need to come to terms with military power, however distasteful it might be, as the agents of their own plans for political change.

Good men should help form a government or join it if they could; otherwise, what were they supposed to do? Ding Wenjiang expected them to form small groups to study the morality, temperament and ability of those in power so that an attitude towards them could be formed; to investigate the most important problems of the day with 'a scientific spirit', such as army retrenchment, financial reorganization, public debts and the like; to make a stand on public issues; to express their political views in public; and to work hard with 'a spirit of sacrifice' to bring about political change.⁵⁹ Hu Shi expected them to be night watchers whose duty it was to monitor government operations without being members of a political party. He himself would not join the government (until 1938) and was happy to be an independent critic. In the manner of a public intellectual, Hu wrote:

Political commentators who supervise the political parties are 'transcendent' and independent, recognizing only the state and society, not the political parties, and having only political views, not party views. . . . Perhaps there are people with executive and organizational abilities who for some reasons cannot give up their jobs to join a political party. A society should not be lacking in political commentators who are above party lines. Being above party lines, the commentator plays the role of a mediator, judge and supervisor – the more of them, the better.⁶⁰

Hu's idea of intellectuals playing the role of a mediator, judge and supervisor reflected a view of the importance of their own ranks. But it was equally a feature of the intelligentsia being deeply influenced by the traditional role of the literati who often expressed their views that were at odds with those of the wayward emperor.

The belief that good men in politics deliver good governance has a clear warrant in traditional Chinese thought. Imperial scholar-officials, presumably virtuous, served the dynasty of the day until it had lost the Mandate of Heaven. According to the dictum, 'When men [of integrity]

⁵⁸ Hu Shi, 'Shei shi Zhongguo jinri de 12 ge darenwu?' 谁是中国今日的 12 个大人物? *Nuli zhoubao* 29 (November 1922): 3–4.

⁵⁹ Ding, 'Da guanyu "women de zhengzhi zhuzhang"', 2.

⁶⁰ Hu Shi, 'Zhenglunjia yu zhengdang' 政论家与政党, *Nuli zhoubao* 5 (June 1922): 2.

are in service, institutions are upheld; when they are gone, institutions become dysfunctional (*rencun zhengju, renwang zhengfei*).⁶¹ Bad personnel undermine good institutions, rendering them dysfunctional. In traditional Chinese political philosophy, politics and morality are inseparable and virtuous men, more than institutions, are constitutive of a good government. Confucius said, 'The practice of government by means of virtue may be compared to the North Pole Star, to which the multitudinous stars pay homage while it stays in its place.'⁶² The Master's teaching resonated with a good many modern intellectuals.⁶³

It is from this perspective that the contemporary historian Xu Jilin interprets 'government by good men' as a modern version of the notion of the sage-king, and he faults Hu and his associates for indulging in 'moral idealism' and 'political utopianism'.⁶⁴ This interpretation, however, is only a half-truth in that neither Hu nor Ding was a political utopian. Hu was a pragmatist; Ding, a rationalist.⁶⁵ The importance of impersonal agents was not lost on them. Gao Yihan explained it best: 'In our political proposals [we] demand not only a change of personnel but also a change of institutions. . . . Clearly, what we are demanding are constitutional government, open government . . . and institutions that are established by law [emphasis added].'⁶⁶ From the outset, they had a clear understanding that institutions are more important than individual personnel. At the same time that they accepted the notion of the state as a moral community, they also sought to fashion a new political polity that combined the moral paragon with rational government.

The 'good men cabinet' of 1922 was short-lived. On 21 November, it resigned en masse after Finance Minister Luo Wengan was framed and held in jail on trumped-up charges of corruption. Even before this happened, Premier Wang Chonghui had been absolutely unable to make any plans because he was preoccupied with the government's intractable

⁶¹ *The Analects*, Book II, Section 1, trans. Raymond Dawson with an introduction and notes, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 6.

⁶² Du Yaquan, for one, thought that nobody who is not rectified is able to rectify others and that the group cannot remain good where parts of it are corrupt; it is imperative for individuals to reform themselves first instead of talking about reforming society. See Du Yaquan 杜亚泉, 'Geren zhi gaige' 个人之改革, in *DYQWC*, 303.

⁶³ Xu Jilin 许纪霖, 'Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi de wutuobang: Hu Shi yu "haozhengfu zhuyi" taolun' 中国自由主义的乌托邦: 胡适与'好政府主义'讨论, in *Hu Shi yu xiandai Zhongguo wenhua zhuanxing* 胡适与现代中国文化转型, ed. Liu Qingfeng 刘青峰 (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1994), 35-54.

⁶⁴ Furth's characterization of Ding in *Ting Wen-chiang*, chap. 9.

⁶⁵ Gao, 'Zhengzhi yu shehui', 3.

debt problems. Pressed repeatedly by Hu for a plan, Wang responded angrily, 'Hu Shi, if you want me to announce any plans, I [have to say that I] don't have any plan other than eat my meals and do my daily routine chores.'⁶⁶ An immensely disappointed Hu noted in his diary that Wang 'turns out to be a useless fellow'.⁶⁷ This was an unfair and harsh judgement. Not in government himself, Hu had little idea about the magnitude of the problems with which the cabinet was confronted. The cabinet found itself in an untenable position, as the resources it required to do its job were simply unavailable.

The shortage of funds notwithstanding, the cabinet was ineffectual from the start, undermined by political interference and the lack of an independent judiciary. Cai Yuanpei was angered by the authorities' handling of the case of Luo Wengan, who had been arrested and detained without due processes of the law. On 19 January 1923, Cai resigned in protest from his position as chancellor of Beida, an action supported by Hu and others.⁶⁸ There was also the problem of political corruption that was too massive for anyone in government to tackle. On 23 November 1923, the militarist Cao Kun had himself elected president of the Republic by bribing the 'Old Parliament', thereby putting an end to the 'good men government' movement.

Yet the movement had been a political education. Elite consciousness of political participation had been raised. In the years that followed, many leading members of the intelligentsia did become more politically active. Ding Wenjing worked for the warlord Sun Chuanfang as director-general of the Port of Greater Shanghai (May–December 1926) and proved to be an excellent administrator.⁶⁹ Hu Shi was approached by numerous people with a view to forming a political party, which he declined, yet he was becoming politically active in other ways, as noted in the preceding chapter.

On the other hand, the failure of the 'good men cabinet' demonstrated with rare clarity that modern politics is not the preserve of men of superior intellectual and high moral character and that good men are not necessarily noble or necessarily able to make correct policies and good administrators. On the contrary, good men may have the best

⁶⁶ Hu Shi, *Hu Shi de riji: shougaoben*: 胡适的日记: 手稿本, reprint, 18 vols. (Taipei: Yuanliu chubang gongsi, 1990), vol. III, entry 22 September 1922.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, entry 27 October 1922.

⁶⁸ Timothy B. Weston, *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals, and Chinese Political Culture, 1898–1929* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 222.

⁶⁹ Furth, *Ting Wen-chiang*, chap. 7.

intentions but quite reasonably mistake the private interest of a few for the well-being of the whole community. They may be ignorant of the problems confronting them or simply be incompetent in handling them. Moreover, with the best efforts, they may be unable to discharge their duties without sufficient resources, public trust, political stability and freedom from political interference.

Another issue arising from the 'good men government' movement was that of politics as 'a vocation' in Weber's sense.⁷⁰ Governing China with a population in excess of four hundred million (for most of the Republican era) was a Herculean task requiring strong leadership (something like Weber's charismatic leadership) and a great deal of expertise. Hu Shi was careful to make a distinction between managing state affairs and respecting civil and political rights. The former requires a body of knowledge that only the educated elite possesses; the latter is something that every citizen should enjoy. Only the intelligent and the educated are fit to govern. Hu believed in enlightened elites who practised a kind of positive elitism.⁷¹ His exhortation to those young people who wished to participate in politics was that they should receive a good education first. 'Henceforth, we must respect experts and appoint them to advise the government on politics and on problem solving. Those without expertise are unqualified to assume the important responsibilities of state and society'.⁷² Hu's message was clear: Government is best served by the educated elite. His notion of expert politics was echoed by Luo Longji, who maintained that the state was a combination of 'entrusted power and expertise service' (his English).⁷³

Republican liberals were as paternalistic as the literati of old, but their belief in an enlightened technocracy was equally a reflection of an Enlightenment influence – an outcome of the historic pursuit of Enlightenment that had delivered the state and political power into the hands of neither capital nor labour but those of the liberal intelligentsia who represented a new class of technocrats and a knowledge-based bureaucracy.

⁷⁰ H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 114–15.

⁷¹ By positive elitism, I mean an elitism that exists in situations where members of a community with special abilities or special qualifications are afforded greater respect by virtue of their abilities or qualifications, and where their position at the top of their field is used to benefit the community more than themselves.

⁷² Hu Shi, 'Sixiang geming yu sixiang ziyou' 思想革命与思想自由, in *HSWJ*, XI, 200.

⁷³ Luo Longji, 'Women yao shenmeyang de zhengzhi zhidu?' 我们要什么样的政治制度? *Xinyue* 新月 2, 12 (February 1930): 21, and 'Zhuanjia zhengzhi 专家政治, *Xinyue* 2, 2 (April 1929): 1–7.

Expert politics was part of the animating project of the Enlightenment, underscoring the importance of the differentiation of functions. A modern bureaucracy, as Weber said, distinguishes itself from a traditional bureaucracy, in which authority was not based on formal justice and legal procedures, by activities organized in a diffuse fashion by a body of experts, the technocrats.

Elitism has long been a characteristic of the liberal tradition. John Stuart Mill's elitism and scepticism of democratic institutions is well-known.⁷⁴ His idea of elite rule was perfectly acceptable to the Chinese, who were accustomed to centuries of paternalistic government. The educated minority scarcely reflected on the hauteur of their own ranks, for they regarded themselves as the conscience of society and the bearers of the burdens of responsibility for the state. However, in the context of the 1920s and 1930s, technocracy could also be linked to fascist tendencies with regard to action and efficiency. Hu Shi wrote in 1926 that China could learn from Mussolini's Italy.⁷⁵ Also, Qian Duansheng, as noted earlier, was impressed with the dictatorial regime in Rome, which was efficient in managing a complex, modern economy.

Elitism is both a necessity and a danger. As Weber postulated, the relationship between bureaucracy and democracy creates one of the most profound sources of tension in the modern social order. The necessity for expertise could result in the government becoming an oppressive bureaucratic regime, that is, in bureaucratic domination as a result of officials performing the specialized duties of their office – what Weber called the 'iron cage' in which people are trapped.⁷⁶ That is an intractable problem of modernity. In a different way, Laski warned:

Expertise, it may be argued, sacrifices the insight of common sense to intensity of experience. It breeds an inability to accept new ideas from the very depths of its preoccupation with its own conclusions. It too often fails to see around its subject. It sees its results out of perspective by making them

⁷⁴ Writing in the 1860s, Mill stressed the tutelage role of the educated and rational elite over their social inferiors; only as people were educated according to elite standards would they become eligible to participate in government. Although he favoured universal suffrage for all taxpayers, Mill advocated plurality of votes for citizens of superior intellect and high character. He thought it 'wholly inadmissible' that anyone should participate in the suffrage, without being able to read, write, and perform the common operations of arithmetic. See John Stuart Mill, 'On considerations of representative government', in *Three Essays*, intro. Richard Wollheim (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 277–99.

⁷⁵ Hu Shi, 'Ouyou dao zhong jixin' 欧游道中寄信, in *HSWJ*, IV, 48.

⁷⁶ Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 3rd edn., trans. Stephen Kalberg (Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing, 2002).

the centre of relevance to which all other results must be related. Too often, also, it lacks humility.⁷⁷

Few would question that elitism was a necessity in China, where the vast majority of the population were uneducated. The problem, however, was that men of talent and integrity were not always recruited into the government because of party politics or lack of personal connections. Luo Longji made this point poignantly in an editorial (15 February 1933) in Tianjin's *Yishibao* ('*Social Welfare Daily*') in response to a speech delivered earlier by the chairman of the National Government, Lin Sen (1868–1943). In that speech, Lin quoted Mencius: 'Give honour to men of talent and virtue, employ the able and fill offices with individuals of distinction and mark' as an injunction for good government. Luo questioned him:

Chairman Lin is the highest government leader but he is not an emperor. His power to employ people is limited by the National Government's Organization Law. The highest civil servants of the state are chosen at Party headquarters; they are not appointed by the Chairman. Even if the person serving as Chairman wants to 'give honour to men of talent and virtue', he would not have the power to do so.⁷⁸

Luo's point was that the Nationalist political system was not open to those wishing to run for public office on their merits and on a competitive basis.

At the same time, elitism was a danger because it was potentially anti-democratic. Ding Wenjiang sounded like a liberal democrat in 1923, when he spoke of the responsibility of a small minority: 'The characteristic of democracy is the search for a way of ensuring that those in political power are always the best talents on one hand, and, on the other, that the greatest number under the control of this minority is still able to exercise supervision over the latter so that power is not abused.'⁷⁹ Yet, a decade later, he had no qualms about advocating a new-style dictatorship. Hu Shi rejected dictatorship but retained elitism. As Jerome Grieder points out, there is nothing inherently democratic in Hu's idea of government with a plan. On the contrary, there is 'a marked strain of potentially antidemocratic elitism'.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Harold J. Laski, 'The limitations of the expert', in *The Intellectuals: A Controversial Portrait*, ed. George B. Huszar (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960), 168.

⁷⁸ *Yishibao* 益世报, 15 February 1933. The translation is Frederic Spar's, 143.

⁷⁹ Ding, 'Shaoshuren de zeren', 2.

⁸⁰ Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 196.

How, then, can the antidemocratic tendencies of elitism be countered? Laski's suggestion was that an educated, responsible and organized electorate capable of asserting its rights and expressing its interests provided the best means of checking the arbitrary rule of technocratic elites.⁸¹ Hu Shi was pragmatic in that he viewed government as a political instrument and a public agency for realizing definite public ends 'by the use of organized energies or forces'.⁸² When the instrument is bad, repair it. If it is beyond repair, replace it. Political tools need to be 'modified or reformed from time to time in order that they may continue to serve efficiently and economically the needs of the changing times. A political institution that resists intelligent experimentation and peaceful revision tends to inefficiency, waste, suffering and violence in reaction.'⁸³ The best safeguard against bad government, Hu continued, lies with democratic control of the administrative machinery through an institutionalized system of checks and balances. 'A government intelligently conscious of its own instrumental potentialities, and, at the same time, subject to democratic control, is the only kind of political machinery worthy of the new age of science and technology.'⁸⁴ At the same time, it was important to develop legal institutions to establish the rule of law.

The Rule of Law

The development of rational law and administration is one of the strongest features of the modern state. From a liberal point of view, the rule of law is the essential and most important condition of individual liberty, comprising a substantive vision of the correct and just relations between individuals and society.⁸⁵ A necessary ingredient for the rule of

⁸¹ Harold J. Laski, *A Grammar of Politics*, 4th edn. (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938), 78, 390.

⁸² Hu Shih, 'Instrumentalism as a political concept', in *Studies in Political Science and Sociology*, eds. Hu Shih et al. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941), 5.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 6. Here, Hu was not original. He learned English utilitarianism from J. S. Mill in 'Considerations on representative government' (1861). And from John Dewey, he learned that an instrument must include the power required to make it work and that the machinery for harnessing that power to act guarantees the attainment of the desired ends.

⁸⁵ Hayek wrote in 1944, 'Stripped of all technicalities this means that government in all its actions is bound by rules fixed and announced beforehand – rules which make it possible to see with fair certainty how the authority will use its coercive powers in given circumstances, and to plan one's individual affairs on the basis of this knowledge.' See Friedrich August von Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, reprint (London: Routledge, 1997), 54.

law is a fully developed legal system with an independent judiciary and fair legal frameworks capable of impartial enforcement.

In Western political philosophy, the rule of law is premised on the ideal of limited government, standing as a constitutional barrier between the ruler and the ruled, power and people. Taken in its broadest sense, the rule of law means that people obey the law and are ruled by it. In a narrower sense, in political and legal theory, it means that the government is ruled by the law and subject to it. It demands that government be by law and not by discretion. Also and especially, lawmakers themselves must be subject to the law. In this form, the rule of law is contrasted rightly with arbitrary power and rough justice. Its ideal is often expressed by the phrase 'government by law and not by men'. Its operative axioms are the generality of official rules and the faithful adherence by government to those declared standards of conduct. In its various manifestations, the rule of law is linked to a liberal theory of political justice and jurisprudence, the constitutional principle of legality. The limitation of state power, the maintenance of a broad sphere of individual liberty and the preservation of a market-exchange economy are its enduring concerns. The legal philosophers Allan Hutchinson and Patrick Monahan have termed this the 'thin' version of the rule of law.⁸⁶ In recent times, there has developed also a 'thick' version that posits a necessary connection between procedural and substantive justice. It demands that positive law embody a particular vision of social justice, structured around the moral rights and duties that citizens have against each other and the state as a whole.⁸⁷

Traditionally, Chinese laws (*fa*) were essentially administrative regulations that did not originate as a defence against the exercise of despotic power or against the abuse of power by those in authority. Particularistic and not procedural, Chinese laws stipulated and articulated administrative duties, supplementing rituals and behaviours in a Confucian society that emphasized social harmony and conflict resolution without normally resorting to litigation. They did not function to protect rights associated with the limitation of state power. The rule of law as we understand it in the West was conspicuous by its absence.

Chinese authorities in the Republican era subscribed to neither the thin nor the thick version of the rule of law. Nevertheless, successive

⁸⁶ Allan C. Hutchinson and Patrick Monahan, 'Democracy and the rule of law', in *Law and Morality: Readings in Legal Philosophy*, eds. David Dyzenhaus and Arthur Ripstein (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 344.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 345.

governments from 1912 to 1937 initiated judicial reforms, creating what the contemporary historian Xiaoqun Xu terms a 'trial of modernity'. Xu defines judicial modernity as formal justice, and judicial modernization as 'the formalization of legal institutions and procedures in accordance with uniform standards and modern techniques'.⁸⁸ He demonstrates that the various initiatives taken during the Nanjing Decade, remarkable as they were, failed to be implemented at the provincial and county levels for a variety of reasons, including financial constraints and institutional inadequacies. Irregularities, abuses, corruption and informal practices remained rife.⁸⁹

In some respects, the new order inaugurated by the Nationalists in 1928 was the kind that Hu Shi and others had long hoped for.⁹⁰ They expected the new government to establish liberal and legal institutions, to differentiate political functions and eventually to implement constitutional rule. They were disappointed, however, when the GMD immediately imposed its will on the nation, banned other political parties and restricted political and civil rights. Some responded by launching a human rights movement following the issuing by the government on 20 April 1929 of an 'Order concerning the protection of human rights'.⁹¹ The movement underscored the very issues that had been raised before: expert politics, open and constitutional government and good governance. The only difference was a new emphasis on human rights, on the rule of law and above all on democratic institutions. Luo Longji stated it best: 'In Chinese politics today, there is only one path to follow, one that recognizes institutions (*zhidu*), not men (*ren*). When institutions are on the right track, we support whoever is in power. Without institutions that are suited to the time, we would oppose whoever is in government.'⁹² The principle is that the law exists to protect rights.

In addition to human rights, four related issues merit attention here. One concerns the relationship of law to democracy and to public morality. Laws not enacted through a democratic process are illegitimate, and the process is undemocratic when citizens are prevented from participating directly or indirectly in it. It was from this perspective that Luo Longji argued that when an individual, a family or a group took possession of

⁸⁸ Xiaoqun Xu, *Trial of Modernity: Judicial Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China, 1901–1937* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2008), 5.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*, 220.

⁹¹ Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy*, chap. 2.

⁹² Luo, 'Women yao shenmeyang de zhengzhi zhidu', 2.

the state and its lawmaking mechanisms and trampled on the rights of the majority as its members pursued their own interests, the law failed to fulfil its functions for which it was made. He accused the ruling GMD of turning itself into a family business for the benefit of the patriarch and its members at the public expense.⁹³ Luo had reason to be angry, for he had been arrested arbitrarily by the authorities on 4 November 1930 for his outspoken criticism of the government's human rights violations and was not released until a senior GMD figure intervened and bailed him out.⁹⁴ He was supported by Wang Zaoshi, who condemned the making of law by powerful figures within the party-state acting in the interest of a particular group without popular consent. Following Rousseau, Wang insisted that the law must be the expression of the general will.⁹⁵ In other words, if the law promulgated by the government was not in the interest of the people as a whole and had no popular consent, it was a bad law and unenforceable.

There is a connection between law and public morality. Whether the law is right and just is a moral-legal issue. Writing in 1938, Zhang Junmai accepted Kant's notion of the state as a 'moral community' and grounded regime legitimacy in what he called 'collective morality' (*jiti daode*) or state morality (*guojia daode*), which he compared to the German concept of the *Rechtsstaat* (a state embodying the rule of law). To Zhang, collective morality best manifested itself in a sense of shame, like the Japanese *bushidō*, in a sense of duty and fair play and in a sense of ministerial responsibility as in the British political tradition. It combined with the rule of law to constitute 'the supreme principle of state building'.⁹⁶ The nation as a cultural and political community, and the state as a moral community, rests on the twin pillars of legal institutions and moral values. For Zhang, as I understand him, the republican state is more than a procedural democracy; it is also a republic of ethics. His conception of public morality comes close to Jürgen Habermas's view that the rationality of law, which according to Weber is essential to its independence, cannot be understood as a merely formal or procedural rationality because law

⁹³ Luo, 'Lun renquan', 11–12.

⁹⁴ Luo Longji, 'Wo de beibu de jingguo yu fan'gan' 我对被捕的经过与反感, *Xinyue* 3, 3 (January 1931): 1–17.

⁹⁵ Wang, *Huangmiaoji*, 270–1.

⁹⁶ Zhang Junmai was impressed with Japanese government ministers who would commit suicide in serious cases of wrongdoings that brought shame to the nation and with British ministers who would resign for misconduct and dereliction of duty. See Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 38–9.

is internally related to morality and politics. Zhang would have agreed with Habermas that the moral principle must be distinguished from the process of legitimate lawmaking and that law itself provides a necessary complement to morality.⁹⁷

A moralistic view of the law allows the intrusion of substantive considerations, such as those of social justice and welfare, into what is in principle a formal system of law. It was on this basis that one Beida professor insisted that the final test of the law was substantive justice, meaning equality and the public interest.⁹⁸ He was virtually talking about the thick version of the rule of law even before the thin version was adopted by the Nationalist party-state.

The second issue concerns the relationship between personnel and institutions in the administration of justice. Traditionally, Chinese rulers and philosophers had emphasized rule by man (*renzhi*) rather than rule by law (*fazhi*). True to Confucian humanism, men of virtue were privileged over institutions, as noted earlier. In the modern state, the opposite is true, as legal institutions are rational and formal. Even so, government is both by law and by man. As Joseph Raz points out, 'government by law and not by man' is the ideal of the rule of law rather than the standard practice.⁹⁹

Rule by man and rule by law are frequently invoked categories in Chinese political discourse past and present, the question being which is more important as constitutive of a successful government, good men (here, 'men' means administrative officials and judicial personnel, invariably male in the old days) or good institutions? During the early Republic, Du Yaquan, with the militarists and politicians in mind, placed more emphasis on rule by man to advocate a greater role for moral reform in political change.¹⁰⁰ Zhang Shizhao, on the other hand, attached greater importance to rule by law, even though he realized the potency of interactions between the two. He wrote in 1915:

If rule by man is not supported by rule by law, then when the man dies institutions cease to function and people do not know what to do. If policy implementation is not supported by rule by law, then the implementer is

⁹⁷ William Outhwaite, *Habermas: A Critical Introduction* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1994), 138, 141.

⁹⁸ Wu Enyu 吴恩裕, 'Falun, daode yu dazhong liyi' 法律、道德与大众利益, *Guancha* 观察 5, 15 (December 1947): 3-5.

⁹⁹ Joseph Raz, 'The rule of law and its virtue', in *Law and Morality*, eds. Dyzenhaus and Ripstein, 291-2.

¹⁰⁰ Du, 'Geren zhi gaige', in *DIQWC*, 303-7.

inclined to procrastinate and those junior to him would act arbitrarily for self-interest. Rule by law is the supreme principle of politics and most suited to China today.¹⁰¹

Fifteen years later, Luo Longji, trained in public administration and mindful of the abuse of power by the Nationalist elite, similarly placed institutions ahead of personnel.¹⁰² Others viewed the two as complementary: Institutions, however sound, cannot be properly maintained without people of integrity, yet nobody can enjoy effective legal protection without sound institutions. State building requires both. It was a common view among Republican intellectuals that institutions should be underpinned by a system of moral values: When institutions became dysfunctional and rule by law ineffective, both the lawmakers and law enforcement agents should be held accountable. Zhang Junmai, for one, recognized the interdependency and relatedness of institutions and human agency: Although the law is rational and formal, the human and moral factors cannot be dismissed altogether. As much as it is a legal problem, failure of the law is a moral failure.¹⁰³ Zhang was implying that the Nationalist regime, like those before it, failed morally in both lawmaking and law enforcement.

The third issue relates to ordinary people's understanding of the law and their rights that the law was meant to protect. The party-state alone was not to blame for their failure to obey the rule of law, because the concept of rights was alien to the masses. Hu Shi pointed out in 1931 that the function of the law in an evolving political order was such that whereas the law could define rights, it could not, of itself, guarantee them. The protection of rights requires a proper understanding of the significance of the law and the cultivation of 'a habit of mind' that refuses to forsake the freedoms defined by law. 'We cannot hope that everyone will understand what rights are or that everyone will be able to defend his own rights.'¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Zhang Shizhao 章士钊, 'Zhengzhi yu shehui' 政治与社会, in *ZSZQJ*, III, 442.

¹⁰² Luo Longji, 'Shenme shi fazhi' 什么是法治, *Xinyue* 3, 11 (December 1930): 1-17.

¹⁰³ Zhang Junmai, 'Xin rujia zhengzhi zhixue' 新儒家政治哲学, in *Zhongxiyin zhixue wenji* 中西印哲学文集, 2 vols., ed. Cheng Wenxi 程文熙 (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuzhu, 1981), vol. I, 387-8.

¹⁰⁴ Grieder, *Hu Shi and the Chinese Renaissance*, 277-8. Hu's comments need to be contextualized. Early in 1932, to the disappointment of his fellow human rights advocates, Hu acknowledged the Nationalist government's right to crack down on subversive activities following the formation of the Human Rights League in Beijing. Though critical of the Nationalist leadership, he recognized Nanjing's legal status and its rights as a government.

It is not good enough to just talk about democratic change. A democratic system would not work if people did not have a habit of acting democratically. Similarly, the rule of law would be ineffective if people accustomed to the old way did not nurture a new habit of obeying the law. In the West, the rule of law is effective because the popular habit is compatible with the legal system. In Republican China, as Zhang Junmai pointed out, there were some new legal institutions, but the legal culture remained old.¹⁰⁵ The problem was that the Chinese would customarily try to evade rules and regulations if they could, showing a lack of civic virtues and public spirit. Few took the law seriously or regarded it with the respect it deserved. It was a question of education, to be sure. But then again, no government officials were exemplary. Political leaders and all those in authority had no intention of obeying the law themselves. Nor would they enact laws that would not advantage themselves. This, lamented Hu Shi, eroded public confidence in the government entrusted to make the Organic Law.¹⁰⁶ It was a vicious circle. To break it, Zhang Junmai urged the government to provide leadership by taking a formal and dignified approach to the administration of justice, by being more serious and more careful in lawmaking and by conforming to the law itself. In any event, the law should be interpreted correctly, enforced impartially and changed when out of date.¹⁰⁷

Last but not least is the question of how, given the internal conditions of China, the rule of law could be more effectively implemented. Seeing that the problems lay with both the government and the governed, the dean of law at Zhejiang University, Li Haopei, proposed in 1947 a number of measures: 1) a national education programme designed to raise the public's awareness of their rights under the law; 2) exposures by the articulate elements of society of the arbitrariness and illegal actions of those in authority; 3) education of all government officials on general law and administrative law; 4) an expansion of the supervisory mechanisms designed to impeach corrupt and law-breaching officials; and 5) an independent judiciary.¹⁰⁸ These were good measures, but no one really expected the party-state to be willing or able to carry them out in the midst of a civil war. There were too much political violence, official corruption and vested interests to give the rule of law a chance.

¹⁰⁵ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 310–12.

¹⁰⁶ Hu Shi, 'Zhixian buru shoufa' 制宪不如守法, in *HSWJ*, XI, 334–7.

¹⁰⁷ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 34–8; also Zhang Junmai, *Xianzheng zhi dao* 宪政之道, no ed. (Beijing: Qinghua daxue chubanshe, 2006), 376–7.

¹⁰⁸ Li Haopei 李浩培, 'Fazhi shixing wenti' 法治实行问题, *Guancha* 2, 12 (May 1947): 3–6.

As the rule of law is premised on the ideal of limited government, throughout the Republican period, liberal elites engaged in a protracted movement for constitutionalism, forcing successive governments to pay at least lip service to constitution making, even during the War of Resistance. Nothing short of twelve constitutions, provisional constitutions and draft constitutions had been promulgated between 1912 and 1949. None, however, was satisfactory, with the possible exception of the 1947 Constitution drafted by Zhang Junmai and others and passed in the National Assembly the previous December. All of them defined an existing sociopolitical order and were 'programmatic' where citizens' rights were concerned.¹⁰⁹ Even in China today, the law is far from being an instrument for the protection of citizen's rights and for the maximization of popular demands.

Conclusion

In Chinese liberal thought, strong state and government with a plan represent a vision of political modernity that can be justified in modern liberal theory: The modern state need not be a minimal state; liberalism is neither egalitarianism nor necessarily antistatist; and state activities may encompass any manner of service functions that are conducted in noncoercive fashion. Even more importantly, this vision of political modernity rested on practical considerations: China, having been so weak in its recent past, could not survive without a strong government. A strong state could hold the country together (keeping alive the notion of the unitary state), negotiate a power relationship between the centre and the periphery and resolve the country's myriad problems. Without political and military muscle, liberal intellectuals needed to come to terms with state power in order to give their reform programmes a chance of success. Even cooperating with the warlords was no anathema provided that they were enlightened and reformist.

A restoration of order was a precondition for good government, and forming a good government, according to the *Endeavour* group, was the responsibility of a small minority of educated elite. Hu Shi soon discovered, though, that good government was not made by good men alone. Nor were good men necessarily recruited into the government, as Luo Longji bemoaned. Good men politics were elite politics. The

¹⁰⁹ Andrew J. Nathan, *Chinese Democracy: The Individual and the State in Twentieth Century China* (New York: Knopf, 1985), 111.

case for elitism and enlightened rule could be justified by China's social conditions; furthermore, the idea itself is consonant with both Millsian liberalism and traditional Chinese paternalism. The only trouble was that the liberal elite hardly considered the contributions that ordinary people could make to good government or the role that the masses could play in achieving social change. The liberal elite were not populists and were averse to social revolution. It was left to the leftist members of the intelligentsia and to the CCP to mobilize the masses socially and politically.

The rule of law was the most important part of the liberal quest for modernity in terms of institutional development. It was also the most difficult to achieve because the ruling elite refused to obey their own laws. The rule of law was a complex question involving many factors, notably, democracy, human rights, administration of justice, the relationship between institutions and personnel and ordinary people's understandings of the law and their rights that the law was meant to protect. At its core was a need for constitutionalism. In the final analysis, the liberal vision of modernity was at odds with the Nationalist party-state, which remained a closed system above the law.

The Rise of Reformist Socialist Thought

On his visit to China in 1920, Bertrand Russell observed that the students and most of the best among their teachers whom he met at universities in Beijing and Nanjing were, to a man, socialists.¹ Russell may have hazy ideas about what sort of socialists they were, but he was correct in feeling a Chinese impulse towards socialism. A belief in socialism of one variety or another was shared across the political spectrum. Indeed, since the 1920s, socialism had become the mainstream of Chinese political thought. This prompted the political scientist Qian Duansheng to write in a 1950 overview of politics in the Nationalist era that the political parties and groups of every stripe were ‘all democratic’ and ‘all tend to be socialistic’ with regard to their professed principles.²

There were two major strands of socialist thought in the Republican era. One was radical Marxism, represented by such protagonists as Chen Duxiu and Li Dazhao and perfected by Mao Zedong. The other was reformist or democratic socialism, inspired by the socialist movements in Western Europe in the interwar years, especially in Weimar Germany and England. Each represented a road to modernity, one revolutionary and the other evolutionary.

Reformist socialist thought illustrates the interrelatedness of the liberal, conservative and socialist triad of modern Chinese thought. Prior to the May Fourth period, reformers and cultural conservatives were already critical of capitalism and laissez-faire economics, speaking about socialism of a moderate variety with a view to bringing about social reform. Then, from May Fourth on, liberalism and socialism were intimately

¹ Bertrand Russell, *The Problem of China* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922), 222.

² Ch'ien Tuan-sheng, *The Government and Politics of China, 1912–1949* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), 362.

intertwined in the minds of many liberal intellectuals. Yet, when China underwent socialist transformation in the 1950s, it was not preceded by an age of liberalism.

This presents a contrast to Western Europe, where many viewed socialism as merely the stage that followed liberalism. Eduard Bernstein (1850–1932), the leading revisionist socialist, held that ‘with respect to liberalism as a great historical movement, socialism is its legitimate heir, not only in chronological sequence, but also in its spiritual qualities, as is shown moreover in every question of principle in which social democracy has had to take up an attitude’.³ L. T. Hobhouse claimed that socialism was ‘in fact, properly considered, only the development of Liberalism under new conditions’.⁴ In a similar vein, the British Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald (1924 and 1929–1931) stated, ‘Socialism, the stage which follows Liberalism, retains everything that was of permanent value in Liberalism, by virtue of its being the hereditary heir of Liberalism.’⁵

Prior to World War I, Marxism in Europe had evolved through two stages: the orthodox stage, with an emphasis on class struggle and historical materialism, followed by the revisionist stage, which set great store by cross-class cooperation and a political route to socialism.⁶ Nineteenth-century Europe had witnessed the founding of the First International (1864) and the Second International (1889), as well as a series of domestic social movements involving the working class. It had also seen a split within the socialist movement between the revisionist and the revolutionary socialists. The former did not reject Marxism but sought to reform it; they toned down their criticism of capitalism, arguing that socialism should be achieved through evolution rather than revolution. The latter, who would call themselves communists, contended that any attempt to reform capitalism was doomed to failure because the reformers would be gradually corrupted and eventually become capitalists themselves. By World War I, some socialist parties had become political forces through the electoral system and parliamentary route,

³ Eduard Bernstein, *Evolutionary Socialism: A Criticism and Affirmation*, with an Introduction by Sidney Hook (New York: Schocken Books, 1961), 149.

⁴ Quoted in Stefan Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology: L. T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England, 1880–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 38.

⁵ Quoted in *ibid.*, 38, note 96.

⁶ On the revisionist stage, Bernstein wrote in 1898: ‘Revisionists set themselves against the notion that we have to expect a collapse of the bourgeoisie economy and that social democracy should be induced by the prospect of such an imminent, great, social catastrophe to adapt its tactics to that assumption.’ See Bernstein, *Evolutionary Socialism*, xxiv.

either as the main opposition force or as partners in coalition governments. The vast changes unleashed by World War I led many Europeans on the left to reject the twin pillars of orthodox Marxism and return to the themes set out by revisionism's pioneers a generation earlier. Another split developed between those who remained committed to abolishing capitalism through evolution and replacing it with a socialist system through the parliamentary route and those who believed that the capitalist system could be retained by making adjustments and improvements to it, such as through the nationalization of key industries, the implementation of social programmes and the partial redistribution of wealth through a welfare state and progressive taxation.⁷ Now Europe's revisionist socialists were well prepared to confront the spread of what the Austrian-born socialist Rudolf Hilferding (1877–1941) called 'organized capitalism' – the growth of monopolies, cartels and trusts that had led to the end of laissez-faire capitalism.

By contrast, China's self-styled reformist socialists of the Nationalist era had no Marxist inheritance – they were statist liberals and social democrats. Chinese socialist thought, as with its liberal and conservative siblings, was from the outset linked to the state-building project. Capitalism had yet to develop, and a political route to socialism did not exist.

This chapter first describes the socialist discourse in 1919 and then analyses the 1920 controversy about capitalism and socialism, followed by a survey of German, British and, to a lesser extent, Soviet Russian influences on Chinese socialist thinking during the 1920s. Before concluding, the chapter will look at the protosocialist elements in ancient Chinese thought that modern intellectuals sometimes used to support modern socialism.

The Socialist Discourse, 1919

Historically, socialism was an inspiration to those who were struggling against exploitation, discrimination, tyranny and injustice, who resented the inequitable society and who wanted to change the existing social order and even the world. Socialism promised distributive justice and a society where people would be motivated by a spirit of unselfishness, sacrifice, cooperation and idealism rather than by an acquisitive impulse. This moral appeal was its strongest point. Philosophically, socialism as

⁷ Donald Sassoon, *One Hundred Years of Socialism: The Western European Left in the Twentieth Century* (New York: The New Press, 1996), 59.

a critique of capitalism offered a theory of history that explained why colonial and semicolonial societies, such as India and China, had fallen behind Europe – not because they lacked the wherewithal to modernize but because they had fallen victim to colonialism or imperialism. Socialism was both Western and anti-Western. An outgrowth of the Western intellectual tradition, socialism represented a fundamental attack on the prevailing socioeconomic order of the Western world, and it was anticolonial. Furthermore, socialism was linked to the idea of a strong state. It emphasized rational planning by the state as a substitute for the reliance on the market, and it promised to provide experts and technocrats with political power. To be socialist was to be modern, international and as advanced as possible. Before it eventually became associated with images of backwardness, socialism claimed to be the epitome of modernity and a model for the future. All of this explains why many in the non-West greeted socialism as a new civilization, an anti-imperialist force and an alternative ideology of modernization.

When first introduced into China via Japan in the late Qing, socialism attracted the attention of Liang Qichao, Liu Shiwei, Sun Yat-sen and his comrades writing for the *People's Journal* (*Minbao*).⁸ Liang Qichao's criticism of capitalism is especially interesting from his point of view of a reformer and cultural conservative. In a 1902 article titled 'On intervention and laissez faire', Liang identified the problems of capitalism with laissez-faire economics and individualism, which led to 'the rich becoming richer and richer and the poor poorer and poorer', hence socialism as an antidote to capitalism.⁹ In the following year, he published another article describing socialism as a special product of the past hundred years, its essence being state ownership of land and capital and the use of labour to value all commodities. He quoted Marx as writing that capitalist societies were controlled by a small minority that had usurped land from the majority of the population, and Ferdinand Lasalle (1825–64) as writing that all land owners and capitalists were thieves.¹⁰ And in a third article, Liang attacked trusts as 'a monster' born in New York, where a great disparity between the rich and the poor existed.¹¹

⁸ Martin Bernal, *Chinese Socialism to 1907* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1976); Pi Mingxiu 皮明修, *Jindai Zhongguo shehui zhuyi sichao mizong* 近代中国社会主义思潮觅踪 (Changchun: Jilin wenshi chubanshe, 1991), 44–8, 77–82.

⁹ Liang Qichao 梁启超, 'Ganshe yu fangren' 干涉与放任, in *LQCQJ*, I, 383–4.

¹⁰ Liang Qichao, 'Zhongguo zhi shehui zhuyi' 中国之社会主义, in *LQCQJ*, I, 392–3.

¹¹ Liang Qichao, 'Ershi shiji zhi juling tuolasi' 二十世纪之巨灵托拉斯, in *LQCQJ*, II, 1099–113.

Liang's view of capitalism was even grimmer after World War I. In 1919, Liang was convinced that a new rich class had emerged in Europe, where 'the more advanced science becomes, the more factories are established, and yet society degenerates increasingly, with the rich becoming richer and richer, and the poor poorer and poorer'.¹² He feared that social revolution, now an undercurrent, would be the 'only characteristic of the twentieth century that no country can avoid'.¹³ Social revolution was anathema to him, but it was not to be confused with socialism, which he acknowledged as 'the most valuable system of thought in modern times' insofar as the livelihood of the people was concerned.¹⁴

Yet Liang did not think postwar European socialism was suited to China. 'It does not scratch where it itches', because China did not experience an industrial revolution, and capital was concentrated in the hands of the warlords and bureaucrats.¹⁵ His immediate concerns were to encourage production, to reward workers for productivity and to achieve even distribution of the wealth thus created. He sought to develop capital formation outside the control of the warlords and state bureaucrats. At the same time, he advocated 'a spirit of mutual aid' and social cooperation between labour and management, between the public and private sectors and between cooperatives and consumers.¹⁶ Liang hoped that Chinese industrialism would develop in a way that would prevent social revolution.

It was his associate, Zhang Dongsun, who brought the socialist discourse into sharp relief in 1919. Zhang initially trained as a traditional scholar before moving to Japan in 1904 to study Western philosophy at Tokyo's Imperial University. There, in 1906, he met Zhang Junmai, then a student of politics at Waseda University, and Liang Qichao. After their return to China, the two Zhangs, who had become close friends, associated themselves with Liang's newly formed Progressive Party (Jinbudang), which was later renamed the Research Clique (Yanjiuxi). Zhang Dongsun earned a living as a newspaper and magazine editor, publishing numerous articles on constitutionalism and other political issues. In 1917, he became editor of the influential *Current News* (*Shishi xinbao*),

¹² Liang Qichao, 'Ouyou xinyinglu' 欧游心影录, in *LQCQJ*, V, 2971.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 2972.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 2984.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 2985.

which had a literary supplement, *Academic Light* (*Xuedeng*). In the pages of *Academic Light*, Zhang Dongsun distinguished himself as a political commentator and social critic. Two years later, he launched a new journal, *Emancipation and Reconstruction* (*Jiefang yu gaizao*) (shortened to *Reconstruction* from the third volume).¹⁷ The journal, virtually an organ of the Research Clique, would become one of the most important political publications of the early 1920s, serving as a vehicle for the introduction of socialist thought to China's reformist intellectuals and as a public forum for a robust debate on socialism and capitalism.¹⁸

In an article titled 'A third kind of civilization' for the inaugural issue of *Emancipation and Reconstruction*, Zhang Dongsun postulated that human history had seen two kinds of civilization. The first was 'the civilization of custom and superstition', its characteristic features being religion, inhibition of thought and institutionalized hierarchies. The second was 'the civilization of liberty and competition', marked by individualism, nationalism, materialism, class-based social organizations and interstate wars. Its flaws had been exposed by World War I. This had led Zhang to believe that capitalism and state nationalism were in their last days. He envisioned the imminent birth of 'a third kind of civilization', 'the civilization of mutual aid and concord', or socialism. In this new civilization, social relations were founded on equality, with the community at its core. Economic activities were aimed at even distribution of wealth, and all institutions would have the world as their centre (that is, they would be global). Zhang visualized a universal spirit of 'mutual aid and harmonious cooperation'. In an expansive mood, he spoke of 'the spring rains' that World War I had brought to germinate the seeds of this new civilization. He imaged himself basking in the sunshine of postwar revolutions, echoing Vladimir Lenin that a world revolution that would bring about global transformations was in the making. Socialism was on the march. Although China remained somewhere between the first and the second kinds of civilization, Zhang was optimistic about its future. There was no need for China to go through the second kind of civilization. Instead, China should be preparing for the advent of the third kind by carrying out a

¹⁷ Zuo Yuhe 左玉河, *Zhang Dongsun zhuan* 张东荪传 (Jinan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 1998), 1–13, 85–96.

¹⁸ According to Chow Tse-tsung, the circulation of the journal was approximately five thousand copies per issue nationwide. See Chow Tse-tsung, *Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China, 1915–1924* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), 47. The journal lasted only three years and closed down in September 1922 because of financial difficulties.

cultural movement that nurtured 'a spirit of mutual aid', 'a personality of harmonious cooperation', 'a capacity for self-rule' and 'a communitarian morality'.¹⁹

Zhang Dongsun's vision is reminiscent of Li Dazhao's vision of 'a third great civilization' promised by the Russian Revolution that would rise to 'mediate between the East and the West'.²⁰ In the immediate postwar climate, Zhang was disenchanted with capitalism, which he found excessively materialistic, greedy and selfish. His sentiment was shared by those who were horrified by a war that they saw as nothing more than the inevitable outcome of a perverted materialistic-cum-imperialistic development.

On 1 December 1919, Zhang Dongsun published another article, titled 'Why do we want to talk about socialism?', in *Emancipation and Reconstruction*. The article was the record of an interview. Asked by the interlocutor what socialism was, Zhang said that, although it had been defined in a variety of ways, there was general agreement among scholars that socialism represented a demand by the proletariat for equality with the property class. He went on to provide an intellectual and metaphysical conception of socialism. Instead of seeing socialism as a form of social organization in which ownership and control of the means of production is vested in the state or as an economic and livelihood issue, Zhang regarded socialism as 'a view of life as well as a worldview – and the most progressive and most modern view at that'.²¹ In this view, socialism was a broad and multifaceted issue encompassing all strands of socialist thought since ancient times. In socialism, Zhang discovered the power of spiritual liberation and global transformation. The transformation would involve society in its totality, from the individual to the collectivity and from spiritual life to material life. Any thought that recognized this transformative power was socialistic. In this perspective, socialism is a principle, culture and spirit, not just a social system or an antidote to economic inequalities. The transformation was driven by general discontent with the status quo, which was felt not only by the proletariat but by every social class. Socialism was not class based.²²

¹⁹ Zhang Dongsun 张东荪, 'Disanzong wenming' 第三种文明, *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 1, 1 (1 September 1919): 1–5.

²⁰ Maurice Meisner, *Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Communism* (New York: Atheneum, 1970), 64.

²¹ Zhang Dongsun, 'Women weishenme yao jiang shehui zhuyi?' 我们为什么要讲社会主义? *Jiefang yu gaizao* 1, 7 (1 December 1919): 5.

²² *Ibid.*, 6.

To realize socialism, argued Zhang, two prerequisites were necessary: reform of the individual spirit and an overhaul of the old institutions of the world. The first condition meant a shift of emphasis from materialism to spiritualism; the second, a shift from a class-based ideology to cosmopolitanism (*shijie zhuyi*). Socialism represented 'a new morality'. Thinking in global terms, Zhang linked spiritual liberation with cosmopolitanism, which was a matter for all humankind.²³

There were many varieties of socialism. Zhang was equivocal about which one he would prefer, only saying that it was not guild socialism, Bolshevism, proletarian dictatorship, anarchism or state socialism. Rather, he spoke of a broad socialism that had a clear direction standing for communal life, labour movements, cooperation and the well-being of the community, in contrast with the 'parasitic life, laissez-faire competition and hedonism' in capitalist societies.²⁴ At this point, Zhang had no institutional proposals for attaining socialism in China:

When we talk about socialism now, we don't mean to begin destroying all the existing institutions materially. Rather, we start from the spiritual so as to spread a new thought, a new morality and a new view and way of life. That is, we begin by destroying the habits of capitalism in the existing order. We don't attempt to solve China's problems alone. Those problems must be solved in the same way that the problems of humankind are solved.²⁵

Marxism did not represent the entirety of socialist thought. Zhang Dong-sun saw modern socialism as the result of numerous revisions by earlier thinkers and not a single doctrine; further revision was a distinct possibility. A constant theme in his socialist thought was a refutation of the notion of class struggle. Not only is class struggle unnecessary, it is bad. Like Liang Qichao, Zhang believed in social harmony and social cooperation.

Following his lead, several short articles appeared in *Reconstruction* introducing various forms of socialism. So that socialism could be properly understood, the journalist Pan Gongzhan (1895–1975) was at pains to show what socialism was not: It was neither anarchism nor communism, it was not about abolishing property rights or about waging class war, it did not clash with liberty and it was not grounded in 'economic determinism'. Instead, socialism was intimately intertwined with equality,

²³ *Ibid.*, 7.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 13–14.

by which Pan meant people working together for 'a harmonious whole' (his English) and enjoying equality of opportunity. Above all, socialism meant promoting the interest of the entire society and not of one class, and it replaced competition with 'the creative wisdom and moral consciousness of the community'.²⁶

The 1920 Controversy: Capitalism Versus Socialism

Given his passions for socialism, it came as a great surprise a year later when Zhang Dongsun had a change of heart, setting off a controversy. The controversy was occasioned by Russell's visit to China. Russell had a busy lecturing schedule. In Shanghai, he talked about the effects of education and the principles of social reconstruction. He had a message for his audience: Chinese industrialism should not follow the Euro-American model, which had the effect of fettering the instinct of the individual. From Shanghai, Russell travelled to Changsha, where he lectured on Bolshevism and world politics. He said that the October Revolution would have a significant impact on the world stage. Yet he disapproved of Bolshevism because it was autocratic; showed no respect for the freedoms of speech, thought and publication; and relied on the military and on propaganda to achieve its goals. Russell had visited Moscow a few months earlier and was unimpressed. He did not think the Bolsheviks were capable of socialist reconstruction. He found the vast majority of Russian peasants ignorant and the working conditions of the proletariat extremely poor. Also, he feared that, although the Bolsheviks appeared sympathetic to the aspirations of the 'oppressed nations of the East', they were only interested in expanding Soviet influence.²⁷ All of this prompted Russell to tell the Chinese that their top priority ought to be education and industrialism, not socialism. Socialism could wait.²⁸

²⁶ Pan Gongzhan 潘公展, 'Shehui zhuyi de wujie' 社会主义的误解, *Jiefang yu gaizao* 2, 2 (January 1920): 3-9.

²⁷ Chow Tse-tung, *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), 249np.

²⁸ Russell wrote in *The Problem of China*, 246, that state socialism, or what Lenin called state capitalism, was suited to Chinese conditions for a variety of reasons. One was that it was easier for the state to ensure that vital industries, such as railways and mining, did not come under foreign control or into private hands. Another was that the state, if it was vigorous and honest, could prevent the growth of many of the evils of private capitalism. He added, 'If China can acquire a vigorous and honest State, it will be possible to develop Chinese industry without, at the same time, developing the overweening power of private capitalists by which the Western nations are now both oppressed and misled.'

After Shanghai, Russell travelled to Hangzhou, Nanjing and other cities in the interior, accompanied by Zhang Dongsun. Zhang was shocked to see abject poverty there and how hard life was outside the coastal treaty ports. What he saw was not localized but was symptomatic of a general, entrenched problem in the hinterland. From the trip, he gleaned 'a valuable lesson': To wit, the Chinese people were destitute, and grinding poverty was China's 'only disease'. He found that, although the material life in the treaty ports was not too bad, the vast majority of the people living in the interior had never experienced 'the life of a human being'. Therefore, talk about socialism, nationalism, anarchism or any other 'ism' rang hollow. In a sudden change of mind, Zhang now had no time for rhetoric but instead was anxious to search for practical solutions. 'There is only one way to save China, which is to generate wealth. And to generate wealth is to industrialize'.²⁹

Zhang's *volta-face* was no doubt due to Russell's influence. But he may also have been inspired by Hu Shi's criticism of Li Dazhao in the controversy about 'problems and isms' during the previous year.³⁰ Whereas Hu was talking politics in a particular sense (he urged his fellow intellectuals to deal with concrete political problems and warned them against the pitfalls of abstractions and vague generalizations), Zhang was talking economics, also in a rather particular sense, focusing on China's grinding poverty. By poverty, he meant not simply indigence, want and scarcity but also underdevelopment. It was a chronic problem to which there was no quick solution. He pointed out that even the Soviet Union, which had achieved even distribution of wealth in a short amount of time under a new economic regime, remained poor and underdeveloped. Tackling the problem of poverty thus was a first priority for China. Socialism could wait, as Russell said.³¹

Zhang Dongsun had long held that lack of capital formation and failure to develop productive capacity were the main causes of China's social problems. In a 1913 article, he had blamed poverty on the lack of a

²⁹ Zhang Dongsun, 'Younaidi lüxing erdezhi youyi jiaoxun' 由内地旅行而得之又一教训, in *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian* 中国现代思想史资料简编, 5 vols., ed. Cai Shangsi 蔡尚思 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1982), vol. I, 616.

³⁰ For Hu's criticism, see Jerome B. Grieder, *Hu Shi and the Chinese Renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution, 1917-1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 181-3.

³¹ Zhang Dongsun, 'Changqi de rennai' 长期的忍耐, *Xin qingnian* 新青年 8, 4 (December 1920): 12.

capitalist class and deplored the failure of successive governments to foster a culture of investment in commerce, business and industry. Finding no labour shortages in China, only shortages of factories and jobs, Zhang was confident that the rise of Chinese capitalism would be greatly welcomed by the labouring classes.³² He was now firmer in his view that underdevelopment was the basic cause of China's entrenched poverty, which had been aggravated in recent times by the importation of foreign goods. Thus, he argued, fighting capitalism was not the answer. To be sure, capitalism was exploitative. But now Zhang was concerned more about massive unemployment than about exploitation. Watching the sweaty exertion of the sedan man moved Zhang not to pity him but to think that the poor man was lucky enough to have a way of eking out a living. Drawing a distinction between Chinese capitalism and foreign capitalism, Zhang blamed the latter for China's economic difficulties and expected the rise of Chinese capitalism to counter its effects.³³

Not surprisingly, his retreat from socialism drew criticism from the Marxist camp. Some critics were simply angered by his apparent *volte-face*. Others took him to task regarding China's poverty and the solution. There was no argument about the need to create wealth through industrialism. Where they differed was over the means of achieving it. Shao Lizi (1882–1967), the chief editor of Shanghai's *Republican News* (*Minguo ribao*) and a member of Chen Duxiu's Marxism Study Group, rejected suggestions that capitalism, which was 'exploitative and plundering', was the best medicine for the Chinese disease. He accused Zhang Dongsun of 'superstition in the industrialism of Western material civilization', countering that only industrialization under socialism could nurture a decent human being's spiritual life.³⁴ Chen Duxiu could not see any difference between Chinese capitalism and foreign capitalism; capitalism per se was bad. Instead, drawing a distinction between capital and capitalists, Chen could see the need for capital formation in China but dismissed the few capitalists as merely compradors serving foreign interests. He accused Zhang of belittling the labouring classes, which could be organized to fight foreign capitalism. He further questioned whether Zhang was

³² Zhang Dongsun, 'Zhongguo zhi shehui wenti' 中国之社会问题, *Yongyan* 庸言 1, 16 (July 1913): 4–6.

³³ Zhang Dongsun, 'Zhi Duxiu de xin' 致独秀的信, *Xin qingnain* 8, 4 (December 1920): 17.

³⁴ Shao Lizi 邵力子, 'Zaiping Dongsunjun de "youyi jiaoxun"' 再评东荪君的《又一教训》, in *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian*, ed. Cai, vol. I, 699–702.

advocating the Euro-American systems. Chen insisted that only socialist education and socialist industrialism could prevent China from going down the same capitalist path as in the West.³⁵

In response, Zhang Dongsun defended capitalism as the best way to industrialize. Capitalism benefited not only the capitalists but also the common people. Even if harmful in the long term, it was immediately beneficial. Moreover, capitalism was a necessary phase in China's development because of the superiority of 'capitalist technology'. Zhang no longer thought that a world socialist revolution was forthcoming. As long as capitalism existed in the West, China must follow the same path to industrialism because it was a 'natural trend'.³⁶

Above all, capitalism would accelerate the rise of a new class that must emerge if China was to develop. Here, Zhang Dongsun was talking not about a new proletarian class but about a new class of 'financial lords' (*caifa*, or what the Japanese called *zaibatsu*), to be composed mainly of capitalists, industrialists, bankers and financiers from gentry-merchant backgrounds. His idea of a new class was based on his diagnosis of China's socioeconomic ills. Zhang saw China suffering from a combination of four diseases: ignorance, poverty, soldier-banditry and external force (meaning foreign capitalism). Of these, ignorance and poverty were most deeply rooted in Chinese society, whereas external force was controlling the Chinese economy. By far, soldier-banditry posed the greatest threat to society because of its links with the warlords. This new class was destined to destroy the power of the warlords, some of whom, once reformed, could well become part of it. Zhang was confident that the poor and unemployed would welcome the rise of this new class because it would create jobs, as would foreign capitalists because their businesses were not helped by soldier-banditry. What made this new class so important was that it represented industrialism and capitalist power, without which there could be no escape from the poverty trap. Nor, in its absence, would there be a strong working class, which was a prerequisite to socialism. Shortening the road to socialism might be possible; circumventing the capitalist stage was not.³⁷

Yet Zhang Dongsun's view of capitalism and the new class was, in its specific form, also shared by Marxism, which preached first the bourgeois

³⁵ Chen Duxiu 陈独秀, 'Fu Dongsun xiansheng de xin' 复东荪先生的信, *Xin qingnian* 8, 4 (December 1920): 17-24.

³⁶ Zhang Dongsun, 'Xianzai yu jianglai' 现在与将来, *Gaizao* 改造 3, 4 (December 1920): 29-30.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 23-6.

revolution and later the proletariat. As is well-known, socialist and Marxist thinkers had argued about Marx's polemic that socialist revolution could succeed only after the development of capitalism, accompanied by the growth of capital formation and class antagonism – that is, the capitalist phase could not be circumvented, as Lenin claimed. In underscoring the primacy of capital accumulation and the development of productive capacity, Zhang was unwittingly employing this polemic. Where he wittingly differed from the Marxists was regarding class struggle and historical materialism.

Moreover, in defending capitalism, Zhang reflected a widely held view that capitalism was a necessary evil if China was eventually to realize socialism. This returns us briefly to Liang Qichao. Liang considered capitalism both a friend and a foe: a friend because it created jobs and a foe because it was exploitative and an adversary of the working class. In a long letter to Zhang Dongsun early in 1921, Liang explicated his thoughts on the Chinese socialist movement. He distinguished it from the socialist movements in Europe and the United States: The former strove to transform the unemployed masses into modern industrial workers, whereas the latter were concerned with improving the status of the labouring classes that already had jobs. For the workers of the West, the question was whether they were well paid and well-off enough to own property; compared with their Chinese counterparts, they were already living in 'a paradise'. For Chinese workers, the pressing problem was not that they owned no property but that many of them were unemployed because of a low level of industrialization and few business enterprises. Liang was wrong to blame foreign economic imperialism for China's economic woes but was correct in thinking that job creation was a top priority. He sought more industrialism and more development and believed that workers should be rewarded for raising productivity. Here, Liang was reiterating his view that even distribution of wealth under a system of rewards was fine, but that even distribution without raising productivity and rewarding workers for their hard work was 'meaningless'. How could production be increased? Liang's answer was better management. He explained that productive organizations were best managed by the state (either the central or local government) or by cooperatives, depending on the nature of the industry, with an input from the workers. It was neither desirable nor possible to prevent the rise of the capitalist class. Liang agreed with Zhang Dongsun that without a capitalist class accompanied by a strong industrial class, there could be no socialism. Rather than demonize the capitalists, it would be more productive to provide for

the well-being of the workers by narrowing the gap between labour and management. Liang called for a wide range of state-funded enterprises, and he also encouraged workers to receive an education and to form trade unions. He was confident that the social inequities of capitalism could be prevented from the start if development were controlled and productive forces harmonized.³⁸

Other *Reconstruction* writers were in agreement with Zhang and Liang but not without their own ideas. Lan Gongwu (1887–1957), a former senator, maintained that there could be no socialism without an industrial revolution; the realization of socialism in China was a long way off because the country was so poor that there were no substantial means of production to be state owned. Lan was careful to make a distinction between the labour movement and socialism: It struck him that in Britain, the labour movement had preceded socialism, whereas in Russia and Germany it was the other way around. Lan made an important contribution to the socialist discourse by viewing capitalism and socialism as having emerged at the same time historically rather than one after the other. He posited a correlation between capitalism and socialism: As capitalism grew and gained strength, so did socialism. The two were in a positive relationship in that socialism rectified the problems that grew out of capitalism. Eventually, perhaps, socialism would supersede capitalism. Until then, it was beneficial that the two coexisted. Lan dismissed ‘scientific socialism’ as no longer credible because, contrary to Marx’s predictions of class antagonisms, a spirit of mutual aid and class cooperation had resulted from capitalist development.³⁹ Lan further argued that, although socialism proceeded from a moral premise, modern socialism in all forms placed an emphasis on economics and development. The very utopianism on which Henri de Saint-Simon (1760–1825) and Robert Owen (1771–1858) had sought to build socialism could be realized only through development. Without resolving the economic problems facing humanity, there was no way of realizing the moral ideal.⁴⁰

The Japanese-educated military strategist Jiang Baili (1882–1938) also had some interesting thoughts on the coexistence of capitalism and socialism. He attributed the birth of capitalism and the rise of the labouring classes and socialism to technological change – that is, the

³⁸ Liang Qichao, ‘Fu Zhang Dongsun lun shehui zhuyi yundong’ 复张东荪论社会主义运动, *Gaizao* 3, 6 (February 1921): 17–26.

³⁹ Lan Gongwu 蓝公武, ‘Shehui zhuyi zai Zhongguo’ 社会主义在中国, *Gaizao* 3, 6 (February 1921): 27–34.

⁴⁰ Lan Gongwu, ‘Zailun shehui zhuyi’ 再论社会主义, *Gaizao* 3, 11 (July 1921): 3–12.

use of machines. The three stood in a sibling rather than a grandfather–son–grandson relationship. To recognize this sibling relationship was to recognize both the rise of the gentry-merchant-industrial class and that of communist thought. It would take a long time for the Chinese socialist movement to succeed. In the interim, the capitalists had nothing to worry about as long as they did not engage in politics.⁴¹ Jiang also thought it was time to disseminate socialist ideas in China. He proposed, first, to promote knowledge of modern economics; second, to establish the fundamental principles of socialism for the educated; and third, to encourage socialist consciousness among the youth. From the German socialist Karl Kautsky (1854–1938), an adversary of the Soviet model, Jiang learned that it is human nature to have ‘a possessive impulse’. Even in revolutionary Russia, quoting Kautsky, ‘the small capitalist wants money and the small farmer wants land’. Socialism was not a denial of property rights.⁴²

Not everyone agreeing with Zhang Dongsun about the necessity of a new class of ‘financial lords’ was optimistic about China’s near future. One *Reconstruction* writer predicted a decade of banditry and civil strife, which would not only impede the rise of the new class but also destroy the old class of gentry-merchants. He believed that capitalism in the West would last a very long time because Marx’s predictions about class wars and about the collapse of capitalism had not been fulfilled. Nonetheless, he agreed with Jiang Baili that socialist thought should be publicized and disseminated.⁴³

In the temper of the day, the Marxists declared that they had won the debate. Consequently, the controversy deepened the split within the intelligentsia, especially after the formation in 1921 of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).

Zhang Junmai and the German Influence

A question arising from the 1920 controversy was whether China’s backwardness was an advantage that could be used to realize socialism. If socialism could take place in Russia, a backward country, why could it

⁴¹ Jiang Baili 蒋百里, ‘Wo de shehui zhuyi taolun’ 我的社会主义讨论, *Gaizao* 3, 6 (February 1921): 35–6.

⁴² Jiang Baili, ‘Shehui zhuyi zenyang xuanchuan’ 社会主义怎样宣传, *Gaizao* 4, 2 (October 1921): 2–3.

⁴³ Peng Yihu 彭一湖, ‘Wo duiyu Zhang Dongsun he Chen Duxiu xiansheng suo zhenglun de yijian’ 我对于张东荪和陈独秀先生所争论的意见, *Gaizao* 3, 6 (February 1921): 39–47.

not happen in China? This was a question for the reformers rather than for the Marxists. Here, Zhang Junmai's view is particularly interesting. Recently returned from Germany, Zhang contended in 1921 that the theory that society must evolve through some broad stages was Marxist, based as it was on historical materialism, which historically had been proved erroneous. He did not believe that there were immutable patterns in historical processes or social evolution. Socialism, he pointed out, emphasized not only equitable distribution but also creation of wealth; socialism promoted industrialism and increased production because it set great store by cooperation and harmony between labour and capital. Productive forces could be harmonized. To generate wealth by exploiting workers and 'enslaving' them (meaning treating them essentially as commodities), as in Europe's recent past, was immoral. Zhang also dismissed the assumption that socialism must grow from the demands of workers' organizations, such as trade unions, as false, because there was no causal link between the rise of organized labour movement and the ideology of socialism. What mattered was a common recognition by Chinese of all classes of socialist values and consciousness. China could attain socialism sooner rather than later.⁴⁴

Regarding this last point, however, Zhang Junmai differed from the Marxists in two respects. First, like Liang Qichao, Zhang viewed socialism as a means of averting social revolution.⁴⁵ He rejected class struggle and the use of violence in realizing socialism. Second, the kind of socialism that he desired was not Soviet Russian but what he saw in Weimar Germany. Zhang was impressed with some of the Bolshevik policies, most notably their insistence that everybody was obligated to labour and their resistance to Western European aggression, and with their new education policy. But he was dismayed by the so-called proletarian dictatorship and by the appropriation of private property without compensation. With regard to democracy, the Soviet model was unacceptable. What Zhang liked was the German model.⁴⁶

Zhang Junmai was perhaps better informed about Germany than was any Chinese of the day. Roger Jeans has written about Zhang's

⁴⁴ Zhang Junmai 张君勱, 'Shehui suoyou zhi yi yi ji Deguo meikuang shehui suoyoufa caoan' 社会所有之意义及德国煤矿社会所有法草案, *Gaizao* 3, 11 (July 1921): 14-15.

⁴⁵ Zhang Junmai, 'Xuanni zhi shehui gaizao tongzhizhui yijianshu' 悬拟之社会改造同志会意见书, *Gaizao* 4, 3 (November 1921): 12.

⁴⁶ Zhang Junmai, 'Du liuxingqi zhi Eguo' 读六星期之俄国, *Gaizao* 3, 2 (1921): 51-66; and Zhang Junmai and Zhang Dongsun, 'Zhongguo zhi qiantu: Deguo hu? Eguo hu?' 中国之前途: 德国乎? 俄国乎? *Jiefang yu gaizao* 2, 14 (July 1920): 1-18.

education there from 1913 to 1915 and again from 1920 to 1921, and about his meeting with a number of German socialists, including Hugo Preuss (1860–1925), the drafter of the Weimar Constitution.⁴⁷ The Weimar Constitution, written under disadvantageous social, political and economic conditions following the German Revolution (also known as the November Revolution) of 1918, had a profound influence on Zhang. Its fundamental tenet was that Germany was a republic with a parliament elected using proportional representation. Universal suffrage was established, with a minimum voting age of twenty. The basic rights and basic obligations of Germans were laid out in the Constitution, which guaranteed individual rights, such as the freedoms of speech and assembly. Every German was equal before the law. Both genders had the same rights and obligations. Privileges based on birth and on social status were abolished. Titles of nobility carried no rights. Germans had the right of mobility and residence, the right to acquire property and pursue a trade, the right to immigrate or emigrate and the right to Reich protection against foreign authorities. The rights of the individual were inviolable. Personal freedoms could be limited or deprived only on the basis of the law. Economically, economic life was to conform to the principles of justice, with the goal of achieving a dignified life for all and securing the economic freedom of the individual. The right to property was guaranteed. Expropriation of property could be made only on the basis of the law and for the public welfare, with appropriate compensation. The Reich protected labour, intellectual creation and the rights of authors, inventors and artists. The right to form unions and improve working conditions was guaranteed, and protection of the self-employed was established. Workers and employees were given the right to participate on an equal footing with employers in the regulation of wages and working conditions as well as in economic development.⁴⁸

The Weimar Constitution was arguably ‘on paper, the most liberal and democratic document of its kind the twentieth century had ever seen, mechanically well-nigh perfect, full of ingenious and admirable devices which seemed to guarantee the working of an almost flawless democracy’.⁴⁹ Yet it was fundamentally flawed in several respects, namely,

⁴⁷ Roger B. Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China: The Politics of Zhang Junmai (Carsun Chang) 1906–1941* (Lanham, Md.: Rowan & Littlefield, 1997), 29–31, 39–41.

⁴⁸ For the full text of the Weimar Constitution, see Heinrich Oppenheimer, *The Constitution of the German Republic* (London: Stevens, 1923).

⁴⁹ William L. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 2 vols. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), vol. I, 56.

the institution of the proportional representation and voting by list, the allocation of presidential powers and the unbalanced distribution of power between the Reich and provincial government.

These flaws were not, however, immediately apparent to Zhang Junmai. Nor could he imagine that the democracy of Weimar Germany could be so fragile and short-lived. Initially, Zhang greeted the Weimar Constitution as 'representing the socialist tide of the twentieth century, just as the U.S. Constitution represents the Anglo-Saxon individualism of the eighteenth century and the French Constitution represents the spirit of liberty and rights of the nineteenth century'.⁵⁰ He was struck by its apparent capacity for mediation between the centre and the states, between the presidential system and the cabinet system, between direct democracy and indirect democracy, between individualism and socialism, between capitalist and worker and between nationalization and private property rights.⁵¹ Zhang was especially interested in the Articles relating to socialism on one hand and what he called *geren ziyou zhuyi* (individual liberalism) on the other. He thought German leaders had struck the right balance between the two.⁵² In 1920, he translated the Weimar Constitution and published it in *Emancipation and Reconstruction*.

Here, Zhang found a model of moderate socialism. He was impressed by the pragmatism of the German Social Democratic Party (Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands). Combining revolutionary rhetoric with reformist practice, this party represented a revisionist brand of Marxist socialism and advocated a parliamentary road to socialism,⁵³ which had a particular appeal to Zhang's sense of moderation, justice and liberty.

This German influence initially informed Zhang Junmai's understanding of socialism. Whereas socialism was open to different interpretations, its true meaning, wrote Zhang, consisted in *sozialisierung* (his German), or socialization (his English). In other words, Zhang equated socialism with socialization, which entailed 1) state ownership of land and the 'organizations of production'; 2) public management of these organizations; and 3) distribution of benefits to the public.⁵⁴ He explained that the

⁵⁰ Zhang Junmai, 'Deguo xin gonghe xianfa ping' 德国新共和宪法评, *Jiefang yu gaizao* 2, 9 (May 1920): 5.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 9–22, especially 14–16.

⁵² Zhang Junmai, 'Deguo xin gonghe xianfa ping yixu' 德国新共和宪法评一续, *Jiefang yu gaizao* 2, 11 (June 1920): 5–7; Zhang Junmai, *Guoxianyi* 国宪议, reprint (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1970; first published in 1922), 86–9.

⁵³ Bernard Crick, *Socialism* (London: Open University Press, 1987), 60.

⁵⁴ Zhang, 'Shehui suoyou zhi yiyi', 15–16.

hardships of ordinary people were the result of private property being overwhelmingly concentrated in the hands of a few, creating a wide gulf between the haves and the have-nots. Although everyone was equal before the law, social and economic inequalities were a fact of life in a capitalist society. To tackle inequality, it was necessary, on one hand, to abolish private ownership that created or widened the social gulf and place such organizations of production as land, forests, telegraphs, railroads and other vital industries in the hands of the state. On the other hand, private ownership of the kind that did not affect the well-being of others should be protected.⁵⁵ In other words, Zhang distinguished between two types of private ownership: One was acceptable and the other was not.

Zhang saw three merits in public management of the organizations of production, namely, concentration of production without laissez-faire competition, no overproduction, as supply and demand were a known quantity, and shorter working hours where production was sufficient to satisfy demands. For the mode of management, he proposed a mix of state management, local management and self government of production units. Producers, consumers, managers and workers all took responsibility as well as shared the profits, as in Germany's coal mining industry. With regard to the distribution of benefits, the profits, after allowing for administrative costs, wages and salaries, were to be spent on social welfare ranging from education to pension to old age to child care.⁵⁶

For Zhang Junmai, socialization was the very embodiment of the socialistic spirit that manifested itself in 'respect for public welfare and in the restraint of self-interest'.⁵⁷ Cognizant of the tension between the public interest and self-interest, he spoke in 1922 of a principle of 'social justice and individual liberty':

Let me tell the nation directly. The organization of the livelihood of the people is based on justice. This is a great principle. If asked what ought to be done if industry fails to develop because of this principle, I would say this. Human happiness is the *raison d'être* for all the activities in the world. Since the nineteenth century, great efforts had been made to achieve wealth and power at the costs of [many] human lives. On reflection, I would rather sacrifice wealth and power than have humans enslaved to the factory. This is what we should do – that is, discard the utilitarian theory of the nineteenth century like worn-off shoes.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 17–18.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Zhang, *Guoxianyi*, 86.

Zhang likened social justice and individual liberty to the wings of the bird and the wheels of the chariot – one cannot function without the other.⁵⁹ The analogy may be appropriate. Yet it is not clear whether justice for him meant both distributive justice and fairness and whether he approached social justice from a political or economic perspective, or both. Moreover, he was unable to resolve the tension between justice and liberty epistemologically or to develop, as he wished them to be, principles of justice and priority rules regarding liberty and wealth, efficiency and welfare.⁶⁰

In 1922, Zhang was commissioned to draft a provisional constitution for the Shanghai National Affairs Conference organized by eight organizations with representatives from fourteen provinces.⁶¹ His draft featured a federal system, a mixed economy, heavy taxes on banks and large industries, municipal control of newly developed commercial ports and land, industrial laws and a social welfare system, among other elements. He did not sanction cheap labour as a means of competing with foreign manufactures. Instead, he placed a high premium on social ethics in the development of industry and commerce.⁶² All of this was to serve as a basis for the platform of the Chinese State Socialist Party in the 1930s.

Zhang Junmai's socialist thought at this point may be compared with Sun Yat-sen's *minsheng zhuyi*, or principle of the livelihood of the people expounded in his 1924 lectures. Sun had been led by the prescriptions of the American reformer Henry George, perceived as a socialist at the time, to adopt the single tax, 'equalization of land right' and 'restriction of capital'. He used the term *minsheng zhuyi* as a synonym for socialism. It was not until 1924, at the start of the GMD–CCP united front, that political reasons led him to associate *minsheng zhuyi* with communism. Even so, Sun refuted historical materialism and class struggle. He viewed *minsheng zhuyi* as a philosophy of history and a developmental strategy.⁶³ Sun favoured state capitalism and a mixed economy and had a plan for China's industrialization and reconstruction involving foreign investment unaccompanied by unequal treaty rights and privileges. It was only the growth of unbridled capitalism and its resulting inequities that

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁶⁰ This is what John Rawls seeks to do in *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977).

⁶¹ The eight organizations represented were provincial assemblies, educational associations, peasant associations, trade unions, banking societies, legal societies and the federation of the news media.

⁶² For details, see Zhang, *Guoxianyi*, 83–6.

⁶³ Marie-Claire Bergère, *Sun Yat-sen*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000), 384–91.

he wanted to prevent. For both Zhang and Sun, socialism was first and foremost a means of averting social revolution.

However, Zhang Junmai differed from Sun in that he was a committed constitutionalist, whereas Sun was more of an authoritarian figure with strong views on political tutelage prior to constitutionalism. The predominant influence for Zhang was German; for Sun it was American of a particular type – first Henry George and then Maurice William, the obscure dentist and Marxist. William's influence on Sun is well-known; his ideas informed Sun's interpretation of social evolution in terms of a quest for human subsistence and social harmony. Less known is that William himself was influenced by both German socialism and the British Labour movement. The historian Audrey Wells has argued that through William, British socialists influenced Sun and that Sun most certainly had read about the ideas of the British Labour Party and of Sidney and Beatrice Webb in particular.⁶⁴

This brings us to the British influence on Chinese socialist thought.

The Influence of British Socialism

The history of socialism in Britain can be traced back to the nineteenth century, and since then British socialist thought had found expression in many different forms. According to Bernard Crick, British socialism 'has its roots in an eclectic fusion of Owen's cooperative ideas, the cultural vision of William Morris, Methodist conscience, Chartist democracy and revisionist Marxism: libertarian, egalitarian and above all ethical, placing more stress on personal exemplifications of socialist values than on public ownership or class legislation'.⁶⁵ The Labour Party, born in the early twentieth century, differed from Continental Europe's social democratic parties, which had revolutionary goals coexisting with reformist practice.⁶⁶ Involved in the British Labour movement was the Fabian Society, founded in 1884 by a number of young, radical, middle-class intellectuals, most prominently Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Graham Wallas, Sidney Olivier and George Bernard Shaw. The Fabian Society drew its main inspiration from the British radical utilitarian tradition. Never Marxist, the Fabians opposed the formation of an independent

⁶⁴ Audrey Wells, *The Political Thought of Sun Yat-sen: Development and Impact* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), 99–100.

⁶⁵ Crick, *Socialism*, 78–9.

⁶⁶ Gregory Elliott, *Labourism and the English Genius: The Strange Death of Labour England?* (London: Verso, 1993), 3.

socialist party and developed an evolutionary, moderate form of socialism, and they did not believe in the inevitable collapse of capitalism.⁶⁷ They never sought to become a mass organization and preferred to be a ginger group of intellectuals working to transform society gradually through practical and unobtrusive advice to those in power. They also favoured an imperialist foreign policy, a welfare state and the nationalization of land. Many had been involved in the formation of the Labour Party.⁶⁸

British socialism held great appeal for China's middle-class non-Marxist intellectuals as the repository of an attractive sociopolitical model. Here again, the influence of Harold Laski deserves special attention. His works were translated into Chinese, including *Authority in the Modern State* (1919), *A Grammar of Politics* (1925) and *Communism* (1927). (Zhang Junmai translated *A Grammar of Politics* with a long introduction describing Laski's political thought.) Many Chinese liberals were particularly impressed with Laski's critique of communism.⁶⁹

Among other things, Laski wrote about property rights and the nationalization of industries. He maintained that property rights were not 'a simple and unchanging thing' but a social fact capable of change, because at no period had those rights been 'generally absolute'. No person had a moral right to property except as a return for functions or service performed. Laski drew a distinction between owning and earning: 'Those whose property is the result of other men's effort are parasitic upon society. They enjoy what they have not assisted to produce. They are given the means of avoiding a contribution to the total productivity of society.' There is nothing inherently wrong with the notion of private property, but 'it must be derived from personal effort organized in such a way as to involve an addition to the common welfare'.⁷⁰

Laski also held that essential services must be nationalized and their ownership vested in the state. He advocated a large measure of state ownership and control of industry, as well as state regulation and intervention in the economy, convinced that only the state had the power to regulate

⁶⁷ For the early history of the Fabian Society, see Edward R. Pease, *History of the Fabian Society: The Origins of English Socialism*, 2nd edn. (London: Fabian Society, 1925).

⁶⁸ In the period between the two world wars, second-generation Fabian socialists, notably R. H. Tawney, G. D. H. Cole and Harold Laski continued to be a major influence on moderate socialist thought.

⁶⁹ See Zhang Xiruo's raving review of *Communism* in *Xiandai pinglun* 现代评论 7, 160 (December 1927): 17–20.

⁷⁰ Harold J. Laski, *A Grammar of Politics*, 4th edn. (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938), 179, and 184, 216 for the last two quotes, respectively.

private economic power and promote social and economic equality.⁷¹ These ideas resonated in Chinese liberal circles, as will be described in the next chapter.

A measure of the influence of Fabianism was the founding in Shanghai in 1929 of a study society known as Level Society (Pingshe) by writers of the journal *The Crescent* (*Xinyue*). This journal had been founded in the previous year by Hu Shi, who had moved to Shanghai temporarily, Xu Zhimo and several others. Initially devoted to literary studies, it soon became a political weekly critical of Nationalist rule. Prominent among its writers were Luo Longji, Liang Shiqiu, Wang Zaoshi and Hu Shi. Modelled on the Fabian Society, Level Society organized weekly gatherings at which presentations were made by its members, followed by discussions and sometimes also dinners. It is particularly noteworthy that on 11 May 1929, Luo Longji spoke on the history of the Fabian Society. After the talk, Hu Shi suggested that each member in turn speak on the problems of China from different viewpoints and that these reports be published in a monograph series known as the Fabian Series. Someone also suggested that a new political review be launched, with Hu as the general editor. For obscure reasons, the journal did not come into being. But interest in Fabianism was undiminished, as evidenced by the fact that in the following years, Laski's new books *Democracy in Crisis* (1933) and *The State in Theory and Practice* (1935) were translated into Chinese as soon as they were published.⁷² A Chinese monograph on his political thought also appeared in bookstores in 1934.⁷³

In addition to the German and British influences, developments in the Soviet Union were watched with great interest by those who thought there might be lessons for Chinese socialism.

A Liberal Response to the Soviet Experiment of the 1920s

Although Russian communism was rejected by China's reformers from the start, Moscow's New Economic Policy (NEP), which the soviet leader Vladimir Lenin had proposed to prevent the Russian economy from collapsing, attracted much attention. Beginning in 1921, the NEP allowed

⁷¹ Herbert A. Deane, *The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 117.

⁷² Jiang Yihua 姜义华, 'Lun Hu Shi yu renquan wenti de lunzhan', 论胡适与人权问题的论战, in *Hu Shi yu xiandai Zhongguo wenhua zhuanxing* 胡适与现代中国文化转型, ed. Liu Qingfeng 刘青峰 (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1994), 75-7.

⁷³ Lu Xirong 卢锡荣, *Lasiji zhengzhi sixiang* 拉斯基政治思想 (Shanghai: Shijie shuju, 1934).

small businesses to reopen for profit while the state continued to control banks and foreign trade and large industries. It improved the efficiency of food distribution and especially benefited the peasants. However, many urban workers resented the profits made by private traders, prompting Joseph Stalin, the new soviet leader following Lenin's death in 1924, to announce the abolition of the NEP and replace it with his First Five-Year Plan (1928–32). One of the primary objectives of the First Five-Year Plan was to build up Russia's heavy industry. In 1929, the plan was revised to include the creation of a system of collective farming, which increased the food output per peasant after state-owned machine tractor stations were set up throughout the Soviet Union and the peasants were allowed to sell any surplus food from the land. The introduction of collectivization spurred industrialization, as millions of people moved from the countryside to the city. In 1932, Stalin declared the First Five-Year Plan a success and announced a second Five-Year Plan (1933–8).⁷⁴

Here, I confine myself to describing Hu Shi's response to these developments. Hu is selected because his response is particularly interesting from a liberal point of view. While a student in the United States, Hu had greeted the February Revolution as 'an encouraging development very worthy of note', and he believed that the new Russia would eventually become a socialist democracy.⁷⁵ Soon after the October Revolution, fellow Columbia University student Zhang Xiruo suggested to him that in the event of a negotiated settlement between Russia and Germany, the new Russian government might implement its policies gradually, which could prove to be the most significant development in world history since the French Revolution. Even if the new regime failed, Zhang thought, it would still be 'a great exercise in politics and in social transformation'.⁷⁶ Hu agreed with this and had since maintained an interest in developments in Soviet Russia.

But it was not until 1926 that Hu had a chance to catch a glimpse of what he called the 'Soviet experiment'. That year, Hu made a three-day trip to Moscow (29 July to 1 August) en route to London for a

⁷⁴ Robert Service, *A History of Twentieth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 124–7.

⁷⁵ Hu Shi 胡适, *Hu Shi liuxue de riji*, 胡适留学的日记, 4 vols. (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1959), vol. IV, 1107, entry 8 March 1917.

⁷⁶ Zhang Xiruo to Hu, 28 December 1917, in *Hu Shi taiwang shuxinxuan* 胡适来往书信选, 2 vols., ed. Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院近代史研究所编 (Hong Kong: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), vol. I, 8.

meeting of the Sino-British Boxer Indemnity Committee. He visited Sun Yat-sen University, the Revolutionary Museum, the Number One Prison and the Association of International Cultural Relations and also met with a number of Russian scientists and educationalists. He was struck by the displays of the history of the Russian Revolution. He was also impressed with the Number One Prison, which was located at the outskirts of Moscow, housing 390 inmates, with two inmates to a cell. He was told that the inmates laboured for eight hours a day, that their wages after deductions could be taken home to their families, and that there were evening activities for them, such as educational discussions, music entertainment and reading group meetings. Hu saw a prisoner who was given a desk because he was a practising musician and composer. The food in the mess hall struck him as not bad at all; the bread was baked by the prisoners themselves and 'tasted even better than at Savoy Hotel'! There were also counsellors as well as doctors attending to sick inmates. No doubt, the visit was prearranged and concocted for propaganda purposes, but Hu believed that the inmates were treated in a humanitarian manner.⁷⁷

On this visit, Hu was accompanied by two professors from the University of Chicago, one of whom was Charles E. Merriam, a specialist on American political theory. Hu asked Merriam when the Soviet dictatorship would end. Merriam responded that he could understand the dictatorship, which was intended to root out antirevolutionary forces, but added that its purpose was to create a new nation through a new education. When a new 'socialistic generation' came into being, the dictatorship would come to an end. Hu thought Merriam's view was 'fair and reasonable'.⁷⁸

Hu was witnessing what he called 'a new, unprecedented great political experiment' that demonstrated the ideals of the Soviet leaders, their 'absolute faith', their 'seriousness of purpose' (his English) and their confidence and determination to succeed. He desired to organize a Chinese study group consisting of politicians, scholars and educationalists to visit Russia for a longer period of time.⁷⁹ By contrast, Hu was unimpressed with Britain, where he went after Moscow, because the Baldwin government seemed to him to be lacking in plans and just 'muddling

⁷⁷ Hu's diary, 30–31 July 1926, in *Hu Shi quanji* 胡适全集, 44 vols., ed. Ji Xianlin 季羨林 (Hefei: Anhui jiaoyu chubanshe, 2003), vol. XXX, 218–20.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ Hu Shi, 'Ouyou dao zhong jixin' 欧游道中寄信, in *HSWJ*, IV, 41–3.

through'. He reserved his admiration for Germany and Japan with regard to action.⁸⁰

A socialist economy could do much for the population provided that private property rights and free enterprise were guaranteed. The Soviet model was repugnant because of its repression. But Hu hoped that the Soviet dictatorship could prove to be a transition to socialist democracy. In addition to the First Five-Year Plan, Moscow's new socialist education impressed him profoundly. It was public and universal. Students were taught civics as well as art and science and were provided with opportunities to receive higher education.⁸¹

An entry in Hu's diary (3 August), two days after his trip to Moscow, provides a rare insight into his thinking. At the time, Hu was contemplating the formation of a liberal party in order to bring about political reform:

[I will] fully recognize the socialist advocacy but reject class struggle as a means [of bringing about political reform]. The CCP regards liberalism as the political philosophy of capitalism. That's wrong. Historically, liberalism expanded gradually [through stages]: first a struggle for liberty by the aristocracy, then a struggle by the propertied class, and now a struggle by the proletariat. . . . The liberal philosophy is grounded not in 'historical teleology' but in 'evolutionary theory'. The problems of capitalism can be managed through human interventions. [My] party platform should have the following features: 1) a politics of planning, 2) implementation of the civil service examinations, 3) development of China's national industry and transport and communications systems with the aid of limited foreign investment and 4) social policies of socialism.⁸²

The 'social policies of socialism' included the liberation of women, the extension of the franchise, the protection of workers and social legislations based on the principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Hu concluded that socialism, 'whether we like it or not, is certainly the highest spiritual idea of social organization'.⁸³

Hu refused to participate in any 'anti-Red' discussions. He thought it was wrong to be narrow-minded and biased against what Soviet Russia was striving to achieve.⁸⁴ As much as he appreciated the socialist movements in Western Europe, Hu noted with satisfaction the rise of Russian workers

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 49–50.

⁸² Hu's diary in *Hu Shi quanji*, ed. Ji, vol. XXX, 223.

⁸³ Hu Shih, 'The Renaissance in China', *Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs*, V (1926): 275.

⁸⁴ Hu, 'Ouyou dao zhong jixin', 42.

and peasants as constituent parts of the 'dictatorship'.⁸⁵ He wrote to the poet Xu Zhimo on 4 October 1926:

Put simply, there have been two different ways [of achieving progress] in recent history. One is today's Soviet way, featuring the proletarian dictatorship that does not allow the existence of the property class; and the other is avoidance of class struggle, using the tendency towards socialization over the past three hundred years to expand gradually the liberty and happiness enjoyed in society. I call the latter 'new liberalism', or 'liberal socialism'.⁸⁶

Yet Xu Zhimo questioned his judgement about the Soviet Union. In Xu's opinion, Soviet utopianism lacked an epistemological basis, and the Soviet system had no universal application. He thought that Hu was being 'Sovietized' (*chihua*).⁸⁷ However, Qian Duansheng endorsed Hu's attitude privately.⁸⁸ The British-educated financier and banker Xu Xinliu (1890–1938) also sent Hu a personal letter, writing that people should 'coolly and calmly' study Moscow's new economic policy instead of dismissing it outright and see if it had any lessons for China.⁸⁹

Hu's favourable response to the Soviet experiment did not, however, turn him away from liberal capitalism. In his visit to the United States in 1927 after an absence of ten years, Hu could see that American capitalism had not led to the bankruptcy of material civilization, as Marx had predicted. On the contrary, a great deal had been achieved. The United States was, paradoxically, experiencing 'a gradual social revolution, making progress every day'. At a New York forum at which he was a guest speaker, Hu was impressed by a labour representative who said it was 'the best and the greatest of times' in human history. Returning home via Japan, Hu met the Japanese economist Fukuda Tokuzō (1874–1930) in Tokyo and disagreed with him that there was no third way between 'pure Marxist socialism' and 'pure capitalism'. For Hu, liberal socialism was just such a way.⁹⁰

⁸⁵ Hu Shi, 'Women duiyu xiyang jindai wenming de taidu' 我们对于西洋近代文明的态度, in *HSWJ*, IV, 11.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 47. Hu's term 'new liberalism' was derived indirectly from Hobhouse. Hu appears to have learned about New Liberalism from John Dewey, who preached what Hobhouse did in England. See Luo Zhitian 罗志田, *Zaizao wenming de changshi: Hu Shi zhuan (1891–1929)* 再造文明的尝试: 胡适传 (1891–1929) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006), 250–2. It is also worth noting that Dewey's China lectures in 1920 contained much about socialism, democracy, liberty, equality and criticism of laissez-faire liberalism. See Gao Like 高力克, 'Duwei yu wusi xin ziyou zhuyi' 杜威与五四新自由主义, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 69 (February 2002): 46–9.

⁸⁷ Xu to Hu, in Hu, 'Ouyou dao zhong jixin', 49.

⁸⁸ Qian to Hu, in *Hu Shi lai wang shu xin xuan*, ed. Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan, vol. I, 406.

⁸⁹ Xu to Hu, in *ibid.*, 419–20.

⁹⁰ Hu Shi, 'Manyou de ganxiang' 漫游的感想, in *HSWJ*, IV, 35.

Back home, Hu published a critical essay, 'Our attitude towards modern Western civilization' (1927). In it, he wrote that an economic system based on free competition could not attain the goals of 'liberty, equality and universal love'. There were only two ways of achieving them. One was to use state power to regulate the capitalists and protect the oppressed classes; the other, to organize all the oppressed classes to fight the capitalists. Hu preferred the first option because it was peaceful. He observed that during the past ten years, socialist movements around the world had made excellent progress, with labour parties in government in a number of European countries and with the proletariat becoming the dominant force in Soviet Russia. In the democratic West, socialist goals had been achieved through social legislations.⁹¹

Clearly, Hu's affirmation of American capitalism did not change his attitude towards socialism or towards Soviet Russia, as one writer has claimed.⁹² In fact, in 1930, Hu still regarded the Russian Revolution as a 'real' revolution that had changed the Russian nation and given it a new direction. He believed that the Soviet Union and the United States represented two ideals that stemmed from the same source, and that the Soviet road was 'precisely the American road' in that both were for the public good and for humanity.⁹³ In a public lecture delivered in Chicago in 1933, Hu reiterated his praise of the Soviet experiment, especially in science and technology, stressing that socialism was an integral part of Western civilization. He even regarded the Soviet Union as a part of the modern West.⁹⁴ His excitement about the Soviet experiment lasted until the early 1940s, when more of the stark realities of Soviet Russia were revealed to the outside world.⁹⁵

⁹¹ Hu, 'Women duiyu xiyang jindai wenming de taidu', 11.

⁹² Zhang Dongdong 张忠栋, *Hu Shi wulun* 胡适五论 (Taipei: Yunchen wenhua, 1987), 37. Zhang maintains that Hu discovered the flaws of Marxism during his 1927 American trip.

⁹³ Hu Shi, *Hu Shi de riji: shougaoben* 胡适的日记: 手稿本, reprint. 18 vols. (Taipei: Yuanliu chubangongsi, 1990), vol. IX, entry 5 March 1930.

⁹⁴ Hu Shih, *The Chinese Renaissance: The Haskell Lectures 1933* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), 42-3.

⁹⁵ Moscow's designs on Manchuria in the Yalta Agreement of February 1945 woke Hu up from his 'new Russian dreams'. For many years, Hu had believed that the Soviet Union was a peace-loving country, and had characterized Soviet foreign policy as 'peace at any price'. Even though the Soviet invasions of Poland and Finland made him suspicious of Moscow's ulterior motives, as late as December 1941, Hu was still dreaming of a peaceful border between the Soviet Union and China. He was immensely disappointed that the Soviet Union had become aggressive. See Hu's letter to Zhou Gengsheng, 21 January 1948, in *Hu Shizhi xiansheng nianpu changbian chugao* 胡适之先生年谱长编初稿, 6 vols., ed. Hu Songping 胡颂平 (Taipei: Lianjing chubangongsi, 1984), vol. VI, 2016. Furthermore, after reading Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom* (1944), Hu turned his back on planning. With the start of the Cold War era, he regretted having expressed 'pro-Soviet' sentiments before. See Hu Shi, 'Cong "dao nuyi zhi lu" shuoqi' 从《到奴役之路》说起, in *HSWJ*, XII, 834.

Protosocialism in Ancient Chinese Thought

‘Socialism is a product of the modern time’, writes Bernard Crick. ‘It has no precedent in the ancient or the medieval world.’⁹⁶ True, Chinese socialism did not derive from a native tradition with roots tracing back to antiquity, but there are ancient Chinese ideals that are congruent with the spirit of socialism. Indeed, there are cultural resources in ancient Chinese thought on which modern intellectuals could draw to support their socialist vision and to garner momentum and legitimacy for Chinese socialism in the twentieth century.

The *datong* (great commonwealth) ideal of the Warring States Period first comes to mind. The following passage from the ‘Liyun’ chapter in the classic *Liji* (*Book of Rites*) is illuminating:

When the Great Way prevails, the whole world becomes a commonwealth. Men of virtue and ability are chosen; sincerity is practised and harmony with neighbours cultivated. Thus, men do not love their parents alone, nor do they treat their children only as their own. Provision for the aged is secured until their death, as are employment for the able-bodied and the means of growing up for the young. Old bachelors, widows, orphans, childless men and cripples are given compassion and security. The males have their work to do and the females their homes to go to. Articles of value are neither carelessly thrown away nor kept for one’s exclusive use. One exerts strength but not exclusively for one’s own benefit. In this way, scheming disappears and finds no outlet. Robbers, filchers and rebellious traitors do not show themselves. Outer doors remain open and are not shut. This is called the great commonwealth.⁹⁷

This passage is often interpreted as containing ideas that promote commerce but decry private property rights, extol the virtues of labour and advocate old-age pensions, health insurance and special schools for the blind and the deaf as well as a republic and internationalism. If *datong* constitutes the quintessence of Chinese civilization, it could be regarded as a Chinese equivalent of Plato’s *Republic* and Thomas More’s *Utopia*.

The Confucian tradition is hardly procapitalism. The Master said, ‘Riches and honours – these are what men desire, but if this is not achieved in accordance with the appropriate principles, one does not cling to them. Poverty and obscurity – these are what men hate, but if this is not avoided in accordance with the appropriate principles, one does not avoid them.’⁹⁸ Also, ‘If one acts with a view to profit, there will be

⁹⁶ Crick, *Socialism*, 1.

⁹⁷ My own translation.

⁹⁸ *The Analects*, Book IV, Section 5, trans. Raymond Dawson with an introduction and notes (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 13.

much resentment.⁹⁹ Even more importantly, 'I have heard that the lord of a state or a family concerns himself not with scarcity but rather with uneven distribution, not with poverty but with discontent. For where there is even distribution, there is no poverty. Where there is harmony, there is no scarcity, and where there is contentment, there is no rebellion.'¹⁰⁰ In Confucius' view, Chinese society suffered not from poverty but from uneven distribution (*buhuanpin er huanbujun*). Confucianism treated the merchant class with contempt (at least in theory), privileged the public sphere over the private realm and disparaged selfishness. Indeed, in Chinese culture, selfishness is an ultimate sin.

Yet private property was not anathema to Confucianism. Mencius had a private property theory that held that it was appropriate for a family with a few members to own a house with an area of five *mu* (approximately 0.33 hectares) and a field with an area of 100 *mu* (approximately 6.66 hectares). His idea was that land ownership on a small or moderate scale was a condition of social order and for keeping people in a 'good-hearted' frame of mind. No supporter of the large landlord class or the aristocracy, Mencius in his exposition on benevolent rule endorsed the utopian concept of 'well-field' community.¹⁰¹

Other ancient schools of thought also cherished values that could be seen as protosocialist. Mozi (c. 470–390 BC), whose moral teachings were different from those of Confucius, preached 'universal love' (*jian'ai*) – that is, 'love for others as for thyself'. Mozi wrote, 'The purpose of the magnanimous is to be found in procuring benefits for the world and eliminating its calamities. . . . Calamities arise out of want of mutual love.'¹⁰² Universal love is not a difficult and distant ideal. 'Whoever loves others is loved by others; whoever benefits others is benefited by others; whoever hates others is hated by others; whoever injures others is injured by others.'¹⁰³ Also, 'The will of Heaven is a source of righteousness, and righteousness is the standard of human conduct. Heaven does not discriminate between rich and poor, the powerful and the weak,

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, Book IV, Section 12, 14.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, Book 16, Section 1, 65, with some stylistic changes to the translation.

¹⁰¹ Under the 'well-field' system, a piece of land was divided into nine blocks in a pattern resembling the ideograph for 'well'. The eight surrounding outer blocks were private, and the one at the centre communal. The produce of the private blocks belonged entirely to the farmers while the communal land was tilled by all eight families, with the produce going to the feudal overlord who owned the entire fields.

¹⁰² Mei Yi-pao (trans.), *The Works of Motze* (Taipei: Wenzhi chubanshe, 1976), 162.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 168.

but treated everyone equally and impartially.’¹⁰⁴ In economics, Mozi believed in producing only to meet the basic needs of the population and disapproved of indulgence in excess, extravagance and luxuries.¹⁰⁵ People who exert their efforts to the best of their ability are virtuous. In Mozi’s ideal society, everyone engages in work and enjoys the fruits of his or her labour. Exploitation is immoral.¹⁰⁶

In short, ancient Chinese thought lent weight to the modern socialistic impulse. Liang Qichao claimed that the spirit of socialism was an indigenous tradition dating back to ancient times – inherent in Confucius’ injunction on even distribution and in Mencius’ private property theory – adding that the ancient ‘well-field’ system rested on the same principle as modern socialism and that socialism had existed in the Xin Dynasty (9–23).¹⁰⁷ In a clear echo of Liang, Hu Shi also identified Emperor Wang Mang of that dynasty as the ‘socialist emperor of nineteen centuries ago’.¹⁰⁸ Du Yaquan viewed socialism as a post-World War I intellectual trend. He embraced it because he found it morally close to Oriental thought, being something that had existed in ancient China.¹⁰⁹ Zhang Junmai harked back to the *datong* ideal to underscore the compatibility of socialism and Confucian thought, universal love and social harmony.¹¹⁰ Last but not least, Sun Yat-sen deployed the concepts of *tianxia weigong* (all under Heaven belongs to all) and *boai* (universal love) to provide a powerful rhetoric of socialism.

Two points may be made here. One concerns the false notion of Chinese origins of foreign ideas. Theodore Hutters has demonstrated the ‘indispensable historical role’ of the late Qing reformers’ idea that certain cultural dimensions of Western modernity originated in China.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 318.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 234–45.

¹⁰⁶ It might be added that the legendary founder of Daoism, Laozi, who lived in the late Spring and Autumn Period (c. 585–500 BC), had a vision of a utopian state that was small in size and population, without exploitation, oppression, war and division of mental and manual labour. He may be seen as a libertarian and egalitarian.

¹⁰⁷ Liang, ‘Ouyou xinyinglu’, 2984; Liang Qichao, ‘Zhongguo zhi shehui zhuyi’ 中国之社会主义, in *LQCQJ*, I, 392–3. Emperor Wang Mang of the Xin Dynasty instituted a revolutionary land redistribution system under which all land in the empire became the property of the empire, to be known as *wangtian* (the king’s land).

¹⁰⁸ Hu Shih, ‘Wang Mang, the socialist emperor of nineteen centuries ago’, *Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 59 (1928): 218–30.

¹⁰⁹ Du Yaquan 杜亚泉, ‘Zhanhou dongxi wenming zhi tiaohé’ 战后东西文明之调和, in *DYQWC*, 348.

¹¹⁰ Zhang Junmai, *Shehui zhuyi sixiangyundong gaiguan* 社会主义思想运动概观 (Taipei: Daoxiang chubanshe, 1988, published posthumously), 6–7.

The reformers used 'China as origin' as a rhetorical strategy to facilitate appropriation of Western ideas.¹¹¹ Many reformers of the Republican era did the same. The other point is that Republican intellectuals manifested what Thomas Metzger terms a 'modern Chinese utopianism' based on visions of a perfect society, the hallmarks of which are individual liberty, social justice, egalitarianism and a democratic system of government that respects human rights and provides for the well-being of the people.¹¹² To invoke the ancient utopian ideal and identify it with modern socialist thought helped to ease the way to socialism.

Conclusion

Socialism appealed to the socialistic impulse of Chinese intellectuals, especially in the wake of the October Revolution and World War I. Chinese reformers were appalled by the social iniquities of unbridled capitalism, the ravages of untrammelled markets and extreme individualism in the West. As a moral community, they were interested in a kind of moderate, evolutionary socialism that provided a model of development, a way of achieving economic growth without creating an unjust and unequal society.

Considering China's socioeconomic conditions, however, socialism could wait, as Russell wrote. Zhang Dongsun, who, in 1919, had greeted socialism as a third kind of civilization, agreed with Russell after his trip to the interior in the following year. Wanting development first, Zhang's idea of a new class of financial lords represented an economic approach to China's problems that placed economic modernity ahead of political modernity. The prevailing view in reformist circles was that creation of wealth must be a top priority; otherwise, the population would remain mired in poverty with nothing to distribute. The 1920 controversy split

¹¹¹ Theodore Hutters, *Bringing the World Home: Appropriating the West in Late Qing and Early Republican China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005), chap. 1.

¹¹² Thomas Metzger, 'Modern Chinese utopianism and the Western concept of the civil society', in *Guo Tingyi xiansheng jiuzhi danchen jinian lunwenji* 郭廷以先生九秩诞辰纪念论文集, 2 vols., ed. Chen Sanjing 陈三井 (Nangang: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1995), vol. I, 273–312. Elsewhere, Metzger wrote that the modern elite envisioned 'a utopian goal', adopting an 'optimistic epistemology' that conferred on them a moral capacity to distinguish between good and bad, right and wrong. This intellectual utopianism is one of the deeply rooted continuities between the Confucian tradition and the structure of the modern Chinese mind. See Thomas Metzger, 'Continuities between modern and premodern China', in *Ideas Across Cultures*, eds. Paul A. Cohen and Merle Goldman (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), 263–92.

the intelligentsia into two camps, with the Marxists claiming that they had won the day. Yet many continued to hold the view that capitalism was a necessary stage on the road to socialism and that capitalism must be humanized as it developed.

The rise of reformist socialist thought was influenced by an interesting mix of foreign ideas: New Liberalism, German social democracy, Fabianism and British Labour ideology. At the same time, some were excited first by the October Revolution and then by the Soviet experiment and the First Five-Year Plan. But they remained opposed to Communist politics because of its violence and repression. These external influences aside, the protosocialist elements in ancient Chinese thought provided cultural resources to support socialism in the twentieth century.

From State Socialism to Social Democracy

China in the 1930s saw the rise of state socialism (*guojia shehui zhuyi*) as an intellectual current and political movement linked to the minor Chinese State Socialist Party (Zhongguo Guojia Shehuidang), or SSP. State socialism is not defined here as the doctrine that all the affairs of the nation should be managed by the state, regardless of individual choice, or as a form of social organization in which ownership and control of the means of production is all in the hands of the state. Instead, it is interpreted in a Chinese context as evolutionary socialism based on the idea of a strong state and government with a plan, as described in Chapter 5. Chinese state socialism was not an ideology resembling Nazism. It did not have the main characteristics of fascism: antiparlamentarianism, antiliberalism, antibourgeoisie, racism, eugenics, ethnic nationalism and mass movements. It had no links with the Blue Shirts movement, which pledged absolute loyalty to Chiang Kai-shek.¹ Nor was it part of the less-known Italian connection of the 1930s, on which Michael Godley has written.² It also had nothing to do with the New Life Movement, which Frederic Wakeman Jr interpreted as a form of 'Confucian fascism'.³ Chinese state socialism differed from fascism in that it opposed

¹ Lloyd Eastman characterized the Blue Shirts as a fascist movement, in *The Abortive Revolution: China under Nationalist Rule, 1927–1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), chap. 2. His view, however, was challenged by Maria Hsia Chang in "Fascism" and modern China', *China Quarterly* 79 (September 1979): 553–67.

² Michael R. Godley, 'Lessons from an Italian connection', in *Ideal and Reality: Transformation in Modern China, 1860–1949*, eds. David Pong and Edmund S. K. Fung (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985), 93–123.

³ Frederic E. Wakeman Jr, 'A revisionist view of the Nanjing decade: Confucian fascism', *China Quarterly* 150 (June 1997): 395–432. More recently, the political scientist A. James Gregor strongly objects to calling the Nanjing government fascist, Confucian or not, in his book *A Place in the Sun: Marxism and Fascism in China's Long Revolution* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2000), chap. 4. Also, Jay Taylor, the American biographer of Chiang

the notion of the dictator, one-party rule and political tutelage, and it never became a mass movement. Rather, it espoused a parliamentary route to socialism, pending which the State Socialists would settle for a coalition government with the Chinese Nationalist Party (GMD) as the senior partner. In many respects, it was in tune with the revisionist socialism of Western Europe.

This chapter treats state socialism as a stage in the evolution of social democracy during the Nationalist period. Social democracy is understood here as a moderate socialism distinct from traditional socialism, which seeks to end the predominance of the capitalist system, and from Marxist socialism, which seeks to replace it completely. Instead, social democracy seeks to reform capitalism through state and social legislations, through state-initiated programmes and through organizations that aimed to ameliorate or remove injustices inflicted by the market system. I make no distinction between social democracy and democratic socialism lest I get bogged down in definitions that are always open to question. However, if the difference between the two is that social democrats are people who are content with a society that combines elements of capitalism and socialism, and democratic socialists are those who still have the objective of establishing democratically a wholly socialist society with a socialist economic system, then China's statist liberals appeared to be a bit of both.

Contrary to the communist-dominated historiography of Chinese socialism, social democracy was the mainstream of socialist thought in the Nationalist period. Social democracy offered a vision of modernity that, in one form or another, was shared across the political spectrum, not least by the GMD.⁴ Although the Nationalist rhetoric of the early 1920s included the notion of preventing the development of capitalism so that China could immediately enter socialism without a class struggle,⁵ Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People represented a form of social democracy.

Kai-shek, has argued that 'Chiang Kai-shek was fascist in neither ends nor means'. In his view, although Chiang 'could be heartless and sometimes ruthless', he 'lacked the pathological megalomania and the absolutist ideology of a totalitarian dictator'. See Jay Taylor, *The Generalissimo: Chiang Kai-shek and the Struggle for Modern China* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009), 101, 103. Despite these revisionist works, fascism in the Nanjing Decade remains a controversial topic.

⁴ There was a distinct social democratic flavour in the GMD's 1924 Programme. See No editor, *Zhongguo Guomindang lici quanguo daibiao dahui xuanyanji* 中国国民党历次全国代表大会宣言集 (Taipei: Zhongyang wenwu gongyingshe, 1951), 10–12.

⁵ Joseph Fewsmith, *Party, State, and Local Elites in Republican China: Merchant Organizations and Politics in Shanghai, 1890–1930* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1985), 92.

His *Programme for National Reconstruction* (*Jianguo fanglue*) included a plan for industrialization involving foreign investment. At the same time, Sun was prepared to forestall the social inequities associated with capitalist development.

This chapter first explores state socialist thought from the early 1930s to approximately 1945 and then probes postwar thought on the third way, the liberty–equality nexus and related questions about liberalism, democracy and socialism, finally concluding with a few remarks on China’s social democrats from a comparative perspective.

State Socialist Thought to 1945

This section focuses on Zhang Junmai and Zhang Dongsun, cofounders of the SSP, which was established surreptitiously in April 1932, when the two were both teaching at Beijing’s Yanqing University. The party was initially called the National Socialist Party in English. However, because this suggested a resemblance to or a connection with the Nazis, it was soon changed to State Socialist Party. The membership was small, estimated at three hundred in the summer of 1934, when the party held its First National Congress in Tianjin and became public. Composed of urban-based, middle-class intellectuals (mostly university professors and their students), the SSP may be seen as the reincarnation of the Research Clique, which had been led by Liang Qichao until his death in 1929.⁶ It provided an alternative framework for state building to the one established by the ruling GMD. Its ideology was an amalgam of evolutionary socialism, statism, nationalism and democracy, echoing Sun Yat-sen’s creed in many respects. Yet from the outset, the SSP differed from the GMD in that it opposed one-party rule and expressed a profound belief in constitutionalism and individual liberty.⁷ Zhang Junmai’s ‘third kind of politics’, or ‘revisionist democracy’, allowed for power sharing in a multiparty coalition government. It represented a liberal socialism that recognized capitalism as a necessity to develop the economy and, at the same time, the need to regulate it so that the social and economic inequalities that capitalism inevitably brought in its wake could be kept in check.

⁶ It was originally proposed that the party be named the Constitutional Party. But Zhang Junmai argued against it on the grounds that it was too old-fashioned. See Roger B. Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China: The Politics of Zhang Junmai* (Carsun Chang) 1906–1941 (Lanham, Md.: Rowan & Littlefield, 1997), 203.

⁷ Zhang Junmai 张君勱, ‘Guojia minzhu zhengzhi yu guojia shehui zhuyi’ 国家民主政治与国家社会主义, *Zaisheng* 再生 1, 2 (July 1932): 1–38, continued in 1, 3 (July 1932): 18–24.

Zhang Junmai grounded state socialism in an intimate relationship between nation and state. He debunked the myth that Marx had been successful in displacing nation with class and nationalism with internationalism. Even in Soviet Russia, argued Zhang, its achievements lay not in the 'internationalization of class struggle' but in the 'nationalization of socialism'. He believed that socialism could be realized within state boundaries and need not involve class struggles around the world. State socialism differed from communism in that it placed an emphasis on the nation rather than on class and class struggle. Because the nation is above class, a class dictatorship was anathema to him.⁸

The nation, however, is not above the state. In his book *The Way to Build the State* (1938), Zhang Junmai made a distinction between nation and state. Drawing on the work of the Swiss jurist and thinker Johann Kaspar Bluntschli, he defined the nation (*minzu*) as a political community made up of a population in different occupations and positions who belong to the same race and who share common sentiments and spirits. It is their common language, customs, beliefs and culture that confer on them a national identity distinct from others. The state, on the other hand, is a defined territory and political entity formed for the protection of the political community. Each state has its own jurisdiction and political, legal and military institutions. Whether every nation should have its own state is a different question.⁹ Zhang subscribed to the organic view of the state. 'The government is the nerve centre of the brains and the people are its arms and legs: together and coordinated, they constitute the state'.¹⁰ The state is not the sum total of self-interest; rather, it is transcendent, with elements of 'communality' (*gonggongxing*), 'universalism' (*pubianxing*) and 'permanence' (*yonghengxing*).¹¹ Zhang's statist thought is more Kantian than Hegelian in that he followed Kant's philosophy that the individual is not to be treated as a means but as an end in itself.

From the Germans, Zhang Junmai learned that the nation was a primordial racial concept and the state a *Wert Begriff* (value concept) that underpinned the state's laws, order and political institutions.¹² Considering the foreign threat and China's conditions in the 1930s, Zhang privileged the state over the nation. Yet he did not believe in the supremacy

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Zhang Junmai, *Liguo zhi dao* 立国之道 (Guilin: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1938), 28–9.

¹⁰ Zhang Junmai, 'Minzu fuxing yundong' 民族复兴运动, *Zaisheng* 再生 1, 10 (February 1933): 4.

¹¹ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 382–3.

¹² *Ibid.*, 29–31.

of the state but instead placed the nation at the centre of his socialist thought, seeing no contradictions between the two. State socialism provided the ideological underpinnings for the state-building project that sought to establish a unified government, develop commerce and industry, improve the livelihood of the people, promote education, build the transport infrastructure, reform the state institutions, establish the rule of law and enhance the state's military capabilities. The nation was to stand firmly behind the state in this project; in return, the state was to respect human rights and individual liberties.¹³

A strong feature of state socialism was planning in the economy. Without planning, wrote Zhang Junmai, there was too much unhealthy competition leading to social and economic inequalities and to waste where there was overproduction. To his way of thinking, planning was rational and offered the best means of lifting the population out of poverty and tackling social injustices.¹⁴ Zhang did not think 'pure capitalism' had ever existed in the capitalist state, for there had always been some forms of handicraft industry, cooperatives and social policies in place. Hence, some sort of a mixed economy was natural, but it could be planned. He postulated that when a natural mixed economy became a planned economy, and as social policies accumulated, the outcome was socialism. He was unable to distinguish between state socialism and state capitalism. To him, the difference was a semantic one, and in some ways, state socialism was identical with collectivism. What mattered was a 'unified plan' (*tongyi jihua*) that determined the proportion of state capital to private capital in the national economy.¹⁵

Planning under the SSP entailed the nationalization of the key industries, such as railways, mines and telegraphs. Industries that were already in private hands were to be bought back by the state. The mixed economy would allow the private sector to invest in nonessential industries. At the same time, there were to be cooperatives, local business organizations and private enterprises under state supervision.¹⁶

Zhang Junmai's idea of planning and a mixed economy owed much to the *Gemischt Wirtschaft* of Philipp Scheidemann (1865–1939), whom he had met in Germany in 1921. But in the 1930s, Zhang was influenced by

¹³ *Ibid.*, 31–3.

¹⁴ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 228.

¹⁵ Jizhe 记者 [Zhang Junmai et al.], *Women suoyashuo de hua* 我们所要说的话 (N.p.: Zaishengshe, 1946), 24–5. This pamphlet was a reproduction of the lead article in the inaugural issue of *Zaisheng* (May 1932), which constituted the political platform of the SSP.

¹⁶ For details, see Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 236–45, 251–63.

two other factors. One was Stalin's First Five-Year Plan, discussed in the previous chapter. Over the years, Zhang had shown an interest, and even admiration for, the new Russia. He had translated the 1918 Soviet Constitution into Chinese and later claimed that he coined the Chinese term *suweiai* for 'soviet'. He admired both Lenin and Leon Trotsky,¹⁷ although he remained strongly anticommunist. In 1932, after a visit to Moscow, Zhang acknowledged the achievements of the First Five-Year Plan: Soviet Russia had become self-sufficient and achieved an increase in its foreign trade, reflecting the strengths of a unified national economy.¹⁸ In his view, planning and state socialism had improved the Soviet economy, in contrast with the German and British economies that were experiencing significant problems in coping with the Great Depression. This had important lessons for China, according to Zhang. One was that large numbers of foreign engineers should be hired, foreign machinery used and basic industries developed before China could produce its own high-calibre engineers and manufacture its own machinery. Another was to place policy making in trade matters in the hands of the government to maintain a balance between exports and imports. A third was that China could emulate Soviet capital-raising techniques by asking the people to economize on food and clothing in order to eventually become self-sufficient.¹⁹

Another influence on Zhang Junmai in the 1930s was a trend set by the new socialist planners of Europe who had emerged in the first half of the decade. Planning was not originally part of pre-1914 socialism. The trend came at a time when the history of socialism had reached the end of a phase, as the growth of monopolies and cartels had led to the demise of laissez-faire capitalism.²⁰ Classical liberalism, the only ideology still favouring the minimal state, was on the defensive even in its Anglo-Saxon heartlands. The transition to organized capitalism now opened the road to a planned organization of society. As Donald Sassoon notes, 'The installation of the state at the helm of the economy, and the consequent assumption of political and social goals in economic management, would pave the way for the transition to socialism'.²¹ Western governments were

¹⁷ Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism*, 121, 127.

¹⁸ Zhang Junmai, 'Guojia minzhu zhengzhi yu guojia shehui zhuyi' 国家民主政治与国家社会主义, *Zaisheng* 1, 2 (July 1932): 21–2.

¹⁹ Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism*, 154–6.

²⁰ Donald Sassoon, *One Hundred Years of Socialism: The Western European Left in the Twentieth Century* (New York: The New Press, 1996), 67.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 51.

wrestling with the problem of massive unemployment in the midst of the Great Depression. Even the U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt began a series of new policies, known as the New Deal, which placed the state at the head of economic enterprises aimed at economic recovery and helping the poor. Yet the crash had had no effect on the Soviet economy because the Soviet Union was not exposed to the vagaries of world markets, as were Western Europe and the United States. Thus, some parties and groups of the reformist left in Europe were beginning to look to the Soviet Union as 'the repository of an enticing economic model'.²² In this changing climate, Zhang Junmai was firmer in his view that the state had an important role to play in the nation's economy. He condemned cartels and monopolies, citing the example of the Morgan Group, which dominated the financial market, railways and many other key industries in the United States.²³

But was planning practicable in the existing conditions of China? Ding Wenjiang, who raised this question in 1934, believed that three requisites were needed. The first was a strong, united central government. Were each provincial authority to plan separately, a national economy was out of the question, as there were many impoverished and landlocked provinces. The second was the recovery of all foreign settlements and the abolition of all the unequal treaties, foreign rights and privileges. And the third was a modernized, clean and efficient bureaucracy with personnel selected on merits through a competitive examination system and who were capable of applying modern science and technologies. Without these requisites, planning was a recipe for disaster.²⁴

Planning required a large and powerful bureaucracy, which was likely to breed official graft, corruption and inefficiency. How could these problems be prevented? Drawing a distinction between planning and management, Zhang Junmai sought the answer in a combination of state authority and trusteeship, which is to say, management was to be taken out of the hands of the bureaucrats and put into those of professional organizations similar to the guilds in the West.²⁵ But he had no specifics as to how the trusteeship would work and how interests would be distributed. Perhaps he hoped that the professionals would regulate

²² *Ibid.*, 64.

²³ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 176–7, 185.

²⁴ Ding Wenjiang 丁文江, 'Shixing tongzhi jingji de tiaojian', 实行统治经济的条件, *Duli pinglun* 独立评论 108 (July 1934): 18–20.

²⁵ Jizhe, *Women suoyaoshuo de hua*, 29.

themselves. It is fair to say that Zhang did not really know how to deal with the problems that planning would inevitably create.²⁶

A related issue was how planning could tackle the relationships between the city and the countryside, industry and agriculture, coastal provinces and the interior. The SSP platform said nothing about that, although much was written about the development of a *minzu jingji* (loosely translated as 'national economy') in terms of a mixed economy and property rights. By contrast, it was the Nationalist government's economic planners who had a clearer vision of economic modernity, based also on a *minzu jingji*, that entailed control and planning by the corporatist state as a means of saving the nation.²⁷

Aside from the issue of planning, there were other aspects of state socialism that were important from a social democratic point of view, such as property rights, industrial relations, taxation and education. With regard to property rights, Zhang Junmai rejected the communist view that they should be abolished through revolution. He argued that private property had existed prior to capitalism and that it is human nature to desire some property; even in ancient societies, life was not entirely communal. Private property was not a creation of capitalism, nor was capitalism a result of private property. The problem with capitalism, Zhang continued, lay not in private property but in laissez-faire economics and the untrammelled market. Combine private property rights with laissez-faire economics, and the result is capitalism. Yet property rights can be defended even in a socialist state, where some forms of ownership provide material incentives for increasing productivity. There is nothing wrong with the individuation of common lands provided that land is legally acquired, properly managed and well utilized.²⁸

²⁶ Soviet Russia faced the same problems. In 1938, Zhang acknowledged that the Soviet bureaucracy was huge, many bureaucrats were not trained in commerce and industry and state power had become so wide that there was little respect for individual liberties. See Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 224.

²⁷ In this vision, best articulated by Wang Jingwei's closest associate, the American-trained Industry Minister Chen Gongbo, *minzu jingji* constituted the foundations of the modern Chinese state. It had several characteristics. One was noninvolvement with foreign economic interests of the Chinese socioeconomic forces that were linked to the control of China's resources. Another was the twin goals of transforming China into a highly unified and centralized economic unit and achieving autarky in order to resist foreign economic control. A third was an emphasis on industrialization in the coastal cities, using the hinterland as a source of raw materials and a domestic market. See Margherita Zanasi, *Saving the Nation: Economic Modernity in Republican China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

²⁸ Jizhe, *Women suoyao shuo de hua*, 30-1.

Following Laski, Zhang Junmai distinguished between the right of landownership and the right to use the land. Both rights hold simultaneously – for example, when someone owns a house and lives in it. If the owner does not want to live there, he has the option of renting it out rather than leaving it vacant. The question is how private property is utilized. When land is put to good use, every party concerned is a beneficiary. Just as there are mixed economies, so there are public and private ownerships at the same time. Private ownership becomes a problem only when it is concentrated in the hands of a few, giving rise to social injustice. To tackle this problem, Zhang Junmai proposed a policy of ‘popularization of private ownership’ based on the notion that people should enjoy what they obtain through their labour. Under this principle, ownership entailed the right to use, sell and enjoy one’s property without state interference, but not the right to be exempt from state regulations. There were to be limitations on land accumulation, but land owned and tilled privately was not to be appropriated by the state. If the land were left to waste (that is, uncultivated and unimproved), then the state would have the right of appropriation. Zhang’s argument was that as times had changed, property rights were no longer absolute. Instead, citizens should have the opportunity to own property, with poor peasants being given land to till, big peasants becoming small peasants tilling their own land and industrial workers given shares in the workplace. Because the individual is a member of society, private property is, theoretically, part of public property, and the state has the right to intervene through legislation where the management of private property does harm to others or is at odds with social equity and community interests.²⁹ In short, Zhang’s idea was that private ownership should be subject to regulations lest it concentrate in the hands of a few.

Property rights were inseparable from the agrarian question. In Soviet Russia, the solution to the peasant problem was collective farming, which suited the local conditions because of an abundance of underdeveloped land. In China, arable land was becoming scarce, and land size was meagre. The answer to the problem, argued Zhang, lay not only in ‘land to the tillers’ but also in the widespread use of science and technologies, especially in the improvement of seeds and irrigation with state aid. The long-term goal was to achieve self-sufficiency in agriculture.³⁰ The state reserved the right to determine how land was utilized and

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 32–3.

³⁰ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 230–1, 253.

to purchase it at appropriate market prices. In remote areas, where virgin land was available and plentiful, some forms of collective farming or cooperatives would be suitable. At the same time, Zhang called for financial assistance to the farmers through state-owned agricultural banks.³¹

Regarding industrial relations, revisionist socialists held that the prospects for socialism depended on the increase of wealth, that there was a natural community of interest between workers and the majority of society that suffered from the injustices of the capitalist system and that cross-class cooperation should prevail. This was precisely the SSP's position on labour-management relations. The SSP platform included provisions for workers' security and compensation, the right to a 'corporate contract' with management, the right to strike, a bonus system based on productivity and efficiency, an indexed minimum wage, a third-party arbitration tribunal for labour disputes and improvement of factory conditions and workers' welfare. No specific mention was made of an eight-hour day or of workers' entitlement to annual leave. But there was a policy designed to enhance the workers' knowledge base and to assist in self-improvement so that, gradually, a system could be instituted enabling them to participate in the running of factories and industries.³²

With regard to taxation, the SSP pledged to abolish all bad taxes, reduce land rents and adopt a progressive taxation system in relation to income tax, land tax and inheritance tax.³³ Party member Wang Zaoshi argued, like Laski, that one should be rewarded for his or her contributions to society. On the issue of inheritance, he maintained that it ran counter to the principle that those who make no contributions deserve no reward. Moreover, inheritance could create a 'parasitic class' and unequal social relations. It was as bad as the hereditary system of official ranks. Yet Wang was not calling for its total abolition. He was only advocating that the state should have a claim to the inheritance in full or in part.³⁴ Luo Longji, who had joined the SSP in 1933, also favoured an inheritance tax for three reasons. First, it would help to realize Sun Yat-sen's principle of the people's livelihood by restricting private capital. Second, it would reduce the tendency of the younger generation to depend on the older generation and on family fortunes. The result would be a strong nation of independent and self-reliant individuals.

³¹ Jizhe, *Women suoyaoshuo de hua*, 24–5.

³² *Ibid.*, 57.

³³ *Ibid.*, 58.

³⁴ Wang Zaoshi 王造时, *Huangmijuji* 荒谬集 (N.p.: Ziyou yanlunshe, 1935), 269–70.

Third, levying the inheritance tax could be 'the first step on China's road to socialism'.³⁵

Lastly, regarding education, the policy of the SSP was to make it compulsory up to high school. There was to be general training in productive technology, connecting schools at all levels with the local industry, factories and agricultural-production units. Military training was to be an integral part of education, aimed at raising national consciousness as well as promoting a disciplined way of life. Because of an impending war with the Japanese, educational policy was given a utilitarian complexion so that young men and women could be mobilized for productive and military purposes.³⁶ Although the importance of Chinese culture was recognized, vocational training, science and technology were to be a high priority. Specialized schools designed to meet the needs of the state were to be established. Academic freedom was to be enjoyed in universities and research institutes. There would be scholarships for students from disadvantaged families to pursue tertiary studies. Equal access to education, a key principle of social democracy, was emphasized.³⁷ Civics education was also on the agenda, aimed at promoting a fusion of traditional, modern and socialist values.³⁸

Now let me return to Zhang Dongsun, whose early thoughts on socialism and capitalism have been explored in the previous chapter. A long-time friend of Zhang Junmai, the two men held similar views on many issues and were referred to intimately in their circles as the two Zhangs, just like twins.³⁹ They codrafted the 1932 lead article 'The words we want to say', published in the inaugural issue of the party organ *Zaisheng* ('*National Renaissance*').⁴⁰ Zhang Dongsun was a member of the party's

³⁵ Editorial 'Enact the inheritance law quickly', *Yishibao* 益世报, 26 February 1936, 1.

³⁶ Jizhe, *Women suoyaoshuo de hua*, 42–3. This practical approach underscored the needs of wartime mobilization. See J. Megan Greene, 'GMD rhetoric of science and modernity (1927–70): a neo-traditional scientism?' in *Defining Modernity: Guomindang Rhetorics of a New China, 1920–1970*, ed. Terry Bodenhorn (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002), 223–62.

³⁷ Jizhe, *Women suoyaoshuo de hua*, 60–1.

³⁸ Through civics education, Zhang Junmai wanted students to be willing to make sacrifices for the common good, to fight for the public interest, to be ready to help a just cause, to express a view forthrightly, to distinguish between right and wrong and to obey the law. See Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 308–9.

³⁹ Zuo Yuhe 左玉河, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu sixiang pingzhuan* 张东荪学术思想评传 (Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 1999), 73; Zhang Pengyuan 张朋园, *Liang Qichao yu minguo zhengzhi* 梁启超与民国政治 (Taipei: Shijihuo chubanshe, 1981), 267.

⁴⁰ According to Zuo Yuhe, in *Zhang Dongsun zhuan*, p. 293, the article was drafted by Zhang Dongsun alone. However, I am unconvinced by the evidence provided by Zuo.

Central General Affairs Committee. In 1933, he was placed in charge of party affairs in the north following Zhang Junmai's resignation from Yanqing University and departure for the south. After the outbreak of the War of Resistance, Zhang Dongsun organized underground anti-Japanese activities at Yanqing, where he was a professor of philosophy. On 8 December 1941, when the Pacific War broke out, he was arrested by the Japanese military authorities in Beijing. He was tortured and detained for four months and ten days before receiving an eighteen-month suspended prison sentence.⁴¹ During the next several years, he devoted a great deal of time to writing two important books, *Thought and Society* and *Reason and Democracy*, both not published until after the war, in 1946.

Zhang Dongsun's attitude towards Marxism had changed since the early 1940s. I have been unable to establish the reason for this change, and can suggest only that it was perhaps because he had become closely associated with a number of underground CCP agents since before his arrest and may have come under their influence.⁴² In any case, as he became more interested in the epistemology of Marxism, Zhang Dongsun began to differ from his party leader. Now he took a more sociological approach to studying philosophy, with a diminishing interest in metaphysics and irrationalism. Combining sociology with epistemology, he studied culture and politics in a wider societal context and was able to engage Weber and R. H. Tawney regarding the rise of capitalism. Sceptical of their theory, Zhang Dongsun argued that capitalism was a product of the Industrial Revolution and that technology, not Protestant ethics, had contributed to its rise. This led him to view capitalism as a system, a state of society, a modern development and above all an economic phenomenon – he called it the 'economics of individualism' – and not a body of ideas, least of all an ideal. Instead of linking the rise of capitalism to any specific religion or ideology, he viewed capitalism as a specific instrument for growth and development, aided by the use of new technologies.⁴³

Previously critical of dialectical materialism, Zhang Dongsun now acknowledged Marx's important contributions to scientific socialism, lauding him as 'the master of socialism' equal in standing to Zhu Xi (1130–1200), 'the master of Neo-Confucianism', and to Kant, 'the

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 336–43.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 342–8.

⁴³ Zhang Dongsun 张东荪, *Sixiang yu shehui* 思想与社会 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1946), 142, 144.

master of modern philosophy'.⁴⁴ (He found no difficulty in admiring these three different thinkers at the same time.) But he remained opposed to class struggle. Linking Marx with Rousseau, he was convinced that true socialism was nonviolent and for the good of the entire population – it was the end of democracy.⁴⁵

Zhang Dongsun now acknowledged that socialism was a nineteenth-century invention rather than the embodiment of a third kind of civilization. He traced socialist thought back to ancient times, connecting it with Christianity. Christianity, he wrote, was essentially and theoretically 'socialistic' (his English), and all forms of socialism were quasireligious.⁴⁶ 'Socialism is hard-hearted Christianity. Christianity is soft-hearted socialism',⁴⁷ he proclaimed, agreeing with the nineteenth-century American social reformer C. L. Brace, who had stated, 'There is no doubt in many of the aspirations and aims of communism a certain marked sympathy or harmony with the ideals of Christianity.'⁴⁸ Zhang inferred that Christianity was not so much an institution as an ideal and that socialists opposed the Church as an institution, not the spirit of Christianity itself. In terms of values, socialism thus was at one with Christianity, representing two important facets of Western life. Invoking Plato's *Republic*, Thomas More's *Utopia* and Thomas Campanella's *City of the Sun*, Zhang further asserted that, historically, the ideals of social reform were all communistic. His conclusion was that communistic thought, like Christianity, was part of the Western tradition that had continued into modern times in a variety of forms, among them Marxism. He did not think that the capitalist system was sustainable in the long term, predicting its eventual collapse under the weight of socialism.⁴⁹

But Zhang Dongsun remained a social democrat. To him, democracy was an ideal, a perfection of living and an inherently flawed but workable way to practise politics; democracy was incremental and capable of continuous improvement through revision and gradual change. Invoking Rousseau, he asserted that if one took the term 'democracy' in the strictest sense, there never had been a real democracy.⁵⁰ Democracy sets the highest standards for democratic institutions, but the standards are not fixed and can only be reached gradually. A little democracy is better

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 146.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 178.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 140.

⁴⁸ Quoted in *ibid.*, 144.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 145–6.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 166.

than no democracy at all, for what little will accumulate and amount to a great deal over time. Zhang did not think the United States and Britain (in 1946) had reached a high degree of democracy, rating them at a mere forty on a scale of one hundred.⁵¹ He failed to justify this extremely harsh judgement. Obviously, however, in the back of his mind were the economic inequalities and social injustices in these countries, where, he thought, democracy was in need of revision.

Under the leadership of the two Zhangs, the SSP represented a compelling conception of Chinese social democracy that sought to forestall revolutionary socialism on one hand and, on the other, to prevent the kind of social problems often associated with capitalism in the West. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the SSP had nothing to do with Nazism or fascism. When the American journalist John Gunther referred to the SSP as a 'semi-fascist' party in his popular book *Inside Asia* (1939), Zhang Junmai took pains to deny the alleged affinity with fascism.⁵² Nor did the SSP have a focus on war and empire. This presents a contrast to Japanese national socialism (*kokka shakai shugi*), which bore a certain resemblance to fascism (*fashizumu* in Japanese)⁵³ and which was intimately linked to the state, empire and war, with an emphasis on the national community in the service of the empire. Whereas Japanese national socialism provided a moral justification for imperialism and for statist liberals 'to be co-opted into a wartime regime in the late 1930s and the 1940s',⁵⁴ Chinese state socialism was largely concerned with state building in a domestic context.

During the War of Resistance, the SSP, along with other minor parties and groups, cooperated with the government, and the two Zhangs became members of the multiparty People's Political Council (1938–45). Of all the minor political parties and groups, the SSP was perhaps the most active, having links with provincial reconstruction movements, especially in Guangdong and Guangxi.⁵⁵ Zhang Junmai joined Liang Shuming and others in forming the Chinese Democratic League (Zhongguo

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 170.

⁵² Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism*, 258.

⁵³ In the 1930s, Japanese social democrats supported the military, the army and the Imperial Way (Kōdō), and became increasingly identified with the militarists who called for tighter government controls on and planning in the economy. By the end of 1937, the social democrats had developed an ideology closely approximating that of the national socialists. See George Oakley Totten, *The Social Democratic Movement in Prewar Japan* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1966), 401.

⁵⁴ Tomoko Akami, 'Nation, state, empire and war: problems of liberalism in modern Japanese history and beyond', *Japanese Studies* 25, 2 (2005): 132–3.

⁵⁵ For details, see Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism*, 209–11.

Minzhu Tongmeng), a loose coalescence of the minor parties and groups, which represented a 'third force' (*disan shili*) between the Nationalists and the Communists.

The history of the League has been well documented elsewhere.⁵⁶ It will suffice here to make three observations: First, the League represented a social democratic movement; its 1944 platform bore a striking resemblance to the platform of the SSP. Regarding constitutionalism, political rights and civil liberties, the League went further in declaring that the right to hold public office should be absolutely free of restrictions of property, education, beliefs, gender and race. Second, the League had a broader social programme encompassing public health care and social welfare; public clinics and hospitals; free rehabilitation homes; benefits for the unemployed, the invalid and the elderly; and security in cases of illness, pregnancy and death. A minimum wage and an eight-hour day for the workers were on the agenda, the first of its kind on the platform of any Chinese political party. In addition, women were promised 'absolute equality' with men before the law as well as economically, politically and culturally. Third, the League proclaimed as its goal the 'gradual realization of socialism' through 'economic democratization' aimed at promoting 'the prosperity and stability of the livelihood of the population' and 'fair (not even) distribution of wealth'. It reaffirmed property rights along with state ownership and called for a planned, mixed economy.⁵⁷ The term socialism, not state socialism, was used in all of the League's proclamations, suggesting a change to a variant of social democracy more attuned to the welfare socialism of Western Europe.

Postwar Social Democratic Thought

Postwar Chinese social democratic thought was dominated by three sometimes overlapping themes: the middle path, new liberalism and the liberty–equality nexus. These themes should first be put in an internal and external context as follows: Internally, no sooner had the war against Japan ended than a renewed civil war loomed large. The Democratic League again appealed for a political settlement, calling for the

⁵⁶ See Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy*, chap. 7.

⁵⁷ For the full text of the platform, see *Zhongguo minzhu tongmeng lishi wenxian 1941–1949* 中国民主同盟历史文献 1941–1949, comp. Zhongguo minzhu tongmeng zhongyang wenshi ziliao weiyuanhui 中国民主同盟中央文史资料委员会编 (Beijing: Wenshi ziliao chubanshe, 1983), 26–8.

formation of a coalition government while General George C. Marshall arrived in China as U.S. President Harry S. Truman's special envoy on a mission to bring about a democratic coalition between the Communists and the Nationalists. Unfortunately, the U.S.-brokered Political Consultative Conference of all the political parties and groups held in Chongqing in January 1946 came to naught, and consequently, the civil war resumed with a vengeance.⁵⁸

A split soon developed within the SSP, now renamed the Chinese Democratic Socialist Party (DSP) (*Zhongguo Minzhu Shehuidang*) following its amalgamation with an American-based group, the Democratic Constitutionalists. The name change completed the shift from state socialism to social democracy. A splinter group opposed to Zhang Junmai formed the DSP (Reformist), led by the constitutionalist Wu Xianzi, who accused Zhang of undemocratic practices in party elections and in the appointment of party personnel. The group's real grievance, however, was Zhang's unilateral participation along with representatives of the Chinese Youth Party (*Zhongguo Qingniandang*) in the National Assembly in November 1946, which was boycotted by the Communists and the Democratic League. He was seen as too progovernment, moving to the right and acting in self-interest. It was for this reason that Zhang Dongsun broke with him to join the splinter group. The two were never to meet again. Zhang Dongsun was moving to the left. After spending some time in Shanghai, he returned to Yanqing University in the autumn of 1946, advocating a middle path between the Communists and the Nationalists. Because of his high standing among the middle-of-the-road intellectuals in the Beijing area, he was approached by CCP agents to help negotiate the peaceful surrender of the Beijing military commander Fu Zuoyi ahead of the People's Liberation Army's seizure of the city in 1948.⁵⁹

Personal rivalries aside, the Democratic Socialists maintained their position on socialism: a repudiation of historical materialism and class struggle and respect for property rights. Again, planning was emphasized, as was a cooperative relationship between labour and management. Zhang Junmai acknowledged an intellectual debt to Ramsay MacDonald and H. G. Wells, declaring that the mission of his party thereafter was to achieve British-style social democracy. Although he acknowledged the strengths of Anglo-American democracy, Zhang wished that Britain and the United States were better able to confront problems of economic

⁵⁸ For a recent account of the Marshall Mission, see Taylor, *The Generalissimo*, 339–41.

⁵⁹ Zuo, *Zhang Dongsun zhuan*, 409–21.

inequality.⁶⁰ Based on his ideas, the DSP's 1947 political report maintained that the party advocated 'liberty, not laissez-faire or organized capitalism', reiterating its opposition to proletarian dictatorship as well as to the GMD's 'bureaucratic capitalism' (*guanliao ziben zhuyi*) and the CCP's radical land reform.⁶¹ The DSP (Reformist)'s platform was not significantly different, but it went a step further in paying more attention to children's welfare and in urging vocational education for women so that they could find employment and thereby achieve economic independence.⁶²

Externally, the immediate postwar years (1945–50) in Western Europe witnessed what Donald Sassoon calls 'the construction of welfare socialism'.⁶³ Many socialist and social democratic parties shared power with nonsocialist parties, whereas those in Britain, Sweden and Norway governed in their own right. European social democracy, now clearly defined as 'non-communism', was prepared to deal with social reform and capitalism more vigorously than ever before. The welfare state was the hallmark of social reform while nationalization and economic planning were implemented to control capitalism. In Britain, for example, the Labour Party had come to power with a mandate for social reform. Between 1945 and 1949, the new government nationalized the Bank of England, civil aviation, telecommunications, the railways, long-distance roads haulage, electricity, gas and iron and steel. Across Western Europe, many of the short-term political objectives of the Second International adopted early in the twentieth century were achieved. Meanwhile, in international politics, social democratic parties were developing a strategic framework to cope with the Cold War.⁶⁴

Having provided the contexts, now I turn to the first of the three dominant themes of postwar Chinese social democratic thought – the idea of a middle path (*zongjian luxian*), advocated most vigorously by Shi Fuliang and Zhang Dongsun. Shi, originally named Shi Cuntong (1899–1970), a native of Zhejiang province, was born into a poor, large, extended peasant family. In the New Culture Movement, he rebelled against the

⁶⁰ Zhang Junmai, 'Minzhu shehuidang de renwu' 民主社会党的任务, *Zaisheng* 164 (May 1947): 2–6, continued in no. 168 (June 1947): 2–6.

⁶¹ Wang Housheng 王厚生, 'Zhongguo minzhu shehuidang de zhengzhi luxian' 中国民主社会党的政治路线, *Zaisheng* 186 (October 1947): 10–12.

⁶² For the platform of the DSP (Reformist), see *Zhongguo minzhu shehuidang* 中国民主社会党, comp. Zhongguo dier lishidang'anguan 中国第二历史档案馆编 (Nanjing: Zhongguo dier lishidang'anguan, 1988), 440–4.

⁶³ Sassoon, *One Hundred Years of Socialism*, 115.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, chap. 6.

Confucian tradition of filial piety, especially against his father, who had a violent character.⁶⁵ In 1921, Shi was a founding member of the CCP and a party ideologue. Later, at the time of the first GMD–CCP united front, he also joined the GMD. After the collapse of the united front in 1927, he severed ties with the CCP as he sought a middle path between the two parties.⁶⁶ Then he joined the left-wing Reorganization Clique (Gaizupai) led by Wang Jingwei but soon broke with the GMD when the party became dominated by Chiang Kai-shek. During the war years, Shi worked in the Economics Research Institute at the Bank of Sichuan in Chongqing and published extensively on the Chinese economy. At the same time, he was involved in the Democratic League's third force movement.⁶⁷

Shi's ideas about the middle path were fully developed in the post-war years. He explained that, socially, the middle path represented the national and petty bourgeoisie that constituted the small middle class. Economically, the emphasis was on industrialization and a mixed economy – the economics of a 'new capitalism' in a transition to socialism. Politically, the middle path represented a form of Anglo-American-style democracy not controlled by a small privileged minority; he called it 'a majority democracy' of and for the entire population. The middle path was an alternative to the authoritarianism of the GMD and to communism. Shi spoke for all of the middle-of-the-road intellectuals when he called for the democratization of politics, the nationalization of the armies and a coalition government as a way of resolving the political conflict. Internationally, the middle path steered a course between the United States and the Soviet Union by building friendly relations with both.⁶⁸

Shi's ideas were echoed by Zhang Dongsun. In a lecture delivered at the Tianjin Youth Association on 22 May 1947, Zhang said that what China needed was a social system that embraced both Anglo-American democracy and Russian-style planning and socialism. 'Negatively, [we] adopt democracy without [liberal] capitalism, and socialism without a proletarian revolution. We want liberty, not licentiousness, cooperation,

⁶⁵ For Shi's early life, see Wen-hsin Yeh, *Provincial Passages: Culture, Space, and the Origins of Chinese Communism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 102–17, 175–82.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 221, 232–7, 254.

⁶⁷ Song Yawen 宋亚文, *Shi Fuliang zhengzhi sixiang yanjiu* 施复亮政治思想研究 (Beijing: Remin chubanshe, 2006), 227–34.

⁶⁸ Shi Fuliang 施复亮, 'Zhongjianpai de zhengzhi luxian' 中间派的政治路线, *Shi yu wen* 时与文 1, 1 (March 1947): 6–10; also 'Zhongjianpai zai zhengzhi shang de diwei he zuoyong' 中间派在政治上的地位和作用, *Shi yu wen* 1, 5 (April 1947): 83–5.

not conflict. That is to say, we want neither capitalist monopoly nor class struggle.⁶⁹

With regard to the second theme, new liberalism (small 'n' and 'l' to distinguish it from Hobhouse's New Liberalism), there was a sense among some leading members of the intelligentsia that capitalism was being 'revised' around the world, not least in the United States following President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. The New Deal provided ordinary working Americans with an 'economic freedom' rarely seen before. Roosevelt encapsulated his philosophy in his 1941 State of the Union Address, in which he envisaged a world founded on 'Four Freedoms' – freedom of speech, expression and worship and freedom from want and fear. The New Deal was perceived by many as smacking of socialism. Revisiting it in an article titled 'Roosevelt and new liberalism', the May Fourth veteran Fu Sinian, now director of the Institute of History and Philology at Academia Sinica, wrote:

When [Roosevelt] assumed the presidency of the United States, it was a time of an unprecedented depression. He implemented the New Deal, which contained moderate, effective socialist elements, to secure the livelihood of the people. Further, [Roosevelt] continuously passed legislations designed to benefit the masses. . . . What were his greatest contributions? There are different points of view. My own view is that he gave liberalism a new direction, a new life, demonstrating with the facts that this revisionist, positive new liberalism is qualified to lead the world to peace and to the progress of humankind.⁷⁰

Securing the livelihood of the people was a reference to Roosevelt's 'freedom from want', which had a particular relevance to China, where the bulk of the population was struggling to survive.

According to Fu Sinian, liberalism was originally a kind of humanism that had since lost its soul through an association with capitalism. 'Now, to resurrect its soul, there is no other way but to oppose developed capitalism'.⁷¹ Fu regarded Roosevelt as a new liberal who had ushered in a new American liberalism:

Needless to say, the American political tradition is grounded in liberalism. But traditional liberalism has become too conservative. Take the 'liberty of

⁶⁹ Zhang Dongsun, 'Yige zhongjianxing de zhengzhi luxian' 一个中间性的政治路线, *Zaisheng* (June 1946): 3–4.

⁷⁰ Fu Sinian 傅斯年, 'Luo Sifu yu xin ziyou zhuyi' 罗斯福与新自由主义, in *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集, 7 vols., comp. Fu Mengzhen xiansheng yizhu bianji weiyuanhui 傅孟真先生遗著编辑委员会编 (Taipei: Lianjing chubang gongsi, 1980), vol. V, 389–90.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 393.

property' [property rights] for example. It has become an obstacle to all other freedoms. All the social legislations that President Roosevelt enacted during his first and second terms in office – the so-called New Deal – represent a major revision of present-day capitalism, even though they were not couched in socialist terms, let alone in radical socialism. This revision is informed by knowledge to suit the conditions of the United States. It contains many elements of moderate socialism.⁷²

New liberalism was equated with moderate socialism. What made new liberalism new in the postwar context was a greater emphasis on the general well-being of the population. In human rights terms, this represented a shift from civil and political rights to economic and social rights – not only the right to subsistence but also the right of consumption and, perhaps more importantly, the right of participation in the workforce and the right to work, to free choice of employment, to strike and to equal pay for equal work.

Some used the term 'liberal socialism'. The American-trained professor of politics Xiao Gongquan (1897–1981) (Ph.D. Cornell University), understood liberal socialism historically as a development first of liberalism and democracy in the eighteenth century and then of socialism in the nineteenth century. Each phase had made contributions to humanity in its unique way, and each also had its shortcomings. The difference between the two was that liberalism and democracy sought individual liberation to the neglect of 'the hunger of the majority', whereas socialism sought to satisfy the hunger of the majority to the neglect of individual emancipation. Historically, liberalism and socialism stood opposed to each other, dividing people into two large camps. Xiao provided an insight into this division: 'Although we cannot say that many of the conflicts in the twentieth century were the direct results of this adversarial relationship, we have to acknowledge that certain contradictions after World War II have much to do with that.'⁷³ Looking to the future, Xiao believed that the contributions of the twentieth century would lie not in the creation of a new 'ism' or a new political movement but in the reconciliation of the special contributions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. 'This would constitute a perfect polity of life (*shenghuo tixi*) to the benefit of all humanity. Because such a polity has the best of both liberalism and socialism, we can call it "liberal socialism".'⁷⁴

⁷² *Ibid.*, 393–4.

⁷³ Xiao Gongquan 萧公权, 'Ershi shiji de lishi renwu' 二十世纪的历史任务, *Shiji pinglun* 世纪评论 2, 5 (February 1948): 6.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

Xiao Gongquan went on to make a fine distinction between socialism and liberal socialism. Socialism neither emphasized nor denied personal freedoms. The goal of socialist reform was the ‘even satisfaction of human needs as a whole’ rather than individual liberation. Liberal socialism, on the other hand, considered liberty as important as equality and thus did not require sacrifice of personal freedoms. ‘Put simply, socialism does not want to see people starve, and liberalism does not want to see people restrained. . . . Liberal socialism wants to see neither. It is not a perfect life when one is adequately fed and clothed but kept in a prison of spiritual emptiness.’⁷⁵

This brings us to the third theme of postwar social democratic thought, the liberty–equality nexus and the tension between the two. This theme was addressed in terms of the relationship between ‘political freedom’ and ‘economic freedom’, ‘political freedom’ and ‘economic equality’, or ‘political democracy’ and ‘economic democracy’. Discussions had begun before the end of World War II, when the Allies brought together the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and China – the Big Four – in the fight against the fascist powers. As the Soviet Union gained strategic acceptance by the Allies, its perceived economic democracy held immense appeal for China’s intellectuals, prompting Luo Longji to declare in 1944 that ‘as far as the majority of the people are concerned, economic democracy is more vital than political democracy’.⁷⁶ The term ‘economic democracy’ denoted a narrowing of the gap between the rich and the poor through state intervention. Luo had been critical of communism in 1930.⁷⁷ But now he believed that the Soviet Union had established an economic system guaranteeing the right to subsistence, work, and a secure livelihood. From this, he inferred that without equitable distribution of wealth, the vast majority of the population were denied the substance of liberty and equality.⁷⁸

After the war, the liberty–equality nexus was a source of continuing discussion. There were a variety of views. Some held that both liberty and equality were essential freedoms and human rights. Again, it was Fu Sinian who wrote:

For more than a hundred years, although liberalism had created equality before the law, it had also helped capitalism create economic inequality,

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁷⁶ Luo Longji 罗龙基, ‘Minzhu de yiyi’ 民主的意义, *Minzhu zhoukan* 民主周刊 1, 1 (December 1944): 3–5.

⁷⁷ Luo Longji, ‘Lun gongchan zhuyi: gongchan zhuyi lilun shang de piping’ 论共产主义: 共产主义理论上的批评, *Xinyue* 新月 3, 1 (November 1930): 1–22.

⁷⁸ Luo, ‘Minzhu de yiyi’, 5.

which is detestable. Without economic equality, all other equalities are false and liberty is unreal. However, equality without liberty will eventually spawn a new kind of inequality, and a life without freedom is not a life worth living. This is because without liberty there is no progress. Therefore, liberty and equality cannot be weighed against each other, and it is not a matter of choice. To use material progress (i.e., science and economics) and spiritual progress (i.e., mutual love rather than mutual hate) to promote liberty and equality is the mission of new liberalism.⁷⁹

Fu refused to make a choice between economic democracy and political democracy. His ideal state was one in which people enjoy both liberty and equality.⁸⁰ Having spent three years as a student at the University of London in the 1920s, Fu thought that postwar Britain under Labour came close to being such a state. He would be happy to live there.⁸¹ Back home, Fu was frustrated that state capitalism had become what he called 'noble house capital' (*haomen ziben*), which was monopolized by two rich and powerful bureaucratic families, the Kongs (H. H. Kung, or Kong Xiangxi, 1881–1967) and the Songs (Song Ziwen, or T. V. Soong, 1894–1971), who were both related to Chiang Kai-shek.⁸²

Britain under Labour demonstrated that with a good government and good policies, the people as a whole could enjoy both political and economic freedoms. The social legislations enacted by Labour benefited the labouring classes that enjoyed individual liberties. To be sure, political freedom does not automatically lead to economic freedom, and there can be political freedom without economic freedom, especially where a free nation is under foreign economic control. But government policy could make a difference, argued the diplomatic historian Jiang Tingfu, rejecting the view that political freedom was an obstacle to economic freedom. Instead, Jiang believed that the history of the past hundred years demonstrated that the people of free countries had been able to wage continued struggles against the capitalists and had made considerable gains in terms of working conditions, unemployment benefits,

⁷⁹ Fu, 'Luo Sifu yu xin ziyou zhuyi', 396.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 403.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 397.

⁸² H. H. Kung, who married one of the Soong sisters, was the finance minister from 1933 to 1944. For a long while he had been attacked by Fu Sinian for corruption and malpractice. He was forced to resign in 1944, succeeded by T. V. Soong, who turned out to be equally corrupt and inefficient. Fu accused the Kungs and the Soongs of controlling state capital, public utilities and state-owned industries to further their own nests. See Fu Mengzhen, 傅孟真 [Fu Sinian 傅斯年], 'Lun haomen ziben zhi bixu chanchu' 论豪门资本之必须铲除, *Guancha* 观察 2, 1 (March 1947): 6–8; Wang Fan-sen, *Fu Ssu-nien: A Life in Chinese History and Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 167–70, 180–1.

social security, union power and so forth. This forced the rich to pay more taxes under a progressive taxation system. Liberalism under capitalism was imperfect and the rich and powerful did dominate society, but Jiang thought the two kinds of freedom were mutually reinforcing and that life was miserable without one or the other.⁸³

Britain under Labour also showed the simplicity of the belief that the difference between capitalism and communism was the difference between the United States and the Soviet Union. Both countries deserved praise for their achievements, and each could be faulted where it had failed – one emphasized liberty to the neglect of equality; the other, equality to the neglect of liberty, as though the two were mutually exclusive.⁸⁴ There was a third way. If political democracy meant ‘by the people’ and economic democracy ‘for the people’, was there any prospect of having both through a compromise between the two? Xiao Gongquan thought so, again citing postwar British socialism to support his argument and adding that Sun Yat-sen’s principle of people’s rights and principle of people’s livelihood had the same objectives.⁸⁵

Many came around to the view that equality and liberty were not separate and distinct. A refreshing analysis of their symbiotic nexus was provided by the historian Qian Shifu, who argued epistemologically that equality stems from liberty, that one cannot exist without the other and that equality is not bestowed by the authorities but is self-determined and incremental. Qian was original in linking equality with self-determination. He reasoned that if the rulers alone have the power to bestow equality on the ruled, it is an unequal society when the rulers become a special class that determines what the ruled can and cannot have. Equality without liberty means that everyone is under the same controls and restrictions socially and economically; it is a ‘submissive equality’ not worth fighting for. ‘Equality is material that can be measured quantitatively. Liberty is spiritual that reflects the free will.’ Equality without liberty is ‘a skeleton without flesh’, ‘a body without a soul’. Moreover, equality needs protection, which only liberty can provide.⁸⁶

⁸³ Jiang Tingfu 蒋廷黻, ‘Zhengzhi ziyou yu jingji ziyou’ 政治自由与经济自由, *Shiji pinglun* 世纪评论 1, 17 (April 1947): 5–7.

⁸⁴ Wu Shichang 吴世昌, ‘Zhengzhi minzhu yu jingji minzhu’ 政治民主与经济民主, *Guancha* 1, 5 (September 1946): 5–7.

⁸⁵ Xiao Gongquan, ‘Shuo minzhu’ 说民主, *Guancha* 1, 9 (October 1946): 3–7. It appeared that Xiao had no problem with Sun’s principles.

⁸⁶ Qian Shifu 钱实甫, ‘Meiyou ziyou de pingdeng’ 没有自由的平等, *Minzhu luntan* 民主论坛 2, 1 (September 1947): 16–18.

Thus, the key to liberty is political rights rather than economic equality, which is to say that where political rights are enjoyed, liberty and all other rights are protected by law. That is democracy. Economic equality has never been the principal goal of liberalism, yet without it there is no real democracy for the people as a whole. In the postwar Chinese discourse, political democracy was often likened to a ballot paper, and economic democracy to a bowl of rice. Some believed that the former was more important than the latter because with political rights, one could fight for a bowl of rice; with a bowl of rice, one may not fight for a ballot paper. Therefore, the ballot paper must not be given up for a bowl of rice.⁸⁷ Again, as one liberal writer pointed out, the case of Britain demonstrated that one could have both in a social democracy.⁸⁸

The stark reality of China, however, was that the people had neither political rights nor economic equality. The vast majority were impoverished and not free, and the rich and powerful who enjoyed freedom were but a tiny minority. Did China have to evolve through stages before equality and liberty were enjoyed? One professor believed that if human history was a narrative of the dialectical relations of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, then liberty without equality was the thesis, equality without liberty the antithesis, and liberty with equality the synthesis, each representing an historical stage. China had not gone through the thesis stage, nor was it at the antithesis stage. Equality without liberty was a stage through which China had to pass, and he hoped it would be a short one.⁸⁹

This last point denoted a stage at which the basic needs of the population were satisfied. It also suggested that democracy and liberalism should be approached from the perspective of the rural masses. The economist Wu Enyu, who had studied politics under Laski, did just that. Historically, he noted, those who had fought for and won liberty in the West were those who were in an economic position to do so, for example, the landlords who rose up against the aristocracy and the capitalists who opposed government controls. With regard to the workers and peasants, it was not a question of whether they should enjoy liberty but of whether they could. Because the privileged class built liberty on economic

⁸⁷Yang Renbian 杨人便, 'Zailun ziyou zhuyi de tujing' 再论自由主义的途径, *Guancha* 5, 8 (16 October 1948), 4.

⁸⁸Shang Zhi 商治, 'Zhengzhi minzhu yu jingji minzhu' 政治民主与经济民主, *Guancha* 1, 11 (March 1947): 12.

⁸⁹Zou Wenhai 邹文海, 'Minzhu zhengzhi shifou rengxu ziyou?' 民主政治是否仍需自由? *Minzhu luntan* 1, 10 (November 1946): 3-5.

inequalities, this was the real obstacle to liberty. So that liberty could be enjoyed by all, it was important to recognize economic equality as a condition of liberty (contrary to the view that liberty is a condition of equality). To remove economic inequality entailed restrictions on property rights, wrote Wu. In the Chinese case, the liberty enjoyed by a tiny minority (the landlords and bureaucratic capitalists) was at odds with the principle of equality. The socioeconomic gulf between the city and the countryside and between the haves and the have-nots was a serious concern.⁹⁰

All of this drew attention back to China's backwardness and abject poverty, to the need to improve the living standards of the population. Attention was now refocused on development and production, which acquired a new urgency in the aftermath of the eight-year war against Japan. It was Zhang Dongsun who made an original contribution to the socialist discourse in two ways. First, he viewed planning as a politically neutral policy that could be practised in countries with different social systems – socialist, communist, fascist or liberal democratic. That is to say, planning was not a socialist monopoly. Zhang did not suggest that all planning was good. But it worked best where it was based on the principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number.⁹¹ Second, Zhang linked liberty and equality with production, which would provide the strongest foundation for socialism. He faulted those who engaged in the liberty–equality discourse as shallow because they did not raise the question of production. For Zhang, production was the defining factor in the transformation of a poor, backward country, because production led to progress, and progress was the ultimate goal of political change. In his view, any social reform or revolution was a success if it led to increased production by unleashing the productive forces and a failure if it led to a fall in production and in living standards. What the people of China badly needed was neither a high degree of liberty nor a high degree of equality but a high level of production that met their demands in everyday life. Liberty and equality were relative and in direct proportion to the level of productivity. People should be rewarded for their ability to produce and for their productivity. Zhang could see no economic inequality, only social injustice, and the two were not to be confused.

⁹⁰ Wu Enyu 吴恩裕, 'Ziyouhu? Pingdenghu?' 自由乎? 平等乎? *Guancha* 3, 12 (15 November 1947): 6–7.

⁹¹ Zhang Dongsun, 'Zhengzhi shang de ziyou zhuyi yu wenhua shang de ziyou zhuyi' 政治上的自由主义与文化上的自由主义, *Guancha* 4, 1 (February 1948): 4.

He observed that social injustice existed even in Soviet Russia, though to a lesser extent than in the capitalist West.⁹²

Zhang Dongsun followed Rousseau in distinguishing between two kinds of human inequality: One is natural and physical; the other, moral and political. The former comes with birth and has to be accepted; the latter is created after birth and can be changed. For Zhang, equality means the absence of moral and political inequalities, and inequalities are privileges created for a small minority at the expense of the majority; to be equal, therefore, is to remove such privileges by reasonable and democratic means.⁹³ Human-made inequality is injustice, but Zhang also believed that 'strict equality' bred injustice because it meant social levelling that provided no material incentive for increasing production. Marxism did not insist on absolute economic equality, only on abolition of classes. Zhang quoted Friederich Engels (1820–95): 'The real content of the proletarian demand for equality is the demand for the abolition of classes. Any demand for equality which goes beyond this of necessity passes into absurdity.'⁹⁴ A planned economy, argued Zhang, had ramifications for political and social lives, including liberty, equality and education. If liberty and equality stood in the way of production, they needed to be 'reasonably and considerably curbed' and even sacrificed. Zhang rejected both laissez-faire economics (he called it 'old-style liberalism') and utopian socialism. Looking at the world realistically, he would accept economic equality only as a distant goal, an abstraction and ideal.⁹⁵

Curbing liberties for the sake of production is at odds with classical liberalism. But Zhang Dongsun thought classical liberalism, or what he called 'political liberalism' (*zhengzhi shang de ziyou zhuyi*), was out of date. Restrictions on liberties should not affect what he termed 'cultural liberalism' (*wenhua shang de ziyou zhuyi*), which meant an 'attitude' (*taidu*) – an attitude of critique, of toleration, especially in cultural, academic and intellectual pursuits.⁹⁶ He could not see the tension between the two liberalisms.

⁹² *Ibid.* See also Zhang Dongsun, *Minzhu zhuyi yu shehui zhuyi* 民主主义与社会主义 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1948), 58, 65, 83.

⁹³ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 129.

⁹⁴ Zhang Dongsun, 'Jingji pingdeng yu feichu boxue' 经济平等与废除剥削, *Guancha* 4, 2 (March 1948): 3–4.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 3–5; Zhang, 'Zhengzhi shang de ziyou', 4.

⁹⁶ Zhang, 'Zhengzhi shang de ziyou', 4.

Questions were also raised about exploitation, a capitalist sin that socialism vowed to abolish. Significantly, Zhang Dongsun distinguished between two kinds of exploitation: feudal and capitalist. Feudal exploitation referred to landlord power and the corrupt bureaucratic control of the economy, as in China. Capitalist exploitation referred to the use of economic power to influence politics in order to manipulate the market, as in the developed countries of the West. Both kinds were bad, because neither was aimed at promoting the interests of the people as a whole; their abolition was warranted on principles of justice and equality. Zhang thought that in China it was important to attack 'feudalism' and to raise production simultaneously. He argued that a just society was conducive to increasing production, but that before justice was realized, to emphasize equality was to put the cart before the horse and risk falling into the pitfall of 'imaginative socialism'.⁹⁷ His argument is reducible to a schema like this: justice → production → equality → justice. That is to say, where there is justice, there is production, and where there is production, there is equality, and equality creates a more just society. This begs the question, how could society be just in the first place? Zhang's answer lay in the overthrow of the 'feudal forces', not of capitalism. Capitalist exploitation in an underdeveloped country like China was tolerable.

Zhang Dongsun's view was echoed by Shi Fuliang, who saw exploitation as an outcome of productive forces. Historically, argued Shi, exploitation was the motor driving production. Capitalist exploitation, bad as it was, had been an improvement to the slave system and on the 'feudal system' (that is, the unequal landlord-peasant relations). It had enhanced the position of the labouring classes and improved their living standards. Exploitation was necessary until a solid material foundation was laid for the entire nation. It existed as long as the capitalist class owned or controlled the means of production. Thus, Shi would defend exploitation as long as it helped to increase production until the material conditions for socialism were ripe. He advocated what he called a 'new capitalism' (*xin ziben zhuyi*) in the transition to socialism. In this new capitalism, national (*minzu*) commerce and industry, or 'national capitalism' (*minzu ziben zhuyi*) as opposed to foreign-controlled capitalism, was to be developed, overthrowing the 'feudal forces' along with bureaucratic capitalism and 'comprador capital' (*maiban ziben*). In the meantime, social legislations were necessary to prevent exploitation from going to the extreme. Shi proposed a minimum wage, restricted working hours, prohibition of

⁹⁷ Zhang, 'Jingji pingdeng yu feichu boxue', 4-5.

child labour below age fourteen, restrictions on female labour below age sixteen, prevention of industrial accidents and introduction of labour welfare.⁹⁸ He exemplifies those who accepted exploitation on one hand and sought to ameliorate injustices inflicted by the capitalist system on the other. In acknowledging that inequality was an outcome of capitalism and a necessity, Shi seemed to come close to Hayek's view that inequality is not an unfortunate aberration under capitalism but an inescapable outcome and an essential condition of its successful economic functioning. But Shi's model was a social democratic one, not liberal capitalism.

There was nothing new about Shi's notion of new capitalism. Capitalism in the West had been 'revised', there being no more 'old capitalism' that ignored the interests of the labouring classes. However, his thoughts on new capitalism are worth noting in a particular context: It was, in a way, a response to Mao Zedong's essay 'New Democracy' (1940), which emphasized the roles of the national bourgeoisie and the labouring classes as well as the leadership of the CCP. For Mao, New Democracy was a transition to socialism. Its economy would be characterized by state ownership of the big banks and big industrial and commercial enterprise, but the state would not confiscate private property in general or forbid the development of capitalist production that did not dominate the livelihood of the people.⁹⁹ Politics aside, Shi's new capitalism was compatible with Mao's New Democracy.

A last question to be explored is the interrelationship between democracy and socialism. This was an important theoretical question that had been on Zhang Dongsun's mind for some time as he searched for an epistemological basis on which to construct the third way. What he found was described in his book *Democracy and Socialism* (1948), a theoretical and empirical study of 'socialistic democracy' (his English), or *shehui zhuyi de minzhu zhuyi*. The book was hastily written, but its basic argument is clear: Democracy and socialism share a cluster of values (liberty, equality, reason, justice and human rights), and therefore, democratic and socialist movements have the same ontological goals, one being the essence of the other. To be democratic is to be socialist, and vice versa, as the two are interrelated. However, Zhang Dongsun added that these values were but rhetoric 'high up in the sky' if they were not brought down to earth and put into practice through a 'medium' (*meijiewu*).

⁹⁸ Shi Fuliang, 'Feichu boxue yu zengjia shengchan' 废除剥削与增加生产, *Guancha* 4, 4 (20 March 1948): 7–9.

⁹⁹ Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, 6 vols. (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1967), vol. II, 339–84, especially 353–4.

There had been two such media in modern world history, he wrote: One was individualism, which laid the basis for capitalism; the other, nationalism, which was at the core of the nation-state. But recently, there was a third, namely, economic planning.¹⁰⁰ Notably, Zhang's treatment of socialism and democracy as a unity resonated with the postwar Western European view that the definition of socialism as a social and economic ideal was inseparable from the idea of democracy, both as a means and an end.¹⁰¹ Together, democracy and socialism constituted the Third Way in Europe.

In *Democracy and Socialism*, Zhang Dongsun renewed his call for increased production. He was hoping that the imminent rise to power of the Communists was not going to be simply a change of dynasty. In a postscript to the book, he wrote that the communist revolution must be tied to production and peaceful reconstruction, noting that all previous revolutions had failed to liberate the productive forces from traditional fetters. Where production was blocked, the popular demand for a better material life gave rise to revolution. Economic equality could not be achieved simply by even distribution of wealth. Nor did it mean a levelling down of the rich; rather, it meant a levelling up of the poor, which was possible only with economic growth. A 'faked revolution' sought power for power's sake. A 'real revolution' ushered in a new era of growth, unleashing individual as well as collective energies for productive purposes.¹⁰²

What sort of social system was best for China? Zhang Dongsun did not confront this question directly. Yet it is clear in *Democracy and Socialism* that he wanted China to be democratic and socialist without copying the Soviet model. He wanted more growth, more industrialization and greater improvement in agriculture through land reform and the use of advanced technology and through collective farming where appropriate. Above all, he advocated distributive justice within a framework of production that entailed planning.

By 1948, although the ultimate victory of the Communists was in sight, the consensus among the middle-of-the-road intellectuals remained that social democracy was the best hope for the future of China. Yin Haiguang,

¹⁰⁰ Zhang, *Minzhu zhuyi yu shehui zhuyi*, 26–7, 30–3.

¹⁰¹ Zhang Dongsun was also attracted to the socialism of some Eastern European countries, especially Czechoslovakia. See his article 'Guanyu Zhongguo chulu de kanfa' 关于中国出路看法, *Guancha* 3, 23 (January 1947): 3–4.

¹⁰² Zhang, *Minzhu zhuyi yu shehui zhuyi*, 82–4; also his article, 'Minzhu zhuyi yu shehui zhuyi buyi' 民主主义与社会主义补义, *Guancha* 5, 1 (August 1948): 7–9; continued in 2 (September 1948): 7–8 and in 3 (September 1948): 8–10.

then chief editor of the *Central News* (*Zhongyang ribao*), summed it up as follows:

In the search for a bright road for China's future, each person has reached his or her own conclusion in a different way. Generally speaking, however, the consensus is that China must go down the 'democratic socialist' road. For democratic socialism is the child born in wedlock between democracy and socialism, having the blood of democracy and the blood of socialism. It combines the best of both worlds to create an ideal society.¹⁰³

A Comparative Perspective

Reformism was the dominant feature of Chinese socialist thought as distinct from radical Marxism. The ideas of such thinkers as Liang Qichao, Zhang Junmai and Zhang Dongsun demonstrated the interrelatedness of conservative, liberal and socialist thought, which was marked by a belief in social and political reform and in the interventionist state. One notes a thread of consistency running through the reformist writings – an insistence on wealth creation prior to even distribution, and on capitalist development and taming it at the same time.

China's state socialists, or social democrats, were in the main middle-class intellectuals. However, unlike Britain's Fabian socialists, who were also middle-class intellectuals, they did not stand for the interests of any particular class. Instead, they exalted the nation above class and claimed to represent the interests of the entire population, even though they were not populists. Apparently, they were too elitist and too conservative socially, or simply ill equipped, to connect with the masses whose cause they were supposed to champion. Their objective was to reform the state, not to overthrow the existing regime. Mass mobilization and seizure of power were left by default to the CCP during and after the War of Resistance.

With the exception of Shi Fuliang, none of them had taken part in organizing the CCP before withdrawing from it and turning to attack it. On one hand, this distinguished them from the prewar Japanese social democrats, many of whom had first taken part in the formation of the Japanese Communist Party and then withdrawn from it.¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, they were in good company with some Japanese statist liberals, such as Nitobe Inazō (1862–1933) and Tsurumi Yūsuke (1885–1973),

¹⁰³ Yin Haiguang 殷海光, *Yin Haiguang xuanji* 殷海光选集, 2 vols. (Hong Kong: Youlian chubanshe, 1971), vol. I, 28.

¹⁰⁴ Totten, *The Socialist Democratic Movement in Prewar Japan*, 396.

who advocated welfare socialism.¹⁰⁵ Also, none of them had trade union involvement, revealing an unwillingness or inability to connect with the industrial workers. This again contrasts them with the prewar Japanese social democrats, whose movement consisted of organized labour backed by agrarian support and who appealed to the 'property-less' or proletarian class in the broadest sense of the term,¹⁰⁶ as well as with the socialists of Europe who had built on the foundation of established trade union movements with decades of experience.

It is also interesting to compare China's self-professed socialists with the socialists of colonial India. Both sought national freedom and fought poverty. Both believed in the role of the state, the efficacy of economic planning and socialism as a graduated project that met the needs of the country. Both held that the means to prosperity lay in hard work and in increased productivity. Finally, both rejected communism because of its violent methods, despite earlier interest in the Soviet experiment. Indian intellectuals, too, had a socialistic impulse. Those who were influenced by the Russian Revolution took an interest in Marxism-Leninism. Yet many refused to be communists, as exemplified by the noted social reform leader Jayaprakash Narayan (1902–79),¹⁰⁷ Ram Manohar Lohia (1910–67), a cofounder of the Congress Socialist Party, which opposed class war and rejected both Heglian and Marxian interpretations of history,¹⁰⁸ and above all Jawaharlal Nehru (1889–1964), the respected leader of the Indian National Congress.¹⁰⁹ Throughout his career, Nehru, who

¹⁰⁵ Nitobe Inazō viewed society as a moral and organic entity and assigned to the state a duty to maximize the public morals of society. Emphasizing the public good and individual services to society (*shakai hōshi*), Nitobe argued for more state intervention for welfare and social reforms. His follower Tsurumi Yusuke understood New Liberalism as a middle-of-the-road philosophy between conservatism and communism. See Akami, 'Nation, state, empire and war', 132–3.

¹⁰⁶ The prewar Japanese social democratic movement contained a phase of trade unionism, even though union support was relatively weak. Japanese social democrats employed organized mass action in the form of demonstrations, parades, rallies and petitions as well as the less organized action of support for political candidates at the polls. There were left-wing and right-wing elements from both working-class and middle-class backgrounds, with the leadership consisting of both workers and intellectuals. See Totten, *The Socialist Democratic Movement in Prewar Japan*, 383–5.

¹⁰⁷ Prakash Chandra, *Modern Indian Political Thought* (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1998), 106–16.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 100–5.

¹⁰⁹ In his presidential address to the Lucknow Congress (April 1936), Nehru expressed the view that there was no better way of ending the poverty and subjection of the people of India than socialism. See B. R. Nanda, *Jawaharlal Nehru: Rebel and Statesman* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995), 185–6.

became the first Indian prime minister after independence, maintained a belief in a mixed economy, unconvinced of the efficacy of a democracy based on a system of liberal capitalism.¹¹⁰ There the similarities end. The Indian socialists and China's self-styled socialists were different in their outlooks: One was largely Marxist (without being doctrinaire or communist) and the other non-Marxist. Perhaps even more importantly, one maintained some political power (tolerated by the British rulers) and the other none at all. Also, the two dealt with different internal problems in their own country.

In the final analysis, Chinese social democracy was at once a part of Chinese political thought and a segment of a European and even world phenomenon. It contained both peculiarly Chinese characteristics and aspects shared universally by social democratic thought and movements elsewhere. It had an intellectual marketplace in the Republican era, but it was, in a sense, ahead of its time, for social democracy required a nonviolent society, a democratic form of government and a process of social reform, none of which existed in China. The social democrats were never in power or partners in a coalition government, and a political route to socialism did not exist. Their difficult position had more to do with the dominant mainstream political culture and the harsh realities of the time than with the liberal or socialist creed itself. Without political and military muscle, their misfortune was being sandwiched between a repressive government and a communist revolution. The illusive middle path was but a myth. When the Communists came to power in 1949, Marxism and Mao Zedong thought ultimately triumphed over social democracy and all other schools of thought.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 188; N. G. Rajurkar and Shri Narhar Krundkar, *Jawaharlal Nehru: The Thinker and the Statesman* (Rohtak: Manthan Publications, 1985), 27–9.

Conclusion

This study has examined three interrelated strands of thought in the Republican era, each a response to the ‘crisis of modernization’, and together, they formed the intellectual foundations of Chinese modernity. The non-Marxist elite in this study were a kind of mainstream intellectuals who were critical of laissez-faire economics, liberal capitalism and extreme individualism, being reformist and not that leftist on the whole. Many held liberal, conservative and socialist ideas simultaneously or at different times, ideas that represented different visions of modernity and yet were formed within a framework of common concepts of the age. Common concerns about the national crisis drove them to grapple with the same or similar questions concerning Chinese culture, state and society. As they interacted, they influenced one another in the discourse on modernity. By taking an integrated approach to exploring liberal, conservative and socialist thought, this study has revised the way we see the intellectuals whose ideas are sometimes far too nuanced to fit neatly under a particular banner.

Modernity is multilayered, internally complex and entails a criticism of modernity itself. It is from this perspective that this study has, first of all, probed the thought of the Westernizers and their critics in terms of cultural radicalism and cultural conservatism. The Westernizers identified themselves with Enlightenment modernity, influenced as they were by evolutionary theory and ideas of progress. They saw the fundamental difference between the cultures of the East and the West as a difference in the stage of development – modernity served to distinguish the advanced West from the backward East – and they considered it necessary to destroy the old culture in its entirety so that China could progress to the next stage of development and into an open future. Paradoxically, they justified their iconoclasm by identifying with the liberal cause. But

the contradictions between the liberal principle of piecemeal change and the extremity of cultural iconoclasm were only too apparent. Hu Shi, in many ways still a traditionalist, did not fail to see that. In 1935, he felt compelled to differ from Chen Xujing to rationalize wholehearted Westernization in terms of abundant cosmopolitanization. Others rejected the idea of total Westernization but accepted modernization as an historical process and also acknowledged the internal dynamics of the indigenous culture and its capability for change. This study has argued that it is not necessary to see cultural radicalism as total iconoclasm, as is often thought. In fact, for the Westernizers, cultural radicalism was more a strategy than a conviction. The greatest obstacle to change was cultural and social inertia, not the entire gamut of Chinese traditions. Radical Westernization was a deeply flawed concept that proved unacceptable to many of those who were themselves looking to the West for inspiration. The decline of Westernized radicalism after 1935 demonstrated the untenable position of the iconoclasts as well as the strength of the conservative backlash that succeeded in rolling back until the late 1940s the radicalization of China described by Yü Ying-shih. This study has shed new light on the reverse process of cultural moderation, which has been previously overlooked by Chinese and Western scholars alike.

The conservatives were no obscurantists. Rather, they were like a modern Janus, with one face towards the West and the other towards China, being more pro-Chinese than anti-Western. Their counter-discourse was itself a part of modernity because its terms were thoroughly embedded in modern concepts and realities. Theirs was the modernity of counter-Enlightenment, of critical modernity, which owed much to the horrors of World War I and to intellectual developments in postwar Europe. They were in good company with Bergson, Eucken, Driesch, Russell and Babbitt. Where they differed from the Westernizers was with regard to the difference between Western and Chinese sensitivities, but this was equally a manifestation of the tensions and paradoxes within modernity itself and of the divisions in Western thought. In the conservative vision of modernity, there was a special place for core Chinese values in relation to the world civilization. Chinese elites were keen to participate in global modernity. Liang Qichao situated China in a global space when he spoke of rescuing the West from crass materialism and moral deficiencies. Liang Shuming framed Easternization as a global question on an equal footing with Westernization. The Critical Review Group combined New Humanism with national essence in universal terms. And the New Confucians extolled Confucianism as something of global significance and

universal validity. Paradoxically, through a critique of Westernized radicalism, cultural conservatism became more responsive to the challenges of modernity. It distinguished itself from traditionalism by its exposure to modern values and the concept of the global. It also accumulated sufficient strength to pull back the zealous Westernizers, forcing them to acknowledge the limitations of the East–West, old–new and tradition–modernity paradigms.

Modernity entails intercultural communication, or what Habermas has termed ‘communicative action’.¹ East and West, and the twain shall meet. In this meeting, the doctrine of mediation and harmony, *tiaohelun*, one of the dominant themes of conservative thought, appealed to the eclectic impulses of many educated Chinese. This study has portrayed the cultural conservatives in a more positive light than did previous scholarship as active participants in the discourse on modernity and thus has redefined the way we understand their relations with the Westernizers.

The conservatives did not defend the prevailing sociopolitical order as a whole, which made conservatism in China more cultural than political, as Benjamin Schwartz has long maintained. But this study has demonstrated that cultural conservatism was pregnant with politics, linked as it was to nationalism and modernity and with the world of political action. Opposition to one-party rule was strong, and the quest for constitutional government never faltered. Yet it was not rare to see some form of enlightened authoritarianism defended, even though democracy was recognized as an important value and a good form of government, as some members of the Critical Review Group demonstrated. Politicocultural nationalists, such as Liang Shuming and Zhang Junmai, were moral innovators who defended the indigenous culture with a modernizing outlook. Others, such as the wartime *Zhanguo* writers, harked back to antiquity to revive the martial spirit of the Warring States Period in order to deal with the problems of the present and to prepare China for the future in a new era of contending states. In treating politicocultural nationalism as a part of the search for modernity, this study has provided new insights into the culture–politics nexus.

A view of the state as a positive good was shared across the political spectrum. Indeed, statism was an important feature of modern Chinese political thought. Almost no intellectual, not even the most liberal of the liberals, favoured the minimal state, because such a state was unsuited

¹ Jürgen Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action*, trans. Thomas McCarthy (London: Heinemann, 1979).

to China's conditions in the absence of a liberal order and a strong bourgeoisie. On the contrary, a strong state – a government with wide powers and with a plan, a technocracy and an elite leadership – was sought as the antidote to China's political, economic and social ills. A strong state could hold the country together, develop the economy and resist foreign aggression.

Although there were different phases in the development of Chinese liberal thought, this study suggests that, taken as a whole, the Republican era represented a statist stage in this development. The reason why the liberals were neither libertarian nor believers in laissez-faire economics was not lack of a normative understanding of liberalism but because of the social and political realities from which they were not detached. To be sure, the Confucian heritage influenced Chinese liberal thought. But more important were the historical contingencies that led to the advocacy of national wealth and power and to an outlook that privileged the public good over self-interest and that expected individuals to contribute to the state and society. Whether they were 'genuinely' liberal has not been an issue to me. My interest has been in the way they understood liberalism and in their specific concerns. What emerges from my analysis is that they were at one with Western liberals in their espousal of individual liberties, personal autonomy and self-development, in their belief in constitutionalism and in their opposition to political violence and social revolution. But they were not opposed to self-restraint or to the exercise of state initiative to develop the economy and to regulate the market simultaneously. Liang Qichao asked his 'new citizen' to be of service to the state. It is not hard to understand his statist thought in the light of the national crisis. Even more significant is the fact that Hu Shi, Zhang Xiruo and others understood perfectly well that rights do not exist to enable citizens to contribute to the state alone (even though citizens may feel a duty to do so) but to protect their interests as well.² What they manifested was double consciousness – rights consciousness and responsibility consciousness. Hu's theory of social immortality was grounded in a notion of dual responsibilities – responsibility to oneself and to society. Freedom is both the right to choose and choosing the right. Chinese liberals imposed morality on themselves, and they sought orderly freedoms in a

² Compare this with the view of Andrew Nathan, who has long maintained that the Chinese state has always failed to protect citizens' rights because rights existed to enable the citizens to serve the state rather than to defend their self-interest. See Andrew J. Nathan, *Chinese Democracy: The Individual and the State in Twentieth Century China* (New York: Knopf, 1985).

free order. They would countenance the use of state power to deal with social and economic inequalities and to assist in the fuller development of the individual through social policies. They shared with statist liberals elsewhere a concern with the public good and social justice. Their new liberalism is not to be confused with the neoliberalism of the present day.

As well, they were careful to make a distinction between the strong state and autocratic rule – the strong state performs and at the same time respects rights and individual liberties, so it is a good state. Some believed that good men in politics would deliver good governance, and they sought an efficient and effective government run by technocrats and supported by a rule of law and an institutionalized system of checks and balances. In advocating enlightened elite rule, they were both traditional and modern, following the centuries-old Chinese tradition of paternalism on one hand and the animating project of Enlightenment on the other. In the context of the 1930s, some may also have had fascist tendencies with regard to action and efficiency.

The liberal vision of modernity revealed a major flaw in that it failed to give sufficient attention to the rural masses. There was no mass movement – not that the liberals were unconcerned with the well-being of the masses, but that their understanding of the rural population was only partial. They wanted them to be led rather than to be a part of the solution. Even so, the masses were neither led nor mobilized. Although the Rural Reconstructionists carried out an experiment of rural social reform, their efforts were limited in scope. Preoccupied with the agrarian economy, Liang Shuming failed to revitalize the countryside that he took to be the locus of Chinese modernity. Ultimately, it was the Communists who succeeded in mobilizing the masses. By the 1940s if not earlier, liberalism in China had been marginalized. Justifiably or not, the liberal vision of modernity lacked concrete solutions to the everyday problems facing the country folks.

Yet liberalism ‘failed’ in China not because it was misunderstood or because of the liberal creed itself. It failed because Chinese society was violent and convulsed by war and revolution, as Grieder has long maintained.³ It failed because of the dominant authoritarian culture, against which the liberals were impotent because they lacked political and military muscle. And it failed because the liberals were unable to tackle the rural problems. Whether the liberals were genuinely liberal

³Jerome B. Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution, 1917–1937* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 345.

was irrelevant, for even if they had maintained a strongest commitment to the worth of the individual, even if they had become the most rational people on earth and even if they had advocated laissez-faire economics and defended the citizens' rights against the state to the utmost, the fate of liberalism in the Republican era would not have made the slightest difference.

This leaves us with the question of whether Chinese liberal thought represented a local variant of liberalism. This is not a simple question. I have shown that traditional cultural resources and specific Chinese concerns alone did not distinguish Chinese liberal thought. More significant in its development was the confluence of Sino-Western sensibilities. Chinese liberal thought was a mix of New Liberalism, German Idealism, Deweyan pragmatism, Fabianism and Confucian philosophy. It was located somewhere between rights-based liberalism and community-based democracy. Its underlying principles were individuality, liberty, community and responsibility, not 'liberty, equality and fraternity'. And it was a hybrid, a Eurasian, which does not necessarily make it illiberal or suggest that liberal intellectuals distorted liberalism to suit their purposes. Liberalism was not essentialized in the liberal thought of the Republican period.

There can be no discourse of modernity outside the terrain of capitalism in that capitalism is at once a product of modernity and a target of critique. In the Republican era, the question of modernity entailed a critique of liberal capitalism – not that China had developed a capitalist economy, but that the intellectuals saw the need to develop capitalism and at the same time to avoid, ameliorate or remove the social injustices that capitalism would inevitably bring in its wake. The socialist appeal was fundamentally a moral one in that it was concerned with social justice. Philosophically, socialism was a revolt against the crass materialism of capitalist societies. The educated elite could relate to it in terms of the communitarian tradition and utopianism in ancient Chinese thought. The socialist influence was modern, though, emanating as it did from Europe, and the Chinese elite also felt the impact of the Russian Revolution. In its reformist fashion, socialism was distinct from the radical Marxism of the Communists.

State socialism as a current of thought and political movement highlighted, once again, the role of the state not only in developing the economy and regulating the market but also and especially in state building. The minor State Socialist Party had a programme with an emphasis on planning, on distributive and social justice and on an

efficient, powerful government that nonetheless respected citizens' rights and individual liberties. There were external influences: State planning in one form or another was very much in vogue in Europe and among development economists in the 1940s and the following decade.⁴ State socialism in China was a stage in the evolution of social democracy. In the immediate post-1945 period, the renewed interest in new liberalism, the search for the elusive middle path and the debate on the liberty–equality nexus all reflected the state of Chinese politics as well as the international context in which Chinese socialist thought developed.

Liberty and equality were a dominant theme in the quest for modernity. Regardless of whether it was possible to have both 'economic democracy' and 'political democracy' simultaneously, and whether one should be privileged over the other, the issue was the livelihood and security of the population, or freedom from want and fear. Political freedom and economic freedom were not separate categories. Zhang Dongsun made a major contribution to the liberty–equality discourse by adding a third factor to the equation – increased production. His view that increased production ensured progress, that people should be rewarded for their productivity, that there was no economic inequality, only injustice, and that liberty and equality were relative has contemporary resonance.

Liberal, conservative and socialist thought ultimately lost to Marxism in the intellectual and political marketplaces. Why? Put differently, why did Marxism ultimately triumph in the late 1940s? Several reasons may be suggested. One is the political and social environment. The contest between Marxism (in its various forms) and non-Marxist thought was becoming more acute as the political struggle developed, and the choices became starker and starker in the 1940s. The middle path was an ineffective response to the exigencies of the context in which a wholesale movement of society was called for. Intellectuals faced the dilemma in stark terms – to call for reform or to join what seemed to many the real struggle. Another reason is the intellectual and philosophical persuasiveness of Marxist ideology and philosophy. Leftist intellectuals were persuaded by the logic and conceptual precision of Marxism and dialectical materialism at a cerebral level, even though they loathed its politics. Third, the international context of Marxism gave CCP intellectuals a very powerful edge in their controversies with other intellectuals. They

⁴ There were exceptions, such as Albert O. Hirschman and P. T. Bauer. For a retrospective study of development economics by the founders, see *Pioneers in Development*, eds. Gerald M. Meier and Dudley Seers (New York: Oxford University Press, published for the World Bank, 1984).

seemed to stand for a powerful historic force, with a well-articulated ideology that claimed a universalistic modernizing message derived from Europe and the supposedly successful experiment in the Soviet Union. Marxism as an ideology of modernization was the wave of the future. To many Chinese intellectuals suspicious of traditional ideas, the thought that Marxism was not Chinese in its essence was a powerful attraction.⁵

The century-old quest for modernity has not come to an end in a Lyotardian sense – it is ongoing in China. In some ways, though, present-day China is already facing some of what Anthony Giddens has called ‘the consequences of modernity [that] are becoming more radicalised and universalized than before’.⁶ In this respect, it is of great historical significance that nearly all the themes that have been developed in this study – Westernized radicalism, cultural conservatism, the modernity of counter-modernity, mediation and harmony, critique of capitalism, reformism, social justice, economic equality and social democracy – recurred in contemporary China, especially in the 1980s and 1990s. To be sure, the contemporary discourse on modernity takes different forms and varying emphases in more complex political, economic and social circumstances, and the contents of each recurring theme differ. But their resurfacing shows a certain degree of historical continuity, which helps us to better understand the specific concerns of intellectuals in their quest for modernity past and present.

The most significant change in the post-Mao period was the revival of reformism in the socialist discourse. Reform, not revolution, was the hallmark of the Dengist era. Deng Xiaoping (1904–97), the paramount leader after Mao, insisted that so long as China remained underdeveloped, there could be no wealth to distribute, and socialism meant little to the people. Development was imperative. In fact, one of the reasons why Deng embarked on a major economic reform programme was the need to improve the lot of a billion impoverished Chinese, hitherto not helped by Beijing’s traditional central planning system, and to solve

⁵ I owe a debt to Nick Knight for sharing his thoughts with me in an e-mail dated 17 February 2009. His original work shows areas of continuity in Marxism – from European to Soviet to Chinese Marxism. This is in the face of dominant views that highlight discontinuity and the rather esoteric and unique character of Chinese Marxism. See Nick Knight, *Marxist Philosophy in China: From Qu Qiubai to Mao Zedong, 1923–1945* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2005).

⁶ Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990), 1.

the problem of rural unemployment, which the Ten-Year Plan (1976–85) had neglected. Deng recognized the dynamics of ‘Asian capitalism’, particularly the ‘little Chinese’ economies of Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore.⁷ His notion of ‘socialism with Chinese characteristics’ was grounded in an assumption that lack of wealth, not uneven distribution, was the cause of China’s grinding poverty. Accordingly, Beijing’s ideologues spoke of China as being at the primary stage of socialism, which justified capitalist development. The Dengist doctrine that a few need to become rich first and that the trickle-down effect will eventually benefit everyone is reminiscent of Zhang Dongsun’s view on increased production and his idea that equality does not mean a levelling down of the rich but a levelling up of the poor and that exploitation is justifiable provided that it is kept within reasonable bounds.

In the changing political and intellectual climate of the 1980s and 1990s, liberalism, conservatism and radicalism revived as a triad of contemporary Chinese thought that contended and influenced one another. As the economic reforms were implemented and the country was opening up to the outside world, a New Enlightenment movement unfolded in the 1980s, seen by many as a logical continuation of the May Fourth Movement, even though it sought modernity within a Marxist ideological framework. Those who were involved in it, often referred to as neorationalists, assumed that modern science, human reason and rationality were integral parts of modernity, and they invoked Marx’s humanistic critique to tackle the problem of alienation in a socialist society. Some used concepts and methods of modern science and social science to analyse the patterns of the Chinese past. The New Enlightenment Movement, like the May Fourth Movement before it, contained internal tensions, at once rational and irrational.⁸

One of the neorationalists, the prominent philosopher Li Zehou, in a clear echo of Liang Shuming, Zhang Junmai and others of a conservative persuasion, called for a creative transformation of Confucianism, linking exploration of traditional thought to an intellectual and philosophical reconstruction of Chinese modernity. Rather than seek to transcend the *ti-yong* dichotomy, as He Lin and Feng Youlan had done, Li developed the controversial concept *xiti zhongyong* (Western essence,

⁷ Barry Naughton, *Growing Out of the Plan: Chinese Economic Reform, 1978–1993* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 61, 63, 77.

⁸ Xu Jilin 许纪霖, ‘Zonglun’ in Xu Jilin 许纪霖 and Luo Gang 罗岗 et al., *Qimeng de ziwo wanjie: 1990 niandai yilai Zhongguo sixiang wenhua jie zhongda lunzheng yanjiu* 启蒙的自我瓦解: 1990年以来中国思想文化界重大论争研究 (Changchun: Jilin chubanshituan, 2007), 16.

Chinese application).⁹ There was a revival of Confucian values to fill the vacuum left by the bankruptcy of Marxism-Leninism. New Confucianism has since been promoted by the authorities on the mainland as a field of research with political implications.

The neoconservatives of the 1980s wrestled with the problems arising from the interactions between a China that had been a closed society for three decades under Mao's rule and the West to which it was opening up. Like their Republican predecessors, they searched for a Chinese path to modernization, albeit in a different sociohistorical context. Also, just as the conservatives of the earlier era had subscribed to a doctrine of mediation and harmony, so they adopted a position of compromise between radical liberalism and extreme conservatism to achieve a synthesis of Western modernism and Chinese tradition, both regarded as useful cultural resources that could be utilized to assist in China's modernization.¹⁰

There also emerged new groups of political radicals and cultural iconoclasts who were disillusioned with the existing sociopolitical system. Many of the political radicals operated within a conceptual framework of the Enlightenment tradition, using such key concepts as liberty, democracy, rationality, scientific truth and modernization. In the late 1980s, the literary figure Liu Xiaobo echoed the May Fourth radicals: 'We should completely bury Confucianism, and Chinese people today should examine traditional culture with a new modern eye [perspective] and establish a modern Chinese culture on the ruins of Confucianism.'¹¹ Just as Chen Xujing had made an impassioned plea for total Westernization, so the authors and interpreters of the 1988 Chinese Central Television documentary *River Elegy* called for the abandonment of Confucianism and traditional culture, with which the Maoist-Stalinist political and economic orthodoxy was equated, and for a new orientation towards the ocean, commerce and the outside world instead of the traditional inland, earth-bound worldview. The only difference is that Chen Xujing had spoken as an independent scholar, whereas his epigones were unabashedly linked to the then reformist Premier Zhao Ziyang (1919–2005).

The 'culture craze' of the 1980s gave way to the rise of yet another form of neoconservatism in the 1990s. One aspect of this neoconservatism was cultural, marked by the flourishing of 'national studies' (*guoxue*). New national studies, or *xingguoxue*, adopted a pluralistic approach to

⁹ Min Lin with Maria Galikowski, *The Search for Modernity: Chinese Intellectuals and Cultural Discourse in the Post-Mao Era* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), 57.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 24–5.

¹¹ Quoted in *ibid.*, 21.

East–West learning and were not strongly supportive of the CCP leadership. There was a revived interest in such reformers as Yan Fu and Liang Qichao, in the Critical Review Group (especially in Wu Mi and Chen Yinke) and in New Confucianism of the pre-1949 period. *Xinguo* scholars reappraised, as I did in Chapter 2, the cultural conservatives of the Republican era in the discourse on Chinese modernity, emphasizing their predominantly modern outlook as cultural pluralists.¹²

Another aspect of this neoconservatism was profoundly political, marked by the advocacy of a strong central government as the agent of reform, thus legitimizing Beijing's ruling elite, and by a strong nationalistic mood that sometimes bordered on xenophobia in the popular press.¹³ The neoconservatives and nationalists advocated a recentralization of political authority and a revival of the national spirit. They favoured a neoauthoritarian regime like the government of Singapore to control economic reform, to maintain social and political stability and to oversee a gradual approach to social transformation. A subgroup of 'soft' neoconservatives, on the other hand, supported the reformist leaders, called for more market-oriented reforms and demanded a more open, liberal and democratic society.¹⁴ In any case, statism in one form or another remains a feature of Chinese political thought.

There has also been a 'rebirth' of liberalism since the late 1990s. Unlike their Republican predecessors, contemporary liberals in the main are classical liberals (labelled neoliberals by their critics) who stress economic liberalism, assert individual and political rights against the state and call for the rule of law and the establishment of an institutionalized system of checks and balances.¹⁵ They discuss constitutionalism, individual liberty, the need to supervise the state and so forth, seeing all of these issues as part of a mutually supportive whole. In this sense, contemporary liberals have moved beyond the statist concerns of Republican liberals and are closer to Western classical liberalism than were their predecessors. They are not insensitive to social injustice, but they have a different view of the sources of the social and economic inequalities – they call for more

¹² Axel Schneider, 'Bridging the gap: attempts at constructing a "new" historical-cultural identity in the People's Republic of China', *East Asian History* 22 (December 2001): 129–44.

¹³ See, for example, Joseph Fewsmith, 'Neoconservatism and the end of the Dengist era', *Asian Survey* 35, 7 (July 1995): 625–51.

¹⁴ Lin with Galikowski, *The Search for Modernity*, 24–5.

¹⁵ Merle Goldman, *From Comrade to Citizen: The Struggle for Political Rights in China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 133–7.

development, not less. At the same time that they seek a great role for the market, their focus is on reforming the existing political system.

It is the so-called New Left that places social justice at the centre of the modernity discourse. A disparate group of leftist intellectuals distinct from the neo-Maoist old left, the New Left tackles the question of how to deal with the serious social dislocations and polarization, economic inequalities, rampant corruption (especially the collusion between state officials and greedy private entrepreneurs) and what has been called 'spiritual degeneration' (*jingshen duoluo*) that accompanies China's economic reforms and opening up to the world.¹⁶ Question and critique have become the major characteristic of contemporary Chinese thought. Wang Hui's 1997 article 'Contemporary Chinese thought and the question of modernity', mentioned at the very beginning of this book, made clear that Chinese modernity was (and still is) about tackling those problems as well as the issues arising from global capitalism. The New Left is not alone. The neo-Marxist (or postmodernist) group, too, focuses on similar issues and problematizes such Enlightenment values as liberty, science and reason.

A last theme that has resurfaced is that of social democracy. This results from the idea of reforming socialism in the Dengist era. Some intellectuals, including members of government think tanks, have reevaluated the theory and practice of social democracy in Eastern Europe and studied the achievements and new development of social democracy in the West. Even some party leaders have flirted with the idea of social democracy.¹⁷ No one would suggest that the CCP would become a social democratic party in the near future. What is worth noting, though, is that there have been echoes of the new liberalism, or liberal socialism, of the 1940s. Political democracy and economic democracy remain a goal for the people of China to fight for. A form of social democracy suited to contemporary times is regarded by some intellectuals as a possibility,¹⁸ just as Giddens thinks it conceivable to renew social democracy in the West as the New Third Way.¹⁹

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 118–27.

¹⁷ Feng Chongyi, 'The return of liberalism and social democracy in contemporary China', *Issues & Studies* 39, 3 (September 2003): 16–25.

¹⁸ See, for example, Zhang Rulun 张汝伦, 'Disantiao daolu', 第三条道路, in *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, ed. Li Shitao 李世涛 (Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002), 334–43.

¹⁹ Anthony Giddens, *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999).

What causes the similarities in the discourse of the Republican era and that of the reformist decades in the contemporary period is that the questions and themes that informed the earlier debates still engage Chinese intellectuals today, especially those about culture and politics, about China's future as a member of the international community and about its rightful place in the world. The recurring themes resonate with contemporary visions of modernity and with China's current conditions. Again, divergent views and rival ideas vie for preeminence, but the discourse still takes place within a framework of common concepts of the age. To understand Chinese modernity intellectually is to understand how different schools of thought contend, interact and influence one another.

Finally, it should be clear that Chinese intellectuals have exhibited a kind of critical reflection that is an integral part of modernity. Reflecting on modernity has been as important as the search for it – the two are linked. A critical approach to modernity requires not a repudiation of Enlightenment modernism but a critical response that is as sensitive to its universalism as to its limitations. To reflect on modernity is to justify assumptions of its very progress and superiority over the past, to confront the crisis of modernization, to explicate the complex relationship between modern values and the modern society and, especially in China's case, to provide the epistemological resources for a broad democracy, a healthy individualism and a just society.

Glossary

B

baihua 白话

baishi bu ruren 百事不如人

bang 邦

bangguo zhuyi 邦国主义

ben 本

boai 博爱

buhuanpin er huanbujun 不患贫而患不均

bunmei kaika 文明開化 (Japanese)

C

Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培

caifa 财阀

Cao Kun 曹锟

Chang Yansheng 常燕生

Chen Duxiu 陈独秀

Chen Gaoyong 陈高佣

Chen Gongbo 陈公博

Chen Jiongming 陈炯明

Chen Jitang 陈济棠

Chen Lifu 陈立夫

Chen Mingshu 陈明枢

Chen Qitian 陈启天

Chen Quan 陈铨

Chen Xujing 陈序经

Chen Yinke 陈寅恪

Cheng Chung-ying (Cheng Zhongying) 成中英

chengqi 成器

Chiang Kai-shek 蒋介石

chihua 赤化

chongfen shijiehua 充分世界化

choudi 仇敌

chuangxin guben 创新固本

chuantong wenhua 传统文化

cong genbenchu xihua 从根本处西化

D

dafushi 大夫士

danwei dingminglun 单位定命论

dao 道

daoli 道理

daotong 道统

dashidai 大时代

datong 大同

Deng Xiaoping 邓小平

Ding Wenjiang 丁文江

disan shili 第三势力

dong 动

dongfanghua 东方化

Du Yaquan 杜亚泉

Duan Qirui 段祺瑞

F

fa 法

fa 法律

Fan Zhongyun 樊仲云

fanben kaixin 反本开新

fangren 放任

fanshen 翻身

fansi 反思

fanxiandaixing de xiandai lilun 反现代性的现代理论

fanxiandaixing de xiandaixing 反现代性的现代性

fanxing 反省

fashizumu (Japanese) ファシズム

fazhi 法治

Fei Xiaotong 费孝通

Feng Enrong 冯恩荣

Feng Guifen 冯桂芬

Feng Youlan 冯友兰
 Feng Yuxiang 冯玉祥
fenhua 分化
 Fu Sinian 傅斯年
 Fu Zuoyi 傅作义
 Fukuda Tokuzō 福田德三 (Japanese)
 Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉 (Japanese)

G

Gaizao 改造
Gaizupai 改组派
gang 纲
ganxing 感性
 Gao Yihan 高一涵
geren zhuyi 个人主义
geren ziyou zhuyi 个人自由主义
gong 公
 Gong Xiangrui 龚祥瑞
gongfei 公非
gonggongxing 公共性
gongshi 公是
gongxin 公心
 Gu Hongming 辜鸿铭
 Gu Weijun (Wellington Koo) 顾维钧
guanliao zhiben zhuyi 官僚资本主义
guo 国
guocui 国粹
guojia daode 国家道德
guojia shehui zhuyi 国家社会主义
guominxing 国民性
Guoshi dagang 国史大纲
guoxue 国学
guyou wenhua 固有文化
guyou wenming 固有文明

H

Han Fei 韩非
 Hang Liwu 杭立武
haomen ziben 豪门资本
haotong wuyi 好同恶异

He Bingsong 何炳松
 He Jian 何健
 He Lin 贺麟
 He Yongji 何永佶
Heshang 河觴
 Hu Shi 胡适
 Hu Xiansu 胡先肃
 Huang Fu 黄郛
 Huang Jie 黄节
 Huang Wenshan 黄文山
 Huang Yanpei 黄炎培
 Huang Zongxi 黄宗羲

J

jian'ai 兼爱
 Jiang Baili 蒋百里
 Jiang Menglin (Chiang Menlin) 蒋梦麟
Jianguo fanglue 建国方略
jianliang 兼两
Jiayin zazhi 甲寅杂志
Jiefang yu gaizao 解放与改造
jiexu zhuyi 接续主义
jihua zhengfu 计划政府
Jinbudang 进步党
jing-dong 静—动
jingshen duoluo 精神堕落
jingtian 井田
jiti daode 集体道德
jiuguo 救国
jiyu 自由 (Japanese)
jizai 自在 (Japanese)
juewu 觉悟
jundengyuzhou, mindengyushui, minkezaijun, yikefujun 君等於舟, 民等於水;
 民可载君, 亦可覆君

K

Kang Youwei 康有为
kaoju 考据
 Katō Hiroyuki 加藤弘之 (Japanese)
kojin shugi 個人主義 (Japanese)

kokka shakai shugi (Japanese) 国家社会主义

kokken 国権 (Japanese)

kokusui (Japanese) 国粹

kokutai 国体 (Japanese)

Kuokumin no tomo 国民之友 (Japanese)

L

Lan Gongwu 蓝公武

Laozi 老子

Lei Haizong 雷海宗

Li Dazhao 李大钊

Li Hongzhang 李鸿章

Li Jishen 李济深

Li Si 李斯

Li Yuanhong 黎元洪

Li Zehou 李泽厚

Li Zongren 李宗仁

Liang Ji 梁济

Liang Qichao 梁启超

Liang Shiqiu 梁实秋

Liang Shiyi 梁士怡

Liang Shuming 梁漱溟

liangqixing 两歧性

lianhe zhengfu 联合政府

lijiao 礼教

Lin Sen 林森

Lin Tongji 林同济

Lin Yüsheng 林毓生

Lin Yutang 林语堂

Lin Zexu 林则徐

Liu Boming 刘伯明

Liu Junning 刘军宁

Liu Shiwei 刘师培

Liu Shu-hsien (Liu Shuxian) 刘述先

Liu Xiaobo 刘 晓波

Liu Yizheng 柳诒徵

lixiang 理想

lixing 理性

Liyun 礼运

Lou Bangyan 楼邦彦

Lu Rongting 陆荣廷

Lu Xun 鲁迅

Luo Jialun 罗家伦

Luo Longji 罗隆基

Luo Wengan 罗文干

Luo Zhenyu 罗振玉

M

Ma Yifu 马一浮

maiban ziben 买办资本

Mao Zedong 毛泽东

Mei Guangdi 梅光迪

meijiewu 媒介物

min 民

Minbao 民报

minben 民本

Minguo ribao 民国日报

minken 民権 (Japanese)

minquan 民权

minsheng zhuyi 民生主义

minweigui, sheji cizhi, junweiqing 民为贵, 社稷次之, 君为轻

minzhu zhuyi 民主主义

minzu huoli 民族活力

minzu jingji 民族经济

minzu yili 民族意力

minzu zhi shengshuai 民族之盛衰

minzu zhuyi 民族主义

minzu ziben zhuyi 民族资本主义

minzu zichan jieji 民族资产阶级

Mou Zongsan 牟宗三

Mozi 墨子

mu 亩

N

Nakamura Masanao 中村正直 (Japanese)

neisheng waiwang 内圣外王

neng 能

Nitobe Inazō 新渡戸稻造 (Japanese)

nonglao zhuyi 农劳主义

Nuli zhoubao 努力周报

Nulige 努力歌

P

Pan Guangdan 潘光旦

Pingshe 平社

pingtianxia 平天下

pipan 批判

pubianxing 普遍性

putian zhi xia, mofei wangtu, shuaitu zhi bin, mofei wangchen 普天之下，莫非王土；率土之滨，莫非王臣

Q

Qian Changzhao 钱昌照

Qian Duansheng 钱端升

Qian Mu 钱穆

Qian Xuanton 钱玄同

Qin Shihuang 秦始皇

qijia 齐家

qingdiao 情调

qipai 气派

Qu Qiubai 瞿秋白

quan 权

quanpan jieshou xifang wenhua 全盘接受西方文化

quanpan xihua 全盘西化

qufahushang, jindeqizhong 取法乎上，仅得其中

Qunji quanjielun 群己权界论

R

ren 仁

renai 仁爱

rencun zhengju, renwang zhengfei 人存政举，人亡政废

renqing 人情

renzhi 人治

S

Sa Mengwu 萨孟武

sangang 三纲

sanhai 三害

sanmin zhuyi 三民主义

Satzuma Shōzan 佐久間象山 (Japanese)

- shakai* 社会 (Japanese)
shakai hōshi 社会奉仕 (Japanese)
 Shang Yang 商鞅
 Shao Lizi 邵力子
shehui 社会
shehui buxiulun 社会不朽论
shehui zhuyi de minzhu zhuyi 社会主义的民主主义
 Shenbao 申报
shenghuo tixi 生活体系
 Shi Fuliang (Cuntong) 施复亮(存统)
shidafu 士大夫
shidai 时代
shijie wenti 世界问题
shijie zhuyi 世界主义
shiluo 失落
shiyān zhuyi 实验主义
 Shuowen 说文
si 私
 Song Ziwen 宋子文
SuE pinglun 苏俄评论
 Sun Chuanfang 孙传芳
 Sun Hanbing 孙寒冰
 Sun Yat-sen 孙逸仙
suweiai 苏维埃

T

- taidu de tongyixing* 态度的统一性
 Tan Sitong 谭嗣同
 Tan Yankai 谭延闿
 Tang Erhe 汤尔和
 Tang Junyi 唐君毅
 Tang Shaoyi 唐绍仪
 Tang Yongtong 汤用彤
 Tao Menghe 陶孟和
 Tao Xingzhi 陶行知
 Tao Xisheng 陶希圣
tianli 天理
tianming 天命
tianren heyi 天人合一
tianshi ziwo minshi, tianting ziwo minting 天视自我民视, 天听自我民听

tianxia 天下

tianxia weigong 天下为公

tianzhi 天职

tiaohelun 调和论

ti-yong 体-用

Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰 (Japanese)

tongyi jihua 统一经济

Tōyō dōtoku sei'yō gijutsu 東洋道徳西洋技術 (Japanese)

Tsurumi Yusuke 鶴見祐輔 (Japanese)

Tu Wei-ming (Du Weiming) 杜威明

W

Wang Boqiu 王伯求

Wang Chonghui 王宠惠

Wang Guowei 王国维

Wang Hui 汪晖

Wang Jingwei 汪精卫

Wang Mang 王莽

Wang Tao 王韬

Wang Xinming 王新命

Wang Zaoshi 王造时

Wang Zheng 王徵

Wang Zhengting 王正廷

wangdao 王道

wangtian 王田

wanneng zhengfu 万能政府

Wei Yuan 魏源

weisheng 卫生

Weishenglun 唯生论

weiwu zhuyi 唯我主义

wen 文

Weng Wenhao 翁文灏

wenhua shang de ziyou zhuyi 文化上的自由主义

wenhua zhezong 文化折衷

wenhuare 文化热

Wenxiang 文祥

wu 武

Wu Enyu 吴恩裕

Wu Jingchao 吴景超

Wu Mi 吴宓

Wu Peifu 吴佩孚
 Wu Xianzi 伍宪子
 Wu Yue 吴越
 Wu Yugan 武埭干
 Wu Zhihui 吴稚晖
wubing de wenhua 无兵的文化
wugui 五鬼
wujie 误解
wulun 五伦
wuwie 无为

X

xiandaihua 现代化
xiangyue 乡约
 Xiao Gongquan 萧公权
xiaowo 小我
xiaowo—dawo 小我—大我
xihua sichao 西化思潮
xin ziben zhuyi 新资本主义
Xinguoxue 新国学
xingzheng gangyao 行政纲要
xinmin 新民
Xinminshuo 新民说
Xinshilun 新事论
Xinxinxue 新心学
 Xiong Shili 熊十力
xiti zhongyong 西体中用
xiushen 修身
 Xu Baohuang 徐宝璜
 Xu Fuguan 徐复观
 Xu Shichang 徐世昌
 Xu Xinliu 徐新六
 Xu Zhimo 徐志摩
xue wu Zhongxi 学无中西
Xuedeng 学灯
 Xunzi 荀子

Y

Yan Fu 严复
 Yan Xishan 阎锡山

Yan Yangchu 晏阳初
 Yanjiuxi 研究系
 yidian yidi 一点一滴
 Yin Haiguang 殷海光
 yin—yang 阴—阳
 yiqie de xifang baxi 一切的西方把戏
 yiyi zhiyi 以夷制夷
 yiyu 意欲
 yonghengxing 永恒性
 yong quanli 用全力
 youxian de kenengshuo 有限的可能说
 Yu Rizhang 余日章
 Yun Daiying 恽代英
 Yusuke Tsurumi 鹤见祐辅 (Japanese)

Z

zaibatsu (Japanese) 财阀
 Zaisheng 再生
 zaizao wenming 再造文明
 Zeng Guofan 曾国藩
 Zhang Binglin 章炳麟
 Zhang Dongsun 张东荪
 Zhang Foquan 张佛泉
 Zhang Jiaao 张嘉璈
 Zhang Jian 张謇
 Zhang Junmai 张君勱
 Zhang Shenfu 张申府
 Zhang Shizhao 章士钊
 Zhang Weici 张慰慈
 Zhang Xiruo 张熙若
 Zhang Xun 张勋
 Zhang Yi 章益
 Zhang Zhidong 张之洞
 Zhang Zuolin 张作霖
 Zhanguoce 战国策
 Zhao Ziyang 赵紫阳
 zhengjiao heyi 政教合一
 zhengli guogu 整理国故
 zhengyou 诤友
 zhengzhi shang de ziyou zhuyi 政治的自由主义

zhidu 制度

zhiguo 治国

zhinan xingyi 知难行易

Zhongguo Guojia Shehuidang 中国国家社会党

Zhongguo Minzhu Shehuidang 中国民主社会党

Zhongguo Minzhu Tongmeng 中国民主同盟

Zhongguo Qingniandang 中国青年党

Zhongguohua 中国化

zhongjian luxian 中间路线

Zhongxue weiti, xixue weiyong 中学为体, 西学为用

Zhongyang ribao 中央日报

Zhongyong 中庸

Zhou Zuoren 周作人

Zhu Jingnong 朱经农

zijue 自觉

ziming qinggao 自鸣清高

ziyou 自由

ziyou sixiang, duli jingshen 自由思想, 独立精神

ziyou zhuyi 自由主义

zizai 自在

Zou Taofen 邹韬奋

Zou Wenhai 邹文海

Zuo Zongtang 左宗棠

zuofeng 作风

zuoren 做人

Selected Bibliography

- Ai Kai 文恺 [Guy S. Alitto]. *Wenhua shoucheng zhuyi lun: fanxiandaihua sichao de pouxi* 文化守成主义论：反现代化思潮的剖析. Taipei: Shibao wenhua, 1986; republished unchanged in a PRC edition under a new title, *Shijie fanweinei de fanxiandaihua sichao: lun wenhua shoucheng zhuyi* 世界范围内的反现代化思潮：论文化守成主义. Guiyang: Guizhou renmin chubanshe, 1991.
- Akami Tomoko. 'Nation, state, empire and war: problems of liberalism in modern Japanese history and beyond'. *Japanese Studies* 25, 2 (2005): 119–40.
- Alitto, Guy S. *The Last Confucian: Liang Shu-ming and the Chinese Dilemma of Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- 'Zhongguo wenhua xingcheng de yaosu ji qi tezheng' 中国文化形成的要素及其特征. In *Guo Tingyi xiansheng jiu zhi danchen jinian lunwenji* 郭廷以先生九秩诞辰纪念论文集, 2 vols., edited by Chen Sanjing 陈三井, vol II, 249–71. Nangang: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1995.
- Anderson, Benedict R. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Apter, David E. *The Politics of Modernization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Bai Ji'an 白吉庵. *Zhang Shizhao zhuan* 章士钊传. Beijing: Zuojia chubanshe, 2004.
- Baudelaire, Charles-Pierre. *Art in Paris, 1845–1862: Salons and Other Exhibitions*. Translated and edited by Jonathan Mayne. London: Phaidon, 1965.
- Beard, Charles A., ed. *Whither Mankind: A Panorama of Modern Civilization*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1928.
- Bell, Daniel. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
- Bell, Daniel A. *Beyond Liberal Democracy: Political Thinking for an East Asian Context*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Bell, Daniel A., and Hahm Chaibong, eds. *Confucianism for the Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Bergère, Marie-Claire. *Sun Yat-sen*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Bernal, Martin. *Chinese Socialism to 1907*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1976.

- Bernstein, Eduard. *Evolutionary Socialism: A Criticism and Affirmation*. Introduction by Sidney Hook. New York: Schocken Books, 1961.
- Bloom, Irene. 'The moral autonomy of the individual in Confucian tradition'. In *Realms of Freedom in Modern China*, edited by William C. Kirby, 19-43. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Bodenhorn, Terry. 'Chen Lifu's *Vitalism*: A Guomindang vision of modernity circa 1934'. In *Defining Modernity: Guomindang Rhetorics of a New China, 1920-1970*, edited by Terry Bodenhorn, 91-122. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002.
- Cai Shangsi 蔡尚思, ed. *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian* 中国现代思想史资料简编. 5 vols. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1982.
- Cao Lixin 曹立新. 'Zouxiang zhengzhi jie jue de xiangcun jianshe yundong' 走向政治解决的乡村建设运动. *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 91 (October 2005): 78-88.
- Carter, Hugh. *The Social Theories of L. T. Hobhouse*. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1927.
- Carter, James R. *Creating a Chinese Harbin: Nationalism in an International City, 1916-1932*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Chandra, Prakash. *Modern Indian Political Thought*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1998.
- Chang Hao. *Chinese Intellectuals in Crisis: Search for Order and Meaning (1890-1911)*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and *Intellectual Transition in China, 1890-1907*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- 'New Confucianism and the intellectual crisis of contemporary China'. In *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, edited by Charlotte Furth, 276-83. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Chang, Maria Hsia. "'Fascism" and modern China'. *China Quarterly* 79 (September 1979): 553-67.
- Chang Yansheng 常燕生. 'Dongxi wenhua wenti zhi Hu Shizhi xiansheng' 东西文化问题胡适之先生. *Xiandai pinglun* 现代评论 4, 90 and 91 (1926): 16-18 and 17-19.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?* London: Zed Books for the United Nations University, 1986.
- The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Chen Duxiu 陈独秀. *Duxiu wencun* 独秀文存, reprint. Hefei: Anhui renmin chubanshe, 1987; first published in 1934.
- 'Fu Dongsun xiansheng de xin' 复东荪先生的信. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 8, 4 (December 1920): 17-24.
- Chen, Joseph T. *The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: The Makings of a Social Movement in Modern China*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- Chen, Leslie H. Dingyan. *Chen Jiongming and the Federalist Movement: Regional Leadership and Nation Building in Early Republican China*. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1999.
- Chen Quan 陈铨. 'Deguo minzu de xingge he sixiang' 德国民族的性格和思想. *Zhanguo ce* 战国家策 6 (June 1940): 26-32.

- 'Fushide jingshen' 浮士德的精神. In *Shidai zhi bo: Zhanguocephai wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 时代之波: 战国策派文化论著辑要, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 359-67. Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995.
- 'Lun yingxiong chongbai' 论英雄崇拜. *Zhanguoce* 战国策 4 (May 1940): 1-10.
- 'Minzu wenxue yundong' 民族文学运动. In *Shidai zhi bo: Zhanguocephai wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 时代之波: 战国策派文化论著辑要, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 368-79. Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995.
- 'Shengshi wenxue yu moshi wenxue' 盛世文学与末世文学. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 411-16.
- 'Wusi yundong yu kuangbiao yundong' 五四运动与狂飙运动. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 349-58.
- Ch'en, Jerome. *China and the West: Society and Culture, 1815-1937*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.
- Chen Xujing 陈序经. *Chen Xujing ji* 陈序经文集. Edited by Yu Dingbang 余定邦 and Niu Junkai 牛军凯. Guangzhou: Zhongshan daxue chubanshe, 2004.
- Dongxi wenhuaguan* 东西文化观, reprint. Beijing: Zhongguo renmindaxue chubanshe, 2004; first published in 1933.
- Zhongguo wenhua de chulu* 中国文化的出路, reprint. Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2004; first published in 1934.
- 'Ping Zhang Dongxun xiansheng de Zhongxi wenhuaguan' 评张东荪先生的中西文化观, in *Quanpan xihua yanlun xuji* 全盘西化言论续集文化观, edited by Feng Enrong 冯恩荣, 116-17. Guangzhou: Lingnan daxue, 1935.
- 'Quanpan xihua de bianhu' 全盘西化的辩护. *Duli pinglun* 独立评论 160 (July 1935): 10-15.
- Chesneaux, Jean. 'The federalist movement in China, 1920-23'. In *Modern China's Search for a Political Form*, edited by Jack Gray, 96-137. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Chi Wen-shun. *Ideological Conflicts in Modern China: Democracy and Authoritarianism*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1986.
- Chiang Yung-chen. *Social Engineering and the Social Sciences in China, 1919-1949*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Ch'ien Tuan-sheng. *The Government and Politics of China, 1912-1949*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Chow Tse-tung. *Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China, 1915-1924*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Cohen, Paul A. *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- 'A reply to Professor Wm. Theodore de Bary'. *Philosophy East and West* 35, 4 (October 1985): 413-17.
- 'The quest for liberalism in the Chinese past: stepping stone to a cosmopolitan world or the last stand of Western parochialism: a review of *The Liberal Tradition in China*'. *Philosophy East and West* 35, 3 (July 1985): 305-10.

- Collini, Stefan. *Liberalism and Sociology: L. T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England, 1880–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Crick, Bernard. *Socialism*. London: Open University Press, 1987.
- Culp, Robert. 'Setting the sheet of loose sand: conceptions of society and citizenship in Nanjing decade party doctrine and civics textbooks'. In *Defining Modernity: Guomindang Rhetorics of a New China, 1920–1970*, edited by Terry Bodenhorn, 45–90. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1992.
- Daruvala, Susan. *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, distributed by Harvard University Press, 2000.
- De Bary, Wm. Theodore. *Asian Values and Human Rights: A Confucian Communitarian Perspective*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . *The Liberal Tradition in China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- . 'Confucian liberalism and Western parochialism'. *Philosophy East and West* 35, 3 (July 1985): 399–412.
- . 'Individualism and humanitarianism in late Ming thought'. In *Self and Society in Ming Thought*, edited by Wm. Theodore de Bary, 145–248. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
- De Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*, introduction by Alan Ryan. 2 vols. New York: Knopf, 1994.
- Deane, Herbert A. *The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- D'Entrèves, Maurizio Passerini, and Seyla Benhabib, eds. *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
- Dikötter, Frank. *Things Modern: Material Culture and Everyday Life in China*. London: Hurst & Co., 2007.
- Ding Wenjiang 丁文江. 'Da guanyu "women de zhengzhi zhuzhang"' 答关于 '我们的政治主张'. *Nuli zhoubao* 努力周报 6, 7 (June 1922): 2–3.
- . 'Shaoshuren de zeren' 少数人的责任. *Nuli zhoubao* 努力周报 7 (June 1922): 2–4.
- . 'Shixing tongzhi jingji de tiaojian' 实行统治经济的条件. *Duli pinglun* 独立评论 108 (July 1934): 18–20.
- Dirlik, Arif. *Anarchism in the Chinese Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- . *Global Modernity: Modernity in the Age of Global Capitalism*. Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Publishers, 2007.
- . *Marxism in the Chinese Revolution*. Lanham, Md.: Rowan & Littlefield, 2005.
- . *Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919–1937*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- . 'T'ao Hsi-sheng: The social limits of change'. In *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, edited by Charlotte Furth, 305–31. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- . 'The ideological foundations of the New Life movement: a study in counterrevolution'. *Journal of Asian Studies* 34, 4 (August 1975): 945–80.
- Dong, Madeleine Yue, and Goldstein, Joshua, eds. *Everyday Modernity in China*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006.

- Du Yaquan 杜亚泉. *Du Yaquan wencun* 杜亚泉文存. Edited by Xu Jilin 许纪霖 and Tian Jianye 田建业. Shanghai: Shanghai jiaoyu chubanshe, 2003.
- Duara, Prasenjit. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questions and Narrative of Modern China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- 'Provincial narratives of the nation: centralism and federalism in Republican China'. In *Cultural Nationalism in East Asia*, edited by Harumi Befu, 9–35. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1993.
- Eastman, Lloyd E. *The Abortive Revolution: China under Nationalist Rule, 1927–1937*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- 'The Kuomintang in the 1930s'. In *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, edited by Charlotte Furth, 191–210. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Edgar, Andrew. *The Philosophy of Habermas*. Chesham: Acumen Publishing, 2005.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. *Modernization: Protest and Change*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- 'Introduction'. In *Patterns of Modernity, Vol. II: Beyond the West*, edited by S. N. Eisenstadt, 1–11. London: Frances Pinter, 1987.
- Elliott, Gregory. *Labourism and the English Genius: The Strange Death of Labour England?* London: Verso, 1993.
- Epstein, Klaus. *The Genesis of German Conservatism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Esherick, Joseph W., ed. *Remaking the Chinese City: Modernity and National Identity, 1900–1950*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
- Eucken, Rudolf, and Carsun Chang. *Das Lebensproblem in China und in Europa*. Leipzig: Verlag Quelle & Meyer, 1922.
- Fairbank, John King. *China: A New History*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Chinabound: A Fiftieth-Year Memoir*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Farquhar, Judith B., and James L. Hevia. 'Culture and postwar American historiography of China'. *positions: east asia cultures critique* 1, 2 (1993): 486–525.
- Feng Chongyi 冯崇义. *Guohun, zai guonan zhong zhengzha: kangRi zhanzheng shiqi de Zhongguo wenhua* 国魂, 在国难中挣扎: 抗日战争时期的中国文化. Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 1995.
- 'The return of liberalism and social democracy in contemporary China'. *Issues & Studies* 39, 3 (September 2003): 1–31.
- 'Zhongguo kangRi zhanzheng shiqi de Zhongguohua sichao' 中国抗日战争时期的中国化思潮. *Wenshi tiandi* 文史天地 98, 2 (1995): 73–9.
- Feng Youlan 冯友兰. *Sansongtang quanji* 三松堂全集, 15 vols. Compiled by Tu Youguang 涂又光. Zhengzhou: Henan renmin chubanshe, 1985.
- Fewsmith, Joseph. *Party, State, and Local Elites in Republican China: Merchant Organizations and Politics in Shanghai, 1890–1930*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1985.
- 'Neoconservatism and the end of the Dengist era'. *Asian Survey* 35, 7 (July 1995): 625–51.
- Fitzgerald, John. *Awakening China: Politics, Culture, and Class in the Nationalist Revolution*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996.

- 'The nationless state: the search for a nation in modern Chinese nationalism'. *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs* 33 (January 1995): 75-104.
- Fogel, Joshua A. 'Issues in the evolution of modern China in East Asian comparative perspective'. In *China's Quest for Modernization: A Historical Perspective*, edited by Frederic E. Wakeman Jr and Wang Xi, 373-94. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1997.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power*, vol. 3. Edited by James D. Faubion and translated by Robert Hurley and others. New York: The New Press, 1994.
- 'What is Enlightenment?' In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 32-50. London: Penguin Books, 1991.
- Friedrich, Carl J. *Tradition and Authority*. London: Pall Mall Press, 1972.
- Fu Mengzhen 傅孟真 [Fu Sinan 傅斯年]. 'Lun haomen ziben zhi bixu chanchu' 论豪门资本之必须铲除. *Guancha* 观察 2, 1 (March 1947): 6-8.
- Fu Mengzhen xiansheng yizhu bianji weiyuanhui, comp. 傅孟真先生遗著编辑委员会编. *Fu Sinian quanji* 傅斯年全集. 7 vols. Taipei: Lianjing chubanshe, 1980.
- Fu Qingmin 付庆敏, and Yu Zuomin 于作敏. 'Shehui zhuyi sichao ji Makesi zhuyi Zhongguohua' 社会主义思潮及马克思主义中国化. In *Zhongguo jindai shehui wenhua sichao yanjiu tonglan* 中国近代社会文化思想研究通鉴, edited by Yu Zuhua 俞祖华 and Zhao Huifeng 赵慧峰, 302-419. Jinan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 2005.
- Fung, Edmund S. K. *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929-1949*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- 'Chinese nationalism and democracy during the war period, 1937-1945: a critique of the *jiuwang-qimeng* dichotomy' In *Power and Identity in the Chinese World Order: Festschrift in Honour of Professor Wang Gungwu*, edited by Billy K. K. So, John Fitzgerald, Huang Jianli and James Chin, 201-20. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003.
- 'Nationalism and modernity: the politics of cultural conservatism in Republican China'. *Modern Asian Studies* 43, 3 (May 2009): 777-813.
- 'New Confucianism and Chinese democratization: the thought and predicament of Zhang Junmai'. *Twentieth-Century China* 28, 2 (April 2003): 41-71.
- 'Socialism, capitalism, and democracy in Republican China: the political thought of Zhang Dongsun'. *Modern China* 28, 4 (October 2002): 399-431.
- 'State building, capital development, and social justice: social democracy in China's modern transformation, 1921-1949'. *Modern China* 31, 3 (July 2005): 318-52.
- 'The idea of freedom in modern China revisited: multiple conceptions and dual responsibilities'. *Modern China* 32, 4 (October 2006): 453-82.
- 'Were Chinese liberals liberal? Reflections on the understanding of liberalism in modern China'. *Pacific Affairs* 81, 4 (Winter 2008/2009): 557-76.
- Furth, Charlotte. *Ting Wen-chiang: Science and China's New Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- 'Culture and politics in modern Chinese conservatism'. In *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, edited by Charlotte Furth, 22-53. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Gan Yang 甘阳. 'Ziyou zhuyi: guizhu de haishi pingmin de?' 自由主义: 贵族的还是平民的? In *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua*

- 知识分子立场：自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化，edited by Li Shitao 李世涛，1-12. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002.
- Gao Like 高力克. *Qiusuo xiandaixing* 求索现代性. Hangzhou: Zhejiang daxue chubanshe, 1999.
- Tiaoshi de zhihui: Du Yaquan sixiang yanjiu* 调适的智慧：杜亚泉思想研究. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1998.
- 'Du Yaquan de Zhongxi wenhuaguan' 杜亚泉的中西文化观. *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 34 (April 1996): 53-62.
- 'Duwei yu wusi xin ziyou zhuyi' 杜威与五四新自由主义. *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 69 (February 2002): 46-9.
- Gao Ruiquan 高瑞泉, ed. *Li Dazhao wenxuan* 李大钊文选. Shanghai: Yuandong chubanshe, 1995.
- Gao Yihan 高一涵. 'Zhengzhi yu shehui' 政治与社会. *Nili zhoubao* 努力周报 3 (June 1933): 2-3.
- Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. 'On alternative modernities'. In *Alternative Modernities*, edited by Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, 1-23. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Gasster, Michael. *Chinese Intellectuals and the Revolution of 1911: The Birth of Modern Chinese Radicalism*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nationalism*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Geng Yunzhi 耿云志. *Hu Shi yanjiu lungao* 胡适研究论稿. Chongqing: Sichuan renmin chubanshe, 1985.
- Geng Yunzhi 耿云志, and Ouyang Zhesheng 欧阳哲生, eds. *Hu Shi shuxinji* 胡适书信集. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1996.
- Gerth, H. H., and C. Wright Mills, eds. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Politics and Sociology in the Thought of Max Weber*. London: Macmillan, 1972.
- The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.
- Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double-consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Godley, Michael R. 'Lessons from an Italian Connection'. In *Ideal and Reality: Transformation in Modern China, 1860-1949*, edited by David Pong and Edmund S. K. Fung, 93-123. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985.
- 'Politics from history: Lei Haizong and the Zhanguo ce clique'. *Papers on Far Eastern History* 40 (September 1989): 95-122.
- Goldman, Merle. *From Comrade to Citizen: The Struggle for Political Rights in China*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Gray, John. *Liberalism*, 2nd edn. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995.
- Greene, J. Megan. 'GMD rhetoric of science and modernity (1927-70): a neo-traditional scientism?'. In *Defining Modernity: Guomindang Rhetorics of a New China, 1920-1970*, edited by Terry Bodenhorn, 223-62. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002.

- Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Gregor, A. James. *A Place in the Sun: Marxism and Fascism in China's Long Revolution*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2000.
- Grieder, Jerome B. *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution, 1917-1937*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Gunther, John. *Inside Asia*. New York: Harper, 1939.
- Guo Huaqing 郭华清. *Kuanrong yu tuoxie: Zhang Shizhao de tiaohelun yanjiu* 宽容与妥协: 章士钊的调和论研究. Tianjin: Tianjin guji chubanshe, 2004.
- Guo Yapei 郭亚佩. 'Lishi de Chen Yinke: "ziyou sixiang, duli jingshen" yu Zhongguo zhengzhi xiandaixing' 历史的陈寅恪: '自由主义思想, 独立精神'与中国政治现代性. In *Ziyou zhuyi yu renwen chuandong: Lin Yüsheng xiansheng qizhi shouqing lunwenji* 自由主义与人文传统: 林毓生先生七秩寿庆论文集, edited by Qiu Huifen 丘惠芬, 397-416. Taipei: Yunchen wenhua, 2005.
- Guo, Yingjie. *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary China: The Search for National Identity under Reform*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. London: Heinemann, 1979.
- _____. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*. Translated by Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: Polity in association with Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Hall, David L., and Roger T. Ames. *Democracy of the Dead: Dewey, Confucius, and the Hope for Democracy in China*. Chicago: Open Court, 1999.
- Hamaguchi Eshun. 'A contextual model of the Japanese: toward a methodological innovation in Japan studies'. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 11, 2 (Summer 1985): 289-321.
- Hao, Zhidong. *Intellectuals at a Crossroads: The Changing Politics of China's Knowledge Workers*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Hay, Stephen N. *Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China, and India*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Hayek, Friedrich August von. *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge, 1997; first published in 1944.
- Hayford, Charles W. *To the People: Jimmy Yen and Village China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- He Lin 贺麟. *Wenhua yu rensheng* 文化与人生, reprint. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1990; first published in 1947.
- _____. 'Yingxiong chongbai yu rengen jiaoyu' 英雄崇拜与人格教育. In *Shidai zhi bo: Zhanguocapai wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 时代之波: 中国战国策派文化论著辑要, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 302-11. Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995.
- He Xiaoming 何晓明. *Fanben yu kaixin: jindai Zhongguo wenhua baoshou zhuyi xinlun* 反本与开新: 近代中国近代文化保守主义新论. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2006.
- He Xinquan 何信全. *Ruxue yu xiandai minzhu: dangdai xinrujia zhengzhi zhaxue yanjiu* 儒学与现代民主: 当代新儒家政治哲学研究. Taipei: Zhongyan yanjiuyuan Zhongguo wenzheshuo, 1996.
- He Yongji 何永佶. 'Lun dazhengzhi' 论大政治. *Zhanguocapai* 战国策 2 (April 1940): 3-7.
- _____. 'Xitela de waijiao' 希特拉的外交. *Zhanguocapai* 战国策 12 (September 1940): 17-25.
- _____. 'Zhengzhiguan: waixiang yu neixiang' 政治观: 外向与内向. *Zhanguocapai* 战国策 1 (April 1940): 37-42.

- Hobhouse, L. T. *Liberalism*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1911.
- Holmes, Stephen. *Passions and Constraint: On the Theory of Liberal Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- 'Can weak-state liberalism survive?'. In *Liberalism and Its Practice*, edited by Dan Avnon and Avner de-Shalit, 31-49. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Hopkins, A. G., ed. *Global History: Interactions between the Universal and the Local*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Howland, Douglas R. *Personal Liberty and Public Good: The Introduction of John Stuart Mill to Japan and China*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
- Hu Shi [Hu Shih] 胡适. *Hu Shi de riji: shougaoben* 胡适的日记: 手稿本, reprint. 18 vols. Taipei: Yuanliu chubangongsi, 1990.
- Hu Shi lai wang shu xin xuan* 胡适来往书信选. 2 vols. Edited by Zhongguo shehui kexue yuan jindaishi yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院近代史研究所编. Hong Kong: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.
- Hu Shi quanji* 胡适全集. 44 vols. Edited by Ji Xianlin 季羨林. Hefei: Anhui jiaoyu chubanshe, 2003.
- Hu Shi wenji* 胡适文集. 12 vols. Edited by Ouyang Zhesheng 欧阳哲生. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1998.
- Liuxue de riji* 留学的日记. 4 vols. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1959.
- Xian Qin mingxue shi* 先秦名学史, reprint. Shanghai: Xuelin, 1983; first published in 1922.
- 'Geren ziyou yu shehui jinbu: zaitan wusi yundong' 个人自由与社会进步: 再谈五四运动. *Duli pinglun* 独立评论 150 (May 1935): 2-5.
- 'Shei shi Zhongguo jinri de 12 ge darenwu?' 谁是中国今日的 12 个大人物? *Nuli zhoubao* 努力周报 29 (November 1922): 3-4.
- 'Xin wenhua yundong yu Guomindang' 新文化运动与国民党, *Xinyue* 新月 2, 6 and 7 combined (10 September 1929): 1-15.
- 'Zhenglunjia yu zhengdang' 政论家与政党, *Nuli zhoubao* 努力周报 5 (June 1922): 2-3.
- Hu Shi 胡适 et al. *Ding Wenjiang zhegeren* 丁文江这个人. Taipei: Zhuanji wenxue chubanshe, 1969.
- 'Women de zhengzhi zhuzhang' 我们的政治主张. *Nuli zhoubao* 努力周报 2 (May 1922): 1-2.
- Hu Shih. *The Chinese Renaissance: The Haskell Lectures* 1933. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- 'A view of immortality'. In *Hu Shi weikan yingwen yigao* 胡适未刊英文文稿, edited by Zhou Zhiping 周质平, 171-7. Taipei: Lianjing chubangongsi, 2001.
- 'Chinese thought'. *Asia* 42, 10 (October 1942): 582-4.
- 'Conflict of cultures'. In *Problems of the Pacific* 1931, edited by Bruno Lasker, 474-6. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932.
- 'Historical foundations for a democratic China'. In *Lectures on Government: Second Series*, edited by Edmund J. James, 1-12. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1941.
- 'Instrumentalism as a political concept'. In *Studies in Political Science and Sociology*, edited by Hu Shih et al., 1-6. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941.

- 'The civilizations of the East and the West'. In *Whither Mankind: A Panorama of Modern Civilization*, edited by Charles A. Beard, 25-41. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928.
- 'The Renaissance in China'. *Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs*, V (1926): 265-83.
- 'The scientific spirit and method in Chinese philosophy'. In *The Chinese Mind: Essentials of Chinese Philosophy and Culture*, edited by Charles A. Moore, 104-31. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1962.
- 'The struggle for intellectual freedom in historic China'. *World Affairs*, 105, 3 (September 1942): 170-3.
- 'Wang Mang, the socialist emperor of nineteen centuries ago'. *Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 59 (1928): 218-30.
- Hu Songping 胡颂平, ed. *Hu Shizhi xiansheng nianpu changbian chugao* 胡适之先生年谱长编初稿. 6 vols. Taipei: Lianjing chuban gongsi, 1984.
- Hu Weixi 胡伟希, Gao Ruiquan 高瑞泉 and Zhang Limin 张利民. *Shiji jietou yu ta* 十字街头与塔. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1991.
- Hu Weixi 胡伟希, and Tian Wei 田巍. 'Ershi shiji Zhongguo "wenhua jijin zhuyi" sichao chuyi' 二十世纪中国 '文化激进主义' 思潮初议. *Tianjin shehui kexue* 天津社会科学 1 (2002): 25-30.
- 'Zhongguo wenhua jijin zhuyi sichao de lishi yanjiu' 中国文化激进主义思潮的历史研究. *Zhongguo renmin daxue xuebao* 中国人民大学学报 6 (2001): 110-17.
- Hu Xiansu 胡先肃. 'Lun pipingjia zhi zeren' 论批评家之责任. *Xueheng* 学衡 3 (March 1922): 1-14.
- trans. 'Bai Bide zhongxi renwen jiaoyutan' 白璧德中西人文教育谈. *Xueheng* 学衡 3 (March 1922): 1-23.
- Hu Xiao 胡晓. *Hu Shi sixiang yu xiandai Zhongguo* 胡适思想与现代中国. Hefei: Anhui renmin chubanshe, 1993.
- Huang Kewu 黄克武. *Yige beifanqi de xuanze: Liang Qichao tiaoshi sixiang zhi yanjiu* 一个被放弃的选择: 梁启超调适思想之研究. Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1994.
- Ziyou de suoyiran: Yan Fu dui Yuehan Mier ziyou sixiang de renshi yu pipan* 自由的所以然: 严复对约翰弥尔自由思想的认识与批判. Taipei: Yunchen wenhua, 1998.
- Huang, Max Ko-wu. *The Meaning of Freedom: Yan Fu and the Origins of Chinese Liberalism*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2008.
- Huang, Philip C. C. 'Centralized minimalism: semiformal governance by quasi officials and dispute resolution in China'. *Modern China* 34, 1 (January 2008): 9-35.
- Hung Chang-tai. *Going to the People: Chinese Intellectuals and Folk Literature, 1918-1937*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Hunt, Michael. 'Chinese national identity and the strong state: the late Qing-Republican crisis'. In *China's Quest for National Identity*, edited by Lowell Dittmer and Samuel S. Kim, 62-79. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Hutchinson, Allan C., and Patrick Monahan. 'Democracy and the rule of law'. In *Law and Morality: Readings in Legal Philosophy*, edited by David Dyzenhaus and Arthur Ripstein, 340-67. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- Hutchinson, John. *Modern Nationalism*. London: Fontana Press, 1994.
- The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.

- Huters, Theodore. *Bringing the World Home: Appropriating the West in Late Qing and Early Republican China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.
- Ip Hung-yok, Hon Tze-ki and Lee Chiu-chun. 'The plurality of Chinese modernity: a review of recent scholarship on the May Fourth movement'. *Modern China* 29, 4 (October 2003): 490-509.
- Jeans, Roger B. *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China: The Politics of Zhang Junmai (Carsun Chang) 1906-1941*. Lanham, Md.: Rowan & Littlefield, 1997.
- Ji Wenfu 稽文甫. 'Mantan xueshu Zhongguohua wenti' 漫谈学术中国化问题. In *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian* 中国现代思想史资料简编, edited by Cai Shangsi 蔡尚思, vol. IV, 49-61. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1982.
- Jiang Baili 蒋百里. 'Shehui zhuyi zenyang xuanchuan' 社会主义怎样宣传. *Gaizao* 改造 4, 2 (October 1921): 2-3.
- 'Wo de shehui zhuyi taolun' 我的社会主义讨论. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 6 (February 1921): 34-9.
- Jiang Pei 江沛. *Zhanguocepai sixiang yanjiu* 战国策派思想研究. Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chubanshe, 2001.
- Jiang Tingfu 蒋廷黻. 'Mantan zhishi fenzi zhi shiming' 漫谈知识分子之使命. In *Zhishi fenzi yu Zhongguo* 知识分子与中国, edited by Zhou Yangshan 周阳山, 53-8. Taipei: Shidai chuban gongsi, 1980.
- 'Zhengzhi ziyou yu jingji ziyou' 政治自由与经济自由. *Shiji pinglun* 世纪评论 1, 17 (April 1947): 5-7.
- Jiang Yihua 姜义华. 'Jijin yu baoshou: yu Yü Yingshi xiansheng shangque' 激进与保守: 与余英时先生商榷. *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 10 (April 1992): 134-42.
- 'Lun Hu Shi yu renquan wenti de lunzhan' 论胡适与人权问题的论战. In *Hu Shi yu xiandai Zhongguo wenhua zhuanxing* 胡适与现代中国文化转型, edited by Liu Qingfeng 刘青峰, 73-98. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1994.
- Jin Yaoji 金耀基. *Zhongguo minben sixiangshi* 中国民本思想史, 2nd edn. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1997.
- Jizhe 记者 [Zhang Junmai 张君勱 et al.]. *Women suoyao shuo de hua* 我们所要说的话. N.p.: Zaishengshe, 1946. Originally published in *Zaisheng* 再生 1, 1 (May 1932): 1-60.
- Karl, Rebecca. *Staging the World: Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Keating, Pauline B. *Two Revolutions: Village Reconstruction and the Cooperative Movement in Northern Shaanxi 1934-1945*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*, 4th edn. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Kirby, William C. *Germany and Republican China*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1984.
- 'Engineering China: birth of the developmental state, 1928-1937'. In *Becoming Chinese: Passages to Modernity and Beyond*, edited by Wen-hsin Yeh, 137-60. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Kirk, Russell. *The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana*, 7th edn. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2001.
- Knight, Nick. *Marxist Philosophy in China: From Qu Qiubai to Mao Zedong, 1923-1945*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Krebs, Edward S. *Shifu, Soul of Chinese Anarchism*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

- Lan Gongwu 蓝公武. 'Shehui zhuyi zai Zhongguo' 社会主义在中国. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 6 (February 1921): 27-34.
- 'Zailun shehui zhuyi' 再论社会主义. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 11 (July 1921): 3-12.
- Lan Gongyan 蓝公彦. 'Shehui zhuyi yu ziben zhidu' 社会主义与资本制度. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 6 (February 1921): 51-4.
- Lary, Diana. *Region and Nation: The Kwangsi Clique in Chinese Politics, 1925-1937*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Laski, Harold J. *A Grammar of Politics*, 4th edn. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938.
- The State in Theory and Practice*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935.
- 'The limitations of the expert'. In *The Intellectuals: A Controversial Portrait*, edited by George B. Huszar, 160-81. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.
- Laue, Theodore H. von. *The World Revolution of Westernization*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Lee, Leo Ou-fan. *Shanghai Modern: The Flowering of a New Urban Culture in China 1930-1945*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- 'In search of modernity: some reflections on a new mode of consciousness in twentieth-century Chinese history and literature'. In *Ideas Across Cultures: Essays on Chinese Thought in Honor of Benjamin I. Schwartz*, edited by Paul A. Cohen and Merle Goldman, 109-36. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- 'Literary trends: the road to revolution, 1927-1949'. In *An Intellectual History of Modern China*, edited by Merle Goldman and Leo Ou-fan Lee, 196-266. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- 'The cultural construction of modernity in urban Shanghai: some preliminary explorations'. In *Becoming Chinese: Passages to Modernity and Beyond*, edited by Wen-hsin Yeh, 31-61. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Lei Chiyue 雷池月. 'Zhuyi zhi bu cun, huanglun chuantong?' 主义之不存、遑论传统? In *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, edited by Li Shitao 李世涛, 487-96. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002.
- Lei, H. T. 'Periodization: Chinese history and world history'. *The Chinese Social and Political Science Review* 20 (1935-1938), reprinted in *The Pattern of Chinese History: Cycles, Development, or Stagnation*, edited by John Meskill, 43-51. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co. 1965.
- Lei Haizong 雷海宗. 'Wubing de wenhua' 无兵的文化. In *Shidai zhi bo: Zhanguocepai wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 时代之波: 战国策派文化论著辑要, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 108-31. Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995.
- 'Zhongguo wenhua de liangzhou' 中国文化的两周. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 132-60.
- Levenson, Joseph R. *Confucian China and Its Modern Fate*. 3 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958-65.
- Liang Chi-chao and the Mind of Modern China*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.
- Li Dazhao 李大钊. *Li Dazhao quanji* 李大钊全集. 4 vols. Edited by Zhu Wentong 朱文通. Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe, 1999.

- Li Haopei 李浩培. 'Fazhi shixing wenti' 法治实行问题. *Guancha* 观察 2, 12 (May 1947): 3-6.
- Li Jiantao 李剑涛. *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang mailuo zhong de ziyou zhuyi* 中国现代思想脉络的自由主义. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2004.
- Li Liangyu 李良玉. 'Jijin, baoshou yu zhishi fenzi de zeren' 激进, 保守与知识分子的责任. *Erhsiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 12 (August 1992): 132-4.
- Li Qingxi 李庆西. 'Ziyou zhuyi zhishi fenzi' 自由主义知识分子. *Dushu* 读书 2 (2000): 60-7.
- Li Shitao 李世涛, ed. *Zhishi fenzi lichang: jijin yu baoshou zhijian de dongdang* 知识分子立场: 激进与保守之间的动荡. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002.
- Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002.
- Li Yi 李怡. 'Lun "Xuehengpai" yu wusi xinwenxue yundong' 论'学衡派'与五四新文学运动. *Zhongguo shehui kexue* 中国社会科学 6 (1998): 150-64.
- Liang Qichao 梁启超. *Liang Qichao quanji* 梁启超全集. 10 vols. Edited by Zhang Pinxing 张品兴. Beijing: Beijing chubanshe, 1999.
- 'Fu Zhang Dongsun lun shehui zhuyi yundong' 复张东荪论社会主义运动. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 6 (February 1921): 17-26.
- Liang Shuming 梁漱溟. *Liang Shuming quanji* 梁漱溟全集. 8 vols. Jinan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 1989.
- Liang Shuming wendalu* 梁漱溟问答录. Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1988.
- Lin Min, with Maria Galikowski. *The Search for Modernity: Chinese Intellectuals and Cultural Discourse in the Post-Mao Era*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999.
- Lin Tongji 林同济. *Wenhua xingtai shiguan* 文化形态史观. Shanghai: Dadong shuju, 1946.
- 'Da zhengzhi shidai de lunli: yige guanyu zhongxiao wenti de taolun' 大政治时代的论理: 一个关于忠孝问题的讨论. In *Shidai zhi bo: Zhanguocapai wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 时代之波: 战国策派文化论著辑要, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 167-75. Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995.
- 'Dafushi yu shidafu: guoshi shang de liangzhong rengexing' 大夫义士与士大夫: 国史上的两种人格性. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 61-8.
- 'Guanliao chuantong: huangquan zhi hua' 官僚传统: 皇权之花. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 76-83.
- 'Li' 力. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 176-83.
- 'Xingtai lishiguan 形态历史观. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 5-13.
- 'Zhanguo shidai de chongyan' 战国时代的重演. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 49-60.
- 'Zhongbao: guanliao chuantong de yimian' 中饱: 官僚传统的一面. In *Shidai zhi bo* 时代之波, edited by Wen Rumin 温儒敏 and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, 84-95.
- Lin Yü-sheng. *The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness: Radical Antitraditionalism in the May Fourth Era*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979.
- Lin Yüsheng 林毓生. *Zhuanhua yu chuanguzao* 转化与创造. Taipei: Youshi wenhua shiye gongsi, 1993.
- Liu Boming 刘伯明. 'Gongheguomin zhi jingshen' 共和国民之精神. *Xueheng* 学衡 10 (October 1922): 1-6.

- Liu Dong 刘东, 'Chuangzuoxing zhuanhua de fanwei yu xianzhi' 创作性转化的范围与限制. *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 30 (August 1995): 139-42.
- Liu Jilin 刘集林. *Chen Xujing wenhua sixiang yanjiu* 陈序经文化思想研究. Tianjin: Renmin chubanshe, 2003.
- Liu Junning 刘军宁. *Gonghe, minzhu, xianzheng: ziyou zhuyi sixiang yanjiu* 共和民主宪政: 自由主义思想研究. Shanghai: Sanlian shudian, 1998.
- Liu, Lydia. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity: China, 1900-1937*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Liu Qingfeng 刘青峰 and Cen Guoliang 岑国良, eds. *Ziyou zhuyi yu Zhongguo jindai chuantong* 自由主义与中国近代传统. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2002.
- Liu Yizheng 柳诒徵. 'Zhongguo wenhua xibi zhi shangque' 中国文化西彼之商榷. *Xueheng* 学衡 27 (1924): 1-7.
- Lü Xichen 吕希晨, and Chen Ying 陈莹. *Zhang Junmai sixiang yanjiu* 张君勱思想研究. Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chubanshe, 1996.
- Lu Xirong 卢锡荣. *Lasiji zhengzhi sixiang* 拉斯基政治思想. Shanghai: Shijie shuju, 1934.
- Lü Xuehai 吕学海, ed. *Quanpan xihua yanlunji* 全盘西化言论集. Guangzhou: Lingnan daxue qingnianhui, 1934.
- Luo Longji 罗隆基. 'Lun gongchan zhuyi: gongchan zhuyi lilun shang de piping' 论共产主义: 共产主义理论上的批评. *Xinyue* 新月 3, 1 (November 1930): 1-22.
- 'Lun renquan' 论人权. *Xinyue* 新月 2, 5 (July 1929): 5-10.
- 'Minzhu de yi' 民主的意义. *Minzhu zhouban* 民主周刊 1, 1 (December 1944): 3-5.
- 'Shenme shi fazhi' 什么是法治. *Xinyue* 新月 3, 11 (December 1930): 1-17.
- 'Wo de beibu de jingguo yu fan'gan' 我的被捕的经过与反感. *Xinyue* 新月, 3, 3 (January 1931): 1-17.
- 'Women yao shenmeyang de zhengzhi zhidu' 我们要什么样的政治制度. *Xinyue* 新月 2, 12 (February 1930): 1-24.
- 'Zhengzhi de minzhu yu jingji de minzhu' 政治的民主与经济的民主. *Minzhu zhouban* 民主周刊 1, 2 (December 1944): 3-5.
- 'Zhuanjia zhengzhi' 专家政治. *Xinyue* 新月 2, 2 (April 1929): 1-7.
- Luo Zhitian 罗志田. *Zaizao wenming de changshi: Hu Shi zhuan (1891-1929)* 再造文明的尝试: 胡适传 (1891-1929). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Ma Fangruo 马芳若, ed. *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化建设讨论集. Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935.
- Makeham, John T., ed. *New Confucianism: A Critical Examination*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Mannheim, Karl. *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology*. Trans. and edited by Paul Kecskemeti. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1953.
- Mao Tse-tung. *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, 6 vols. Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1967.
- McClelland, J. S. *A History of Western Political Thought*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Mei Guangdi 梅光迪. 'Ping tichang xinwenhuazhe' 评提倡新文化者. *Xueheng* 学衡 1 (January 1922): 1-15.

- Mei, Yi-pao, trans. *The Works of Motze*. Taipei: Wenzhi chubanshe, 1976.
- Meier, Gerald M. and Duddley Seers, eds. *Pioneers in Development*. New York: Oxford University Press, published for the World Bank, 1984.
- Meisner, Maurice. *Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism*. New York: Atheneum, 1970.
- Metzger, Thomas A. *Escape from Predicament: The Evolution of Chinese Political Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.
- ‘Continuities between modern and premodern China: some neglected methodological and substantive issues’. In *Ideas Across Cultures*, edited by Paul A. Cohen and Merle Goldman, 263–92. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- ‘Modern Chinese utopianism and the Western concept of the civil society’. In *Guo Tingyi xiansheng jiu zhi danchen jinian lunwenji* 郭廷以先生九秩诞辰纪念论文集, 2 vols. Edited by Chen Sanjing 陈三井, 273–312. Nangang: Zhongyang yanjiu-yuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1995.
- Mill, John Stuart. ‘On considerations of representative government’. In *Three Essays*, with an introduction by Richard Wollheim, 145–423. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Mitter, Rana. *A Bitter Revolution: China’s Struggle with the Modern World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Nairn, Tom. *The Break-up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-traditionalism*. London: Verso, 1981.
- Najita, Tetsuo, and H. D. Harootunian. ‘Japanese revolt against the West: political and cultural criticism in the twentieth century’. In *The Cambridge History of Japan*, vol. 6, edited by John W. Hall et al., 711–826. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Nanda, B. R. *Jawaharlal Nehru: Rebel and Statesman*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Nathan, Andrew J. *Chinese Democracy: The Individual and the State in Twentieth Century China*. New York: Knopf, 1985.
- Naughton, Barry. *Growing Out of the Plan: Chinese Economic Reform, 1978–1993*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Ng Yu-kwan. ‘Xiong Shili’s metaphysical theory about the non-separability of substance and function’. In *New Confucianism: A Critical Examination*, edited by John Makeham, 219–52. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- Nisbet, Robert. *Conservatism: Dream and Reality*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986.
- Oppenheimer, Heinrich. *The Constitution of the German Republic*. London: Stevens, 1923.
- Outhwaite, William. *Habermas: A Critical Introduction*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Pan Gongzhan 潘公展, ‘Shehui zhuyi de wujie’ 社会主义的误解. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 2, 2 (January 1920): 3–9.
- Panichas, Gorge A., and Claes G. Ryn, eds. *Irving Babbitt in Our Time*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986.
- Pease, Edward R. *History of the Fabian Society: The Origins of English Socialism*, 2nd edn. London: Fabian Society, 1925.

- Peng Yihu 彭一湖. 'Wo duiyu Zhang Dongsun he Chen Duxiu xiansheng suo zheng-lun de yijian' 我对于张东荪和陈独秀先生所争论的意见. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 6 (February 1921): 39-47.
- Pi Mingxiu 皮明庥. *Jindai Zhongguo shehui zhuyi sichao mizong* 近代中国社会主义思潮觅踪. Changchun: Jilin wenshi chubanshe, 1991.
- Pierson, John D. *Tokutomi Sohō 1863-1957: A Journalist for Modern Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Qian Mu 钱穆. *Guoshi dagang* 国史大纲, 2nd edn. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1947.
- Qian Shifu 钱实甫. 'Meiyou ziyou de pingdeng' 没有自由的平等. *Minzhu luntan* 民主论坛 2, 1 (September 1947): 16-18.
- Qian Xuantong 钱玄同. *Qian Xutong wenji* 钱玄同文集. 6 vols. No editor. Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 1999-2000.
- Rajurkar, N. G., and Shri Narhar Krundkar. *Jawaharlal Nehru: The Thinker and the Statesman*. Rohtak: Manthan Publications, 1985.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Raz, Joseph. *The Morality of Freedom*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- 'The rule of law and its virtue'. In *Law and Morality: Readings in Legal Philosophy*, edited by David Dyzenhaus and Arthur Ripstein, 290-307. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- Ren Jiantao 任剑涛. *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang mailuo zhong de ziyou zhuyi* 中国现代思想脉络中的自由主义. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2004.
- Richardson, James L. *Contending Liberalisms in World Politics: Ideology and Power*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001.
- Rogaski, Ruth. *Hygienic Modernity: Meaning of Health and Disease in Treaty-Port China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Rorty, Richard. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Russell, Bertrand. *History of Western Philosophy*, new edn. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961.
- The Problem of China*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922.
- 'Science' In *Whither Mankind: A Panorama of Modern Civilization*, edited by Charles A. Beard, 60-82. New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1928.
- Sassoon, Donald. *One Hundred Years of Socialism: The Western European Left in the Twentieth Century*. New York: The New Press, 1996.
- Schneider, [Laurence] Axel. 'Bridging the gap: attempts at constructing a "new" historical-cultural identity in the People's Republic of China'. *East Asian History* 22 (December 2001): 129-44.
- 'National essence and the new intelligentsia'. In *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, edited by Charlotte Furth, 57-89. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- 'The one and the many: a classicist reading of China's tradition and its role in the modern world'. In *Zhongguo wenxue lishi yu sixing zhong de guannian bian-qian guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 中国文学历史与思想中的观念变迁国际学术研讨会论文集, edited by Guoli Taiwan daxue wenxueyuan 国立台湾大学文学院, 311-73. Taipei: Taiwan daxue wenxueyuan, 2005.
- Schwarcz, Vera. *The Chinese Enlightenment: Intellectuals and the Legacy of the May Fourth Movement of 1919*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

- Schwartz, Benjamin I. *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- 'Notes on conservatism in general and in China in particular'. In *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, edited by Charlotte Furth, 1–21. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- 'The limits of "tradition versus modernity": the case of the Chinese intellectuals'. In *China and Other Matters*, edited by Benjamin I. Schwartz, 45–64. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- 'The primacy of the political order in East Asian societies: some preliminary generalizations'. In *Foundations and Limits of State Power in China*, edited by Stuart R. Schram, 1–10. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1987.
- Schwarzmantel, John. *The Age of Ideology: Political Ideologies from the American Revolution to Postmodern Times*. London: Macmillan, 1998.
- Service, Robert. *A History of Twentieth-Century Russia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Shang Zhi 商治. 'Zhengzhi minzhu yu jingji minzhu' 政治民主与经济民主. *Guancha* 1, 11 (March 1947): 10–13.
- Shao Lizi 邵力子. 'Zaiping Dongsunjun de "you yi jiaoxun"' 再评东荪君的《又一教训》. In *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian* 中国现代思想史资料简编, 5 vols., edited by Cai Shangsi 蔡尚思, vol. I, 699–702. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1982.
- Shi Fuliang 施复亮. 'Feichu boxue yu zengjia shengchan' 废除剥削与增加生产. *Guancha* 观察 4, 4 (20 March 1948): 7–9.
- 'Zhongjianpai de zhengzhi luxian' 中间派的政治路线. *Shi yu wen* 时与文 1, 1 (March 1947): 6–10.
- 'Zhongjianpai zai zhengzhi shang de diwei he zuoyong' 中间派在政治上的地位和作用. *Shi yu wen* 时与文 1, 5 (April 1947): 83–5.
- Shi Yuangao 石原皋. *Xianhua Hu Shi* 闲话胡适. Hefei: Anhui renmin chubanshe, 1985.
- Shils, Edward. *Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Shirer, William L. *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*. 2 vols. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960.
- Song Yawen 宋亚文. *Shi Fuliang zhengzhi sixiang yanjiu* 施复亮政治思想研究. Beijing: Remin chubanshe, 2006.
- Song Zhiming 宋志明, ed. *Rujia sixing de xin kaizhan: He Lin xinruxue lunzhu jiyao* 儒家思想的新开展: 贺麟新儒学论著辑要. 2 vols. Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dian-shi, 1995.
- Spar, Frederic J. 'Human rights and political activism: Luo Longji in Chinese politics, 1928–1958'. Unpublished manuscript. 1993.
- Spengler, Oswald. *The Decline of the West*, new edn. London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926.
- Strauss, Julia. *Strong Institutions in Weak Politics: State Building in Republican China, 1927–1940*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Sun Chengxi 孙承希. 'Xi guojia zhuyipai de "xin fajia zhuyi" yu "shengwu shiguan"' 析国家主义派的“新法家主义”与“生物史观”. *Fudan xubao* 复旦学报 3 (2003): 109–16.
- Sun Hongyun 孙洪云. 'La Siji yu minguo zhishijie' 拉斯基与民国知识界. In *Liang'an sandi yanjiusheng shiyexia de jindai Zhongguo yantaohui lunwenji*

- 两岸三地研究生视野下的近代中国研讨会论文集, edited by Hu Chunhui 胡春惠 and Zhou Huimin 周惠民, 483–97. Taipei and Hong Kong: Zhengzhi daxue lishixi, Xianggang zhuhai shuyuan, 1990.
- Tamir, Yael. *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Tan Sor-hoon. *Confucian Democracy: A Deweyan Reconstruction*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2004.
- Tang Degang 唐德刚. *Hu Shi zayi* 胡适杂议. Taipei: Fengyun shidai, 1990.
ed. *Hu Shi koushu zizhuan* 胡适口述自传. Taipei: Zhuanji wenxue, 1986.
- Tang Xiaobing. *Global Space and the Nationalist Discourse of Modernity: The Historical Thinking of Liang Qichao*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Tao Xisheng 陶希圣. 'Fengjian zhidu yi ziben zhuyi?' 封建制度抑资本主义?. In *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian* 中国现代思想史资料简编. 5 vols., edited by Jiang Yihua 姜义华, vol. III, 71–7. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe.
- Taylor, Charles. 'Two theories of modernity'. In *Alternative Modernities*, edited by Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, 172–96. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Totten, George Oakley. *The Social Democratic Movement in Prewar Japan*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Tsai, Weipin. *Reading Shenbao: Nationalism, Consumerism and Individuality in China 1919–37*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Tsu, Jing. *Failure, Nationalism, and Literature*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Tu Wei-ming. 'Hsiung Shi-li's quest for authentic existence'. In *The Limits of Change: Essays on Conservative Alternatives in Republican China*, edited by Charlotte Furth, 242–75. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Wachtel, Andrew. 'Translation, imperialism, and national self-definition in Russia'. In *Alternative Modernities*, edited by Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, 58–85. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Walicki, Andrzej. *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*. Translated by Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Wakeman, Frederic E. Jr. 'A revisionist view of the Nanjing decade: Confucian fascism'. *China Quarterly* 150 (June 1997): 395–432.
'Introduction'. In *China's Quest for Modernization: A Historical Perspective*, edited by Frederic E. Wakeman Jr and Wang Xi, vii–xxii. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1997.
- Wang Fan-sen. *Fu Ssu-nien: A Life in Chinese History and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Wang Guimei 王桂妹. 'Wusi wenhua jijin zhuyi xunzong' 五四文化激进主义寻踪. *Jilin daxue shehui kexue xuebao* 吉林大学社会科学学报 3 (May 2001): 104–11.
- Wang Housheng 王厚生. 'Zhongguo minzhu shehuidang de zhengzhi luxian' 中国民主社会党的政治路线. *Zaisheng* 再生 186 (October 1947): 10–12.
- Wang Hui 汪晖. *Wang Hui zixuanji* 汪晖自选集. Nanning: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 1997.
- Xiandai Zhongguo sixiang de xingqi* 现代中国思想的兴起. 4 vols. Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2004.

- 'Contemporary Chinese thought and the question of modernity', translated by Rebecca Karl. In Wang Hui, *China's New Order: Society, Politics, and Economy in Transition*, edited by Theodore Hutters, 139–87. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- 'Dangdai Zhongguo de sixing zhuangkuang yu xiandaixing wenti' 当代中国的思想状况与现代性问题. In *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, edited by Li Shitao 李世涛, 83–123. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002.
- 'Yuyan yu lishi (shang pian): Zhongguo xiandai lishi zhong de wusi qimeng yundong' 预言与历史 (上篇): 中国现代历史中的五四启蒙运动. *Wenxue pinglun* 文学评论 3 (1989): 17–25.
- 'Yuyan yu lishi (xia pian): Zhongguo xiandai lishi zhong de wusi qimeng yundong' 预言与历史 (下篇): 中国现代历史中的五四启蒙运动. *Wenxue pinglun* 文学评论 4 (1989): 35–45.
- Wang Hui 汪晖, and Ke Kaijun 柯凯军. 'Guanyu xiandaixing wenti dawen' 关于现代性问题答问. In *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, edited by Li Shitao 李世涛, 124–54. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002.
- Wang Keping. 'Wang Guowei: philosophy of criticism'. In *Contemporary Chinese Philosophy*, edited by Chung-ying Cheng and Nicholas Bunnin, 37–56. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Wang Rongzu 汪荣祖. *Shijia Chen Yinke zhuan* 史家陈寅恪传. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005.
- Wang Xinming 王新命 et al. 'Women de zong dafu' 我们的总答复. In *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化建设讨论集, edited by Ma Fangruo 马芳若, part II, 180–3. Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935.
- 'Zhongguo benwei de wenhua jianshe xuanyan' 中国本位的文化建设宣言. In *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化建设讨论集, edited by Ma Fangruo 马芳若, part I, 1–6. Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935.
- Wang Zaoshi 王造时. *Huangmijuji* 荒谬集. N.p.: Ziyou yanlunshe, 1935.
- Wang Zhongjiang 汪中江. 'Quanpan xihua yu benwei wenhua lunzhan' 全盘西化与本位文化论战, *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 8 (December 1991): 39–45.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 3rd edn. Translated by Stephen Kalberg. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing 2002.
- Wells, Audrey. *The Political Thought of Sun Yat-sen: Development and Impact*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- Wen Rumin 温儒敏, and Ding Xiaoping 丁晓萍, eds. *Shidai zhi bo: Zhanguocepai wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 时代之波: 战国策派文化论著辑要. Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995.
- Weston, Timothy B. *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals, and Chinese Political Culture, 1898–1929*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Wilson, Rob, and Wimal Dissanayake. *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1996.

- Womack, Brantly. 'The phases of Chinese modernization'. In *Modernization in China*, edited by Steve S. K. Chin, 1-16. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Centre of Asian Studies, 1979.
- Wong, Young-tsu. *The Search for Modern Nationalism: Zhang Binglin and Revolutionary China 1869-1936*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Wu Enyu 吴恩裕. 'Falun, daode yu dazhong liyi' 法律、道德与大众利益. *Guancha* 观察 5, 15 (December 1947): 3-5.
- 'Ziyouhu? Pingdenghu?' 自由乎? 平等乎? *Guancha* 观察 3, 12 (15 November 1947): 6-7.
- Wu Jingchao 吴景超. 'Da Chen Xujing xiansheng de quanpan xihualun' 答陈序经先生的全盘西化论. In *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化建设讨论集. 2 vols., edited by Ma Fangruo 马芳若, part 1, 2-4. Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935.
- Wu Mi 吴宓. 'Baibide lun minzhi yu lingxiu' 白璧德论民治与领袖. *Xueheng* 学衡 32 (August 1925): 1-23.
- 'Lun jinri wenxue chuangzao zhi zhengfa' 论今日文学创造之正法. *Xueheng* 学衡 15 (March 1923): 1-17.
- 'Lun xinwenhua yundong' 论新文化运动. *Xueheng* 学衡 4 (April 1922): 1-23.
- 'Wo zhi renshengguan' 我之人生观. *Xueheng* 学衡 16 (April 1923): 1-15.
- Wu Pi 吴丕. *Jinhualun yu Zhongguo jijin zhuyi, 1859-1924* 进化论与中国激进主义, 1859-1924. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005.
- Wu Shichang 吴世昌. 'Zhengzhi minzhu yu jingji minzhu' 政治民主与经济民主. *Guancha* 观察 1, 5 (September 1946): 5-7.
- Xiao Gongquan 萧公权. 'Ershi shiji de lishi renwu' 二十世纪的历史任务. *Shiji pinglun* 世纪评论 2, 5 (February 1948): 5-8.
- 'Shuo minzhu' 说民主. *Guancha* 观察 1, 9 (October 1946): 3-7.
- Xu Fuguan 徐复观. *Rujia zhengzhi sixiang yu minzhu ziyou renquan* 儒家政治思想与民主自由人权. Edited by Xiao Xinyi 萧欣义. Taipei: Bashi niandai chubanshe, 1979.
- Xu Jilin 许纪霖. *Lingyizhong qimeng* 另一种启蒙. Guangzhou: Huacheng chubanshe, 1999.
- Xunqiu yiyi: xiandaihua bianqian yu wenhua pipan* 寻求意义: 现代化变迁与文化批判. Shanghai: Shanghai sanlian shudian, 1997.
- 'Jijin yu baoshou de mihuo' 激进与保守的迷惑. *Ershiye shiji* 二十一世纪 11 (June 1992): 137-40.
- 'Shehui minzhu zhuyi de lishi yichan: xiandai Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi de huigu' 社会民主主义的遗产: 现代中国自由主义的回顾. In *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, edited by Li Shitao 李世涛, 474-6. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002.
- 'Xiandai Zhongguo de ziyou zhuyi chuantong' 现代中国的自由主义传统. *Ershiye shiji* 二十一世纪 42 (August 1997): 27-35.
- 'Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi de wutuobang: Hu Shi yu "haozhengfu zhuyi" taolun' 中国自由主义的乌托邦: 胡适与'好政府主义'讨论. In *Hu Shi yu xiandai Zhongguo wenhua zhuanxing* 胡适与现代中国文化转型, edited by Liu Qingfeng 刘青峰, 35-54. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1994.
- ed. *Ershi shiji Zhongguo sixiangshi lun* 二十世纪中国思想史论. 2 vols. Shanghai: Dongfang chubanshe, 2000.

- Xu Jilin 许纪霖, Luo Gang 罗岗 et al. *Qimeng de ziwo wajie: 1990 niandai yilai Zhongguo sixiang wenhuajie zhongda lunzheng yanjiu* 启蒙的自我瓦解: 1990年以来中国思想文化界重大论争研究. Changchun: Jilin chubanshituan, 2007.
- Xu Xiaqun. *Trial of Modernity: Judicial Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China, 1901-1937*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2008.
- Yang Renbian 杨人便. 'Zailun ziyou zhuyi de tujing' 再论自由主义的途径. *Guancha* 观察 5, 8 (16 October 1948): 3-5.
- Yang Zhende 杨贞德. 'Hu Shi de ziyou zhuyi yu "xiushen" de zhengzhiguan' 胡适的自由主义与修身的政治观. In *Dangdai ruxue lunwenji: tiaozhan yu huiying* 当代儒学论文集: 挑战与回应, edited by Liu Shuxian 刘述先, 61-104. Taipei: Zhonggang yanjiuyuan Zhongguo wenzhe yanjiusuo, 1995.
- Yeh Wen-hsin. *Provincial Passages: Culture, Space, and the Origins of Chinese Communism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- ed. *Becoming Chinese: Passages to Modernity and Beyond*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Yin Haiguang 殷海光. *Yin Haiguang xuanji* 殷海光选集. 2 vols. Hong Kong: Youlian chubanshe, 1971.
- Zhongguo wenhua de zhanwang* 中国文化的展望. Taipei: Guiguan chubanshe, 1988.
- Young, Ernest P. *The Presidency of Yuan Shi-k'ai: Liberalism and Dictatorship in Early Republican China*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977.
- Yu Dingbang 余定邦 and Niu Junkai 牛军凯, eds. *Chen Xujing wenji* 陈序经文集. Guangzhou: Zhongshan daxue chubanshe, 2004.
- Yü Ying-shih [Yü Yingshi 余英时] 'Chen Yinke de xueshu jingshen he wannian xinjing' 陈寅恪的学术精神和晚年心境. In Yü Yingshi, *Xiandai weiji yu sixiang renwu* 现代危机与思想人物, 361-73. Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2005.
- 'Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment: a historian's reflections on the May Fourth movement'. In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by Milena Doleželo-Velingerová and Oldřich Král, 299-324. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- 'The radicalization of China in the twentieth century'. *Dialysis* 122, 2 (Spring 1993): 125-150.
- 'Zhongguo jindai sixiangshi shang de jijin yu baoshao' 中国现代思想史上的激进与保守. In Yü Yingshi 余英时, *Qian Mu yu Zhongguo wenhua* 钱穆与中国文化, 188-295. Shanghai: Yuandong chubanshe, 1994.
- 'Zhongguo wenhua weiji ji qi sixiangshi de beijing' 中国文化危机及其思想史的背景. In Yü Yingshi 余英时, *Lishi renwu yu wenhua weiji* 历史人物与文化危机, 187-96. Taipei: Dongda tushu, 1995.
- Yü Yingshi 余英时 et al., *Wusi xinlun* 五四新论. Taipei, Lianjing shudian, 1999.
- Yu Zuhua 俞祖华 and Zhao Huifeng 赵慧峰. 'Jindai Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi sichao yanjiu zongshu' 近代中国自由主义思潮研究综述. In *Zhongguo jindai shehui wenhua sichao yanjiu tonglan* 中国近代社会文化思想研究通鉴, edited by Yu Zuhua 俞祖华 and Zhao Huifeng 赵慧峰, 250-66. Jinan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 2005.
- Zanasi, Margherita. *Saving the Nation: Economic Modernity in Republican China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Zarrow, Peter. *Anarchism and Chinese Political Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- China in War and Revolution 1895-1949*. London: Routledge, 2005.

- ed. *Creating Chinese Modernity: Knowledge and Everyday Life, 1900–1940*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- ‘Anti-despotism and “rights talk”: the intellectual origins of modern human rights thinking in the late Qing’. *Modern China* 34, 2 (April 2008): 179–209.
- Zhai Zhicheng 翟志成. *Feng Youlan xuesi shengming qianzhuan (1895–1949)* 冯友兰学思生命前传 (1895–1949). Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, 2007.
- Zhang Dongsun 张东荪. *Lixing yu minzhu* 理性与民主. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1946.
- Minzhu zhuyi yu shehui zhuyi* 民主与社会主义. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1948.
- Sixiang yu shehui* 思想与社会. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1946.
- ‘Changqi de rennai’ 长期的忍耐. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 8, 4 (December 1920): 12.
- ‘Disanzhong wenming’ 第三种文明. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 1, 1 (1 September 1919): 1–5.
- ‘Guanyu Zhongguo chulu de kanfa’ 关于中国出路看法. *Guancha* 观察, 3, 23 (January 1947): 3–4.
- ‘Jingji pingdeng yu feichu boxue’ 经济平等与废除剥削. *Guancha* 观察 4, 2 (March 1948): 3–4.
- ‘Minzhu zhuyi yu shehui zhuyi buyi’ 民主主义与社会主义补义. *Guancha* 观察 5, 1 (September 1948): 7–9; continued in 2 (September 1948): 7–8 and in 3 (September 1948): 8–10.
- ‘Women weishenme yao jiang shehui zhuyi?’ 我们为什么要讲社会主义?. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 1, 7 (1 December 1919): 3–14.
- ‘Xiandai de Zhongguo zenyang yao xue Kongzi’ 现代的中国怎样要学孔子. In *Zhishi yu wenhua: Zhang Dongsun wenhua lunzhu jiyao* 知识与文化: 张东荪文化论著辑要, edited by Zhang Yaonan 张耀南, 404–13. Beijing: Zhongguo guangbo dianshi chubanshe, 1995.
- ‘Xianzai yu jianglai’ 现在与将来. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 4 (December 1920): 23–36.
- ‘Yige zhongjianxing de zhengzhi luxian’ 一个中间性的政治路线. *Zaisheng* 再生 (June 1946): 3–4.
- ‘Younaidi lüxing erde zhi you yi jiaoxun’ 由内地旅行而得之又一教训. In *Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi ziliao jianbian* 中国现代思想史资料简编. 5 vols., edited by Cai Shangsi 蔡尚思, vol. I, 616. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1982.
- ‘Zhengzhi shang de ziyou zhuyi yu wenhua shang de ziyou zhuyi’ 政治上的自由主义与文化上的自由主义. *Guancha* 观察, 4, 1 (February 1948): 3–5.
- ‘Zhi Duxiu de xin’ 致独秀的信. *Xin qingnian* 新青年 8, 4 (December 1920): 17.
- ‘Zhongguo zhi shehui wenti’ 中国之社会问题. *Yongyan* 庸言 1, 16 (July 1913): 4–6.
- Zhang Foquan 张佛泉. ‘Bangguo zhuyi de jiantao’ 邦国主义的检讨. *Guowen zhoubao* 国闻周报 11, 40 (November 1934): 1–8; continued in the following issue, 1–8.
- ‘Geren ziyou yu shehui tongzhi’ 个人自由与社会统制. *Guowen zhoubao* 国闻周报 12, 28 (July 1935): 1–11.
- ‘Lun ziyou’ 论自由. *Guowen zhoubao* 国闻周报 12, 3 (January 1935): 1–10.
- ‘Xihua wenti zhi pipan’ 西化问题之批判. In *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化建设讨论集. Edited by Ma Fangruo 马芳若, part II, 18–23. Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935.

- 'Xihua wenti de weisheng' 西化问题的尾声, In *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化讨论集, edited by Ma Fangruo 马芳若, part II, 282–7. Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935.
- Zhang Hao 张颉. *Youan yishi yu minzhu chuantong* 幽暗意识与民主传统. Taibei: Lianjing chubangongsi, 1989.
- 'Chongfang wusi: lun wusi sixiang de liangqixing' 重访五四: 论五四思想的两歧性. In *Wusi xinlun* 五四新论, edited by Yü Yingshi 余英时 et al., 33–65. Taibei: Lianjing shudian, 1999.
- Zhang Junmai 张君勱. *Guoxianyi* 国宪议, reprint. Taibei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1970; first published in 1922.
- Liguo zhi dao* 立国之道. Guilin: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1938.
- Mingri zhi Zhongguo wenhua* 明日之中国文化. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1936.
- Minzu fuxing zhi xueshu jichu* 民族复兴之学术基础. 2 vols. Beiping: Zaisheng zazhishe, 1935.
- Shehui zhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan* 社会主义思想运动概观. Taibei: Daoxiang chubanshe, 1988; published posthumously.
- Xianzheng zhi dao* 宪政之道. No editor. Beijing: Qinghua daxue chubanshe, 2006.
- Zhongxiyin zhaxue wenji* 中西印哲学文集. 2 vols. Edited by Cheng Wenxi 程文熙. Taibei: Taiwan xuesheng shuzhu, 1981.
- 'Deguo xin gonghe xianfa ping' 德国新共和宪法评. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 2, 9 (May 1920): 5–24.
- 'Deguo xin gonghe xianfa ping erxu' 德国新共和宪法评二续. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 2, 12 (June 1920): 5–15.
- 'Deguo xin gonghe xianfa ping yixu' 德国新共和宪法评一续. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 2, 11 (June 1920): 4–12.
- 'Du liuxingqi zhi Eguo' 读六星期之俄国. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 2 (1921): 51–66.
- 'Fei Xide dui Deyizhi guomin yanjiang zhaiyao' 菲希德对德意志国民演讲摘要. *Zaisheng* 再生 1, 3 (June 1932): 1–13.
- 'Guojia minzhu zhengzhi yu guojia shehui zhuyi' 国家民主政治与国家社会主义. *Zaisheng* 再生 1, 2 (July 1932): 1–38, continued in 1, 3 (July 1932): 1–39.
- 'Minzhu shehuidang de renwu' 民主社会党的任务. *Zaisheng* 再生 164 (May 1947): 2–6, continued in 168 (June 1947): 2–6.
- 'Minzu fuxing yundong' 民族复兴运动. *Zaisheng* 再生 1, 10 (February 1933): 1–8.
- 'Ouzhou wenhua zhi weiji ji Zhongguo xinwenhua zhi quxiang' 欧洲文化之危机及中国新文化之趋向. *Dongfang zazhi* 东方杂志 19, 3 (February 1922): 117–23.
- 'Shehui suoyou zhi yiyi ji Deguo meikuang shehui suoyoufa caoan' 社会所有之意义及德国煤矿社会所有法草案. *Gaizao* 改造 3, 11 (July 1921): 13–27.
- 'Wo zhi Eguo guan' 我之俄国观. *Zaisheng* 再生 1, 1 (May 1932): 1–4, continued in 1, 5 (September 1932): 1–6.
- 'Xuanni zhi shehui gaizao tongzhizhi yijianshu' 悬拟之社会改造同志会意见书. *Gaizao* 改造 4, 3 (November 1921): 1–14.
- Zhang Junmai 张君勱 and Zhang Dongsun 张东荪. 'Zhongguo zhi qiantu: Deguo hu? Eguo hu?' 中国之前途: 德国乎? 俄国乎? *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 2, 14 (July 1920): 1–18.
- Zhang Pengyuan 张朋园. *Liang Qichao yu minguo zhengzhi* 梁启超与民国政治. Taibei: Shiji-huo chubanshe, 1981.

- Zhang Qing 章青. 'Hu Shi pai xuerenqun' yu xiandai Zhongguo ziyou zhuyi '胡适派学人群' 与现代中国自由主义. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004.
- Zhang Rulun 张汝伦. 'Disantiao daolu' 第三条道路. In *Zhishi fenzi lichang: ziyou zhuyi zhi zheng yu Zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化, edited by Li Shitao 李世涛, 334-43. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2002.
- 'Zhongguo xiandai sixiangshi shang de Zhang Junmai' 中国现代思想史上的张君勱. In *Ershi shiji Zhongguo sixiangshilun* 二十世纪中国思想史论, 2 vols. Edited by Xu Jilin 许纪霖, vol. II, 124-53. Shanghai: Dongfang chubanshe, 2000.
- Zhang Shibao 张世保. *Chen Xujing zhengzhi zhaxue yanjiu* 政治陈序经哲学研究. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2007.
- Zhang Shizhao 章士钊. *Zhang Shizhao quanji* 章士钊全集. 10 vols. Edited by Zhang Hanzhi 章含之 and Bai Ji'an 白吉庵. Shanghai: Shanghai wenhui chubanshe, 2000.
- Zhang Xiruo 张熙若. 'Guomin renge zhi peiyang' 国民人格之培养. *Duli pinglun* 独立评论 150 (May 1935): 14-17.
- 'Quanpan xihua yu Zhongguo benwei' 全盘西化与中国本位. In *Zhongguo wenhua jianshe taolunji* 中国文化建设讨论集, edited by Ma Fangruo 马芳若, part II, 244-57. Shanghai: Longwen shudian, 1935.
- Zhang Yingjin, ed. *Cinema and Urban Culture Shanghai, 1922-1943*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Zhang Zhongdong 张忠栋. *Hu Shi wulun* 胡适五论. Taipei: Yunchen wenhua, 1987.
- Zhao Libin 赵立彬. *Minzu lichang yu xiandai zhuiqiu: 20 shiji 20-40 niandai de quanpan xihua sichao* 民族立场与现代追求: 20 世纪 20-40 年代的全盘西化思潮. Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2005.
- Zhao, Suisheng. *A Nation-State by Construction: Dynamics of Modern Chinese Nationalism*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Zheng Dahua 郑大华. *Liang Shuming yu Hu Shi: wenhua baoshou zhuyi yu xihua sixiang de bijiao* 梁漱溟与胡适: 文化保守主义与西化思想的比较. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1994.
- Liang Shuming zhuan* 梁漱溟传. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2001.
- Zhang Junmai xueshu sixiang pingzhuan* 张君勱学术思想评传. Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 1999.
- Zhang Junmai zhuan* 张君勱传. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997.
- 'Diyci shijie dazhan dui zhanhou (1918-1927) Zhongguo sixiang wenhua de yingxiang' 第一次世界大战对战后 (1918-1927) 中国思想文化的影响. In *Xifang sixiang zai jindai Zhongguo* 西方思想在近代中国, edited by Zheng Dahua 郑大华 and Zou Xiaozhan 邹小站, 158-204. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe.
- Zhongguo dier lishidang'anguan 中国第二历史档案馆编, comp. *Zhongguo minzhu shehuidang* 中国民主社会党. Nanjing: Zhongguo dier lishidang'anguan, 1988.
- Zhongguo Guomindang lici quanguo daibiao dahui xuanyanji* 中国国民党历次全国代表大会宣言集, no editor. Taipei: Zhongyang wenhua gongyingshe, 1951.
- Zhongguo Guomindang zhongyang weiyuanhui dangshi weiyuanhui 中国国民党中央委员会党史委员会编, comp. *Guofu quanji* 国父全集. 6 vols. Taipei: Zhongguo Guomindang dangshihui, 1981.

- Zhongguo minzhu tongmeng zhongyang wenshi ziliao weiyuanhui 中国民主同盟中央文史资料委员会编, comp. *Zhongguo minzhu tongmeng lishi wenxian 1941-1949* 中国民主同盟历史文献 1941-1949. Beijing: Wenshi ziliao chubanshe, 1983.
- Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo Zhonghua minguoshi yanjiushi 中国社会科学院近代史研究所中华民国史研究室, ed. *Hu Shi lai wang shu xinxuan* 胡适来往书信. 2 vols. Hong Kong: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.
- Zhou Changlong 周昌龙. *Chaoyue xichao: Hu Shi yu Zhongguo chuantong* 超越西潮: 胡适与中国传统. Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 2001.
- 'Yan Fu ziyouguan de sanceng yiyi' 严复自由观的三层意义. *Hanxue yanjiu* 汉学研究 13, 1 (June 1995): 43-59.
- Zhu Xueqin 朱学勤. 'Rangren weinan de Luosu' 让人为难的罗素. *Dushu* 读书 1 (January 1996): 1-10.
- Zou Wenhai 邹文海. 'Minzhu zhengzhi shifou rengxu ziyou?' 民主政治是否仍需自由? *Minzhu luntan* 民主论坛 1, 10 (November 1946): 3-5.
- Zuo Yuhe 左玉河. *Zhang Dongsun wenhua sixiang yanjiu* 张东荪文化思想研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1998.
- Zhang Dongsun xueshu sixiang pingzhuan* 张东荪学术思想评传. Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 1999.
- Zhang Dongsun zhuan* 张东荪传. Jinan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 1998.

Index

- 'abundant cosmopolitanization', 55, 257
 Academia Sinica, 148, 242
Academic Basis of National Renaissance, The
 (1935), 108, 110
Academic Light, 196
 Adams, Brooks, 65
 Adams, Henry, 65
*Addresses to the German Nation (Reden an die
 deutsche Nation)*, 108–9
 Alitto, Guy, 85, 106, 107
 American War of Independence, 100
 Ames, Roger T., 7, 8
 anarchism, 5, 27, 30, 172, 198, 200; in the
 late Qing and early Republican period,
 30
 Anderson, Benedict, 100
Annals of the Warring States, 20, 120
 anti-imperialism, 103, 127
 Aristotle, 84
 Arnold, Matthew, 31, 65
 Australia, 90
Authority in the Modern State (1919), 212

 Babbitt, Irving, 69, 70, 72, 86, 97, 257. *See*
also New Humanism
 Bank of England, 240
 Battle of the Fei River (383), 121
 Baudelaire, Charles-Pierre, 9
 Beard, Charles A., 46–7
 Beijing, 39, 108, 136, 191, 239
 Beijing University (Beida), 16, 18, 38, 42,
 134, 135, 136
 Belinsky, Vissarion G., 59
 Bell, Daniel, 15
 Belloc, J. H., 46
 Bentham, Jeremy, 129

 Bergson, Henri, 22, 69, 72, 75, 257
 Berlin, 148
 Berlin University, 46
 Bernstein, Eduard: on socialism and the
 revisionists, 192 and n6
 Big Four, 244
 Bismarck, Otto von, 110, 113
 Blue Shirts, 224
 Bluntschli, Johann Kaspar, 97n4, 227
 Bolshevism, 198, 199
Book of Rites, The, 219
 Bornhak, Gustav, 97n4
 Bosanquet, Bernard, 156
 Boutroux, Émile, 67
 Brace, C. L., 235
 Britain, 30, 54, 215, 237, 239, 244, 245,
 246, 247
 British Labour Party, 211, 212; in
 government after World War II, 240
 Buddhism, 71, 121; Chan, 45
 Burke, Edmund, 64, 59, 96

 Cai Yuanpei, 16, 18, 134, 173, 175, 176;
 resigned as chancellor of Beida, 178
 Cambridge University, 137
 Cao Kun, 76, 178
 capitalism, 5, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 25, 50, 51,
 52, 115, 134, 138, 143, 193–9, 203, 204,
 205, 225, 226, 228, 229, 231, 234, 237,
 242, 243, 244, 246, 250, 251, 261;
 American, 217; Asian, 264; bureaucratic,
 126, 240; critique of, 3, 146, 191, 192,
 194, 261; global, 268; liberal, 217, 251,
 255, 261; new, 241, 251–2; organized,
 193, 240; social inequities of, 11, 222;
 state, 210, 216, 246

- Carlyle, Thomas, 124
 Cecil, Hugh, 61
Central News, 253
 'centralized minimalism', 162
Century Critics, 20
 Chaadayev, Piotr Y., 59
 Chang Yansheng, 34
 Chang, Carsun, *see* Zhang Junmai
 Chang, Hao, 11, 27, 80, 145
 Changsha, 199
 Chatterjee, Partha, 100–1
 Chen Duxiu, 18, 19, 30, 37, 44, 60, 75,
 104, 134, 136, 137, 175, 191; advocates
 science and democracy, 16; criticizes
tiaohelun, 90; as dean of arts at Beida, 37;
 in the debate on capitalism versus
 socialism, 201–2; in the East–West
 cultural debate, 32–3; as editor of the
New Youth journal, 17; opposes
 Easternization, 76; on religion and
 Christianity, 80–1; targets selected
 Confucian ethics, 60n118; as a
 Westernized radical, 37–8
 Chen Gaoyong, 52n88
 Chen Gongbo, 106, 231n27
 Chen Jiongming, 163, 175
 Chen Jitang, 113
 Chen Lifu, 114
 Chen Mingshu, 104
 Chen Qitian, 97
 Chen Quan, 123–5
 Chen Xujing, 4, 24, 31, 39, 84, 86, 114,
 257, 265; advocates total Westernization,
 46–56; appointed to Nankai University,
 58; attempts to revive total
 Westernization during the war against
 Japan, 57; birth and education of, 46;
 criticized by cultural conservatives and
 liberals alike, 51–2; criticizes Hu Shu
 and Chen Duxu, 48; death of, 58; as a
 fervent nationalist, 53–4; at Lingnan
 University, 46–7; relations with Hu Shi
 regarding total Westernization, 54–5
 Chen Yinke, 87–8, 135, 266
 Cheng Chung-ying, 90
 Cheng Yi, 91
 Chesterton, G. K., 46
 Chiang Kai-shek, 107, 114, 124, 126, 224,
 241, 245
 China Public Institute, 136
China's Destiny (1943), 118
 Chinese Communist Party (CCP), 14, 216,
 253, 267; founding of, 205; land
 programme and peasant movement,
 106–7; united front with GMD, 115, 210
 Chinese conservatism, 2, 21–3, 24; critique
 of, 93–5; politics of, 96–127, 102, 103,
 118; rise of, 63–72. *See also* conservatism
 Chinese Cultural Construction Council,
 52n88
Chinese Culture Tomorrow (1936), 108, 111
 Chinese Democratic League, 98, 107,
 237–8, 239, 241
 Chinese Democratic Socialist Party,
 239–40
 Chinese liberalism, 2, 128, 130, 134, 136,
 138; Confucian, 94; as expressed in 'Our
 Political Proposals', 172; 'failure' of,
 129, 139, 260–1; rebirth of, in
 contemporary China, 266–7; rise of,
 130–4; understanding of, 22–25, 129,
 138–46, 259. *See also* liberalism
 Chinese modernity, 1–4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 16,
 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 256–7, 260, 264, 266,
 267–8; interpreted in terms of global
 modernity, 12; towards an
 understanding of, 5–13. *See also*
 modernity
 Chinese nationalism: as anti-Japanese
 aggression, 109–10, 117–19, 148; as
 politicocultural nationalism, 98, 101–3,
 103–19, 117–19, 258. *See also*
 nationalism
 Chinese Nationalist Party (GMD), 20, 225;
 rise to power in 1928, 45; united front
 with CCP, 210, 241
 Chinese State Socialist Party, 109, 136,
 210, 261–2; founding and First Party
 Congress of, 226; on education, 234; on
 industrial relations, 233; on taxation,
 233–4; planning under, 228. *See also*
 Democratic Socialist Party
 Chinese Youth Party, 97, 239
 Chongqing, 239, 241
 Christianity, 51, 54, 71, 91, 111, 236
 Chu Anping, 137
 civil service examinations, 5, 216
 Cohen, Paul, 60, 131
 Cold War, 240
 Columbia University, 50, 78, 92
Communism (1927), 212
 Comte, Auguste, 33n20, 81

- Confucianism, 29, 74, 76, 83, 91, 92, 93, 133, 161, 162, 220, 257, 265; 'authentic', 75; discredited, 38; imperial, 30
- Confucius, 83, 143; birthday celebrated by GMD; on good government, 177; not procapitalism, 219–220
- Congress Socialist Party, 254
- conservatism, 2, 4, 5, 13, 17, 21, 96, 98, 119, 126; Burkean, 63–4; cultural, 5, 23–4, 28, 43, 53, 56, 61–95, 96, 97, 98, 103, 108, 114, 115, 117, 157, 158, 256, 258. *See also* Chinese conservatism
- Constitution of 1947, 189
- Constitution Study Society, 135
- Cornell University, 243
- cosmopolitanism, 27, 88, 198
- Cotton Control Commission, 106
- Crescent, The*, 19, 213
- Critical Review Group, 70, 71, 86, 97, 257, 258, 266
- Critical Review*, 20, 70
- Cultural Construction Monthly, 52n88
- cultural eclecticism, 85
- cultural iconoclasm, 30, 45, 158, 257. *See also* radicalism
- Cultural Revolution, 29, 39, 58, 61
- cultural synthesis, 4
- cultural universalism, 58
- 'culture craze', 31, 265
- Current News*, 195
- Dagongbao* ('*L'Impartial*'), 120, 148
- Daoism, 143, 161, 162
- datong* ideal, 219, 221
- De Bary, William Theodore, 130–1, 132
- De Saint-Simon, Henri, 204
- 'Declaration of cultural construction on a Chinese base', 52, 114
- Democracy in Crisis* (1933), 213
- democracy, 2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 23, 27, 31, 37, 38, 43, 46, 48, 50, 59, 74, 75, 78, 80, 86, 89, 94, 97, 98, 105, 111, 117, 124, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 139, 143, 150, 160, 166, 171, 180, 181, 185, 258, 265, 268; Chartist, 211; and law, 184, 190; revisionist, 127, 226; social, 25, 27, 224–6, 237, 239–53, 255, 262, 263, 267; socialist, 214, 216
- Deng Xiaoping, 263–4
- Dewey, John, 15, 75, 137, 155
- dialectical materialism, 3
- Diary of a Madman*, 38
- Dikötter, Frank, 7
- Ding Wenjiang, 16, 68, 134, 177, 178, 181; advocates new-style dictatorship, 97, 164, 171; on good men in politics, 173–4, 176; on the military elite, 175; questions planning, 230
- Dirlik, Arif, 116
- doctrine of mediation and harmony (*tiaohelun*), 24, 84–90, 258, 265
- Doctrine of the Mean*, 84
- Doll's House*, A, 153
- Dong, Madeleine Yue, 6
- Dream of the Red Chamber, The*, 44
- Driesch, Hans Adolph, 22, 68, 72, 257
- Du Yaquan, 84; on the East–West cultural difference, 35–6; as editor of *Eastern Miscellany*, 35, 67; on the old–new dichotomy, 77–8; on religion and science, 80–1; on rule of law, 186; on socialism, 221; on *tiaohelun*, 84, 88; on World War I, 67–8
- Duan Qirui, 19, 136, 175
- Duara, Prasenjit, 99, 101
- Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies* (1921), 72–73, 76, 105, 111
- 'Eastern ethics, Western technology', 31
- Eastern Miscellany*, 20, 67, 68, 77
- 'Eastern ways, Western machines', 32
- Easternization (*dongfanghua*), 24, 72–6, 257
- egalitarianism, 189
- eight-legged essays, 31
- Eisenstadt, S. N., 8, 57n109
- Eliot, T. S., 70
- elitism, 159, 179–82, 190; positive, 179n71
- Emancipation and Reconstruction*, 20, 196, 197, 208
- Endeavour Weekly*, 20, 135, 172, 174
- Engels, Friedrich, 249
- England, 27, 40, 99, 144, 191
- enlightened despotism, 97, 127, 162
- Enlightenment, 6, 9, 11, 22, 23, 27, 28, 31, 63, 64, 66, 72, 73, 98, 100, 109, 133, 179, 180, 130, 132, 133, 141, 150, 161, 179, 180; Chinese, 27; core beliefs of, 8; counter-, 28, 257; critique of, 65–6, 67, 82; legacy of, 10; 261, 260
- Epstein, Klaus, 64

- equality, 2, 5, 13, 16, 25, 132, 136, 139, 157, 160, 180, 196, 197, 199, 109, 218, 238, 244, 261, 264; cultural, 72; gender, 28, 133, 146; socioeconomic, 146, 213, 240, 244, 262, 263. *See also* liberty–equality nexus
- Eucken, Rudolf Christoph, 22, 68, 72, 75, 257
- Europe, 53, 167, 203; Eastern, 267; Western, 23, 130, 134, 191, 192, 225, 230, 238, 240, 262
- Europeanization, 37, 38, 71, 105. *See also* Westernization
- Evolution and Ethics* (1893), 33
- evolutionary theory, 33, 44, 48, 72, 78, 88, 132, 256
- exploitation, 201, 221, 250–1
- Fabian Society, 211–12, 213
- Fabianism, 213, 223, 261
- Fairbank, John King, 150
- Fan Zhongyun, 52n88
- fascism, 50, 52, 126, 224, 225, 237
- fashizumu* (Japanese fascism), 237
- February Revolution, 214
- federalism, 163–4
- Fei Xiaotong, 137
- Feng Chongyi, 119
- Feng Enrong, 53
- Feng Guifen, 37
- Feng Youlan, 19, 57, 90, 127, 264; on *tiaohu*, 92, 118
- Feng Yuxiang, 175
- Fengtian Clique, 172
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 108–9, 110
- Final Awakening of the Chinese National Self-Salvation Movement, The* (1931), 104
- First International (1864), 194
- Fitzgerald, John, 104, 168
- Foucault, Michel, 9–10, 19
- 'Four Freedoms', 242
- France, 27, 30, 33, 40, 100, 144
- French Constitution, 208
- French Revolution, 64, 109, 214
- Friends of the Nation*, 59
- Fu Sinian, 15, 19, 38, 147–8; on Franklin D. Roosevelt and new liberalism, 242–3; on the liberty–equality nexus, 244–5
- Fu Zuoyi, 239
- Fudan University, 46
- Fukuda Tokuzō, 217
- Fukuzawa Yukichi, 132, 141
- Gao Yihan, 14, 175, 173, 177
- Gellner, Ernest, 99
- General History of China, A* (1940), 117–18
- George, Henry, 210
- German Revolution, 208
- German Romantic Movement, 125
- German Social Democratic Party, 208
- Germany, 40, 87, 100, 108, 205, 206, 214, 216; Weimar, 191
- Giddens, Anthony, 157; on the consequences of modernity, 9, 263; on the New Third Way, 267
- Gilroy, Paul, 11
- globalization, 2
- Godley, Michael, 224
- Gong Xiangrui, 137
- 'good men cabinet', 25, 175, 178
- 'good men government', 25, 178, 179
- 'government with a plan', 23; and omnipotent government, 167–71, 224
- Grammar of Politics, A* (1925), 212
- Gray, John, 129, 140, 160
- Great Depression, 40, 229, 230
- Green, T. H., 155
- Greenfeld, Liah, 99–100
- Grieder, Jerome, 45, 128, 140, 181, 260
- Gu Hongming, 62
- Gu Weijun (Wellington Koo), 135, 175
- Guangdong, 108, 113, 163, 237
- Guangxi, 164, 237
- Guangzhou, 39
- Guizhou, 164
- Gunther, John, 147, 237
- Guo, Yingjie, 102
- guocui* (national essence), 63n6. *See also* National Essence School
- guyou wenhua* (inherent ancestral culture), 49, 86, 147
- guyou wenming* (inherent ancestral civilization), 77
- Habermas, Jürgen, 10, 258; on law and morality, 185–6; on modernity as an unfinished project, 1, 9
- Hall, David, 7, 8
- Hamaguchi Esyun, 15
- Han Dynasty, 161
- Han Fei, 97
- Hang Liwu, 137

- Hangzhou, 38, 200
 Harvard University, 69, 87, 122
 Hayek, Friederich von, 138, 251
 He Bingsong, 52n88
 He Jian, 113
 He Lin, 19, 57, 90, 124, 264; on the *ti-yong* dichotomy, 91
 He Yongji, 122–3
 Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 9, 72, 77, 109n53, 111
 Heraclitus, 84, 122
 Herder, Johann Gottfried von, 109
 Herzon, Aleksandr I., 59
 Hilferding, Rudolf, 193
 historical materialism, 14, 192, 203, 206, 210, 239
History of Chinese Philosophy (1931, 1933), 92
 Hitler, Adolf, 123
 Hobhouse, L. T., 152, 156; on socialism, 192. *See also* New Liberalism
 Holmes, Stephen, 129, 140, 160
 Hong Kong, 90, 137, 145, 264
 Howland, Douglas, 22; on the introduction of John Stuart Mill to China and Japan, 143; on the modernization of Meiji Japan, 141–2
 Hu Hanmin, 14
 Hu Shi, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 39, 47, 54, 60, 84, 86, 94, 104, 110, 128, 134, 135–6, 137, 139, 151, 157, 158, 163, 164, 172–3, 180, 188, 189, 213, 257, 259; on ‘abundant cosmopolitanization’, 55; advocates wholehearted and thorough Westernization, 39–45; arrives in Taiwan, 132; on China’s internal problems, 40, 42, 46; at the China Public Institute in Shanghai, 136; as Chinese ambassador to the U.S., 56, 131, 136, 147; on the Chinese liberal tradition, 131–2; on Chinese nationalism, 146–7; and *The Crescent*, 213; criticized by Tao Xisheng, 116; criticizes the GMD regime, 48; criticizes Wang Chonghui, 178; cultural iconoclastic image of, 44–5; debates Li Dazhao regarding ‘problems and isms’, 200; disappointed by the Yalta Agreement (1945) and Soviet aggression, 218n45; on the East–West cultural difference, 34–5; and *Endeavour Weekly*, 135, 172; faults the Chinese national character, 42–3; goes to London for a meeting of the Sino-British Boxer Indemnity Committee, 214–5; on ‘good men government’, 178–9; on government by experts, 179; on ‘government with a plan’, 170; on government as a political instrument, 182; and the human rights movement (1929–31), 184; on individualism, 153–6; on intellectuals as independent critics and political commentators, 176; on materialism and spirituality, 40–1; on the military elite, 175; nominates twelve great men in China, 175–6; on the notion of dual responsibilities, 153–4; opinion of Liang Shuming, 104; opposes selective assimilation and cultural synthesis, 43; on ordinary people’s understanding of law, 187; and ‘Our political proposals’, 172–3; and Pingshe, 213; private life and marriage of, 45; as a professor at Beida, 38, 135, 136; rejects *tiaohelun*, 90; relations with Chen Xujing regarding total Westernization, 54–6; relations with officials of the Beijing government in 1925, 135; on religion and science, 80, 81; and ‘reorganization of the national heritage’, 44; response to the Russian Revolution, 214; response to the ‘Soviet experiment’, 214–18; on social immortality, 154–5; as a student of John Dewey at Columbia University, 39; and the vernacular movement, 38; visit to Moscow in 1926, 214–6; visit to the U.S. in 1927 and impressions of it, 40, 217; and Wu Peifu, 135–6; on ‘*wuwei* government’, 170n45
 Hu Xiansu, 70, 97
 Huang Fu, 136
 Huang Jie, 62
 Huang Kewu, 143
 Huang Wenshan, 52n88
 Huang Yanpei, 104, 136
 Huang Zongxi, 130
 Huang, Philip, 162
 human rights, 167, 185, 190, 222, 228, 243, 244, 251; movement, 184
 humanism, 27
 Hume, David, 27, 113
 Hunan, 38, 163, 172

- 'Hundred Days' Reform', 29, 77, 132, 145
 Hunt, Michael, 162
 Hutchinson, John 101–2
 Hutters, Theodore, 221
 Huxley, Thomas, 33, 132
- Ibsen, Henrik, 153
 Imperial University (Tokyo), 195
 imperialism, 11, 53, 54, 59, 99, 100, 109, 112, 115, 126, 138, 145, 146, 147, 148, 194, 203, 237. *See also* anti-imperialism
Independent Critic, 20, 136
 India, 25, 32, 35, 46, 49, 59, 73, 74, 101
 Indian National Congress, 254
 Industrial Revolution, 133, 235
 Institute of Rural Self-Government, 104
 Italy, 180
- Japan, 19, 25, 53, 54, 74, 216; Meiji, 59, 141
 Japanese Communist Party, 253
 Jeans, Roger, 206
 Ji Wenfu, 119
 Jiang Baili, 204–5
 Jiang Menglin (Chiang Menlin), 78, 135
 Jiang Tingfu, 97, 134, 164; on the liberty–equality nexus, 245–6
 Jiang Yihua, 61
 Jiangxi, 172
- Kang Youwei, 29, 132, 175
 Kant, Immanuel, 10, 72, 82, 87, 111, 112, 129, 185, 235
 Karl, Rebecca, 17
 Katō Hiroyuki, 132, 141, 145
 Kautsky, Karl, 205
 Kemal, Mustapha, 58n113
 Kiel University, 46
 Kipling, Rudyard, 31, 36
 Kirby, William C., 7
 Kirk, Russell, 69, 93
 Kong Xiangxi (H. H. Kung), 245
- L'Évolution créatrice* (1907), 69
 Lan Gongwu, 204
 Laozi, 143
 Lary, Diana, 164
 Lasalle, Ferdinand, 194
 Laski, Harold J., 137, 156, 232, 247; on the dangers of elitism, 180–2; on the end of state, 165; socialist thought of, 212–13
- Laue, Theodore H. von, 58
 law: rule by, 186; rule by man, 186; rule of, 14, 159–60, 166, 171, 182–9; and constitutionalism, 189–90; and democracy, 184–5; and human rights, 184; and public morality, 185–6; 'thick' and 'thin' versions of the rule of, 183, 186; traditional Chinese, 183
 League of Nations, 123
Lebensanschauung, 80, 81, 82, 86
L'Évolution créatrice (1907), 69
 Lee, Leo Ou-fan: on Chinese modernity, 5–6
 Lei Haizong, 121–2
 Leibniz, Gottfried 155
 Lenin, Vladimir, 196, 199n28, 203, 213, 229
 Level Society, 213
 Li Dazhao, 30, 104, 134, 136, 173, 191, 197; as the chief librarian at Beida, 37; debates with Hu Shi on issues versus isms, 200; on the East–West cultural difference, 36–7; on 'orderly freedoms in a free order', 157; response to the October Revolution, 36
 Li Haopei, 188
 Li Hongzhang, 37
 Li Jishen, 104
 Li Si, 97
 Li Yuanhong, 175, 195
 Li Zehou, 264
 Li Zongren, 19
 Liang Ji, 73
 Liang Qichao, 15, 16, 29, 71, 88, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 151, 157, 162, 163, 175, 198, 206, 221, 253, 257, 266; on China's responsibility to world civilization, 67; criticizes capitalism in the West, 193–5; death of, 226; endorses capitalist development in China, 203–4; on enlightened despotism, 97; his 'New citizen' (1902), 132; his 'New historiography' and view of history, 66–7; on the horrors of World War I, 66; liberal thought of, 144–5; as a member of an unofficial delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, 66
 Liang Shiqiu, 70, 136, 213
 Liang Shiyi, 172
 Liang Shuming, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 35, 71, 83, 90, 93, 98, 114, 119, 126,

- 173, 221, 237, 257, 258, 260, 264; on agriculture as the foundation of the nation, 106; appointed to the Beida faculty, 73; at Beida, 104; criticizes the Chinese Communist movement, 106–7; disapproves of constitutional rule in China in the 1940s, 98; on Easternization, 72–6; final awakening of, 104–5; looks back at his life, 12; as a member of the People's Political Council, 107; politicocultural thought of, 102–7; relations with Hu Shi and Li Dazhao at Beida, 104; on religion, 80; on rural reconstruction, 105–7, 126; in Shandong, 104; supports science and democracy in the New Culture Movement, 75, 105; visit to Yan'an, 107
- liberalism, 1, 2, 5, 8, 13, 17, 80, 114, 126, 128, 129–30, 133–4, 150, 160, 189, 190, 192, 216, 264; American, 137; British, 133, 134, 137; meaning of, 128, 140; new, 25, 217, 238, 242–3, 260, 262, 267; relationship to nationalism, 146–9. *See also* Chinese liberalism
- liberty, 2, 5, 11, 13, 16, 17, 85, 110, 132, 133, 136, 138, 140, 142, 143, 149, 151, 152, 155, 156, 157, 261, 265–7, 241, 242, 249, 251. *See also* liberty–equality nexus
- liberty–equality nexus, 25, 226, 238, 244–8, 262
- Lin Sen, 181
- Lin Tongji, 126; on war and power, 120–1, 122
- Lin Yü-sheng; on Chinese conservatism, 21; on creative transformation of Chinese traditions, 95n125; on radical antitraditionalism, 4, 39
- Lin Yutang, 42
- Lin Zexu, 132
- Lincoln, Abraham, 76
- Lingnan High School, 46
- Lingnan University, 46, 47, 53, 56
- Liu Boming, 70, 97
- Liu Junning, 139–40
- Liu Shipai, 62, 161, 194
- Liu Shu-hsien, 90
- Liu Xiaobo, 265
- Liu Yizheng, 73
- Liu, Lydia, 22, 141
- Locke, John, 27, 59, 129, 134, 136
- Lohia, Ram Manohar, 254
- London School of Economics, 137
- London, 148
- Lou Bangyan, 137
- Lovejoy, Arthur O., Jr., 148
- Lu Jiuyuan, 91
- Lu Rongting, 172
- Lu Xun, 18, 19, 142; attacks the family system, 37–8; disapproves of total Westernization, 50–1
- Ludendorff, Enrich, 110
- Luo Jialun, 38, 114n67
- Luo Longji, 19, 135, 136, 137, 179, 189, 213; anti-communism of, 244; arrest of, 184; bemoans men of talents not being recruited into the government, 181, 189; changed attitude towards the Soviet Union, 244; on the end of the state, 166; on expert politics, 179; and the human rights movement (1929–31), 136, 184; on the importance of institutions over personnel, 184; on inheritance tax, 233; on law and democracy, 184–5; on 'political democracy' and 'economic democracy', 244
- Luo Wengan, 173, 177, 178
- Luo Zhenyu, 175
- Lyotard, Jean-François, 9
- Lytton Commission, 148
- Ma Yifu, 90
- MacDonald, Ramsay, 192, 239
- Makeham, John, 90
- Manchuria, 172; Japanese aggression in, 42, 108, 109, 148
- Mandate of Heaven, 165, 166, 176
- Mannheim, Karl, 13, 64
- Mao Dun, 38n37
- Mao Zedong, 3, 191, 263; land policy of, 106; on New Democracy, 251; and the Sinification movement, 118–19; thought of, 3, 255
- Marshall, George C., 239
- Marx, Karl, 194, 203, 217, 235, 236
- Marxism, 2, 5, 14, 51, 126, 137, 198, 202, 249, 255; Chinese, 2, 3; in Europe, 192–3; radical, 4, 30, 191, 253; revisionist, 192, 193, 208, 211, 212; ultimate triumph of, in China, 262–3
- Marxism-Leninism, 254, 265
- Marxism Study Group, 201

- May Fourth Movement, 19, 21, 27, 29, 38, 64, 65, 94, 125, 264. *See also* New Culture Movement
- Mei Guangdi, 70, 86
- Mencius, 54, 165, 181; on private property, 220
- Merriam, Charles E., 215
- Metzger, Thomas, 222
- middle path, 238, 240–2, 255, 262
- Mill, John Stuart, 129, 132, 138, 143, 156; on elitism, 180; on liberty, 138, 143, 144, 156
- minben* (primacy of the people), 166
- Ming Dynasty, 130
- Mitter, Rana, 27
- modernity, 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 20; acultural theory of, 12, 34; alternative, 12; consequences of, 9, 263; counter-, 22, 63, 93, 263; cultural, 9, 12 and 145; economic, 7, 231; as an epoch and an attitude of questioning the past and the present, 9–10; global, 12, 76, 257; historical meanings of, 8; hygienic, 7; identified with the Enlightenment, 8; industrial, 7; pathologies of, 10, 12–13; philosophical interpretations of, 7–8; political, 159, 171, 189; societal, 9. *See also* Chinese modernity
- modernization, 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 23; anti-, 2, 63, 72, 93; compressed intellectual, 5; Confucian, 106; contrast with Westernization, 56–7; crisis of, 64, 65, 93, 256, 268
- Montesquieu (Charles-Louis de Secondat), 132, 134
- More, Thomas, 219
- Morley, John, 89, 174
- Morris, William, 65, 211
- Moscow, 72, 199, 214, 215, 216
- Mou Zongsan, 90
- Mozi, 143, 220–1
- Muir, Ramsay, 149
- Mussolini, Benito, 180
- Nakamura Masanao, 132, 141
- Nanjing Decade (1928–37), 7, 164, 184
- Nanjing, 70, 191, 200
- Nankai University, 58
- Narayan, Jayaprakash, 254
- National Assembly, 169, 172; convening of, in November 1946, 189, 239
- National Economic Council, 106
- National Essence School, 62, 65, 118
- National News Weekly*, 148
- National Southwest Associated University, 57, 120
- nationalism, 5, 13, 17, 22, 23, 24, 27, 59, 99–102, 103, 104, 110, 114, 115, 117, 118, 124, 125, 126, 130, 133, 145, 162, 164, 198, 200, 226, 227, 251, 258; ethnic, 224; German, 108–9; relationship to liberalism, 146–9; state, 196. *See also* Chinese nationalism
- ‘national economy’ (*minzu jingji*), 231, especially, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231
- Nazism, 224, 237
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, 254–5
- Neo-Confucianism, 22, 62n5, 91, 113, 143
- neoconservatism, 25, 265–6
- neocultural iconoclasm, 25
- neoliberalism, 25
- neorationalism, 25
- ‘New Administration’, 4
- ‘New citizen’ (1902), 132
- New Confucianism, 24, 80, 90–3, 265, 266
- New Culture Movement, 4, 19, 27–9, 31, 38, 45, 64, 65, 71, 75, 125, 240. *See also* May Fourth Movement
- New Deal, 230, 242, 243. *See also* Franklin D. Roosevelt
- New Democracy, 251
- New Economic Policy (NEP), 25, 213–14
- New Enlightenment Movement, 264
- New Hegelism, 91
- ‘New historiography’ (1902), 66
- ‘New History’, 29
- New Humanism, 69, 71, 81, 93, 257. *See also* Babbitt, Irving
- New Left, 1, 267
- New Liberalism, 134, 139, 144, 152, 157, 223, 242, 261. *See also* Hobhouse, L.T.
- New Life Movement, 113, 224
- ‘New Literature’, 6, 38, 133
- New national studies, 265–6
- New Third Way, 252, 267
- New Tide* (*Xinchao*), 6, 38
- New Village Movement, 154
- New York, 40, 194, 217
- New Youth* (*Xin qingnian*), 6, 17, 20, 77
- Newman, John Henry Cardinal, 65

- new-style dictatorship, 16, 127, 134, 164, 171, 181. *See also* Ding Wenjiang, Jiang Tingfu and Qian Duansheng
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 22, 44, 65, 72, 87, 123, 124
- Nitobe Inazō, 253, 254n105
- Northern Expedition, 104, 172,
- Norway, 240
- Observer, The*, 20
- October Revolution, 36, 199, 214, 222, 223. *See also* Russian Revolution
- Olivier, Sidney, 211
- 'On compromise' (1874), 89
- 'On liberty' (1859), 138, 143
- On New Matters* (1940), 118
- Opium War, 4
- Pacific War, 235
- Pan Gongzhan, 198–99
- Pan Guangdan, 55
- Paris, 67
- Paris Peace Conference, 66
- People's Journal*, 194
- People's Liberation Army, 239
- People's Political Council, 107, 237
- Pingshe, 213
- Plato, 84
- Political Consultative Conference, 239
- pragmatism, 72, 80, 208, 261
- Preuss, Hugo, 207
- Principles of Social Reconstruction* (1917), 85
- Princeton University, 148
- Programme for National Reconstruction*, 226
- Progressive Party, 195
- Public Enemy*, A, 153
- Qian Changzhao, 137
- Qian Duansheng, 171, 180, 191, 217
- Qian Mu, 117–18, 127
- Qian Shifu, 246
- Qian Xuanton, 38
- Qing Dynasty, 4, 112, 121
- Qinghua College, 81, 173
- Qu Qiubai, 30
- radicalism, 4, 13, 22, 24; Confucian, 30; cultural, 2, 4, 5, 28, 30, 37, 61, 65, 93, 94, 128, 157–8, 256, 257; late Qing, 29; Westernized, 4, 24, 27–60, 72, 94, 133, 158, 257. *See also* cultural iconoclasm
- rationalism, 27, 131
- Raz, Joseph, 151, 160
- Reason and Democracy* (1946), 235
- Reconstruction*, 20, 195, 198
- Rehabilitation Conference, 136
- religion: relationship to science, 79–81
- Renaissance, 80, 111, 133; Chinese national, 73, 101, 102, 108–10, 113, 126, 147
- Reorganization Clique, 241
- Republican News*, 201
- Research Clique, 195, 196, 226, 241
- Respect Confucius and Study the Classics Movement, 84
- Revolution of 1911, 64
- Richardson, James, 140
- River Elegy*, 31, 265
- Rogaski, Ruth, 7
- romanticism, 27
- Rome, 180
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 230, 242
- Rorty, Richard, 129
- Rousseau and Romanticism* (1919), 70
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 27, 65, 70, 136, 185, 236, 249
- Rural Reconstruction Group, 20
- Russell, Bertrand, 22, 47, 59, 72, 75, 85, 137, 222, 257; visit to China, 191, 199–200
- Russia, 205; Czarist, 72, 100. *See also* Soviet Russia and Soviet Union
- Russian Revolution, 23, 36, 197, 254, 261. *See also* October Revolution
- Sa Mengwu, 52n88
- Sarkar, Jadunath, 59
- Sassoon, Donald, 229, 240
- Satzuma Shōzan, 31
- scepticism, 27
- Scheidemann, Philipp, 228
- Schopenhauer, Arthur, 65, 72, 73, 87, 124
- Schwartz, Benjamin, 13, 22, 24, 52, 139, 162, 258; on conservatism in China, 96–7; on conservatism in general, 64; on the emergence in modern Europe of conservatism, liberalism and radicalism, 22; on totalistic iconoclasm, 39
- Scotland, 27, 89
- Second International (1889), 194, 240
- Second Revolution, 78

- Self-Strengthening Movement, 4, 37
 Shaanxi, 106
 Shandong, 104
 Shandong Rural Reconstruction Institute, 104
 Shang Yang, 97
 Shanghai National Affairs Conference, 210
 Shanghai, 6, 38, 40, 136, 145, 199, 239
 Shanxi, 108
 Shao Lizi, 201
 Shaw, George Bernard, 46, 211
Shenbao (Eastern Times), 7
 Shenyang Incident, 147
 Shi Fuliang (Cuntong), 240–1, 253; on exploitation, 250–1; on the middle path, 238, 240–2; on new capitalism, 251–2
 Shils, Edward, 45, 85
 Singapore, 47, 264, 266
 Sinification movement, 117–19, 127
 Sino-Japanese War (1894–5), 4
 Slavophilism, 72
 Smith, Adam, 132, 134
 social Darwinism, 33, 58, 133, 139
 social justice, 1, 5, 149, 157, 183, 186, 209, 210, 260, 261, 263, 267; and individual liberty, 209, 222
Social Welfare Daily, 181
 socialism, 2, 5, 6, 16, 19, 23, 27, 50, 52, 77, 78, 193–4, 142, 157; British, 23, 25, 211–12; democratic, 113; evolutionary, 146; guild, 198; revisionist, 3; revolutionary, 21. *See also* state socialism
 Socrates, 84
 Song Dynasty, 62n5, 112, 113
 Soong T.V. (Song Ziwen), 245
 Southeast University, 86
 Soviet Russia, 52, 218, 227, 249. *See also* Soviet Union
 Soviet Union, 123, 200, 213, 263; First Five-Year Plan (1928–32) of, 214, 216, 223, 229, 230, 241, 244, 246; Second Five-Year Plan (1933–8) of, 214. *See also* Soviet Russia
 Spencer, Herbert, 33, 132
 Spengler, Oswald, 46, 47, 65–6, 117, 120, 121
 Stalin, Joseph, 214, 229
 state building, 5, 126, 159, 168, 171, 185, 187, 190, 226, 228, 237
State in Theory and Practice, The (1935), 213
 state socialism, 23, 25, 129, 198, 199n28, 261; defined, 224. *See also* Chinese State Socialist Party
 statism, 5, 161, 258–9, 226, 266
 Sun Chuanfang, 175
 Sun Hanbing, 52n88
 Sun Yat-sen, 101, 115, 147, 148, 175, 194, 221, 226; centrist vision of, 164; on omnipotent government, 167–8; and the principle of the people's livelihood, 210–1, 233, 246; and the Three Principles of the People, 45, 225
 Sun Yat-sen University, 215
suweiai, 229
 Sweden, 240
 Switzerland, 87
System of Positive Polity, The (1851–4), 81
 Tagore, Rabindranath, 46, 47; visit to China, 71
 Taiwan, 90, 137, 264
 Tamir, Yael, 149
 Tan Sitong, 29, 132
 Tan Yankai, 163
 Tang Dynasty, 87
 Tang Erhe, 135, 173, 195
 Tang Junyi, 90
 Tang Shaoyi, 136
 Tang Yongtong, 70
 Tanggu Truce (May 1933), 110
 Tao Menghe, 173
 Tao Xingzhi, 173
 Tao Xisheng, 52n88, 115–16, 127
 Tawney, R. H., 235
 Ten-Year Plan (1976–85), 264
 third force movement, 241
 third way, 226, 246, 251, 252
Thought and Society (1946), 235
 Tianjin, 7, 226
Tiger, The, 77–8, 88
ti-yong dichotomy, 32, 37, 48, 91, 119, 264
 Tocqueville, Alexis de, 154
 Tokutomi Sohō, 59
 Tokyo, 78, 195, 217
 Toynbee, Arnold J., 120
 Trotsky, Leon, 229
True Story of Ah Q, The, 42n53
 Truman, Harry S., 239
 Tsai, Weipin, 7
 Tsurumi Yusuke, 253, 254n105
 Tsu Jing, 143

- Tu, Wei-ming, 90
 Turkey, 58n113
- U.S. Constitution, 208
 United States, 19, 30, 40, 46, 57, 87, 203, 217, 218, 230, 237, 239, 241, 242, 244, 246
 University of California, 120
 University of Chicago, 121
 University of Illinois, 46
 University of London, 245
 University of Michigan, 120
 utopianism, 27, 261; moral, 94; political, 177
- vernacular movement, 17, 38. *See also* Hu Shi
Vitalism, 114
 Vocational Educationalists, 136
 Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet), 27
- Wakeman, Frederic Jr, 162, 224
 Wallas, Graham, 211
 Wang Boqiu, 173
 Wang Chonghui, 135, 173, 175–6, 177–8
 Wang Guowei, 18, 86–7, 175
 Wang Hui, 13; on Chinese modernity and its pathologies, 12–13; on common attitudes of the May Fourth intellectuals, 13–14; on doubt and critique as a feature of Chinese thought on modernity, 10–11; on modernity and contemporary Chinese thought, 1, 267; on modernity of counter-modernity', 22, 63; on Zhang Junmai in the science versus metaphysics debate, 82
 Wang Jingwei, 106, 124n101, 136, 241
 Wang Mang, 121
 Wang Tao, 37
 Wang Xinming, 52n88
 Wang Yangming, 91
 Wang Zaoshi, 135, 137, 213; on the end of the state, 167; on inheritance tax, 233; on law and democracy, 185
 Wang Zheng, 173
 Wang Zhengting, 135, 176
 War of Resistance (1937–45), 20, 57, 90, 113, 117, 121, 122, 127, 189, 235, 237, 253
 Warring States Group: politicocultural thought of, 120–6
- Waseda University, 195
Way to Build the State, The (1938), 108, 113, 227
 Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, 211
 Weber, Max, 8, 9, 169, 235; on elitism, 180
 Wei Yuan, 132
 Weimar Constitution, 207–8
 Well, Audrey, 211
 'well-field' system, 67, 220n101, 221
 Wells, H. G., 46, 239
Weltanschauung, 80
 Weng Wenhao, 114n67
 Wenxiang, 37
 Westernization, 16, 17, 28, 34, 56, 74, 92; advocacy of, 46–56, 265; contrast with modernization, 56–7; as cultural radicalism, 37–9; push for thorough, 37–45; total, 4, 31, 44–57, 257; wholesale, 114, 257. *See also* Europeanization
 Whampoa Clique, 114
 William, Maurice, 211
 Womack, Brantly, 5
 World War I, 2, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 58, 65, 71, 72, 77, 93, 192, 193, 195, 196, 222; horrors of, 46, 64; influence on Chinese conservative thought, 66–8
 World War II, 21, 150, 243, 244
 Wu Enyu, 137; on the liberty–equality nexus, 247–8
 Wu Jingchao, 51
 Wu Mi, 70, 266; critique of New Culture, 70–1; on the question of the old and the new, 79; on religion and human nature, 80–1; on *tiaohelun* in relation to a new Chinese culture, 85–6
 Wu Peifu, 19, 76, 135, 172, 175
 Wu Xianzi, 239
 Wu Yugan, 52n88
 Wu Zhihui: attacks Confucianism, 38; rejects Easternization, 76, 175
- Xiao Gongquan, 246; on liberal socialism, 243–4
 Xin Dynasty, 121
xinguoxue, 265–6
 Xiong Shili, 90; on the *ti–yong* dichotomy, 91
 Xu Baohuang, 173
 Xu Fuguan, 90, 94n122
 Xu Jilin, 1, 132, 135, 177

- Xu Shichang, 172
 Xu Xiaqun, 184
 Xu Xinliu, 217
 Xu Zhimo, 137, 213, 217
 Xunzi, 84, 165
- Yale University, 195
 Yalta Agreement (1945), 218n45
 Yan Fu, 29, 136, 139, 143–5, 151, 157, 266; regarded as the precursor of Chinese liberalism, 132, 134; translates *Evolution and Ethics*, 33; on the *ti-yong* mode of thinking, 37
 Yan Xishan, 19, 175
 Yan Yangchu, 20n63, 104
 Yan'an, 107, 119
 Yanqing University, 226, 235, 239
 Yin Haiguang: on Chinese liberalism, 138; on democratic socialism as a consensus among educated Chinese, 252–3
yin-yang metaphysics, 84–5
 Yu Rizhang, 176
 Yü Ying-shih, 87; on cultural conservatism, 61; on the radicalization of China, 29, 39, 93–4, 257
 Yuan Shikai, 159, 163, 172
 Yun Daiying, 30
 Yunnan, 163
 Yūsuke Tsurumi, 46
- Zaisheng*, 20, 109, 234
 Zanasi, Margherita, 7
 Zarrow, Peter, 6, 30, 39, 96, 97
 Zeng Guofan, 37
 Zhang Binglin, 18, 62, 163, 175
 Zhang Dongsun, 25, 69, 136, 157, 222, 226, 234, 240, 253; arrested by Japanese military authorities and imprisoned in Beijing, 235; assessment of British and American democracy, 237; breaks with Zhang Junmai, 239; on capitalism, 235; change of attitude towards Marxism, 235–6; change of heart about socialism, 199–201; on China's internal problems, 202; as co-leader of the State Socialist Party, 234–5; criticized by the Marxists, 201–2; defends capitalism, 202–4; on exploitation, 250; on how to learn from Confucius, 83–4; on inequality, 249; on the interrelationship between democracy and socialism, 251–2; on liberalism and liberty, 152–3; on the middle path, 241–2; on production, 248, 252, 262, 264; on the rise of a new class of 'financial lords', 202–3; in the socialist discourse, 195–8
 Zhang Foquan, 51; on liberty, individualism and social order, 156–7; on nationalism, 148–9; opposed to total Westernization, 51
 Zhang Jiaao, 135
 Zhang Jian, 175, 176
 Zhang Junmai, 15, 16, 19, 25, 71, 86, 90, 92, 93, 98, 103, 107, 114, 119, 126, 134, 135, 136, 137, 189, 195, 221, 237, 253, 264; attends the National Assembly in November 1946 and criticized by some party colleagues, 239; as co-founder and leader of the Chinese State Socialist Party, 226; on the distinction between state and nation, 227–8; faults Chinese culture, 112–3; in the founding of the Chinese Democratic League, 107; German influence on his socialist thought, 205–11; kidnapped by GMD agents, 108; on law and public morality, 185–6, 188; as a New Confucian, 90, 92; on omnipotent government, 168–9; polticocultural thought of, 108–13; on property rights, 231–33; on the public sphere and the private sphere, 168–9; reacts to Hu Shi's faulting of the Chinese national character, 111; rejects historical materialism, 206; relations with Zhang Dongsun, 234, 239; in the science versus metaphysics debate, 81–3; on social justice and individual liberty, 210; on state power and personal freedom, 168; on state socialism, 226–34; as a student in Germany, 68, 103, 207; as a student in Japan, 103, 195; translates *A Grammar of Politics* and *Der Totale Krieg* (1935), 110, 212; understanding of socialism, 206, 208–9; visit to Moscow, 229; on the Weimar Constitution, 208; on Western learning, 92; on World War I, 68
 Zhang Shenfu, 57
 Zhang Shizhao, 163; on agriculture as the foundation of the nation, 106n39, 134; on compromise and toleration in politics, 88–9; education in Scotland and Germany, 79; launches *The Tiger*

- magazine, 79; on the new age, 78–9; on
 the rule of law, 186–7; on strong
 democratic government, 165; on
tiaohelun, 84, 88–9
 Zhang Weici, 173
 Zhang Xiruo: on individualism, 150;
 rejects total Westernization, 50;
 response to the October Revolution,
 214; on two kinds of modernization,
 56
 Zhang Xun, 65
 Zhang Yi, 52n88
 Zhang Zhidong, 31
 Zhang Zuolin, 172
 Zhao Ziyang, 265
 Zhili Clique, 172
 Zhixing College, 108
 Zhongshan University, 47, 58, 108
Zhongxue weiti, xixue weiyong (Chinese
 learning as essence, Western learning for
 practical use), 32. *See also* *ti-yong*
 dichotomy
 Zhou Shuren. *See* Lu Xun
 Zhou Zuoren, 154
 Zhu Jingnong, 173
 Zhu Xi, 91, 235
 Zimmern, Alfred Eckhard, 149
 Zou Taofen, 58n113
 Zou Wenhai, 137
 Zuo Zongtang, 37